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Abstract

Transformational and transactional leadership are known to be related to organizational variables, including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), turnover intention, and job performance. As these relationships are relevant to intercollegiate sports in the United States, the purpose of this study was to investigate athletic director’s transformational and transactional leadership and its impact on the five variables reported by followers (i.e., head coaches) in intercollegiate sports. This study employed transformational and transactional leadership as antecedents, and organizational commitment and job satisfaction as mediators bridging leadership and three organizational outcomes (OCB, turnover intention, and job performance).

Using a census method, the researcher asked 2,627 head coaches at NCAA Division II institutions to respond to a web survey questionnaire. The questionnaire contained items from the Multiple Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (1995), and items to measure job satisfaction, commitment, OCB, turnover intention, and job performance. A total of 359 (13.7%) usable responses were collected and used for the analysis.

Regarding the results of this study, confirmatory factor analysis was used to investigate relationships among the leadership and other variables. Transformational leadership exhibited direct and positive relationships with organizational commitment and job satisfaction, an indirect and negative relationship with turnover intention.
through organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and an indirect and positive relationship with OCB through organizational commitment. Transactional leadership exhibited direct and positive relationships with organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and an indirect and negative relationship with turnover intention through organizational commitment.

Two important implications arose from the findings from this study: the importance of contingent rewards, as well as transformational leadership, and withdrawal behavior and OCB of coaches in relation to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. A contingent reward dimension in transactional leadership was shown to have more influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment than transformational leadership. Some methods to address contingent reward may be to offer better compensation packages to followers or to provide better resources or budgets to upgrade team operation systems. Athletic directors or university administrators need to bear in mind that compensation or budget issues are critical to have satisfied and committed coaches.

On the other hand, regarding OCB and withdrawal behavior, transformational leadership affected turnover intention through both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and also affected OCB through organizational commitment. However, transactional leadership was shown to affect turnover intention only through organizational commitment and had no effect on OCB. These results indicate that transformational leadership engenders positive effects in the organization to a broader extent than transactional leadership.

In sum, it was shown that transactional leadership, especially contingent rewards, positively affects followers’ organizational behavior and that
transformational leadership more broadly affected followers beyond the extent of effects that transactional leadership engenders.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the sports industry in North America, intercollegiate athletics are one of the most important sectors (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005). Fans of intercollegiate athletics enthusiastically support their favorite teams and incur a great deal of expenditures by attending games and purchasing sports products related to those teams (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). Kent and Chelladurai also argued that a broad range of media coverage of intercollegiate athletics is obvious evidence of the influence of intercollegiate athletics.

Turner and Chelladurai (2005) argued that for the success of intercollegiate sports, athletes are an obvious resource and coaches are another important resource. They argued:

Coaches are another significant resource. In so far as they recruit the athletes (i.e., mobilize the human resources), attempt to develop them into excellent athletes (i.e., motivate and train them), and mold them into effective teams (i.e., coordinate their efforts and activities), the coaches constitute a strategic and important human resource of the athletic department. (p. 194)

On the other hand, Chelladurai (1985) claimed that athletes and coaches are the primary resources that can generate excellence and entertainment of sports, and that athletic directors and managers guide the resources to be effectively used in the pursuit of excellence in sports. Along with the same logic, Kent and Chelladurai (2001) argued, “the efficiency and effectiveness of the operating core (primary resources) is largely dependent on the managerial elements that support the operating
core and shield it from environmental turbulence” (p. 139). They continued that the roles of athletic directors are important in managing and implementing the resources. Given the importance of athletic directors in intercollegiate sports, the present study focused on athletic directors’ leadership and its impact on coaches’ behaviors (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover intention) and job performance.

**Research Variables**

*Transformational Leadership*

Armstrong-Doherty (1995) argued that sports administrators should have an ability to motivate organization members to accomplish higher goals and to voluntarily step forward to take extra roles for the organization in today’s consistently changing and complicated environment in sports. In fact, transformational leadership has received increasing attention from researchers. Yukl (1989) argued that transformational leadership brings changes in the attitudes and behaviors of organizational members and induces commitment toward the organization’s mission and goals. Doherty and Danylchuck (1996) described transformational leadership as the “new leadership” approach compared to transactional leadership which deals with the leader-follower exchange relationship, and they explained:

> The common theme of the approach is leadership that influences subordinates to: (a) exert greater effort in the pursuit of higher-order needs, (b) embrace a greater vision for their group or organization, and (c) ultimately perform beyond expectations. (p. 293)

According to Bass (1985), transformational leadership theory investigates the leadership behaviors that generate significant organizational outcomes, such as increased expectations, strengthened motives to achieve, and improved overall performance. Bass (1999) also claimed that transformational leadership has an impact
on followers’ job satisfaction, but transactional leadership alone cannot result in job satisfaction. He further argued that in today’s rapidly transforming world, voluntary behaviors beyond ones’ self-interests for the benefit of the organization are necessary and transformational leadership is needed for such an OCB (Bass, 1999).

In addition, it has been shown that transformational leadership strengthens organizational commitment and loyalty of followers (Bass, 1999), and strengthened organizational commitment can decrease turnover intentions (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003).

In sports, Doherty and Danylchuck (1996) showed that athletic directors’ transformational leadership in Canadian universities was positively related to coaches’ satisfaction with leadership and extra effort. Geist (2001) investigated NCAA Division II athletic directors’ perceptions of transformational leadership and found that the athletic directors assessed their transformational leadership more favorably than middle managers assessed the directors’ leadership. In other words, a significant difference was found between athletic directors’ and middle managers’ perceived opinions of the athletic directors’ transformational leadership. Kent and Chelladurai (2001) researched transformational leadership of the athletic director in a large Midwestern university, and showed that there was a positive relationship between transformational leadership and a perceived leader-member exchange quality (LMX) between second level managers (such as associate and assistant athletic directors) and their followers. In addition, they found that transformational leadership was positively associated with organizational commitment, but no relationship was found between transformational leadership and OCB, contrary to previous research results (e.g., Organ, Podaskoff, & Mackenzie, 2006; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996).
Kent and Chelladurai (2003) continued their transformational leadership research by surveying a State Parks and Recreation Department, and showed that the Department CEO’s transformational leadership was positively related to LMX with middle managers. They also showed a positive relationship between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment, OCB, and psychological empowerment. However, the impact of transformational leadership on OCB was weaker than on the other variables. Wallace and Weese (1995) examined the relationship between transformational leadership, organizational culture, and employee job satisfaction in Canadian YMCA organizations. They found that organizations led by high transformational CEOs were more likely to build the culture of managing change, accomplishing goals, collaborating through teamwork, and customer-focused activities than those by low transformational CEOs.

**Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leadership is usually observed when a certain type of exchange relationship is formed between leaders and followers for their respective needs (Hughes, Ginnet, & Curphy, 2008). Hughes et al. (2008) explained, “transactional leadership is very common but tends to be transitory, in that there may be no enduring purpose to hold parties together once a transaction is made” (p. 532). Bass and Riggio (2006) stated that while transformational leaders develop and grow followers’ leadership capabilities by listening to their individual needs, empowering them, and matching their goals and objectives with an organizational vision, transactional leaders tend to lead through social exchange (e.g., financial rewards, subsidies for campaign contributions, and jobs for vote). Comparing transactional leadership to transformational leadership, Bass and Riggio (2006) argued:
Transactional leaders…can supply solutions for immediate needs perceived by their followers. There is immediate satisfaction with such leadership but not necessarily long-term positive effectiveness in coping with the stressful conditions. What may be necessary are transformational leaders who evoke higher level needs, such as for the common good, and who move followers into a fully vigilant search for long-term readiness. (p. 73)

*Organizational Commitment*

Commitment has been discussed using a variety of definitions, but no definition is considered better or more commonly accepted than the others (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen (1997) explained that regardless of the numerous definitions, the common theme is commitment can be explained in terms of two aspects: the group members’ relationship with the organization and their decision to continuously belong to the organization. In that sense, Meyer and Allen (1997) summarized, “regardless of the definition, committed employees are more likely to remain in the organization than are uncommitted employees” (p. 11). This summarized core is well reflected in Mowday, Porter, and Steers’ (1982) definition of commitment - “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 27).

Meyer and Allen (1991) explained organizational commitment using three components in order to capture different dimensions observed across various definitions. First, affective commitment indicates “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). Considerable evidence has been accumulated that employees with strong affective commitment will be a more valuable resource than those with weak commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Second, normative commitment refers to “a feeling of obligation to continue employment” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). Although normative commitment of employees gives weaker impact on organizations
than affective commitment, organizations are also influenced by employees’ normative commitment (Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Third, continuance commitment refers to “an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). Meyer and Allen (1997) stated, “employees with strong continuance commitment might be poorer performers, engage in fewer citizenship behaviors, and exhibit more dysfunctional behaviors than those with weak continuance commitment” (p. 38). In the current study, the researcher considered affective and normative commitment as dimensions of an organizational commitment variable, but excluded continuance commitment because of the findings of Allen and Meyer (1996) and Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995) who found continuance commitment is a fundamentally distinct concept from affective and normative commitment (thus no association with transformational leadership has been found in previous studies). Furthermore, Kent and Chelladurai (2001, 2003) did not consider continuance commitment in their transformational leadership studies in sports for this reason.

Job Satisfaction

Spector (1997) stated that job satisfaction refers to the extent to which a person likes one’s job. He argued that the research on the antecedents and consequences of this important employee attitude (i.e., job satisfaction) has been one of the main topics of organizational behavior studies.

Spector (1997) found that the antecedents include “how people are treated, the nature of job tasks, relations with other people in the workplace, and rewards” (p. 30). One of the examples of “how people are treated” is clearly related to leadership as Judge and Piccolo (2004) found that both transformational leadership and a
contingent reward dimension of transactional leadership showed a strong positive relationship with employee job satisfaction. As far as potential effects of job satisfaction, researchers (e.g., Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Mitra, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1992; Organ & Konovsky, 1989) showed that job satisfaction affects job performance, OCB, and turnover intention, although causal relationships were not established.

**OCB**

Organ (1988) defined OCB as helping others, displaying loyalty to the organization, being conscientious, and acting fairly toward others. Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) found two factors in OCB after conducting a factor analysis. The first factor, altruism, is defined as “behavior that is directly and intentionally aimed at helping a specific person in face-to-face situations (e.g., orienting new people, assisting someone with a heavy workload)” (Smith et al., 1983, p. 657). The second factor, generalized compliance, is defined as “a more impersonal form of conscientiousness that does not provide immediate aid to any one specific person, but rather is indirectly helpful to others involved in the system” (Smith et al., 1983, p. 657). Smith et al. (1983) illustrated behaviors such as punctuality and not wasting time as examples of generalized compliance.

Emphasizing a leader’s role to enhance employees’ OCB, Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) argued:

… a leader can do a number of things to influence the extent to which employees want to or feel they ought to engage in citizenship behavior… leaders can try to shape the work environment to provide greater opportunities for OCB. Indeed, it would be hard for an employee to exhibit altruism if that employee had little contact with coworkers (and therefore no opportunities to observe their need for help) or if the work rules were so inflexible that the employee was prevented from helping coworkers. Similarly, employees would find it difficult to responsibly participate in the governance of the organization or to offer constructive suggestions (i.e., civic virtue) if there were no staff meetings or other forums for doing so. Thus, leaders can
potentially enhance OCB by changing the structure of the tasks employees perform, the conditions under which they do their work, and/or human resource practices that govern their behavior. (p. 94)

In line with this argument, Bass and Riggio (2006) stated that employees led by transformational leaders were certainly better organizational citizens. In other words, Bass and Riggio argued that transformational leaders are more likely to induce followers’ OCB.

Job Performance

Responding to Bass’ (1985) question of why certain leaders induce superior performance from their followers, Bass and Riggio (2006) argued, “transformational leadership makes the difference” (p. 47). They summarized that transformational leadership tends to positively influence performance, regardless of whether performance is measured as what followers or supervisors perceive as performance (i.e., subjective performance) or whether performance concerns about more objective and bottom-line outcomes (i.e., objective performance). However, Lowe, Kroek, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) reported that transformational leadership is more strongly related to subjective performance measures than to objective measure. In addition, it should also be noted that transactional leadership contributed to eliciting greater objectively measurable performance, whereas transformational leadership contributed to eliciting greater subjective or qualitative performance (Hoyt & Blascovich, 2003). However, Bass and Riggio (2006) argued that performance beyond expectations is generated by transformational leadership rather than transactional leadership.

Turnover Intention

Hughes et al. (2008) argued that of the many organizational outcomes, employee turnover must be the most visible impact on leaders. Turnover unfavorably
affects an organization (Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2005). Research has revealed that turnover intention is directly related to actual turnover (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Mitchell, Holton, Lee, & Erez, 2001). Researchers (Bass, 1985, 1998; Griffith, 2004) showed that transformational leadership can effectively prevent turnover behavior by arousing employees’ positive emotions toward the leader.

Statement of Problem

Although there have been some studies about transformational leadership in sports, application of the transformational leadership theory in sport settings has been still very limited (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Rowold, 2006; Yukl, 2002). Doherty and Danylchuck (1996) argued that by neglecting transformational leadership, “sport management research has not examined truly effective leadership – that is, leadership that can incite performance beyond expectations” (p. 293). In fact, Chelladurai (2007) stated that transformational leadership’s influences on sports have not been fully captured by researchers in sports.

Another issue is that both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors in sports have not been sufficiently researched, although there are a few studies (e.g., Doherty & Danylchuck, 1996; Geist, 2001; Rowold, 2006). Burns (1978) explained that transactional leadership plays a role in satisfying the needs of both leaders and followers by activating a certain type of exchange relationship between the two parties and such leadership legitimizes the consistent and stable situations. Daft (1999) emphasized that transactional leadership is necessary in maintaining current organizational stability by focusing on a commitment to implementing mutually agreed upon rules between leaders and followers, while a different kind of leadership (i.e., transformational leadership) is required if organizational change is
pursued. Emphasizing the role of transactional leadership in relation to transformational leadership, Bass (1999) claimed, “Transactional leadership can be reasonably satisfying and effective but transformational leadership adds substantially to the impact of transactional leadership.” (p. 12). Transactional leadership needs to be equally considered with transformational leadership in sports.

Reviewing the importance of transformational leadership in sport management research with consideration for the transactional leadership elements, it is necessary to empirically test an organizational research framework of transformational and transactional leadership and its impact on consequences such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCB, job performance, and turnover intentions. In the organizational behavior research field, these consequences are considered important in relation to transformational and transactional leadership. Numerous researchers (e.g., Bass & Riggio, 2006; Fullagar, McCoy, & Shull, 1992; Koh, 1990; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Pitman, 1993) showed that transformational leadership is positively related to organizational commitment. According to several researchers (e.g., Bass, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Brown & Keeping, 2005; Towler, 2003), there is clear evidence that transformational leadership is more important in incurring job satisfaction by providing employees with autonomy and challenging work than transactional leadership. It has also been shown that transformational leadership positively affects OCB (e.g., Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999), performance (e.g., Avolio & Bass, 2000; Bass 1999; Towler, 2003), and decreases turnover intention (e.g., Bass, 1985; Martin & Epitropaki, 2001). Although organizational behavior researchers have dealt extensively with these outcome variables in relation to both
transformational and transactional leadership behaviors, no studies have been conducted to deal with these variables simultaneously in sports, especially in an intercollegiate sports setting, despite the perceived importance of transformational leadership research in sports.

Purpose of Study

Considering the importance of athletic directors’ role in intercollegiate sports and transformational and transaction research in sport management, the current study focused on athletic director’s transformational and transactional leadership and its impact on followers’ (i.e., head coaches’) attitudinal behaviors and job performance in NCAA Division II institutions.

Specifically, it is anticipated that job satisfaction and organizational commitment will be mediating variables bridging transformational and transactional leadership of athletic directors to OCB, turnover intention, and job performance of head coaches. Research has shown that job satisfaction is highly correlated with OCB (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Williams & Anderson, 1991), task performance (e.g., Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Spector, 1997), and turnover intention (e.g., Bluedorn, 1982; Crampton & Wagner, 1984). On the other hand, organizational commitment has been found to be positively related to OCB (e.g., Meyer & Allen, 1986, 1991, 1997; Organ & Ryan, 1995), task performance (e.g., Bashaw & Grant, 1994), and decreased turnover intention (e.g., Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Especially with regard to the relationship between job satisfaction and task performance, the researcher took satisfaction as an antecedent while several scholars in sport management (e.g., Chelladurai, 1978) argued that satisfaction should be considered as an outcome along
with performance. On the other hand, some scholars in organizational behavior have shown that satisfaction is an important factor affecting task performance (Koy, 2001; Rucci, Kirn, & Quinn, 1998). Giving an example that satisfaction of employees was shown to lead to positive behaviors toward customers and improved task performance, Koy (2001) argued that employee satisfaction contributed to better performance. Similarly, using employee attitude data from 35 firms over eight years, Schneider, Hanges, Smith, and Salvaggio (2003) showed that overall job satisfaction was significantly related to task performance. Following these prior organizational behavior studies, the researcher used satisfaction as an antecedent of performance.

Furthermore, it has been persistently claimed that as job satisfaction and organizational commitment are highly correlated, they should be paired together in predicting related consequences (e.g., Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988; Schappe, 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991). In other words, those researchers argued that when organizational outcomes are assessed in relation to organizational commitment or job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job satisfaction should be considered at the same time, which helps organizational managers and practitioners to better understand the relationship of organizational variables.

While numerous studies have been done in investigating transformational and transactional leadership in various organizational settings, no studies have been done in assessing the impact of transformational and transactional leadership on important organizational outcomes such as OCB, job performance, and turnover intention with paired-up mediating variables of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Turner (2001) examined the relationship between organizational commitment and employee outcome variables such as satisfaction, performance, and turnover intention.
of intercollegiate coaches but he did not consider transformational and transactional leadership of athletic directors as an antecedent of organizational commitment, and treated organizational commitment and satisfaction separately. Turner and Chelladurai (2005) investigated organizational commitment of intercollegiate coaches on turnover intention and performance without considering the leadership and satisfaction factors. Kent and Chelladurai (2001) examined the relationship among transformational leadership, LMX, organizational commitment, and OCB but omitted transactional leadership elements as a variable. Doherty and Danylchuck (1996) studied the impact of transformational and transactional leadership on followers’ extra effort, satisfaction, perceived leadership effectiveness, and commitment in Canadian intercollegiate sports but did not develop their framework into a model using satisfaction and commitment as mediating factors. Kim and Chang (2007) examined the effects of occupational commitment and organizational commitment on turnover intention and OCB in Korean sport organizations, but they omitted transformational and transactional leadership as an antecedent. Yusof (1998) researched the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors and coaches’ job satisfaction but did not consider transactional leadership and other organizational outcomes.

Considering the important research progress in organizational behavior and sport management, this study investigated the influence of athletic directors’ transformational and transactional leadership in NCAA Division II institutions on job performance, OCB and turnover intention of head coaches, with organizational commitment and job satisfaction used as mediating factors. The researcher hoped to provide a better understanding of leadership’s role and its impact on various outcomes
Leadership refers to either transformational leadership or transactional leadership. OC = Organizational commitment. OCB = Organizational citizenship behavior.

Figure 1. A model of leadership, its mediators, and outcomes
Significance of Study

In the setting of intercollegiate athletics, the athletic directors are responsible for implementing multidisciplinary roles with effective leadership. They have been increasingly required to provide their leadership across multiple roles such as promotion, planning, organizing, evaluating, and marketing of the teams, the events, the department, and the university (Branch, 1990; Geist, 2001; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). In addition, Kent and Chelladurai (2001) emphasized that the athletic directors are the critical part of “the linking pins between their respective departments and umbrella agencies such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the National Association for Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA)…and they interact with the media and other external groups in the task environment.” (p. 139).

As intercollegiate athletics has experienced increasingly complex internal and external environmental changes with high visibility, athletic directors need to provide truly effective leadership that can bring extraordinary organizational outcomes by successfully leading the organization and followers (Doherty & Danylchuck, 1996; Geist, 2001). Transformational leadership has been shown to be closely related with organizational outcomes (e.g., satisfaction, commitment, and performance) in a variety of organizational settings (e.g., military, business, and health care industry). In that sense, it seems valuable to study the effects of transformational leadership in sports. On the contrary, some might argue that as intercollegiate athletics has been operated in an encaged system, it would not be clear why transformational leadership, which manages changes and unpredictability, is necessary in intercollegiate athletics. If that argument is true, transactional leadership may be more needed than transformational leadership in a stabilized and encaged intercollegiate athletic system.
However, no empirical studies have yet investigated which of the two leadership constructs is preferable in intercollegiate sports. In that sense, considering both transformational and transactional leadership is critical in intercollegiate athletics. Specifically, the researcher focuses on intercollegiate sports by examining the athletic directors’ transformational and transactional leadership and its impact on outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) through two mediating variables (organizational commitment and job satisfaction).

