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Effective leadership is a concept shown to be important for successful team performance in the fields of business, education, and sport. In sport, the role of the athlete leader has been under-examined and specifically, how coaching behaviors can affect athlete leader behaviors and how various leadership models (e.g., trait, behavioral, situational) relate to the athlete leader role has never been studied.

The present study examined how autocratic, democratic, and collaborative coaching styles affect the athlete leader behavior preferences of athletes of different genders and sport types. Three coach scenarios reflecting the three aforementioned coaching styles were created so that athletes could imagine that they were coached by the individual presented in the scenario and then rate what type of athlete leader behaviors that they would prefer given the style of the coach that they read about. Results showed that the coach scenarios failed to have a significant impact; however, significant differences were discovered between men and women and between individual and team sport athletes on variables measuring preferred performance/task, relationship, motivation, and representation behaviors. Data were gathered on the style of athletes’ current coach and this variable also produced significant differences for such behaviors as resolving conflict, providing positive reinforcement, and acting respectfully towards others. In addition, exploratory analyses showed that athletes who hold different leadership positions prefer different athlete leader behaviors.

The current study seemed to offer concrete evidence on how coaching style can affect athlete leader preferences and how the athlete leader role can be explained by trait, behavioral,
and situational leadership theories; however, future studies will have to further explore the impact that a coach’s style can have on the behavior of athlete leaders as well as analyzing the relationship between athlete leaders and teammates utilizing the transformational leadership approach.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Implications of Leadership in Various Contexts

Leadership is a concept that allows for both horizontal and vertical applications to human behavior. At young ages, individuals who exhibit leadership skills are often identified and encouraged to continue on a path that may end in prominent political, educational, or business positions. In addition, individuals can apply their leadership skills to a variety of areas at any given point during their lifespan, whether it be parentally, vocationally, recreationally, and/or socially. Consequently, the study of leadership has been conducted in many different contexts including but not limited to education (e.g., Brown, 1975; Rawlings, 1971; Widdop & Widdop, 1975; Zhang & Wu, 2001), business (e.g., Fiedler, 1967; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; House, 1971; Vroom & Yetton, 1973), and sport (e.g., Case, 1987; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Glenn & Horn, 1993; Smith, Small, & Hunt, 1977). Across these areas, empirical studies on leadership generally focus on individuals in appointed or elected positions such as teachers, principals, managers, politicians, CEOs, and coaches.

The athlete leader role is unique because the position can be acquired through any of three distinct routes: appointment, election, or emergence. Therefore, it is difficult to define as one may consider that an athlete leader is the captain of the team, the most skilled athlete on the team, or the athlete that provides the most emotional support. In addition, depending on the team that the athlete is affiliated with, the individual may have been appointed by the coach, been elected by teammates, or emerged during the course of a season into the position of leader. None of the aforementioned leadership positions can claim this capricious selection process as, for example, teachers are only appointed (e.g., hired) and politicians are only elected. In addition,
the athlete leader is subjected to the direct influence of another leader, the coach, whereas other areas of leadership with similar hierarchies (e.g., business managers under the direct supervision of general managers) cannot fully exemplify the coach/athlete leader relationship (e.g., both types of managers are paid to perform a duty and training performed by a general manager is often minimal; coaches are paid in most cases and athlete leaders are not or are not offered extra compensation for their leadership performance and lengthy training periods are regularly present with sport teams (Zhang, Jensen, & Mann, 1997)). Therefore, the direct application of leadership behaviors found with one well-known leadership position alone most likely can clarify some elements associated with athlete leader behaviors, such as varying views on leadership across genders and different racial/ethnic groups, but probably cannot completely explicate the athlete leader role.

The present study was designed not to define the athlete leader role, but to describe effective athlete leader behaviors more closely. The study also aimed to determine if other leadership positions in society, as examined by the four main approaches to studying leadership, the trait, behavioral, situational, and transformational approaches, can provide insight into how an athlete leader can behave in a manner that is preferred by other athletes. The leadership phenomenon is well documented in social, business, and sport literature (e.g., Ben-Yoav, Hollander, and Carnevale, 1983; Case, 1987; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1978; Fiedler, 1967; Glenn & Horn, 1993; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Hollander, Fallon, & Edwards, 1977; House, 1971; Pandey, 1976; Smith, Small, & Hunt, 1977; Vroom & Yetton, 1973), thus commonality of empirical methods used in these areas should be able to provide me with tools to obtain valid and reliable data on the athlete leader role (i.e. See Table 1 and 2).
It should be noted that those leadership studies conducted in the field of education that address teacher-principal and principal-superintendent leader-follower relationships (e.g. Bell, 1969; Fernandez, 2003; Murphy, 1970; Rawlings, 1971; Sanchez-Perkins, 2002; Zhang & Wu, 2001) are comparable to relationships between managers and subordinates, so any applicable studies will be grouped within areas involving the review of business leadership research. For example, Zhang and Wu found that a principle’s displayed concern for teachers positively correlated with teachers’ perceived job satisfaction, similar to person-oriented, consideration-type behaviors found in many theories measuring effective leadership in business (e.g., Bales, 1954; Halpin, 1957; House, 1971).

Again, leadership research, no matter if the research is conducted in a social, sport, educational, or business context, has been categorized into four main approaches: trait, behavioral, situational/interactionist, and transformational (Aditya, House, & Kerr, 2000; Murray & Mann, 2001; Weinberg & Gould, 1999). Each approach will be independently evaluated and examined for elements that can be used to measure effective athlete leader behaviors in the present investigation. In addition, other factors that transcend any single approach, such as situational variables (i.e., sport type, gender, and race/ethnicity) and the relationship between leaders and managers, will be reviewed.

Trait Approach

The main goal of trait theories has been to identify particular characteristics that are typical of leaders identified as effective. Trait theories were dominant in the early to mid-1900s until researchers began to review the literature on the trait approach (e.g., Gibb, 1947; Jenkins, 1947; Stogdill, 1948). The overwhelming result of these reviews was that universal traits common to all effective leaders could not be identified. For example, Stogdill (1948, 1974)
conducted two studies, one reviewing 124 studies and later, one reviewing 163 studies, that cataloged leadership traits and found only a few consistent characteristics common to a significant number of leaders. These traits included intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence, self-confidence, sociability, sense of personal identity, and vigor. Stogdill concluded that whereas these traits seem somewhat stable across leaders in various environments, the demands of the situation ultimately dictated the traits that would help the leader be effective. In support of Stogdill’s claim that traits alone cannot completely explain effective leadership, Zaccaro, Foti, and Kenny (1991) found that 59% of the variance in leadership can be explained by trait attributes. Although this figure is high, almost half of the variance in leadership ability is still unknown and most likely can be explained by situational constraints and specific behaviors that are required in order for the a leader to be effective. Today, the trait approach is not often used to evaluate leaders independently; however, the trait approach does offer an important component (i.e., an analysis of leadership traits) that is subsumed in situational and transformational approaches, which are used extensively and will be discussed later.

A lack of support for a trait approach also exists within the sport context. For example, characteristics such as tough-mindedness, authoritarianism, willingness to bear pressure of fans and media, emotional maturity, independence in thinking, and being realistic have been hypothesized as traits required for successful leadership in coaching (Ogilvie & Tutko, 1966, 1970); however, evidence was never gathered to reinforce this claim (Weinberg & Gould, 1999).

In addition, research is divided regarding whether or not traits necessary for successful leadership in other settings and sport are comparable. For example, Zhang, Jensen, and Mann (1997) claimed that measures developed for business are not transferable to the sport context
because athletic teams possess a time-limited, win-loss, and lengthy training component not found in business. Spitzer and Evans (1997) supported this notion and believe because business leaders are subjected to a command and control model not found in its totality in sport (i.e., the development of close relationships is not always a necessity), it would be difficult to take information acquired from the characteristics of successful business leaders and apply them to the sport context.

Not all researchers agree with the above assessments, however, as a link between business and sport leaders has been established in the literature both empirically and anecdotally. For instance, Covey (1990) found that business leaders who possess the capacity for trust, vision, and effective communication have the ability to handle the pressure of being a leader successfully and it seems a natural relation exists between these traits and those found in many high profile coaches. More specifically, Weinberg and McDermott (2002) interviewed a sample of 10 business executives and upper managers and 10 athletic directors and coaches with each sample being approximately equal in age, race, gender, and years of experience. Interviews were semi-structured and designed to address topics such as leadership, group cohesion, and communication. Results showed all interviewees agreed leadership was important to overall organizational success. Higher-order themes also emerged in responses by both types of leaders and these themes included leadership characteristics, interpersonal skills, and leadership style.

Within leadership characteristics, the four lower-order themes of honesty, consistency, decisiveness, and organization composed the category (Weinberg & McDermott, 2002). Business leaders mentioned honesty more often than sport leaders and sport leaders mentioned consistency more often than business leaders. The lower-order themes of the interpersonal skills dimension included empathy, ability to interact with a variety of individuals, listening skills, and
trust in other’s abilities. Sport leaders favored interacting with a variety of people more often than business leaders and business leaders emphasized being a good listener more so than sport leaders. In the final high-order theme, leadership style, both sport and business leaders seemed to endorse a democratic style over an autocratic style; however, a situational approach was preferred most by both groups.

Weinberg and McDermott’s (2002) study focused on identifying effective leadership traits of business leaders and coaches. More related to the current study, there has been an attempt to identify common characteristics among athlete leaders. For instance, one approach has been to delineate leaders from non-leaders based on the position they play, unfortunately results have been equivocal (e.g., Glenn & Horn, 1993; Melnick & Loy, 1996; Trapp & Landers, 1979). Taking a more in depth approach, Klonsky (1991) found, after assessing coaches’ ratings of athlete leaders, that characteristics such as aspirational level, competitiveness, emotional expressiveness, daring, responsibility, acceptance, and dominance were necessary for effective athlete leadership. Glenn and Horn used measures of anxiety, competence, self-esteem, sex-role orientation, and leadership behaviors to assess perceived leadership characteristics of athlete leaders and had coaches, athlete leaders, and athlete non-leaders complete the measures. To measure leadership traits, Glenn and Horn developed the Sport Leadership Behavior Inventory (SLBI). The SLBI listed 25 leadership characteristics and required those completing the measure to rate, on a 7-point Likert scale, how descriptive each item was of the individual in question; thus participants were actually rating the leadership traits of the athlete leader and not the behaviors exhibited by the athlete leader that makes the leader perceived to be effective. For example, the measure included items such as organized, consistent, mature, talented, leader, and
eager, which represent traits of an individual and not specific behaviors the individual displays that make others perceive him/her as effective.

Results showed players scoring high in self-esteem, competence, psychological androgyne, and low in anxiety were more likely to be identified as leaders than other team members (Glenn & Horn, 1993). Also there was a low correlation between coach, peer, and self-ratings of leadership, suggesting each group may define leadership differently. This low correlation of agreement on leadership traits between groups of individuals involved in sport, coupled with the aforementioned results of Stogdill’s (1948, 1974) meta-analyses, call to mind the notion that although traits help identify effective athlete leaders, traits cannot alone define what is expected of leaders, once they have acquired their position, to enhance task performance and to aid in the development of group cohesion. In other words, it is clear these traits will allow the athlete leader to help the team be more successful but how to go about this task remains unclear.

Although traits may help determine why an athlete has been placed into a leadership role, traits fail to offer information on what an athlete should do once in that role to add to a team’s success. For instance, simply stating athlete leaders need to be decisive, organized, and sympathetic to be effective would perpetuate the ambiguity associated with athlete leadership. In essence, traits are labels for groups of behaviors, thus concentrating on identifying the behaviors themselves not only offers more specific information about the leadership role but also allows leadership to be studied without ignoring the influence of traits. In other words, it is not always recognizable, by simply using a trait to describe a leader, what behaviors that trait may exactly be encompassing. For example, instead of stating an athlete leader must be “sympathetic” to be effective, further exploration could reveal that when an athlete leader shows warmth to
teammates, acts like he/she cares about the concerns of teammates, speaks positively of the team even when the team is not successful, and does not show too much sensitivity, then he/she is perceived as being effective. The overall trait of “sympathy” is not ruled out; however a more detailed examination of “sympathy” may reveal certain behaviors that are deemed effective or not effective.

This is not a new concept as the focus on a behavioral approach for studying leadership began in the early 1950s (Fiedler, 1967; Halpin, 1957; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). Ultimately, these researchers determined that because the listing of traits failed to provide detailed information regarding the specific actions of an effective leader, a new approach was needed that would solve this problem. Specifically, through observing leaders and asking others about leader behaviors that helped the environment be more conducive for success, researchers were able to clearly outline effective leader behaviors. “Success” was generally regarded as helping a group to complete a task more efficiently or helping to maintain harmony among group members (Bales, 1954). In general, this shift from the general to the more specific study of leadership behaviors supported the creation of the behavioral approach to examining leadership.

Behavioral Approach

Studies involving the specific identification of behavioral components of effective leadership began in the mid-1900s and continue today. For example, Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) categorized adults working with 10-year-old boys in an educational setting as either authoritarian, democratic (later authoritative), or laissez-faire based on their leadership styles. Authoritarian leaders used instruction without a large amount of explanation and feedback to lead. Democratic leaders attempted to gather information from their groups and achieve an overall sense of agreement before committing to a decision. Adults displaying more of a laissez-
faire approach essentially opted not to lead at all and offered little direction and instruction to their groups. This labeling of leadership behaviors utilized by Lewin et al. and others at the time led to the categorization of behaviors in other areas (e.g., parenting, Baumrind [1971]) and soon researchers from three leading universities began to explore the importance of adopting particular leadership styles.

Researchers from Harvard University, The Ohio State University, and the University of Michigan maintained the drive for studying leadership using a behavioral approach in the mid 1900s (e.g., Bales, 1954; Halpin, 1957; Kahn & Katz, 1953; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). During this time, several advances were made regarding classifying effective leader behaviors. Bales (1954) indicated that there were two separate leader roles, task leader and social leader, and that expecting the same individual to successfully perform both roles was unrealistic. He recommended finding an individual to help the group stay on task and finding another individual skilled in maintaining group cohesion to occupy leadership roles; he concluded that this would be the best approach to leadership of a group.

Assessment of Leader Behaviors

Complementing Bales’ (1954) suggestions, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957; Stogdill, 1963; Stogdill & Coons, 1957) was developed and categorized leader behaviors as either Being Considerate (i.e., socially- or relationship-oriented) or Initiating Structure (i.e., task-oriented). Being considerate or Consideration involved behaviors related to developing friendships, establishing trust, showing respect, and displaying warmth toward subordinates. Specific items on this scale asked the individual to rate, for example, how often the leader performs favors for the group, listens to the group, explains his/her actions, treats all members of the group as equals, and
utilizes suggestions made by the group. Those high on the Consideration index could communicate well and establish good rapport. Initiating Structure referred to behaviors associated with creating rules and regulations, general procedural methods, effective communication, and overall organization (Halpin, 1957; Stogdill, 1963). Specific items on this scale included those asking individuals to rate how well the leader makes his/her attitudes clear to the group, rules with an iron hand, assigns tasks, encourages uniform procedures, asks the group to follow the rules and regulations, and monitors the coordination and effort of group members. Those high on the Initiating Structure index could direct and organize others toward achieving goals.

Three versions of the LBDQ scale were created: a self-evaluation of leader behaviors for the leader, an actual evaluation of leader behaviors completed by subordinates, and an ideal evaluation of leader behaviors. In general, effective leaders scored high on both subscales of the LBDQ, meaning leaders who helped their groups function at a high level through effective communication, good organization, the display of warmth toward others, and the establishment of trust were found to be the most successful leaders. Later studies challenged this idea, however, suggesting leaders can still be successful even if they display competence in only one area, either Consideration or Initiating Structure (e.g., Stogdill, 1974).

The LBDQ was revised and 12 subscales were created to further delineate leader behaviors (Stogdill, 1963). The 12 subscales included Representation, indicating the leader spoke and acted like a representative of the group, Demand Reconciliation, specifying behaviors related to reducing disorder and balancing conflicting demands, Tolerance of Uncertainty, showing an ability to adapt to unforeseen events without displaying discomfort, Persuasiveness, indicating the presence of strong convictions and effective use of persuasion, Initiation of
Structure, showing an ability to define roles for all group members, Tolerance and Freedom, allowing for a clear amount of initiative, decision, and action from followers, Role Assumption, showing a consummate, constant attempt at being the leader, Consideration, indicating a concern for the welfare of the members of the group, Production Emphasis, specifying that a leader’s role involves applying pressure to meet goals at times, Predictive Accuracy, displaying an ability to predict outcomes accurately, Integration, showing a continued effort to resolve conflict, and Superior Orientation, indicating a desire to communicate effectively with superiors and strive to improve one’s position in the system. In general, the revised LBDQ provided an effective assessment tool from which to study leadership for decades to come (e.g., Case, 1987; Vos Strache, 1978).

The LBDQ has also been used in the sport environment to measure leader behaviors. For example, Case (1987) asked athletes of four different competitive levels to assess the behavior of their coaches through the LBDQ. Athletes participating at the junior high school level, the senior high school level, college level, and Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) level completed LBDQ questionnaires, and statistical differences existed between coaches of different competitive levels on the scales of initiating structure and consideration. Specifically, junior high and AAU coaches displayed a lower task style than senior high and college coaches, meaning AAU and junior high coaches spent less time initiating structure, setting/enforcing rules and regulations, and actively directing athletes toward specific goals. In addition, senior high and college coaches showed a lower relationship style than AAU and junior high coaches, meaning AAU and junior high coaches spent more time developing trust, displaying warmth, and showing respect than senior high or college coaches.
Case (1987) suggested that the differences in approaches of the coaches from four competitive levels might reflect the needs of the situation. In junior high, coaches may have to take a more relationship-oriented approach while still maintaining structure because their athletes are still in the learning stages of the game and thus trust and patience are important when trying to teach. At the AAU level, athletes have learned the game and are generally self-motivated and set their own rules and boundaries so showing respect and warmth are key elements to earn respect and trust back from players. With senior high and college coaches, a high task style may be required due to, for example, environmental variables that emphasize the need for strict rules and regulations (e.g., availability of alcohol).

Other studies have explored behaviors associated with successful coaches (e.g., Orlick & Botterill, 1975; Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977; Solomon, DiMarco, Ohlson, & Reece, 1998). For example, particular leadership behaviors like positive communication, display of warmth, and involving team members in decision-making have been associated with necessary elements for team success such as team cohesion (Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Shields, Gardner, Bredemeier, & Bostro, 1997), athletic performance (Garland & Barry, 1988, 1990), and coaching efficacy (Sullivan & Kent, 2003). The Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) is one of the most extensive methods of identifying and describing coaching behaviors (Smith, Noland, Smoll, & Coppel, 1983; Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1978, 1979; Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977; Smoll & Smith, 1989; Smoll, Smith, Curtis, & Hunt, 1978; Solomon, DiMarco, Ohlson, & Reece, 1998). The system uses objective observation to classify the actions of the coach (i.e., an independent rater observes a coach’s actions) as opposed to the paper-and-pencil approach used by many leadership classification systems.
Overall, the CBAS leadership approach divides coaching behaviors into two broad categories, reactive behaviors and spontaneous behaviors, and 5 sub-categories (3 reactive and 2 spontaneous), including response to desirable performance, response to mistakes, response to misbehavior, game-related spontaneous behaviors and game-irrelevant spontaneous behaviors. These sub-categories are further divided into 12 behavior areas including reinforcement (positive, rewarding action), non-reinforcement (not responding to successful performance), mistake-contingent encouragement (encouragement following a mistake), mistake-contingent technical instruction (instruction following a mistake), punishment (negative reaction following a mistake), punitive technical instruction (instruction given in a negative manner following a mistake), ignoring mistakes (not responding following a mistake), keeping control (behaviors that help restore/maintain order), general technical instruction (game-related instruction not following a mistake), general encouragement (game-related encouragement not following a mistake), organization (game-related administrative behavior that assign duties and/or responsibilities), and general communication (game irrelevant interactions with players).

After the CBAS was used to categorize the behaviors of coaches, researchers found that the coaches’ actions could be organized into specific dimensions (Smoll & Smith, 1989). These dimensions included supportiveness (reinforcement and mistake-contingent encouragement), instructiveness (general technical instruction and mistake-contingent technical instruction versus general communication and general encouragement), and punitiveness (punishment and punitive technical instruction versus organizational behaviors). Originally, high amounts of supportiveness and instructiveness were found to positively correlate with responsiveness in young athletes with low self-esteem (Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1978). Further research was conducted to test causality with this population. Specifically, researchers trained a group of
coaches to relate more effectively with their team of little league players and compared this
group with a group of untrained coaches (Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1979). The training consisted
of a cognitive-behavioral approach to enhancing interaction with children that included
behavioral feedback and self-monitoring techniques to spread the coach’s self-awareness to
compliance with the training (Smoll & Smith, 1980). To assess the effectiveness of the training,
CBAS profiles were compiled with results showing the that trained coaches displayed more
effective coaching behaviors and were more positively evaluated by their team than untrained
coaches. Also, little leaguers playing for trained coaches experienced a significant increase in
measured amounts of self-esteem as compared to a year prior whereas children playing for
untrained coaches did not experience this increase. Overall the CBAS has been used to advance
the skills of coaches working with youth (Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1978) and thus may help
athlete leaders be more effective as well.

There have been efforts to develop other measures that describe coaching leadership
behaviors in sports. For example, Rushall and Wiznuk (1985) developed the Coach Evaluation
Questionnaire for use in any sporting environment. The measure was constructed in a
questionnaire format, emphasized good coaching attributes and not negative features, was
regarded as valid, reliable, and standardized by the authors, and was able to provide coaches with
meaningful information regarding their coaching. Overall questions on the measure addressed
characteristics such as the dedication, patience, communication ability, appearance,
encouragement skills, attention to detail, control, organization, teaching ability, interest in the
activities of players as people, and motivation skills of the coach. Each question is rated and a
total leader effectiveness score, as determined by the athletes’ ratings, is compiled. Total
assessment scores are then used to provide coaches with feedback.
In addition, Cole (1979) developed the Cole Descriptive Analysis System (Cole-DAS) to specifically address how coaches give feedback to athletes following the performance of a motor skill. Some categories in the system are similar to CBAS categories; however the Cole-DAS has added such categories as mode of feedback (auditory, tactile, visual), time of delivery relative to the action of the athlete (immediate, delayed), general referent (whole movement, part of movement, result of movement), and specific referent (force, space, rate). Each new area is related to the process of delivering effective leader behaviors.

Overall, the information compiled on how coaches can be effective leaders may provide some insight into how the athlete leader role could be used to help a team be more successful. On most teams, the coach is the primary leader so one of the main focuses of the investigation was to determine how an athlete leader could use certain leader behaviors to enhance team effectiveness while being subjected to particular coaching behaviors. For instance, coaching behaviors help to determine the breadth of athlete leader behaviors than can be expressed. An autocratic coach, by definition, does not consult with athletes often when making decisions, and in general, does not encourage freedom of action from athletes. So, the athlete leader behaviors that are preferred in an autocratic culture may be different than the behaviors preferred in a democratic culture. Because an autocratic coach is more focused on task-oriented issues, athlete may prefer a more relationship-oriented athlete leader and the opposite may occur for athletes who are coached more democratically (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

Therefore, it may be important to ask the following question: is the main role for the athlete leader to be a manager of tasks for team members, a buffer between team members and the coach, or do athlete leaders have a more active role, depending on their particular coach’s style? Components of the answer to this question may be found in social psychology work
examining the behavior of emergent, elected, and appointed leaders because how a leader came to earn his/her position may moderate certain responsibilities associated with the leader role, such as level of coach/leader interaction. The results of social psychology experiments will be reviewed later in the introduction.

Leadership in Therapy Groups

An additional area of research that may add insight into athlete leader behaviors is the area of group psychotherapy. Beck and colleagues (e.g., Beck, 1981b; Brusa, Stone, Beck, Dugo, & Peters, 1994; Peters & Beck, 1982) examined the process of group development and of leader emergence in psychotherapy groups. Four leadership roles have been identified. The task leader, usually the therapist in the group who guides communication and self-exploration, models the sharing of power and control, and influences norm development, goal clarification, group boundaries, and style of communication. The emotional leader, usually the group member who is most willing to participate and engage in the group process, models change for the group and conflict between the formation or denial of deep bonds with other group members, is well-liked, supports other members of the group and later, acts as manager of group emotion. The scapegoat leader, usually a group member (but sometimes the therapist) who is the subject of verbal and nonverbal attacks from group members, engulfs negative emotion of the group, helps to solidify group issues such as the establishment of norms, boundaries, goals, and leadership roles, and models the conflict of individualism versus group conformity. Finally, the defiant leader, usually a group member expressing ambivalence regarding participating in-group processing, achieving close ties with group members, and trusting others in general, models a certain expression of apathy toward the overall group process (Beck, 1981b). Later, a non-leader member role was identified to further help understand group interaction and the authors noted
that different individuals can occupy the different roles during the course of the group (Brusa et al., 1994).

To gather data on these roles, researchers have developed a sociometric test to identify members occupying these roles (Peters & Beck, 1982; Brusa et al., 1994). The test consists of 21 items and members of psychotherapy groups are asked to rank the other members of the group based on questions related to likeness for members of the group, impact of ideas of individuals in the group, disagreement with other group members, understanding of others in the group, comfort with others, degree to which one is supported by others, and dominating and/or ambivalent behaviors of others in the group, among other questions. Assignment of roles is connected to which of the 9 phases of development the group occupies within Beck’s theory of group development (1974, 1981a, 1981b). For example, phase 1 of the theory addresses the “settling in” of roles, phase 2 is associated with group members competitive testing of each others’ roles in group therapy, and once these competitive issues are resolved, more personal disclosure can occur and the group reaches a deeper level of intimacy in phase 3. Again, different group members can also occupy different leadership positions throughout the life of the group (Beck, 1981b).

