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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Every aspect of a firm's activities is determined by the competence, motivation, and general effectiveness of its human organization. Of all the tasks of management, managing the human component is the central and most important task, because all else depends upon how well it is done (Likert, 1967, p. 1).

The essence of managing any organization that is goal oriented lies in the proper management of the most important aspect of the organization, its human resources. Business, industry, and various aspects of the educational community have for years studied the components of successful management and successful leadership. The purpose of this study will be to confront the problem of successful leadership within NCAA Division III departments of intercollegiate athletics.

1
The construct of leadership has been studied by researchers for decades. Many contemporary theorists attempt to define leadership in terms of the situational variables surrounding the leader-subordinate relationship. These theorists base their current thoughts upon the work of several generations of researchers.

Early researchers attempted to define leadership in terms of traits (Stogdill, 1974). Finding that successful leaders did not possess identical characteristics, theorists then attempted to define leadership in terms of styles of leader behavior (Fleishman, 1957, and Likert, 1967). As with the trait theorists, those studying leader behavior found no specific leadership styles that were common to all successful leaders.

The situational aspects of the leader-subordinate relationship were first explored by Fiedler (1964). His model was situational in nature but lacked in its ability to provide successfully an explanation of the leadership phenomena as leaders changed their leadership style or as the situation in which the leader functioned changed.

Current theorists are focusing the study of leadership on the situational variables surrounding the leader-subordinate relationship. Researchers in the late 1960's and early 1970's, based upon the foundation laid by both the trait theorists and the behaviorists, focused upon the variables within the situation as a method of explaining
leadership (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1983). One such theoretical framework is commonly known as path-goal theory and is tied closely to the expectancy model of motivation (Vroom, 1964; Porter and Lawler, 1967; and Graen, 1968).

Although numerous styles of leadership behavior have been identified during the past half century of leadership research, two distinct styles have been identified and utilized by the path-goal theorists. These styles are most frequently described as initiation of structure and consideration. "Psychologists who have studied leadership have independently discovered these dimensions" (Korman, 1966).

The literature reveals numerous studies relating leadership style to subordinate performance and/or satisfaction. Path-goal theory proposes a framework with which the leader-subordinate relationship can be studied. Leadership style, initiation of structure or consideration, is hypothesized to be predictive of subordinate satisfaction dependent upon given situational factors. Early researchers proposed two classes of situational variables that could have a moderating effect on the leader-subordinate relationship, characteristics of the environment and characteristics of the subordinate. As additional research was completed, suggested moderating variables received mixed support among various samples and additional moderators have since been proposed and tested.
Researchers in studying the path-goal framework have studied many different types of leaders functioning in numerous situations with the purpose of exploring those elements of the situation which may effect the relationship of leadership style and the satisfaction of subordinates.

Studies of this nature facilitate the understanding of successful leadership practices by the practitioner. Leadership studies that evaluate the situational aspects of the leader-subordinate relationship can provide guidance for the practitioner as he evaluates his leadership style in relation to the environment in which he functions as the leader.

Until recently, the shifting sands of practitioner judgment were the major if not the only source of knowledge about how to organize and run an enterprise. Now, research of leadership, management, and organization, undertaken by social scientists, provides a more stable body of knowledge than has been available in the past (Likert, 1967, p. 1).

Research in the field of leadership frees the practitioner from learning how to be a successful leader only through the experience of trial and error. The body of knowledge generated by the leadership researchers provides the practitioner with the knowledge of the experiences, successful and non-successful, of the many practitioners who have preceded him. The framework of leadership theory
proposed by the path-goal theorists has withstood exploration in varied situations. Of prime importance to the leader of an athletic department are the findings of the application of this framework to the unique situation in which they function.

Statement of the Problem

This study considers the relationship of the leadership style of intercollegiate directors of athletics in the Ohio Athletic Conference and The North Coast Athletic Conference and a selected set of their subordinates, the coaches of football, basketball, baseball, and track within their institutions. Students of leadership who adhered to the concept of trait theory would hold that there are specific traits that are found in all successful leaders and these traits would be found in all successful athletic directors. Those who would define leadership in behavioral terms would contend that there are specific behaviors (leadership styles) that would be found in all successful leaders and these characteristics would be found in all successful athletic directors.

This study will approach leadership from a situational viewpoint. Utilizing the path-goal framework to analyze leadership, the relationship between the leadership style of intercollegiate directors of athletics and the coaches within
their departments will be explored.

The following research question will be considered:
What is the relationship of the leadership style of directors of intercollegiate athletics to the satisfaction of the coaches within their institutions as moderated by the complexity of the task (i.e., the sport coached), the experience of the coach, and the success that the coach has had in the past?

Definition of Terms

Consideration - leadership behavior that is considered as friendliness, developing mutual trust, warmth, and understanding between the leader and the subordinate. Consideration would promote two-way communication and would involve the subordinate in the decision making process (Fleishman and Harris, 1962, pp. 43-44).

Expectancy I - the belief that certain immediate actions or effort will attain specific immediate outcomes or successful performance (Vroom, 1964). Expectancy I is the link of effort to performance. An example would be that the a specific effort will provide a specific level of performance. (Expectancy I and instrumentality denote the same idea.)
Expectancy II - the subordinate's expectation of future satisfaction that will follow if a specific behavior is demonstrated. An example would be that constant high performance would eventually result in a promotion because the organization historically promotes from within. (Expectancy II has the same meaning as expectancy.)

Initiation of structure - leadership behavior that serves to direct the activities of both individuals and groups. These activities would include rules, procedures, job descriptions, and other methods of providing specific direction to enable subordinates to accomplish tasks germane to the goals of the organization (Fleishman and Harris, 1962, pp.43-44).

Instrumental leader behavior - leader behavior directed at clarifying role expectations, assigning specific tasks, and specifying procedures. (House and Dessler, 1974)

Instrumentality - the linkage between an action and perceived consequences of the action (Vroom, 1964). For example, if a subordinate perceives that a certain level of output will produce a specific amount of pay, he will strive to meet that output if pay is important to him (synonymous to Expectancy I).
Job satisfaction - refers to the meaningfulness of the job in terms of personal rewards in the form of the intrinsic value of the work itself, pay and advancement, and the fulfillment of social needs (House and Dessler, 1974).

Path instrumentality - the extent to which the path is seen as helping or hindering the individual in attaining his goals (Evans, 1970, p. 279).

Supportive leader behavior - the extent to which the leader is characterized as friendly and considerate of subordinate needs (House and Dessler, 1974).

Role clarity - refers to the view of the subordinate in regard to the ambiguity of the demands of their job (House and Dessler, 1974).

Role conflict - the degree of incompatible roles perceived by the subordinate (Fulk and Wendler, 1982). An example would be the pressure for both quality and quantity output.

Task structure - refers to the degree to which the task of the subordinates is clear in its definition in relation to rules, procedures, and overall simplicity (House and Dessler, 1974).
Valence - the value that an individual places on the rewards that will be produced by a specific outcome (Vroom, 1964). Such rewards might be pay, promotion, or approval from the leader.

Willingness to leave the organization - the measure of turnover (Fulk and Wendler, 1974).

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study may be generalized only to the population of the coaches and athletic directors selected from the OAC and NCAC. Further generalizations can not be made. Moreover, any relationships among the variables can be construed only as relationships and not as cause and effect.

The selection of the three moderating variables, task complexity, the success of the subordinate, and the experience of the subordinate, does not indicate that these are the only variables that might effect the relationship of leadership style and satisfaction. These three factors are simply three of many factors compatible with the path-goal leadership hypothesis that could have a moderating affect on the relationship of leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction. These three factors were chosen based past research done utilizing the path-goal framework.
Assumptions of the Study

The assumptions made in this study are similar to those made in the numerous other studies that have dealt with the leader-subordinate relationship. The primary assumption is that leader behavior is readily observable by the subordinate and is quantifiable by specific items selected from Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII. Previous research supports the validity of the LBDQ - Form XII and is based upon the premise that leader behavior is observable. The LBDQ will quantify the leadership style of athletic directors within the two dimensions of initiation of structure and consideration.

The second assumption is that subordinates are readily able to ascertain their own levels of job satisfaction. As supported by the literature, the Job Descriptive Index is a valid measure of subordinate satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969). This questionnaire will quantify subordinate satisfaction in six dimensions, the work which they are performing, their pay, their supervision, promotional opportunities, people or co-workers, and the job in general.
Significance of the Problem

The significance of this study is twofold. It can be considered applied research in that it deals with the practical issues of the leadership phenomenon which are useful in a practical sense. Secondly, it is basic research in that the findings will add to the theoretical body of knowledge on the construct of leadership.

From the practical standpoint, the study gives the athletic director insight into the relationship of leadership style to the satisfaction of subordinates in specific situations. This is valuable information for the practitioner because it affords him the opportunity to formulate his own style as he evaluates his specific situation without having to rely initially upon the trial and error process.

From a theoretical point of view, this study expands the current body of knowledge dealing with the construct of leadership. It is another study which tests the basic premises of the path-goal theory of leadership. The study is of importance in that it explores the variable relationships in a situation which has not previously been studied.

Of final importance is that the findings in this study can be used as a basis for further research into the relationship of athletic directors and coaches in different situations in which other sets of environmental variables
might be of significance. Specific situations in which the leader-subordinate relationship might be examined could be the high school level or the major college level. Also of future importance could be the proposition of additional or alternative moderating variables that might effect the leader-subordinate relationship.

Summary

Path-goal theory provides a framework within which the leader-subordinate relationship can be explored. Leadership has been defined as having two distinct styles, consideration and initiation of structure. The path-goal framework proposes that there is a relationship between these two specific leadership styles and subordinate satisfaction. This relationship can be moderated by numerous situational variables.

This research is designed to investigate the relationship between the leadership style of the leader, the athletic director, and the satisfaction of the subordinate, selected coaches within the athletic departments of selected NCAA Division III institutions as moderated by specific variables as supported by the path-goal hypothesis.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The major approaches to the study of leadership can be categorized chronologically. An evaluation of each of the three major schools of thought illustrates that there is a chronologic pattern of development leading to the most current theoretical base.

There are essentially three periods of leadership study. Each is characterized by a basic school of thought. The trait theorists dominated the 1940's and 1950's. An outgrowth of this approach in the 1950's and 1960's was the behavioral approach. Current theorists favor the study of leadership from a situational standpoint.

Prior to World War II there was little formally organized, satisfactory leadership theory. Most studies of leadership had attempted to define leadership in terms of traits possessed by the leader. Examples of these theories would be the "great man theory", the environmental theories, and the personal situational theories.

The "great man theory" holds that great leaders possess specific, unique inherited characteristics that enable them
to become great leaders. The environmental theorists represented by the thoughts of Mumford (1909) maintained "the leader emerges by virtue of his abilities and skills enabling him to solve social problems in times of stress, change, and adaptation (Stogdill, 1974, p. 18). "The personal-situational theorists attempted to explain leadership in terms of the interaction between the individual leader, his specific traits, and the situation in which he functions.

