

A COMPARISON OF LEADERSHIP PRACTICES OF COLLEGIATE STUDENT-
ATHLETES AND NON-ATHLETE PEERS: SEEKING SOLUTIONS TO THE
LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION CRISIS IN CORPORATE AMERICA

by

Bruce L. Lund

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

Middle Tennessee State University
March 2013

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Steven Estes

Dr. Scott Colclough

Dr. Roy Earl Thomas

Dr. Harold Whiteside

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the three mentors who influenced me most during my professional experiences as a doctoral student including Dr. Colby Jubenville, Coach Micheal Burt, and Dr. Steve Estes. Each of you have provided me with invaluable knowledge and have entrusted me with opportunity that has allowed me to accelerate my own growth and experiences. I will always value your insights and am privileged to have you as mentors.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committee (Dr. Estes, Dr. Scott Colclough, Dr. Earl Thomas, and Dr. Terry Whiteside) for all your guidance and feedback during the dissertation process. After hearing many off-putting dissertation stories, I truly appreciate how enjoyable it was to work with this committee and am proud of the finished product we are adding to the body of knowledge. I would like to thank Dr. Thomas specifically for the many discussions over the years and for always making me feel like a colleague more than a student.

Last I would like to acknowledge the many personal and professional relationships that have been formed during my time at MTSU and in Middle Tennessee. Your hard work, sacrifice, and dedication have been an inspiration to me during my time here. I look forward to staying in touch and following all of your successes in the future.

ABSTRACT

Executives throughout corporate America have been critical of higher education due to a lack in leadership readiness of recent college graduates. The leadership epidemic of young professionals is being described as the Leadership-Succession Crisis in corporate America where a shortage of young, high potential leaders who are capable of replacing upper-level managers transitioning out of their current roles exists. Recent literature suggests Human Resource (HR) departments are recruiting and hiring former student-athletes as a possible solution to the Leadership Succession Crisis. Participation in sports has long been viewed to provide athletes with increased leadership ability dating back some 2,500 years to the ancient Olympic Games. Athletic involvement is widely believed to provide enhanced leadership development. Athletes have the opportunity to learn and grow in structured environments through ongoing relationships with teammates and coaches. However, limited empirical evidence exists when comparing leadership development of student-athletes with their non-athlete peers.

The purpose of this study was to compare whether collegiate student-athletes are better leaders than their collegiate non-athlete peers based on their perceptions of their leadership skills. The study utilized the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) to measure self-perceptions of leadership behaviors of college students ($n = 1,454$). Kouzes and Posner's LPI is one of the most widely used leadership assessments in the business world and the Student LPI is one of the few leadership instruments designed for and validated on students. The instrument uses a 5-point Likert-scale to measure when

students are “at their personal best” as leaders through five practices (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart).

Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to measure the relationship between athlete status (student-athletes ($n = 660$) and non-athlete peers ($n = 794$)) and division level (Division I ($n = 398$), Division II ($n = 328$), Division III ($n = 728$)) on the five leadership practices. The study provides empirical evidence that collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in four out of five leadership practices (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Encourage the Heart) than their collegiate non-athlete peers. The results indicate that athletic involvement can serve as a type of leadership development experience for collegiate student-athletes, and that it is reasonable for HR departments to consider candidates with athletic backgrounds as more likely to possess some leader skills than their non-athlete peers during the hiring process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Hypothesis.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Assumptions.....	8
Limitations	9
Delimitations.....	9
Significance of Study.....	9
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	13
The Leadership Challenge in Higher Education	14
Student-Athletes and Corporate America	16
Character in Sport	18
Leadership is Character.....	20
Leadership and Character in Sport.....	22
Moral and Social Character in Sport.....	26
Moral Character	26
Social Character	27
Leadership Practices Inventory	29
Student Leadership Practices Inventory.....	30
Five Constructs from the Leadership Practices Inventory.....	31
Social Identity in Collegiate Athletics and Corporate America.....	31
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	34
Research Questions and Hypotheses	35
Research Questions	35
Hypotheses	36
Participants.....	36
Collegiate Student-Athletes	37
Collegiate Non-Athletes Peers.....	37
Instrumentation	38
Procedures.....	39
Collegiate Student-Athletes	40
Collegiate Non-Athlete Peers	40
Data Analysis	41
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	43
Demographics by Division	43
Demographics by Age.....	44

Overview of the Five Student Leadership Practices	45
Analysis of Variance.....	53
Results by Student LPI Subscale	54
Model the Way.....	54
Inspire a Shared Vision.....	59
Challenge the Process	63
Enable Others to Act.....	66
Encourage the Heart.....	70
Summary of Results	72
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	75
Purpose of the Study	77
Results Overview	78
Discussion of the Five Leadership Subscales	78
Model the Way.....	78
Inspire a Shared Vision.....	82
Challenge the Process	84
Enable Others to Act	86
Encourage the Heart.....	88
Comparing Results.....	89
Limitations and Future Studies	91
Research Summary	93
REFERENCES	96
FOOTNOTES	118

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1	107
Table 2	108
Table 3	44
Table 4	45
Table 5	47
Table 6	48
Table 7	49
Table 8	50
Table 9	51
Table 10	52
Table 11	53
Table 12	55
Table 13	55
Table 14	57
Table 15	58
Table 16	59
Table 17	60
Table 18	61
Table 19	62
Table 20	63
Table 21	64
Table 22	65
Table 23	66
Table 24	67
Table 25	68
Table 26	69
Table 27	70
Table 28	71
Table 29	72

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A: Student LPI Permission Letter	110
APPENDIX B: MTSU IRB Approval	111
APPENDIX C: Consent Form for Student-Athletes.....	112
APPENDIX D: Consent Form for Non-Athlete Peers.....	113
APPENDIX E: Student-Athlete Demographic Questions	114
APPENDIX F: Non-Athlete Peers Demographic Questions	115
APPENDIX G: Student LPI Instructions.....	116
APPENDIX H: Student Leadership Practices Inventory	117

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Companies are set to lose the majority of their upper-level management personnel due to workplace demographic changes (Ready and Conger, 2007), a phenomenon being described as the Leadership-Succession Crisis (Groves, 2010). One key factor for the change in executive-level personnel is a direct result of departure from the workplace as nearly one-third of Americans are reaching retirement age (Dychtwald, Erickson and Morison, 2006). Corporate boards, top management teams, and Human Resource (HR) departments are feeling pressure like never before to develop a pipeline of young leadership talent during the so-called 5/50 crisis—where firms are estimated to lose upwards of 50 percent of their top leaders within the next five years (Groves, 2010; Ready and Conger, 2007). The leadership void is expected to expand across multiple disciplines and industries. Organizations are scrambling to find leadership solutions to not only account for current, short-term problems, but to also have succession plans in place to ensure long-term leadership stability.

An emerging theme in corporate America is the recruitment and hiring of collegiate student-athletes (McAfee, 2011) as a possible solution to the leadership shortage. Societal perceptions are widely believed that athletic experience can build increased leadership skills. This observation is not going unnoticed in the corporate world

where competition is fierce and companies persistently seek ways to get ahead and stay ahead. A recent study of 56 corporate recruiters revealed that,

“40% of these recruiters have actively sought college athletes for their leadership abilities. Additionally, of those reporting 89% felt athletics contributed to leadership development, 85% believed that former athletes they hired had been effective leaders and 80% would use athletics as a consideration in hiring” (McAfee, 2011, p. iii).

Findings such as this lead to the conclusion that corporate recruiters have either been scripted to believe student-athletes possess leadership traits or that their personal experiences working with student-athletes have proven positive. Either scenario should be explored more in depth to discover: (1) Why society holds the perception that student-athletes are leaders and/or (2) Why athletic experience better prepares student-athletes for leadership roles?

Athletics, if done properly, can provide multiple opportunities for students to acquire leadership skills that many educational environments simply cannot. Several reasons exist for the hypothesized smoother college to employee transition for student-athletes as compared with their non-athlete peers. Explanations can be as simple as business language that is full of expressions borrowed from and used in athletics (Brandenburger and Nalebuff, 1995), or more complex explanations that argue athletics instill responsibility, competitiveness, leadership, teamwork, cooperation, and time-management skills (Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder, 2009).

Sport has been associated with the development of leadership traits dating back to ancient times (Crowther, 2007). Sociologists and historians argue that sport helps define a sense of self and determines behavior (Guttmann, 2004). The influence of sport on different facets of society shows up throughout civilization in the form of paintings,

carvings, and other historical documents (Woods, 2007). But despite the natural connection of sport and leadership dating back thousands of years, limited empirical evidence still exists when comparing athletic participation and leadership development (McAfee, 2011; Shulman and Bowen, 2001; Dobosz and Beaty, 1999).

Student-athletes themselves believe their participation in athletics contribute to professional development according to a 2005 survey at 18 Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institutions. FBS institutions are described as NCAA Division IA colleges with major football programs. The study found that 82.2 percent responded “very much” or “quite a bit” when asked the question, “To what extent, if any, has your athletics participation added to your educational and/or personal development?” In addition, respondents said that athletics positively influenced their leadership skills (98 percent), teamwork (98 percent), work ethic (97 percent), and management skills (94 percent) (Potuto and O’Hanlon, 2006, p. 10).

While inappropriately placed confidence can be a detriment to leadership effectiveness, confidence is commonly revealed as an important component of a leadership—particularly for a leader’s presence (United States, 2006). Collegiate student-athletes must be confident in their core values in today’s connected age where their lives are constantly monitored both online and offline with the evolution of social media. In addition, collegiate student-athletes’ lives are evaluated more than their “normal” non-athlete peers (Shulman and Bowen, 2001). Student-athletes, particularly those on scholarship, are expected to perform athletically as well as to model idealized student behavior for their institutions. From the moment student-athletes step foot on campus they are required to balance the demands of academics and athletics (McAfee, 2011).

Student-athletes who have proven effective in their ability to handle pressure situations with emotional intelligence are the same student-athletes who are seen as desirable in the corporate world. However, lack in measurement of athletic involvement and leadership practices remain, directly relating to the potential importance of this study.

A leadership comparison of student-athletes and non-athlete peers is also important in higher education because business industries are pressuring universities and colleges to “respond more quickly to the changing world” (Fife and Losco, 2000, p. 166). Consequently business leaders are challenging legislators, higher education administrators, and faculty to shift their mindsets in relation to traditional patterns of leadership development in higher education (Fife and Losco, 2000). Organizations face a shortage of leaders, and surveys indicate that three-quarters of them are concerned with their ability to strategize a solution to fill these positions successfully (Corporate Leadership Council, 2000).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to measure whether collegiate student-athletes are better leaders than their collegiate non-athlete peers based on their perception of their leadership practices. If student-athletes perceive themselves to be better leaders than their non-athlete peers then higher education can explore the athletic experience as a means by which leader skills can be taught in the classroom setting.

This study will utilize the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) to measure self-perceived leadership behavior of collegiate student-athletes and their non-athlete peers at NCAA Division I, II, and III institutions. Kouzes and Posner’s Student LPI is the most widely used leadership assessment instrument designed for and validated

on students (Leadership Challenge, 2008; Posner, 2004). The Student LPI has been used to study leadership practices of fraternity leaders (Posner and Brodsky, 1992; Posner 2004), sorority leaders (Posner and Brodsky, 1994), resident advisors (Posner and Brodsky, 1993), and orientation advisors (Posner and Rosenberger, 1998).

Research Questions

The study was piloted using the following research questions:

RQ1: What effect does participation in athletics have on the self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate student-athletes as compared with their non-athletes peers?

RQ2: What effect does NCAA division level (Division I, II, III) have on the self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate student-athletes as compared with their non-athlete peers?

RQ3: What effect does NCAA division level have on self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate student-athletes when comparing across division levels (Division I, II, III)?

RQ4: What effect does NCAA division level have on the self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate non-athletes when comparing scores across division levels (Division I, II, III)?

Hypotheses

The study was piloted using the following research hypotheses:

H1a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Model the Way than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H2a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H3a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Challenge the Process than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H4a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Enable Others to Act than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H5a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Encourage the Heart than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following terms were used operationally:

1. This study will use the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)

definition of student-athlete:

“A student whose enrollment was solicited by a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests with a view toward the student’s ultimate participation in the intercollegiate athletics program. Any other student becomes a student-athlete only when the student reports for an intercollegiate squad that is under the jurisdiction of the athletics department, as specified in Constitution 3.2.4.5. A student is not deemed a student-athlete solely based on the basis of prior high school athletics participation” (NCAA Manual, 2010-11).

2. Collegiate non-athletes for this study were defined as:

“Any student who was not currently participating in college athletics at the time of the administration of the (instrument). In most cases this means

that a non-athlete was someone who had never been involved in athletics or someone who had been involved in athletics but not at the college level” (Rudd and Stoll, 2004, p. 2).

3. Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI): The Student LPI is an instrument created by Kouzes and Posner (1998) that surveys the daily actions and behaviors of exemplary leaders at every level and over multiple organizational backgrounds. The Student LPI is a student-focused, multi-rater instrument used to measure the five practices of exemplary leaders (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) and was originally developed using the Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner, 2004).

4. Self-Perception is the process of becoming aware of one’s sense of self. As Bem (1972) states:

“Individuals come to ‘know’ their own attitudes, emotions, and other internal states partially by inferring them from observations of their own overt behavior and/or the circumstances in which this behavior occurs. Thus, to the extent that internal cues are weak, ambiguous, or uninterpretable, the individual is functionally in the same position as an outside observer, an observer who must necessarily rely upon those same external cues to infer the individual’s inner states” (Bem, 1972, p. 2).

5. Leadership-Succession Crisis is a term used in corporate America, because of the shortage of young leaders entering the workplace. Ready and Conger (2007) state:

“Organizations face a myriad of challenges addressing what many have dubbed a leadership-succession crisis. Corporate boards, top management teams, and human resource (HR) professionals are under increasing pressure to develop a sustained pipeline of leadership talent in the context of this “5/50” crisis—that is, the fact that over the next five years firms could lose 50 percent of their executive personnel due to the confluence of workforce demographics, retirement trajectories, and marketplace realities” (Ready and Conger, 2007, p. 69).

Assumptions

Stating the studies assumptions is important because it helps prevent misunderstandings between the researcher and the audience (Leedy and Ormond, 2005).

The following assumptions were made:

1. Leadership will continue to be a skill-set that is valued inside and outside of corporate America.
2. Respondents had some level of awareness about leadership in their current or previous environments.
3. The Student Leadership Practices Inventory will continue to be a valid and reliable leadership assessment of students.
4. Participants had computer and Internet access to complete the online surveys and did so on their own without discussion with others during the completion of the actual survey.
5. Survey questions were answered truthfully by all participants and to the best of their ability.
6. Participants only completed the survey once despite possibly receiving it more than once from coaches, athletic directors, or faculty.
7. Collegiate student-athletes only completed the student-athlete questionnaire and non-athlete peers only completed the non-athlete peer questionnaire as identified in emails and agreement to participate.
8. Participants had knowledge of the information requested during the survey and understood what was being asked of them.

9. Results of this study could enhance self-awareness and understanding of leadership.
10. The editing, coding, and categorization of the raw data followed standard research design and data collection procedures.

Limitations

1. Data will be based solely on participants' responses to the survey instrument.
2. Participants may evaluate and respond to each question differently based on education level and knowledge of leadership behavior.

Delimitations

1. Responses to the survey instrument are predicated upon interest and time to respond.
2. Responses were collected using only the "self" version of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory due to difficulty in collecting "observed" multi-rater assessments for the entire population of collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athlete peers.

Significance of Study

This study extends a line of research first developed by Posner and others since the mid-1990s when the Student LPI was created (Posner and Brodsky, 1992, 1993, 1994; Posner and Rosenberger, 1997; Posner, 2004, 2009). Posner (2004) expressed hope that future studies would focus on diverse college student populations to help understand both leadership and student development. He hoped that these studies would look at more "diverse populations such as student body officers, officers in professional clubs, sports teams, peer educators, and even graduate students" (Posner, 2004, p. 454).

This study focused on the recommendation for future studies to utilize the Student LPI on team sports and athletes' leadership practices as suggested by Posner (2004).

Sport has long been considered a leadership training and development environment for student-athletes to acquire the necessary skills for lifelong lessons as exemplary citizens and professionals that provide teachable moments. Former UCLA basketball coach John Wooden, often cited for his ability to instill character in his athletes, advocated for a principled way of both living and coaching.¹ Wooden argued that lifelong leadership would follow from participation in quality athletic experiences (Van Mullen, Brunner, and Stoll, 2008). Similarly, the United States Army uses sport as a vehicle to develop character (United States, 2006). Character is a component of leader development and has long been seen as a mechanism to develop character during competition through morality, moral problems, and moral judgments (Frankena, 1973).

