University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1999

The Community College Coach: Leadership Practices and Athlete Satisfaction

Jodi P. Coffman EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Coffman, Jodi P. EdD, "The Community College Coach: Leadership Practices and Athlete Satisfaction" (1999). *Dissertations*. 651.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/651>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE COACH: LEADERSHIP
PRACTICES AND ATHLETE SATISFACTION

by

Jodi P. Coffman

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1999

Dissertation Committee

Susan Zgliczynski, Ph.D., Director
Ronn Johnson, Ph.D.
Robert Mechikoff, Ph.D.

Copyright © 1999

by

Jodi P. Coffman

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

The Community College Coach: Leadership Practices and Athlete Satisfaction

Community college coaches and athletes completed the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), to assess the leadership practices of coaches of various sports. Soccer coaches and their athletes were also surveyed to assess the impact of the congruence of leadership practices ratings upon athlete satisfaction. Two samples were taken from Spring and Fall, 1998 sports: (a) 225 full-time head coaches of team sports in which there was a male and female equivalent in California's community colleges, and (b) 280 men's and women's soccer athletes.

The descriptive statistics conducted indicated that there were more similarities than differences between the male and female coaches, as well as coaches from different sports. Male soccer athletes' ratings of their coaches were lower, on all five leadership practices, than their coaches' ratings of themselves. While conversely, female soccer athletes' ratings of their coaches were higher, on all five

LPI leadership practices, than their coaches' ratings of themselves.

Male and female community college coaches (of the team sports surveyed) are similar in their leadership practices. However, the gender of athletes indicated the most satisfaction of female athletes with their female coaches.

DEDICATION

To my family, who has offered so much to my continued education and development. My father and brother, for their love, support, and guidance. And in loving memory of my mother, my eternal guide and inspiration. I live my life as she would want, to the fullest and as if each day was my last.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank various people for their much appreciated contributions.

- To my dissertation committee, Drs. Susan Zgliczynski, Ronn Johnson, and Robert Mechikoff, who offered practical support and guidance.
- To Dr. Bill Howe and Shari Gittleman, for their valuable advice and encouragement.

Thank you, all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	x
 CHAPTER	
I. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Problem	4
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	9
Significance of the Study	12
Research Questions	14
Scope of the Study	15
Limitations	15
Delimitations	16
Definitions of Terms	17
Leadership	17
Leadership Behaviors	17
Satisfaction	18

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. (Continued)	
Coach Effectiveness	18
Community College	18
Summary	18
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	20
Introduction	20
Leadership	20
Coaching as Leadership	25
Introduction	25
Instructional Leadership	26
Athletic Coaching	30
Satisfaction of Athletes	32
Equity and Athletics	34
Gender and Leadership	35
Gender and Coaching	38
Leadership Instruments	43
Leadership Instruments in Sports	48
Summary	54
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	55
Introduction	55
Methodology	56
Design	56
Samples	56

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. (Continued)	
Procedure	57
Instrumentation	59
Leadership Practices Inventory	60
Scale of Athlete Satisfaction	61
Data Collection Strategies	62
Data Analysis	65
Human Subjects	66
Summary	67
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	69
Introduction	69
Response Frequencies	70
Research Question #1A	73
Research Question #1B	75
Research Question #2	77
Research Question #2A	78
Research Question #2B	83
Research Question #3	88
Research Question #4	90
Instrumentation	96
Summary	97
Findings Related to Research Hypotheses . .	98

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	104
Nature and Purpose of the Study	104
Summary of Findings	105
Research Question 1A	105
Research Question 1B	106
Research Question 2A	107
Research Question 2B	108
Research Question 3	109
Research Question 4	111
Implications for Community College Coaching System	113
Athlete/Coach Relationship and Instruments' Use in Leadership	115
Recommendations for Enhancement of Current Study	117
Recommendations for Further Study	118
Summary	123
REFERENCES	124

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Characteristics of the Sample: Coaches	71
2. Characteristics of the Sample: Athletes . . .	72
3. Coaching Leadership Practices by Sport	75
4. Male and Female Soccer Coaches' and Female Athletes' Responses on the Five Leadership Practices	81
5. Female Soccer Coaches' and Female Athletes' Responses on the Five Leadership Practices . .	82
6. Male Soccer Coaches' and Male Athletes' Responses on the Five Leadership Practices . .	86
7. Soccer Athlete Satisfaction Scores	89
8. Community College Coaching Sample: Qualitative Responses	91

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Multidimensional Model of Leadership	63
2. Male and Female Coaches' Leadership Practices	74
3. Female Soccer Coaches' and Athletes' Responses of Leadership Practices	79
4. Male Soccer Coaches' and Athletes' Responses of Leadership Practices	84
5. Coach/Athlete Agreement on LPI Scales	88
6. Comparison of Athlete LPI Mean Scores: Mail and In Person	121

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	PAGE
A. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	133
B. AUTHORIZATION TO USE SCALE OF ATHLETE SATISFACTION	135
C. DETAILED SAMPLE OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE HEAD COACHES	137
D. THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY: SELF . . .	144
E. THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY: OBSERVER	149
F. SCALE OF ATHLETE SATISFACTION	154
G. COACH DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	156
H. ATHLETE DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	158
I. LETTER TO COACH	160
J. COACH CONSENT FORM	163
K. ENDORSEMENT LETTER FROM DR. FORTUNATO.	165
L. LETTER TO SOCCER COACH	167
M. SOCCER COACH CONSENT FORM	170
N. LETTER TO ATHLETE	172
O. ATHLETE CONSENT FORM	175
P. REMINDER POSTCARD TO COACHES	177
Q. REMINDER POSTCARD TO ATHLETE	179

APPENDIX	PAGE
R. REMINDER FAX TO COACHES	181
S. DETAILED SUMMARY OF SUBJECTS TAUGHT	183
T. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH QUESTION RESULTS	185

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

Introduction

Throughout the twentieth century, the community college system has been one of the fastest growing segments in American education. Rapid expansion began in the early 1900s. Koos (1924) reported that the 20 community colleges existing in 1909 had, by 1919, grown to 170. By the year 1930, there were 450 colleges located in all but five states. Growth has continued with 1,236 two-year colleges established by 1994 (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Community colleges presently account for half of the students who begin college in America.