Stogdill (1974) reports that findings prior to 1950 indicated: 1) little success had been attained in attempts to select leaders in terms of traits, 2) that numerous traits differentiated leaders from followers, 3) that traits demanded from a leader varied from one situation to another, and 4) that the trait approach ignored the interaction between the leader and his group. Although trait theorists found that explaining leadership in terms of traits was not an acceptable approach to a comprehensive definition of leadership, this school of thought left future researchers with the groundwork in which contemporary explanations of leadership are founded.

The next major group of researchers approached the study of leadership by investigating the leadership behavior or the style of leadership demonstrated by both successful and non-successful leaders. There are two major schools of thought in the behavioral approach. The first, conducted at The Ohio
State University, was descriptive in nature. The second, conducted at the University of Michigan, was prescriptive in its definition.

Behavioral scientists at The Ohio State University defined leadership in two dimensions, initiation of structure and consideration. These behavioral characteristics were quantified by the use of The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Researchers at The Ohio State University, led by Hemphill, compiled a list of approximately 1800 items which described different dimensions of leader behavior. These items were placed on several sub-scales. From this work, the original Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire was formed. Originally, researchers indicated that there were nine subscales that effectively described leader behavior. Halpin and Winer (1957) performed factor analytic studies that produced the two factors, consideration and initiation of structure, previously suggested by Hemphill, that effectively represented all dimensions of leadership.

Studies were performed attempting to determine which style of leadership was most effective, i.e., which leadership behavior related to both work-group performance and subordinate satisfaction. The results were inconclusive as to which style related most strongly to group performance and morale. The studies were descriptive in nature in that they did effectively describe the two main elements of
leadership. They did not, however, prescribe which style was the most appropriate style of leadership.

The main criticism of the attempt to define leadership with these two dimensions is that situational factors are not considered. The Ohio State studies are most useful in defining the main components of leadership and have laid much of the groundwork for current leadership research.

At approximately the same time that the Ohio State Studies were being conducted, studies at the University of Michigan (Likert, 1967) were also being undertaken to identify styles of leadership behavior that resulted in increased performance and satisfaction among subordinates. These studies resulted in two dimensions of leadership style, job-centered leadership and employee-centered leadership. The findings of these studies were significant. First, it was determined that performance is not the only variable to which leadership should be related. Employee-centered factors such as satisfaction are suggested. Secondly, as with the Ohio State Studies, it was found that various situational factors may relate to the style of leadership employed by the leader. These factors might be attributed to the nature of the task, the nature of the group, or the nature of individuals within the group.

The University of Michigan studies went a step further than the work done at The Ohio State University in that they were prescriptive in nature. The findings suggest that
employee-centered leadership style is more effective than leadership style that is job-centered.

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and in all relationships within the organization, each member, in light of his background, values, desires, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his personal worth and importance (Likert, 1961, p. 103).

The weakness of this position, researchers have found, is that in some situations, primarily those which are highly unstructured, job-centered leadership (leadership providing structure) relates to subordinate performance and subordinate job satisfaction. Based upon these criticisms, researchers turned their efforts toward the investigation of the situational aspects of the leader–subordinate relationship.

The leadership research done in the three decades prior to 1970 laid the groundwork for two situational explanations of leadership. Within the situational approach, there have been two dominant models proposed. The first approach, proposed by Fiedler, is termed a contingency model of leadership. The second, proposed by House, and others, is known as path-goal theory.
Fiedler (1964) proposes a model that "attempts to spell out the specific conditions under which certain leadership attitudes result in effective performance (Fiedler, 1964, p. 183)." In his Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness, Fiedler suggests three situational components which are likely to influence the leader-subordinate relationship: 1) the leader's personal relations with members of his group, 2) the leader's power and authority which his position provides, and 3) the degree of structure in the task which the group has been assigned to perform (Fiedler, 1964, p. 158).

These three situational variables can be classified as being either positive or negative. According to Fiedler's hypothesis, the interaction of these three situational attributes will determine the leadership style appropriate to that specific situation. In order of importance, proposed situational attributes may be classified as follows: leader/member relations is postulated to be of greatest importance, followed by the structure of the task, and position power.

Leadership style, according to Fiedler, is not readily changeable. "He (the leader) will probably be able to do so (alter his leadership style) to the same extent to which he can alter other strongly entrenched attitudes (Fiedler, 1964, p. 184)." As a consequence, the leader is essentially "locked in" to a specific style of leadership. As has been proposed in previous behavioral approaches to leadership,
Fiedler suggests two distinct styles of leadership, task centered and employee centered. The strategy of the leader would be to attempt to adapt the various situational variables so that they are compatible to his leadership style. Fiedler cites, as an example, the situation that is highly unstructured and the leader is very task (or structure) oriented. In order to be an effective leader the strategy of the leader would be to lend structure to the situation so that the task oriented leader approach would be effective. Effective leadership, according to this situational approach, is dependent upon the leader diagnosing the favorableness of the situation. Should the situation be unfavorable to his innate leadership style, effective leadership would be attained through adapting the situation to his particular style.

Fiedler's work is significant in that he attempts to define effective leadership through a framework based upon situational factors. Contrasted to the other major situational approach, path-goal theory, Fiedler's situational model is somewhat limited. In essence, he proposes a model which presupposes that leaders can not change their style or adapt to situational factors. Moreover, he proposes a model in which the leader is projected to be successful in only three of the eight proposed situations.

The other major situational theory of leadership proposes a model which serves as a framework to explain and
define the leadership phenomenon. Based upon the findings of both the trait theorists and the behavioral theorists, this framework predicts the effectiveness of the leader dependent upon the situational factors that comprise the environment in which the leader functions. Based upon previously mentioned drawbacks of the trait theory approach, the behavioral approach, and Fiedler's hypothesis, this research will approach the study of the leadership style of athletic directors from the situational framework known as path-goal theory.

The path-goal theory of leadership was originally proposed by Evans (1970), House (1971), and House and Dessler (1974). Their findings are based upon the path-goal approach to productivity (Georgopoulos, et. al., 1957), the two dimensions of leadership, initiation of structure and consideration (Hemphill, and Halpin and Winer (1957), and the expectancy theory of motivation (Vroom, 1964). Based upon the need for a more comprehensive model of leader effectiveness as reflected by the criticisms of previous research, an alternative situational theory is proposed.

Georgopoulos proposed the following problem,
The question is why some workers tend to be high producers, or why persons of largely similar backgrounds who are engaged in the same activity under comparable conditions exhibit considerable variability in output. Specifically, what determines high
productivity (Georgopoulos, et. al., 1957, p. 345)? Georgopoulos reduced the question of productivity to the notion of the worker having needs and goals coupled with the rational decision making capability to attempt to meet these needs through the completion of said goals. Productivity is a function of one's motivation to produce at a given level. The path-goal approach proposed by Georgopoulos, suggests that motivation is based upon two factors: one, individual needs as reflected in the goals toward which each individual is moving; and, two, the individual's perception as to the usefulness of productive behavior as a path or as an instrumentality to the accomplishment of his goals.

From these concepts, Georgopoulos proposed the "path-goal hypothesis":

If a worker sees high productivity as a path leading to the attainment of one or more of his personal goals, he will tend to be a high producer. Conversely, if he sees low productivity as a path to the achievement of his goals, he will tend to be a low producer (Georgopoulos, et. al., 1967, p. 346).

The motivation for productivity is construed as being a function of personal needs and goals and the probable methods of meeting these needs and goals. The path to be chosen will be dependent upon the intensity of the need, the reality of attaining the goal, the availability of alternative more economical paths, and the freedom of the individual to pursue
the desired path. Of great importance to the study conducted by Georgopoulos, et al. is the perception that the worker has relating productivity on the job to the attainment of job related goals.

The three key variables relating to the path-goal hypothesis are: the path-goal perception of the individual worker, the level of need of the individual worker, and the level of freedom enjoyed by the individual to pursue his goal. These concepts are closely related to Vroom's expectancy theory of motivation (1964). Whereas Georgopoulos defines motivation as it relates to production, Vroom lends theoretical structure that is situational in nature to the study of motivation and proposes a methodology whereby it may be measured.

Vroom (1964) formulated a theory which has been termed instrumentality or an expectancy theory. This theory, much like the path-goal approach proposed by Georgopoulos, is based upon the concept of choice behavior. In essence this theory hypothesizes that workers will evaluate the many possibilities of on-the-job behavior and choose the behavior that will meet their job related goals.

Simply stated, expectancy theory defines motivation utilizing relationships between two distinct variables and their outcomes. On the first level, the relationship, as psychologically perceived by the individual, is termed expectancy. The individual perceives that specific effort
will lead to a specific outcome or a specific level of performance. The relationship on the second level is termed instrumentality. The individual perceives the linkage of performance and reward for such performance. Motivation is then based upon several psychological states within the individual: 1) the valence of the reward, 2) the individuals' perception that his performance will lead to the specific reward, and, 3) the individuals' realization that he can indeed accomplish the task with a specific performance level.

Should any of these factors be lacking, motivation will be low in that the hypothesized variable relationship is multiplicative in nature. The individual must psychologically relate effort to performance and have the confidence that he can accomplish the task. Secondly, performance must be psychologically related to a specific valent reward. These relationships are diagrammed in Figure 1.

The theoretical groundwork for the path-goal theory of leadership has been laid by Hemphill and The Ohio State Leadership Studies (1967) through their definition of the two dimensions of leadership, initiation of structure and consideration; Georgopoulos, et. al. (1957), and his path-goal approach to production; and, Vroom (1964) and his expectancy theory of motivation.

Evans (1970) builds upon these ideas to formulate the concept of path-goal instrumentality. According to this
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The Expectancy Theory of Motivation
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concept, a subordinate, viewing his actions as being positively rewarding, will continue to follow the path that will provide him with those desired rewards. A worker following a productive path leading to desired rewards will continue to follow that path. A worker following a non-productive path, who realizes rewards of value, will also continue to follow the same path. Moreover, Evans proposes that two assumptions must be made in order for a particular path to be chosen: 1) a need must be present that will be met with a reward, and, 2) an easier path producing the same rewards must not be available (Georgopoulos, 1957).

Figure 2 illustrates these hypothesized relationships. According to Evans, supervisory behavior in the form of the two dimensions of leadership, initiation of structure and consideration, can influence the perceptions of the subordinate in terms of his perceived path-goal instrumentality. Moreover, motivation is also moderated by the level of goal importance. The frequency with which a specific path is traveled is moderated by both the individual's motivation to follow a specific path as well as environmental characteristics such as the nature of the task and/or the abilities of the subordinate. Path frequency coupled with the actual path-goal instrumentality, the actual relationship of performance to reward, will produce goal attainment. According to Evans (1970, p. 280), "the motivation model presented here provides a link in
Figure 2
Evans Motivation Model
(Underlined characteristics are those variables actually tested.)
(Evans, 1970)
understanding the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction."