These behaviors exhibited by members of psychotherapy groups could be related to behaviors displayed by members of a sport team. For example, many sport teams have players who keep the team on task, provide an emotional boost, are the target of team attacks, and project an apathetic attitude. Overall, each leadership role in the psychotherapy group serves a particular function and perhaps many leadership roles exist within a sport team that perform similar functions and they simply have not been identified yet. In addition, the behaviors exhibited by the task leader/therapist may be comparable to the behaviors of the coach and the
other leaders of the therapy group may have to learn to lead given the actions of the task leader, similar to how an athlete leader must adjust given the leadership style of the coach.

Athlete/Student Leader Behaviors

Behaviors associated with the athlete leader role have been speculated about in the past (Mosher & Roberts, 1981). For example, researchers reviewing captains in Canadian sports proposed that the role of the team captain is to (1) “. . . be a catalyst which results in individual athletes coming together as a functional team, (2) . . . act as a liaison person between the coaching staff and players, (3) . . . implement coaching directives (his own as well as those of the coach), (4) . . . act as a leader and/or example during all team activities, (5) . . . act as a team official- interact with officials on the field of play, and (6) . . . reinforce team discipline (support the coaches in this regard)” (pp. 2). Mosher and Roberts failed to provide any empirical data but certain themes described, such as adding to team cohesion, have been found in experimental investigations examining effective leadership in sport (e.g., Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Shields, Gardner, Bredemeier, & Bostro, 1997).

The empirical study of the athlete leader role has encompassed behaviors particular athlete leaders have displayed with their teams as well as the behaviors athlete leaders have exhibited and experienced from significant relationships during their development. Specifically, Wright and Côté (2003) interviewed 6 male university varsity athlete leaders from similarly structured sports (e.g., hockey, basketball, volleyball) about their leadership development. Common areas identified between the 6 athletes were grouped into peer, coach, and parent categories. Under the peer category, athlete leaders were found to compete with older or more skilled peers during the athlete leader’s development, exhibit a strong work ethic, establish mutual trust and honest communication with peers, perform different roles in play activities,
such as the organization of games, designation of teams, provision of motivation for others to participate, and referee activities. Items listed under the coach category included experiencing “nice” coaches at each competitive level, receiving good instruction on positioning, technique, and rules, being accustomed to sport environments open to creativity in which coaches made efforts to open up opportunities for creativity, being placed in a leadership role by coaches to model their high ability and strong work ethic, acting as a communication bridge between athletes and coaches, being involved in team strategizing and player placement, and monitoring the interaction between officials and the team during competition.

As for the parent category, the leader athletes acknowledged the significant role parents played in their development and some items grouped under the parent heading included the importance parents placed on being physically active, the effort parents gave in ensuring their children participated in sports (e.g., signing them up for various teams), the total financial and emotional support given by parents, the use of encouragement and positive reinforcement by parents, the level of participation in the leader’s sport by the parent in the form of role modeling, the coaching and/or playing with the athlete the parent did, and the involvement of parents in the sport outside the practice domain such as discussing sport strategy and technique and planning their future course in sport at home. These results suggest that many of the behaviors that may lead to the development of effective leadership have been modeled by prominent figures in the athlete leader’s past (Wright & Côté, 2003).

The general approach to studying athlete leader behavior has been to gather information from either leaders themselves, teammates, coaches, or a combination of the three using various measures and questionnaires (e.g., Klonsky, 1991; Magyar, 2003; Rees, 1982) or to have objective raters observe the behavior of athletes (Weese & Nicholls, 1986). For instance, Rees
(1982) asked members of competitive intramural leagues to complete surveys measuring leadership development throughout the course of their season. Teams did not have appointed coaches and questions were designed to gather information on instrumental leadership (i.e., player with the most ability), expressive leadership (i.e., player contributing most to team harmony), and overall what made strong leaders effective. Results showed top leaders identified by teams scored high on both instrumental and expressive leadership measures and both types of leadership were found to contribute to overall leadership (i.e., at one measurement, the two types of leadership explained 67% of the variance in overall leadership) with expressive leadership having a greater impact.

Kim (1992) had track and field, kendo, and basketball players, minus the team captain, complete a leadership scale to examine the prominence of group-maintenance behaviors or goal-orientation/performance behaviors of team leaders. Results showed leaders high in both group-maintenance and goal-orientation behaviors were associated with teams with the highest performance norms. Magyar (2003) also found a correlation between two classifications of leader roles: performance leaders and motivational leaders. Specifically, the Athlete Leadership Skills in Sport Questionnaire was used to identify leader behaviors in male and female collegiate rowers. This scale asked leaders and non-leaders to rate each of the 26 items on the scale on whether or not each behavior was not at all important, somewhat important, or very important for an athlete leader to portray. Items reflected both performance (e.g., be the “go to” person in a time of need; do anything to win [jump the start, or cheat, etc.]; display 100% effort) and motivational (e.g., foster “togetherness” or cohesion; resolve conflict between teammates; provide external motivators [foster team-bonding situations, develop team identity, etc.])
qualities. Results reflected the importance of leaders to be both performance- and motivationally-oriented as perceived by both non-leaders and leaders.

Loehr (2005) had a somewhat similar method of categorizing leader behaviors as described above except two dimensions were added. He believed overall effective leadership could be reached if spiritual, mental, emotional, and physical leadership areas were present. Spiritual leadership involved developing a clear team vision and mission, aligning team members with team values, and instituting ethical standards and conduct. Mental leadership was viewed as engaging in clear and rational thought under pressure, cognitive preparedness, decision-making, and time management. Emotional leadership was related to communication ability, the ability to enhance confidence, hope, and trust even when faced with adversity, and exhibiting empathy and compassion with teammates. Finally, physical leadership involved actually behaving ethically and according to established team values and helping teammates to see how their behavior would lead to the team successfully performing goals. Loehr also explained how each aspects of each dimension could be used to overcome adversity. For example, spiritual leaders, in the face of adversity, were described as continuing to keep the vision of the team clear, keeping within team rules and regulations regardless of the outcome of performance, and conforming personal values with the team’s values, among others. Loehr’s conceptualization of leadership was theoretically and not empirically based but the framework does identify other possible areas of leadership.

Weese and Nicholls (1986) used the independent rater approach and attempted to delineate between leaders and non-leaders using an Observable Leadership Behavior Classification system. Results showed, however, that leaders differed from non-leaders only on the *instructional/task leadership behavior* dimension and not on *supportive leadership behavior*.
and non-supportive leadership behavior dimensions. Thus, in this study, effective leadership seemed to be measured by behaviors that led only to an elevation of accuracy in task completion.

Studies examining student leader behavior may also help to clarify the athlete leader role. Specifically, Blachly (1975) identified collegiate student leaders in many organizations (e.g., student government, sororities, etc.), had them participate in an 18-hour leadership training course focused on enhancing leader effectiveness in two specific leadership dimensions, consideration and initiating structure, and finally asked them to complete the 16PF and the LBDQ. Results of the measures were compared with control groups who were not taken through the training course. Researchers discovered that when comparing 16PF outputs, the leader group and the control group overall did not differ. LBDQ results showed leader groups subjected to the leader training scored significantly better on measures of task (initiating structure) and emotional (consideration) leader behavior competency. Thus in this study, effective leadership was judged to be associated with not only task-oriented leadership behaviors but relationship-oriented behaviors as well.

Finally, Cornett (1999) utilized a semi-structured interview to examine leadership behaviors as displayed by leaders in learning organizations. A learning organization was defined by Cornett as an environment in which a conscious effort is made to acquire information and improve the systems within the organization. Cornett made connections with school, family, career, and sport leaders, and summarized their findings into 8 conclusions: (1) leaders possess purpose and vision, (2) leaders make efforts to communicate their vision with others and align efforts, (3) leaders adopt a systems approach to defining their environment and share their observations with others, (4) leaders have faith in the ambition of others and look to empower those around them, (5) leaders adapt, embrace new ideas, and balance problems no matter the
complexity and ambiguity of the problems, (6) leaders have a realistic view of their weaknesses and prevent these weaknesses from negatively affecting their effectiveness, (7) leaders possess a high level of ability regarding communication, and (8) leaders are open to learning and developing themselves as well as other members of the system. Other important leadership dimensions mentioned in structured interviews included leaders taking risks, showing a spiritual side, and having fun.

Collectively, the available research on student and athlete leader behaviors, similar to research studying leadership in business and education, offers insight and consensus on what behaviors would lead to an athlete leader being effective (e.g., task-oriented and person-oriented behaviors) and proposes other behaviors that may help enhance leader effectiveness (e.g., providing vision, organizing/procedural behaviors, etc.). However, what the literature fails to provide is a comprehensive examination of athlete leader behaviors across different situations, for instance with athletes exposed to different coaching leadership styles and with athletes of different genders who play different sports (e.g., team versus individual). For example, Kim (1992) asked athlete non-leaders of different sports and competition levels to offer descriptions of athlete leader behaviors; however, no information was offered on the race/ethnicity or gender of athletes. Magyar (2003) sampled the perceptions of athletes from only one sport and reported results from only one gender due to a lack of viable information received from male athletes. A difference has been discovered between males and females and their perceptions for coaching leadership behaviors (e.g., Gardner et al., 1996; for example males perceived significantly more autocratic coaching behaviors than females) suggesting male and female athletes may be led differently or that different characteristics of the leader are important and/or salient to the different genders. Weese and Nicholls (1986) used an independent rater approach to observing
the differences in behavior between athlete leaders and non-leaders and actually found no difference between the two on a dimension of leadership, supportive behaviors, commonly recognized to be essential for effective leadership. The present study will attempt to further explore these findings.

Finally, Rees (1982) sampled from coach-less teams, which eliminated an important variable in sport leadership: the leadership style of a coach and before the current investigation, little evidence existed on how this variable affects athlete leadership. Therefore, because of the apparent need for a comprehensive analysis of athlete leader behaviors across a variety of contexts, the current investigation is justified. In addition, describing leadership behaviors versus listing leadership traits has been found to be an effective method of studying leadership as described by the behavioral approach, thus this method was incorporated into the present study.

Situational Approach

In the late 1960s and 1970s, researchers began to believe the best approach to examining leadership was not to apply the behavioral approach absolutely, but rather to observe leadership behaviors and judge them as effective based on their effectiveness within a given context. The result, often labeled interactionist or situational approaches, is the manner in which leadership is often conceptualized today. Examples of situational theories include Fiedler’s (1967) contingency model, House’s (1971) path-goal theory, Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) decision process model, Hersey and Blanchard’s (1977) situational/life-cycle approach, and Chelladurai’s (1978, 1990) multidimensional model of leadership, among others. The situational approach has been spearheaded by researchers in the industrial/organizational field so the review of the literature will begin here.
Overall, several approaches to leadership have dominated the industrial/organizational psychology field in an effort to spread awareness about the elements are necessary for effective leadership. Fiedler’s (1967, 1971) contingency model is a situational approach to explaining leadership and has gained general support over the years (e.g., Peters, Hartke, & Pohlman, 1985; Strube & Garcia, 1981). The model addresses the particular style of the leader, situational influences, and the performance of the followers, with this last variable used to judge effectiveness of the leader. Leadership style was calculated through scores on the least preferred co-worker scale (LPC) in which details about the leader are collected. For example, respondents to the questionnaire are asked to rate the behavior of the individual with whom they feel they do not work well. Respondents or subordinates, by offering information on pleasantness/unpleasantness, friendliness/unfriendliness, rejecting/accepting behaviors, tense/relaxed nature, supportive/hostile actions, self-assured/hesitant nature, and open/guarded approach of, again, the co-worker with whom they work the worst, help researchers create a profile of both leaders, those who attempt to create harmony in the workplace, and non-leaders, those who do not contribute to workplace harmony. Specific profile results offer information on whether or not the leader is motivated by task consideration (low scores on the LPC) or relationship consideration (high scores on the LPC), reflecting the task-oriented/person-oriented approach that is common in the leadership literature (e.g., Bales, 1954; Stogdill, 1963; Stogdill & Coons, 1957).

The situational branch to the contingency model has three components: how much the situation allows for the leader’s use of power and influence, the level of structure involved with the task, and the quality of the leader-follower relationships (Fielder, 1967, 1971). All components are dichotomously measured and when the situation allows for the leader’s use of
power and influence, the task is structured, and the quality of leader-follower relationships is high, the situation is deemed to be favorable. Further distinctions are also made in that task-oriented leaders were stated to be most effective in very favorable or unfavorable situations and relationship-oriented leaders were said to be most effective in moderately favorable situations. In general, the situational components provide a context to compare styles detailed by the LPC measure.

Another theory detailed in business literature is the path-goal theory (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974), which states the leader’s primary role is to facilitate the achievement of goals by followers. This situational theory was developed specifically to help clarify discrepancies in the general approach to categorizing leadership behaviors by labeling them either person-oriented or task-oriented (Aditya, House, & Kerr, 2000) and the theory has received mixed support (Wofford & Liska, 1993). The interaction of leader behaviors (initiating structure, consideration, participative behaviors, and achievement-oriented behaviors), situational moderators (task structure, role ambiguity, job autonomy, job scope, task interdependence), follower traits (dependence, authoritarianism, ability, locus of control), and other variables (follower expectancies, valences, and path instrumentalities) are used by the theory to explain two outcome measures: follower satisfaction and follower performance. This model has been refined recently to reflect the idea that follower rationality is an important key to the validity of the theory. Specifically, in instances of stress and uncertainty when particular follower behaviors and other variables do not follow a logical path, the theory cannot effectively explain the leader-follower relationship (House, 1996).

The situational leadership theory or the life-cycle approach developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1982) involves the description of four leadership styles: telling, selling, participating,
and delegating. These labels represent different levels of maturity marking an increasing amount of self-sufficiency in subordinates. For example, subordinates with a low maturity level need to be told what to do but as they gain more independence, leaders need only to delegate them tasks. The approach, like others in the leadership literature, has received mixed support with some researchers finding training leaders using this approach displayed no change in leader effectiveness (Pascarella & Lunenburg, 1988) and others finding the approach significantly aids the leader-follower interactions of new employees because of their need for structure and the structure emphasized with the telling style (Vecchio, 1987).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) developed a decision-model that also took into consideration situational variables. The model describes how effective leadership can be defined through one important aspect, decision-making, and further the model strives to aid those in leadership positions in making informed decisions. The theory is related to the transformational approach to studying leadership in that emphasis is placed on involving followers in the decision-making process so that they feel more involved in the decisions of the group and thus more attached to the group; however, the theory is categorized as a situational approach because the degree to which followers are involved with decision-making varies from group to group according to, for example, the communication effectiveness within the group.

The model is presented in a question format, with the 7 following questions asked sequentially serving as the method of gathering information about the system: Is decision quality (quality being economic and technical appropriateness) an issue for consideration; Is there sufficient information for a high-quality decision; Is the problem structured; Is subordinate acceptance of the decision crucial to effective implementation; If the decision were to be taken by the leader alone, is there reasonable certainty that the subordinates will accept it; Are the
organizational goals relevant to the problem shared by subordinates; Is the solution likely to lead to conflict among subordinates. The model then details seven decision-making methods, ranging from autocratic to democratic, in which five methods involve group decision-making, including two authoritarian, two consultative, and a joint decision-making process method, and five methods of individual decision processing, including three taken from the group methods and two, joint decision-making by leader and follower and delegation of the decision, are particular to individual decision-making. Altogether, the seven questions posed, the seven decision-making methods, and seven problem attributes related to decision-making compose the theory of leader decision-making, which overall has received mixed support (Field, 1982; Margerison & Glube, 1979; Vroom & Jago, 1988). Vroom and Jago increased the number of decision-making methods, problem attributes, and decision questions in order to improve the effectiveness of the model.

The Vroom and Yetton (1973) model has been applied to the sport context. Chelladurai and colleagues (e.g., Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1978; Chelladurai, Haggerty, & Baxter, 1989; Chelladurai & Quek, 1995) have studied the use of the decision-making model with coaches and identified four styles of decision-making, including: autocratic, meaning the coach makes the decision alone based on available information; consultative, indicating the coach confers with a few members of the team and gathers additional information from them before making the decision; participative, meaning the coach and players all have an equal share in making the decision; and delegative, indicating the decision is given to a player or group of players. The styles are not viewed as independent of one another, rather they are considered to be entities of a common continuum that ranges from total coach influence (autocratic) to no coach influence (delegative). Later studies developed five decision-styles that
were similar to the four described previously, except the continuum was altered to reflect a range from making a decision alone (autocratic I) to making a decision with every team member possessing equal influence (group), including the coach (Chelladurai, Haggerty, & Baxter, 1989). Research shows most coaches prefer an autocratic or consultative/group style with situational factors, including the level of quality required for the decision, information available to coach to make decision, problem complexity, the power/influence of the coach, acceptance of the coach’s decision, team cohesiveness, and time pressure mediating what coaching style coaches would prefer to adopt (Chelladurai & Quek, 1995). In addition, gender differences have been found regarding decision style and these differences will be discussed later in the review of situational variables affecting leadership.

Other situational theories have also developed within the sport environment and one of the best researched of these theories has been the multidimensional model advanced by Chelladurai and colleagues (e.g., Chelladurai, 1978; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Chelladurai & Carron, 1981; Chelladurai & Carron, 1983; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). The multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1978, 1990) is an interactionist approach designed to show how situational characteristics, leader characteristics, and member (follower) characteristics interact to produce required leader behavior, actual leader behavior, and preferred leader behavior in coaches that help to create overall team satisfaction and performance. Specifically, situational characteristics, such as the organizational structure of the context (e.g., grade school, college, or professional), and member characteristics, such as the inability of members to make decisions on their own, often determine what behaviors are required of the leader (Chelladurai, 1990). For example, in professional sports, the emphasis is placed on winning and generating income for the owners of the team and members of the team are for the most part adults, so the
coach is required to participate in promotional activities that help generate more income. The
coach must also allow players to have more independence than perhaps a junior high school team
where the focus is on participation and general personal growth through group interaction and
players can be restricted from playing based on academic performance.

Preferred leader behavior is also the product of the influence of situational and member
characteristics (Chelladurai, 1990). Regarding situational characteristics, some organizations
(e.g., Notre Dame) would like to emulate more of a “clean-cut” image and prefer that coaches
and athletes display a similar impression to the public. Likewise, depending on the personality
traits of members, a coach’s approach may change according to preferences of their athletes. For
example, athletes who are achievement oriented may respond better to a more autocratic style
versus athletes who are participating just to have fun, and therefore may prefer a more
democratic style (Chelladurai, 1990). Actual leader behavior is determined through the
interaction of many variables including required behavior, preferred behavior, and a coach’s
abilities, experience, and personality (Chelladurai, 1990). Ultimately, actual leader behavior
demonstrates a coach’s final decision on how to proceed based on all of the aspects mentioned
above.

The multidimensional model of leadership led to the development of the Leadership
Scale for Sports (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), which separates coach behaviors into five
dimensions: Training and Instruction (i.e., behaviors related to instructing/teaching athletes skills
and techniques, coordinating activities, and facilitating training), Democratic Behavior (i.e.,
behavior that involves athletes in decision-making), Autocratic Behavior, (i.e., behavior related
to independent decision-making and authority of the leader), Social Support (i.e., behavior that
shows concern for athletes and projects a positive, warm approach), and Positive Feedback (i.e.,
behavior related to the rewarding of good performances) (Chelladurai, 1990). Research has provided evidence for both the reliability and validity of the LSS although the Autocratic Behavior scale has displayed low internal consistency (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Chelladurai, 1984). A full discussion of the reliability and validity of the LSS can be found in the Method section of the document. Three versions of the LSS are utilized to gain a global perspective on how a particular coach’s leadership behaviors are viewed. The different versions include one that measures an athlete’s perception of leader behaviors, an athlete’s preference for leader behaviors, and the coach’s self-perceptions of leadership behavior.

Zhang, Jensen, and Mann (1997) revised the Leadership Scale for Sport (RLSS) in order to make the scale more comprehensive (e.g., 2 new subscales and 240 new items were added). In the end, the revised scale contained 6 subscales in all (items from one of the new subscales, group maintenance behavior, were found to be subsumed in the other scales), with situational consideration behavior being the component added. Items related to the Democratic Behavior scale included those involving empowering athletes, allowing them to participate in decisions, using feedback received from athletes, and generally encouraging athletes to set their own goals. Items on the Autocratic scale involved an unwillingness to implement ideas from athletes, a refusal to compromise, and an expectation that athletes will follow instruction regardless of explanation and involvement in the decision-making process. Positive Feedback items related to offering praise, encouragement, and appreciation both verbally and nonverbally. Items on the Situational Consideration scale included those that reflect a knowledge that adapting to a given set of circumstances is needed, such as when a coach is faced with a group of athletes who have a high or low maturity or ability levels and when unforeseen events disrupt the flow of a season. Social Support items involved a personal interest in the health of a team by the coach and an
effort to ensure the team is aware the coach can be consulted with about any personal as well as performance concerns. Teaching and Instruction scale items measured how well a coach can teach the skills necessary for the team to have success. Good knowledge of the sport and helping athletes to understand difficult concepts are also important parts of this scale.

Multiple studies have used both the LSS and the RLSS to measure various aspects of coaching leadership (e.g., Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Bennett & Maneval, 1998; Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Garland & Barry, 1988, 1990; Hightower, 2001; Jambor & Zhang, 1997; Martin, Jackson, Richardson, & Weiller, 1999; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Schliesman, 1987; Sherman, Fuller, & Speed, 2000; Shields, Gardner, Bredemeier, & Bostro, 1997; Sullivan & Kent, 2003). Chelladurai (1984) examined satisfaction ratings and the leadership preferences and perceptions of college basketball, wrestling, and track and field athletes towards their coaches. Demographic information on the gender of the participants was not included in the publication.

Results showed that for basketball players, the athletes possessed higher ratings of the perception of these coaching behaviors relative to a preference for these types of behaviors for levels of Training and Instruction, Democratic Behavior, Social Support, and Positive Feedback and lower ratings of perception relative to preference for levels of Autocratic Behavior. These measurements significantly related to their own satisfaction with leadership, indicating when the pattern in LSS scales occurred as just described, satisfaction with leadership was high. Similar results were found with early and late adolescent athletes in another study as well (Martin et al., 1999). Wrestlers showed a similar pattern to basketball players regarding the Training and Instruction and Social Support scales and there existed a significant curvilinear pattern with the Positive Feedback scale and ratings of leader satisfaction. In essence, the curvilinear relationship...
indicated that “when the athletes’ perception of positive feedback . . . on the part of the coach was equal to their preference, satisfaction was optimal” (pg. 39). Track and field athletes also showed higher satisfaction ratings relative to Training and Instruction behaviors when the perception of the amount of Training and Instruction behaviors as measured by the LSS exceeded the preference for a certain amount of this type of behavior. Similar to wrestlers, track and field athletes displayed a curvilinear pattern relative to Autocratic behavior and satisfaction with leadership.

Taken together, the results of this study offer two important pieces of information: (1) athletes of various sport types generally prefer different types of leader behaviors, with those involved in individual sports preferring more democratic coaches and those involved in team sports preferring more autocratic coaches and (2) athletes, regardless if he/she participates on a team or in an individual sport or plays a sport that involves a lot of change, are most satisfied with Training and Instruction behaviors when the preference for Training and Instruction behaviors is exceeded by the perception of this dimension.

Schliesman (1987) also investigated how perceived and preferred leader behaviors related to satisfaction with leadership. Forty male college track and field athletes completed the perception and preference versions of the LSS and results showed only perceived ratings of leadership and not preferred ratings significantly related to general satisfaction with leadership. Specifically, perceived ratings of Democratic and Social Support behaviors were significantly and linearly related to general satisfaction. Discrepancy scores were also calculated and these scores were similar to the analysis described in the Chelladurai (1984) study. As Training and Instruction, Social Support, and Positive Feedback perception ratings rose relative to preference ratings, general satisfaction ratings increased as well. The results of this study showed how the
perception of actual leader behaviors is more strongly related to general satisfaction than preferred leader behaviors and Training and Instruction behaviors exhibited by the coach are also strongly related to satisfaction with leadership.

In addition to leader satisfaction ratings, LSS scales have been utilized in conjunction with personality measures to compare coach leadership style and team success. Garland and Barry (1988, 1990) asked coaches to group their collegiate football players into three performance categories: regulars, or athletes who regularly started and/or played 50% or more of the time during games; substitutes, or athletes who started and/or played 50% less of the time during games; and survivors, or athletes who did not play except for acknowledgment purposes. Then, they asked athletes to complete the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF; Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1982) and the coach perception version of the LSS. Results showed that group-dependence, tough-mindedness, extroversion, and emotional stability personality factors and the five scales of the LSS were related to athletic performance in that these qualities were associated with athletes who received more playing time. Further analyses revealed the most successful athletes (i.e., regulars) possessed group dependence and tough-mindedness characteristics while perceiving their coaches as displaying less autocratic behavior. Overall, regression analyses showed that coaching behaviors could account for approximately 51% of the variance in athletic success.