However, empirical evidence contradicts the common assertion that student-athletes have higher character (Shields and Bredemeier, 1995; Rudd and Stoll, 2004; Park, 2010). The many definitions of both leadership and character are complex in and of themselves. Combining the study of character and leadership with the institution of sport is particularly problematic (Rudd and Stoll, 2004; Shields and Bredemeier, 1995). Longstanding critics argue that the idea that involvement in athletics results in increased development of moral character is a myth² (Rudd and Stoll, 2004; Shields, and Bredemeier, 1995). These researchers consequently call for empirically driven studies to test the notion that sports builds character. If athletics is a developer of leadership and character, as expressed by the United States Army and many other individuals and

organizations, then further study is needed to compare athletes and their non-athlete peers' leadership behavior scores.

With a database of over 60,000 student-athletes and non-athlete peers and over 250 university studies, the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI) has consistently found that the majority of athletes practice “social” character versus “moral” character. Rudd and Stoll (2004) have since hypothesized that many individuals seem to define character from a social perspective rather than a moral perspective. Social characteristics (teamwork, loyalty, self-sacrifice, work ethic, and perseverance) have widely been viewed to work well in corporate structures, explaining why corporate America has turned to the recruitment of student-athletes during the Leadership-succession Crisis (McAfee, 2011). But when emphasis on “moral” character, long held as the baseline for measuring character development, is studied, then it is understood why some confusion exists. “Moral character,” composed of virtues such as honesty, fairness, empathy, and compassion, can sometimes be absent in the world of sport.

Consequently, critics of the idea that “sport builds character” often confuse the social and moral dimensions of character. Proponents note that athletics teaches for teamwork, loyalty, and self-sacrifice—all social virtues that contribute to positive athletic performance. Critics, however, note that participating in sport often leaves participants lacking in empathy, compassion, and a sense of fairness. Without this distinction it appears that the “sport builds character” mantra is both right and wrong at the same time, a logical inconsistency that both confuses and obfuscates the real relationship between sport and moral development. Scholars can better understand why complexities exist between leadership, character, and sport if they parse the types of virtues into the two

categories. This study seeks to compare leadership development of student-athletes and non-athlete peers based from both a social and moral aspect of leadership, and all that leadership effectiveness embodies.

The question as to whether or not athletes make better leaders than non-athletes is one that will continue to be asked while corporate America seeks to fill entry-level positions with capable young leaders. Considering both leadership and athletics are two of the oldest recorded historical concepts studied, history only supports the notion that this topic will not soon be retired (Paul et al., 2002; Woods, 2007). With varying evidence on leadership development and participation in athletics (Rudd and Stoll, 2004; Shields and Bredemeier, 1995) further empirical research is needed to add to the body of literature on these complex issues. To gain a clear understanding of the complexities that exist for researchers, Chapter II will focus on defining leadership and identify traits that are commonly held in regards to athletic participation and why they are sought after in corporate America.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership has been important to humans since history has been recorded (Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh, and Omary, 2009), and today effective leadership is a topic studied all over the world by academicians, politicians, and business people (Adams and Keim, 2000). Despite leadership's historical significance, the topic continues to be one of both relevance and confusion as specific behavioral patterns of leadership tend to vary across time and cultures (Bass, 1990). Leadership has been important to all societies (Bass, 1990) and the concepts of leader and follower are represented in Egyptian hieroglyphics written over 5,000 years ago (Paul et al., 2002). Greek philosophers Plato (*The Republic*) and Aristotle (*Ethics*) wrote about the education of leaders, as well as the characteristics and uniqueness of leadership (Abu-Tineh et al., 2009; Plato, 1955; Aristotle, 1958). For example, Aristotle wrote that virtuous character provides the foundation for individuals to deal with important matters, and "leadership" is about character and virtue. Aristotle points out that we should not necessarily inquire to know what "virtue" is, but to become good humans we should inquire what is appropriate to the occasion (Aristotle, 1958, p. 183).

Even though leadership has been an area of study for centuries, the topic as a whole only began to be studied scientifically at the turn of the 20th century (Abu-Tineh et al., 2009). According to Johnson (2002), sociologist Max Weber was the first to carefully

study leadership as a “phenomenon” during the early turn of the 20th century. Through his work, Weber divided leadership into three stages: the first stage identified “traits” of leaders; the second stage focused on the “behavior” of leaders; and the third stage determined a “fit” between the leadership style of a leader and the situation the leader is faced with (Tirmizi, 2002). The leadership challenge of today is preparing for the changing times ahead and preparing future leaders to be equipped to handle these complex times. Contemporary scholars have learned much about the concept, and the scholars who have influenced this particular study the most argue that leadership in the future should be less about positions, titles, and roles and more about the collection of best practices and behaviors (Kouzes and Posner, 1995). One place to start when assessing future studies of leadership practices is in higher education.

The Leadership Challenge in Higher Education

When it comes to preparing college students for the rigors of the real world higher education has a great responsibility. That responsibility goes well beyond simply teaching in the classroom. Shulman and Bowen (2001) conducted one of the largest empirical studies comparing collegiate student-athletes and their non-athlete peers in various components relating to “The Game of Life.” They stated that,

Life in general is, in many ways, structured like a game, and although colleges have a major impact on who wins and who loses in this game, they also play a more fundamental role. Beyond admitting students, educating them, and sending them into the world with impressive credentials, these institutions help to shape our collective interpretation of what the game itself is all about, what its rules are, and how we as a society define winning and losing (p. xxv).

Studies like Shulman and Bowen (2001) provide insight into the evolution of both athletics and higher education over the past 50 plus years. Issues in higher education have

always existed and when combining past problems with current problems there is a cause for concern. Internal issues such as rising tuition costs and historically high student-debt, and external issues such as corporate America expressing concern with lack of preparedness of college students have many questioning the benefits of higher education today. One commonly cited goal of higher education is to educate students to be future leaders (Astin, 1993; Johnson, 2002; Komives, Lucas, and McMahon, 2006), but this goal is now being called into question with evidence of young professionals struggling to find jobs after graduation. Evidence of this issue was reported in an Associated Press (2012) study that half of recent college graduates are underemployed or jobless.

Yet higher education may not be entirely to blame regarding the Leadership Succession Crisis as there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are scholars. Indeed, as Burns (1978) indicated, “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2). In fact, various leadership scholars and practitioners view leadership literature as “confusing, discrepant, disorganized, and unintegrated” (Rost, 1993, p. 91). Examples of this stance include lack of a school of leadership (Burns, 1978); literature that just does not “add up” (Argyris, 1979; Hosking and Morley, 1988); and literature that is irrelevant because it does not deliver a consistent message (Mintzberg, 1982).

The failure to define leadership notwithstanding, there are many college and university leadership development programs in the United States. In the early 21st century there were an estimated 1,000 student leadership developmental programs in the United States (Riggio, Ciulla, and Sorenson, 2003). Over 60% of the top-50 business schools in the United States advertise coursework in leadership (Doh, 2003). A large number of

programs indeed exist, which leads to the questioning of curriculum in the classroom and whether or not it enhances leadership practices of college students.

Student-Athletes and Corporate America

As a possible solution to the leadership crisis in young professionals, corporate America has turned to athletics as a talent pool for high potential leaders (McAfee, 2011), because of the many traits that are parallel between the athletic field and the business industry. If done properly, collegiate student-athletes are engaged in activities over the course of their playing experience which results in increased leadership opportunities upon graduation. This ongoing process of leadership training is backed by studies that have shown that students who return during their second year in a leadership capacity engage in leadership behaviors significantly more often than those who were just starting in that same position (Posner, 2004, p. 552; Levy, 1995; Posner and Rosenberger, 1998). Students who participate in formalized leadership training programs often experience significant growth in leadership skills (Cress et al., 2001).

If it can be shown that athletics provides students with consistent, quality leadership training then athletic programs are in a much better position to assert that they are fulfilling an educational function, and not just an entertainment or recreational experience for students and fans. The development of students as young men and women during their collegiate careers is important (Astin, 1993). Despite the debate surrounding character development in athletics, the argument can be made that athletics must be doing something “right” given the popular belief that athletes are better leaders, and with the high demand that corporate America and other industries are placing on athlete recruitment (McAfee, 2011).

Corporate boards, top management teams, and human resource (HR) departments are feeling pressure like never before to develop a pipeline of young leadership talent during this “5/50” crisis—where over the next five years firms are set to lose nearly 50 percent of their top leaders due to demographic changes (Groves, 2010; Ready and Conger, 2007). Companies are set to lose the majority of their upper-level management personnel due to workplace demographic changes (Ready and Conger, 2007), a phenomenon being described as the Leadership-Succession Crisis (Groves, 2010). Nearly one-third of Americans are reaching retirement age (Dychtwald, Erickson and Morison, 2006). The leadership void is expected to expand across multiple disciplines and industries. Organizations are in desperate search for high potential leaders to become solutions for both the short-term and long-term problems.

Many people in society argue that competitive sports serve as an excellent training ground for life (Shulman and Bowen, 2001). A trend that has emerged in corporate America to offset the shortage of high potential leaders is the recruitment and hiring of collegiate student-athletes in anticipation that their experiences in athletics will provide the foundation for leadership skills that will manifest in the workplace (McAfee, 2011). Business language, for instance, parallels the language used in athletics, and familiarity with this jargon may be another example of why student-athletes transition well into leadership positions within business settings. (Brandenburger and Nalebuff, 1995). In addition, athletic participation is argued to instill responsibility, competitiveness, leadership, teamwork, cooperation, and time-management skills (Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder, 2009).

According to McAfee (2011) human resources recruiters are more inclined to regard student-athletes as having more leadership attributes, and it is believed by many HR professionals that “leadership skills learned through competitive sports in college can be transferred to the competitive world of work” (McAfee, 2011, p. iii). The attractiveness of hiring athletes in the corporate world is easy to understand when managers can be surrounded with a team full of former athletes who are, “Trained to sacrifice body and soul for the team, taught to depersonalize opponents, schooled in the art of aggression, willing to dutifully follow coach’s rules, orders, and schedules without question” (Shulman and Bowen, 2001, p. 183). However, limited empirical evidence exists on the topic of student-athletes and leadership, despite the perceptions of corporate America that athletes are more prepared to lead than non-athletes. In fact, evidence exists that refutes this claim. An examination of the athlete as leader myth is in order to explain how leader development in athletics just might occur.

Character in Sport

A controversial topic today is “character” in sport and its effects on shaping leaders, including both coaches and student-athletes (Rudd and Stoll, 2004). While many in society argue that competitive sports serve as an excellent training ground for life, there are others who argue that individuals who carry the values learned from sport off-the-field do so at a societal cost (Shulman and Bowen, 2001). Rudd and Stoll (2004) point out that advocates of sport believe sport builds character because society define(s) character from a social perspective, and that they value “teamwork, loyalty, self-sacrifice, work ethic, and perseverance” (paragraph five).

The purpose of Rudd and Stoll's (2004) study was (1) to develop an instrument that measured two types of character from a sport context: moral versus social; (2) to determine whether college athletes, particularly those who participate in team sports, support social character over moral character as a result of the way they define character fostered by coaches, parents, and society in general. The study used a sample of 595 college students from a various colleges and universities in NCAA Division I, II, and III institutions (223 were non-athletes, 290 were team sport athletes, and 76 were individual sport athletes).

Results from the study indicated a significant difference between team sport athletes, individual athletes, and non-athletes on moral character and social character. Non-athletes scored significantly higher than team sport athletes on moral character. Even more, individual sport athletes scored significantly higher on moral character than team sport athletes, while non-athletes scored slightly higher than individual sport athletes. Results also showed that females scored significantly higher than males on the moral character index. Interestingly, team sport athletes scored significantly higher than non-athletes on the social character index and team sport athletes scored significantly higher than individual sport athletes.

Collegiate athletes is often criticized when high profile coaches and athletes place themselves in bad legal situations, which lead to question whether participation in organized college sports trains an individual to be a leader (Shulman and Bowen, 2001). Rudd and Stoll (2004) provide a framework to explore why emphasis on character in relation to leadership in the study of student-athletes is important. Many organizations that study leadership closely, including the United States Army, place much value on

character as it relates to leadership (Army Leadership, 2006). Some, such as Havard (2007), argue that leadership *is* character. A closer look into character and the preparation of student-athletes for leadership roles through their participation in athletics needs to be done to gain a better understanding of the leadership literature and its impact on character in athletics.

Leadership is Character

The study of leadership has steadily increased over recent years (Adams and Keim, 2000) and according to the American Society of Training and Development (2012), businesses in the U.S. spend nearly \$170 billion on leadership training and development programs. According to Burns (1978), “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2). In fact, by the end of the 20th century over 300 different definitions of leadership existed (Rost, 1993) Evidence-based leadership is hard to determine (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2006). Uncertainty on this subject matter dates as far back as Ancient Greece when Aristotle said “he did not agree with Socrates on some points regarding continence” of leadership (Walters, 2009). Specifically, Plato in *The Republic* argued that athletics would not develop in the Guardians the virtues necessary to lead. “I am afraid, I said, that a habit of body such as they have is but a sleepy sort of thing, and rather perilous to health. Do you not observe that these athletes sleep away their lives, and are liable to most dangerous illnesses if they depart, in ever so slight a degree, from their customary regimen?” (Plato, 2008, p. 121). Plato argued that the specialization of athletics would cause athletes to focus solely on their physicality and their performance, rather than on the virtues that are necessary to be a Guardian.

Lickona (2003) described ten essential virtues most important for strong character as: *wisdom* (good judgment), *justice* (respect the rights of others), *fortitude* (do what is right in difficult situations), *self-control* (ability to govern ourselves), *love* (sacrifice for the sake of others), *positive attitude* (be an asset to others instead of a burden), *hard work* (no substitute in life), *integrity* (adhere to moral principles), *gratitude* (count blessings daily), and *humility* (awareness of imperfections to become better). Some of the earliest works in defining leadership have referenced character (Aristotle, 1958; Plato, 1955). In addition, Aristotle reflected the importance of character in relation to leadership in the writings of his “Books I, II, and III” on various virtues of human character (Walters, 2009; Aristotle 1958).

In 1963, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. made his now infamous “I have a dream” speech and made a point to include the importance of character in saying, “I have a dream that my four children one day will live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character” (King, 1963). Other influential leadership philosophers include the “Father of Management” Peter Drucker who believes that leadership is exercised through character (Drucker, 2005). The question becomes, What is the content of character? Havard (2007) answered that,

“It is virtue, or, more precisely, the set of classical human virtues—above all, magnanimity, humility, prudence, courage, self-control, and justice. Leaders either strive to grow in virtue as surely as they breathe or they are not leaders” (Havard, 2007, p. 2).

The United States Army Field Manual 6-22 (2006) is the most widely cited leadership manuals in the world having been downloaded over 3 million times, and dedicates an entire section on building character. *FM 6-22 states:*

“Character is a person’s moral and ethical qualities, helps determine what is right and gives a leader motivation to do what is appropriate, regardless of circumstances or the consequences. An informed ethical conscience consistent with Army Values strengthens leader to make the right choices when faced with tough issues. Since Army leaders seek to do what is right and inspire others to do the same, they must embody these values” (p. 4-1).

Underlying keywords exist between the body of knowledge of leadership and character, just as it does in comparing leadership and athletics. The Army expects enlisting soldiers to begin with values that are ingrained into them through the “aptitude for certain ‘sports’ and intellectual abilities” (Army Leadership, 2006, FM 6-22). An interesting point to make is how the Army includes “sports” and its influence on leadership in the opening sentences of their description of character. The late General Douglas MacArthur of World War II stated, “On the fields of friendly strife are sown the seeds that on other days and other fields will bear the fruits of victory” (MacArthur, 2001, p. 12). If character is a key component to leadership, and if sports are widely viewed to build leadership skills, then it is arguable that sport can be a mechanism in shaping character.