Critical to the understanding of the theory proposed by Evans is the relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate.

"It is the nature of the supervisor's role that he is called upon to influence his subordinates to perform organizationally relevant tasks, therefore supervisory behavior may be at its most effective when it has some influence upon the subordinate's path-goal instrumentalities (Evans, 1970, p. 281).

In that the literature supports two dimensions of leadership behavior, the question that this theoretical framework attempts to confront is the effect of each dimension of supervisory leadership on the motivation of the subordinate. Evans (1970, p. 282) suggests that in attempting to affect a path-goal instrumentality, there are three aspects to consider: 1) The subordinate must psychologically envision an environment in which there exists a supply of rewards and punishments. In most situations the supervisor has control of these rewards and punishments. The supervisor high in consideration would provide the appearance of controlling a larger supply of rewards than the supervisor who is high in initiation of structure. The supervisor high in consideration would appear to control rewards in such need areas as promotion, social interaction, and esteem, as well
as pay and security. The latter two areas would be the prime areas in which the leader high in initiation of structure would appear to have control. 2) The subordinate must relate the rewards and punishments that he is receiving to the specific on-the-job behavior that he demonstrates. Supervisory behavior that is high in initiation of structure has an impact in this area. The subordinate, through a comprehension of the guidelines established by the supervisor, is readily able to understand the kinds of paths that the leader desires that he follow and relate them to the rewards over which the leader has control. Evans contends that consideration will affect the abundance of potential outcomes but does not affect the expectation that a particular behavior will be rewarded. Initiation of structure conversely will relate specific behavior to specific rewards, but will not affect the perception of an abundance of rewards. 3) The final aspect of the situation that Evans suggests be considered is the set of circumstances that might be considered by the subordinate to be either high or low performance paths. The supervisor who is high in both consideration and initiation of structure consistently rewards high performance paths and fails to reward low performance paths. Variable paths, those which might be construed as either high or low performance paths, will be more readily followed by the subordinate if the superior demonstrates behavior that is high in consideration.
Evans (1970) studied 311 workers in a public utility and 88 nurses in a general hospital. The findings of his studies indicated: 1) support for path-goal instrumentalities relating to both behavior and goal attainment; and 2) supervisory behavior can relate to path-goal instrumentalities in predictable ways. Moreover, it can be predicted that when it does, path-goal instrumentalities will also relate to satisfaction. In essence, Evans concludes effective supervisory behavior must affect the path-goal instrumentalities of the subordinate.

House (1971, p.324), building upon the prior theoretical basis established by Georgopoulos, Vroom, Evans and others, suggests the following: 1) the essence of motivational functions of a leader consist of increasing personal pay-offs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, and making the paths to these personal pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing the roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the possibilities for personal satisfaction en route (House, 1971, p. 324).

2) Leader behavior that clarifies path-goal instrumentalities will provide positive motivation in that it may remove role ambiguity and exercise externally imposed controls that will link subordinate behavior to specific rewards if they are under the control of the supervisor. 3) If the task of the subordinate is clear and unambiguous, attempts to add
structure and externally imposed control will result in a decrease in motivation and satisfaction. 4) Leader behavior directed at increasing the psychological perception of the need satisfaction of the subordinate will be effective in increasing performance to the extent that it increases the net positive valence associated with the effort to achieve the work goal.

Based upon these assumptions, House proposes that there are specific moderating variables common to each situation that would effect the relationship of leader behavior to subordinate performance. The research dealing with the path-goal approach prior to that of House did not incorporate additional situational moderators. Specific situational factors proposed are: the routineness of the task, the intrinsic satisfaction of the task, and the level of task interdependence.

House conducted three studies. The first and second studies were conducted among 199 professional, administrative, and semi-administrative personnel of a heavy equipment manufacturing company. The third was conducted among 122 employees (13 managers, eight technicians, 2 secretaries, and 99 hourly workers) of a chemical manufacturing plant. House's findings supported most of his hypothesized relationships. In the first study leader initiating structure positively related to subordinate satisfaction, leader initiating structure was negatively
related to subordinate role ambiguity, and, the variance in role ambiguity accounted for the relationship between initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction. In the second study it was found that the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction increased as job autonomy increased, and the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction decreased as job autonomy increased. Job scope was not found to have a moderating effect on the relationship between consideration and satisfaction in jobs with a low job scope. However, among jobs of low job scope, consideration did relate to performance due to the presence of satisfying, friendly behavior when the subordinate was performing a routine task. This was not found to hold true in non-routine tasks. Findings in House's third study supported those of the second study.

According to House (1971, p. 324) these situational moderators "do not constitute an exhaustive list of relationships between the variables, but rather, serve to illustrate how the general propositions can be operationalized." Although House hypothesizes specific variable relationships, the importance of his work lies not only with his findings regarding his hypothesized relationships but also that he proposes a general framework of the theory within which his hypotheses and other additional hypotheses may be explored.
House, in 1973, at the Southern Illinois University symposium on the contemporary developments on the study of leadership, proposed that in the study of the effect of leader behavior (as an independent variable), the appropriate dependent variables were the specific psychological states of the subordinates as opposed to measures of satisfaction and performance. The contention was that the relationship of leader behavior to satisfaction and performance was confounded by too many intermediating variables, examples of which would be attitudes, expectations, abilities of subordinates, and task characteristics. House suggests that a focus on the psychological states would systematically allow for the effect of intermediating variables. Examples of psychological states would be the subordinate's intrinsic job satisfaction, satisfaction with extrinsic rewards, the expectancy that effort leads to performance, and the expectancy that performance leads to rewards.

House and Dessler (1974) identified two classes of situational variables: 1) characteristics of subordinates, such as the individual's perception of his own ability and individual needs; and, 2) environmental pressures and demands, such as the task of the subordinate, the formal authority system of the organization, and the primary work group. They tested their theory on two samples drawn from employees from all levels of two medium sized electronics firms.
In both samples the relationship between instrumental leadership (initiation of structure) and intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, role clarity, and the expectancy that effort leads to performance and performance leads to rewards was negatively moderated by task structure. The higher the structure of the task, the lower the relationship between initiation of structure and the dependent variables. In essence, it was found that the more routine the task, the less direction the subordinate needs from the leader. Conversely, it was found in both samples that the relationship between supportive leader behavior (consideration) and the same dependent variables was positively moderated by task structure. Subordinates performing tasks that were high in structure did not need considerate leader behavior in that the task itself produced intrinsic satisfaction due the the variety of work performed.

The research of Evans (1970), House (1971), and House and Dessler (1974) established a framework and a starting point for the study of leadership utilizing the path-goal approach. Their findings in regard to the hypothesized variable relationships were significant in that they provided a basis from which other researchers could test not only their findings, but the framework of the theory itself.

House and Dessler (1974) propose that further research need be done considering situational variables that might influence the leader–subordinate relationship. Suggested as
possible moderating variables are subordinate's needs for achievement and affiliation, subordinates perceived ability relative to task demands, the formal authority system of the organization, and the norms of the group.

Schriesheim and DeNisi (1981, p. 390) indicate: "Although a number of aspects of the situation are suggested by the theory, task structure is the only dimension that has been extensively examined to date." Schriesheim and Schriesheim (1976) noted that there is no reason that the theory should not focus on other variables as suggested by the original proposition of the theory.

Numerous researchers have proposed and tested additional situational variables that act as modifiers of the leadership style-subordinate satisfaction relationship. These situational variables have been both environmental in nature as well as individual characteristics of the subordinates. Numerous situational moderators have been explored as to their impact on the relationship of leadership style to subordinate satisfaction.

Prior to a discussion of the various suggested moderators, it is appropriate to note that conflicting findings have been found. Studies have attributed these conflicting results to inconsistencies in the measurement of the independent variable, initiation of structure. Schriesheim, House, And Kerr (1976) found that studies exploring the path-goal relationships utilized numerous
instruments in order to quantify the independent variable, including, the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ), the early Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), the Revised Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Schriesheim and associates found that the SBDQ is slightly more concerned with punitive leader behavior, and the revised LBDQ was more concerned with autocratic leader behavior. As a consequence, the SBDQ reflects a dominance of the measurement of production oriented items while the LBDQ reflects communication and organizational dimensions which largely measure leadership behavior that aids subordinate psychological states.

In a subsequent study, Schriesheim and Von Glinow (1977) found that the LBDQ, the LBDQ - Form XII, and forms using items from them positively moderated the relationship between initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction. The SBDQ, however, did not produce results consistent with the theory's predicted relationship of the same two variables. Based upon their findings, Schriesheim and Von Glinow suggest that the SBDQ not be utilized as an instrument to measure initiation of structure. As conflicting findings are discussed, the results of these studies should be considered.

As researchers have considered the moderating effects of various situational variables, the effects of environmental variables have been the most frequently explored. Within
this class of variable, task ambiguity has been the most frequently explored moderating variable. House (1971) in a study conducted among 199 professional, administrative, and semi-administrative employees of a heavy equipment manufacturing plant and 122 employees from all levels of a chemical manufacturing plant found that task ambiguity positively moderated the relationship between initiation of structure and job satisfaction. Alternatively stated:

The more ambiguous the task the more positive the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction and performance. Structure serves to reduce role ambiguity and clarify path-goal relationships for ambiguous tasks but is viewed as unnecessary and redundant for nonambiguous tasks (House, 1971, p. 325).

These findings are supported by a number of studies. Szilagyi and Sims (1974) in a study of all levels of employees of a major midwestern hospital found support among professional and administrative employees. House and Dessler (1974) found support among samples of employees from all levels of two medium sized electronics firms. Their findings indicated that as task certainty increased, the subordinated required less direction from the leader. Moreover, direction or structure was redundant and unacceptable to the subordinate. House, Valency, and Van der Krabben (unpublished) supported the hypothesis that task ambiguity
moderated the relationship of leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction. Schriesheim and DeNisi (1981) found that task variety had a moderating influence on the leader behavior—subordinate satisfaction relationship.

A number of studies did not support the path-goal hypothesis that task ambiguity would positively moderate the relationship between initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction. Szilagyi and Wallace (1974), in their study of hospital employees, found that the proposed relationship did not hold true with lower level employees.

House and Dessler (1974) found that task ambiguity positively moderated the relationship between considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction. The essence of this relationship is that unambiguous tasks are inherently uninteresting and provide little intrinsic valence. Consequently, considerate leader behavior, as demonstrated by the leader, is a behavior that is valued by the subordinate.

Schriesheim and Schriesheim (1980) did not find that task structure had a significant moderating relationship between initiation of structure subordinate satisfaction in a study of 290 managerial and clerical employees of a large eastern public utility. These findings were supported on all organizational levels and job types.

Predictability of the environment or task certainty was explored by Szilagyi and Wallace (1974). Their findings indicated that initiation of structure was positively
moderated by task certainty as it related to satisfaction of employees. However, in relation to performance, initiation of structure did not positively relate to performance regardless of the certainty of the task.

