EXAMINING LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS OF NCAA DIVISION I ATHLETIC
DIRECTOR AND CORE COACH FINALISTS FOR THE 2012-2013 LEARFIELD
DIRECTORS' CUP

by

Michael K. Lawson

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Human Performance

Middle Tennessee University
2014

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Colby B. Jubenville, Chair

Dr. Steve Estes

Dr. Don P. Roy

To my wife Loren, who has always supported my ambitions, no matter how crazy they

may be. To my children, Ashley, Drew, Addison and Adam for being

my inspiration to continue to be better every day.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

This study examined the self-perceived leadership orientations of successful

athletic directors and core head coaches, as determined by being a Top 15 finalist in the

2012-13 Learfield Directors' Cup. This work expanded the current body of research that

supports Bolman and Deal's (2003) multi-frame explanation that leaders may use

different orientations when clarifying roles, or leading organizations. Using the four-

frame model (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) by Bolman and Deal,

this study sought to determine if there was a congruence of leadership orientations among

the athletic directors and core head coaches. The study also identified which frames

athletic directors and core head coaches perceive the most important leadership

orientations to draw upon when leading their athletic department or teams.

The *Leadership Orientation Survey* developed by Bolman and Deal (2011) was

sent to 15 athletic directors and 270 core head coaches that were eligible to participate as

determined by being a 2012-13 Learfield Directors' Cup Finalists. Data was collected

from 13 athletic directors responded and 141 core head coaches responded, for a total 154

respondents.

An analysis of the data revealed that athletic directors and core head coaches,

through descriptive statistics, differed in the human resources and political frames of self-

perceived leadership orientations. In addition, data analysis revealed there was a

congruence in the structural and symbolic frames.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

For many, collegiate athletics is the most visible face of higher education. Both men's and women's sports attract widespread television coverage, endorsement deals, and multimillion dollar coaching contracts, leading to the conclusion that college sports are a big business. Being a National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I athletic program—the highest level of intercollegiate athletics in the United States— comes with a hefty price tag, one that is usually paid in part by institutions and students. At public colleges and universities, Division I athletic programs were a $6 billion enterprise in fiscal year (FY) 2010, with costs rapidly climbing in recent years (Desrochers, 2013). At the root of these rising athletic costs are the multimillion dollar coaching contracts, a demand for more staff and better facilities, an increase in scholarship commitments needed to keep pace with rising tuitions, and an argument for a new kind of leader (Kirwan & Turner, 2010). At the same time, colleges and universities have struggled to control cost escalation elsewhere on campus due to declining state support and endowment income as well tuition prices that have continued to rise (Desrochers & Kirshstein, 2012).

As a result of these changes, intercollegiate athletic departments and the people who lead them have changed. College and university administrators are required to have a new kind of business acumen, considering their burgeoning responsibilities. Suggs (2004) claimed that athletic directors are not only preoccupied with the daily activities of

their department, they also have to lead and inspire, as well as balance all the varying

needs and demands of the different stakeholders in intercollegiate sports.

As American colleges and universities expand and develop so has athletic

competition. As the mission and purpose of higher education underwent redefinitions and

refinements, intercollegiate athletics became a source of institutional unity and solidarity,

money and increased enrollments (Sheehan, 2000). All facets of the university became

much more concerned with funding and image, and intercollegiate athletics arguably is

one of the best representations of these changes in higher education.

With the Supreme Court's ruling in *NCAA versus Board of Regents of the*

University of Oklahoma in 1984, NCAA athletics proved its economic and financial

significance for colleges and universities. Based on the Court's decision, the NCAA

should not be limiting and dictating the number of times a school's football team could

be televised. The NCAA should not be the only party negotiating the contracts. With this

ruling, NCAA was immediately prevented from governing the activities of individual

members or conferences that promotes products related to these athletic activities.

Colleges and universities were able to negotiate contracts and raise millions. Suggs

(2004) stated that this court decision enabled college sports to become a source of

economic competition because money became an important factor in these games.

Athletic administration and leadership also changed as a result.

Suggs asserted that in the 1990's, college sports became a business and less of an

educational endeavor. However, the costs of maintaining a quality intercollegiate

athletics program came with significant and perhaps prohibitive costs. Moreover, colleges

and universities underwent a managerial revolution, and athletic directors have to work harder to satisfy the stakeholders while making do with shrinking state appropriations (Altbach, 2006).

As these intercollegiate sports gained widespread audience and revenue, athletic programs evolved, as did the role of athletic directors (Lattinville & Speyer, 2013). For instance, athletic directors' roles changed when the usual athletic programs went from being directed by volunteer students to full-time athletic directors and coaching professionals who are paid largely out of tuition fees (Thelin, 2005). What started as friendly competition, coaches or athletic directors are now professionally trained as such. When the position of athletics director became a professional position, the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics was established in 1965 (2009). The Association now has more than 6,100 collegiate athletics administrators (NACDA, 2007).

In the 1980's, directors of athletics assumed responsibility for fundraising, marketing, and compliance (Raiborn, 1990). Today, they are also expected to balance the expectations and interests of students, prospective students, student athletes, alumni, faculty, and staff. Because they are expected to generate revenue and recruit talent, maintain operation in-line administratively and competitively, athletic directors are expected to be entrepreneurial leaders that build long-term sustainable winning programs.

Athletic directors and head coaches are expected to balance the expectations and interests of students, prospective students, student athletes, alumni, faculty, and staff. Athletic directors and head coaches who have achieved success, employ and prioritize many different leadership techniques in order to achieve such success.

As a Top 15 finalist in the 2012-13 Learfield Directors' Cup, athletic directors and head coaches, at these universities have experienced a high level of success. The question arises; was that success the result of congruence in leaderships styles between the athletic directors and coaches? Or do athletic directors and head coaches have different leadership orientations that, while contrasting one another, lead to successful overall results.

Learfield Sports Directors' Cup

The bar for measuring athletic success in this study will be the Learfield Sports Directors' Cup. This award honors the University that has received the most success in a given year across a variety of athletics (Learfield Sports, 2013).

In June of 2011 it was announced that the NACDA, Learfield Sports, and USA Today would sponsor the Directors' Cup through 2016 (Learfield Sports, 2011). The announcement was made at a luncheon which was sponsored by the United States Olympic Committee. The NACDA and Learfield Sports also announced that there would be a new logo designed to represent the Directors' Cup (Learfield Sports, 2011).

Since the 1990's, the Directors' Cup has been a mark of distinction, which is widely recognized by athletic departments in the United States (Learfield Sports, 2011). Institutions are awarded the Cup based on a points system. The athletic departments gain points through their standing in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) or the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The award was founded by the NACDA and USA Today during 1993. The cup is the only award which

is sanctioned through the collegiate athletic directors that recognizes the best performance across all women's and men's sports (Learfield Sports, 2011).

The Directors' Cup indicates comprehensive excellence within the field of collegiate athletics (Learfield Sports, 2011). It was announced in August 2008 that Learfield Sports would become the title sponsor of the Directors' Cup. The president and chief executive officer of Learfield, Greg Brown, reported that the experience of working with the NACDA and USA Today has been a rewarding experience for Learfield. The key individuals associated with the NACDA who interact with Learfield are Mike Cleary and Bob Vecchione (Learfield Sports, 2011).

Annually, there are four champions who receive the Directors cup within the MCA divisions III, II, and I (Learfield Sports, 2011). There is also an award honoring a sports champion from the NAIA. The winner within each of the divisions is provided with a crystal trophy which is recognized during the NACDA annual convention in June. The institutions winning the award for the 2010 and 2011 seasons were as follows: Williams in Division III, Grand Valley State in Division II, and Stanford in the NCAA Division I (Learfield Sports, 2011).

Historical Perspective

Learfield Sports has been involved with collegiate athletics since 1975 (Learfield Sports, 2011). During that year, the company began operating the radio associated with the University of Missouri. The Learfield Communications operating unit now handles multimedia rights for over 50 colleges, associations, and conferences. These include the Black Coaches & Administrators (BCA), Boise State, Stanford, Miami Florida, Indiana,

Texas A&M, Colorado, Alabama, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Penn State, Missouri

Valley Conference, and the Big 10 Conference (Learfield Sports, 2011).

  The NACDA has its headquarters in Cleveland Ohio and was founded during

1965 (Profile of the National, 2014). During 1966, the organization published its first

magazine, which was the NACDA quarterly. Furthermore, during this year the initial

convention was held in Chicago at the Pic-Congress Hotel. Furthermore, the national

office was opened, which was then in Minneapolis Minnesota. The first director of the

NACDA was also named during 1966 (Profile of the National, 2014).

  During 1968, the NACDA published the men's edition of the National Directory

of College Athletics (Profile of the National, 2014). In the following year, 1969, the

national office of the NACDA was moved to its present location in Cleveland Ohio. In

1973, the NACDA had an individual membership which had reached 1000. During this

year, it also published the first women's edition of the National Directory of College

Athletics. In 1977, the institutional membership of the NACDA reached 1000. The

institutional membership rose to 2000 during 1980. In 1983, the NCAA gave the

authority to the NACDA to host the Kickoff Classic football game during the preseason.

The 20th anniversary for the NACDA was celebrated in 1985 at a new headquarters

which was located in the suburbs of Cleveland Ohio (Profile of the National, 2014).

  In 1986, the NACDA recognized an affiliation with the Division I-A Athletics

Directors Association (Profile of the National, 2014). During 1989, the NACDA was

given authority by the NCAA to hold the Disneyland Pigskin Classic football game.

During 1990, the individual membership in the NACDA reached 3000 and the 25th

anniversary was celebrated. The following year, in 1991, institutional membership of the NACDA reached 1500. In 1992, the NACDA was given administrative responsibility for the National Association of Collegiate Marketing Administrators (NACMA) (Profile of the National, 2014).

During 1993, the NACDA began administering the National Association of Athletic Development Directors (NAADD) (Profile of the National, 2014). A celebration was held for the 100th anniversary of the athletics director profession. Individual membership for the NACDA reached 4000, and the organization began administering the Sears Directors' Cup program. During the following year, 1994, individual membership of the NACDA reached 5000. There was a celebration for the 125th anniversary of the sport of college football. In 1995, the NACDA expanded the Sears Directors Cup and began including all divisions of the NAIA and NCAA. The first Internet home page for the NACDA was launched during 1996 (Profile of the National, 2014).

From 1997 until 2011, the NACDA continued to assume additional administrative responsibilities and initiate new programs supporting college athletics (Profile of the National, 2014). The organization also continued to expand its individual and institutional membership.

<div align="center">**Significance**</div>

The Directors Cup has the purpose of honoring institutions, which maintain excellent broad-based programs for the achievement of success in sports (Directors Cup, 2014). These sports include both women's and men's sports. The institution which wins the Directors Cup is the one which has the highest points for the Directors Cup standings

in their division. The crystal trophy has become a prestigious sign of sports excellence (Directors Cup, 2014).

The sports in the cup include 10 women and 10 men's sports in Division I (Directors Cup, 2014). There are seven women's and seven men's programs in Division II. In Division III, there are nine women's and nine men's sports. In the NAIA, there are six women's and six men's sports. There is also a community college section. The winner for this award division is the institution which has the highest score within the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NATYCAA) Cup standings. This division includes State Associations, Non-Scholarship Institutions, and National Junior Collegiate Athletic Association (NJCAA) members (Directors Cup, 2014).

Sports Included and the Points System

This study will focus on the Division I programs and not the NAIA section of the cup; however, the Cup itself is awarded on an annual basis to the University that demonstrates excellence across 52 sports. The breakdown across Divisions is predominately Division I and Division II with 18 sports comprising (nine men and nine women's) the Division III component of the Cup. Division I includes 20 sports (10 men and 10 women's) and the Division II incudes 14 sports (seven men and seven women's). Each institution is awarded points based on its winning percentage in a pre-determined number of core and wild card sports (Learfield Sports, 2013). Since this study is focused on excellence in athletic directorship, the Learfield Sports Directors' Cup provides an excellent benchmark for this goal. The school that has won the Cup most frequently is Stanford University in California. The University has won the Cup 19 straight times,

which provides an excellent opportunity to determine what the athletic director does there that can potentially contribute to this level of NCAA success.

College Athletics Department

College athletics remain dominated by men, which is consistent with the trend of leadership in other college and university departments in the United States. Whisenant (2008) reported that 85% of athletic directors are males. Women remain minorities in the leadership of athletic department (Hoffman, 2010). The phenomenon of *homologous reproduction*, wherein the hiring of leaders is based on gender, could explain the entrenched position of male coaches or athletic directors (Kitty, 2006). However, there is also a suggestion that homologous reproduction is observed only among coaches, not among athletic directors (Whisenant, 2008).

Because of the higher profile of college athletics departments, donations to them have increased considerably (Greenberg, 2008). These contributions are used pay coaches, arms race, and other maintenance costs. Greenberg (2008) reported that between 2002 and 2007, $3.9 billion was raised among the six main athletic conferences in the United States. This growth in the funding of athletics departments has sometimes been criticized because of the decline in the amount of donations made to academic programs (Wolverton, 2007a)

The media also exerts a great deal of influence on intercollegiate athletics (Schroeder, 2010). Media coverage of sports conferences can be extended to an audience beyond the campus (Noll, 2004). Moreover, every mistake or controversy that involves an intercollegiate athletics program will be reported (Yow, 2009).

As reflected by this discussion of college athletics department, from the gender politics to media to funding, athletics directors shoulder a huge responsibility. The hiring of athletics directors has become sophisticated process, with candidates being expected to possess a wide range of abilities and credentials are expected (Lattinville & Speyer, 2013).

The Role of the Coach and its Historical Development

From the end of the 18th century until the beginning of the 19th century, philosophy emerged as a unique branch of the social sciences (Sabock & Sabock, 2011). This meant that studies were being done to understand the various intricacies involved with individuals and the human society. The academic discipline of psychology was developed during at this time, an attempt to seek explanations for perceptions and mental functions. William James and Wilhelm Wundt carried out studies during the late 1870's focusing on what was then a philosophical tradition and how we might understand what we now know as psychological concepts. While individuals who acted as instructors and teachers for sporting events had existed for thousands of years, it was not until these early psychological concepts were developed that the modern idea of coaching came into being during the early 20th century (Watterson, 2006).

During the 20th century coaches became responsible for progressively more aspects of sports (Watterson, 2006). This is especially true with regard to college sports involving teams. Coaches began to be responsible for recruiting the best players given the resources available. Many times this will determine the success of a coach. During the 21st century, this often consists of reviewing reports and videotapes for hundreds of

players. The coach is responsible for examining the details regarding the character and

ability of potential players. When the coach identifies an individual whom they believe

will fit well into their program, they usually contact the player by telephone, although

contact through electronic media such as email is also common. Sometimes coaches will

approach the player in person in order to gain a better impression. Due to the process of

recruiting, a college coach must work year round instead of only during the sport season

(Watterson, 2006). As the role of athletic director has evolved, so too has that of the head

coach, a role that requires an advanced set of skills in both the technical aspects of the job

as well as in the ability to provide leadership.

