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ABSTRACT

Coaches play a large role in accomplishing the objectives of the intercollegiate athletic department. They interact with student-athletes on a regular basis and provide leadership for the team as a representative of the university. The role of a coach as a leader within intercollegiate athletics has been criticized for rule violations and ethical problems to achieve the ultimate goal of winning (Byers, 1995; Simon, 1991; Sperber, 1990; Zimbalist, 1999). Critics of intercollegiate coaches’ leadership have described their behavior as “greedy”. These behaviors include: demanding high salaries, pushing to win at all costs, lacking time spent with players, breaking contracts, scalping tickets, focusing on their own income from summer camp revenue, and asking for bonuses based on wins in order to gain greater financial incentives. Another paradigm of coaches’ leadership focuses on their concern for athletes’ development. The importance is placed on caring about athletes’ athletic and personal well being. This type of altruistic leadership is defined as having the ultimate goal of improving the well being of followers. No studies exist on altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching. Thus, it is vitally important to examine this understudied area of leadership in intercollegiate athletics. This qualitative study has the primary purpose of exploring coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. A secondary purpose was to examine the connection between altruism and emotional intelligence by determining what factors of emotional
intelligence emerged with the coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Lastly, the relationship of coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership with performance and psychosocial outcomes was examined.

The results indicated that several themes emerged from 15 interviews with Division I intercollegiate head coaches from one university. Coaches perceived character, consistency, balance, caring, and empowerment as altruistic leadership factors. Emotional intelligence factors of self-awareness, self-regulation, social skills, empathy, and self-motivation were reinforced in relation to altruistic leadership. Coaches connected altruistic leadership to several outcomes, including improved performance, reciprocity, improved experience, good relationships, and appreciation. Implications of these findings are discussed and future research is suggested.
Dedicated to Mom, Dad, Rob, Pam, Paul, and John

for years of influencing and encouraging my audacious goals.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my committee members. Dr. Pastore taught me the importance of having fun despite the serious academic university environment. My academic and personal life has been much more enjoyable due to her teachings. Her 3 Ps of being patient, positive, and perseverant also helped me struggle through this challenging process. I also wish to thank my co-advisor, Dr. Janet Fink, for listening to my struggles and discussing her experiences and recommendations. My desire to impress her kept me working for hours upon hours. She taught me that professors are capable of having a balanced life. I owe much appreciation to Dr. Pamela Highlen. She taught me the teaching philosophy of challenging your students while still loving and caring for them. My self-awareness and self-acceptance was nourished immensely in my first counseling psychology laboratory. Dr. Judith Tansky also receives my appreciation. She taught me anything is possible by discussing her family and academic accomplishments. I have enjoyed her enthusiasm and openness to my topic and future research projects.

I thank the staff of The Fisher College of Business, especially Rema King, Arleen Robinson, Linda Miller, Melinda McDonald, Barb Gladman, and Jay Yutzey. They taught me the complex balance of effectiveness, efficiency, caring, teamwork, and going above and beyond to help students.
I appreciate the support from my close friends. Elizabeth has taught me that there is much more enjoyment to life beyond research and teaching. Anna has been my friend through twenty years of philosophical discussions. Andrea and Ilana provided interesting psychological conversations for me to ponder. Michelle was always willing to advise and encourage me. My friends have been wonderful diversions when I most needed to take a break from my workaholic tendencies.

I wish to thank all my close family members. My dad was always pushing me to try new things and to go a step beyond what I thought was my limit. My brother, Rob, convinced me to pursue organizational behavior topics just by showing the enthusiasm he has for his work. My sister, Pam, always took time to discuss the topic of leadership with me and provided resources for my reading enjoyment. Paul always included me in sport activities and never discouraged me from playing even though I was the only girl. John has helped me believe that anything is possible when you have a loving family who are role models of balancing hard work, dedication, stability, loyalty, fun, and ambition.

Lastly, I am grateful to my mom for all the laughter, comfort, and liveliness she has brought to my life throughout my graduate school challenges. She also gave me the idea for the study. After watching her children play sports for over twenty years, she thought the biggest problem in sports was the selfishness of coaches and their overemphasis on winning. This helped me see how much I benefited from having her as an altruistic person in my life and how much others could benefit from having altruistic leaders in their lives.
VITA

November 20, 1975…………………………..Born – Springfield, Ohio
June, 1998……………………………………..B.S. in Psychology from Wright State
September, 1998 – present………………….G.A.A at Fisher College of Business
June, 2000……………………………………..M.L.H.R from The Ohio State University

PUBLICATIONS

Research Publication


FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: College of Education
Cognate Area: Sport and Exercise Psychology
Minor Field: Research Methods for Human Resource Development
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ...................................................................................................................ii

Dedication .................................................................................................................iv

Acknowledgment ......................................................................................................vi

Vita ............................................................................................................................vii

Table of Contents .....................................................................................................viii

List of Tables .............................................................................................................x

List of Figures ..........................................................................................................xi

Chapters:

1. Introduction .........................................................................................................1
   Problem Statement ..............................................................................................2
   Brief Literature Background .............................................................................4
   Purpose Statement .............................................................................................11
   Definitions ..........................................................................................................13
   Limitations and Delimitations ..........................................................................15
   Overview of the Chapters ................................................................................16

2. Literature Review ..............................................................................................17
   Leadership ..........................................................................................................17
   Motivation ...........................................................................................................43
   Altruism .............................................................................................................73
   Emotional Intelligence .......................................................................................80
   Summary ............................................................................................................87

3. Methodology .....................................................................................................89
   Rationale for the Research Design ...................................................................89
   Sampling Methods and Participants .................................................................91
   Background Information ..................................................................................93
   Data Collection .................................................................................................94
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel of Experts</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Issues</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Researcher</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Results</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Altruistic Leadership</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic Leadership and Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes Related to Altruistic Leadership</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Altruistic Leadership in Intercollegiate Coaching</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Outcomes</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Research</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications and Recommendations</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Demographic Questionnaire</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Interview Guide</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Consent Form</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prenotification E-mail</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rational versus Ethical Leaders</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of Leadership Theory</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of Motivation Theory</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managerial Approaches to Motivation</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demographic Information</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LIST OF FIGURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrelationship of four main categories of variables</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes for Ohio State and Michigan Studies</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House’s Path-Goal Theory of Leadership</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional and transformational leadership</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The multidimensional model of leadership</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of ethical leadership</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory adapted for intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary model of altruistic leadership</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Researchers have examined several aspects of coaches’ leadership styles in intercollegiate athletics (Armstrong, 1993; Bird, 1977; Branch, 1990; Buckiewicz, 1975; Chelladurai & Carron, 1983; Cusak & Schraibman, 1986; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; McKay, 1986; Quarterman, 1998; Scott, 1999; Snyder, 1990, Watkins, 1983). These studies have aligned with the progression of leadership theories. For example, studies on coaches’ leadership styles have been conducted on traits, behaviors, and situations involved in the leadership process. Most recently, sport researchers have applied the theories of transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership involves the leader’s ability to focus on task responsibilities, and transformational leadership involves the ability to motivate followers to go beyond expectations to reach higher goals. While knowledge of the requisite skills and strategies of a game are paramount to winning, many of these studies on leadership indicate that this knowledge alone will not produce a successful coach.

A coach as a leader must also be able to communicate with and motivate players. Such aspects of coaching are dependent upon the interpersonal dynamics between a coach and player. These dynamics involve psychological factors that assist coaches
toward more successfully managing the efforts of athletes. Interpersonal efforts put forth by the coach influence athletes’ performance and psychological outcomes, such as self-esteem and satisfaction (Chelladurai, 1984; Smoll, Smith, Barnett, & Everett, 1993). Poczwardowski, Barott, and Henschen (2002) viewed athletes’ relationship with the coach as having “a great impact on the athletes’ training processes, performance outcomes, and many aspects of their personal lives” (p. 117).

One type of leadership that draws heavily on interpersonal dynamics is altruistic leadership. This type of leadership has been examined recently in other areas of the literature, such as business and psychology, but has yet to be examined within the sport literature. Altruism, as defined in social psychology (Batson, 1991), is a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare. Altruistic leadership, as defined in this study, is the ability of leaders to guide followers with the ultimate goal of increasing the followers’ welfare. Partington and Shangi (1992) stated that the current literature “doesn’t come near to portraying the depth of mutual respect and caring that can develop between players and coaches” (p. 30). Studies on leadership that focus on the welfare of followers have not received research attention in intercollegiate athletics.

Problem Statement

Although studies have been completed on altruism (Batson & Shaw, 1991), a dearth of literature exists on the examination of altruism and coaching. A review of the literature indicated that studies have occurred in psychology (Batson, Ahmad, Yin, Bedell, Johnson, Templin, & Whiteside, 1999), business (Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996), and medicine (Cohen, 1998; Glannon & Ross,
Altruism could also be studied in intercollegiate coaching as well. For example, coaches and student-athletes spend a considerable amount of time together when care and concern would be helpful to the athletes, not only in their skill development but also in their overall personal development.

The interaction between intercollegiate coaches and athletes occurs during an especially vital stage of a student-athletes development (Chickering, 1969). A coach could guide student-athletes who have academic concerns, social difficulties, or career decisions. LeUnes and Nation (2002) quoted college coaches regarding their role in student-athletes lives. Terry Holland, a basketball coach at the University of Virginia stated, “When you’re a surrogate father for 14, 15 kids, you’re shackled with this mind-boggling responsibility.” Another college coach, George Raveling, stated, “You spend a great part of your time in activities that have nothing to do with coaching, and many times coaches aren’t qualified to deal with those areas. You’re dealing with drugs, agents, gambling, academics, all the spillovers from everyday society.” In addition, LeUnes and Nation (2002) described the role of a coach as being concerned with athletes’ overall welfare. They also described the importance of players sensing commitment from the coach to not only care about their athletic welfare but also their personal well being. Thus, it is vitally important to examine this understudied area of leadership in intercollegiate athletics.
Brief Background Literature

The following provides a brief introduction to the important aspects of the literature guiding this research. This literature has been utilized to develop the purpose of the research.

Interpersonal Dynamics of Coaches’ Leadership

Leadership has been related to interpersonal dynamics as a role to be filled by a leader. Mintzberg (1973) stated that interpersonal dynamics come in many different forms. Some forms are more ceremonial and symbolic, such as greeting people. Others are similar to a liaison interaction where the leader maintains informational links through mail, phone calls, and meetings. Yet, others are more directive and motivational, such as training and counseling followers. This motivational and counseling role of leadership interactions is certainly a part of the interaction between coaches and athletes. Intercollegiate coaches spend a considerable amount of time training and counseling their players.

The complex and multifaceted nature of the coach-athlete interpersonal relationship is intriguing. To focus on the nature of interpersonal relations in general, Chrzanowski (cited in Anchin & Kiesler, 1982) stated that interpersonal relations represent “boundaries between the individual and his overall environment that are always in a state of complex interpretation” (p. xiii). Teyber (2000) offered insight into this interpersonal complexity by distinguishing aspects of the interpersonal interaction. These aspects included the content of the interaction and the process of how people interact. For example, Teyber explained an interpersonal dynamic process called response
specificity. This aspect included the ability to determine the specific relationship experience that each person needs and the ability to be flexible in meeting the other person’s needs. Therefore, through this and other aspects of interaction, coaches may be better able to help athletes by responding to athletes’ needs.

Several studies pave the way to understanding the interpersonal dynamics between athletes and coaches. Carron and Chelladurai (1978) presented a framework to examine interpersonal behavior of coaches and athletes (figure 1). Their main concern was the compatibility between a coach and athlete. This compatibility involved the degree of congruence between the situational demands and the actual behavior that is reciprocally wanted to meet the needs of the coach and the athlete. Singer (1972) stated, “many grueling hours of practice with meaningful interactions between the coach and athlete serve as a basis for athletic achievement” (p. ix) (cited in Carron & Chelladurai, 1978). However, the outcomes go beyond athletic achievement (Weiss & Friedriches, 1986) to include psychosocial impacts. For example, satisfaction of the athlete has been shown in relation to the coaching style, such as whether the coach’s style provides positive feedback or social support (Chelladurai, 1984; Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Horne & Carron, 1985). Therefore, the interpersonal dynamics between a coach and athlete has effects on outcomes.

Interpersonal Dynamics and Altruistic Motivation

Interactions between people come in many forms, and one form of interaction is helping. Motives involved in helpful interactions also come in various forms, such as egoistic motives and unselfish motives. One type of motivation is called altruism. The
topic of altruism has a conceptual complexity that challenges researchers to question human nature and the underlying motives of helpful interactions. Altruism is defined as a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare (Batson, 1991). To improve another’s welfare, the person providing the help must be able to identify the needs of the other person. This could be accomplished through skills that facilitate interactions, such as caring and listening.

Skills and abilities have been linked to interpersonal interactions and altruism. Foa and Foa (1975) linked altruism to the social exchange theory that described human interactions as strategic transactions that are to maximize one’s rewards and minimize one’s costs. However, the question with social exchange theory is whether this is simply self-interest in disguise as opposed to altruism. Another skill related to interactions and altruism was empathy. Empathy occurs when a person focuses more on the distress of another instead of their own issues. Hoffman (1981) supported that empathy comes naturally with sympathy and compassion. With further research, Batson, Ahmad, Lishner, and Tsang (2002) separated interactions that involve sympathy, compassion, and empathy. The findings indicated that when empathy was aroused, people consistently helped regardless of environmental challenges, whereas sympathy and compassion did not result in consistent helpful behaviors. Therefore, empathy, whether naturally aroused or trained, facilitates altruism in social interactions.
Development of Altruistic Leadership

As this research study began, altruistic leadership was the singular topic of concern. However, after further reading of the literature on altruism (Batson, 1987; Hoffman, 1981; Krebs, 1975), the findings appeared to reveal several factors that comprise altruistic leadership, even though none of the studies comprehensively investigated these factors in relation to altruistic leadership. That is, for a leader to be considered “altruistic”, he or she may require several abilities. These abilities include the development of empathy, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, and social skills, all of which form the construct of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995).

Previous research indicated a clear connection between the development of empathy and altruism (Batson, 1987, 1991; Coke, Batson, & McDavis, 1978; Krebs, 1975). Batson (1991, 1995) theorized that empathy creates a willingness to help. Empathy in the context of altruistic motivation (Batson, Ahmad, Lishner, & Tsang, 2002) has been defined as “other-oriented emotional response elicited by and congruent with the perceived welfare of someone else” (p. 486). A feeling of empathy shifts a person’s focus to the person suffering. Krebs (1975) stated, “When required to make a choice between helping themselves at a cost to the performer or helping the performer at a cost to themselves, the subjects who reacted most empathetically behaved most altruistically” (p. 1134).

Empathy is only one factor of emotional intelligence, but the other factors have not been consciously connected to altruism. However, Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) discussed the association between emotional intelligence and leadership. He
wrote, “The emotional task of the leader is primal - that is, first - in two senses: It is both the original and the most important act of leadership” (p. 5). Thus, altruistic leadership may never be enacted without the ability to control emotions and implement social skills to interact with others. According to Goleman (1998), the skills of emotional intelligence are trainable. Even though no intentional connection has been researched, previous literature indicated that altruism could be developed in many ways associated with the learning of emotional intelligence. Therefore, a connection between emotional intelligence and altruistic leadership could produce interpersonal interactions that facilitate helpful behaviors.

*Outcomes of Effective Interpersonal Dynamics*

Effective interpersonal dynamics are interactions that maintain positive relations with others (Vangelisti, Daly, & Friedrich, 1999). Altruistic leadership is a form of effective interpersonal dynamics. When people recognize that another person is willing to devote time, energy, and resources on their behalf, commitment and intimacy grows within the relationship (Vangelisti, et al. 1999). This investment of effort that the leader makes in helping a follower directly related to commitment between the individuals. The following section discusses the outcomes of effective interpersonal interactions of coaches and athletes.

Both youth and collegiate coach-athlete interactions were examined in these studies, and a synthesis of these findings is summarized. Many outcomes have been discussed in the coach-athlete interpersonal dynamics literature. Berardinis, Barwind, Flaniningam, and Jenkins (1983) investigated the link between interpersonal skills
training and performance for an intercollegiate women’s track team. The findings indicated that interpersonal skills predicted athletic performance. Also in support of the performance outcome from interpersonal dynamics, Tutko and Richards (1971) utilized professional team consulting to identify key factors to performance. These factors related to interpersonal dynamics, such as mutual respect, feelings of importance, and fair treatment felt by athletes from their interactions with coaches. Therefore, relationships between coach-athlete interactions have been linked to successful performance.

Another line of literature focused on the impact of training and developing youth coaches on helpful coaching behaviors, and the impact of this training on psychosocial outcomes. A study by Smoll et al. (1993) investigated the effects on athletes’ self-esteem from training appropriate behaviors for Little League baseball coaches. The players with the eight-trained coaches showed improvement in self-esteem over the course of the season, but the players of the ten untrained coaches did not gain self-esteem. Another study examining the effects of training coaches, this time in anxiety-reduction strategies designed to help athletes, found the players reported having more fun. In addition these players also showed reduced amount of trait anxiety (Smith, Smoll, & Barnett, 1995). Therefore, there was support for psychosocial advantages to athletes with the appropriate training and development of coaches.

Cohesion is another psychosocial outcome from interpersonal dynamic research in sport. In 1971, Martens and Petersen developed the Sport Cohesion Questionnaire. Several factors were used to measure cohesion, including athlete’s sense of belonging and value of team membership, player’s mutual liking, and their direct perception of the
team’s closeness and teamwork. Partington and Shangi (1992) delineated several forms of cohesion, including mutual liking, attraction to the group, task integration, and a sense of self-transcendent group identity. Carron was involved in studies to validate the connection between team cohesion and team performance (Shangi & Carron, 1987; Brawley, Carron, & Widmeyer, 1987). Therefore, the effectiveness of interpersonal interaction between athletes and coaches is connected to the multidimensional nature of cohesion and may, subsequently, interact with other outcomes.

The literature reviewed regarding interpersonal dynamics between athletes and coaches indicated that coaches could use the relationships they establish with athletes to achieve beneficial outcomes such as enhanced performance, higher self-esteem, and higher cohesion. Coaches’ genuine concern for athletes helps in many ways, and this review of performance and psychosocial outcomes associated with athletes’ interpersonal interactions with coaches suggests that future studies regarding altruistic leadership is warranted given the positive outcomes stated above.
Purpose Statement

The primary purpose of this study was to explain coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. A secondary purpose was to determine what factors of emotional intelligence emerged with the coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Lastly, the relationship between perceptions of altruistic leadership and the outcomes that emerged in the coaches’ perceptions was examined.

In order to accomplish this purpose, interviews were utilized to explore perceptions of intercollegiate coaches. The following research questions guided the study:

Research Questions

The major research questions in this study are:

1. What are coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership?
2. Are factors of emotional intelligence related to interview responses regarding a coach’s development of altruistic leadership?
3. Do coaches’ associate altruistic leadership with positive outcomes of performance and increased psychosocial development among student-athletes?

Importance and Implications of the Study

Development of altruistic leadership may seem like an ideal rather than an attainable objective. However, the conscientious effort to develop altruistic motivations may be the first important step towards improving the emotional sensitivity people have for others in sport contexts. In over 25 experiments in other contexts, researchers have
found that people do focus on the welfare of others without regard for their own well-being (Batson, 1991, 1995; Dovidio, 1991; Staub, 1991; Wallach & Wallach, 1983). By also training and developing the development factors of emotional intelligence, coaches may obtain a greater sense of self and others (Bianco, & Eklund, 2001). These coaches with heightened self-awareness, motivation, self-regulation, empathy, and social skills may be better able to produce positive outcomes for their athletes as well as themselves.

Intercollegiate athletics provides a competitive environment where considerable challenges to altruistic leadership exist. The “big business” of intercollegiate athletics, where rule violations and ethical problems occur, is not going to disappear (Byers, 1995). There is still a need for practical sport management skills guided by effective business theory, such as a training and development program guided by a theoretical model of altruistic leadership. However, a similar need exists for knowledge in the field of sport psychology that pertains to the psychosocial needs of the athletes and coaches.

In order to pursue the objectives of an athletic program, the athletic department must effectively manage the human resources for the athletic teams. In addition, the needs of the individuals within the organization must also be considered. Athletes have performance and psychosocial needs that may be enhanced by training and development programs for coaches that include the knowledge related to sport psychology. Therefore, this synthesized background literature on interpersonal dynamics of coaches and athletes, altruism, and emotional intelligence provides a connection between sport management and sport psychology. This step moves toward a more caring sport environment that many research methodologies could investigate further. As summarized by Batson et al.
(2002), “Many questions remain about the emotional and motivational resources that could be tapped to build a more caring, humane society” (p. 494).

Definitions

This section contains definitions used to design the interview questions. These constitutive and operational definitions are included to give the reader a better understanding of the concepts being explored. Kerlinger (1986) defined a constitutive definition as using constructs to define a construct and operational definitions as assigning meaning to a construct by specifying the operations or activities to measure it. The definitions for topics in this study are listed below.

1. Development of Altruistic leadership: An article by Twemlow (2001) defined altruistic leadership in organizations as being “motivated to a leadership style that emphasizes self development with care and concern for others rather than on technical, materialistic, or organizational components” (p. 450).

2. Emotional Intelligence: Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) defined emotional intelligence as “how leaders handle themselves and their relationships” (p. 6). In this study, emotional intelligence is operationally defined by the five factors determined by Goleman (1998) including self-awareness, empathy, self-regulation, social skill, and self-motivation. Each factor will be examined through the interview responses on the coaches’ altruistic leadership.

3. Self-Awareness: using “the ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions, and drives, as well as effects on others” (Goleman, 1998). Self-awareness has been operationally defined as the indication in interviews of the coaches’ ability
to recognize her or his own moods and drives, as well as her or his effects on others in the athletic department.

4. Empathy: using “the ability to understand the emotional makeup of other people and the skill in treating people according to their emotional reactions” (Goleman, 1998). Empathy has been operationally defined as the indication in interviews of the coaches’ ability to understand emotions of others’ in the athletic department and treating others with regard to their emotional reaction.

5. Self-regulation: using “the ability to control or redirect disruptive impulses and moods, in addition to the propensity to suspend judgment to think before acting” (Goleman, 1998). Self-regulation has been operationally defined as indications in interviews of the coaches’ controlling her or his moods in addition to thinking before acting.

6. Social Skill: using “proficiency in managing relationships and building networks, in addition to an ability to find common ground and build rapport” (Goleman, 1998). Social skill has been operationally defined as indications in interviews of the coaches’ skill in managing relationships and building rapport.

7. Self-motivation: using “a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status, in addition to a propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence” (Goleman, 1998). Motivation has been operationally defined as the indication in interviews of the coaches’ reasons for coaching and level of energy pursuing her or his goals.

8. Outcomes: Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) defined an outcome as a variable effected or expected to be effected by another variable. Outcomes have been operationally
defined as the indication in interviews of variables effected by altruistic leadership, such as performance and psychosocial outcomes.

9. Performance: Chelladurai (1990) questioned the use of team performance as a reliable measure of performance. In this study, performance was defined as an advancement in an athlete’s pursuit of excellence (LeUnes, et al., 2002). The operational definition is the indication of athletes’ performing at a higher level.

10. Psychosocial Outcomes: Webster’s College Dictionary (2000) defined psychosocial as pertaining to the psychological development of an individual in relation to his or her social environment. Smith and Smoll involved several psychosocial factors in their studies (Smoll et al., 1993; Smith et al., 1995). In this study, the factors of psychosocial outcomes were operationally defined as indications of self-esteem, cohesion, and anxiety levels.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study was limited by the nature of the data collected and delimited by the sample selected. For example, the data was collected through interviews that have little control over participants’ responses. Participants could respond in a way to enhance their self-image, or they may respond arbitrarily without putting much thought into their answers. This study was delimited to Division I intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. It was also delimited by using only head coaches from Division I. Therefore, the results may not be generalized to other populations, such as head coaches in Division III or assistant coaches in Division I.
Overview of the Chapters

Chapter 1 introduced the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, the importance of the study, limitations, and delimitations. Additionally, the conceptual basis of the study was established. The research questions were also clarified. Chapter 2 contains literature and research related to the broad topics that contain altruism and emotional intelligence. These topics are leadership and motivation. Methodology for this study is presented in Chapter 3 and includes the research design, selection of the sample, data collection tasks, and data analysis procedures. Results obtained from this method are available in Chapter 4. The final chapter, Chapter 5, is a discussion of the study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to explore intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Altruistic leadership is defined as the ability to guide with the ultimate motivation of increasing followers’ welfare. To accomplish the purpose of the study, the review of literature will examine several contextual factors that relate to altruistic leadership. This chapter was divided into four sections to facilitate the review: (a) leadership; (b) motivation; (c) altruism; (d) and emotional intelligence. A common thread connects these contextual factors and will be described through previous literature.

Leadership

Burns (1978) stated that leadership is one of the “most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2). Previous research on the topic of leadership has created a complex puzzle of findings interpreted from several different perspectives. These varying interpretations have resulted in a lack of clear understanding of leadership and what creates effective leadership. At this point in the research, the puzzle has pieces of findings that are inconsistent, and gaps reveal that pieces are still missing. Muchinsky (1987) wrote that, despite the 8000 citations and references in The Handbook of Leadership (Bass, 1981), theories contain only partial truths”.
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A review of the literature indicated that the various leadership models fall short of recognizing the full range of variables influencing leadership. Many theories focused on the traits or behaviors of the leader, and other theories focused on the situation surrounding the leader. However, recent trends in leadership theory have given greater consideration to a variety of factors. Another trend has been to focus on a particular aspect of leadership, such as ethical leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). The variety of perspectives has accompanied a variety of definitions. Klenke (1993) stated that leadership definitions are divergent, overlapping, and inconsistent.” Based on research evidence, this existence of gaps and disagreements in leadership conceptualization lent support for continued research efforts.