Leadership and Character in Sport

The notion that athletics enhances one’s ability to lead and to be led (Harper, 1986; Hood, Craig, and Ferguson, 1992; Thompson, 1986) is not new. McAfee (2011) conducted a study which found that 40 percent of recruiters in corporate America actively seek college athletes because of their enhanced leadership skills. The study also found that 89 percent believe that sports contribute to leadership development. Other studies have supported athletic participation for a wide range of increased abilities (Zaugg, 1998), because collegiate athletes play unique roles as representatives of their institutions

through social status and public appearances (Chandler, Carroll, and Johnson, 1999). Sports are said to teach responsibility, leadership, sportsmanship, teamwork, and cooperation, which are all traits that should contribute to more productive workers after graduation (Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder, 2009). Furthermore, it is argued that sport can increase the development of character, but the perceptions of what character actually is can have positive and negative impacts in society (Rudd and Mondello, 2006). Since corporate America is turning to the athletic arena as a talent pool for increased leadership skills then due diligence must be further examined in the context of leadership, character, and athletics.

The idea that sport builds character is an adage strongly held by society (Shields and Bredemeier, 1995). The challenge for academia is the relative lack of research in the area of character building through sports (Rudd and Stoll, 2004; Shields and Bredemeier, 1995). From a historical standpoint, educational institutions have promoted athletic participation because it sponsors character building (Marino, 2007). Character development in athletics can be described through coaching and competition as ethical guidelines for how individuals should act (Fox and Demarco, 1990). If done properly, training for competition and the competition itself should instill and reinforce moral values by following agreed upon rules for participants (Keating, 1964) as character development in athletics can be described through ethical guidelines for how to act through coaching and competition (Fox and Demarco, 1990). But, as critics note, character building through sport is not always done properly.

The dynamics in today's athletic participation, particularly at the collegiate level, is that too often athletes live out a win at all costs orientation (Gill and Deeter, 1988).

Many athletes at elite athletic institutions often appear to view their athletic participation as a stepping stone to a larger, professional stage and, it is argued, exhibit a morality that deemphasizes the virtues and emphasizes a win at all costs mentality. Such behavior emphasizes a lack of concern or respect for the opponent, the rules, or the officials (Vallerand, Briere, and Provencher, 1994). In essence, athletes behaving poorly are displaying a lack of character in regards to sportsmanship—creating a sportsmanship paradox that as talent level increases, sportsmanship decreases (Lund, 2011). It is argued, then, that the higher the level of competition, the more likely it appears that the athlete will possess poor character or a lack of character. If this is the case, then, it is arguable that sport does not in fact build character; rather it impoverishes it.

Examples of poor sportsmanship and lack of character range across multiple levels, in multiple sports, and have seemingly taken over headlines around the country. While responsibility for personal behavior rests with the athlete, the character of the coach can also have an impact on the student-athletes' moral development (Stoll and Beller, 2006). This topic is especially relevant in the early 21st century, where scandals in college football dominate national media outlets globally and can spread instantly through the internet. The Big Ten Conference in particular, which has labeled its two divisions “Legends” and “Leaders” to emphasize the myth of sport and character building, has found itself in the middle of several scandals. Within one calendar year (2010-11), two of the Big Ten's illustrious programs have been under heavy scrutiny for their “failure to act” with character.

Former Ohio State University head football coach Jim Tressel was forced to resign after he failed to report players who were breaking NCAA rules. Tressel was a

highly regarded coach for 25 years, and led the Buckeyes to a National Championship during in 2003. But Tressel's leadership ultimately led to NCAA violations and sanctions on the school (Wieberg, 2011). One year later, the Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) was involved in arguably the biggest scandal in collegiate sports history as head football coach Joe Paterno was fired for allegedly not taking the necessary actions to report an incident involving his assistant coach, Jerry Sandusky. Sandusky was convicted of sexual abuse of children while a coach at Penn State, as well as during his retirement while leading his Second Mile charity. Paterno was the all-time winningest coach in NCAA football history, and an exemplar of the sport builds character mythology. He was fired after the Board of Regents was informed of Paterno's role in the situation, along with university president Graham Spanier (Mihoces, 2011).

It should also be noted that, as of this writing, Penn State continues to litigate penalties incurred in the Sandusky situation, and over time the public may come to understand that Paterno and his staff were not the source of the moral failures they have been charged with. Yet the myth works both ways: one cannot simply benefit from the sport builds character myth, and then not be responsible for a failure of leadership in an athletics environment. Stoll and Beller's (2006) research would seem to argue that the problem with character development in team sport athletes begins with the behaviors of coaches. If the exemplars of the myth of "sport builds character" can fail, how is one to argue for the development of character among their athletes?

How did programs as prestigious and storied as Ohio State University and the Pennsylvania State University, led by men who were consistently referenced as "high character" coaches, fail to exhibit it when they needed it most? Stoll, who has spent her

career studying values and morals of athletes, said, “In sport we have moved away from honorable behavior” and replaced it with more emphasis on winning (Associated Press, 2005, paragraph 3). Stoll’s 17-year-study, in which 72,000 athletes filled out questionnaires to measure moral reasoning, found that team sport athletes’ social character scores were higher than their moral character scores. Also, non-athletes scored significantly higher than team sport athletes on moral character. It can then be argued that the behaviors of Tressel and Paterno are not necessarily aberrations, but in fact are consistent with the studies done by Beller and Stoll.

Moral and Social Character in Sport

One possible explanation for this perceived failure to act in a manner consistent with good character is to further define it. Scholars distinguish between moral and social character, explaining that the two aspects of character lead to some of the confusion (Rudd and Stoll, 2004; Shields and Bredemeier, 1995). Results from these studies indicated that sport does not build character from a moral standpoint (Rudd and Stoll, 2004). However, parents, coaches, and the media continually endorse that sport does in fact build character (Browit, 1999; Docheff, 1997; Herman, 2000; Zimmerman, 2001). One explanation for the contrasting beliefs and results is that society implicitly defines character as more of a social construct than a moral one (Rudd and Stoll, 2004).

Moral Character

Moral character is a phrase that was first known to be explained by Aristotle who believed a person with moral character was a person who conducted him or herself in agreement with moral standards of fairness, honesty, and compassion (Arnold, 1999; Rudd and Mondello, 2006; Aristotle, 1958). The emphasis in this statement is on the

individual, not on how the individual fits into the group. As athletics have evolved, many team sports have placed more emphasis on winning. In short, virtues associated with the team such as teamwork, work ethic, and loyalty have taken precedence over the moral virtues which place their emphasis on the individual (Eitzen, 1999). In essence, many athletes are not being taught to appreciate moral idealism or to value moral character during competition (Rudd and Stoll, 2004). Many advocates of sport believe that individuals learn to distinguish between right and wrong by participating in sport. It is argued that these individuals begin the process of developing their moral reasoning skills, which directly relates with Aristotle's view on moral character (Lumpkin, Stoll, and Beller, 2003). However, studies in the literature consistently suggest that minimal evidence supports the idea that sport develops moral reasoning (Rudd and Stoll, 2004).

Social Character

Rudd and Stoll (2004) hypothesized that coaches, parents, media, and general society (American ideology) put more emphasis on social values such as "teamwork, loyalty, self-sacrifice, perseverance, and work ethic in team sports" (paragraph 5). There is more difficulty, however, when assessing "social character" because of the mindset society has which is that character has only one dimension, and is not split into two components such as moral and social (Rudd and Mondello, 2006). These views go hand-in-hand with the mindset that collegiate athletics can be used to instill the types of traits that corporate America values in their search for employees. Sport sociologists contend that social character promotes a "means to an end" approach that is necessary to achieving a shared vision through teamwork and self-sacrifice for the greater good of a group (Sage, 1988; Coakley, 2004). It is then believed that these possessed values lead

student-athletes to be better prepared to handle corporate issues and are equipped to be better competitors (Rudd and Mondello, 2006). After all, according to Murphy, Pirozzolo, and Riggio (2002) leadership is a social phenomenon that exists in the actions of the individual, or group of individuals, who seek to move the collective group along a defined path. Problems that surface along this path do so from the social dynamics that occur collectively between and within the group and its social environments.

When defining both moral and social character, scholars can better understand why society generally believes that sports builds character and leadership. The public observes successful individuals and teams from a social character perspective. The public admires the teamwork, loyalty, self-sacrifice, work ethic, and social commitment athletes display. At the same time, the often-publicized incidents of cheating and violent behaviors demonstrate that some athletes have not developed moral virtues such as honesty, compassion, and respect. Distinguishing between social and moral character can help the public understand exactly the kind of character organized athletics builds or promotes (Shulman and Bowen, 2001).

Review of literature on character and leadership in athletics reveals need for empirical research in the area, and for purposes of this study the Student Leadership Practices inventory (Student LPI) will be used to measure self-perceived leadership effectiveness of student-athletes and non-athlete peers (the most widely used leadership assessment for students). This will allow the researcher to compare these two groups of students, and to determine what type of change occurred as a result of the athletics experience.

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is the result of an effort to survey “real” leaders on the characteristics perceived to be possessed by individuals in leader roles. When developing the original model of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), Kouzes and Posner (2007) collected case studies from over 2,500 professional managers and asked them to report when they were at their personal-best as leaders. Kouzes and Posner’s (1987) initial version was empirically developed through thousands of interviews, which lends credibility to their research (Sashkin, 2004). Following interviews of professional managers, Kouzes and Posner (1987) analyzed the content to distinguish specific leadership characteristics and created an inventory of questions about leadership behavior. Hundreds of managers were then asked to answer these questions by describing exemplary managers they currently or previously worked with. The original version of the LPI was then established after the results determined five distinct constructs when leaders are at their personal-best. Based on defined behavioral terms, Kouzes and Posner developed a multi-rater instrument known as the Leadership Practices Inventory. What makes the LPI unique from other instruments is the items are more distinct and behaviorally focused than other well-established instruments such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Sashkin, 2004); therefore, feedback can target precise behaviors that factor in effective leadership.

A criticism of Leadership Practices Inventory, and of using the Student LPI, could be made that this type of study only uses a “self” rating assessment instead of the 360-degree leadership assessment using both observed and self raters. To respond to this criticism, Posner (2010) updated the psychometric properties of the Student LPI ($n =$

38,944) and found that, “scores from Observers are generally higher than those reported by Self respondents” (p. 26). Put differently, there is a significant and positive relationship between scores on the Student LPI and observations of leadership. Consequently, self-perceived indicators of leader skills are also a good indication of how others perceive one’s leadership skills.

Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI)

A student version of the LPI was developed in the 1990’s and has been a widely popular instrument that has reliability and validity (Posner and Brodsky, 1992, 1993, 1994; Posner 2004, 2009). Results from both the student study and the professional study pointed toward the same five factors. Changes from the original LPI to the Student LPI were minor and consisted mainly language changes such as “at work” in the original LPI to “in our group or organization” in the Student LPI (Kouzes and Posner, 1998, p. 7). The five factors were placed into a leadership model called, *The Five Practices of Exemplary Student Leadership* (Kouzes and Posner, 2006). Both the leadership practices and behaviors have been established to compliment the developmental issues geared specifically for collegiate students (Posner and Brodsky, 1994).

The Student LPI is one of few leadership instruments intended for measurement of college students and that has been validated within a framework for college students (Posner, 2004; Schwartz and Gimbel, 2000). The instrument has established sound psychometric properties in all five leadership constructs (Posner, 2009), and across a variety of campus populations (Posner, 2004). Past studies using the Student LPI includes fraternities and sororities (Posner and Brodsky, 1992; Posner and Brodsky, 1994; Posner, 2004), residential assistants (RAs) (Posner and Brodsky, 1993), orientation advisors

(Posner and Rosenberger, 1997), and Reserve Officer Training Corp (ROTC) students (Baxter, 2001). The Student LPI has been called the most reliable leadership development instrument available today and lends quantitative evidence to the qualitative data provided by “personal-best” leadership case studies (Kouzes and Posner, 2003).

Five Constructs from the Leadership Practices Inventory

A representative of statements for the leadership constructs are defined by Posner (2009, p. 389) as:

- (1) *Model the Way* (e.g. I set a personal example of what I expect from others);
Sample item, “I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.”
- (2) *Inspire a Shared Vision* (e.g. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like); Sample item, “I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.”
- (3) *Challenge the Process* (e.g. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my skills and abilities); Sample item, “I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.”
- (4) *Enable Others to Act* (e.g. I develop cooperative relationships with the people I work with); Sample item, “I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.”
- (5) *Encourage the Heart* (e.g. I praise people for a job well done); Sample item, “I praise people for a job well done.”

Social Identity in Collegiate Athletics and Corporate America

Since less scholarly literature exists on social character compared to moral character we can examine how social identity might factor into collegiate athletics and

corporate America. In psychology, social identity theory is a concept that rests outside of the mainstream (Haslam, Reicher, and Platow, 2011). According to social identity theory, people are motivated by a necessary need for self-esteem in the course of identity construction (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Many people have an affinity for belonging and to fit in with groups of people that relate with their values. In this regard, athletes are no different in their pursuit to fit-in among their teammates. Teams are comprised of leaders who gain their status and influence by being able to pull people together to create a “we-ness” that represents the group (Haslam et al., 2011).

By gaining a basic understanding of social character and social identity theory it should come as no surprise why athletes, particularly athletes on teams, score higher on social character than non-athletes. But the question still remains: are student-athletes better leaders than non-athlete peers? Social identity and group behavior are important to leadership because people join groups when “they find other group members attractive and, in particular, when they consider the benefits of joining to outweigh the potential costs (Haslam et al., 2011, p. 46). Furthermore, there are three major reasons people join groups according to Napier and Gershenfeld (1999): (1) They like the task or activity of the group; (2) They like the people in the group; (3) Although the group does not satisfy the person’s needs directly, it is a means of satisfying his or her needs.

The same characteristics of social identity ultimately hold true for leaders in corporate America. Upper-level managers are in search of what Haslam et al. (2011) describe as a “we-ness” in terms of putting a team together for a common vision, mission, goals, and objectives. Teamwork and relationship building is part of the culture for organizations to get the right people on the bus, the wrong people off the bus, and the

right people in the right seats (Collins, 2001). The central theme between athletics and corporate America in relation to social identity and group behavior is that groups are comprised of individuals who become dependent upon each other for similar reasons: “to satisfy their personal interests and their mutual needs” (Haslem et al., 2011, p. 47; Rabbie, 1991).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter gives an overview of the research design and describes information related to the research questions, hypotheses, population sample, variables, instrumentation, collection procedure, and data analysis techniques. The objective of this empirical research was to measure whether collegiate student-athletes are better leaders than their collegiate non-athlete peers based on leadership practices. The study utilized the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) to measure self-perceived leadership scores of collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athlete peers. The study also compared leadership scores of collegiate student-athletes and non-athlete peers based on NCAA Division level (I, II, and III).

Kouzes and Posner's LPI is one of the most widely used leadership assessments in the business world and the Student LPI is one of few leadership instruments designed for and validated on students (Posner, 2010). Student LPI has been administered to various groups of college students including fraternity leaders (Posner and Brodsky, 1992; Posner 2004), sorority leaders (Posner and Brodsky, 1994), resident advisors (Posner and Brodsky, 1993), and orientation advisors (Posner and Rosenberger, 1998). The instrument measures five different leadership constructs based on when students believe they are "at their personal best" as leaders.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research question was, “Are collegiate student-athletes better leaders than their collegiate non-athlete peers?” Limited empirical evidence exists in the comparison of leadership among student-athletes and non-athletes (Posner, 2009; Posner, 2004; McAfee 2011). Therefore, this study explored the self-perceived leadership scores of both student-athletes and non-athlete peers among NCAA Division I, II, and III member institutions.

Research Questions

The study was piloted using the following research questions:

RQ1: What effect does participation in athletics have on the self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate student-athletes as compared with their non-athletes peers?

RQ2: What effect does NCAA division level (Division I, II, III) have on the self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate student-athletes as compared with their non-athlete peers?

RQ3: What effect does NCAA division level have on self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate student-athletes when comparing across division levels (Division I, II, III)?

RQ4: What effect does NCAA division level have on the self-perception of leadership practices of collegiate non-athletes when comparing scores across division levels (Division I, II, III)?

Hypotheses

The study was piloted using the following research hypotheses:

H1a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Model the Way than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H2a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H3a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Challenge the Process than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H4a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Enable Others to Act than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

H5a: Collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Encourage the Heart than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Participants

Participants recruited for this study consisted of 1,454 college students from NCAA Division I, II, and III member institutions from around the country—including 660 collegiate student-athletes and 794 collegiate non-athlete peers. Colleges and universities were targeted based on convenience sampling such as: (a) accessibility (surveys could be administered in person if needed); and (b) previous and current networks (coaches and instructors at Division I, II, and III institutes). Participant

inclusion for the study consisted of current NCAA collegiate student-athletes between the ages of 18-25 and current NCAA collegiate non-athlete peers between the ages of 18-25. Collegiate Student-Athletes who play(ed) one or more of the following sports at their NCAA member institutions were included in this study: baseball, basketball, bowling, cross country, fencing, field hockey, football, golf, gymnastics, ice hockey, lacrosse, rifle, skiing, soccer, softball, swimming and diving, tennis, track and field, volleyball, water polo, and wrestling. The NCAA officially recognizes these sports (NCAA.org) and therefore was the basis for this study.