        One of the earliest coaching activities was conducting practices (Robinson, 2010).

This was done even in the Roman era when gladiators practiced for tournaments in the

Coliseum. At that time, gladiators would usually have a single individual who helped

them learn skills, tactics, and strategies. The modern coach will often lead practice

sessions involving many athletes. This is especially true in team sports. The coach is

responsible for determining the needs of each player with regard to their development as

well as the entire team. They must create practice drills, which turned the weaknesses of

the individual or team into strengths. In the 21st century, this is one of the primary

responsibilities of a college coach. In order to accomplish these goals successfully, the

coach must fully understand the sport and have the ability to teach it to groups and

individuals (Sabock & Sabock, 2011).

        Coaches involved with college sports during the 20th century began to be

responsible for game strategy (Robinson, 2010). Before the game, the coach spent hours

learning the weaknesses and strengths of their opponents in order to devise the best plan

for defeating them. This still holds true in the 21st century. While the game is in session,

the coach will adjust the strategy in order to maximize the chances for success. This can

only be done when the coach has a thorough understanding of the sport their coaching.

They must also understand the counts of each of their players and the strengths of their

own team as a whole (Mandel, 2007).

From the early history of coaching, this individual is responsible for leadership

(Watterson, 2006). This was true in the area in which gladiators were trained and is still a

major factor in the 21st century. The coach serves as a role model for the college athlete.

The actions of the coach will influence how players approach the game, the opposing

team, and interact with each other. It is vital that the coach understands this role and

makes the appropriate decisions with regard to their behavior at all times. This is

especially true when the coach's behavior can be directly observed by the athletes. The

choices made by the college coach can impact the athletic department and the entire

college (Oriard, 2009).

A modern addition to the coach's responsibilities is safety (Mandel, 2007).

Historically, many of the sports had almost no safety rules or precautions. This began to

change during the 20th century and continues to become stricter during the 21st century.

The recent lawsuits by NFL players claiming damages due to brain injuries are an

example, and this argument in professional football is affecting intercollegiate football in

that coaches and athletic directors must take into account changes to the game through

performance and equipment. The college coach has the responsibility for maintaining the

health as well as the safety of their athletes. Each team must have healthy players in order to win the games and competitions. The coach of younger players has the additional responsibility for maintaining the health of students who are still in the care of their children. Most coaches in the 21st century have training in first aid as well as cardiac pulmonary resuscitation (CPR). Many coaches also have a rudimentary knowledge of proper nutrition and hydration (Sabock & Sabock, 2011). However, due to role specialization and the vast sums of money involved, most athletic directors and coaches delegate these tasks to professional athletic trainers and physicians associated with their teams, another indication of the elevated status of their roles in that professionals in medicine, business, and other professions now work as athletic directors and coaches.

In ancient times, the coach for a gladiator was often one of the few individuals who survived to retire from the profession (Watterson, 2006). This model persisted well into the 20th century, but the continuing need for new practices led to a change. During the 20th century, formal educational programs came into existence for coaches. The majority of entry-level coaches for a college first work as a graduate assistant, and will then work as a full time assistant coach. This training will generally not begin until the apprentice coach attains a bachelor's degree, and then commences on graduate study. Most universities will require their upper-level coaches to have at least a master's degree. It is also desirable if the coach has experience as a player in the sport. Nearly all head coaches at a college level are required to have experience working as an assistant (Oriard, 2009).

Public and Self-Perceptions of Coaches as Leaders

Studies involving coaches have indicated that there are a number of personal attributes which may predict or explain their success (Sabock & Sabock, 2011). One of the most important factors identified is that of self-efficacy. The need to understand self-efficacy as an athletic director or coach is important because research shows that individuals with a high-level of self-efficacy are more likely to put in greater effort to achieve specific outcomes. Leaders with high self-efficacy are likely to attribute failures to something that they may have controlled as opposed to placing blame on others. Another important consideration is those with a high-level of self-efficacy have been show to recover quickly from set-backs and are more likely to achieve goals (Mandel, 2007). Self-efficacy is a part of the social cognitive theory of Albert Bandura. This is a theory which explains human attitudes, behaviors, and motivations within a context involving environmental and individual factors. Self-efficacy is a belief which is situation specific and can lead to the successful production of a necessary outcome. There were six basic sources for self-efficacy identified originally by Bandura. These sources are emotional arousal, physiological arousal, verbal persuasion, imaginable experiences, precarious experiences, and mastery experience. The most influential of the sources has generally been identified as the mastery experience. Self-efficacy has a significant influence on important behavioral attributes of a coach such as goal setting, persistence, and effort. Both individuals observing coaches, and the coaches themselves who are successful, are rated as being high on traits involved with self-efficacy (Mandel, 2007).

The efficacy of a coach can be roughly defined as their ability to believe they have the capability to affect the performance and learning of their players (Robinson, 2010). This is often referred to as coaching efficacy. A model of coaching efficacy has been developed, which is based on and similar to Bandura's model for teaching efficacy. There are four basic dimensions to coaching efficacy, which are character building, technique, motivation, and game strategy. The strategy efficacy refers to the confidence displayed by the coach during competitions and their relative ability for leading a team to successful performance. The motivation efficacy involves the confidence the coach has in their own ability to alter the abilities and psychological states of the athletes they coach (Watterson, 2006). Teaching technique refers to the confidence exhibited by the coach regarding their teaching and diagnostic skills. Efficacy with regard to character building includes the perception the coach has of being able to influence athletes with regard to positive sporting attitudes and personal maturation. It should be remembered that all of these self-efficacy majors of the coach are also pertinent for others who are observing the coach. In other words, it is important that the coach be viewed by the players and others involved as being competent with regard to character building, technique, motivation, and game strategy (Mandel, 2007).

Research has been done which examines the ability coaches have to develop efficacy within the athletes they are leading (Sabock & Sabock, 2011). A study of elite level intercollegiate wrestling coaches in the United States found that positive self-talk was important. It was further discovered that successful coaches enhanced the self-efficacy of their athletes through the use of rewarding statements, drills and instruction,

and enhancements to an athlete's personal performance. These coaches were models of self-confidence (Oriard, 2009). Coaches were further found to use verbal persuasion as a method for enhancing the self-efficacy of their athletes. The strategies of verbal persuasion, precarious modeling, and performance accomplishments used by the successful coaches are based on the efficacy information explained by Bandura's theory. Further supporting evidence for successful coaching factors was provided by US Olympic athletes who reported the best coaches had enhanced their personal performance as well as provided them with confidence and support (Robinson, 2010).

A study was done to determine the relationship between team performance and 3coaching efficacy (Mandel, 2007). Coaches of intercollegiate women's basketball teams were interviewed regarding their confidence in the team's ability for performing certain basketball skills the coaches also rated the importance of the skills, their own perceived control over the outcome, and the opponent's ability to control the outcome. The results indicated that coaches with the lease of high efficacy for their team also perceived that they had more control over the performance of the team. Interestingly, the higher the perception of the opponent's ability was, the lower the coach believed their own efficacy was with regard to their team (Oriard, 2009).

This same study looked at what coaches used as the basis for their efficacy judgments of their team (Watterson, 2006). And inductive content analysis was done and identified both low and high efficacy sources. The factors which were related to high efficacy expectations included an injured player returning, favorable comparison to the opponents, good practice performances, and better past game performance. The coaches,

furthermore, indicated that better performance preparation by the players, their staff, and themselves was a contributing factor to having high efficacy expectations regarding their own team. Many of the coaches indicated that previous poor performance led to their being confident in their team as it had the ability to rebound from losses. The inferior efficacy factors were similar to the factors involved with high efficacy, only in the opposite direction. In other words, poor practice performance, players who were tired were injured, and poor performance in relation to opponents led to low efficacy (Robinson, 2010).

There has also been research done which indicates that there is a relationship between the intercollegiate coach's efficacy and the leadership style being used (Watterson, 2006). A sample of coaches indicated that coaching efficacy made up 42% of the variance within the leadership style. Technique and motivation efficacy were important predictors of the leadership style (Oriard, 2009).

Effective Leadership Styles

Throughout history, certain individuals have emerged from the crowd to distinguish themselves as being effective leaders of others. It is little wonder that so much attention has been paid to understanding such leaders because they have time and again charted mankind's history. Much research has been attempted to identify the qualities that contribute to effective leadership. This is particularly relevant to athletics directors given their greater responsibilities and the increased importance of university athletic departments (Lattinville & Speyer, 2013).

Baruch (1998) defined leadership as a "key issue in the development of groups, organizations and nations. The study of leadership plays a crucial role in the behavioral and management sciences" (p. 100). According to Tannenbaum, Weschler and Massarik (2013), today, all organizations require effective management in order to survive, but the stage of the organization's "lifecycle" will dictate the type of leadership style will provide the most desirable results.

A start-up, for example, will require a leader who can motivate others to achieve a common goal through a path-goal leadership approach. In contrast, a more mature company may require a more transformational leader to continue increasing productivity and to keep employee morale high. A fully mature organization; however may need a leader who can not only "put out the daily fires," but also identify opportunities for improvement; such leaders may combine transformational with transactional leadership (Tannenbaum et al, 2013). While the debate continues as to which leadership style is most effective and when, there is a growing consensus that an effective leader is able to inspire and motivate rather than just resolve day-to-day problems or "manage" an organization (Goleman, Welch, & Welch, 2004).

According to the Sports Education and Leadership Program at UNLV (SELP), "successful leadership has been defined as the ability to get others to behave as the manager intends them to behave" (Youth First, p. 1). There were no clear recommendations from past researchers about the nature of leadership needed in intercollegiate sports programs. However, some researchers singled out specific leadership styles as appropriate in intercollegiate sports.

Burton and Welty (2013) recommended servant leadership in intercollegiate athletics because of the emphasis on the needs of the followers. Moreover, servant leadership promotes ethical leadership, which suited to the people-centered work of athletic directors. Effective communication skills is important to possess among athletic directors (Peachey, Bruening, & Burton, 2011).

Yusof (2002) suggested that transformational leadership among athletic directors is related to the job satisfaction of their followers. This is based on data provided by 618 coaches in NCAA Divisions I and III. The participants were asked to rate the transformational leadership behaviors of their athletics director and their own job satisfaction.

Kihl, Leberman, and Schull (2010) argued that the perspectives of key stakeholders are often neglected in the conceptualization of leadership in athletics departments. To close this gap, Kihl et al. conducted a qualitative case study of the ways in which these stakeholders perceive leadership in the athletics department. The results of the study indicated that stakeholders associated leadership with their own experiences with the leaders of the athletic department.

These diverse views of the nature of leadership needed in college athletic departments are represented by Bolman and Deal's (1991, 2011) "multiple frame" approach to management and leadership in organizations. Bolman and Deal recognized that leaders' frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) help them manage and, if needed, change organizations. In this study, a primary objective was to

find evidence of Bolman and Deal's (2011) four frames in athletic director and core coaches leadership and organizational climate and culture.

For Bolman and Deal (2003), effective leaders function within political, human resources, structural and symbolic organizational frames. Through these frames, leaders are expected to reconstruct and improve organizations, motivate and inspire their followers, formulate and attain goals and visions, as well as design systems for continuous improvement. The proponents believed that effective leaders move an organization forward while maximizing its human potential, by empowering them and capitalizing on opportunities. The process of leading, according to Bolman and Deal (2003), is a holistic one wherein leaders must understand each of these frames or mechanisms so that they can understand their stakeholders and the organization.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture consists of the long-held values and beliefs of the organization (Tsai, 2011). Organizational culture is often conceptualized as a three-tiered model consisting of artifacts, espoused values, and basic assumptions (Schein, 2004). Based on Schein's (2004) model, artifacts were described as the most artificial component of organizational culture because artifacts can be seen, heard, or felt. Espoused values are the "norms that provide the day-to-day operating principles by which members of the group guide their behavior" (Schein, 2004, p. 18). Finally, basic assumptions are a mental framework that the people who work in the organization use to guide their behavior.

Tsai (2011) examined the relationship of organizational culture and leadership behaviors in a cross-sectional study in Taiwan. The results of the study revealed a relationship between organizational culture and leadership behaviors, including leaders' job satisfaction leaders. The link between leadership and organizational culture underscores the importance of leadership that fits the organizational culture (Schroeder, 2010).

Even though each intercollegiate athletics department is unique, Schroeder (2010) provided a model of a typical organizational culture. This model consists of four components: (a) institutional culture, (b) internal environment, (c) external environment, and (d) leadership and power. Each component will be discussed briefly.

Institutional culture includes components such as the mission of the program, academic programs, and institutional control (Schroeder, 2010). These components affect membership to national sports organizations wherein different intercollegiate athletics are members. Schroeder also noted that parameters of institutional culture also affect the way in which the athletic program is run.

The external environment includes the media, boosters and fans, and professional leagues (Schroeder, 2010). These entities are part of the organizational culture of intercollegiate athletics because they can influence the way in which the sports program will be managed. The media can exert its influence through coverage of specific issues, whereas external governing bodies are able to exert influence by imposing rules and restrictions (Yow, 2009).

The internal environment includes artifacts, subculture, and history (Schroeder, 2010). Schroeder argued that internal environment is part of the organizational culture of intercollegiate athletics because artifacts, subculture, and history can counterbalance the influences of external environment and internal culture on the organization. For instance, internal symbols such as mascots or slogans may be difficult to decipher by outsiders to the organization, but not by insiders.

The last components of Schroeder's (2010) model are leadership and power. Leadership and power are important parts of an intercollegiate athletics' organizational culture because leaders can address and balance the influence of all the other components for the sake of the organization. Some of the important factors related to this component are the formal and informal leaders, sources of power, and expectations from leaders.

Change is one the enduring characteristics of the organizational culture of intercollegiate athletics (Peachey et al., 2011). These changes are intended for the betterment of the program and department, given the problems associated with athletics departments such as academic fraud, violations of regulations, and proliferation of arms race (Schroeder, 2010). As a consequence, transformational leadership practices are relevant in intercollegiate athletics (Peachey et al., 2011; Yusof, 2002).

For Bolman and Deal (2003), effective leaders function within political, human resources, structural and symbolic organizational frames. Through these frames, leaders are expected to reconstruct and improve organizations, motivate and inspire their followers, formulate and attain goals and visions, as well as design systems for continuous improvement. The process of leading, according to Bolman and Deal (2003),

is a holistic one wherein leaders must understand each of these frames or mechanisms so that they can understand their stakeholders and the organization.