Even though general leadership theories have been conceptualized since the beginning of the twentieth century (Bass, 1981), sport leadership has only been studied within the last 30 years (Danielson, 1976; Danielson, Zelhart, & Drake, 1975). These studies on leadership constituted a major segment of physical education and sport administration literature (Paton, 1987). Soucie’s (1994) literature review revealed that many of the studies were descriptive in nature and focused on the previous leadership theory of task-oriented structure versus relationship-oriented consideration. Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) reported a lack of strong support for these previous theories. However, many sport management researchers have undertaken the study of more recent leadership theories (Armstrong, 1993; Bourner & Weese, 1995; Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996; Pruin & Boucher, 1995; Reimer & Fink, 2000; Wallace & Weese, 1995; Weese, 1995a; Yusaf, 1998; Case, 1998).
The purpose of this section is to acknowledge the previous leadership research, determine the weaknesses, and utilize the strengths to create an understanding of leadership for the current study on coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. This information was arranged in a sequence beginning with a general viewpoint progressing to a specific research purpose. Therefore, this section will add value to leadership literature by integrating past research, acknowledging various perspectives, placing leadership theory in the context of intercollegiate coaching, and leading to the future research of altruistic leadership.

Leadership Definition

The concept of leadership has changed throughout time and will continue to change as research advances. For the purpose of this study, a general definition of leadership was chosen, but several definitions were reviewed. Rost (1993) defined leadership as an influential relationship among leaders and followers who intend changes that reflect a shared purpose. Three key portions of this definition included 1) the concept of leadership being among people, 2) the desired change, and 3) a shared purpose. Previous definitions focused on the influence of leaders on followers (Smith & Peterson, 1988). For example, Barrow (1977) stated that, “Leadership is the behavioral process of influencing individuals or groups toward set goals” (p.232). Rost’s (1993) definition assumed a reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers. In addition, leadership definitions typically involved a goal or striving toward changes, instead of accepting the current situation. Rost’s (1993) definition included a shared purpose. The inclusion of followers’ input into goals was a change occurring through history. For
example, many previous definitions focused on the organization’s goals only, such as Tosi, Rizzo, and Carrol (1986) stated, “Leadership is interpersonal influence which occurs when one person is able to gain compliance from another in the direction of organizationally desired goals” (p. 550). Therefore, follower needs have become more influential on leadership theories. Overall, Chelladurai (2001) summarized, “All definitions of leadership emphasize that it is a behavioral process aimed at influencing members to work toward achieving the group’s goal” (p. 277).

In the management of sport, many people are considered to be in leadership positions. Athletic directors, coaches, and even athletes serve as leaders in intercollegiate athletics. The central leadership position considered for this study was the intercollegiate coach. However, the literature reviewed included samples from the athletic director population as well. Many issues still remain to be addressed in the leadership of sport. Chelladurai (1993) recommended that studies on leadership in sport should investigate various antecedent, consequent, and moderating variables. Studies presented throughout this section include a variety of these variable types in relation to sport leadership, and by acknowledging these variables in relation to altruistic leadership, an understanding of important factors to consider with altruistic leadership was established.

*Early Leadership Theories*

Early theories of leadership shifted from a focus on the person, to a focus on behaviors, and to a focus on the situation surrounding the leader. In this section, six early leadership theories have been chosen for analysis based on connections with sport
literature. However, these six theories certainly are not an exhaustive review of all early leadership theories. These theories include trait theory, behavior theory, Fielder’s contingency theory, path-goal theory, life-cycle theory, and the functional model. Each theory has also been synthesized with issues in intercollegiate coaching.

*Trait Theory*

The trait theory focused on the characteristics of the leader. For example, Bass (1981) reported 23 studies that found more intelligent leaders were more effective than less intelligent leaders. This categorization of effective and ineffective traits was a strength of the trait theory. Based on traits found to be more effective for leaders, organizations could base their selection processes on the presence or absence of these traits. However, Bass (1981) also mentioned that five other studies disagreed with these findings regarding intelligence. Stogdill (1948) also examined many empirical studies on leadership attributes. His findings indicated that only the traits of intelligence and height consistently separated leaders and followers. In addition to these incongruent results, another weakness is the potential for constructing a long list of unrealistic traits for leader selection. Further review of leadership theories will show the lack of comprehensiveness of the trait theory.

The trait theory is often applied to intercollegiate coaches. For example, Hendry (1969) investigated the connection between coaching success and personality traits of swimming coaches. Danylchuk, Inglis, and Pastore (1996) found that one of the most critical factors in attainment of intercollegiate coaching positions was personal traits. Therefore, traits of coaches are still used as perceived factors to successful leadership.
Behavior Theory

The behavior theory focused on what the leader does as opposed to the characteristics of the leader. In the 1950's, The Ohio State University studies (Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957) created several scales that isolated two behaviors: consideration and structure. Consideration involved behaviors that created trust and rapport. Structure dealt with behaviors to make sure work is completed, such as planning and motivating. Subordinates completed a checklist of behaviors on the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). At the same time of the Ohio State studies of leadership, Michigan studies were also independently configuring a model with similar components (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950; Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, & Floor, 1951). These components were called employee orientation and production orientation. A strength of these theories was the relationship found between consideration scores on the LBDQ and employee satisfaction (Fleishman & Harris, 1962). In addition, Morse & Reimer (1956) reported that production orientation caused employee dissatisfaction, resentment, turnover, and absenteeism. Figure 2 illustrated the outcomes associated with the leadership behaviors. Many weaknesses have also been suggested for the behavioral approach. For example, a weakness was the behaviors of a leader in one situation might not be effective for leaders in other situations (House & Dessler, 1974; Yukl, 1971). Therefore, considerable variation was found in preferred leadership behaviors across situations.
The behavior theory also showed similar weaknesses in sport literature. Differences were found in leadership behaviors preferred by different age groups (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). In addition, athletes also reported differences for male and female coaches. Despite these differences, coaching behaviors are one of the primary criteria for coaching evaluations (Barber & Eckrich, 1998). For example, MacLean and Chelladurai (1995) developed six criteria of coaching that included team products, personal products, direct task behaviors, indirect task behaviors, administrative maintenance behaviors, and public relations behaviors. In a follow-up study by MacLean and Zakrajsek (1996), the findings indicated the most important criteria, according to both coaches and athletic directors, was direct task behaviors. Therefore, behaviors are still considered important in coaching leadership. In addition, structure behaviors appeared to be perceived as more important than consideration behaviors. This clearly illustrated the previous importance people placed on task accomplishment of leaders over interpersonal relationships.

*Fielder’s Contingency Model*

Fielder’s contingency model (1967, 1978) focused on the situational aspects of the leader’s environment. Berry and Houston (1993) reported that this was the most widely researched and criticized of more modern theories. The theory suggested that both situations and traits predict effective leadership. Two styles were formed from this theory: task oriented and relationship oriented. Task oriented referred to an autocratic style of leadership, and relationship oriented referred to a democratic style of leadership. Moreover, the leadership style had to fit the situation. Three factors contributed to the
situation: leader and member interaction, task structure, and power position of the leader. The measurement questionnaire used in accordance with this theory was the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC). To complete this questionnaire, the leader responded to questions about least preferred behaviors of opposing extremes. Scores indicated whether the leader was relationship oriented or task oriented. Many weaknesses were considered regarding Fiedler’s model. These weaknesses included a lack of statistical significance for the model, problems with interpretation, and confounded variables (Graen, Alvares, Orris, & Martella, 1970; Graen, Orris, & Alvares, 1971; Kerr & Harlan, 1973; Rice, 1978; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977).

Sport researchers have had some success with Fiedler’s contingency model. For example, Chelladurai and Doherty (1998) stated that situation favorableness and leadership orientation matched when university Canadian athletes preferred coaches who demonstrated more autocratic decision-making. However, sport researchers also had problems with the use of this theory. A study conducted by Bird (1977) did not find support for the contingency model with female intercollegiate volleyball players and coaches. Even though the contingency model has had success in the business literature (Fiedler, 1954), the sport environment may not be as supportive of the contingency theory (Danielson, 1976).

Path-Goal Theory

House (1971) developed a situational model of leadership called the path-goal theory. The model described what a leader could do to motivate subordinates to achieve goals. An effective leader was described as a catalyst and facilitator to provide
subordinates with a personal payoff. Therefore, the leader’s main function was to motivate others and make an easier path to their goals. This model also used a contingency framework by showing concern for situational factors that affect leadership. These factors included characteristics of the subordinates and environmental constraints that would impact subordinate needs and effectiveness. Figure 3 showed that leadership behavior may be supportive, directive, achievement-oriented, or participative, and the connection to subordinates’ satisfaction and effort is mediated by their expectancies and valences and moderated by their characteristics and environmental factors. Szilagyi & Wallace (1990) reported that most research focused on dimensions of directive and supportive leadership, and these studies support directive leadership styles for ambiguous and unstructured tasks but supportive leadership for defined and structured tasks (House & Dessler, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974). Weaknesses of the theory have been recognized. Yukl (1994) questioned theoretical deficiencies, such as the possibility of leadership styles interacting with one another. Regardless of the weaknesses, the path-goal theory accounted for many leadership behaviors and situational influences.

In the sport literature, Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) found partial support for the path-goal theory. Their findings indicated that members of team sports preferred leadership styles that would improve individual performance and facilitate improvements by clarifying relationships among team members. Vos Strache (1979) conducted a study with the path-goal theory on female intercollegiate basketball players. In support of the theory, players from winning teams perceived the coach to be high on technical skills to facilitate their improvement towards their goal. However, losing team players perceived
their coach to be higher on tolerance. Therefore, sport research has shown support for the relationship between leadership behavior, athletes’ expectancies and valences, and effort.

*Life-Cycle Theory*

The life-cycle theory focused more on subordinate behavior than leader behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; Hersey, Blanchard, & Hambleton, 1980). This theory suggested three factors to leadership effectiveness: maturity of followers, task behavior, and relationship behavior. Maturity referred to motivation, compliance, and experience of the subordinates. Task behavior involved one-way communication and what, when, and how to do a task. Relationship behavior included two-way communication, social support, and reinforcement. Four styles of leadership were configured from the three factors. These styles were called telling, selling, participating, and delegating. For example, the delegating style was low in task behavior and low in relationship behavior. Therefore, the delegating style would be appropriate for mature followers by giving them the freedom to make their own decisions.

Few studies have been conducted on the life-cycle theory in the sport literature. However, the theory would appear to apply across the ages from youth to elite sport. For example, youth athletes might require a coach low in task behavior and high in relationship behavior, whereas an intercollegiate athlete might need a coach low in task and relationship behavior. A study by Neil and Kirby (1985) gave partial support to the life-cycle theory. They collected information from elite and novice Canadian athletes in outdoor sports, such as rowing, canoeing, and kayaking. A difference occurred between
Novice and elite athletes. Novice athletes preferred coaches that were more helpful and less task specific. Therefore, the maturity of athletes may influence the effectiveness of the leadership style.

**Functional Model**

Behling and Schriesheim (1976) proposed the functional model. This model suggests that success of the group depended on the satisfaction of needs related to expression and instrumental functions. Expressive needs referred to interpersonal interactions, social and emotional connections, and cohesion and morale. Instrumental needs refer to task achievement. The functional model has not been tested extensively in sport contexts, but the theory seems to apply to sport. For example, some coaches are better at fulfilling social psychological needs and others are more task-oriented. Reese (1983) studied collegiate intramural basketball teams for expressive and instrumental needs. The findings indicated a moderate correlation between the two types of needs. Another study (Reese & Segal, 1984) on football teams also found little support for the functional theory. Therefore, no support was indicated for the distinction made in the theory, but the two factors of functional needs seem similar to the distinctions in consideration versus initiating structure and employee orientation versus production orientation leader behavior determined by the Ohio State and Michigan studies.

**Summary of Early Theories**

As time progressed, the theories included more factors. The beginning theories referred to either traits or behaviors. Later theories included aspects of leadership styles, followers, goals, and situations. A distinction between relationship needs and task needs
did not gain support. Perhaps, coaches need both relationship oriented and task oriented behaviors to meet the relationship oriented and task oriented needs of the athletes. Therefore, the key to effectiveness may be a leader’s ability to be empathetic to the interpersonal and the task needs of the athletes in each situation, in addition to knowing and regulating the appropriate behaviors to these needs. Clearly, more research is still needed due to the inconsistencies indicating that a variety of factors are influencing outcomes.

*Current Leadership Theories*

More recent leadership theories focused on leader-participant interactions with an emphasis on the importance of followers in the leadership process (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998). In addition, Weese (1995b) recognized that attention was shifting back towards leader traits and behaviors. Bass and Avolio (1993) felt that the recent leadership theories go beyond the behavioral theories, contingency theory, and path-goal theory. Due to the vast amount of recent leadership theories, the theories chosen for review align with the topic of intercollegiate coaching. These theories include the transactional and transformational theory, multidimensional theory, and ethical leadership theory.
**Transactional and Transformational Leadership**

Burns (1978) originally conceptualized the contrast between transactional and transforming leadership, and Bass (1985) suggested the label “transformational” leadership. Transactional leadership referred to an exchange process between leaders and followers. Leaders strove to meet the followers’ needs in return for the followers’ efforts to meet the set goals. The relationship was based on economic and social transactions geared toward the present management of the organization.

Transformational leadership differs from transactional leadership in many ways. Instead of a focus on current management, the transformational leader was concerned with change through vision and strategy. They built relationships through the use of common shared values and ideas with the followers. Four differences between the two types of leadership have been clearly determined: the development of followers into leaders; the elevation of followers’ needs from basic to self-actualization; the inspiration of followers beyond their self-interest for the better of the group; and a creation of a future desirable vision (Bass, 1995, 1990; Yammarino, Sprangler, & Bass, 1993).

Bass (1985) also acknowledged four distinct qualities of a transformational leader: charisma, vision, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Charisma involved the ability to inspire others. Vision meant the leader idealized a future goal. Intellectual stimulation referred to the ability to encourage creative problem solving. Individualized consideration acknowledged the ability to develop others beyond their lower level needs of security and affiliation to higher order needs of self-esteem and self-actualization.
Burns (1978) described transforming leadership as a “process that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation to improve” (p. 20). According to Burns (1978), the transforming leader would be idealistic and moralistic by placing high value on justice and equality. In addition, Burns (1978) described leaders as having altruistic qualities through their motivation to fulfill follower’s self interests. Even though Bass (1985) agreed that a transformational leader would heighten motivation toward extra effort (figure 4) and take action to meet the needs of followers, he stated that transformational leaders might not act in accordance with moral values. This relates to another leadership theory to be discussed later in this chapter.

The sport literature of transactional and transformational leadership has been proposed as a path to understanding effective leadership (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). However, findings did not show a clear path to effectiveness. Prujin and Boucher (1995) studied Dutch national sport organizations and they found no statistical difference between transactional and transformational leaders in relation to organizational effectiveness. A study conducted by Bourner and Weese (1995) investigated the Canadian Hockey League. Their findings indicated no significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness. Even with a broader sample, Langley and Weese’s (1995) study on the Canadian national sport organizations also found no significant difference in effectiveness or employee satisfaction in relation to whether the leader was transactional or transformational.
Hope for the effectiveness of the transformational theory was lifted by Doherty and Danylchuk’s (1996) study. The researchers used athletic directors of Ontario University’s Athletic Association and the Ontario Women’s Interuniversity Athletic Association. The findings indicated a positive relationship between coaches’ satisfaction and perceived leader effectiveness to transformational leadership behavior. Another study by Yusof (1998) also supported the helpfulness of transformational leadership behavior. This study was based on athletic directors and coaches from NCAA Division III athletic organizations. Coaches’ job satisfaction significantly related to transformational leadership behavior. Therefore, more support was added to the proposed connection between transformational leadership and job satisfaction.
Multidimensional Model of Sport Leadership

The multidimensional model of leadership (figure 5) encouraged congruence among actual, required, and preferred leaders’ behaviors to determine performance and satisfaction (Chelladurai, 1990; Chelladurai & Carron, 1978). Required coaching behavior from the Leadership Scale in Sports included selection of players, organization of practices, creation of a disciplined atmosphere, meeting the press and public, and other similar activities. Preferred behavior, according to players, was competence, fairness, and humane treatment. Actual behavior depended on the coach and was consistent with her or his own goals, ability, and personality. In studies by Chelladurai and Salah, (1978, 1980), five coaching behaviors were placed into three categories: training and instruction, decision styles (democratic and autocratic), and motivational factors (social support and rewarding behavior). Congruence between these three types of behavior was proposed to determine satisfaction and performance.
This model has been supported by various studies through the use of the Leadership Scale in Sports (LSS). Many sport related studies have tested the multidimensional model. Chelladurai (1984) investigated the issue of congruence by administering both the preferred and perceived versions of the LSS. This study indicated Canadian University athletes’ satisfaction depended on training and instruction and social support behaviors. Chelladurai and Carron (1983) used a high school and university sample of basketball players with the preferred leadership version of the LSS. They assessed the relationship between maturity of the athletes and their preference for task or relationship oriented leaders. The findings indicated a preference for both orientations increased as maturity increased. These findings stimulated concern with the weakness of defining maturity, and the role of sport in maturity development.

In regards to gender issues, gender has been found as a factor creating differences in preferences. Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) in their study of physical education students found females preferred autocratic styles of leadership less than male students’ preferences. Therefore, the multidimensional model offered useful guidance to the numerous variables related to leadership impacting the performance and satisfaction of subordinates.
Lastly, in alignment with the creation of the multidimensional model as a conglomeration of previous theories, the most recent revision of the multidimensional model added the theory of transformational leadership as an antecedent to situational characteristics, leader characteristics, and member characteristics (Chelladurai, 2001). Transformational leaders would have to attempt to assess the characteristics according to the vision of the leader.

**Ethical Leadership**

A basic underlying description of ethical leadership among the literature was the tension created for leaders by competing altruistic and egoistic decisions (Bass & Steidmeier, 1999; Ciulla, 1998; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1992; Kanungo & Mendoca, 1998; Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Milner, 2002). The importance of ethical leadership has taken a turn towards greater awareness in organizations due to recent debacles in financial reporting that has created difficulties for many stakeholders. Despite the damaging impact of unethical decisions in organizations, few empirical studies have investigated ethical leadership.

Harkness, Edwards, and Super (1981) created the first connection between moral development and leadership. They used a sample from Kenya, Africa to measure the moral reasoning of elders. These community-based leaders exhibited greater complexity of moral reasoning than non-leaders in the village. Other findings have been supportive of this research. Tiejen and Walker (1985) found elders in Papua New Guinea also tested to have more complex moral reasoning if the elder was a leader. Organizational literature
has taken a different direction by attempting to form models (figure 6) (Aronson, 2001) or typologies (Table 1) of moral reasoning and leadership (Howell, et al., 1992). This contributed to the connection between moral reasoning and transformational leadership (Graham, 1995; Lichtenstein, Smith, & Torbert, 1995; Petrick & Quinn, 1997).

Among these researchers, no studies reviewed for this paper used a scale that measured ethical leadership. Moral reasoning was often measured through written dilemmas that required a decision by the test taker. For example, the most recent article on ethical leadership by Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, and Milner (2002) measured ethical leadership by administering the Defining Issues Test (DIT) to determine moral reasoning (Rest, 1990). In addition, they also administered Multifactor Leadership Questionnaires to determine the level of transformational versus transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The findings of this study on a two-country sample of managers and subordinates indicated leaders scoring higher on moral reasoning also enacted more
Rational Leader | Ethical Leader
---|---
Concerned primarily with self and own goals and career advancement | Considers others equal to self, shows concern for development of others
Uses power for personal gain and impact | Uses power to serve others
Promotes own personal vision and aspirations | Aligns visions with followers’ needs
Denounces critical or opposing views | Considers and learns from criticism
Demand decisions be accepted without question | Stimulates followers to think independently and to question the leader’s view
One-way communication | Two-way communication with listening to others
Insensitive to followers’ needs | Coaches, develops, and supports followers’; shares recognition with them
Relies on convenient external moral standards to satisfy self-interests | Relies on internal moral standards to satisfy organizational and societal interests

Table 1. Rational versus ethical leaders (Daft, 1999)
transformational leadership behaviors. Other previous literature also supported a similar conceptual connection. Dukerich, Nichols, Elm, and Volrath (1990) in their study of small groups found task leaders’ level of moral reason had a positive association to group performance and the groups’ level of moral reasoning. These researchers also stated that leaders higher in moral reasoning served more as a coach and teacher.

However, not all studies have been supportive of the connection between leadership and moral development. Atwater, Dionne, Camobreco, Avolio, and Lau (1998) reported that military cadets that showed higher moral reasoning during their first year of military training did not have any relationship to future effective leadership. The authors suggested that the lack of a relationship may be influenced by the strictness of the military atmosphere. Therefore, these contradictions warrant further study on ethical leadership in other contexts.

The sport context contained articles on the importance of moral education for athletes (Bredemeier, 1995; Bredemeier, Weiss, Shields & Cooper, 1986; Gibbons, Ebbeck, & Weiss, 1995; Kleiber & Roberts, 1981; Lidor, 1998), but no sport literature was found on the influence of coaches’ ethical leadership on athletes. However, Kleiber and Roberts (1981) indicated the existence of ethical leadership problems, such as illegal recruitment of athletes, use of performance enhancement drugs, aggressive behaviors, and cheating. Howell and Avolio’s (1992) study could be applied to the sport context by qualitatively investigating the difference in charismatic sport leaders who demonstrate ethical and unethical behavior in addition to examining the impact on athletes. Several avenues for future research in sport and ethical leadership are available.
Summary of Current Theories

Current theories of leadership illustrated a change in researchers’ perceptions of leadership, but the research findings indicated further studies are still needed. A paradigm shift took place with the multidimensional model toward integration of various aspects of the situation, the leader, and the followers. This model also signifies recognition of important findings from previous studies of other leadership theories. The ethical leadership theory symbolizes a complete turn from the early focus on traits of the leader to a focus on followers and moral decisions, but moral reasoning and a leaders’ ability to focus on followers may still be considered traits. Theories such as transformational, multidimensional, and ethical leadership exemplify the many factors that influence the outcomes of leadership. At a deeper level of examination, a connection between the three theories may be a possibility. A connection has been made between transformational leadership and multidimensional leadership and between transformational leadership and ethical leadership. How would ethical leadership fit into the multidimensional model? This offers yet another path for future research on the current theories of leadership.

Now that the past and present theories of leadership have been examined (Table 2), a broad perspective has been gained. The specific purpose of this study will now be related to the leadership literature. This purpose will be a synthesis of leadership theories and the leaders sampled of this study, intercollegiate coaches.
Synthesizing Leadership Theories and Intercollegiate Coaching

Each of the leadership theories previously discussed applied to intercollegiate coaching. Intercollegiate coaches are in a leadership position with many stakeholders (Coakley, 1994), and the leadership theories on traits, behaviors, and environment apply to leaders’ ability to fulfill the goals of the stakeholders. However, some leadership theories apply to the current and future needs of intercollegiate coaching better than other theories. Previous literature has indicated the behaviors that are important in the evaluation of intercollegiate coaches (Barber & Eckrich, 1998; MacLean & Chelladurai, 1995; MacLean & Zakrajsek, 1996). This literature has helped researchers analyze perceptions of athletic directors and coaches regarding leadership needs of coaches. The next important step is to synthesize leadership theories with current and future needs of intercollegiate coaches.

Much research has been conducted on the past and current conditions of intercollegiate coaching (Leland, 1988; Martin, Arena, Rosencrans, Hunter, & Holly, 1986; Pastore, 1991; Pastore, Goldfine, & Riemer, 1996; Sabock, 1979). For example, Sabock (1979) discussed the roles a coach must fill in intercollegiate coaching. These roles included a teacher, disciplinarian, psychologist, mother, father, community citizen, university citizen, and role model. Unfortunately, coaches do not always serve as a good role model within these roles. Sperber (1990) wrote a section about coaches in his book on intercollegiate athletics, and this section was entitled A Greed City. The chapters described coaches’ “greedy behavior”, such as: demanding high salaries, pushing to win at all costs, lacking time spent with players, tending to break contracts, scalping tickets,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stodgill</td>
<td>Trait Theory</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stodgill</td>
<td>OSU Studies</td>
<td>1948, 1957, &amp; 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halpin &amp; Winer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemphill &amp; Coons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Maccoby, &amp; Morse</td>
<td>Michigan Studies</td>
<td>1950 &amp; 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, &amp; Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiedler</td>
<td>Contingency Model</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Path-Goal Theory</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey &amp; Blanchard</td>
<td>Life-Cycle Theory</td>
<td>1977 &amp; 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey, Blanchard, &amp; Hambleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behling &amp; Schriesheim</td>
<td>Functional Model</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>Transactional versus</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transforming Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelladurai</td>
<td>Multidimensional Model</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger &amp; Kanungo</td>
<td>Ethical Leadership</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Development of leadership theory
focusing on their own self interest concerning summer camp revenue, and asking for bonuses based on wins in order to gain greater financial incentives. Others have reinforced the existence of these problems (Byers, 1995; Simon, 1991; Zimbalist, 1999), but what leadership theories provide possible solutions to these current and future problems in intercollegiate coaching?

Many theories offer explanations for these problems in intercollegiate coaching. One theoretical perspective aligns with the trait approach to leadership. For example, Bellar and Stoll (1995) and Lumpkin, Stoll, and Bellar (1994) examined the problem as a difference in integrity and moral reasoning of leaders in athletics. Another approach focused more on behavior orientation of leadership. Eitzen (1989) and Simon (1991) both focused on the overemphasis on winning. This aligns with the behavioral approaches taken in the Ohio State (Halpin & Winer, 1957) and Michigan leadership studies (Katz, et al., 1950; Katz, et al., 1951). These studies divide leadership behaviors into a focus on interpersonal importance and task importance. The over emphasis on task importance, in this case would be winning, was found to create a negative impact on other work behaviors (Morse & Reimer, 1956).

In line with the transactional view of leadership, many researchers believe intercollegiate problems occur due to an economic cost benefit analysis (Sperber, 1990; Stern, 1981; Zimbalist, 1999). Transactional leadership perspective (Bass, 1985) was defined as an exchange of rewards for effort. Coaches may perceive that the rewards of misbehavior outweigh the costs. In addition, Chelladurai and Carron (1983) found athletes’ preference for task oriented leadership increased as student athletes entered the
collegiate level. Therefore, House’s path-goal theory (1971) that focused on the facilitation of subordinates to their goals may indicate a sense of responsibility that pushes for leadership problems in coaching.