The researcher chose the head coaches as a subject group in measuring the outcome and mediating variables for the following reasons. According to Turner (2001), understanding the behavior of coaches is beneficial for athletic administrators to lead an organization more effectively. Specifically, Turner (2001) explained the head coaches’ roles in relation to the athletic directors by comparing intercollegiate athletics with the business world:

Athletic directors have many of the same responsibilities associated with chief executive officers of business organizations, including the overall effectiveness of the athletic department. Similarly, head coaches of intercollegiate athletic teams can be compared to mid-level managers in a typical business setting. These coaches have supervisory responsibility for the actions and performances of certain individuals (team members, assistant coaches, and support personnel) and are held accountable for these duties by a higher level manager (usually the athletic director or an assistant athletic director). Like managers in the business world, coaches have a direct impact on the effectiveness of their team and therefore play a major role in the overall effectiveness of the organization (i.e., the athletic department). Consequently, understanding the behavior of athletic coaches may help sport managers operate a more effective organization. (p. 1)

In addition, explaining Horn’s (2002) model of coaching effectiveness, Chelladurai (2007) stated that organizational climate, along with sociocultural context and coaches’ personal characteristics, influences coaches’ behavior indirectly through coaches’ expectancies, values, beliefs, and goals, and that coaches’ behavior
influences athletes’ performance and behavior. Considering that organizational climate is in a large part affected by a leader in an organization, athletic directors’ leadership cannot be ignored in boosting coaching effectiveness and furthermore its impact on athletes’ performance and behavior.

Considering the importance of the athletic directors’ leadership and the head coaches’ behavior under the leadership for an effective organization, this study will contribute to the limited research in transformational and transactional leadership of athletic administrators in the sport setting. Furthermore, this study will analyze the athletic directors’ leadership in relation to the organizational behaviors or outcomes (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) that the head coaches show under their leadership. This study will benefit the athletic directors to:

1. Become transformational leaders, who have a holistic view in leading an organization by aligning the objectives and goals of the followers, the leader, and the organization.

2. Know the values of transformational leadership and/or transactional leadership, and recognize appropriate timing and situations to provide either or both of the two leadership behaviors.

3. Have a better understanding of the organizational outcomes, which are affected by transformational and transactional leadership, and

4. Recognize the importance of developing their transformational leadership for organizational success in the increasingly complicated environment of intercollegiate athletics.
For this study, NCAA Division II institutions are targeted as the subject group due to the following reason. Division II institutions share common characteristics in purpose and policies in comparison with Division I institutions (Geist, 2001). However, the survival of Division II athletics has been consistently threatened by internal and external factors despite its appearing similarity to Division I athletics, while Division I institutions have enjoyed their athletic programs’ continuing success. According to Hoopedia (2009), Division II institutions have confronted ongoing challenges for their viability, contrary to Division I or III institutions. With regard to uniquely challenging environmental characteristics of Division II institutions, it is noted that:

NCAA Division II athletics programs share many of the major expenses of their Division I counterparts with regard especially to scholarships, facilities upkeep, and travel while receiving for the most part far smaller gate receipts and almost no television revenue. An increasing number of Division II schools are under pressure from administrators, boosters, and other interested parties either to step up to Division I or down to Division III. (http://hoopedia.nba.com, Pressure to Move to Division I or III)

In addition, it has been noted that regulation changes and the economic situation affects Division II programs unfavorably (NCAA, 2009). Regarding the regulatory and economic issues in Division II, it is pointed out that:

While Division II programs were not awash in money even in the roaring ’90s, many now are much worse off economically as endowments have shrunk, investments have collapsed and state budgets have imploded. Besides all of that, Division II deregulated its financial aid legislation in 2002. Some funding that previously applied to grants-in-aid no longer does, raising questions about whether those actions may have altered what the limits should be…Most schools give much less than the maximum limits in various non-revenue sports…Such a situation sets the stage for friction between the so-called “haves” and “have-nots” and raises the larger question of what Division II stands for…Administrators should have a long-term vision of what they really want their institution to be. (http://www.ncaa.org, Division II interests stake out ground on financial aid limits)
Remembering that transformational leadership is especially called for in ever-changing unpredictable situations, the researcher believes that studying the intercollegiate athletic directors’ transformational leadership and its consequences in the Division II institutions will be helpful for ongoing survival of Division II athletic departments.

Hypotheses

Transformational and Transactional Leadership

As reviewed earlier, transformational leadership is more likely to bring positive impact on organizational outcomes than transactional leadership. Emphasizing an augmentation role of transformational leadership over transactional leadership, Hughes et al. (2008) stated that transformational leadership is a significantly more effective predictor of organizational outcomes than transactional leadership. Avolio and Bass (2000) also claimed that transformational leadership results in better outcomes by augmenting transactional leadership’s roles within organizations. Taking such research results, a hypothesis on the roles’ transformational and transactional leadership as an antecedent of organizational outcomes is proposed as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Transformational leadership is more related to outcome variables (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and decreased turnover intention) than transactional leadership.

Effects of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

It has been found that committed and satisfied employees put extra efforts (i.e., OCB), perform better, and tend not to leave the organization. First of all, three
dimensions of organizational commitment need to be briefly explained before proposing the next hypothesis. Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed that organizational commitment was comprised of three dimensions: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment is the degree to which employees feel attached to the organization. Continuance commitment is related to restriction in leaving the organization due to externally imposed cost issues. Normative commitment is the degree to which employees feel obliged to stay in the organization. More detailed explanations on organizational commitment will be presented in Chapter 2.

Researchers (e.g., Meyer & Allen, 1997) have shown that while organizational commitment in general positively affects the organization, employees especially with strong affective and normative commitment positively contribute to the organization but the effect of continuance commitment is relatively weaker. Therefore, a hypothesis is proposed in relation to organizational commitment and its effects as follows:

Hypothesis 2: Organizational commitment will be positively associated with OCB, job performance, and decreased turnover intention.

As reviewed earlier, job satisfaction has been shown to be positively related with OCB, decreased turnover intention, and job performance in organizational behavior research. Therefore, the same logic is expected to be applied to sports.

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction will be positively associated with OCB, job performance, and decreased turnover intention.

Partial Mediational Model

According to the framework in Figure 1, the relationship between
transformational or transactional leadership and outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) is partially mediated by organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Such a partial mediation model is designed in consideration of the direct impact of transformational and transactional leadership on the outcome variables, which has been shown in previous research.

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between transformational or transactional leadership and outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) will be partially mediated by organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Alternative Model

Researchers (e.g., Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006) suggested consideration of an alternative model in researching transformational and transactional leadership in relation to other variables. It would be additionally necessary to investigate an alternative model which does not include paths connecting transformational and transactional leadership to outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention), which is described in Figure 2.

Hypothesis 5: The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) will be fully mediated by organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Delimitations

This study is delimited to the athletic directors’ leadership and its organizational outcomes related to the head coaches within NCAA Division II institutions. In addition, this study is delimited to surveying the head coaches only in
their assessing the athletic directors’ leadership and their self-reporting of their own organizational behaviors.

Leadership refers to either transformational leadership or transactional leadership. OC = Organizational commitment. OCB = Organizational citizenship behavior.

Figure 2. An alternative fully-mediated model of leadership, its mediators, and outcomes

Limitations

A limitation of this study is that leadership is measured in the eye of the followers (i.e., head coaches) only and outcomes of leadership are also self-reported by them. Therefore, with regard to the leadership measurement, resulted leadership assessment may be biased due to not examining the athletic directors’ own perceptions about their own leadership behaviors. With regard to the self-reports,
responses could be misrepresented because respondents (i.e., head coaches) may respond arbitrarily or in favor of their status. Respondents may also ask for others to fill out the questionnaire instead of completing it themselves.

Definitions of Terms

Leadership

Leadership is the procedure of influencing an organization toward achieving its goals (Roach & Behling, 1984).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leaders possess excellent visioning, rhetorical, and emotion management skills which are used to build close emotional bonds with subordinates, and they tend to be more successful in handling organizational change due to subordinates’ improved emotional levels and their efforts to achieve the leader’s vision (Bass, 1985).

Transactional Leadership

In contrast to transformational leaders, transactional leaders tries to maintain the status quo and focus on motivating subordinates by designating goals and promising rewards for satisfactory performance without making efforts to deal with organizational changes (Bass, 1997).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982, p. 27).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as “simply how people feel about their jobs and
different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

**OCB**

OCB is defined as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006, p. 8).

**Job Performance**

Job performance can be explained in comparison with effectiveness in that performance “concerns those behaviors directed toward the organization’s mission or goals or the products and services resulting from those behaviors… performance would only include those behaviors related to the production of goods or services or obtaining good grades. Performance differs from effectiveness, which generally involves making judgments about the adequacy of behavior with respect to certain criteria such as work-group or organizational goals” (Hughes, Ginnet, & Curphy, 2008, p. 370).

**Turnover Intention**

Turnover intention is defined as “a conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization” (Tett & Meyer, 1993, p. 262).
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the researcher will review literature which relates to the purpose of this study. The review will be presented through four sections: (a) Leadership, (b) Outcomes of Transformational and Transactional Leadership, (c) Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction as Mediators, and (d) Summary.

Leadership

Leadership Definitions

There are a variety of leadership definitions. Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) claimed that leadership definitions differ in various aspects such as leader types, leadership objectives, and methods of leadership exercise. Nahavandi (2008) explained that researchers disagree with leadership definitions because of the fact that leadership is a complicated phenomenon mixed with the leader, the follower, and the situation. Hughes et al. (2008) explained that some researchers have paid attention to the leader’s personal traits while others have focused on the relationship between leaders and followers or situational factors that influence leadership behavior. Therefore, researchers have defined leadership in various ways. For example, Fiedler (1967) defined leadership as managing group work with appropriate control and coordination. Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, and Fleishman (2000) claimed that leadership is a complicated form that provides solutions for social concerns. Roach
and Behling (1984) defined leadership as the procedure of guiding an organized team toward achieving its objectives. Rost (1993) defined leadership as influence dynamics among leaders and followers who attempt to bring true organizational changes that reflect their common goals.

Daft (1999) claimed that leaders today face a major challenge; the rapidly changing world requires a new leadership paradigm. He elaborated that leaders should realize the transformational shift from cherishing stability to valuing change, from central to empowerment, from competition to collaboration, from focusing on each part to building relationships of parts, from uniformity to diversity. He further claimed that in the new era represented by a dramatic change, an old philosophy of control-oriented leadership is not effective anymore, and that leaders should make effort to retain soft elements of leadership qualities in addition to hard management skills.

*The Evolution of Leadership*

Leadership has developed into a systematic and organized theory largely since the 20th century (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003; Grint, 2000; Higgs, 2002; Kets de Vries, 1993). Daft (1999) summarized the flow of leadership theory’s development in detail. He explained that the evolution of leadership theories has been made through four eras. The two dimensions (micro versus macro leadership scope, stable versus chaotic situations) determine the eras. The first era is characterized by macro leadership in a stable world. As organizations were usually small and the future could be predictable in this era, it was believed that an individual with extraordinary abilities and talents was able to lead an organization and followers by the leader oneself. An early perspective of leadership in this era stressed an importance of ‘Great Men’ and believed that a good leader was born with specific leadership traits. As a
leader, the Great Man ran an organization on a macro level by drawing the big picture, developing a vision, and motivating followers to achieve the vision (Daft, 1999).

Daft (1999) explained that the second era is characterized by *micro leadership in a stable world*. Rational management with a standardized scientific approach was emphasized in order for leaders to efficiently control large hierarchical and bureaucratic organizations. As the world was stable in this era, leaders’ good management and analytical skills were enough to lead organizations even without their visioning abilities. Therefore, this era preferred good managers who had management skills to complete a specific function on a micro level within a huge organization. Leadership scholars during this era were interested in segmenting leadership behaviors into pieces and wanted to find some effective leadership behavioral characteristics with a hope of managing companies more efficiently. With such reason, they developed behavioral and contingency leadership theories to investigate effective leadership behaviors, their followers’ outcomes, and situations by which leader behaviors were affected (Daft, 1999).

The third era is characterized by *micro leadership in a chaotic world* (Daft, 1999). Daft explained that during this era the world experienced various economic challenges, such as global competition after World War II, the OPEC oil embargo, and the Japanese dominance of world trade. As a result, organizations felt necessary to abandon a traditional control management system and adopt a new system than emphasized empowerment, cross-functional collaboration, teamwork, and a horizontal organizational structure. However, despite such recognition of a change, most managers could not shake off an old mindset of micro management in a stable world (Daft, 1999).
The fourth era is characterized by *macro leadership in a chaotic world* (Daft, 1999). Leaders build relationships, develop a shared vision, and control with others rather than control over others. To deal with chaotic situational changes, leaders continuously try to transform organizations and motivate followers to be involved in solving challenging problems. While the leaders in the first era developed a vision and drew a big picture in macro perspectives by themselves, leaders in this era work together with others by using empowerment and motivation (Daft, 1999).

The next step is to specifically investigate leadership theory improvements, which were briefly touched on above while exploring the leadership evolution process. *Leadership Theory*

From the 1940s to late 1990s, researchers (e.g., Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003; Partington, 2003) categorized approaches to leadership theory improvements into several schools, according to time order. The four major schools are the trait school, the behavioral school, the contingency school, and the visionary school.

*The Trait School*

The trait school leadership theories were prevalent until the 1940s. Hogan (1991) explained that traits refer to repetitive patterns in a person’s behavior and the trait approach attempts to explain people’s behavioral trends in terms of certain strengths of traits that they retain. Stogdill (1974) referred to the Great Man theory, which argued that leaders are fundamentally different from followers due to some common leader traits. In other words, Turner (1999) explained that leaders are born with natural talents of great leadership, so they cannot be made. Stogdill’s (1948) study about leaders’ traits showed that although leaders are not different from followers in terms of physical height, outgoing personality, and ambitions, leading...
people tend to be more hardworking, conscientious, friendly, and willing to take responsibility more so than others. He claimed that such leader characteristics increase a group’s goal achievement possibility. However, this cannot be completely guaranteed.

After Stogdill’s study, numerous researchers have maintained the position that leaders are not different from followers, but in the 1980s and the 1990s, the trait approach regained its popularity in studying leadership’s effect on outcomes (Hogan, 1991). For example, Turner (1999) found that effective managers have traits such as excellent communication ability, energy and initiative, self-confidence, outcome-orientation, and negotiating ability.

The Behavioral School

The behavioral approach to leadership was popular from the 1940s to the 1960s. The representative studies on leadership behaviors were conducted by researchers at The Ohio State University and the University of Michigan. The Ohio State studies found that leaders’ behaviors can be explained in terms of two independent factors, which are consideration and initiating structure (Fleishman, 1973; Halpin & Winer, 1957). According to the Ohio State studies, consideration indicates the degree to which leaders show supportive and friendly attentions to followers, while initiating structure indicates the degree to which leaders stress achieving goals and tasks. On the other hand, the Michigan studies found that effective group performance is associated with four dimensions of leadership behaviors: leader support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation (Bower & Seashore, 1966). According to the Michigan studies, leader support behaviors are related with personal concerns for subordinates, and interaction facilitation behaviors
are related with reconciling relational conflicts among group members. Goal emphasis behaviors are related to motivating followers to achieve the given tasks, and work facilitation behaviors are related with role clarification, resource securing and allocation, and conflict management. Bower and Seashore (1966) explained that in sum, goal emphasis and work facilitation are job-centered dimensions, but leaders support and interaction facilitation are employee-centered dimensions. In comparing the two universities studies, Hughes et al. (2008) explained that according to the Ohio State studies, leaders could combine the two factors of consideration and initiating structure (e.g., high consideration and high initiating structure, high consideration and low initiating structure, etc.) as the two factors are independent from each other, while according to the Michigan studies, such a combination of job-centered and employee-centered dimensions is impossible as the two dimensions are two opposite concepts. However, both institutions’ studies fundamentally assumed that certain leadership behaviors are related to a group success in achieving its goals (Hughes et al., 2008).

Researchers (e.g., Curphy, 2003; Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003) have claimed that considering certain leadership behaviors are adopted for effective leadership, leadership can be developed. According to the behavioral school, leaders can change their behavior through reflection, organizational development systems, 360-degree feedback and so on (McCauley, Ruderman, Ohlott, & Morrow, 1994).

The Contingency School

The contingency leadership approach was mostly discussed in the 1960s and 1970s. There are four well-known contingency leadership theories: the Vroom and Yetton’s normative decision model, the situational leadership model, Fiedler’s
First, the *normative decision model* explores how leaders determine an optimal level of followers’ participation in the decision-making process for effective group performance depending on various situations (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). In other words, the normative decision model investigates leadership in terms of the leader-follower-situation framework (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Depending on the level of a group members’ participation in decision-making, Vroom and Yetton (1973) put a leader’s completely autocratic leadership style at one end of a continuum of decision-making style and equal group participation together with followers at the other end, while placing consultative decision style at the middle. Some researchers (e.g., Field, 1982; Vroom & Jago, 1988) showed that leaders taking the normative decision model tend to be more effective decision-makers, but not the other way around, meaning that effective decision-makers are not necessarily equal to effective leaders (Miner, 1975).

Second, the *situational leadership model* was developed based on the Ohio State studies’ two leader behaviors explained previously: initiating structure and consideration (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). The situational leadership model considers leaders’ task behaviors (i.e., initiating structure), relationship behaviors (i.e., consideration), situational factors, and most importantly follower readiness (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Hersey and Blanchard explained that follower readiness refers to followers’ abilities to take on a specific task rather than a personality factor. They explained that leadership effectiveness can be improved if the two leader behaviors are appropriately combined considering the followers’ readiness level (i.e., high task readiness versus low task readiness) and the situation at the moment. Daft (1999) explained that the *telling* style (a very directive form) is appropriate for low-readiness
followers while the *selling* style (a mixture form that contains a leader direction and seeks input from followers) and the *participating* style (a form that supports followers’ development) are appropriate for moderate-readiness followers. He also stated that the *delegating* style (a form of little direction and little support) is appropriate for high-readiness followers.

Third, the *contingency model* refers to the theory that there are specific situations in which a leader’s behavioral tendency fits better for leadership effectiveness than other behaviors (Fiedler, 1995). According to Fiedler, leaders consistently maintain their leadership behaviors (relationship-oriented or task-oriented) and rarely change them, whereas the previously explained situational leadership model assumes that leaders can modify their behaviors depending on situations. In other words, the contingency model recommends that leadership effectiveness can be achieved by correctly matching a specific leadership style with a certain situation. Fiedler basically argued that there are some situations that some leaders can exercise their leadership styles well, while others cannot. Fiedler (1995) specifically explained situational factors using the concept situational favorability. Fiedler explained that situational favorability is the extent to which the leader can exercise control over followers. It is determined by three elements: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. If situational favorability is high in considering the combined level of these three elements, the situation is favorable to a leader. Fiedler emphasized that as it is very difficult for leaders to change their behaviors which are developed through lifetime experiences, leaders should be trained to recognize and change important situational factors in order to make them fit well with their leadership behaviors rather than changing leaders’ behaviors.
Fourth, the path-goal theory basically attempts to explain how to induce followers’ work effort through motivation and to achieve high levels of performance (Daft, 1999). Daft (1999) explained that a leader can motive followers “…by either (1) clarifying the follower’s path to the rewards that are available or (2) increasing the rewards that the follower values and desires” (p. 102). In other words, the leader’s behavior should be able to increase followers’ expectancy, and with leader efforts, followers will be able to successfully complete the task and achieve valued rewards (House & Dressler, 1974). House (1971) identified four leadership behaviors: directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement-oriented leadership. The path-goal theory claimed that leaders can vary such leadership behaviors as the situational leadership model assumes, depending on the follower and the situation characteristics (House, 1971; House & Dressler, 1974). With regard to the follower factor, the path-goal theory explains that followers take the leader’s behavior when the leader can satisfy them. Depending on followers’ locus of control, experience, and their perceived abilities, a leader needs to vary leadership styles to satisfy them (House & Dressler, 1974). In addition, depending on situational factors such as the level of task structure, formal authority system, and norm of work group, an appropriate leadership style should be selected to motivate followers to put forth effort and eventually satisfy them (House & Dressler, 1974). Hughes et al. (2008) explained the four types of leadership styles according to the path-goal theory: supportive, directive, achievement-oriented, and participative styles. Supportive leadership style refers to the leader behavior that shows individual concerns for followers’ development and needs. Directive leadership style refers to the leader characteristic that directs all the specifics and logistics related to task performance.
Participative leadership style refers to the leader effort that seeks opinions from followers and encourages group discussions. Achievement-oriented leadership style refers to the leader behavior of setting high objectives for followers and leading them to achieve the goals with relevant supports (Hughes et al., 2008).

*The Visionary School*

The visionary school has gained popularity from the 1980s. Specifically, transformational and transactional leadership theory has recently drawn careful attention (e.g., Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003). According to Hughes (2005), the visionary leadership approach has originated from the criticism against an extreme focus on rationality without considering human side elements of leadership. Zaccaro, Rittman, and Marks (2001) claimed that although leaders’ technical skills are certainly necessary for effective leadership, more attention to leaders’ interpersonal abilities is required in the current dynamically changing organizational environment.

