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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past three decades, sport psychologists and sport sociologists have studied coaching behaviors from a number of different perspectives. Several researchers (Ogilvie and Tutko, 1966; Hendry, 1969) have attempted to identify the personality factors associated with "successful" coaches. Other investigators (Alderman, 1978; Carron, 1980) have attempted to delineate the motivational strategies and techniques used by coaches. More recently, sport researchers at Ohio State and other universities (Crossman, 1979; Tharp and Gallimore, 1976) have attempted to analyze coaching behaviors through the use of various observation systems.

One important dimension of coaching which has received very little research attention is leadership behavior. According to Cratty (1973) and Straub (1978), there is little doubt that an essential aspect of effective coaching is the leadership behavior exhibited by the coach. Although the coach's leadership behavior may be vested or designated in nature, he is clearly in a central leadership position since he is involved in
the wielding of influence and power so that members of the group will achieve the goals of the group.

The sports literature is replete with comments pertaining to the leadership qualities, or their absence, of coaches. The leadership abilities of Woody Hayes, Billy Martin, John Wooden, Bobby Knight, and the late Vince Lombardi have been described by sport journalists on many occasions.

Although leadership is one of the most frequently discussed aspects of coaching, it is clearly one of the least understood and least studied areas of coaching. Empirically, very little is known about the leadership behaviors of coaches or how team members perceive these behaviors. In a recently published sport psychology text, Straub (1978) described the problem as follows:

One of the most neglected topics in sport psychology is leadership. Only a few researchers have carefully examined the underlying dimensions of this important ingredient of coaching and teaching success. The search for the 'ideal' leader continues. (p. 257)

Background of the Problem

The limited number of sport psychologists who have studied leadership in athletic environments have examined the leadership behaviors of athletic directors, coaches, and participants. The identification of leadership behaviors in these studies was facilitated by the use of
checklists, behavior coding instruments, Likert scales, and questionnaires. Although these studies have added to the general knowledge of leadership dimensions in athletic environments, only a few of these studies have gone beyond the descriptive stages and actually attempted to test contemporary leadership theories.

Loy, McPherson, and Loy (1978) point out that a dominant characteristic of small-group research in sport environments is its atheoretical nature. According to them, "Few studies are based on a well-formulated theoretical perspective. In fact, many, if not most, studies of sport groups are highly descriptive in terms of both theoretical framework and empirical findings" (p. 69).

The few individuals who have attempted to test leadership theories in sport settings have generally made use of Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory of Leadership. For example, studies by Danielson (1974), Iciong (1974), and Wardell (1977) all attempted to test some aspect of Fiedler's theory in a coaching environment. Unfortunately, all three studies failed to adequately support Fiedler's basic theoretical premise that "leadership effectiveness depends upon the leader's style of interacting with his group members and the favorableness of the group task situation" (Fiedler and Chemers, 1974, p. 81).
In a recently published leadership monograph, Chelladurai and Carron (1978) note that Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory (1969, 1977) may have particular relevance for the study of leadership behavior in sport. Originally referred to as the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, the Situational Leadership Theory is based on the amount of direction (task behavior) and the amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader must provide given the situation and "the level of maturity" of the follower or group. In other words,

...as the level of maturity of their followers continues to increase in terms of accomplishing a specific task, leaders should begin to reduce their task behavior and increase relationship behavior until the individual or the group reaches a moderate level of maturity. As the individual or group begins to move into an above average level of maturity, it becomes appropriate for leaders to decrease not only task behavior but also relationship behavior. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977, p. 163) (See Figure 1).

The acceptance of task and relationship as two essential dimensions of leadership behavior has been an integral part of leadership research for over three decades. In coaching environments, these two leadership dimensions have been labeled various things ranging from "hard-nosed" and "nice-guy" (Tutko and Richards, 1971) to "authoritarian" and "democratic" (Lenk, 1977).
**FIGURE 1.** Situational leadership theory (From Paul Hersey, Kenneth H. Blanchard, *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*, 1977, p.167.)
For several years, it was believed that task and relationship were either/or styles of leadership and thus, could be conceptualized in terms of a continuum with authoritarian (task) leadership behavior at one extreme and democratic (relationship) leadership behavior at the other.

The belief that task and relationship are either/or styles has been dispelled as the result of extensive leadership research conducted at The Ohio State University. By observing leaders in a variety of situations, the Ohio State researchers were able to classify most of the leader activities into two distinct behavioral categories which they termed "Initiating Structure" (task behavior) and "Consideration" (relationship behavior). These two dimensions were defined as follows:

Initiating Structure - a leader concerned with the group goals. He will maintain positions and functions within the group and will set up procedures to assure that the tasks are completed. (Stogdill, 1963, p. 53)

Consideration - a leader concerned with the social-emotional climate of the group or the personal processes that are occurring within the group. (Stogdill, 1963, p. 53) (See Figure 2).
Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory (1969, 1977) is an outgrowth of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. However, the maturity and effectiveness dimensions used by Hersey and Blanchard make the Situational Leadership Model much more situation and task specific in nature.

Although the Situational Leadership Theory has not been extensively tested in the sport environment, Chelladurai and Carron (1978) indicate that it is possible to extend the Hersey and Blanchard theory to this context (p. 42). But, they emphasize that it would have to be assumed that "athletic maturity" increases progressively from the early participation levels (junior high school) to the later participation levels (professional or semi-professional). They suggest further that:
...it would be consistent with this theory to propose that a coach should be high task and less relationship oriented at the junior high level (Q1); show high relationship and low task behavior at the university level (Q3); and finally demonstrate both reduced relationship and task oriented behavior at the professional level (Q4). (Chelladurai and Carron, 1978, p. 42)

After thoroughly reviewing the limited amount of leadership research specifically related to coaching, Chelladurai and Carron (1978) concluded that a modification of the Hersey and Blanchard model should be made in order to be consistent with previously completed coaching leadership research. They recommended retaining the curvilinear relationship between leadership style and subordinate maturity but changing the ordered pattern represented in each of the four quadrants. Thus, as the individual "matures" through the various levels from junior high to professional, "the most appropriate leadership style should vary from low task/high relationship (Q1) to high task/high relationship (Q2), to high task/low relationship (Q3), and finally, to a low task/low relationship (Q4)" (p. 43). (See Figure 3)

In a recent study of coaching leadership behaviors, Vos Strache (1978) tested Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory and House's (1971) Path Goal Leadership Theory in an athletic setting. She used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII to identify
FIGURE 3. A modified model of situational leadership in athletics. (From P. Chelladurai and A.V. Carron, *Leadership*, 1978, p. 44)
perceived coaching leadership behavior. One of her findings regarding the Situational Leadership Theory was that the range used in her study to identify maturity levels (i.e., class level) "may not have been broad enough to allow differentiation in maturity" (Vos Strache, 1978, p. 77). One of her suggestions for future research using the Situational Model was to study the interaction between leadership style and maturity of followers over a broader range of levels.

Similar recommendations were made by Bird (1976) in her study of leadership and cohesion within successful and unsuccessful teams. Using Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory of Leadership, she stated that "it would appear justifiable to suggest that the most effective coaching style requires modification to level of skill or competition" (p. 180).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this descriptive-analytic field study was threefold.

1. To identify the leadership behaviors, as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, of selected successful basketball coaches at four distinct competitive levels.

2. To determine if any significant differences exist between the leadership behaviors of selected successful junior high school, senior high school, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A.A.U.) basketball coaches.

In order to accomplish parts two and three of the purpose stated above, it was necessary to formulate and test null hypotheses pertaining to the leadership dimensions of initiating structure (task behavior) and consideration (relationship behavior) as well as the competitive levels of junior high school, senior high school, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A.A.U.). It was postulated that:

la. There will be no significant difference between junior high and senior high basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

lb. There will be no significant difference between junior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

c. There will be no significant difference between junior high and A.A.U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

d. There will be no significant difference between senior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

e. There will be no significant difference between senior high and A.A.U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

f. There will be no significant difference between college and A.A.U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.
2a. There will be no significant difference between junior high and senior high basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2b. There will be no significant difference between junior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2c. There will be no significant difference between junior high and A.A.U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2d. There will be no significant difference between senior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2e. There will be no significant difference between senior high and A.A.U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2f. There will be no significant difference between college and A.A.U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

Significance of the Study

Myths and misconceptions have surrounded the profession of coaching for decades. During the early 1970's, Scott (1971), Shaw (1972), and Meggyes (1971) portrayed coaches in certain team sports as being autocratic, authoritarian, and impersonal team leaders. In contrast, Coakley (1978) reported that the authoritarian stereotype associated with team sport coaches is based more on fiction than fact. Loy et al. (1978) concur with Coakley (1978) when they state:
Notwithstanding the several polemic perspectives about the autocratic leadership of coaches, only a few empirical investigations have examined the leadership behaviors of coaches. (p. 80)

Despite the lack of empirical research related to the leadership behavior of coaches, most sport psychologists and sport sociologists would agree that the leadership behavior of coaches is an important factor in maximizing team performance. For example, Sage (1973) identified the leadership behavior of coaches as one of the most important factors which help a team reach its highest potential. Likewise, Straub (1978) emphasized that "providing effective leadership" is one of the coach's most important functions.

The possibility of dispelling myths associated with the leadership behaviors of coaches through expanded research and the possible enhancement of athletic performance through a better understanding of leadership behaviors in situational contexts are certainly sufficient reasons for studying the leadership behaviors of coaches. However, two fairly recent developments have added even more significance to the need for additional coaching leadership research. First, the phenomenal growth of youth sport programs in the United States during the past decade has resulted in a concomitant need for extensive research in this area. Smoll and Smith (1978) point out that, "although emphasis is placed on the importance of
'high quality supervision,' research pertaining to coaching behaviors and their influence on children is virtually nonexistent" (p. 174). This study was undertaken, in part, to meet this need by identifying the leadership behaviors of coaches who are involved with young athletes. Hopefully, the findings from this study will eventually aid youth sport coaches in selecting leadership styles which are appropriate for their situation and not just an imitation of the leadership styles of college or professional coaches.

Secondly, the training and certification of individuals to coach at various competitive levels is becoming a recognized responsibility of college physical education departments throughout the United States. The results of this study pertaining to the leadership behaviors of successful coaches at different competitive levels should prove to be particularly helpful to physical educators when developing research based coaching preparation curriculums.

In addition, the present study was considered to be significant because it attempted to examine what Vaill (1978) calls "high-performing systems" (HPS). He defined HPS as a "group of men using some collection of technologies in performing, in relation to some predefined goals or standards, in a way that may be described as 'excellent' or 'outstanding' or 'high performing'" (p. 104). In this
study, the leadership behaviors of highly successful basketball coaches were identified and closely examined in terms of a contemporary leadership theory. To date, only a few researchers have focused on the social-psychological aspects of successful sport teams. The lack of research concerning "high-performing systems" in sport has caused Straub (1980) to make the following assertion:

There are many HPS in sport. The Pittsburgh Pirates, Pittsburgh Steelers, and, as mentioned previously, the U. S. hockey team qualify for HPS status. Many interesting questions may be posed about these teams. For example, what is the nature of player-player, player-coach, and coach-front office interactions... What is the coach's leadership style? Are the coaches master teachers? Among the players themselves who are the leaders? How did they earn leadership status? Is there player-coach congruence? If coaches would allow researchers to study HPS from within, many of these questions could be answered. (p. 8)

Finally, this exploratory study was important because it dealt with five approaches which have not been examined extensively in sport leadership research heretofore. First, a major thrust of this study was to identify the leadership behaviors of basketball coaches at four distinct competitive levels. A review of the literature indicates that no studies to date have used this approach. Second, this study focused primarily upon the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. Although some form of task or relationship behavior are the most
frequently used descriptors of leadership behavior in sport, only a few studies have singled out these two dimensions to be analyzed. Moreover, no sport leadership studies completed to date have used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to identify the leadership dimensions of consideration and initiating structure. A few studies have used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII.

Third, this study was undertaken, in part, to determine the applicability of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory to a sport setting. Although the basic tenets of the theory have strong intuitive appeal, it has not been tested in a sport environment where competitive levels have been used to define maturity levels. Moreover, most of the research which has been concerned with Situational Leadership Theory has focused on the vertical-dyad linkage model in which the superior-subordinate dyad is the basic unit of analysis. Throughout their writings, Hersey and Blanchard contend that the logical arguments which surround Situational Leadership Theory also apply to group leadership situations. This study was an attempt to confirm or reject these possible applications.
Definition of Terms

In order to facilitate the understanding of terms used in this study, the following definitions have been formulated:

Amateur Athletic Union (A.A.U.) Level. Highest competitive level identified in this study. It is assumed that members of this group generally possess more basketball skill, playing experience, and education than members of the junior high, senior high, and college levels.

Athletic Maturity Level. The competitive level (junior high, senior high, college, or A.A.U.) will be used to define athletic maturity level in this study. It is assumed that "athletic maturity progressively increases from the elementary school level through the secondary school level to university and professional levels" (Chelladurai and Carron, 1978, p. 42).

College Level. The third highest level of competition identified in this study. It is assumed that members of this group generally possess more basketball skill, playing experience, and education than members of the junior high and senior high levels.

Competitive Level. The organizational groupings of teams with consideration given to age, skill level, class level, and experience. Designated in this study as junior high, senior high, college, Amateur Athletic Union (A.A.U.).
**Consideration.** Same as Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) relationship behavior dimension. Leadership behavior in which the leader is concerned with the social-emotional climate of the group or the personal processes that are occurring within the group. (Stogdill, 1963).

**Initiating Structure.** Same as Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) task behavior dimension. Leadership behavior dimension in which the leader is concerned with group goals. He will maintain positions and functions within the group and will set up procedures to assure that the tasks are completed. (Stogdill, 1963).

**Junior High Level.** The lowest level of competition identified in this study. It is assumed that members of this group generally possess less basketball skill, playing experience, and education than members of the senior high, college, and Amateur Athletic Union levels. (Includes grades 7 through 9).

**Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).** A questionnaire in which the respondent is asked to describe leadership behavior consisting of two dimensions: consideration and initiating structure.

**Leadership Behavior.** The behavior of an individual who is involved in the wielding of influence and power so that members of the group will achieve the goals of the group. The manifestations of initiating structure and consideration displayed by the head coaches in their
interaction with team members.

**Leadership Style.** "The consistent patterns they (coaches) use when they are working with and through people as perceived by those people. These patterns emerge in people as they begin to respond in the same fashion under similar conditions; they develop habits of action that become somewhat predictable to those who work with them" (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977, p. 16).

**Senior High Level.** The second highest level of competition identified in this study. It is assumed that members of this group generally possess more basketball skill, playing experience, and education than members of the junior high level. (Includes grades 10 through 12).

**Successful Coach.** A coach whose teams have won fifty-five percent or more of their basketball games during the past three seasons (including this season).

**Delimitations of the Study**

The present study was delimited to a random sample of forty "successful" basketball coaches (i.e., winning percentage of fifty-five percent or higher over the past three seasons) and their teams from Central Ohio. Ten coaches were selected from each of the following competitive levels: junior high, senior high, college, and Amateur Athletic Union. Only teams affiliated with
the Ohio High School Athletic Association, National Collegiate Athletic Association, National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, or the Amateur Athletic Union were used in this study. All data were collected during the last quarter of the 1979-1980 basketball season.

Limitations of the Study

The present study was limited by the following:

1. Certain innate weaknesses with regard to reliability and validity may be present with the survey-questionnaire method of gathering data.

2. The limitations imposed by the validity and reliability of the instruments.

3. The examination of leadership behavior of coaches within the context of interacting groups (e.g., basketball teams). Leadership behavior within coacting groups and the possible dyadic interactions between specific leaders and followers were not the subject of this investigation.

4. The accuracy of the coaches' and players' responses to items on the instruments used in this study.

The results of this study may only be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn (i.e., successful basketball coaches at the junior high, senior
high, college, and A.A.U. levels in Central Ohio). The results of this study may not be representative of leaders in other situational contexts (i.e., business, industry) or "unsuccessful" coaches (i.e., winning percentage of fifty-four percent or lower over the past three seasons).

**Summary**

Within this chapter, a rationale was developed for the importance of examining the leadership behaviors of successful basketball coaches at four distinct competitive levels. A brief overview of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory was presented. The purpose of the study and the specific hypotheses to be tested were enumerated. Delimitations, limitations, and special terms were carefully delineated.

The next chapter will review the related literature which is critical to the implementation of this study. Literature pertaining to the development of leadership theories as well as completed research related to sport leadership will be presented.

The research design as well as specific methods and procedures used in this study will be described in Chapter III. Sampling procedures, pilot study, instrumentation, collection of data, and statistical procedures will be discussed in this chapter.
Results of the data analysis procedures and a discussion of these results will be covered in Chapter IV. The acceptance or rejection of null hypotheses will also be determined in this chapter.

Chapter V will include a summary and interpretation of the findings. Practical implications for the profession of coaching as well as recommendations for further study will be outlined.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is presented in two sections. The first is an historical review of leadership theory development. The second considers leadership research in athletics.

Historical Review

The study of leadership has probably existed as long as people have seriously questioned how leaders are different from other individuals. During ancient times, Plato described virtues which his "philosopher-rulers" should possess in order to govern the ideal state. In the 1500's, Machiavelli questioned whether or not it is better for the political leader of the state to be hated or loved. Weber, in the nineteenth century, attempted to develop a threefold typology of authority possessed by leaders. However, it was not until the twentieth century that significant inroads were made into the development of leadership theory and research methodologies.
Historically, the study of leadership in the United States has moved through three distinct phases or periods. In the first, theorists tried to identify the traits and qualities of effective leaders and to eventually formulate a trait theory of leadership which held in all situations. The second phase, behavioral theory, attempted to examine the behaviors which leaders display as well as the effects of these behaviors on group performance and satisfaction. In the third phase, situational theory, leadership was described as a function of complex interactions among leader behaviors and situational factors.