Several researchers explored characteristics of the leaders as possible moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship. House, Valency, and Van der Krabben (unpublished) suggest achievement orientation of the leader. Podsakoff, Schuler, and Todor (1983) found that leader expertise positively moderated the relationship of both initiation of structure and consideration to the subordinate's perception of role ambiguity. In essence, the greater the perception of the subordinate that the leader was knowledgeable, the less the perception of the subordinate of the ambiguity of his task. In that ambiguous tasks are frustrating to the employee, clarification of these paths through leader behavior is construed as producing a satisfying psychological state within the employee.

Szilagyi and Sims (1974) suggested that organizational goals moderate the leader-subordinate relationship. Their findings indicated mixed support that role ambiguity did indeed function as a moderator. The authors suggest that most of the research done on the path-goal hypothesis was conducted primarily in industrial organizations which have different goals than humanistic service organizations. As a consequence, the authors suggest that the goals of the
organization may serve as moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship.

Dessler and Valenzi (1977) studied occupational level as a possible moderator. The higher the occupational level, they hypothesized, the more complex and varied the tasks. Their findings did not support the hypothesis that structure would relate to satisfaction among supervisors. This hypothesis, however, assumed that the role of a supervisor would be ambiguous. This relationship did not exist in this sample of supervisors. Consequently, their role was perceived as unambiguous. The tenets of House's original path-goal theory were then supported. If the task is unambiguous, leader behavior that initiates structure will seem redundant and not relate to the satisfaction of the subordinate.

Schriesheim and DeNisi (1981) found support using moderated regression analysis for task feedback having a negative moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction. In conjunction with the original path-goal hypothesis, the presence of feedback serves as task direction. Initiation of structure is viewed by the subordinate as unnecessary and redundant.

Schriesheim and DeNisi (1981) in the same study also suggest that subordinates having the on-the-job opportunity to deal with others will negatively moderate the relationship
of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction. Moderated regression analysis indicated that there existed a negative interaction between initiation of structure and opportunities for employees to deal with others. These findings are supportive of the original assumptions of the path-goal theory hypothesis.

Mitchell (1973) hypothesized that participatory leadership style moderated the relation between the leader and the subordinate. His findings indicated:

to have the expectations increase the level of effort they must be both clear and valued. A more participative approach would certainly clarify them; in most cases they should become of greater value as well, because the individual has contributed to their construction (he is as Vroom suggests "ego involved") (Mitchell, 1973, p. 676).

Hunt (1975) suggested, and found promise for the following as moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship: the effect of other supervisory personnel in the organization, organizational policy, and the experience and training of the subordinate.

House and Dessler (1974) proposed a second class of moderating variables, characteristics of the subordinate, that they felt might influence the leader behavior-subordinate satisfaction relationship. Although the literature provides a more extensive study of environmental
variables as moderators, it does reflect some support for a number of factors that would be considered characteristics of the subordinates.

House (1971), in his initial proposition of the path-goal theory of leadership, suggests:

The motivational functions of a leader are to increase the net positive valences associated with work-goal attainment, increase the net positive valences associated with the path-behavior-to work-goal attainment, and increase the subordinate's path instrumentality with respect for work-goal attainment for personal outcomes and the behavior required for work-goal attainment (House, 1971, p. 323).

The subordinate's perception of the value of performance and the value the outcome (reward) contingent on performance is critical to his motivation to perform. House's description of the function of the leader is that it is his task to influence positively the awareness of the subordinate of the values that he, the employee, will reap contingent upon the effort-performance-reward relationship. "Leader behavior directed at need satisfaction of subordinates will result in increased performance to the extent that such satisfaction increases the net positive valence associated with goal-directed effort (House, 1971, p. 324)." Through his actions, the leader has the ability to enhance the psychological states of the subordinate in relation to the
subordinate's perception that performance is valued because it is closely related to outcomes that may be under the control of the leader. If the task is intrinsically satisfying, House hypothesizes that leader initiation of structure will be more motivating to the subordinate than considerate leader behavior. Conversely, when the subordinate is engaged in routine, non-interesting tasks, considerate leader behavior will be valued by the subordinate.

There is a great complexity in the relationships of values to rewards on both first (performance) and second level (rewards) outcomes. The subordinate's perception of the value of both levels of outcomes is contingent not only upon the predisposition of the employee, but also upon his interaction with the leader with whom he is working. House (1971) found moderate support for his hypotheses in the three studies that he reported.

House and Dessler suggest "leader behavior will be viewed as acceptable to subordinates to the extent that the subordinates see such behavior as either an immediate source of satisfaction, or as instrumental to future satisfaction (1974, p. 31)." House and Dessler suggest several individual characteristics that could be possible moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship. Individuals with high needs for affiliation and social approval would view friendly, considerate leader behavior as a source of immediate
satisfaction. Subordinates with high needs for achievement would receive satisfaction from leader behavior that was high in initiation of structure. This type of leader behavior would clarify path-goal relationships and provide goal oriented feedback. Individuals with high need for extrinsic rewards would also view leader behavior that was high in initiation of structure in much the same manner. Leader behavior that related effort to performance and performance to reward would produce satisfaction if the subordinate desired recognition, promotion, security, or wage increases as second level outcomes.

Porter and Lawler (1968) and House and Dessler (1974) also suggest that the subordinate's perception of their own ability in relation to the demands of the task can serve as a significant moderator. In situations in which the subordinate perceives his own ability as high, initiated structure or directive leader behavior will be viewed as unnecessary external control and will not provide satisfaction within the subordinate.

Knoop (1982) suggests work values as a moderator of the leader-subordinate relationship. In a study of 363 college and university instructors, Knoop hypothesized that subordinates who were people oriented would see considerate leader behavior as satisfying and subordinates who possessed self-expressive value orientations would view structured leader behavior as satisfying. Moderated regression analyses
did not support these hypotheses. Knoop suggests that the complexity of the path-goal relationships warrant the investigation of other moderating variables which can be incorporated into the theoretical framework.

Mitchell (1973) suggests that various personality characteristics may interact with leadership style and subordinate satisfaction. Although he does no empirical research as the the effects that personality might have, he suggests, as an example, locus of control. It is possible, he contends, that those with an external locus of control would prefer a directive leadership style.

**SUMMARY**

The path-goal theory of leadership has received a great deal of support as a theoretical means of explaining the construct of effective leadership. Previous attempts at defining leadership in terms of traits of leader behavior have lacked the situational dynamics contained in the path-goal framework.

Path-goal leadership theory is closely related to the the expectancy theory of motivation. The motivational function of the leader is to influence the psychological perceptions of the subordinate as to the linkages between his effort and his performance and his performance and the rewards contingent on satisfactory performance.
The literature supports two distinct styles of leadership behavior, initiation of structure and consideration (Halpin and Winer, 1957). Both leadership styles have been shown to relate to subordinate satisfaction. Studies have shown a strong relationship between subordinate satisfaction and performance (House and Wahba, 1972; Lawler, 1971; and Vroom, 1964).

Path-goal theory provides a framework to predict the relationship of leadership style to subordinate satisfaction dependent upon the presence of situational moderators. House and Dessler (1974) identified two classes of situational variables, characteristics of subordinates and characteristics of the environment, that modify the leader-subordinate relationship. The majority of the research done in relationship to possible situational moderators has focused on the structure of the task, although researchers unanimously acclaim the need for future research to focus on additional factors that warrant investigation as to being possible moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

As supported by numerous other leadership studies following the path-goal framework, this study is correlational research. Both the independent and the dependent variables are measured by survey instruments commonly utilized in past research of this nature. The three variables suggested as moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship are attributes measured by a demographic questionnaire.

All instruments were mailed to the respondents. Those who did not respond were mailed a second questionnaire three weeks after the first. Two weeks later, non-respondents were called and urged to respond.

All of the constructs that are being studied are measured through the administration of questionnaires to the subordinates (coaches). Three distinct instruments are utilized. The first is demographic in nature and quantifies demographic information relating to the respondents. The second instrument quantifies the subordinates' perceptions of their leaders' (athletic directors) style. The third
instrument quantifies the level of satisfaction that each individual coach finds within his job.

Subject Selection

The population in the study is the men's football, basketball, baseball, and track coaches of the sixteen institutions in the Ohio Athletic Conference and the North Coast Athletic Conference. The institutions in the population are small liberal arts colleges that are N.C.A.A. Division III members. All of these institutions compete in football, basketball, baseball, and track. The largest athletic department with one athletic director administering both men's and women's sports would offer competition in 20 sports. The smallest department would offer competition in 11 sports. The smallest span of control that one male athletic administrator would have is nine sports (Figure 3).

At seven of the institutions the athletic director holds one of the positions that is designated to be a respondent. At four of the institutions, the same individual holds two of the head coaching positions to be studied. One position is vacant, and, the author is excluded from the population. Consequently, the total population studied will will be comprised of 51 coaches as opposed to 64.
### MEN'S

| AD FB BK BB TR CX SO LX HR SW GO TE AD FB BB TE SO TR CX LX SB SW |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| AL  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| BW  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| CA  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| CW  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| + FENCING & RIFLE + FENCING |
| DE  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| HB  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| KE  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| MA  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| + CREW + CREW |
| MT  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| MK  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| OB  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| ON  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| OW  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| + SAILING + SAILING |
| OT  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| WO  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| WI  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |

### WOMEN'S

| AD FB BK BB TR CX SO LX HR SW GO TE AD FB BB TE SO TR CX LX SB SW |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| AL  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| BW  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| CA  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| CW  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| + FENCING & RIFLE + FENCING |
| DE  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| HB  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| KE  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| MA  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| + CREW + CREW |
| MT  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| MK  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| OB  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| ON  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| OW  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| + SAILING + SAILING |
| OT  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| WO  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |
| WI  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X  X |

**KEY:**

- AL = Allegheny College
- BW = Baldwin Wallace College
- CA = Capital University
- CW = Case Western Reserve University
- DE = Denison University
- EB = Elyria College
- KE = Kenyon College
- MA = Marietta College
- MT = Mt. Union College
- MK = Muskingum College
- OS = Oberlin College
- OW = Ohio Northern University
- OW = Ohio Wesleyan University
- OT = Otterbein College
- WI = Wittenberg University
- AD = Athletic Director
- FB = Football
- BK = Basketball
- BB = Baseball
- TE = Track
- LX = Cross Country
- SO = Soccer
- LX = Lacrosse
- MR = Wrestling
- SM = Swimming
- SW = Swimming
- TE = Tennis
- PB = Field Hockey
- VB = Volleyball
- SB = Softball

**FIGURE 3**

The Varsity Sports Sponsored by OAC and NCAC Institutions
Outcome Measures

Three distinct instruments will be utilized. The first is demographic in nature and measured pertinent personal data relating to the respondent. Appendix A illustrates this questionnaire.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form - XII (Stogdill, 1963) is used to measure the leadership style of the athletic director. The ten items quantifying initiation of structure and the ten items measuring consideration are used to measure these constructs. The Job Descriptive Index (Smith, 1967) is used to measure the satisfaction of the subordinate. Although all five segments of the JDI were administered to the subjects as well as the Job in General (JIG) questionnaire, subordinate satisfaction is quantified by the two facets of the JDI which measure satisfaction with work and satisfaction with supervision and the JIG is utilized to measure overall job satisfaction. Appendices B and C illustrate these questionnaires.