Chelladurai’s (1978) approach to studying effective coaching leadership, as well as other situational theories, offers a large amount of data that may help clarify the athlete leader role. The coach is primarily the central leader figure for sports teams and how athletes view the coaching leader role should also help clarify their view of the athlete leader role. In addition, a coach’s style may also influence how the athlete leader role is defined on the team. For example,
autocratic coaches may not want an athlete leader to have much influence over the team and in contrast, democratic coaches may want the athlete leader to have a large role. Therefore, because of the ability of the multidimensional approach to leadership to effectively describe coaching leadership, which is an aspect that has direct influence over the athlete leader role, elements of that approach, specifically dimensions of the LSS were completed by participants, and other situational variables such as playing time of athletes, were integrated into the current investigation.

Transformational Approach

The transformational leadership approach (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) is a relatively contemporary idea that was developed in the business literature. The essential feature of the approach is that the focus of leadership study is directed on the relationship between leaders and subordinates and the interactions of various behaviors between the two groups. Overall, the approach is represented by several different theories that possess this element (e.g., leader member exchange theory, Graen & Cashman, 1975; implicit leadership theory [ILT], Lord, Binning, Rush, & Thomas, 1978; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1984; Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1986). As the followers in the leader-follower relationship began to command more attention, additional insight was gained into how effective leadership can be created.

For example, in the ILT approach, leadership is defined through the perceptions of followers. In other words, the behavior of leaders is judged solely on comparisons with the expectations or cognitive representations that followers have formed of what type of leadership they would like to experience and this “schema” is based on past behaviors and known traits of the leader. Kenney, Schwartz-Kenney, and Blascovich (1996), utilizing the ILT framework, examined preconceived expectations of followers for both appointed leaders and elected leaders
judged to be worthy of influence. Participants were asked to imagine being in a situation in which the leader was elected or appointed and then posed the question, “What characteristics and/or behaviors does this person have to exhibit in order for you to allow him or her to influence your attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors?” (pp. 1131). Participants generated 108 behaviors/attitudes for the appointed-leader situation and 131 behaviors/attitudes for the elected-leader situation. Researchers were able to group the two sets of information such that 14 basic level behavioral categories were created for the appointed-leader condition, including being funny, caring, interested, truthful, open to others’ ideas, imaginative, knowledgeable, responsible, active, determined, influential, in command, aggressive, and finally speaking well. Nineteen basic level behavioral categories were created for the elected-leader condition, including being tall, clean-cut, open to others’ ideas, friendly, caring, honest, enthusiastic, humorous, popular, knowledgeable, responsible, independent, influential, determined, aggressive, in command, taking risks, speaking well, and respecting group members. Evidence from this study supported the notion that followers can identify leadership behaviors they perceive to be effective and this information can then be used to define effective leadership.

A transformational leadership approach has been applied to the sport context in the past (Case, 1998; Charbonneau, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001). Charbonneau et al. collected data on 123 males’ and 45 females’ responses to charisma (e.g., optimistic view of future), intellectual stimulation (e.g., utilizes different perspectives in decision-making), and individualized consideration (e.g., aware of various needs and abilities of athletes) scales on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Form 5X (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995). The MLQ measures athletes’ perceptions of coaching leadership, and researchers used this measure to test to see if the scales of the measure correlated with the intrinsic motivation level and/or overall performance of
athletes. Conclusions of leadership ability are made through the perceptions of followers. Results showed the charisma factor of coaches did not correlate with measures of performance and did not seem to influence the intrinsic motivation of athletes. Intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration were, however, related to intrinsic motivation. Overall, transformational leadership as measured through athletes’ perceptions of a coach’s charisma, intellectual stimulation abilities, and individualized consideration for athletes, was found to account for 50% of the variance associated with intrinsic motivation which in turn accounted for 65% of the variance in sport performance. Therefore, effective leadership can be defined through athletes’ perceptions of what enhances their own intrinsic motivation and again, intrinsic motivation was found to be closely related to successful performance. So the focus here remained on the subordinates’ judgments of effective leadership and what they felt could raise their intrinsic motivation to successfully execute sport skills.

In the leader member exchange theory, developed from the vertical dyadic linkage model (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975), leadership is examined based on relationships formed with followers and followers are broken down into two groups: the in-group and the out-group. The original theorists believed that this separation of follower groups occurred because leaders typically endure various pressures and time restraints and thus realistically do not have the capacity to develop close relationships with all followers. In general, in-group members have much influence over decision-making, enjoy open communication with the leader, and have confidence in and consideration for the leader. Out-group members simply adhere to role expectations and take direction from the leader and therefore do not have much influence over leader behavior (Case, 1998).
This theory has been applied to the sport context in the past (Case, 1998). Specifically, researchers examined how squads of female basketball players participating in a summer basketball camp rated their coach, who led them in drills and competition throughout the camp, on the Leader Member Exchange Scale (LMX; Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975). All starters (in-group) and all non-starters (out-group) were compared and results showed that starters significantly rated their coach higher on the LMX scale than non-starters, indicating starters viewed their coach more favorably than non-starters. Case believes that these results showed that the LMX approach could be successfully applied to the sport context.

Another leadership theory gaining some prominence in the literature that has ties both to the transformational approach and the trait approach is the charismatic theory of leadership (House, 1977; Yukl, 1993). This theory, and similar contemporary theories (e.g., attributional theory of charismatic leadership, Conger & Kanungo, 1987; visionary theories of leadership, Bennis & Nanus, 1985) focuses on leader relationships with subordinates and charismatic features of leaders at the top of organizational structures. In essence, this theory combines trait (e.g., charisma of leader) and transformational (e.g., relationship between leader and subordinates) components in order to explain leader effectiveness. House and Shamir (1993) have identified leader behaviors under the umbrella of this theory that seem to significantly contribute to effective leadership and they include behaviors that involve visionary, empowering, role-modeling, image-building, and risk-taking elements. Aditya, House, and Kerr (2000) reported charismatic leaders are also thought to be self-confident and have a strong need for power, enthusiasm behind the morality of their beliefs, a risk-taking quality, and the ability to overcome adversity.
Neocharismatic/value-based leadership theories represent the new form of the charismatic leadership theory. Although the new theories contain the same general idea as the traditional approach, specifically that leadership can be defined through the charismatic elements of the leader and how subordinates react to these features, new ideas have been introduced. For example, Howell and House (1992) identified two dimensions of charismatic leadership: personalized and socialized. The personalized dimension involves more negative qualities such as self-aggrandizing, exploitative, and authoritarian traits and the socialized dimension refers to more positive qualities such as altruistic, collectivistic, and egalitarian traits. As researchers began to examine these contemporary approaches more closely, specifications were made regarding the motivation behind why charismatic leaders desire to lead. Overall, research in the area of charismatic leadership has been dwarfed by the amount of theory-generation completed so future studies will have to determine the validity and usefulness of the approach, especially the contemporary theories.

Of the four main approaches to defining leadership, the trait, the behavioral, the situational, and the transformational approach, elements of each can aid the current investigation because the goal was to help athlete leaders effectively perform their role given certain situational restraints. I recognize that perhaps not all leaders, because of particular personality traits, will be able to execute all effective behaviors that may be associated with effective leadership; however, the goal of the study was not to profile the ideal athlete leader, but rather to provide an athlete leader, once in the leadership position, information on what behaviors were preferred of him/her by those being influenced by the athlete leader, mainly teammates. Situational influences mediating these preferences, for instance leadership behaviors of the coach, sport type (i.e., individual or team) and the gender of teammates, were also accounted for.
Ultimately, what can help clearly define what an athlete leader’s role may be are elements of all four approaches and particular variables discussed next that transcend approaches and seem to affect the athlete leader role no matter what approach is used to examine the phenomenon.

Leadership Selection

Social psychology has offered an objective analysis of leadership in a context free of parameters. In other words, experiments are designed so that participants, regardless of connections to sport, business, or any other field, are assigned to groups, given problems to solve, and then observed. This method of gathering information allows researchers to appoint leaders, elect leaders, or observe group interactions to see if a leader emerges and thus gain a greater understanding of effective leader behaviors and the leadership phenomenon overall (e.g., Hollander, Fallon, & Edwards, 1977; Huertas & Powell, 1986; Pescosolido, 2002). Because athlete leaders can be appointed, elected, or emerge, information gathered from these social psychology experiments may provide some understanding of the athlete leader role.

A common method of examining leadership in social psychology is to assign participants to groups, appoint or elect leaders, and then have the group solve a task. Ben-Yoav, Hollander, and Carnevale (1983) created groups of four and asked them to review and discuss common urban problems. Then, participants were asked to rate other group members’ contributions to the discussion. Next, experimental groups were randomly assigned to either election conditions, in which participants were asked to rank order the other members of their group for the position of leader, appointment conditions, in which the experimenter appointed a leader, or control conditions, in which no leader was elected or appointed and instead, the individual who spoke the most when discussing the urban problems was chosen as leader. In actuality, the election results were not used and in all conditions, the individual who spoke the most during the initial
discussions was chosen as leader by the experimenter without the knowledge of participants. After the leader selection period, groups were asked to again discuss the set of urban problems and come to a consensus on how to solve the problems. When the discussions ended, participants completed surveys about the group interaction.

Post-experimental results showed elected leaders were rated as more responsive to the needs of followers, more interested in the task, more competent, and preferred to lead in a similar situation in the future more so than appointed leaders. Elected leaders were not preferred more than leaders in control conditions, perhaps reflecting the impact of emergent leaders. Support for this idea does exist in the literature as Huertas and Powell (1986) discovered control groups provided a naturalistic setting for leader emergence and subsequently, more conforming statements were made by group members in control groups than in either an appointed group or elected group. Correlational analyses were also conducted in the Ben Yoav et al. (1983) study and results of these analyses showed the more elected leaders interacted with their groups, the more the group wanted the individual as a leader in the future. This effect was not observed for the appointed leader condition, most likely due to the fact that leaders in the appointed condition were not initially endorsed by group members and thus less likely to be followed in the future. The results of this experiment showed how the influence of leaders in elected positions and leaders in appointed positions can differ.

Using a similar approach, Pandey (1976) initially asked participants to complete Fiedler’s (1967) Least Preferred Co-workers (LPC) scale and personality measures in order to identify those with leadership characteristics and then formed groups of three that were composed of a leader and two others not selected to be leaders based on results of the pre-measures. Using personality measures and the LPC, leaders were grouped into four categories: (1) task-oriented,
extrovert, ascendant, and independent leaders; (2), task-oriented, introvert, submissive, and dependent leaders; (3), relationship-oriented, extrovert, ascendant, and independent leaders; (4), relationship-oriented, introvert, submissive, and dependant leaders. Participants were not aware of how the groups were formed, and more specifically, were unaware that anyone in the group had been pre-selected to be a leader. When the study began, participants were asked to talk with the members of their group and fill out a measure rating the interpersonal skills of each group member. Next, each group was told that for the task, a group leader would have to be selected and unbeknownst to them, the method of leader selection varied by appointment, election, or rotation. In reality, experimenters had appointed the leaders pre-selected to be leaders to direct the task for each group. For example, in rotation groups, after the group completed the first task in which the pre-selected leader held the leadership position in the first spot of the supposed “rotation”, the experiment concluded. In appointed groups, after group members completed a measure designed to identify a leader, experimenters noticeably did not view the measures and appointed a leader. In elected groups, experimenters took the pre-measures, pretended to score/and analyze them, and came back to the groups and informed them based on the pre-measures, a particular individual had been elected as leader for the task.

The tasks the groups completed involved generating ideas related to the solving of social problems experienced by their university (e.g., student unrest), discussing the ideas generated by each individual, and finally the leader was required to rank the ideas in order of importance. At any time, individuals could withdraw their idea and leaders could reject or accept any ideas for ranking. Each group completed these steps for two social problems. Results showed groups led by relationship-oriented leaders generated significantly more ideas than groups led by task-oriented leaders. Closer analyses revealed relationship-oriented leaders regardless of their
method of selection and task-oriented leaders selected by rotation significantly differed from task-oriented leaders selected by election, with this group generating fewer ideas than the latter three groups. Task-oriented elected leaders and task-oriented appointed leaders did not significantly differ regarding number of ideas generated. Further, relationship-oriented groups significantly withdrew more ideas than task-oriented groups. A difference also existed between both relationship-oriented groups of leaders, task-oriented, extroverted, ascendant, independent leaders, and task-oriented, introverted, submissive, dependent leaders with the latter group withdrawing significantly fewer ideas than the others.

Finally, regarding the rejection of ideas, significantly more ideas were rejected by appointed leaders versus rotation or elected leaders. Specific analyses revealed task-oriented appointed leaders rejected the largest number of ideas, followed by relationship-oriented appointed leaders, followed by relationship-oriented elected leaders, followed by the remaining groups who did not differ from one another. The results of this study showed how the type of leader selection and the leaders’ orientation could impact leader decision-making and actions of the group. Therefore, by gathering information on how athlete leaders came to acquire their position (i.e., election, appointment, or emergence), the athlete leader position can be more clearly defined. In the present study, participants will be asked if they prefer athlete leaders to be elected, appointed, or emergent to help clarify preferences for mode of leader selection.

Hollander, Fallon, and Edwards (1977) conducted two similar experiments to the one described previously on the influence of appointed and elected leaders. Groups either elected a leader or had a leader appointed for them by experimenters and were asked to rank a list of action plans associated with solving an array of problems in 10 areas of an imaginary city. Before discussing the rankings as a group, participants individually completed the task so a
baseline measure could be collected and used to compare how rankings changed due to group member/leader influence. The change in members’ rankings and in leaders’ rankings over time served as the main dependent measure.

Two phases composed the main manipulation: the initial phase involved the ranking of the action plans for first 5 areas and the second phase, the ranking of the plans associated with the remaining 5 areas, occurred after the group was given feedback on the success/failure of the first phase. A second experiment mirrored the first experiment; however, a third phase of rankings was added and groups were either appointed or elected a new leader after the second phase. Success/failure feedback was manipulated and this variable, along with method of leader selection, was maintained throughout the second experiment. A post-experiment questionnaire measuring responses to questions regarding group performance, enjoyment with working with the group, performance of the leader, and desire to have the leader lead again also served as dependent measures (Hollander, Fallon, & Edwards, 1977).

Results of experiment one show there was not a significant difference between the influences of appointed leaders versus elected leaders after the first phase as measured by a change in participant’s rankings over time. In phase two, elected leaders in the failure condition displayed a significant increase in influence score as compared to members of their group and the appointed leaders’ conditions. In addition, elected leaders in the success condition were found to be less influential relative to group members. Overall, experimenters failed to find a significant difference regarding a stronger influence of either appointed or elected leaders. However, when examining specific influence ratings, elected leaders in the failure condition received the highest influence score from their groups and elected leaders in the success
condition did not receive any recognition for their ability to influence group members (Hollander, Fallon, & Edwards, 1977).

Experiment two yielded slightly different results in phase two of the experiment. Elected leaders under the failure condition again showed a higher influence score than appointed leaders in this condition; however, group members seemed to have more influence on the changing of rankings than the leaders themselves. When analyzing the influence of new leaders (phase 3), results showed that new leaders who were most influential were those in the appointment following failure condition and the elected following success condition. So it seems after experiencing failure, elected leaders possess more of an ability to influence group members’ decisions than appointed leaders. After success, group members appear to be less likely to be influenced by leaders, especially elected leaders, when making their next decision (Hollander, Fallon, & Edwards, 1977).

The preceding studies reviewed dealt mostly with elected and appointed leadership positions. Emergent leadership, however, is also a phenomenon studied in social psychology. Emergent leadership is examined in a similar fashion as appointed and elected leadership in that groups are assembled and given a task to solve. In essence, emergent leadership groups are similar to control groups in appointed/elected leadership studies because the experimenter has no instruction for potential leaders in these groups. Specifically, Guastello (1998) gave groups of eight a game to play that allowed for emergent leadership. After the game had concluded, participants were asked to rank the individuals exhibiting the most and second most amount of leadership skills. Results of the ranking and subsequent scoring showed that multiple individuals can display leadership skills. The behaviors that were related to these skills were not identified;
however, the study gives evidence to the fact that emergent leadership may allow for a number of individuals to lead within a given group.

Schultz (1974) selected 19 variables common to leadership research and after groups of participants discussed and generated solutions to social problems, all participants were asked to rate others in the group, self included, on the 19 variables. Some of the variables included in the experiment were cooperative/uncooperative, seeks information/does not seek information, informative/uninformative, and assertive/defensive. In addition, participants were asked if a leader emerged during the task and if so, to name the leader. Results showed leaders were rated higher on giving directions, formulating goals, and being self-assured and lower on being quarrelsome and less sensible than non-leaders. These data offer some information on what followers see in leaders when involved in a situation in which a leader has emerged.

Crockett (1955) also examined leadership behaviors of emergent leaders and utilized a categorization system developed from observations gathered at business, government, and industrial organization conferences held over the course of 2 years. These categories included goal setting, problem proposing, information seeking, information giving, solution proposing, development seeking, development giving, opposing, supporting, summarizing, and non-problem directed and conference-goers composed the sample utilized for the study. In the experiment, using some elements of the categorization system, a leader was defined as “a group member who directs the group’s behavior. He generally sets the groups’ goals, summarizes contributions of others, and seeks out contributions by others.” (pp. 379) Participants were asked who the leaders of their groups were and if these leaders then fit the definition given. Results showed that groups with leaders who did not fulfill certain roles described by the categorization system were subject to emergent leadership by other members of the group. These findings suggest that the behaviors
described by the system may be necessary behaviors that need to be displayed regardless of the type of group in question. In addition to these findings, other behaviors associated with emergent leadership that have been identified, and include listening effectiveness (Johnson & Bechler, 1998) and a lack of indecisiveness, overcautiousness, and vacillation (Dubno, 1965).

The categorization of leader behaviors described in Crockett (1955) addressed primarily task-oriented behaviors. Pescosolido (2002) discussed the role of emergent leaders in managing group emotion, which is more of a relationship-oriented role. Specifically, Pescosolido believed, based on anecdotal evidence, emergent leaders should interpret ambiguous situations, model appropriate emotional responses, and manage group emotional reactions with empathy, charisma and modeling with an emphasis placed on effective communication. The idea of perhaps identifying leaders through effective communication behaviors was further supported in a study in which undergraduates were able to take written verbal and nonverbal information and identify emergent leaders from those data (Stein, 1975). The criteria used to identify leaders and non-leaders in this experiment were dimensions of harmony, or the creation of a warm atmosphere, liking, or the positive feelings group members had for each other, coordination, or the organization of group efforts, and participation, or the amount of talking each group member contributed to group interactions. So overall, behaviors demonstrated by emergent leaders in controlled experiments, coupled with information gathered on appointed and elected leaders, can provide further insight into the athlete leader role, specifically by detailing typical behaviors of leaders who have acquired their position via the three methods of leader selection applicable to the athlete leader role: appointment, election, and emergence.

Although social psychology experiments help enhance understanding regarding the leadership role in general, what the studies sometimes lack is evidence of external validity.
Some studies have made efforts to enhance the external validity of experiments by adding more of a real-life atmosphere to experiments by attempting to make participant groups more emotionally involved in the task. The tasks, often entitled mortality salience problems or survival tasks, were implemented in a study asking participants to initially answer one of two open-ended questions: (1) what are the emotions associated with thinking about their own death and what would happen when they physically die (experimental group)? And (2) a more mundane subject, what emotions are associated with college exams (control group) (Cohen, Solomon, Maxfield, Pyszczynski, & Greenberg, 2004)? Next participants read campaign statements about researcher-created political candidates of different leadership styles: relationship-oriented, task-oriented, and charismatic. The relationship-oriented candidate was portrayed as being compassionate, respectful, trustworthy, and displaying effective communication behaviors, confidence in followers, and treating followers with recognition and appreciation. The task-oriented candidate was characterized by setting goals and organizing the group so that the goals would be achieved. The charismatic candidate’s description alluded to the individual having high expectations of and confidence in followers, taking calculated risks, and emphasizing a greater vision for the group.

After reading the descriptions, participants were asked to judge (1) how much each candidate would contribute to society, (2) how much they would enjoy living in the state in which each candidate would be elected, (3) how much they admired each candidate, (4) how much each candidate’s views related to their own views, (5) how good of a governor each candidate would be, and finally, (6) which candidate the participant would vote for. The first 5 questions were averaged into a composite score and results showed a significant interaction existed between composite scores of perceived effectiveness of different leaders and participants.
in the two mortality salience conditions. Participants overall gave more favorable evaluations to the task-oriented candidate than either of the other two candidates. Differences did exist between participants completing mortality salience (MS) questions and college exam (CE) questions. Specifically, MS participants displayed significantly higher composite ratings of the charismatic-candidate than CE participants. No difference between groups was found for ratings of the task-oriented candidate. Regarding the relationship-oriented candidate, the CE group displayed higher composite ratings than the MS group. In addition, the MS group rated the charismatic candidate as highly as the task-oriented candidate who was rated significantly higher than the relationship-oriented candidate regarding composite scores. In the CE condition, the charismatic candidate was rated significantly lower than the other two candidates. Finally, participants in the MS condition were significantly more likely than CE participants to vote for the charismatic candidate but overall, the task-oriented candidate received the most votes from both conditions. These results reinforce how differently relationship-oriented, task-oriented, and charismatic leaders are perceived by individuals and this point is supported in a more externally valid social psychology experiment.

Taken collectively, the results of social psychology experiments targeting leadership offer many clues into how athlete leader behaviors can be defined. Themes that have been identified, such as particular communication behaviors, could perhaps be applied to the athlete leader role. Overall, social psychology experiments identifying behaviors associated with certain aspects of the athlete leader role can help confirm the applicability of these experimental results with athlete leadership. The results of the current investigation can confirm how applicable the social psychology results are with actual effective athlete leader behaviors given the situation the behaviors are exhibited in. It should also be noted that no study has ever asked athletes if they
prefer to have an athlete leader be elected, be appointed, or emerge during the course of the season. As social psychology experiments have demonstrated, the mode of leader selection may moderate how followers perceive leader behavior, therefore, participants in the current study were asked about their preference for how they would like their leaders to be selected. Now that the leadership literature has been reviewed, a discussion of the components of the current investigation will follow.

Situational Variables Implemented

The varying preferences of coaching leadership behaviors between males and females have been well documented (e.g., Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Gardner et al., 1996; Sherman, Fuller, & Speed, 2000). For example, Chelladurai and Arnott, using Vroom and Yetton’s (1973) model of decision-making, found that females seem to prefer more participation in decision-making than males and situational factors, including how specific and a clear a solution must be in order to adequately solve the problem, how much information the leader possesses related to the problem, the complexity of the problem, and the cohesiveness of the team, explained significantly more variance regarding females’ style preferences for coaching leadership than males. These results suggest women may prefer to have more information about problems to be solved by the team and more involvement in the decisions to be made by their coach than men.

LSS scores have also been used to compare perceived and preferred coaching leader behaviors and social cohesion of the different genders. Gardner et al. (1996) asked male baseball players and female softball players to complete the LSS and a group-cohesion measure and found that a split existed between the leadership preferences and perceptions of the different genders. Specifically, women perceived significantly more training and instruction, democratic
behavior, positive feedback, and task cohesion than men and men perceived significantly more autocratic behavior in their coaches than women. Authors suggested that the large discrepancy in perceptions between the genders may reflect the idea that coaches may have detected different preferences from the different genders and acted accordingly. Regarding measured preferences, men showed a significant negative correlation between Autocratic Behavior and social cohesion and women showed a significant positive correlation between Democratic Behavior and social cohesion.

In another study utilizing the LSS, Sherman et al. (2000) asked 170 male (110 Australian football players and 60 basketball players) and 142 female athletes (88 netball players and 54 basketball players) to complete the leadership preference version of the LSS. Athletes, regardless of gender or sport they played, indicated Positive Feedback was the most preferred coach behavior, as indicated by preference rankings of each dimension, followed by Training and Instruction, Democratic Behavior, Social Support, and lastly Autocratic Behavior. When gender was analyzed separately and compared, female athletes showed a higher mean score for preferred Positive Feedback (female $M = 4.36$, male $M = 4.14$), Training and Instruction (female $M = 4.04$, male $M = 3.91$), and Democratic (female $M = 3.61$, male $M = 3.40$) coach behaviors. Although both genders preferred low amounts of these dimensions, male athletes showed a higher preference for Autocratic behaviors (male $M = 2.43$, female $M = 2.21$) and Social Support behaviors (male $M = 2.97$, female $M = 2.78$) than female athletes. Effect sizes were reported and used to determine the magnitude of differences between genders and analyses yielded small to moderate effect sizes for gender comparisons on each dimension.

Beam, Serwatka, and Wilson (2004) conducted a study similar to the one described above except the RLSS was utilized to record athletes’ preferences for coaching leader behaviors. One-
hundred and seventy-nine males and 229 females of different competition levels (Division I versus Division II), sport type (independent, such as golf, tennis, and track, versus interdependent, such as basketball, baseball, and volleyball), and task variability (open, sport in which the environment changes significantly during competition, versus closed, sport in which the environment does not change significantly), completed the preference version of the RLSS. Results, mostly in support of the findings of the Sherman et al. (2000) study, showed male athletes prefer significantly more Autocratic and Social Support behaviors than female athletes and female athletes prefer significantly more Training and Instruction behaviors than male athletes. Situational Consideration, again a scale distinct to the RLSS that measures an adherence to situational factors such as athlete skill and/or maturity level, was also a dimension that displayed gender differences. Specifically, female athletes preferred significantly more situational consideration behavior than male athletes. Analyses did not produce significant results regarding competition level and task variability and the sport type results will be discussed in the next section. It should be noted no interaction was found between gender and sport type.