If all of these theories are capable of applying to the problem, the theoretical perspective with the greatest explanatory utility could be Chelladurai’s multidimensional model of leadership (1993, 1999). The multidimensional model of leadership synthesizes other leadership theories. The leader characteristics, situational characteristics, and member characteristics may influence the coach’s actual behavior. In the reviewed literature, a leadership characteristic creating the problem was self-serving motivation of coaches, and characteristics of the intercollegiate situation and the needs of the athletes were also pinpointed. Could these factors form the structure of the problem and solution of intercollegiate coaching?

Summary

Studies on leadership have changed focus over time to recent inclusion of various factors, such as traits, behaviors, situations, and followers. Leadership theories applied to sport have followed a similar path. However, a need exists for future attempts to apply leadership theories to sport contexts. In particular, leadership problems in intercollegiate coaching still run rampant with rule violations, unethical decisions, and selfish overemphasis on winning. Solutions to these problems will require prudent hindsight, visionary foresight, ethical conviction, and influential persuasion. One key factor will be the creation of a model applicable to intercollegiate athletic leaders that guides their decisions toward the satisfaction of other’s needs.
Sport management researchers have contributed significantly to knowledge of intercollegiate administrators’ and coaches’ leadership tactics. However, Yukl (1994) also wrote, “The field of leadership is presently in a state of ferment and confusion. Most of the leadership theories are beset with conceptual weaknesses and lack empirical support” (p. 438). Many years have passed since Yukl’s (1994) statement, and important theoretical integration of leadership has occurred. Chelladurai (2001) wrote, “Because leading focuses on the interactions and reciprocal influence among the manager, the subordinates, and the situation, and because differences among individuals are numerous and complex, some have suggested that this is the most difficult and critical of the managerial functions” (p. 97). Therefore, the review of literature on various aspects of leadership was a critical step to putting the pieces of this challenging puzzle in appropriate context.

Leadership also involves motivation of a leader. Motivation is a complex internal process, and further investigation into the theories of motivation would be helpful to understanding these processes.

Motivation

Motivation is one of the most fundamental and critical behavioral topics. The number of books and periodicals on motivation indicates the intensity of interest in this area. This highly complex phenomenon affects and is affected by a multitude of factors. Weiten (2000) stated that complicated interactions occur between biological and social factors of motivation. Therefore, variables within people and variables of situations both impact the applicability of a motivation theory. Over the century, copious studies have
been conducted on various aspects of an individual’s motivation, such as genetic and hormonal processes, but studies have also been conducted on environmental factors, such as social interactions and external rewards. These studies have occurred in fields such as management, psychology, and sport.

The field of sport management is a meeting ground for these various theoretical perspectives on motivation. Sport management involves a variety of business related tasks in a sport context that involves interacting with others towards a goal, and the psychology of human behavior provides additional insight on these interactions. Typically, a sport manager interacts by leading others, and leading others involves motivating others. Chelladurai (2001) wrote, “If managers are to be effective as leaders, they should have clear understanding of how individuals are motivated, and what factors influence such motivation” (p.231). Several specific contexts in sport management require motivating subordinates to achieve goals. One specific context is intercollegiate athletics. Motivation in intercollegiate athletics may involve the motivation of athletic directors, coaches, or athletes. The position of the person leading will determine the goals to be met and who must be motivated to help meet the goals.
Athletic coaches rely on motivational tactics to help athletes do their best. Martens (1997) stated that understanding the needs of athletes and helping the athletes meet their needs is the coach’s key to motivation. Therefore, one technique for motivation will not fit each athlete’s needs. Each athlete’s needs are different, and many motivational theories must be explored to understand these differences. In addition, coaches have their own motivational style that relates to their decision making and personality (Frederick & Morrison, 1998). This adds to the complexity of the motivational situation in athletics.

This section of the literature review examined motivation by analyzing and synthesizing the available research. A broad perspective was first taken to configure a picture of early and recent theories of motivation. To configure a framework, the theories were placed in a classification structure, and the strengths and weaknesses of the classes were evaluated. Based on the knowledge gained from the analysis of previous theories, future studies were recommended. However, prior to discussing these endeavors, a definition would facilitate a common understanding of motivation.

**Definition**

Motivation has been defined in numerous ways, and the definitions have become more complex over time. For example, the word “motivation” originated in Latin with the word “movere” that was defined as “to move” (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996). Lewin (1935) wrote that “Motivation is energy (potential or kinetic), a force within the individual.” Vroom (1964) defined motivation as “a process governing choice made by persons or lower organisms among alternative forms of voluntary activity.” Some recent
definitions are still simplistic. Weiten (2000), based in the field of psychology, defined motivation as “goal directed behavior.” This definition provides simplicity, but the question is whether all aspects of motivation are acknowledged.

Typically, though, three aspects of definitions appear often. These include internal and external triggers, behavior towards a goal, and maintenance of behavior (Steers et al., 1996). Greenberg and Baron (1997), based in the field of business, included these three aspects by defining motivation as “the set of processes that arouses, directs, and maintains human behavior toward attaining some goal” (p. 585). Roberts (2001), with a sport focus, stated the importance of understanding the psychological processes of motivation that include the person’s internal qualities, their future orientation, and their evaluative process of one’s self or in comparison to others. To summarize, Roberts (2001) wrote, “motivation is an integrative construct that represents the energy with which the goal will be pursued and the perception whether the person can or will reach his or her goal” (p. 9). Theories of motivation utilize the components of these definitions.

**Evolution and Classification of Theories**

An overwhelming number of researchers have written about theories of motivation, and a thorough description of all theories goes beyond the scope of this study. However, significant historical contributions to the study of motivation have been briefly examined, and key theories providing insight into athletic motivation were acknowledged. These theories are important to sport management researchers by offering a variety of perspectives and ideas for motivation within athletics. The theories
take perspectives based on situational approaches, needs, and cognitive processes.

Overall, each researcher that provided a theory attempted to communicate a meaningful view of human factors that influence motivation.

To classify the theories, a system accepted by several researchers was utilized (Chelladurai, 2001; Muchinsky, 1997; Steers et al., 1996). However, similar to other researchers (Daft, 1999; Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1996), a variation to the classification system seemed appropriate for the conglomeration of theories from diverse disciplines related to sport management. The system included a focus on the internal contents of a person’s motives, such as physiological needs, and psychological processes, such as decision making processes, underlying behavior. Many management researchers produced theories related to motivation starting back in the early portion of the twentieth century that also focused on interpersonal management situations. Therefore, a managerial approach was added to the classification system.

On the psychological forefront of motivation, Weiten (2000) simplifies the theories into innate and biological basis of motivation or learned and social basis of motivation. The prominent theorists in the area of managerial approaches included Taylor and Mayo. The theorists in the internal content motivation included Maslow, Adlerfer, Herzberg, and McClelland. In process theories of motivation, Vroom and the research pair of Porter and Lawler have contributed viewpoints. These researchers’ theories, in addition to several others, will be discussed in the following sections.
Strengths and weaknesses related to the theory, and typically the class of theories, were evaluated. As the evolution of theories unfolded, an attempt was made to place previous research on topics related to intercollegiate athletics and contingent factors within intercollegiate athletics, such as gender and culture, with an appropriate theory of motivation. Within the sport context, some motivational issues have been investigated more than other issues. Therefore, some theories may be rich with applicable sport studies, while others lack sport support. The sequence of theory classification progresses from managerial approaches, to needs or content approaches, and to process approaches. Due to the nature of the classification system, the chronological order of the theories will not be clear. Therefore, Table 3 includes a chronological arrangement for the theories of motivation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Scientific Management</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heider</td>
<td>Attribution Theory</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maslow</td>
<td>Hierarchy of Needs</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClelland</td>
<td>Learned Needs Theory</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blau</td>
<td>Social Exchange Theory</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vroom</td>
<td>Expectancy Theory</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Human Resource Model</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotter</td>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter-Lawler</td>
<td>Porter-Lawler Model</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderfer</td>
<td>Existence-Relatedness-Growth Theory</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandura</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy Model</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harter</td>
<td>Perceived Competence Model</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird &amp; Brame</td>
<td>Functional Attribution Model</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Equity Theory</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner</td>
<td>Cognitive Attribution Model</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis</td>
<td>Sport Motivation</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dweck</td>
<td>Goal Achievement Model</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg</td>
<td>Injustice Theory</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Development of motivation theory
Managerial Approaches

The managerial approaches provided a concise view of the changes in theories of motivation within the twentieth century (Table 4). These theories begin with a simple view of human motivation. Due to the uproar of workers from the practical implications of the traditional managerial model, researchers realized the simplification did not thoroughly account for the needs of the workers. The following theories illustrate this appreciation for the complexity of human motivation.

Traditional Managerial Model. During this time period, the nature of work motivation changed from intrinsically driven home industries to extrinsically driven rewards from large industries (Steers et al., 1996). People began to focus on their own rewards in the workplace instead of their independent impact on others. As industrial life developed, Taylor (1911) wrote about scientific management in these industries (cited in Muchinsky, 1997). He proposed more efficient means of designing work. The social exchange relationship between workers and the industry became much more impersonal. Management had a negative view of workers as being dishonest and lazy with mostly extrinsic motivation for payment (Steers et al., 1996). Therefore, scientific management involved strict adherence to rules with little job variation. Weaknesses of this theory became apparent when workers put an end to scientific management by restricting output among themselves, and they formed unions to protect their interests. Therefore, motivation was not completely extrinsically based as once thought by managers. Motivation also involved the interpersonal treatment received by the workers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional model</th>
<th>Human relations model</th>
<th>Human resource model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s basic task is to closely supervise and control subordinates</td>
<td>Manager’s basic task is to make each worker feel useful and important</td>
<td>Manager’s basic task is to make use of “untapped” human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She or he must break tasks into simple, repetitive, easily learned operations</td>
<td>She or he should keep subordinates informed and listen to their objection to her or his plans</td>
<td>She or he must create an environment in which all members may contribute to the limits of their ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She or he must establish detailed work routines and procedures, and enforce these firmly but fairly</td>
<td>She or he should allow subordinates to exercise some self-direction and self-control on routine matters</td>
<td>She or he must encourage full participation on important matters, continually broadening subordinates self-direction and control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Managerial approaches to motivation (Steers et al., 1996)
Sport literature supports the need of followers to strive for more than extrinsic rewards. For example, studies on intrinsic motivation have indicated the need to participate in athletics for reasons such as challenge, fun, and social interaction (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Frederick & Ryan, 1993). Chelladurai and Carron (1983) found that university basketball athletes preferred coaches who were high in both task orientation and social support. Therefore, athletes wanted more than just wins and trophies. They also wanted to build strong relationships. These motives were further investigated in later theories.

*Human Relations Model.*

Mayo (1933, 1945) argued against the scientific model as a way to motivate workers (cited in Muchinsky, 1997). A view of human needs surfaced that took the whole person into account and recognized the need for satisfaction based on relationships at work. Without good relations and strong social ties, Mayo thought motivation would be low (cited in Steers et al., 1996). Importance was placed on making employees feel important and useful. This responsibility was assigned to the managers. Morale measures were used as indicators of job satisfaction, and managers tried to make workers feel important, capable of upward communication and decision-making, and rewarded for teamwork (Steers et al., 1996). However, the weakness was that workers were still expected to do as the managers ordered.

Human relations are also important within athletic settings. Blann (1992) recommended that coaches meet the needs of elite athletes by focusing on their achievement and success in addition to their need to feel powerful, special, and
exhilarated. However, in alignment with the weakness of the human relations model, sport has also been viewed as an autocratic endeavor where athletes are not given the freedom to mature on their own (Chelladurai et al., 1983). Therefore, the human relations model may not be the best alternative to motivating intercollegiate athletes.

*Human Resource Model.*

Miles’ (1965) human resource model contained contributions from various researchers. For example, McGregor’s (1960) x-theory, Likert’s (1967) system 4 theory, and Scheins’ (1972) complex man theory were eventually developed into this model. The underlying commonality among the theories was the inclusion of multiple factors to motivation and the uniqueness of each individual’s needs. Assumptions about human behavior changed. Humans were now seen as wanting the freedom to contribute, more task variability, more responsibility, more decision-making autonomy, and more meaningfulness. With this change in concern for human needs, management also changed to utilize a more complex design for motivating workers. Employees’ goals and the organization’s goals were both taken into consideration. This was a less manipulative strategy towards motivation.

Many interesting questions are introduced through the application of the human resource model to athletes. Do athletes want more freedom to contribute, more task variability, more responsibility, more decision-making autonomy, and more meaningfulness to their athletic experience? Multiple factors lead to human motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000), and these factors apply to athletes as well (Vallerand & Losier, 1999). According to Deci and Ryan (1985), human beings have an innate nature for
needing competence, autonomy, and relatedness, as indicated in the human resource model. Future research on the human resource model in sport could determine the needs of athletes and coaches regarding task variability and meaningfulness.

Needs Approach

The needs approach, also called the content approach, discussed the internal factors of motivation. According to the theories, these internal factors signify the driving force that directs behavior. These factors may be lower-level needs, such as physiological needs or security needs, or higher-level needs, such as growth and self-actualization. However, each theory had a unique perspective on motivation, and a sequence of need activation may or may not be distinguished within the theory. Despite the differences, the following theories provide answers to the question of what internal factors motivate humans.

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs.

Maslow (1954, 1968) created the most widely known theory of motivation. The hierarchy of needs focused on the healthy personality that grows over time. In the hierarchy of needs, a need influences behavior until the need is satisfied. These needs were arranged in a hierarchy from obtaining fundamentals of life, including physiological, security, and belongingness needs, to obtaining higher order needs, such as self-esteem and self-actualization needs. These may be further categorized into deficiency and growth needs. A health deficiency occurs when physiological, security, or belongingness needs are not met. However, the fulfillment of growth needs leads to greater potential through self-esteem and self-actualization. According to the theory,
each need would be attended to sequentially from the bottom physiological needs to the peak self-actualization needs. Steers and Black (1994) described a cycle of deprivation, domination, gratification, and then activation of the next need. Therefore, higher order needs will be ignored until lower level needs are met. A large amount of research has been conducted to examine Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. The theory has gained wide acceptance, despite the lack of research support. Support has been given to the two categories of deficiency and growth needs but not to the five distinctive needs or the sequential activation (Alderfer, 1972). Another weakness is the focus on one need at a time (Alderfer, 1972). Regardless of a lack of clear support, Maslow’s theory provided a useful paradigm of motivation development.

Maslow’s theory may also be useful to the description of athletes’ needs. Intercollegiate coaches may be better able to motivate players if they know the athlete’s needs. However, Gunderheim (1982) compared self-actualization between athletes and non-athletes and found no significant connections between athletics and self-actualization. Fitts (1965) used the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale for a measure of self-actualization of athletes versus non-athletes, and the findings indicated that athletes were lower on their self-concept. Another study using the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) by Shostrom (1963) indicated a difference between male and female athletes where females scored higher on self-actualization. Ibrahim and Morrison (1976) also used this scale, and they found that both male and female high school and college athletes were average or above average on self-actualization. Schindler and Waters (1983) found differences between sexes and between college students with different degrees of athletic
involvement. Male athletes were significantly higher on self-actualization than non-athletes, but no difference occurred for females. In a study of female gymnasts, researchers found improvements in their POI scores after 15 weeks containing one-hour training sessions on self-growth (McClure, Holladay, & Foster, 1988). Sherrill conducted an interesting line of research on athletes with disabilities (Sherrill, Gench, Hinson, Gilstrap, Richir, & Mastro, 1990; Sherrill & Rainbolt, 1988; Sherrill, Silliman, Gench, & Hinson, 1990; and Silliman & Sherrill, 1989). These studies found significant differences between both able-bodied and disabled athletes and non-athletes on many specific factors. Therefore, these studies indicate that athletics should be further investigated as a factor of self-actualization.

**Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory.**

Herzberg (1966) created the most controversial model of motivation (figure 7). Motivators were considered intrinsic factors to the job itself, such as responsibility, growth, and advancement. Hygiene factors created dissatisfaction from non-job related factors, such as politics, co-worker relations, and supervisor’s style. However, the process of eliminating dissatisfaction would not result in satisfaction. Only motivators result in satisfaction. Negative reviews have been made regarding Herzberg’s theory. First, critics see no accordance given to individual differences (Chelladurai, 2001). Second, research has failed to support the existence of the distinct two factors (Chelladurai, 2001). Third, the method of measurement through critical incident reports are likely to be unreliable and invalid due to bias attributions (Chelladurai, 2001). However, the theory has stimulated thought on specific ways to increase motivation.
Despite the weaknesses of Herzberg’s theory, the basic idea may apply to student-athletes. They may be more motivated by increased responsibility on their team, growth as a player, and advancement of their team. Dissatisfaction may arise from unfair team procedures, problems with teammates, or disagreements with coaches. But, the criticisms are also likely to apply to the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of student-athletes. For example, teammate interactions may add to an athlete’s participation satisfaction not only subtracting from their dissatisfaction.

McClelland’s Learned Needs Theory. In 1938, Murray wrote that people differed in their needs to overcome, to exercise power, and to strive toward difficult goals. Murray developed the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) as a means to measure human variation in motivation through participant explanations of story cards. McClelland (1961, 1962, 1965 a, b, 1971) expanded on Murray’s theory by proposing that we acquire certain needs from the culture within our society by experiencing different events (Steers et al., 1996). The theory has four learned needs: need for achievement (n Ach), need for power (n Pow), need for affiliation (n Aff), and need for autonomy (n Aut). One of the needs becomes a personal predisposition that affects perceptions of work and influence pursuit of certain goals. McClelland measured these needs through the TAT. This is one of the criticism’s of the theory; the TAT has questionable predictive validity (Walsh & Betz, 2000). Other critics questioned the acquisition of needs (Steers et al., 1996). However, the theory also has strengths. A clear application to organizations and work is possible. Also, McClelland provided a view that life encounters are as important as our innate motives.
In regards to sport, McClelland’s learned needs theory may suggest that athletes learn the need for achievement, power, affiliation, or autonomy from their experiences in sport. Atkinson (1974) made an addition to the line of research on the need to achieve by including the concept of extrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation involves the desire to acquire trophies, money, or praise. Deci (1975) applied the concept to sport by stating that intrinsic motivation is a function of the degree of competency, self-determination, and feelings of self-worth from sport competition. For example, Deci (1975) stated that if a player perceives that the sport is played based on the desire for extrinsic rewards of the game, then intrinsic motivation is likely to decrease. Lepper, Greene, and Nisbett (1973) also proposed that this addition of extrinsic motivation may create overjustification that the game is no longer played just for the enjoyment, and the enjoyment may be discounted as being important (Kelley, 1972). Weinberg (1984) suggested that coaches use strategies to include intrinsic motivation. A recent study by Amorose and Horn (2000) found a positive relationship between intrinsic motivation of collegiate athletes and perceptions of positive coaching behaviors. Moreover, they also found gender differences in intrinsic motivation where males reported higher intrinsic motivation than females. Therefore, experiences created by coaches also impact athletes’ motivation, and athletes’ differences in motivation influence the perceived interactions with the coach.

In another line of research on sport, Willis (1982) borrowed from McClelland’s theory to design a measure of sport motivation. The sport motivation scale had three dimensions, including motive to achieve success (MAS), motive to avoid failure (MAF),
and motive to achieve power (MAP). After sampling from many high school and college teams, Willis (1982) found the scale to be reliable based on coefficient alpha and test-retest procedures. In addition, the scale was content, criterion, and construct valid. Future research is likely to include Willis’s sport motivation scale.

*Alderfer’s Existence-Relatedness-Growth Theory.* Alderfer (1972) regarded motivation as being relevant to organizational settings. Within the setting, motivation was categorized into existence, relatedness, and growth. The order of activation was set, but frustration at a motivational level could create regression back to the previous level. Moreover, if a level cannot be satisfied, the person would remain at the previous level. In contrast to Maslow’s theory, more than one need could be activated at a time. This theory gained greater research support due to the flexibility of the categorization of needs.

Athletes may go through these need levels. For example, an athlete just beginning on a team may have the need to exist on the team. As the athlete interacts with the team, a need for continued relatedness may occur. At this point, the athlete begins to grow and develop her or his skills. Vallerand and Losier (1999) supported this structure of needs with findings that motivational impact of social factors takes place through autonomy, relatedness, and competence. These three appear to align with Alderfer’s existence, relatedness, and growth needs.
In summary, the needs approach focuses on a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic needs and wants. Examples of these needs are achievement, fun, self-esteem, power, and praise. Another approach to motivation involves the process of motivation, not what is the motivation but what creates the motivation.

**Process Approach**

The process approach focuses on how a decision is made between many alternatives. Instead of the needs approach focus on personal factors, this approach contains theories on how a person evaluates choices. In addition, the factors that influence the decision are also examined. Each theory briefly explained below has been classified within the process approach.

**Attribution Theory.** Heider (1944, 1958) took a cognitive approach to explanations of behavior. Attribution theory referred to how a person interpreted behavior. Two types of attributions were suggested: causal attributions are inferences about why something happened; and dispositional attributions are inferences about a quality or trait that an individual may possess. Heider (1958) suggested that attributions helped people gain closure, maintain integrity or self-esteem, and configure some order to the world. However, these attributions are subject to bias, such as discrepancies between one’s perceptions and others’ perceptions.

Athletes may attribute events in sport to consequences outside of their actions. For example, Adler and Adler (1991) wrote about attributions of student-athletes on scholarships. They considered whether student-athletes attribute their scholarships to payment for physical labor or as a reward for their abilities. This type of attribution
could influence the motivation of athletes. In addition, Heider (1958) suggested that people try to maintain order and closure by making biased attributions. Athletes may also make biased attributions. For example, the lack of student-athletes campaigning for additional payment outside of scholarships (Schneider, 2000) may be due to their bias attribution that the athletic system is systematic and fair. This attribution may allow them to be motivated to represent their university in athletic competition. Therefore, the way athletes explain behavior may influence their motivation.

Vroom’s Expectancy Theory. Vroom’s theory (1964) was the first of process theories that believed behavior is purposeful, goal-directed, and based on intentions. This particular theory conceptualized work behavior as determined by conscious and rational choices. According to Vroom (1964), people use rational evaluation to choose the most valued rewards. Four key points were discussed as a part of this theory. First, outcomes were defined as consequences of behavior that a person could anticipate. Second, the importance of the outcomes, also called valence, influenced behavior. Third, people differ on their expectancy that effort will determine performance. Fourth, people also differ on their expectancy that performance in a situation will lead to a particular outcome. The expectancy of performance, outcome, and the importance placed on the outcomes influence motivation. Researchers have also been critical of the theory. The criticisms revolve around the assumed conscious rationale of motivation (Stahl & Harrell, 1981). Subconscious and habitual behavior was ignored in the theory.
Sport behavior has also been perceived as rational and quantifiable (Gutmann, 1994). The four key points of Vroom’s expectancy theory may apply to athletic contexts. First, coaches and athletes expect a certain level of performance based on previous training and competition. Second, the importance of the outcome may influence sport behavior. For example, athletes may play at a higher level when the outcome is a championship rather than a regular season game. Third, coaches and athletes individually differ on their expectancy that effort will determine performance. Some coaches and athletes may be optimistic about outcomes, while other coaches and athletes are more pessimistic. Fourth, coaches and athletes may differ on their expectancies in certain situations. A coach may expect that running a particular play may help the team score, but other coaches or players may not agree. These key points seem to fit the sport context, however the criticisms of this theory also apply. Athletes may be unaware or not conscious of what motivates them to perform. For example, Thill and Brunel (1995) found that varsity soccer players who focused on competition and winning instead of mastering skills performed less deep-processing for learning due to interrupted mental processing of social comparisons. Therefore, the athlete is unaware of this factor that may influence performance. An additional criticism in the sport context is the unexpected nature of competition. For example, many people are attracted to sport due to the unpredictable outcomes.

*Locus of Control.* A factor influencing motivation is locus of control. Rotter (1966) defined locus of control as an individual’s beliefs about the amount of control that they have over themselves and their situations. The generalized expectancy to perceive
reinforcement contingent on one’s efforts and abilities is called internal locus of control. A perception of reinforcement as the result of outside forces is called external locus of control. These external factors may include any uncontrollable fate, luck, or powerful others. Rotter (1966) developed a scale to measure locus of control called the I-E Scale, and this scale is still in use today (Schrader & Wann, 1999).

Many sport studies have used the I-E Scale (Bleak & Fredrick, 1998; Celestino, Tapp, & Brument, 1979; Hall, Church, and Stone, 1980). Lynn, Phelan, and Kiker (1969) found sport participants to be more internally driven than non-participants. Finn and Straub (1977) also found cultural differences between American and Dutch softball players. American players scored higher on internal locus of control. Despite this detection of differences, some sport researchers have not found the I-E Scale to be valid. Gilliland (1974) divided college males and females into groups based on sport involvement, and no results were significant. McKelvie and Huband (1980) also studied various college athletes and non-athletes and found no significant differences in locus of control. Therefore, the mixed results bring questions to the use of the I-E Scale.

Another scale to measure locus of control was developed by Levenson (1974). Levenson’s IPC Scale measures the extent of internal or external locus of control held by a person, but the scale divides externality into powerful others and chance. This scale was used to determine that college football players rated powerful others higher as an external control than non-athletes (Daiss, LeUnes, & Nation, 1986). Therefore, a coach may have a significant influence on how athletes are motivated externally. A cultural issue was also found. Black defensive lineman rated their internal locus of control higher
than others did, but black players rated higher overall on external belief in luck. Therefore, their cultural background may influence their perceptions in locus of control. Chalip (1980) suggests that internal locus of control leads to more success, but further research is needed to support this claim and to reexamine cultural differences. Frederick (2000) indicated gender and athletic status differences in a study that found a negative correlation between internal locus of control and competitiveness. In summary, studies have shown Levenson’s IPC scale to be valid (Blau, 1984; Levenson, 1974; Ward, 1994) and useful in demonstrating whether people believe in their ability to regulate their situation. Future research studies would allow further utilization of the scale to determine factors of motivation.