According to Bolman and Deal (2002), the use of multiple frames offers a different perspective on common challenges while presenting three advantages:

1. Each frame can be coherent, focused, and powerful.

2. The collection of frames can be more comprehensive than only single one.

3. Only after you have multiple frames can you reframe. Reframing is a conscious effort to size up a situation from multiple perspectives and then find a new way to address that situation. (p. 3)

Being a successful athletic director and core head coach is an increasing complex task. As such, experiences and information can be classified according to the leadership orientations the leader is able to employ. Bolman and Deal's (2003) four frame model describes the orientations used to classify such information. Once classified, the athletic director and core head coaches are able to draw upon and compare experiences to choose which course of action may be best suited to manage and lead the athletic department or team.

Statement of the Problem

Athletic directors and core head coaches are expected to balance the expectations and interests of students, prospective students, student athletes, alumni, faculty, and staff. Athletic directors and head coaches who have achieved success, employ and prioritize many different leadership techniques in order to achieve such success.

Having become a Top 15 finalist in the 2012-13 Learfield Cup, athletic directors and core head coaches, have achieved a high-level of success. The question arises, was that success the result of congruence in leaderships styles between the athletic directors and coaches? Or do athletic directors and head coaches have different leadership orientations that, while they may contrast one another, still lead to successful overall results?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the styles of leadership characterizing successful athletic directors and successful coaches. Gaining insight into the differences in the leadership styles of successful practitioners of these two occupations will enable a better understanding of the distinctive role of athletics directors in the contemporary world of intercollegiate sports.

The Research Design

This study employed a quantitative non-experimental design. Data was collected on the leadership orientations of athletic directors and core head coaches at NCAA Division I universities which meet explicit criteria of having successful intercollegiate athletic programs.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study addressed the following research question: To what extent is there congruence between the leadership orientations of athletic directors and head coaches at universities which have intercollegiate sports programs that are recognized as successful, as determined by performance in the 2012-13 Learfield Cup?

Leadership orientations will be conceptualized in terms of Bolman and Deal's (1991) four leadership 'frames': Structural, Human Resources, Political, and Symbolic. Accordingly, the research question will be addressed through tests of four null hypotheses, which are presented below accompanied by their alternative hypotheses.

$H_{1,0}$: There is no difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as structural.

$H_{1,A}$: There is a difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as structural.

$H_{2,0}$: There is no difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as human resources.

$H_{2,A}$: There is a difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as human resources.

$H_{3,0}$: There was no difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as political.

$H_{3,A}$: There was a difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as political.

$H_{4,0}$: There was no difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as symbolic.

$H_{4,A}$: There was a difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as symbolic.

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

This study makes the following assumptions:

1. The set of athletic directors and head coaches from universities and colleges qualifying as finalists for the 2012-2013 Learfield Sports Directors' Cup are representative of all the finalists for this cup from the inception of the award in 1993 through the foreseeable future.

2. A limitation of this study is that only the athletic director and core head coaches who were finalists for the 2012-13 Learfield Sports Directors' Cup at the NCAA Division I level. The results of the data may reflect only the opinions of those directors and coaches at the Division I level.

Definition of Terms

Organizational Culture: This is an aspect of an organization which is not easily observed through external analysis. It is composed of shared values and various assumptions, which exist at the deep levels of the organization. They define the way that the organization operates.

Organizational Climate: This consists of facets of an organization which involve processes that are understood by the members of the organization. These characteristics are empirically observable in our reflection of the organizational culture.

Frames: This is a reference to the four original frames as explained by Bolman and Deal (1991). They consist of human resource, political, symbolic, and structural frames. This will be measured by the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Survey (Bolman & Deal, 1991). This instrument uses frames in order to explain the organizational process.

Leadership Orientation: This will be measured by the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Survey (Bolman & Deal, 1991) which is a self-evaluation of political, human resource, structural, and symbolic frames.

Athletic Director: This is the chief administrator who is responsible for leading, organizing, planning the intercollegiate athletics at a university.

Core Head Coach: This is a head coach of one the core NCAA Division I sports designated for use in Learfield Directors' Cup.

Learfield Cup: This is a trophy awarded annually by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics NACDA) to the universities and colleges in the United States which have the most successful collegiate athletic programs.

Bolman and Deal Framework: This is a theoretical framework developed by Bolman and Deal (1991) which conceptualizes a leader's approach in terms of four 'frames' or orientations. These frames include structural, human resource, symbolic, and political.

Summary

While a wealth of literature has been devoted to athletic success and revenue, even the increased enrollment in association to the changing dynamics of intercollegiate sports, there is a dearth on literature assessing the relationship between the success of an athletic program and the athletic director's and core head coaches perceived leadership orientation in intercollegiate athletic departments. Chapter 1 presented the background of the problem, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the nature of the study, and the significance of this study. Chapter 2, which includes the Literature Review, will cover related constructs such as leadership, athletic leadership, and intercollegiate sports climate and culture. Chapter 3 introduces the research methodology to investigate whether or not there is congruence in the leadership orientations of athletic directors and successful coaches in intercollegiate athletic departments experiencing broad program success. Chapter 4 analyzes results and findings. And Chapter 5 offers interpretations, conclusions, and further recommendations for study and immediate action.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review will be organized into several sections in order to address the different components pertinent to the research problem. The presentation will be organized into the following: (a) historical overview of different leadership theories, (b) leadership in athletic department, including effective leadership among athletic directors; (c) school climate and culture; and (d) effective leadership frameworks, focusing on Bolman and Deals's (2008) leadership frameworks.

Historical Overview of Different Leadership Theories

The different leadership theories that will be discussed in this section include: (a) charismatic leadership, (b) transactional leadership (c) path-goal theory, (d) servant leadership, (e) transformational leadership, and (f) leader-member exchange theory. These leadership theories were selected because key elements represented within these theories are reflected in the Bolman and Deal Leadership Survey instrument and further investigation into each style adds depth to understanding the differences in each Bolman and Deal's frames.

Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership is often characterized by heroism and exceptional influence because of the emotional attachment and respect that followers feel for their leaders (Avolio & Yammarino, 2002). Through charisma, leaders are able to influence positive work outcomes from their followers, who are often willing to do things for the benefit of the vision of the leader that they admire. Followers who perceive leaders as

charismatic tend to view them as powerful and successful, underscoring the influential role of charismatic leaders to their followers (Jacobsen & House, 2001).

Similar to leader-exchange theory, charismatic leadership also capitalizes on the relationship between leaders and followers. Hayibor, Agle, Sears, Sonnenfeld, and Ward (2011) examined whether the relationship of leaders and followers is characterized by congruence in order to be effective. Hayibor et al. found that value congruence is only effective when there is perception from followers that their leaders possess charismatic leadership qualities. No such relationship was found when the actual value congruence between leaders and followers were examined.

There is some empirical evidence that charismatic leadership is also conducive for the implementation of organizational change. Michaelis, Stegmaier, and Sonntag (2009) examined the relationship between charismatic leadership and innovation behaviors of followers using data from 194 employees. The results of the quantitative study of Michaelis et al. indicated that there is a positive relationship between charismatic leadership and the innovation behaviors of followers, with the commitment of followers to change acting as a mediating variable in the relationship. While charismatic leadership is easily recognized through likeability and other traits, the study of the charismatic leader is unfulfilling in that it cannot be trained for, or replicated.

Transactional Leadership

It is evident transactional leadership denotes a different form or concept than transformational leadership, even if the actions don't always make this distinction, which in fact has not always been the case (Day, Halpin & Zaccaro, 2004). As implied by the

name, transactional leadership contains a simple give-and-take of one thing for another in a quid pro quo fashion. This leadership style is related to transformational leadership, but, "Transactional leadership emphasizes the transaction or exchange that takes place among leaders, colleagues, and followers. This exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards these others will receive if they fulfill the requirements. Constructive transactional leadership or contingent reward is reasonably effective under most circumstances" (Avolio & Bass, 2002, p. 1). In this regard, then, transactional leadership suggests that leadership involves a wide range of tacit negotiations and trade-offs (Southworth, 1998). Bass's (1985) research into effective leadership styles identified two primary factors that comprised transactional leadership:

> 1. Contingent reward leadership is regarded as being an active and positive exchange between leaders and followers whereby followers are rewarded for accomplishing agreed-upon goals; and,

> 2. In the alternative, leaders also can transact actively or passively with followers by focusing on mistakes, delaying decisions, or avoiding situations until problems arise (Bass calls such behavioral exchanges "management by exception" (Gellis, 2001, p. 17).

Early on, Downton (1973) described transactional leadership as being "a process of exchange that is analogous to contractual relations in economic life [and] contingent on the good faith of the participants" (p. 75). Downton pronounced transactional leadership as demonstrating the delivery of contractual obligations. Which over a period time, delivery on these contractual obligations could generate trust and develop into a constant rapport where mutual remunerations can be exchanged between leaders and their constituents.

According to Ciulla (1998), the negotiations and trade-offs are related to the values inherent in any act: "transactional leadership rests on the values found in the means of an act. These are called modal values, which are things like responsibility, fairness, honesty, and promise keeping. Transactional leadership helps leaders and followers reach their own goals by supplying lower-level wants and needs so that they can move up to higher needs" (Ciulla, 1998, p. 16). While most leaders and managers have fundamentally different responsibilities in their organizations (leaders are supposed to have the organizational "vision" and managers are supposed to take care of the day-to-day nuts-and-bolts needs of the organization), Southworth (1998) points out that, "Transactional leadership is often equated with management because it is to do with ensuring that, on a day-to-day basis, the organization works efficiently" (p. 43). The transactional leader who focuses on simple rewards and punishments and the demands by followers for immediate gratification, though, will likely be prone to accept hasty, poorly thought-out decisions (Bass, 1998).

In this regard, Bass (1998) points out that, "Indeed, leadership may contribute to stress. Personalized, self-aggrandizing, charismatic leaders can cause more stress among their followers, for instance, when they excite a mob to take hasty actions" (p. 34). In many situations then, poor leadership may result in an environment that is detrimental to a company's effectiveness and overall organizational morale, and once loyal employees will stop being as effective and dedicated as they once were. This may be the situation with transactional leaders who lead by exclusion.

Many ineffective transactional leaders are viewed as domineering and even "tyrannical" in their leadership styles, a fact that contributes in no small way to worker dissatisfaction, turnover, absenteeism and even employee sabotage. Bass advises that "abrasive leaders use their power to coerce their followers. They cause stress. For many subordinates, their immediate leaders may be the most stressful aspect of the work situation. This becomes most extreme when the transactional leader says, either you do as I say or else" (1998, p. 34). By contrast, the more constructive form of transactional leadership now being described in the literature as contingent reward can be described as follows: "If you perform this task, then you will receive this outcome or reward" (Day et al., 2004, p. 74). The recent shift to transactional contingent reward leadership is congruent with the recent trends in the workplace, and today, the concept of what comprises effective transactional leadership transcends such contingent reward exchanges and has important implications for leadership development in the future. "Executing transactions reliably builds trust and respect, which provides a solid base for transformational leadership," Day and his colleagues point out. "Developing leadership perspective in this part of the range requires leaders to understand how to build such exchanges with followers and how to execute those exchanges reliably." (p. 74)

The research showed that Bass's (1985) theory of transformational leadership was developed from Burns's (1978) description of transactional and transformational leaders; in transactional leadership, leader-follower relationships are based on a series of exchanges between them. The research also showed while the debate over whether effective leaders are born are made continues, studies over the past 20 years have shown

that the most effective leaders exhibit both transactional and transformational styles of

leadership (Bass, 1997), but any effective leadership theory must also include

components of the path-goal theory (Chemers, 1997).

Path-Goal Theory

Path-goal theory of leadership maintains that the effective leader clarifies the

transactional exchange or the path the subordinate needs to follow for goal attainment;

contingencies in these exchanges include the types of motivation and expectancies of the

subordinate and the structure of the situation (Bass, 1998). House's path-goal theory was

based on data obtained using the Ohio State scales (data which Miner [2002] suggests

House did not fully understand) and Evans' (1970) article on path-goal leadership (Bayar

& Kerns, 2012). House maintained that Evans' approach failed to incorporate the

characteristics of the followers and the followers' tasks; indeed, these situational

variables should determine when and how the leader's behavior affects the motivation,

performance, and satisfaction of the followers (Chemers, 1997). "Like Evans," Chemers

says, "House argued that the motivational function of the leader is to increase followers'

perceptions of rewards for performance and to make the path to these rewards easier for

the follower to travel by clarifying the appropriate behavior and criteria of performance

and by removing roadblocks or barriers" (p. 45).

Schriesheim, Wu & Cooper (2011) claimed that the original path-goal model as

promulgated by Evans (1970) contained five steps, beginning with the leader or leader

behaving in certain ways. In this leadership theory, two kinds of behavior are

emphasized, drawing on the conceptual framework originally developed at Ohio State.

Miner reports that the first type of behavior involves identifying indications of trust, respect, warmth, concern for personal needs, and so forth in dealing with subordinates; this is reflected in considerable two-way communication and subordinate participation in decision making which is a reflection of the level of consideration provided. The second type of behavior is known as "initiation of structure"; this type of behavior is focused more directly on organizational goals and includes organizing and defining work, establishing role prescriptions for subordinates, assigning tasks, planning work, and encouraging desired performances (Miner, 2002).

The leader's behaviors in this leadership style tend to affect the subordinate by influencing perceptions of path-goal instrumentalities; in other words, the degree to which following a certain path (behaving in a certain way) is seen as likely to result in goal attainment or to constrain the accomplishment of organizational goals. Furthermore, Miner points out that these perceived path-goal instrumentalities are then multiplied with the importance of the goals involved to the subordinate (known as their valence) to provide the level of motivation required to follow a path or engage in a specific behavior; however, Miner cautions that motivation is just one contributor to actual job behavior; environmental factors, including the nature of the task (as well as particular individual abilities), also exert an influence. The resulting incidence with which the subordinate actually follows the path and demonstrates a particular kind of behavior, when multiplied with the actual path-goal instrumentality (the extent to which that behavior really does contribute to attaining the goal and is not merely perceived as doing so), then produces

the level of goal attainment; thereafter, goal attainment is considered to be a partial measure of job satisfaction (Miner, 2002).

The focus of the path-goal theory of leadership is at the level of leadership behavior; however, "how can a leader influence path-goal instrumentalities? For one thing, the subordinate must perceive the superior as being in a position to influence rewards and punishments" (Miner, 2002, p. 274). Based on these factors, a considerate organizational leader would be viewed as an abundant source of rewards and a source that carefully links the rewards given to the desires of the individual; by contrast, an inconsiderate leader would differentiate less in terms of individual needs or goals (Miner, 2002). In addition, subordinates must view these rewards as being associated with, or contingent on, specific types of behaviors (Miner, 2002). Initiation of structure is the process by which rewards are tied to specific behavior paths. A leader who does not structure this way fails to indicate what paths should be utilized and distributes rewards without reference to the path followed (Miner, 2002).