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire Form - XII, commonly known as the LBDQ Form - XII, was developed for use in describing supervisors by the group members whom he supervises. This instrument quantifies the two levels of the independent variable into the constructs of initiating structure and consideration. Ten items from the LBDQ - Form XII are utilized to measure initiation of structure and ten
items were utilized to measure consideration.

The two factorially defined subscales, Consideration and Initiation of Structure, have been widely used in empirical research, particularly in military organizations, industry, and education. Halpin reports that "in several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by 'between group vs within group' analysis of variance, the \( F \) ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly" (Stogdill, 1963).

Additional support for the reliability of the LBDQ Form -XII is presented in The Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII.

The two factorially defined subscales, Consideration and Initiation of Structure, have been widely used in empirical research, particularly in military organizations, industry, and education. Halpin reports that "in several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a 'between group vs within group' analysis of variance, the \( F \) ratios have all been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of
different leaders differ significantly" Stogdill, 1963, p.1).

Schriesheim and DeNisi (1976, p. 591-592) cite several examples supporting the use of this instrument. The literature supports the use of the LBDQ - Form XII. This measure (LBDQ) was used because (a) it has psychometric properties that are known and are superior to those of the other available instruments (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1977), (b) it is commonly used in leadership research (Hunt, Osborne, and Schriesheim, 1978), and (c) it has been found to be an adequate measure of instrumental behavior in previous research (Schriesheim & Von Glinow, 1977).

The Job Descriptive Questionnaire, known as the JDI, was developed to be completed by the subordinates in order to measure their job satisfaction. Subordinate satisfaction was broken down into the subcategories of satisfaction with work, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with supervision, and satisfaction with coworker. Schriesheim and Kinicki (1980) support the use of the JDI. "This measure (the JDI) has been subjected to extensive validity and reliability examination, with highly supportive results."

The Job in General questionnaire (JIG) measures the overall job satisfaction of the respondent and was developed separately from the JDI and derived from several
different and diverse samples. The initial analysis of the JIG indicates both high internal consistency reliability and good convergent validity. The Coefficient Alpha reliability was .93 for a sample of 670 employees in clerical, technical, engineering, and administrative positions, and .96 for a sample of 132 county employees (Summary Report on the Job-in-General Scale of the JDI).

Analysis of Data

Prior to testing the hypotheses, zero-order correlations were performed among the variables to determine their interrelationship. These intercorrelations will be presented along with the means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliabilities.

Hierarchical moderated regression analysis (Cohen, 1975, and Arnold, 1982) will be utilized to test the hypotheses. The statistical results will be illustrated in appropriate tabular form.

Recent literature supports the use of this method of analysis (Schriesheim and DeNisi, 1976; Schriesheim and Schriesheim, 1980; Knoop, 1982; Cohen, 1975; and Podsakoff, Todor, & Schuler, 1983). Arnold (1982, p.143-144) asserts, "Contingency" theories, by definition, hypothesize that the relationship between two variables is "contingent" upon some third variable, and as a result researchers
have been concerned with the issue of whether "moderator" variables "interact" with independent variables in some predicted manner. The technique of hierarchical moderated regression will determine not only if a suggested moderating variable interacts with an independent variable to effect the dependent variable, but also the direction in which it influences the dependent variable if, indeed, there is an effect. Arnold suggests two aspects of the relationship:

The degree (or strength) of the relationship between the two variables is indicated by the partial coefficient $R$ between the two variables. The square of the correlation coefficient $R^2$ indicates the percentage of $Y$ variance accounted for by $X$ (1982, p. 145).

As each of the dependent variables (subordinate satisfaction) is regressed on the independent variable (leadership style), the moderating variable (task complexity, experience, and success), and the cross product of the independent and dependent variable a change in $R^2$ may occur. The equation illustrated in Figure 4 is utilized to determine the degree of the moderating effect, if any, of the selected moderating variables upon the relationship of the independent variable and the dependent variable.
Y = dependent variable  \[ Y = X \]
X = independent variable  \[ Y = X + Z \]
Z = moderating variable  \[ Y = X + Y + (XZ) \]

Figure 4
Hierarchical Regression

If there is a significant change in R square between the second and third steps in the equation, an interacting effect of the moderating variable (Z) has been found. According to Arnold (1982, p. 168): "The critical test of the validity of the moderator hypothesis is the statistical significance of the interaction (product) term, not its magnitude relative to main effects." More simply stated, if there is a significant change in R square from step two to step three in the regression, a moderating effect of Z has been determined.

As in prior research (Podsakoff, Todor, and Schuler, 1983), following the suggestions of Arnold (1982) who cites the conservative moderating technique that is prone to Type II errors (neglecting a moderating effect that does exist), a .10 criterion level has been selected to determine the existence of a significant moderating effect.

Once the existence of a significant moderating effect has been established, a second step (Bill Todor, personal conversation, March 21, 1985) will be conducted to determine the direction of, i.e., the form of the moderating effect.
The moderating variable will be dichotomized into a high and a low group and the independent variable (initiation of structure or consideration) will be regressed on the dependent variable. The direction of the moderating effect will determined by a comparison of the regression coefficients as determined for both the high and low groups. If the slope of the high group exceeds that of the low group, positive moderating effect has been determined. Conversely, if the slope of the low group exceeds that of the high group, a negative moderating effect has been determined. The results of these analyses will be graphed to illustrate the directions of any significant moderating effects that will be found.

Statement of Hypothesis

The purpose of this research is to analyze the situation in which the athletic administrator functions in order to determine if there are specific moderating aspects of the situation which effect the relationship of the leadership style of the athletic director and the satisfaction of the subordinate coaches within his department. There are present within this leader-subordinate relationship numerous potential moderator variables that could influence the relationship of leader behavior to subordinate satisfaction. Three potential moderating variables have been selected as possible moderators based upon the foundation laid in the
literature: 1) the complexity of the task that each coach
performs, 2) the success that each coach has had in his
specific sport, and 3) the experience of the coach. As
proposed by House and Dessler (1974) these factors may
influence the psychological states of the coach as he relates
his effort to his performance and his performance to possible
valent outcomes.

Football, basketball, baseball, and track coaches have
been selected as the sample to be studied. Each of these
sports differ in terms of their structure and complexity.
Each sport can be analyzed as to its complexity considering
many different factors. For the purpose of this study, each
sport has been rated as to the complexity of the task of the
administration of said sport. The ranking is derived
considering the following elements: 1) the interest of the
institutional communities in each activity; 2) the number of
staff employed to support each sport; and, 3) the amount of
money expended on each sport. Based upon these criteria,
football is rated as the most complex sport to administer,
followed by basketball, baseball, and track. Complexity
refers to the number of variables with which the coach of the
sport is confronted. The greater the number of variables,
the more complex the nature of the task.

Based upon House's (1971) original proposition and the
work of numerous others (House and Dessler, 1974; Schriesheim
and DeNisi, 1981; Szalagyi and Sims, 1974; Szilagyi and
Wallace, 1974; Schriesheim and Schriesheim, 1980), task complexity will be considered as a moderating variable. According to House's hypothesis, subordinates who are involved in complex tasks will find satisfaction with leadership that lends structure to the task. Conversely, when involved in tasks that are highly structured, subordinates find that initiation of structure from a leader is redundant and does not relate to satisfaction within the subordinate.

The first six hypotheses suggest task complexity as having moderating effects on the leader-subordinate relationship.

H1: Task complexity will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction with work.

H2: Task complexity will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

H3: Task complexity will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction the job in general.

H4: Task complexity will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship between considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with work.

H5: Task complexity will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship between considerate leader
behavior and subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

H6: Task complexity will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship between considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with the job in general.

Due to the complexity of the task confronted by the football coach, i.e., the complex environment with which he must interact, the football coach will find satisfaction in the form of structure initiated by the athletic administrator. Examples of structure of this nature would be assistance with and guidelines relating to public relations, alumni relations, academic counseling, travel, budget, recruiting, and well defined goals for the program. The nature of the job of all of the head coaches is such that they must be concerned with all of these tasks. The environment in which the football and basketball coaches function is much more complex than that in which the baseball and track coaches function. The time of the football and basketball coaches is so limited that direct involvement with all aspects of the environment on a daily basis is difficult. The coaches of football and basketball must know that these functions are being maintained in order to assure that their core function, the actual coaching of and the recruitment of athletes, is not threatened. Structure enables the head football and basketball coaches to control their environment as well as sets up approved methods for meeting the various
goals of the program. Moreover, structure provides the key expectancy link between effort and performance and performance and reward. The coach will find that the structure that is provided for him by the athletic administrator will assist him down the correct path that will lead him to the attainment of the goals that have been established for his program as well as his own personal goals.

The emphasis on the importance of these supportive areas to the football coach and basketball coach does not preclude their importance to baseball and track coaches. However, due to the complexity of the task of football and basketball coaches as compared to baseball and track coaches and the environment in which they both function, the coaches of these two sports will have greater difficulty controlling all of these factors without leader initiated structure than will the coaches of baseball and track.

The football and basketball coaches will look at the structure provided by the athletic administrator as relating to satisfaction. This assumes that the structure provided allows the coach to perform in such a manner as to facilitate the attainment of specific goals and consequently valent rewards, whether they be intrinsic or extrinsic. In line with the path-goal hypothesis, leader initiation of structure will decline in importance as the complexity of the administration of each sport decreases (or, as the complexity
of the structure of the tasks increase).

Considerate leader behavior, when viewed by the football coach will be of secondary importance due to his need for structure. As hypothesized in the original path-goal theory, intrinsic rewards are present within complex tasks and leader consideration will not be as satisfying if the task is of high complexity rather than low complexity. The very nature of highly complex tasks makes them rewarding. It would follow, in line with the path-goal hypothesis, that the complexity of the environment in which the football and basketball coaches function would provide intrinsic reward and thus render leader consideration secondary in significance. Although considerate leader behavior may be appreciated, it may not be instrumental to the outcomes desired by the coach.

Considerate leader behavior, when viewed by the baseball and track coaches, due the less complex environments in which they function, will prove to be related more strongly to satisfaction than will initiation of structure. In essence, consideration will fill the void created by the less complex environment which is less interesting and less intrinsically satisfying than the environment in which the football and basketball coaches function.

The second factor suggested as a moderator is the past success that each given coach has enjoyed in intercollegiate coaching. These hypotheses are stated below.
H7: The past achievements (success) of the subordinate will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship of leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction with work.