The rise and development of community colleges added a necessary extension to American education. Social forces in the early part of the twentieth century contributed to the rise of the community college. These included: (a) an increased need for skilled workers, (b) a push for social equality, and (c) rapid growth in the high school population. Upon completion of their secondary education, more

and more students choose the community college setting. A majority of these working class students prefer the pragmatic to the theoretical and the informal to the formal. Cohen and Brawer (1996) contended that community colleges arose in the United States in the belief that "all individuals should have the opportunity to rise to their fullest potential" (p. 10).

In the early part of the century, many of the community colleges developed in the largely unsettled West. The support of the University of California, Stanford University, and the emphasis on public education at all levels allowed California to become a leader in the development of community colleges. As the new millenium approaches, the West continues to house the most rapidly growing portion of our "higher educational" system, the California community college.

California continues to establish itself as a leader in its community college athletic programs. Kanter and Lewis (1991) stated that in California's 106 Community Colleges, which educate over 1.4 million students annually, the intercollegiate athletic program is an integral part of the educational program. Thornton (1966) declared:

Every sign points to the conclusion that athletics on the two-year college campus will continue to increase in importance. . . . because of their inherent

attraction for many junior college students as participants and as spectators and because of their appeal to the public at large, they offer unlimited opportunities to achieve the objectives of student activities. (pp. 264-265)

According to the Community College League of California's home page, nearly 30,000 student-athletes annually compete in intercollegiate athletics in California's community colleges.

An increase in the importance of athletics brings a focus on the role of the coach. The leadership provided by a coach is essential to the effective mobilization, utilization, and development of human resources. Howe (1993) suggested the need "for coaches to adjust their coaching behaviors [to] improve the psychological skills of the athletes and themselves" (p. 30). This study investigates coaches' perceptions of their leadership practices, along with athletes' observations and satisfaction with those practices.

This chapter discusses the following: background and statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, scope of the study, limitations, delimitations, definition of terms, and a summary.

Background of the Problem

Community college coaching has characteristics that set it apart from other levels but also requires increased standards of effectiveness. Compared to 4-year institutions with major athletic programs, the pressure to win at the 2-year school is not as intense. In addition, this allows the community college athlete to concentrate on the many lifelong learning benefits traditionally associated with community college athletics. In addition to being full-time students, many community college athletes are working and/or single parents. Therefore, the need for discipline and time management is even more crucial for these student-athletes. Student-athletes attend community college for a variety of reasons, including a need for experience, economics, and academics. By competing for 2 years at a community college, student-athletes can: (a) improve their ability and gain the skills necessary for playing at the 4-year level, (b) save money and improve their academics to increase their chances and success rate in matriculating to a 4-year school, and (c) gain exposure to another coaching style to better understand and choose the best opportunity for them to continue their athletic career at a 4-year school.

While athletes seem to benefit from the community college athletic environment, coaches must face a variety of

obstacles. Pastore and Judd (1993) contended that coaching burnout among community college coaches is higher due to the shorter period of time coaches have to work with athletes at the community college level. Gender also plays a large part in the coaching domain, especially at the community college level. Women have become subordinates in the male-dominated occupation of coaching. The paradox that has accompanied Title IX is that as female participation in sports has risen, the number of female coaches has declined. Male coaches and administrators have engendered themselves as the dominant group, placing women in a subordinate coaching role. As a direct result, female coaches may lack confidence in their skills to succeed in the coaching domain. Lincoln (1989) stated that

relations of power which produce subordination, and which assign some voices to silence and marginalization . . . [Cause women to] have their feminist and egalitarian concerns relegated to the trivial because they themselves do not control the forms of discourse in male dominated organizations. (p. 176)

The dominant group has defined the model and turned a deaf ear to the voice of subordinates – female coaches and athletes. However, Jean Baker Miller (1986a) declared that “as subordinates move toward freer expression and action, they will expose the inequality and throw into question the basis for its existence” (p. 12). The female coach’s

struggle for voice and some control over the forms of discourse, forces the field of coaching to move forward and expand the opportunities for future coaches. As Knoppers (1992) stated, "if we want the social groups who are minimally represented in the coaching ranks to enter coaching and not exit through the revolving door, then we obviously have to change the dominant definitions surrounding the occupation of coaching" (p. 224).

A comparison of male and female coaches adds a dimension of understanding for a paradigm shift of females back into the male-dominated domain. Coaches would benefit from the self-exploration of their own leadership, that of their colleagues, and the preferences of athletes. As Clive Charles (cited in Greenlee, 1996), the coach of both the men's and women's soccer teams at the University of Portland, points out, "the way I treat a player depends on that particular individual. It's more like managing people rather than coaching different genders" (p. 21).

Statement of the Problem

Gould, Giannini, Krane, and Hodge (1990) reported that most of the estimated three million coaches in the United States today have received little or no formal training. Where, then, are the majority of coaches learning to coach?

Gould et al. surveyed elite coaches and found that modeling largely determined coaching behaviors. In other words, coaches observe other coaches and, as a result, do what other successful coaches do.

There is little research in the area of coaching behaviors at the community college level. One of the major reasons for this is the lack of full-time athletic coaches in community colleges. Of the approximately 550 community college head coaches of team sports in California, fewer than half are full-time. Therefore, lack of coaching opportunities forces these coaches to find additional jobs and sources of income to supplement their work at the community college level. Because of the reduction in the time coaches devote to coaching: (a) they are not able to potentially increase their coaching skills, (b) they are not present for their athletes' needs, or (c) they do not serve as full-time resources to aid in the matriculation process of their athletes to 4-year schools.

The numbers of women in sporting leadership positions of coaching and administration are on the decline. According to Acosta and Carpenter (1988), in a national study of 4-year NCAA colleges and universities:

- Less than 1% of the coaches of men's teams are female

- Only 16% of women's programs are headed by a female administrator
- Women hold 29% of all administrative jobs in women's programs
- Thirty-two percent of women's programs do not have a female administrator. (p. 3)

This study investigates: (a) the employment of leadership practices for development of community college coaches, (b) the impact of coach and athlete assessments of these leadership practices upon athlete satisfaction, and (c) reasons surrounding the decline in the number of female community college coaches. Specifically, of the 230 full-time coaches of team sports in community colleges in California, only a third are women. It will be necessary to recruit, develop, and promote females in the coaching arena, especially at the community college level.