Behling and Schriesheim (1976) have developed a very useful typology which can be utilized to examine leadership theories. Table 1 is an adaptation of this typology. In the typology, trait, behavioral, and situational leadership theories are categorized depending upon (1) whether they focus on traits or behaviors of the leader and (2) the degree to which they are universal or take the specifics of the situation into account.

The discussion which follows will rely heavily upon Behling and Schriesheim's typology of leadership theories in order to present an organized review of leadership theory development.
### TABLE 1

**A TYPOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP THEORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conception of the Situation</th>
<th>TRAITS</th>
<th>BEHAVIORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORE UNIVERSAL</strong></td>
<td>Early &quot;Great Man&quot; Theory</td>
<td>Ohio State and Michigan Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORE SPECIFIC</strong></td>
<td>Contingency Model of Leadership (Fiedler, 1967)</td>
<td>Path-Goal Theory (House, 1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role-making Model (Graen and Cashman, 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Situational Theory (Heresey and Blanchard, 1969, 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive-Reactive Theory (Osborn and Hunt, 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Normative Model of Decision-making (Vroom and Yetton, 1973)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Adapted from Behling and Schriesheim, 1976)*
Trait Theory

Trait theory evolved from the early "great man" approaches which were prevalent during the nineteenth century (Carlyle, 1841; Galton, 1870). The basic premise of trait theory is that leaders possess certain inherited or acquired physical or psychological characteristics which differentiate them from their less effective colleagues. Trait theorists hypothesized that effective leaders in one situation would likely emerge as effective leaders in other situations because they possess the necessary characteristics or traits to be effective leaders.

From roughly the end of World War I until the beginning of World War II, trait researchers dominated the study of leadership. Unfortunately, most of the trait studies completed during this period offered little in the way of consistent results. For example, Stogdill (1948) and Carter and Nixon (1949) were critical of trait approaches in their reviews of leadership theory. They cited several instances of contradictory findings in research related to trait theory. Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly (1979) have offered the following reasons for the inconsistent results:

First, the list of potentially important traits is endless. Every year new traits are added to personality, physical characteristics, and intelligence. This continual 'adding on' results in more
confusion among those interested in identifying leadership traits. Second, trait test scores are not consistently predictive of leader effectiveness. Traits do not operate singly, but in combination, to influence followers. This interaction influences the leader-follower relationship. Finally, the trait approach does not provide insight into what the effective leader does on the job. Observations are needed that describe the behavior of effective and ineffective leaders. (p. 191)

The growing dissatisfaction with trait theory eventually led researchers to look for alternative leadership research approaches. Behavioral theory soon emerged as the second distinct phase in the study of leadership.

Behavioral Theory

During the 1940's, the focus of leadership research shifted to the behavior of the leader—namely, what the leader does and how he or she does it. Theorists using the behavioral approach attempted to identify the behaviors which leaders display as well as the effects of these behaviors on group performance and satisfaction. Unlike trait theories, the behavioral approach focused on leader performance, not the emergence of an individual as a leader.

Foremost among the efforts to examine leadership from a behavioral perspective were research projects initiated at the University of Michigan and The Ohio State University. The major emphasis of the University
of Michigan Studies was to determine the "...principles
which contribute both to the productivity of the group
and the satisfaction that group members derive from their
participation" (Likert, 1950, p. 32). In these studies
various factors, such as type of work, working methods,
and working conditions were carefully analyzed. Leaders
were eventually categorized as "job-centered" or "employee-
centered." Likert and his associates concluded from
their research that "employee-centered" leaders out-
performed job-centered leaders; this was explained by the
fact that increased freedom allowed people the flexibility
in accomplishing job objectives.

While the Michigan studies were in progress, concurrent
investigations were taking place at The Ohio State Univer-
sity's Bureau of Business Research. The Ohio State studies
were conducted by several well-known leadership theorists
including Shartle, Hemphill, Coons, and Stogdill. Much
of the Ohio State program was devoted to describing the
types of behaviors which leaders display and then
determining the effects of leadership style on work
group performance and satisfaction. In addition, Shartle
(1957) pointed out that one of the principal objectives
of the Ohio State research was "the testing of hypotheses
concerning the situational determinants of leader behavior"
(p. 1).
Since the Ohio State studies were partially funded by the military, several of the early studies took place in military organizations. In a follow-up to Hemphill's 1949 study of military organizations, Halpin and Winer (1957) administered a lengthy leadership questionnaire to B-52 bomber crews. After extensive factor analysis, four dimensions were identified as characterizing the leadership behavior of these aircrew commanders as seen by their subordinates. The four dimensions identified included the following:

1. **Consideration.** Consideration explained the most variation in the answers to the questionnaire. Leader Consideration behaviors were defined as being "indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth" (Halpin and Winer, 1957, p. 42).

2. **Initiating Structure.** This behavior dimension was the second largest factor. Initiating Structure behaviors were defined as those "which indicate that the aircraft commander... organizes and defines the relationship between himself and the members of the crew" (p. 42).

3. **Production Emphasis.** This factor was distinctly less important than either Consideration or Initiating Structure. Behaviors falling in this category were those whereby the leader attempted "motivating the crew to greater activity by emphasizing the mission or job to be done" (p. 43).

4. **Sensitivity (Social Awareness).** Sensitivity was found to be the least important dimension. This category contained behaviors which indicated "the aircraft commander's sensitivity to and awareness of social relationships and pressures existing both inside and outside the crew" (pp. 43-44).
Subsequent attempts at refining the questionnaire resulted in dropping the production emphasis and sensitivity dimensions from the original questionnaire. The final version was called the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and it specifically identified the two leadership dimensions of initiating structure (task behavior) and consideration (relationship behavior).

The LBDQ has been used for research purposes in industrial, military, and educational settings. Halpin (1965) used a sample of 89 aircraft commanders and 662 crew members to study the leadership behavior and effectiveness of these commanders. He used the LBDQ, an individual criterion-rating form that was completed by staff officers who knew the commanders, and a satisfaction index (a sociometric instrument), which was completed by members of the crews. He found that, to identify a leader acceptable to both the leader's crew and his superiors, it was best to select a leader who scored high on the two dimensions of leadership behavior—consideration and initiating structure.

In another investigation using the LBDQ, Halpin (1956) studied the actual leadership behavior and the ideal leadership behavior of 132 aircraft commanders and 64 public school superintendents. His findings revealed that school administrators generally scored higher on
the consideration dimension for both the actual and the ideal ratings than did the aircraft commanders, but that the opposite was true for initiating structure. In this study, a low relationship was found between the ideal and actual leadership behavior. Halpin concluded, "In general, a leader's beliefs about how he should behave as a leader are not highly associated with his behavior as described by his followers" (pp. 74-79).

After the air crew studies, Halpin (1957) investigated the leadership behavior of 50 school superintendents. He obtained descriptions of both the actual and ideal leadership behavior of the superintendents from school board members, the school faculty members, and from the superintendents themselves. In terms of consideration, the superintendents did not view their behavior to be scored as high as did the board members or faculty members. Board members tended to rate superintendents higher on consideration and on the initiating structure than did faculty members. The board members tended to agree with one another on how superintendents should behave as leaders. The faculty members tended to agree with one another in terms of how much consideration superintendents should show, but faculty members were not in total agreement in terms of how much structure the superintendents should
initiate. Both the faculty and the board members were in general agreement concerning the leadership behavior of the superintendents. Board members indicated that the superintendents should show greater consideration to the faculty members that the faculty members considered necessary. Halpin concluded that superintendents with effective leadership were those who scored high on both consideration and the initiating structure. The reverse was also true for ineffective superintendents. These conclusions are in agreement with the findings of the studies of air crews.

In another educational study using the LBDQ, Hemphill (1956) examined the leadership behavior of 22 department chairpersons in a liberal arts college in order to identify the relationship between the leadership behavior of departmental administrators and the reputation of their department for being well administered. He utilized four instruments in this study: A Background Information Questionnaire, the LBDQ, a Group Dimension Questionnaire that consisted of 13 dimensions of group behavior, and a Reputational Ranking Form. Each of these instruments were administered to the departmental heads and to department members. The members in each of the 22 departments described, by means of the LBDQ, the chairperson of their department. The purpose of this
aspect of Hemphill's investigation was to determine if the reputation of the departments considered to be well administered by members of the department was associated with the leadership styles of the departmental chairpersons. Hemphill concluded that those departments considered to have a reputation for being well run were those chaired by individuals who were above average on the two dimensions measured through the use of the LBDQ.

Several authors (Behling and Schriesheim, 1976; Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly, 1979; Robbins, 1976; Gibb, 1969, Fleishman, 1973) have noted that the identification of initiating structure and consideration as two major dimensions of leadership behavior was a major breakthrough in the history of leadership research. Chelladurai and Carron (1978) describe the significance of the Ohio State studies in the following way:

The identification of consideration and initiating structure as the major behavioral dimensions in leadership could be viewed as a major development in the research in leadership. In a general way, these two represent the two major classes of behavior that leaders engage in in the process of leadership: viz., behavior which is interpersonal in orientation (i.e., consideration) and behavior which is production/task/goal oriented (i.e., initiating structure). Although a number of different terms or phrases have been used, these two classes of behaviors have repeatedly reappeared in similar or identical form in other theoretical approaches to leadership. (p. 11).
Although the Ohio State investigators did not totally achieve their goal of "testing hypotheses concerning the situational determinants of leader behavior," the studies did make significant contributions in terms of defining and describing the behaviors and roles displayed by leaders. The need for further research relating to situational variables led Fleishman (1973) to propose that "what we need are theory and data to develop a conceptualization of situational and personality variables as they relate to the effective operation of consideration and structure and other dimensions of leadership" (p. 37). Gradually leadership theorists have moved in the direction proposed by Fleishman. Today most of the leadership research is associated with one or more of the situational leadership approaches which will be discussed in the remainder of this section.

Situational Theories

The third and final phase in the study of leadership is situational theory. Although situational theory had its biggest push in the late 1960's, it has been around for several years. For example, in 1947 Stogdill pointed out that "an adequate analysis of leadership involves not only the study of leaders but also situations" (p. 65). Two years later Hamphill published a book entitled: Situational Factors in Leadership. During the 1950's, many theorists attempted to catalog the situational
factors associated with effective leadership (French, 1950; Gerth and Mills, 1952; Davis, 1954; Stogdill, 1959). Despite these efforts, Chelladurai and Carron (1978) note that "it has been only relatively recently that a systematic analysis of the situational characteristics of leadership behavior have been undertaken" (p. 20).

Situational or contingency theory usually involves viewing leadership as the result of interactions among (1) either the leader's traits or behaviors; (2) the performance requirements of the tasks of both the leader and subordinates; (3) the attitudes, needs, and expectations of subordinates; and (4) the organizational and physical environment of the leader and the group (Filley and House, 1969, p. 397). Situational leadership approaches do not seek to uncover universal leadership characteristics, but instead attempt to discover situational variables which cause or permit leader behaviors to be effective.

Three of the situational models will appear in the next section of this chapter. The three models include the following: Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory, House's (1971) Path-Goal Theory, and Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory.

**Fiedler's Contingency Theory.** One of the first systematic situational leadership models was Fiedler's "Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness" (1967). The basic premise of Fiedler's model is that the
effectiveness of the leader in achieving high group performance is contingent upon the need structure of the leader and the degree to which the leader has control and influence in a particular situation. Fiedler's model has been described in terms of four factors: (1) leadership style assessment; (2) task structure; (3) group atmosphere; and (4) the leader's position power. The first factor identifies the motivational aspects of the leader; the other three factors describe the situational favorableness for the leader. (See Figure 5)

Fiedler developed the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (LPC) to assess the level of esteem in which the leader holds his least preferred co-worker. Leaders were asked to describe the person with whom he or she has worked least well in accomplishing some task. A sixteen-item semantic differential instrument was used for this purpose (See Figure 5). In the interpretation of the meaning of the LPC score, Fiedler stated:

...we visualize the high-LPC individual (who perceives his least preferred co-worker in a relatively favorable manner) as a person who derives his major satisfaction from successful interpersonal relationships, while the low-LPC person (who describes his LPC in very unfavorable terms) derives his major satisfaction from task performance. (1967, p. 45)
The last element in the model is situational favorableness, the extent to which the leader is able to influence his work group. Fiedler views it as being composed of three subfactors: (1) whether leader-member relations are good or poor; (2) whether the task is relatively structured or unstructured; and (3) whether the position power is relatively strong or weak (Filley, House, and Kerr, 1976, p. 244). Thus, a group can be classified depending on each of these situational factors. The resulting classification is shown in Figure 4. It indicates that it is easier to be a leader in groups which fall into situation 1 in which you are liked, have a structured task, and position power. The situation is more favorable for the situation 1 leader than the situation 8 leader.

Fiedler suggests that a permissive, more lenient (relationship-oriented) style is best when the situation is moderately favorable or moderately unfavorable. Therefore, if a leader were moderately liked and possessed some power, and the tasks for the subordinates were vague, the leadership style needed to achieve the best results would be relationship oriented. On the other hand, if the situation is highly favorable or highly unfavorable, a task-oriented approach generally produces the desired performance.
FIGURE 4: Fiedler's Contingency Model of Leadership
(Adapted from Fiedler, 1967)
Instructions: Think of the person with whom you can work least well. He may be someone you knew in the past. He does not have to be the person you like least well, but should be the person with whom you had the most difficulty in getting a job done. Describe this person as he appears to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unenthusiastic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncooperative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrelsome</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloomy</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 5: The Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC) (Adapted from Fiedler, 1967)
The Contingency Theory has undergone a considerable amount of criticism since it was first developed by Fiedler and his associates at the University of Illinois. Although the criticisms are several in number, four criticisms seem to reoccur in the literature. First, a longstanding question among researchers has been: "What does LPC really measure?" In his early research, Fiedler assumed that LPC was a measure of the leader's personality. However, his later research changed the measure of LPC to reflect an individual's motivational structure with respect to social need gratification in groups.

Second, a number of authors (e.g., Graen, Alvares, Orris, and Martella, 1970) suggest that the situational octant predictions in Fiedler's model are not adequately supported by current research. For example, they point out that task-oriented leader behavior under octant 1 (good leader-member relations, routine task structure, and strong position power) is not always accurate. According to other findings, the predictions for octants 3, 4, 7, and 8 are especially inaccurate.

Third, some theorists (e.g., Ivancevich, Szilagyi, and Wallace, 1977) have contended that Fiedler's model does not really consider the relationship between the leader and the situational variables. They note that a task-oriented leader style may provide enough structure to make a complex task semiroutine. But, for another,
good leader-member relations over a period of time may help to alter a leader's task-oriented style to a more people-oriented style.

Finally, the Contingency Theory proposes that leaders are either task oriented or people oriented; that is, leadership style is essentially a unidimensional concept. However, research completed at Ohio State and other universities has consistently shown that leadership dimensions such as initiating structure and consideration can co-exist in a given leadership situation. In other words, research has shown that it is possible for leaders to be both task oriented and people oriented, varying from a high to low orientation on each factor.

Despite the criticisms, the contingency model has proven to be a major addition to the study of leadership. Perhaps the most important contribution of the theory was the fact that it sought to include situational variables within its theoretical framework. This set the stage for subsequent situational leadership research approaches.

House's Path-Goal Theory of Leadership. The second situational theory to be reviewed in this section is the Path-Goal Theory. It was originally proposed by House (1971) and then elaborated upon by House and Dessler in 1974. The theory was designated "path-goal" because it focused on how the leader influences the follower's
perceptions of work goals, self-development goals, and paths to goal attainment (House and Mitchell, 1974).

The basis for the Path-Goal theory is the expectancy motivation theory. Expectancy theory states that a person's behavior, attitudes, work initiative, and satisfaction can be predicted from the following: (1) the degree to which behavior is seen as leading to various outcomes (expectancy), and (2) the preferences for these outcomes (valences) (Vroom, 1964). In addition, it was suggested that individuals are pleased with their performance and will work harder if they believe that their effort will lead to desirable outcomes. The implication of these assumptions for leadership is that subordinates are motivated by the behavior of the leader to the extent that it influences expectancies (goal paths) and valences (goal attractiveness) (House, 1974).

House's model is centered around two basic propositions. The first states that "the leader's function is a supplemental one" (House, 1971, p. 323). He is effective to the extent that he provides subordinates with sufficient support, guidance, and rewards. House (1974) summarizes the first proposition as follows:

...the motivational function of the leader consists of increasing personal pay-offs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, and making the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing road blocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for reducing satisfaction en route. (p. 31)
The second major proposition presented in House's Path-Goal Theory is that "the motivational impact of specific leader behaviors is determined by the situation in which the leader operates" (House, 1971, p. 324). House describes the "situation" as being composed of two classes of factors which include: (1) characteristics of the subordinates being led, and (2) environmental demands and pressures with which subordinates must cope to accomplish work goals and satisfy their own needs.

According to the Path-Goal model, leader behavior is acceptable to subordinates to the extent that it is viewed as being either an immediate or future source of satisfaction. If a subordinate has high needs for affiliation, then he or she would probably view a considerate leader as a source of satisfaction. On the other hand, subordinates with a high need to achieve would probably see leader behaviors which facilitate task accomplishment, such as initiating structure, as a source of satisfaction.