H8: The past achievements (success) of the subordinate will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship of leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

H9: The past achievements (success) of the subordinate will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship of leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction with the job in general.

H10: Past achievements of the subordinate (success) will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration to subordinate satisfaction with work.

H11: Past achievements of the subordinate (success) will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration to subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

H12: Past achievements of the subordinate (success) will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration to subordinate satisfaction with the job in general.

Downey, et. al. (1976) suggest that the need for achievement will serve as a moderator of the leader-subordinate relationship. In that coaches are largely judged
by the public by their won/loss records and the achievements of their teams, coaches who have experienced success in the past will be less responsive to change and the initiation of structure by the leader because the practices that they have employed in the past have proven to be successful. Consequently, the imposition of structure will appear to be redundant and contrary to the methods that have been successful for the coach in the past. The coach who has not been successful will be provided satisfaction by leader initiation of structure that will create within the coach a psychological state that will provide him with the belief that he will be more successful in the future.

Consideration will be viewed by the subordinate who has been successful in the past as a valued leader behavior in that he will prefer consideration to structure. The coach who has not experienced success will look for initiated structure by the leader to help him achieve success. This type of leader behavior will be greatly preferred by that coach who has not been successful, by won/loss standards, and be preferred to considerate leader behavior.

The final factor suggested as having a moderating effect on the relationship of the athletic director and the coach is the experience of the coach. The moderating effects of experience are hypothesized as follows.

H13: Subordinate experience will negatively moderate the relationship between leader initiating structure and
subordinate satisfaction with work.

H14: Subordinate experience will negatively moderate the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

H15: Subordinate experience will negatively moderate the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction with the job in general.

H16: Subordinate experience will positively moderate the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with work.

H17: Subordinate experience will positively moderate the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

H18: Subordinate experience will positively moderate the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with the job in general.

Experience is the third factor to be considered as a moderator of the leader–subordinate relationship. Hunt (1975) suggests that the experience of the subordinate will moderate the relationship.

Alternatively stated, hypotheses thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen suggest that the imposition of structure on the experienced coach will not relate as well to his satisfaction as the imposition of structure on the coach with less experience. The experienced coach, by virtue of the fact that he has performed his duties for a long period of time,
will resist changes in procedures and policies. He will derive satisfaction from considerate leader behavior rather than initiation of structure which will seem redundant to him.

Summary

The literature supports that leadership is contingent upon the situation in which the leader functions. Path-goal theory is a framework which suggests that certain factors within a given situation interact in predictable ways with the relationship of leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction.

Numerous factors have been proposed as potential moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship. This study, through the use of hierarchical moderated regression analysis, will analyze the moderating effects of task complexity (sport), past coaching success (won/loss record), and years experience in coaching upon the relationship of the leader behavior of selected NCAA Division III athletic directors and the satisfaction of the football, basketball, baseball, and track coaches for whom they are responsible.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of specific moderating variables, selected as potential moderators as suggested by the original path-goal hypothesis and the review of recent literature, on the relationship between leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction among athletic directors and coaches in the Ohio Athletic Conference and the North Coast Athletic Conference. Of the 51 eligible respondents in the population, 49 returned usable questionnaires.

As previously discussed, the two dimensions of leadership, initiation of structure and consideration, are quantified by the 20 items from the LBDQ Form - XII. Subordinate satisfaction is measured by the two subscales of the JDI measuring satisfaction with work and satisfaction with supervision. Overall job satisfaction is measured by the JIG. Hypothesized to be moderators of the leader-subordinate relationship are the sport coached (i.e. task complexity), the success of the subordinate, and the experience of the subordinate.
Table 1 illustrates the mean, standard deviation, internal reliability, internal reliability with the specified variable removed, and the correlations of all variables. Internal reliability is measured by Coefficient Alpha = .69. Strong evidence of internal reliability is shown. Zero order correlations were performed on all variables. Both independent variables, initiation of structure and consideration, are significantly related to two of the dependent variables in this study, satisfaction with work and satisfaction with supervision. Of the variables suggested to have a moderating effect on the relationship between leadership style and subordinate satisfaction, none relate with either of the independent or dependent variables in this study. There is a significant relationship, however, between the suggested moderating variables of subordinate experience and subordinate success.

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the effect of task complexity, subordinate experience, and subordinate success on the relationship between leadership style and subordinate satisfaction. The results of these analyses are illustrated in Tables 2-19. Significant moderating effects are found in eight of the 18 hypothesized relationships.

Sport significantly moderated the relationship between both dimensions of the independent variable and subordinate satisfaction with supervision (Table 3 and Table 4).
Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities with Variable Removed, and Intercorrelations of All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>WOR</th>
<th>SUP</th>
<th>JIG</th>
<th>SPO</th>
<th>EXP</th>
<th>SUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56** .43** .52** .24+</td>
<td>- .00</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>35.04</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.35* .70** .31*</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOR</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.45** .53**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>46.94</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUC</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10

Coefficient alpha = .69
Experience is found to have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between initiation of structure and satisfaction with work (Table 8). Experience also has a significant effect on the relationship between considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with both work and supervision (Table 11 and Table 12). Finally, subordinate success has a significant moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction work, supervision, and the JIG (Table 14, Table 15, and Table 16).

Evidence has been presented that all of the suggested moderating variables do indeed have an effect on the relationship of some dimension of leader behavior and various measures of subordinate satisfaction. In order to determine the direction of the moderating effect (significant p < .10) of each of the suggested moderating variables upon the relationship the independent and dependent variables, each moderator was dichotomized into a high average group and a low average group. The construct of task complexity, operationalized by the sport coached, was divided into a high complexity group, coaches of football and basketball, and a low complexity group, coaches of baseball and track. The variable experience was divided into a low experience group, coaches with six or less years experience, and a high experience group, coaches with ten or more years experience. The variable success was split into a low average group,
coaches who have a won/loss percentage of 49.9% or less, and a high average group, coaches with a won/loss percentage of 60% and greater.

Once these groups were created, each dependent variable was regressed to the appropriate leadership dimension. Of concern to the study is the intercept and the slope of the regression. A graph of the regression coefficients for each group indicates the direction of the moderating effect, positive or negative. If the slope of the high average group line is greater than that of the low average group, the moderating effect is positive. Should the slope of the low average group exceed that of the high average group, the moderating effect is negative in nature.

Hypotheses

H1: Task complexity will have a positive moderating effect upon the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work. Task structure was not found to have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work (Table 2).

H2: Task complexity will have a positive moderating effect upon the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. Table 3 illustrates that task complexity significantly
Table 2

Moderating Effect of Complexity on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of structure (IS)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>10.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>3.15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Complexity</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tot chg in R sq = .253

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
Table 3

Moderating Effect of Complexity on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>17.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Complexity</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>3.27+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R sq =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
(p < .10) moderates the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. In order to determine the direction of the moderating effect the variable was divided into a high complexity group (football and basketball coaches) and a low complexity group (baseball and track coaches). The results are graphed in Figure 5. The relationship is positive in that the regression coefficient of high task complexity (1.40) is greater in slope than that of low task complexity (.37). The results support H2.

H3: Task complexity will have a positive moderating effect upon the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with the JIG. Task structure was not found to have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with the JIG (Table 4).

H4: Task complexity will have a negative moderating effect upon the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with work. Task structure was not found to have a significant moderating effect on the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with work (Table 5).

H5: Task complexity will have a negative moderating effect upon the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. As illustrated in
FIGURE 5
The Moderating Effect of High and Low Task Complexity on the Relationship of Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision

Low Complexity
Intercept = 27.77
Slope = .37

High Complexity
Intercept = -8.64
Slope = 1.40
Table 4

Moderating Effect of Complexity on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with JIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2.96+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Complexity</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
Table 5
Moderating Effect of Complexity on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>3.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>3.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Complexity</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
*  p < .05
+  p < .10
Table 6, task complexity was found to have a significant ($p < .01$) moderating effect on the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. Task complexity was broken into groups of high and low average complexity as previously done. Figure 6 illustrates a positive moderating effect. The regression coefficient of the high complexity group (2.08) is greater than that of the low complexity group (.93). H5 is not confirmed.

H6: Task complexity will have a negative moderating effect upon the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with the JIG. No significant moderating effects were found (Table 7).

H7: The experience of the subordinate will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work. Experience was found to have a significant ($p < .01$) moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction (Table 8). A group with low average experience (less than seven years of experience) and a group with high average experience (greater than nine years of experience) were created. The dependent variable, subordinate satisfaction with work was then regressed to the independent variable, leader initiation of structure. The results are illustrated in Figure 7. In that the regression coefficient for the low experience group
Table 6
Moderating Effect of Complexity on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>44.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Complexity</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>7.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R sq =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
*  p < .05
+  p < .10
FIGURE 6

The Moderating Effect of High and Low Task Complexity on the Relationship of Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision

Low Complexity
Intercept = 6.67
Slope = .93

High Complexity
Intercept = -33.63
Slope = 2.08
Table 7

Moderating Effect of Complexity on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with JIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>5.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Complexity</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R sq =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
*  p < .05
+  p < .10
Table 8

Moderating Effect of Experience on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>10.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Experience</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>11.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
FIGURE 7

The Moderating Effect of High and Low Experience on the Relationship of Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

Low Experience
Intercept = 38.23
Slope = .06

High Experience
Intercept = .45
Slope = .02
(.06) is greater than that of the high experience group (.02), the effects of experience negatively moderate the IS-subordinate satisfaction with work relationship. As indicated by the results, H7 is supported.

H8: The experience of the subordinate will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. No significant moderating effects were found (Table 9).

H9: The experience of the subordinate will have a negative moderating effect on the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with JIG. No significant moderating effects were found (Table 10).

H10: The experience of the subordinate will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with work. As illustrated in Table 11, experience is shown to have a significant (p < .05) moderating effect on the relationship between considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with work. The respondents were divided into high and low average groups. Figure 8 illustrates that experience has a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with work. The high experience group had a regression coefficient (2.48) that greatly exceeded the slope
Table 9
Moderating Effect of Experience on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>17.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Experience</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R sgu =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
Table 10

Moderating Effect of Experience on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with JIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2.95+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Experience</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
Table 11

Moderating Effect of Experience on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>6.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Experience</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>6.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R sq  =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
FIGURE 8
The Moderating Effect of High and Low Experience on the Relationship of Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

**Low Experience**
Intercept = 29.85
Slope = .29

**High Experience**
Intercept = -.43.35
Slope = 2.48
of the low experience group (.29). The results support H10.

H11: The experience of the subordinate will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. Table 12 illustrates that experience does have an effect on the relationship of considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. The respondents were divided into two groups, a group high in experience and a group low in experience. The dependent variable, satisfaction with supervision, was regressed to the independent variable in the same manner as previously discussed. Figure 9 illustrates the results of this regression. The regression coefficient of the high average group (1.56) demonstrates a lesser slope than that of the low average group (2.31) indicating a negative moderating effect. The results fail to support H11.