To influence performance, a leader must make judgments as to which are high-performance paths and which are low. Although usually these judgments are easily made, there are instances in which only the highly considerate leader can make them. In particular, the considerate leader will perceive (1) being provided suggestions by subordinates, and (2) assisting coworkers as high-performance paths; by contrast, less considerate leaders will not (Miner, 2002). As a result, these two so-called variable paths can reasonably be expected to be perceived as having higher path-goal instrumentalities when the leader is regarded as being high in levels of consideration (Miner, 2002). The

resulting hypotheses regarding the effects of different leader behaviors on perceived path-goal instrumentalities are shown in Table 1, later.

The path-goal approach identified the specific variables that must be addressed in defining follower motivation; in this regard, the path-goal theory involves a concentration on follower reactions to leader behavior (Schriesheim et al, 2011)). Evans (1970) believed that these path-goal perceptions moderated the effects of leader behaviors such as initiation of structure and consideration; he also reasoned that the behaviors did not always have the same effects on group outcomes such as productivity or satisfaction because they did not always have the same effects on path-goal perceptions (Schriesheim, et al, 2011).

For example, Evans maintained that considerate and participative supervision improved the subordinates' perceptions of the availability of goals that were typically associated with higher order needs (such as self-esteem and feelings of accomplishment); however, these did not provide the subordinate with any guidance as to how to accomplish those goals (Chemers, 1997). By contrast, initiation of structure provided clarification of the appropriate path (such as increased productivity, improved quality standards, and obedience); initiation of structure, though, did not necessarily ensure the availability of suitable rewards. As a result, a combination of the two types of behaviors should provide most effective result (Chemers, 1997). According to this author, "Structuring leader behavior should have a very positive effect on motivation when consideration levels are high, but no effect when consideration behavior is absent." (Chemers, 1997, p. 45)

The path-goal theory has been replaced in large part in recent years by the transformational and transactional approaches, but the growing body of evidence on effective leadership suggests that the major tenets of this theory are likely accurate. Indeed, the behaviors exhibited by leaders can have a powerful impact on their subordinates' motivation and satisfaction and in most cases, the actions taken by leader that provide their subordinates with requisite information or desired support will be the most effective, and those subordinates needs and desires will likewise be influenced by personal and environmental considerations; therefore, Chemers suggests that "A comprehensive theory of leadership must integrate the path-goal principles" (1997, p. 48).

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership was conceptualized first by Greenleaf, who defined servant leadership as the desire to be a servant to his or her followers, putting the leader's own needs aside for the benefit of the followers. According to Dierendonck (2010), even though the definition lacks precision, this definition of servant leadership provided by Greenleaf remains popular and recognized by contemporary researchers as the core characteristic of servant leaders. For instance, Luthans and Avolio (2003) also defined servant leadership as a type of leadership wherein power is not the main concern of leaders, but a tool used to serve their followers.

Several characteristics of servant leadership have been identified by various researchers. Russell and Stone (2002) offered an extensive framework for servant leadership, identifying nine functional characteristics and 11 accompanying

characteristics of servant leadership. However, Spears (1995) conceptualization of servant leadership remains the most popular. From this model, the 10 characteristics of servant leadership include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment, and building community.

Some of the antecedents of servant leadership include self-determination, cognitive complexity, and moral cognitive development. Self-determination is an antecedent of servant leadership because there should be an initiative from leaders to be servants to their followers (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Cognitive complexity is an antecedent because this complexity will equip leaders to perceive social behaviors accurately. Finally, moral cognitive development is an important antecedent of servant leadership because it equips leaders with reasoning skills needed for social interaction.

Servant leadership shares some similarities with other types of leadership such as transformational leadership and ethical leadership (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leadership does not contain a unique set of characteristics, but an amalgamation of some characteristics from different leadership styles. What separates servant leadership from other leadership theories is that servant leadership "distinctively specifies a combined motivation to be(come) a leader with a need to serve that is at the foundation of these behaviors" (Van Dierendonck, 2011, p. 1238).

Transformational Leadership

Generally there is the belief that "transforming" something is good because it implies improvement, although improvement does not always occur when it comes to transforming organizations. Organizations, particularly larger ones, are notoriously

difficult to change in any substantive way, and people naturally try to avoid any change in their routine. James MacGregor Burns (1978) maintained that transforming leadership takes place when the leader engages with a follower in such a manner that both parties are raised to higher levels of motivation and morality with a common purpose (Avolio, Walumbawala, & Weber, 2009). The concept of transformational leadership was later conceptualized as leadership that raises levels of awareness about the importance and value of designated outcomes and facilitates development and vision among subordinates (Maher, 1997).

According to Heilbrunn (1994), "Unquestionably, Burns's most important insight was to draw a distinction between transformational and transactional leadership. Where transactional leadership is merely a version of managerialism that appeals to the economic self-interest of followers, transformational leadership alters the expectations of followers. Burns maintains that effective leaders can raise their followers to new levels of morality and rectitude: "Moral leadership emerges from, and always returns to the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations and values of followers" (p. 66). Bass maintains that Burns created a completely artificial distinction between transactional and transformational leaders but this is generally not the case in the real world. For example, Heilbrunn points out that, "Far from being antithetical, the two types of leadership can exist in the same person. Leaders such as Charles de Gaulle, Franklin Roosevelt, and Lyndon Johnson displayed varying degrees of transactional and transformational qualities. By the same token, Bass points out, a leader may exhibit neither set of qualities" (p. 66). Effective transformational leaders are likely to exhibit charisma,

employ symbols to help focus employee efforts, encourage their followers to question

their own way of doing things, and treat their followers differently but equitably based on

their needs (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

According to Ciulla (1998), "transforming leaders have very strong values. They

do not water down their values and moral ideals by consensus, but rather they elevate

people by using conflict to engage followers and help them reassess their own values and

needs" (p. 15). In this regard, Avolio and Bass (2002) point out that, "transformational

leaders motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often even more

than they thought possible. Such leaders set more challenging expectations and typically

achieve higher performances" (p. 1). Avolio and Bass (2002) report that since the 1980's,

research has provided growing support for the notion that transformational leadership is

more effective than transactional leadership in generating the extra effort, commitment,

and satisfaction required of those being led. "True transformational leaders," they say,

"raise the level of moral maturity of those whom they lead. They convert their followers

into leaders. They broaden and enlarge the interests of those whom they lead. They

motivate their associates, colleagues, followers, clients, and even their bosses to go

beyond their individual self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or society."

(p. 1) In this regard, Bass and Avolio (1994) maintain that the focus of transformational

leadership is to create organizational change through an emphasis on new values, and a

vision of the future, both of which are supposed to transcend the status quo.

Today, there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that those leaders

described by their followers as being transformational more frequently than other

leadership styles will be more likely to be both subjectively and objectively more effective and satisfying than those transactional leaders who more frequently exchange promises of rewards for appropriate role enactment by subordinates (Bass, 1998). Further, Bass reports that reward-oriented leaders are frequently more effective and satisfying than those who more frequently manage-by-exception or are laissez-faire and abdicate their leadership responsibilities; however, situational contingencies can make a difference in these exchanges (Bass, 1998).

Effective transformational leaders are able to address each subordinate's sense of self-worth in order to engage the individual in fully committing to the goals and to become involved in the initiative.

There are some similarities found between transformational leadership and charismatic leadership, which could explain why charismatic leadership is sometimes subsumed in transformational leadership. Besides the focus on the relationship between leaders and followers, one significant similarity is the focus on organizational change (Michaelis et al., 2009). Both theories are found to be conducive for implementing change because of the influence of the leaders to their followers (Michaelis et al., 2009). Another similarity is the focus on effective communication in both types of leadership, wherein leaders communicate with their followers to extend their vision (Levine, Muenchen, & Brooks, 2010).

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

Emerging from the 1970's, the leader-member exchange theory on leadership posited the importance of the exchanges that occur between leaders and followers to

affect an organizational outcome (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). According to Schyns and

Day (2010), the leader-member exchange theory was the first theory that integrated the

role of followers on leadership. Moreover, was also the systematic theory to argue that

both leaders and followers are affected by each other's behaviors.

Providing credence for the leaders-member exchange theory, previous researchers found

evidence supporting the dyadic relationship between leaders and followers, resulting in

positive organizational outcomes. Drawing from the principles of leader-member

exchange theory, when the working relationship of the leaders and members are

considered effective, the result is job satisfaction and strong levels of commitment from

followers (Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Vidyarthi, Liden, Anand, Erdogan, and

Ghosh (2010) also found positive work outcomes based on positive relationship between

leaders and followers.

Despite the empirical evidence supporting the leader-member exchange theory,

some criticisms were leveraged by other researchers. For example, Ford (2011) argued

that dyadic relationship between leaders and followers are not explained in terms of how

leaders can be more effective in communicating with their followers. The theory simply

underscores the mutual relationship between leaders and followers.

A recent study addressed the knowledge gap noted by Ford (2011), focusing on

the antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange (Dulebohn, Bommer,

Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012). Dulebohn et al. (2012) found that variables pertaining to

leaders are more significant determinants of positive outcomes, suggesting that leader

variables are more significant antecedents of leader-member exchange. Leadership

behaviors and perceptions are important in the leader-member exchange, more than the behaviors and perceptions of followers, even if they also contribute to positive outcomes.

Leadership in Athletics Department

Management is inherently more process-based and calls for the navigation of player needs, personal desires, chemistry issues and a number of other factors shaping clubhouse culture (Mallett, 2005). Management involves planning, organizing, and controlling to achieve outcomes (Moss & Green, 2001). The work of managers has been described in a more finite and technical ways wherein the nature of their job is considered less dynamic (Mallett, 2005; Moss & Green, 2001).

Leadership on the other hand involves a much more dynamic position, wherein in addition to job of managing various tasks, leaders are also involved in inspiring their followers, setting a mission and vision, and engaging in political activities to sustain the organization (Burton & Welty, 2013; Goleman et al., 2004; Tannenbaum et al., 2013). Leadership is the "key issue in the development of groups, organizations and nations" (Baruch, 1998, p. 100). On this point, Mallett described the effective leader as being defined as much by how he relates to the needs of his followers. Mallett contended that a pre-condition of effective leadership in athletics is the capacity to "display care and interest in [the] 'whole' person," a characteristic that will certainly distinguish the effectiveness with which the coach relates to his team. (Mallett, 2005, p. 9)

The average number of staff of athletics department is about 115, including the coaches and administrators (Blue Book of College Athletics, 2012), and anecdotal information indicates that athletic departments, like other aspects of higher education

administration, have gotten larger. According to the report of Wolverton (2007b), the athletics department faces academic issues that range from accountability wherein coaches and athletics leaders need to sustain a level of success in order to remain in their jobs, integrated sports programs, and faculty involvement in the athletics department. Athletics leaders are in charge of leading and managing the entire department (Trail & Chelladurai, 2002).

Leadership in athletics departments consists of both formal and informal leaders (Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). The formal leaders of athletic departments are the athletic directors and university presidents, whereas the informal leaders may comprise of coaches, alumni, and boosters (Withers, 2006). Even though the formal leaders have the obvious influence in the athletics department, informal leaders can also shape the policies of the department (Schroeder, 2010).

Effective Leadership in Athletic Directors

Athletic directors are the top leaders of intercollegiate athletics departments, excluding the university presidents who are in charge of the entire university (Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). Athletic directors "are expected to provide direction, guidance, and short and long term plans for the success and management of the athletic program" (Swalls, 2004, p. 18). Athletic directors are the focus of this study because of the central role in intercollegiate athletics.

There is currently limited literature on the effective leadership style in intercollegiate athletics. However, some researchers have found some leadership characteristics that suggest positive organizational outcomes. Transformational leadership

can be appropriate in intercollegiate athletics because of the relevance of affecting

organizational (Yusof, 2002). There was also a suggestion that servant leadership can be

effective because of the emphasis on the needs of the followers more than the leaders.

(Burton & Welty, 2013). It is arguable, however, that quality leadership in athletic

departments is considered to be a primary factor in the performance of the teams in the

department.

School Athletics Culture and Climate

Over the past twenty years championship teams in football and basketball have

led to increases in undergraduate admission applications for the years following the

championship (Toma and Cross, 1998). In addition, winning teams bring notoriety, which

allows for the university to be more selective in their admissions process but also

motivates booster donations to the athletic department and the university as a whole

(Zimbalist, 1999). Robert Frank, a professor at Cornell University, suggests that athletic

success may serve two functions toward perspective students; "one is that many

prospective students are sports fans, some of whom may decide where to apply in part on

the basis of their assessments of which institutions are most likely to play host to exciting

athletic contests. A second influence is the broader effect of university name recognition.

The names of institutions with successful big-time athletic programs appear frequently in

the media, making them generally more familiar to prospective students. On this view, a

big-time athletic program serves much like a national advertising campaign" (Frank,

2004).

The beginning of the professional coach into college sports did as much as anything to achieve the validation of intercollegiate athletics. The professional coach began with the Yale crew in 1864. The pro coach so dominated the athletic program among leading colleges and universities and at times was paid more than the highest salaried professor, and he was becoming as visible as the college president. The history behind the professional coach does much to detonate the illusion that there was ever a long period when the amateur spirit prevailed in college athletics.

Additionally, some of the revenue attributed to athletic departments may come in the form of financial backing from student fees, transfers from the university budget, or appropriations from the state budget. Athletic departments benefit from large donations from local booster organizations, which help to discharge basic athletic department expenses. They also receive assistance from alumni gifts that in many cases come in place of giving to the general fund. Therefore, it may be an accounting impossibility to truly compare the financing of athletic programs from one university to the next.

While much more could be said regarding inaccurate analyses of the direct revenues and expenses of major college athletic programs, other issues relevant to making strategic decisions relating to university athletics could also be quantitatively examined. There are many subjective reports of indirect impacts such as increased visibility, applications, and donations of athletic success. However, minimal work exists concerning the extent of indirect impacts of such turnarounds athletic programs across different campuses using basic descriptive statistics, much less using sophisticated statistical analyses. The universal skepticism associated with measurements of the

indirect impacts of athletics pertains to the credibility of sizable effects. This doubt usually comes from a misunderstanding of the mechanisms by which athletics influence outwardly unrelated behavior. One question arise, which is "other than hardcore fans, are there sufficient people who care so powerfully about athletics to change enrollments, giving, and other seemingly unrelated outcomes?" The cause-effect relationships can be quite ambiguous.

The Relationship between Athletic Directors and Coaches

There is a difference between coaches and athletic directors (Sabock & Sabock, 2011). The coaches involved with the training, instruction, and direction of the individual players or sports team. Some coaches also serve as teachers. Most coaches are supported by one or even several assistant coaches as well as specialized support staff. This staff can include trainers, fitness specialists, experts and strength, and coordinators. These professionals help the coach achieve long-term successes for the athletes and their team (Robinson, 2010).