In addition, House views the environment of the subordinate as containing those variables which are not under the control of the subordinate but which are important to satisfaction or to the ability to perform effectively. The environmental factors include the tasks, the formal authority system of the organization, and the work group. Any of these factors can motivate or constrain the subordinate.
The Path-Goal Theory is a valuable addition to situational leadership theory. It not only attempts to suggest what type of leader may be effective in a given situation, it also attempts to explain why the leader is effective. Although testing of the Path-Goal Theory is still in its infancy stages, several well-known leadership theorists have predicted that various forms of the model will influence much of the leadership research to be undertaken during the last part of this century.

Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory. Originally referred to as the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, the Situational Leadership Theory is based on the amount of direction (task behavior) and the amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader must provide given the situation and "the level of maturity" of the follower or group. In other words:

...as the level of maturity of their followers continues to increase in terms of accomplishing a specific task, leaders should begin to reduce their task behavior and increase relationship behavior until the individual or the group reaches a moderate level of maturity. As the individual or group begins to move into an above average level of maturity it becomes appropriate for leaders to decrease not only task behavior but also relationship behavior. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977, p. 163) (See Figure 6)

By dividing the maturity continuum of the situational model into four levels (M1, M2, M3, M4), some benchmarks
of group maturity and leadership style can be provided. The theory proposes that if a leader has followers who are below average in maturity, a high task style (quadrant I) has the best possibility of being effective; whereas in dealing with subordinates of slightly below average or moderate maturity, the quadrant II styles seem most appropriate. Quadrants III and IV styles appear best suited for subordinates who are slightly above average in maturity.

Hersey and Blanchard (1979) define maturity as "the relative independence, ability to take responsibility, and achievement - motivation of an individual or group. These components of maturity are often influenced by level of education and amount of experience" (p. 97). The definition of maturity used by Hersey and Blanchard is similar to the Argyris (1964) immaturity-maturity continuum. Argyris proposes that as a person matures, he or she moves from a passive state to a state of increasing activity and from a state of dependency on others to relative independence.

The Situational Leadership Theory suggests that leader behavior, to be effective, must change as subordinates mature. The sequence of change should be from: (1) high task-low relationships behavior to (2) high task-high relationships behavior to (3) high relationships-low task behavior to (4) low task-low
relationships behavior. For example, Hersey and Blanchard (1979) note that in a college setting the Situational Leadership Theory has been validated by studying the teacher-student relationship. They point out that:

...effective teaching of lower division students (freshmen and sophomores) has been characterized by structured behavior on the part of the teacher as he reinforces appropriate patterns in attendance and study habits, while more relationships behavior seems to be appropriate for working with upper division undergraduates and Master's students. And finally the cycle seems to be completed as a teacher begins to work with mature Ph. D. candidates, who need very little guidance or socio-emotional support. (p. 98)

In the context of Situational Leadership Theory, high task-low relationship leader behavior is referred to as telling because the style is characterized by one-way communication. The high task-high relationship style is designated as selling. The leader attempts through two-way communication and supportive behaviors to influence the subordinate(s) to agree to decisions that must be made. In addition, high relationship-low task behavior is called participating because the leader and subordinate(s) share in the decision making through two-way communication and facilitative behavior from the leader. Finally, low relationship-low task behavior is referred to as delegating. This simply means that subordinates can work without close supervision because of high maturity levels. (See Figures 7 and 8.)
Maturity of Followers (S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 7 Situational Leadership

Style of Leader

- S1 Telling: High directive and low supportive behavior
- S2 Selling: High directive and high supportive behavior
- S3 Participating: High supportive and low directive behavior
- S4 Delegating: Low supportive and low directive behavior

FIGURE 8 Situational Leadership
Research with Situational Leadership Theory has been limited. In a recent study, Beck (1978) tested the basic premise of Situational Leadership Theory that leader effectiveness results from the adaptation of leadership style to follower maturity level. He used principals and elementary school teachers as subjects in his study. Although there were strong indications that the Maturity Scale used by Beck did not accurately discriminate levels of maturity, it was concluded that:

...Styles 2, 3, and 4 were all effective with some teachers in some situations. Another was that there was a tendency, though no significant, for S2 to be perceived as the most effective style regardless of maturity level. A third was that the high relationship styles (S2 and S3) were perceived to be significantly more effective than the low relationship styles (S1 and S4) regardless of maturity level. (p. 97)

In another recently completed study which dealt specifically with the Situational Leadership Model, Boucher (1980) attempted to determine if the perception of leadership effectiveness co-varies with the congruence of leadership style and task-relevant ability. He used intramural/recreation administrators and their subordinates as the subjects. His conclusions included the following:

...all leadership styles were perceived as being the most effective at one time or another. This general conclusion supports the major thrust of the contingency leadership theories... A second conclusion was that there was a tendency
for the High Task/High Relationship (S2) to be perceived as the most effective regardless of the task-relevant ability level of the subordinates... A third conclusion was that the high relationship styles (S2, S3) were perceived to be more effective than the low relationship styles (S1, S4) regardless of the subordinate task-relevant ability. (p. 172)

In two other studies dealing with Situational Leadership Theory in educational settings, Morris (1978) found that student performance could be increased by manipulating teacher/leader styles so that they were in agreement with the SLT model. Smith (1975) used principals and teachers in elementary schools as her subjects. She found partial support for the SLT model by using reading achievement scores of students as an indirect measure of teacher effectiveness. However, a conclusive statement regarding the SLT model was not possible because she lacked sufficient data in the low task/low relationship leadership quadrant.

In addition, Damico (1976) and Gooding (1978) used Hersey and Blanchard's model in their studies dealing with the leadership behaviors of supervisors and administrative heads. Both researchers returned ambiguous results. They attributed part of their difficulties to the way in which they operationalized and measured maturity level. They recommended that future studies utilizing the SLT model pay particular attention to the operationalization of maturity level.
The only study to date which has attempted to test the SLT model in an "athletic" setting was recently completed by Vos Strache (1978). One of her findings regarding the Situational Leadership Theory was that the range used in her study to identify maturity levels (i.e., class level) "may not have been broad enough to allow differentiation in maturity" (p. 77). She suggested that future studies using the SLT model should try to identify the interaction between leadership style and maturity of followers over a broader range of levels.

In summary, Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory is gradually developing a body of empirically-based data that will be used to accept, reject, or modify the present model. Although the SLT is grounded in logical arguments which have intuitive appeal, the fact remains that much more SLT research is needed in field and laboratory settings. When compared with the amount of research already completed on Fiedler's Contingency Theory, SLT research efforts can be considered still in their infancy stages.

In a recently published leadership monograph, Chelladurai and Carron (1978) note that Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory may have particular relevance for the study of coaching leadership behaviors. They point out that "it is possible to extend the Hersey and Blanchard theory to this context" (p. 42).
One aspect of this study is to examine the propositions of Situational Leadership Theory in a basketball coaching (leadership) environment. But, before this can be undertaken, it will be necessary to review leadership research in athletics.

**Leadership in Sport**

**Introduction**

Although a recent study by Stogdill (1974) produced more than 3,000 references, there is a paucity of research and conceptual literature about sport leadership. In fact, many of the recent texts in sport psychology do not even mention the term. Leadership is by far one of the forgotten variables in sport psychology research. (Straub, 1980, p. 1)

The preceding statement was made by William Straub, a well-known sport psychologist, in a paper presented at the Ninety-fifth Anniversary Convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance. It speaks directly to the need for more research related to leadership in sport.

Leadership is probably one of the most discussed and least understood terms in sport. The leadership styles of such coaches as Knute Rockne, John Wooden, Vince Lombardi, Tom Landry, Woody Hayes, Bobby Knight, Billy Martin, and more recently Herb Brooks have been frequent topics of conversation in the mass media.
Few individuals in our country are in more clearly defined leadership positions than coaches. With the exception of politicians, coaches are probably in one of the most visible leadership positions in our society. The public's insatiable desire for sport, aided by extensive mass media coverage, has thrust many coaches into the "spotlight" of American life. The visibility and notoriety of certain coaches has placed them in positions of power not only in athletics but in community affairs as well. An example of this fame is the fact that millions of Americans know who Woody Hayes, "Bear" Bryant, and Herb Brooks are, but only a small number of these same individuals know the names of the presidents at The Ohio State University, the University of Alabama, and the University of Minnesota!

Unfortunately, myths and misconceptions have surrounded the profession of coaching for decades. During the 1970's, Scott (1971), Shaw (1972), and Meggyesy (1971) portrayed coaches in certain team sports as being autocratic, authoritarian, and impersonal team leaders. In contrast, Coakley (1978) points out that the authoritarian stereotype associated with team sport coaches is based more on fiction than fact. Loy et al. (1978) concur with Coakley (1978) by stating:
Notwithstanding the several polemic perspectives about the autocratic leadership of coaches, only a few empirical investigations have examined the leadership behaviors of coaches. (p. 80)

Historically, the study of leadership in sport has moved through similar trait, behavioral, and situational phases which have characterized leadership research in general. This section will present an overview of sport leadership with particular emphasis being given to research related to the coach.

**Trait Approach**

One of the earliest studies of the personality traits of coaches examined the personality profiles of sixty-four coaches in four major sports. In this study, Ogilvie and Tutko (1966) pointed out that coaches, as a group, represent highly success-driven, dominant, organized, conscientious, persevering, and emotionally stable individuals. In addition, coaches were found to be "very high in leadership qualities when compared with norms based on men who were selected or elected leaders" (Ogilvie and Tutko, 1966, p. 61).

Using the Cattell 16 PF inventory, Hendry (1968) identified the personality traits of fifty-six amateur swimming coaches. He reported that the coaches were bright, aggressive, anxious, and insecure individuals.
In a follow-up study, Hendry (1969) found no significant differences between thirty "successful" swimming coaches and a group of less "successful" coaches. However, in a more recent study, Hendry (1972) indicated that coaches were aggressive and authoritarian types who enjoy being the center of attention.

In another early study, Ogilvie and Tutko (1966) found that coaches can be characterized by two traits which might detrimentally influence their leadership behavior in sport situations. First, male coaches reported a low interest in the dependency needs of others, and thus might not provide much emotional support to others. Second, coaches expressed a notable degree of psychological inflexibility and extreme conservatism, and thus might be expected "to limit their use of new information or different thinking in terms of dealing with new problems" (Ogilvie and Tutko, 1966, p. 24).

During the early 1970's, coaches received a barrage of criticism for their leadership practices (Scott, 1969 and 1971; Shaw, 1972; Meggyesy, 1971; Ogilvie and Tutko, 1971). Tutko and Richards (1971) noted that most coaches, as leaders, believe in strong discipline, extrinsic motivation, rigidity of rules, and an impersonal attitude toward their athletes. Consequently, they characterized most coaches as being hard-nosed and authoritarian.
According to Scott (1969), the roots of the malevolent behavior of coaches lie in the personalities of the coaches. He pointed out that:

Psychologists who have done extensive psychological testing on college coaches found them to be one of the most authoritarian groups in American society; they often outscore policemen on measures of authoritarianism. (p. 6)

Scott (1969) made further reference to the characteristics of coaches in the following quote:

For every relaxed, understanding coach... there are one hundred rigid, authoritarian coaches.... The typical university coach is a soulless, back slapping, meticulously groomed, team-oriented efficiency expert.... Most coaches have as much concern for the welfare of their athletes as a general has for the soldiers he sends into battle...for most college coaches, the athlete is significant only to the extent that he can contribute to a team victory. (p. 7)

In contrast, four investigations of the personality traits of coaches have not supported the stereotype of the coach as being conservative, manipulative, and dogmatic. First, Ongmuir (1972) administered Rokeach's (1960) Dogmatism Scale to high school basketball and football coaches. His findings indicated that coaches do not differ significantly from other occupational groups on the dogmatism scale.

Second, Sage (1972a) obtained measures of Machiavellianism for randomly selected national samples
of collegiate football, basketball, and track coaches, as well as randomly selected high school basketball and football coaches in the state of Colorado. He reported no differences in Machiavellianism between the athletic coaches and male college students. In addition, Sage (1972a) found no significant differences in Mach scores when comparing coaches with win-loss records above and below sixty percent.

Third, Walsh and Carron (1977) compared the degree of Machiavellianism among three groups of Canadian coaches and a control group of non-coaching teachers. Their findings indicated that community volunteer coaches scored significantly lower on the Mach scales than either the non-physical education coaches or the non-coaching teachers. Other intergroup comparisons revealed no significant differences.

Fourth, Sage (1972b) examined the value orientations (liberalism versus conservatism) of randomly selected national samples of collegiate football, basketball and track coaches using the Polyphasic Values Inventory (PVI) developed by Roscoe (1965). Sage compared his findings with Elliott's (1969) study dealing with businessmen. He found that the coaches, as a group, demonstrated more liberal tendencies in such domains as the treatment of communists, international relations, educational methodology, academic freedom, and sexual and racial
relations. However, the coaches were more conservative than businessmen on such issues as labor unions and the use of alcoholic beverages.

A few studies have assessed the relationship between personality traits and team success. For example, Penman, Hastad, and Cords (1974) used the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale to measure degree of authoritarianism between successful and unsuccessful coaches. They noted that: "It has been traditionally assumed that the development of successful athletic teams is based on a strict adherence to discipline, organization, and conformance on behalf of players" (Penman et al., 1974, p. 156). The researchers found that "the more successful coaches were more authoritarian than the less successful coaches" (p. 156).

Hastad (1972) examined authoritarianism and its relationships to success in high school football and basketball programs in the State of Washington. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was used to measure general authoritarianism and the win-loss record was used to determine team success. "Successful" and "unsuccessful" coaches were compared through the use of the Mann Whitney U Test. The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the "more successful" coaches and the "less successful" coaches in regard to the authoritarian nature of their personality.
In another study dealing with personality and team success, Cooper and Payne (1972) investigated the relationship between personality and performance using seventeen English soccer teams. The Bass Orientation Inventory (1960, 1962) was used to measure the personality characteristics of self-orientation, interaction orientation, and task orientation. The researchers obtained a significant correlation ($r = .72$) between the task orientations of coaches and team success. However, no significant correlations were found between task orientations of team captains and team success. Regarding the task orientations of team captains, Cooper and Payne (1972) note that "they are not appreciably more task oriented than players, their task behavior is presumably not sufficiently different to have much influence on the players' performances" (p. 16).

In a study of forty-two coaches of football and basketball teams in Edmonton, Canada, Bain (1973) found that coaches, as a group, scored lower on authoritarianism than two control groups of educators and a sample of the general male population. Also, within the coaching group itself, younger coaches tended to score higher on authoritarianism than did older coaches.

Nelson (1968) examined the personality traits of leaders on thirty-one top caliber high school basketball teams. The findings revealed that five of the sixteen traits identified on the personality test were significantly
different between the groups of leaders and non-leaders. Leaders were found to be more mature emotionally, more extroverted, and less threatened by the environment than non-leaders.

As in leadership research in general, the trait approach has received its share of criticism (See Carron, 1975; Fisher, 1974; Droll, 1970; Martens, 1974; Ryan, 1974). Chelladurai and Carron (1978) point out that the personality trait approach "has not provided great insight into the characteristics of leaders and the process of leadership" (p. 6). Furthermore, Gibson et al. submit that "the trait approach does not provide insight into what the effective leader does on the job" (p. 191). This dissatisfaction with the trait approach has caused researchers to look to alternative approaches including the behavioral and situational approaches which follow.

Behavioral Approach

Since the trait approach has not been particularly fruitful, sport researchers have turned to the study of leadership behaviors (i.e., the types of behaviors that the leader engages in while carrying out the process of leadership). Loy et al. (1978) indicate that "leaders display the same behaviors as other group members but their patterns of behavior are typically more frequent and dominant" (p. 77). Moreover, Shaw (1971) has stated:
"Since characteristics of individuals presumably reflect behavioral tendencies, it has seemed to many students of leadership that investigations should deal with behavior directly" (p. 63).

A few studies have been completed which deal with the leadership behavior of coaches and team success. Swartz (1973), for example, sampled seventy-two college coaches in order to assess the relationship between type of coaching leadership (i.e., laissez-faire, democratic-cooperative, autocratic-submissive, autocratic-aggressive) and team success. He classified coaches with a win-loss record of fifty percent or better as successful, and those with a poorer record as unsuccessful. Results indicated that similar leadership styles were manifested by both successful and unsuccessful coaches.

Anspaugh (1971) selected his sample from fourteen private and church supported colleges in Indiana and Michigan. The 163 subjects who participated in the study were administered a sociometric questionnaire, the ASO scale, and the Group Atmosphere (GA) scale. The ASO was used to determine whether the sociometrically chosen leaders were task oriented or group oriented in their leadership orientation and the GA scale was used to determine how leaders and non-leaders perceived their group atmosphere. In addition, Anspaugh attempted to determine if winning and losing teams tended to respond
differently to the scaled items. Winning teams were defined as winning fifty percent or more of their games.

The findings indicated that winning teams responded differently from losing teams on all items of the Group Atmosphere (GA) scale. Winning teams believed their group atmosphere was quite satisfying while losing teams' group atmosphere reflected frustration. Furthermore, leadership behaviors were clearly more evident on winning teams than on losing teams. Leaders were characterized as being more task oriented, more intelligent and venturesome, and more self-opinionated than non-leaders.