*Porter-Lawler Model.* Porter and Lawler (1968) based their model on Vroom’s expectancy theory. These researchers agreed that the importance placed on the outcomes and the degree of effort would eventually influence the outcome. However, Porter and Lawler (1968) emphasized that effort may not lead to performance due to a greater amount of complexity. Two examples of further complications include the lack of ability and the lack of task understanding. Therefore, high motivation may not lead to high performance. More research is still needed on this model, but Porter and Lawler (1968) provided a useful view of motivational practices.

Strengths are apparent in the Porter-Lawler Model when applying the theory to the sport context. The importance coaches and athletes place on the outcomes and their degree of effort do influence outcomes. In addition, coaches and athletes lack of ability and task understanding also influence performance. High motivation does not always
lead to the desired outcome in sports, as suggested by Porter and Lawler. This encourages researchers to question the use of winning as an outcome of increased motivation. Future research in sport utilizing this model could examine these contentions.

*Social Cognitive Model.* Three models fall within the social cognitive category of motivation. These include self-efficacy theory, perceived competence, and achievement goal approach. Bandura (1977) developed the self-efficacy theory. He proposed that one’s belief in their competency in a particular situation determined their performance. Therefore, a way to improve performance was to enhance a person’s self-esteem. Two factors proposed were efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Efficacy expectations were a person’s sense of self-confidence or self-worth, whereas outcome expectations were beliefs that behavior would lead to the desired outcome. Several studies have been centered on self-efficacy theory.

Studies in a sport context have examined self-efficacy theory. Weinberg, Gould, and Jackson (1979) empirically tested self-efficacy theory by a measure of leg endurance. The results indicated that those with high self-efficacy had better performance. Lee (1982) conducted a study on gymnasts to determine the influence of self-perceptions. Their perception of future performance was a better predictor than previous performance. However, the coach’s perception of the gymnast’s future performance was the best predictor. Therefore, a coach’s motivation and perceptions may have an important impact on athletes’ self-efficacy and performance. Feltz (1984) stated that self-efficacy played an important role in sports by mediating performance. For example, a coach’s or
athlete’s tendency to question herself may intrude on performance. The influence of four factors has been found to impact self-efficacy. These include performance accomplishment, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. Marcus, Selby, Niaura, and Rossi (1992) also investigated self-efficacy. They determined that efficacy interventions help establish behavior. Therefore, motivation from previous performance, motivation from vicarious learning, motivation from verbal persuasion, and motivation from emotional arousal are possible ways a coach could improve athletes’ performance.

Self-efficacy theory has received much more support than the perceived competence theory that was developed by Harter (1978, 1980). This theory focused on the experience of the performer and the role of others’ perceptions, such as a coach. The theory suggests that positive experience and positive perceptions by others should lead to higher confidence and in turn lead to an increase in motivation. A reverse was also proposed where negative experiences and negative perceptions by others would lead to anxiety and in turn lead to a decrease in motivation. Despite the appeal of coaches’ positive influence, little support has been found for this theory (Roberts, 1992).

Dweck (1986) developed the third theory called the goal-achievement model. This model proposed an interaction between task, learning, and mastery goals with ego, performance and ability goals. Therefore, variation in achievement may not be due to high or low motivation but may reflect appropriate motivation for particular situations (Roberts, 1993). In this model, two types of goals are possible. These include mastery goals that produce internal motivation and competitive, also called ego, goals that are
externally motivated by comparisons to others. Support has been given to this model in the sport context (Roberts, 1993). Another way to examine the mastery and ego orientations is through motivational climate. According to Williams (1998), motivational climate refers to a particular situation and the achievement structure within the situation. A mastery climate rewards achievement of learning and improving, whereas a performance climate rewards achievement for winning. Ames (1992) wrote that task orientation is facilitated by a mastery climate, whereas ego orientation is facilitated by a performance climate. Considerable research in sport has focused on achievement motivation and motivational climate. Thus, the goal achievement model indicates the need for appropriate motivation of athletes determined by the situation, and the coach is a part of that situation.

The sport literature also examines another theory involving intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) differentiated between intrinsic motivation for fun and enjoyment versus extrinsic motivation for rewards and material gain. Positive outcomes have been associated with intrinsic motivation. Frederick and Ryan (1993) found participants high in intrinsic motivation participated in sports more often and had less mental symptoms of depression and higher self-esteem. This indicated the benefits achieved from a focus on intrinsic motivation, and a coach may have an influence on the climate that creates intrinsic or extrinsic motivation.

*Functional Attribution Model.* The functional attribution model proposed that motivation is based on the desire to enhance or maintain self-esteem. Self-serving bias was one function that allowed a person to attribute success to internal factors and failure
to external factors. Support has been given to the self-serving function (Bird & Brame, 1978). For example, Bird and Brame (1978) found that players on unsuccessful teams were critical of the team’s ability but not of their own ability. In addition, players on successful teams made positive attributions to both the team and their own ability. Bird, Foster, and Maruyama (1980) added the impact of team cohesion to attributes. They found that more cohesive collegiate women’s basketball teams had greater agreement on self attributions and team attributions, while less cohesive teams agreed less and made more luck attributions and less task attributions. Therefore, cohesion may be another factor to consider in studies of motivation, and a coach’s leadership may have a significant impact on factors like cohesion. Biddle (1993) encouraged more real life research and of better measures of attribution theory.
Social Exchange Theory. Despite the exclusion of the social exchange theory from books and articles on motivation, the concept is a motivational theory. The social exchange theory proposes that people interact with others based on the motivation to increase their rewards and reduce their costs. Several researchers have applied the social exchange theory within the topic of research methods (Adams, 1965; Blau, 1964; Dillman, 1978; Foa & Foa, 1975; and Goyder, 1987). For example, Piliavin, Evans, and Callero (1982) suggest that people are not consciously aware of the subtle calculations of rewards and benefits that go into the motivational process. Dillman (2000) utilized the theory of social exchange to explain the use of extrinsic rewards to achieve increased return rates for survey research. This theory provides ample opportunity for future research in the sport domain, especially on studies of coaches’ motivation. Are they motivated to increase their rewards, while reducing their costs?

Summary of Theory Classification

Many differences exist between the theories based in the managerial approach, needs approach, and process approach. This allowed for a clear distinction between theories of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation with early managerial theories focused more on external compensation and needs theories involving more intrinsic motivation. The importance of conscious rationale eventually influenced the psychological theories through the process theories, and the importance of relationships eventually penetrated the managerial approach.
In addition, the theories within the classes advanced toward a higher level of complexity to represent motivation. The recent strengths of the motivation classes emphasize the psychological factors as antecedents to behavior. The human resource model in the managerial approach encouraged greater freedom to followers, in addition to variation of work, greater responsibility, greater autonomy, and more meaningfulness to duties. Within the needs approach, a strength occurred as the theories considered environmental influences. For the process theory, Porter and Lawler’s model increased the strength of this classification through the complexity added by ability and task understanding factors. Also, several theories were helpful within the social cognitive models that included self-efficacy and achievement goals with mastery and ego orientation.

Each classification also contained weaknesses. The managerial theories lacked applicability to every situation. For example, the human resource approach is becoming more prevalent (Steers et al., 1996), but many managers adhere to former theories claiming that different situations require different techniques. Therefore, one theory might not be helpful in all situations.
Weaknesses of the needs approach have also been acknowledged. A few examples include the lack of importance placed on situational variables, problems with measurement, and no indications of individual differences. In regards to the process theories, more research is needed to validate the models. Some theories also ignore the irrationality of human cognitive processes. These theories also focused on short-term means of motivation, whereas needs approaches focused on more long-term development. Therefore, each class of motivation theories has both strengths and weaknesses.

Many studies regarding motivation in sport contexts were included within each classification. Some theories were more applicable to intercollegiate athletics than others. However, the advantage of briefly reviewing the theories of motivation in relation to intercollegiate athletics is to recognize the strengths of the current literature and to reveal future research needs. Several of the theories offered interesting and unexplored perspectives on intercollegiate athletics. Based on this review of literature, it is clear that motivation in intercollegiate athletics requires further study.

Study of Motivation for Intercollegiate Coaches

As illustrated by the literature reviewed, the motivation of human behavior is complex due to variations in personality, cognitions, abilities, task differences, and needs of the people involved. Intercollegiate athletics also contains diverse people with diverse needs. Also demonstrated in the review of previous theories, some of the factors of motivation have been studied extensively, while others have not gained a similar amount of attention. The same is true for athletic studies as demonstrated by the copious studies
supporting certain theories, while other theories lack athletic literature. Weiner (1990) wrote an overview of the future for the study of motivation. He stated that the early theories, such as drive theory, are losing attention in return for more emphasis on achievement needs, causal cognitions, and learned helplessness. In alignment with Weiner’s prediction, athletics has been inundated with studies on achievement needs, attribution cognitions, and locus of control. More recently, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) advocated a movement toward more positive and optimistic perspectives in sport studies. One way to guide future studies on motivation toward a more positive perspective is to reexamine theories of motivation for imbalances toward a negative emphasis. To begin with Weiner’s (1990) suggestions for future studies, coaches may be able to achieve better outcomes if they could focus more on student-athletes’ needs, the cause of their cognitions, and their beliefs of helplessness. This begins with investigation of interactions between coaches and athletes.

Adams’ theory of equity (1977) suggests a negative view where an individual compares their outcomes to their inputs, and an inequity creates tension. This is similar to the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Foa & Foa, 1975; Dillman, 1978; and Goyder, 1987). The social exchange theory proposes that people interact with others based on the motivation to increase their rewards and reduce their costs. Both theories suggest that behaviors and interactions with others are a means to an end reward. The question must be posed as to whether these theories adequately explain all motivations for interactions. Do interactions also exist without the motivation for rewards and reduction of costs?
In the literature on motivation, theories on positive interactions existed within the managerial and needs classification. The managerial approach exemplified the change toward positive relations from the scientific management to human resource management. Within the needs approach, Maslow, Herzberg, and McClelland all recognized the need for affiliation and belongingness. However, the process approach theories lack inclusion of how individuals make decisions not based on rewards and costs but rather on positive interpersonal relations. Therefore, future research could investigate the possibility for a theory based on a motivational state with less focus on personal rewards and costs.

Altruism

Batson (1991) defines altruism as a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare. Not a single source on motivation theory included this theory. As opposed to the social exchange theory focusing on interactions based on increasing rewards and decreasing costs, an altruism theory would be defined as the theory that some interactions are motivated by the ultimate goal of increasing others’ welfare, not just calculating self-benefits and costs. The person is not concerned with equity of rewards and costs, but the person is concerned with positive interactions with others.

Social Exchange Theory Versus Altruism Theory

Motivation theories present a conceptual challenge due to the internal, cognitive nature of the phenomena, and the debate of social exchange theory and altruism theory is just as puzzling. Is every interaction motivated by a conscious or unconscious calculation
of costs and benefits? Or, are some interactions based on the motivation with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare without any calculation? The basis of these questions has been debated for centuries, and the debate has not come to an end.

Batson (1991) wrote about the altruism question. He explained the multiple factors that contribute to the complexity of the unanswered question. Despite the continued debate, many researchers use the term altruism as if it existed without question (Canale & Beckley, 1999; Dulin, 2000; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Grusec & Redler, 1980; Wagner & Rush, 2000; Wagstaff, 1998). Previous literature also supports several motivational outcomes of altruistic behaviors. For example, the motive for cohesion, effort, and reciprocal sacrifice have been investigated (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1999; Prapavessis & Carron, 1997; Sparks & Schenk, 2001).

Outcomes such as cohesion, effort, and reciprocal sacrifice could be helpful in the context of intercollegiate athletics. Increased cohesion could reduce transfers and increase adherence to appropriate team policies and norms. Increased effort would also be helpful from athletes, and reciprocal altruism may also be helpful to coaches as they interact with their student-athletes. Instead of the focus on rewards, such as winning, a focus on helping one another may also bring intrinsic rewards that outweigh the costs. Therefore, these motivational outcomes could be used in future research studies utilizing the altruism theory.

Literature on altruism in the sport context has focused mostly on the motives of volunteers (Chelladurai, 1999). However, Chelladurai (1999) also applied Organ’s model (1988) on organizational citizenship behavior that included altruism to the sport
context. Altruism was defined as extra-role behaviors to help another person in an organizationally relevant task or problem. This motivation to help could apply to the organizational citizenship of coaches and athletes. Therefore, altruistic sport motivation provides fruitful opportunities for future research.

**Altruistic Leadership and Intercollegiate Coaching**

One problem described was the self-serving motivation of intercollegiate coaches. As opposed to self-serving motivation, another motivation has been described as a focus on serving others. Auguste Comte (1798-1857) developed the first definition of this type of motivation, what he called “altruism.” He described altruism as a motive opposite of egoism or the focus on one’s self. Altruism, as defined more specifically by Batson (1991), is a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare. Therefore, altruistic leadership would be defined as the ability to guide with the ultimate goal of improving the welfare of followers. The ongoing academic debate argues whether altruism exists without some self-serving objective. Batson (1991) called the debate on altruism a “Pandora’s box of complex issues and conceptual traps.” Despite this debate, many researchers in various fields use the term altruism in reference to the motive for helping others (de Vos, Smaniotto, & Elsas, 2001; Frank, 2002; Palmer, 2000; Rada, 2000; Sharf, 2002). In the field of psychology, researchers still use the term altruism in widely used assessments, such as the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (Hacbarth & Mathay, 1991) and the Saliency Inventory (Super, 1990).
In fact, Batson’s (1991) definition confronted this concern over self-serving motives by using the term “ultimate.” Other self-serving goals may be achieved through altruistic leadership, but the action is still altruistic if the ultimate goal is to improve another’s welfare. Therefore, for the purpose of this paper, altruistic leadership will be assumed to exist based on the lack of research to support otherwise. Batson (1991), who spent a quarter of a century on conceptual and empirical examination of altruism, used this quote from Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes mystery, “The Sign of Four”, in summarizing his research to disprove altruism. “When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth.” However, Batson’s research continues the process of eliminating the impossibility of altruism, but currently no research exists to disprove the possibility for altruistic leadership.

No literature exists on measures for altruistic leadership, either. However, Greenleaf (1977) coined the term servant-leadership to refer to leadership that focuses on the needs and well-being of followers. Four basic factors were part of Greenleaf’s servant-leadership: put service before self-interest; listen first to affirm others; inspire trust by being trustworthy; and nourish others and help them become whole. Therefore, the theoretic background of altruistic leadership relates to Greenleaf’s servant-leadership, and the only measure found for servant-leadership was practitioner-based (Corvision Media, 1999). No listing for a servant-leadership measure was in Clark and Clark’s (1990) Measures of Leadership. In addition, within the sport literature, another term was used for this type of interaction. Prapavessis and Carron (1997) used the term self-sacrificial to refer to initiating an action or privilege for the sake of another without
expecting reciprocity. Therefore, many terms have been used to describe a similar type of interaction, but altruistic leadership focusing on the motivational state of the leader has not been investigated within intercollegiate coaching.

As Scott (1999) indicated, no simple approach to examining leadership and its effectiveness exists. However, altruistic leadership may provide another theoretical and practical approach to confront leadership problems in intercollegiate coaching. Kleiber and Roberts (1981) contended that competition reduces prosocial behavior. Altruistic leadership might be able to increase prosocial behavior of a coach and athletes. Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) found intentions for reciprocity with self-sacrificing behavior. However, the question of altruistic leadership goes beyond understanding behavior. Altruistic leadership requires an understanding of inner processes that produce the behavior. Hogan and Jones (1988) developed a scale an Inventory of Personal Motives. Altruism is one personal motive scale on the inventory. This inventory may be utilized to configure an altruistic leadership scale. To apply the altruistic leadership scale to sports, the Revised Leadership Scale for Sports (Zhang, Jensen, & Mann, 1997) may also be referenced for guiding measurement statements. Therefore, this theoretical approach may provide ample opportunity for future research in relation to problems in intercollegiate coaching.

The theory of altruistic leadership may also provide a focus on positive outcomes. Prapavessis and Carron (1997) conducted a study of the positive outcomes of self-sacrifice on high-level cricket teams. They found self-sacrifice to be related to team cohesion and conformity to norms. Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) found other positive
outcomes besides the intention to reciprocate that was mentioned previously. They also found effects on followers’ attributions of charisma and attributions of legitimacy to the coach. These positive outcomes may be associated with development of altruistic leadership. Future studies may provide more answers to important questions on the positive and antidotal outcomes of altruistic leadership. Therefore, studies on altruistic leadership are needed.

Future Research on Altruistic Leadership of Intercollegiate Coaches

The conceptual side of altruistic leadership has been described, but future research must go beyond description to empirical examination. Therefore, sport management researchers must utilize previous related research to configure methods of synthesizing leadership, altruism, and intercollegiate coaching experiences. The starting point would be to explore and describe coaches’ perceptions regarding altruistic leadership.

Problems in intercollegiate coaching require attention due to the many stakeholders of intercollegiate athletics. The athletic administration, alumni, faculty, staff, and athletes must be able to trust coaches. Kouzes and Posner (1995) believe trust is more important than anything for leaders. Coaches must be trusted to act in the best interest of athletes. In addition, what are the barriers and facilitators, or mediators and moderators, of altruistic leadership? What outcomes are significantly related to coaches’ altruistic leadership? This could be useful information to sport administrators for selection, training, and development purposes.

To answer these questions, an altruistic leadership scale would be helpful. In a leadership review, Chelladurai (1990) noted many problems with the status of leadership
studies. He suggested further research on scales. An altruistic leadership scale for intercollegiate coaches could be based on a combination of previous altruism scales, sport leadership scales, coaching behavior evaluations, and in depth analysis of coaches’ perceptions regarding this form of leadership. Therefore, the factors of this scale may require exploratory methods followed by rigorous reliability and validity methods. Once a scale is established, important outcomes could be tested also.

Chelladurai (1990) also recommended further studies on outcome measures of leadership. Previous sport leadership studies have used satisfaction, commitment, and performance as outcome variables. However, previous studies on self-sacrificial leadership and team interactions indicate connections to outcomes, such as cohesion, intention for reciprocity, and effort (Prapevessis, et al., 1997; Choi, et al., 1999). Are these important outcomes for sport managers to know? Could satisfaction, commitment, and performance also be related to altruistic sport leadership? These are questions to address in future research studies.

Chelladurai’s multidimensional model (1993) illustrated the potential of adapting leadership theories to the sport context. Hurley (2000) suggested that researchers configure a structure to provide ways of conceptualizing the information and consider specific questions to be answered through the design of methods. A model of altruistic leadership may also be helpful to illustrate the important relationships. Figure 8, for example, contained a preliminary model that integrates transformational leadership, the multidimensional model, and altruistic leadership. A transformational leader would strive towards increasing the welfare of others though adaptations that influence the
situational, leader, and member characteristics. Actual behavior would now be altruistic leadership with the ultimate motive to increase the welfare of others in the organization. This preliminary model also included the outcomes found in empirical studies related to similar styles of leadership. A model similar to this would be beneficial to the theoretical understanding of the antecedents, behaviors, and consequences associated with altruistic leadership. The next step would be to further investigate motivational theories and psychological processes to design a research study on altruistic leadership.

As illustrated in this literature review, many aspects of leadership and motivation have been investigated in intercollegiate athletics, but a gap exists in regards to the topic of leaders’ motivation. Leadership with the ultimate motivation to increase followers’ welfare has not been studied in intercollegiate coaching. Altruism is a form of motivation focusing on the welfare of others, and this fits into the needs approach. However, the way this need is developed may align with the process approach. Emotional intelligence could be considered a process that develops altruistic motivation. Through self awareness, self motivation, self regulation, empathy, and social skills, the motivation to help others may be developed. The following section depicts the connection between altruism and emotional intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence refers to the ability to identify, express, and understand emotions; to assimilate emotions into thought; and to regulate both positive and negative emotions in oneself and others (Mathews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002). Mathews, Zeidner, and Roberts (2002) discussed the empirical evidence supporting emotional intelligence as
a valid construct. In this review of literature, emotional intelligence is categorized into five factors: self-awareness, self-regulation, social skills, motivation, and empathy.

*Self-Awareness.* The definition of self-awareness is being aware of what one is feeling, being conscious of the emotions within one’s self, and being confident in one’s values and beliefs (Goleman, 1995). For example, coaches who are aware of their emotions are able to understand the feelings that guide their behaviors and recognize whether their actions align with their values and beliefs. A lack of self-awareness may lead a person to turn outside for meaning, peace, and value (Myers, Speight, Highlen, Cox, Reynolds, Adams, & Hanley, 1991). This lack of awareness instigates a motivation to find meaning through material objects and a “better than” attitude to supply them with self-worth (Myers et al., 1991). For example, some coaches may strive towards winning only in order to gain greater financial rewards or to be comparably better than others are.

In the link between self-awareness and altruism, a self-aware person may be able to understand the impact they have on others. For example, a coach is in the position to positively help athletes. Staub (1989, 1991, 1992) conducted research on having a value orientation towards helping others, instead of towards personal rewards. This research indicated that the value of helping others leads people to gain a sense of responsibility for others’ welfare. Therefore, a coach who is aware of their impact on athletes and the value they should place on those athletes may gain an altruistic motivation to increase the athletes’ welfare.

Deutsch (1990) also linked learning altruism, by broadening concern for others, to improvements in self-awareness. According to Deutsch, altruism was improved in
children by helping them develop a secure sense of self, and this encouraged them to accept social diversity without feeling threatened by others. Coaches who want to see themselves as winners may feel threatened by losing, and this leads them to focus less on athletes’ development and more on winning. Batson (1983) noted that altruism increases when people broaden their personal concern for others. Improvements in self-awareness may help coaches feel secure enough to concentrate on athletes’ concerns and interact with them effectively (Englund, 1994). Overall, this literature suggests that self-awareness may facilitate altruistic motivation in sport leaders.

**Self-Regulation.** Self-regulation as defined by Goleman (1995) is the ability to balance a person’s own moods so that worry, anxiety, fear, or anger do not get in the way of what needs to be done. In the altruism literature, negative moods were often lifted after helping (Williamson & Clark, 1989), but certain negative moods were barriers to helpful behaviors. Anger, for example, often creates conflict in organizations that lead to downward outcomes and detracts from cooperation (Thomas, 1992). Coaches are often known for becoming angry during games that may build barriers to helping behaviors. Another negative and difficult to self-regulate mood that affects altruism is depression. Depressed individuals tend to turn their focus to constant self-concern (Carlson & Miller, 1987), and a symptom of coaching burnout is depression (LeUnes, et al. 2002). In addition, worry and grief about one’s self has been found to reduce helping behavior (Thompson, Cowan, & Rosenhan, 1980).

In relation to coaching, intercollegiate coaches feel much pressure to win and have much self-concern as the prospect of losing their jobs depends on the performance
of their athletes. Coaches are often seen losing their temper with athletes and allowing their emotions to dominate interactions. Therefore, coaches’ helpful behaviors may be increased if they are trained to regulate their emotions related to stress and anger.

Social Skills. The definition of social skills as provided by Goleman (1995) is the ability to connect with others, build positive relationships, respond to the emotions of others, and influence others. Altruism tends to occur when people take the time to notice and interpret the emotions of others. A study conducted by Darley, Teger, and Lewis (1973) found that people chose to help more after hearing a crashing noise when they worked face-to-face with someone than when they worked back-to-back or worked alone. These researchers suggested that the face-to-face workers could interpret their partner’s concerned facial expression, and this social awareness led them to feel a responsibility to help. Shotland and Straw (1976) conducted an experiment on the way people respond to an emotional outburst. The findings indicated that 65% of people were willing to help a woman when she screamed as if the person bothering her was a stranger. However, only 19% helped when she screamed as if the person was her husband. This indicated the difference in how people use their social skills to interpret situations, and how this interpretation influences their willingness to help.

Groups that have developed relationships through social skills may also provide more altruism. Another study investigated whether a connection to others in a group would encourage more people to help (Yinon, Sharon, Gonen, & Adam, 1982). Groups of friends provided more help than people who were strangers within a group. The researchers proposed that strangers do not as easily interpret one another’s reactions in
situations needing help. This inability to notice and interpret others’ emotions builds a barrier to helping. These studies illustrate the importance of social skill, such as managing interactions, to inducing helping behaviors. Coaches who are able to develop strong friendships and provide an environment with positive interactions may be more willing and able to help. Intercollegiate coaches spend a considerable amount of time interacting with their players, and Sullivan (1993) stated that interpersonal communication skills have an important role in developing psychosocial aspects of athletes. Miller (2002) found that intercollegiate coaches place a considerable amount of importance on interpersonal skills. Many coaches in this qualitative study indicated the importance of listening to athletes in order to understand their needs. The coaches linked their ability to interact with the psychosocial outcome of student-athlete satisfaction and student-athletes’ emotional stability. In other words, intercollegiate coaches could be altruistic leaders if social skills improve their response to student-athlete needs. Therefore, this literature indicates that altruism may be facilitated by social skills.

Motivation. Motivation is defined by Goleman (1995) as the ability to be hopeful and optimistic despite obstacles, setbacks, or failures. Altruism has been enhanced by attributing helpful behavior to a person’s altruistic motives instead of attributing helping to selfish motives. For example, studies by Batson and others (1978, 1979) found that university students felt more altruistic after they agreed to help someone without payment or social pressure. In an additional experiment, volunteers were led to attribute helping to compliance or compassion. Of those who saw themselves as complying, only 25 percent volunteered again. On the other hand, 60 percent of those who saw themselves as
compassionate volunteered again. Other studies also support that a self-image containing altruistic motivation leads to further contributions (Piliavin, Evans, & Callero, 1982; Thomas & Batson, 1981; Thomas, Batson, & Coke, 1981). Therefore, people are more altruistic when they attribute their actions to being motivated by their caring, generous, and helpful nature. Coaches have many opportunities to provide leadership in a caring, generous, and helpful way towards their athletes. If they are encouraged to attribute this helping to altruistic motives, the studies previously cited suggest that altruistic behaviors would continue to be enacted.