In the United States, all the major collegiate sports have coaching associations, which engage in a number of professional development activities (Watterson, 2006). In some of the sports, the coaches have associations which are less formal. Some of these groups are organized more as a union similar to the athletes in leagues. The coaching contracts in the United States require that the coach be terminated if there is a violation of certain rules. These are often associated with how the team retains or recruits its players (Mandel, 2007).

Most coaching contracts also allow for the coach to be terminated with almost no notice or specific cause (Robinson, 2010). When the coach is high profile, there can be a financial settlement involved. Coaching can be a profession which is fickle. Many times the perception of the coach's success is solely based on how a team is doing any particular season. Many college-level coaches will go from being considered one of the best during one season, only to discover they have difficulty finding employment during the next year. Coaches in both the collegiate and professional leagues are frequently former players. This can provide the coach with important perspectives on how their players are affected by various rules and contingencies (Sabock & Sabock, 2011).

Both professional and collegiate coaches can have contracts for several million dollars per annum (Watterson, 2006). Head coaches at the professional level generally have more time for playbooks and tactics. This material is the focus of the staff of a professional team more than those at the college level. Head coaching at the professional level involves long hours and extensive time on the road. For this reason, many professional head coaches retire relatively early (Mandel, 2007).

In the majority of American universities and colleges, the athletic director is a type of administrator (Watterson, 2006). Their job is to oversee the work done by the coaches and their staff that is related to the school's sports programs. Historically, the athletic director also held some type of academic rank. However, this is becoming less common. In most colleges or universities, the athletic director is a full-time administrator rather than a faculty member (Robinson, 2010).

The athletic directors in many 21st century colleges and universities are in an interesting position (Watterson, 2006). This is especially true with regard to larger institutions of learning. While the athletic director is responsible for the coaches, they are usually not as well compensated and are not well known by the public. For example, many successful college coaches have their own radio or television programs. This is rarely true for an athletic director. When dealing with misconduct of coaches, the athletic director can be rendered powerless by powerful connections of the coach. This is especially true when the coach has a long record of winning. On the other hand, when coaches engage in severe misconduct, and it is proved, the athletic director can be held responsible. This makes the athletic director position at a 21st century college or university a precarious position which is often avoided by those who are eligible to be a coach (Mandel, 2007).

There is a tradition in the American south for universities of higher learning, especially those with successful football teams, having a head coach who is also the athletic director (Watterson, 2006). A few of the individuals who have held both the athletic director and head football coach position are Darrell Royal of Texas, John Vaught of Ole Miss, Vince Dooley of Georgia, Shug Jordan of Auburn, Frank Broyles of Arkansas, and Bear Bryant of Alabama. An exception to this is Louisiana State University (LSU), which does not tend to hire head coaches to be the athletic director as well (Sabock & Sabock, 2011).

Even in the institutions where the head coach serving as the athletic director was a usual practice, it was only done nominally (Robinson, 2010). It generally allowed for the

head coach to have additional pay, prestige, and supervision directly by the college president. In most cases, the associate athletics director acts as the athletic director for daily operations and works on the coach's behalf. This has also been true in some institutions in which basketball was the primary sport. In the 21st century, this has become a practice which is largely abandoned. This is because with regard to compliance, sports have become too complicated to have the head coach act as a part-time athletic director. The last head coach who served as an athletic director at a major university was Derek Dooley for Louisiana Tech. This was discontinued during the 2009 season (Sabock & Sabock, 2011).

Career Advancement of Athletic Directors

The transition from coach to athletic director is relevant in the discussion of career advancement of athletic directors because there is some suggestion that effective athletic directors are also effective coaches, underscoring the significance of previous experience in coaching of athletic directors (Sullivan & Kent, 2003). Whisenant, Miller, and Pedersen (2005) reported that in 122 school districts in Texas, 17% required the experience of head coach of a football team in their job postings for athletic directors. According to Whisenant et al., this is an unfair practice, further decreasing the prospect of female applicants to be successful in athletic director positions.

Generally, there is not much literature on the career background of athletic directors. According to Swalls (2004), athletic directors tend to be former coaches, business managers, compliance officers, and fund raisers. What is known is that athletic directors tend to be males, with female administrators still experiencing difficulty in

career advancement (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). This is inconsistent with

the higher success rate of female athletic directors compared to their male counterparts

(Whisenant et al., 2002).

According to Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007), most women are in the mid-level

positions in the intercollegiate athletics departments. Homologous reproduction was cited

as one of the possible reasons for the continued under-representation of women in top

leadership positions. Because the current athletic directors are predominantly males, the

people who are hiring their successors tend to hire applicants of the same gender

(Knoppers & Anthonissen, 2007).

High Performance Teams

Teams in the 21st century, whether they are in corporate America or collegiate

sports, are frequently filled with confusion, turbulence, complexity, and ambiguity

(Vries, 2011). This creates difficulties for human beings who have biological limits to

their information processing and memory. There is too much activity occurring at a rapid

pace and those who were in a leadership role are frequently unable to attend to all the

factors, which are important. In order to accomplish anything, they must simplify the

situation. This is frequently done by interpreting and filtering their experiences according

to cognitive maps these maps are referred to as frames by Bolman and Deal (1991).

These frames are developed through experience and formal education. When the frames

are too simple or not applicable, they can mislead the leader, and team will exhibit poor

performance. If the frames are too complex, they will overwhelm the leader who will be

unable to process the information in an accurate fashion (Peters, 2013).

Complex situations can be understood by using a manageable number of frames (Fretwell & Kiland, 2013). This provides the leader with a method of solving the difficult dilemmas of an organization. Each frame can be conceptualized as a type of window, which gives a view of various spheres of the social situation. Using several frames has advantages. Each of the frames can be powerful, parsimonious, and coherent. They can also work together as a collection which is comprehensive and more inclusive than a singular frame. Multiple frames allow the leader to refrain when necessary. The reframing is an effort which is conscious on the part of the leader and allows them to understand the situation from a variety of viewpoints (Vries, 2011).

When a leader is unable to reframe when necessary, they can become overwhelmed and confused (Peters, 2013). This results in immobilization or making judgments, which are misguided or even reckless. According to Bolman and Deal (1991) there are at least four frames, which are common. These are the frames of the political, human resources, structural, and symbolic. The structural frame places emphasis on policies, planning, efficiency, and rationality. This type of leader will value data and analysis. They focus on providing clear directions and holding their subordinates accountable for the results. They tend to solve organizational problems through developing additional procedures and policies. They may also engage in restructuring (Fretwell & Kiland, 2013).

Another frame of reference is one, which is political (Wheelan, 2010). This emphasizes the conflicts which frequently exist between groups or interests in relation to scarce resources. A political leader will advocate negotiations and spend resources

toward building a base of power, creating coalitions, and networking. They will also attempt to negotiate compromises. Conflict is a type of energy, which can be utilized (Peters, 2013).

The symbolic frame interprets the world as being chaotic and requiring social constructs to have meaning (Vries, 2011). Facts are interpreted in contrast to being objective. The symbolic leader will focus on stories, ceremony, ritual, myth, and a variety of symbolic forms. When there is a problem, they will conceptualize the situation as a new type of story, which can be solved through cherished values (Peters, 2013).

The human-resource frame concentrates on the interaction between organizational and individual needs (Sotiriadou, 2013). This type of leader will value relationships as well as feelings and approach leadership through empowerment and facilitation. When there are problems, they will choose solutions, which involve training and participation (Fretwell & Kiland, 2013).

Each of these frames is significant as they capture an important part of reality (Wheelan, 2010). When one studies high-performing teams in collegiate sports, they will find that each of the frames has contributed to the organization's success. During the 1960s and 1970s, there were a number of articles indicating that successful teams could be understood as having characteristics related to the human side of leadership. These included shared leadership, open communications, clear goals, and an informal atmosphere which was comfortable. During the early 1990s structural as well as human-resource variables were determined to be important factors for group effectiveness (Peters, 2013).

Prior to the work of Bolman and Deal (1991), there were elements missing with regard to successful teamwork (Vries, 2011). Little attention was paid to issues related to conflict and power. Both factors tend to block a group from performing at their highest level. They rarely focus on symbolic elements such as magic, spirit, and flow. These are frequently present in organizations exhibiting extraordinarily high levels of performance. A leader working to help a team achieve the highest levels of performance will often focus on symbolic and political issues. There is generally an over reliance on the human-resource perspective and the structural frame. Focusing on structure and human resources can lead to a superior manager, but not the best type of leader. This leads teams being overly well-managed, but not properly led (Peters, 2013).

One reason that effective leaders are rare is that it often requires using symbolic thought. This type of thinking is complex and subtle (Sotiriadou, 2013). It relies more on artistry and intuition in contrast to linear thinking. This leaves the symbolic frame as being mysterious, inclusive, puzzling, and unfathomable. However, this frame frequently addresses the important issues which are not addressed by other perspectives (Vries, 2011).

There are a number of different factors, which can lead to an exceptional team (Fretwell & Kiland, 2013). One of these is the way in which team members are indoctrinated. The joining of the team must be more than simply making some rational decision. It must be a mutual choice involving some type of ritual. When there is a ritual involved, the team member is entering into a sacred declaration that they will put forth their utmost effort to ensure that the team will succeed (Sotiriadou, 2013).

Another factor which is important to a successful team is diversity (Sotiriadou, 2013). Many times this is institutionalized within the roles of 18. For example, a football team will have a kicker, quarterback, receivers, linemen, and other specific positions. Each of these positions requires a different set of skills. However, the team can only operate at its highest level of efficiency when the team is diverse and contains individuals who are uniquely suited to their particular position (Peters, 2013).

Many highly successful teams are led by someone who commands through example (Fretwell & Kiland, 2013). This type of leader will avoid the traditional elements used for command and control. It is frequently more efficient for a leader to act in a fashion, which provides direction and inspiration. This can be done through their actions, which provide implicit and subtle signals in contrast to explicit guidelines or rules. Leading by example tends to increase a group's cohesiveness and provided with a commonsense of purpose (Wheelan, 2010).

Team can be led to higher levels of performance through the use of stories that lend history in value as well as reinforcing the team identity (Vries, 2011). Many high-performing teams' stories are used to maintain traditions and provide examples of how to behave daily. Group stories can be used to extend as well as reinforce the powerful and subtle influences of leaders. Stories involving creativity, irreverence, and persistence can be especially helpful in encouraging an atmosphere which leads to a higher performing team (Sotiriadou, 2013).

Higher levels of creativity can be created in a team through the use of play and humor, which reduces tensions (Wheelan, 2010). Teams often fall into the habit of

focusing only on the tasks which they are immediately working. There can be the discouragement of unrelated activities. In these cases, seriousness becomes the desired virtue. However, most effective teams balance the level of seriousness with humor and play. A wide variety of groups such as cockpit crews and surgical teams engage in playful banter and joking to encourage higher levels of invention as well as group spirit. The humor tends to release tensions and can resolve issues, which arise daily. This is especially true in teams, which are involved in emergency situations. A perfect example of this is the emergency medical team portrayed in the series M*A*S*H. The team was constantly engaged in humor and play, but operated at a high level of performance. The same is true for collegiate teams operating at the highest levels of performance (Vries, 2011).

Ceremonies and rituals can renew the spirit of a team and reinforce its values (Wheelan, 2010). Ceremonies and rituals serve as expressive activities. They are exceptions to the ordinary day-to-day activities and can be understood as a special type of behavior. The observable and surface activities in these ceremonies and rituals are less important than the underlying the communication. Ceremony and ritual are opportunities for bonding individuals within the team, revitalizing spirits, and reinforcing values (Fretwell & Kiland, 2013).

In many highly successful teams, informal cultural players can make contributions, which are greater than their formal roles (Sotiriadou, 2013). This can be conceptualized as a type of priest. This can be a pastor that is responsible for ministering to the spiritual needs of the group. The team may also have informal spiritual leaders who

accept confession, provide blessings, intercede in important matters, and maintain traditions. There will be a network of informal players who handle human issues, which are outside of formal channels (Wheelan, 2010).

The symbolic frame is a challenge to the traditional approach of building a team through finding the appropriate people and providing them with structure (Sotiriadou, 2013). It also does not involve the negotiation of political agreements. The essence of the highest performing teams is their spirit. One must be careful not to banish myth, ceremony, ritual, and play or teamwork can be destroyed rather than enhanced. The symbolic frame is functional in addition to being expressive. Symbolism provides internal meaning as well as promoting an external confidence and faith (Fretwell & Kiland, 2013).

Each of the frameworks is important for its particular bounded rationality (Sotiriadou, 2013). The structural view focuses on deterministic goals and forces as well as technologies. The human-resource frame pays more attention to and during motives and human needs. The political approach emphasizes scarce resources as well as interests, which are intransigent. Each of these frames is important and valid. The highest for performing teams will address each of them with care (Vries, 2011).

The highest performing teams have leaders who understand that they must focus on team building as a spiritual undertaking (Sotiriadou, 2013). This means their outcomes will be more durable and powerful. This approach serves a deeper meaning and creates a community of believers. This type of team unites through its shared culture and faith. The highest performing teams have discovered their soul and spirit within (Wheelan, 2010).

Effective Leadership Frameworks

Bolman and Deal (2011) identified four effective leadership frameworks: (a) structural framework, (b) human resource framework, (c) political framework, and (d) symbolic framework. Each of these frameworks will be discussed to get an understanding of what constitutes as effective leadership from a more general perspective. These leadership frameworks do not necessarily pertain to school leadership, but the focus on this study will be based on leadership in education institutions.

Structural leadership framework involves leadership style that is focused on analysis and design, similar to what an architect does (Bolman & Deal, 2011). Structural framework is all about implementation, strategy and the environmental context of leadership. One of the core principles of structural framework is the creation of a guideline that would serve as guide for employees to increase productivity and efficiency (Taylor, 2011). In this leadership framework, the individual is examined under the context where they work and interact with other individuals (Bolman & Deal, 2011).

Human resource leadership framework focuses on people, specifically empowering, supporting, and increasing their participation (Bolman & Deal, 2011). The task of leaders also involves matching the needs of employees and the organization as a whole. According to Bolman and Deal, four core principles are central human resource leadership, which include: (a) serve the needs of individuals, (b) the inter-connectedness of organizations and the people who work in them, (c) there needs to be a fit between the environment and the people, and (d) a complimentary organization and workers benefit each other.

Political leadership framework involves leaders who are advocates, and engage in negotiations to achieve a goal (Bolman & Deal, 2011). Moreover, political leadership framework is also concerned about the distribution of power and reconciling the conflicting interests of different interest groups. As noted by Bolman and Deal (2011), the five core assumptions of the political leadership framework include the presence of different groups, the presence of different interest and goals in these various groups, the allocation of scarce resources need to be effectively distributed, possible conflict as a result of the scarcity of budget among different groups, and decisions are made based on bargaining and negotiations among the different interest groups.