Lenk (1977) compared "authoritarian" with "democratic" styles of coaching. His findings suggested that neither style has proven to be more effective than the other. He noted that each style has its particular advantages and disadvantages. More specifically, Lenk (1977) pointed out that:

...whereas the 'authoritarian' style seems to be simpler and easy to procure and to have a larger range of applicability, the 'democratic' method certainly involves or engenders a greater degree of internal identification and commitment on the side of intellectual athletes.... Because of this higher grade identification it is hypothesized that, under a 'democratic' style of coaching athletes, teams, and crews may be able to mobilize psychic reserves not accessible otherwise, in particular not 'on command.' (p. 88)

In Psychology in Contemporary Sport, Cratty (1973) described several advantages and disadvantages of
task-oriented and people-oriented leadership styles. These advantages and disadvantages are listed in Tables 2 and 3. Cratty (1973) indicated that a task-oriented coach may not be concerned with team conflicts or overly competitive behavior among team members. He may view them as a healthy sign of player-task orientation similar to his own. On the other hand, the people-oriented coach may overreact to minor team conflicts and possibly alienate certain team members as a result.

Cratty (1973) continues by pointing out that there may also be a difference in coacting and interacting teams when studying leadership in sport situations. In discussing coacting teams, Cratty stated that:

...the players work independently in the achievement of a group goal, i.e., the bowling team, most events in track and field, and swimming races excluding relays. Also, coacting teams are those in which the players act separately but in series. Their efforts are chained together in a meaningful way, such as the members of relay teams in swimming or track. Players can also coact in a roughly parallel manner, such as members of a bowling, archery, or rifle team, who may compete at once or separately--it makes no difference, and their combined scores contribute to an overall measure of team success. (p. 233)

On the other hand, a team may be interacting when the sport requires the players to constantly interact, to anticipate the movements of teammates, and to integrate their actions. Interacting teams may have interchangeable positions (i.e., basketball, soccer) or
TABLE 2

TASK-ORIENTED LEADER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More efficient, energy directed primarily toward the task</td>
<td>May raise anxiety levels of certain group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little time is taken for interpersonal communication</td>
<td>Sacrifices expediency for personal security of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designates jobs quickly in highly structured task situations</td>
<td>Less effective in moderately stressful situations in which group members may wish to interact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective in situations highly favorable to leadership, i.e., high leader power and obvious task requirements, and in highly unfavorable leadership situations, low leader power, unstructured task of unaccepting group members.</td>
<td>May not work well with important subordinates nor satisfy these people's need for secondary leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

**PEOPLE-ORIENTED LEADER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May reduce anxiety in situations in which the task has been completed unsuccessfully</td>
<td>Lack of concern about successful execution of the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can deal better with insecure people</td>
<td>Less effective in highly stressful situations or those in which great power or power symbols are obviously awarded to the leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can deal better in situations that are moderately favorable for the leader and in which group members usually need a greater hand in decision making</td>
<td>May cause anxious responses in group members who are highly task-oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
highly specialized functions (i.e., football, baseball). Cratty (1973) concludes that coacting teams "in which the athlete feels relatively alone may require more capable and sensitive leadership on the part of the coach than teams in which the basic nature of the sport is to engender close physical interaction among team members" (p. 233).

LaGrand (1970) collected data from college athletes regarding the behavioral characteristics of former coaches. Three hundred and four semantic differential scales were administered to athletes involved in basketball, soccer, wrestling, and tennis. The results revealed that there are no significant differences between individual and team sport coaches in giving personal attention to their athletes. But, his findings did indicate that coaches, in general, are lacking in the sensitivity and understanding of the individual attitudes and needs of athletes.

Percival (1971) compared the ratings of coaches by athletes with the coaches' self-ratings on the categories of personality, techniques and methods, and general knowledge and mechanics. Table 4 shows that there were marked differences between the ratings of coaches and athletes. The greatest discrepancy occurred on the "personality dimension." Seventy-two percent of the coaches rated themselves as having a positive coaching personality, but only thirty-two percent of the athletes gave them the same rating.
TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE REACTIONS WITH REGARD TO FOUR SPECIFIC FACTORS INVOLVED IN COACHING EFFICIENCY

#1-personality
#2-techniques & methods
#3-general knowledge
#4-mechanics

Athletes' evaluation

Coaches' evaluation

#1-personality
#2-techniques & methods
#3-general knowledge
#4-mechanics
Sixty-six percent of the 382 athletes gave their coaches a negative overall rating while only twenty-four percent gave them a positive rating. The results were also analyzed in terms of individual and team sports. Individual sport athletes generally rated the coaches less positively than did team sport athletes. Percival attributed these differences to the fact that less capable coaches can be ignored more easily in team sport situations than in individual sport situations.

Mudra (1965) attempted to identify the leadership behaviors of collegiate football coaches through an assessment of the applications which coaches make of certain learning principles. He conceptualized learning principles as being gestalt-field or stimulus-response. Mudra found that coaches at small colleges tend to support a gestalt-field approach to coaching, which involved interacting and problem-solving behavior; whereas, major-college coaches tend to stress stimulus-response principles of learning, which emphasize trial and error learning and the acquisition of habits. He concluded that the difference between leadership behaviors of college coaches is closely aligned to the underlying philosophies which govern athletic programs at large and small institutions. In other words, Mudra suggests that the leadership behaviors of college coaches are closely associated with the situation in which the coach finds himself or herself.
In a philosophical analysis of leadership behavior, Rendek (1972) analyzed a basketball coach who was an effective leader and compared the coach's basic philosophy with his personal experiences and beliefs. Rendek concluded that consistency between philosophy and behavior on the part of the leader is the very essence of effective coaching. Ehlen (1977), in another theoretical analysis, attempted to classify the leadership behaviors of teachers of physical education and coaches. He noted in his analysis that:

The teacher of physical education (the sport's teacher of school-class) as well as the coach of a performance oriented group (a sport's team) are people who play a leader's role vis-a-vis a particular group. They must be defined as formal leaders and not as emergent leaders in the context of the group theory. (p. 79)

After analyzing the leadership behaviors of teachers and coaches, Ehlen (1977) made the following assessment:

The leader's behavior of the physical education teacher and that of the coach are distinguishable on the grounds of their differing functions, which are derived from the aims.... The physical education teacher becomes an informal leader because he holds the aspect of the processes within the learning group to be as significant as subject orientation.... A coach, on the other hand, must subordinate the process aspect to the aspect of the objective because of his subject orientation. (p. 85)
During the past decade, an increasing number of researchers have studied the leadership behaviors of female coaches. One of the earliest studies dealing with women coaches was completed by Lowery (1972). She administered five paired leadership comparison instruments to forty-eight administrators, sixty-one coaches, and team members representing seventy-six volleyball and basketball teams in an effort to identify leadership functions, sources of power, and sources of group attraction. She found that the administrators, coaches, and players agreed significantly with one another with respect to the ranks assigned to the leadership and power functions to be performed by the coach. She also found that the same three groups viewed the leadership functions of the coach as being task oriented in nature (Lowery, 1972, p. 132).

In a study completed in 1974, Clark attempted to assess athletes' perceptions of selected characteristics of successful women intercollegiate coaches and to provide profile comparisons of women coaches in four sports. Some of the characteristics examined included: knowledge of the sport, ability to teach, personal appearance, and fairness in dealing with each player. Using a version of Osgood's Semantic Differential, respondents were asked to rate twelve characteristics on a seven-point scale. The findings showed that among
the four groups of athletes responding, swimmers rated their coaches highest on the twelve characteristics studied. In addition, "Knowledge of the Sport" rated highest when pooled means were used to establish a rank order listing of the twelve characteristics. "Ability to Motivate" was the only characteristics which received similar ratings among the four groups of athletes.

Scholten (1978) investigated the leadership dimensions of training behavior, autocratic behavior, democratic behavior, social support behavior, and rewarding behavior in ten female coaches. Ninety-nine athletes were asked to report how they prefer coaches to act and how they perceived their coaches as acting by completing a Leadership in Sports Questionnaire. Results revealed that the athletes perceived their coaches as exhibiting less training behavior, democratic behavior, social support behavior, and rewarding behavior than expected. However, the athletes' observations concerning the autocratic behavior of coaches were greater than expected.

In a study dealing with the leadership behaviors of female athletes, Mason (1977) administered the Sweeney Response to Power Measure (RPM) Test to sixty-eight intercollegiate volleyball players and one hundred non-participant university students. The findings indicated that non-participants scored higher than the participant leaders on the Cooperator and lower on the Ingratiator
dimensions. On the Rebel dimension of the (RPM) Test, participant leaders scored higher than participant non-leaders. The data also showed that participant leaders were older, more educated, and more experienced in volleyball than the non-leaders. As a group, the non-leaders exhibited a permissive-rebel leadership style (i.e., they give up power as leaders and take power as followers).

Fariss (1978) studied the effect of autocratic and democratic leadership styles on the success of high school female sport participants. Sixty-one female high school volleyball coaches and 610 high school athletes participated in her study. She used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII and Mach Scale to measure autocratic and democratic leadership behaviors. The results of the investigation showed that there was no significant difference between the frequency of percent of success between women volleyball coaches who demonstrated autocratic leadership behaviors and those who demonstrated democratic leadership behaviors. In addition, she found that the size of the school and number of games played did not appear to affect the frequency of percent of success.

Gill and Perry (1979), in another study dealing with female athletes, examined the relationship of selected characteristics to the relative leadership
status within a women's intercollegiate softball team. Leadership status was assessed with a questionnaire completed by all team members three times—at the beginning, middle, and end of the season. Separate step-wise multiple regression analyses were used to determine the relationship of the selected characteristics (i.e., team, class, year, playing position, previous experience) to leadership status at each of the three times. The results indicated that team, playing position, and previous experience were related to leadership status as predicted, and that relationship was consistent throughout the season.

In a recent study, Tropp and Landers (1979) quantified the interaction channels used by intercollegiate field hockey teams and compared these to Bavelas' centrality index and the emergence of leadership/interpersonal attraction. Interaction frequencies, defined as passes to teammates, were determined for each playing position on the teams. Analyses of variance showed that high-interaction frequencies were not indicative of high leadership and attraction ratings. Only "leadership," "years on the varsity," and "attraction" were found to discriminate between the captains and non-captains. Tropp and Landers (1979) point out that, "The results suggest that for highly dynamic tasks functional centrality and task independency are perhaps more
important factors than spatial centrality and high interaction" (p. 228).

Several researchers have used behavioral observation systems to analyze coaching behaviors (Crossman, 1979; Quarterman, 1980; Rushall, 1977; Smoll et al., 1978; Keane, 1978; Mancini and Agnew, 1978; Danielson et al., 1975; Tharp and Gallimore, 1976). Although these studies did not deal specifically with the leadership behaviors of coaches, the results can be used to gain a better understanding of leadership behaviors. For example, Tharp and Gallimore (1976) conducted a study in which they observed John Wooden's behavioral acts during practice sessions at U.C.L.A. They recorded 2,366 acts of teaching by Wooden, which they classified in terms of ten categories of leadership behavior. They found that 50.3% of Wooden's behavioral acts during practice sessions constituted instructions (that is, "verbal statements about what to do or how to do it"). Tharp and Gallimore point out, as a result of their investigation, that coaches may appear as "take-charge" individuals, but they are far from autocratic in nature. In fact, coaches such as John Wooden seem to invest most of their time in communicating information (Tharp and Gallimore, 1976).

Danielson, Selhart, and Drake (1975) completed a study in which they analyzed the perceptions of high
school hockey players concerning the behaviors of their coaches. On the basis of multidimensional scaling and factor analysis of fifty-seven frequently reported coaching behaviors, they concluded that "commonly perceived behaviors in hockey coaching are mainly of a communicative nature with surprisingly little emphasis on domination" (p. 333). These results tended to concur with the findings of Tharp and Gallimore (1976).

In examining the role of sex as it affects leadership behavior in sport, Keane and Cheffers (1978) studied ten coaches (five male and five female) and six randomly selected players from each coach's team. They administered Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale to the coaches and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII to the players. In addition, the Cheffers Adaptation of Flanders Interaction Analysis System (CAFIAS) was used to describe player-coach interaction in terms of selected parameters. Keane and Cheffers reported that the sex of the coach was not a factor in leadership style or behavior and that significant differences exist within rather than between the sexes.

In summary, the major thrust of the behavioral approach has been to describe the types of behaviors that the leader engages in while carrying out the process of leadership. In the sports setting, researchers have
analyzed the leadership behaviors of "successful" and "unsuccessful" as well as male and female coaches. Likert scales, questionnaires, and behavior observation systems have been the instruments used most often to assess the leadership behaviors of coaches and team members.

Although the behavioral approach to leadership in sport has added to a better understanding of coaching behaviors, a few criticisms have surfaced regarding this mode of research. For example, very few of the behavioral studies completed to date have attempted to identify the specific situational variables which may interact with leadership behaviors to influence leadership effectiveness. Moreover, the behavioral approach has failed to answer such situationally oriented questions as: Do successful coaches from one competitive level exhibit similar leadership styles as coaches from other competitive levels? Do effective leaders in athletics prove also to be effective leaders in business or industry?

In an effort to answer these and other situationally specific leadership questions, sport researchers have recently turned to situational leadership models with the hopes of gaining a better understanding of leadership in sport. A review of this recent research trend will be presented in the next section.
**Situational Approach**

As we previously mentioned, the trait and behavioral approaches to leadership research over-simplify what determines the effectiveness of leader behavior. Consequently, sport researchers have turned their attention to the interaction between leaders and the many variables within their sport situations that may influence leader behavior. They have been guided by the situational approach which does not seek to identify universal leader characteristics, but is instead directed toward discovering situational variables which cause or permit leader behaviors and characteristics to be effective.

Many theorists outside of sport have attempted to catalog the situational factors that determine which leader behaviors are appropriate (French, 1949; Cattell, 1951; Davis, 1954; Bass, 1960; Likert, 1961). According to these theorists, the characteristics required of leaders vary with the following: (1) their personalities; (2) leader and subordinate task requirements; (3) the attitudes, needs, and expectations of subordinates; and (4) the organizational and physical environment. The situational approach, then, is based on a recognition that both the situation and the behavior of leaders must be considered in order to understand the effects of leadership.

In the sports setting, Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership has been the most frequently studied situational
approach. Fiedler (1954), for example, used sport teams in one of his early studies to test the basic tenets of the contingency leadership theory. He hypothesized, in a study of fourteen high school basketball teams, that interpersonal perception scores are related to the proportion of games a team wins. He therefore tested whether members of winning or successful teams perceived each other differently from members of losing teams. The results indicated that teams in which members chose their friends as co-workers performed less effectively than teams in which the most preferred co-worker and best friend were not the same individual.

In the same study, it was also hypothesized that teams in which the leader perceived his most and least preferred co-worker in an accepting and positive manner would be more effective. Negative correlations ($-0.63, ASp; -0.41, ASn; -0.69, ASo$) resulted when the leaders' Assumed Similarity scores were correlated with the percent of games won at mid-season. Similarly, in a validation study conducted at the end of the season, leaders of winning teams had low ASo scores. The results led Fiedler (1954) to conclude that winning basketball teams were teams which regulated interpersonal concerns to one of secondary importance and were first concerned with team performance. The less successful teams were more concerned with good interpersonal relationships.
Similar results were obtained by Meyers and McGrath (1962) who employed Fiedler's classification of interpersonal relations to their study of rifle teams. Specifically, Meyers and McGrath attempted to determine the relationship between group performance and interpersonal relations and satisfaction between team members. Like Fiedler's (1954) basketball study, their findings demonstrated that for the non-positive interpersonal relations groups (task oriented), group success was central to their concerns; they had significantly better marksmanship scores and showed considerable improvement. On the other hand, team members who were more concerned with relating to other team members did not improve and perform as well.

In Vander Velden's (1971) study of sport teams, he hypothesized that team success is directly related to: (1) the level of task ability and experience of the group; (2) the positive task attitudes (LPC) of the formal leaders (coaches) and the informal leaders (team members chosen by the group); and (3) the degree of experience of the coaches. He found no empirical support for the stated hypotheses. However, when controlling for selected situational factors, he discovered significant relationships between task attitude of leaders and team success.
In addition, when he held task ability constant, Vander Velden (1971) found that task attitudes of leaders were closely related to team performance. The results indicated that within senior high school ability groups, the combination of a task-oriented coach and a relationship-oriented team leader contributed to team success. However, with low ability groups, the combination of a relationship-oriented coach and a task-oriented team leader was most effective.

In terms of Fiedler's (1967) leadership model, Vander Velden (1971) reported that:

The classification of teams into three categories similar to Fiedler's model showed task-oriented informal leaders to be most effective under favorable conditions with formal leaders performing maintenance functions in the group. In favorable situations, the roles were reversed. Groups intermediate on the favorableness continuum performed best when both leaders were less directive. (p. 137)

Danielson (1974, 1976) conducted a study of forty minor league hockey coaches with emphasis on the relationship between the least preferred co-worker scores of coaches and the demographic variables of age, socio-economic status, playing experience, and coaching experience. He found significant relationships between LPC and team success. But, his findings were contrary to Fiedler's theory, in that the individuals with the low LPC scores
were most effective in situations of medium favorability and vice versa.

In another leadership study using Fiedler's model, Inciong (1974) attempted to determine the relationship between the leadership styles of high school head basketball coaches and team success. Inciong hypothesized, consistent with Fiedler's theory, that the LPC score would be positively correlated with effectiveness in moderately favorable situations and negatively correlated in very favorable and unfavorable situations. The results showed that the leadership styles of task-oriented or interpersonally-oriented high school head basketball coaches appeared to be unrelated to team success.