Empathy. Empathy was defined by Goleman (1995) as being able to put yourself in someone else’s shoes, to recognize what others are feeling without them needing to tell you. Coaches are often in a central position to recognize the feelings of athletes in order to monitor their nutrition, motivation, and psychological well being (Mooney, 1995). One example of a coach who develops empathy induced altruism would be when he/she provides sympathy and understanding to an athlete who suffers a career ending injury (Bianco, & Eklund, 2001). Batson (1991, 1995) reported that empathy especially occurs when a person feels attached to the person in distress. For example, parents go to great lengths to help their children through distressing events. Moreover, studies have also shown that people who have developed empathy towards others are more willing to help (Batson & Ahmad, 2001; Batson, Batson, Slingsby, Harrell, Peekna, & Todd, 1991; Cialdini, Schaller, Houlihan, Arps, Fultz, & Beaman, 1987; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). One group of researchers found that children who felt empathy toward a sad child also agreed to give a portion of their research earning to a charity, whereas less empathetic
children gave less to the charity (Knight, Johnson, Carlo, & Eisenberg, 1994). In a study on negative outcomes, Miller and Eisenberg (1988) found a lack of empathy in those who committed acts of cruelty towards others. Therefore, developing empathy in coaches may encourage them to help their players and avoid decisions that could cause harm to athletes.

**Summary of Altruistic Leadership and Emotional Intelligence**

The literature presented in this section supported the development of altruism through emotional intelligence. Self-awareness, self-regulation, social skills, motivation, and empathy each provided a way to increase helping behaviors. A person’s awareness of their emotions and values facilitates their ability to look beyond themselves to have concern for others. Self-regulation allows a person to control their emotions in order to put aside stress and anger detracting from contributions to the welfare of others. Social skill facilitates altruism by helping a person recognize when others are in trouble and provides them with the tools to interact appropriately. Motivation of a person that has been labeled as altruistic motivation encourages congruent with the emotions of others that may need help.

A study by Maniar, Curry, Sommers-Flanagan, and Walsh (2001) found that athletes prefer to seek help from their coaches. Athletes are in need of help with time management, skill development, academic issues, and team relationships. A stigmatism exists that coaches are ultimately motivated to win as opposed to helping student-athletes through these challenges. Therefore, a study of coaches’ perceptions on altruistic leadership would allow researchers to explore this stigmatism.
Also in the review of literature, many outcomes were associated with effective leadership and approaches of motivation. These outcomes included such variables as performance, effort, satisfaction, self-esteem. To place these outcomes in categories, two categories seem appropriate: performance and psychosocial outcomes. Coaches’ perception of these outcomes in relation to altruistic leadership would also be important to explore. The following chapter describes the methodology used in this study to explore intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership and the associated outcomes.

**Summary**

The evolution of theories reviewed in this study revealed the complexity and intricacies of human leadership and motivation. These theories provided many perspectives of why leaders behave as they do. Some theories explain factors in the workplace, others focus on internal elements of leadership and motivation within a person, and others focus on how psychological processes help determine actions. Despite the strengths and weaknesses associated with the theories, each theory provided a valuable conceptual context to this study.

Some of the theories reviewed in this study have been adequately conceptualized in a sport context, but other theories lack examination by sport researchers. For example, many sport researchers have utilized transformational leadership, the hierarchy of needs, and goal achievement theory. Other theories lack attention from sport researchers, such as the ethical leadership theory, learned needs theory, and the Porter-Lawler model.
Regardless of whether the theories have been extensively investigated by sport researchers, each theory was considered for applicability to intercollegiate athletics.

In summary, the literature reviewed for this study provided important information for sport management and sport psychology research and practice. The behavior of athletes and coaches in intercollegiate athletics and other sport contexts relies on leadership and motivational processes. These critical elements to the functioning of sport organizations help unleash potential within organizational members by guiding, stimulating, and fulfilling their needs, wants, and desires. Knowledge of leadership and motivational creates a powerful tool for helping, learning, meeting goals, and overcoming challenges. Sport managers could benefit from understanding intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership and the perceived outcomes related to this type of leadership. Problems in intercollegiate coaching require thorough investigation, and altruistic leadership is a paradigm of possible improvement.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study was to explain coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. A secondary purpose was to determine what factors of emotional intelligence emerged with the coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Lastly, the relationship of coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership with performance and psychosocial outcomes was examined.

This chapter highlights the methods used for obtaining and analyzing data for the study. Specifically, the chapter is divided into the following: (a) rationale for the research design, (b) sampling methods and participants, (c) background information, (d) data collection, (e) procedures, (f) panel of experts, (g) analysis, (h) role of the researcher, (i) peer debriefer, and (j) validity.

Rationale for the Research Design

Qualitative research was chosen for this study. Vogt (1999) defined this type of research as having variables that are typically described in words not numbers. Bernard (2000) explained that all early stages of science rely primarily on qualitative data. Data on altruistic sport leadership is in an early stage of investigation and would best be explored through interviews that are used to gain insight on the phenomena. Many
reasons led to the use of a qualitative methodology. This type of methodology allowed complexities and intricacies of altruistic sport leadership to be recognized. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) stated that qualitative research is helpful to see multiple layers of socially constructed realities or qualities that are complex and indivisible into discrete variables. The indication of interrelations of multiple influences on altruistic leadership was possible through the qualitative data collection methods. Interviews also facilitated interpretation and comprehension of how coaches construct the reality of intercollegiate athletics. This in-depth richness showed multifaceted realities within their positions at the same coaching level. The information provided the development of a paradigm for analyzing, synthesizing, and adapting current leadership and motivation models for further research. A deeper understanding of intercollegiate coaches and the phenomena of altruistic leadership were possible with a qualitative methodology.

LeCompte and Schensul (1999) further classified qualitative designs into case studies, ethnographies, narratives, compressed designs, and action research. Case studies are based on an identified community, target population, or other identified unit of study, whose outcomes and parameters are unclear or unexplored. The case study design was utilized in this study with the target population being head coaches of intercollegiate athletic teams. A case study method allows formulation of more specific research problems or hypotheses related to altruistic sport leadership. However, Bernard (2000) proposed that, as studies mature, more quantitative data will help investigate relationships and test hypotheses. Despite this increased focus on quantitative research as
investigation progresses, qualitative research is helpful for collecting important exploratory information.

In summary, qualitative research assisted in acquiring personal experiences and viewpoints of the intercollegiate coaches. They described the multiple dimensions of their perceptions of altruistic leadership. This methodology allowed the research to be open and flexible for exploration, whereas quantitative research does not have this strength. Prior assumptions and hypotheses were minimized in order to search for important details. Therefore, in order to build theory on coaches’ altruistic leadership, this study utilized a qualitative approach.

Sampling Methods and Participants

The participants chosen for this study are a heterogeneous sample of intercollegiate, Division I, male and female, coaches from revenue and non-revenue and individual and team sports. Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) defined a sample as a group in a research study on which the information is obtained. The sample comes from the target population and is used to infer back to the target population. Prior to sampling, a target population must be defined, but the researcher may have to settle for an accessible population instead of the target population. This is an important issue when considering external generalizability (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). In this qualitative study, an accessible population was used, and the generalizability is limited to that population.

Once the population has been specifically defined, sampling refers to the process of selecting individuals for the sample. Two major types of sampling exist called random and nonrandom sampling. Random samples occur when every member of the population
have an equal chance of being selected (Vogt, 1999). Therefore, those not selected for
the sample should be represented within the sample. The types of random samples
include simple random sample, stratified random sample, cluster random sample, and
two-stage sampling (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). Any of these sampling methods could be
useful for future research, but this study used a nonrandom sample. Nonrandom samples
occur when each member of the population does not have an equal chance of being
selected (Vogt, 1999). This may also be called purposeful sampling. These sample
methods include systematic sampling, convenience sampling, and purposive sampling.
Systematic sampling is when each 10th or so person on the population list will be chosen
(Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). For example, every tenth coach from a list of all
intercollegiate coaches could be used. Convenience sampling takes individuals from a
group who are conveniently available for study. In this study, convenience sampling
occurred with coaches chosen due to their availability at the time the researcher collected
the data. A purposive sampling method is when the individuals are chosen based on
previous knowledge of the population, and this method was also used.

One university was selected for this study for the following reason. Trail and
Chelladurai (2000) conducted a research study on goals and processes of intercollegiate
athletics, and they encouraged the use of a case study approach. For example, differences
in size, structure, and process of athletic departments could create differences that mask
the differences being explored in this type of study. The choice of one university would
control for university differences. Therefore, Division I-A institution was chosen for this
study. This university is known for athletic achievements. In addition, Division I
athletics appears to place more importance on winning than the other divisions do. Mahony, Fink, and Pastore (1999) expected more focus on winning at the Division I level where sports produce revenue and receive more media attention. Division I coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership would provide insight into the fit between altruistic leadership and a competitive culture known to value winning as an outcome.

Background Information

Ideal conditions exist for qualitative research methods. Marshall and Rossman (1995) described ideal conditions as having: (a) access to the target population, (b) a high probability of gaining a rich mix of information, (c) a likelihood of building trusting relationships, and (d) an assured data quality and credibility. Access to the target population was gained by obtaining coaches’ office telephone numbers from the school’s staff and faculty telephone directory. Then, the coaches were personally contacted to arrange an interview time. A high probability of gaining a rich mix of information was assured through choosing both male and female coaches and a variety of sport teams. The researcher increased trusting relationships by reading journal articles, books, and previous dissertations on coaching careers to understand coaches’ responses and informatively ask for further information. Data quality and credibility was improved by following qualitative validity and reliability guidelines from Fraenkel and Wallen (2000). This concerns issues of transferability and dependability. Qualitative researchers must use several techniques to ensure their perceptions are the same as the participants’ responses. These techniques were identified by Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) and were implemented in this study: (a) use a variety of data collection methods through a process
called triangulation, (b) checking participants’ responses against each other to ensure validity, (c) writing down the questions asked in addition to the responses, (d) recording personal thoughts during the interview, (e) documenting sources of remarks, (f) documenting the basis for inferences, (g) describing the context in which questions are asked, (h) using audio tapes, and (i) drawing conclusions based on researcher’s understanding. The degree of confidence researchers can place in qualitative methods is increased with these methods, and researcher bias in this study was reduced through these techniques.

Data Collection

Many tasks were involved in this study in order to collect details on coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Three contexts were utilized as sources of data. These sources included: (a) a background questionnaire to gather demographic information, (b) semi-structured interviews with the coaches, and (c) field note recordings.

Questionnaires

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was used to obtain information about the coaches’ age, sex, ethnicity, sport coached, whether their athletes are male or female, and years of coaching experience. This information helped to recognize contextual influences on coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership.
Interviews

An interview process was also undertaken in this study. The in-depth interviews lasted a range of 20 to 45 minutes in length. Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte (1999) define in-depth interviews as exploration of any and all facets of a topic in detail. The purpose of using the interviewing method in this study was to allow the coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership to be open and not bounded by strict guidelines and preconceptions. Then, coaches’ perceptions revealed patterns and provided increased understanding of their experiences and context. The appropriate number of interviews was determined by consistent patterns in the responses emerging. Then the decision was to end the data collection process. Denzin (1978) called this data saturation.

An interview guide was developed for the study (Appendix B). In order to allow freedom to explore perceptions yet obtain consistent data on focused topics, the researcher chose a semi-structured format. Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte (1999) defined semi-structured interviews as consisting of predetermined questions related to domains of interest to confirm study domains and identify factors, variables, and items or attributes for analysis or use in a survey. This semi-structure kept the researcher focused while conversation flowed with participants desire to express their experiences and knowledge. An additional consideration is where the interview guide originated. Only two options are available: either the researcher finds an existing instrument, or an instrument is designed. For this research study, Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte’s (1999) guidelines were followed to configure specific questions. The researcher used an audio-tape during the interviews in addition to taking field notes throughout the interview
process in order to record responses to the interview questions. Transcriptions were made following each interview. The transcriptions were composed of all spoken words.

Field Notes

Another instrument used in this study besides a questionnaire and interviews was notes. Questionnaires and interviews are designed to obtain information from the participants, and one classification of instruments depends on who provides the information (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). If the researcher provides the information, the instrument may be a tally sheet, performance checklists, time-and-motion logs, or field notes. Field notes were taken in this study. Field notes are defined by Bogdan and Bilken (1992) as a written record of what the researcher hears, sees, experiences, and thinks while collecting information and reflecting on a qualitative study. The researcher for this study made notes when personal perceptions arose regarding aspects of the study. These notes included contextual, methodological, and personal notes.

Procedures

Several steps are taken in research, such as defining the problem, identifying the target population, choosing a mode of data collection, selecting the sample, preparing the instrument, preparing a cover letter, and dealing with nonresponse (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). In addition, IRB approval must be obtained, and the human subjects procedures must be followed. The problem for this study has been defined as describing the perceptions of altruistic leadership by intercollegiate coaches. Next, the identification of the target population was discussed previously. In this study, a single university from Division I was chosen. Considerable differences in size, structure, and processes of
universities may mask expected differences. Many modes of data collection are possible, such as mail surveys, telephone surveys, and personal interviews. For this study, personal interviews were chosen due to advantages listed by Fraenkel and Wallen (2000).

Interviews were in-depth and semi-structured. Once a coach agreed to an interview, a time and place to meet was determined. Participants were informed of tape recordings and the researcher’s note taking prior to starting the interview. Participants read and signed a consent form (Appendix C) to participate in the study. They were also informed that they do not have to answer all the questions. Procedures for securing their confidentiality were described as being assigned a pseudo-name kept separate from any record of their name. In addition, the results were written in a careful manner to assure no connection to a particular coach. For example, the coaches’ name, age, and ethnicity were not reported in the results. A range of years coaching was used instead of the specific number. In addition, any reference to the specific sport that the participants coached was changed to a general sport reference. A question guide was prepared, but the researcher allowed flexibility of the questions and answers. The interview lasted in a range of 20 to 45 minutes. The participants coach a variety of sports, including two revenue and 13 non-revenue and 8 individual and 7 team sports.

The interview schedule included open-ended questions. The researcher ensured that questions were unambiguous, simple, short, common language, lacking bias, specific, and lacking double negatives as recommended by Fraenkel and Wallen (2000). Guidelines by Dillman (2000) were used to configure the overall format of the contact
with coaches. For example, a prenotice e-mail (Appendix D) was sent followed by the phone call, the interview questions, and a final telephone contact. In a recent study by Kent and Turner (2002), coaches’ response rates were increased with the use of prenotification procedures, such as an e-mail method. Therefore, this approach was implemented in this study.

Research using interviews also requires building trusting relationships between the researcher and participant in order to acquire accurate information. The researcher tried to accomplish this by informing the participants of their common background in intercollegiate sports and their common affiliation with a university. Therefore, a thorough description and autobiography of the researcher’s background were also given. In interactions with participants, social skills, such as politeness and attentive listening helped develop rapport between the interviewer and the interviewee.

Aside from these procedures to build trusting relationships, some aspects are uncontrollable. For example, the participants’ response to the age, gender, or ethnicity of the interviewer could not be pre-determined. This makes a difference to the access of data because distrust may be present due to these aspects of the interviewer. To confront these types of barriers, the researcher tried to find common experiences to discuss. These topics included experiences with student-athletes, interactions with previous coaches, or barriers of gender. This background information helped establish a common connection to facilitate the dissemination and acquisition of knowledge.
Panel of Experts

A panel of experts was requested to review each question on the interview guide for appropriateness and relevance to the topic of altruistic leadership. This procedure establishes content validity. Content validity is the degree to which an instrument covers the intended content area. The panel of experts consisted of 10 people: 2 sport management experts; 2 qualitative research experts; 2 leadership experts; 2 intercollegiate coaches; 1 sport psychology expert; and 1 human resources expert. These individuals were provided detailed information about the purpose of the study and directions to assist them in their task.

The directions instructed the experts to determine whether the questions were appropriate and relevant to the purpose of study. Experts were also asked for comments or suggestions, and the interview guide was adjusted based on this information. For example, one expert suggested that the questions ask for stories of personal experiences that exemplify altruistic leadership. Another suggestion was to ask coaches whether a relationship existed between success and altruistic leadership. Two questions from the demographic questionnaire were moved to the interview guide. Lastly, another expert expressed concern that one question may be too personal for the coaches. Therefore, the expert panel’s advice was helpful in refining the interview guide.

Analysis

For this study, the procedures of analysis involved systematically organizing evidence from the interviews. Glense and Peshkin (1992) explained that working with data helps researchers create explanations, pose hypotheses, develop theories, and link
stories to other stories. Several steps were taken to work with the data. The oral data had to be transcribed to written form. This allowed the information to be carefully reviewed to see emerging patterns and themes. To facilitate the review, analytical coding was used for categorizing and classifying the data. Each sentence was analyzed for connections to the themes. For the purpose of triangulation, the questionnaire and field notes were also analyzed. Analytical files helped organize the coding. The researcher labeled sentences that reflected central themes, such as emotional intelligence factors. Also, the NUDIST N-6 computer program was useful for this examining process. Results of patterns and relationships were obtained after data entry and coding. These results were related back to the research questions.

Research Issues

Triangulation

In order to determine whether the same conclusion would be obtained from multiple data collection processes, interviewers, and coders triangulation is enacted. Triangulation allows a researcher to explore perceptions from different standpoints. In this study, conclusions were analyzed from background questionnaires, interviews, and field notes. These sources of information were used as cross-checks on the interpretations. In addition, multiple coders were utilized to increase perspectives and perceptions on altruistic leadership.
Member Checks

Respondents were contacted for member checks. Member checks involve going back to the respondents with information collected and interpretations made in order to clarify or modify the data. Lincoln and Guba (1989) stated that member checks are the most important technique for establishing credibility. The process in this study involved giving the participants copies of their transcripts. They were asked to confirm the accuracy of the statements, and they could add additional comments and delete or change comments. The researcher changed the data recommended from one participant. Other participants responded with a thank you for the information. This process added credibility to the research design.

Reflective Journal

A reflective journal was utilized in this study to record the researcher’s perceptions. This process allows the researcher to be aware of issues, biases, and subjectivity (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Therefore, a more trustworthy interpretation is produced. In this study, the researcher kept a journal as a way of recording thoughts and questions. The researcher wrote in the reflective journal after each interview and anytime an important issue occurred in the process. This information was used to identify important themes for coding. As the study progressed, this record provided the researcher with dependable data to review during the interpretive process. For example on April, 29, 2003, the researcher wrote, “Coaches have helped me see things differently. I’m not sure the division is that important. Years of coaching experience may be more
important. Why would these coaches be better at altruistic leadership? They all seem to be altruistic leaders.” Other questions and comments focused on methods and concepts.

Role of the Researcher

Marshall and Rossman (1995) described the role of the researcher in qualitative research as an additional “instrument” to be considered. In their view, the researcher changes the paradigm from which the data are viewed. The researcher influences the trust, mutual respect, and reciprocity involved in the interview (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). They also recommend that a researcher define his or her role in the study. The researcher’s role in this study was to ask questions that would improve the knowledge and understanding of coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Another role was to learn from the participants. This involved the tasks of actively listening and actively learning from their stories. In addition, the researcher’s role was to facilitate the conversation by actively asking questions and searching for meaning and gaps to be filled. Therefore, the researcher was aware of the influence that an individual’s paradigm could have and the role the qualitative researcher should maintain. The researcher was aware of a bias toward the existence and helpfulness of altruistic leadership to intercollegiate athletics. With knowledge of this bias, the researcher was vigilant of influencing coaches to respond in a desirable manner by using neutral wording in questions and comments.
Trustworthiness and Validity

Marshall and Rossman (1992) stated that qualitative validity depended on the researcher as an instrument. The researcher influences information through their knowledge, skills, and abilities. In qualitative terminology, the trustworthiness, dependability, and credibility of the researcher’s processes must be ensured. This is often accomplished through triangulation, member checks, peer debriefing, and a reflective journal. These procedures were utilized in this study.

Many processes could be used to increase the trustworthiness of the data. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) proposed that triangulation in qualitative studies increases the trustworthiness of the data. Triangulation was utilized in this study with a questionnaire, interviews, and field notes. The member checks involved the coaches in the interview process by having them review their interview transcripts to check for errors (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). The members returned their edited copy of the manuscript to allow changes. They were asked whether anything was misinterpreted, missing, not wanted in there, or revealing their identity. Peer debriefing was also useful to check credibility. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described peer debriefing as an external check of the research process. In the peer debriefing process, a peer unrelated to the dissertation process helps explore aspects of the study that might remain unchallenged and encourages the researcher to expand the assumed viewpoint. Two peer debriefers were chosen in this study. One is also a doctoral student with an interest in sport psychology and qualitative research. The second is a doctoral student in policy and leadership also with an interest in qualitative research. Awareness of personal bias and subjectivity also helps ensure
trustworthiness. For example, the reflective journal kept by the researcher reveals opinions that may influence the interpretation of the data. Therefore, the researcher took steps to improve the trustworthiness of the research methodology.

**Summary**

This chapter described the methodology utilized for this study. Prior to explaining the details of the method, a rationale for the research design was presented. In alignment with the rationale, sampling methods and participants, background information, data collection, procedures, panel of experts, analysis, role of the researcher, and validity were a part of the methodology. The next chapter consists of the research data collected from the methods explained in this chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study explored intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Another objective of this study was to examine the connections between coaches’ perceptions toward altruistic leadership and emotional intelligence. In addition, coaches’ perceptions were investigated to examine the relationship between performance, psychological outcomes, and altruistic leadership. This chapter presents the findings from the participants’ responses to the interview questions. To maintain the confidentiality of the participants, an in-depth individual analysis will not be presented. Findings are presented as a cross case analysis for each research question. A cross case analysis was enacted to determine similarities and differences among coaches’ responses. This chapter was divided into five sections: (a) participants, (b) perceptions of altruistic leadership, (c) altruistic leadership and emotional intelligence, (d) outcomes related to altruistic leadership, and (e) summary.

Participants

Fifteen NCAA Division I head coaches from a selected university participated in this study. Seven coaches were female and eight were male. Eight coaches were from team sports, and seven were from individual sports. Their coaching experience ranged
from 8 to 36 years. The average years of head coaching experience were 17 years. Therefore, this sample of coaches is quite developed in terms of coaching experience. Table 5 contains the participants’ pseudo-name, gender, years of coaching experience, and whether they coached an individual or team sport. Pseudo-names were chosen by the researcher to ensure no connection to the participants. In addition, it should be noted that quotes from each coach were incorporated throughout the chapter. However, not every coach was represented in the quotes provided for each topic. The researcher selected the quotes based on the richness of the coach’s response and how well a coach’s perception represented the definition given for each topic.

Perceptions of Altruistic Leadership

The first research question explored intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Five themes emerged from their responses and are presented in the order of the number of coaches that endorsed each theme: character, caring, empowerment, balance, and consistency. Each of these themes is discussed in the following section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach’s Pseudo-Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Coaching Experience</th>
<th>Coaching Individual or Team Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 20</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 20</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 15</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 20</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertram</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 20</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 10</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Greater than 20</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Demographic Information.
Character

Webster’s Dictionary (2000) defines character as “the pattern of behavior or moral constitution found in an individual” (p. 246). Coaches indicated the importance of character in defining altruistic leadership. They also connected altruistic leadership to the opposite of altruistic leadership and barriers to altruistic leadership. Lastly, coaches perceived character as a strategy to improving altruistic leadership.

When asked to define altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching, 14 out of 15 coaches alluded to the importance of morals, ethics, integrity, trust, honesty, humility, and fairness. For example, Coach Leonard said:

> It comes down to your ideology, down to your ethics, and down to your integrity because you stand before them. They know you after having you for five years as a coach. They know whether you're an honest person or whether you're a fair person or not, whether you're moral.

In addition, examples of exceptionally good altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching were related to coaches’ philosophy or values. Coach Pam offered an example of one coach with altruistic leadership, “He has all kinds of things about family, university pride, values, faith, and work ethic. You can see that all over almost everywhere in his auditorium.” Coach Kate described the importance of ethical decisions in her program:

> Even in decisions because I've never seen a live example but you read in magazines about athletes making bad decisions that maybe you'll sweep under the rug. Probably because you want to win that game for nationals or it's good for them since the draft is coming up. In our program if someone violates a rule or goes outside of what we want as a team, they will be disciplined whether it's a national championship or an exhibition. I would never think of giving in for wins for something I think is right.
When asked about behaviors and attitudes that are the opposite of altruistic leadership, coaches described opposites with unethical actions and attitudes. They often mentioned intimidation and harsh comments and behaviors. Coach Al stated:

Yeah, I've seen a lot of guys like that. My philosophy is as a coach I will never embarrass anybody or talk negatively to somebody in front of other people or their own teammates. I've seen coaches get right into kids’ faces and start swearing at them and everything. I've never done that and hope I never will do that. I know I never will do it. It kind of embarrasses the kid, and he feels bad and the coaches feel bad.

Some coaches perceived this to be the way a coach motivates players. For example, Coach Guy reported:

Yes, not here at this school. I've seen that happen plenty of times where on television and I've seen it in real life and from other coaches on occasion. They coach through intimidation. You have to do this because I said so. I told you to do this. They motivate differently. They may get in somebody's face or they put their hands on a kid or they intimidate, which I don't buy.

Therefore, coaches perceived harsh comments and actions as the opposite of altruistic leadership.

Another question asked coaches whether they knew of any barriers to altruistic leadership. Coach Marcus perceived the short recruiting time as a barrier to achieving altruistic leadership:

You're under intense competition, and you try to draw a picture of what you'll be getting. So, you have to try to adjust as you go. Hopefully, they grow into good people, too. It's very difficult to judge their character. You're only allowed three contacts off campus and then the official visit.

This coach worried about problem student-athletes creating images of unethical behavior. Another barrier in regards to recruitment would be breaking ethical rules to obtain a “thoroughbred” athlete. Coach Maria said:
There are a couple of different things. One, I think a coach is a role model of what you do, which is struggled with sometimes in sports. There is instant gratification in sports, and you want to get away from that and do the right thing, especially when it comes to recruiting. You do what you know is right. You act with integrity and honesty. You hope in the long run, it pays off, but sometimes you lose. You win the war, but sometimes you lose the battle. Kids know that and players see it, and they know from the very beginning of the recruiting process that you'll be very honest with them. If the parents see that, then the trust gets built up, and you can instill those values into them of why that is important and how it has affected them. Then, you look at the big picture. You bring them in here hoping they want to win. Then, you want them to do things the right way by working hard.