H12: The experience of the subordinate will have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction and the JIG. No significant effects were found (Table 13).

H13: Subordinate past achievements (success) will negatively moderate the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work. Subordinate experience has a significant (p < .10) moderating effect on the relationship between considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with work (Table
### Table 12

**Moderating Effect of Experience on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>44.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Experience</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>4.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**

* p < .05

+ p < .10
FIGURE 9

The Moderating Effect of High and Low Experience on the Relationship of Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision

**Low Experience**
- Intercept = -41.14
- Slope = 2.31

**High Experience**
- Intercept = -17.50
- Slope = 1.56
Table 13

Moderating Effect of Experience on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with JIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>5.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Experience</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
14). As with the past variable relationships, the respondents were divided into two groups, high average success (won/loss percentage of > 59.9%) and low average success (a won/loss percentage of < 50%). The moderating effect of success is positive. As indicated, the slope of the relationship between IS and satisfaction with work (.57) in the high success group is greater than the slope of the relationship of IS and satisfaction (-1.36) in the low average success group. Figure 10 illustrates these results. H13 is not supported.

H14: Subordinate past achievement (success) will negatively moderate the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. Success has a significant (p < .05) moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision (Table 15). The respondents were again divided into two groups based upon high average success and low average success. A positive moderating effect of success is illustrated by the greater slope (1.75) of the regression line between IS and satisfaction with supervision in the higher group as compared to the lower group (1.66) as illustrated by Figure 11. H14 is not supported.

H15: Subordinate past achievement (success) will negatively moderate the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with
Table 14

Moderating Effect of Success on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>10.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Success</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>3.10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ</td>
<td></td>
<td>.244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
FIGURE 10

The Moderating Effect of High and Low Success on the Relationship of Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

**Low Success**
- Intercept = 40.95
- Slope = -1.36

**High Success**
- Intercept = 20.19
- Slope = .57
### Table 15

**Moderating Effect of Success on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>17.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Success</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>4.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R sq</td>
<td></td>
<td>.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01  
* p < .05  
+ p < .10
FIGURE 11

The Moderating Effect of High and Low Success on the Relationship of Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision

Low Success
Intercept = -18.76
Slope = 1.66

High Success
Intercept = -20.06
Slope = 1.75
the JIG. Success has a significant ($p < .05$) moderating effect on the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with the JIG (Table 16). The respondents were again divided into groups of high and low success. As illustrated by Figure 12, subordinate success has a positive moderating effect on the variable relationship. The slope of the regression line is steeper in the high success group (regression coefficient = .40) than the low success group (regression coefficient = -.18). H15 fails to be supported.

H16: Subordinate past achievement will (success) positively moderate the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with work.

No significant moderating effects were found (Table 17).

H17: Subordinate past achievement (success) will positively moderate the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. No significant moderating effects were found (Table 18).

H18: Subordinate past achievement (success) will positively moderate the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction and the JIG. No significant moderating effects were found (Table 19).
Table 16

Moderating Effect of Success on the Relationship Between Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with JIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure (IS)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2.95+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Success</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tot chg in R squ = .194

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
FIGURE 12

The Moderating Effect of High and Low Success on the Relationship of Leader Initiation of Structure and Subordinate Satisfaction with JIG

Low Success
Intercept = 52.37
Slope = -.18

High Success
Intercept = 36.72
Slope = .40
Table 17

Moderating Effect of Success on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>6.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Success</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R sq u =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
*  p < .05
+  p < .10
### Table 18

**Moderating Effect of Success on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>44.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Success</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01  
* p < .05  
+ p < .10
Table 19

Moderating Effect of Success on the Relationship Between Leader Consideration and Subordinate Satisfaction with JIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Chg in R-Sq</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration (C)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>5.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>3.15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X Success</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot chg in R squ =</td>
<td></td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
* p < .05
+ p < .10
Summary

Significant results were obtained in eight of the 18 hypotheses tested. Of the eight hypotheses in which significant results were found, three were supported and five were rejected.

Task complexity (sport) was found to have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with supervision as hypothesized. Contrary to the hypothesized relationship, task complexity (sport) also positively moderated the relationship of leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision.

Subordinate experience, as hypothesized, negatively moderated the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work and positively moderated the relationship between leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with work. Moreover, subordinate experience was found to have a negative effect on the relationship of leader consideration to subordinate satisfaction with supervision. These findings do not support the hypothesized relationship.

Significant results were found from the moderating effect of subordinate success on the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work, satisfaction, and the JIG. Contradictory to the
hypotheses proposed, subordinate success was found to have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of initiation of structure and satisfaction with work, supervision, and the JIG.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The purpose of this study has been to explore the leader-subordinate relationship between NCAA Division III Athletic Directors and the coaches within their respective institutions. Although significant results have not been obtained for every hypothesized variable relationship, the results not only support various aspects of the path-goal hypothesis, but also provide some useful information for the practitioner.

Task Complexity as a Moderator

Six hypotheses suggested task complexity (sport) as a construct which moderates the leader-subordinate relationship. Significant results were found for two of these relationships. The relationships of both dimensions of leadership (initiation of structure and consideration) and subordinate satisfaction with supervision are found to be positively moderated by task complexity (sport). Specifically, coaches of football and basketball, sports of
high complexity, are satisfied with leaders who are high in both initiation of structure and consideration.

These findings support H2 which suggests that task complexity has a positive moderating effect on the relationship of initiation of structure and satisfaction with supervision. This hypothesis is based upon the presupposition that initiation of structure will clarify the paths to established organizational goals when the paths to these goals were unclear. Tasks of high complexity have unclear paths. These findings support the contention that coaches of football and basketball respond positively to the imposition of structure by the athletic administrator. As hypothesized, the complexity of their tasks is such that guidelines, procedures, rules, and regulations clarify the paths to the goals of the organization and subsequently to outcomes valued by each individual coach.

The moderating effect of task complexity on the relationship of leader consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision is positive. This is not in the direction as predicted by H5. Previous research has indicated that leader consideration consistently relates to subordinate satisfaction (Schriesheim, House, and Kerr, 1976, p. 397). This research confirms prior findings, but does not confirm the interaction of task complexity with the leader-subordinate relationship as predicted by path-goal theory when the leadership dimension is consideration. These
findings are of significance to the practitioner, although they do not completely support the path-goal hypothesis.

The application of the tenets of Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory of motivation, one of the theories girding the path-goal approach to leadership, to the interaction of task complexity and the two leadership dimensions can provide an explanation for high levels of both leadership dimensions relating to subordinate satisfaction with supervision as positively moderated by task complexity.

In educational institutions such as those from which the population for this study was drawn, the goals of the athletic program are varied and diverse. Although winning may be one measurement which is easily quantifiable, other, less quantifiable goals may also be present. Examples of such goals could be the personal growth and development derived by the participants through participation in the program; the public image of the program; the coach's relationship with the students, the alumni, and the community; or student satisfaction with the program as to make it attractive for other students to matriculate to the institution.

Success, when measured in these terms is a very difficult construct to quantify. Most coaches are concerned with goals of this nature as well as the goal which is the most obvious to the public, winning.

The diversity of the goals of the program coupled with the difficulty in quantifying these goals may explain the
findings that both task complexity positively moderates the relationship of both initiation of structure and consideration as it relates to satisfaction with supervision. In applying the premise of the path-goal leadership theory to the study of this relationship, it has been assumed, as in other studies, that one dimension of leadership would be dominant in its relationship to satisfaction. In the complex environment in which the coach of football and/or basketball coach functions, it is evident that the coach has dual needs as far as demonstrated leadership behavior by the athletic director is concerned.

The quantifiable outcome that the coach desires is a winning team. Due to the complexity of the task as created by the complexity of the environment in which the coach functions, structure initiated by the athletic director is needed in order to promote success in terms of winning and losing. This structure enables the coach to have a positive link between his own effort and his performance as a coach. Moreover, the coach on the second level of expectancy is able to relate his satisfactory performance to those intrinsic and extrinsic benefits that accompany the success that he desires.

However, it is much more difficult for the coach to realize that he has been successful in meeting those more difficultly quantified goals within his program. He does not receive immediate, objective feedback as to his success at
meeting these goals. Furthermore, if the coach is not successful at meeting the goals of being successful in a won/loss sense, greater doubt may be cast on whether the other goals within the program are being successfully met.

Considerate leader behavior may serve as a surrogate for the knowledge that these goals are, indeed, being met. The very complexity of the task may demand one type of leader behavior for some of the task dimensions and another type of leader behavior for other task dimensions. Structure may not relate to satisfaction if the structure is imposed on the explicit coaching functions and/or hinders the coach from expending his efforts in the direction that the coach deems appropriate for his success in terms of wins and losses. Structure may relate to satisfaction with supervision if it protects and enhances the core function of the coach. Conversely, consideration may not relate to satisfaction, if needed structure is not present.

Considerate leader behavior is important for two reasons. First, there are no coaches in the profession for an extended period of time who are successful in winning 100% of the contests in which their teams participate. As a consequence, considerate behavior by the athletic director fills a need when the unfortunate occurrences of a loss on the field or court happens to take place. Secondly, in that the coach does not have immediate, objective feedback as to whether the more intangible goals of his program are being
met, considerate leader behavior is in itself reassuring in the absence of the immediate knowledge of success in goal areas that are difficult to quantify.

Experience as a Moderator

Significant results are found in three of the six hypothesized relationships of the moderating effect of experience on the leader-subordinate relationship. As predicted (H7), experience negatively moderates the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work and positively (H10) moderates the relationship of considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with work. As hypothesized, experienced coaches have developed their own styles and methods of reaching their goals. Structure may appear to be redundant to the experienced coach. And, if structure is construed as not leading to the coaches individual goals, structure will relate to low levels of satisfaction with work.

Considerate leader behavior, to the experienced coach, relates to satisfaction because the very essence of his experience indicates that he has survived as a coach because his own structure has been successful. Consequently imposed structure is redundant. However, considerate leader behavior provides support. As hypothesized in the original path-goal
hypothesis, in that the paths to goal attainment are clear, the experienced coach relates considerate leader behavior to satisfaction with his work.

Of interest is the result of the hypothesized relationship of leader consideration to satisfaction with supervision as moderated by experience. The effects of experience are hypothesized (H11) to be positive. However, a negative relationship is found. An alternative explanation for these findings could be that experienced coaches relate consideration to satisfaction with work in that they do not care for redundant guidelines. However, at the same time due to their impressions that a successful athletic director must provide structure, experienced coaches may view considerate athletic directors as failing in terms of providing the overall structure that is needed within the athletic department for the department to function effectively. Consequently, it follows that the experienced coach might not relate structure to satisfaction with supervision when it is he upon whom the structure is being imposed. However, the experienced coach might desire that structure be imposed on other members of the athletic department. Experience could relate to the impressions that a coach will have in regard to how an athletic director should function in his overall leadership responsibilities.
Success as a Moderator

Significant effects were found in three of the six hypotheses suggesting that the success of the subordinate moderates the leader-subordinate relationship. Contrary to the hypothesized effects of success, success is found to positively moderate the relationship of leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work, supervision, and the JIG. In accordance with the original path-goal hypothesis, success was anticipated to have a negative moderating effect on the leader initiation of structure - subordinate satisfaction relationship. This premise was based upon the assumption that successful coaches would find the imposition of structure as redundant in that the structure under which they are operating has proven to be successful based upon their past success.