In a follow-up to the Inciong (1974) study, Wardell (1977) conducted a cross-sport comparison of leadership styles and team success using the Fiedler model. He collected data from eighty-four head football, basketball, wrestling, and track coaches in Utah high schools. As in the Inciong (1974) study, it was hypothesized that in situations of intermediate favorableness, the coaches' LPC scores and team success for each sport would be positively correlated; high LPC assessed coaches would be more effective. It was also hypothesized that in the favorable and unfavorable situations, the respective coaches' LPC scores would be negatively correlated with team success; low LPC coaches in each sport would be more
effective. Wardell concluded that in the sports of football and wrestling, LPC correlated with team success and performance. However, the relationship between LPC and team success in the sports of basketball and track and field was not significant.

Gruetter (1979) attempted to determine the relationship between the leadership styles of selected Division I athletic directors and the combined win-loss percentages of their respective football and basketball teams over three seasons. Fiedler's (1967) Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC), Task Structure Rating Scale, Position Power Rating Scale, and a Group Atmosphere Scale were the instruments used to identify various leadership dimensions. The results from the forty-seven athletic directors who participated in the study indicated that Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Model did not appear to be appropriate in predicting success in Division I athletic administration.

Kjeldsen (1976) examined Fiedler's (1967) theory from several different perspectives in his study of thirty high school gymnastic teams. The Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale as well as interview techniques were used to determine leadership behaviors. He found that task-oriented (low LPC) coaches tended to be associated with successful teams in situations of low favorability, while relationship oriented (high LPC) coaches tended to be associated with successful teams in situations of moderate favorability. However,
Kjeldsen cautioned that the results should be treated as probability statements rather than as categorical facts and used with sensitivity to the complexity of the situation.

In another study utilizing Fiedler's Model, Lewis (1978) used the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) Scale, the Group Atmosphere Questionnaire, and a Task Structure Rating Scale to determine the relationship between the leadership behaviors of forty-eight female volleyball coaches at the high school level and team success. After completing the data analysis, she concluded that there was no significant relationship between the leadership styles of female volleyball coaches and team success.

Naylor (1976) investigated the relationship between various determinants of coaching ability and actual coach effectiveness as measured by team performance. Data was collected from fifty head coaches of amateur football teams in Canada. He found no significant relationship between LPC scores and measures of coach effectiveness. He did find, however, that measures of coach-team relations were positively related to team performance. Both the effects of winning on the coach and the efforts of the coach to improve coach-team relations were suggested explanations.
Bird (1977) studied the relationships between leadership, cohesion, skill, and success on women's intercollegiate volleyball teams. She found that Division I players on winning teams perceived their coaches as being relationship-oriented, whereas players on losing teams perceived their coaches as being task-oriented. In addition, the results showed that Division II players on successful teams perceived their coaches as being task-oriented, whereas members of unsuccessful teams perceived their coaches as relationship-oriented. Bird attempted to explain these conflicting results in the following way:

An alternative explanation may be that players on more highly skilled teams may be sufficiently motivated and, therefore, respond more to a supportive, socio-emotional coach. In either case, the results strongly suggest that effective leadership or coaching style is somewhat related to situational factors such as player skill. (Bird, 1977, p. 31)

Horwood (1979) surveyed twenty-five Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union coaches in an attempt to identify the components of leadership effectiveness in sport. Coaches were asked to respond to questions relating to their training, experience, leadership style, relations with team members, and role perception. Also, a version of Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) was used to measure the coaches' motivational style.
Horwood (1979) concluded from his analysis that there is no relationship between such variables as degree of authoritarianism, coach-player relations, role perception, motivational style, and coach effectiveness measures. The only positive relationship identified by Horwood was between positive peer ratings and the winning percentage of the coach.

Based upon the preceding discussion related to the testing of Fiedler's model in sport settings, one can see that there has not been consistent support for the theory. Chelladurai and Carron (1978) describe some reasons for the inconsistent findings in the following paragraph:

The research applications of Fiedler's theory to the athletic context and/or recreation field do not appear to have provided for the specific contingencies specified by that theory, particularly in reference to those parameters comprising situational favourableness. For example, in the Inciong (1974) study only one aspect of determinants of situational favourableness was assessed. Also, and somewhat related, in both the Inciong and Danielson (1976) studies, teams from the same sport and level of competition were used. Thus, the situation was highly similar for all leaders tested. Fiedler's construct of situational favourableness assumes considerable variance in the dimensions and requires complex measurements. In the absence of differences in the situational parameters, Fiedler's model cannot be adequately tested. (p. 29)
As a result of the inconsistent findings related to the Fiedler model, some sport researchers have turned to other situational leadership models in an effort to better understand leadership in sport. For example, Martin (1979) used a research model developed by Korphage (1976) to test a contingency theory of leadership based upon the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy, Stogdill, 1974). Martin examined the leadership behaviors of selected Division I and Division III college soccer coaches. He found that there are significant differences in leadership behavior style of soccer coaches in Division I and Division III as described by the LBDQ - Form XII. In addition, Martin found significant differences between soccer coaches as a group and six previously tested leader groups. The situational elements of coaches, as determined by a demographic questionnaire, were used to help explain the results. In terms of the contingency theory proposed by Kerr et al., Martin (1979) concluded that:

The situational elements as summarized by Kerr et al. (1974) seem to explain these significant differences. Leadership behavior seems to be affected by the subordinate characteristics, supervisor characteristics and task characteristics. (p. 117)

Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) attempted to determine if certain propositions related to House's (1971) Path-Goal
Theory of Leadership are generalizable to the dimensions of sport. They used an analysis of variance design to test the effects of sex, task dependence, and task variability in sports on preferred leadership behavior (e.g., training behavior, autocratic behavior, democratic behavior, social support behavior, rewarding behavior).

The researchers developed a questionnaire and administered it to eighty male and eighty female physical education students. The results showed that: "a) athletes in interdependent sports preferred their coach to emphasize more training behavior than athletes in independent sports; b) athletes in closed sports preferred their coach to emphasize more training behavior than athletes in open sports; c) males preferred more autocratic behavior and social support than female athletes; and d) males in closed sports expected more supportive behavior than males in open sports and all female athletes" (p. 85). The authors concluded that these findings only partially support House's Path-Goal Theory of Leadership.

In a recent study designed to test certain aspects of House's (1971) Path-Goal Theory and Hersey and Blanchard's (1972) Situational Leadership Theory in an athletic setting, Vos Strache (1978) used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII to identify perceived leadership behavior of twenty collegiate coaches. The findings from
her investigation partially supported certain aspects of House's (1971) Path-Goal Theory. From the results of the study, it was concluded that losing coaches may not have clearly identified the path of success for their team members. It was also concluded that starters perceived their leader to be more persuasive than the non-starters, thus assisting the starters in clarifying the direction for an effective performance.

Vos Strache (1978) also noted that the findings did not support Hersey and Blanchard's Situational of Life-Cycle Leadership Theory. She concluded that the range used in her study to identify maturity levels (i.e., class level) "may not have been broad enough to allow differentiation in maturity" (Vos Strache, 1978, p. 77). One of her suggestions for future research using the Situational Model was to study the interaction between leadership style and maturity of followers over a broader range of levels.

**Summary**

A review of the sport leadership research has uncovered more questions than answers. Sport leadership research has historically moved through similar trait, behavioral, and situational phases which have characterized leadership research in general. However, when comparing the quantity and quality of sport research completed to date with leadership research in other areas, it is clear
that sport leadership research is still in its infancy stages.

A recent trend in leadership research has been to combine certain behavioral leadership concepts with situational variables. House's (1973) revised Path-Goal Theory and Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory are examples of this trend. Kerr et al. (1974) have also expressed the need to combine the behavioral constructs of consideration and initiating structure with situational variables.

This review of the leadership research in sport has revealed that only three studies to date (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1978; Vos Strache, 1978; Martin, 1979) have clearly attempted to interpret behavioral leadership concepts in terms of situational variables. This study is but one more attempt to add to the sport leadership body of knowledge by examining the leadership behaviors of selected successful basketball coaches from four distinct competitive levels. The results of this study will be discussed in terms of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory which applies behavioral leadership constructs to situational variables.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter presents descriptions of the methods and procedures employed in this study. Specifically, the chapter will include the following: 1) a description of the study, 2) the research design, 3) the sample and its selection, 4) the pilot study, 5) instrumentation, 6) field procedures, and 7) treatment of data.

Description of the Study

This study was designed to identify the leadership behaviors of selected successful basketball coaches at four distinct competitive levels. In addition, the study attempted to determine if any significant differences exist between the leadership behaviors of selected successful junior high school, senior high school, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A.A.U.) basketball coaches. The results of the study were interpreted in terms of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory and Chelladurai and Carron's (1978) modification of the Situational Leadership Theory.
Research Design

The research design employed in this investigation was that of a descriptive-analytic field study. According to Kerlinger (1973), "Field studies are strong in realism, significance, strength of variables, theory orientation, and heuristic quality" (p. 406). However, Kerlinger (1973) continues by pointing out that field studies are not without their weaknesses. He states that:

...the field study is the scientific weak cousin of the laboratory and field experiments. Its most serious weakness, of course, is ex post facto character. Thus, statements of relations are weaker than they are in experimental research. (p. 408)

Despite these limitations, Loy, McPherson, and Kenyon (1978) note that field studies using sport groups "possess unique structural features that offer special advantages with respect to small-group research" (p. 68). Schafer (1966) has identified four such special advantages:

First, the sports group is a 'natural' rather than an artificial or a laboratory group.... Second, research focused on a particular sport controls a number of confounding variables by automatically holding them constant. Examples of such variables include group size, role structure, and rules of conduct. Third, because sport groups are typically in pursuit of zero-sum goals, they often provide an ideal context for the study of co-operation and competition and intergroup and intragroup conflict. Finally, sport groups with an emphasis on winning typically offer objective measures of group effectiveness.
in terms of the number of errors made, points scored for or against, and percentage of games won. That is, they offer ideal settings... for the study of the effects of such variables as membership composition, cohesion, informal norms, leadership, and social environment on the attainment of group goals (Loy et al., 1978, pp. 68-69).

In this field study, the selection of basketball coaches and their teams as research subjects offered special advantages in studying leadership theory. For example, the leadership roles and responsibilities of the coach are fairly well defined in the sports setting. Cratty (1973) points this out when he states:

According to every criteria that may be applied, the athletic coach is a powerful group leader. His authority has usually been designated by a superior such as the Board of Education or team owner. He can make decisions such as group membership, the duties each group member may assume, and often the general manner of reaching team goals. Moreover, he possesses information and skills superior to those of the team members and thus is purportedly in a most favorable position to aid the achievement of group objectives. (p. 236)

Thus, by a designation from some higher authority, coaches have the legitimate power to exert influence and control over their teams. He is able to select players for the team, assign them to positions, organize practices, plan practice and game strategies, and decide who is to play. Furthermore, the leadership effectiveness of the coach can be readily and objectively determined through an analysis of his or her win-loss record.
The Sample and Its Selection

A total of forty successful head basketball coaches and their teams were randomly selected from a list of successful basketball coaches (i.e., winning percentage of fifty-five percent or higher over the past three seasons) in Central Ohio. Twelve coaches were initially selected from each of the following competitive levels: junior high, senior high, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A. A. U.). The first ten coaches drawn for each competitive level constituted the random sample. Since twelve names were initially drawn for each competitive level, the eleventh and twelfth names were selected as alternates in the event that one of the first ten coaches or his team was not willing to participate in the study. If more than two coaches were not willing to participate in the study, then a redraw would have been instituted for that particular competitive level. The Rand Corporation table of random digits was used in the random selection process (Guenther, 1965).

Fifty-five percent or higher winning percentage over the past three seasons was used to define successful coaches. Studies by Inciong (1974), Wardell (1977), and Vos Stache (1978) also used fifty percent or higher winning percentage as an indication of successful coaching or effective leadership. A three year time span was selected in order to eliminate coaches who may have had
one successful year because of an over abundance of player talent. Wardell (1977), Danielson (1974), and Inciong (1974) all used similar safeguards in their studies dealing with athletic teams.

The list from which this investigator randomly selected names of successful basketball coaches in Central Ohio was compiled during the last quarter of the 1979-1980 basketball regular season. Only the names of coaches whose teams have won at least fifty-five percent of their games were included on the list.

Various sources were used to determine which coaches were successful during the past three years. A list of successful Amateur Athletic Union coaches was developed after consultation with district and Region XII A. A. U. officials. A list of successful college coaches was developed after searching back issues of the National Directory of College Athletics, Blue Book of College Athletics, and the Columbus Dispatch. Successful high school coaches were identified after reviewing records provided by the Ohio High School Athletic Association and cross-checking this information with coaching records listed in the Columbus Dispatch's annual "High School Basketball Preview." In addition, a list of successful junior high school basketball coaches was compiled after identifying the few school districts which provide competitive and well-organized junior high basketball
programs. Of particular assistance in this task was the Director of Physical Education for the City of Columbus Public Schools who provided this investigator with information pertaining to the large and well-organized junior high basketball program in the City of Columbus Public Schools. It was also necessary to confer with a few veteran coaches who have been active in Central Ohio junior high basketball programs for many years in order to cross-check previously obtained information. Only teams affiliated with the Ohio High School Athletic Association, National Collegiate Athletic Association, National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, or the Amateur Athletic Union were used in this study.

Pilot Study

Sample questionnaires were administered to four coaches (one from each of the four competitive levels) and their teams to determine whether the pre-established data collection procedures needed any revisions. The questionnaires to be used in this study were administered to these groups under conditions comparable to those anticipated in the actual questionnaire administration. The subjects participating in the pilot study were also representative of the actual study group.
The subjects who participated in the pilot study generally felt that the questionnaire directions were clear. Statements pertaining to the purpose of the study and requests for voluntary participation were also viewed as requiring no further clarification. It was suggested, as a result of the pilot study, that the completed questionnaires be sealed in individual envelopes to insure anonymity. The total time involved in administering the pilot study questionnaires did not exceed fifteen minutes.

Instrumentation

The following instruments were selected for use in this study: (1) Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire; (2) Coaches' Personal Data Questionnaire. A description of each instrument is provided in this section.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In order to accomplish the stated purpose of this study, it was necessary to utilize a leadership instrument which specifically measures the leadership dimensions of task behavior and relationship behavior. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) have developed the Lead-Self and Lead-Other leadership instruments in order to identify task and relationship behaviors of leaders in coacting groups. As the result of several studies (Beck, 1978; Smith, 1975; Damico, 1976; Gooding, 1978), the reliability and validity of the Lead-Self and Lead-Other instruments have been criticized.
Moreover, the use of these instruments in dyadic rather than group leadership studies has drawn additional criticism. Sashkin and Garland (1979) note that leadership studies solely concerned with dyadic relationships "suffer from results that are consistently weak and seem to have little practical utility" (p. 80).

Since basketball teams are generally classified as interacting groups (i.e., a group which requires the close coordination of several team members in the performance of the primary task), it was necessary to find an instrument to measure the leadership dimensions of task behavior and relationship behavior in a sport group. It was also desirable to find a leadership instrument which has been shown to be consistently valid and reliable through extensive leadership research.

One such instrument is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The LBDQ was developed at The Ohio State University as a project of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. It originally consisted of 150 items with nine dimensions of leadership behavior. After several subsequent investigations, the Ohio State researchers found that the large number of hypothesized dimensions of leadership behavior could be reduced to two well-defined factors. These were identified by Halpin and Winer (1957) and Fleishman (1957) as (1) consideration, and (2) initiation
of structure.

It is interesting to note that none of the studies which have dealt with the leadership behaviors of coaches have specifically used the LBDQ. A few studies have used modified versions of the LBDQ-Form XII (Danielson, 1974; Martin, 1979). This is despite the fact that "task behavior" and "relationship behavior" are the terms which have been used for decades to describe the behaviors of coaches (Tutko and Richards, 1971; Sage, 1973; Cratty, 1973; Scott, 1972; Meggyesy, 1971; Shaw, 1972).

The LBDQ is considered one of the most reliable and valid instruments available to measure the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. Halpin (1957) reported the reliability as estimated by the split-half method to be .93 for the consideration scores and .86 for the initiating structure scores when corrected for attenuation.

In a number of studies the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been determined by a between-group versus within-group analysis of variance. The F ratios were found to be significant at the .01 level. Therefore, subordinates tended to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly.
In describing the reliability and validity of the LBDQ, Stogdill (1969) noted that "the findings constitute evidence that the subscales of the LBDQ measure what they are purported to measure...the LBDQ may be regarded as valid" (pp. 157-158).

The original version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was modified slightly for purposes of this investigation. Although the forty questions of the LBDQ remained basically the same, the wording was changed slightly to emphasize the player-coach relationship and the team concept. For example, the term "team" was substituted for the term "group" and the term "coach" was substituted for the term "supervisor" (See Appendix B).

Coaches' Personal Data Questionnaire. All forty head basketball coaches involved in this study were asked to complete a Coaches' Questionnaire in an effort to obtain certain demographic and situational information. This information was used to formulate coaches' profiles for each competitive level. The questionnaire was a modified version of the Stanford Academic Governance Project Questionnaire (Korphage, 1976; Martin, 1979) which was originally developed to ascertain the duties, background, and influence of college professors throughout the United States.
The information obtained from the Coaches' Questionnaire can be categorized into the following areas:

1. Personal information: age, sex, education, etc.

2. Coaching information: coaching experience, playing experience, win-loss record, etc.

3. Employment information: employment status, full-time profession, evaluation procedures, etc.

4. Program emphasis information: hours per week devoted to coaching duties, future coaching ambitions, team ranking, etc.