Finally, symbolic leadership framework involves leadership wherein leaders act as prophets, who are symbolically the source of inspiration for other people (Bolman & Deal, 2011). They also lead by communicating a vision and symbols through their own personal stories and experiences. According to Bolman and Deal (2011), the creation and interpretation of meaning is significant in order for an even to be symbolic for the workers. Leaders need to be able to communicate and tell stories in order for symbolic leadership to prosper within the organization.

Even though Bolman and Deal (2011) believed that human resource and political frameworks are the most important frameworks in education setting, there seems to be no clear consensus as to what leadership framework is the most effective in education settings (Baete, 2011; Masiki, 2011; Othman, Mujir, & Ibrahim, 2010; Winton & Pollock, 2013). There is argument for applying one framework instead of another. Some of the literature that noted these four leadership frameworks will be discussed.

The political framework seems relevant and effective in leaders in educational institutions. Winton and Pollock (2013) examined the political role of education leaders' preparation programs for leadership. The researchers found that even though preparatory leadership programs do not focus on the political role of leaders, these leaders often engage in political activities once they become leaders. These political activities include negotiating and pursuing the goals of the institution. School leaders can also be symbolic leaders due their influence to the entire school (Bolman & Deal, 2011; Masiki, 2011).

There is a lot of evidence that these four frameworks do not necessarily have to be practiced exclusively (Bolman & Deal, 2011; Willert, 2012). For instance, Othman et al. (2010) found in a study conducted in an academic department in Malaysia that leaders adopt a multi-dimensional framework to leadership. However, they found that in this particular setting of academic leaders, human resource framework was more salient in its usage despite the use of the other three leadership frameworks. Willert (2012) also noted that leadership among school superintendents applies different frameworks to be effective in their job.

Baete (2011) also demonstrated the need for a combination of different leadership frameworks in education. The researcher noted the importance of communicating with the parents, teachers, and the different stakeholders, emphasizing the importance of the human resource framework. However, Baete also argued that school culture should not be ignored, because school culture also plays a role in the leadership of school leaders. The importance of school culture among school leaders underscored the need for structural framework in leadership.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of some of the key constructs and leadership theories from previous studies that are relevant to the proposed research into athletic director leadership. The factors related to NCAA success were discussed along with leadership in general, Path-Goal Theory and the theoretical framework for the study. The next chapter will provide a detailed discussion of the methodology that will be used to undertake the quantitative proposed study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of this research was to investigate whether or not there was congruence in the leadership orientations of athletic directors and successful coaches in intercollegiate athletic departments experiencing broad program success. Gaining insight into the differences in the leadership styles of successful practitioners of these two occupations will enable a better understanding of the distinctive role of athletics directors and coaches in the contemporary world of intercollegiate sports.

In congruence with this purpose, athletic departments of the top 15 finalists for the 2012-13 Learfield Sports Directors' Cup award at the NCAA Division I level were chosen for the study. This award gives honor to the institution that has been most successful in maintaining a broad-based program, as demonstrated by success and achievements in a variety of men's and women's sports (Learfield Sports, 2013). In competition for the award, each institution is awarded points based on its winning percentage in a pre-determined number of core and wild card sports.

The primary theoretical consideration addressed by the study is based on Bolman and Deal's (1991, 2011) "multiple frame" approach to management and leadership in organizations. In their approach, Bolman and Deal (1991, 2011) recognized that leaders' frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) help them to better manage and, if needed, change organizations. In this study, the primary focus was to determine congruence of Bolman and Deal's (2011) four frames in athletic director and core head coach's leadership perceptions.

As indicated in Chapter 2, although there is debate regarding the theoretical and methodological approach to the study of climate and culture, there appears to be an agreement that leadership in organizations influences both. In addition, Poropat (2010) recognized that shared perceptions of the work environment (climate) may uncover information regarding the underlying assumptions shared by members of an organization (culture).

Based on the theoretical consideration for this literature, the present study sets forth the uncovering of clues regarding leadership orientation and the cultural "frames" of collegiate athletic departments that are broadly successful. The methodology employed the use of surveys to gain insight into shared perceptions of leadership orientation regarding the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames recognized by Bolman and Deal (2011). This chapter describes the methods by which these components of organizational behavior in select collegiate athletic departments were studied.

Research Design

For this research, a quantitative non-experimental design was used. As stated by Mustafa (2011), quantitative methods employ objective measurement and statistical analysis of numeric data to investigate differences between groups and both causal and non-causal interactions between variables. Consequently, a quantitative method is suitable for this research for the following reasons: data was collected in a quantified form, and a probabilistic determination of the validity of the null hypothesis is desired.

Quantitative designs are used to support theory and are considered to be a reasonable and unbiased method, while qualitative studies are inductive and subjective by

nature (Zikmund, Babin, Carr, & Griffin, 2010). Subsequently, speculation arrives at a specific results based on broad views. Deduction is in some sense the submission of information to form new knowledge as when observations are observed that correspond with the predicted results. In contrast, inductive reasoning takes events and makes generalizations (Sternberg, 2009). Inductive reasoning starts with observations and patterns and progresses toward the development of a theory (Steinberg, 2008). With the understanding that the hypotheses were generated from theory, a deductive or quantitative approach is appropriate for the research conducted in this study.

The procedures used for the collection and analysis of data in this study are described in the following sections. These sections include a description of the population and sample, procedures used for data collection, Leadership Orientation Survey explanation, instrumentation, design, and data analysis.

Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of members of the NCAA Division I collegiate athletic departments that were the Top 15 finalists for the 2012-13 Learfield Directors' Cup award. The Top 15 finalists were selected based on the access and availability to potential respondents. Sample respondents for the study were athletic directors and core sport program head coaches within these organizations. Head coaches, at institutions included in the study, were only those who were actively coaching core sport teams eligible for Learfield Directors' Cup completion during the 2012-2013 academic year. According to the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, the core sports are football and baseball for men, volleyball and softball for

women, and basketball, soccer, cross country, track and field, swimming, golf, and tennis
for both men and women.

The total number of head coaches that received questionnaires numbered 270. The
total number of athletic directors that received questionnaires numbered 15.

Names of athletic directors and coaches were obtained from each school's athletic
website. Current addresses were confirmed by telephone calls to the athletic office of
each institution included in the study.

Procedure for Data Collection

The online survey service, SurveyMonkey, was used to collect the quantitative
data, which was accomplished by creating a SurveyMonkey account and following the
instructions to develop the survey using an online database. The Leadership Orientation
Survey used for this study were delivered electronically through a link that was sent in an
e-mail to the athletic directors and core head coaches. Additionally, an informed consent
letter was attached that asked for the athletic director's and core head coaches permission
to participate in the research. The use of an online delivery for gathering data for research
purposes, especially when administering a survey, was beneficial for a number of
reasons. O'Neill (2004), stated there are several benefits to conducting data collection via
the web. Online surveys are easily delivered and can reach desired recipients with near
certainty. Further, the intended recipients from other parts of the country can be reached
with the implementation of this form of survey.

Additionally, it has been observed online surveys minimize interviewer bias
(O'Neill, 2004). When conducting a survey in person, the presence of a researcher has

the potential to adversely affect the answers of the interviewee. Conducting a survey via the web can eliminate any effect the interview may have. Also, collecting data through SurveyMonkey and other web services cost less in general (O Neill, 2004). Because e-mails are delivered at no expense, any associated costs were mitigated in conducting the survey. Also, all of the intended subjects were given a copy of the questionnaires. Finally, conducting studies online reduced the response time. Research has shown that e-mail responses were collected more quickly than using the postal service (O'Neill, 2004).

The link to the Leadership Orientations survey was emailed to potential respondents with cover letter and email that informed the participant as to the nature of the research that was being conducted. Attached in the email and delivered via the postal service was an informed consent for participating in the research. This ensured everyone who pursued completing the study agreed to participate given the explanation and detail that was in the informed consent letter. There were no time limits for completing the survey; therefore, completion of the survey was dependent on the pace of the respondent. The expected time to complete the survey was 15 minutes. As for the entire data collection process using the survey, to complete all the data requirements in terms of number of respondents, spanned for nearly 40 days.

Additionally, a preview letter was sent to each athletic director and head coach explaining the nature and need for the study. In addition, the cover letter reemphasized the purpose and usefulness of the study, as well as assure anonymity to the athletic directors and core head coaches as respondent well as their universities.

Anonymity was achieved by assigning a random number, known only to the researcher, to each university, athletic director and core head coach. Respondents were notified of the system in the cover letter that accompanied the email that contained the survey access hyperlink.

Instrumentation

The survey consisted of a set of demographic questions, including participants' gender and ethnicity, and the Bolman and Deal (2011) Leadership Orientations Survey, which is described below.

Leadership Orientation Survey

The Leadership Orientation Survey was developed by Bolman and Deal (Cunningham, 1999). The instrument was designed to measure the perceived use of four leadership frames by organizational administrators or managers. These frames are: (a) structural, (b) human resource, (c) political, and (d) symbolic. The instrument contains three sections: Section 1 consists of 32 rating scale items; Section 2 consists of 6 ipsative ranking items; and Section 3 consists of 2 overall effectiveness self-rating items. Only Section 2 was used in this study. It should be noted that the four elements of the Leadership Orientation scale all exceed the .70 threshold generally accepted for scale reliability. Table 2 reports the reliability of the scale scores produced by the 6 items in this section, as reported by one of the instrument's authors (viz., Lee Bolman) on a web page entitled, "Research using Leadership Orientations Survey Instrument" (Bolman, 2014).

Table 1

Reliability Measures for the Four Scale Scores Produced by Section II of the Leadership

Orientation Survey

Frame scale	Number of observations	Split half correlation	Spearman brown coefficient	Guttman (Rulon) coefficient	Coefficient alpha (all items)
Structural	1229	.644	.783	.780	.841
Human resources	1233	.755	.861	.856	.843
Political	1218	.708	.829	.824	.799
Symbolic	1221	.825	.904	.892	.842

Data Analysis

The collected data was downloaded from the Survey Monkey website and was imported into the SPSS statistical analysis system for both ease of data storage and management and subsequent analyses. Completed surveys were obtained from 13 Athletic Directors and 141 head coaches.

Each of the study's four hypotheses posit a difference between Athletic Directors and Head Coaches in this exemplary group of university athletic programs on one of the four Leadership Orientation frames. Accordingly, the method of analysis was the application of the *t-* test for the significance of the difference between the means of two independent groups. The data was analyzed for its conformance to the two basic assumption of this t-test: normality of the distributions of the data and homogeneity of variance between the two groups. Although the homogeneity of variance was satisfied, the normality assumption was violated. Consequently, bootstrapping was used to

empirically estimate the standard error of the difference between the two groups on each of the Leadership Orientation Frame scores.

Ethical Considerations

The use of humans in experiments in all fields of study, including intercollegiate athletics, imposes important responsibilities on the researcher to comply with relevant ethical principles (Shapiro, 2001). Respecting the rights and views of all participants with the use of language that does not discriminate is one of the ethical and moral considerations that must be observed and followed in conducting research of this nature. Approval was sought and approved by the Middle Tennessee State University Internal Review Board (IRB).

Confidentiality Concerns

The researcher ensured the anonymity of participants by removing identifying information regarding the respondents from their survey responses. Any identifying information was replaced by a subject number code, the association of which with subjects' identities was destroyed after data entry. Results of the analyses of data gathered from the respondents will be reported only in aggregate for the two groups being compared in this study (i.e., athletic directors and head coaches). Data that was collected will be kept for five years following the completion of the research at which point they will be destroyed.

Informed Consent

An informed consent form was included in the invitation email message that also conveyed the hyperlink to the electronic survey. This form explained the purpose of the

study and the means by which data would be collected. It provided assurance that the

participants' anonymity would be protected during the survey and in all uses of the data

collected. Finally, the form assured the participant that should he/she feel any

uncomfortable in answering any part of the survey, he/she was free to refuse to answer or

to quit answering the survey altogether.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The following information indicated the perceptions of respondent's leadership orientation in the four frames identified by Bolman and Deal (2011). Self-perceptions of athletic directors and head core coaches respondents were examined and compared. It is important to note that Bolman and Deal's frames are not mutually exclusive, so to that the degree to which one perceived a leadership orientation behavior could have been high in all four frames.

The final sample of respondents numbered 154 of which 13 were athletic directors and 141 were head coaches. The sample characteristics that were measured on categorical scales are summarized in Table 2, below.

Table 2

Frequency Distributions of Sample Characteristics Measured on Categorical Scales

Characteristic	Level	Athletic directors		Head coaches		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender	Male	13	100.00	76	53.90	89	57.79
	Female	0	0.00	65	46.10	65	42.21
Ethnicity	White	12	85.71	118	82.52	130	82.80
	African-American	1	7.14	10	6.99	11	7.01
	Hispanic	1	7.14	5	3.50	6	3.82
	No response	0	0.00	10	6.99	10	6.37

Note. The average number of years of experience in one's profession was 17.6 for athletic directors and 14.2 for head coaches.

The descriptive statistics for the four Bolman and Deal (1991) Leadership

Orientation frame scales, which constituted this study's dependent variables, are

presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation Frame Scales

Leadership orientation	Position	*N*	*M*	*SD*
Structural	Athletic directors	13	2.96	.582
	Coaches	141	2.75	.561
Human resources	Athletic directors	13	2.90	.747
	Coaches	141	3.30	.580
Political	Athletic directors	13	2.24	.676
	Coaches	141	1.81	.536
Symbolic	Athletic directors	13	1.90	.459
	Coaches	141	2.15	.468

The study encompassed 4 null hypotheses regarding the differences between

athletic directors and head coaches on the four Leadership Orientation scales. The tests of

these hypotheses were 2-tailed since there were no a prior expectations as to the

directions of the differences between the two occupational groups. Alpha was set at .05.

The distributions of the 4 scale scores were evaluated for normality within each of

the two occupational groups. For the athletic directors the distributions of all four scales

exhibited significant departures from normality as indicated by the Shapiro-Wilk test.

Given the small size of the sample of this group, it is not unusual for such non-normality

to be found. The Shapiro Wilk test is used as a method for determining normality

(Meyers & Gamst, 2013). The normality tests can indicate if the data set approaches a

normal distribution. This is necessary in order to determine the likelihood of random

variables, which make up the data set falling into a normal bell-shaped distribution.

These types of tests, including the Shapiro Wilk test, are considered as a type of model

selection. It is important for many types of statistics for the sample set to be normally

distributed (Warner, 2008).

According to probability theory, the normal distribution occurs frequently (Huck,

2012). It consists of a continuous probability distribution. This is sometimes referred to

as a Gaussian distribution. It is a function which explains the probability that an

observation will be between a set of two real numbers. The normal distribution is

sometimes referred to as the bell-shaped curve as it can be plotted on an X and Y axis.