Burns (1978) discussed two forms of visionary leadership: transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Burns explained that transactional leadership refers to a certain type of exchange relationship between leaders and followers to fulfill both party’s needs. He further claimed that transactional leadership legitimizes the consistent and stable situations, so this leadership does not cause organizational transformation. Chelladurai (1999) summarized transactional leadership by stating, “Transactional leadership implies that the leader and members are satisfied with the status quo, and the leader’s function is to motivate the members to attain the established goals” (p. 172). Geist and Pastore (2002) also stated that transactional leadership is displayed by assuming stable organizational environments and a satisfactorily agreed match between organizational goals and subordinates’
preferences. Similarly, Hughes et al. (2008) explained that as transactional leadership focuses on a commitment to implementing mutually agreed upon rules between leaders and followers, transactional leaders’ interest stays on maintaining current organizational stability rather than bringing change. Hughes et al. further stated that although transactional leadership is necessary, a different kind of leadership is required if organizational change is pursued. This is why researchers have emphasized the importance of transformational leadership in changing situations and the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership should be made.

Burns (1978) explained that transformational leaders attempt to induce changes in organizations with a compelling vision and an emotional attachment with followers. Researchers (e.g., Burns, 1978; Parameshwar, 2006) explained that transformational leaders are not afraid of confronting challenges, and they are ready to sacrifice themselves for their organizations’ survival. Hughes et al. (2008) stated, “Transformational leaders possess good visioning, rhetorical, and impression management skills and use them to develop strong emotional bonds with followers” (p. 648). Transformational leaders are also great motivators in inducing subordinates to achieve more than a task imposed by a leader (Bass, 1985). Chelladurai (1999) described transformational leadership as “the extent to which the leader attempts to change the situation in terms of goals and processes, incites the higher-order needs of his or her followers, and exhibits confidence in their capacity to attain the elevated aspirations” (p. 172).

Daft (1999) pointed out four significant areas to differentiate transformational leadership from transactional leadership. First, he argued, “Transformational leadership develops followers into leaders” (Daft, 1999, p. 428). He explained that
transformational leaders allow followers to take initiatives with their own decisions to achieve goals and help them to develop into leaders. Second, he argued, “Transformational leadership elevates followers’ concerns from lower-level physical needs such as for safety and security to higher-level psychological needs such as for self-esteem and self-actualization” (Daft, 1999, p. 428). He explained that the transformational leaders focus on developing individual follower’s higher level of needs in addition to lower level of needs. They also empower followers to bring true changes to organizations. Third, he argued, “Transformational leadership inspires followers to go beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group” (Daft, 1999, p. 428). He explained that the transformational leaders effectively communicate the importance of achieving organizational goals and changes to followers, inspiring them to put an organizational mission over their individual interests. Fourth, he argued, “Transformational leadership points a vision of a desired future state and communicates it in a way that makes the pain of change worth the effort” (Daft, 1999, p. 428). He explained that the most important role of transformational leaders is to establish a significantly improved, compelling vision, and to persuade followers to buy into the vision to achieve goals.

Researchers (e.g., Avolio & Bass, 1988; Bass, 1985; Bono & Judge, 2003) have claimed transformational leaders are more likely to bring successful changes to organizations than transactional leaders due to strong emotional attachment to followers and a compelling vision that lead followers to achieve higher goals, while transactional leaders motivate followers with goal setting and reward promise without an attempt to bring organizational change and to build an emotional relationship with followers.
Bass (1985, 1990, 1997) described dimensions of transactional and transformational leadership. He explained that transactional leadership consists of two dimensions: contingent reward and management-by-exception. Contingent reward refers to giving rewards to followers when they complete a job directed by the leader. Management-by-exception refers to leaders’ action to be involved in followers’ work processes when things do not go well as planned.

On the other hand, Bass elaborated that transformational leadership consists of four dimensions: charisma (idealized influence), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Charisma refers to a leadership characteristic of acting upon a newly developed shared vision and bringing about trust, pride, and respect by influencing followers. Inspirational motivation refers to a leadership characteristic that motivates followers to accomplish highly expected goals and shows exemplary behaviors. Intellectual stimulation refers to a leadership characteristic that challenges followers with innovative ideas and perspectives, raises questions on generally accepted assumptions, and restructures ways to think. Individual consideration refers to a leadership characteristic that shows individual concerns, attention, and respect to followers (Bass, 1985, 1990, 1997).

It is necessary to note that transactional leadership cannot be replaced by transformational leadership (Bass, 1999). Bass explained that transformational leadership augments the effects of transactional leadership and the best leaders have both of these two leadership characteristics. He gave an example that Franklin D. Roosevelt showed a balance of transactional and transformational leadership. With inspirational speeches and an ability of visioning an American future, Roosevelt was a transformational leader but he was also a skilled transactional leader who could
effectively use rewards to achieve goals. Bass (1985) claimed that transactional leadership characteristics establish a basis of leader-follower relationships by concretizing expectations, specifying responsibilities, and recognizing achievement of expected performance results. On the other hand, Bass explained that transformational leadership accommodates the development of followers by challenging their thinking to induce creativity and inspiring and motivating them to achieve more than expected.

**Leadership Research in Sport Management**

In the sport management field, Chelladurai has led the leadership research. Chelladurai (1980) developed the multi-dimensional model of leadership in sport. According to him, this model emphasizes the appropriate combination of three characteristics (i.e., the leader, the situation, and the members), which forms congruent leadership by reflecting three leadership aspects (i.e., required, preferred, and actual leadership). He claimed that congruent leadership significantly affects team outcomes and member satisfaction. In addition, Chelladurai (1993) stated that the leaders need to train themselves so as to make their leadership behaviors better and that such training efforts should be assessed in the perspective of the influences of their behavioral improvement on followers’ performance and satisfaction.

On the other hand, Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) introduced a normative model of three decision-making leadership styles. According to this model, proper leadership styles are determined by taking into consideration environmental factors and followers’ perceived opinions on the leaders’ leadership styles. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) explained this model as follows. First, the autocratic decision style results in dogmatic decision making by the leaders. Second, the delegative style refers to leadership that the leaders implement delegation efforts of transferring the
decision-making power and authority to followers. Third, the participative decision style combines these two extreme leadership styles such that decision-making is implemented by both the leaders and followers. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) explained that the choice of a decision-making style needs to be made by considering situational factors associated with the decision topics and contexts.

The researcher considers that all these leadership research in sport are in line with the transformational and transactional leadership theory. According to the theory of transformational and transactional leadership, the leader (e.g., athletic director) should display different combinations of both transformational and transactional leadership characteristics, which engenders differently appropriate leadership behavior fit to various situations. Such a suggestion for taking different leadership behaviors or styles depending on situations is also a core message of Chelladurai and his colleagues’ leadership models in sport management.

Importance of Transformational and Transactional Leadership in Sport

Chelladurai (2007) emphasized the importance of transformational leadership in sport. He argued that a sport leader’s transformational leadership can transform followers from an easy-going and relaxed individual to a dedicated, committed, and hardworking follower.

Rowold (2006) explained reasons why transformational leadership research is important in sport. First, he argued that transformational leadership has been shown to be valid and effective in a variety of organizations including profit and nonprofit-organizations, educational institutions, religious organizations, the military, and sport organizations. Second, he explained that as there have been research findings that transformational leadership is closely related to various organizational outcomes such
as subordinates’ satisfaction, motivation, commitment, extra efforts, and performance, it would be valuable to study outcomes of transformational leadership in sport.

Lim and Cromartie (2001) also explained that because the world becomes increasingly turbulent, leaders in sport organizations need to possess transformational leadership characteristics in order to achieve better organizational outcomes. Lim and Cromartie (2001) claim that as sport has various transformational contextual issues such as diversity, ethics (e.g., drug, sex scandal, and game fixing scandal), league changes, gender issues and so on, sport leaders should have transformational leadership characteristics as well as transactional leadership characteristics. Even with the importance of transformational leadership in sport, there have been very few studies on transformational and transactional leadership in sport.

Vallee and Bloom (2005) conducted a qualitative study to investigate factors that lead to coaching success in a Canadian collegiate sport setting. They found that those factors were explained by the characteristics of transformational leadership. They emphasized that the leaders “…were visionaries, motivators, goal-setters, and organized leaders who were able to achieve success by gaining commitment and enthusiasm from their followers, and by having them buy into their vision” (Vallee & Bloom, 2005, p. 193). They also found that the coaches’ efforts to build positive relationship with their athletes were very important for the team’s success. They commented, “The coaches worked very hard at developing healthy personal relationships with their players based on trust, respect, communication, and care for the person” (Vallee & Bloom, 2005, p. 193). In addition, they showed that the coaches empowered their athletes for athletes’ leadership development and gave significant individualized consideration to every member of the team. Vallee and Bloom
concluded that the coaches’ transformational leadership fostered their athletes’ holistic development and elicited extraordinary team success.

Doherty and Danylchuck (1996) investigated the coaches’ perceived assessment of the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors of athletic administrators in Ontario universities. They showed that the coaches were more satisfied with the administrators’ transformational leadership characteristics and the contingent reward component of transactional leadership than with the management-by-exception component of transactional leadership. They explained that the administrators’ transformational leadership behaviors were positively related to the coaches’ perceived leadership effectiveness and their initiatives to put extra effort overall, compared to transactional leadership behaviors. Specifically, their study results emphasized the importance of leaders’ active effort to interact with followers.

Geist (2001) conducted research in order to examine perceptual differences about the athletic directors’ transformational leadership behaviors using the perspective of the athletic directors themselves and in the perspective of the middle managers. He showed that athletic directors were more likely to assess themselves as transformational leaders than the middle managers assessed them. Geist pointed out that sport leaders should put more effort to better understand followers by approaching them in collegial and supportive manner to improve organizational effectiveness.

Kent and Chelladurai (2001) examined the impact of transformational leadership of the athletic directors in a large Midwestern university on perceived leader-member exchange equality (LMX) between middle managers (i.e., assistant athletic directors) and their subordinates. They also examined whether subordinates’
organizational commitment and OCB were positively related to both perceived transformational leadership and LMX. Briefly explaining the definition of LMX, Howell and Hall-Merenda (1999) stated that LMX refers to the degree of social exchange relationships between leaders and followers. They explained that a low degree of LMX is made from unidirectional top-down influence, economic-oriented exchange relationships, formally directed job responsibilities, and loosely connected objectives, while a high degree of LMX is established by mutual influence, trust, and interpersonal interaction (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). Kent and Chelladurai (2001) reported the result that a high level of perceived transformational leadership of the athletic directors positively influenced perceived level of LMX and subordinates’ organizational commitment level. In addition, they showed that the level of LMX was positively related to subordinates’ OCB, but surprisingly unlike other research results, no direct relationship was found between transformational leadership and OCB in their study.

Kent (1999) used transformational leadership theory to investigate the impact of top position leaders’ and middle position leaders’ behaviors on subordinates within a parks and recreation department. He showed that both the top position managers’ and the middle position managers’ transformational leadership behavior tended to increase the subordinates’ organizational commitment, their loyalty level toward the organization, and their OCB.

Outcomes of Transformational and Transactional Leadership

A meta-analysis by Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) showed that transformational leadership is a better indicator of outcomes across a variety of organizational settings than transactional leadership. A few examples of outcomes
would be followers’ satisfaction, commitment, turnover intention, OCB, and job performance. In this section, the researcher will review the literature on OCB, job performance, and turnover intention in detail, which are the primary outcome variables of this study. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction will be discussed as mediating variables in the next section.

**OCB**

OCB has been studied as one of the major organizational outcomes by numerous researchers (e.g., Moorman, 1993; Organ & Lingl, 1995; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Organ et al. (2006) defined OCB as “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (p. 8). Katz and Kahn (1966) commented that this type of extra behavior is so mundane that we rarely felt necessary to discuss it, but such behavior is very crucial using the following statement:

> Within every work group in a factory, within any division in a government bureau, or within any department of a university are countless acts of cooperation without which the system would break down. We take these everyday acts for granted, and few of them are included in the formal role prescriptions for any job (p. 339).

Smith et al. (1983) listed some examples of OCB, including arriving at work on time, helping colleagues work while they are absent, not taking undeserved work breaks, voluntarily taking on extra work not formally required, not wasting time in personal conversation, and so on.

Smith et al. (1983) explained OCB using two dimensions: altruism and generalized compliance. They put altruism in the “helping” category, which has been considered an important form of citizenship behavior by numerous researchers (e.g.,
Graham, 1989; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Smith et al. (1983) defined altruism as “…captures behavior that is directly and intentionally aimed at helping a specific person in face-to-face situations (e.g., orienting new people, assisting someone with a heavy workload)…” (p. 657).

The other dimension is generalized compliance, which Smith et al. (1983) put in the “organizational compliance” category. They defined generalized compliance as follows:

… pertains to a more impersonal form of conscientiousness that does provide immediate aid to any one specific person, but rather is indirectly helpful to others involved in the system. The behavior (e.g., punctuality, not wasting time) seems to represent something akin to compliance with internalized norms defining what a ‘good employee ought to do’. (Smith et al., 1983, p. 657)

Organ et al. (2006) explained that this dimension is regarded as a form of OCB as follows:

Generalized compliance appears to capture a person’s individual’s internalization and acceptance of the organization’s rules, regulations, and procedures, which results in a scrupulous adherence to them, even when no one observes or monitors compliance. The reason that this behavior is regarded as a form of OCB is that even though everyone is expected to obey company regulations, rules, and procedures at all times, many employees simply do not. Therefore, an employee who religiously obeys all rules and regulations, even when no one is watching, is regarded as an especially good citizen. (p. 309)

In addition to the two dimensions of OCB, Organ (1988, 1990) later added three more dimensions. According to Organ, those additional dimensions are sportsmanship, civic virtue, and courtesy. Organ (1990) defined sportsmanship as “a citizen-like posture of tolerating the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without whining and grievances…” (p. 96). Organ et al. (2006) argued that Organ’s (1990) definition of sportsmanship is rather narrow because Organ et al. believed that people with sportsmanship not only do not complain when things do not
go well as expected but also are actively willing to accept others’ critique and
sacrifice themselves for the work group.

Civic virtue is “responsible, constructive involvement in the political process
of the organization, including … expressing opinions” (Organ, 1990, p. 96). Organ et
al. (2006) explained civic virtue as follows:

Civic virtue is shown by a willingness to participate actively in its governance
(e.g., to attend meetings, engage in policy debates, express one’s opinion
about what strategy the organization ought to follow, and so on), to monitor
its environment for threats and opportunities (e.g., to keep up with changes in
the industry that might affect the organization), and to look out for its best
interests (e.g., to report fire hazards or suspicious activities, lock doors, and
so on) even at great personal cost. (p. 310)

Organ (1990) defined courtesy as “…subsumes all of those foresightful
gestures that help someone else prevent a problem – touching base with people before
committing to actions that will affect them, providing advance notice to someone who
needs to know to schedule work” (p. 96).

Twigg, Fuller, and Hester (2008, p. 29) claimed, “Transformational leadership
theory provides a more comprehensive means to investigate the effects of leadership
style on citizenship behaviors than previous leadership styles (e.g., leader/member
exchange, contingency, situational, path-goal).” Other researchers (e.g., Bass &
Steidlmeier, 1999; Van Dyne, Graham, & Dienesh, 1994) also agreed upon the merit
of transformational leadership in incurring citizenship behavior by arguing that
transformational leaders enable others to pursue goals beyond the economic, social, or
psychological contracts made by transactional relationship and be ready to sacrifice
themselves for the organizational development. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, &
Fellter (1990) argued that leaders need to be trusted in order to induce follower to be
willing to commit to the organization and take transcendental OCB such as altruism,
generalized compliance, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Bass (1999) claimed that in order to be a trustworthy leader, transformational leadership is required with ongoing leadership development efforts through selection, training, development, and organizational policies.

On the other hand, researchers (e.g., Podsakoff, Bommer, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2004; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996) have shown that transactional leadership has been less likely to give positive influence on OCB than transformational leadership. In general, only contingent reward behavior of transactional leadership has been rather positively related to OCB (e.g., MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Rich, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 1996).

Organ et al. (2006) argued that researchers still have conducted few studies on the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB. They also commented that even the small number of studies considered transformational leadership only and ignored transactional leadership.

Job Performance

Explaining job performance, especially in comparison with effectiveness, Hughes et al. (2008) stated:

Performance concerns those behaviors directed toward the organization’s mission or goals or the products and services resulting from those behaviors. At work or school we can choose to perform a wide variety of behaviors, but performance would only include those behaviors related to the production of goods or services or obtaining good grades. Performance differs from effectiveness, which generally involves making judgments about the adequacy of behavior with respect to certain criteria such as work-group or organizational goals. (p. 370)

Furthermore, Hughes et al. emphasized the role of transformational leadership in showing a high level of performance such that transformational leaders, whether they work for Navy, Air Force, banks, schools, or factories, tend to perform better than
transactional leaders.

According to Charbonneau, Barling, and Kelloway (2001), studies on transformational and transactional leadership and its influence on performance have still been limited in sport management, and most of times, transformational leadership only has been considered without transactional leadership. As one example of studies on transformational leadership and performance, they cited Chelladurai and Saleh’s (1980) study, which revealed that coaches’ social support in order to improve athletes’ welfare (which is similar to individualized consideration in transformational leadership) was positively related to performance.

Turner (2001) stated that the type of performance measure, whether objective or subjective, is crucial in sports. He explained the drawback of using objective performance only. Turner (2001, p. 13) elaborated as follows:

…the drawback of factual performance (i.e., win-loss record) is the difficulty of separating contributions of individuals. For coaches, the skill level of team members plays a vital role in the objective performance of coaches. Many factors may also influence whether his or her team wins or loses (e.g., available resources, skill level of opponents, decisions of referees)…

**Turnover Intention**

Price (1977) explained that turnover conceptually represents how frequently an individual changes one’s membership status from an organization to another organization. It has been shown through many studies that turnover badly affects an organization to a great degree (Shaw, Duffy, Johnson, & Lockhart, 2005). Researchers (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, & Erez, 2001) have claimed that turnover intention is an important organizational outcome variable because it is directly related to actual turnover behavior. Hom and Griffeth (1995) emphasized the importance of researching turnover because turnover may increase an organization’s
costs. The examples of such costs are employee hiring and development cost (e.g., Dess and Shaw, 2001), inefficient production process (e.g., Price, 1989), decreased financial performance (e.g., Huselid, 1995), and many other consequences.

In relation to transformational leadership, Bass (1985, 1998) argued that transformational leadership has been regarded as one of the most important factors that prevent turnover behavior. Researchers (e.g., Griffith, 2004) have shown that transformational leadership is negatively related to turnover intention and actual turnover behavior. Bass (1998) explained that the transformational leader can reduce employees’ turnover by arousing their positive emotions for the leader and the organization and enabling them to internalize the organizational values. Given such an important role of transformational leadership to control turnover behavior, little empirical research has been done in investigating the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover behavior (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995).

Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction as Mediators

Researchers (e.g., Farkas & Tetrick, 1989; Mathieu, 1991; Schappe, 1998) have argued that organizational commitment and job satisfaction need to be considered together because those factors reciprocally affect each other, which results in a high correlation between the two concepts. In that sense, this study will pair up the two concepts, and investigate their roles as mediating variables bridging the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and the outcome variables of OCB, job performance, and turnover intention.

Organizational Commitment

Mowday et al. (1982) defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular
organization” (p. 27). Meyer and Allen (1991) pointed out that although there are numerous definitions about commitment, the core about organizational commitment is “the view that commitment is a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization” (p. 67). Meyer and Allen further explained that it is necessary to acknowledge the nature of the psychological state being described by delving into organizational commitment with its components. In that sense, Meyer and Allen (1991) introduced three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) as follows:

Affective commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so. Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so. Finally, normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization. (p. 67)

Researchers (e.g., Meyer & Allen, 1991; Somers, 1995; Saks, 1995) have suggested a number of studies that employees with strong affective commitment to the organization are more likely to be valuable organizational resources than those with weak commitment. Albeit weaker, normative commitment has been shown to have similar positive effects on the organization (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996). Specifically in relation to the focus outcome variables of the study (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention), organizational commitment positively influences each.

Organizational Commitment and OCB

With regard to the relationship between organizational commitment and OCB,
Meyer and Allen (1997) argued by emphasizing the role of affective commitment, “as many managers have suspected all along, employees with strong affective commitment appear much more willing to engage in OCB than those with weak affective commitment” (p. 34). Similarly, Shore, Barksdale, and Shore (1995, p. 1596) argued:

Logically, a manager may infer that an employee who … goes above and beyond its requirements, thus demonstrating OCB, has a high level of affective commitment, or emotional attachment, to the organization. In contrast, low levels of … OCB may signify to the manager that the employee remains with the organization only because he or she has little or no choice in the manner (continuance commitment).

Contrary to affective commitment, Shore et al. (1995) found negative effects of continuance commitment on OCB. In fact, researchers (e.g., Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Shore & Wayne, 1993) showed that continuance commitment and OCB are not related, while they reported positive relationship between affective commitment and OCB. According to a meta-analysis by Organ and Ryan (1995), there were significant correlations between affective commitment and two OCB dimensions (altruism and generalized compliance) but continuance commitment was unrelated to either of those dimensions.

Normative commitment has been less studied in relation to OCB (Meyer & Allen, 1997). However, Meyer and Allen (1991) reported a positive relationship between normative commitment and OCB, although the influence of normative commitment was weaker than affective commitment.

Organizational Commitment and Job Performance

Researcher (e.g, Bycio et al., 1995; Sager & Johnston, 1989) have shown that employees with strong affective commitment generally put more work efforts and perform their jobs better than those with weak commitment. Affective commitment
has been positively linked to employees’ performance indicators such as sales records (Bashaw & Grant, 1994), supervisors’ assessment for employees’ promotion potential (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989), and overall job performance (e.g., Meyer et al., 1989).