Field Procedures

On January 31, 1980, an initial contact letter was mailed to the forty coaches who were randomly selected for this study. The letter explained the general nature of the investigation and solicited the coaches' voluntary participation as well as the voluntary participation of team members. The coaches were informed that a follow-up telephone call would be made to determine if the coach and his team were willing to voluntarily participate in the study. Once permission was received from the coach and players, then an appointment time was set-up to administer the questionnaires. All forty coaches and players voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. Therefore, it was not necessary to select alternate teams or institute a redraw of the random sample.
The administration of the questionnaires was accomplished over a five-week period. The method of administering the questionnaires was standardized throughout all group sessions. The coach and team members were read a pre-established set of general instructions (See Appendix F) prior to answering the questionnaires. The general instructions covered the following areas:

1. Introduction and purpose of the study;
2. Requests for voluntary participation (informed consent);
3. Safeguards concerning respondent confidentiality and anonymity; and
4. Importance of answering all questions honestly and accurately.

After the general instructions were read to all subjects, a pre-established set of specific directions and procedures for answering the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaires were then read to the same subjects (Appendix F). Coaches were asked to complete the Coaches' Questionnaire apart from the players in order to avoid any influence that their presence might have on the players' responses.

Treatment of the Data

Scoring the LBDQ

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) is composed of two leadership dimensions: consideration
and initiating structure. Each of the dimensions is summed independently. The respondent indicated the frequency with which he or she perceives the leader to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs: 4 = always; 3 = often; 2 = occasionally; 1 = seldom; 0 = never (See Scoring Key in Appendix C). For each of the leadership dimensions, the scores from the team members are then averaged to yield an index of the coaches' behavior in respect to that dimension.

Only 30 of the 40 items are scored on the LBDQ; 15 for each of the two dimensions. The 10 unscored items have been retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire. The score for each dimension is the sum of the scores assigned to responses marked on each of the 15 items in the dimension. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 0 to 60.

Statistical Analysis

After the data collection was completed, it became necessary to select the appropriate statistical procedures for analysis of the data in order to determine the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses set forth in Chapter I of this study. Since more than two factors were examined in this study, analysis of variance (nested) was selected as the major statistical technique. The
advantages of using ANOVA over separate t-tests are numerous. Hopkins and Glass (1978) describe three definite advantages as follows:

1. ANOVA yields an accurate and known type-I error probability, whereas the actual $\alpha$ for the set of several separate t-tests is high yet undetermined;

2. ANOVA requires less computational effort than several separate t-tests; and

3. ANOVA is more powerful (when $\alpha$ is held constant)—that is, if the null hypothesis is false, it is more likely to be rejected. (p. 334)

Analysis of variance was used to test for significant main effects between the four competitive levels on the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. A hierarchical design of three factors (level, coach, player) was used to facilitate the analysis of variance. A hierarchical design is one in which the levels of one factor are "nested within, or are subsamples of, levels of another factor" (Hicks, 1964, p. 166). The design is illustrated in Table 5.
To test if there are significant main effects between competitive levels on the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration, it was necessary to consider the following model for each leadership dimension separately:

$$X_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + B_{j(i)} + \epsilon_{k(j(i))}$$

where

- $X_{ijk}$ = the observation from the $k^{th}$ player under the $j^{th}$ coach in the $i^{th}$ competition level
- $\mu$ = overall effect (constant)
- $\alpha_i$ = the effect of the $i^{th}$ competition level (constant)
- $B_{j(i)}$ = the effect of the $j^{th}$ coach in the $i^{th}$ competition level (random)
- $\epsilon_{k(j(i))}$ = the error term associated with $X_{ijk}$
- $n_{ij}$ = the number of players observed for the $j^{th}$ coach in the $i^{th}$ competition level
The hypothesis to be tested within this nested design is
\( H_0: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 \) versus \( H_1: \alpha_i \neq \alpha_j \) for some (i, j). The corresponding ANOVA table is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach (Level)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player (Coach (Level))</td>
<td>( n_{ij} - 40 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic for testing \( H_0 \) versus \( H_1 \) will be the ratio of the sum of squares due to level divided by 3 to the sum of squares due to coach within level divided by 36. Under normality assumptions, the test statistic has a F distribution with 3 and 36 degrees of freedom.

If the ANOVA results in rejection of the null hypothesis \( H_0: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 \), then the Bonferroni multiple comparison method will be used to determine which means differ significantly from which other means.

According to Neter and Wasserman (1974), an advantage of using the Bonferroni method is that "the Bonferroni method can be used whether the factor level sample sizes are equal or unequal, and for pairwise comparisons as well as for general contrasts" (p. 482).

Next, a determination will be made concerning the acceptance or rejection of the twelve hypotheses set
forth in this study. The specific hypotheses include the following:

1a. There will be no significant difference between junior high and senior high basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1b. There will be no significant difference between junior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1c. There will be no significant difference between junior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1d. There will be no significant difference between senior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1e. There will be no significant difference between senior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1f. There will be no significant difference between college and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

2a. There will be no significant difference between junior high and senior high basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

2b. There will be no significant difference between junior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.
2c. There will be no significant difference between junior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2d. There will be no significant difference between senior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2e. There will be no significant difference between senior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2f. There will be no significant difference between college and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

The .05 level of significance was selected for determining statistical significance of the preceding hypotheses.

Statistical Analysis System was the statistical package used in this study. All computations were done on the IBM S/360 computer at The Ohio State University Computer Center.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis and a discussion of the results. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section deals with the development of profiles for each group of coaches who participated in this study. An analysis of the demographic information obtained from the Coaches' Personal Data Questionnaire will be used for this purpose.

The second section reports the scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The coaches' scores on the leadership dimensions of consideration and initiating structure will be presented according to competitive level. Means and standard deviations for each group of coaches will be included in this section.

The third section describes the statistical treatment applied to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire data to determine if any significant differences exist between the leadership behavior dimension of initiating structure in selected successful junior high school, senior high school, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A. A. U.) basketball coaches. The results of the data
and a discussion of hypotheses la through lf are included in this section.

The fourth section describes the statistical treatment applied to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire data to determine if any significant differences exist between the leadership behavior dimension of consideration in selected successful junior high school, senior high school, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A. A. U.) basketball coaches. The results of the data and a discussion of hypotheses 2a through 2f are included in this section.

Coaches' Questionnaire Data

A Coaches' Personal Data Questionnaire was administered to the forty head basketball coaches who participated in this study. The total sample included ten coaches from each of the following competitive levels: junior high school, senior high school, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A. A. U.). The Coaches' Questionnaire was a modified version of the Stanford Academic Governance Project Questionnaire (Korphage, 1976; Martin, 1979). It was designed to identify certain demographic information and situational variables which are characteristic of the groups being studied. Five of the questions on the questionnaire specifically attempted to identify possible influences and pressures which may
directly or indirectly affect the coaches' behavior.

Question one asked for the sex of the coach. The results indicated that all forty coaches were male. The second question dealt with the age of the coach. Fifty percent of the junior high coaches were under the age of thirty and fifty percent were between thirty and forty. Senior high coaches reported that seventy percent of their group were between thirty and forty years of age and thirty percent were forty-one to fifty. Sixty percent of the college coaches were between the ages of thirty to forty and forty percent were between forty-one to fifty. The data for the A. A. U. coaches revealed that forty percent were under thirty, forty percent were thirty to forty, one coach was forty-one to fifty, and one coach was fifty-one to sixty (See Table 6).

Question three asked the coach to list the number of years that he has been coaching basketball at this school or organization. Fifty percent of the junior high coaches indicated that they have been coaching at this school or organization from one to three years. Thirty percent had four to eight years and twenty percent had nine to fifteen years longevity. The data for the senior high sample showed that twenty percent had one to three years experience, forty percent had four to eight years, thirty percent had nine to fifteen years, and one coach had more than fifteen years. Twenty percent of the college
# TABLE 6

COACHES' AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>5 50</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 40</td>
<td>9 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>5 50</td>
<td>7 70</td>
<td>6 60</td>
<td>4 40</td>
<td>22 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 30</td>
<td>4 40</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>8 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>40 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coaches responded that they had been coaching at this school or organization from one to three years. Fifty percent (n = 5) of the college coaches listed four to eight years, twenty percent (n = 2) had nine to fifteen years, and ten percent (n = 1) had over fifteen years experience. Forty percent of the A. A. U. coaches replied that they had one to three years experience and the majority (n = 6, 60%) reported that they had four to eight years longevity (See Table 7).

Table 8 summarizes question four which asked for the total number of years of basketball coaching experience. Sixty percent of the junior high coaches answered that they had from four to eight years coaching experience. In contrast, sixty percent of the senior high coaches and fifty percent of the college coaches responded that they had nine to fifteen years experience. Like the junior high coaches, sixty percent of the A. A. U. coaches marked four to eight years total coaching experience.

Question five also pertained to experience but this time it was highest level of basketball playing experience. Predictably, the college coaches had the highest percentage (90%) of former college players in their group. The highest percentages listed for the remaining three groups included the following: forty percent of the junior high coaches had senior high
TABLE 7

COACHES LONGEVITY ON STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

TOTAL COACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>6 60</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>6 60</td>
<td>14 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>3 30</td>
<td>6 60</td>
<td>5 50</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>15 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or More</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 30</td>
<td>4 40</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>8 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>40 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


school playing experience, sixty percent of the senior high coaches had high school playing experience, and forty percent of the A. A. U. coaches had college playing experience (Table 9).

The highest degree earned was the subject of question six which is summarized in Table 10. Sixty percent of the junior high and senior high coaches responded that they had earned a master's degree. The college respondents indicated that seventy percent of their group had attained master's degrees. The results from the A. A. U. group were dispersed with six of the seven possible choices receiving at least one response.

Question seven asked the coaches to identify their full-time profession. The majority of junior high, senior high, and college coaches described their full-time profession as being a teacher. Once again the responses of the A. A. U. coaches were varied. Professional (30%) and businessman (30%) were the full-time professions selected most often by the A. A. U. coaches (See Table 11).

Question eight dealt with the subject area of specialization of coaches and is summarized in Table 12. Forty percent of the junior high and sixty percent of the college coaches were physical education specialists. It is interesting to note that none of the senior high coaches listed physical education as their area of specialization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10

COACHES HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. D., etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11

**COACHES FULL-TIME PROFESSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSION</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Coach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12

SUBJECT AREA OF COACHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Phys. Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Educ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instead, thirty percent listed math and thirty percent reported social studies as their major subject areas. All of the A. A. U. coaches indicated that this question did not apply to their particular situation.

The next five questions were particularly crucial because they attempted to identify some of the influences and pressures associated with coaching at each competitive level. For example, question nine tried to find out how secure the coach was in his position by asking him to reveal his employment status. Fifty percent of the junior high coaches replied that they were full-time tenured; sixty percent of the senior high coaches listed full-time tenured. The responses from the college coaches were split evenly between full-time tenured and full-time non-tenured. Ninety percent of the A. A. U. coaches indicated that the question did not apply to them (See Table 13).

Question ten asked the coach to reveal his future coaching ambitions. Sixty percent of the junior high and A. A. U. coaches replied that they would like to someday coach at a higher level. Fifty percent of the senior high and college coaches desired instead to stay at the same competitive level (See Table 14).

Question eleven and Table 15 describe the percentage of time that the coach devotes to coaching activities per week. The majority of junior high and A. A. U. coaches noted that they devote between eleven and twenty hours per
## TABLE 13

### COACHES EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Tenured</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Non-Tenured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 14
COACHES FUTURE AMBITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Retire)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
week to coaching activities (e.g., coaching, scouting, practices, games, travel). Forty percent of the high school coaches spend from thirty-one to forty hours per week on coaching activities and forty percent of the college coaches spend forty-one to fifty hours per week.

The next question dealt with the criteria used in evaluating the coach for salary, promotion, and other rewards. This question asked the coach to identify the area given the most emphasis by his employer or sponsor. The majority of junior high, senior high, and college coaches listed teaching as the major area of evaluation. All of the A. A. U. coaches responded to this question by stating that it did not apply to them (See Table 16).

The thirteenth question asked, "Was your team ranked (nationally, statewide, locally) at one point during the 1979-1980 basketball season?" All of the junior high coaches gave a no response to this question. However, the majority of senior high, college, and A. A. U. coaches gave a yes reply (See Table 17).

The next to the last question asked for the win-loss record of the coach over the past three seasons (including this season). Table 18 shows the results for this question. A. A. U. coaches had the highest winning percentage (.831). Senior high coaches were second
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>JR. HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR. HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. A. U.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Win-Loss Record</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Not Apply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 17
NATIONAL OR STATEWIDE TEAM RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>9  90</td>
<td>6  60</td>
<td>9  90</td>
<td>24  60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>4  40</td>
<td>1  10</td>
<td>16  40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>10 100</td>
<td>40 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18
COACHES WON-LOST RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>Win</td>
<td>Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS
264  107  409  137  475  258  786  159

MEAN
26.4  10.7  40.9  13.7  47.5  25.8  78.6  15.9

WINNING PERCENTAGE
.711  .749  .648  .831
highest with a .749 winning percentage. Junior high coaches reported .711 and college coaches listed .648 percentages.

The final question asked the coach to identify his level of professional involvement. Very important job, one of several important jobs, and modest level of job importance were the three choices offered to the coach. Seventy percent of the junior high coaches indicated that coaching was one of several important jobs. Sixty percent of the senior high school coaches regarded coaching as one of several important jobs. Sixty percent of the college coaches described coaching as being their primary job while fifty percent of the A. A. U. coaches selected "several jobs" as their choice (See Table 19).

Summary of Respondent Characteristics

In an effort to develop situational profiles for coaches from each competitive level, a summary of coaches will be presented according to the most frequently appearing answer to each question. At the junior high level, the respondent to this demographic questionnaire was male; between thirty to forty years of age; coached basketball at this school from one to three years; coached basketball a total of four to eight years; had previous playing experience at the high school level; held a master's degree; was a full-time physical educator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>JR. HIGH</th>
<th>SR. HIGH</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>A. A. U.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
<td>NO. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important Prime Job</td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>4 40</td>
<td>6 60</td>
<td>3 30</td>
<td>15 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of Several Important Jobs</td>
<td>7 70</td>
<td>6 60</td>
<td>4 40</td>
<td>5 50</td>
<td>22 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 20</td>
<td>3 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with tenure; would like to eventually coach at a higher level; devoted between eleven to twenty hours per week to basketball coaching duties; was evaluated mainly for his teaching performance; had a winning percentage of over fifty-five percent over the past three seasons; and considers basketball coaching as only one of several career activities.

The senior high school coaches who responded to this demographic questionnaire were male; between thirty and forty years of age; coached basketball at this school from one to three years; coached basketball a total of nine to fifteen years; had previous playing experience at the high school level; held a master's degree; was a full-time social studies or math teacher with tenure; would like to stay at the same coaching level; devoted between thirty-one and forty hours per week to basketball coaching duties; was evaluated mainly for his teaching performance; had won over fifty-five percent of his games over the past three seasons; and considered coaching as one of several career activities.

The college coaches who responded to the demographic questionnaire were all male; between thirty and forty years of age; coached basketball at this school from four to eight years; coached basketball a total of nine to fifteen years; had previous college playing experience; held a master's degree; was a full-time physical educator
with tenure; would like to stay at the same coaching level; devoted forty-one to fifty hours per week to coaching duties; was evaluated mainly for his teaching performance; had won over sixty percent of his games during the past three seasons.

The Amateur Athletic Union coaches who answered the demographic questionnaire were between thirty and forty years of age; coached basketball for this organization from four to eight years; had previous playing experience at the college level; held a high school diploma; was a businessman or professional; would like to eventually coach at a higher level; devoted between eleven and twenty hours per week to basketball coaching duties; had won over sixty percent of his games during the past three seasons; and considered coaching to be one of several important career activities.

An overview of the responses to the demographic questionnaire revealed that the differences between coaches from four competitive levels did not appear to be extreme. However, some differences were identified which should be discussed. First, A. A. U. coaches, as a group, indicated less educational training than the other three groups. This response was certainly expected since the A. A. U. coaches represent a diverse group of individuals (e.g., businessmen, salesmen) who may not
require as much educational training as a college coach who also teaches physical education. Second, senior high and college coaches tended to devote more time to coaching activities than coaches from the other levels. This response was expected since senior high and college coaches are usually assigned release time or paid extra to coach. In addition, college coaches spend a lot of time recruiting athletes for their teams.

Third, senior high and college coaches indicated less job security in terms of tenured and non-tenured status when compared with the junior high and A. A. U. coaches. This trend was not totally unexpected since A. A. U. coaches are usually employed full-time in professions other than coaching. Fourth, senior high and college coaches revealed a higher degree of professional involvement than junior high and A. A. U. coaches. This trend was also expected since senior high and college coaches are usually given release time or extra pay for coaching duties.

Fifth, senior high and college coaches listed win-loss record as an area of evaluation more often than junior high and A. A. U. coaches. Once again, this response was not unexpected since senior high and college coaches are often under extreme pressure to win. It is interesting to note that the clear majority of junior high, senior high, and college coaches identified "teaching performance"
as the major area considered when being evaluated for promotion. This is despite the fact that senior high and college coaches would likely lose their jobs if they consistently produced losing seasons.