Overall, studies examining the preferred coaching leadership style of athletes showed differences in what leadership behaviors female athletes would like to experience versus what behaviors male athletes would like to see displayed by their coach but preferred leadership style of athlete leaders by the different genders has not been examined. The evidence is strong enough, however, to suggest that males and females may differ regarding their preferences for particular athlete leader behaviors as well, similar in the way that they differ regarding preferred coaching behaviors. Therefore, gender was an independent variable implemented into the present study.
In addition to gender, Beam et al. (2004) examined different preferences for leadership behaviors between athletes of different sport types. Sport type essentially discriminated between athletes of independent and interdependent (i.e., team) sports. Again, researchers utilized the LSS to collect data on preferred coaching leadership behaviors and analyses produced significant differences in that athletes performing independent sports preferred significantly more Democratic, Positive Feedback, Situational Consideration, and Social Support behaviors than athletes performing interdependent sports (Beam et al., 2004). Past results (e.g., Terry, 1984; Terry & Howe, 1984) in general support these findings. Specifically, athletes participating in independent sports were found to prefer more democratic and social support behaviors than athletes participating in interdependent sports. In contrast to the Beam et al. findings, however, past researchers found athletes of interdependent sports preferred more positive feedback behaviors than athletes of independent sports (Terry, 1984; Terry & Howe, 1984).

Together, studies examining coaching leadership preferences of athletes in different sport types showed significant differences between leadership preferences of individuals involved in team (i.e., interdependent) sports and those involved in individual (i.e., independent) sports. Similar to how the results of coaching behavior preferences have been conceptualized in regards to gender, it is reasonable to believe that the sport an individual is participating in may affect the preferred athlete leadership behaviors of that individual. Therefore, sport type was used as an independent variable in the present investigation.

Present Study

Each of the four approaches reviewed offers different levels at which to examine the leadership phenomenon. The transformational approach, however, was not examined in the current investigation due to what can be realistically studied. In other words, the
transformational approach examines how effective leadership is determined through the quality of the relationship between the leader and the followers and it would be difficult to create a hypothetical relationship between a coach, an athlete and an athlete leader, therefore, future research will have to address the applicability of the transformational approach to athlete leadership. The author did feel it was important to include research on transformational studies in the literature review, however, as the future of leadership research will undoubtedly address transformational issues.

The trait approach, though not widely regarded as applicable to leadership investigations in its totality (Stogdill 1948, 1974), cannot be ignored due to the information the approach reveals about individuals in leadership positions. For example, in Stogdill’s reviews, initiative and sociability were two traits identified as common to many leaders. These two traits reinforce the findings of behavioral researchers who have found two categories of behaviors essential to effective leadership: task-oriented behaviors, which, in order for the behaviors to be effective, require initiative from the leader exhibiting the behaviors, and relationship-oriented behaviors, which require a certain level of sociability in order for an acceptable level of effectiveness to be reached (Bales, 1954; Stogdill & Coons, 1974). In addition, the trait approach adds an element to many situational approaches (i.e., coaches’ styles as described in Chelladurai’s [1978] multidimensional model of leadership), thus utilizing the LSS, which is a product of a situational approach with trait-oriented qualities, in the current study served as the method to which the trait approach was incorporated.

The behavioral approach generates data on what behaviors make leaders effective (e.g., Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957; Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1978). These behaviors were originally categorized by Bales (1954) and utilized as the basis for the Leader
Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ has been used as a model for other leadership scales (e.g., Leadership Scale for Sports [LSS]; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) that gather data on the behaviors of leaders (e.g., Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Garland & Barry, 1988, 1990; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Schliesman, 1987). In general, the behaviors leaders exhibit serve as the best evaluation criteria for the leader’s effectiveness, thus some type of behavioral evaluation must be implemented in any leadership study. Leadership behaviors that are most interesting are those sport-specific, task- and relationship-oriented behaviors outlined in coaching leadership scales such as the LSS. What makes the leadership behavior evaluation most effective is when situational variables are also considered.

The situational approach to studying leadership is the most widely endorsed approach today (e.g., Chelladurai, 1978; 1990; Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; House, 1971; Murray & Mann, 2001; Stogdill, 1948; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Weinberg & Gould, 1999). Taking a set of behavioral and trait components and examining them under a particular set of parameters offers a wide array of information. This approach also served as the impetus for the some of the most dominant leadership theories in both business and sport, for example, Fiedler’s contingency model of leadership and Chelladurai’s multidimensional model of leadership. Accounting for situational variables, such as the age, gender, and racial/ethnic composition of the group/team, when measuring leadership behaviors has been shown to be essential for increasing both the internal and external validity of leadership studies; therefore, situational elements were identified and examined in the present investigation.

The purpose of the present investigation was to determine what behaviors, as perceived by athletes, displayed by an ideal athlete leader are most preferred by athletes given a particular
set of situational variables, particularly varying coaching styles that athletes may experience.
Again, it is believed that because a coach’s style determines the breadth of leadership behaviors
that can be expressed, coaching leadership behaviors will affect what type of athlete leadership
behaviors are preferred by athletes. Aspects of the trait, behavioral, and situational approaches
were the basis of this study. Specifically, no past study has attempted to describe athlete leader
behaviors as perceived by athletes while accounting for characteristics detailed by all three
approaches.

The behavioral approach offers the most detailed system of gathering information on
effective leadership behaviors, therefore three measures with behavioral qualities, specifically
subscales from the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), the Athlete
Leadership Skills in Sport Questionnaire (A-LSSQ; Magyar, 2003), and the Leader Behavior
Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ; Stogdill, 1963), were employed. The LSS,
although designed to measure coach behaviors and not athlete leader behaviors, has been used in
the sport environment with much success (e.g., Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Chelladurai,
1984; Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Garland & Barry, 1988, 1990; Riemer &
Chelladurai, 1995; Schliesman, 1987). Therefore, the 3 scales of the LSS to be implemented into
the study were modified to question athlete leader behavior and not coaching behavior.

The primary situational variable incorporated that has not before been used as a variable
when describing ideal athlete leader behaviors, was coach leadership behaviors. Specifically, the
main independent variable was the coach description presented to participants and athletes, after
reading either a description of a high task-oriented coach, a high relationship-oriented coach, or a
high task and relationship-oriented coach that is assumed to be coaching their team, described
the behaviors they would want from an “ideal” athlete leader of that team. In other words,
athletes described ideal athlete leader behaviors they perceived would be most effective given the behaviors of the coach in their scenario. A control group was also created as participants in this group simply described ideal athlete leader behaviors using the assessments and did not read a coach scenario.

The situational approach requires the observation and analysis of various situational factors, thus several other situational influences were tested. These included coaching style (i.e., via the coach scenarios), gender, and sport type of the athletes completing the study. Information on athlete’s age, race/ethnicity, years playing their sport, preferred leader selection method, and the athlete’s role on the team as defined by playing time also was collected and these variables were viewed as exploratory variables not to be included in the primary analyses.

In order to gather information on independent variables in a systematic way, dependent variables were categorized into conceptual groups based on content similarity. A total of 19 dependent measures were included in the study and they were grouped into 4 conceptual categories that included performance/task (7 measures: Performance-Execution [A-LSSQ], Training & Instruction [LSS], Initiating Structure, Tolerance of Uncertainty, Tolerance and Freedom, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy [LBDQ]; leader involved with optimizing performance, structure, and decisions of team), relationship (5 measures: Motivational-Interpersonal [A-LSSQ], Social Support [LSS], Consideration, Demand Reconciliation, Integration [LBDQ]; leader displays concern for welfare of teammates and works to reduce conflict), motivation (3 measures: Negative Tactics [A-LSSQ], Positive Feedback [LSS], Persuasiveness [LBDQ]; leader provides motivation for actions of team), and representation (4 measures: Respect-Communication [A-LSSQ], Representation, Role Assumption, Superior
Orientation [LBDQ]; leader displays behaviors showing to others that he/she is the leader). All independent variables were compared using the 4 dependent variables groups.

Hypotheses

I propose five main hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 predicted that a two-way interaction would occur between the independent variables of coach scenario and gender on the performance/task variable groups, with main effects being present for gender and coach scenario. For Hypothesis 1, men were predicted to consistently prefer the same level of performance/task behaviors from their athlete leaders regardless of what coach scenario they were required to read and this preference level would always be higher than the preference level of women, which would differ depending on which scenario was read. The differing preference levels for performance/task behaviors between males and females has been suggested by previous literature examining coaching leadership. So, because men have a higher preference for these behaviors, this preference may be more stable (e.g., Beam et al., 2004). Females’ preferences would change depending on which coach scenario they read because of their lower preferences for this type of behavior. Specifically, women who read the task-oriented coach scenario would prefer fewer performance/task behaviors from their athlete leader than women reading the task/relationship-oriented coach scenario who in turn would want fewer behaviors than those who read the relationship-oriented coach scenario. Therefore, because women may react more strongly to performance/task behaviors than men, the scenarios that offer varying degrees of this type of behaviors was believed to impact the responses of females for this group of behaviors to a higher degree.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the reverse would be expected for the relationship and motivation dependent variables regarding gender, coach scenario, and athlete leader behavior
preferences. Specifically, women were expected to prefer a stable amount of *relationship* and *motivation* behaviors from their athlete leaders regardless of what coach scenario was read, and this amount would be significantly higher than the preferences of men. Men would prefer a varying amount of these types of behaviors, again all lower than the preferences of women, depending on which scenario was read. Men reading the task-oriented coach scenario would prefer significantly more of these behaviors than men reading the task/relationship-oriented and relationship-oriented coach scenario. Men reading the task/relationship-oriented coach scenario would prefer significantly more of these behaviors from their athlete leader than men reading the relationship-oriented coach scenario. The reasoning supporting this hypothesis mirrored the reasoning for Hypothesis 1; specifically, that because the preferences of men for *relationship* and *motivation* behaviors historically have been lower than women’s preferences, these preferences may be more unstable, thus more likely to be affected by a coaching style variable expressed via the scenarios. In addition, main effects were expected for both gender and coach scenario, with women preferring more *relationship* and *motivation* behaviors than men and those reading more democratic-coach scenarios preferring more of these types of behaviors those reading the autocratic coach scenario.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that a two-way interaction would occur with the independent variables of coach scenario and sport type on the *relationship* and *motivation* dependent variables, with main effects for sport type and coach scenario also being present. Specifically, past research has suggested those participating in individual sports prefer more *relationship* and *motivation* behaviors from their coaches than those participating in team, or interdependent sports (e.g., Beam et al., 2004). In collegiate sports, individual sport athletes are on teams and interact with leaders of those teams so it is likely that they would prefer a high level of these
types of behaviors from their athlete leader as well due to the individual attention that is often required in individual sports. Thus, individual sport participants were expected to prefer a consistent and yet higher amount of relationship and motivation behaviors from their athlete leader than interdependent sport participants regardless of what coach scenario was read. For interdependent sport participants, because of a lower level of individual attention and a broader influence the coach has over the team as a whole, athlete leader behavior preferences for relationship and motivation behaviors would differ depending on which coach scenario is read. Interdependent sport participants reading the task-oriented coach scenario were expected to prefer significantly more relationship and motivation behaviors from their athlete leaders than interdependent sport participants reading the task/relationship-oriented and the relationship-oriented coach scenario. Interdependent sport participants reading the task/relationship-oriented coach scenario were then expected to prefer significantly more of these behaviors than interdependent sport participants reading the relationship-oriented coach scenario.

Regarding Hypothesis 4, past research examining effective coaching behaviors found no differences between sport types on performance/task dependent variables, although how independent and interdependent sport teams are structured may provide an indication of potential performance/task differences (e.g., Beam et al., 2004). Specifically, independent sport athletes perform their sport independent of teammates, thus regimes vary from athlete to athlete regarding how preparation and practice are approached. Conversely, interdependent sport athletes rely on each other for successful performance, thus they must follow more of a structured performance schedule. Therefore, because of inherent differences between sports, interdependent sport athletes are hypothesized to prefer more performance/task behaviors from athlete leaders than independent sport athletes, regardless of what scenario is read. Because the
structure of sport types (i.e., independent versus interdependent) are stable, coach scenarios are believed to have little impact on what type of performance/task behaviors athletes would prefer to experience from athlete leaders. Interdependent sport athletes and those reading the autocratic coach scenario were also expected to prefer more performance/task behaviors than independent sport athletes and those reading more democratic coach scenarios because the culture of interdependent sports and autocratically-coached teams seems to focus more energy on performance and each individual’s contribution to winning than independent teams and more democratic cultures.

Finally, for Hypothesis 5, two-way interactions were expected between gender and coach scenarios, and between sport type and scenarios for the representation dependent variables, with main effects occurring for each independent variable. Past research again fails to offer any clues as to how athletes of different genders and sport types would differ regarding representation behaviors, thus specific predictions on how groups would differ was not offered. Men and women, and independent and interdependent sport types seem to differ with other leadership variables, so differences were expected; however, how groups would differ was again, unclear (e.g., Beam et al., 2004; Sherman et al., 2000).

It should be noted that three-way interactions were not predicted for the independent variables of coach scenario, gender, and sport type for the 4 dependent variable groups because past research does not suggest that gender and sport type interact when leadership preference ratings are analyzed (Beam et al., 2004). For the purposes of expanding the literature base, however, I tested for the presence of three-way interactions.

The impact certain independent variables, such as leader selection preference, level of participation, and leadership role of participants, would have on dependent measures was unclear
so these independent variables were not included in hypotheses. Exploratory analyses were conducted, however, to determine if any differences existed between secondary independent variables on dependent measures.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Participants

For the pilot study, 25 students (15 females, 10 males) with previous sport experience and who were currently enrolled in an undergraduate Kinesiology course participated in the pilot study. Five were sophomores, 17 were juniors, and 3 were seniors; they had an average age of 20.44 years ($SD = .651$). In terms of race/ethnicity, 23 were Caucasian, 1 was Hispanic, and 1 did not disclose. Participants were asked by their instructor to participate voluntarily and were not given specific compensation for their participation; all students in attendance participated.

For the main study, 186 male and 168 female varsity athletes from two Division I universities located in the Northeast and in the Southwest completed the study. Average age was 20.0 years ($SD = 1.39$); 123 were freshman, 94 were sophomores, 75 were juniors, and 62 were seniors. Eighty percent ($n = 283$) of participants were Caucasian, 9.9% ($n = 35$) African-American, 3.1% ($n = 11$) Hispanic, 1.7% Asian-American ($n = 6$), and 5.4% ($n = 19$) did not identify their racial/ethnic background. Participants represented the following sports: men’s ($n = 27$) and women’s ($n = 18$) ice hockey, men’s ($n = 60$) and women’s ($n = 52$) track and field, men’s ($n = 10$) and women’s ($n = 10$) skiing, women’s lacrosse ($n = 23$), women’s gymnastics ($n = 15$), women’s basketball ($n = 11$), women’s volleyball ($n = 10$), women’s swimming and diving ($n = 13$), women’s field hockey ($n = 16$), men’s soccer ($n = 16$), and football ($n = 73$).

Two hundred fifty-one participants believed that athlete leaders should be elected, 50 believed leaders should be appointed, and 46 believed leaders should emerge. Regarding participation level, 221 athletes reported that they started or played more than 50% of the time (starters), 64 athletes reported that they played between 25% and 50% of the time (substitutes),
and 63 athletes reported that they played less than 25% of the time (survivors). Seventy-two
participants reported that their current coach was autocratic, 72 reported that their current coach
was democratic, and 202 reported that their current coach’s style was a combination of autocratic
and democratic styles. The majority of the participants (86.3%) imagined a coach whose gender
and ethnicity matched the gender and ethnicity of their current coach when they read the vignette
and completed the questionnaires.

Measures

The 100-item Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ; Stogdill, 1963) measures preferred leadership behaviors along 12 dimensions: Representation (5 items; leader speaks and acts as representative of the group), Demand Reconciliation (5 items; leader reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder), Tolerance of Uncertainty (10 items; leader is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety), Persuasiveness, (10 items; leader uses persuasion and argument effectively and exhibits strong convictions), Initiation of Structure (10 items; leader clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected), Tolerance and Freedom (10 items; leader allows followers scope for initiative, decision-making, and action), Role Assumption (10 items; leader actively exercises leadership role rather than surrendering leadership), Consideration (10 items; leader regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers), Production Emphasis (10 items; leader applied pressure for productive output), Predictive Accuracy (5 items; leader shows foresight and ability to predict outcome accurately), Integration (5 items; leader maintains a closely knit organization and resolves inter-member conflicts), and Superior Orientation (10 items; leader maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them, and is striving for higher status). Questions on the LBDQ were modified to reflect a sport team and not a business.
organization. For instance, many of the questions on the LBDQ refer to “the group” and this phrase was changed to reflect “the team.” This modification made the measure more sport specific for the participants and seemed more applicable to their own experiences with athlete leadership. Questions for the LBDQ are scored using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 5, *always* to 1, *never*. Total scores for each subscale are computed by summing across subscale items and then dividing by the number of items in order to create an average score. Higher scores reflect a greater preference for that behavior.

Internal consistency coefficients for the subscales have ranged from .38 to .91 (Stogdill, 1963). Cronbach alphas from the current sample were .60 (Demand Reconciliation), .61 (Representation), .63 (Tolerance Freedom), .67 (Predictive Accuracy), .68 (Role Assumption), .69 (Tolerance Uncertainty), .72 (Superior Orientation), .72 (Integration), .73 (Consideration), .74 (Persuasiveness), .75 (Production Emphasis), and .78 (Initiating Structure). Concerning the validity of the LBDQ, Tracy (1987) reported a low, negative correlation between initiating structure and consideration scales suggesting the two categories are independent of one another. Schriesheim and DeNisi (1980) discovered significant discriminant and convergent validity between scales on the LBDQ and scales on the Michigan Four-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (as cited in Schriesheim, 1981). In addition, Szilagyi and Keller (1976) examined the convergent validity between the LBDQ and the Supervisory Behavior Descriptions Questionnaire (SBDQ; Fleishman, 1957). Results showed that overall, the initiating structure and consideration scales from the LBDQ correlated highly with the initiating structure and consideration scales from the SBDQ (*r* = .50, *p* < .001; *r* = .85, *p* < .001 respectively).

The 40-item Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) assesses preferred leadership styles along 5 dimensions, including: Training and Instruction (13 items;
leader behavior that includes emphasizing training, instructing athletes on skills and tactics, and structuring team activities), Positive Feedback (5 items; leader behavior directed towards positively reinforcing good performances), Social Support (8 items; leader behavior that includes having a warm approach with teammates and a concern for teammates’ welfare), Autocratic behavior (5 items; leader behavior reflecting independent decision-making and the establishment of personal authority over others), and Democratic behavior (9 items; leader behavior directed at involving teammates in decision-making and the sharing of authority). Each item is scored using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1, never, to 5, always. Total scores on each subscale are computed by summing the responses and dividing by the number of items to create an average score; higher scores indicate higher preferences for behaviors.

Because the LSS has been used only to assess coaching leadership behaviors and, due to identical Likert scales, parts of the scale were subsumed in the LBDQ and the scale was modified to fit the needs of the study. Three specific modifications were made: (1) athletes were asked to indicate which behaviors they would prefer to be displayed by an ideal athlete leader, (2) only three of the five subscales (i.e., Training & Instruction, Social Support and Positive Feedback) were used, and (3) the three subscales, because they use the same anchors as the LBDQ, were added to that questionnaire. The Democratic Behavior scale and the Autocratic Behavior scale were not included in the present study as many of the items of these scales were similar to items presented in the Initiating Structure and Consideration scales of the LBDQ.

Overall, the LSS has shown adequate reliability and validity. Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) reported test-retest (period of 4 weeks) and internal consistency reliability coefficients ranging from .71 to .82, and .45 to .93, respectively. Cronbach alpha levels for the 3 scales used in the present study were .87 (Training and Instruction), .74 (Social Support), and .77 (Positive
Validity of the LSS was supported by Chelladurai (1990) who offered evidence for construct, content, and criterion-related validity. The LSS was created through a factor analysis with the dimensions being in accordance with a task/relationship approach found in the leadership literature (e.g., Bales, 1954; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Stogdill, 1963). In addition, the LSS has been effectively used with sports participants in a variety of contexts such as youth sports (Chelladurai & Carron, 1981) and athletes of different cultures (Chelladurai, 1986). Chelladurai (1990) also reported the LSS’s use with a variety of variables including performance, coach-athlete compatibility, dropout behavior in athletics, and athlete satisfaction, which offers evidence for the criterion-related validity of the measure.

The 26-item Athlete Leadership Skills in Sport Questionnaire (A-LSSQ; Magyar, 2003) measures specific athlete leader behaviors across four dimensions: Performance-Execution (10 items; behaviors related to personal performance success and influencing the performance success of teammates), Motivational-Interpersonal (7 items; behaviors related to providing support and the emotional regulation of teammates), Respect-Communication (5 items; behaviors related to effective communication and engaging in appropriate conduct), and Negative Tactics (4 items; behavior related to negative reinforcement and the encouragement of negative action). Using a 5-point Likert scale, respondents indicate how important it is for athlete leaders to display particular behaviors ranging from 1, *not at all important*, to 5, *very important*. Total subscale scores are obtained by averaging the values of the items, with higher scores indicating higher preferences for the behavior.

Internal consistency coefficients have ranged from .60 to .73 (Magyar, 2003). Cronbach alphas from the current investigation were .64 (Performance-Execution), .73 (Motivational-Interpersonal), .76 (Respect-Communication), and .65 (Negative Tactics). Magyar provided
evidence of both content and construct validity. Specifically, items on the A-LSSQ based on from Bandura’s (1997) social cognitive theory and Eagly’s (1987) social role theory so that cognitive, behavioral, and emotional aspects of leadership could be represented. The 26-item scale also was created from the factor analysis of a 13-scale, 52-item original measure.

The Demographic questionnaire (Appendix D) included questions about age, gender, race/ethnicity, sport type, current sport, years of playing experience, preferred mode of leader selection (i.e., elected, appointed, or emergent), participation level (i.e., start and/or play more than 50% of the game [starter], substitute and/or play less than 50% of the game [substitute] but more than 25% of the game, or enter the game less than 25% of the time [survivor]), and the style of their current coach. In addition, participants who read scenarios were asked to report about the race/ethnicity and gender of the coach that they had imagined.

Procedure

Participants for the pilot study were contacted through their instructor and I visited the participants’ class to administer the questionnaire packet. Pilot test participants, who had previous sport experience, were asked to read their given scenarios and then asked to describe the coach in the scenario using the Initiating Structure and Consideration Scales of the LBDQ and the Autocratic and Democratic Scales of the LSS (see Measures in Method Section of document for description). These scales provided specific information regarding the perceived leadership style of the coaches. In addition, because these scales were used to develop the coach scenarios, ratings of the scenarios using the scales helped to confirm content validity. Each participant was given 2 scenarios to evaluate so that an adequate sample size would be achieved. A filler task of completing 6 mathematics problems was implemented in between the evaluations of the scenarios to ensure information from the first was not easily transferred to the second.
Past studies have implemented math problems as filler tasks in the past (e.g., Dreben, Fiske, & Hastie, 1979). After participants had completed the pilot test, they were individually thanked for their participation.

I predicted that the task-oriented coach and the relationship-oriented coach would be perceived significantly differently from each other on each of the 4 scales with the task-oriented coach being rated higher on the Initiating Structure and Autocratic scales and lower on the Consideration and Democratic scales when compared to the relationship-oriented coach. Ratings for the task/relationship-oriented coach were predicted to be consistent across all 4 scales because the scenario was designed to reflect a coach who, for example, has both autocratic and democratic qualities. Therefore, there was uncertainty of how this scenario would compare to the other 2 scenarios, so no specific predictions were made regarding differences between the task/relationship scenario and the other scenarios.

For the main study, the descriptions of the three different coaches and a no-scenario control group served as independent variables for the main study. The age, gender, sport, and race/ethnicity of each coach outlined in the descriptions were not presented, thus participants were not subjected to any experimenter biases. In addition the participants were told to pretend that the coach described in the scenario was coaching them in their sport. The scenarios were approximately one page in length and described coaches as task-oriented, relationship-oriented or task and relationship-oriented.

The task-oriented coach scenario (See Appendix A) detailed a coach who communicated what was expected of athletes, implemented uniform procedures, tried out his ideas with the team, made his attitudes clear to the team, decided what team activities would be conducted and how the activities would be performed, and assigned team members to particular tasks. The
relationship-oriented scenario (See Appendix B) described a coach who was friendly and approachable, did little things to create a pleasant environment (e.g., took interest in players’ lives outside of sport), actively utilized suggestions from the team, treated all team members as his equals, gave advance notice of changes, and looked out for the personal welfare of team members. Finally, the task/relationship-oriented coach (See Appendix C) exhibited a combination of the behaviors described above. For the no scenario control group, participants were not given a scenario but were asked to offer their overall preferences for athlete leader behaviors using the questionnaires. All scenarios presented identical situations in which the reader interacted with the hypothetical coach and the actions of the coach were manipulated to reflect the three specific orientations. It should be noted again that the formulation of descriptions of coach behaviors were guided by behaviors described in the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ; Stogdill, 1963) and the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). In other words, the behaviors of each coach detailed in the scenarios mirrored the task-oriented/autocratic and relationship-oriented/democratic behaviors outlined in questions on both the LBDQ and the LSS.