Male and female community college coaches need to learn the most effective ways of producing a high level of performance in their athletes. Douge and Hastie (1993) defined coaching effectiveness as "a coach's ability to react to the characteristics and needs of players" (p. 18). This concept is of utmost concern at any level of athletic competition, but especially so at the community college level. Coaches need to listen and incorporate the voices of athletes to be able to meet the athletes' needs. According to Riemer and Chelladurai (1998), the effective athletic organization is

the one meeting the needs of its athletes. Finally, the area of athlete satisfaction is essential to an inquiry in assessing the effectiveness of leadership in sports.

Purpose of the Study

The inquiry into effective coaching leadership in the athletic environment primarily within the last 15 years concerned coaches' personalities, attributes, behaviors, and interactions. According to Weiss and Friedrichs (1986), the effectiveness of a coach's leadership relates to two outcomes: individual or team performance and athlete satisfaction.

Gardner, Shields, Bredemier, and Bostrom (1996) studied the relationship between perceived leadership behaviors and team cohesion in high school and junior college baseball and softball teams. Two premises set the stage for the importance of studying this relationship: (a) understanding the antecedents to group cohesion, and (b) the influence of group cohesion on group performance. The role of the coach is evident as Williams (1993) states: "The coach is probably in the best position to influence change [in team cohesion]" (p. 120). Therefore, the researching of community college coaches' behaviors may lead to an increase in potentials for them to influence and even increase team cohesion.

Athlete satisfaction is the other area believed to influence the effectiveness of a coach's leadership. Douge and Hastie (1993) claimed that "modern coaching requires that the athlete be included in the coaching process" (p. 14). The voice of the athlete is necessary for coaches to assess their own ability and effectiveness as a leader. Carron and Bennett (1977) contended:

Inherent in any conclusion about coach-athlete compatibility based on the coach's personality traits, attitudes, and/or values is one major shortcoming – the athlete is treated as a virtual non-participant in the relationship, the factor of interaction is ignored. An accurate assessment of the factors contributing to or detracting from coach-athlete compatibility must take into account the needs, involvements, and contributions of both. (p. 162)

The inclusion of athletes' voices, perceptions, and satisfaction allows the coaches to assess and even improve their leadership effectiveness. Laughlin and Laughlin (1994) agreed as they claim "[coaches] must acquire some knowledge regarding what teaching and coaching behaviors are most desired and effective for their students and athletes" (p. 397).

According to Chelladurai and Riemer (1995), "the central thrust of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership is that the congruence of perceived (actual) and preferred (observed) leadership enhances member satisfaction" (p. 280). To assess perceived (actual) leadership, coaches

complete Kouzes and Posner's (1987) Leadership Practices Inventory: Self; while athletes complete the LPI: Observer to address preferred (observed) leadership. However, only the athletes will complete Chelladurai, Imamura, Yamaguchi, Oinuma, and Miyauchi's (1988) Scale of Athlete Satisfaction, in an attempt to corroborate the central argument of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership.

Most of the scarce systematic research done on leadership in sport emphasizes the leader's viewpoint. However, such a viewpoint provides only one voice. Listening to the voices of the players, the direct recipients of the leadership behaviors of the coach, is also a necessity. The present study utilizes a multi-rater feedback system, which provides a means for comparison between coach and athlete perception of leadership behavior, and potential satisfaction. The potential perceptual congruence between athlete and coach may lead to improved compatibility and effectiveness. The feedback provided to coaches regarding their athletes' perceptions and satisfaction with their behavior allows for enhanced communication and quality in the coach-athlete relationship. In addition, the present study attempts to: (a) increase coaches' self-analysis and reflection, (b) improve leaders' knowledge and confidence in their

coaching ability, and (c) find means to increase their effectiveness.

Significance of the Study

The leadership behaviors employed by the coaches and those observed by the athletes will provide direction for the retention and recruitment of future coaches. In determining perceptual congruence of behaviors and athlete satisfaction, a more accurate description of the profession may result. The explicit delineation of leadership behaviors exhibited by coaches, and preferred by athletes, aids in setting expectations and boundaries. Future community college coaches can learn which leadership behaviors' athletes prefer.

This study further adds to the dearth of literature in the area of sport coaching leadership by allowing the voice of the athlete to be heard. The relational nature of leadership, particularly the importance of followers, is an important aspect in the present literature. According to Rost (1993), leadership is "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes" (p. 102). An enhanced coach-athlete relationship allows for potential increases in: (a) communication, (b) compatibility, and (c) effectiveness.

This study highlights the need to view leadership development as a process of self-development allowing coaches to be the best that they can be. Kouzes and Posner (1987) discuss the need for leaders to establish an ethical set of standards on which to base actions. Critical inquiry into current leadership behaviors will clarify these standards. In order "to exhibit harmonious leadership – where words and deeds are consonant – you must be in tune internally" (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, p. 300).

Coaches' and athletes' perceptions of leadership style and satisfaction are the main areas of investigation in the present study. Finally, the present study attempts to corroborate the central tenant of Riemer and Chelladurai's (1995) Multidimensional Model of Leadership, that the congruence of perceived and preferred leadership enhances member satisfaction.

Potentially, this study also will provide the necessary information for present instructors at the community college to become involved in coaching. The findings will benefit present and future instructors and coaches who apply to work in the community college system every year. This study may provide present instructors the direction necessary to become involved in coaching. Adjunct instructors of various

disciplines may supplement their teaching load with coaching a particular sport.

Research Questions

The following research questions address coaches' perceptions of their own leadership behaviors, athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behaviors, and satisfaction with those behaviors.

1. Are the leadership behaviors on the LPI: Self, more similar or dissimilar:
 - A. between male and female coaches?
 - B. between coaches from different sports?
2. How do coaches' and athletes' ratings of leadership practices relate to the gender of the coaches and athletes?
 - A. How do female athletes' observations compare to their coaches' perceptions?
 - B. How do male athletes' observations compare to their coaches' perceptions?
3. How is athlete satisfaction related to congruence between the perceptions of coaches and athletes regarding leadership behavior?

4. What are some reasons given by coaches for the deficit in the number of female coaches hired to coach women's teams?

Scope of the Study

This study surveyed California community college head coaches of team sports in which there was a male and female equivalent. The LPI: Self developed by Kouzes and Posner (1987), used with their permission (see Appendix A), assessed the coaches' leadership behaviors. The researcher compared the coaches' results from the LPI: Self to those of the athletes of men's and women's soccer teams, using the LPI: Observer. Soccer athletes were used as the comparison group for the following reasons: (a) soccer is the researcher's area of expertise (for over 25 years), (b) due to the large number of players on the soccer teams under study, and (c) an equal number of men's and women's teams to survey. The athletes also completed the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS) developed by Chelladurai et al. (1988) to assess satisfaction with various aspects of leadership in athletics.