When this is done, and the X axis indicates the number of observations and the y-axis is

the quantity of the observation. The curve will resemble the shape of a bell. That is, the

most frequent observations occur toward the middle, and fewer on the extreme low and

high portions (Huck, 2012).

The normal distribution is useful according to the Central Limit Theorem

(Warner, 2008). According to this theory, the average of a group of random variables

which have been independently chosen will be distributed in the form of a bell-shaped

curve when plotted on x and y-axis. This distribution is found in a wide range of

circumstances and situations. An example is the intelligence quotient. The greatest

number of people will fall in the center of the curve representing this statistic at an IQ of

100. As one moves to the upper and lower limits of IQ, there are fewer individuals (Meyers & Gamst, 2013).

Bootstrapping was consequently used to obtain empirical estimates of the standard errors of differences for use in assessing the significance of differences between the groups on the four scales. Note that the use of the Levene test to assess the homogeneity of variance assumption indicated that the variances of the two groups did not differ significantly on any of the four scales, thereby satisfying this assumption.

Bootstrapping is a statistical method for assigning measurements of accuracy to a sample (Warner, 2008). This accuracy can be defined in terms of prediction errors, confidence intervals, variance, or bias. This technique can be used to estimate the sampling distribution of many types of statistics using relatively simple methods. Bootstrapping falls into the category of a resampling method (Huck, 2012).

Bootstrapping involves the estimation of properties for a specific type of estimator (Warner, 2008). These estimators can be of many types, including variance. The measurement of these properties can be useful for determining how accurately the sample is being represented by the statistic being used. One of the more popular approaches for approximating a distribution is to use an empirical distribution for the observed data. If a set of observations is assumed to have been taken from in identically distributed in independent population, the process can be accomplished through construction of multiple re-samples for the observed data set. Each of these should be obtained through random sampling with replacement taken from an original data set. The bootstrapping is useful when constructing tests of hypotheses. It is sometimes used as a

type of alternative to inferences, which are reliant on parametric assumptions. This can be important when there is a question regarding parametric techniques being appropriate (Meyers & Gamst, 2013).

One of the major advantages of bootstrapping is its relative simplicity (Huck, 2012). It is an effective method for estimating conference intervals as well as standard errors even for complex parameters and estimators.

Levine's test is a type of inferential statistic, which enables assessment regarding the quality of variances in two groups or more (Huck, 2012). There are a number of statistical procedures, which are commonly used that assume that the variances of populations from which samples have been drawn are equivalent. Levine's test can be used to determine if this assumption is correct. Essentially, Levine's test addresses the null hypothesis that population differences in the sample variances are not likely to have occurred according to random sampling involving populations with equal variances. This means that the null hypothesis of equal variances can be rejected using the Levine's hypothesis. Therefore, it can be concluded that the variances between the populations were different. Levine's test is especially helpful for statistical procedures which require homoscedasticity (Warner, 2008).

Homoscedasticity refers to a sequence of random variables having finite variances, which are the same. This is also referred to as homogeneity of variance (Huck, 2012). When the variances are different, it can be said that the variables exhibit heteroscedasticity. When homoscedasticity is present, many of the statistical computations are simplified. When the assumption homoscedasticity is seriously

violated, there can be inaccurate estimation regarding the goodness of fit when using the Pearson coefficient. The goodness of fit will be overestimated in this case (Warner, 2008).

It should be noted that Levine's test is similar to the Brown-Forsythe test. However, the Brown Forsythe test makes use of the median rather than the mean which is used in Levine's test. Levine's test was chosen for this analysis due to its higher level of statistical power (Huck, 2012).

Table 4

Differences on Leadership Orientation Scales Between Athletic Directors and Head Coaches Assessed for Significance Using Bootstrapped Standard Errors

Leadership orientation scale	Mean difference (ADs – Coaches)	*SE*	Sig. (2-tailed)
Structural	.216	.172	.206
Human resources	−.404	.215	.049
Political	.436	.192	.015
Symbolic	−.248	.132	.052

The results indicate that null hypotheses 2 and 3 are rejected. Athletic directors have significantly lower means on the Human Resources scale, and significantly higher means on the Political scale. The means of the two groups on the Structural and Symbolic scales did not differ significantly, thereby failing to justify the rejection of null hypotheses 1 and 4.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The most efficacious leaders are those who understand the needs and

qualifications of the individuals and the team that they are leading. In other words, a

leader cannot be effective if he or she does not identify with the individual nature of those

that they lead in comparison to the entirety of the team environment. A truly effective

leader, then, is one that takes time to focus on the needs of the individual and the needs of

the group as a whole. At the same time, leadership is not something that one assumes

without the comprehension that a group needs the actions and valuations of the leader.

An athletic director or coach cannot perform the duties required by his job without

understanding the primary principle required in the process itself. With that said, as the

primary assumption for this project was to ascertain and compare the styles of leadership

utilized by successful athletic directors and coaches in that gaining insight into the varied

leadership styles of the most successful leaders in the industry will allow for a more

comprehensive definition for the distinctive roles that athletic directors play in the

contemporary world of intercollegiate sports.

Additionally, the focus of this study was to utilize a quantitative methodology to

perform a non-experimental design for the purpose of applying real-world results to the

primary assumptions and research questions. Data was collected on core head coaches

and athletic directors at NCAA Division 1 universities (which met the previously

indicated criteria of being highly successful in athletics). The study was intended to

address the following: To what extent is there congruence between the leadership

orientations of athletic directors and head coaches at universities which have

intercollegiate sports programs that are recognized as successful?

The research question is systemic in that it provides a solid and foundational

approach to the study of leadership and performance success. In other words, by

reviewing behaviors of successful coaches with highly successful teams within a specific

period of time, a direct correlation can be made as to the nature of leadership and its

impact on team performance. At the same time, though this study demonstrated positive

results, it must be noted that negative results could have been found using the same

methodology. For instance, reviewing the worst rated teams in the same intercollegiate

sport could have yielded situations in which team behavior was influenced by the

negative leadership orientation choices made by the coach, and further, would have

demonstrated valuations of loss and disadvantage promoted by poor leadership

frameworks.

Further, establishing a systemic congruence between leadership orientations and

preferences of head coaches and the success rates of their intercollegiate sports programs

allowed for a direct identification of leadership styles to performance valuations.

Assertions for this valuation were made based upon available data, performing analyses

of available data, and making assumptions based upon the results of the data collection

process. More, leadership orientations were conceptualized utilizing Bolman and Deal's

(1998) four leadership frames, concerning, 1) structural, 2) human resources, 3) political,

and 4) symbolic measures of leadership.

The existence of the four hypotheses was geared towards determining whether the leadership skills employed by NCAAs Division I core coaches and athletic directors differed significantly. All these hypothesis ware tested using a two tailed test based on 5% level of significance. The results obtained compared the leadership orientation of these core coaches and directors based on the four frame of leadership, which entails structural element, political elements, symbolic element, and the human resource factor. The quantitative results obtained from the survey showed that the tabulated value based on the t-tests of the orientation scales for structural, human resource, and political factors were less than 0.05 (5%) level of significance. However, the tabulated value for symbolic factor was greater than the tabulated value. The results with tabulated values that are less than the level of significance indicate that the null hypotheses should be rejected because the results lacks statistically significant statistical evidence to support the null hypothesis.

Therefore, the null hypothesis for the human resource and political orientation scales are rejected based on the tabulated results. However, a conclusive decision is based on the difference of means results. Therefore, the conclusion based on the tabulated t-value provides the hypotheses that are most likely to be rejected. The null hypothesis for the structural and symbolic orientation scale is not rejected. This is because there is significant statistical evidence indicating no difference between athletic directors and head coaches at universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these groups characterize their leadership orientation as structural and symbolic.

Based on the results on the differences in means, the statistical evidence is consistent with the evidence-based on the tabulated t-value. As such, the high differences

obtained in the means on human resource scale and political scales results in the rejection

of the second and third hypotheses. The rejection of these hypotheses results in the

conclusion a significant difference exists between athletic directors and head coaches at

universities with successful intercollegiate sports programs in the degree to which these

groups characterize their leadership orientation as symbolic and human resources.

However, the lack of significance difference between the first and the fourth means

indicates that the first and fourth null hypotheses should not be rejected (Yusof & Mohd

Shah, 2008). These results override the first conclusion of rejecting the first hypothesis

because of the presence of evidence to fail to reject the hypothesis in questions. As such,

it is evident that the presence of significant evidence outweighs the lack of evidence with

regard to drawing statistical conclusions.

Findings show that a core value of the leadership skill lies in the ability of both

coaches and athletic directors in collegiate athletics to formulate and implement an

effective framework in terms of guideline, strategy, and expectation for efficiency and

productivity. In addition, it also indicates that the result-oriented coaches and athletic

directors possess leadership orientations that reflect the prophetic element of leaders in

terms of linking expected outcome to a set of guidelines and strategies through symbolic

and inspirational approach (Barringer, 2002). As such, the results obtained from this

study show that the leadership orientation of NCAA's Division 1 athletic directors and

core coaches for the 2012-2013 Learfield Directors Cup Finalists was similar in some

ways and differed in others. However, it is evident that these leadership orientations were

similar in structural and symbolic scales. Therefore, such leaders should possess the

ability to communicate effectively and enable the team to perceive the intended value through a range of personal motivational stories and experiences that change the mindset of the team to an optimistic and dedicated state due to their perceived reality of the expected result (Yusof & Mohd Shah, 2008).

As such, these findings show that collegiate athletics core coaches and athletic directors' leadership and orientations are similar to a significant extent. This is because findings show that both collegiate athletics coaches and directors use similar structural and symbolic principles in their strategic moves towards their desired outcome. Additionally, the similarity under the structural scale is consistent with the provisions of the Path-Goal theory, which requires the leader to establish the applicable structure in terms of what should be done, the timescale, and the expected benefits, and lay down a specific path to be followed in order to obtain the desired result (Barringer, 2002). As a result, it necessitates the leader to be able to link events and their outcomes such that it creates a precise image of what happens when a given practice and approach is adopted. As a result, the research obtains outcomes that are consistent with the findings obtained from the literature that shows that visionary aspect of the leader and is the primary aspect of leadership (Barringer, 2002). This is reflected by the ability of the leader to influence and motivate the team in a manner that directs their behaviors and the achievement of a mutual goal.

Leadership orientations for core coaches and directors in collegiate athletics require them to understand themselves and their team in a manner that maximizes their capabilities. As such, the findings from the literature in this study show that, in the case

where athletic directors and core coaches in collegiate athletics seek to define their leadership orientation the adopted technique must reflect the core values of the team (Kihl et al., 2010). Therefore, the nature of behavior that they adopt be it the initiation of structure behavior or the behavior based on personal relationship establishment, must be based on an in-depth knowledge of his team, their needs, strengths, and his strengths and weaknesses(Barringer, 2002).

The findings show that the leadership orientation of athletic directors and head coaches at universities, which have intercollegiate sports programs that are recognized as successful, differs significantly in terms of human resource scale, and political scale. These findings do not imply that these two factors are less significant than the symbolic and structural scales of leadership orientation. However, the findings imply that successful collegiate athletics directors and coaches apply these factors differently. The findings in the literature show that the political element of a leader is vital in ensuring optimal performance of the team in the case where there exists a conflict of interest (Yusof & Mohd Shah, 2008). Even though, athletic team is usually defined by a mutual goal of attaining victory, other factors such as team leadership positions may cause division among members. The division of team members destroys the essence of the team, which is founded on the value of teamwork and collaborative effort. Hence, the athletic directors and core coaches apply political structure in their leadership roles in order to ensure that the team remains focus and works under optimal conditions.

Additionally, the findings show that the political structure is a suitable for leaders in the academic institution as it facilitates negotiation, and motivation for pursuing

desired goals based on logical argument based on cause-effect kind of reasoning for obtaining group and personal benefits that is appealing to the entire team. However, the difference in the political scale of leadership orientation between coaches and directors could be attributed to the claim that coaches and athletic directors are faced by dissimilar challenges and need for the application of political leadership skills, in addition, the political scale is problem specific and is bound to vary from one group to another. On the other hand, researchers assert that the political factor must go hand in hand with symbolic element of leadership in order to obtain a state of balance and effectively impact the team into adopting desired practices, which are in accordance to the strategic leadership plan of both coaches and directors (Barringer, 2002)..

These findings show that the leadership orientation of coaches and athletic directors are based on the structural and symbolic aspects, which are performed in a manner that indicates a statistically significant level of similarity. In this case, the symbolic scale is forms the basis for the leadership value in the part of both athletic directors and coaches. This is because the symbolic form of thought bases its value on intuition as opposed to linear form of thought that creates a state of understanding and mutual respect among team members. In addition, findings based on a review of the literature show that focusing on the structure as well as the human resource elements in leadership establishes effective managers but causes detrimental impact on leadership skills (Yusof & Mohd Shah, 2008).

The human resources aspect is of equal significance among directors and core coaches at universities, which have intercollegiate sports programs that are recognized as

successful. Nonetheless, the findings indicate no statistical significant level of similarity in the manner in which coaches and athletic directors implement the human resources leadership framework in their leadership roles. Even though, Learfield Directors Cup finalists' athletics directors and core coaches practice human resources aspect of their leadership framework differently, they acknowledge the value of human resource in increasing participation of members, empowering the team and supporting the objective of the team through merging the needs and interests of team members with that of the institution. As such, the difference in the role of coaches and athletic director causes a significant difference in the manner in which they implement their human resources leadership orientation in leading, managing, and working with their teams (Kight, 2007).

The results that examine leadership orientations of Learfield Directors Cup finalists' athletics directors and coaches show that these coaches and athletic directors implemented effective leadership framework. These coaches and athletic directors implement a leadership strategy that constitute of several leadership frameworks and skills that address the needs of the team members, and the interests of the institution. These results are supported by the findings if the study conducted by Kihl et al. (2010) which affirms that effective leaders apply multi-dimensional leadership structure. It cannot be gainsaid that NCAAs Division I athletic directors and core coaches for the 2012-2013 Learfield Directors Cup finalists are effective leaders, since the evidence of their effectiveness is reflected by the outstanding athletic performance of their teams. As such, these leaders must implement the specification of the human resource, orientation, structural leadership orientation, political, and most of all symbolic orientation in

performing their roles in order to attain and maintain exceptional performance (Kihl et al., 2010). This is because, various researchers assert on the values of all these four frameworks in the creation of optimal leadership orientation, and assert that these frameworks cannot work effectively in isolation (Kight, 2007).