Initially, the primary investigator contacted and gained approval from the compliance director and the athletic director of a Northeastern University to contact and request that all varsity teams complete the study. In addition, the head coach of a Southwestern University track and field team agreed to allow access to his student-athletes in an attempt to increase the number of participants for the study. Teams willing to participate were offered a summary of the results of the study as well as their particular team results as compensation for their participation. I was given permission by the head coaches of 13 out of 17 teams at the Northeastern University to meet with student-athletes and ask them to complete the study. Teams overall completed the
study as a group and participants took 20-30 minutes to complete the packet. Before the packets were distributed, participants completed the consent form. Contained in each packet was either the scenario describing the task-oriented coach, the relationship-oriented coach, the task/relationship-oriented coach, or no scenario for control group members, the LBDQ, the Training and Instruction, Social Support, and Positive Feedback subscales of the LSS, the A-LSSQ, and the demographic questionnaire. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure an equal number of scenarios were distributed among each subgroup (e.g., males and females, independent and team sport athletes, etc.). Participants were instructed to read the scenario in their packet while pretending that they were a member of the team coached by the individual described in the scenario, and complete the LBDQ, the three subscales of the LSS, and the A-LSSQ (i.e., in this order), rating the behaviors that the participants would prefer to see from their athlete leader based on how the coach in the scenario behaved. Instructions were written at the top of each questionnaire to remind participants how to complete the questionnaires. After participants finished filling out their responses, they completed the demographic questionnaire, were debriefed and then released.

For their participation, coaches and athletes were provided with results from the study. Athletes were informed that results would be anonymous to individuals and that teams would be able to view their individual team’s perception of effective athlete leadership and each team’s collective perception of effective athlete leadership.

Data Analyses

In order to test for differences between the scenarios in the pilot study, a Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted along with measures of effect size (Cohen, 1988) for the independent variable of scenario (i.e., task-oriented coach [TOC], relationship-
oriented coach [ROC], and task/relationship-oriented coach [TROC]) and the 4 dependent measures that participants used to report about the behaviors that the various coaches displayed in the scenarios (i.e., the Initiating Structure and Consideration scales of the LBDQ and the Autocratic and Democratic scales of the LSS). In addition, follow-up Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) were conducted for the variable of scenario and each dependent measure. Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses were conducted for significant ANOVAs so that mean differences could be identified within each dependent measure.

For the main study, the 19 dependent measures were grouped into 4 conceptual categories that included performance/task (7 measures: Performance-Execution [A-LSSQ], Training & Instruction [LSS], Initiating Structure, Tolerance of Uncertainty, Tolerance and Freedom, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy [LBDQ]; leader involved with optimizing performance, structure, and decisions of team), relationship (5 measures: Motivational-Interpersonal [A-LSSQ], Social Support [LSS], Consideration, Demand Reconciliation, Integration [LBDQ]; leader displays concern for welfare of teammates and works to reduce conflict), motivation (3 measures: Negative Tactics [A-LSSQ], Positive Feedback [LSS], Persuasiveness [LBDQ]; leader provides motivation for actions of team), and representation (4 measures: Respect-Communication [A-LSSQ], Representation, Role Assumption, Superior Orientation [LBDQ]; leader displays behaviors showing to others that he/she is the leader). For hypotheses measuring the independent variables of coach scenario (TOC, ROC, TROC, control), gender, and sport type (independent, interdependent), 4X2X2 MANOVAs were implemented for each of the 4 conceptual groups. Follow-up ANOVAs for each of the dependent measures, measures of effect size, and Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses also were conducted. For all MANOVAs and ANOVAs for the study, an alpha level of $p < .01$ was used due to multiple
comparisons. After the analyses of the initial hypotheses showed that the coach scenarios had little-to-no impact on attitudes towards athlete leader behaviors, it was hypothesized that the style of athletes’ current coaches may have a greater influence. Therefore, hypotheses were re-analyzed with the coaching style variable replacing the coach scenario variable. 3X2X2 MANOVAs were conducted for the re-analysis of the hypotheses measuring coaching style (autocratic, democratic, combination), gender, and sport type, for each of the 4 conceptual groups of dependent variables. In addition, follow-up ANOVAs for each dependent measure, measures of effect size, and Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses were utilized.

Exploratory MANOVAs, follow-up ANOVAs, Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses (i.e., when appropriate), and measures of effect size were conducted for additional variables as measured by each conceptual dependent measure group. For the leadership position variable, 3X2X2 MANOVAs were conducted with gender and sport type. The class variable was condensed from 4 levels (i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) to 2 levels (i.e., underclassmen: freshman/sophomore; upperclassmen: junior/senior) so that adequate sample sizes could be created for analyses. Four 2X2X2 MANOVAs were conducted for each conceptual group with the condensed class variable, gender, and sport type. The years-played variable was grouped into experienced (i.e., played 1-8 years) and expert (i.e., played 9-22 years) and sample size allowed for 2X2X2 MANOVAs to be conducted with sport type and gender. The participation level variable (i.e., starter, substitute, survivor) was collapsed into starters ($n = 221$) and non-starters ($n = 121$) so that adequate sample sizes could be compared. The leader selection preference (i.e., elected, appointed, emergent) did not yield adequate sample sizes for interaction effect analyses with other independent variables such as gender and sport type, thus main effects for the 4 conceptual groups were examined only.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Pilot Study

Each evaluation of the scenarios was considered to be an independent data point so that a between-subjects design could be employed and each scenario could be compared independently. The MANOVA for the 3 scenarios on the Initiating Structure and Consideration scales of the LBDQ and the Autocratic and Democratic scales of the LSS was significant, Wilks’s lambda = \( F(8, 82) = 14.5, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .586 \). ANOVAs revealed significant differences by scenario on Initiating Structure, \( F(2, 44) = 10.6, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .324 \), Consideration, \( F(2, 44) = 54.5, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .712 \), Autocratic behaviors, \( F(2, 44) = 26.9, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .550 \), and Democratic behaviors, \( F(2, 44) = 77.5, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .779 \) (i.e., see Table 3).

Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses showed that for Initiating Structure, the TOC (\( M = 4.54, SD = .534 \)) was rated as engaging in significantly more initiating structure behaviors than both the ROC (\( M = 3.84, SD = .501, d = -1.35 \)) and the TROC (\( M = 3.91, SD = .335, d = -1.42 \)), who were not significantly different from each other. For Consideration, the TOC (\( M = 2.43, SD = .639 \)) was seen to be engaging in significantly fewer consideration behaviors than both the ROC (\( M = 4.11, SD = .392, d = 3.22 \)) and the TROC (\( M = 3.87, SD = .395, d = 2.71 \)), who did not significantly differ from one another. For Autocratic behaviors, the TOC (\( M = 3.77, SD = .788 \)) scored significantly higher than both the ROC (\( M = 2.26, SD = .647, d = -2.11 \)) and the TROC (\( M = 2.29, SD = .488, d = -2.26 \)), who did not differ significantly from one another. For Democratic behaviors, the TOC (\( M = 1.99, SD = .597 \)) was perceived as displaying fewer behaviors than both the ROC (\( M = 4.16, SD = .386, d = 4.38 \)) and the TROC (\( M = 3.63, SD = .532, d = 2.29 \)). The ROC scored significantly higher than the TROC (\( d = 1.15 \)).
Overall, results of the pilot study supported the proposed hypotheses. The TOC and the ROC were rated as significantly different from each other on each of the 4 scales with the TOC being perceived as engaging in more autocratic/task behaviors and fewer democratic/consideration behaviors than the ROC. The TROC also was found to be significantly different from the TOC on all 4 scales identically to how the TOC and the ROC differed. In addition, the TROC was significantly different from the ROC on the Democratic Scale of the LSS. These results suggest that valid differences existed between scenarios so no changes were made to the coach vignettes.

Main Study

Overall, 92 participants were given the no scenario control (males, \( n = 51 \), females, \( n = 41 \); independent sport, \( n = 40 \), interdependent sport, \( n = 52 \)), 85 participants read the task-oriented coach scenario (males, \( n = 49 \), females, \( n = 36 \); independent, \( n = 37 \), interdependent, \( n = 50 \)), 92 participants read the relationship-oriented coach scenario (males, \( n = 48 \), females, \( n = 44 \); independent, \( n = 44 \), interdependent, \( n = 48 \)), and 82 participants read the task/relationship-coach scenario (males, \( n = 38 \), females, \( n = 44 \); independent, \( n = 38 \), interdependent, \( n = 44 \)).

Hypotheses 1 and 2 predicted that a two-way interaction would be found with the independent variables of coach scenario (task-oriented, relationship-oriented, task/relationship-oriented, and control) and gender on the performance/task, relationship, and motivation conceptual groups of dependent variables and Hypothesis 3 and 4 predicted that a two-way interaction would be found between the coach scenario variable and sport type (i.e., independent, interdependent) for the 3 dependent measure groups. Hypothesis 5 predicted that differences would be found between genders and sport types on the representation dependent variables. Again, based on coaching
leadership studies, past research did not suggest three-way interactions would be found although analyses tested for the presence of triple interactions.

For the performance/task measures, there were no interaction effects between coach scenario, gender and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(21, 945)= 1.00, p > .827, \eta_p^2 = .008$, between coach scenario and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(21, 945)= .662, p > .872, \eta_p^2 = .014$, and between coach scenario and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(21, 945)= .542, p > .954, \eta_p^2 = .011$. An interaction between gender and sport type was supported, Wilks’s lambda= $F(7, 329)= 3.24, p < .002, \eta_p^2 = .064$. Although, no main effect was found for scenarios, Wilks’s lambda= $F(21, 945)= 1.10, p > .339, \eta_p^2 = .023$, main effects for gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(7, 329)= 3.43, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .068$ and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(7, 329)= 10.6, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .184$, were discovered. See Tables 4, 5, and 6 for a summary of significant effects involving gender and sport type.

Follow-up ANOVAs for the sport type/gender interaction showed no differences on Performance-Execution, $F(1, 335)= 1.40, p > .238, \eta_p^2 = .004$, Training and Instruction, $F(1, 335)= .101, p > .751, \eta_p^2 = .000$, Initiating Structure, $F(1, 335)= .630, p > .428, \eta_p^2 = .002$, Tolerance and Freedom, $F(1, 335)= .357, p > .551, \eta_p^2 = .001$, Production Emphasis, $F(1, 335)= 1.25, p > .264, \eta_p^2 = .004$, and Predictive Accuracy, $F(1, 335)= .220, p > .639, \eta_p^2 = .001$. A significant effect was found for Tolerance of Uncertainty $F(1, 335)= 17.1, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .049$. Follow-up ANOVAs for gender revealed no differences on Performance-Execution, $F(1, 335)= .014, p > .905, \eta_p^2 = .000$, Training and Instruction, $F(1, 335)= .558, p > .455, \eta_p^2 = .002$, Production Emphasis, $F(1, 335)= .790, p > .375, \eta_p^2 = .002$, and Predictive Accuracy $F(1, 335)= 2.14, p > .145, \eta_p^2 = .006$. Significant differences were found on Initiating Structure, $F(1, 335)= 7.63, p < .006, \eta_p^2 = .022$, Tolerance of Uncertainty, $F(1, 335)= 12.0, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .035$, and
Tolerance and Freedom, $F(1, 335)= 11.6, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .034$. Follow-up ANOVAs for sport type showed no differences on Training and Instruction, $F(1, 335)= .061, p > .805, \eta_p^2 = .000$, Initiating Structure, $F(1, 335)= .264, p > .608, \eta_p^2 = .001$, Tolerance of Uncertainty, $F(1, 335)= 2.53, p > .113, \eta_p^2 = .007$, Tolerance and Freedom, $F(1, 335)= 1.39, p > .239, \eta_p^2 = .004$, and Predictive Accuracy, $F(1, 335)= .102, p > .749, \eta_p^2 = .000$. Significant differences were found on Performance-Execution, $F(1, 335)= 12.1, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .035$, and Production Emphasis, $F(1, 335)= 37.0, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .099$.

Post-hoc analyses were conducted for significant effects for the interaction between gender and sport type and for main effects of gender and sport type. For the interaction effect, male team sport athletes ($M = 3.57, SD = .429$) were found to prefer significantly less tolerance of uncertainty behaviors from athlete leaders than female individual sport athletes ($M = 3.82, SD = .465, d = -.562$), male individual sport athletes ($M = 3.85, SD = .471, d = -.629$), and female team sport athletes ($M = 3.94, SD = .410, d = -.878$), who did not significantly differ from each other. This suggests that male team sport athletes would prefer athlete leaders to exhibit less patience awaiting decisions and the outcome of uncertainties than male individual sport, female individual sport, and female team sport athletes. For gender, females were found to prefer more initiating structure ($M = 3.81, SD = .469$), and tolerance and freedom ($M = 3.61, SD = .398$) behaviors from athlete leaders than males (IS, $M = 3.67, SD = .498, d = -.289$; TF, $M = 3.46, SD = .425, d = -.364$). These results suggest that females prefer athlete leaders to have more of an impact on defining team roles and to encourage input from teammates regarding decisions about team and personal performance than males. For sport type, interdependent sport athletes were found to prefer more performance-execution ($M = 4.12, SD = .377$) and production emphasis ($M = 4.02, SD = .471$) behaviors from athlete leaders than independent sport athletes (PeE, $M =$
3.98, $SD = .500, d = .320$; PrE, $M = 3.74, SD = .457, d = .602$), suggesting interdependent sport athletes would like athlete leaders to perform at a high level, actively influence the performance of teammates, and apply pressure when needed to elevate the performance of teammates more so than independent sport athletes.

For the relationship dependent variables, there were no interaction effects between coach scenario, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda$= F(15, 914)= 1.33, p > .179, \eta_p^2 = .020$, between coach scenario and gender, Wilks’s lambda$= F(15, 914)= .597, p > .879, \eta_p^2 = .009$, between coach scenario and sport type, Wilks’s lambda$= F(15, 914)= 1.94, p > .017, \eta_p^2 = .028$, and between gender and sport type, Wilks’s lambda$= F(5, 331)= 2.81, p > .017, \eta_p^2 = .041$. No main effect was supported for coach scenario, Wilks’s lambda$= F(15, 914)= 1.23, p > .239, \eta_p^2 = .018$, and main effects for gender, Wilks’s lambda$= F(5, 331)= 10.8, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .140$, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda$= F(5, 331)= 4.16, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .059$, were found.

Follow-up ANOVAs for gender, showed no significant effects on Demand Reconciliation, $F(1, 335)= 3.14, p > .077, \eta_p^2 = .009$, Motivational-Interpersonal, $F(1, 335)= 6.24, p > .013, \eta_p^2 = .018$, and Social Support, $F(1, 335)= 4.08, p > .044, \eta_p^2 = .012$. Significant effects were found for Consideration, $F(1, 335)= 47.0, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .123$, and Integration, $F(1, 335)= 9.15, p < .003, \eta_p^2 = .027$. For sport type, no effects were discovered for Motivational-Interpersonal, $F(1, 335)= 3.55, p > .060, \eta_p^2 = .010$, Consideration, $F(1, 335)= 6.04, p > .014, \eta_p^2 = .018$, and Demand Reconciliation, $F(1, 335)= 3.06, p > .081, \eta_p^2 = .009$. Significant effects were found, however, for Social Support, $F(1, 335)= 7.91, p < .005, \eta_p^2 = .023$, and Integration, $F(1, 335)= 18.2, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .052$.

Post-hoc analyses were conducted for significant effects for both gender and sport type. For gender, females were found to prefer more consideration ($M = 4.21, SD = .421$), and
integration ($M = 4.26$, $SD = .476$) behaviors from athlete leaders than males ($Con$, $M = 3.90$, $SD = .460$, $d = .439$; $IN$, $M = 4.14$, $SD = .550$, $d = .364$). These results suggest that females prefer athlete leaders who show more concern for the welfare of teammates, consistently resolve conflicts, and are an emotional support to teammates more so than males. For sport type, interdependent sport athletes were found to prefer more social support ($M = 3.42$, $SD = .525$), and integration ($M = 4.29$, $SD = .477$) behaviors from athlete leaders than independent sport athletes ($SS$, $M = 3.28$, $SD = .537$, $d = .320$; $IN$, $M = 4.09$, $SD = .548$, $d = .602$), suggesting interdependent sport athletes would like athlete leaders to provide more emotional support, be more considerate, and actively resolve conflict than independent sport athletes.

A 4X2X2 MANOVA was conducted for the motivation group of dependent variables and no effects were found between coach scenario and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(9, 811) = 1.08$, $p > .373$, $\eta^2_p = .010$, between coach scenario and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(9, 811) = 1.75$, $p > .074$, $\eta^2_p = .015$, between sport type and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 333) = .663$, $p > .575$, $\eta^2_p = .006$, and for coach scenario, Wilks’s lambda= $F(9, 811) = .886$, $p > .537$, $\eta^2_p = .008$. A significant 3-way interaction was discovered between coach scenario, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(9, 811) = 2.85$, $p < .003$, $\eta^2_p = .025$, in addition to main effects for gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 333) = 6.81$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .058$, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 333) = 8.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .072$.

Follow-up ANOVAs for the 3-way interaction found non-significant effects for Persuasiveness, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 335) = 1.45$, $p > .229$, $\eta^2_p = .013$, and for Positive Feedback, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 335) = 3.19$, $p > .024$, $\eta^2_p = .028$. A significant effect was discovered for Negative Tactics, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 335) = 4.74$, $p < .003$, $\eta^2_p = .041$. For gender, Persuasiveness again was non-significant, Wilks’s lambda= $F(1, 335) = 2.46$, $p > .118,
\( \eta_p^2 = .007 \), but significant effects were found for Negative Tactics, \( F(1, 335) = 9.30, p < .002 \), \( \eta_p^2 = .027 \), and Positive Feedback, \( F(1, 335) = 9.11, p < .003, \eta_p^2 = .026 \). For sport type, no effects were found for Persuasiveness, \( F(1, 335) = .253, p > .615, \eta_p^2 = .001 \), and Positive Feedback, \( F(1, 335) = .399, p > .528, \eta_p^2 = .001 \). A significant effect was discovered for Negative Tactics, \( F(1, 335) = 24.9, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .069 \).

Post-hoc analyses for the 3-way effect showed that several significant differences existed between groups for Negative Tactics. Specifically, male, team sport, control group athletes (\( M = 2.90, SD = .777 \)) preferred significantly more negative tactics from athlete leaders than female, individual sport, control group athletes (\( M = 1.96, SD = .609, d = 1.31 \)), female, individual sport, task scenario group athletes (\( M = 2.04, SD = .883, d = 1.05 \)), female, individual sport, relationship scenario group athletes (\( M = 1.82, SD = .606, d = 1.52 \)), and female, team sport, task/relationship scenario group athletes (\( M = 2.03, SD = .612, d = 1.21 \)). Female, individual sport, relationship scenario group athletes (\( M = 1.82, SD = .606 \)) also preferred significantly less negative tactics from athlete leaders than male, team sport, relationship scenario group athletes (\( M = 2.79, SD = .779, d = -1.38 \)), and male, team sport, task/relationship coach scenario group athletes (\( M = 2.81, SD = .725, d = -1.48 \)). The significant differences displayed via the 3-way effect showed that the different scenarios had little impact; instead, the gender and sport type variables seemed to be representing the majority of the significance discovered. For example, the male, team sport, control (i.e., no scenario) group displayed the majority of differences with groups with a constant gender (i.e., female), and sport type (i.e., individual). In fact, 3 of the 4 groups that the male, team sport, control group differed from were female, individual sport type groups and the scenario group simply changed (i.e., control, task, relationship), thus showing little impact from the scenario variable. Due to the small impact of scenarios, the significant
main effects for gender and sport type on the Negative Tactics scale were included in this section.

Analyzing gender showed that males preferred more negative tactics ($M = 2.53, SD = .786$) and less positive feedback ($M = 3.88, SD = .580$) from athlete leaders than females (NT, $M = 2.20, SD = .812, d = .414$; PF, $M = 4.08, SD = .572, d = -.347$). These results suggest that males and females differ regarding the amount of both positive and negative reinforcement that they would like to receive from athlete leaders. Males seem to tolerate negative reinforcement and the encouragement of negative tactics by athlete leaders more so than females and females seem to prefer larger amounts of positive reinforcement from athlete leaders than do males. For sport type, interdependent sport athletes preferred significantly more negative tactics ($M = 2.58, SD = .820$) from athlete leaders than independent sport athletes ($M = 2.13, SD = .738, d = .574$), showing that athletes in traditionally team sports accept higher amounts of negative tactics from athlete leaders than those in individual sports.

Finally, for the representation group of dependent variables, a 4X2X2 MANOVA yielded non-significant effects for the interaction of coach scenario, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(12, 879)= .710, p > .743, \eta^2_p = .008$, for coach scenario and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(12, 879)= .832, p > .618, \eta^2_p = .010$, for coach scenario and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(12, 879)= 1.72, p > .058, \eta^2_p = .020$, for sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 332)= 2.49, p > .047, \eta^2_p = .029$, and for coach scenario, Wilks’s lambda= $F(12, 879)= .954, p > .492, \eta^2_p = .011$. Significant effects were found between gender and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 332)= 3.81, p < .005, \eta^2_p = .044$, and for gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 332)= 4.36, p < .002, \eta^2_p = .050$. 
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Follow-up ANOVAs showed that for the 2-way gender/sport type effect, no significant effects were found for Respect-Communication, $F(1, 335)= 1.90, p > .169, \eta^2_p = .006$, Representation, $F(1, 335)= 3.18, p > .076, \eta^2_p = .009$, and Superior Orientation, $F(1, 335)= 1.80, p > .181, \eta^2_p = .005$. Significant effects were found for Role Assumption, $F(1, 335)= 7.50, p < .006, \eta^2_p = .022$. For the gender main effect, no effects were discovered for Representation, $F(1, 335)= .794, p > .374, \eta^2_p = .002$, Role Assumption, $F(1, 335)= 6.00, p > .015, \eta^2_p = .018$, and Superior Orientation, $F(1, 335)= 3.86, p > .050, \eta^2_p = .011$. Significant effects were found for Respect-Communication, $F(1, 335)= 6.91, p < .009, \eta^2_p = .020$.

Post-hoc analyses for the gender/sport type interaction showed that female team sport athletes ($M = 4.09, SD = .479$) preferred significantly more role assumption behaviors from athlete leaders than female individual sport athletes ($M = 3.79, SD = .555, d = .575$), male individual sport athletes, ($M = 3.82, SD = .464, d = .572$), and male team sport athletes ($M = 3.81, SD = .508, d = .564$), who did not significantly differ from each other. These results suggest that female team sport athletes prefer that leaders take the lead and behave in a manner that lets others know that he/she is the leader more so than female individual, and male individual and team sport athletes. Results for gender showed that females preferred more respect-communication ($M = 4.61, SD = .505$) behaviors from athlete leaders than males ($M = 4.49, SD = .490, d = .241$). These results suggest that females, more so than males, would like to see athlete leaders acting in a way that shows to others that they are the leader more so than males.

Re-Analysis of Hypotheses

After a majority of non-significant interaction results for hypotheses were obtained and the coach scenario variable failed to produce significant main effects in any of the 4 dependent
measure groups, the influence of the styles of the athletes’ current coaches was tested to determine its potential impact on athlete leader preferences. Therefore, hypotheses were re-analyzed with the coaching style variable replacing the coach scenario variable. Findings involving the implicit leadership theory (Lord, Binning, Rush, & Thomas, 1978; Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1984; Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1986) support this hypothesis/re-analysis as followers are believed to have an internal framework for how they would prefer leaders behave. For example, Kenney, Schwartz-Kenney, and Blascovich (1996) found that participants could generate behaviors that composed 14 different basic-level categories of leadership behaviors. In addition, to ensure participants were not presented with a scenario whose coach’s style matched the style of their current coach, an analysis was conducted and results showed that 68.4% of participants read about a different style than that of their current coach. See Table 7 for a summary of significant main effects for coaching style.

For each dependent measure group (i.e., performance/task, relationship, motivation, and representation), 3X2X2 MANOVAs were conducted for coaching style (autocratically coached [males, n = 38, females, n = 34; independent, n = 42, interdependent, n = 30], democratically coached [males, n = 31, females, n = 41; independent, n = 30, interdependent, n = 42], collaboratively coached athletes [males, n = 116, females, n = 86; independent, n = 84, interdependent, n = 118]), gender, and sport type. The 3-way interaction for the performance/task dependent variables has non-significant, Wilks’s lambda= F(14, 656)= .354, p > .986, ηp² = .007. The interactions between coaching style and gender, Wilks’s lambda= F(14, 656)= .676, p > .799, ηp² = .014, sport type and coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= F(14, 656)= 1.73, p > .046, ηp² = .036, sport type and gender, Wilks’s lambda= F(7, 328)= 2.49, p > .017, ηp² = .050, and the main effect for gender, Wilks’s lambda= F(7, 328)= 2.53, p > .015, ηp² = .051,
and coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= $F(14, 656)= 1.25, p > .237, \eta^2_p = .026$, were non-significant. Significant effects were found for sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(7, 328)= 8.49, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .153$.

Follow-up ANOVAs showed that for the sport type main effect, non-significant differences were found for Performance-Execution, $F(1, 334)= 4.45, p < .036, \eta^2_p = .013$, Training and Instruction, $F(1, 334)= .553, p < .458, \eta^2_p = .002$, Initiating Structure, $F(1, 334)= .339, p < .561, \eta^2_p = .001$, Tolerance of Uncertainty, $F(1, 334)= 3.75, p < .054, \eta^2_p = .011$, Tolerance and Freedom, $F(1, 334)= 3.55, p < .060, \eta^2_p = .011$, and Predictive Accuracy, $F(1, 334)= .738, p < .391, \eta^2_p = .002$. A significant effect was found for Production Emphasis, $F(1, 334)= 22.5, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .063$.