This presupposition was, indeed, incorrect and may be explained, as suggested by House and Dessler (1974), by reverting to an analysis of the psychological states of the coaches under consideration in this study. Of interest is the perception of the coach as to the overall importance of imposed structure on the pathways to success in athletics.

One would estimate that close to 100% of all intercollegiate athletic coaches participated in some form of organized, competitive athletics. As athletes they experienced the imposition of structure by the coaches with
whom they were associated. The essence of coaching is
establishment of guidelines, methods, rules, techniques, and
procedures that are designed to promote the performance of
individuals and of teams. This type of leadership activity
is not only expected from the coach by the athlete, but
demanded by the athlete in that the athlete sees these
structures as instrumental to success. Structure clarifies
the pathway to the outcomes desired by the athlete. It might
be suggested here that complex team sports require more
structure, due to more variable relationships, than do
individual sports.

In that most coaches have participated in organized
athletics and experienced the importance of structure, they,
themselves, in the administration of their own programs, are
likely to demonstrate leadership behavior that is high in
initiation of structure. As a consequence of his past
experiences as a player and as a coach, the very fact that
that person is a coach may be indicative of the fact that he
understands and appreciates the importance of structure in
the administration of any organization. It would follow that
individuals who are continually in the position to place
importance on the initiation of structure to clarify paths to
valent outcomes will be appreciative of leadership that
initiates structure that will enable them to more clearly see
the pathways to their own individual valent outcomes whether
they be extrinsic or extrinsic.
Moreover, House and Dessler (1974) suggest that individual characteristics such as the need for achievement and the desire for external rewards will positively moderate the relationship between leader initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction. Coaches, by the very essence of the competitive situation in which they function, would appear to be individuals who would place a premium on achievement.

The path-goal approach to the understanding of effective leadership is dependent on the correct interpretation and understanding of the psychological states of the subordinates. In that success was hypothesized to have a negative moderating effect on the relationship of initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction, it is evident that this hypothesis was based on a misinterpretation of the psychological states of the subordinate coaches in this population. Successful coaches desire leadership from their athletic directors that is high in the initiation of structure.

Conclusion

The results of this study provide moderate support for the path-goal hypothesis and suggest appropriate leadership behavior for the athletic director that will relate to subordinate satisfaction. As evidenced by the findings, coaches relate high levels of satisfaction to both dimensions
of leadership behavior based upon the contingencies of the situation. These findings clearly support a situational approach to leader behavior.

Task complexity has a positive moderating effect on the relationship of both leadership dimensions, initiation of structure and consideration, and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. The experience of the coach has a negative moderating effect on the relationship of initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work. Experience has a positive moderating effect on the relationship of leader consideration and satisfaction with work and a negative effect on the relationship of leader consideration and satisfaction with supervision. The success of the subordinate has a positive moderating effect on the relationship of initiation of structure and subordinate satisfaction with work, supervision, and the JIG.

If the alternative explanation of the psychological state of the successful coach is accepted, six of the eight hypotheses confirmed the original path-goal leadership hypothesis. Findings contrary to the original path-goal theory were found in the relationship of consideration and satisfaction with supervision which was originally hypothesized to be negative. Also, experience was hypothesized to have a positive moderating effect on the relationship of consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision.
An alternative explanation of the contra-indicated effects of task structure on the relationship of consideration and satisfaction with supervision is that there are various innate aspects of complex tasks that interact with considerate leader behavior and positively effect subordinate satisfaction with supervision. Present within the situation are various factors, unexplained by task structure alone, that have multiple effects upon the leader-subordinate relationship. Furthermore, the negative effects of experience on the relationship of consideration and subordinate satisfaction with supervision may be alternatively explained by subtle differentiation between the dependent variables of satisfaction with work and satisfaction with supervision. Experienced coaches, by the very fact that they are experienced in a highly structured environment, expect leaders to provide structure both for themselves and the other coaches within the department. Consequently, a leader who provides no structure is viewed as a leader who is not effective.

Recommendations

Future research should further test these hypothesized variable relationships. Ambiguous results are found as experience moderates the relationship between considerate leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with work and
with supervision. The differences in these two levels of satisfaction should be determined in order to further investigate the effects of experience. It is possible that a more definitive definition of the dependent variable may offer an explanation of these findings in support of the original path-goal hypothesis.

Other environments should be investigated. Those situational components of other levels of athletic competition should be explored as well as the leader-subordinate relationship in women's athletic departments. There may be factors within these environments that may lend more clarity to the findings of this study.

Of ultimate importance for the practitioner is that he realize that leadership is situational. It is clear from the findings of this study that the leader of an athletic department has a good chance of having satisfied coaches on his staff if he is high in both dimensions of leadership.
Appendix A
I. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Please circle the sport in which you are the head coach. (If you are the head coach in two of the sports, circle the one in which you spend the most time.)
   a. Football
   b. Basketball
   c. Baseball
   d. Track

2. Is your employment:
   a. Fulltime
   b. Parttime

3. Indicate the number of years that you have been a head coach in the sport circled above on the intercollegiate level.
   a. 1-3 yrs.
   b. 4-6 yrs.
   c. 7-9 yrs.
   d. 10-12 yrs.
   e. 13+ yrs.

4. Indicate the highest degree that you have received.
   a. Bachelor's
   b. Master's
   c. Ph.D.

5. In the sport circled above, indicate your won-loss record for your coaching career as a head coach at your present institution.
   a. Below 40%
   b. 40 - 49.9%
   c. 50 - 59.9%
   d. 60 - 69.9%
   e. 70% and above

6. Indicate your approximate gross yearly salary.
   a. Less than $15,000
   b. $15,000 - $19,999
   c. $20,000 - $24,999
   d. $25,000 - $29,999
   e. Greater than $29,999

7. Do you serve as an assistant coach in another sport?
   a. Yes
   b. No

8. Do you serve as a head coach in another sport?
   a. Yes
   b. No

9. Does part of your job description indicate additional administrative responsibilities?
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. Indicate the number of academic hours that you teach during the academic year. Indicate semester or quarter hours.
    Circle one:
    a. Less than 5
    b. 5-9
    c. 10-14
    d. 15-19
    e. More than 19
Appendix B
II. LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - FORM XII

(Fill this questionnaire out in reference to your athletic director.)

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader (A.D.) engages in the behavior

c. DECIDE whether he/she (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer that you have selected.

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

1. Lets group members know what is expected of them ........ A B C D E
2. Is friendly and approachable.......................... A B C D E
3. Encourages the use of uniform procedures............ A B C D E
4. Does little things to make it pleasant............... A B C D E
to be a member of the group
5. Tries his/her ideas out in the group.................. A B C D E
6. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.... A B C D E
7. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group.......... A B C D E
8. Treats all group members as his/her equals.......... A B C D E
9. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.. A B C D E
10. Gives advance notice of changes.................... A B C D E
11. Assigns group members to particular tasks........... A B C D E
12. Keeps to himself/herself.............................. A B C D E
13. Makes sure that his/her part in the group............ A B C D E
is understood by the group members
14. Looks out for the personal welfare ................. A B C D E
of the group members
15. Schedules the work to be done....................... A B C D E
16. Is willing to make changes......................... A B C D E
17. Maintains definite standards of performance........ A B C D E
18. Refuses to explain his/her actions................... A B C D E
19. Asks that group members follow standard... rules and regulations A B C D E
20. Acts without consulting the group................... A B C D E

Copyright 1967 College of Administrative The Ohio State University
Appendix C
NO:____

III. THE JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX
(Fill this questionnaire out in reference to your feelings about your job.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ON PRESENT JOB</th>
<th>PRESENT PAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For &quot;Yes&quot; if it describes your work</td>
<td>For &quot;Yes&quot; if it describes your work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For &quot;No&quot; if it does not describe it</td>
<td>For &quot;No&quot; if it does not describe it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you cannot decide</td>
<td>If you cannot decide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fascinating
- Routine
- Satisfying
- Boring
- Good
- Creative
- Respected
- Hot
- Pleasant
- Useful
- Tiresome
- Healthful
- Challenging
- On your feet
- Frustrating
- Simple
- Endless
- Gives sense of accomplishment

Income adequate for normal expenses
Satisfactory profit sharing
Barely live on income
Bad
Income provides luxuries
Insecure
Less than I deserve
Highly paid
Underpaid

Bowling Green State University, 1978
(Fill this questionnaire out in reference to your feelings about your job.)

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB

Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word given below write

___ if it describes the people you work with
___ if it does NOT describe them
___ if you cannot decide

___ Stimulating
___ Boring
___ Slow
___ Ambitious
___ Stupid
___ Responsible
___ Fast
___ Intelligent
___ Easy to make enemies
___ Talk too much
___ Smart
___ Lazy
___ Unpleasant
___ No privacy
___ Active
___ Narrow interests
___ Loyal
___ Hard to meet

___ for "Yes" if it describes your job
___ for "No" if it does NOT describe it
___ if you cannot decide

___ Pleasant
___ Bad
___ Ideal
___ Waste of time
___ Good
___ Undesirable
___ Worthwhile
___ Worse than most
___ Acceptable
___ Like to leave
___ Better than most
___ Disagreeable
___ Makes me content
___ Inadequate
___ Excellent
___ Rotten
___ Enjoyable
___ Poor

Copyright, 1975, Bowling Green State University. Revised, January 1981
(Fill this questionnaire out in reference to your feelings about your job.)

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION**

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe these? In the blank beside each word put

- ___ for "Yes" if it describes your opportunities for promotion
- ___ for "No" if it does not describe them
- ___ if you cannot decide

**SUPERVISION OF PRESENT JOB**

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word put

- ___ if it describes the supervision you get on your job
- ___ if it does NOT describe it
- ___ if you cannot decide

---

___ Good opportunities for promotion. ___ Asks my advice
___ Opportunity somewhat limited ___ Hard to please
___ Promotion on ability ___ Impolite
___ Dead-end job ___ Praises good work
___ good chance for promotion ___ Tactful
___ Unfair promotion policy ___ Influential
___ Infrequent promotions ___ Up-to-date
___ Regular promotions ___ Doesn't supervise enough
___ Fairly good chance for promotion. ___ Quick Tempered
___ Tells me where I stand ___ Annoying
___ ___ Stubborn
___ ___ Knows job well
___ ___ Bad
___ ___ Intelligent
___ ___ Leaves me on my own
___ ___ Around when needed
___ ___ Lazy
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