Limitations

Discussion of potential limitations of this study is essential before attempting to generalize beyond the sample

populations. First, the sports selected may not be representative of all community college coaches and athletes. This study does not include individual sports such as aquatics, tennis, golf, gymnastics, track, or cross country. One criterion for the inclusion of the sports was the presence of a male and female equivalent team, for analyses on gender.

Another potential limitation is the willingness of coaches and athletes to complete the questionnaires for fear of the confidentiality of their results.

A thorough literature review revealed that studies using the LPI: Self and Observer surveys are lacking in the coaching domain. Finally, the findings are contingent upon individuals' perceptions, and may vary according to the respondents.

Delimitations

A delimitation of this study is the use of head coaches of community colleges in California. The researcher further delimited the population of coaches to include those employed full-time in the college with four or more head coaches of team sports. Team sports, identified by the National College Athletic Association (NCAA) Manual (Bollig & Summers, 1997), included those which had a male and female

equivalent: softball, baseball, basketball, soccer, volleyball, and water polo.

Definition of Terms

Leadership

Burns (1978) defined leadership as:

a reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a content of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers.
(p. 425)

Leadership Behaviors

Generally, leadership behaviors include the acts, practices, and activities leaders engage in the process of leadership. Specifically, Kouzes and Posner (1987) outlined the five scales and strategies for each behavior in their

Leadership Practices Inventory:

1. Challenging the Process
 - A. Search for opportunities
 - B. Experiment and take risks
2. Inspiring a shared vision
 - A. Envision the future
 - B. Enlist others
3. Enabling others to act
 - A. Foster collaboration
 - B. Strengthen others
4. Modeling the way
 - A. Set the example
 - B. Plan small wins
5. Encouraging the heart
 - A. Recognize contributions
 - B. Celebrate accomplishments. (p. 310)

Satisfaction

As derived from Yukl's (1971) discrepancy model, the athlete's satisfaction with the leader is a function of the congruence between the leader's actual behavior and that observed by the athlete. Therefore, a greater discrepancy between actual and observed behavior, causes greater dissatisfaction with the leader. The specific tool used to measure satisfaction in the present study entitled the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS), developed by Chelladurai et al. (1988).

Coach Effectiveness

Douge and Hastie (1993) described effective coaching as "a coach's ability to react to the characteristics and needs of players" (p. 18).

Community College

Cohen and Brawer (1996) defined the community college as "any institution accredited to award the Associate of Arts or the Associate in Science as its highest degree" (p. 5).

Summary

This chapter discussed the importance of the role of the athletic coach at the community college level. In

addition, the research strongly suggests that these coaches need direction from other coaches and athletes in order to be more effective. Coaching effectiveness in community college appears to be more difficult, due to the number of obstacles facing coaches and athletes that may reduce performance. This study will attempt to determine the correlation between athletes and coaches' perceptions of their leadership behaviors. In addition, this study will examine the athletes' satisfaction of the leadership style utilized by coaches. The general intent of the study is to improve the overall effectiveness of the community college coach, athletes' potential experience in sports, and further improve the athlete-coach relationship.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviews five topics in the leadership literature regarding coaching. First, instructional leadership includes the skill building and enhancement of the educational process by teachers and administrators. The role of the coach, in both the educational and athletic settings, is also discussed. Next is a section regarding the student-athlete's evaluation of satisfaction needed for the development of community college athletics. Fourth is a component briefly detailing the need for gender equity in coaching. Finally included is a section summarizing leadership instruments, including those used in the sport setting.

Leadership

Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth (Burns, 1978, p. 2). According to Partridge (1977), the origin of the word "lead" lies in the meaning "to go" (p. 342). Kouzes and Posner (1987) elaborate on this action orientation as they utilize the metaphor

of a journey, in which leaders "guide to new and often unfamiliar destinations" (p. 32). In other words, leaders assist their followers in exploring uncharted territory. A majority of the multitude of leadership definitions account for the necessity and inclusion of followers in the overall leadership process. The "great man" theory of leadership places the emphasis of leadership in the traits of a single figure. The mass media fosters such a misconception through the proliferation of political figures and sports heroes. Burns (1978) does not believe that a singular "great man" is responsible for making history or is the cause of real and intended social change. He proposes that the study of leadership should contribute to developing theories of causation, and "that history is made by masses of people acting through leaders, who are merely agents for the popular or majority will" (p. 52).

The presence of the follower is central to that of the effective leader. Kouzes and Posner (1987) contend that "followers are what makes the leader, not the other way around" (p. 133). Collaboration and reciprocation lie at the heart of the leader-follower relationship. Burns (1978) states, "The effectiveness of leaders must be judged not by their press clippings but by actual social change measured by intent and by the satisfaction of human needs and

expectations" (p. 3). Therefore, followers are the agents through which leaders bring about social transformations. The journey of leadership is reciprocal in nature, in which leaders and followers together practice leadership.

Kouzes and Posner (1987) maintain that "leadership is a relationship between leaders and the people that they aspire to lead" (p. 135). While past theories of leadership have concentrated on the traits and characteristics of the leader alone, more recent investigations define leaders in relation to their followers. Relationship and mutuality are central to Burns' (1978) definition of leadership:

A reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers.
(p. 425)

The combination of these definitions of leadership illustrates the need for collaboration and mutuality in the relationship of leader and follower.

Burns (1978) further elaborates on the relational concept of leadership in his description of two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. He describes transactional leadership in terms of "leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign

contributions" (p. 4). While in transformational leadership, "the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engage the full person of the follower" (Burns, 1978, p. 4). Collaboration and mutual reliance set transformational leadership apart from its counterpart. Burns explains that "transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (p. 4).

Kouzes and Posner (1987) purport that "the transactional leader closely resembles the traditional definition of the manager" (p. 281). Adding to the long-standing differentiation between managers and leaders, transactional leadership is a managerial style, while the transformational style is a leadership style. The manager may motivate others to do, while leaders are able to motivate others to want to do. Tichy and Devanna (1990) maintain three transformational themes: (a) Recognizing the need for revitalization, (b) Creating a new vision, and (c) Institutionalizing change (pp. 5-6). As evidenced by Bass (1985), "transformational leadership factors, particularly charisma and individualized consideration, were more highly related than transactional leadership factors to satisfaction and effectiveness" (p. 219). The action-orientation for

leadership is also present in Tichy and Devanna's definition of leaders as "self-acknowledged change agents who defined themselves and their criteria for success in terms of fundamental change of their organizations" (p. 6). Therefore, the collaboration and mutuality of a leader-follower relationship are necessary to mobilization for change and effective leadership.