Post-hoc analyses showed that for sport type, interdependent sport athletes ($M = 4.03, SD = .471$) preferred more production emphasis behaviors from athlete leaders than independent sport athletes ($M = 3.74, SD = .449, d = .628$). Specifically, team sport athletes preferred athlete leaders to apply more pressure in order to achieve successful performance more so than individual sport athletes.

For the relationship dependent variables, there were no significant effects for coaching style, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(10, 660)= .712, p > .713, \eta^2_p = .011$, coaching style and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(10, 660)= 1.33, p > .213, \eta^2_p = .020$, sport type and coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= $F(10, 660)= 2.13, p > .020, \eta^2_p = .031$, gender and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(5, 330)= 1.16, p > .329, \eta^2_p = .017$, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(5, 330)= 2.57, p > .027, \eta^2_p = .037$. Significant effects were found for coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= $F(10, 660)= 3.97, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .057$, and for gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(5, 330)= 11.1, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .144$. 
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Follow-up ANOVAs for coaching style revealed non-significant effects for Social Support, \( F(2, 334) = 3.70, p > .026, \eta_p^2 = .022 \), and Demand Reconciliation, \( F(2, 334) = 3.93, p > .021, \eta_p^2 = .023 \). Significant effects were found for Motivational-Interpersonal, \( F(2, 334) = 10.6, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .060 \), Consideration, \( F(2, 334) = 5.35, p < .005, \eta_p^2 = .031 \), and Integration, \( F(2, 334) = 4.94, p < .008, \eta_p^2 = .029 \). For gender, non-significant effects were found for Motivational-Interpersonal, \( F(1, 334) = .810, p > .369, \eta_p^2 = .002 \), Social Support, \( F(1, 334) = 1.78, p > .183, \eta_p^2 = .005 \), and Demand Reconciliation, \( F(1, 334) = 2.85, p > .093, \eta_p^2 = .008 \). Significant effects were found for Consideration, \( F(1, 334) = 45.7, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .120 \), and Integration, \( F(1, 334) = 7.53, p < .006, \eta_p^2 = .022 \).

Post-hoc analyses for coaching style showed that democratically-coached athletes (\( M = 4.06, SD = .439 \)) preferred significantly more motivational-interpersonal behaviors from athlete leaders than collaboratively-coached athletes (\( M = 3.87, SD = .589, d = .343 \)) and autocratically-coached athletes (\( M = 3.63, SD = .623, d = .798 \)). Collaboratively-coached athletes also significantly differed from autocratically-coached athletes (\( d = .401 \)). This finding suggests that coaching style may help predict how much emotional support athletes prefer from athlete leaders, with democratically-coached athletes preferring the most emotional support, followed by collaboratively-coached athletes and then autocratically-coached athletes. For consideration behaviors, collaboratively-coached athletes (\( M = 4.10, SD = .418 \)) preferred athlete leaders to act more relationally and consider the decisions/feelings of others more than autocratically-coached athletes (\( M = 3.93, SD = .532, d = .377 \)), with no other significant differences being present between groups. For integration behaviors, autocratically-coached athletes (\( M = 4.00, SD = .602 \)) preferred significantly less action from athlete leaders than both democratically-coached athletes (\( M = 4.29, SD = .534, d = -.510 \)) and collaboratively-coached athletes (\( M = 4.24, SD = .
.459, \(d = -.480\), who did not significantly differ from each other, suggesting democratically- and collaboratively-coached athletes would prefer that athlete leaders consistently resolve conflict more often than autocratically-coached athletes. For gender, females were found to prefer significantly more consideration (\(M = 4.22, SD = .414\)) and integration (\(M = 4.27, SD = .466\)) behaviors from athlete leaders than males (Con, \(M = 3.90, SD = .461, d = .728\); Int, \(M = 4.14, SD = .552, d = .253\)), indicating females would prefer that athlete leaders exhibit more warmth and place more effort into continually resolving conflict more often than males.

Regarding the motivation dependent variable group, multivariate analyses showed that significant interactions between sport type, gender, and coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= \(F(6, 664) = .142, p > .991, \eta_p^2 = .001\), between sport type and coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= \(F(6, 664) = .869, p > .517, \eta_p^2 = .008\), between gender and coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= \(F(6, 664) = 1.39, p > .218, \eta_p^2 = .012\), between sport type and gender, Wilks’s lambda= \(F(3, 332) = .623, p > .600, \eta_p^2 = .006\), nor main effects for gender, Wilks’s lambda= \(F(3, 332) = 3.32, p < .020, \eta_p^2 = .029\). Significant main effects were found for coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= \(F(6, 664) = 3.12, p < .005, \eta_p^2 = .027\), and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \(F(3, 332) = 9.03, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .075\).

Follow-up ANOVAs for coaching style showed non-significant differences for Negative Tactics, \(F(2, 334) = .557, p > .573, \eta_p^2 = .003\), and Persuasiveness, \(F(2, 334) = .772, p > .463, \eta_p^2 = .005\). A significant effect, however, was found for Positive Feedback, \(F(2, 334) = 8.97, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .051\). For sport type, non-significant differences were found for Positive Feedback, \(F(1, 334) = 3.75, p > .054, \eta_p^2 = .011\), and Persuasiveness, \(F(1, 334) = 2.12, p > .147, \eta_p^2 = .006\). A significant effect was found for Negative Tactics, \(F(1, 334) = 20.8, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .059\).
Post-hoc analyses for coaching style showed that autocratically-coached athletes ($M = 3.78, SD = .621$) preferred significantly less positive feedback behaviors from athlete leaders than both democratically-coached athletes ($M = 4.15, SD = .569, d = -.621$) and collaboratively-coached athletes ($M = 3.98, SD = .562, d = -.346$), who did not significantly differ from each other. This finding suggests that autocratically-coached athletes require less positive reinforcement from athlete leaders than more democratically-coached athletes, perhaps because autocratically-coached athletes are used to not receiving positive-feedback from their coach, thus they do not expect positive feedback behaviors from athlete leaders. Regarding sport type, interdependent sport athletes ($M = 2.59, SD = .814$) were found to prefer significantly more negative tactic behaviors from athlete leaders than independent sport athletes ($M = 2.15, SD = .736, d = .564$), indicating team sport athletes tolerate the use of more negative tactics (e.g., cheating, intimidation, and open confrontation) from athlete leaders than individual sport athletes.

Finally, for the representation dependent variables, non-significant multivariate effects were found between coaching style, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 662)= 1.32, p > .233, \eta_p^2=.016$, between coaching style and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 662)= 1.54, p > .140, \eta_p^2=.018$, between coaching style and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 662)= 1.08, p > .373, \eta_p^2=.013$, and between sport type and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 331)= 2.11, p > .079, \eta_p^2=.025$. Significant main effects were found for coaching style, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 662)= 3.63, p < .001, \eta_p^2=.042$, gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 331)= 3.69, p < .006, \eta_p^2=.043$, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 331)= 3.59, p < .007, \eta_p^2=.042$.

Follow-up ANOVAs for coaching style showed no significant differences for Representation, $F(2, 334)= 2.93, p > .055, \eta_p^2=.017$, and for Role Assumption, $F(2, 334)= 4.19,
$p > .016$, $\eta_p^2 = .024$. Significant effects, however, were found for Respect-Communication, $F(2, 334) = 4.63, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .027$, and Superior Orientation, $F(2, 334) = 7.33, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .042$. For gender, non-significant effects were found for Respect-Communication, $F(1, 334) = 3.83, p > .051, \eta_p^2 = .011$, Representation, $F(1, 334) = 1.48, p > .224, \eta_p^2 = .004$, and Superior Orientation, $F(1, 334) = 1.43, p > .223, \eta_p^2 = .004$. A significant effect was found for Role Assumption, $F(1, 334) = 7.58, p < .006, \eta_p^2 = .022$. For sport type, significant effects were not present for Respect-Communication, $F(1, 334) = 1.02, p > .313, \eta_p^2 = .003$, Representation, $F(1, 334) = 3.95, p > .048, \eta_p^2 = .012$, and Superior Orientation, $F(1, 334) = .790, p > .375, \eta_p^2 = .002$. A significant effect, however, was found for Role Assumption, $F(1, 334) = 7.80, p < .006, \eta_p^2 = .023$.

Post-hoc analyses for coaching style showed that autocratically-coached athletes (RC, $M = 4.40, SD = .586$; SO, $M = 3.69, SD = .541$) preferred less respect-communication and superior orientation behaviors from athlete leaders than both democratically-coached (RC, $M = 4.66, SD = .406, d = -.516$; SO, $M = 3.97, SD = .405, d = -.586$) and collaboratively-coached athletes (RC, $M = 4.56, SD = .489, d = -.318$; SO, $M = 3.87, SD = .444, d = -.382$), who did not significantly differ from each other. This finding suggests that autocratically-coached athletes prefer athlete leaders to communicate, act appropriately, and appear to strive toward coaching less than more democratically-coached athletes. For gender and sport type, females ($M = 3.94, SD = .537$) and interdependent sport athletes ($M = 3.92, SD = .518$) were found to prefer more role assumption behaviors from athlete leaders than males ($M = 3.81, SD = .492, d = .253$) and independent sport athletes ($M = 3.81, SD = .510, d = .214$), respectively, suggesting females and members of team sports would like athlete leaders to actively act as the leader and not relinquish leadership responsibilities more often than males and individual sport athletes.
Replacing the coach scenario variable with the coaching style variable yielded a higher number of significant main effects for the conceptual category of coaching style. It seems the influence of the style of athletes’ current coaches holds more meaning and therefore may have impacted how well athletes could imagine being coached with a different style (i.e., via the scenarios). Overall patterns continued to emerge in that females and interdependent sport athletes seem to prefer more action from athlete leaders than males or independent sport athletes.

Exploratory Analyses

Exploratory analyses were conducted to examine the impact of other independent variables for which data was gathered (i.e., class [underclassmen, upperclassmen], leadership position [leader, model, follower]), years played given sport, participation level [starter, substitute, survivor], and preferred mode of leader selection [elected, appointed, emergent], on the 4 dependent measure groups (i.e., performance/task, relationship, motivation, representation). It should be noted that race/ethnicity could not be analyzed because only 57 people identified with a race/ethnicity other than Caucasian. This imbalance prevented adequate comparisons from being made. For each subsequent analysis, the results for the interaction between gender and sport type and the main effects of these variables will not be reported in the exploratory analyses section because they have been previously reported.

For the performance/task dependent variables with the variable of class, non-significant results were found between class, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= F(7, 337)= .279, \( p > .962, \eta_p^2= .006 \), between class and gender, Wilks’s lambda= F(7, 337)= .753, \( p > .627, \eta_p^2= .015 \), between class and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= F(7, 337)= 1.06, \( p > .390, \eta_p^2= .022 \), and for class, Wilks’s lambda= F(7, 337)= 2.18, \( p > .036, \eta_p^2= .043 \). For the relationship group, non-significant differences also were found between class, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= 
For the motivation dependent variables, there were no significant effects for class, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 341)= .609, p > .609, \eta_p^2 = .005$, class and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 341)= .514, p > .673, \eta_p^2 = .005$, class and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 341)= .172, p > .915, \eta_p^2 = .002$, and for the main effect of class, Wilks’s lambda= $F(3, 341)= .984, p > .400, \eta_p^2 = .009$. Finally for the representation group, non-significant effects again were found between class, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 340)= .632, p > .640, \eta_p^2 = .007$, between class and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 340)= .585, p > .674, \eta_p^2 = .007$, between class and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 340)= .364, p > .834, \eta_p^2 = .004$, and for class, Wilks’s lambda= $F(4, 340)= 1.42, p > .226, \eta_p^2 = .016$. Overall, the results for class suggest that an athlete’s year in school has little-to-no effect on preferences for athlete leader behaviors.

Participants had the choice of 6 leadership positions in which to describe themselves. For the analysis, the “other” ($n = 11$) category was dropped, as a leadership position could not be defined with this descriptor. The categories of elected captain ($n = 26$), appointed leader ($n = 7$), and vocal/emotional leader ($n = 63$) were collapsed to form a category of Leader, as participants in this category had others recognize their leadership abilities or displayed the vocal element necessary for strong leadership. Leader was separated from Model, which was composed of participants who identified with the “lead by example” descriptor. Finally, a Follower category was developed from participants who marked “hold no leadership position” as the descriptor best describing their leadership position. This resulted in the creation of three distinct categories for
analysis: *Leader* \( (n = 96) \), *Model* \( (n = 111) \), and *Follower* \( (n = 123) \). The leadership position variable was analyzed with gender and sport type for each of the 4 dependent measure groups. See Table 8 for a summary of significant results.

For the *performance/task* dependent variables, non-significant effects were found for the leadership position, gender, by sport type interaction, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(14, 624)= .806, p > .664, \eta_p^2 = .018 \), the leadership position by gender interaction, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(14, 624)= .632, p > .839, \eta_p^2 = .014 \), and the leadership position by sport type interaction Wilks’s lambda= \( F(14, 624)= 1.19, p > .282, \eta_p^2 = .026 \). A significant effect was discovered for leadership position, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(14, 624)= 2.10, p < .01, \eta_p^2 = .045 \). Follow-up ANOVAs showed non-significant effects for Training and Instruction, \( F(2, 318)= 3.51, p > .031, \eta_p^2 = .022 \), Tolerance of Uncertainty, \( F(2, 318)= 1.66, p > .192, \eta_p^2 = .010 \), Initiating Structure, \( F(2, 318)= 3.14, p > .045, \eta_p^2 = .019 \), Tolerance and Freedom, \( F(2, 318)= .836, p > .434, \eta_p^2 = .005 \), Production Emphasis, \( F(2, 318)= 3.88, p > .022, \eta_p^2 = .024 \), and Predictive Accuracy, \( F(2, 318)= .102, p > .903, \eta_p^2 = .001 \). A significant effect was found for Performance-Execution, \( F(2, 318)= 5.43, p < .005, \eta_p^2 = .033 \).

Post-hoc analyses showed that leaders \((M = 4.19, SD = .393)\) preferred significantly more performance-execution behaviors from athlete leaders than followers \((M = 3.96, SD = .490, d = .489)\). Models \((M = 4.06, SD = .406)\) did not significantly differ from either group. This finding suggests that leaders prefer athlete leaders to show a higher level of physical ability than do followers.

Similar to the *performance/task* dependent variables, the *relationship* dependent variables produced non-significant effects between leadership position, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(10, 628)= .408, p > .943, \eta_p^2 = .006 \), leadership position and gender, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(2, 318)= .836, p > .434, \eta_p^2 = .005 \), and leadership position and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(2, 318)= 1.66, p > .192, \eta_p^2 = .010 \).
$F(10, 628)= .484, p > .901, \eta^2_p = .008$, and leadership position and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(10, 628)= .428, p > .933, \eta^2_p = .007$. A significant effect was found for leadership position, Wilks’s lambda= $F(10, 628)= 2.31, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .035$. Follow-up ANOVAs showed non-significant effects for Motivational-Interpersonal, $F(2, 318)= .891, p > .411, \eta^2_p = .006$, Social Support, $F(2, 318)= 2.73, p > .067, \eta^2_p = .017$, Consideration, $F(2, 318)= 3.47, p > .032, \eta^2_p = .021$, and Demand Reconciliation, $F(2, 318)= 1.81, p > .166, \eta^2_p = .011$. A significant effect was found for Integration, $F(2, 318)= 7.15, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .043$.

Tukey HSD post-hoc analyses showed that followers ($M = 4.05, SD = .555$) preferred significantly less integration behaviors from athlete leaders than both leaders ($M = 4.30, SD = .465, d = -.483$) and models ($M = 4.30, SD = .470, d = -.484$), who did not significantly differ from each other. This finding indicates that followers prefer that athlete leaders spend less energy in consistently resolving conflict than both leaders and models.

The representation group of dependent variables also produced non-significant interaction effects between leadership position, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 630)= .640, p > .745, \eta^2_p = .008$, leadership position and gender, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 630)= 1.32, p > .232, \eta^2_p = .016$, and leadership position and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 630)= .844, p > .564, \eta^2_p = .011$. There was, however, a significant main effect for leadership position, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 630)= 2.52, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .031$. Follow-up ANOVAs showed no significant differences for Representation, $F(2, 318)= 1.96, p > .143, \eta^2_p = .012$, Role Assumption, $F(2, 318)= 2.70, p > .069, \eta^2_p = .017$, and Superior Orientation, $F(2, 318)= 3.95, p > .020, \eta^2_p = .024$. A significant effect was found for Respect-Communication, $F(2, 318)= 6.41, p < .002, \eta^2_p = .039$, with post-hoc analyses showing followers ($M = 4.40, SD = .578$) preferred significantly less respect-communication behaviors than both leaders ($M = 4.71, SD = .360, d =
and models ($M = 4.56, SD = .470, d = -.302$), who did not significantly differ from each other. This finding suggests that both leaders and models would prefer athlete leaders to communicate and act in a respectful manner more often than do followers.

For the motivation dependent variables, there were no significant interaction effects between leadership position, gender, and sport type, Wilks's lambda $= F(6, 632) = .499, p > .809, \eta^2_p = .005$, leadership position and gender, Wilks’s lambda $= F(6, 632) = 1.41, p > .210, \eta^2_p = .013$, and leadership position and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(6, 632) = 1.70, p > .119, \eta^2_p = .016$, and non-significant main effects for leadership position, Wilks’s lambda $= F(6, 632) = 1.55, p > .159, \eta^2_p = .015$.

Overall, analyses of leadership position yielded no interaction effects. Main effects showed that leaders and models preferred more action from athlete leaders than followers, perhaps reflecting a higher mental and emotional investment of energy by leaders and models versus followers. This notion will be further explored in the discussion section.

The Years Played variable was divided into halves for the purpose of creating comparable sample sizes in order to conduct analyses with gender and sport type. The range of years played varied from 1 to 22 years. Those participating in 1-8 years of their sport comprised the experienced group ($n = 160$), and those participating in their sport for 9-22 years composed the expert group ($n = 187$).

For the performance/task dependent variables, significant differences were not found between years played, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(7, 333) = 1.12, p > .352, \eta^2_p = .023$, years played and gender, Wilks’s lambda $= F(7, 333) = .703, p > .670, \eta^2_p = .015$, years played and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(7, 333) = .757, p > .624, \eta^2_p = .016$, and for years played, Wilks’s lambda $= F(7, 333) = .642, p > .721, \eta^2_p = .013$. For the relationship dependent
variables, there were no significant differences between years played, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(5, 335) = 2.42, p > .035, \eta_p^2 = .035 \), years played and gender, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(5, 335) = .701, p > .623, \eta_p^2 = .010 \), years played and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(5, 335) = 1.37, p > .235, \eta_p^2 = .020 \), and for years played, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(5, 335) = 2.85, p > .015, \eta_p^2 = .041 \). For the motivation dependent variables, non-significant effects were discovered for years played, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(3, 337) = 2.06, p > .105, \eta_p^2 = .018 \), for years played and gender, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(3, 337) = .700, p > .553, \eta_p^2 = .006 \), for years played and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(3, 337) = .837, p > .474, \eta_p^2 = .007 \), and for years played, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(3, 337) = 3.22, p > .023, \eta_p^2 = .028 \). Finally for the representation dependent variables, there were no significant effects between years played, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(4, 336) = 2.68, p > .032, \eta_p^2 = .031 \), years played and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(4, 336) = 2.54, p > .040, \eta_p^2 = .029 \), years played and gender, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(4, 336) = 2.01, p > .092, \eta_p^2 = .023 \), and for years played, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(4, 336) = .871, p > .482, \eta_p^2 = .010 \). The multiple non-significant effects for the years played variable showed that athletes with varying levels of experience most likely prefer similar amounts of athlete leader behaviors.

Participation level referred to the starter, substitute, and survivor distinctions described in the method section. Starters (\( n = 221 \)) were compared against non-starters (\( n = 121 \)) so that adequate sample size could be obtained to compare the participation level variable with gender and sport type. For performance/task dependent variables, non-significant effects were found between participation level, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(7, 328) = .416, p > .892, \eta_p^2 = .009 \), participation level and gender, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(7, 328) = .581, p > .772, \eta_p^2 = .012 \), participation level and sport type, Wilks’s lambda= \( F(7, 328) = 1.86, p > .075, \eta_p^2 = .038 \), and for
participation level, Wilks’s lambda $= F(7, 328)= .985, p > .442, \eta^2_p = .021$. For relationship dependent variables, non-significant effects also were found for each MANOVA: between participation level, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(5, 330)= .891, p > .487, \eta^2_p = .013$, between participation level and gender, Wilks’s lambda $= F(5, 330)= 1.17, p > .326, \eta^2_p = .017$, between participation level and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(5, 330)= 1.17, p > .323, \eta^2_p = .017$, and for participation level, Wilks’s lambda $= F(5, 330)= 1.58, p > .166, \eta^2_p = .023$.

For the motivation dependent variables, non-significant effects were found between participation level, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(3, 332)= .633, p > .594, \eta^2_p = .006$, participation level and gender, Wilks’s lambda $= F(3, 332)= .093, p > .964, \eta^2_p = .001$, participation level and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(3, 332)= 1.76, p > .156, \eta^2_p = .016$, and for participation level, Wilks’s lambda $= F(3, 332)= 1.27, p > .284, \eta^2_p = .011$. Finally for the representation dependent variables, there were no significant interactions between participation level, gender, and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(4, 331)= 1.32, p > .261, \eta^2_p = .016$, participation level and gender, Wilks’s lambda $= F(4, 331)= 1.12, p > .349, \eta^2_p = .013$, participation level and sport type, Wilks’s lambda $= F(4, 331)= .325, p > .861, \eta^2_p = .004$, nor a main effect for participation level, Wilks’s lambda $= F(4, 331)= .346, p > .847, \eta^2_p = .004$. The results for participation level do not support differences between athletes who participate at different amounts in their sport (i.e., starter, substitute, survivor) for the athlete leaders behaviors measured.

The final independent variable to be tested was the variable of leader selection preference. Participants reported if they would prefer leaders to be elected ($n = 251$), appointed ($n = 50$), or emerge ($n = 46$). Adequate sample size did not allow for the leader selection preference variable to be compared with other independent variables, thus one-way MANOVAs
were conducted for each conceptual dependent variable group. Non-significant main effects were present for *performance/task*, Wilks’s lambda= $F(14, 676) = 1.16, p > .304, \eta_p^2 = .023$, *relationship*, Wilks’s lambda= $F(10, 680) = .925, p > .510, \eta_p^2 = .013$, *motivation*, Wilks’s lambda= $F(6, 684) = 1.01, p > .419, \eta_p^2 = .009$, and *representation*, Wilks’s lambda= $F(8, 682) = 1.13, p > .342, \eta_p^2 = .013$, dependent variables. These findings indicate that knowing whether an athlete prefers an athlete leader to be elected, appointed, or emerge, cannot help to predict how much *performance/task, relationship, motivation*, and *representation* athlete leader behaviors that the athlete would prefer.
Overall, results of the study did not support the hypotheses. The impact of the coach scenarios on the preferred athlete leader behaviors of individuals of different genders and sport types was found to be minimal and generally non-significant. The non-significant results were obtained despite pilot study results that supported differences between scenarios. Findings from a re-analysis of the data with the style of athletes’ current coaches (i.e., autocratic, democratic, collaborative) replacing the coach scenario variable suggested that coaching style may have an influence on athlete leader behavior preferences. In the sections that follow, the results from each set of analyses will be discussed.

Coaching Style Based on Written Scenarios

Contrary to prediction, the coach scenarios had no effect on preferences for athlete leader behaviors. In other words, no main effects for coach scenario were discovered on dependent variables measuring preferences for athlete leader behaviors and overall, the variable of coach scenario was involved in only a single significant effect: a 3-way interaction that seemed to be driven by the gender and sport type variables. Although no study had previously examined the impact of coaching style on athlete leader behavior preferences, past research had supported both the use of scenarios in their methodology to identify significant differences (e.g., Cohen et al., 2004) and the varying impact that coaching style can have on athlete attitudes (e.g., Chelladurai, 1984; Gardner et al., 1996). The pilot study also indicated that the coach scenarios represented significantly different coaching styles, with the task scenario displaying the qualities of a task-oriented coach, the relationship scenario possessing qualities of a relationship-oriented coach,
and the task/relationship scenario displaying qualities of both a task and relationship-oriented coach. Thus, the question of why the scenarios did not elicit the expected results must be considered. It may be that the athletes were unable to sufficiently dismiss the influence of current coaches and/or past coaches and focus primarily on the scenarios that they were given. Specifically, past research has shown that the coach-athlete relationship is one in which powerful emotions are involved (e.g., trust, support, closeness), so requiring athletes to imagine a relationship of this nature may have been unrealistic, especially when this type of relationship already may have been present with a current coach (Jowett & Cockerill, 2003). In addition, information was gathered regarding the gender and ethnicity of the coach that participants imagined during the experiment. Approximately 86% of participants imagined a coach with the same gender and ethnicity as their current coach during the task. Although this information is not definitive, it does suggest that athletes may have been influenced by their current coach. This percentage, along with the ineffectiveness of coach scenarios found in the present study and past research highlighting the strength of the athlete-coach bond, supported re-analyzing the hypotheses using the coaching style of athletes’ current coaches in place of the styles of the imagined coaches (Jowett & Cockerill, 2003).