Therefore, coaches perceived unethical behavior as a barrier to altruistic leadership.

Coaches also mentioned character within their recommendations for improving altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching. Coach Howard felt that altruistic leadership started with the hiring process of selection:

Well, we have a group of coaches put together by our administration that are the right kind of people and the right kind of teachers. It starts with the athletic director’s beliefs in core values that everyone of them heard during the interview process and is truly what he wants the university's athletics to be all about. I think the people that choose to come here to coach that that is important to them. We're fortunate. We have outstanding people on our staffs, and while there is the reality that you better win some games in order to stay employed, we all really buy into the values philosophy that really what is most important is the experience we give the student-athletes and the way we represent the institution. We all have the understanding that this is part of orientation.

This statement indicated the importance of taking character into consideration during the hiring process of intercollegiate coaches. Another issue with developing altruistic coaches involved individual feedback. One coach voiced concern with players’ character flaws. Coach Annie stated:

You have to get feedback on how you're doing. If you're winning all the time, there might not be any feedback. Then, the only situation they might be facing is
when a kid does something wrong, and it's frustrating. So, you need constant feedback, and keep them up to date on where you think problems are going to be.

From the coaches’ comments, character is perceived to be a component of altruistic leadership. Coach Kate discussed the importance of working from inside out to develop altruistic coaches. She was referring to building good character within a leader to increase student-athletes’ welfare. In being motivated by the ultimate goal to increase the welfare of student-athletes, coaches perceive that character is important to provide a good role model of ethical and moral values.

Caring

Webster’s Dictionary (2000) defines caring as “to feel concern, interest, love, or liking” (p. 221). Thirteen of the 15 intercollegiate coaches perceived caring to be part of altruistic leadership. They included topics such as meeting student-athletes needs, providing individual attention, having a parent’s mentality, and thinking of the greater good. Coach Pam used these techniques to meet student-athletes’ needs:

She needs to practice her weaknesses, not her strengths. So, if she continually sees certain patterns in her game, then it's really easy to convince her here is where she needs to go to practice. So preparation and then I learned from their weaknesses and try to make their weaknesses their strengths. I guess that is the lines I try to go on, and what I need to do to help them improve.

Individual attention was suggested by many coaches. They suggested setting aside time to get to know each player. For example, Coach Leonard said:

You can't coach everybody the same way. In my business, I think I have to be more knowledgeable about more things if I'm going to have more success with more people than any other job I could imagine. You just don't put the blinders on and do it, because then you only meet the certain aspects of a certain clientele. The rest of them you lose.
Caring was also communicated as having a parent’s mentality. Coaches described themselves as being like a dad or a mom to their student-athletes. Coach Marcus stated, “You want to treat them like one of your sons or daughters. I think the administration always looks at it from a standpoint of whether they would want their son or daughter playing for you. You have to always remember that.” Lastly, concern for the greater good was also acknowledged in the coaches’ responses. For example, Coach Shaun provided this explanation:

Letting someone know that there is something more than yourself. We talk a lot on this team about you're not just doing it for yourself. You have to be willing to be giving of yourself. You have to be willing to do it for the person standing next to you, for your parents, and for the university and so many other things besides yourself. You have to look beyond yourself for you to train hard and your team to do well. I think we've had a lot of leaders on this team, and just for myself watching these young men mature. I'm working for these guys who really want to be unselfish and do so much for this team. It's not hard. It's not hard for these young men to give of themselves. As far as myself in terms of being the coach, I'm always available. They may have a test, and they can't make the normal workout. Unlike football or basketball where you have to put an offense or a defense together to get an effective workout, it is an individual sport. Yeah, it's a team, but as a young man they know the coach is going to be there if I have to come in at 9 o'clock or I have to stay late, whatever, so they can do well in school. They see me being willing to give as much as I can of myself to them. In terms of following my lead, they need to be as giving as you can for their teammates, for their coaches, and for their university. That type of leadership leads them to what they want.

An important concept in Coach Shaun’s explanation is the phrase “willing to give as much as I can of myself to them.” The coach reinforces the importance of striving for the greater good beyond one’s self.

When asked to describe the opposite of altruistic leadership, coaches often gave examples of egoistic coaches who have their own goals as their ultimate motivation. Coach Leonard explained:
Yes, I've seen coaches use athletes for their own level of achievement. I think when they're done they haven't proved themselves. They may have survived, and they may have made a living. But, they haven't left a legacy. Coaching is probably the number one place where you're judged by the people you serve, because their success is totally dependent on what you truly are.

Coach Leonard clearly stated the difference in impact between an altruistic and egoistic leader. The opposite of an altruistic leader was an egoistic leader who does not leave a positive impact on others.

As barriers to altruistic leadership, the theme of caring also emerged in relation to coaches’ inability to show care and in NCAA rules. Coach Annie explained the inability to show care:

Their both really caring, maybe one more than the other. The other is not because he wants to be. That is just who he is, the way he was brought up. He doesn't show affection real well. He is loyal to the T with other coaches, like with me and me with him. I don't think I could coach the way he coaches.

Coach Charlie also pinpointed that coaches really care, but some just don’t know how to show it. This coach also found NCAA rules to be a barrier to altruistic leadership and caring. He explained:

I think there are a lot of limitations right now with the NCAA on the amount of time you're allowed to spend with your student-athletes just because of the hours it takes to do your sport. I talked to the coach everyday when I was playing. There were no restrictions. It was great, because I really got to know the guy. So, with NCAA legislation coming through, it's all good regulations, but you just don't have enough interaction with your student-athletes some times, because it's just the type of season you're in. That's a barrier, but that can be worked around. The time you do have with your student-athletes make sure it's quality. Make sure you get a chance to know them. It's just during the hours, you're focused on practice and getting your team ready. When you didn't have those restrictions, you had more time to get to know people. So, those are just the rules we have to go by.
In summary, caring for individuals by meeting needs, providing individual attention, and taking a parent mentality in addition to caring for the greater good emerged from the coaches’ responses regarding altruistic leadership. Coaches’ perceptions of the opposite of altruistic leadership also aligned with caring for others, but the opposite was egoistic leadership where the focus was on meeting their own individual goals. Barriers also reflected caring as an altruistic leadership factor. These barriers were the inability to show care and NCAA rules that restricts coaches’ time to get to know athletes.

**Empowerment**

Webster’s Dictionary (2000) defined empowerment as “to give ability to or to enable” (p. 466). The coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership included many forms of empowerment. Ten out of 15 coaches mentioned their desire to teach, to improve life skills, to encourage striving for excellence, and to maintain a positive attitude.

Several coaches included teaching and educating athletes on a variety of life skills. Coach Leonard described actions and attitudes of altruistic leadership as teaching about more than just playing the sport. He said:

> You impact them. I get involved with my athletes. I have a variety of speeches I give my kids. I feel as an educator I should. I talk about honesty. I actually talk about sexual issues. I first talked about it as respect for everyone else in their lives, but now it can make a difference of whether you live or die.

One coach’s comments combined teaching and altruism. Coach Marcus was concerned with the selfishness of student-athletes coming into intercollegiate programs. He said, “Many players have their own personal reasons. Most coaches will try to take that selfish person and try to change him, but that takes time.” He felt that changing the selfish ways of players would improve the student-athlete’s interactions with coaches and teammates.
Coach Annie focused more on teaching life skills in general. She commented:

I feel that each year I impacted them somewhat. So, life skills are very important. We guide them, show them what's good and what's bad. We see them grow so much between the ages 18 and 22 years old. You can't even imagine what we see.

Another coach when asked about the actions and attitudes of an altruistic leader described how he was taught by his coach to strive for excellence. Coach Guy said:

I didn't think I could do it. I became a little internally negative. I think the coach probably saw that. I didn't see that. I was a high school sophomore or junior. All I saw was that I couldn't do it. I had this roadblock, it's too much to ask kind of thing. How can you ask this of me? I believe looking back today my coach believed I could do it. His vision was that I could handle it. He thought it would be something of value to me, an obstacle for me to overcome. I didn't handle it well. So, he kicked me out. The next day he made me do it again. I wasn't getting out of the set I thought it was going to go away. Although, I learned a couple of valuable lessons: 1) if you don't do it right the first time, you're probably going to do it again, 2) you didn't accomplish, to attempt is not do it. The attempt is not good enough. To complete something, to succeed, to believe you can do it, I obviously didn't believe I could do it. The coach was trying to teach me that. I needed to believe it first. Then, third was to stretch your limits to stretch your imagination to what your possibilities are. Those are the things athletics brings to most kids. Those are some of the values, as I look back today, that my coaches were trying to teach me.

Another example this coach provided as an action or attitude that aligned with altruistic leadership focused on his way of teaching and motivating some student-athletes to strive for excellence. He explained:

I do believe that there are some people that need a strong person to demand excellence from them, not allow them to give no as an answer or I'm not going to do that as an answer. Maybe that is a window in our lives when someone has to drive us that way and get us over the hump. Maybe it's because we're being a knucklehead. We're 16 or 18 or 19, and no one can teach us anything. We have points in our lives when we can't be taught anything. I think at that point in our lives we need to have someone strong who won't take no from us and help us understand that there are no exits. There are no exits. I use that term with our guys. We're in this together. There are no exits. You can't get out. You can't just
walk out the door. You can't crawl out through a window. You're either going to win it or lose it as a team. Nobody points fingers. Nobody is more or less responsible than another. You are responsible. You can't escape it. That's your responsibility to understand you win it or lose it as a team. This is our job today to be the best we can be. We can't have any excuses. You can't say today was not my day. I felt bad today. So, I teach young people to do it right the first time, to be all into it, to give it all up, to challenge yourself to be in the here and now, to be in the moment, not I'll do it tomorrow.

In addition to Coach Guy’s perception of teaching excellence as a part of altruistic leadership, he also encouraged teaching student-athletes to strive for excellence regardless of the expected outcome and to consider the impact this has on others. He encouraged:

If you do these things and you're still striving and you're teaching winning, you could be eighth and you could still be striving to be number one in everything and you're still teaching to be number one, you just didn't get to be number one. You're still teaching it. There is a difference between the right things. You can fail at what you're doing. People fail all the time at what they're doing. Those folks who choose not to play the best or settle for less than the best, aren't doing justice to themselves, their team, their university, or their alumni.

Another related action and attitude to empowerment is maintaining a positive attitude. Coach Al had this to say about the importance of teaching student-athletes to be positive with themselves. He said:

The other thing is a positive influence on them and staying positive the whole way. In this sport it's easy to get down on yourself real quick. You're out there all by yourself. You can't call timeout. You don't have a half-time or anything like that. You just have to battle it out there. It's hard for the kids to keep it together. We try to keep it like a positive influence out there. I tell them a lot about positive self-talk. You're your own best friend out there, because you're probably the only one out there with you.
According to Coach Al’s perception, a positive attitude empowers athletes to overcome obstacles. Therefore, the ability to teach how to maintain a positive attitude would align with altruistic leadership to improve the well-being of student-athletes.

This theme of empowerment also emerged when coaches were asked to provide an example of behaviors or attitudes that were the opposite of altruistic leadership. These opposites include dependence and negative attitude. Coach Kirby spoke about creating dependence on the coach by not allowing choices. She said:

I hate being put in a situation where I don't have a choice or where I'm told what to do. So, your choice may be not to do this, but don't feel like a victim. You always have a choice. Even when they might be in trouble, they still have a choice.

Another coach described a situation opposite of altruistic leadership. In this example, a negative attitude led the student-athletes to feel afraid and powerless. Coach Annie said:

I had a coach that came in after I left a university she told the seniors you can do whatever. I don't care if you like my program or not, because they were from my program. She came in, and she didn't care about what the kids needed. She was just worried about living up to what I built. I can't fault her for that. It's an insecurity. I don't think that is who she is, but it came off like that. It turned those kids off. They had a terrible experience all the way down to the freshman that I recruited, because they heard how the seniors were treated.

Empowerment also emerged in the barriers to altruistic leadership perceptions of coaches. These barriers included parents and team resources. For example, Coach Marcus spoke about parents and their over-involvement in the student-athletes experience. He stated:

Then, one thing about this sport is it's a lot of parental involvement. It's very unique to the sport because you're playing high school volleyball or high school soccer, you're staying after school, and football and basketball. Whereas, in this sport, you have to be driven to the playing facility. There is the expense of it, too. The school isn't paying for it. The parents are. Not only the expense of the
equipment, but also the expense of driving them there and back. And, the parents have invested so much time in these kids that when they get to this level, they think they can still be involved just like they were in minors. They think this is minor, but it isn't. They get so frustrated, and they phone everybody. But, you're dealing with the kid in a fair way. You're there everyday with them in practice. He might not have the ability. People have caught up and surpassed him. He might not have the strength, and the parents are saying you're crazy. How come he's not playing right now? It's because this kid over here is better than him. So, it makes it difficult.

In regards to team resources, Coach Charlie talked about the barrier created by lack of funding for teams. He connects altruistic leadership to making student-athletes feel important:

When you get to our sports which are smaller, you look around the country, and there aren't huge budgets for our sport. You want those student-athletes to really feel like they're important. Sometimes it's hard when you play a minor sport. So, one is trying to put out there a winning team, building some tradition that kids can buy into. Then, making them feel like what they do is important. I think that is helping with building tradition, and that's helping with looking the part with uniforms and practice uniforms and just making you feel like you're important, and the university cares about you and how you represent the university.

Therefore, according to the coaches’ perceptions, altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching involves empowerment. Coaches enable student-athletes by teaching them a variety of lessons about building life skills, striving for excellence, and maintaining a positive attitude.

**Balance**

Webster’s Dictionary (2000) defines balance as “a state of equality in amount, value, or importance” (p. 108). In intercollegiate athletics, balance often refers to student-athletes’ ability to balance athletics and academics. Seven of the 15 coaches discussed the importance of balance within student-athletes’ lives and within their own
life. Coach Marcus provided the encouragement he provides his players in regards to maintaining a balance of athletics and academics:

I graduated in four years. I wasn't a physics major or anything like that, but it helped me go out and pursue a professional sports career knowing I could fall back on my education. I was very lucky to have it, because I played up and down in the pros for five years. Then would I have come back to school? Probably not. I just want to stress how important that was to the young kids and getting the opportunity to stay in the game that I liked. It's extremely difficult for kids to accept the fact when I tell them is you better get your education in four years. If you have any intention of playing in the pros, you better get your education. I'm not saying he won't make it, but I'm saying there is a 70 to 80% chance that he won't make it. There is a 20% chance that he will, but your education is going to be so important to the rest of your life. Kids can go one way or another. They can go crazy on their education and making sure they understand that. A lot of kids are starting to understand. Other guys might go the other way, like what the hell are you talking about. That's the hardest part of this job, getting them to understand the truth of what we're seeing. You can be a great intercollegiate player, but you're probably not going to make the big money in the pros. Having the experience of playing the minors and having an education after four years, go ahead and go. Try it for a few years. Experience it. You'll come back to your education. You're going to drop thirty to sixty thousand dollars in two years, because they don't pay you very well in the minors. With your education, you could be well ahead of the game. It's hard trying to tell them that when they're freshman or sophomores. Now, the seniors start to understand that. You hope you recruit good enough to combine that character of wanting to get an education and wanting to play intercollegiate, and the pros will be there when they get done. In the meantime, get your education, because you'll enjoy it more. You won't have to go back to school. Go give it a shot. Guys are starting to understand that.

Coaches also show concern for student-athletes’ entire college experience. Coach Pam stated:

I think balance. Those are things that I think you also have to understand that they're also students. I was just talking to the men's coach from Northwestern, and he was talking about dealing with school and trying to play, too. Like this weekend, we're not doing anything. We're off. I think it's really important if you want them at maximum amount at practice and tournaments that they have some time away and time to be college students, too, and enjoy doing other things.
Therefore, coaches connect the importance of balance in student-athletes experiences to altruistic leadership.

The opposite of balance also emerged as an opposite to altruistic leadership. Coach Kate described the overemphasis on athletics and winning, and she believes in balance for her team:

I think you see it sometimes with those higher profile sports, maybe basketball, hockey, and football. That is where it is win or lose at all costs. Maybe the athletes don't get the degree, or you don't have the follow-up and they flunk out of school. You're not looking at the whole picture of what is important about that student-athlete. I think you have to have that balance. If you asked me what was number one I would say there is a tie of academics and the sport. You have to put emphasis on both of them. You can't let the sport overshadow academics. Academics has to be the top and the sport is right there with it. But, I would say with those other sports, the big bucks are hanging there. The priority is that sport and then the academics.

Several coaches also felt a barrier to altruistic leadership was requiring coaches to win, and that detracts from balance. Coach Leonard stated it clearly and succinctly. He said, “We get hired and fired based on wins and losses. It's a terrible way of evaluating a coach, I think.” Coach Marcus also agreed, “I think certain sports you have to win. Bottom line is usually it's winning and losing. I'm sure they hope to hire a coach that can combine everything.” The requirement to win was depicted by Coach Marcus, “You’re turning out a better character person, but we're losing. That's just the nature of the beast, because he's a big money maker.” Coach Guy had a similar perception:

The barrier to altruistic leadership is the win at all cost attitude. It's clear. If your job is win and you don't win, no one cares if you were altruistic or not. I think you have to come to grips with this yourself. It's a personal decision. It's a personal choice. You have to come to grips with it. The balance of you can do both.
However, one coach downplayed winning requirements in non-revenue sports:

Whereas you get non-revenue sports, it may be completely different. It's all about family and being a part of the student-athletes. If you're an income sport, you don't get as much time. Wins and loses are too important to the income of the university so these other programs can function. Ultimately, we're an income sport. We make money. If we make money, it goes to fencing and other athletic programs so the athletic department can function. I think they try to put an equal amount of pressure on the fencing coach as they do on the football coach or the basketball coach or the hockey coach, but there is no comparison. In those non-income sports, the coach does a great job at making sure it's a family. I think the coaches put the pressure on themselves to win by nature. And, they should. I'm sure that's what the administration tries to recruit.

A non-revenue sport coach had this to say about winning:

I just think it's kind of your philosophy, and every coach has a different philosophy. Of course, probably number one is winning. That's what you have to do to keep your job I guess. But, the things that are getting out of hand are what they're paying the coaches. I don't know about that in our major sports. I know they make the money, but the pressure goes along when you're making a million dollars a year. That seems to be the going rate now for the football and basketball coaches at the really good programs. I'm not sure how it got that way. I'm not sure how pro sports got that way. That's kind of our society.

Another non-revenue sport coach sounded as though she had put winning as a high priority. She said, “At this level, yeah, winning is important. I'm struggling, because I'm not going to sacrifice being great for a bunch of girls who are being bitches. I'm not going to do it. I can't do that right now.”

Overall, coaches desire balance for their student-athletes, but also for themselves in the coaching career. One coach thought a coach could consciously choose to be both a winner and an altruistic leader. Although, the focus and requirement to win seems to build barriers that some coaches cannot overcome. Coach Guy provided a summary that also depicted winning as a monster threatening balance:

It's not just about win, win, win, or the university or the team doing well. I would
say it is a monster. Winning is a monster. Winning drives us, yet at the same time, it's our method of evaluating ourselves against the competition. Yet, at the same time, it's the worst method of evaluating yourself in how you're doing in a healthy, holistic manner of people. Hopefully you're not going to put yourself in the position where you're evaluated by just that one thing. Many times it is the bottom line.

*Consistency*

Webster’s Dictionary (2000) defined consistency as “an agreement with what has already been done or expressed” (p. 311). Four coaches of the 15 aligned consistency with altruistic leadership. Coach Pam simply defined altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching, “Well, I think the work ethic is really important. I think being consistent is really important.” Coach Marcus provided a more extensive description of the importance of consistency:

You have to be consistent with what you're saying and what you're doing. I think they have to respect where you come from and what you've done. I think if you're consistently honest with the kid and consistently telling them when he doesn't do things right, it's not saying he can't do it. It's trying to teach him. They start to understand that.

Therefore, coaches perceived consistency as being related to altruistic leadership through repeatedly teaching student-athletes important concepts.

The lack of consistent discipline emerged as an opposite of altruistic leadership. Coach Marcus stated, “Yeah, when players are behaving badly just because he's a good football player or hockey player or basketball player, the coach lets him do what he wants.” In addition, Coach Kate discussed how bad decisions by certain players get “swept under the rug.” She treats her players the same regardless of who violates the rules, “We want consistency.”

The extensive requirements of winning also create barriers to consistency. Coach
Howard stated, “You see people that say how many games did you win and how many people came. If the seats aren't full then we better make a change. That makes it a little harder to take a patient and methodical approach.”

In summary, consistency emerged as a theme of altruistic leadership. Coaches perceived that messages should be consistent regardless of the player or the situation. The focus on winning and the requirements to win may create barriers that direct coaches to make decisions without the ultimate goal of increasing student-athletes’ welfare.

Summary

Overall, coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership were clear, consistent, and positive. Coaches understood how the concept of altruistic leadership applies to their position in intercollegiate athletics. They easily aligned coaches’ behaviors and attitudes with this concept of leaders having the ultimate goal of caring for the welfare of student-athletes. In addition, they also easily described behaviors and attitudes of coaches that would be the opposite of altruistic leadership, such as intimidation, dependence, lack of discipline, harsh comments and behaviors, negativity, focus on winning, and egoism. Their comments on barriers also aligned with the emerging themes of altruistic leadership. For example, the barrier of required winning aligned with the altruistic leadership factor of balance. Therefore, intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership provided clarifying, consistent, and helpful information.
Altruistic Leadership and Emotional Intelligence

The second research question explored intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership and underlying connections to emotional intelligence. Five factors of emotional intelligence were explored within the coaches’ comments: self-awareness, social skills, empathy, self-motivation, and self-regulation. Each of these themes is discussed in the following section and is presented in the order of number of coaches reinforcing the theme.

Self-Awareness

Goleman (1998) defined self-awareness as the ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions, and drives, as well as the effects on others. This theme was reinforced in seven of the 15 interviews from coaches. Coach Bertram said:

This is my own personal approach, we talk about athletics as an experience of self discovery, and I find coaching to be very much that way. Like every button, every neuroses, every wound that I have gets exposed through this endeavor. So, for me, I'm very clear that the things I need to do to become a better coach is about me becoming a better person.

This statement ends with a connection to character and becoming a better person. This may be facilitated by self-awareness. He jokingly added, “Yeah, so I think all coaches should have to be in therapy.” Another means of self-awareness is reflection on past motivation. For example, Coach Guy said, “

What does it take for me to accomplish this dream? So, it becomes clearer and clearer as you back up. So, I think teaching and coaching today to me is that. Now, when I was 27, I don't think I got that.

Coach Kirby also acknowledged the importance of recognizing and understanding personal characteristics and motivations:
I think you have to have a strong sense of yourself, who you are, what you believe in, what you want, what direction you want to be going in. I was 24 during my first head coaching job, and it's not like it was 40 years ago, but I look back on that now and think a) how did they ever hire me, and b) how did I get through it. It's like anything, leadership is something I definitely study and read up on. Anything I get my hands on I'm willing to read. I often say yeah that works for them, but that's not how I would do it. I think you have to have a strong sense of what your message is. What direction are we headed? Are we about winning? Are we about winning at all costs? Are we about if we do the right things winning will happen? You have to know what you're all about. I think that is the key to being a good leader and moving people in the right direction.

Coach Kirby also mentions how coaches are perceived by the athletic department, and this aligns with being aware of your past behaviors and attitudes in addition to knowing the effect those have had on others:

I think a lot of times the stereotyping of how a head coach is motivates people's actions. If an administrator hears that I've behaved in a certain way, they don't necessarily look into me, what my action was, and why did I act that way and how does that relate to how I've acted in the past.

Therefore, consistency is another factor connected to self-awareness. Consistent attitudes and actions allow coaches to establish their reputation to avoid the danger of being stereotyped and doubted by the administration.

These coaches expressed the importance of self-awareness to ensure that they lead their team with the right message and in the right direction. Self-awareness was reinforced as a useful competency as coaches determine their leadership style. In addition, coaching may involve challenging moments with student-athletes or the administration, and the coach’s self-awareness helps develop their character and their consistency. Another concept that Coach Bertram and Coach Kirby mentioned was the development process of altruistic leadership as they became more self-aware.
Social Skills

Goleman (1998) defined social skills as having proficiency in managing relationships and building networks, in addition to an ability to find common ground and build rapport. Seven of the 15 coaches reinforced social skills in their responses regarding altruistic leadership. In alignment with this skill, Coach Marcus clearly stated, “Sometimes coaching is difficult, and you have to be able to communicate.” Another coach discussed getting to know the players at a deeper level. Coach Guy said, “You have to read them. You have to be involved with them enough to know when it's time to step up to help them.” He also suggested other social skills that show the coach cares about the student-athletes’ lives outside of athletic as well:

You have to be in continuous communication and continuous dialogue with them. You have to talk, find out what's going on in their life, whether it be in the middle of something, when they're going to or from, or walking back and forth to the weight room. Whatever chance that you have, it can't be walking with silence. You have to continuously ask questions. What's going on? How are you doing? How is school going? Do you have big projects coming up? Are you still dating this girl? You have to find out as much as you possibly can.

In this coaches’ response, the social skills of talking and asking questions emerged as important skills of altruistic leaders. Coach Shaun discussed the social skills of a fellow coach:

I stopped to introduce myself. He knew who I was, and just taking the time out to send a note to the guys when we won. All the players on his team signed a picture to congratulate our team, and his assistant coaches sent something to our staff. Just taking time out when his schedule is probably even busier than mine to really unselfishly give back to other sports. He could take time to write us a little note of good luck. I'm just blown away by little things like that.
This coach was impressed by another coaches’ social skills that included small gestures to show support and concern for others.

In summary, social skills was reinforced as a theme connected to altruistic leadership. Coaches mentioned the importance of communication, especially asking questions to student-athletes and also interacting with other coaches and student-athletes. Social skills also related to the altruistic leadership factor of caring through wanting to indicate to the student-athlete that the coach cares for them beyond their role on the team. In addition, coaches could use their social skills to show care for other coaches and for others in the community. The questioning and taking time for thoughtful gestures helped build rapport and indicate the coach’s care and concern for others.