Relationship is central to the voice of feminist scholars as they define leadership. In Miller's (1986a) terms, a growth-fostering relationship will lead to each person feeling: (a) a greater sense of "zest," (b) a greater ability to act and take action, (c) a more accurate picture of him/herself and the other person, (d) a greater sense of worth, and (e) more connected to the other person and a greater motivation for connections with other people beyond those in the specific relationship. These connections allow those in the relationship to become more than they would without it. Such is the contention of Surrey (as cited in Miller, 1986b), as she claims that mutual empathy is central to psychological development; and she further delineates empathy as development within a relationship. Gilligan (1993) claimed that the essence of relationship results in the "rediscovery of connection, in the realization that self and other are interdependent, and that life, however

valuable in itself, can only be sustained by care in relationships" (p. 127). Finally, Astin and Leland (1991) also see leadership as empowerment through collective action. Relationship offers an opportunity to enhance knowledge and behavior for transformational leadership.

The study of coaches as transformational leaders is again equated to a journey into uncharted territory. However, there are times when barriers of convention may block a leader's vision. Kouzes and Posner (1987) explain that

in times of uncertainty and turbulence . . . the leader's expectations have their strongest and most powerful influence . . . when accepted ways of doing things are not working well enough, then a leader's strong expectations about the destination, the processes to follow, and the capabilities of the team to complete the journey serve to make dreams come true. (p. 243)

Coaching as Leadership

Introduction

In the 1500s, the word "coach" was first used to refer to a particular kind of transportation, a carriage. Modern terms applied the root meaning of the verb "to coach" to a variety of situations in which one "conveys a valued person from where he or she was to where he or she wants to be" (Witherspoon & White, 1997, p. 1). Applications of the role of the coach include the following leadership settings: instructional, higher education, and sports.

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership is a comprehensive term that includes teachers and administrators working toward skill building and enhancing the educational process. Numerous studies have looked at instructional leadership and coaching of teachers and administrators in their pursuit of strategies for a collective vision (Acheson, 1990; Bernd, 1992; Chell, 1995; Makabbin & Sprague, 1993; Olthoff, 1992; Sagor & Barnett, 1994).

Instructional leadership and coaching in the educational setting has a variety of applications. The premise of the coaching approach in this arena is that "people learn fundamentally by doing more than receiving — by acting on information . . . more than just soaking up information" (Perkins, 1991 p. 6). Teachers and administrators use facilitation skills for collaborative learning and staff development through: peer coaching, mentoring, and cognitive coaching.

Peer coaching is one of the areas in instructional leadership devoted to staff development. Numerous studies have looked at the benefits of peer coaching in the school setting (Lee, 1991; Walter, 1991). The responsibility of instructional leadership falls upon the shoulders of the principal or teacher. Cunard (1990) described a

reconceptualization of the principal's leadership role: "This new conception of the principal's role could free principals to be innovators as they strive to develop schools that will meet the needs of twenty-first century learners" (pp. 31-32). Roberts (1991) takes the concept a step further by also including the assistant principal in potentially improving instructional leadership through peer coaching. This study of 14 principals and assistant principals from Denver metropolitan elementary schools was undertaken to determine the effects of participation in a peer coaching project on their instructional leadership behaviors. The study found that the peer leadership coaching among principals resulted in a "deeply-felt positive feeling about the experience and self-perceived growth" (p. 32) in instructional leadership.

An extension of peer coaching is necessary for instructional leadership in schools. Teachers need to feel as if they are taking a more active role in education, of students, and each other. Showers and Joyce (1996) attempted to broaden the view of peer coaching as a mechanism to increase classroom implementation of training, and recommended the formation of more permanent peer coaching structures. The results included enhanced staff development and increased support for teachers as they implemented new

strategies. Findings also suggest that when "two teachers observe each other, the one teaching is the 'coach' and the one observing is the 'coached'" (Showers & Joyce, 1996, p. 15). Peer coaching in the educational setting has a central purpose of collaboration and has a direct effect on student learning.

Mentoring as coaching helps students realize behaviors that promote the mentoring relationship. In an article by Trimble (1994), she describes the mentoring process from a protégé's point of view. Protégé behaviors believed to foster positive mentorships included: (a) clarifying needs and expectations and work toward "mutual agreements," (b) being time conscious, (c) nurturing consideration, respect, and appreciation for a valued professional, (d) maintaining dialogue, not monologues, (e) promoting story telling, (f) fostering a sense of development by mentioning advice given in past sessions, and (g) providing the mentor with positive feedback (pp. 46-47). Leadership competencies can result from mentorships in the development of collegial relationships.

Cognitive coaching is the final staff development technique used for instructional leadership. Garmston, Linder, and Whitaker (1993) described the Cognitive Coaching Process as "a three phase cycle (preconference, observation,

and postconference) . . . the purpose of which is helping the teacher improve instructional effectiveness by becoming more reflective about teaching" (p. 57). In the article, each of the three junior high school teachers described their relations to their inclusion in the Cognitive Coaching Process. Results indicated that the participants believed "Cognitive Coaching to be a powerful process for fostering collegiality, deepening reflective skills, and developing cognitive autonomy" (p. 60). As teachers are able to evaluate and reflect upon their performance, they may explore areas of alternative teaching styles. A study by Geltner (1993) utilized qualitative research methods to document effectiveness of cognitive coaching in a graduate administrator program. Results of the 17 students evaluated indicated a deeper understanding, improved linkages of theory and practice, and higher levels of achievement. An enhanced linkage of theory and practice allowed the students to solve complex problems of practice and reaffirm themselves as developing leaders.

The strategies of peer coaching, mentoring, and cognitive coaching illustrate the role of coach in the arena of instructional leadership.