Coaching Style Based on Actual Coach

Athletes whose coaches have different interpersonal styles prefer significantly different behaviors from athlete leaders in terms of relationship, motivation, and representation behaviors. Autocratically-coached athletes consistently preferred less action from athlete leaders than more democratically-coached athletes (i.e., democratically- and collaboratively-coached athletes). For example, autocratically-coached athletes preferred athlete leaders to be less active in creating a warm environment, offering support to teammates, consistently resolving conflicts, providing
positive feedback, showing others respect, actively communicating with teammates, and striving towards coaching. No differences existed for *performance/task* behaviors, suggesting that coaching style did not influence the amount of action directed at creating structure and directly influencing team performance and success that athletes expected from their leaders.

Although no previous research has examined coaching style and athlete leader preferences, the finding that autocratically-coached athletes preferred less action directed towards maintaining a positive team climate from athlete leaders than more democratically-coached athletes can be understood by considering the coaching leadership literature. Specifically, autocratic coaching behavior is represented in the LSS through items such as “plan relatively independent of athletes” (item 6), “do not explain actions” (item 12), “refuse to compromise on a point” (item 27), “keep aloof from the athletes” (item 34), and “speak in a manner which discourages questions” (item 40) (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The stems suggest that an autocratic coach does not encourage much communication and independent action on the part of his/her team. Thus, athletes who are coached autocratically may believe that asking for their athlete leader to, for example, provide support at a high level, communicate often, and consistently resolve conflicts, is a meaningless venture because ultimately, the coach will not allow such behaviors to occur.

Conversely, more democratically-coached athletes preferred athlete leaders to provide support, create a warm environment, consistently resolve conflicts, and communicate more often than autocratically-coached athletes, perhaps because their coach would support that action. For the democratic scale of the LSS (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), stems include, “ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions” (item 2), “get group approval on important matters before going ahead” (item 9), “let the athletes share in decision making” (item 15),
“encourage athletes to make suggestions for ways to conduct practices” (item 18), and “let the 
athletes work at their own speed” (item 33), among others. These questions suggest that a 
democratic coach would encourage and accept communication and involvement from both 
athletes and leaders. Thus, democratically-coached athletes may prefer action from athlete 
leaders because such actions would fit within and be accepted by the environment established by 
the coach.

Regardless of the style of their current coach, athletes preferred their leaders to directly 
influence performance in a positive manner, as seen through the overall high ratings given by all 
athletes for athlete leader behaviors, in such ways as being one of the more highly skilled 
athletes on the team, modeling hard work and effective performance behavior (e.g., showing a 
proper baseball swing in practice), and being an individual who provides training and instruction 
to teammates. When these “direct behaviors” are displayed, the connection to successful 
performance during competition is transparent. For example, in softball, if an athlete leader 
provides instruction to a teammate on how to improve their swing and the instruction is utilized, 
than the displayed behavior by the athlete leader directly improves the teammate’s, and 
ultimately the team’s, chances for success during competition. Again, a high amount of this 
“direct behavior” is recognized as important by every athlete, regardless of the style of their 
coach. What seems to be lacking in athlete leader behavior preferences of autocratically-coached 
athletes is the recognition of indirect ways in which performance can be positively impacted, for 
example, via athlete leader positive reinforcement, the creation of a warm, friendly environment, 
and by athlete leaders presenting themselves and conducting themselves in a respectful manner. 
Although these actions do not occur necessarily on the field of play, the factors do help increase 
an athlete’s emotional investment in his/her team, which ultimately can improve performance
(Gould, Guinan, Greenleaf, Medbery, & Peterson, 1999). Therefore, what autocratic coaches may do is place too much emphasis on the direct methods for which performance is aided, such as structure and training, and not enough emphasis on indirect methods, such as involving athletes in decision-making and providing athletes with emotional support. This type of culture would affect what type of athlete leader behaviors are then displayed.

Despite coach scenarios yielding non-significant results for athlete leader behavior preferences, analyses examining the influence of athletes’ current coaches’ interpersonal style offered evidence for the impact of coaching style. An autocratic coaching style seemed to discourage athletes’ beliefs that leader behavior directed at improving team climate can be successfully implemented, perhaps because the autocratic style of the coach would most likely fail to support the independent behavior of athletes. On the contrary, a more democratic coaching style seemed to promote an environment of support for athlete leaders to be relational, motivate, and act appropriately. Future research must validate this hypothesis and further explore why the athlete leader behavior preference differences existed between athletes who are coached with different interpersonal styles.

Gender by Sport Type Interaction Effects

Similar to past studies examining athletes’ preferences for coaching leader behaviors (e.g., Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Sherman et al., 2000), gender and sport type differences were found with regards to athlete leader behavior preferences. Overall, patterns of women preferring more athlete leader behaviors than men, such as allowing teammates the freedom of making their own decisions, considering the opinions of others when making decisions, and providing positive feedback, and team sport athletes preferring more athlete leader behaviors than individual sport athletes, such as providing social support, consistently resolving conflicts,
and applying pressure to meet performance goals, were found. Two interaction effects were found for the Tolerance of Uncertainty scale, which measures behaviors reflecting patience when an uncertainty of action or decision exists on the team, and the Role Assumption scale, which measures behaviors directed at taking the lead and showing others that he/she is the leader.

For tolerance of uncertainty, male team sport athletes preferred significantly fewer behaviors from athlete leaders directed at tolerating the unknown and waiting patiently for decisions than male individual sport athletes, female individual sport athletes, and female team sport athletes. Past studies have shown that men and women differ regarding preferences for being patient. For example, Gladue (1991) discovered that men scored significantly higher on the lack of patience scale from the Aggression Inventory than women. This finding supports the difference between male team sport athletes and female athletes; however, male team sport athletes and male individual sport athletes also differed.

One hypothesis that may help explain the difference between male team and individual sport athletes for athlete leader tolerance of uncertainty behaviors is that an individual’s success on a team is dependent upon the decisions and performance of others whereas success in individual sports can still occur without the decisions/performance of others. For instance, if a star player on a football team might be suspended for the next game, other players may want the athlete leader to do all that he can to find out if the star player will in fact be suspended, as the star player’s performance directly affects the individual performance of others. If the star player is a receiver, the quarterback’s ability to complete passes may be affected or if the star player is a lineman, the line’s ability to block may be lessened. In contrast, if a star player on a golf team might be suspended, that star player’s suspension will not directly affect the performance of, for instance, the second-ranked golfer on the team. The second-ranked golfer does not need the star
player in order to shoot a low round in golf, therefore, there may be less urgency and less need
for the athlete leader to do everything that he/she can to find out if the star player will be
suspended. The level of impact that others have on an individual’s success in team sports versus
individual sports may explain why male team sport athletes and male individual sport athletes
differed regarding a preference for tolerance of uncertainty behaviors from athlete leaders.

Regarding role assumption, female team sport athletes were found to prefer their leaders
to take the lead and show others they are the leaders more so than female individual sport
athletes, male individual sport athletes, and male team sport athletes. Evidence does exist in the
literature that suggests differences should not have been obtained on the role assumption scale.
Russell, Rush, and Herd (1988) asked a sample of women to report about their expectations for
effective male and female leadership. Participants gave opinions of expectations in such areas as
initiating structure, consideration, role assumption, and production emphasis. The researchers
hypothesized that male leaders would be expected to display more initiating structure, role
assumption, and production emphasis behaviors and female leaders would be expected to display
more consideration behaviors (Russell, Rush, & Herd). Females were expected to show more
consideration and initiating structure behaviors and no differences were found for role
assumption and production emphasis behaviors. Even though the sample was composed of only
women, men and women were judged to show an equal amount of role assumption behaviors.
So, for the interaction effect found in the current study, gender and sport type seemed to have
combined to produce a difference not yet suggested in the literature. This difference will have to
be further explored in future studies.

Interaction effects showed how the variables of gender and sport type can combine to
influence athlete leader preferences. Should the results be replicated, coaches and athlete leaders
of teams of the different genders and sport types can use this information to determine how best to lead their respective teams. For example, leaders of male team sport athletes could create a more comfortable team environment if leaders would do everything that they could to gather information on any outstanding decisions, especially when compared to women’s sports and male, individual sport teams.

Overall, female athletes consistently preferred more action from athlete leaders than did their male athlete counterparts. Specifically, the female athletes showed preferences for higher amounts of leader behavior directed at incorporating structure and the leader’s own procedures to the team, acting independently of teammates, showing a tolerance for indecisiveness, allowing for freedom of action and decision from teammates, incorporating teammates’ input into decisions of the team, consistently resolving conflict, giving positive feedback, acting appropriately, and acting as if they were the leader of the team. Male athletes preferred that leaders utilize negative tactics more so than females, with such practices as intimidation, cheating, and open confrontation. No differences were found on scales measuring such behaviors as training/instructing teammates, applying pressure to meet performance goals, making accurate predictions, creating a warm environment, being one of the most skilled members of the team, being persuasive, and having aspirations to become a coach.

Although no specific studies have addressed preferences for athlete leader behaviors, past research has suggested that males and females differ on preferences for coaching behaviors. Specifically, Sherman et al. (2000) found that women preferred higher levels of positive feedback, training and instruction, and democratic coaching behaviors and men preferred higher levels of autocratic and social support behaviors. Beam, Serwatka, and Wilson (2004) replicated
these results and found that men preferred more autocratic and social support behaviors from coaches and women preferred more training and instruction coaching behaviors.

Compared to results for athlete leader behaviors, similarities were seen between coaching style and athlete leader style, with women desiring more positive feedback and democratic/consideration behaviors from both types of leaders when compared to men. It seems women prefer a consistent approach from both coaches and athlete leaders regarding positive feedback and consideration behaviors. Differences include men preferring more autocratic coaching behavior and women preferring that their athlete leaders act more task-oriented by implementing standard procedures and making their attitudes clear to the team. Men seem to be more accepting of autocratic/task-oriented behavior from their coach whereas women take the opposite approach.

Non-significant results for gender also provided new information that contrasts with past findings for coaching behavior (Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Sherman et al., 2000). For instance, no differences were found between men and women for social support and training and instruction behaviors whereas for coaching behaviors, men preferred more social support behavior than women and women preferred more training and instruction behavior than men. Regarding training and instruction, men and women both may feel that coaches are responsible for the majority of the training and instruction that they receive, thus receiving training and instruction behavior from athlete leaders is not desired. This notion was supported by the fact that absolute scores showed both men and women preferred that athlete leaders only sometimes exhibit training and instruction behaviors. Female athletes perhaps desire more training and instruction behavior from coaches when compared to male athletes because female athletes may be more open to training and instruction in general at the college age (i.e., 18-22 years-old).
Further exploration will be needed to confirm this hypothesis. For social support, men and women also preferred that athlete leaders sometimes display this type of behavior. It is not clear at this time why differences were not present for the social support construct and why preferences for social support were not viewed as more important. Future studies must further explore the finding for athlete leader social support behaviors.

Similar to interaction effects, results for main effects for gender can help leaders of athletic teams tailor their behaviors to the preferences of athletes and also distinguish effective athlete leader behaviors from effective coaching behaviors. If athlete leaders of women’s sports knew that athletes preferred high amounts of positive reinforcement, conflict resolution, and the freedom to make their own decisions independent from them, then the leaders could be more effective by altering their behavior to fit the needs of the athletes. Likewise, if leaders of men’s sports knew what level of these behaviors that male athletes preferred, then they also could be most effective by molding their behavior to fit the preferences of the team. With athletes and leaders in agreement regarding leadership behaviors, less conflict would occur between athletes and leaders and more energy could be placed into the improvement of performance.

Team sport athletes (i.e., interdependent) preferred significantly more action from athlete leaders than individual sport athletes (i.e., independent) in terms of applying pressure to teammates in order to increase performance, being a highly skilled athlete and directly influencing the performance of teammates, using negative tactics to create success, consistently resolving conflict, and showing warmth and a concern for the welfare of teammates. No differences were found between sport types for behaviors such as implementing standard procedures, making decisions without consulting teammates, allowing athletes to make their own decisions, feeling content with having leaders wait patiently for decisions, considering the
decisions of others, providing positive reinforcement, being persuasive, acting appropriately, showing to others that they are the leader of the team, communicating consistently, and striving towards coaching. Results appear to show that team sport athletes would like athlete leaders to be more active in helping the team be successful on the field of play. In addition, team sport athletes seem to recognize that performance success may be related to team chemistry, wanting athlete leaders to place more energy into creating a cohesive environment when compared to individual sport athletes.

Overall, team sport athletes preferred that their athlete leaders place more effort into helping the team be successful when compared to individual sport athletes. Team sport athletes preferred that athlete leaders be more active in areas of conflict resolution, maintaining a warm environment, applying pressure to others to improve performance, being one of the best athletes on the team, using cheating, intimidation, and open confrontation if necessary, and being aware of the needs of each teammate more so than individual sport athletes. These results are expected as an individual’s experience of success in a team sport is directly related to how well the team performs whereas an individual’s success in an individual sport can occur even though the team does not win. For example, a football player relies heavily on teammates in order to gain victory and experience individual success. Each football player has a different role and if performance gaps exist between roles, than the team most likely will not be successful. This idea is best illustrated when examining the relationship between an offensive line, a quarterback, and wide receivers. A team can have an outstanding quarterback but the team will not score points and the quarterback cannot be individually successful unless the offensive line can block opponents and the wide receivers can catch the football. In individual sports, for example downhill skiing, athletes do not rely on teammates for success. A downhill skier can be ranked #1 in the state and
still not experience team-level success. The skier does not need teammates in order to ski down the mountain the fastest whereas a quarterback needs teammates in order to gain successful individual statistics such as completion percentage, passing yards, and touchdowns. Therefore, it is expected that team sport athletes would prefer athlete leaders to be contributing to the team’s success as much as possible when compared to individual sport athletes.

Non-significant differences showed that similarities do exist between individual and team sport athletes regarding preferences for some athlete leader behaviors. The majority of non-significant differences were related to decision-making as all athletes, regardless of sport type, expressed a desire for athlete leaders to include them in decisions. It seems that all athletes are aware that the decisions of the athlete leader affect them and perhaps there is some recognition that they could influence the decisions of the athlete leader more so than the decisions of the coach. Past research has shown that team sport athletes may have this awareness as they preferred less of a democratic coaching style when compared to individual sport athletes, most likely because a democratic coaching style with many team sport coaches is unlikely (Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004). Future studies must explore the difference in preferences of team and individual sport athletes for leader and coaching behaviors.

Regarding coaching behaviors, Beam et al. (2004) found that athletes participating in individual sports preferred significantly more democratic, positive feedback, and social support behaviors from coaches than athletes participating in team sports. Other researchers supported these results except for findings related to positive feedback behaviors, in which the results were in the reverse direction (Terry, 1984; Terry & Howe, 1984). The current investigation showed that team, and not individual sport athletes, preferred the highest amount of social support behaviors from athlete leaders and no significant differences were found between groups
regarding positive feedback and consideration (i.e., similar to democratic) behaviors. The change in sport type preferences for social support behaviors when comparing coach to athlete leadership may reflect with whom athletes of different sport types form the closest relationships. In team sports, athletes must work with teammates directly to achieve success, so much time is spent with teammates. Subsequently close relationships often form. In individual sports, for instance golf, athletes often work closely with the coach for the majority of the time and may work with various individuals directly but not consistently. In other words, a golfer may play a practice round with one teammate one day and not see any other teammates and then play another practice round the next day with a different teammate and again, not see any other teammates. In team sports, athletes work with the same people directly each day. Thus, team sport athletes prefer more athlete leader social support behaviors than individual sport athletes and the opposite has been found for coaching social support behaviors.

In general, findings related to sport type appear logical and predictable with team sport athletes preferring that athlete leaders be more involved with team operations than individual sport athletes. It seems that a challenge for individual sport leaders and coaches is to foster a warm team climate so that individual sport athletes are able to form tight bonds with teammates and coaches in order to have an additional source of motivation when competing. If more efforts were placed into securing close interpersonal relationships in individual sports, perhaps an increase would be observed in both the preferred athlete leader behaviors of individual sport athletes and performance.

Leadership Position

Initially, results for the leadership position variable displayed a pattern similar to that found for gender and sport type. Specifically, “followers,” or those individuals who identified
themselves as holding no leadership position, consistently preferred less action from athlete leaders than either “leaders,” those individuals who were elected captains, appointed leaders, and/or vocal/emotional leaders, or “models,” those individuals that lead by example. “Leaders” wanted leaders who helped to increase one’s own and teammates’ performance successes, continually resolved conflict, and communicated/acted in a respectful manner, more so than “followers.” For the majority of behaviors, however, leaders, models, and followers did not differ regarding preferences. For example, the three groups displayed similar ratings for leader behaviors such as implementing structure, considering the decisions of others, allowing teammates the freedom to make their own decisions, being comfortable with leaders tolerating the unknown, applying pressure to make performance goals, accurate predicting the team’s progress, providing positive feedback, acting persuasively, creating a warm environment, resolving conflict, acting appropriately, acting as if they were the team’s leader, and striving towards coaching. Non-significant differences were found in each dependent variable group (i.e., performance/task, relationship, motivation, and representation) and past research seems to support similarities versus differences regarding leader and follower characteristics (e.g., Martin, Gross, & Darley, 1952; Nelson, 1964). Specifically, Nelson found that a leader group and a follower group, who were initially separated from each other by attributes such as self-confidence, alertness, job motivation, and aggressiveness, gave similar ratings for satisfaction with assignment, emotional control, acceptance of authority, and motivation to be part of the group, which were considered important leader characteristics. It was suggested that leaders in one context might be followers in another and vice versa. If leaders and followers possess similar characteristics and then may switch roles in various contexts, it would not then be unexpected to find similar leader behavior preferences from each group, as was discovered in the
present study. Although past research seemed to help explain non-significant results, past research failed to explain the significant differences that were found.

Why the differences for helping to increase one’s own and teammates’ performance successes, continually resolving conflict, and communicating/acting in a respectful manner exist cannot be answered by past research as no previous study has asked leaders and followers to discuss leadership preferences. One explanation that may explain the data, which was generated from anecdotal evidence, is that leaders seem to be more committed to a team’s success than followers, especially at the high school and college levels where no specific compensation is given to athletes. Leaders also typically participate more during competition than followers and thus leaders may want their team to be more successful due to the higher commitment of both mental and physical energy. This would explain why “leaders” would prefer that leaders contribute as much as possible to a team’s success because “leaders” want their team to win more strongly when compared to followers. Future research must place effort into clarifying and replicating the results.

Class, Years Played, and Participation Level

There were no significant differences found for any of these variables on any of the dependent measure groups, even though developmental trends with younger samples have been well-documented regarding coaching leadership preferences (e.g., Case, 1987; Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). For example, Chelladurai and Carron conducted a cross-sectional investigation and gave 262 basketball players, who ranged in experience from high school to college, the Training and Instruction and Social Support scales of the LSS. On the Training and Instruction scale, preferred behavior decreased throughout the high school age groups and then increased in the university athlete sample. Regarding Social Support, the desire for these coaching behaviors
increased steadily throughout high school and into college. The researchers suggested that the results on the Training and Instruction scale reflect emerging independence found in adolescence, with athletes preferring more control over their own self-learning. In college, however, when identity is consolidated, athlete become more receptive to feedback again (Chelladurai & Carron). Social support scale findings were thought to exemplify a connection between length of involvement in sport and the greater percentage of deep social relationships represented by relationships on one’s athletic team. Thus, a heavier reliance existed on sport relationships, such as the coach-player relationship, to fulfill an athlete’s need for support and sociality.

The Chelladurai and Carron (1983) study did not specifically examine differences between the four college classes; however, results did show increases at each age level in, for example, social support. A future study may target collegiate age levels and gather information on both coaching and athlete leadership preferences. The results of the current study indicated that freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors and athletes of varying experience levels did not differ regarding athlete leader preferences, although the results must be replicated so that they can be further validated.

Leader Selection Preference

Although how athletes want their leaders selected was unrelated to leadership preferences, it is interesting to note that most athletes want to be involved in determining team leaders. Specifically, 72.3% of athletes preferred that leaders be elected, 14.4% preferred that the coach appoint leaders, and 13.3% preferred that leaders emerge. These results are similar to findings by Sherman et al. (2000) who discovered that when coaching behavior preference ratings were average for all athletes included in the study, democratic coaching behavior was
preferred to be observed *sometimes* to *often*. Coaches may want to consider these findings and the results from the current study when considering how to select athlete leaders.

**Connection to Past Leadership Theories**

As previously discussed, the present study incorporated elements of each major category of leadership theory, except for the transformational theories, and so the results of the study also have connections to trait, behavioral, and situational models. Each connection will be discussed.

Regarding the trait approach, the findings that suggest athletes of different genders and sport types prefer varying amounts of leadership behaviors from athletes have direct implications to the traits that athlete leaders possess. For example, if a female, team sport athlete prefers that an athlete leader often show patience when awaiting decisions, as suggested by the results of the current investigation, and the athlete leader does not possess a high amount of patience by nature, then conflict may occur between that athlete and the athlete leader. Because, as previously theorized, traits are labels for patterns of behaviors, it is possible for the athlete leader to learn to be more patient and change her behaviors; however, this would most likely be a struggle for the athlete leader because many behaviors have to be present for the “trait” label to be used, suggesting the athlete leader exhibits many impatient behaviors. In other words, in addition to having impatience for upcoming decisions, the athlete leader most likely has impatience for other issues affecting the team such as waiting for teammates to learn new skills. Therefore, the present results may help to identify potential conflict between traits that athlete leaders possess and behavior preferences that athletes have for leadership actions.

For connections to the behavioral approach, the design of the study was targeted at identifying preferred athlete leader behaviors, so the connection between behavioral theories and the results of the study are transparent. Past research has suggested that leaders display
particular behaviors that are preferred by followers and results from gender, sport type, coaching style, and leadership position variables support these conclusions (e.g., Bales, 1954; Halpin, 1957; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). Future studies may aim to determine if leadership preferences are correlated to what athletes view as effective leadership behaviors. The value of behavioral theories with the present results is increased when the behaviors are placed in context, which is the purpose of situational theories.

Finally with regards to the situational approach, multiple situational theories were reviewed and theories that match best with the results of the current study will be discussed. The theory that seems to fit best overall is the multidimensional model of leadership (e.g., Chelladurai, 1978). This theory showed how situational, leader, and follower factors interact to produce actual, preferred, and required leader behavior. The present study targeted preferred behavior only; however, the results showed how follower and situational characteristics affect preferred athlete leader behavior. Specifically, the gender of the athlete, the type of the sport in which the athlete participates, the leadership role that the athlete occupies, and the style of the athletes’ current coach (i.e., situational variable) all seem to affect the amount of particular athlete leader behaviors that are preferred. Future research must expand on the athlete leader role to determine if the multidimensional model of leadership applies to athlete leadership in the model’s entirety (i.e., as related to required and actual behavior).

Similarly to the Chelladurai’s (1978) multidimensional model of leadership, the path-goal theory also has application to the present results. This theory discussed how follower satisfaction and performance is determined by leadership style, follower traits, situational factors, and other variables (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974). In addition, a leader’s main purpose was believed to be to facilitate the achievement of goals by followers. The central focus of the
behaviors examined in the present study was to help leaders be more effective and subsequently help team members be more effective. The study was also attempting to identify factors that may affect how effective an athlete leader can be (i.e., coach’s leadership style). Future studies must take the next step and examine the affect of athlete leader behaviors on follower behavior and more closely study the relationship between athlete leaders and their teammates. A study of this nature not only serves to increase the understanding on how leader behavior helps followers to achieve goals, but it may also help to expand the athlete leadership literature base to an additional category of leadership: transformational theories.

Past leadership theories not only aided in the development of the current study, but the theories also related to what was discovered in the results of analyses. It is vital that these theories are considered in the development of future studies and an emphasis must be placed on finding ways to incorporate the transformational theories into the design of these future studies.

Limitations

The study displayed limitations that included a lack of generalizability due to sampling from mostly one university and due to a lack of racial/ethnic groups that were represented in the study. My geographic location limited my ability to sample from populations with more diverse racial/ethnic groups and in order to prevent misassumptions about the data, race/ethnicity was not analyzed and it was clearly stated earlier in the document that inadequate sampling prevented this variable from being studied. Geographic and race/ethnic differences are important to the literature base and should be targeted in future studies.

An additional limitation was the use of self-report data. Self-report data typically will produce a larger amount of measurement error when compared to other forms of data collection. Future studies examining athlete leader behavior preferences may incorporate the use of
interviews and qualitative data in order to avoid the problems associated with self-report measures. This notion will be further discussed in a later section of the discussion.

The moderate size of reliability coefficients for the dependent measures of the study can also be considered a liability. Essentially, the moderate size of the coefficients indicates that some non-significant findings may indeed be significant, because the relationship between the variables might be considered weak. Future studies may utilize other dependent measures, perhaps those that would produce higher reliability coefficients, so that potentially significant results would not be overlooked.

Finally, the coach scenarios did not produce the expected significant differences between the independent variables that were included in the study. Coach scenarios were expected to create an objective coach-player experience so that coaching style could be controlled for sampling distribution purposes (i.e., a similar amount of coaching styles could be studied); however, athletes seemed to fail to connect to the coach presented in the scenario enough so that the coach’s behavior could be considered when completing dependent measures. This occurred despite the fact that pilot study results supported differences between coach scenarios. In order to compensate for this limitation, information on the coaching style of athletes’ current coaches was gathered so that coaching style could still be studied as a potential influence on athlete leader behavior preferences. This measure proved to be beneficial and significant differences were found for athlete leader behavior preferences between athletes who are coached with different styles.