Empathy

Goleman (1998) defined empathy as the ability to understand the emotional makeup of other people and the skill in treating people according to their emotional reactions. Seven coaches of the 15 reinforced empathy in alignment with altruistic leadership. For example, Coach Guy explained his desire to understand the perspective of his student-athletes, “To see it. To see from their perspective in a long term picture what is really of value to them.” He wanted to understand them at a deeper level see what is important to the student-athletes.

Several coaches described the importance of understanding others and treating them as individuals. Coach Kirby said:

But, if you're interested in getting to know me, just say hey. I'll say you want to go to lunch, no problem. You want to go to a movie, no problem. I've always felt that the same applies to me. I've called up an administrator and said let's go to lunch. It would seem funny if the athletic director called me and said hey let's go
to lunch. I would think what did I do? I think we're pretty clear as to how that works. Some are more comfortable building that relationship than others. Some are going to share more and some are more interested in having a better relationship, not just with myself but with the whole staff. We've had to talk a lot about that. Then, those kids have become known as ass kisses or coaches’ pet. We've had to address that. Why are we stereotyping them? They're in a place where they want that relationship.

Coach Shaun described his experience as a student-athlete with a coach who gave him the individual attention and understanding that helped him see his potential. He said, “I had an assistant coach when I was an athlete that put a lot into me and spent a lot of time with me. He told me I could be really good. He saw things in me that I didn't see.”

Coach Annie stated clearly the importance of empathy to being an altruistic coach. She said, “If you're not an empathetic person, you can't be an altruistic coach. You just have to have it. You care about what other people think.” This statement also connected empathy to the altruistic leadership factor of caring.

Empathy was reinforced in these coaches’ responses to questions regarding altruistic leadership. They show an understanding for their student-athletes, and Coach Shaun indicated how empathy from an intercollegiate coach helped his welfare. A relationship is also established between the emotional intelligence factor of empathy and the altruistic leadership factor of caring. Coaches’ perceived altruistic leaders as caring about others’ needs and also caring about others’ perceptions when they show empathy.

*Self-Motivation*

Goleman (1998) defined self-motivation as a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status, in addition to a propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence. This competency was included in six of the 15 interviews of coaches.
Coach Guy stated:

I just fell in love with working with kids. I thought I belonged in education or teaching. I sort of changed my degree to teaching. So, my degree is in K through 12 teaching physical education, but my personal emphasis was that I wanted to stay in coaching and go as far as I could go with that. It's about the values that sports bring to people and the discipline, attitudes, and the notions that you teach kids to become successful. So, what is the process to become excellent in something? What is the process? Well, you start with a goal, and then you back up from there.

For Coach Pam, she was motivated to look beyond money or status to help kids learn from her mistakes:

And, so I thought now I have the knowledge of what I have done passed this that maybe I could come back and help kids at a level where they improve quicker and maybe avoid any mistakes that I made, not bad things. Just things I learned about the way I should have played or practiced that I should have worked on that I didn't realize till I got down the road.

Coach Annie felt that her motivation did not align with the athletic department’s goals.

When asked what motivated her to become an intercollegiate coach, she said, “Probably knowing after your athletes are done, you have impacted their life in some way. Being at this school I probably shouldn't say that because I should want to win, but I don't coach to win.”

Coach Leonard described his motivation to teach student-athletes at this stage in their development:

I'm with young kids all the time, the 18 to 22 years of age. They're full of fire. They're full of enthusiasm, and sometimes they're full of the dickens. You look in the mirror, and the only guy getting older is you. That's the truth. You have a profound impact on these young people when they're eager to learn from somebody else.
This coach also explained the difference between trying to be a legend based on wins and leaving a legacy based on empowering the student-athletes with knowledge:

Don't do it so everyone remembers what a great coach you were. You do it for all the kids on the team, so they know you're a good coach. You taught them something that had a profound impact on them. That is a legacy.

In summary, self-motivation was reinforced as a theme in the coaches’ responses. The coaches’ comments represent a motivation that focuses on impacting student-athletes as opposed to driving for wins and status. A connection also occurred between self-motivation and empowerment by coaches being a good role model for striving towards excellence. Coaches are driven to teach athletes to be their best and empower them through this learning.

**Self-Regulation**

Goleman (1998) defined self-regulation as the ability to control or redirect disruptive impulses and moods, in addition to the propensity to suspend judgment to think before acting. Self-regulation was reinforced as a theme in six of the 15 interviews of coaches. For example, Coach Kirby perceived the importance of self-regulation by controlling her natural response to be overly decisive for the team. The following comment also created a connection from self-regulation to empowerment.

Also being able to step away. Okay, I've given you the message. You guys figure out how you're going to get there. It may not always be a, b, c, d, and f. Here is where we want to go, and there might be two or three ways to get there. That's taken me a long time to be able to do that.

In addition, she commented on how competitive situations challenge coaches to control their emotions:
It's about the kids and the experience. And, I think that is evident in competitive situations. Someone's true colors come out when they're faced with adversity. Are they screaming at the kids every time they lose, or do they say, ‘Hey, we got beat today. We did some good things and hopefully down the road it will help us out.’

Coach Pam offered a different perspective on self-regulation. She suggested that a coach should be able to change when needed:

I would say I think it's important that coaches are willing to change. I even had this talk last week with one of my players. She said, ‘Coach, you wouldn't have done that last year.’ Last year is not this year, and you have to be willing to adapt, and the kids are always different.

Another coach described self-regulation as a competency he requires when hiring assistant coaches. A connection is also created in this quote between self-regulation and the altruistic leadership factor of character:

I never hire people who cuss or people who have a temper. I am not going to hire someone who can't emotionally control themselves in a trying moment. I'm not going to hire someone that would hit somebody. I'm not going to hire somebody who swears all the time. They have to educate themselves into realizing that using appropriate adjectives is important to being a good influence. I am concerned about their personal life. Someone who is always drinking won't be a positive influence on the kids and what they do.

Coach Shaun teaches his student-athletes that controlling emotions is important during wins as well as loses. He said, “When we're about to win, I'll pull them all together and say we'll be going against them another time, be humble in victory. Be humble in victory.”

In summary, self-regulation was reinforced as a theme in relation to several aspects of these intercollegiate coaches’ positions. They use self-regulation to empower their student-athletes to make decisions, to change what needs to be changed, to hire
appropriate assistants, and to behave calmly after wins and losses. Connections also emerged in relation to the altruistic leadership factors of empowerment and character by coaches indicating the usefulness of self-regulation that helps them step back from taking complete control and helps them maintain team ethics and morals.

*Summary*

The factors of emotional intelligence were reinforced from coaches’ responses regarding altruistic leadership. Comments aligned with self-awareness, social skills, empathy, self-motivation, and self-regulation. Each factor also related to one or two factors of altruistic leadership. Self-awareness related to character. Social skills and empathy both related to caring. Self-motivation related to empowerment. Self-regulation related to both character and consistency. Therefore, a connection emerged in the interviews between emotional intelligence and altruistic leadership.

**Outcomes Related to Altruistic Leadership**

The third research question explored intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership and the relationship to performance and psychosocial outcomes. Five themes emerged: improved performance, improved experience, reciprocity, good relationships, and appreciation. Each of these themes is discussed in the following section and is presented in the order of the number of coaches supporting the theme.

*Improved Performance*

Every coach perceived a connection between altruistic leadership and success. They responded with beliefs that altruistic leadership involves empowerment, and empowerment teaches athletes the process of being successful. Coach Pam said, “I think
that altruistic leadership) gives them the best chance to perform to their best. They know there's a will there's a way' type of situation.” She also described how she implements altruistic leadership, “I always tell them you want to leave the place better than when you found it. Then, you've helped it gain value. They make it a better experience for those that follow you.” This response also connected to another topic related to performance. The tradition that a team builds often relies on the performance of student-athletes. Coach Charlie also believes altruistic leadership influences performance and tradition. When defining altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching, he said:

So, one is trying to put out there a winning team. Building some tradition that kids can buy into. Then, making them feel like what they do is important. I think that is helping with building tradition.

One coach connected performance to two of the altruistic leadership factors. These factors were empowerment and consistency. Coach Kirby said:

I think this year we have proven that you can win and empower players to make their own choices. I think if you're consistent, then absolutely. You can be very successful.

Coach Bertram also perceived a positive connection between altruistic leadership and performance:

Absolutely. I think if your philosophy is a solid one. So if you're trying to develop better people, but if the characteristic traits that you want the athlete to leave with are really fundamentally important then that will end up with positive performance on the field. That is why it is easy to be an altruistic leader. You believe the things you're trying to teach are really important as a person. Then, you're going to have better athletes and better performance as well.
Coach Marcus summarized the connection he recognized between altruistic leadership and performance:

Yeah, I think there is a connection to the success of the coach, performance of athletes, and success of the athletic department. If you have that positive influence we're talking about without the negativity. We can talk about that being good from the top to the bottom. Just like our staff out here. We try to be very positive and very nice to all the people that come out here. I can't think of anything negative that could come out of being a positive person.

Lastly, Coach Howard recognizes a connection between performance and altruistic leadership, and suggests that a formula to achieve the right balance of altruistic leadership actions and attitudes with technical teaching may be possible:

It’s funny. I’ve said many times to coaching groups and non-coaching groups that I really believe, and I have no data to back it up, that the harder I work on the right things and on the things that genuinely can positively affect student-athletes, the harder I work on those the more we win. Sometimes, simply focusing on drawing the Xs and Os, the less I win. I can’t point to exactly X number of hours spent on this or X hours spent on that. I don’t have a formula, but in my heart I feel the harder we work on the right things, we’re going to have our successes, maybe championships and that kind of stuff. But, I believe there is a direct correlation.

Therefore, many coaches perceived a connection between altruistic leadership and success. They mentioned connections between improved performance and empowerment, consistency, character, balance, and caring. The possibility for formulating altruistic leadership into coaches’ training programs was also encouraged.
Improved Experience

Improved experience for student-athletes was another outcome coaches’ perceived from altruistic leadership. Seven coaches of the 15 perceived benefits, such as student-athletes becoming more well-rounded or learning more about citizenship. For example, Coach Shaun described the connection he perceived between altruistic leadership and improved experiences:

You got to win, however you do it, you got to win. For the athletes' experience to have a coach they know cares about them as individuals, as people, as students is great. But, if that coach wasn't winning and another coach came in that was a lot tougher but won, I think they might settle for it. But, in terms of the experience for the athlete, it would be much better if he could have went through all of this and we just fell short. We fell short of our goals. We didn't win the national championship, but I still feel good about everything that went on. I don't have any guys that at the end would say, ‘that certainly wasn't worth it. We went through all that, and the coach dumped on us all year, for what? We got second.’ I think everyone enjoyed the journey. That's what's important to me.

Coach Guy also connected altruistic leadership to improved experiences for student-athletes:

That's not what it's about. If you interview athletes twenty years later, you'll find out what was valuable to them was their experience and what they gained from their experience, the value in the experience. So, I think as time wears on a smart coach really gets it. They'll say they enjoyed the going fast and winning part, but it was the experience with the guys, with the coaches, and with the goal setting of the group. It would be the process. The venture of this experience was really what it was all about.
One coach described the benefits of being a student-athlete that has altruistic coaches that care about their welfare. Coach Annie said, “Other kids in college don't have these athletes' benefits. They don't have someone looking over their shoulder, watching them make mistakes and helping them if they get in too deep. They're really lucky.”

Coaches perceived a connection between altruistic leadership and an improved collegiate experience related to the factor of coaches caring for them. To these coaches, the experience is more valuable than winning. They believed the journey of interacting with coaches and fellow student-athletes in addition to the process of goal setting and striving to achieve goals within the presence of an altruistic leader added to an improved experience for student-athletes.

*Reciprocity*

Another outcome of altruistic leadership acknowledged by five of the 15 coaches was reciprocity. Some coaches felt that by being altruistic towards student-athletes that they would return the gestures. For example, Coach Shaun felt that his student-athletes reciprocated his willingness to give all his effort:

The guys are willing to give up whatever they can. Yeah, you know that attitude of I want to win, and it's all about me. If you don't do well, then I look bad. I've seen that, and I'm certainly furthest away from that. I would say if you talk to my guys, they would say I'm a tough coach, but it's done in a way that they want to do well. The coach that I had when I played football, I did not want to disappoint my coach. I hope my guys feel like that. They want to do well. They don't want to disappoint me. They know I will do everything I can to help them.
Coach Shaun also stated that altruistic leadership would produce other altruistic leaders:

The possible outcome is that you're helping to produce other altruistic individuals. I see that in my guys as they move on. They have these characteristics. They've gone through this program, and they see this is one way to be. I've had a couple guys graduate and come back as assistant coaches as well. They wanted to stay part of the program. They've seen how I do it. You can see some of those characteristics in them, how they do it. It's like your son. Good job, and you see them and say glad you were paying attention.

Coach Kirby also teaches her student-athletes to reciprocate in caring and relationship building. She said, “I think it is important for them to step up and do it, too, not always let me do it.” Coach Guy discussed the likelihood of student-athletes giving back to the program after experiencing altruistic leadership from their coach:

You'll find that kids will relate to you better. They will give back to your program. They'll give up more time for the needs of the program, if they sense that you're interested in more than just the program.

Therefore, coaches recognized reciprocity as an outcome of altruistic leadership.

Some coaches perceived that student-athletes would learn to reciprocate altruistic leadership to help the team during their season. Coaches also saw the reciprocity that occurs once a student-athlete moves beyond college. They see student-athletes giving back to programs by returning as assistant coaches or just helping meet the needs of the program.

Good Relationships

Several coaches perceived a connection between altruistic leadership and the outcome of building good relationships. Five coaches of the 15 reinforced good relationships as an outcome of altruistic leadership. They shared stories of past
relationships with their coaches and student-athletes. For example, Coach Shaun described the reason he became a coach:

I didn't want to get into coaching, but I had an assistant coach when I got to the university that put a lot into me and spent a lot of time with me. I never left his side the whole summer we were together. He could have been out playing golf and other things, we would go to the gym and he would be there. He believed in me so much and his time spent with me. He could have been doing things and making money in the summer, but he gave those things up to help me. I think one of the ideal people in terms of being altruistic I've seen was him.

Coach Annie also had an influential relationship with a previous coach. She said, “The men's coach where I went to school was awesome, and I could see his interaction with the athletes. I really admired that, and I became really close with him.”

On the other side of relationships, coaches described the good relationships with their own student-athletes. Coach Annie said, “All my former athletes keep in touch with me. I just went back to Chicago for a competition and 14 of my old players came to our competition. I spent the night so I could go out with them. That is really important to me.” Coach Leonard said, “The thing that has had the biggest impact on me is that athletes become your lifelong friends. They come back and tell you about the things you did that you didn't think necessarily had an impact on them.” This coach also took the perspective of the athletes:

There was also a high percentage of good people. If you talked to athletes, they would say it wasn't about the winning. It was about how the coach he understood me, and how he shared with me. He was a leader to me. He made me believe that this was important.
Coach Annie spoke about a relationship she developed with one of her players. She said, “I have a young girl that has a lot of problems, and she told me something yesterday that she's never told anyone in her entire life. It's big. I pretty much told her that is why I coach.”

Overall, coaches perceived good relationships as an outcome of altruistic leadership. They discussed good relationships with their former coaches and good relationships with their own student-athletes. Friendship was a term often used when asking about outcomes of altruistic leadership. Coaches have had lifelong friendships evolve from their interactions with student-athletes, especially when they show care beyond just athletic performance.

**Appreciation**

Another outcome of altruistic leadership perceived by coaches is appreciation from student-athletes. Five coaches of the fifteen recognized a connection between altruistic leadership and appreciation. Coaches described the appreciation showed to them by their student-athletes. For example, Coach Shaun said:

> It's amazing how much you can impact lives, and you don't realize it until they've gone and they come back to tell you or sometimes when they're even here they tell you. You impacted their lives more than I know. I need to try and remember that.

He also spoke about one student-athlete that showed appreciation in a unique way:

> I had a young man who graduated and was among the top 20 graduating seniors. The university president invited him and someone who impacted him to get him to this point and to be as good a student as he could be. He invited me. I said don't you want your parents or a professor. He said no coach, you really did. He wanted me to be there with him. The university president said, ‘Coach what are you doing here?’ ‘One of my graduating seniors is one of the top graduating seniors.’ It was quite awesome that even he amazed the other students there for a
scholarship to Oxford in England. Everyone stood up and said who they brought and why, what are you doing next year. It was one of my proudest moments as a coach better than the national championships, for me to see him as one of the top students at our university.

Coach Marcus described the process he perceives with appreciation from student-athletes when his staff uses an altruistic leadership approach:

It's gratifying when kids come back, and it's been eight years. I would say it takes five to 10 years for a kid to come back. Other than that, you're too close to them. Then, all the sudden they grow up, and they respect even more what you did for them. In the meantime, you're telling them to get to bed early, eat right, and go to school. You treat them like their mother does. And, then they end up doing pretty well. All the sudden, you knew your mother and father were right, but had to do it yourself. But, you respect them later on when you're a good person in society. That's the fun part about teaching them, when they come back. We're a young staff that is starting to see that. You can talk to them on a whole different level. You see a player later, and they tell you they wanted to come over and stone your house and stab you seven times in the back. You just stand there and laugh. It's funny now, but at the time, it was tough. You're training them the best you could.

Coach Al had many stories to illustrate this outcome of appreciation from his over 20 years of experience:

I had a guy call me the other day that played on my 1985 team, and I probably haven't talked to him for 10 years. He said, ‘You know coach, I was just thinking about you. As the years go by, I understand what you were trying to accomplish. You weren't just teaching us about our sport. You were teaching us to become better people, and I just want to thank you.’ That means more to me than a championship when the guys call you up to tell you about that. When my wife passed away, I know they set it up, but one of those guys called me every week for six months. They would say how are you doing coach. One guy made a great comment to me after returning from the tour, and I ran into him on campus. I said how is everything going. He said, ‘I wish I had listened to you more. You know when you're 18 to 21 you know everything. As it goes on here, I'm understanding what you were trying to say.’ Those positive influences are what I think coaching is about.
Therefore, coaches experienced the appreciation that develops within student-athletes who were empowered and cared for by coaches. Many coaches felt this appreciation was better than winning championships. The appreciation that student-athletes show to their coaches connected to the care and concern for student-athletes’ welfare beyond just athletics.

Summary of Outcomes

The outcomes recognized by the coaches were numerous and all beneficial. Coaches perceived altruistic leadership to result in better performance, improved experiences, reciprocity, good relationships, and appreciation. These are benefits to the athletes, coaches, athletic department, and the university. This indicates the usefulness of altruistic leadership to a variety of constituents.
Summary

Intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership included a variety of themes. Behaviors, attitudes, opposites, and barriers that aligned with altruistic leadership included character, caring, empowerment, balance, and consistency. Of course, other minor themes emerged within these themes, such as trust, teaching, individual attention, and striving for excellence. Factors of emotional intelligence also emerged from the coaches’ responses. Self-awareness, social skills, empathy, self-motivation, and self-regulation appeared as tools utilized by coaches to enact altruistic leadership. Another important finding was the numerous outcomes coaches related to altruistic leadership. The themes of improved performance, improved experience, reciprocity, good relationships, and appreciation emerged from the coaches’ responses. Many coaches felt confident in regards to the relationship between success and altruistic leadership.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This qualitative study was helpful to the conceptualization of coaches’ altruistic leadership in intercollegiate athletics. Specifically, the study attempted to explore coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching. The study also examined underlying connections between altruistic leadership and emotional intelligence. In order to determine the impact of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate athletics, perceived outcomes from this type of leadership were investigated as well.

Three major messages regarding intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership resulted from this study. The three messages discussed in this chapter are (a) the definition of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching, (b) competencies to develop altruistic leadership, and (c) important outcomes of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate athletics. In addition, future research, implications and recommendations, and conclusions are also included in this chapter. Each of these is described next.
Definition of Altruistic Leadership in Intercollegiate Coaching

The intercollegiate coaches in this study provided their perceptions on altruistic leadership. They commented on behaviors and attitudes that they perceived to align with the definition of altruistic leadership. Additionally, they described examples of behaviors or attitudes opposite of altruistic leadership along with barriers to altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching. The findings of this study are discussed in relation to previous research in leadership, motivation, altruism, and emotional intelligence. Each of these themes is discussed in the following sections.

Leadership Themes

The responses to the interview questions align with previous research in many ways. For example, this study produced similar findings to the OSU Studies (Stodgill, et al., 1947) and the Michigan Studies (Katz, et al., 1950). Coaches perceived that consideration for followers will lead to both satisfaction with followers’ experience and improved performance. Similar to Fiedler’s Contingency Model (Fiedler, 1954), some coaches also said that appropriateness of a leader’s style depends on the followers, such as whether the followers are more task oriented or interpersonally oriented. Intuitively, altruistic leadership may appear to be focused on interpersonal orientation only. However, according to the data derived in this study, altruistic leadership involves the needs of the followers, whether those needs are task or interpersonally focused. For intercollegiate coaches who want to be more altruistic leaders, these results indicate the importance of caring for student-athletes individual needs, needs both task or interpersonal in nature.
Similar to House’s Path-Goal Theory (House, 1971), the coaches’ responses suggest that environmental and personal barriers and facilitators may be moderators of altruistic leadership. In House’s model, environmental factors and subordinate characteristics were moderators of leadership outcomes. This model also indicated expectancy and valence as mediators to leadership outcomes. The responses of coaches in this study suggest that altruistic leadership may be mediated by emotional intelligence. For example, the altruistic leadership factor of caring may not be implemented without the emotional intelligence factors of social skills and empathy. These findings indicate that intercollegiate coaches could have the intention to be altruistic leaders, but they cannot achieve the outcomes of altruistic leadership due to a lack of competency in emotional intelligence mediators or moderating characteristics of the student-athletes they recruit.

The coaches in the current study also perceived outcomes similar to House’s outcomes of performance and effort. Several coaches supported the connection between altruistic leadership and success. They also indicated the belief that student-athletes would reciprocate the effort enacted by altruistic coaches. These findings imply that intercollegiate coaches could achieve outcomes such as success and maximum effort from student-athletes through altruistic leadership. Therefore, the profession of intercollegiate coaching could benefit from an altruistic leadership development program.

The coaches’ responses also aligned with more recent theories of leadership. Bass’s (1985) transformational leadership model included the importance of individual consideration and concern. Individual attention along with caring and concern emerged
as themes in the current study. Transformational leadership also spoke to the importance of vision. This aligns with the altruistic leadership factor of empowerment that emerged in the current study. Coaches described empowerment as teaching student-athletes to strive for excellence and initiate the goal setting process. For example, Coach Guy described how he envisions specific goals for his student-athletes based on his individual evaluation of their abilities and capabilities, and he empowers them to accomplish these goals by showing individual consideration for them.

Another recent model in congruence with coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership is Chelladurai’s multidimensional model of leadership (1993). Altruistic leadership would match the leader characteristic factor of Chelladurai’s model, and barriers and facilitators of altruistic leadership would be similar to the situational characteristic factor in his model. For example, the altruistic leadership factors of character, consistency, balance, caring, and empowerment would represent the leader characteristics. A barrier that would represent the situational characteristics factor would be overly restrictive NCAA rules and regulations. However, the overall factors of altruistic leadership may not change based on member characteristics like Chelladurai’s model suggests. For example, the altruistic leadership factors of character, balance, consistency, and empowerment, could be useful in all levels of athletics, from beginners to elite levels. Therefore, beginners may prefer a more democratic leader and elite players may prefer a more autocratic leader, but all players may prefer a leader with strong character.
The multidimensional model also illustrates changes based on required behaviors set forth for coaches to follow. In the current study, coaches’ responses aligned with the aspect of required behaviors as they described their feelings of having required and restricted behaviors according to rules and regulations set by the NCAA and the administration. For example, Coach Charlie described how he enjoyed the opportunity as a student-athlete to spend a considerable amount of time with his intercollegiate coach. As an intercollegiate coach now, he expressed his frustration with the time restrictions enforced by the NCAA rules and regulations.

Furthermore, the multidimensional model included preferred behavior. The factors of altruistic leadership may be perceived as the preferred behaviors by three constituencies of intercollegiate athletics: coaches, athletes, and the administration. Therefore, altruistic leadership would be the preferred behavior, and coaches, student-athletes and the administration could be informed and evaluative based on these altruistic leadership characteristics. For example, instead of solely focusing on developing intercollegiate coaches’ altruistic leadership, the administration and student-athletes could receive training on evaluating intercollegiate coaches based on altruistic leadership.

Lastly, the outcomes may also fit between the multidimensional model and the altruistic leadership model. The multidimensional model designates performance and satisfaction as outcomes. Coaches in the current study also perceived the outcomes of success and improved experiences from altruistic leadership. Therefore, altruistic leadership aligns with many aspects of the multidimensional model.
Another leadership model in alignment with the results of this study is Aronson’s model of ethical leadership (2001). Aronson’s model suggested that genuine transformational leadership increases as leaders’ morals and altruism increase. The coaches’ responses in this study suggest a similar conceptual connection. Many coaches perceived a connection between altruistic leadership and morals and ethics. Therefore, the coaches’ responses to altruistic leadership conceptually align with recent research on ethical leadership.

Overall, the findings of the current study on altruistic leadership appear to align with previous leadership literature. The literature review for leadership in this study revealed that previous studies contained only “partial truths”. As indicated in this reflection to previous research, altruistic leadership connects many portions of these previous models. Therefore, this exploration of altruistic leadership may be indicating a synthesis of factors that fill previous gaps in the leadership literature.

Motivation Themes

The coaches’ responses also aligned with previous motivation literature. For example, the coaches spoke about meeting the needs of student-athletes in order for the athletes to reach their full potential. This “self-actualization” aligns with Maslow’s model of the hierarchy of needs (1954). Maslow created the hierarchy with physiological, security, relationship, and esteem needs. When a person became all that she or he was capable of becoming, self-actualization had been achieved. The responses of coaches regarding the definition of altruistic leadership aligned with the hierarchy by empowering student-athletes to reach their full potential. For example, Coach Bertram
described how he pushes his student-athletes to strive to be the best in all aspects of their lives. Therefore, the motivation to reach self-actualization had a connection to what coaches’ defined as altruistic leadership.

Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory (1966) included many issues that the coaches mentioned in this study. Coach Marcus mentioned self-motivation of players in revenue sports as striving toward opportunities for advancement into professional sports. Opportunity for advancement was one of Herzberg’s motivation factors. Coach Bertram’s response also aligned with Herzberg by recognizing the importance of personal growth as a motivator. He said personal growth must be a motivator considering the amount of time coaches and players practice compared to the amount of time they actually compete. Without deeper motivation, he thought student-athletes would not be using their time efficiently. Another motivator included by Herzberg was recognition. In alignment with motivation for recognition, Coach Charlie described student-athletes’ need to feel important. Many of the coaches also alluded to the motivation to achieve, and the motivation to achieve was also part of Herzberg’s model. However, in opposition to Herzberg’s model, coaches seem to think their interactions with the student-athletes certainly could create satisfaction and not just contribute to avoiding dissatisfaction.

The findings of this study also align with Vroom’s expectancy theory (1964). For example, Vroom’s theory involves first-level outcomes that include meeting the expectations of the organization. According to the current study, expectations of the athletic department create first-level outcomes of winning. Another important piece to the theory is instrumentality that leads into second-level outcomes of individuals’ goals.
within the organization. In this study, second-level outcomes would apply to the important outcomes according to the coach. Many of the coaches stated that their goal was to positively impact student-athletes. Therefore, Vroom’s model aligned with the altruistic leadership perceptions of coaches by indicating that the organization’s expectation are met first, but the coaches’ goals are also achievable. Many coaches perceived that they had to win in order to keep their job, even though their primary motivation was to positively impact student-athletes. This implied the dual levels of motivation that coaches must manage. They desire to be an altruistic leader, but they must also maintain the motivation to win. These dual motivations could come into conflict with one another. The perceived pressure to win could form a barrier to altruistic leadership. However, the athletic department could implement support systems for altruistic leadership. One example would be basing coaches’ evaluations equally on winning and factors of altruistic leadership.

Porter and Lawler’s model of work motivation would apply to intercollegiate coaching and altruistic leadership. The model encourages the employer and employee to consider, not only effort in regards to motivation, but also abilities, traits, role perceptions, intrinsic rewards, and extrinsic rewards. Responses from the coaches in this study indicated a need to consider these factors. For example, Coach Kirby spoke about not forcing a particular leadership style on coaches with different traits and different perceptions of their role. Therefore, Porter and Lawler’s model suggests the complexity of motivation and the various factors to be considered when conceptualizing a model of altruistic leadership.
Overall, the theories on motivation provided important keys to motivating coaches. The coaches’ responses in this study aligned with several previous theories of motivation. Maslow’s, Herzberg’s, Vroom’s, and Porter and Lawler’s theories offered perspectives on self-actualization, motivators, organizational expectancies, and individual goals.

Altruism Themes

Responses from coaches also aligned with previous literature on altruism. Batson (1990) clarified the nature of the motive to help. If the motive was egoistic then receiving self-benefits would be the ultimate goal. For the coaches in this study, when asked their motivation for becoming a coach, many stated that their ultimate goal was to impact student-athletes. Of course, they also mentioned the helpful self-benefits that come along with winning, but their ultimate goal was to have an impact, thus it appears their primary motivation was altruistic in nature.

Batson (1987) developed a model with variables indicating altruistic motivation. These variables of altruism as opposed to egoism included: the salient cognition is the victim’s welfare regardless of cost; escaping the situation is not a viable option to the altruist; effectiveness of helping is necessary as opposed to just appearing to help; and anyone could help as long as the person’s welfare improves. Coaches’ responses included these variables indicating altruism. Coach Charlie said, “Most coaches I know give a great part of their life. It doesn't matter which sport you're in, it doesn't have weekends normally. They have families, but they never see them. So, they give up a lot, and they care a lot.” This presents an example of serving the student-athlete regardless of
cost. As reported in Chapter 4, Coach Guy provided his no escape philosophy in which he said they are in competition to help the team, and escaping that responsibility is not an option. This philosophy obviously spreads across the coaches considering the many years of coaching experience among them. Coaches also stated the importance of effectively helping athletes by encouraging them to learn from their experiences as opposed to worrying about the effectiveness of their performance. This relates to the altruistic leadership factor of empowerment. Lastly, Coach Bertram believed anyone could help his athletes, but he worried that another coach taking his position may place too much emphasis on winning. This relates to the altruistic factor of character. Therefore, many of the coaches’ responses meet the criteria of being considered altruistic.

In summary, coaches provided many examples in alignment with literature on altruism. Through their definition of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching, the coaches in this study provided a number of factors to consider for further analysis of altruistic leadership. Caring and forms of empowerment have been mentioned in previous altruism literature, but the factors of character, consistency, and balance have not. These factors could be unique to the sport context or unique to the leadership aspect of altruistic leadership. In addition, they contributed real life experiences of altruistic leadership that offer support for the theory.

*Emotional Intelligence Themes*

The intercollegiate coaches in this study were not asked specifically about their emotional intelligence. However, the factors of emotional intelligence often emerged when they provided their perceptions of altruistic leadership. Five factors of emotional
intelligence were preconceived as possible factors of altruistic leadership. These included self-awareness, social skills, empathy, self-motivation, and self-regulation, and empathy. All of these factors were mentioned by the coaches interviewed. Each of these is discussed in more detail below.

Self-awareness was reinforced in several of the coaches’ perceptions regarding altruistic leadership. Some of their perceptions included the importance they placed on self-reflection. For example, coaches described their self-reflection in regards to following their ethical and moral philosophies in challenging situations, considering their role in athletes quitting their team, and assessing their part in conflict with assistant coaches. These examples also indicated the coaches’ attempts to understand the impact of their emotions on others. Therefore, coaches’ responses aligned with Goleman’s (1998) definition of self-awareness as the ability to be aware of one’s feelings, the impact of their feelings, and one’s values and beliefs.

The emotional intelligence factor of social skills was reinforced with coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Coaches commented on the importance of developing good relationships with their student-athletes. For example, coaches utilized communication skills to keep “everyone on the same page”, to find out student-athletes’ needs through individual meetings, and to draw an appropriate line between friendship and coaching. According to the comments of coaches, social skills help them connect with their student-athletes without developing problems in their interactions. Therefore, coaches’ perceptions aligned with Goleman’s (1998) definition of social skills as the ability to proficiently manage relationships and build rapport.
Empathy was reinforced in coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Coaches’ comments were often centered on caring about student-athletes. For example, one coach described her desire to have empathy and teach empathy by arranging a service outing for the team every quarter. Another coach directly equated altruistic leadership to being an empathetic person to student-athletes. Several coaches mentioned the importance of understanding that these are student-athletes who have academic responsibilities and social needs. Therefore, coaches’ responses aligned with Goleman’s (1998) definition of empathy as the ability to understand the emotional makeup of others and treating them in accordance to their emotional responses.

Self-motivation was another emotional intelligence factor reinforced from coaches’ responses regarding altruistic leadership. Every coach in the current study described their ultimate motivation to coach as a desire that goes beyond winning or maintaining their career. Common motivations of coaches included positively impacting student-athletes, love of the sport, and desire to utilize their skills. Coaches offered numerous quotes and speeches they use with their student-athletes to impact and empower them. Examples of self-motivation included having a work ethic that drives the coach to stay awake for long work hours, confronting parents who become overly negative with student-athletes, and describing the joy of having student-athletes that have outstanding academic performance. Therefore, coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership aligned with Goleman’s (1998) definition of self-motivation as ability to be hopeful and optimistic while having a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status.
Self-regulation also was reinforced in coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. Some of their perceptions of altruistic leadership included controlling emotions, controlling language, and remaining consistent with athletes. Coaches discussed the importance of not yelling and screaming at athletes, not instantaneously rejecting suggestions from assistants, using appropriate language, and staying positive regardless of the team record. This aligns with Goleman’s (1998) self-regulation skill of balancing one’s moods so that anxiety and anger do not get in the way of what the coach needs to accomplish. This skill would oppose historical examples of intercollegiate coaches exhibiting anger toward student-athletes, assistant coaches, or referees.

In summary, all five factors of emotional intelligence were reinforced in the coaches’ responses regarding altruistic leadership. These tools helped them accurately assess their behaviors and attitudes, help student-athletes maintain moderation in their lives, have awareness of others, communicate messages, strive towards achievement, and have self-control. Emotional intelligence is a competency that provides intercollegiate coaches the knowledge and skills to altruistically lead student-athletes.

Implications

A gap exists in the vast literature on leadership, motivation, and coaching regarding the potential helpfulness of altruism and emotional intelligence in coaching competencies. The findings of this study indicate an alignment with previous theories, but the current results also suggest a path to filling the existing gaps in the research. Coaches offered perceptions that support the existence of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching. Their responses indicated common factors of altruistic
leadership, and the most important factors were character, balance, consistency, caring, and empowerment. Coaches may behave in different ways to align with these factors, but the underlying motivation for character, balance, consistency, caring, and empowerment would be consistent in order to be an altruistic leadership.

In addition, coaches’ comments also supported the facilitation of altruistic leadership by emotional intelligence. Self-awareness, self-motivation, self-regulation, empathy, and social skills were all reinforced by the coaches as helpful competencies to altruistic leadership. The absence of these would create barriers to achieving altruistic leadership.

Overall, the coaches responded supportively of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching. Due to the dual motivation of winning and impacting student-athletes, some coaches may require more structured support, such as financial rewards in order to develop an altruistic motivation. Many coaches also mentioned the word “genuine” in regards to the care and concern they show to student-athletes. They could enact caring behaviors for the motive of pushing student-athletes to win more, but coaches believed athletes would see through this type of insincerity. Lastly, the findings indicated that intercollegiate coaches were supportive of altruistic leadership, but the history of intercollegiate athletics has plenty of examples that would indicate otherwise. Therefore, these findings encourage future research to solidify the conceptual, contextual, and practical factors of altruistic leadership in sports.
Important Outcomes

The intercollegiate coaches in this study generated several connections between altruistic leadership and beneficial outcomes. These outcomes are important to the student-athlete, coach, and athletic department. Themes emerged regarding improved performance, improved experience, reciprocity, good relationships, and appreciation. Each of these outcomes will be discussed in more detail below.

Improved Performance Theme

Coaches supported a connection between altruistic leadership and improved performance. Coaches used expressions such as “absolutely”, “oh yeah”, and “definitely” in response to whether they perceive a connection between success and altruistic leadership. For example, many coaches believed that altruistic leadership enabled student-athletes to pursue their best performance.

In addition, Coach Howard told a story about the relationship he perceives between winning and focusing on doing the right things for student-athletes as opposed to focusing on the technical aspects of the game. One quote repeated by two coaches was that people care about what you know when they know you care about them. Therefore, coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership included a connection to improving performance for student-athletes in intercollegiate athletics.

Improved Experience Theme

An improved experience emerged as another outcome of altruistic leadership. This experience included improvements in student-athletes’ athletic, academic, and social lives. For example, Coach Pam hoped athletes would be taught to learn from their
mistakes and make improvements in all areas of their lives. Coach Bertram thought their experience should go far beyond just winning competitions. Coach Annie described the benefits of being cared for as a student-athlete that are not obtained by other college students. Therefore, coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership indicated a relationship to improved experiences.

*Reciprocity Theme*

Reciprocity was another important outcome acknowledged by coaches in this study. They perceived that altruistic leadership would teach student-athletes to focus less on their own goals and focus more on team goals. For example, Coach Marcus believed coaches should try to help student-athletes become less selfish. He believed an altruistic coach would attempt to change the student-athlete to be a team-oriented player. Coach Bertram described the help he receives from former student-athletes following the end of their career. He described former student-athletes returning to help in a similar way that the coaches helped them. Coach Kate saw reciprocity from a different perspective in regards to the community. She described that when the team gave service to the community, the community reciprocated by attending their games. These perceptions relate to Choi and Mai-Dalton’s work who (1999) also found connections to self-sacrifice and intention to reciprocate in their study connected to altruism.

*Good Relationship Theme*

Good relationships emerged as another outcome from coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. This aligns with Prapavessis and Carron’s (1997) study that found increased cohesion within the team as a result of self-sacrificial leadership. Several
coaches mentioned their joy in seeing previous athletes return to visit the coach and the team. For example, Coach Al provided numerous examples of the good relationships that developed between him and his student-athletes. He shared a unique story about former athletes contacting him on a weekly basis when his wife passed away. Coach Marcus described his experience as a younger coach who is just realizing the connection between altruistic leadership and the close relationships that develop. He was surprised by former student-athletes returning to spend time talking with him. Therefore, coaches’ perceived good relationships as a beneficial outcome of altruistic leadership.

"Appreciation Theme"

Appreciation emerged as an outcome of altruistic leadership in the coaches’ responses. Many coaches offered stories about athletes returning to thank them for teaching them about their sport and about life-skills. In many cases, the athletes realized a few years later that the coach was trying to teach more than the aspects of the sport. They realized they learned important life lessons. For example, Coach Bertram described the appreciation he received when one of his student-athletes earned academic honors and asked the coach to be the person he invited to a ceremony that celebrated the people who helped them achieve academically. Coach Howard offered a story about the impact he saw on an athlete who became very successful and still attributed his success to lessons he learned from his coach. Therefore, appreciation emerged as a theme in the coaches’ responses regarding altruistic leadership.
Summary

These outcomes are extensive and meaningful to student-athletes, coaches, and the athletic department. For student-athletes, they could be confident that coaches are making decisions to improve their welfare and overall experience. Coaches would benefit by improving interactions and relationships with student-athletes. The athletic department would have a structure to select, train, develop, and evaluate their coaches. The department may also be better able to avoid scandals and rule violations that haunted previous offenders.

When this study was in the developmental stages, an administrator with the athletic department advised that a connection to performance should be explored if the study intended to gain attention. These outcomes go far beyond just performance. As perceived by coaches, the entire experience of student-athletes could be improved with altruistic leadership.

Implications

The outcomes coaches perceive from altruistic leadership are numerous and beneficial to practitioners in intercollegiate athletics. Many benefits to the student-athletes, coaches, and athletic department were recognized. These benefits may lead to an athletic environment that builds excellence, reciprocity, helpful experiences, good relationships, and appreciation of athletic opportunities.

Student-athletes could benefit in many ways from the outcomes perceived by the coaches in this study. Improved performance would ensure student-athletes that they reach their full potential. As coaches focus more on balance in life, student-athletes
would be supported in developing other interests and career opportunities. Good relationships with their coaches could ensure clear communication and keep student-athletes committed to the program. Therefore, student-athletes would be receiving interpersonal resources along with technical resources to help ensure their satisfaction, health, and commitment to the team.

Coaches would also benefit from the outcomes they perceived from altruistic leadership. Reciprocity could help coaches build teamwork between players and between the coach and the players. For example, if the coach sacrifices their time to spend on student-athletes’ individual problems, then the student-athletes are likely to give extra effort to meet the coaches’ expectations. If student-athletes are willing to help each other, instead of developing conflicts within the team, teammates develop cohesion and trust. Good relationships would also benefit the coach. The communication between coaches and athletes and the liking towards one another could help avoid conflicts that often arise in competitive environments. In addition, the coaches may gain satisfaction from knowing they are not only building athletes, they are also developing lifelong friends and a legacy of their teachings. By having good relationships and receiving appreciation from student-athletes, coaches could avoid burnout and feel motivated to continue to improve.

The athletic department could benefit as well from the outcomes perceived by the coaches in this study. Of course, improved performance improves the athletic department’s image and reputation. They improve their ability to develop superb athletes. However, the benefits perceived by the coaches surpass this basic goal.
Athletic departments also desire to ensure good experiences for student-athletes. The well-balanced experiences perceived by coaches could improve the athletic department’s reputation for academic performance and respect for the university community. With good relationships, the athletic department avoids time wasted on negotiating and resolving problems between coaches and athletes. Appreciation from former student-athletes often evolves into future resources, such as donations for student-athlete scholarships and funding for new equipment or new facilities. An additional outcome unrecognized by coaches would be the educational planning for coaches’ careers. Evaluating and developing coaches based on altruistic leadership could help the athletic department understand coaches needs and goals in addition to retaining the coaches’ services based on the improved outcomes.

With further research on outcomes of altruistic leadership, researchers may design training and development programs for altruistic leadership in coaching. This type of training and development could help coaches focus their attention on important aspects of coaching aside from winning. An altruistic leadership needs assessment could begin the process by determining how satisfied coaches are with their current situation and how altruistic leadership could be improved. Coaches could develop short-term and long-term plans for their careers. In addition to knowing the coaches better, the athletic department will also be helping coaches develop important life skills, such as balance and empathy. Therefore, the athletic department will be helping student-athletes and also helping coaches maintain a support system to counterbalance the strains and stresses of the coaching profession.
Future Research

The qualitative methodology was utilized in this study as a preliminary attempt to explore possible factors and conditions for altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching. Literature has not examined possible antecedents to the development of altruistic leadership. Further research is required to fully investigate the topic, but first, the conceptual foundation must be examined to ensure logical theoretical and empirical observations in the future.

Many possible outcomes were indicated in previous literature. For example, previous literature connected leadership styles with performance and satisfaction of followers and altruism with effort and cohesion. According to the findings in this study, the possibilities for further examination of various outcomes appear to be fruitful for inquiry.

Based on these conclusions, future research could include the following studies:

1. Another qualitative study could investigate student-athletes’ and the athletic department administrations’ perceptions of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate athletics. This could also cross-validate the coaches’ perceptions.

2. Further exploration utilizing qualitative methodologies could obtain knowledge of coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership at the Division III level of the NCAA. A comparison to the perceptions of Division I coaches would be interesting in consideration of the perceived differences in athletic department objectives of the two types of institutions.
3. In an effort to utilize the findings of this study, an altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching scale could be developed through a quantitative methodology.

4. Further refinement of the qualitative and quantitative studies could distinguish exceptional altruistic leaders. This could help determine what factors differentiate them from other altruistic leaders.

5. The usefulness of an altruistic sport leadership scale could be examined by designing a selection, development, and evaluation system for intercollegiate coaches. This could be helpful to athletic departments.

6. Another study would be to examine satisfaction and retention of intercollegiate coaches and their student-athletes prior to and following the implementation of development of altruistic leadership programs for coaches.

7. The theory of altruistic sport leadership could also be applied to other levels of sport. This could include youth, high school athletics, and professional sports. In a similar fashion, a qualitative investigation could be followed by the design of a development system involving quantitative methodologies. The overall factors may be the same, but the description of the factors may be different. For example, the factor of balance may apply to coaches encouraging professional athletes to find balance as well, but balance may be described in regards to spending time with their families as opposed to student-athletes spending time on academic endeavors.
Implications and Recommendations

Greater understanding of altruistic leadership in coaches could be beneficial to the research on altruism. The concept of altruism has not been examined in the sport leadership context. This study implies that further research on altruistic leadership in sports could provide further understanding of the usefulness and development of altruism. In addition to benefits to research, practical rewards could result from further investigation of altruistic leadership in sports. Sport management interventions at the intercollegiate level could bring improved relations between coaches and athletes. At the professional level, altruistic leadership could encourage professionals to give back to their communities to help others. Youth sport may also benefit from recreational leaders who strive to contribute to the welfare of children at-risk of negative influences. Therefore, more research on our capacity for helping and caring for others is needed, and leadership of intercollegiate coaches provides one context where helping and caring for others is beneficial to both the individuals and the organization.

Conclusion

The motivation in intercollegiate athletics often becomes misdirected by an overemphasis on winning, maintaining a reputation, and obtaining budgetary resources. At the essence of intercollegiate athletics, the motivation is intended to be improving the welfare of college students by offering opportunities to participate in athletic experiences. Intercollegiate coaches offer the direct leadership for these opportunities. Their motives influence the experience of student-athletes. Therefore, an important endeavor is to tap the resources of caring for the welfare of student-athletes within intercollegiate coaches.
Caring was a concept often linked to altruism in previous literature, but this study found several links to altruistic leadership. Altruistic leadership differs from altruism alone. Leadership often involves an ongoing relationship with followers and includes additional responsibilities beyond caring about others. Intercollegiate coaches and student-athletes are involved in a relationship where the coach assumes the responsibilities of being a good role model, helping student-athletes holistically, providing consistent feedback, and enacting behaviors to help student-athletes and the organization reach their goals. Not only are caring and empowerment needed, coaches in this study also perceived the need for character, consistency, and balance. According to themes that emerged from coaches’ responses, altruistic leadership is multifaceted in order to align with multiple roles and responsibilities.

In regards to the competencies that facilitate altruistic leadership, previous research on altruism identified empathy as the source of altruism, but several sources emerged from coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership. These sources aligned with Goleman’s (1995) factors of emotional intelligence. Self-awareness, self-reflection, self-motivation, empathy, and social skills were all within coaches’ definitions of altruistic leadership. Therefore, altruistic leadership is multifaceted and is facilitated by multiple competencies.

The findings of this study indicate the beneficial outcomes intercollegiate coaches’ associate with altruistic leadership. Coaches within the highly competitive environment of NCAA Division I athletics perceived improvements in performance, attitude, and interpersonal interactions with the genuine concern for student-athletes’
welfare. Despite the expression of pressure and desire to win, coaches believed in an ultimate motivation that transcends self-interest in order to focus on benefiting student-athletes and reinforce their role as a teacher. This suggests a motivational pluralism that complicates the assumptions regarding intercollegiate coaches. Coaches did not support a “win-at-all-costs” philosophy, and material rewards and public praise was not their main concerns. Many of the participating coaches stated that they became a coach based on the motivation to help student-athletes. Therefore, the challenge is to continue the exploration and creation of a systematic process to help intercollegiate coaches manage the motivational pluralism to be both a successful and an altruistic leader.
Figure 1. Interrelationship of Four Main Categories of Variables in Motor Performance (Carron & Chelladurai, 1978).
Figure 2. Outcomes for Ohio State and Michigan Studies (adapted Chelladurai, 2001).
Figure 3. House’s Path-Goal Theory of Leadership (Steers, Porter, & Bigley, 1996).
Figure 4. Transactional and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985).
Figure 5. The multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1993).
Figure 6. Model of ethical leadership (Aronson, 2001).
Figure 7. Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory adapted for intercollegiate athletics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>Leader Behaviors</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational Characteristics</td>
<td>Required Behavior</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Leader Characteristic</td>
<td>Intention to reciprocate Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Characteristics</td>
<td>Altruistic Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Preliminary model of altruistic leadership
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to the following questions by printing in the space provided or by circling the appropriate response.

1) Age: __________ YEARS

2) Gender (please circle one):

A. FEMALE  B. MALE

3) Ethnicity/Race (please circle one):
   A. AFRICAN-AMERICAN/BLACK
   B. ASIAN-AMERICAN/Pacific Islander
   C. CAUCASIAN/WHITE
   D. HISPANIC
   E. NATIVE AMERICAN
   F. MULTI-RACIAL
   G. OTHER: ____________________

4) Which sport do you coach?
   A. MEN’S BASKETBALL
   B. WOMEN’S BASKETBALL
   C. FOOTBALL
   D. SOFTBALL
   E. BASEBALL
   F. MEN’S TENNIS
   G. WOMEN’S TENNIS
   H. MEN’S HOCKEY
   I. WOMEN’S HOCKEY
   J. MEN’S SWIMMING
   K. WOMEN’S SWIMMING
   L. MEN’S DIVING
   M. WOMEN’S DIVING
   N. OTHER: ________________

5) How many years have you been a coach? _____ YEARS
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. What we are hoping to do is get a better understanding of intercollegiate coaches perceptions of altruistic leadership. I have a list of topics I want to cover today, but I would like this to be a relaxed conversation. Feel free to give many examples or tell stories related to the question.

1. Could you tell me about your experience as an intercollegiate coach? What motivated you to become an intercollegiate coach?

2. Altruistic leadership is the ability of leaders to guide with the ultimate goal of increasing followers’ welfare as opposed to focusing on their own benefits. How would you define altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching? What would altruistic leadership be like in intercollegiate coaching?

3. Could you describe an experience when a coach exhibited altruistic leadership to you? How did this experience influence you?

4. Which coaches at your university are exceptionally good at altruistic leadership? To what extent are these coaches also successful at winning? Do you think there is a relationship between altruistic leadership and success?

5. Could you give examples or tell a story about attitudes and actions of intercollegiate coaches that are the opposite from this definition of altruistic leadership?

6. What are some barriers and facilitators of altruistic leadership in intercollegiate coaching? To what extent do you think support for altruistic leadership would be given from your university?

7. What impact do you think altruistic leadership would have on athletes? What other benefits do you think would be related to intercollegiate coaches’ altruistic leadership? Have you seen examples? Could you describe the examples?

8. Do you think an altruistic leadership style could be trained in intercollegiate coaching? If so, what techniques would you recommend to accomplish this training and development?
APPENDIX C

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

PROTOCOL # _________________

I consent to participate in research entitled:

A qualitative investigation of intercollegiate coaches’ perceptions of altruistic leadership.

Donna Pastore, Principal Investigator, or her authorized representative Lisa Miller has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described, as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation without prejudice to me.

Date:__________________________ Signed:_________________________

(Participant)

Signed:____________________________________________

(Principal Investigator or her authorized representative)

Witness:_______________________________________________
April 9, 2003

Dear Coach,

This message is intended to introduce myself and a research project in which you have been selected to participate. My name is Lisa Miller and I am a graduate student at The Ohio State University in Sport and Exercise Management. Dr. Janet Fink, Dr. Donna Pastore, and I are conducting research that pertains to intercollegiate coaches and their perceptions of altruistic leadership.

You will be receiving a telephone call to inquire about your interest in participating in this research. Please note that participation in this study is completely voluntary and your non-participation will not be known to anybody. All information will be kept confidential, and a pseudo-name will be chosen to ensure confidentiality. Your participation would be greatly appreciated and is critical to the success of the study.

I thank you in advance for your time and assistance in this project. You can expect the telephone call and a more detailed description of the study within the next week. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (614) 783-2130.

Best Regards,

Lisa Miller
Ph.D. Candidate
The Ohio State University

Dr. Janet Fink
Assistant Professor

Dr. Donna Pastore
Professor
The Ohio State University
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