Collegiate Student-Athletes: Current NCAA collegiate student-athletes were targeted for their participation first for many reasons: (1) Data collection began during Christmas vacation and most traditional students were not enrolled in classes at that time. (2) Receiving feedback from coaches and athletic directors as well as participation from student-athletes was hypothesized to be more difficult due to time constraints compared to non-athletes. (3) There is a smaller population of student-athletes on campus compared to non-athletes.

Collegiate Non-Athlete Peers: Collegiate non-athletes were targeted through academic faculty and/or department heads. The university or college was targeted based on (1) IRB approval and (2) the volume of response rates from collegiate student-athletes at that institution. For example, if the researcher received a large number of responses from a particular NCAA college or university, then collegiate non-athletes from those colleges or universities were then targeted once classes resumed.

Instrumentation

The study utilized the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) to assess self-perceived leadership effectiveness of NCAA Division I, II, and III student-athletes and non-athlete peers. The Student LPI is an instrument created by Kouzes and Posner (1998) as part of a widespread and ongoing research project into the daily actions and behaviors of exemplary leaders at every level. Multiple organizational backgrounds (Kouzes and Posner, 1998) such as fraternities and sororities (Posner and Brodsky, 1992; Posner and Brodsky, 1994, Posner, 2004), orientation advisors (Posner and Rosenberger, 1997), RAs (Posner and Brodsky, 1993), and ROTC students (Baxter, 2001) have previously been measured by the Student LPI.

The Student LPI is a brief, multi-rater, 30-item questionnaire that has both a “self” instrument for the focal leader and an “observer” instrument for raters to complete for assessment of the focal leader. This study focused solely on the self-assessment of the focal leader when at their “personal best” and did not collect responses from observers. The majority of the surveys were administered online, but were also made available in-person with pencil and paper format. Less than one hundred participants completed the survey in person (including both student-athletes and non-athletes).

The Student LPI measures leadership practices in the following five constructs: Challenge the Process, Inspire a Shared Vision, Enable Others to Act, Model the Way, and Encourage the Heart. Each of these five constructs consist of 6-items (statements) and are measured based on a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from (1 = *rarely or seldom*; 2 = *once in a while*; 3 = *sometimes*; 4 = *often*; 5 = *very frequently*). Scores can range from 6 to 30 on each of the five scales. The instrument was only administered to participants

once. Repeated measures (pretest/posttest) were not used because the study was interested in analyzing athletic participation as a type of leadership intervention; therefore the intervention (athletic participation) had already taken place.

Procedures

Approval of the proposed research was obtained through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Protection of Human Subjects at Middle Tennessee State University. Data collection took place for nearly three months. The compliance office of each member institute was contacted before recruitment of participants was initiated. The institutes were provided with documented permission of IRB approval from Middle Tennessee State University (Appendix B) as well as written permission from the publishers of the Student LPI instrument (Appendix A). Once an institution granted IRB approval for the study, then the researcher attempted to make contact with athletic directors and coaches via email. Efforts to maximize collegiate student-athlete responses included contacting the director of the Athletic Enhancement Center in some cases.

Two separate links were created (one for student-athletes and one for non-athlete peers) because some demographic questions varied for the two groups (Appendix E and Appendix F). Demographic questions were based on previous athletic and leadership experiences. Each participant was provided access to the appropriate online Internet link through Survey Monkey that took him or her directly to the agreement to participate (Appendix C and Appendix D). Collegiate student-athletes were informed through the agreement to participate that they were only allowed to take the survey once and was based on their current status as an NCAA collegiate student-athlete. The same guidelines were given to NCAA collegiate non-athlete peers. Participants were provided instructions

on how to best answer the Student LPI 30-item questionnaire. Freshmen were allowed to take the survey even if they had not started their official season yet. Seniors were allowed to take the survey even if their season had already ended. The entire process for completing the survey was estimated to take between 10-15 minutes. The participants were informed that they had the right to end the survey at any time.

Collegiate Student-Athletes: Athletic directors were asked to either forward the online survey to their coaches or directly to their student-athletes during Christmas break to best utilize time and energy. Coaches were also contacted by email with details of the study and asked to share the online survey link with their players. Contact information for both athletic directors and coaches were found via the official athletics website from each institution. All head coaches listed on the school's website were contacted for participation through similar email scripts. The only change in the script was the personalization of the email to each coach.

Collegiate Non-Athlete Peers: Department chairs and instructors were contacted by email with a link to the online surveys and asked to share with their faculty and/or students. The same email script was used for faculty members of targeted institutions. The only changes in the script were the personalization of the email to each instructor. Institutions were targeted based on the high volume of response rates of student-athletes from that college or university. This methodology was used to increase internal validity of the research study since participants should have more similar demographic backgrounds. Internal validity allows the researcher to draw more accurate conclusions about the cause-and-effect within the data (Leedy and Ormond, 2005). For instance, 1,158 (80%) of responses across all Division levels came from institutions in the states of

Michigan or Tennessee. Additionally, all responses from non-athletes were collected from the same institutions as student-athletes.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to measure whether collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to be better leaders than their collegiate non-athlete peers based on leadership practices. The study controlled for participation by NCAA division level (I, II, and III) for collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athlete peers. Descriptive statistics for the overall mean and standard deviations for each group were reported. This study did not focus on gender comparisons since previous studies using the Student LPI have revealed that leadership practices do not vary according to gender (Posner, 2010, 2004; Bardou et al., 2003; Endress, 2000; Pugh, 2000; Kouzes and Posner, 1998; Edington, 1995; Posner and Brodsky, 1994, 1993). Additionally, the study did not analyze race demographics, because previous studies using the Student LPI have not revealed that practices vary based on race (Edington, 1995; Posner, 2004, 2010; Pugh, 2000).

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze each of the five Student LPI leadership practices (experimental variables). Two-way ANOVA was used because each of the two explanatory variables (athlete status and NCAA division level) “can be exposed to any combination of one level of one explanatory variable and one level of the other explanatory variable” (Seltman, 2012, p. 267). The Main Effects model measured if an interaction occurred between the two independent variables (athlete status and NCAA division level) for each of the five leadership practices. If a significant interaction ($p < .05$) occurred in the full model then a follow-up simple effects test by

division using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels were used. If no significant interaction ($p > .05$) occurred then the interaction term was removed and the model was run again to interpret the main effects. If results of the main effect were significant by division level (I, II, III) then a Tukey Post Hoc Test was run to analyze significance of the division level. All analyses were performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

A total of 1,454 NCAA college students completed the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI). A total of 95 (15%) participants completed the survey in person and 1,359 (85%) completed the survey online. Of the college students who participated, 660 (45%) were collegiate student-athletes and 794 (55%) were collegiate non-athlete peers from NCAA Division I, II, and III institutions. The study reported more female than male participants (961 female participants and 493 male participants). A complete list of demographics for student-athletes can be found in the additional tables (Table 1, p. 100). A complete list of demographics for student-athletes can be found in the additional tables (Table 2, p. 101).

Demographics by Division

Participants were recruited based on their institution's division level and were included only if they attended NCAA Division I, II, or III colleges and universities. Students were separated into two categories based on athlete status (collegiate student-athlete or collegiate non-athlete peer) and division level (I, II, or III).

Student-athletes: Of the 660 collegiate student-athletes, 180 (27%) competed at the NCAA Division I level; 193 (29%) competed at the NCAA Division II level; and 287 (44%) competed at the NCAA Division III level.

Non-athlete peers: Of the 794 collegiate non-athletes, 218 (27%) attended NCAA Division I institutes; 135 (17%) attended NCAA Division II institutes; and 441 (56%) attended NCAA Division III institutes.

Demographics by Age

Data were collected for students between the ages of 18-25. The age of respondents was grouped into three categories for purposes of this study and 961 participants were 18-20 year olds (66%), 471 of total participants were 21-23 year olds (32%), and 22 of total participants were 24-25 year olds (2%).

Student-athletes: Of the 660 total collegiate student-athlete peers, 448 (68%) were between the ages of 18-20; 212 student-athletes (32%) were between the ages of 21-23; and no student-athletes were between the ages of 24-25. The study's age demographic (Table 3) revealed that the age range of traditional student-athletes' who most commonly compete is 18-23 years at all NCAA division levels.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Student-Athletes

Age	<u>Division I</u> <u>(n = 180)</u>		<u>Division II</u> <u>(n = 193)</u>		<u>Division III</u> <u>(n = 287)</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
18-20	114	63.33	125	64.77	209	73.82
21-23	66	33.67	68	35.23	78	27.18
24-25	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Non-athlete peers: Of the 794 total collegiate non-athlete peers, 513 (65%) were between the ages of 18-20; 259 non-athlete peers (33%) were between the ages of 21-23; and 22 non-athlete peers (3%) were between the ages of 24-25 (Table 4). The average age of non-athletes is likely higher as a result of the 24-25 year old age group. An explanation of this group can be attributed to the fact that traditional student-athletes receive four years of eligibility, while non-athlete peers have no such limitation to complete a degree. However, the overall means of student-athletes and non-athlete peers were similar by age group and division level.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Non-Athletes

Age	Division I (n = 218)		Division II (n = 135)		Division III (n = 441)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
18-20	153	70.18	77	57.04	283	64.17
21-23	49	22.48	55	40.74	155	35.15
24-25	16	8.34	3	2.22	3	0.68

Overview of the Five Student Leadership Practices

The Student LPI measures five leadership practices when students are “at their personal best” as leaders in a 30-item survey (Appendix H). Each leadership practice consists of six questions with a minimum score of 6 and a maximum score of 30 based on a 5-point Likert-scale (1 = rarely or seldom, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 =

often, 5 = very frequently). Kouzes and Posner (2008, p. 22) briefly describe each of the five subscales through the following ten commitments:

Model the Way

1. Clarify values by finding your voice and affirming shared ideals.
2. Set the example by aligning actions and shared values.

Inspire a Shared Vision

3. Envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities.
4. Enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations.

Challenge the Process

5. Search for opportunities by seizing the initiative and by looking outward for innovative ways to improve.
6. Experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from experience.

Enable Others to Act

7. Foster collaboration by building trust and facilitating relationships.
8. Strengthen others by increasing self-determination and developing competence.

Encourage the Heart

9. Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence.
10. Celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community.

Student-Athletes: Table 5 contains the means and standard deviations of collegiate student-athletes by NCAA division level for each of the five Student LPI subscales. Enable Others to Act rated the highest (23.78) while Challenge the Process rated the lowest (21.72).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Student-Athletes by Division

Subscale	<u>Division I</u> (<i>n</i> = 180)		<u>Division II</u> (<i>n</i> = 193)		<u>Division III</u> (<i>n</i> = 287)		<u>Total</u> (<i>n</i> = 660)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Model	22.97	3.67	22.98	3.47	22.46	3.42	22.75	3.65
Inspire	22.58	4.24	22.53	3.99	22.16	4.00	22.39	4.07
Challenge	21.65	3.94	21.95	3.88	21.61	3.81	21.72	3.87
Enable	23.88	3.02	23.91	2.72	23.64	2.64	23.78	2.77
Encourage	23.83	3.64	23.47	3.71	23.10	3.68	23.41	3.68

Skewness and kurtosis of NCAA student-athletes were tested for normality (Table 6). Since none of the skewness results were greater than ± 3 and none of the kurtosis were greater than ± 10 (Kline, 2005), an accepted distribution was determined.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Student-Athletes by Division

Subscale	<u>Division I</u> (<i>n</i> = 180)		<u>Division II</u> (<i>n</i> = 193)		<u>Division III</u> (<i>n</i> = 287)		<u>Total</u> (<i>n</i> = 660)	
	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.
Model	-.385	.133	-.731	1.18	-.364	.263	-.460	.423
Inspire	-.575	.203	-.476	.325	-.490	.272	-.504	.241
Challenge	-.322	-.199	-.342	.176	-.193	-.023	-.271	-.040
Enable	-.332	-.234	-.411	.646	-.235	.309	-.307	.195
Encourage	-.625	.671	-.624	.221	-.521	.398	-.573	.374

Non-Athlete Peers: Table 7 contains the means and standard deviations of collegiate non-athlete peers by NCAA division level for each of the five Student LPI subscales. Enable Others to Act rated the highest (23.83) while Challenge the Process rated the lowest (20.73).

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Non-Athletes by Division

Subscale	<u>Division I</u> (<i>n</i> = 218)		<u>Division II</u> (<i>n</i> = 135)		<u>Division III</u> (<i>n</i> = 441)		<u>Total</u> (<i>n</i> = 794)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Model	21.35	3.94	22.49	3.75	21.91	3.45	21.85	3.65
Inspire	20.86	4.40	22.18	4.06	21.03	4.53	21.18	4.44
Challenge	20.49	4.10	21.19	4.25	20.71	4.10	20.73	4.12
Enable	23.15	3.27	24.06	3.10	24.10	2.82	23.83	3.02
Encourage	22.11	4.36	22.64	3.99	21.84	4.09	22.05	4.15

Skewness and kurtosis of NCAA non-athletes were tested for normality (Table 8). Since none of the skewness results were greater than ± 3 and none of the kurtosis were greater than ± 10 (Kline, 2005) an accepted distribution was determined.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Non-Athletes by Division

Subscale	<u>Division I</u> (<i>n</i> = 218)		<u>Division II</u> (<i>n</i> = 135)		<u>Division III</u> (<i>n</i> = 441)		<u>Total</u> (<i>n</i> = 794)	
	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.
Model	-.524	.625	-.477	.288	-.799	.698	-.653	.631
Inspire	-.594	.833	-.403	-.400	-.625	.056	-.596	.249
Challenge	-.422	.843	-.388	-.071	-.676	.371	-.546	.397
Enable	-.524	.730	-.380	.525	-.496	.571	-.523	.713
Encourage	-1.13	2.043	-.367	-.011	-.609	.539	-.736	.955

Table 9 provides overall means and standard deviation scores for both collegiate student-athletes and non-athlete peers. Student-athletes have a higher mean score than non-student athlete peers on four of the five constructs (Model, Inspire, Challenge, and Encourage). Non-athlete peers have a higher mean score on one Student LPI construct (Enable). When comparing the overall scores for both groups it is notable that student-athletes and non-athlete peers rated the highest (Enable) and the lowest (Challenge) in the same subscales.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Student-Athletes and Non-Athletes

Subscale	<u>Student-Athletes</u> (<i>n</i> = 660)		<u>Non-Athletes</u> (<i>n</i> = 794)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Model	22.75	3.65	21.85	3.65
Inspire	22.39	4.07	21.18	4.44
Challenge	21.72	3.87	20.73	4.12
Enable	23.78	2.77	23.83	3.02
Encourage	23.41	3.68	22.05	4.15

Overall Population: Table 10 contains the means and standard deviations of the overall population and includes means and standard deviation by NCAA division level for each of the five Student LPI subscales. Enable Others to Act rated the highest (23.81) while Challenge the Process rated the lowest (21.18).

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Entire Student Population by Division

Subscale	<u>Division I</u> (<i>n</i> = 398)		<u>Division II</u> (<i>n</i> = 328)		<u>Division III</u> (<i>n</i> = 728)		<u>Total</u> (<i>n</i> = 1,454)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Model	22.08	3.90	22.78	3.59	22.13	3.45	22.26	3.61
Inspire	21.64	4.41	22.39	4.02	21.48	4.36	21.73	4.31
Challenge	21.02	4.07	21.64	4.05	21.07	4.01	21.18	4.04
Enable	23.48	3.17	23.97	2.88	23.92	2.75	23.81	2.91
Encourage	22.89	4.13	23.13	3.83	22.34	3.98	22.67	4.00

Skewness and kurtosis of the entire population ($n = 1,454$) were tested for normality (Table 11). Since none of the skewness results were greater than ± 3 and none of the kurtosis were greater than ± 10 (Kline, 2005) an accepted distribution was determined.