Athletic Coaching

Sports enhance education by contributing a sense of community, student involvement, and the sense of success of the participants and the institution (Chu, 1989). Viewing coaches as positive leaders is evident in the study by Pruitt (1990), where leadership students rated the modern leaders. Ninety-eight college speech communication majors were surveyed regarding: (a) the ideal traits of leaders, (b) how leadership has changed in the last 100 years, (c) professions and individuals who set positive examples of leadership in today's society, and (d) advice they would offer to future leaders. Results from the 11-item open-ended question survey indicated that important leadership characteristics included honesty, trustworthiness, having the ability to communicate well, and being knowledgeable and intelligent. Students also believed that leaders today lack moral and ethical integrity, diminishing interest in serving others and being more concerned with self-interests. Finally, findings suggested that educators, coaches, and religious leaders provided examples of leaders held in high esteem. A note of caution must accompany the results of this study. Generalization of these findings to a larger population is difficult because of the specific nature of the responding group. A study by Conway (1991) used

athletic coaching terminology as a metaphor to clarify the roles of principal, department head, and teacher. To help the teachers refine their roles, the study equated the role of principal to the Head Coach; the Department Chair to the Assistant Coach, and the teacher to the Peer Coach. Results indicated that: (a) for the principal (or head coach role), there is a need to monitor the movement of the system in implementing a strategy, and adjust appropriately, (b) the department level coaches (or assistant coaches) needed direct assistance with instructional techniques, and (c) for teachers there was a need to locate other peers as coaches. The utilization of the coaching hierarchy was beneficial for principals and their staff in role clarification and applications.

Two studies explored the effects of community college athletic participation on student-athlete academic success (Berson, 1996; Kanter & Lewis, 1991). The Community College League of California's, Commission on Athletics (COA) states that regarding student eligibility;

1. Each student who participates in athletics must be continuously and actively enrolled in a minimum of 12 credit units at his/her college during the season of participation.
2. Once a student participates in athletics, he/she must maintain a cumulative minimum grade point average (GPA) of 2.0 in course work attempted for credit.

3. In order to be eligible for a second season of a sport, the student must complete and pass 24 semester or 36 quarter units prior to his or her next participation in that sport. (Kanter & Lewis, 1991, p. 2)

In their study, Kanter and Lewis compared transcripts of 924 student-athletes (in women's volleyball, softball, and basketball; and men's basketball, football, track and field) and 1,034 nonathletes to determine potential differences in educational and goal achievement. Results of the study found: (a) women athletes earned a higher GPA (2.63) than the men (2.45), and completed more units (42.70 compared to 35.50); and (b) athletes completed more units (37.3) than the comparison group (33.0), but earned a slightly lower GPA (2.50 versus 2.62). Two glaring limitations of the study included: (a) the sports selected may not be representative of all students in athletic programs, and (b) the lack of a true control group. However, according to the study, the significance of athletics in students' lives does contribute to the completion of requirements for graduation (i.e., GPA and units) and potential transfer to a 4-year college or university.

Satisfaction of Athletes

A central factor of any evaluation of a student services program is student satisfaction. Slark and Pham

(1991) surveyed a random sample of 1,495 students enrolled in a random sample of courses at Rancho Santiago Community College (CA). The study investigated students' attitudes and satisfaction with the programs and services provided by the college. Results indicated 82% satisfaction by students with the recreational and athletic programs. However, further investigation is necessary, as the respondents were not student-athletes. Berson (1996) accounted for this limitation as she conducted an ethnographic interview study of 14 current and 2 former student-athletes from the Broward community college softball team, and their coach. She examined the effect of participation in intercollegiate athletics on student academic success and student-athlete satisfaction. The findings suggested student-athlete satisfaction with the college, the athletic program, the coach, the level of financial support, and playing conditions. Furthermore, the results indicated a link between student-athlete success and satisfaction.

Coaching behaviors are also contributors to athlete success and satisfaction. The multidimensional model created by Chelladurai and Carron (1978) emphasized that research on coaches' leadership be directed toward behaviors to better examine and assess these behaviors on the performance and satisfaction of athletes.

Equity and Athletics

According to the *NCAA Manual* (Bollig & Summers, 1997), gender equity in sports

describes an environment in which fair and equitable distribution of overall athletic opportunities, benefits, and resources is available to women and men and in which student-athletes, coaches, and athletics administrators are not subject to gender-based discrimination. An athletics program is gender equitable when either the men's or women's sports program would be pleased to accept as its own the overall program of the other gender. (p. 1)

Twenty-five years after the passage of Title IX, men continue to dominate all areas of collegiate sports, including: (a) athletic scholarships, (b) coaching salaries, and (c) operating expenses (from the Hearing on Title IX Impact on Women's Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics and Gender Equity). Although Title IX, of the Education Amendments of 1972, prohibits institutions that receive federal funding from discriminating on the basis of gender in educational programs or activities (Priest & Summerfield, 1995), it still occurs. Coaching is one of the areas most directly affected by the lack of compliance with Title IX.

Despite the fact that sports for girls and women have made great strides in the past 25 years, equality clearly does not exist. With the enactment of Title IX, sports participation by female athletes in intercollegiate sports has increased, while leadership positions have decreased.

Gender and Leadership

Two important questions fueled early research on gender and leadership: (a) Why are so few women in "positions" of leadership, and (b) What are the personal and institutional roots of gender differences in access to leadership roles? (Astin & Leland, 1991). An inquiry into the second of these questions lends evidence to the first question.

Sexual stereotyping created an obstacle to the research and progression of gender and leadership. A study conducted by Bem (as cited in Walsh, 1987) summarized adjectives given by men and women thought to be more desirable in one sex than the other included: (a) Masculine items – act as a leader, aggressive, athletic, competitive, self-reliant, willing to take risks, and (b) Feminine items – affectionate, compassionate, gullible, loyal, understanding, and yielding. A paradigm shift in utilizing such labeling and stereotyping of qualities has transformed and allowed alternate models to emerge in the study of leadership.

Within the last two decades, the domain of leadership has engendered numerous previously stereotypical "feminine" traits. In an effort to redefine leadership beyond position, scholars equate leadership with collaboration, relationship, and cooperation. Chrislip and Larson (1994) purported that "collaborative leaders . . . must take

responsibility for building broad-based involvement" (p. 140). The image of the leader as a single figure is an outdated conceptualization in the shifting paradigm of leadership.

"Gender is a category of experience" (Regan & Brooks, 1995, p. 42). Therefore, male and female attributes reflect one's experience, which in turn affects one's leadership. As men have previously held positions of power, it is through their experience that the old paradigm rests. However, Astin and Leland (1991) believed it to be essential to "conceive of leadership as a creative process that results in societal change to improve our human condition" (p. 6). Therefore, concentration on the end result will continue to shift the focus off the position of the leader onto the process. This is a necessary process to increase the number of women in leadership positions and eliminate previous gender stereotyping and labeling.