However, in some studies (e.g., Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Williams & Anderson, 1991), commitment was not related to performance. Angle and Lawson (1994) stated that job performance could be affected by a number of factors such as an individual’s abilities, skills, and knowledge; available resources (e.g., time, financial or expert support); and an individual’s motivation level to perform the job. Johns (1991) explained that considering such various factors affecting job performance, even a modest relationship between commitment and job performance should be considered important.

It has been shown that normative commitment positively influences job performance, but to weaker degree than affective commitment (e.g., Ashforth & Saks, 1996). Continuance commitment has been reported as a nonsignificant or negatively related factor in relation to job performance (e.g., Meyer et al., 1989; Shim and Steers, 1994).

Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

Allen and Meyer (1996) reported the result of several literature reviews that organizational commitment was negatively related with both employee turnover intention and actual turnover. Further, Allen and Meyer stated that although associations are strongest for affective commitment, negatively significant relationships are shown between all three commitment dimensions (affective, normative, and continuance) and the turnover variables (turnover intention and actual turnover).
Turner (2001) stated that citing the work of Mathieu and Zajac (1990), turnover intention seems to be better predicted by organizational commitment than actual turnover behavior.

As a next step, the researcher reviewed studies on the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and organizational commitment, since leadership is the focus of this study as an antecedent of organizational commitment.

Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Commitment

Mowday et al. (1982) argued that leadership must be a key element that determines organizational commitment. Emphasizing the importance of transformational leadership in relation to organizational commitment, Gal (1987) argued that the previous leadership models of path-goal or situational leadership are not as effective as transformational leadership in inducing strong commitment of followers.

Bass (1999) argued that transformational leadership strengthens employees’ commitment, involvement, and loyalty more effectively than transactional leadership. Bass (1999) further claimed that transformational leaders inspire followers to have “a sense of obligation to serve the group ahead of oneself and a sense of loyalty to the group to defend its well-being and survival” (p. 23). Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) argued that transformational leaders successfully motivate their followers to be more actively involved in their job and induce them to be more committed to the organization by encouraging them to find out new methods to solve problems and identifying with followers’ needs. Research has suggested that transformational leadership is positively related to organizational commitment in a variety of organizational contexts and cultures (e.g., Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Bono &
Among the three dimensions of organizational commitment, affective and normative commitment are shown to be positively related to transformational leadership while affective commitment is more strongly influenced by transformational leadership (e.g., Bycio et al., 1995; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001, 2003; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). These researchers explained that such associations can be established because transformational leadership engenders strong emotional attachment (i.e., affective commitment) and a sense of moral obligation (i.e., normative commitment) to the organization.

With regard to continuance commitment, Kent and Chelladurai (2001, 2003) decided not to consider this commitment dimension by following the research results of Allen and Meyer (1996) and Bycio et al. (1995) that continuance commitment is a fundamentally distinct concept from affective and normative commitment, and so no association with transformational leadership has been found in the previous studies.

Avolio et al. (2004) and Bono and Judge (2003) claimed that there have not been sufficient empirical studies on the relationship between transformational leadership and followers’ commitment. In this study, the researcher will investigate the relationship in sport context, and in addition, the researcher will consider followers’ job satisfaction along with commitment and furthermore three outcome variables as reviewed earlier.

**Job Satisfaction**

Spector (1997) argued, “Job satisfaction is a topic of wide interest to both people who work in organizations and people who study them. In fact, it is the most frequently studied variable in organizational behavior research” (p. 1). Spector (1997)
defined job satisfaction as “simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (p. 2).

Regarding antecedents of job satisfaction, Kristof (1996) classified them into two major categories. One important category is about the job environment itself and job-related factors, including how people are treated, job characteristics, the relationship with other workers, and rewards. The other category is factors related to an individual employee themselves, including personality and previous job experiences. In this study, the researcher will use leadership, especially transformational and transactional leadership, as an antecedent, which belongs to the first category because leadership is related to the relationship with people in the workplace.

Regarding consequences of job satisfaction, research has shown that job satisfaction is related to a variety of organizational outcomes including job performance, OCB, and turnover intention (e.g., Spector, 1997; Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Crampton & Wagner, 1994).

*Job Satisfaction and Job Performance*

Researchers (e.g., Huselid, 1995; Koys, 2001; Schneider, Hanges, Smith & Salvaggiom 2003) have stated that job satisfaction positively affects job performance. However, it is also necessary to note that a few researchers (e.g., Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990) have stated that job performance can result in job satisfaction because employees who perform well receive rewards, which boost job satisfaction.

*Job Satisfaction and OCB*

Research has found that employees who feel more satisfied with their jobs
appear to more engage in OCB (e.g., Illies, Scott, & Judge, 2006; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004). Kopeland, Brief, and Guzzo (1990) claimed that job satisfaction is likely to induce citizenship behaviors, which encompasses prosocial behaviors such as cooperative attitude that is beneficial for organizational effectiveness. Specifically, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) showed that job satisfaction, measured in an affective or emotional aspect, predicted the altruism dimension of OCB but not the generalized compliance dimension. On the other hand, Williams and Anderson (1991) found that job satisfaction, measured in a cognitive aspect, is positively related to both altruism and generalized compliance.

Organ and Ryan (1995) performed a meta-analysis on the relationship between OCB and job satisfaction. They showed that the mean correlation between altruism and job satisfaction was .24 after reviewing 28 related studies and that between generalized compliance and job satisfaction was .22 after reviewing 25 studies. With regard to these results, Spector (1997) commented that it was necessary to note that correlation alone cannot establish causality.

Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Spector (1997) stated that withdrawal behaviors including turnover intention have been given more attention than any other variables in job satisfaction studies. A number of researchers (e.g., Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, & Summers, 1998; Locke & Latham, 2004) have found that job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intention, which furthermore is directly related to actual turnover. Dissatisfaction must be one of the key reasons employees leave organizations and leadership is greatly related to whether employees feel satisfied or dissatisfied (Sutherland, 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993).
Spector (1997) argued for the causality relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention or turnover by stating:

The reason for certainty about the causal effects of job satisfaction on employee turnover is because longitudinal designs are usually applied in these studies. Job satisfaction is measured in a sample of employees at one point in time. At a later time, perhaps a year later, the researcher determines who has quit. Job satisfaction levels are compared between those who quit and those who did not. It is clear with this design that causality must run from job satisfaction to turnover rather than the reverse because the behavior did not occur until months or in some cases years after the job satisfaction assessment. (p. 62)

Transformational and Transaction Leadership and Job Satisfaction

In the current study, transformational and transactional leadership is an antecedent factor of job satisfaction. Follower job satisfaction has been studied as an outcome of leadership for a long period of time since scholars from The Ohio State University and the University of Michigan started the leadership behavioral research in the 1940s and 1950s (Yukl, 1989). Bass (1990) argued that follower job satisfaction must be one of the most directly impacted important outcomes of leadership. A number of researchers (e.g., Krug, 2003; McElroy, Morrow, & Rude, 2001) agreed that leaders’ role is critical for employee job satisfaction, which continues to have a substantial influence on various organizational outcomes.

Discussing a positive impact of transformational leadership of the athletic director on coaches’ job satisfaction at NCAA Division III institutions, Yusof (1998) argued, “since job satisfaction has been shown to be positively related high subordinates’ performance, low job turnover, low absenteeism, and higher productivity, athletic directors who are transformational will make a significant difference in terms of their organization’s performance and effectiveness” (p. 173). Wallace and Weese (1995) claimed that leaders in the sport context will be more
interested in whether the positive impact of transformational leadership on organizations' member satisfaction found in business, social service, and military organizations will also hold true for the sport world. They continued that sport management researchers need to pay more attention to researching the potential link between transformational leadership and employee satisfaction in sport.

Summary

In the previous section, the researcher reviewed studies on transformational and transactional leadership, their outcomes (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention), and two mediating variables (organizational commitment and job satisfaction) that bridge the relationship between the leadership and outcome variables.

Kent and Chelladurai (2001) emphasized that intercollegiate athletics plays an important role in sports industry due to its significant influence on North American society. Geist (2001) claimed that within intercollegiate athletics, the athletic director is responsible for implementing leadership and managing majority of organizational functions (planning, operating, organizing, and evaluating) regarding the intercollegiate athletic department. However, leadership research, especially focusing on transformational and transactional leadership of the athletic administrators, is still limited, despite its recognized importance in sport management (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Slack, 1996).

Furthermore, it has been widely known that organizational commitment and job satisfaction are significant consequences of transformational and transactional leadership and also have significant relationship with OCB, job performance, and turnover intention as reviewed extensively earlier. For this reason, the current study considers organizational commitment and job satisfaction together as mediating
variables by following the rationale that as job satisfaction and organizational commitment are highly correlated, they should be paired up together in predicting related consequences (e.g., Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988; Schappe, 1998; Williams & Anderson, 1991). With regard to meditational relationship, the current study examines both fully meditational and partially meditational models, so the impact of transformational and transactional leadership will be able to be studied in a different perspective.

In sum, it is necessary to examine the role of transformational and transactional leadership of athletic administrators in assessing organizational outcomes using a meditational model. The researcher believes that this study will add to the body of leadership research in sport management and benefit the management of intercollegiate athletics.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter outlines the procedures used to investigate transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention within intercollegiate athletic directors and coaches. This chapter is presented in five sections: (a) Research Design; (b) Sample; (c) Instrumentation; (d) Data Collection; and (e) Data Analysis.

Research Design

Depending on a research purpose, various research methods are available such as survey research, experimental research, qualitative research, and historical research and so on (Singleton & Straits, 2005). For this study, the researcher adopted a survey research method to examine the athletic directors’ leadership and its consequences, including coaches’ attitudes or opinions and performances. According to Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, and Sorensen (2006), survey research belongs to quantitative research. Quantitative research can be broken into two parts, descriptive and experimental research. Survey research has descriptive research characteristics. Ary et al. (2006) explained that descriptive research pays more attention to describing phenomena itself rather than probing into the reasons why phenomena occur. Therefore, it is important to note that descriptive survey research findings about specific variables should not be
interpreted using causality in explaining a certain association between the variables (Singleton & Straits, 2005).

Survey research is implemented to investigate the characteristics, attitudes, behavior or opinions of a specific population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Salant & Dillman, 1994). Singleton and Straits (2005) stated that systematic sampling needs to be used to ensure accurate predictions about population characteristics. For such an inferential purpose, Ary et al. (2006) emphasized the usage of probability (random) sampling method for examining a target population. With regard to advantages, survey research makes it possible to gather a broad range of information from a large population and to handle the real world setting by directly collecting data from actual situations (Ary et al., 2006; Singleton & Straits, 2005). Singleton and Straits (2005) stated, “Among all approaches to social research, in fact, surveys offer the most effective means of social description; they can provide extraordinarily detailed and precise information about large heterogeneous populations” (p. 226).

However, there are disadvantages in survey research, also. Gratton and Jones (2004) stated that compared to qualitative study, it would be harder to deeply and thoroughly investigate what and how respondents think about survey topics. In addition, Singleton and Straits (2005) stated:

The major disadvantage of surveys relates to their use in explanatory research. Beyond association between variables, the criteria for inferring cause-and-effect relationships cannot be established as easily in surveys as in experiments. For example, the criterion of directionality – that a cause must influence its effect – is predetermined in experiments by first manipulating the independent (or causal) variable and then observing variation in the dependent (or effect) variable. But in most surveys this is often a matter of interpretation, since variables are measured at a single point in time….Thus, the causal inferences from survey research generally are made with less confidence than inferences from experimental research. (p. 227)
Data collection methods in survey research are various as there are many collection channels such as mail, interview, telephone, internet-based survey, email, and so on (e.g., Ary et al., 2006; Dillman, 2000; Singleton & Straits, 2005). Among those methods, the researcher used an internet-based survey (web survey) for the current study. According to Dillman (2000), web surveys reduce various costs related to paper printing, postage, package mailout process, and data entry. Free internet service is increasingly available and if web surveys are done using institutional networking systems in places such as universities, there would be no internet usage cost at all (Mann and Stewart, 2002). Time-saving would be another advantage of web surveys because compared to mail surveys (which could take at least a few weeks to complete data collection) much less time is needed for data collection (Singleton & Straits, 2005). Dillman (2000) also mentioned another advantage that web surveys enable researchers to survey larger sample size and cover broader geographical areas with lower cost because the cost of access to additional subjects is very small compared to traditional mail or interview methods. Additionally, Dillman (2000) stated that web surveys can be made, “to provide a more dynamic interaction between respondent and questionnaire than a paper survey” (p. 354). As another advantage, researchers (e.g., Ary et al., 2006; Gratton & Jones, 2004) mentioned a quick response time due to the guarantee of anonymity and reduction of response bias.

On the other hand, web surveys have some weaknesses, too. Singleton and Straits (2005) stated that the most serious weakness would be coverage error. They further explained that the error is related with the percentage of internet users among the population. For example, Couper (2000) reported, “College graduates are 16 times more likely than others to have internet access, and black and Hispanic households are
only about 40 percent as likely as white households to have home internet access” (p. 471). In that sense, this study surveyed head coaches in universities, so such a coverage error concern was lessened. Mentioning nonresponse error, Couper (2000) stated that web surveys usually show lower response rates compared to traditional mail survey. On the other hand, Kwak and Radler (2002) stated that web survey participants tend to answer specific questions more and also to fill out longer answers than mail survey respondents.

Sample

Singleton and Straits (2005) defined sampling as “the process of selecting a subset of cases in order to draw conclusions about the entire set” (p. 146). They also continued that researchers have a goal of establishing generalization as broad as possible, applicable to the population. Ary et al. (2006) defined population as the whole collection of units that meet specific designated characteristics. Singleton and Straits (2005) further explained that the researcher should clarify the target population, which refers to the whole group to which the researcher hope to generalize the research outcomes, and stated that for such generalization, a sample should be able to represent the target population. In that sense, sampling design is very important.

Sampling design is usually divided into two categories: probability sampling and nonprobability sampling (e.g., Ary et al., 2006; Gratton & Jones, 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005). With regard to probability sampling, Singleton and Straits (2005) explained, “Probability sampling always involves the process of random selection at some stage” (p. 119). In categorizing probability sampling, researchers (e.g., Ary et al., 2006; Gratton & Jones, 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005) stated that there are four types of probability sampling. First, those researchers explained that simple random
sampling refers to such a method that each unit of the target population is designed to be selected with equal probability. Gratton and Jones (2004) explained that simple random sampling is “considered the best technique to obtain a representative sample, and produce findings that will be generalisable to the overall population” (p. 101).

Second, Gratton and Jones (2004) explained stratified random sampling by giving an example such that:

If there are certain subgroups within the population, for example based on age, sex and so on, then it may be necessary to ensure that they are adequately represented in the final sample. In this case, the population is divided into subgroups. Thus, you may divide your population into ‘male’ and ‘female’, and randomly select 50 percent of your sample from the list of your female participants. This will ensure your initial sample reflects the appropriate subgroups that are present within the population. (p. 101)

Third, Singleton and Straits (2005) explained that cluster sampling is implemented by randomly selecting group of subjects rather than selecting individuals. In selecting the cluster, Gratton and Jones (2004) stated that when combining all the selected clusters, the whole combined group should ensure generalization of the results. Fourth, systematic sampling refers to the method that sampling from the target population list is done by following a certain designated selection rule (Gratton & Jones, 2004). In other words, Singleton and Straits (2005) explained, “Systematic sampling consists of selecting every Kth (e.g., fifteenth or twentieth) case from a complete list of file of the population, starting with a randomly chosen case from the first K cases on the list” (p. 131).

With regard to nonprobability sampling, Singleton and Straits (2005) defined this sampling as “processes of case selection other than random selection” (p. 132). Gratton and Jones (2004) stated that by using nonprobability sampling, generalization to the population could not be achieved. Researchers (e.g., Ary et al., 2006; Gratton &
Jones, 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005) explained this sampling by listing several specific method types. First, Singleton and Straits (2005) explained that in using convenience sampling the researcher just approaches a planned number of subjects who are accessible conveniently. Gratton and Jones (2004) claimed that although this method is convenient, the researcher should try to avoid such a temptation “to hand out questionnaires to those you are in day to day contact with, or interview people that you know” (p. 103). Second, purposive sampling can be used when the researcher depends on one’s own expert judgment in choosing subjects who can represent the population (Ary et al., 2006; Singleton & Straits, 2005). The basic strategy in using this method is to identify key variability sources in the population and then to choose a relevant sample that reflects such variability (Singleton & Straits, 2005). Like any other nonprobability sampling, this method has weaknesses, too. Researchers (e.g., Ary et al., 2006; Singleton & Straits, 2005) claimed that purposive sampling cannot be an accurate alternative for probability sampling if precise generalization is necessary. Singleton and Straits (2005) pointed out such a weakness that the research should be equipped with a considerable level of expert knowledge to choose relevant samples using purposive sampling. Third, Singleton and Straits (2005) defined quota sampling as one type of purposive sampling that bears similar characteristics with stratified random sampling. They further explained that this sampling procedure starts with categorizing the population into “relevant strata such as age, gender, race, and geographic region” (p. 134). Singleton and Straits (2005) explained the difference between quota sampling and proportional stratified random sampling is that in quota sampling the case quota is chosen by the researcher’s decision but in stratified random sampling the cases are selected by using simple random sampling. In that sense, Ary
et al. (2006) claimed that the researcher’s bias could be involved in selecting the quota. Fourth, Gratton and Jones (2004) explained snowball sampling that could be done by the way that the researcher “locates the initial participants, and these initial participants identify further potential participants themselves” (p. 103). They further continued that this sampling has an advantage that as the previous participants introduce new participants to the researcher, the greater trust would be established between the researcher and the participants.

On the contrary to the various sampling methods explained above, a census method refers to collecting data on certain variables from every member of the target population (Singleton and Straits, 2005). It has been generally noted that a census method requires a great deal of man power, time, and monetary resources. However, the researcher chose to take a census method for this study because the researcher already had information on every member of the target population and a web survey enabled the researcher to contact every member without spending a great deal of time and monetary resources. Other than these reasons, however, an expected web survey response rate and a sample size requirement for statistical analysis were the main reasons for choosing a census method, which will be discussed in detail later.

Pilot Study

All the survey questionnaire items in this study have shown to be valid and reliable through numerous empirical studies. Face and content validity of the items were further reviewed by three sport management professors who have expertise in the research on leadership and its organizational outcomes. Comments made by these individuals were incorporated to make better of the survey items.

With the refined questionnaire items, a pilot study was conducted. After
permission was secured from The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Committee, a survey invitation email (see Appendix A) was sent to 400 randomly selected head coaches at NCAA Division II institutions. They were asked to click a web survey link to fill out the questionnaire answers. As soon as a coach completed the survey, his or her answers were automatically saved under the researcher’s web survey account. A total of 29 questionnaires were collected from the 400 coaches (7.3% response rate). This low response rate could have occurred because a large number of coaches were off duty as schools just closed their semester or quarter. The collected responses were used to test reliability of subscales of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational commitment, OCB, turnover intention, and job satisfaction. Internal consistency, which is the most commonly used, was taken to measures reliability, and Cronbach’s alpha is usually used to represent internal consistency (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). The pilot study results were presented in Table 1. All the internal consistency measures were comparable to those reported in the literature, except for management by exception – passive of transactional leadership (alpha = .56) and job satisfaction (alpha = .61).
## CRONBACH'S $\alpha$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence - Attributed (4 items)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence - Behavior (4 items)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (4 items)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (4 items)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (4 items)</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward (4 items)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception - Active (4 items)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception - Passive (4 items)</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITMENT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (6 items)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment (6 items)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruism (6 items)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Compliance (8 items)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TURNOVER INTENTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2 items)</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 items)</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Reliability measures from the pilot test

---

*Sample for the Current Study*

For this study, the target population was head coaches of athletic teams at NCAA Division II institutions. To capture an accurate frame, the researcher built a list of all coaching positions in all sports who work for Division II institutions. This list was presented in Table 2. The list was made based on the most updated coaches’ job information gathered from a commercial website (http://www.collegecoachesonline.com).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Coaching Positions (Number of Schools)</th>
<th>% of Total Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's Baseball</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Cross Country</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Diving</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Football</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Golf</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Ice Hockey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Indoor Track</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Lacrosse</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Rifle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Skiing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Soccer</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Swimming</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Volleyball</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Water Polo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Wrestling</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Bowling</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Cross Country</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Diving</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Fencing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Golf</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Gymnastics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Field Hockey</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Ice Hockey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Indoor Track</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Lacrosse</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Rifle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Rowing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Skiing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Soccer</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Softball</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Swimming</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Track</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Volleyball</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Water Polo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3387</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of coaching positions
A total of 4,081 athletic coaching positions exist at Division II institutions. As a result of sorting out coaches’ contact information (i.e., email addresses) pertaining to the 4,081 positions using a statistical software R 2.5.1, 175 coaches’ email addresses were missing and 879 addresses were duplicate. Therefore, excluding the sum of 175 and 879 (i.e., 1,054) from 4,081, the researcher calculated 3,027 which was the number of respectively different coaches’ email addresses. As the researcher already contacted 400 coaches in performing a pilot test, 2,627 coaches were the whole group of prospective subjects (after excluding the 400 from 3,027).