In a recent study, Martin (1979) found significant differences between Division I and Division III soccer coaches who responded to questions on a demographic questionnaire. Specifically, Martin noted that:

The win-loss record for Division I coaches was significantly better than for Division III coaches, the percentage of time devoted to coaching was significantly higher for Division I coaches than Division III coaches, there were significantly more scholarships granted by Division I institutions than Division III, and the evaluation process of Division I and Division III coaches was clearly different. (p. 78)

Similar situational differences between Division I and Division II or III coaches were also reported in studies completed by Bird (1977) and Mudra (1965).

In order to determine if any significant differences exist between coaches' responses to the demographic questionnaires used in this study, a series of tests (e.g., factor analysis, equality of proportions) were run. The results (excluding A. A. U. coaches' "Does Not Apply" responses) showed no significant differences between levels on responses to the coaches' questionnaire. Therefore, it does not appear that the same "extreme" situational influences which were present in the Martin
(1979) investigation are present in this study. Moreover, Martin (1979), Bird (1977), and Mudra (1965) examined Division I coaches who are oftentimes under severe pressure to win. According to them, this pressure to win is reflected in the leadership styles Division I coaches select. In the present study, the "extreme" situational factors associated with Division I coaches do not appear to be of concern since no Division I coaches were involved in this study.

**Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Scores**

This section presents the coaches' scores on the leadership dimensions of consideration and initiating structure. As mentioned in Chapters I and III, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was used to measure the two leadership dimensions. Hemphill and Coons (1950) constructed the original form of this questionnaire, and Halpin and Winer (1952), in reporting the development of an Air Force adaptation of this instrument, identified initiating structure and consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. These dimensions were identified on the basis of a factor analysis of the responses of 300 crew members who described the leader behavior of their 52 aircraft commanders. Initiating structure and consideration accounted for approximately thirty-four and fifty percent, respectively, of the common variance.
Halpin (1966) noted that, "By measuring the behavior of leaders on the initiating structure and the consideration dimensions, we can determine by objective and reliable means how specific leaders differ in leadership style, and whether these differences are related significantly to independent criteria of the leader's effectiveness and efficiency" (p. 88). The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire offers a means of defining the leader behavior dimensions of consideration and initiating structure operationally, thus making it possible to empirically test additional specific hypotheses pertaining to leader and group behavior.

As mentioned previously, the LBDQ is composed of a series of short, descriptive statements of ways in which leaders may behave. The members of the team indicate the frequency with which the coach engages in each form of behavior by checking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never. Each of the keys to the dimensions contains fifteen items, and each item is scored on a scale from 4 to 0. Consequently, the theoretical range of scores on each dimension is from 0 to 60.

A total of forty successful head basketball coaches were randomly selected for this study. Ten coaches were chosen from each of four competitive levels. A total of
399 players from forty basketball teams completed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaires pertaining to their head coaches. Table 20 presents the means and standard deviations of the scores obtained from the LBDQ questionnaires.

A total of ninety-nine junior high school basketball players filled out the questionnaires. The mean score was 43.7 with a standard deviation of 7.0 on the consideration dimension. On the initiating structure dimension, the overall mean was 41.5 with a standard deviation of 8.2.

A total of one hundred and fourteen senior high school players completed the LBDQ questionnaires. The overall mean score for consideration was 47.4 with a standard deviation of 7.7. The overall mean score for initiating structure was 39.8 with a standard deviation of 7.5.

For the college level group, a total of one hundred and twenty players responded to the questionnaires. The overall consideration dimension mean was 45.5 (7.0 standard deviation). On initiating structure, the group mean was 37.7 and the standard deviation was 7.8.

The data collected from the sixty-six A. A. U. players who responded to the LBDQ indicated that the overall mean score for consideration was 40.4 with a
# Table 20

LBDQ Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 114)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 399)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
standard deviation of 8.8. The overall mean for initiating structure was 43.0 with a standard deviation of 7.8.

In Table 21, the differences between the leadership styles of basketball coaches from four competitive levels are presented according to the number and percent of cases from each level that fall into each of four quadrants: (1) high task and low relationship; (2) high task and high relationship; (3) high relationship and low task; (4) low relationship and low task. The overall means for relationship behavior and task behavior are based upon the pooled scores for coaches from each competitive level. The overall means are used as coordinates which define the four quadrants.

Using the highest percentage to represent the leadership style at that particular competitive level, Level I coaches were described as being high relationship and low task; Level II coaches were described as being high task and high relationship; Level III coaches were described as being high task and low relationship; Level IV coaches were described as being high relationship and low task (See Table 21).

Although the preceding discussion attempts to describe the LBDQ data in terms of mean scores and percentages, it is important to find out which set of data are statistically significant before any definitive statements
### TABLE 21
SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP QUADRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 3</th>
<th>Quadrant 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH RELATIONSHIP</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>LOW TASK</strong></td>
<td><strong>HIGH TASK</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>HIGH RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I 5 (50%)</td>
<td>Level I 2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II 0 (0%)</td>
<td>Level II 2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III 1 (10%)</td>
<td>Level III 2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV 6 (60%)</td>
<td>Level IV 2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant 4</th>
<th>Quadrant 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW RELATIONSHIP</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>LOW TASK</strong></td>
<td><strong>HIGH TASK</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>LOW RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I 1 (10%)</td>
<td>Level I 2 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II 3 (30%)</td>
<td>Level II 5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III 1 (10%)</td>
<td>Level III 6 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV 2 (20%)</td>
<td>Level IV 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 44.8

Low --------------------- TASK BEHAVIOR --------------------- High

Mean = 40.1

Low --------------------- RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIOR --------------------- High

Low --------------------- STYLE OF LEADER --------------------- High
can be made. Therefore, a statistical analysis will be conducted in the next section to determine if any significant differences exist between basketball coaches from four different competitive levels on the leadership dimensions of consideration (relationship behavior) and initiating structure (task behavior).

**LBDQ Initiating Structure Scores**

To test if there are significant main effects between competitive levels on the leadership dimension of initiating structure, it was necessary to consider the following nested model:

\[ X_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + B_j(i) + \varepsilon_{k(j(i))} \]

\[ i = 1,2,3,4 \quad j = 1,\ldots,10 \quad K = 1,\ldots,n_{ij} \]

Where

- \( X_{ijk} \) = the observation from the \( k^{th} \) player under the \( j^{th} \) coach in the \( i^{th} \) competition level
- \( \mu \) = overall effect of the \( i^{th} \) competition level (constant)
- \( B_j(i) \) = the effect of the \( j^{th} \) coach in the \( i^{th} \) competition level (random)
- \( \alpha_i \) = the effect of the \( i^{th} \) competition level (constant)
- \( \varepsilon_{k(j(i))} \) = the error term associated with \( X_{ijk} \)
- \( n_{ij} \) = the number of players observed for the \( j^{th} \) coach in the \( i^{th} \) competition level
The hypothesis to be tested within this nested design is $H_0: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4$ versus $H_1: \alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$ for some $(i,j)$. The corresponding ANOVA Table 22 is:

**TABLE 22**

**ANOVA TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2247.05</td>
<td>749.02</td>
<td>4.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6107.07</td>
<td>169.64</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>16342.31</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>24696.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As a result of the preceding ANOVA analysis, the null hypothesis $H_0: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4$ is rejected. There appears to be a significant difference (at the .05 level of significance) between competitive levels on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

**Hypothesis Testing**

In order to test hypotheses la through lf which are listed in Chapter I (p. 11), the Bonferroni multiple comparison method was used to determine which competitive levels differ significantly from the others (See Table 23). The acceptance or rejection of each null hypothesis
relative to initiating structure is summarized below:

(1) Hypothesis 1a is rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level between Level I (junior high) and Level II (senior high) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. Level I coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension (at the .05 level of significance) than Level II coaches.

(2) Hypothesis 1b is accepted. There was no significant difference found at the .05 level between Level I (junior high) and Level III (college) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. However, Level I coaches showed a tendency to score lower on the initiating structure dimension than Level III coaches.

(3) Hypothesis 1c is rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level between Level I (junior high) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. The Level IV coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating
### TABLE 23
BONFERRONI MULTIPLE COMPARISONS FOR INITIATING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRAST</th>
<th>POINT ESTIMATE</th>
<th>STANDARD ERROR</th>
<th>CONFIDENCE INTERVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 - \alpha_2$</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>(-5.84, -.58)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 - \alpha_3$</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>(-4.19, 1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 - \alpha_4$</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>(.38, 6.48)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 - \alpha_3$</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>(-.89, 4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 - \alpha_4$</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>(3.67, 9.60)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_3 - \alpha_4$</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>(2.08, 7.96)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not contain zero (Significant at 0.05 level)
structure dimension (at the .05 level of significance) than Level I coaches.

(4) Hypothesis 1d is accepted. There was no significant difference found at the .05 level between Level II (senior high) and Level III (college) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. However, Level II coaches showed a tendency to score slightly higher on the initiating structure dimension than Level III coaches.

(5) Hypothesis 1e is rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level between Level II (senior high) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. The Level IV coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension (at the .05 level of significance) than Level II coaches.

(6) Hypothesis 1f is rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level between Level III (college) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.
The Level IV coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension (at the .05 level of significance) than Level III coaches.

Discussion

The findings from the statistical analysis revealed that there were significant differences between successful basketball coaches from four distinct competitive levels on the leadership dimension of initiating structure (task behavior). Significant differences were identified between junior high and senior high, junior high and A. A. U., and college and A. A. U. basketball coaches.

Level IV coaches scored significantly lower on the leadership dimension of initiating structure than coaches from the other three competitive levels. In addition, Level I coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension than did Level II coaches. The differences between Level I and Level III coaches were not significant. However, Level I coaches tended to score lower on the initiating structure leadership dimension.

According to Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory (as interpreted in this study), Level IV coaches would be expected to score lower on the leadership dimension of initiating structure (task behavior) than coaches from Levels I and II. Within the Situational
Leadership Model, the expected leadership style for the fourth quadrant is low task and low relationship.

An overview of the results for initiating structure reveals a tendency toward a curvilinear relationship between competitive level and initiating structure scores. In other words, coaches from Levels I and IV tended to score lower on initiating structure than coaches from Levels II and III. This tendency does not support the Situational Leadership Model as proposed by Hersey and Blanchard (1977). But, these findings do support the task behavior dimension in a modified Situational Leadership Model proposed by Chelladurai and Carron (1978, 1980). They recommend switching quadrants one and three thus creating a low task relationship in quadrants one and four and a high task relationship in quadrants two and three (See Figure 9).
FIGURE 9. A modified model of situational leadership in athletics.
(From P. Chelladurai and A.V. Carron, Leadership, 1978, p. 44)
LBDQ Consideration Scores

This section presents the results of the statistical treatment applied to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire data to determine if any significant differences exist between basketball coaches at different competitive levels on the leadership dimension of consideration. Analysis of variance was once again selected as the main method of statistical analysis. The advantages of using ANOVA have already been discussed in the previous section.

In order to facilitate the use of analysis of variance and to test if there were significant differences, it was necessary to consider the following nested or hierarchical model:

\[ X_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + B_{j(i)} + \epsilon_{k(j(i))} \]

\[ i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad j = 1, \ldots, 10 \quad k = 1, \ldots, n_{ij} \]

Where

- \( X_{ijk} \) = the observation from the \( k \)th player under the \( j \)th coach in the \( i \)th competition level
- \( \mu \) = overall effect (constant)
- \( \alpha_i \) = the effect of the \( i \)th competition level (constant)
- \( B_{j(i)} \) = the effect of the \( j \)th coach in the \( i \)th competition level (random)
- \( \epsilon_{k(j(i))} \) = the error term associated with \( X_{ijk} \)
- \( n_{ij} \) = the number of players observed for the \( j \)th coach in the \( i \)th competition level
The hypothesis to be tested within this nested design is

\[ \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 \] versus \[ \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_j \] for some \((i, j)\). The corresponding ANOVA Table 24 is:

**TABLE 24**

ANOVA TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1411.30</td>
<td>470.43</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5294.84</td>
<td>147.08</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>18924.64</td>
<td>52.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>25630.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

As a result of the preceding ANOVA analysis, the null hypothesis \( H_0: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 \) is rejected. There appears to be a significant difference (at the .05 level of significance) between competitive levels on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

**Hypothesis Testing**

In order to test hypotheses 2a through 2f which are listed in Chapter I (p. 11), the Bonferroni multiple comparison method was used to determine which competitive levels differ significantly from the others (See Table 25). The acceptance or rejection of each null hypothesis is
### TABLE 25
BONFERRONI MULTIPLE COMPARISONS
FOR CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRAST</th>
<th>POINT ESTIMATE</th>
<th>STANDARD ERROR</th>
<th>CONFIDENCE INTERVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 )</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>(-.57, 4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_3 )</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>(1.44, 6.28)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_4 )</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>(-4.42, 1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_3 )</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>(-.35, 4.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_4 )</td>
<td>-3.47</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>(-6.23, -.71)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\alpha}_3 - \hat{\alpha}_4 )</td>
<td>-5.45</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>(-8.18, -2.72)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not contain zero (Significant at 0.05 level)
summarized as follows:

(1) Hypothesis 2a is accepted. There was no significant difference at the .05 level between Level I (junior high) and Level II (senior high) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. However, Level I coaches showed a tendency to score higher on the consideration dimension than Level II coaches.

(2) Hypothesis 2b is rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level between Level I (junior high) and Level III (college) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. Level III coaches scored significantly lower on the consideration dimension (at the .05 level of significance) than Level I coaches.

(3) Hypothesis 2c is accepted. There was no significant difference found at the .05 level between Level I (junior high) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. However, Level IV coaches showed a tendency to score higher on the consideration dimension than Level I coaches.
(4) Hypothesis 2d is accepted. There was no significant difference found at the .05 level between Level II (senior high) and Level III (college) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. However, Level II coaches showed a tendency to score higher on the consideration dimension than Level III coaches.

(5) Hypothesis 2e is rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level between Level II (senior high) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. Level II coaches scored significantly lower on the consideration dimension (at the .05 level of significance) than Level IV coaches.

(6) Hypothesis 2f is rejected. There was a significant difference found at the .05 level between Level III (college) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. Level III coaches scored significantly lower on the consideration dimension (at the .05 level of significance) than Level IV coaches.
Discussion

The findings from the statistical analysis revealed that there are significant differences between successful basketball coaches from four distinct competitive levels on the leadership dimension of consideration (relationship behavior). Significant differences were identified between junior high and college, senior high and A. A. U., and college and A. A. U. basketball coaches.

Level III coaches scored significantly lower on the leadership dimension of consideration than Level I coaches. In addition, coaches from Levels II and III scored significantly lower on the consideration dimension than Level IV coaches. The differences between Levels I and II, I and IV, and II and III were not significant at the .05 level. However, it should be noted that coaches from Levels II and III tended to score lower on the leadership dimension of consideration than either Level I or Level IV coaches.

According to Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory (as interpreted in this study), a curvilinear relationship would be expected with leaders from Levels I and IV exhibiting low relationship styles. On the other hand, leaders from Levels III and IV would be expected to exhibit high relationship styles.
The results of this study indicated a curvilinear relationship but in the opposite direction. Coaches from Levels I and IV tended to score higher on the leadership dimension of consideration and coaches from Levels III and IV tended to score lower. The curvilinear relationship is illustrated in Figure 10.

The pattern illustrated in Figure 10 is also contrary to the one proposed in the Chelladurai and Carron (1978) modified Situational Leadership Model. In their model, coaches from Levels I and II exhibit high relationship styles and coaches from Levels III and IV exhibit low relationship styles.
FIGURE 10. A modified model of situational leadership for successful basketball coaches from four competitive levels.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

A review of the sport literature indicates that the leadership behavior of coaches is one of the most frequently discussed and least understood aspects of coaching. Sage (1973), Cratty (1973), Coakley (1978), Straub (1980), and Carron (1980) have all expressed a need for more leadership research in sport.

A close examination of the roles and responsibilities of coaches clearly shows that they are in positions of leadership. They possess the legitimate power, usually designated from some higher authority, to exert influence so that members of the group will achieve the goals of the group. The coach generally makes decisions regarding group membership, the duties each group member may assume, and often the general manner of reaching team goals.

Although the coach may exhibit a number of leadership behaviors during the course of a competitive season, task behavior and relationship behavior are the two leadership behaviors mentioned most often in the sport literature.
Coaches are usually characterized as possessing either an authoritarian or democratic leadership style.

A recent trend in leadership research has been to examine and identify the specific situational factors which may influence leadership behaviors and leadership effectiveness. To date, only a small group of sport researchers have examined the leadership behaviors of coaches using situational approaches. The majority of these researchers (Iciong, 1974; Danielson, 1974; Wardell, 1977) have attempted to test various aspects of Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory of Leadership in sport settings. Unfortunately, the results of these studies have not been supportive of the basic tenets of Fiedler's theory.

During the past three years, a few sport researchers (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1978; Vos Strache, 1978; Martin, 1979) have turned to other situational leadership approaches in an effort to better understand the various situational factors which may affect leadership behavior in sport. Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory and House's (1971) Path-Goal Theory are two such situationally oriented leadership theories which have attracted the attention of sport researchers. However, neither theory has been extensively tested in the sport environment.
In an effort to expand the body of knowledge related to situational leadership factors in coaching, this investigation examined the leadership behaviors of selected successful basketball coaches from four competitive levels. The specific purpose of this descriptive-analytic field study was three-fold. First, an effort was made to identify the leadership behaviors, as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), of selected successful (i.e., winning percentage of fifty-five percent or higher over the past three seasons) junior high school, senior high school, college, and Amateur Athletic Union (A.A.U.) basketball coaches. Second, an effort was made to determine if any significant differences exist between successful coaches from each competitive level on the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. Third, the results were interpreted in terms of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory and Chelladurai and Carron's (1978) modification of the Situational Leadership Theory.