In more than one case, the collegiate athletics directors and coaches use similar leadership skills and strategies that are geared towards the attainment of best results. These results show that significance of leadership orientation and skills practiced by NCAAs Division I athletic directors and core coaches for the 2012-2013 Learfield Directors Cup finalists' lays in their ability to establish an effective communication network. This is because all leadership frameworks inclusive of political, symbolic, human resource and structural orientation rely on the manner in which the leader communicates with his team and the form of information that he conveys (Barringer, 2002). As such, NCAAs Division I athletic directors and core coaches for the 2012-2013 Learfield Directors Cup finalists have established a communications network that facilitates information sharing processes through the creation of a neutral ground in which all members can share their opinions, and concerns without the fear of prejudice. The team-building strategy is the ultimate leadership strategy practiced by NCAAs Division I athletic directors and core coaches for the 2012-2013 Learfield Directors Cup finalists as it enables the team to work together as a single entity towards their set goal.

However, the findings from the survey and the review of the extant literature fail to capture the significance of emotional intelligence in the establishment of an effective leadership framework. Emotional intelligence is the heart of leadership skills; it is

founded on the knowledge of the leader to manage emotions of their entire team and his

own and controls the emotions in such a way that channels all emotional energy towards

the achievement of the desired outcome (Kihl et al., 2010). As a result, all forms of

leaders, be it transformational leader, the transactional leader, charismatic, as well as the

implementation of servant leadership ideas are rooted in the theory of emotional

intelligence. These ideas emphasize on the importance of self-efficacy in terms of self-

confidence and self-determination, interpersonal skills, motivation, and inspirational

elements of a leader.

As a result, the leadership orientation of NCAAs Division I athletic directors and

core coaches for the 2012-2013 Learfield Directors Cup finalists should reflect the

interpersonal skills, self-efficacy, and the ability to motivate and influence the team

(Barringer, 2002). While it can be argued that these aspects are somehow reflected in the

four scales of the fore-mentioned leadership frameworks, the value of emotional

intelligence can only be reflected through direct analysis of these factors since they hold a

central position in the definition, and understanding of leadership concepts.

Conclusion

The study indicates that there is no difference in the structural leadership

orientation as manifested by athletic directors and head coaches of colleges with

intercollegiate sports programs. Whereas athletic directors are regarded as the formal

leaders in intercollegiate sports programs, with much impact on the planning and running

of these sports programs, head coaches are regarded as integral parts of the leadership

due to the impact they can have in policy formulation. Athletic directors and core coaches

engage in a similar leadership orientation as far as the structural framework of leadership

is concerned (Yusof & Mohd Shah, 2008). Results indicate that the structural leadership

is concerned with the design of athletics and deals with implementation, strategizing and

employing the environmental leadership context. Both athletic directors and core coaches

of athletics in universities, which compete in collegiate sports program, have a high

regard for establishing guidelines that increase the efficiency, as well as productivity of

employees. However, the research indicates that athletic directors deal with the formation

of structural framework at a higher level that core coaches, which are mainly involved in

structural formations that affect the players and other employees closely related to the

actual sports participation.

A critical examination of the leadership orientation in the human resources

framework indicates that core coaches have better leadership orientation in the human

resources department as compared to athletic directors. This could be a result of the close

association that core coaches have with the athletes and other active members of the team

as compared to athletic directors who are involved in planning and organizing stages.

Since sports is an emotional sector, core coaches have to deal with emotions and

streamline them with performance; hence making them good in human resource

management as compared to athletic directors who are mostly superficial as far as

emotional orientation is concerned (Yusof & Mohd Shah, 2008).

However, athletic directors of intercollegiate sports programs show a superior

leadership orientation in the political framework as compared to coaches. Most political

functions such as acting as advocates and negotiating for deals aimed at achieving goals

are conducted by athletic directors. They usually represent the face of the university

sports. On the other hand, core coaches are not actively represented on the political front

of organizational leadership. Since most of the times coaches are in the spotlight, a good

management of political leadership could be beneficial for the university, as poor

leadership orientation in the political frame could lead to poor policy formation and

reputation. While this role may be seen as a superficial one, it has important components

such as the balancing of power, which ensure smooth operations and that the interests of

different groups are addressed.

The symbolic leadership orientation indicates a strong congruence between the

leadership portrayed by athletic directors and core coaches of university teams

participating in intercollegiate sports programs. Both athletic directors and core coaches

provide the necessary inspiration to other stakeholders (Kihl et al., 2010). The leadership

orientation is demonstrated through sharing experiences and stories, which improve the

communication of the goals, vision and other symbols, which the leaders need to pass

across. Therefore, as much as some leadership orientations are inclined to either coaches

or athletic directors, the successful leadership of universities participating in

intercollegiate sports programs requires a consolidating of all leadership orientations by

both core coaches and athletic directors.

Recommendations

Recommendations based upon the conclusions are defined by the nature of the

study and the limitations provided by the study itself. It would be of great advantage to

continue to add to the body of literature on the success factors of intercollegiate athletic

directors and coaches by identifying:

1. Factors of leadership orientations in teams and athletic departments that
   are not Learfield Cup finalists at the NCAA I level, but are finalists at the
   NCAA Division II, III and NAIA levels.

2. Factors of failure in athletic departments and teams to include: university
   oversight, coaching behaviors, athlete behaviors, incidents, factors that led
   to direct failure, or variables that would introduce success but the team
   was overcome by skill or talent on the field.

Taking these into account, genuine leadership valuations could be made to

interpret success factors defined by the athletic department itself, success factors defined

by the socioeconomic natures of the team dynamic, and success factors limited to the

coach. In other words, though the leadership orientations of the most successful athletic

departments and team was the focus of this discussion, it cannot be proven as an exacting

measure for guaranteed success. And though athletic directors and core coaches can make

framework implementations, their success cannot be granted due to a change of

leadership alone. The data suggests that they will have a greater chance at success, but it

cannot be absolutely or definitively guaranteed.

REFERENCES

Australian Associated Press. (2012, May 25). Essendon's James Hird plays down Kevin Sheedy showdown. *The Australian.* Retrieved from http://www.theaustralian .com.au/sport/essendons-james-hird-plays-down-kevin-sheedy-showdown/story-e6frg7mf-1226366808160

Ashton-Lawson, H. (2010, April 30). James Hird's words to motivate bombers: Jobe Watson. *Herald Sun.* Retrieved from http://www.heraldsun.com.au/sport/afl /james-hirds-words-to-motivate-bombers-jobe-watson/story-e6frf9jf-1225860736303

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership: Cases on transactional and transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 421–449. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621

Baruch, Y. (1998). Leadership: Is that what we study? *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *5*(1), 100–124. doi:10.1177/107179199800500110

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*(2), 130–139. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.52.2.130

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. Chemers and R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bayar, A., & Kerns, J. H. (2012). Leadership: Theory and practice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *50*(3), 380–383. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/products/journals/journals.htm?id=jea

Bolman, L. G. (n.d.). *Research using leadership orientations survey instrument*. Retrieved from http://www.leebolman.com/orientations.htm.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, *30*(4), 509–534. doi:10.1002/hrm.3930300406

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2011). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ciulla, J. B. (1998). *Ethics: The heart of leadership*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Clark, J. (2012, May 25). Essendon coach James Hird backs mid-year draft. *Herald Sun.* Retrieved from http://www.heraldsun.com.au/sport/afl/essendon-coach-james-hird-backs-mid-year-draft/story-e6frf9jf-1226366627739

Clotfelter, C. T. (2011). *Bigtime sports in American universities*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Day, D. V., Halpin, S. M., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2004). *Leader development for transforming organizations: Growing leaders for tomorrow*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Estrop, C. V. (2012, June 8). Essendon coach James Hird welcomes test against Sydney Swans. *Couriermail.* Retrieved from http://www.couriermail.com.au/sport/afl/essendon-coach-james-hird-welcomes-test-against-sydney-swans/story-e6frepf6-1226389238680#

Evans, M. G. (1970). The effects of leadery behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *5*, 279–282. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/00305073

Fairholm, G. W. (1998). *Perspectives on leadership: From the science of management to its spiritual heart.* Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Fretwell, P., & Kiland, T. B. (2013). *Lessons from the Hanoi Hilton six characteristics of high performance teams*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

Frank, R. (2004). Challenging the Myth: A Review of the Links Among College Athletic Success, Student Quality, and Donations. *Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics*. Prepared May, 2004.

Gellis, Z. D. (2001). Social work perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership in health care. *Social Work Research*, *25*(1), 17–25. doi:10.1093/swr/25.1.17

Gill, R., Levine, N., & Pitt, D. C. (1998). Leadership and organizations for the new millennium. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *5*(4), 46–59. doi:10.1177/107179199900500405

Goleman, D., Welch, S., & Welch, J. (2004, January). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from http://hbr.org/2004/01/what-makes-a-leader

Harrison, L., Li, W., Solmon, M. (2004). College students' implicit theories of ability in sports: Race and gender differences. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *27*(3), 291–305. Retrieved from http://www.southalabama.edu/psychology/journal.html

Heilbrunn, J. (1994, Spring). Can leadership be studied? *The Wilson Quarterly*, *18*(2), 65–68. Retrieved from http://www.wilsonquarterly.com

Herrnstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Horan, M. (2011, June 9). Nathan Buckley and James Hird among AFL Hall of Fame stars. *Herald Sun.* Retrieved from http://www.heraldsun.com.au/sport/afl/afl-hall -of-fame/story-fn8wskg9-1226072664536

House, R. J. (1988). Power and personality in complex organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *10*, 305–357.

Huck, S. W. (2012). *Reading statistics and research* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Hyun-Duck, K., Seok-Won Ham, S., Sun-Yoong, K., & LaVetter, D. (2011). The leadership traits of directors at the intercollegiate athletic programs including "Collegiate Golf Teams." *Korean Society of Golf Studies*, *5*(1), 27–38. Retrieved from http://www.koreasociety.org

Learfield Sports. (2013). *About*. Retrieved from http://thedirectorscup.com/about

Maher, K. J. (1997). Gender-related stereotypes of transformational and transactional leadership. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, *37*(3–4), 209–225. doi:10.1023/A:1025647811219

Mallett, C. (2005). Coaching effectiveness. *Sport & Recreation New Zealand.* Retrieved from http://www.sportnz.org.nz

Mandel, S. (2007). *Bowls, polls & tattered souls: Tackling the chaos and controversy that reign over college football*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Maon, F., Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2010). Organizational stages and cultural phases: A critical review and a consolidative model of corporate social responsibility development. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *12*(1), 20–38. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN %291468-2370

Matthews, B. (2012, June 3). James Hird says shock loss to Melbourne a reality check. *Herald Sun.* Retrieved from http://www.heraldsun.com.au/sport/afl/james-hird -says-shock-loss-to-melbourne-a-relaity-check/story-e6frf9jf-1226381813603#

Meyers, L. S., & Gamst, G. (2013). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Miner, J. B. (2002). *Organizational behavior: Foundations, theories, and analyses*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mustafa, R. F. (2011, August). The P.O.E.Ms of educational research: A beginners' concise guide. *International Education Studies*, *4*(3), 23–30. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n3p23

Nicholson, R. (2012, May 13). Bombers coach James Hird puts lid on after big win. *Herald Sun.* Retrieved from http://www.heraldsun.com.au/sport/afl/bombers -coach-james-hird-tightens-lid-after-big-win/story-e6frf9jf-1226353897796

Oriard, M. (2009). *Bowled over big-time college football from the sixties to the BCS era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Peltier, L. G., & Laden, R. (1999). Do high school athletes succeed in college: A review of the research. *High School Journal, 82*(4), 234–238. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/40364480?uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid =4&sid=21102563601127

Peters, D. J. (2013). *High performance team coaching*. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Friesenpress.

Poropat, A. (2010). The validity of the performance environment perception scales: Environmental predictors of citizenship performance. *Journal of Management & Organization, 16*(1), 180–190. doi:10.5172/jmo.16.1.180

Robinson, P. E. (2010). *Foundations of sports coaching*. London, England: Routledge.

Ryu, Y., Shin, B., Kim, B. H., Kim, A., & Kim, H. (2010). Legal and ethical consideration in the use of human biological material. *Korean Journal of Pathology*, *44*(2), 111–116. doi:10.4132/KoreanJPathol.2010.44.2.111

Sabock, M. D., & Sabock, R. J. (2011). *Coaching: A realistic perspective* (10th ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sashkin, M., & Morris, W. C. (1987). *Experiencing management*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Schriesheim, C. A., Wu, J. B., & Cooper, C. D. (2011). A two-study investigation of item wording effects on leader–follower convergence in descriptions of the leader–member exchange (LMX) relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(5), 881–892. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.009

Scott, D. K. (1999). A multiframe perspective of leadership and organizational climate in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, *13*(4), 298–316. Retrieved from http://www.nassm.com/InfoAbout/JSM

Shapiro, H. (2001). *Ethical considerations in research on human subjects: A time for change . . . again*. Paper presented at the Sixth Annual Raymond Waggoner Lecture, St. Ann Arbor, MI. Retrieved from http://www.princeton.edu/~hts/PDFs/Considerations.pdf

Sotiriadou, P. (2013). *Managing high performance sport*. Abingdon-on-Thames, England: Routledge.

Southworth, G. (1998). *Leading improving primary schools: The work of head teachers and deputy heads*. London, England: Falmer Press.

Sperber, M. (1998). *Onward to victory: The crisis that shaped college sports.* H. Holt, NY

Steinberg, W. L. (2008). *Statistics alive*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sternberg, R. J. (2009). *Cognitive psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I., & Massarik, F. (2013). *Leadership and organization*. Routledge.

Toma, J. D., & Cross, M. E. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student college choice: Understanding the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, *39*(6), 633–661. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/40196314?uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&sid=21102563601127

Vries, M. F. (2011). *The hedgehog effect: the secrets of building high performance teams*. Chichester, England: Wiley.

Walsh, C. (2012, June 9). Hird says Jetta not born for the stage. *The Australian.* Retrieved from http://www.theaustralian.com.au/sport/afl/hird-says-jetta-not-born-for-the-stage/story-fnca0u4y-1226389515953

Warner, R. M. (2008). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques*. Thousand Oaks,CA: Sage.

Watterson, J. S. (2006). *College football: History, spectacle, controversy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wheelan, S. A. (2010). *Creating effective teams: A guide for members and leaders* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Youth First. (2000). Successful versus effective leadership. *Sports Education and Leadership Program at UNLV*, *1*(8). Retrieved from http://www.unlv.edu

Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professionals: Commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

Fom: Bolman, Lee G. [mailto:BolmanL@umkc.edu]

Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2014 7:19 PM

To: Lawson, Michael K

Subject: RE: Permission Request for Research using Leadership Orientations Survey Instrument

Dear Mr. Lawson

I'm happy to give you permission to use the Leadership Orientations Survey in your research.

I look forward to hearing about the results of your study.

Lee G. Bolman, Ph.D.

Professor and Marion Bloch/Missouri Chair in Leadership

Bloch School of Management

University of Missouri-Kansas City

5100 Rockhill Road

Kansas City, MO 64113

Tel: (816) 235-5407

Web: www.leebolman.com

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D