In general, it has been widely accepted that collecting data from approximately 300 subjects is recommended to properly run structural equation modeling (Hair et al., 2006). Considering that the number of prospective subjects was 2,627 and an estimated web survey response rate may be approximately 10% as the researcher has no relationship with the coaches, in which case response rates tend to range from 0% to 20% (Henning, 2009), the researcher determined that the entire 2,627 coaches needed to be contacted. If 10% of the 2,627 coaches respond, 263 surveys could be used. This is still less than but close to the recommended 300 subjects. With this rationale, the researcher chose to use a census method. The 2,627 coaches were invited to a web survey and asked to indicate their perceptions of their athletic directors’ leadership and also to respond to questions on their own organizational behaviors (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention).

Instrumentation

The researcher used theoretically and empirically established scales to measure transformational and transactional leadership, organizational commitment,
job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention. These scales were modified for the current study. The details about each instrument will be described in the following sections.

*Transformational and Transactional Leadership*

Following the recommendation of Bass and Avolio (1995), transformational leadership was measured in five dimensions (levels) – idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Also, following their recommendation, transactional leadership was measured in three dimensions (levels) – contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive).

The athletic directors’ transformational and transactional leadership styles were measured by the 5x-short form Multiple Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). The transformational leadership Likert subscale is composed of 20 items: 4 items for idealized influence (attributed), 4 items for idealized influence (behavior), 4 items for inspirational motivation, 4 items for intellectual stimulation, and 4 items for individual consideration. The transactional leadership Likert subscale is composed of 12 items: 4 items for contingent reward, 4 items for management-by-exception (active), and 4 items for management-by-exception (passive).

Researchers (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1995; Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996) have reported reliability and validity of the MLQ. After testing the MLQ on over 2,000 respondents, Bass and Avolio (1995) showed that all the transformational and transactional leadership dimensions have good internal consistency reliability with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .74 to .94. Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) also
reported satisfactory reliability of the MLQ dimensions with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .74 to .89, larger than .70 suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), by testing the scale on university athletic directors. After conducting extensive content analysis of the MLQ, Bass and Avolio (1995) showed the satisfactory construct validity (convergent and discriminant validity) of the MLQ with significant factor loadings for each leadership construct, ranged from .37 to .88 (mostly over .70), by confirmatory factor analysis.

Head coaches were asked to score each item of a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 = not at all, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = fairly often, 5 = frequently if not always) for their assessment of the athletic directors’ leadership.

Organizational Commitment

As reviewed in Chapter 2, affective and normative commitment dimensions were measured using Meyer and Allen’s (1997) organizational commitment instrument. Affective commitment was measured with eight items and its reliability was .85 using Cronbach’s alpha (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen also reported a reliability value of .73 on normative commitment composed of six items.

Coaches were asked to score each item of a Likert scale from 1 to 7 with anchors labeled (1) strongly disagree and (7) strongly agree.

Job Satisfaction

There are various kinds of job satisfaction scales in organizational behavior and sport management fields. As the current study is concerned with an overall job satisfaction of head coaches, the researcher used a three-item overall satisfaction subscale labeled as the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire developed by Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1979). Camann et al. reported an internal
consistency reliability of .77, although Jex and Gudanowski (1992) reported the score as .87. Coaches were asked to score each item of a Likert scale from 1 to 7 with anchors labeled (1) strongly disagree and (7) strongly agree.

**OCB**

Two dimensions (altruism and generalized compliance) of OCB developed by Smith et al. (1983) were measured using their OCB scale. Altruism was measured with seven items on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 with anchors labeled (1) very characteristic and (5) not at all characteristic. Generalized compliance was measured with nine items on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 with the same labeled anchors. Organ et al. (2006) reported estimates of internal consistency reliability for the altruism scale, ranged from .72 to .91, while those for the generalized compliance were ranged from .80 to .82.

**Job Performance**

Following Turner’s (2001) measurement of performance as mentioned in Chapter 2, the researcher measured head coaches’ performance in both objective and subjective aspects. With regard to assessing performance subjectively, coaches were asked to evaluate their performance by comparing with both other coaches at their universities and coaches of the same sports at other universities. They were asked to choose numbers from (1) poor to (5) outstanding.

Objective assessment was made by asking coaches to provide their previous season’s won-loss record (if applicable) and also their conference standing at the end of the season. As implemented by Turner (2001), the averaged percentile was calculated using each percentile number calculated from won-loss record and conference standing, resulting in a single objective performance measure.
Turnover Intention

As reviewed in Chapter 2, it has been shown that turnover intention is the best indicator of actual turnover behavior (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Mitchell et al., 2001). The researcher used two items to measure turnover intention, which were adapted from a scale developed by Meyer et al. (1993). Those items were as follows with response anchors ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree): first, I frequently think about leaving the athletic department, and second, I would likely leave the athletic department for another coaching position within the next two years.

Demographic Information

Coaches were asked to provide the following demographic information: (a) age; (b) gender; (c) ethnicity; (d) occupational tenure; (e) institutional tenure; (f) number of student-athletes supervised; (g) job status (full time or part time); (h) sport(s) coached; and (i) athletic directors’ gender.

Data Collection

As it was important for the researcher to protect human subjects, the researcher obtained approval from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University. This study used a web survey design. A pre-notification email was sent to head coaches to introduce the researcher, the study purpose, and upcoming study schedule (see Appendix B). On Monday of the following week, the researcher sent the coaches study invitation emails in which the web survey link was included (see Appendix C). The coaches were allowed to voluntarily participate or not participate in the survey. A week after sending the invitation emails, follow-up emails were sent to non-respondents (see Appendix D).

As a result of all these procedures, a response rate of 13.7% \((n = 359)\) was
obtained. Among the 359 respondents, 117 coached men’s teams and 174 coached women’s teams. Furthermore, 66 coached multiple teams (i.e., both men’s and women’s teams), and 2 coaches did not reveal their coaching sports. A response rate by each coaching position is presented in detail in Table 3. The respondents’ demographic information is presented in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Coaching Positions</th>
<th>Total Returned by Positions</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's Baseball</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Cross Country</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Diving</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Football</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Golf</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Ice Hockey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Indoor Track</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Lacrosse</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Rifle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Skiing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Soccer</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Swimming</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Track</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Volleyball</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Water Polo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Wrestling</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Bowling</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Cross Country</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Diving</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Fencing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Golf</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Gymnastics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Field Hockey</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Ice Hockey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Indoor Track</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Lacrosse</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Rifle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Rowing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Skiing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Soccer</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Softball</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Swimming</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Track</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Volleyball</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Water Polo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,387</strong></td>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Response rates by coaching positions corresponding to 2,627 coaches
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall (n=359)</td>
<td>Male (n=256)</td>
<td>Female (n=103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCC. TENURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG. TENURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of ATHLETES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>284 (80.0%)</td>
<td>204 (81.0%)</td>
<td>80 (77.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>71 (20.0%)</td>
<td>48 (19.0%)</td>
<td>23 (22.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
<td>(8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87.1%)</td>
<td>(87.5%)</td>
<td>(86.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER OF AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(85.2%)</td>
<td>(85.1%)</td>
<td>(85.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14.8%)</td>
<td>(14.9%)</td>
<td>(14.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Demographic information of respondents
Non-Response Error

As one type of method to deal with non-response error, Miller and Smith (1983) suggested comparing early to late respondents. It has been shown that late respondents have often similar characteristics with non-respondents, so generalization of the results to the sample can be established if early respondents are not statistically different from late respondents. The researcher considered the coaches who completed the questionnaire after the follow-up emails were sent as late respondents. Those late respondents \((n = 83)\) were compared to the early respondents \((n = 276)\) using independent \(t\)-test in order to determine whether there were significant mean differences between the two groups.

Results showed that late respondents were not significantly different from early respondents on all research variables (i.e., transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, turnover intention, and job performance). Therefore, the researcher concluded that non-respondents were not significantly different from the respondents (see Table 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence – Attributed</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence – Behavior</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception – Active</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception – Passive</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMITMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Compliance</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TURNOVER INTENTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB SATISFACTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No t-values were significant

Table 5. Comparison of early and late respondents
Data Analysis

The data obtained from the respondents were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.0. Descriptive statistics such as means and standard deviations on the sample were investigated to assess whether the data met statistical assumptions such as normality and homogeneity of variance. Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency measures were calculated on the scales to check their reliability.

To test the research hypotheses proposed in Chapter 1, structural equation modeling was used to investigate the relationships among the constructs: leadership (transformational and transactional leadership) as an antecedent, organizational commitment and job satisfaction as mediating variables, and OCB, job performance, and turnover intention as outcome variables.

Structural equation modeling is similar to multiple regression in that relationships for each construct can be represented by a scale, and in addition, structural equation modeling can examine the relationships among measured items by a scale like multiple regression does (Hair et al., 2006). However, the technique has advantages over multiple regression in that unlike multiple regression which handles manifest (observed) variables only, it can simultaneously investigate complex relationships among unknown latent constructs, which cannot be directly measurable (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2007). Therefore, in using structural equation modeling, it is not necessary to try to test the research hypothesis from the first to the fifth one by one because the technique allows the researcher to examine those hypotheses at the same time. Another advantage is that as Hair et al. (2006) stated, the technique can consider
measurement error to calculate more precise relationships among latent constructs, which cannot be done in multiple regression.

As a first step, using SPSS 17.0, an exploratory factor analysis was performed to determine whether each conceptually different dimension within a construct variable was actually distinct. In addition, a correlation matrix was examined to explore preliminary relationships among all research variables.

As a next step, the AMOS version 17.0 statistical software was used to test both measurement models and structural models as a structural equation modeling analysis. The researcher followed two separate procedures for the analysis. First, in order to assess measurement models, a confirmatory factor analysis was implemented on the construct variables (transformational/transactional leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention). Specifically, transactional leadership, organizational commitment, and OCB constructs formed second-order latent constructs. As these constructs were composed of respectively distinguished sub-constructs as a result of an exploratory factor analysis, the sub-constructs formed first-order latent constructs from the relevant manifest (observed) variables. Second, the proposed structural models were assessed by a structural equation modeling, which is “a series of separate, but interdependent, multiple regression equations simultaneously” (Hair et al., 2006, p. 777). In testing structural models, all the variables including the manifest variables and latent constructs were considered in examining relationships among latent constructs. The researcher examined fit levels of the proposed models and relationships between latent constructs.

Lastly, respondents were welcomed to write comments regarding their
thoughts and experiences as intercollegiate coaches in the comment box at the last page of the web survey. Responses are listed in Appendix F.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter, the researcher will describe the results of the quantitative data analysis. The data were collected using the instruments measuring transformational and transactional leadership, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention. The respondents reported their perceptions on their athletic directors’ leadership by answering the leadership instruments and also assessed their own organizational behaviors as NCAA Division II intercollegiate head coaches.

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section contains the results of reliability tests on all scaled variables. In the second section, the researcher reported the results of an exploratory factor analysis to ensure that separately reliable measures were used for assessing the variables. In addition, a correlation matrix was produced to investigate relationships among the variables. The next section contains the results of confirmatory factor analysis that was used to test the hypothesized models.

Reliability Estimates

The internal consistency measures (Cronbach’s alpha) were reported for all research variables (transformational/transactional leadership, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) in Table 6. Using the .70 Cronbach’s alpha criteria suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), all the measures were estimated to be reliable.
As a next step, the statistical assumptions (i.e., normality and homogeneity) were examined for statistical analyses used for this study. The researcher observed no seriously unacceptable violations of the assumptions that may affect results when running structural equation modeling. Regarding the normality assumptions, the researcher used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and a normal Q-Q plot. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed significant results ($p < .05$) for all the variables, meaning that normality assumption was violated. However, the test has a limitation that with large sample sizes significant results can be achieved very easily, so it is not clear whether the deviation from normality is large enough to bias any data analysis procedures (Field, 2005). Therefore, the researcher also checked normal Q-Q plots, and observed that for all the variables, the observed values were not exactly on a straight diagonal line that represents the expected values, while deviations from the line were not seriously large. The result also indicated that normality assumption was violated. However, this slight violation of normality assumption will not severely affect structural equation modeling procedures because structural equation modeling is fairly robust to the violation of normality assumption (Grover & Vriens, 2006).

Regarding homogeneity assumption, Grover and Vriens (2006) explained that in structural equation modeling, the assumption of homogeneity cannot be applied because variances of the elements of the sample covariance matrix have no reasons to be equal. In that sense, the researcher was not concerned about the homogeneity assumption in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Estimates for All Research Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence - Attributed (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence - Behavior (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception - Active (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception - Passive (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (6 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment (6 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism (6 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Compliance (8 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Performance (2 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Performance (2 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TURNOVER INTENTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB SATISFACTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Reliability estimates for all research variables

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to examine how the questionnaire items loaded together for the data collected in this study without consideration of conceptual distinctions among related item clusters. A principal-components analysis was performed as an exploratory factor analysis method, and factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 were extracted. The results of the
principal-components analysis are presented in Table 7.

With regard to transformational leadership, two factors were extracted. However, all 20 transformational leadership items loaded on the first factor with an eigenvalue of 11.4 and 57.2% variance explained while only 6 items loaded on the second factor with an eigenvalue of 1.2 and 6% variance explained. Based on these results of the six items’ cross-loadings and relatively weak contribution of the second factor in explaining variances, the researcher determined to combine the two factors into one global transformational leadership dimension by collapsing all conceptually different categorized four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. In fact, researchers (e.g., Bycio et al., 1995) showed that transformational leadership dimensions failed to exhibit discriminant validity due to high correlations among them. Therefore, the researcher treated transformational leadership as a single dimension in subsequent analyses. The single transformational leadership dimension explained 57.2% of the variance in the measures.

With regard to transactional leadership, three factors were extracted. Four contingent reward items and one management-by-exception (passive) item loaded on the first factor. Four management-by-exception (passive) items loaded on the second factor. Four management-by-exception (active) items loaded on the third factor. As one management-by-exception (passive) item (“My athletic director waits for things to go wrong before taking action”) loaded on more than one factor, the item was removed for the improvement of interpretation. After excluding the item, three distinct factors emerged as conceptually defined in the literature: contingent reward, management-by-exception (passive), and management-by-exception (active). The contingent reward
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigen value</th>
<th>Variance explained (%)</th>
<th>Total variance explained (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception (Active)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception (Passive)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Compliance (Conscientiousness)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Compliance (Conscientiousness)**</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Compliance (Non-tardiness)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TURNOVER INTENTION</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB SATISFACTION</strong></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A factor consisted of negatively worded items
** A factor consisted of reversely coded items

Table 7. Principal-components analysis of variables

factor explained 27.2% of the variance in the transactional leadership measures.

Management-by-exception (passive) and management-by-exception (active)

respectively explained 13.6% and 20.0% of the variance, respectively. In total, 60.8%

of the variance in the transactional measures was explained by the three transactional

leadership dimensions.
With regard to organizational commitment, two factors were extracted. Six affective commitment items and three normative commitment items loaded on the first factor, and four normative commitment items loaded on the second factor. As one normative commitment item (“This athletic department deserves my loyalty”) loaded on more than one factor, the item was removed. In addition, two other normative commitment items (“I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer” and “I owe a great deal to this athletic department) were removed because they loaded on the first factor with six affective commitment items, which was not consistent with factor distinction in the commitment theory. As a result, six affective commitment items formed the first factor by explaining 47.4% of the variance in the commitment measures and three normative commitment items produced the second factor by explaining 17.2% of the variance. In total, 64.6% of the variance in the commitment measures was explained by the affective and normative commitment dimensions.

With regard to OCB, four factors were extracted. All the six altruism items loaded on the first factor but three factors emerged from the eight generalized compliance items. The second factor consisted of three generalized compliance items, and three other items produced the third factor while the remaining two items formed the fourth factor. While research has shown that generalized compliances items tend to split into two factors, Dalton and Cosier (1989) reported that the compliance items loaded on three factors. Furthermore, considering Organ et al.’s (2006) statement that underlying structures of the compliance items are not still clear, the researcher determined to split generalized compliance into three factors as the exploratory factor analysis results indicated. As a result, the first factor composed of the six altruism items explained 22.9% of the variance in OCB. Three of the compliance items (“My
punctuality,” “My attendance at work is above the norm” and “I give advance notice if unable to come to work”) seem to be related to non-tardiness at work and these items produced the second factor by explaining 7.9% of the variance. The three negatively worded compliance items (“I do not take unnecessary time off work,” “I do not take extra breaks,” and “I do not spend time in idle conversation”) seem to be related to conscientiousness at work and these items formed the third factor by explaining 17.8% of the variance. The remaining reverse-scored two items (“I take undeserved breaks,” and “I spend a great deal of time in personal phone conversations) seem to be also related to conscientiousness but produced the separate fourth factor. These results might be obtained because the reverse-scored compliance items loaded on one factor, and the negatively worded items loaded on another factor (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). The fourth factor explained 10.5% of the variance. As a result, the four OCB dimensions explained 59.1% of the variance in total.

With regard to job satisfaction, turnover intention, and job performance, one factor was extracted respectively. A job satisfaction factor explained 78.8% of the variance in the satisfaction measures. A turnover intention factor explained 81.9% of the variance in the turnover intention measures. Lastly, a job performance factor explained 79.1% of the variance in the performance measures.

Table 8 contains the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the study variables. Transformational leadership had no significant positive relationship with the two transactional leadership dimensions – management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive). However, transformational leadership showed a significant positive relationship with the other transactional leadership dimension – contingent reward. Transformational leadership
was significantly related to affective and normative commitment, the altruism 
dimension of OCB, turnover intention, and job satisfaction. Similarly, the contingent 
reward dimension of transactional leadership showed the similar correlation pattern 
with these variables. However, the two remaining transactional leadership dimensions 
had relatively low correlations with these variables.
| Dimension | $M$  | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  |
|-----------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. TF     | 3.28 | 0.91| -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 2. CR     | 3.14 | 1.03| .84 | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 3. MEA    | 2.78 | 0.76| .00 | .05 | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 4. MEP    | 2.94 | 0.91| -.31| -.22| .07 | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 5. AC     | 4.80 | 1.40| .63 | .53 | -.05| -.20| -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 6. NC     | 3.93 | 1.73| .33 | .34 | -.01| -.12| .45 | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 7. ALT    | 3.78 | 0.69| .13 | .11 | .09 | .07 | .20 | .19 | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 8. GC1    | 3.80 | 1.11| .08 | .09 | .01 | -.11| .06 | .01 | .06 | -   | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 9. GC2    | 4.37 | 0.75| .07 | .00 | -.01| -.13| .05 | .07 | .03 | .18 | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| 10. GC3   | 4.45 | 0.62| .02 | .08 | .10 | -.05| -.06| .11 | .16 | .25 | .26 | -   | -   | -   |
| 11. PER   | 2.20 | 0.50| -.04| -.04| -.11| -.08| .02 | .01 | .05 | .08 | .10 | .12 | -   | -   |
| 12. TI    | 3.29 | 1.85| -.52| -.43| .09 | .17 | -.64| -.46| -.04| -.08| -.08| .06 | -.01| -   |
| 13. SAT   | 5.56 | 1.27| .58 | .55 | -.02| -.18| .65 | .45 | .13 | .00 | .06 | .03 | .05 | -.66|

TF = Transformational leadership  
CR = Contingent reward  
MEA = Management by exception (Active)  
MEP = Management by exception (Passive)  
AC = Affective commitment  
NC = Normative commitment  
ALT = Organizational citizenship behavior (Altruism)  
GC1 = Organizational citizenship behavior (Generalized compliance – conscientiousness, negatively worded)  
GC2 = Organizational citizenship behavior (Generalized compliance – conscientiousness, reversely coded)  
GC3 = Organizational citizenship behavior (Generalized compliance – non-tardiness)  
PER = Job performance  
TI = Turnover intention  
SAT = Job satisfaction  
* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

Table 8: Means, standard deviations, and correlation matrix of variables
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Following an exploratory factor analysis procedure, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed to investigate the structural paths between the leadership latent variables and the remaining latent variables. First, the researcher tested a partially mediated and a fully mediated model, which included transformational leadership as seen from Figure 1 and Figure 2. Table 9 includes the fit indices of those models. According to the Hu and Bentler’s (1999) fit guideline, the partially mediated model closely fitted the data (RMSEA = .056) and the fully mediated model also closely fitted the data (RMSEA = .056). These similar fit results indicated that the added three paths to the fully mediated model did not improve the partially mediated model. The evidence was that paths from transformational leadership to OCB, job performance, and turnover intention were not significant in the partially mediated model. In fact, when the researcher started to eliminate the nonsignificant paths, one by one, from the path with the largest $p$-value, those three paths from transformational leadership ended up being eliminated. For this reason, the fully mediated model was used for further analyses. In the fully mediated model, the researcher started to delete nonsignificant paths, one by one, from the path showing the largest $p$-value, and acquired a final model presented in Figure 3. The final model showed a close fit to the data (RMSEA = .059) according to Hu and Bentler’s (1999) fit guideline. Results showed that transformational leadership had positive and direct relationships with organizational commitment and job satisfaction; organizational commitment and job satisfaction had a negative and direct relationship with turnover intention; organizational commitment had a positive and direct relationship with OCB; and job satisfaction had no significant relationship with job performance. Although paths from
Table 9. Results of assessing structural models containing transformational leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>2465.91</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.056*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>2470.05</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.056**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1 = partially mediated model containing transformational leadership
Model 2 = fully mediated model containing transformational leadership
All chi-square values are statistically significant at $p<.01$
$df$ = degrees of freedom
CFI = comparative fit index
RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation
* Confidence interval = (0.053, 0.059)
** Confidence interval = (0.053, 0.059)

job satisfaction to OCB and from organizational commitment to job performance were not presented in the final model, those were eliminated in the process of acquiring the model due to their nonsignificant results.