Table 11

Distribution for Entire Student Population

Subscale	<u>Division I</u> ($n = 398$)		<u>Division II</u> ($n = 328$)		<u>Division III</u> ($n = 728$)		<u>Total</u> ($n = 1,454$)	
	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.	Skew.	Kurt.
Model	-.478	.483	-.622	.716	-.626	.583	-.573	.590
Inspire	-.571	.543	-.444	-.005	-.615	.223	-.580	.316
Challenge	-.383	.422	-.384	.085	-.522	.359	-.447	.310
Enable	-.466	.427	-.386	.606	-.386	.428	-.437	.537
Encourage	-1.02	1.97	-.517	.068	-.606	.567	-.706	.877

Analysis of Variance

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), 2x3 factorial design was used to determine the relationship between athlete status (independent variable) and NCAA division (independent variable) on each of the five leadership practices (dependent variables). Factors included two levels of athlete status (collegiate student-athletes, collegiate non-athlete peers), and three levels of NCAA division (I, II, III). The five leadership practices (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, Encourage) were analyzed separately (five different means). A results and analysis of each leadership practice is

provided before proceeding onto the next practice. The data analysis process for each leadership practice includes:

- (1) The interaction effect was measured for significance in the full model (athlete status by division level).
- (2) If a significant interaction ($p < .05$) occurred between the two categorical, independent variables (athlete status by division level), then a simple effects test by division was run using Bonferroni adjusted at alpha levels.
- (3) If no significant interaction ($p > .05$) occurred, then the interaction term (athlete status by division level) was removed and the reduced model was run to interpret the main effects of athlete status and division level on leadership practice.
 - a. If results of the main effect were significant ($p < .05$) by division level (I, II, III), then a Tukey Post Hoc Test was run to analyze significance of the division level on leadership practice for student-athletes and non-athlete peers.

Results by Student LPI Subscale

Model the Way

H1a: Collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Model the Way than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Table 12 shows the six items measured for the subscale “Model the Way.”

Table 12

Subscale One: Survey Items for Model the Way

Item	Model the Way Survey Items
1	I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.
6	I spend time and energy making sure that people in the organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.
11	I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.
16	I find ways to get feedback about how my actions affect other people's performance.
21	I build consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.
26	I talk about the values and principles that guide my actions.

The two-way ANOVA revealed there was a significant interaction (Table 13) between athlete status and NCAA division level $F(2, 1,148) = 3.26$, $MSE = 12.80$, $p = .039$) for Model the Way. Therefore, a follow-up simple effects test was run (Table 14).

Table 13

Analysis of Variance for Model the Way

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
Between Subjects				
Athlete Status	1	19.48	< .001	.013
NCAA Division	2	3.01	.050	.004
Athlete Status*NCAA Division	2	3.26	.039	.004
Within-group error	1,448	(12.80)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

The simple effects test using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels (Table 14) had varying results when comparing Model the Way for collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athletes by NCAA division level (Table 8).

NCAA Division I student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Model the Way than their collegiate non-athlete peers $F(1, 396) = 17.72, p < .001$. No significant difference was determined between NCAA Division II student-athletes and non-athlete peers $F(1, 326) = 1.49, p = .224$, or between NCAA Division III student-athletes and non-athlete peers $F(1, 726) = 4.56, p = .033$.

No significant difference was found for collegiate student-athletes by division $F(2, 657) = 1.72, p = .180$. A significant difference for collegiate non-athletes by division was reported $F(2, 791) = 4.20, p = .015$. Therefore a Tukey Post Hoc was run (Table 15).

Table 14

Simple Effects Test for Model the Way

Source		<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Student-Athletes					
NCAA Division	Between	21.08	2	1.72	.180
	Within	12.26	657		
Non-Athletes					
NCAA Division	Between	55.67	2	4.20	.015
	Within	13.25	791		
Division I					
Athlete Status	Between	258.12	1	17.72	< .001
	Within	14.57	396		
Division II					
Athlete Status	Between	19.10	1	1.49	.224
	Within	12.85	326		
Division III					
Athlete Status	Between	53.82	1	4.56	.033
	Within	11.81	726		

Note: Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels = .025 for athlete status and .0167 for division level.

The Tukey Post Hoc using Bonferroni adjusted alpha level indicated a significant difference for collegiate non-athletes by division level for Model the Way (Table 15). NCAA Division II non-athletes ($M = 22.49$, $SD = 3.75$) reported engaging more frequently in Model the Way than Division I non-athletes ($M = 21.35$, $SD = 3.94$). No significant difference was found when comparing Division I collegiate non-athletes with Division III collegiate non-athletes. No significant difference was found when comparing Division II collegiate non-athletes with Division III non-athletes.

Table 15

Tukey Post Hoc of Non-Athletes by Division Level for Model the Way

<i>(I)</i>	<i>(J)</i>	<i>(I-J)</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Division I	Division II	-1.14	0.40	.012	-2.08	-.204
Division I	Division III	-0.56	0.30	.153	-1.27	.149
Division II	Division III	0.58	0.36	.235	-.259	1.42

Note: Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels = .0167.

Inspire a Shared Vision

H2a: Collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Table 16 shows the six items measured for the subscale “Inspire a Shared Vision.”

Table 16

Subscale Two: Survey Items for Inspire a Shared Vision

Item	Inspire a Shared Vision Survey Items
2	I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.
7	I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.
12	I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.
17	I talk with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.
22	I am upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.
27	I speak with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.

The two-way ANOVA revealed there was no significant interaction (Table 17) between athlete status and NCAA division level $F(2, 1,148) = 2.27, MSE = 18.18, p = .104$). Since the interaction effect was not significant the interactions were removed and a two-way ANOVA reduced model was run for the leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision (Table 18).

Table 17

Analysis of Variance for Inspire a Shared Vision

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
	Between Subjects			
Athlete Status	1	20.00	< .001	.014
NCAA Division	2	3.57	.028	.005
Athlete Status*NCAA Division	2	2.27	.104	.003
Within-group error	1,448	(18.18)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Inspire a Shared Vision ($M=22.39$, $SD=4.44$) than their collegiate non-athlete peers ($M = 21.18$, $SD = 4.44$), $F(1, 1,450) = 24.47$, $MSE = 18.21$, $p < .001$). Additionally, the reduced model (Table 18) indicated a significant difference by NCAA division level. Therefore, a Tukey Post Hoc test was run.

Table 18

Analysis of Variance for Inspire a Shared Vision

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
	Between Subjects			
Athlete Status	1	24.47	< .001	.017
NCAA Division	2	3.02	.049	.004
Within-group error	1,450	(18.21)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Results of the Tukey Post Hoc (Table 19) reported a significant difference for the entire population of students ($n = 1,454$) when comparing NCAA Division II students with NCAA Division I and III students. NCAA Division II students ($M = 22.39$, $SD = 4.36$) reported engaging more frequently in Inspire a Shared Vision than both NCAA Division I students ($M = 21.64$, $SD = 4.41$) and NCAA Division III students ($M = 21.48$, $SD = 4.36$). There was no significant difference of Inspire a Shared Vision when comparing Division I students and Division III students. A complete list of the Means and Standard Deviations can be found in Table 10.

Table 19

Tukey Post Hoc Comparisons for Inspire a Shared Vision by Division

<i>(I)</i>	<i>(J)</i>	<i>(I-J)</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Division I	Division II	-0.75	0.32	.049*	-1.50	p < -.01
Division I	Division III	0.16	0.27	.813	-0.46	0.79
Division II	Division III	0.91	0.28	.004*	0.25	1.58

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 familywise alpha level.

Challenge the Process

H3a: Collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Challenge the Process than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Table 20 shows the six items measured for the subscale “Challenge the Process.”

Table 20

Subscale Three: Survey Items for Challenge the Process

Item	Challenge the Process Survey Items
3	I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.
8	I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.
13	I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.
18	When things do not go as we expected, I ask, “What can we learn from this experience”
23	I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.
28	I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.

The two-way ANOVA revealed there was no significant interaction (Table 21) between athlete status and NCAA division level $F(2, 1,148) = 0.23$, $MSE = 16.08$, $p = .795$). Since the interaction effect was not significant the interactions were removed and a two-way ANOVA reduced model (Table 22) was run for the leadership practice of Challenge the Process.

Table 21

Analysis of Variance for Challenge the Process

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
	Between Subjects			
Athlete Status	1	17.43	< .001	.012
NCAA Division	2	1.55	.212	.002
Athlete Status*NCAA Division	2	0.23	.795	.000
Within-group error	1,448	(16.08)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Challenge the Process ($M = 21.72$, $SD = 4.07$) than their collegiate non-athlete peers ($M = 21.18$, $SD = 3.65$), $F(1, 1,450) = 24.47$, $MSE = 16.06$, $p < .001$). Additionally, there was no significant difference to report (Table 22) by division level for Challenge the Process; therefore, a Tukey Post Hoc test was not run.

Table 22

Analysis of Variance for Challenge the Process

	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
Variable	Between subjects			
Athlete Status	1	19.43	< .001	.013
NCAA Division	2	1.50	.224	.002
Within-group error	1,450	(16.06)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Enable Others to Act

H4a: Collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Enable Others to Act than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Table 23 shows the six items measured for the subscale “Enable Others to Act.”

Table 23

Subscale Four: Survey Items for Enable Others to Act

Item	Enable Others to Act Survey Items
4	I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.
9	I actively listen to diverse points of view.
14	I treat others with dignity and respect.
19	I support the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.
24	I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
29	I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.

The two-way ANOVA revealed there was a significant interaction (Table 24) between athlete status and NCAA division level $F(2, 1,148) = 5.30$, $MSE = 8.38$, $p < .001$) for Enable Others to Act. Therefore, a follow-up simple effects test was run.

Table 24

Analysis of Variance for Enable Others to Act

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
Athlete Status	1	0.06	.802	.000
NCAA Division	2	2.77	.063	.004
Athlete Status*NCAA Division	2	5.30	< .001	.007
Within-group error	1,448	(8.38)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

The follow-up simple effects test using Bonferroni adjusted alpha level (Table 25) showed no significant effects by division for collegiate student-athletes when compared with collegiate non-athlete peers. No significant difference was found for collegiate student-athletes by division. Collegiate non-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Enable Others to Act by division $F(2, 791) = 7.75$ ($p < .001$). Therefore a Tukey Post Hoc test was run (Table 26).

Table 25

Simple Effects Test for Enable Others to Act

Source			<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Student-Athletes					
NCAA Division	Between	5.30	2	0.69	0.501
	Within	7.67	657		
Non-Athletes					
NCAA Division	Between	69.52	2	7.75	< .001
	Within	8.96	791		
Division I					
Student-Athletes	Between	52.02	1	5.22	0.023
	Non-Athletes	Within	9.97		
Division II					
Student-Athletes	Between	1.73	1	0.21	0.649
	Non-Athletes	Within	8.30		
Division III					
Student-Athletes	Between	36.21	1	4.80	0.029
	Non-Athletes	Within	7.55		

Note: Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels = .025 for athlete status and .0167 for division level.

The Tukey Post Hoc using Bonferroni adjusted alpha level indicated a significant difference for collegiate non-athletes by division level for Challenge the Process (Table 26). NCAA Division III non-athletes ($M = 24.10$, $SD = 2.82$, $p < .001$) reported engaging more frequently in Enable Others to Act than Division I non-athletes ($M = 23.15$, $SD = 3.27$). No significant difference was found when comparing Division I collegiate non-athletes with Division II collegiate non-athletes. No significant difference was found when comparing Division II collegiate non-athletes with Division III non-athletes.

Table 26

Tukey Post Hoc of Non-athletes by division level for Enable Others to Act

<i>(I)</i>	<i>(J)</i>	<i>(I-J)</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Division I	Division II	-0.91	0.33	.016	-1.68	-.138
Division I	Division III	-0.95	0.25	< .001	-1.53	-0.36
Division II	Division III	-0.04	0.29	.991	-0.73	0.65

Note: Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels = .0167.

Encourage the Heart

H5a: Collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently in the leadership practice of Encourage the Heart than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Table 27 shows the six items measured for the subscale “Encourage the Heart.”

Table 27

Subscale Five: Survey Items for Encourage the Heart

Item	Encourage the Heart Survey Items
5	I praise people for a job well done.
10	I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.
15	I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.
20	I make it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.
25	I find ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.
30	I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.

The two-way ANOVA revealed there was no significant interaction (Table 28) between athlete status and NCAA division level $F(2, 1,148) = 1.12$, $MSE = 15.52$, $p = .327$). Since the interaction effect was not significant the interactions were removed and a two-way ANOVA reduced model (Table 29) was run for the leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision.

Table 28

Analysis of Variance for Encourage the Heart

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
	Between Subjects			
Athlete Status	1	32.84	$p < .01$.022
NCAA Division	2	3.28	.038	.005
Athlete Status*NCAA Division	2	1.12	.327	.002
Within-group error	1,448	(15.52)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Encourage the Heart ($M = 23.41$, $SD = 3.68$) than their collegiate non-athlete peers ($M = 22.05$, $SD = 4.15$, $F(1, 1,450) = 37.79$, $MSE = 15.52$, $p < .001$). Since no significant difference was found by NCAA division level (Table 29) no Tukey Post Hoc was reported.

Table 29

Analysis of Variance for Encourage the Heart

Variable	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial eta</i> ²
	Between Subjects			
Athlete Status	1	37.79	< .001	.025
NCAA Division	2	2.93	.054	.004
Within-group error	1,450	(15.52)		

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square errors.

Summary of Results

Model the Way: The interaction (athlete status by division level) was significant; therefore, a simple effects test using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels were run. Division I student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Model the Way than their Division I non-athlete peers and was significant. No significant difference was reported between Division II student-athletes and their non-athlete peers or Division III student-athletes and their non-athletes.

No significant difference was found for collegiate student-athletes by division level. NCAA Division II non-athletes ($M = 22.49$, $SD = 3.75$) reported engaging more frequently in Model the Way than Division I non-athletes ($M = 21.35$, $SD = 3.94$). No

significant difference was found when comparing Division I collegiate non-athletes with Division III collegiate non-athletes. No significant difference was found when comparing Division II collegiate non-athletes with Division III non-athletes.

Inspire a Shared Vision: The interaction effect (athlete status by division level) was not significant; therefore, a reduced model was run and determined there was a significant difference for both athlete status and division level. Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Inspire a Shared Vision than their collegiate non-athlete peers. Additionally, Division II students ($n = 328$) reported engaging more frequently in Inspire A Shared Vision than Division I ($n = 398$) and Division III ($n = 728$) students. No significant difference was found when comparing Division I students and Division III students.

Challenge the Process: The interaction effect (athlete status by division level) was not significant; therefore, a reduced model was run and determined significant difference for athlete status but not by division level. Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Challenge the Process than their collegiate non-athlete peers and was significant. No significant difference was found by NCAA division level.

Enable Others to Act: The interaction effect (athlete status by division level) was significant; therefore, a simple effects test using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels were run. Results indicated no significant difference between NCAA Division I, II, or III student-athletes as compared with NCAA Division I, II, or III non-athlete peers.

No significant difference was found for collegiate student-athletes by division level. NCAA Division III non-athletes ($M = 24.10$, $SD = 2.82$, $p < .001$) reported engaging more frequently in Enable Others to Act than Division I non-athletes ($M =$

23.15, $SD = 3.27$). No significant difference was found when comparing Division I collegiate non-athletes with Division II collegiate non-athletes. No significant difference was found when comparing Division II collegiate non-athletes with Division III non-athletes.

Encourage the Heart: The interaction effect (athlete status by division level) was not significant; therefore, a reduced model was run and determined significance for athlete status but not by division level. Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Encourage the Heart than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Leadership is a concept that has stood the test of time and continues to be an ability that is often studied but difficult to define (Day & Halpin, 2001; Bass, 1990, Rost, 1993). As of this writing, a quick search of “leadership” in the EBSCO database yielded 623,646 results, and Rost (1993) reported over 300 definitions in leadership-specific literature. Researchers are not hard-pressed to find literature on the topic but leadership continues to be a phenomenon that is often observed but difficult to understand (Haslam et al., 2011; Burns, 1978). The leadership field has hundreds of definitions that apply to particular conditions (Rost, 1993; Walters, 2009) and groups of people, but a lack of empirical research exists for leadership in athletics. The common perception is that athletes have increased leadership ability and character (McAfee, 2011; Doty, 2006; Shields and Bredmeier, 1995), but the lack of empirical evidence on the matter is well-documented (McAfee, 2011; Posner, 2004; Park, 2010).