A total of forty successful head basketball coaches and their teams were randomly selected for participation in this study. The forty coaches were administered a Coaches' Personal Data Questionnaire in an effort to obtain demographic and situational information. The players, on the other hand, were administered the Leader
Behavior Description Questionnaire which is specifically designed to measure the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. A total of three hundred and ninety-nine players competed the LBDQ pertaining to their head coaches.

In order to achieve the stated purpose of this study, it was necessary to formulate and test the following null hypotheses pertaining to the leadership dimensions of initiating structure (task behavior) and consideration (relationship behavior):

1a. There will be no significant difference between junior high and senior high basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1b. There will be no significant difference between junior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1c. There will be no significant difference between junior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1d. There will be no significant difference between senior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1e. There will be no significant difference between senior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.

1f. There will be no significant difference between college and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure.
2a. There will be no significant difference between junior high and senior high basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2b. There will be no significant difference between junior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2c. There will be no significant difference between junior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension on consideration.

2d. There will be no significant difference between senior high and college basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2e. There will be no significant difference between senior high and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

2f. There will be no significant difference between college and A. A. U. basketball coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration.

After the data collection was completed, appropriate statistical procedures were selected in order to determine the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses set forth in this study. Consequently, analysis of variance (nested) was used to test for significant main effects between the four competitive levels on the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. A hierarchical design of three factors (level, coach, player) was used to facilitate the analysis of variance. If the ANOVA resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4$, then the Bonferroni multiple comparison method was
used to determine which means differ significantly from which other means.

**Findings**

The results of the analyses of data from this investigation indicated the following:

1. There was a significant difference found between Level I (junior high) and Level II (senior high) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. Level I coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension than Level II coaches ($p < .05$).

2. There was a significant difference found between Level I (junior high) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. Level IV coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension than Level I coaches ($p < .05$).

3. There was a significant difference found between Level II (senior high) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating
structure. Level IV coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension than Level II coaches (\( p < .05 \)).

4. There was a significant difference found between Level III (college) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of initiating structure. Level IV coaches scored significantly lower on the initiating structure dimension than Level III coaches (\( p < .05 \)).

5. There was a significant difference found between Level I (junior high) and Level III (college) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. Level III coaches scored significantly lower on the consideration dimension than Level I coaches (\( p < .05 \)).

6. There was a significant difference found between Level II (senior high) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. Level II coaches scored significantly lower on the consideration dimension
than Level IV coaches ($p < .05$).

7. There was a significant difference found between Level III (college) and Level IV (A. A. U.) coaches on the leadership dimension of consideration. Level III coaches scored significantly lower on the consideration dimension than Level IV coaches ($p < .05$).

Conclusions

In relation to the purpose, procedures, and research hypotheses posed for this investigation and based upon the subsequent statistical treatment, the conclusions from this study are:

1. Leadership behavior styles of successful basketball coaches seemingly can be described using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Specifically, the leadership dimensions of consideration and initiating structure appear to be discernible components of the leadership styles of successful basketball coaches.

2. There are significant differences between successful basketball coaches from different competitive levels on the
leadership dimension of initiating structure. A consistent pattern of leadership behavior was identified which included a low task style at the junior high and A. A. U. levels and a high task style at the senior high and college levels. These findings were not consistent with the pattern proposed by Hersey and Blanchard (1977) in their Situational Leadership Model. However, the findings did support the pattern proposed in Chelladurai and Carron's (1978) modified Situational Leadership Model (See Figure 11).

3. There are significant differences between successful basketball coaches from different competitive levels on the leadership dimension of consideration. A consistent pattern of leadership behavior was identified for each competitive level which included a high relationship style at the junior high and A. A. U. levels and a low relationship style at the senior high and college levels. These findings were not consistent with the patterns proposed by
FIGURE 11. A modified model of situational leadership in athletics.
either Hersey and Blanchard (1977) or Chelladurai and Carron (1978) (See Figure 11).

4. The situational elements associated with coaching basketball teams at different competitive levels seem to explain the significant differences found in this study. The traditional stereotype of successful team sport coaches as being excessively task-oriented or authoritarian was not supported by the results of this research. Successful basketball coaches did exhibit task-oriented behaviors but in varying degrees depending on the situational determinants associated with each competitive level.

Recommendations and Implications for the Coaching Profession

This investigation was directed at examining the leadership behaviors of coaches involved in what Straub (1980) calls "high performing systems." The research approach utilized in this study (i.e., analyzing "high performing systems" in sport) plus the findings of the
investigation provide implications for coaches and future sport researchers.

First, it is apparent from the results of this study that the traditional stereotype of successful team sport coaches as being authoritarian by necessity is unfounded. Coaches from each competitive level were perceived as being task-oriented but in varying degrees depending upon the situational factors associated with the competitive level.

Secondly, it appears that the leadership styles associated with coaching basketball are not either/or propositions. In other words, coaches may exhibit both task-oriented and people-oriented leadership behaviors in given sport situations. The successful coaches examined in this study displayed both task and relationship oriented leadership behaviors depending upon the situation.

Third, the findings from this study suggest that coaches who are successful at one competitive level may not be successful at another competitive level unless they are willing and able to adapt their leadership styles to fit the needs of the given situation. Although much more research is needed in this area, it appears that the present criteria often used for hiring coaches (e.g., win-loss record) may not be the best approach. Perhaps
an instrument can be developed in the future to assess a coach's past leadership style and his willingness and ability to change it to meet present situational needs.

Fourth, since task and relationship leadership behaviors were identified as being discernible leadership behaviors in sport settings, it is important that future sport researchers continue to examine these two leadership dimensions in more detail. Systematic leadership observation instruments may be developed to further identify the situational factors affecting these important leadership dimensions.

Finally, the findings of this research point out the need for more research to test various aspects of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory and Chelladurai and Carron's (1978) modification of the model. As the results of this study have demonstrated, the various situational factors associated with coaching at different competitive levels (e.g., athletic maturity level) affect the leadership style exhibited by the coach. Coaches at the junior high and A. A. U. levels were characterized as being low task and high relationship when compared to the senior high and college coaches. The junior high coaches seemingly adopted a more people oriented leadership style in order to effectively deal with the less skilled and less experienced junior high players. A. A. U. coaches adopted a similar leadership style in order to effectively deal
with the highly skilled and very experienced A. A. U. players (See Figure 11).

In addition, results from the coaches' questionnaire indicated that senior high and college coaches were less secure in their jobs and had more external pressure placed upon them to win than did junior high or A. A. U. coaches. These findings would seem to partially explain the high task and low relationship leadership styles exhibited by the senior high and college coaches.

If effective coaching preparation curricula are to be developed in the future, more attention needs to be given to the specific situational factors affecting leadership behavior in sport settings. Since situational differences associated with competitive levels seem to affect the leadership styles of coaches, a concerted effort should be made to inform future coaches about situational variables. Additional research is needed to identify the specific leadership styles which are most effective in certain situations. This study was an initial effort in this direction. Through an examination of successful basketball coaches at different competitive levels, specific leadership behaviors and patterns were identified. Only through a continuing process of examining and re-examining leadership behaviors as they relate to specific sport situations can we eventually
hope to develop an effective "sport leadership theory."

Recommendations for Future Studies

This investigator suggests that further studies be conducted to examine the following areas:

1. A longitudinal sport leadership study of successful basketball coaches could be undertaken to identify changes in perceived leadership behaviors which occur over time.

2. Replication of the present study using behavior observation systems specifically designed to code the leadership behaviors of successful basketball coaches and specific situational influences.

3. A study to compare the leadership behaviors of successful and unsuccessful basketball coaches in order to identify the possible determinants of leadership effectiveness.

4. A comparative study of the leadership behaviors of successful individual sport and successful team sport coaches using group leadership and dyadic interaction research procedures.
5. Interview procedures may be utilized to identify specific role conflicts facing coaches with different philosophical orientations. The leadership styles of coaches who advocate "winning at all costs" could be compared with coaches who emphasize the educational benefits of athletics.

6. A more comprehensive instrument may be developed to identify additional situational variables such as pressure for production, favorableness of the situation, player satisfaction, alumni influences, economic influences, prestige of position, and spectator influences.

7. Additional studies are needed to determine the applicability of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory and Chelladurai and Carron's (1978) modification of the Situational Leadership Theory in other sport settings. Instruments may be developed to measure more precisely the various components of "athletic maturity" and "relationship behavior" and their
relationship to leadership effectiveness in sport.
Dear

I am presently a doctoral candidate in the Physical Education Department at the Ohio State University. In a short time I will be conducting a major research project involving head basketball coaches and their teams. The investigation will examine the leadership behaviors of highly successful basketball coaches from four distinct competitive levels. Hopefully, the results from this study will help us to better understand the leadership dimensions associated with this rewarding and challenging profession.

You and members of your team have been randomly selected as possible participants in this study. Team members who elect to participate will be asked to complete a questionnaire designed to assess the leadership behavior of the head coach. In addition, the head coach will be asked to complete a coaches' questionnaire in order to obtain demographic and situational information. The time involved in answering the questionnaires is not expected to exceed fifteen minutes. I've enclosed copies of the instruments for your perusal.

Please note that no names are required on any of the instruments. The data will be combined to form group profiles (i.e., junior high, senior high, college, Amateur Athletic Union). The results will not be used to analyze individual coaches or teams. All information received will be kept in the strictest of confidence.

I will be telephoning you in approximately one week to ascertain the willingness of you and your team members to participate in this study. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you could meet with your team sometime this week to determine the possibility of participation.

I would like to thank you and your team for taking a few minutes out of your busy schedules to consider the possibility of participating in this worthwhile study. As a former basketball coach, I realize how difficult it is to spare the time.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Case

College of Education
APPENDIX B

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your coach. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your coach.

NOTE: This questionnaire is exactly the same as the original LBDQ with the following exceptions:

The term "team" has been substituted for the term "group."

The term "coach" has been substituted for the term "supervisor."

The term "teammates" has been substituted for the term "members."

Published by
College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Copyright 1957

This Revision Prepared by
Robert W. Case
Division of Physical Education
The Ohio State University
1980
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequent head coach engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE WHETHER he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

1. Does personal favors for team members .............. A B C D E
2. Makes his attitudes clear to the team .............. A B C D E
3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the team.......................... A B C D E
4. Tries out his new ideas with the team............. A B C D E
5. Acts as the real leader of the team............... A B C D E
6. Is easy to understand.............................. A B C D E
7. Rules with an iron hand............................ A B C D E
8. Finds time to listen to team members............. A B C D E
9. Criticizes poor work............................... A B C D E
10. Gives advance notice of changes................... A B C D E
11. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.......... A B C D E
12. Keeps to himself.................................. A B C D E
13. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual team members............................ A B C D E
14. Assigns team members to particular tasks........ A B C D E
15. Is the spokesperson for the team................. A B C D E
16. Schedules the work to be done.................... A B C D E
17. Maintains definite standards of performance.... A B C D E
18. Refuses to explain his actions.................... A B C D E
19. Keeps the team informed.......................... A B C D E
20. Acts without consulting the team. A

21. Backs up the team members in their actions. A B C D E

22. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. A B C D E

23. Treats all team members as his equals. A B C D E

24. Encourages the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E

25. Gets what he asks for from his superiors. A B C D E

26. Is willing to make changes. A B C D E

27. Makes sure that his part in the team is understood by team members. A B C D E

28. Is friendly and approachable. A B C D E

29. Asks that team members follow standard rules and regulations. A B C D E

30. Fails to take necessary action. A B C D E

31. Makes team members feel at ease when talking with them. A B C D E

32. Lets team members know what is expected of them. A B C D E

33. Speaks as the representative of the team. A B C D E

34. Puts suggestions made by the team into operation. A B C D E

35. Sees to it that team members are working up to capacity. A B C D E

36. Lets other people take away his leadership in the team. A B C D E

37. Gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the team members. A B C D E

38. Gets team approval on important matters before going ahead. A B C D E

39. Sees to it that the work of team members is coordinated. A B C D E

40. Keeps the team working together as a group. A B C D E

41. How many seasons have you played for this coach? (Count this season as one). 5 4 3 2 1

42. Are you a starter for your team? (Please check) Yes, No
APPENDIX C

SCORING KEY FOR INITIATING STRUCTURE
SCORING KEY FOR INITIATING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

SCORING KEY FOR CONSIDERATION
### SCORING KEY FOR CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

COACHES DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Coaches Questionnaire

General Instructions: Please answer all questions with the response that most nearly fits your particular situation.

1. Sex:
   _____ male
   _____ female

2. What is your age?
   _____ under 30
   _____ 30-40
   _____ 41-50
   _____ 51-60
   _____ over 60

3. How long have you been coaching basketball at this school?
   _____ 1-3 years
   _____ 4-8 years
   _____ 9-15 years
   _____ more than 15 years

4. How long have you been coaching basketball?
   _____ 1-3 years
   _____ 4-8 years
   _____ 9-15 years
   _____ more than 15 years

5. What type of basketball playing experience do you have?
   _____ junior high
   _____ senior high
   _____ college
   _____ pro
   _____ other

6. Highest degree earned:
   _____ high school diploma
   _____ associates
   _____ bachelors
   _____ masters
   _____ professional other than masters
   _____ Ph.D., Ed.D, or equivalent
   _____ Other

7. What is your win-loss record for the past three seasons?  (Include this season as one season)
   1977-1978:  _____ Wins,  _____ Losses (Record two seasons ago)
   1978-1979:  _____ Wins,  _____ Losses (Record last season)
   1979-1980:  _____ Wins,  _____ Losses (Record this season to date)
   TOTAL  _____ Wins,  _____ Losses

8. Your full-time profession?  _____ If teacher, what subject?  _____
9. Employment status: (Please check one)
   - full-time tenured at the school where you coach basketball
   - full-time non-tenured at the school where you coach basketball
   - part-time at the school where you coach basketball
   - this question does not apply to me

10. In terms of your future basketball coaching ambitions, at what level would you like to eventually coach?
   - the same competitive level at which I now coach
   - a higher competitive level
   - a lower competitive level
   - other (retire from coaching, etc.)

11. During the basketball season, approximately how many hours per week do you devote to basketball related activities (e.g., coaching, scouting, practices, games, travel, etc.)
   - 0-10 hours per week
   - 11-20 hours per week
   - 21-30 hours per week
   - 31-40 hours per week
   - 41-50 hours per week
   - Over 50 hours per week

12. Please indicate by rank order the areas used to evaluate you for salary, promotion and other rewards; (E.g., tenure) (1 is an area of most concern)
   - Teaching (Performance, Experience, Etc.)
   - Community service
   - Coaching, win-loss record, etc.
   - Advanced degree or additional graduate credits
   - This question does not apply to me

13. Was your team ranked (nationally, statewide, locally) at one point during the 1979-1980 basketball season?
   - Yes
   - No

14. Which of the following statements best characterizes your involvement with the team you coach?
   - My coaching position is one of the most important aspects of my life. It is my prime job and consumes most of my non-family time.
   - Although my coaching position is important, it is only one of several important career activities. Other activities such as practicing a profession are of similar importance.
   - My relation to my coaching position is fairly modest. I have other career activities which are more important, such as finishing a degree, practicing a profession, etc.

Thank you for your time!
APPENDIX F

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING QUESTIONNAIRES
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

READ: My name is Bob Case. I am a doctoral student in the Physical Education Department at the Ohio State University. I'm conducting a research project dealing with the leadership styles of head coaches. Your coach has given me permission to briefly discuss the study with you and determine if you are willing to participate in the study.

ACTION: Give the head coach a copy of the coaches' questionnaire and ask him to complete it away from the players so that his presence will not influence the players' responses.

ACTION: Hand out questionnaires, pencils, and clip boards to players.

READ: Please take a look at the questionnaires and note that no names are required on any of the pages. All information will be kept confidential. Your coach will not see your answers. The questionnaire only takes about ten to fifteen minutes to answer.

READ: Please look at the paragraph on page one of your questionnaire that deals with the purpose of the study.

PAUSE

READ: "On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your coach. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your coach."

READ: Your participation in this study is very important since your team was selected from several successful teams in Central Ohio. Is there anyone who does not want to participate in this study. Please raise your hand.

SPECIFIC DIRECTIONS

READ: Please turn to the second page of your questionnaire and place your age in the top left corner and your year in school (e.g., freshman, senior) in the top right corner.
PREVIEW DIRECTIONS (CONT.)

PAUSE
READ: Please take a look at the directions listed near the top of page two. I'll go over the directions with you.

READ: a. READ each item carefully.
   b. THINK about how frequently your head coach engages in the behavior described by the item.
   c. DEDIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
   d. Draw a circle around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected. (A=Always, B=Often, C=Occasionally, D=Seldom, E=Never)

READ: Please take a look at number forty-one on page three. If you have started the game at any time during the season, then indicate that you are a starter.

READ: Before answering the questionnaires, try to do the following:
   a. Answer all questions and answer them honestly.
   b. Answer the questions alone and not with a friend.
   c. Answer the questions as they pertain to the head coach only.
   d. When you are finished, please raise your hand and I will give you an envelope in which you can seal your questionnaire.

READ: Are there any questions.

READ: Then please begin to answer the questions.

ACTION: Collect all materials.

READ: Thank you for your assistance.

ACTION: Find coach and thank him for his cooperation. Ask coach if he would like an abstract of the results of the study. Collect the coaches' questionnaire.
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