Within the local relationship between organizational commitment and its two related first order latent variables (i.e., affective and normative commitment), positive relationships were observed. Positive and significant relationships were also observed between OCB and its two generalized compliance variables. In addition, the researcher examined indirect effects of transformational leadership on turnover intention mediated through organizational commitment and job satisfaction and its indirect effect on OCB through organizational commitment. Transformational leadership had an indirect effect of $-0.33 \times (.71 \times -.47)$ on turnover intention through organizational commitment and similarly $0.33 \times (.66 \times -.51)$ through job satisfaction. In total, transformational leadership had an indirect effect of $-0.66 (-0.33 + -0.33)$ on turnover intention through organizational commitment and job satisfaction.
Transformational leadership also had an indirect effect of .17 (.71 \times .22) on OCB through organizational commitment.
$\chi^2 = 2286.70$ with 1023 df
$\chi^2/df = 2.24$, CFI = 0.87
RMSEA = 0.059 with confidence interval (0.056, 0.062)

* $p < .05.$
TF = Transformational leadership
SAT = Job satisfaction
OC = Organizational commitment
AC = Affective commitment
NC = Normative commitment
PER = Job performance
OCB = Organizational citizenship behavior
ALT = OCB (Altruism)
GC1 = OCB (Generalized compliance – conscientiousness, negatively worded)
GC2 = OCB (Generalized compliance – conscientiousness, reversely coded)
TI = Turnover intention

Figure 3. Final model including transformational leadership with path coefficients
In sum, transformational leadership exhibited direct and positive relationships with organizational commitment and job satisfaction; an indirect and negative relationship with turnover intention through organizational commitment and job satisfaction; and an indirect and positive relationship with OCB through organizational commitment. Transformational leadership accounted for approximately 50.9% and 43.4% of the variance in organizational commitment and job satisfaction, respectively. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction accounted for approximately 21.7% and 25.5% of the variance in turnover intention, respectively. Organizational commitment accounted for approximately 4.6% of the variance in OCB. Lastly, job satisfaction and organizational commitment combined accounted for approximately 69.4% of the variance in turnover intention.

Second, the researcher tested a partially mediated and a fully mediated model that included transactional leadership as seen from Figure 1 and Figure 2. Table 10 includes the fit indices of these models. The partially mediated model closely fit the data (RMSEA = .048) and the fully mediated model also closely fit the data (RMSEA = .049). Like transformational leadership, transactional leadership was not directly related with OCB, job performance, and turnover intention in the partially mediated model because the three paths from transactional leadership to the three outcome latent variables were not significant.
Therefore, the fully mediated model was used for further analyses. As a result of conducting nonsignificant path coefficients’ elimination process as done in the model including transformational leadership, the final model including transactional leadership, was acquired as seen in Figure 4. The final fully mediated model showed a close fit to the data (RMSEA = .054). Results showed that transactional leadership had direct and positive relationships with organizational commitment and job satisfaction; and organizational commitment had a direct and negative relationship with turnover intention. In addition, the transactional leadership latent variable was positively related with its sub-construct, contingent reward, but negatively related with management-by-exception (passive). This result indicated that transactional leadership is strengthened (i.e., increasingly influenced) by a leader’s contingent reward behavior but weakened (i.e., decreasingly influenced) by management-by-exception (passive) behavior in the current study. Management-by-exception (active) was not shown in the model due to its nonsignificant relationship with transactional leadership.

Table 10. Results of assessing structural models containing transactional leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \chi^2/df )</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>1390.08</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>1407.91</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>0.049**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 3 = partially mediated model containing transactional leadership.
Model 4 = fully mediated model containing transactional leadership.
All chi-square values are statistically significant at \( p < .01 \).
\( df \) = degrees of freedom
CFI = comparative fit index.
RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.
* Confidence interval = (0.044, 0.052)
** Confidence interval = (0.045, 0.053)
leadership. Organizational commitment was positively related with affective and normative commitment constructs, and OCB was significantly related with its two generalized compliance sub-constructs but not with altruism. With regard to the indirect effect, transactional leadership had an indirect effect of -.64 (.95 × -.67) on turnover intention through organizational commitment. In sum, transactional leadership exhibited direct and positive relationships with organizational commitment and job satisfaction; and an indirect and negative relationship with turnover intention through organizational commitment.

Transactional leadership accounted for approximately 89.7% and 80.0% of the variance in organizational commitment and job satisfaction, respectively. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction accounted for approximately 45.0% and 4.8% of the variance in turnover intention, respectively. Organizational commitment accounted for approximately 23% of the variance in OCB. Lastly, job satisfaction and organizational commitment combined accounted for approximately 75.5% of the variance in turnover intention. However, in interpreting the meanings of these relationships, it needs to be noted that the relationships between job satisfaction and turnover intention and between organizational commitment and OCB were not significant ($p < .06$) when using the .05 significance level.
Figure 4. Final model including transactional leadership with path coefficients

\[ \chi^2 = 1052.22 \text{ with } 513 \text{df} \]
\[ \chi^2/df = 2.05, \ CFI = 0.90 \]
\[ \text{RMSEA} = 0.054 \text{ with confidence interval } (0.050, 0.059) \]

\( p < .05 \)
\( p < .06 \)

TS = Transactional leadership
CR = Contingent reward
MEP = Management by exception (Passive)
SAT = Job satisfaction
OC = Organizational commitment
AC = Affective commitment
NC = Normative commitment
PER = Job performance
OCB = Organizational citizenship behavior
ALT = OCB (Altruism)
GC1 = OCB (Generalized compliance – conscientiousness, negatively worded)
GC2 = OCB (Generalized compliance – conscientiousness, reversely coded)
TI = Turnover intention
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The primary purposes of this study were to (a) compare athletic directors’ transformational and transactional leadership in terms of their effects on head coaches’ various organizational attitudes or behaviors (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intention), (b) investigate roles of organizational commitment and job satisfaction as mediators between transformational and transactional leadership and organizational outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention), (c) examine whether transactional and transformational leadership affect the outcome variables only through the two mediators or not. A discussion of the results will be explained following the above format. This chapter also includes recommendations for future studies and practical implications of this study.

Instrument

Prior to discussing the study results, the psychometric properties of instruments used in this study are discussed. First, all the scales used in this study were shown to be reliable by passing the .70 Cronbach’s alpha criteria suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). Specifically, transformational and transactional leadership were found to be reliable, with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .70 to .91. These were consistent with the reliability measures of .74 to .94 reported by Bass and
Avolio (1994). With regard to organizational commitment, affective and normative commitment were found to be reliable, with Cronbach’s alphas of .85 and .84, respectively. The affective commitment reliability was consistent with the Cronbach’s alpha of .85 reported by Meyer and Allen (1997), and the normative commitment reliability was higher than the reliability of .73 reported by Meyer and Allen (1997). Job satisfaction was found to be reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .86. This result was consistent with the reliability of .87 reported by Jex and Gudanowski (1992). With regard to OCB, altruism was found to be reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .80 and generalized compliance was also reliable with .71. The altruism reliability was consistent with the reliability measures of .72 to .91 reported by Organ et al. (2006), while the generalized compliance reliability was lower than the reliability estimates of .80 to .82 also reported by Organ et al. With regard to job performance, objective and subjective performance were found to be reliable, with Cronbach’s alphas of .90 and .83, respectively. These reliability measures were higher than .87 for objective performance and .76 for subjective performance reported by Turner (2001). Lastly, turnover intention was also found to be reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .78, which is similarly consistent with the .80 reported by Turner (2001). Overall, the results of reliability tests were consistent with previous studies and acceptable in the social science research field.

Next, the results of an exploratory factor analysis showed that the questionnaire items within a specific construct successfully loaded together on one factor after several items (which loaded on more than one factor) were eliminated. With regard to the elimination, four questionnaire items in total were eliminated: one item for management-by-exception (passive) in transactional leadership and three
items for normative commitment in organizational commitment. As the elimination did not alter the original meanings of transactional leadership and organizational commitment, the researcher continued to perform a confirmatory factor analysis to test structural models, and the results are discussed in the following sections.

Comparison of Transformational and Transactional Leadership

In Chapter 1, the first test hypothesis was to investigate whether transformational leadership is more related to outcome variables (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and decreased turnover intention) than transactional leadership.

Hypothesis 1: Transformational leadership is more related to outcome variables (organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and decreased turnover intention) than transactional leadership.

This hypothesis was partially supported primarily because the contingent reward dimension of transactional leadership affected other variables in an opposite direction in comparison with management-by-exception, the other dimension of transactional leadership. The transactional leadership construct, which was positively affected by contingent reward but negatively by management-by-exception in this study, was related to outcome variables in the same pattern of directional paths with similar magnitudes of coefficients when compared to transformational leadership, as observed in Figure 5 and 6. This corresponds to Bass and Riggio’s (2006) argument that similar to transformational leadership, contingent reward tends to be reasonably effective in positively influencing employees’ organizational behavior and performance while management-by-exception has been found to less effectively affect
organizational variables than transformational leadership or contingent reward. Other researchers (Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Lowe et al., 1996) also showed that contingent reward strongly correlated with leader effectiveness like transformational leadership, whereas management-by-exception had no or a negative relationship with leader effectiveness.

The researcher found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment were directly explained by both transformational and transactional leadership. OCB, job performance, and turnover intention were not directly related to leadership. Once again, it is necessary to note that the transactional leadership construct in this study was positively related with its contingent reward dimension but negatively related with its management-by-exception dimension. So for example, if transactional leadership was positively related to an outcome variable, the outcome variable was also positively related to contingent reward but negatively to management-by-exception.

Regarding organizational commitment, the researcher found that transformational leadership accounted for approximately 50.9% of the variance in organizational commitment, and transactional leadership accounted for approximately 89.7% of the variance in organizational commitment. In addition, transformational leadership had an indirect effect of .67 on affective commitment and an indirect effect of .39 on normative commitment through their higher construct (i.e., organizational commitment) but transactional leadership had an indirect effect of .89 on affective commitment and an indirect effect of .57 on normative commitment through the organizational commitment construct. From these results, the researcher showed that both transformational leadership and transactional leadership were related to both
affective and normative commitment as Kane and Tremble (2002) showed similar results in their study of U.S. Army leaders. However, transactional leadership accounted for more of the variance in organizational commitment than transformational leadership. This may be compared to Doherty and Danylchuck’s (1996) study. Although the authors failed to find any significant relationship between all transformational and transactional leadership dimensions measured on athletic directors and the coaches’ commitment, they showed that only the contingent reward dimension closely approached significance. The authors explained that the promise of rewards may strengthen coaches’ commitment to athletic departments as rewards are directly given by departments while the link between leader behaviors and coaches’ commitment to department may be too indirect. Recalling that transactional leadership was mainly determined by contingent reward in this study, the authors’ explanation is noteworthy. If the researcher followed this explanation, transactional leadership more greatly affected organizational commitment because contingent rewards influence on departmental commitment may be more direct than leader behaviors.

Second, regarding job satisfaction, transformational leadership accounted for approximately 43.4% of the variance in job satisfaction, and transactional leadership accounted for approximately 80.0% of the variance in job satisfaction. This result is somewhat different from previous research. Researchers (Dumdum et al., 2002; Lowe et al., 1996) showed that transformational leadership was generally more strongly related with job satisfaction than transactional leadership. Bass (1990) also argued that highly transformational leaders who pursue higher goals such as justice and humanitarianism are more likely to increase followers’ job satisfaction. However,
these researchers’ positions were not supported in this study. A possible explanation may be that monetary compensation (e.g., contingent reward) could be a more influencing incremental factor that further improves coaches’ job satisfaction than any other intangible leadership behaviors. In fact, several respondents in this study commented that they love coaching regardless of their current athletic directors or departments but as intercollegiate coaches receive significantly little compensation, monetary issues are the only factor that negatively affects their passion about coaching (see Appendix F).

Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

The second and third hypotheses were to investigate whether organizational commitment and job satisfaction, respectively, were positively related to OCB, job performance, and turnover intention.

Hypothesis 2: Organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) will be positively associated with OCB, job performance, and decreased turnover intention.

Hypothesis 3: Job satisfaction will be positively associated with OCB, job performance, and decreased turnover intention.

These hypotheses were partially supported and the results varied depending on whether transformational leadership or transactional leadership was the antecedent. When transformational leadership was an antecedent, organizational commitment was positively related to OCB and decreased turnover intention, but not related to job performance. Job satisfaction was positively related to decreased turnover intention, but not related to job performance and OCB. On the other hand, when transactional leadership was an antecedent, organizational commitment was positively related to
decreased turnover intention only. Job satisfaction was not related to any outcome variable.

Regarding organizational commitment and OCB in relation to transformational leadership as an antecedent, the results of this study parallel previous research. Foremost, the results are meaningful because the influence of transformational leadership on OCB was confirmed such that Daft (1999) previously argued, “Transformational leadership inspires followers to go beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group” (p. 428). Back to the relationship between organizational commitment and OCB, researchers (e.g., Scholl, 1981; Weiner, 1982; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986) theoretically or empirically showed that organizational commitment is closely related to OCB. Kim and Chang (2007) also found that organizational commitment significantly affected employees’ OCB in sport organizations. In addition, this study showed that organizational commitment influenced more on generalized compliance dimensions than on an altruism dimension, which corresponds to previous studies. For example, Organ and Ryan (1995) reported that a correlation between organizational commitment and generalized compliance was greater than that between commitment and altruism. The researcher speculates that this result may occur because altruism requires more proactive initiatives to actively “help” others, but, on the other hand, generalized compliance does not require immediate efforts to “help” others (Organ et al., 2006), so it might be easier for the coaches to act on generalized compliance than altruism. However, when transactional leadership was an antecedent, organizational commitment was not significantly related to OCB. In fact, this result seems to confirm the nature of transactional leadership. As Hughes et al. (2008) explained that
Transactional leadership primarily focuses on implementing mutually agreed contracts between the leader and followers, followers’ voluntary efforts to contribute to an organization beyond the agreed tasks could not be expected and also observed in the workplace.

Regarding organizational commitment and turnover intention, the results of this study correspond to previous studies when both transformational and transactional leadership were antecedent. It has been generally shown that organizational commitment is negatively related with turnover intention (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Turner (2001) found that organizational commitment of head coaches at NCAA Division I and III institutions was significantly and negatively related to turnover intention. Similarly, Kim and Chang (2007) showed that a sport organization with high employee turnover intentions tends to have low organizational commitment.

Regarding organizational commitment and job performance, no significant relationship was found regardless of whether the antecedent was transformational or transactional leadership. These results were contradictory to previous studies. For example, Turner (2001) found that using both objective (i.e., won/loss record and conference standings) and subjective (i.e., coaches’ self-ratings) performances, positive and significant relationships were observed between performance and organizational commitment (both affective and normative commitment). Especially emphasizing the role of affective commitment, Turner explained that highly committed coaches want to continue to work in their organizations, which connects to a high level of performance. However, such positive and significant relationships were not observed. From the coaches’ comments (see Appendix F), the researcher
speculates that even highly committed coaches could not necessarily result in high performance because regardless of their commitment level, a low degree of departmental support prevented them from achieving high performance. Another reason may be that committed coaches had not been rewarded appropriately in the past despite their successful performance, so they had no motives to put more efforts to improve performance.

Next, the resulted relationships between job satisfaction and outcome variables are discussed. Regarding job satisfaction and turnover intention, the results of this study correspond to previous research (e.g., Bluedorn, 1982; Crampton & Wagner, 1994) when transformational leadership was an antecedent. Spector (1997) very strongly argued that from previous studies it appears to be certain that job dissatisfaction causes turnover behavior. Spector (1997) explained his argument in detail:

The reason for certainty about the causal effects of job satisfaction on employee turnover is because longitudinal designs are usually applied in these studies. Job satisfaction is measured in a sample of employees at one point in time. At a later time, perhaps a year later, the researcher determines who has quit. Job satisfaction levels are compared between those who quit and those who did not. It is clear with this design that causality must run from job satisfaction to turnover rather than the reverse because the behavior did not occur until months or in some cases years after the job satisfaction assessment. (p. 62)

However, it needs to be noted that when transactional leadership was an antecedent, job satisfaction was not significantly related to turnover intention. The researcher speculates that the type of job satisfaction that the coaches felt was different between when leaders showed transformational leader behavior and when they showed transactional leader behavior, such results were shown. Specifically, under transactional leadership (i.e., represented by contingent reward), job satisfaction that
the coaches felt might be temporary and not influencing other types of organizational behavior because the effects of contingent reward tended to be short-term. On the other hand, under transformational leadership, the coaches might feel more fundamental and long-term satisfaction in their jobs, so job satisfaction might have a significant and negative relationship with turnover intention. As a matter of fact, Bass and Riggio (2006) argued that transactional leadership could engender immediate satisfaction but not necessarily long-term positive effects. In that sense, such different aspects of the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention under the two different leadership types need to be further examined in the context of intercollegiate athletics.

Regarding job satisfaction and job performance, the results did not meet an expected hypothesis that job satisfaction is positively related to job performance. A possible explanation may be that if coaches were not rewarded appropriately as several respondents commented, a high correlation between the two variables might not be observed, regardless of types of leadership. In fact, Jacobs and Solomon (1977)’s showed that a strong relationship was observed between job satisfaction and job performance in organizations where rewards were tied well to high job performance. From a different perspective but also emphasizing the role of rewards, Spector (1997) stated:

Although it is possible that job satisfaction leads to job performance, the opposite direction of causality is also equally feasible… There is stronger evidence that people who perform better like their jobs better because of the rewards that are often associated with good performance. (p. 56)

Because of this reason, the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance needs to be investigated by differentiating organizations in terms of rewards given to employees.
Regarding job satisfaction and OCB, the results of this study were contradictory to previous studies’ finding that job satisfaction tends to be correlated with OCB (e.g., Becker & Billings, 1993; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991). However, similar to this study’s results, Schappe (1998) did not find that job satisfaction is a significant predictor of OCB, and he explained that referring to the studies of Moorman (1991) and Organ (1988), when fairness perceptions are involved, job satisfaction will not affect OCB. Schappe further explained that because job satisfaction and fairness perceptions may share a certain common construct, satisfaction may not be related to OCB when fairness perception is considered. In fact, in this study, fairness perception was not explicitly considered as a variable but the researcher speculates that fairness perception might be unconsciously involved when respondents filled out the questionnaire. Such a reason was drawn from respondents’ comments that some, especially those who were working for less popular sports to the public, felt unfairness from their athletic directors or university administrators because the coaches were not provided appropriate support for the team operations compared to the coaches working for popular sports such as football and basketball (see Appendix F). Therefore, it may be possible that no significant relationship was observed between job satisfaction and OCB because fairness perception was implicitly involved.

Model Comparison

In testing the last two hypotheses, a structural equation modeling analysis showed that a fully mediated model is better than a partially mediated model. In other words, hypothesis 5 was supported but hypothesis 4 was not.

Hypothesis 4: The relationship between transformational or transactional
leadership and outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) will be partially mediated by organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and outcome variables (OCB, job performance, and turnover intention) will be fully mediated by organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Specifically, when transformational leadership was an antecedent, turnover intention was indirectly and negatively related to the leadership through job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and OCB was indirectly and positively related to the leadership only through organizational commitment. When transactional leadership was an antecedent, only turnover intention was indirectly and negatively related to the leadership through organizational commitment. Overall, these results indicate that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are important variables that connect relationships between leadership and certain organizational outcomes such as turnover intention and OCB.

The local relationships between leadership and mediators and also those between mediators and outcome variables were already discussed earlier, so indirect relationships from leadership to outcome variables are discussed in this section. Regarding transformational leadership and turnover intention, the researcher speculates that it would make more sense that transformational leadership indirectly affects turnover intention through organizational commitment and job satisfaction because followers become more committed and satisfied under transformational leadership and due to increased level of commitment and job satisfaction in the
current workplace, they are more likely to stay in their organizations. However, when transactional leadership was an antecedent, it was also indirectly related to turnover intention through organizational commitment, but not through job satisfaction. As mentioned earlier, the type of job satisfaction that the coaches felt under transactional leadership might be more short-term and temporary than that under transformational leadership, so job satisfaction might not be a mediator between transactional leadership and turnover intention.

Transformational leadership was indirectly and positively related to OCB through organizational commitment but not through job satisfaction. These results are similar to Schappe’s (1998) study that only organizational commitment was significantly related to OCB when job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perception were considered together. As discussed earlier, because fairness perceived by followers was not controlled in this study job satisfaction might not be related to OCB. On the other hand, transactional leadership was not related to OCB through any mediator. As discussed earlier, this nonsignificant relationship might be due to the nature of transactional leadership as opposed to the nature of transformational leadership.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study attempted to examine some of the research hypotheses regarding transformational and transactional leadership and other important organizational behavior variables in the context of NCAA Division II intercollegiate athletics. More studies are needed to further investigate transformational and transactional leadership in sport.