An explanation for the void in literature is the myth that excellent athletic performance is synonymous with leadership—therefore, leadership and athletics are commonly associated. Recognition of athletics as a leadership developer can be traced as far back as some 2,500 years to ancient times (Plato, 2008), and arguments that “sport builds character” became popular in the 19th century and were used to justify athletics as an academically appropriate activity in the schools and colleges (Lucas and Smith, 1978).

Throughout history, countless iconic leadership figures and stories involving athletes have been celebrated. Athletics has long served as a national platform for more than just entertainment but for key political issues. This generation alone is full of stories and public figures with backgrounds in athletics who used their public stage for the betterment of the United States—for example, former Presidents Teddy Roosevelt, John Kennedy, Gerald Ford, and Dwight Eisenhower; civil rights movement activists Joe Louis, Jackie Robinson, and Muhammad Ali; and recent 21st century inspirations former professional football player and Army Ranger Patrick Tillman. High school, college, and professional athletes continue to serve as key public figures in communities both nationally and locally.

The mythology continues into the 21st century. McAfee (2011) examined why recruiters are hiring former college athletes for corporate jobs and found that,

“Candidates with previous college athletic experiences were considered more desirable. This view is based on a near consensus concerning the leadership attributes gained and demonstrated by student-athletes. In fact, a clear majority of the corporate recruiters indicated that, all things being equal, they would hire a student-athlete over other nonstudent-athletes every time” (p. 85).

The continued prevalence of the mythology of the association of athletics and leadership justifies the current study. The demographic of college students was targeted because a shortage of young leaders in corporate America is a common topic today (McAfee, 2011; Groves, 2010; Ready and Conger, 2007; Byham, 2001). Corporate executives have been critical of academia recently in their noted lack of preparation of young professionals capable of handling leadership challenges (Fife and Losco, 2000). A term used to describe such challenges is the Leadership-Succession Crisis, which is having an effect on multiple disciplines and in multiple industries. The perception that

student-athletes can be more successful in corporate America as compared with their non-athlete peers is evidenced through research by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE, 2012) who found that the top two traits employers look for in an employee is (1) the ability to work in a team and (2) leadership.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether collegiate student-athletes are better leaders than their collegiate non-athlete peers based on self-perceived leadership practices measured by the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI). The Student LPI was used to measure self-perceptions of leadership behaviors of college students ($n = 1,454$). Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is one of the most widely used leadership assessments in the business world, and the *Student LPI* is one of few leadership instruments designed for and validated on students (Posner, 2010). The instrument uses a 5-point Likert-scale to measure when students are "at their personal best" as leaders through five practices (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart).

A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to measure the relationship of college athlete status (student-athletes ($n = 660$) and non-athlete peers ($n = 794$)) and NCAA division level (Division I ($n = 398$), Division II ($n = 328$), Division III ($n = 728$)) for the five leadership practices using the Student LPI. The study provides empirical evidence that collegiate student-athletes perceive themselves to engage more frequently in four out of five leadership practices (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Encourage the Heart) than their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Results Overview

The study provides empirical evidence that athletic participation can be understood as a leader development experience at the collegiate level. Results of this study indicated that athletic involvement has a positive effect on leadership practices and that Human Resources departments are justified in seeking out college graduates with athletic backgrounds during the recruitment and hiring process to the extent that they are looking for employees who possess specific character and leadership skills.

The conclusion of this study will focus on the “why” of the results, and is based on each of the five leadership practice findings. In short, athletics is doing something “right” as measured by the Student LPI, and shows that there is an interaction between intercollegiate athletic participation and leadership development. Significant ($p < .05$) results were determined for four of the five Student LPI subscales. Specifically collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently than their non-athlete peers in Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, and Encouraging the Heart. The subscale Enable Others to Act was the only leadership practice to not have significance among the two groups.

Discussion of the Five Leadership Subscales

Each of the five subscales will be discussed in detail by providing a summary of results for the subscale, the definition of the subscale (including the six items measured), and a conclusion emphasizing leadership traits of student-athletes based on literature.

Model the Way

Summary of Results: Results indicated a significant difference ($p < .001$) in Model the Way for Division I student-athletes compared with Division I non-athletes. No

significant difference was reported between Division II student-athletes and their non-athlete peers or Division III student-athletes and their non-athlete peers. The subscale “Model the Way” was different from the other three leadership practices that had significant differences because only one division level was found to be significant.

Definition of Subscale:

1. Find your voice by clarifying personal values.
2. Set the example by aligning actions with shared values (Kouzes and Posner 2006, p. 10).

According to Kouzes and Posner (2008), “Research shows that the people who are most frequently mentioned as admired leaders all had strong beliefs about matters of principle, an unwavering commitment to a clear set of values, and passion about their causes” (p. 30). Essentially, those leaders who hold strong convictions in their beliefs stand up for them and are admired for being so passionate. Table 12 provides the six items measured in the subscale Model the Way.

Table 12

Subscale One: Survey Items for Model the Way

Item	Model the Way Survey Items
1	I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.
6	I spend time and energy making sure that people in the organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.
11	I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.
16	I find ways to get feedback about how my actions affect other people’s performance.
21	I build consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.
26	I talk about the values and principles that guide my actions.

Conclusion Based on Literature: Although it was hypothesized that collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently than collegiate non-athlete peers in all five leadership practices, a review of the literature determined that Model the Way was the subscale that might have different results. Rudd and Stoll (2004) provide evidence that character focuses on two distinct values: moral and social character. Their study compared collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athlete peers' ($n = 595$) social character index and moral character index scores. Results indicated that non-athletes scored significantly higher than team sport athletes on moral character. Additionally, team sport athletes scored significantly higher than non-athletes on social character index. The study provides evidence that character emphasis for student-athletes is placed on social character, while non-athlete peers place more emphasis on moral character. Rudd and Stoll argue that society tends to view character more as "social character," and this explains why athletics is perceived to "build character."

What is of significance when comparing Rudd and Stoll's (2004) study with this study is that corporate America recruits and hires employees based more on social character, the set of virtues that society views as important to success (Van Mullem, Brunner, and Stoll, 2008). Social character is described through terms such as teamwork, loyalty, self-sacrifice, work ethic, and perseverance. Therefore, it is easy to see why corporate recruiters tend to favor student-athletes who have demonstrated social character, as compared to moral character which is composed of the virtues of honesty, fairness, empathy, and compassion. Interestingly, when athletes are embroiled in controversy in the popular media, they are often criticized for lacking *moral* character. Such a distinction between social and moral character may explain the recent (2013)

support for the Baltimore Ravens star linebacker Ray Lewis. Lewis' leadership on the football field is lauded by both teammates and fans. However, his performance as a citizen in 2000 when he admitted to obstruction of justice in a murder case calls into question his moral character (Babb, 2013).

A closer look into the six items measured for Model the Way (Table 12) reveals how components from both social and moral character exist and why this subscale might have scored differently when compared to the others. For example, social character focuses more on a group (or in this case the organization), while moral character focuses more on the individual (Mullem, Brunner, and Stoll, 2008). Questions 6, 11, and 21 all use social constructs based on the organization, while questions 1 and 26 focus on the moral character of the individual. Placing questions into the categories of social and moral character constructs may help explain why Model the Way was the only construct that had varying results by division when comparing collegiate student-athletes and non-athlete peers.

Comparing differences of NCAA Division I student-athletes with NCAA Division II and III student-athletes may also help explain the difference for Model the Way as compared with the other three subscales which reported significant difference. Social media has changed the landscape of collegiate athletics. Student-athletes at Division I institutions have reached celebrity-like status on their campuses, and their actions both on- and off-the-field are on constant on display—especially for high profile athletes in football and basketball. It has never been more important for student-athletes to understand that their every move is being monitored both on and off the court by family, friends, coaches, administrators, and fans. Exemplary student leaders who Model the

Way know that “if they want to gain commitment and reach the highest standards, they must be models of the behavior they expect of others” (Posner, 2008, p. 11). Student-athletes are viewed as community public figures (Shulman and Bowen, 2001; Carroll, Chandler, and Johnson, 1999) and role models for kids. It just so happens that Division I student-athletes—particularly in high profile sports—have a much larger platform to demonstrate Model the Way.

Inspire a Shared Vision

Summary of Results: Results indicated a significant difference ($p < .001$) in Inspire a Shared Vision when comparing collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athlete peers. Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Inspire a Shared Vision than their collegiate non-athlete peers. Additionally, significant difference was determined for Division II students ($n = 328$) who reported engaging more frequently in Inspire a Shared Vision than Division I students ($n = 398$) and Division III students ($n = 728$). No significant difference was found when comparing Division I students and Division III students.

Definition of Subscale:

1. Envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities.
2. Enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations (Kouzes and Posner 2006, p. 10).

Exemplary student leaders have the ability to envision a future that is filled with opportunities. They visualize extraordinary possibilities for the common good of a group and ensure that others are able to see it as well (Kouzes and Posner, 2008). Table 16 provides the six items measured in the subscale Inspire a Shared Vision.

Table 16

Subscale Two: Survey Items for Inspire a Shared Vision

Item	Inspire a Shared Vision Survey Items
2	I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.
7	I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.
12	I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.
17	I talk with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.
22	I am upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.
27	I speak with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.

Conclusion Based on Literature: At the start of every season, coaches and athletes set goals based on their expectations and then track their results throughout the season. Successful teams have a common understanding of a shared vision that bonds the group together in hopes of achieving shared goals. According to John Schlifske, chairman and chief executive officer of Northwestern Mutual, “College sports are a great brand. The student-athletes are amateurs, and most will never be professional athletes, but they participate because they want to be part of something that’s bigger than themselves” (Mullich, 2012, B8).

Reviewing the six items of the subscale reveals the importance of maintaining open lines of communication within the organization. Communication is a common leadership trait and specifically focuses on transformational leadership where results can be monitored (Hadden, 2003). Athletes act in a transformational manner on a regular

basis as they are constantly evaluating where they currently are and where they are going collectively as a team. Athletics allow tangible results to be tracked because wins and losses are constantly monitored and often define the success of the team—whether fairly or not.

Challenge the Process

Summary of Results: Results indicated a significant difference ($p < .001$) in Challenge the Process when comparing collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athlete peers. Collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Challenge the Process than their collegiate non-athlete peers. No significant difference was found by NCAA division level.

Definition of Subscale:

1. Search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve.
2. Experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes (Kouzes and Posner 2006, p. 10).

Challenges in organizations are commonplace, and, according to Kouzes and Posner (2008), the work of personal-best leaders is to actively seek ways to make things better through change. Instead of being discouraged by challenge, exemplary leaders seek challenges and are energized by overcoming difficult experiences through competitive spirits. Table 20 provides the six items measured in the subscale Challenge the Process.

Table 20

Subscale Three: Survey Items for Challenge the Process

Item	Challenge the Process Survey Items
3	I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.
8	I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.
13	I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.
18	When things do not go as we expected, I ask, "What can we learn from this experience"
23	I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.
28	I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.

Conclusion Based on Literature: When it comes to the "curriculum of life," struggle is something that every human must endure. The ability to handle adversity and change in corporate America has been linked with the ability to sustain high achievement demands both through physical and emotional strength. In an article titled, *The Making of a Corporate Athlete*, Loehr and Schwartz (2001) said that, "If there is one quality that executives seek for themselves and their employees, it is sustained high performance in the face of ever-increasing pressure and rapid change" (p. 120) and that executives must "learn what world-class athletes already know: recovering energy is as important as expending it" (p. 120). The ability to persevere when things go wrong is a leader trait that coaches emphasize to their athletes.

When analyzing subscale items for Challenge the Process, questions 3, 18, and 23 stand out in athletics because of their emphasis on accelerating growth through competitive spirits both individually and collectively. Great athletes are known for their competitiveness and ability to get the most out of their skills. Similarly, great *leader*

athletes such as college football quarterbacks are admired for their ability to get their teammates to perform at their best levels when their performance is most sorely needed. When leaders challenge the process they are seeking ways to maximize the performance of their colleagues, and ultimately get the best returns on their investments. If they are not getting the desired results then athletes must be able to make changes based on the evaluation of their current situations and actions. This leader skill, then, is clearly identifiable in athletes and therefore sought after in the corporate world.

Enable Others to Act

Summary of Results: Results indicated no significant difference between collegiate student-athletes as compared with their collegiate non-athlete peers. Nor were significant differences found when comparing collegiate student-athletes by division level. However, there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) when comparing collegiate non-athletes by division level. NCAA Division III non-athletes reported engaging more frequently in Enable Others to Act than Division I non-athletes ($p < .001$). No significant difference was found when comparing Division I non-athletes and Division II non-athletes or when comparing Division II non-athletes with Division III non-athletes. While this finding is interesting, it is beyond the scope of this study, one that has focused on the characteristics of athletes as leaders and not on the characteristics of leaders of non-athletes.

Definition of Subscale:

1. Foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust.
2. Strengthen others by sharing power and discretion (Kouzes and Posner 2006, p. 10).

Exemplary leaders understand how to get extraordinary things done through collaboration with others and to create trust in relationships so that people can rely on one another throughout various environments (Kouzes and Posner, 2008). Table 23 provides the six items measured in the subscale Enable Others to Act.

Table 23

Subscale Four: Survey Items for Enable Others to Act

Item Enable Others to Act Survey Items

- | | |
|----|--|
| 4 | I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with. |
| 9 | I actively listen to diverse points of view. |
| 14 | I treat others with dignity and respect. |
| 19 | I support the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own. |
| 24 | I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work. |
| 29 | I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities. |
-

Conclusion Based on Literature: The subscale of Enable Others to Act rated the highest for both student-athletes and non-athlete peers but was the only subscale that was not significant and that non-athlete peers rated slightly higher ($M = 23.83$) than student-athletes ($M = 23.78$). It is possible that the measure is simply the result of being a college student. When analyzing the six items in subscale four, it could be assumed that the first item (question 4) could be rated lower by athletes since they are constantly in competition; even with teammates, going head-to-head in practices and seeking scholarships and for playing time. However, it could also be argued that athletes on teams are still more aware of the cooperation they experience with their teammates as they engage in competition with opponents. Competitive relationships in athletics, even inside

the organization, are natural. A common mindset scripted into athletes is that in order for them to win then someone else has to lose. With all that said, this subscale was still rated the highest for both collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athletes and the results were statistically equivalent.

Encourage the Heart

Summary of Results: Results indicated a significant difference ($p < .001$) in Encourage the Heart when comparing collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athlete peers. Collegiate student-athletes reported to engage more frequently in Challenge the Process than their collegiate non-athlete peers. No significant difference was found by NCAA division level.

Definition of Subscale:

1. Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence.
2. Celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community (Kouzes and Posner 2006, p. 10).

Exemplary student leaders need to be able to “encourage the heart of their team by recognizing people’s contributions and celebrating the group’s values and victories” (Kouzes and Posner, 2008, p. 122). Student leaders who are extraordinary understand that the key to recognition of others is about acknowledging positive results and reinforcing positive performance. Expecting teammates to succeed instead of fail is an important aspect of encouraging the heart. Table 27 provides the six items measured in the subscale Encourage the Heart.

Table 27

Subscale Five: Survey Items for Encourage the Heart

Item	Encourage the Heart Survey Items
5	I praise people for a job well done.
10	I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.
15	I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.
20	I make it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.
25	I find ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.
30	I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.

Conclusion Based on Literature: Encouraging the Heart is strongly represented in athletics. This is evidenced by the countless high-fives and other gestures by teammates whether in locker rooms, during practices, and witnessed by the public throughout live, in-game competitions. Student-athletes celebrate wins and congratulate teammates often. Similarly, they encourage teammates after experiencing a loss in hopes of improving performance. The helping up of teammates when they've been knocked down can be used as both a simile and metaphor in collegiate athletics for everything that's right about the strong bonds that can be formed on teams.

Comparing Results

Upon reading the results and discussions of this study it is notable that these results are similar to those done by Kouzes and Posner with college students using the Student LPI. Posner (2010) provided an article on psychometric properties for comparisons of this study. The most recent version of the Student LPI is an online

version run between 2007 and 2009. The article provided by Posner (2010) updates the psychometric properties of the Student LPI (Posner, 2004) with a total sample involving 38,944 respondents (Self = 8,208 and Observed = 30,736). Just over one-half of Self respondents were categorized as college students ($n = 983$). Even though the two sets of data cannot be analyzed because of age category differences, there were similarities in the results.