In education, the community college has adopted such a paradigm shift to include a collaborative and relational leadership perspective. Cohen and Brawer (1996) defined leaders and leadership in terms of "vision, personal commitment, and empowerment . . . [and] view the college not as a rationally managed, hierarchical organization, but as a collectivity of interacting people" (p. 132). Such an

adoption is particularly evident in the number of women in leadership positions at the community college level.

According to Taylor (as cited in Eaton, 1981), "no type of secondary institution has exceeded the community colleges' 200 percent gain in women presidents during the past five years, and their ranks will continue to grow in the decades ahead" (p. 1). The community college system has embraced a new paradigm in placing value on the process of leadership and all leaders, including women.

Despite strides in the educational arena, women are overwhelmingly absent from sport leadership positions. Although female sports participation has increased, female sport leaders are greatly underrepresented. Opportunities for females to compete at the international level are at an all time high as well. However, despite women comprising 25% of participants in the Olympic Games, disproportionately few women are in positions of leadership. According to Kluka (1992) "since 1971, only 6 women, comprising 6.3%, have been appointed to the International Olympic Committee" (p. 7). At the collegiate level, less than 14% of (4-year) college athletic directors are women. Of that 14%, there are only four female athletic directors at the Division I-A level (Peter, 1994, p. 10). Acosta and Carpenter (1992) add to the statistics by showing that in 1972 females headed

more than 90% of women's programs, but only 16.8% of women's programs in 1992. Also in 1992, women held 30.8% of all administrative jobs in women's programs, and no females at all were involved in the administration of 27.8% of women's programs. In an attempt to remedy the lack of women in positions of sport leadership, the National Association for Girls and Women in Sport (NAGWS) made it a priority to "recruit, develop, and promote women for leadership positions in sport and physical activity" (Hester & Dunaway, 1991, p. 30). However, until promoting women in these positions becomes a priority, a true paradigm shift cannot occur.

Gender and Coaching

Women are also underrepresented in the domain of athletic coaching. In 1972, the year of the enactment of Title IX, women coached more than 90% of women's teams (Peter, 1994). In 1978, 58.2% of the coaches of women's college teams were women. By 1988, the number declined to 48.3%; and in 1990, it was 47.3% (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992). Despite attempts to increase the number of women, such as workshops, job postings, certification programs, and so forth, the proportion of female coaches has declined.

True (1990) believed that without women to coach, "female athletes will lose the opportunity to have a female role model in a leadership role in athletics" (p. 48). If women, who are underrepresented in coaching already, continue to leave at the present rate, coaching will remain a male-dominated sport (Knoppers, 1992).

The decline in female coaches brings a decline in role models for the numerous young participants in sports today, both boys and girls. A study by LeDrew and Zimmerman (1994) investigated the acceptance of high school male and female athletes regarding females in coaching. The results indicated that 43% of the athletes surveyed believed that females and males have the same opportunities to coach. Further investigation showed that female athletes were more likely to respond that females have equal opportunities to coach as males (LeDrew & Zimmerman, 1994). It is encouraging that female adolescents believe coaching is a viable opportunity for them to pursue. However, the responses of the male high school students may be more realistic in light of the recent trend of the decline in the number of female coaches. Acosta and Carpenter (1992) point out that "the lack of female coaches deprives the female athletes of valuable role models of women in leadership, decision-making positions" (p. 5).

One of the explanations given for the decline in the number of female coaches, is the male take-over that accompanied the enactment of Title IX. The popularity and higher salaries connected with the rise in female sports contributed to the influx of male coaches. Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) examined gender differences in the role of efficacy, occupational valence, valence of coaching, and perceived barriers in preference to coach at the high school, 2-year college, and NCAA Division, I, II, and III levels. They found that working hours most negatively affected the desire to coach at every level. In addition, male athletic directors hired male coaches because they had the experience that the women could not get prior to the passage of Title IX.

Women coaches are also lacking at the community college level. According to Price (as cited in Eaton, 1981) "more women are needed at the [community] college level to serve as role models for women and men at a crucial stage of their development when many students are making career decisions that will affect the rest of their lives" (p. 13). Approximately one-third of all full-time community college coaches of team sports in California, are women. Another facet missing from the ethnically diverse community colleges is that of minority women coaches. Young female

student-athletes may choose not to participate in selected sports due to the severe lack of ethnic female role models for them.

There are numerous obstacles women coaches presently face. According to Acosta and Carpenter (1992), women held a higher percentage of assistant coaching positions than head coaching positions within women's athletics. Also, women hold 58.7% of the paid assistant coaching positions, and 53.1% of the unpaid (p. 8). Such an exploitation of female coaches only serves to build upon an already seemingly insurmountable obstacle.

Opportunities for women in coaching are a structural determinant of the male-dominated system of coaching. A study by Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) explored how access to positions, income, networking, and frequency of feedback from supervisors were gendered for male and female Division I coaches. The results indicated fewer opportunities for female coaches than for men. For example, a woman coaching basketball at the Division I level can make only horizontal moves to other women's basketball positions. However, a man who also coaches basketball at the same level can move to other basketball positions of both men's and women's teams. The results of the study also indicated that

men were more satisfied with their jobs and were less likely to consider leaving coaching than were women.

Although males became coaches for women's teams after the passage of Title IX, women breaking into the coaching ranks of men's teams was much slower. A later study by Acosta and Carpenter (1992) found that only 2% of the head coaches of men's teams within the NCAA are females. Of this 2%, almost half of those coaches were of combined teams (teams practicing together) such as swimming, cross country, and tennis. Women coaches will continue to be underrepresented if they are made to believe that "male coaches are more knowledgeable, female athletes prefer male coaches, and hiring committees perpetuate the 'Good Old Boy' network" (Thorngren, 1990, p. 58). Female athletes need female role models, as well as ethnic minority role models. Coaching will continue to be a male-dominated arena without a gender balance. For according to Peters and Austin (1985), true "coaching is face-to-face leadership that pulls together people with diverse backgrounds, talents, and experiences and interests, encourages them to step up to responsibility and continued achievement" (p. 325).