First, leadership and followers’ organizational behavior need to be examined
by using 360 degree format questionnaires rather than self-rating formats. In this study, all the leadership and organizational behavior items were measured by head coaches (i.e., in the perspective of followers). Geist (2001) found that athletic directors’ transformational leadership was rated lower by their followers (middle managers) than by the athletic directors themselves and that the contingent reward dimension of transactional leadership was also rated lower by the followers. Similarly, with regard to organizational behavior variables, self-rating only may not capture actual aspects of followers’ organizational behaviors. By designing leadership and follower behaviors to be assessed by both a leader and followers, the relationships between leadership and other organizational behavior variables would be more objectively investigated.

Second, the relationship between leadership (either transformational or transactional) and job performance needs further investigation. In this study, job performance was not directly related to leadership and also was not indirectly related to leadership through job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Specifically, it is surprising that unlike previous research (e.g., Bass & Riggio, 2006), no relationship was found between transformational leadership and job performance because transformational leadership has been known to bring about exceptional performance beyond expectation. Further studies are needed to examine the role of transformational and transactional leadership in relation to followers’ job performance.

Third, this study did not focus on analyzing transformational and transactional leadership in relation to various demographic variables such as gender, race, and experience, but focused on path analyses between leadership and other organizational behavior variables. Future studies need to compare multiple
dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership in relation to demographic variables in order to have more detailed descriptive knowledge on intercollegiate sport leadership.

Fourth, this study found that contingent reward was effective in engendering positive organizational behavior, showing that improving followers’ organizational behavior or attitude was not limited to transformational leadership. Especially in a direct relationship with job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the effects of contingent reward were greater than those of transformational leadership. Further studies are needed to examine the role of contingent reward in comparison to transformational leadership.

Finally, research on leadership development or training is needed in sport contexts. Although significant studies have been done in transformational leadership development (e.g., Avolio & Bass, 1994) in a variety of fields, few studies have been done on leadership development in sport contexts. For future studies, transformational leadership researchers in sport may need to consider the statement of Bass and Riggio (2006) that it is needed to understand the roots of transformational leadership development as successful transformational leadership training requires such fundamental understanding.

Practical Implications

Several practical implications were drawn from the results of this study for practitioners in intercollegiate athletic departments. The researcher considers that helpful points for practitioners can be discussed in the following two categories: (a) the importance of contingent reward, as well as transformational leadership and (b) withdrawal behavior and OCB of coaches in relation to job satisfaction and
organizational commitment.

The results of this study showed that contingent rewards significantly influenced job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Transactional leadership (mainly represented by contingent reward) accounted for approximately 80.0% and 89.7% of the variance in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, respectively. This amount of variance explained was even greater than the amount explained by transformational leadership. The effectiveness of transactional leadership shown in this study corresponds to researchers’ (e.g., Burns, 1978; Daft, 1999) remarks that transactional leadership is important in satisfying followers’ needs and maintaining organizational stability by focusing on a follower commitment through implementing mutually agreed upon contracts between the organization (or the leader) and followers. Some effective ways to implement transactional leadership may be to offer better compensation packages to the coaches or to provide better resources or budgets to upgrade team operations and athletic training facilities. Athletic directors or university administrators need to bear in mind that compensation or budget issues are critical if they want satisfied and committed coaches. However, it is obviously hasty that transactional leadership is better than transformational leadership because transformational leadership seems to affect a broader range of organizational outcomes than transactional leadership. This is discussed in relation to withdrawal behavior and OCB.

When transformational leadership was considered as an antecedent, it indirectly affected turnover intention through both job satisfaction and organizational commitment and also affected OCB through organizational commitment. On the other hand, when transactional leadership was an antecedent, it affected turnover intention
only through organizational commitment and had no effect on OCB either directly or indirectly. These results indicate that transformational leadership engenders positive effects in the organization to a broader extent than transactional leadership. It was surprising that any type of leadership did not affect job performance in this study, but considering that turnover intention and OCB were also important variables measuring organizational outcomes, athletic directors or administrators need to consistently develop their transformational leadership qualities. Hughes et al. (2008) emphasized, “Transformational leaders possess good visioning, rhetorical, and impression management skills and use them to develop strong emotional bonds with followers” (p. 648). This statement seems to be very meaningful to athletic directors or administrators in that a majority of the respondents in this study wanted visionary and emotionally attached leaders as observed from their comments (see Appendix F).

Lastly, the researcher emphasized Bass’ (1999) argument that transactional leadership cannot be replaced by transformational leadership. Rather, transformational leadership augments the effects of transactional leadership (Bass, 1999). It was clearly shown that transactional leadership, especially contingent reward, positively affects followers’ organizational behavior and that transformational leadership more broadly affected followers beyond the extent of effects that transactional leadership engenders. In that sense, this study confirmed the argument of Bass (1999) that the best leader has all aspects of transformational and transactional leadership.
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APPENDIX A
Email – Pilot Study
May 4, 2009

Dear Coach:

We are conducting research on intercollegiate athletic coaches’ organizational behaviors and their perceptions of their athletic director’s leadership. Our focus of research is to find out some meaningful relationships between the director’s leadership and your attitudes and behaviors in the organization. A better understanding of this issue may be of interests to coaches, athletic directors and administrators, and other university personnel. We are inviting you to participate in our research examining the issue as a head coach at the Division II level. Your input is the most important and invaluable part of this study.

This study is being conducted by Hakwoo Kim and Dr. Brian Turner from The Ohio State University. Participation in this research is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any point without penalty and may refuse to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. By completing this online survey, you consent to participate. Although respondents receive no personal benefit or reward for their participation, your responses will contribute to the expanding sport management knowledge base. It is expected that the questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. You can access the questionnaire by clicking on the following link:

https://surveys.ehe.osu-state.edu/TakeSurvey.aspx?EID=981B5m3B038BL12o6MB776B059B082

If you are not able to click on the link due to some reasons, you may copy and paste the link address into your browser.

Please be assured that the survey software program in this study allows for anonymous collection of data (i.e., email address will not be linked to respondents). Although every effort to protect confidentiality will be made, no guarantee of internet survey security can be given, as, although unlikely, transmissions can be intercepted and IP addresses can be identified. The results of the study will not be linked to any individual or institution, and any discussion will be based only on group data.

If you have any questions concerning your research rights at any time, contact either Hakwoo Kim at kim.2130@osu.edu or 734-657-6566 or Dr. Brian Turner at bturner@ehe.osu.edu or 614-247-8374. In addition, for questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Please complete the survey by May 12, 2009. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Hakwoo Kim
Ph.D. candidate
Ohio State University

Dr. Brian Turner,
Assistant Professor
Ohio State University
APPENDIX B

Email – Pre-Notification
May 27, 2009

Dear Coach:

This email is intended to introduce myself and a research proposal in which you have been randomly selected to participate. My name is Hakwoo Kim and I am a Ph.D. candidate in Sport Management at The Ohio State University. Along with Dr. Brian Turner from The Ohio State University, I am conducting some important research that pertains to the organizational behaviors of intercollegiate coaches and the leadership of athletic directors.

You will be receiving another email which includes an internet link connecting to a brief (10-15 minutes) web survey questionnaire on June 1. By means of this brief introduction I am requesting that you kindly participate in this research project for which you have been randomly chosen. Please note that participation in this study is voluntary and your non-participation will not be known to anybody. Your participation would, however, be greatly appreciated and is crucial to the success of this research endeavor. After completing this research, I will send you a copy of research results.

I thank you in advance for your time and assistance in this important project. You can expect the questionnaire and a more detailed description of the study to arrive at your email account on June 1. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Hakwoo Kim at kim.2130@osu.edu or 734-657-6566 or Dr. Brian Turner at bturner@ehe.osu.edu or 614-247-8374.

Sincerely,

Hakwoo Kim
Ph.D. candidate
Ohio State University

Dr. Brian Turner,
Assistant Professor
Ohio State University
APPENDIX C

Email – Study Invitation
June 1, 2009

Dear Coach:

We are conducting research on intercollegiate athletic coaches’ organizational behaviors and their perceptions of their athletic director’s leadership. Our focus of research is to find out some meaningful relationships between the director’s leadership and your attitudes and behaviors in the organization. A better understanding of this issue may be of interests to coaches, athletic directors and administrators, and other university personnel. We are inviting you to participate in our research examining the issue as a head coach at the Division II level. Your input is the most important and invaluable part of this study. If your institution does not belong to the Division II any more, you can still participate in this survey but please note the Division change in the comment box on the last page of this web survey.

This study is being conducted by Hakwoo Kim and Dr. Brian Turner from The Ohio State University. Participation in this research is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any point without penalty and may refuse to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. By completing this online survey, you consent to participate. Although respondents receive no personal benefit or reward for their participation, your responses will contribute to the expanding sport management knowledge base. It is expected that the questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. You can access the questionnaire by clicking on the following link:

https://surveys.ehe.ohio-state.edu/TakeSurvey.aspx?EID=981B5m3B038BLL2o6MB776B059B082

If you are not able to click on the link due to some reasons, you may copy and paste the link address into your browser.

Please be assured that the survey software program in this study allows for anonymous collection of data (i.e., email address will not be linked to respondents). Although every effort to protect confidentiality will be made, no guarantee of internet survey security can be given, as, although unlikely, transmissions can be intercepted and IP addresses can be identified. The results of the study will not be linked to any individual or institution, and any discussion will be based only on group data. We will send you a copy of research results soon after completing this study.

If you have any questions concerning your research rights at any time, contact either Hakwoo Kim at kim.2130@osu.edu or 734-657-6566 or Dr. Brian Turner at btturner@ehe.osu.edu or 614-247-8374. In addition, for questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251. Thank you very much.
Sincerely,

Hakwoo Kim
Ph.D. candidate
Ohio State University

Dr. Brian Turner,
Assistant Professor
Ohio State University
APPENDIX D

Email – Follow-Up
June 8, 2009

Dear Coach,

You should have already received an email containing a web survey questionnaire link concerning intercollegiate athletic coaches’ organizational behaviors and their perceptions of their athletic director's leadership. This web survey link was emailed to a random sample of head coaches at the NCAA Division II level. To get an accurate view of organizational behaviors and leadership within intercollegiate sport, your input is vitally important. A better understanding of this issue may be of interest to coaches, athletic directors and administrators, and other university personnel.

If you have already completed the web survey, please accept our sincere thanks. If you have not yet filled it out, please do so by June 14, 2009. The questionnaire should only take 10-15 minutes for you to complete. You can access the questionnaire by clicking on the following link:

https://surveys.ehe.ohio-state.edu/TakeSurvey.aspx?EID=981B5m3B038BL12o80B776B059B082

Please be assured that the survey software program in this study allows for anonymous collection of data (i.e., email address will not be linked to respondents). Although every effort to protect confidentiality will be made, no guarantee of internet survey security can be given, as, although unlikely, transmissions can be intercepted and IP addresses can be identified. The results of the study will not be linked to any individual or institution, and any discussion will be based only on group data.

If you did not receive the web survey link or if you were not connected to the web survey questionnaire after clicking the link, please feel free to contact either Hakwoo Kim at kim.2130@osu.edu or 734-657-6566 or Dr. Brian Turner at bturner@ehe.osu.edu or 614-247-8374 to solve the problems. In addition, for questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Hakwoo Kim
Ph.D. candidate
Ohio State University

Dr. Brian Turner,
Assistant Professor
Ohio State University
APPENDIX E

Web Survey Questionnaire
A Study Measuring Athletic Directors' Leadership and Head Coaches' Organizational Behaviors in NCAA Division II Institutions

Hakwoo Kim
School of Physical Activity and Educational Services
The Ohio State University
A20 PAES Building
305 West 17th Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210-1284

PART I - Leadership (Athletic Director)

Part I is designed for head coaches to answer in relation to the athletic director to whom they report. Please answer all items in this section (Part I questions are Copyright (C) by Mind Garden). If any item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Judge how frequently each statement fits your athletic director. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals. Check the appropriate number according to the scale below.

Not at all  Once in a while  Sometimes  Fairly often  Frequently if not always
1 2 3 4 5

1. My athletic director provides me with assistance (e.g., financial support, secretarial support, etc.) in exchange for my efforts.
1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

2. My athletic director re-examines critical standards and policies to question whether they are appropriate.
1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

3. My athletic director fails to interfere until problems become serious.
1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

4. My athletic director focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.
1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

5. My athletic director talks about his/her most important values and beliefs.
1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My athletic director seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director talks optimistically about the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director waits for things to go wrong before taking action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director spends time teaching and coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director shows that he/she is a firm believe in &quot;If it ain't broke, don't fix it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My athletic director goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. My athletic director treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

18. My athletic director demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

19. My athletic director acts in ways that build my respect.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

20. My athletic director concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.
    1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

21. My athletic director considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.
    1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

22. My athletic director keeps track of all mistakes.
    1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

23. My athletic director displays a sense of power and confidence.
    1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

24. My athletic director articulates a compelling vision of the future.
    1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

25. My athletic director directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.
    1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always

26. My athletic director considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.
    1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
27. My athletic director gets me to look at problems from many different angles.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

28. My athletic director helps me to develop my strengths.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

29. My athletic director suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

30. My athletic director emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

31. My athletic director expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

32. My athletic director expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.
   1- Not at all; 5 - Frequently if not always
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

PART II - Organizational Behaviors (Head Coach)

Part II is designed to measure head coaches' organizational behaviors in a variety of dimensions. Please answer all items in this section. If any item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Answer questions 33-53 based on your feelings about the athletic department you work for by checking one of the following seven numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this athletic department.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

34. I really feel as if this athletic department's problems are my own.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree
35. I do not feel like "part of the family" at this athletic department.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

36. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this athletic department.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

37. This athletic department has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

38. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this athletic department.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

39. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

40. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave this athletic department now.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

41. I would feel guilty if I left this athletic department now.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

42. This athletic department deserves my loyalty.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

43. I would not leave this athletic department right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

44. I owe a great deal to this athletic department.
   1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

45. It would be very hard for me to leave this athletic department right now, even if I
wanted to.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

46. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave this athletic department right now.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

47. Right now, staying with this athletic department is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
1- Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

48. I believe that I have too few options to consider leaving this athletic department.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

49. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this athletic department would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

50. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this athletic department is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice; another athletic department may not match the overall benefits I have here.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

51. If I had not already put so much of myself into this athletic department, I might consider working elsewhere.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

52. I frequently think about leaving this athletic department.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

53. I would likely leave this athletic department for another coaching position within the next two years.
1 - Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

Answer questions 54-56 based on your feelings about your job by checking one of the following seven numbers.

Strongly  Strongly
54. All in all I am satisfied with my job.  
1- Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. In general, I don’t like my job.  
1- Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. In general, I like working here.  
1- Strongly Disagree; 7 - Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer questions 57-70 based on your feelings about your behaviors in the athletic department by checking one of the following five numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Characteristic</th>
<th>Very Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. I help others who have been absent.  
1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. I volunteer for things that are not required.  
1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59. I orient new people even though it is not required.  
1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. I help others who have heavy work loads.  
1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. I assist supervisor with his or her work.  
1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. I make innovative suggestions to improve department.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
63. My punctuality.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
64. I take undeserved breaks.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
65. My attendance at work is above the norm.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
66. I give advance notice if unable to come to work.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
67. I spend great deal of time in personal phone conversations.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
68. I do not take unnecessary time off work.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
69. I do not take extra breaks.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
70. I do not spend time in idle conversation.
   1 - Not at all Characteristic; 5 - Very Characteristic
   
**PART III - Other Information**

Please respond to the following questions by printing in the space provided or by checking the appropriate response.
71. Age (years old)

72. Total number of years as a coach (years)

73. Number of years working for your current athletic department (years)

74. Are you a full-time coach or a part-time coach?

○ FULL-TIME  ○ PART-TIME

75. Gender

○ MALE  ○ FEMALE

76. Ethnicity/Race

○ AFRICAN-AMERICAN/BLACK
○ ASIAN-AMERICAN
○ CAUCASIAN/WHITE
○ HISPANIC
○ NATIVE AMERICAN
○ Other, please specify

77. In what sport(s) are you a head coach?

What kind of sport(s)?

Gender (Male or Female) of sport(s)

78. Number of student-athletes on last year's team
79. Previous season’s won/loss record (if applicable)

WON

LOSS

80. What place did you finish in your conference’s standings?

Placed in your conference’s standings

Out of number of schools in your conference

81. Compared to other coaches at your university, how would you rate your performance?

- POOR
- BELOW AVERAGE
- ABOUT AVERAGE
- ABOVE AVERAGE
- OUTSTANDING

82. Compared to coaches of your sport at comparable universities, how would you rate your performance?

- POOR
- BELOW AVERAGE
- ABOUT AVERAGE
- ABOVE AVERAGE
- OUTSTANDING

83. Is your athletic director male or female?

- MALE
- FEMALE

84. Comments on your overall experiences as an intercollegiate coach will be appreciated. You are also welcomed to comment on your athletic director’s leadership and its influences on you and your organization.
Thank you very much for your help!
APPENDIX F

Coaches’ Comments from Questionnaire
Coaches’ Comments from Questionnaire

- I took over a program from a female coach that belittled the players; spent money without authorization; and demanded money and equipment beyond the means of the institution. I had 12 players left a month before the season. Records do not always equate to success. The AD and department have been extremely helpful in my rebuilding of my programs. I will have 32 soccer players and 24 track athletes this year. The AD treats me as an experienced professional and gives me the room and means to improve my program. He does not look for mistakes, but rather is there to encourage and assist if there is a problem that arises.

- I love my job but my personal situation makes it very hard to leave it. I like my AD but my confidence in him took a turn for the worse in the last 3 months when it was decided to drop my men's team and the reasons given for the cut, were not the truth.

- Our athletic director is very supportive of me and our sport. She is very visible and dedicated to our university.

- The work at the University has always been about feeling a calling from God. It is not about me or the glory of the school. Instead, it is done for the glory of God.

- Love my job; money is the most stressful aspect. I am referring to operating money and personal pay! I work with great people and would consider retiring with this job if compensation was improved.

- Many of the questions do not take into account the demands on the athletic director to manage the sports in this down economy.

- He is just a nice guy who wants to survive to retirement without any issues or conflicts with administration. He will always do exactly what he is told to do, no more, no less.

- The sad part about the situation is we have a VP of Athletics that was the AD. The VP is pulling all of the strings of the new AD. The new AD is the puppet. I believe the new AD could be an efficient leader if he was truly in charge. Most of my thoughts about the AD questions pertain to the VP of Athletics because he is truly calling all of the shots in the athletic department. It is destroying the department.

- The time-money ratio is the only negative of this job. I also feel that while I may have a ton of skills applicable to the business world, my resume forces me to stay in athletics.

- I have had experience at several levels of coaching. I have never run into a dictatorship that is so out of hand. As we look for other coaches in positions at this University I would recommend to top level coaches look in another direction. Due to personal reasons I have had to turn down 4 positions over the last 6 months to leave, but I am unfortunately tied to the department. The only bright spot are the players and the people that they have become!
I have been at my institution for 2 years and we are now getting ready for our 3rd athletic director. There has been little support from the school due to administration changes and fiscal issues. There is very little direction and the entire department is in a state of flux. Most coaches are seriously applying for jobs in an effort to leave. I cannot at this time or I would.

I appreciate all the opportunities that are presented to me with being an intercollegiate coach. My primary coaching duty is Men's basketball and my professional goals are based on my success in that sport. This past year I was given the men's golf coaching duties and have had to rebuild a program that was dropped for many years. That has been a very big challenge but large strides are being taken. Our athletic director is finishing up his first year in the position. He also assumes the duties of head wrestling coach which he has done very well over the last 30 years. Our previous athletic director had no other duties other than his administration position. At the Division II and Division III athletic levels it is much more efficient to have a coach serve in the administrative role as well. At the Division I level you need someone who has the primary role of just athletic director. Our athletic programs are beginning to flourish again under our new athletic director and I enjoy working with him. I hope that my opinion will help you in your survey.

We are in transition for D-I.

A lot of questions!!! It's not as easy as it looks. You really have to learn to be a fair minded person. Sometimes I feel isolated when we lose...actually from our AD...all the time...to me that is when we need the most guidance. I have had some great mentors to talk to that have helped....and not our AD...he is a great AD but maybe he could quit spending so much time asking our Football coaches what they need...and at least talk to the other sports....

Our AD here is on a 10 month contract and is more concerned with his outside activities than having a successful athletic program.

AD is very supportive on personal issues, and sticking up for staff, but can never pin him down to talk through issues, it has taken me 10 months to deal with one issue that still has not been resolved, and there is absolutely no reason why it shouldn't have been resolved by now. We have a piecemeal staff here, an SID who knows nothing about track, and has never bothered to find out, I have to write my own reports, and call the local newspaper myself after meets. Trying to build the program, bringing in more coaching staff, and raising the profile of the team is difficult because I feel like I am banging my head up against the wall everyday, but I am not giving up--!