What is of most significance when comparing this study with Posner's (2010) are the results from the leadership subscales for college students Self scores.

“In these analyses comparisons were made between “below average” and above average” effectiveness groups on each of the demographic variables across the five leadership practices... Those above average on the effectiveness scale (comprised of responses to their assessment of their leaders' skills and satisfaction with this person's leadership) reported engaging in four leadership practices (Modeling, Inspiring, Challenging, Encourage) more than those who were below average on this scale” (p. 17).

Therefore, the same four subscales (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Encourage) that this study found to be significant ($p < .001$) for collegiate student-athletes to engage more frequently than their collegiate non-athlete peers were also found to be significant in Posner's study comparing “below average” and “above average” effectiveness groups for college students.

The studies have similar gender, age, and race frequencies after observing basic frequencies. Posner (2010) determined that results by gender “did not reveal any particular consistency” (p. 26), and analyses by gender and ethnicity “reveal that while there may be differences *between* people based on these demographic variables, the same patterns are found *within* these categories between those who were below and above average in effectiveness” (p. 27).

A summary of Posner's results indicate that Enable Others to Act is the most frequently engaged leadership practice followed by Encourage the Heart. The same results were found for collegiate student-athletes and non-athlete peers in this study. Additionally, the subscales of Model the Way Inspire a Shared Vision, and Challenge the Process all scored similarly, lending further validity to the current study's results when comparing collegiate student-athletes and collegiate non-athletes significance.

Limitations and Future Studies

Based on the study's findings and limitations, recommendations for future studies would include administering more survey's in-person to both student-athletes and non-athlete peers to try to increase variance of the race population. Research could also be improved with the addition of more student-athletes and non-athletes from Division I and Division II institutions. Increased sample sizes could increase variance of race since a large sample of this study's population came from Division III institutes with a majority of the population being white/Caucasian.

Future studies could also focus on tracking response rates (in-person) for each institution by sport. The majority of participants from this study were from low-profile sports as classified by Shulman and Bowen (2001). Having a large enough sample size from all NCAA sports would provide research to compare leadership practices by sport to determine which sports report more athletes frequently engaged in leadership practices. Future studies may also want to exclude freshman from the study's criterion since most freshman student-athletes are only in their first semesters on a team, and therefore may not have experienced a significant effect from having been on a college team.

The majority of the study's population sample was received from online participants. Even though the assumption for college students today is that they have computer and internet access it does not necessarily follow that all students have the same amount of access. For instance, not all students have home access and may only focus on academic activities when the internet is accessible. Therefore, an online survey probably would not rank highly in the priority of time-use on the internet. Consequently, since the online survey was shared with coaches and faculty members who were asked to forward to student-athletes and non-athlete peers, it may be that the sample is not as representative of either athletes or non-athlete peers as would be desirable.

Future studies could focus on the demographic of sports targeted for participants. A higher volume of athletes from sports categorized as "low profile" (sports excluding football and basketball) completed the survey. Athletes from higher profile sports, particularly at the Division I level, were not as easily obtained (either by email or in-person). To overcome this limitation, researchers should seek approval from Athletic Directors who strongly support the importance of the study or research and are able to influence coaches from high profile sports to participate. Another possible way to increase high profile athletes' response rates would be to administer the surveys out-of-season when coaches might be more open to administering such surveys to their players.

Even though results of the study indicated similar race demographic results for both collegiate student-athletes and non-athlete peers, a large percentage of participants of both groups were white. The majority of the responses came from Division III private institutions with a larger race population of white/Caucasians. Future studies should seek more participants from more racially diverse campuses and collect responses from

general education classes in person with more diverse populations of students. Similarly, a higher percentage of females filled out the surveys due to similar reasons (more females than males attended the Division III schools surveyed). Therefore, schools with a more equal male-to-female ratio should be included in the studies.

A limitation of this study, and of using only the “Self” Student LPI, could be made that the results are not assessing a 360-degree leadership assessment using both observed and self raters. However, Posner (2010) updated the psychometric properties of the Student LPI ($n = 38,944$) and found that, “scores from Observers are generally higher than those reported by Self respondents” (p. 26). Put differently, there is a significant and positive relationship between scores on the Student LPI and observations of leadership. Consequently, the criticism that the Student LPI focuses on self-perception is not supported. In the case of this study, since athletes are perceived to be more confident and in many cases know how to carry themselves with confidence (Loehr and Schwartz, 2001; Shulman and Bowen, 2001) they correctly rate themselves higher than their non-athlete peers.

Research Summary

Limited empirical evidence exists when measuring leadership of student-athletes with their non-athlete peers. The results of this study indicate that collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in four out of the five leadership practices measured (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Encourage), and provides empirical evidence that athletic participation can be viewed as a training practice for leadership development. The study sought to provide possible solutions to the Leadership Succession Crisis that has industries scrambling to secure top young talent while nearly half of upper-level

managers shift out of their current leadership positions. The results provide evidence that recruiters can turn to collegiate athletics to recruit and hire student-athletes as a solution to the current leadership shortage because athletics, if done properly, can provide environments that allow student-athletes to engage in and refine leadership practices. These experiences result in an ongoing, systematic process that allows student-athletes to track tangible results. This growth model is highly attractive to corporate America recruiters. Steve Reinemund, dean of Wake Forest University Schools of Business and retired chairman and CEO of PepsiCo., stated that:

“In my 30 years in the business world, I have found that what an athlete brings to the workplace is discipline, teamwork, a drive for success, the desire to be held accountable and a willingness to have their performance measured. Those characteristics are very valued in the marketplace, especially in career fields such as finance, sales, and marketing” (Mullich, 2012, p. B7).

The NCAA is comprised of 1,079 institutions across three divisions (Mullich, 2012) with over 450,000 collegiate student-athletes taking part in intercollegiate athletics each year (NCAA.org, 2012). Based on numbers provided by the NCAA an estimated 99% of student-athletes “go pro” in something other than sports after graduation meaning that collegiate athletics can be a talent pool rich with leaders who possess social skills valued in corporate settings. This study is one of the first of its kind that provides empirical evidence that collegiate student-athletes engage more frequently in leadership practices when compared to their collegiate non-athlete peers.

Executives throughout corporate America have been critical of higher education due to a lack in leadership readiness of recent college graduates. Companies in the U.S. spend a combined \$740 billion annually for training and education with emphasis on employee growth (Spence, 2001). To maximize on their investments, companies should

follow the Jim Collins (2001) approach to corporate success in getting the right people on the bus, the wrong people off the bus, and the right people in the right seats. Hiring the right people in the first place is one of the most difficult aspects of human resource departments today.

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences between student-athletes and their non-athlete peers with regard to self-perceived leadership practices. The study provides significant empirical evidence that collegiate student-athletes reported engaging more frequently in four of five leadership practices (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Encourage the Heart) than their collegiate non-athlete peers. The results indicate that athletic involvement is an experience that either attracts individuals who already possess leader skills, or that these skills are learned and enhanced by student-athletes through their athletics experiences. In either case, Human Resource departments can support their practice of viewing student-athletes as desirable employees during the Leadership-Succession Crisis today.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Tineh, A., Khasawneh, S., and Omary, A. (2009). Kouzes and Posner's transformational leadership model in practice: The case of Jordanian schools. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 7(3).
- Adams, T. C., and Keim, M. C. (2000). Leadership practices and effectiveness among Greek student leaders. *College Student Journal*, 34(2), 259-270.
- Army Leadership: Competent, Confident, and Agile, FM 6-22. October 2006.
- Arendt, S. (2004). *Leadership behaviors in undergraduate hospitality management and dietetics students*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames.
- Argyris, C. (1979). How normal science methodology makes leadership research less additive and less applicable. In J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in leadership*, 47-63. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Aristotle. (1958). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.) In J. D. Kaplan (Ed.), *The pocket Aristotle*, 158-274. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Arnold, P. (1999). The virtues, moral education, and the practice of sport. *Quest*, 51 (1), 39-54.
- Associated Press (2005). Study sheds light on why athletes behave badly. September 27, 2005. Retrieved from: <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/news/story?id=2172121>.
- Associated Press (2012). Half of recent college grads underemployed or jobless. April 23, 2012. Retrieved from http://www.cleveland.com/business/index.ssf/2012/04/half_of_recent_college_grads_u.html.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Babb, K. (2013). Ray Lewis's ties to Atlanta murders now a footnote, but one victim's family struggles to cope. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved February 26, 2013, from: http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-01-24/sports/36527538_1_jacynth-baker-atlanta-murders-ray-lewis.
- Bardou, K., Byrne, S., Pasternak, V., Perez, N., and Rainey, A. (2003). Self-efficacy and student leaders: The effects of gender, previous leadership experiences, and institutional environment. *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association*, 33-48.

- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Baxter, W. (2001). *Engineering leadership*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 6.
- Brandenburger, A. M., and Nalebuff, B. J. (1995). The right game: Use of game theory to shape strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 1995.
- Brodsky, B. (1988). *Development of a modified version of the Leadership Practices Inventory for use with college students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). San Jose State University, CA.
- Browit, J. (1999). Character paves way for L-C. *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, 1B-3B.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Chandler, S., Johnson, D., and Carroll, P. (1999). Abusive behaviors of college athletes. *College Student Journal*, 33 (4), 638-645.
- Coakley, J. (2004). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies*, (8th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Corporate Leadership Council. (2000, April). Challenges in managing high-potential employees: Results of the council's membership survey. *Managing High-Potential Employee Series*, Vol. 1 (Rep. No. E00-006). Washington, DC: Author.
- Cress, C. M., Astin, H. S., Zimmerman-Oster, K., and Burkhardt, J. C. (2001). Developmental outcomes of college students' involvement in leadership activities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42(1), 15-27.
- Crowther, Nigel B. (2007). *Sport in Ancient Times*. Connecticut: Praeger
- Day, D. V., & Halpin, S. M. (2001). *Leadership development: A review of industry best practices*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Research Institute Fort Leavenworth Research Unit.
- Denhart, M., Villwock, R., and Vedder, R. (2009). The academics athletics trade-off. *Center for College of Affordability and Productivity*.

- Docheff, D. (1997). Character in sport and physical activity. *Journal of Physical Activity, Recreation, and Dance*, 68(9), 34-37.
- Doh, J. P. (2003). Can leadership be taught? Perspectives from management educators. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2(1), 54-67.
- Drucker, P. (2005). *The Practice of Management*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Dychtwald, K., Erickson, T., and Morison, R. (2006). *Workforce crisis: How to beat the coming shortage of skills and talent*. Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- Edington, L. M. (1995). *College classroom leadership practices: What gender has to do with it*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ball State University, Indiana.
- Eitzen, D. S. (1999). *Fair and foul: Beyond the myths and paradoxes of sport*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Endress, W. (2000). *An exploratory study of college students' self-efficacy for relational leadership: the influence of leadership education, cocurricular involvement, and on-campus employment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, College Park.
- Estes, S. (1990). *Sport Myth as Lived Experience*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.
- Fife, B. L., and Losco, J. (2000). *Higher Education in Transition: The Challenges of the New Millennium*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Fox, R. and Demarco, J. (1990). *Moral Reasoning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Frankena, W. (1973). *Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gill, D. L., and Deeter, T. E. (1988) Development of the sport orientation questionnaire. *Research Quarterly*, 59(3), 191-202.
- Groves, K. S. (2010). Six steps for confronting the emerging leadership-succession crisis. *Graziado Business Review*, 13(1).
- Guttmann, A. (2004). *Sports: The First Five Millennia*. Boston, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Hadden, J. C. S. (2003). *A pilot study of the relationship between competitive athletic participation and transformational leadership ability: a communication perspective*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Central Connecticut State University, 2003.
- Harper, T. (1986). Academic eligibility requirements for student-athletes: Two points of view. *NASSP Bulletin*.
- Haslam, S.A., Reicher, S.D., and Platow, M.J. (2011). *The New Psychology of Leadership*. Psychology Press: New York, NY.
- Havard, A. (2007). *Virtuous Leadership*. Scepter: New York, NY.
- Herman, J. (2000). They're 'good guys, good players'. *Statesman Journal*, p. 3B
- Hirschfield, S. Clinical research definitions and procedures. *National Institute of Child Health and Human Development*. Retrieved from: http://www.nichd.nih.gov/health/clinicalresearch/references/upload/clinical_research-definitions_procedures.pdf.
- Ho, E. (2011). Study: 85% of new college grads move back in with Mom and Dad. *Time*, May 10, 2011. Retrieved from <http://newsfeed.time.com/2011/05/10/survey-85-of-new-college-grads-moving-back-in-with-mom-and-dad/>.
- Hood, A.B., Creag, A.F., and Ferguson, B.W. (1992). The impact of athletics, part-time employment, and other activities on academic achievement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33 (1), 447-53.
- Hosking, D. M., and Morley, I. E. (1988). The skills of leadership. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, and C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 89-106). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Johnson, J. R. (2002). Leading the learning organization: Portrait of four leaders. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 23(5), 241-249.
- Keating, J.W. (1964). Sportsmanship as a moral category. *Journal of Ethics*, 75.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "I Have a Dream." March on Washington. Lincoln Memorial: Washington. 28 August 1963. Retrieved from: http://mlk-kpp01.stanford.edu/kingweb/publications/speeches/address_at_march_on_washington.pdf
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford.

- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., and McMahon, T. R. (1998). *Instructor's Guide for Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Komives, S.R., Lucas, N., and McMahon, T.R. (2006). *Exploring Leadership: For College Students Who Want to Make A Difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (2008) *The Student Leadership Challenge: Five Practices for Exemplary Leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The Leadership Challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Academic Administrator's Guide to Exemplary Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Leadership Practices Inventory LPI Self* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (1998), *Student Leadership Practices Inventory: Facilitator's Guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations* (4th ed.). San Diego: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (1988). *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Trainer's Manual*. San Diego: Pfeiffer and Company.
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Loehr, J., and Schwartz, T. (2001). The making of a corporate athlete. *Harvard Business Review*, January 2001.

- Levy, M. (1995). *Followers' perceptions of leaders: Prototypes and perceptions of resident assistants*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Maryland, College Park.
- Lickona, T. (2003). The content of our character: Ten essential virtues. *Journal of The Fourth and Fifth Rs*, 10(1).
- Lucas, J., and Smith, R. (1978). *Saga of American sport*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Lea and Febiger.
- Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S.K. and Beller, J.M. (2003). *Sport ethics: Applications for fair play* (3rd ed.). St. Louis, MO: McGraw Hill.
- Lund, B. L. (2011). *The effect of a sportsmanship education module on coaches and student-athletes' sportsmanship perceptions and behavior in NCAA Division I athletics*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro.
- Lyons, L. (2003). Which skills hold the secret to success at work? *The Gallup Organization*.
- MacArthur, G. D. (2001). *General MacArthur: Wisdoms and Virtues*. New York, NY: Turner Publishing.
- Marino, G. (2007). Building camaraderie from competition. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53.
- McAfee, Doreen. (2011). *The recruitment and hiring of collegiate student-athletes in corporate America*. (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing.
- Mihoces, G. (2011, November 10). Penn State Board of Regents fires Joe Paterno, President. *USA Today*. Retrieved July 30, 2012 from: <http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/bigten/story/2011-11-09/Joe-Paterno-fired-Penn-State/51147098/1>.
- Mifflin, E. H. (2000). *The America Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Mintzberg, H. (1982). If you're not serving Bill and Barbara, then you're not serving leadership. In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, and C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond Establishment Views* (pp. 239-250). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Mullich, Joe. (2012). College athletics build to business success. *Wall Street Journal*. March 12, 2012.
- Mullich, Joe. (2012). An investment in values: In sports and in personal finance, planning and perseverance matter. *Wall Street Journal*. March 12, 2012.
- Murphy, S. E., Pirozzolo, F. J., and Riggio, R. E. (2002). *Multiple Intelligences and Leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Napier, W. N. & Gershenfeld, M.K. (1999), *Groups: Theory and Experience* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- NCAA.org. Estimated probability of competing in athletics beyond the high school interscholastic level. Retrieved February 25, 2013 from: <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/pdfs/2011/2011+probability+of+going+pro> .
- NCAA.org. NCAA student-athlete participation hits 450,000. Retrieved February 25, 2013 from: <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/Resources/Latest+News/2012/September/NCAA+student-athlete+participation+hits+450000> .
- NACE Research. (2012). Job Outlook Survey. *National Association of Colleges and Employers*, November 2011.
- Paul, J., Costley, D. L., Howelly, J. P., and Dorfman, P. W. (2002). The mutability of charisma in leadership research. *Management Decision*, 40(1), 192-200.
- Pfeffer, J., and Sutton, R.I. (2006). Evidence-Based Management. *Harvard Business Review*, January 2006.
- Plato. (1955). *The Republic* (Penguin Classics). (D. Lee, Trans.). London, England: Putnam Books. (Original work written 360 BCE).
- Plato. (2008). *The Republic*. (Translated by Jowett, Benjamin). The Forgotten Books.
- Posner, B. Z. (2010) *Psychometric Properties of the Student Leadership Practices Inventory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Posner, B. Z. (2009). A longitudinal study examining changes in students' leadership behavior. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(5), 551-563.