**Future Directions**

Although the present study helped to uncover factors that influenced athlete leader behavior preferences, it also generated additional questions that future studies can address.
These questions include: (a) would different results have been found if participants were not asked to imagine a scenario and simply asked to consider the style of their current coach report about athlete leader preferences? (b) do age differences exist regarding athlete leader behavior preferences? (c) what differences exist between perceived athlete leader behaviors and preferred athlete leader behaviors? (d) what preferences do athletes have for athlete leadership teams? And (e) how do the leadership behaviors of assistant coaches fit into the leadership hierarchy?

Would different results have been found if participants were not asked to imagine a scenario and simply asked to consider the style of their current coach report about athlete leader preferences? This question is difficult to answer and implicit leadership theory seems to help bolster the argument, as discussed previously, that conducting a second experiment that simply asked participants to report about the style of their current coach would most likely not change the results. What implicit leadership theory does suggest to change, however, is how the coach style variable would be created within the study. Specifically, a future study may not ask about an athlete’s current coach, but rather would ask an athlete to talk about their most memorable coach and then have them discuss what type of athlete leader behaviors they would prefer to see given this coach. This method may help to answer what athletes consider to be the most effective athlete leader behaviors given their most ideal coaching situation.

Do age differences exist regarding athlete leader behavior preferences? Age differences regarding preferred coaching leadership have been well-documented in the past (e.g., Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). It can be hypothesized that age differences may exist for athlete leadership because the current study and past studies showed differences existed for both athlete leadership behaviors and coaching behaviors for other variables (e.g., gender and sport type). The present study sampled athletes who generally were close in age (i.e., 18-24) and who were competing at
the same level (i.e., collegiate), so perhaps not enough variability in age or developmental level was present for differences to be expressed. Future studies should test for differences between the various levels of sport participation (e.g., pee wee, junior high school, high school, college, and professional) and preferences for athlete leader behaviors.

What differences exist between perceived athlete leader behaviors and preferred athlete leader behaviors? Recently, researchers have been able to search for differences and summarize what behaviors athletes perceive from coaches and athlete leaders in higher levels of sport. Loughead and Hardy (2005) administered the perceived version of the LSS, which measures coaching behaviors, and a modified version of the same measure that reflected perceived athlete leader behaviors to 238 Canadian male and female, independent and interdependent sport athletes from generally high performance levels (i.e., Two-hundred and twelve athletes participated on the varsity university level or higher and the remaining 26 athletes participated on the club level). Results showed that coaches were observed as engaging in significantly more behaviors directed at instructing athletes on skills and tactics and making decisions independent of athletes when compared to athlete leaders. Regarding more relational scales, athlete leaders were found to engage in more behaviors directed at providing positive reinforcement, offering support, and involving athletes in decision-making when compared to coaches. The results of the Loughead and Hardy study provide data on what behaviors athletes are observing that athlete leaders engage in compared to coaches. A future study should then compare and contrast perceived and preferred athlete leader behaviors and perceived and preferred coaching behaviors so that any disparities between perceptions and preferences of each type of leader could be discussed and perhaps aligned to fit the needs of athletes.
What preferences do athletes have for athlete leadership teams? Many teams seem to implement leadership groups versus identifying a single team member who is responsible for displaying all necessary leadership behaviors. When designing the measures for the current study, care was taken to ensure dependent measures did not assume a single athlete leader or a group of athlete leaders would identify best with participants. For instance, headings for questions for the LSS and the LBDQ read, “Given the coach you read about, an ideal athlete leader should . . .” The language used in this header made it possible for athletes to assume that I was referring to leadership behavior of a single athlete leader or of a team of athlete leaders. In other words, expressions such as “. . ., your athlete leader . . .” and “. . ., the athlete leader . . .” were avoided so that the idea that an athlete leader could be a part of a leadership team could not be ruled out. Again, it is believed that most athletic teams have a coalition of athlete leaders that were either elected or appointed; however, the benefits of this approach compared to an individually-led team are unknown and what this approach lacks can also only be answered by future studies.

How do the leadership behaviors of assistant coaches fit into the leadership hierarchy? Similar to athlete leader behaviors, not much is known regarding the leadership role of assistant coaches. Are assistant coaches perceived by athletes as engaging in leadership behaviors similar to the way that head coaches behave, similarly to athlete leaders, or somewhere in between? This question could be the focus of a future study that may incorporate the use of interviews and qualitative data in order to gather information on athletes’ and head coaches’ opinions of what behaviors they would prefer from assistant coaches.
Implications for Practice

Findings from four key independent variables have direct, practical implications for the organization of athlete leadership on sport teams. First, based on findings in which the leadership approach of athletes’ current coaches was identified and assuming the implicit leadership theory supports the re-analysis of the hypotheses where the coach scenario variable was substituted for the style of athletes’ current coaches, coaching style was found to affect the preferred athlete leader behaviors of team members. A strictly autocratic coaching style was found to dissuade a desire for action by athletes providing support to teammates, consistently trying to resolve conflict, creating a warm and positive atmosphere, offering direct and positive reinforcement to teammates, and acting in a respectful manner. These actions by an athlete leader can create an environment more conducive for success, so coaches who have adopted an autocratic style must amend their approach in an attempt to maximize the effectiveness of their athlete leaders and ultimately improve performance.

Second, female athletes preferred more action and involvement from athlete leaders than men in areas such as clearly defining one’s own role and the roles of teammates, tolerating uncertainty and patiently waiting for decisions, allowing teammates the freedom to make their own decisions, having consideration for the opinions of teammates, consistently resolving conflict, providing positive reinforcement, and behaving in a respectful manner. Men preferred more action from athlete leaders when compared to women on a single scale that measured the amount of negative tactics (e.g., cheating, intimidation, open confrontation) that an athlete leader should utilize. For coaches who coach women’s sports, it is important to know that female athletes prefer a large amount of involvement from their athlete leaders so having athlete leaders be active in practice, during performances, and in team meetings would be essential. For
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coaches who coach men’s sports, knowing that men’s preferences for athlete leader involvement are not as high as women’s preferences is important, but coaches also should be aware that men still feel that high athlete leader involvement is preferable, as indicated by the absolute scores reported by men. The results also suggest that male and female athlete leaders should be aware that their teammates most likely would prefer them to be active sometimes-to-often in the majority of leadership areas detailed in the study, again as indicated by average scores on dependent measures. Athlete leaders may not have known that athletes prefer much effort to be placed into maintaining the team, such as consistently resolving conflict or providing training and instruction on skills and techniques.

Third, team sport individuals preferred significantly more athlete leaders behaviors, such as applying appropriate pressure to meet goals, aiding in the optimization of performance of teammates, creating a warm atmosphere, consistently resolving conflict, and utilizing negative tactics to increase performance, when compared to individual sport athletes. Coaches of team sports should be aware that their athletes prefer that athlete leaders remain active in performance/task, relational, and motivational areas of leadership and often, how active athlete leaders can be depends upon their coaching style. Adopting a coaching style that allows for athlete leaders to be involved in decisions, conduct team-building activities, and lead team discussions would likely help to create a positive team environment. Coaches of individual sports also should realize that athlete leaders can play an important role on their team even though the sport itself may be individually performed. Individual sport athletes preferred a high amount of action from athlete leaders, as seen through high preference scores for performance/task, relationship, motivation, and representation constructs, so involving them in team decisions, methods of motivation, and in training and instruction may help to create an
environment that is warm and comfortable for athletes so that the majority of focus and effort can be placed into improving performance.

Finally, findings related to the leadership position variable showed differences between leaders/models and followers regarding athlete leadership preferences for such behaviors as increasing one’s own and teammates’ performance successes, continually resolving conflict, and communicating/acting in a respectful manner, although the majority of differences were non-significant. Assuming the significant results can be replicated, the findings may help to explain how athlete leaders should behave towards other athlete leaders and those team members who have not taken a specific leadership role. Specifically, results showed that athlete leaders and models of leadership behavior prefer higher amounts of action in the identified areas of behavior from other athlete leaders when compared to followers. Athlete leaders may be able to use this information in that if there are leaders on their team who have not been chosen as an officially recognized captain/leader, they can feel confident that they can resolve more conflict, communicate more, and attempt to help these individuals with their performance more so than followers. Thus, the leadership position findings can help athlete leaders determine how much effort they may place in leading particular individuals.

The findings of the current investigation offer both coaches and athlete leaders guidance as to how much involvement various types of athletes prefer from athlete leaders as well as specific behaviors that certain athletes would like to experience from athlete leaders. The results of future studies examining athlete leadership have the ability to provide more information to athlete leaders and coaches so that athlete leaders can continue to be aware of how the behaviors that they adopt affect team climate and team performance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>Stogdill</td>
<td>1948, 1974</td>
<td>Effective leaders possess particular traits that allow them to be effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>Bales</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Effective leaders display particular behaviors that make them effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halpin</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stogdill &amp; Coons</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Model</td>
<td>Fiedler</td>
<td>1967, 1971</td>
<td>Leader’s style, situational factors, performance of followers interact to determine effective leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path-Goal Theory</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Follower satisfaction/performance determined by leader style, follower traits, situational factors, other variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Model</td>
<td>Vroom &amp; Yetton</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Leadership evaluated through decision-making style ranging from autocratic to democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional</td>
<td>Chelladurai</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Situational, leader, follower factors interact to produce actual, preferred, and required leader behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-Cycle Approach</td>
<td>Hersey &amp; Blanchard</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Effective leader behaviors determined via follower maturity judged along a continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Member Exchange</td>
<td>Graen &amp; Cashman</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Leader’s relationship with in-group and out-group examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic Theory</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Leadership examined through how followers react to charismatic traits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 1 *(continued).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Leadership</td>
<td>Lord, Binning,</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Effective leadership judged by comparing follower’s perceptions of versus expectations of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rush &amp; Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neocharismatic/</td>
<td>Howell &amp; House</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Behaviors judged as personalized (positive) or socialized (negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-Based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

#### Assessments Related to Leadership Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trait</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Leadership Behavior Inventory</td>
<td>Glenn &amp; Horn</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7-pt Likert scale used to identify presence of 25 leadership traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behavior Description</td>
<td>Halpin &amp; Winer, Hemphill &amp; Coons</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>5-pt scale used for 100 questions organized in 12 subscales describing leadership behaviors; 3 versions exist (self, ideal, actual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Stogdill</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Behavior Assessment System</td>
<td>Smith, Smoll, &amp; Hunt, Also Revised</td>
<td>1977, 1978, 1979, 1983, 1989, 1998</td>
<td>Objective observations of coaching behaviors are grouped into 2 broad categories (reactive &amp; spontaneous), and 5 sub-categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Descriptive Analysis System</td>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Similar to Coaching Behavior Assessment System with added sub-categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Evaluation Questionnaire</td>
<td>Rushall &amp; Wiznuk</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>36 coaching behaviors listed with 5-pt scale used to evaluate desirability of each behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete Leadership Skills in Sport</td>
<td>Magyar</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>26 items require leaders and non-leaders to judge, using 5-pt scale, effective leader behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Preferred Coworker Scale</td>
<td>Fiedler</td>
<td>1967, 1971</td>
<td>7 scales ask followers to describe the coworker they would least prefer to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Scale for Sports</td>
<td>Chelladurai &amp; Saleh</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>40 questions grouped into 5 categories, respondents describe either self, perceived, or preferred coach behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Leadership Scale for Sports</td>
<td>Zhang, &amp; Mann</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>New scale added to original 5 of LSS, items also revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader-Member Exchange Scale</td>
<td>Graen &amp; Cashman &amp; Schriesheim &amp; colleagues</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3 scales examine follower’s perceptions of, in general, how important they feel they are to their leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Form 5X</td>
<td>Bass &amp; Avolio</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Measure examines follower’s perceptions of charismatic leader qualities such as individualized consideration and charisma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Pilot Study Results of Mean (Standard Deviation) Coach Scenario Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measures</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Task/Relationship</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 16)</td>
<td>(n = 17)</td>
<td>(n = 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>4.54&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.534)</td>
<td>3.84&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.501)</td>
<td>3.91&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.335)</td>
<td>10.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>2.43&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.639)</td>
<td>4.11&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.392)</td>
<td>3.87&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.395)</td>
<td>54.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>3.77&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.788)</td>
<td>2.26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.647)</td>
<td>2.29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.488)</td>
<td>26.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>1.99&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.597)</td>
<td>4.16&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.386)</td>
<td>3.63&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (.532)</td>
<td>77.5***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>***</sup> p < .001

<sup>a,b,c</sup>-Groups that do not share common superscripts are significantly different (<sup>ab</sup> p < .001, <sup>bc</sup> p < .05)

Note. For all tables, LBDQ (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire), LSS (Leadership Scale for Sports), and A-LSSQ (Athlete Leadership Skills in Sports Questionnaire), scores range from 1 (never [LBDQ, LSS]/not important [A-LSSQ]) to 5 (always/very important), regarding behavior preferences.
Table 4

*Means (Standard Deviations) for Significant ANOVAs for Interaction Effects for Gender and Sport Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV Group</th>
<th>Individual Sport</th>
<th>Team Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depend. Variable</td>
<td>domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tol. of Uncertainty</td>
<td>3.85 (0.471)</td>
<td>3.82 (0.465)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Assumption</td>
<td>3.82 (0.464)</td>
<td>3.79 (0.555)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dependent variables displayed are scales of the LBDQ

- Groups that do not share common superscripts are significantly different at $p < .01$. 

Table 5

Means (Standard Deviations) for the 3-way Interaction between Coach Scenario, Gender, and Sport Type on the Negative Tactics Scale of the A-LSSQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n = 19)</td>
<td>Female (n = 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.24&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt; (.674)</td>
<td>1.96&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt; (.506)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>2.35&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt; (.659)</td>
<td>2.04&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>2.21&lt;sup&gt;abc&lt;/sup&gt; (.475)</td>
<td>1.82&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.606)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a,b,c</sup> - Groups that do not share common superscripts are significantly different at <i>p < .01</i>.

*table continues*
Table 5 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Relationship</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( (n = 13) )</td>
<td>( (n = 25) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.06(^{abc}) (.767)</td>
<td>2.38(^{abc}) (.990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a,b,c}\)- Groups that do not share common superscripts are significantly different at \( p < .01 \).
Table 6

*Means (Standard Deviations) for Significant ANOVAs for Main Effects of Sport Type and Gender from Hypotheses 1-5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sport Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV Group</td>
<td>(n = 186)</td>
<td>(n = 165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance/Task</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>3.67 (.498)</td>
<td>3.81 (.469)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tol. of Uncertainty</td>
<td>3.67 (.465)</td>
<td>3.87 (.444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tol. of Freedom</td>
<td>3.46 (.425)</td>
<td>3.61 (.398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>3.46 (.425)</td>
<td>3.61 (.398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf-Execution</td>
<td>4.02 (.471)</td>
<td>3.74 (.457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>3.90 (.460)</td>
<td>4.21 (.421)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>4.14 (.550)</td>
<td>4.26 (.476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>3.42 (.525)</td>
<td>3.28 (.537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>3.88 (.580)</td>
<td>4.08 (.572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Tactics</td>
<td>2.53 (.786)</td>
<td>2.20 (.812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect-Commucate</td>
<td>4.49 (.490)</td>
<td>4.61 (.505)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***p < .001, **p < .01; aLBDQ, bLSS, cA-LSSQ
Table 7

Means (Standard Deviations) for Significant ANOVAs for Main Effects for Coaching Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV Group</th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Collaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>( n = 72 )</td>
<td>( n = 72 )</td>
<td>( n = 202 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot-Interpersonal</td>
<td>3.63&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.623)</td>
<td>4.06&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.439)</td>
<td>3.87&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (.623)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.602)</td>
<td>4.29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.534)</td>
<td>4.24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.93&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.532)</td>
<td>4.03&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt; (.507)</td>
<td>4.10&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>3.78&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.621)</td>
<td>4.15&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.569)</td>
<td>3.98&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect-Comm&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.40&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.586)</td>
<td>4.66&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.406)</td>
<td>4.56&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.489)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup Orientation&lt;sup&gt;x&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.69&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (.541)</td>
<td>3.97&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.405)</td>
<td>3.87&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (.444)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* <sup>x</sup>LBDQ, <sup>y</sup>LSS, <sup+z</sup>A-LSSQ

<sup>a,b</sup>- Groups that do not share common superscripts are significantly different at \( p < .01 \).
Table 8

*Means (Standard Deviations) from Significant ANOVAs for Leadership Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV Group</th>
<th>Leadership Position</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader (n = 96)</td>
<td>Model (n = 111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Performance/Task</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Execution$^z$</td>
<td>4.19$^a$ (.393)</td>
<td>4.06$^{ab}$ (.406)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration$^x$</td>
<td>4.30$^a$ (.465)</td>
<td>4.30$^a$ (.470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect-Communication$^z$</td>
<td>4.71$^a$ (.360)</td>
<td>4.56$^a$ (.470)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $^x$LBDQ, $^y$LSS, $^z$LSSQ

$^{a,b}$ Groups that do not share common superscripts are significantly different at $p < .01$. 
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APPENDIX A

TASK-ORIENTED COACH SCENARIO
Please read the following coach description and as you read, think about what it would be like to play for this coach. Assume the coach is coaching you in your current sport. Also, think about the ideal athlete leader you would like to have given this coach. In other words, think about what you would want from your athlete leader on the team coached by the individual detailed below. After reading the coach description, you will be asked questions about the ideal athlete leader you would like to have on your team if you played for this coach.

Practice is about to start and Coach does what Coach always does: Coach outlines what it is you and your teammates should do in practice and how and when it should be done. Coach also talks about a new idea for changing up practice a bit that Coach wants to try today. Practices are very structured and generally run very efficiently. Frequently, Coach will come up with ideas and implement them in practices without notice. Coach lets you know what to do and expects everyone to do it the same way. Even when Coach can’t attend practice, Coach posts a practice schedule or instructs assistant coaches to give each member of the team assignments to accomplish that day.

From the beginning, you knew what to expect from Coach. On the first day of practice, Coach brought you and the rest of the team together to lay out the ground rules: The “Big 3” were no smoking, no drinking regardless of whether or not you were legally allowed to, and no failing classes. It was also expected that you show improvement by various “performance dates” scheduled throughout the year. There were 4 dates altogether and on these days you were evaluated by Coach regarding your play. That first “performance date” was difficult because Coach told you that your performance was below expectation. You told Coach that you disagreed and Coach responded with, “My evaluation is the one we will go by.” With that, Coach handed you a list of goals that you were expected to meet by the next performance date and the conversation ended without explanation of why Coach thought you were performing below expectation.

Overall, Coach rarely interacts with you and your teammates outside of the sport. Only during required meetings do you see Coach when not practicing or competing. Coach rarely expresses interest in you outside of your sport or how you are doing in classes, which of course determines whether or not you can compete. You often feel like Coach’s sole focus is on what needs to be done and how it can be done best, which is usually determined by Coach.

Coach’s number one goal has always been winning. During competitions, Coach is very vocal and constantly gives you feedback on how to improve mistakes. You remember one time, you made a mistake and you were aware of your mistake. Before you could start figuring out what to do differently the next time, Coach was shouting instructions about what you did wrong and how to fix it. During competitions, Coach tells you what to do and how to do it and expects you to implement the changes as they have been laid out.
APPENDIX B

RELATIONSHIP-ORIENTED COACH SCENARIO
Please read the following coach description and as you read, think about what it would be like to play for this coach. Assume the coach is coaching you in your current sport. Also, think about the ideal athlete leader you would like to have given this coach. In other words, think about what you would want from your athlete leader on the team coached by the individual detailed below. After reading the coach description, you will be asked questions about the ideal athlete leader you would like to have on your team if you played for this coach.

Practice is about to start and Coach does what Coach always does: Coach asks for suggestions about what you and your teammates think you need to work on in practice and how and when it should be done by. Coach also asks for new ideas about changing up practice, specifically something that you could try that day. Frequently, Coach asks for new ideas or consults the group about Coach’s new ideas before implementing them. Generally, Coach treats everyone as equals and tries to communicate in advance of any changes that are planned. When Coach can’t attend practice, Coach leaves it up to the team and the assistant coaches to determine what to accomplish that day.

From the beginning, Coach has given you and your teammates a lot of responsibility for deciding the team rules and climate. On the first day of practice, Coach told you and the team to come together to decide on the ground rules: The team’s “Big 3” that were agreed upon by the team were no smoking, no drinking regardless of whether or not you were legally allowed to, and no failing classes. The team also decided that on various “performance dates” scheduled throughout the year, team members would be evaluated by both coaches and teammates to see how well they were improving. There were 4 dates altogether and on these days you were evaluated by Coach and your teammates regarding how you were improving. That first “performance date” was difficult because Coach told you that your performance was below expectation. You told Coach that you disagreed and Coach responded with, “Ok, let’s sit down and talk about why you are performing below expectation.” With that, you and Coach reviewed the evaluation and talked about goals you could set for yourself that would help you improve in the areas the team outlined.

Overall, Coach constantly interacts with you and your teammates and takes an interest in your life outside of sport. Coach often checks up on you and the team to make sure everything is going well. Coach asks about family, friends, and significant others and is curious about your hobbies and other interests. You often feel like Coach focuses a lot on the team’s life outside of sport while allowing the team to make a lot of their own decisions.

Coach’s number one goal has always been winning, yet during competitions, Coach often remains quiet and allows you to play through your mistakes. You remember one time, you made a mistake and you were aware of your mistake. You looked up and Coach stood there and offered only encouragement. During competitions, Coach is mostly positive and encouraging, allowing you and your teammates to figure out what you need to do to work through challenges and be successful.
APPENDIX C

TASK/RELATIONSHIP-ORIENTED COACH SCENARIO
Please read the following coach description and as you read, think about what it would be like to play for this coach. Assume the coach is coaching you in your current sport. Also, think about the ideal athlete leader you would like to have given this coach. In other words, think about what you would want from your athlete leader on the team coached by the individual detailed below. After reading the coach description, you will be asked questions about the ideal athlete leader you would like to have on your team if you played for this coach.

Practice is about to start and Coach did what Coach always does: Coach has taken suggestions from you and your teammates and has arranged a specific practice schedule that will be followed. This happens frequently, Coach molding the team’s ideas with his own and coming up with a plan. Coach treats each person with respect and seriously considers everyone’s ideas. Sometimes, the team is even permitted to vote on what should be accomplished that day in practice. When Coach can’t attend practice, Coach will usually leave it up to the team and the assistant coaches to determine how to accomplish the general tasks he has left for them to do.

From the beginning, Coach has taken suggestions from the team on how things should be run and using the team’s ideas, decides the best course of action. On the first day of practice Coach, you, and the team came together and laid out the ground rules. Coach suggested the “Big 3,” which were agreed upon by the team: no smoking, no drinking regardless of whether or not you were legally allowed to, and no failing classes. Based on the Coach’s suggestions the team also decided that on various “performance dates” scheduled throughout the year, team members would be evaluated to determine how well they were improving. There were 4 dates altogether and on these days you were graded by Coach and your teammates regarding your improvements. That first “performance date” was difficult because Coach told you that you were performing below expectations. You told Coach that you disagreed and Coach responded with, “Ok, well I see some things you need to improve upon but let’s sit down and decide what you can do to improve.” With that, you and Coach reviewed the evaluation and talked about goals that Coach wanted you to set for yourself and others that you wanted to set for yourself that would help you improve in the areas outlined by the evaluation.

Overall, Coach takes an interest in you and your teammates outside of sport but is equally focused on performance. Coach often checks up on you and your teammates outside of practice and also asks about family, friends, and significant others. Clearly Coach cares about you, but Coach wants you to stay eligible and be focused on winning.

Coach’s number one goal has always been winning. During competitions, Coach offers both technical instruction and positive encouragement. You remember one time, you made a mistake and you knew you made a mistake and Coach stood there encouraging you to play through your mistake. Another time, you made a mistake and again you knew you made the mistake and before you could start figuring out what to do different next time, Coach was shouting instructions about what you did wrong and how to fix it. During competition, Coach is clearly communicates what you need to do during competitions to be successful. Although Coach tolerates mistakes and allows you to learn from them, Coach will not let inconsistent performance interfere with winning.
APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Please answer the following:

1. Age:  
2. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female 
3. Year in school: _____ freshman _____ sophomore _____ junior _____ senior 
5. What is your primary sport? _____________________________ 
6. How many years have you played this sport? _____________________ 
7. If you had a choice, would you prefer that the athlete(s) selected to be the leader(s) of your team be (circle one): 
   a. **Elected** (by the team) 
   b. **Appointed** (by the coaching staff) 
   c. **Emergent** (have no formal elections or appointments and those wanting to lead simply display leadership behaviors throughout the course of the season) 
8. How much playing time do you receive on average (circle one)? 
   a. Start and/or play more than 50% of the game 
   b. Substitute and/or play less than 50% of the game but more than 25% of the game 
   c. Play less than 25% of the game 
9. What is your leadership position on the team? ____ Vocal/Emotional leader ____ Lead by example ____ Hold no leadership position ____ Other ( ) 
10. What is the leadership style of your coach in your primary sport? 
    a. Autocratic, makes decisions alone, a task master ______ 
    b. Democratic, involves team in decisions, builds relationships _____
c. A combination of the two styles

11. What is the gender and race/ethnicity of the coach you envisioned when reading your scenario?

Gender ______________ Race/Ethnicity ________________
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