I have always been a volunteer coach at the University where I was a (non physical education faculty member). I grew up in the sport and continue coaching (now retired) as part of my giving back philosophy.

The new vision for this college is extraordinary. The economy has put brakes on some items, but they have not been permanently cancelled. It is a great place to work. Coming in with a smile on my face and leaving each day with a smile on
my face; good day or bad, victory or loss, makes me realize just how fortunate I have been over the past 21 years.

- My athletic director has not met with me in 8 years other than a quick evaluation which took less than 5 minutes every year. He has not once visited my office. He has no leadership skills and does not deserve to be in his position.

- Our department is a wonderful place to work. We have hired a new AD October 2008. He is not a good leader or communicator. On various occasions he has lied to me and other coaches. He has a temper and treats people like they are inferior. Until he came on there was not a better place to work in the country.

- Coaching college golf is the best job I’ve had. I love working with the players on my team and it is an honor to be in a position to help them on the golf course and mentor them off the course. I hope that I get to coach the rest of my working career.

- Coaching at the collegiate level has been one of the most rewarding and fun times of my career. I have had a variety of Athletic Directors. Those that care 100% about me and the program to those that only cared if we did a good job AND didn’t care about the problems.

- My director is great. She allows use freedom and has great personal loyalty to us and our personal lives. She has been criticized as laizze-faire, however, she probably has such challenges in the university that only she knows about. While things here could be a lot better, they could also be a lot worse. The only criticism is that there is a lot of gender bias in our department. This is not necessarily due only to our athletic director, however.

- I like my job as a coach. As for my Athletic Director I think I could get some more help at times but I do appreciate the help of my Associate AD and our Compliance Director. They both have helped me in the past year and a half just coming out of school to become a head coach. Overall I like where I am at to get started but I do not think I will be here for more than 5 years.

- Honesty and openness create an atmosphere of trust. This is lacking in many athletic departments. There is a loss of everyday connectedness between administration and sport coaches at many schools.

- I love my job and my department. The only way I would leave would be to become a stay-at-home mom or to make enough money by myself that my husband could be a stay-at-home dad. My athletic director is a friend, mentor, and confidant. He is an excellent man, consistently going above and beyond the call of duty.

- Love my athletic department and my AD. While I feel a sense of loyalty to it and am not looking to leave, I still feel if something significantly better came up I would look to move on.

- I have been here 8 years and my current AD has been here one year. Much of his time has been dealing with a MAJOR project that will benefit all of the programs
at this university. However, that has kept him from dealing with other items within our department. This might have skewed the results of that portion of the survey. I can say that I feel he is doing a great job, I love my job, and having him here has made me all the more excited to be a part of this university.

- I believe that the biggest disconnect in college sports between administrators and coaches is the decision making efforts between the two. Administrators upset because the coach does something without permission (but within in the rules) and coaches upset because the administrators make policy change without consulting the coach on the change. Blanket policies do not work for every sport. Are the coaches there to serve the administrators, or are the administrators there to serve the coaches.

- I have found that there needs to be a greater work ethic by new young coaches particularly on the women's side. They seem to hide under Title IX.

- I have coached at the same institution for my entire collegiate coaching career, for three different ADs. Our present AD is first class, but has had to deal with starting football within the past five years, with limited support and limited budget, obviously that has impacted other sports and coaches somewhat negatively.

- I have a great working relationship with my AD. He is available and accessible, but he lets me do my job and does not get involved in my program unless he is asked to do so. I see it as more of a partnership. He stresses that we must all work together and pulls the wagon together. Our program is one of the smallest DII programs in the country (1500 student enrollment). However, I have found that many things that people might perceive as problems can also become advantages. It is just a matter of perspective.

- We have a good Athletic Director. He sees what needs to be done and he does what it takes to give the coaches in the department the chance to win.

- Better than having a real job!

- The open door policy of our athletic director is of great benefit to our staff.

- Program just finished its second year, with this being my first year. Conference placing reflects team size. We did however have one swimmer qualify for the NCAA Championships - only three teams in our conference had swimmers qualify. I took this job because of the type of leader the athletic director is. I respect his character, experience, and values - as well as his loyalty to this university.

- The football program was cancelled on January 8th; I was given not notice till that date.

- Obviously, I am not overly impressed with the performance of my athletic director. I have developed a saying that our university is a great place to coach, but not a good place to work. Employee morale is bad, and sound leadership is lacking. Much could be improved to say the least.
• The most concerning aspects for me (and other staffs) is a lack of support and vision for our department and program(s).

• I am fortunate to work for an Athletic Director who was at one time a coach. I feel this is an absolute advantage to any department because of the knowledge that brings to the position.

• My reason for coming to this university was in a large part due to the leadership and character of the athletic director. He has not disappointed.

• When weighing the option of staying at my institution or leaving, I also have considered the other coaches and support staff. I have never met a more wonderful group of people, minus the Athletic Director. I feel he thinks he does an excellent job, when in fact - most coaches do not like nor respect him or his decisions.

• A lot of our problems have to do with the administration above our athletic director. She's on our side in frustration with them.

• I am on my 4th AD in 4 years so there has never really been a structure.

• Our athletic director is basically destroying our athletic department. My team(s) has been the most successful teams in the athletic department (7 national titles in the last 9 years) and we aren't even given half of the amount of scholarships that are available per NCAA rules. He gives teams that continue to fail more money. Our admissions standards do not allow the football team to be successful; however, our AD gives them all the money in the world! This makes all of the other teams that work hard to earn their success very unhappy.

• Athletic Director has an open door policy and is very helpful. Coaching is a very rewarding career.

• I am a full time assistant athletic director and head baseball coach. I have a lot on my plate with many responsibilities. As an administrator, I deal with 16 sports with multiple responsibilities. As a head coach it is a full time job in itself which requires much of my professional and personal time. It is not an easy combination but I love it. I need to make a better salary. My AD is great. He is a great leader. Encourages our staff to take ownership and work hard. He is definitely one that I would like to work for a long time. He is very new, only 3 months old and has already left a mark. Hopefully he can become my mentor and help me improve on developing as a professional.

• I absolutely love my job and my career. I wouldn't change what I do and I hope to continue to be able to do it at the collegiate level and be able to coach softball and create a positive environment for my athletes to grow as people and players.

• Our AD is restricted in his vision and development only by the administration of the school.

• Coaching is in my blood. Our battle at the university is with the lip-service we get from the top not being backed up by resources. Our AD is all about finding ways and is always an advocate for more resources.
• Our D-II women's tennis program was started 4 years ago. I was hired to kick-start and grow the program 3 years ago. We made major strides in just 3 years. We could not have accomplished this without the support of my Athletic Director.

• Our athletic director is very active with all the sports, very accessible, and approachable. He tries to help all the coaches and sports.

• This AD is the best boss I have ever worked for. He sets out what the expectations are and then allows us to do it. His support is readily available as long as you are doing what is expected. He definitely instills a “we are all in this together” attitude and all coaches have bought into it.

• There have been 4 AD's in the 3 years I have been here so some answers depend on the AD of the moment. Cheerleaders are pretty much second class citizens in the athletic dept compared to football and basketball. They usually don't even respond to my emails or inform me of changes in the dept even though they tell me we are important. It is very frustrating, so I have given up and pretty much just do my own thing. I don't work at the school other than for cheer so I don't really see people from the athletic office much.

• I love my job and I like the school I work at. We have had a number of changes in the AD office over the past few years for an assortment of reasons but things are still heading in the right.

• My AD is very supportive of his staff. He stands behind his coaches to parents and other administrators.

• As in several Division II schools I have two jobs on campus. I work as an administrator and as a coach. Our athletic director is the men's basketball coach as well. He is inept at best and this is his first ever college head coaching position and he is the AD also. He is in way over his head. The school itself and department are wonderful.

• I've had an outstanding career and many great experiences. The relationships with former players have been very rewarding. Our Athletic Director has one thing on his mind Men/Women’s basketball and football; all other sports have to fend for themselves.

• This past year was tough. It was my first year and our AD quit in December. Our Asst. AD was the interim and did a terrible job. I was never given a policy and procedures manual. He was extremely unsupportive of cheerleading. My cheerleaders were very unappreciated. We were not given a safe or regular place to practice most of the time. The only reason I have stayed on is because I bonded with the kids, love to coach and hope with our new AD starting in June things will change.

• It was hard to change my job about 1.5 years ago because of loyalty tenure, etc. I do not feel attached to this new school yet, maybe with some more time?
• It is a great experience and I enjoy being able to help student athletes to achieve their goals. Our university is growing and our AD is always looking for ways to improve our programs.

• We have no leadership from our AD. I have enjoyed my experience as a college coach. I do not enjoy all the NCAA crap though; the wrong people make the decisions.

• It has been my experience at the collegiate level: Players are GREAT; I thoroughly enjoy the team and the game. The Athletic Department is a train wreck, from the AD on down. There is negativity and bad attitudes, no sense of civility. Issues are not dealt with the same among differing (focus sports) sports. Focus sports receive much better care, gear, etc. Not one person from our athletic administration attended our Conference Championship game, workers and employees were present. That is indicative of the lack of support the women's lacrosse program has received despite earning national athletic and academic awards (we have had the highest team GPA on campus for the past 3 yrs and the highest winning percentage as well!). I just resigned my position 2 weeks ago and I GREATLY appreciate someone stepping forward to conduct a survey such as this.

• I have enjoyed every day that I have been a collegiate coach. I started as a volunteer assistant while still in school and continued after graduation. I hope and expect to do this until I retire. My AD gives me the freedom to run my program the way I see fit, which I like very much. She will get involved in situations when I ask and is most times very supportive of my decisions. The main reason I would leave for another job is my ambition to reach the highest levels of my sport.

• In 32 years of coaching and over 700 wins at the college level, I have witnessed many things, both positive and negative. I've worked at three different schools over that time and have had some very good working environments and then there's this one! The athletic director does not know how to handle people. He has very little compassion for coaches who do not meet his expectations, which he sets very high for his coaches. He has had very little coaching experience himself, so he really doesn't understand all that goes into producing a quality team.

• Our athletic director is an outstanding leader and communicator. Problems at this institution are lack of financial support.

• As you can see from the responses I have, we are very displeased with our athletic department. Basically, we feel we get little support financially or otherwise from the AD. We feel our AD is very insecure and will not challenge the President on unfair athletic issues. I have remained at the university because of personal reasons. We have family here and this community is our home.

• First year at school. Team was 1-27 and 6-22 prior to arrival. Lots of young coaches. Good job that needs some urgency, experience and effort. AD is fine. I am loyal to the program and department, but your questions that insinuate loyalty are garbage. We have been trained with the impatience in college coaching to look
out for yourself. You should have asked how many jobs, did you ever get fired. Those are huge variables to what you are seeking........

- I enjoy coming to work because I have a strong work ethic and love coaching college aged athletes. Additionally, my Athletic Director does not micromanage the people in the department giving us the freedom to work the hours we need to work which are often not from 9 - 5.

- In general, I am very satisfied to be in this profession. It is a healthy challenge to compete at a high level while working with student-athletes to complete their degrees. The only real negatives about being a coach, is the lack of outside community respect, more often than not, people ask what else I do for work, besides coach. And the money is terrible and not adequate to support a family without another salary.

- I have coached at various universities. My current position is by far the most respected, great benefits, strong faculty, staff, and president support is top notch!

- I enjoy the opportunity to coach the golf teams and to work as a part of the athletic teams of my university. The athletic director is very competent and enthusiastic and very helpful to me.

- My athletic director has little or no power at this institution. The department is run by the VP of student affairs with an iron fist. Therefore for some of the AD questions I substituted the VP that runs the department.

- The economy has put a big strain on our department. Our athletic director has had to focus a lot of his time on finding new ways to balance the budget.

- I really enjoy coaching. However, it can be difficult when you don't have the necessary resources and support that is needed to be successful.

- The athletic director has brought a very positive attitude to the department. She was hired just over 2 years ago and has done a great job in changing the culture at the school. It used to be very negative but now is much more positive and there is a greater sense of determination. I feel like I get the support I need as a coach while I understand there are limitations and the Athletic Director does a good job of explaining these limitations and working within them. She is also very willing to support us when there is something that we need.

- This athletic director has no loyalties unlike the three previous ones. He is too self-serving.

- There were multiple questions regarding satisfaction and desire to work for the athletic department/desire to leave and reasons for that......I think it is important to note, that my satisfaction is based on working with the members of the team I coach as opposed to being associated with the athletic department. I am not unhappy because I love what I do (being with student athletes). I don't feel negative towards my athletic department (I am actually an Asst. AD and SWA), but don't feel like I am utilized to help as much as I believe I could. My athletic director is very well intentioned but, in my opinion, is not a good leader. I like
him and respect the person he is, I just don't think he is the quality of athletic
director that can elevate our department. I would be very much interested in the
results of your survey.

- I love coaching golf. I'm retired from another university and coach 2; thus, my
  staying to coach is strictly personal choice... not financially necessary (I have a
  pension). Where I work I believe there is great potential for all if A.D. had
  stronger leadership skills. Completely hands-off and unavailable (he is a former
  football coach who had no choice but to become A.D.).

- I always appreciate the input, positive or negative, an athletics staff has to say
  knowing they have my best interest at heart.

- As a minor non-revenue sport I think there is a different standard with the ADs
  involvement. Basically he wants a team that reflects well on the univ. does well in
  class, community and on the court.

- Love my job. Seeing athletes grow and develop over four years is very rewarding.
  Program's financial situation could be much improved (we are funded poorly
  compared to other schools in our conference). I appreciate the opportunity the AD
  has given me, but she has never inspired me to become better or never
  complimented a performance (even when we were in the Top 25 and made the
  NCAA tournament for the first time ever). Would like someone to paint a vision
  for the department.

- It is great experience coaching on the collegiate level.

- Athletic Director provides a strong can-do attitude and strongly supports his staffs’
  efforts. He is fair but expects successful results. Budget cuts the last couple of
  years have strained.

- I love coaching the problem is my school does not have that much to offer.
  Facility wise it is not appealing and trying to recruit is difficult. In order to get top
  athletes you need a top university. My athletic director is a good one. He is kind
  and caring. He is overloaded with little help so he is hard to communicate with on
  a face to face basis. His expectations are high for the quality that my school has to
  offer.

- We are a department of “have” and “have not.” Several teams are fully funded
  with 1 head/assistant coaches and scholarships. Other programs do not receive
  adequate funding and have 2 head coaches.

- Only wants to see the basketball team be successful, does not help other programs.

- The athletic director’s hands are tied in order to be allowed much freedom over
  the department. Last season was my first season with the college, where the
  softball program never got a lot of attention. In the future we are planning to make
  some changes and look upward.

- I truly think our AD has no vision or guts. We have no plan to better our athletic
  department or facilities. I stay here for my players and that it. I love the location
but it’s a shame we have an AD who has no prior experience, and no leadership skills. Our athletic department meetings last 30 minutes once a month and are the biggest waste of time. We don’t discuss anything...and everything he tells us could be sent in an email. We have no unity!!! It’s sad but very true.

• Coaching is the best job in the world because you are a teacher, mentor, counselor, academic advisor, and many other jobs. We all do it for that reason.

• Our athletic director provides amazing leadership and is a positive motivational force in our programs. Division II coaches do have a high emotional desire to coach, because the financial opportunities are so much greater in other divisions and job fields. I am satisfied with coaching at my school and also work within the athletics' department. However, I still make about $14,000 less than I would make as a first year high school teacher without even coaching. This is a point that resurfaces frequently in my mind since I am certified to teach. All of the coaches at our school are required to teach classes in addition to their coaching responsibilities. I am still working on my masters, which should increase me pay upon graduation since I will be qualified to teach.

• Our athletic director is in his 2nd year. He has been very helpful so far. I work strictly as a coach and commute 45 miles to coach. I am self-employed which allows me to continue to coach but am unable to attend most coaching staff meetings.

• He is well organized and articulate. He has been verbally very supportive of me even though resources are not adequate.

• Too many athletic directors have never coached or played a sport at the college level and don't understand how difficult it is to be successful. They have huge egos and want success to be about them and not about the coaches and student/athletes. A coach has one bad year and his job is on the line. I don't like what the big money in D-I has done to college athletics and it has filtered down to the lower divisions and the AD's think they can fire coaches just like D-I. We don't get paid like D-I coaches and shouldn't be held to those types of million dollar standards.

• I really enjoyed my first year. The travel was more than expected taking me away from my job as a Golf Professional at my facility. Loved working with the young men both mechanically and mentally. Wished our University on a whole was more supportive of athletics. The budget always seems to be what everything has to be based on and I wish it was the student and what would best help them succeed and feel good about themselves and their University.

• Additional Info -The AD is just completing his first year. I was promoted to assistant AD six months ago.

• I enjoy coaching Softball. It is something I want to do for the rest of my career.

• I coach because I love coaching- and I love my athletes, not because of the athletic department. My program is not rewarded based on performance, nor am I.
• I really enjoy working in my athletic department. We have a new athletic director this year and he is excited to improve and build on our department. It is always refreshing to have someone new come in who is innovative and motivated!

• I am a part time coach and hardly spend time at the athletic dept except for meetings sand to sign papers. I work full time as a professor. Our AD in and interim Ad and is not around cause she also has an important full time job so this survey is hard for me to be objective. I hardly have any contact with her.

• I love college coaching, DII however is an academic/athletic balance for the SA, but not for the coaches, we wear a lot of hats and have less pay with less perks.

• My experience has positive for 3 out of the 7 years. Recently, things have changed. My last four years have been very hard and the lack of communication has been poor. I am hoping that we will come together as a department because I love my job, the atmosphere, student-athletes etc... We have had great deal of turnover: New coaches, and administrators have come and gone. Not sure why... I am trying to hang in to make a difference.

• It is a good life!

• It is simple. Women’s athletic teams live like queens and the male athletic teams live like peons. When the women’s volleyball team gets more scholarship money than the football team, there is a problem in the athletic department. When the women’s softball team gets four times as much scholarship money than the men’s baseball team, there is a problem in the athletic department. You get the idea. Gender equity out of control.

• My AD and all the AD's I have worked for are blood suckers. I have never had an AD that helped me or the team I was coaching be successful. It would be fair to say that I have a very bad attitude towards administrators. I think they look out for themselves. If I ran my team they way they ran the athletic department I would win a game and would be able to recruit any players. I have been a DII coach for most of my career. Most of that career has been at small private colleges in the southeast. At these schools they do not care if you are successful. They only care about numbers.

• The work of building a strong program and the development of students is focus of my service to the department. That's why I do this job. The AD is a good guy, but not a visionary leader. I'll continue to work with the program as long as the opportunity and resources to do so are available.

• I love being around the athletes otherwise I would not have continued as a coach for 42 years. I have been a head coach of baseball (11 yrs), asst. football (17 yrs), head women’s basketball (11 yrs), and head women’s softball (15 yrs).

• Our Athletic Director is a member of the good old boys club. There has been a great deal of talk from our upper administration regarding his removal, but to date this has not happened. Unfortunately, this has been detrimental to the overall morale of the department.
• It is a team effort- it is up to the AD to hire associates that complement him or her and demonstrate the leadership to not only win championships but develop coaches to reach their potential and be a team of the university.

• I coach because of the kids on my team, and the fact that I love tennis. Tennis tends to be a back seat sport, but I am very proud of our program. We do very well despite our funding.

• I have been through 12 ADs in the 21 years I have been at this institution. I have had all types. Our current AD has been here for nine months - and is the third one in the past two academic years. This AD is strong on vision but tends to be a little narcissistic. Not as bad as most, but very interested in self. Provides strong vision but forces buy-in rather than selling vision. Tends to lead with an authoritative style rather than participative. Not a servant leader, nor transformational. However, he is transforming our department due to his efforts to tie our department more tightly to the university. We have been very loosely-coupled in our tie to the university, and even loosely-coupled within the department. He is working to change that as well, but again very much from a top-down perspective. While I do not feel personally connected to him, I do have loyalty to the university developed from my years here, plus the educational benefits are tough to pass by - my wife and daughter are enrolled, I finished my undergraduate and then graduate degrees here while coaching (and am currently at the dissertation phase of my PhD through another university). As a university we are coming out of a very dark era due to a period of “dark-side” leadership from both the President and an AD. We are only now beginning to rebuild the organizational culture of the campus as a whole. So trust is still slow to be established with any new administrator. Our new AD is forcing change at a rapid rate, and has run into obstacles - both internal and external to the department. However, I do believe he is making a great deal of progress. Good luck with your data collection!

• Anticipation of new facility keeps me here.

• I have had some great seasons here. This past season was my worst one recorded. I believe my athletic director does the best that he can do with being a head coach also.

• While he is splendid at looking at the future and making improvements for the dept, he also spends too much time reminding his coaches of their mishaps that have occurred over the years, however minor (as a form of teasing, I do not know) I feel the AD is very difficult to talk to. FYI, Pay is very low and I simply stay for the athletes, not to any ties to the department.

• We have an outstanding athletic administration who all work very hard together to get things accomplished. I wouldn't necessarily give all the credit to the AD, but he delegates well and has a great staff of administrators and coaches who love their jobs and get along well.

• Love it!
- My AD leadership is weak. I love working here but he doesn't lead or communicate well. He doesn't make those that don't volunteer to help with community service and they are the ones with all the scholarships.