- Posner, B. Z. (2004). A leadership development instrument for students: Updated. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(4), 443-456.
- Posner, B., and Brodsky, B. (1994). The leadership practices of effective student leaders: Gender makes no difference. *NASPA Journal, 31* (2), 113-120.
- Posner, B., and Brodsky, B. (1993). The leadership practices of effective RAs. *Journal of College Student Development, 34*(4), 300-304.
- Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1992). A leadership development instrument for college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*(4), 231-237.
- Posner, B. Z., and Rosenberger, J. (1998). *The impact of situational factors on students' leadership behaviors*. (Unpublished manuscript). Santa Clara University.
- Posner, B. Z., and Rosenberger, J. (1997). Effective orientation advisors are leaders too. *NASPA Journal, 31*(2), 113-120.
- Potuto, J.R., and O'Hanlon, J. (2006). National study of student athletes regarding their experiences as college students. *NCAA Research Committee*.
- Pugh, D. (2000). *College student leadership development: program impact on student participation*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens.
- Rabbie, J. M. (1991). Determinants of instrumental intra-group cooperation. In R. A. Hinde & J. Groebel (Eds.), *Cooperation and Prosocial Behavior* (pp. 238-262). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ready, D. R., and Conger, J. A. (2007). Make Your Company a Talent Factory. *Harvard Business Review, June 2007*. Retrieved from: <http://hbr.org/2007/06/make-your-company-a-talent-factory/ar/1>.
- Riggio, R. E., Ciulla, J. B., & Sorenson, G. J. (2003). Leadership education at the undergraduate level: A liberal arts approach to leadership development. In S. E. Murphy & R. E. Riggio (Eds.), *The Future of Leadership Development* (pp. 223-236). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rost, J. (1993). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Rudd, A., and Mondello, M. (2006). How do college coaches define character? A qualitative study with Division IA head coaches. *Journal of College and Character, VII*(3).

- Rudd, A., and Stoll, S.K. (2004). What type of character do athletes possess? An empirical examination of college athletes versus college non-athletes with the RSBH Value Judgment Inventory. *The Sport Journal*, 7(2). Retrieved from: <http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/what-type-character-do-athletes-possess>.
- Sage, G. (1988). Sport participation as a builder of character? *The World and I*, 3(10), 629-641.
- Sashkin, M. (2004). Transformational leadership approaches: A review and synthesis. In J. Antonakis, A. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 171–196). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sashkin, M., and Rosenbach, W. E. (2001). A new vision of leadership. In W. E. Rosenbach and R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership (5th Ed.)* (pp. 19-41). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Schwartz, M., & Gimbel, K. (2000). *Leadership resources: A guide to training and development tools*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Seltman, H. J. (2012). *Experimental Design and Analysis*. EBook: Carnegie Mellon University.
- Shields, D., and Bredemeier, B. (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Shulman, J. L., and Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The Game of Life*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Spence, L.D. (2001). The Case Against Teaching. *Change*, 33(6), 10-20.
- Stoll, S. K. and Beller, J. M. (2006). Ethical dilemmas in college sport. In R.E. Lapchick, *New game plan for college sport*. (pp. 75-90). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tirmizi, S. A. (2002). The 6-L framework: A model for leadership research and development. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 23(5), 269-279.
- Thompson, R. (1986). Improving the Academic Performance of Athletes. *NASSP Bulletin*.

- United States (2006). *Army leadership: Competent, confident, and agile*, Field Manual 6-22, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Dept. of the Army.
- Vallerand, R.J., Briere, N.M., and Provencher, P.J. (1994). *On the development and validation of the Multidimensional Sportsmanship Orientations Scale (MSOS)*. (Unpublished manuscript). Universite du Quebec a Montreal.
- Van Mullem, P., Brunner, D., and Stoll, S. (2008). "Practical Application for Teaching Character through Sport." AAHPERD National Convention, Fort Worth, TX.
- Walters, D.C. (2009). *Exploring a definition of leadership and the biography of Dr. Frank B. Wynn*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Montana, Missoula.
- Wieberg, S. (2011, May 30). Time runs out on Jim Tressel as Ohio State coach resigns. *USA Today*. Retrieved from: http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/bigten/2011-05-30-ohio-state-jim-tressel_N.htm.
- Woods, R. B. (2007). *Social Issues in Sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Wren, J. T. (1995). *The Leader's Companion-Insights on Leadership through the Years*. New York: Free Press.
- Zaugg, H. (1998). *Academic Comparison of Athletes and Non-Athletes in a Rural High School*. Sage Publications.
- Zimmerman, P. (2001). New England Patriots. *Sports Illustrated*, 95(9), 162-163.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Student-Athletes (N = 660)

Source	<u>Division I</u> <u>(N = 180)</u>		<u>Division II</u> <u>(N = 193)</u>		<u>Division III</u> <u>(N = 287)</u>	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age						
18-20	114	63.33	125	64.77	209	73.82
21-23	66	33.67	68	35.23	78	27.18
24-25	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Gender						
Male	58	32.20	74	38.30	111	38.70
Female	180	67.80	119	61.70	176	61.30
Class						
Freshman	46	25.60	51	26.40	82	28.60
Sophomore	47	26.10	43	22.30	78	27.20
Junior	37	20.60	44	22.80	65	22.60
Senior	50	27.80	55	28.5	62	21.60
Race						
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0.00	2	1.00	1	0.30
Asian	1	0.60	1	0.50	10	3.50
Black or African American	13	7.20	9	4.70	6	2.10
Hispanic or Latino	8	4.40	14	7.30	5	1.70
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	1.10	3	1.60	0	0.00
Other	3	1.70	7	3.60	6	2.10
White	153	85.00	157	81.30	259	90.20

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for NCAA Non-Athletes (N = 794)

	<u>Division I</u>		<u>Division II</u>		<u>Division III</u>	
	<u>(N = 218)</u>		<u>(N = 135)</u>		<u>(N = 441)</u>	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age						
18-20	153	70.18	77	57.04	283	64.17
21-23	49	22.48	55	40.74	155	35.15
24-25	16	8.34	3	2.22	3	0.68
Gender						
Male	90	41.30	43	31.90	117	26.50
Female	128	58.70	92	68.10	324	73.50
Class						
Freshman	113	51.80	25	18.50	113	25.60
Sophomore	43	19.70	29	21.50	115	26.10
Junior	29	13.30	35	25.90	96	21.80
Senior	33	15.10	46	34.10	117	26.50
Race						
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	1.40	1	0.70	0	0.00
Asian	9	4.10	2	1.50	10	2.30
Black or African American	57	26.10	5	3.70	11	2.50
Hispanic or Latino	9	4.10	14	10.40	12	2.70
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.50
Other	11	5.00	2	1.50	15	3.40
White	129	59.20	111	82.20	391	88.70

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Student LPI Permission Letter

JOSSEY-BASS™

An imprint of WILEY

June 6, 2012

Bruce Lund
1503 Old Lucasas Rd
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Dear Mr. Lund:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to *reproduce* the instrument in written form, as outlined in your request, at no charge. If you prefer to use our electronic distribution of the LPI (vs. making copies of the print materials) you will need to separately contact Lisa Shannon (lshannon@wiley.com) directly for instructions and payment. Permission to use either the written or electronic versions requires the following agreement:

- (1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities.
- (2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright © 2003 James M. Kouzes and Harry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission".
- (3) That one (1) **electronic** copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent **promptly** to our attention; and,
- (4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to me either via email or by post to, 1548 Camino Menlo San Jose, CA 95125. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) Bruce Lund Date 6/7/12Expected Date of Completion is: April 2013

APPENDIX B – MTSU IRB Approval

October 10, 2012

Bruce Lund, Dr. Steven Estes
 Department of Health and Human Performance
bl13b@mtmail.mtsu.edu, steven.estes@mtsu.edu



Protocol Title: "SEEKING SOLUTIONS TO THE LEADERSHIP-SUCCESSION CRISIS IN CORPORATE AMERICA: A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS IN COLLEGIATE STUDENT-ATHLETES AND NON-ATHLETE PEERS"

Protocol Number: 13-085

Dear Investigator(s),

The exemption is pursuant to 45 CFR 46.101(b) (2). This is because the research being conducted involves the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or public behavior.

You will need to submit an end-of-project report to the Office of Compliance upon completion of your research. Complete research means that you have finished collecting data and you are ready to submit your thesis and/or publish your findings. Should you not finish your research within the three (3) year period, you must submit a Progress Report and request a continuation prior to the expiration date. Please allow time for review and requested revisions. Your study expires on **October 10, 2015**.

Any change to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB before implementing this change. According to MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who works with data or has contact with participants. Anyone meeting this definition needs to be listed on the protocol and needs to provide a certificate of training to the Office of Compliance. **If you add researchers to an approved project, please forward an updated list of researchers and their certificates of training to the Office of Compliance before they begin to work on the project.** Once your research is completed, please send us a copy of the final report questionnaire to the Office of Compliance. This form can be located at www.mtsu.edu/irb on the forms page.

Also, all research materials must be retained by the PI or **faculty advisor (if the PI is a student)** for at least three (3) years after study completion. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
 Andrew W. Jones
 Graduate Assistant to:
 Emily Born
 Compliance Officer
 615-494-8918
Emily.Born@mtsu.edu

APPENDIX C – Consent form for Student-Athletes

Student Leadership Practices Inventory for Student-Athletes

This is a 30-item leadership survey and will take approximately 5-15 minutes.

We will provide you with a summary of the study results (if you wish to receive them) at the conclusion of the study. All data collected will be summarized in a final report in which individual responses will be anonymous. All records will be secured and stored by the researcher.

Agreement to Participate:

I confirm that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the survey at any time, without having to give a reason and without any consequences. I understand that any information recorded will remain confidential and no information that identifies me will be made publicly available. I understand that there are no foreseeable risks.

By checking "yes" I agree to participate and certify that I am between the age of 18-25, and an NCAA collegiate student-athlete.

YES _____ **or** **NO** _____

APPENDIX D – Consent form for Non-Athlete Peers

Student Leadership Practices Inventory for Undergraduate Non-Athletes

This is a 30-item leadership survey and will take approximately 5-15 minutes.

We will provide you with a summary of the study results (if you wish to receive them) at the conclusion of the study. All data collected will be summarized in a final report in which individual responses will be anonymous. All records will be secured and stored by the researcher.

Agreement to Participate:

I confirm that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the survey at any time, without having to give a reason and without any consequences. I understand that any information recorded will remain confidential and no information that identifies me will be made publicly available. I understand that there are no foreseeable risks.

By checking "yes" I agree to participate and certify that I am between the age of 18-25, am currently enrolled as an undergraduate college student, and am not a collegiate student-athlete.

YES _____ **or** **NO** _____

APPENDIX E – Student-Athlete Demographic Questions

Participant Background (fill in):

Age _____ GPA _____ School _____

Current College Sport(s) _____

Race/Ethnicity (check one):

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
 Asian
 Black or African American
 Hispanic or Latino
 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 White
 Other

Athletic Class (check one):

Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____

Current Major (if unsure list "undecided"):

Have you been a team captain at the collegiate level? (check one):

Yes _____ No _____

How many years have you participated in a college sport (counting this year)? (check one):

1 Year _____ 2 Years _____ 3 Years _____ 4 Years _____ 5 (or more) Years _____

Were you a varsity captain on any team in HIGH SCHOOL? (check one):

_____ Yes _____ No _____

How many years did you participate in HIGH SCHOOL athletics? (check one):

1 Year _____ 2 Years _____ 3 Years _____ 4 Years _____ None _____

Which HIGH SCHOOL sport(s) did you play (list all that apply):

LIST _____

Are you, or have you been, involved in any student organizations on campus (check all that apply):

Greek Life _____ Army ROTC _____ Resident Assistant _____ Intramural _____
 Honors _____ Political _____ Other _____ None _____

APPENDIX F – Non-Athlete Peers Demographic Questions

Participant Background (fill in):

Age: _____

Male or Female: _____

GPA: _____

Race/Ethnicity (check one):

_____ American Indian or Alaskan Native

_____ Asian

_____ Black or African American

_____ Hispanic or Latino

_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

_____ White

_____ Other

Class (check one):

_____ Freshman

_____ Sophomore

_____ Junior

_____ Senior

Current Major (if unsure list "undecided"): _____

Did you participate in a High School Varsity Sport (Yes or No):

Which High School varsity sport did you play (List all that apply)?

Were you a varsity captain on any team in high school (Yes or No)? _____

Are you, or have you been, involved in any student organizations on campus (check all that apply):

_____ Greek Life

_____ Army ROTC

_____ Resident Assistant

_____ Intramural

_____ Honors

_____ Political

_____ Other

_____ None

APPENDIX G – STUDENT LPI Instructions

Student Leadership Practices Inventory, Second Edition (Self)

By James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner

STUDENT LPI Questionnaire (Copyrighted Material: Kouzes and Posner, 2006)

Instructions:

On the next page are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then rate *yourself* in terms of *how frequently* you engage in the behavior described. *This is not a test* (there are no right or wrong answers). The usefulness of the feedback from this inventory will depend on how honest you are with yourself and how frequently you *actually* engage in each of these behaviors.

Consider each statement in the context of one student-organization with which you are now (or have been most) involved. This organization could be a club, team, chapter, group, unit, hall, program, project, and the like. As you respond to each statement, maintain a consistent perspective to your particular organization. The rating scale provides five choices. Circle the number that best applies to each statement:

1. If **RARELY** or **SELDOM** do what is described
2. If you do what is described **ONCE IN A WHILE**
3. If you **SOMETIMES** do what is described
4. If you **OFTEN** do what is described
5. If you **VERY FREQUENTLY** or **ALMOST ALWAYS** do what is described

In selecting the response, be realistic about the extent to which you *actually* engage in the behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you *typically* behave.

For example, the first statement is “I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.” If you believe you do this *once in a while*, select the number 2. If you believe you do this *often*, select the number 4. Select only one option (response number) for each statement.

Please respond to every statement. If you can’t respond to a statement (or feel that it doesn’t apply), circle a 1. When you have responded to all thirty statements, please hit the submit button and you will be debriefed. Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX H – Student Leadership Practices Inventory

How frequently do you *typically* engage in the following behaviors and actions? Circle the number to the right of each statement, using the scale below, that best applies.

	1	2	3	4	5
	RARELY OR SELDOM	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	VERY FREQUENTLY
1. I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I praise people for a job well done.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I spend time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I treat others with dignity and respect.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I find ways to get feedback about how my actions affect other people's performance.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I talk with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.	1	2	3	4	5
18. When things do not go as we expected, I ask, "What can we learn from this experience?"	1	2	3	4	5
19. I support the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I make it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I build consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I am upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I find ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I talk about the values and principles that guide my actions.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I speak with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.	1	2	3	4	5

FOOTNOTES

¹ John Wooden inspired many advocates of character and leader training to use sport to try to develop young adults. His example proves the point that many argue about teaching for character, but these arguments lack empirical evidence (see www.woodencourse.com).

² In essence, the idea that “sport builds character” is a myth because people believe this to be true. This is not necessarily a bad thing – believing the story to be true is what “makes it true.” When people continue to state that “sport builds character,” they implicitly understand that participation in sport causes some sort of positive change in their spiritual essence. So it is in the telling of this story that people begin to believe in the theme of the story. This is how a myth works. In its most expansive form, a system of myths or a mythology provides a worldview for a people in a particular society, an illustration of “the way things are.” This system provides good, ‘workable’ ways by which the contradictions among people, ideals and confusing realities in a society are somehow reconciled, or at least made manageable and tolerable. The possibility exists that participating in sport *builds character*. The fact that people participate in a myth does not necessarily mean that the story is *false* (Estes, 1990). What needs to be done is to test empirically—in the corporeal world—whether or not sport builds character. This study aimed to do just that.