Leadership Instruments

Early studies of leader behavior focused on the personality traits associated with the "great men" in politics, business, and sports. However, a paradigm shift occurred, changing the focus from the evaluation of traits to a behavioral approach to leadership. According to Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (1996), there were two main reasons for this shift: (a) data showing that certain personality traits do not correlate with successful leadership, and (b) a shift in the field of psychology in the 1940s and 1950s that put emphasis on the effects of situational factors on behavior. Fiedler's theory, or Contingency Model, integrates situational parameters into the equation of leadership. The situational characteristics considered most vital to this model are: (a) the expected support, acceptance, and commitment to the decision by subordinates, and (b) the amount of structured, clear, decision relevant information available to the leader (Kellerman, 1984). The Path-Goal Theory is a contingency model of leadership concerned with the effects of specific leader behavior on subordinate motivation and satisfaction. Much of the Path-Goal research has investigated the effects of Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

The LBDQ was one in a series of questionnaires developed under the direction of Hemphill at Ohio State University to measure leader behaviors in the work setting. The initial compilation of 1,800 questionnaire items were refined in 1957 by Hemphill and Coons (cited in Hughes et al., 1996) to 150 statements that became the LBDQ. The two dimensions of leader behavior evaluated by the LBDQ are "consideration" and "initiating structure." According to Hughes et al. (1996), "consideration" is how friendly and supportive a leader is toward subordinates; "initiating structure" refers to how much a leader emphasizes meeting work goals and accomplishing the task (p. 220). The development of two related questionnaires by the researchers at Ohio State University: (a) the Supervisory Descriptive Behavior Questionnaire (SDBQ), and (b) the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), measured the extent of consideration and initiating structure utilized by leaders in industrial settings.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is similar to the LBDQ as it also measures two factors of leadership behavior: transactional and transformational leadership. Bass (1985) developed the MLQ to measure: (a) the extent to which leaders exhibited transformational or transactional leadership, and (b) the subordinates'

ratings of satisfaction and perceived effectiveness of the leader. The MLQ assesses three transformational and two transactional leadership components. The transformational items are: (a) charisma, (b) individualized consideration, and (c) intellectual stimulation; the transactional items are: (a) contingent reward and (b) management-by-exception. Followers complete the MLQ to assess the relationship between the MLQ factors and the follower's satisfaction and leader effectiveness ratings. According to Hughes et al. (1996), "the two dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership were highly related in which both the transformational factors and the contingent reward factor of transactional leadership were strongly related to followers' satisfaction and leadership effectiveness ratings" (p. 304). Therefore, evidence suggests that transformational leaders may also use contingent reward behaviors with their followers.

Two studies utilizing the LBDQ investigated the prominent leader behaviors in sport. Danielson, Zelhart, and Drake (1975) administered a 150-item questionnaire, a modified version of the LBDQ, to 160 junior and high school hockey players. The study was an attempt to determine the range of commonly perceived coaching behaviors of the hockey players. The results designated 8 to 20 different

behavioral dimensions from athletes' descriptions of their coaches. These dimensions represented a communicative nature related to hockey coaching. Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) developed and refined a leadership scale with the assistance of 485 physical education students from a Canadian university. The instrument that resulted from the study was called the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS), a 40-item questionnaire containing five factors: (a) Training and Instruction, (b) Democratic Behavior, (c) Autocratic Behavior, (d) Social Support, and (e) Positive Feedback. The scale measured: (a) an athlete's preferred leader behavior for the coach, (b) an athlete's perceptions regarding actual leader behavior of the coach, and (c) the coach's perceptions of his/her own leader behavior in which responses are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (Ostrow, 1990, p. 165). Two studies investigated athlete preferences for leadership behaviors utilizing the LSS. The first study conducted by Peng (1997) assessed Division III female and male basketball players' ($M = 88$, $F = 96$) preferences for coaching behaviors utilizing the modification and revision of the LSS. Results indicated a significant difference between preferences of male and female athletes for specific coaching behaviors. Specifically, Scheffe' post hoc comparison indicated females preferred more Democratic Behavior

($p < .05$) and Situational Consideration Behavior ($p < .05$) from their coach than males. A second study by Horne and Carron (1985) also used the LSS to assess compatibility in coach-athlete relationships. Subjects were coach-athlete dyads from female intercollegiate teams. Results indicated the LSS dimensions of training, reward, and social support correlated most highly with athlete satisfaction.

The previous studies represented a starting point, but further research is required. Two reasons to view these studies with caution are: (a) the lack of presented evidence of the reliability or validity of the scales utilized, and (b) the samples were limited in size and variety of sport (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980, p. 36). In order to be able to generalize the results of these studies, future research needs to include male athletes and an increased number of respondents.

Further investigation into the coach's version of the LSS yields subsequent caution on its use. A study by Dwyer and Fischer (1988) utilized the data from 38 wrestling coaches to analyze the psychometric properties of the coach's version of the LSS. However, two shortcomings of the study included "both the autocratic behavior and social support subscales had unacceptably low internal consistency reliabilities" (p. 798). Therefore, the assessment of the

factorial validity and test-retest reliability of the scale requires additional research and analysis.

Leadership Instruments in Sports

The continuation of leadership behavior studies took place in the athletic domain. Hart (1980) discussed the importance of the investigation of leadership behaviors, rather than leadership personality traits, for effective leadership. A majority of studies on leader behavior in athletics looked at the preferences of athletes. As stated by Singer (1977), leadership style should reflect the outstanding qualities of the coach, be compatible with the situation, and believed in by the athletes.

The majority of research identified with the role of leadership in sports falls under one of three models: Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS), the normative model, or the multidimensional model; all of which help determine the relation of coaching behaviors to leadership.

The research by Curtis, Smith, and Smoll (1979) provided the basis for the CBAS to evaluate and code coaches behaviors, train coaches to improve the behaviors, reevaluate the behaviors, and measure the effects of the change on the satisfaction and enjoyment of the followers. The development of the CBAS utilized observers' frequency ratings of

leadership behaviors. This approach paralleled a behavior analytic framework, emphasizing behavioral antecedents and the subsequent rewards or punishments. However, the CBAS was difficult to use because it required substantial training and numerous observations.

Two studies implemented the CBAS in the athletic domain to investigate coaching behaviors. The first study by Allen and Howe (1998) examined the relationship between athlete ability and coach feedback with perceived competence and satisfaction of female adolescent athletes. Athletes ($N = 123$) completed a questionnaire version of the CBAS to assess their perceptions of their coach's feedback. Analyses revealed significant relations of both coach feedback and ability to perceived competence and satisfaction. Specifically, hierarchical regression analysis revealed that more frequent praise and information, as well as frequent encouragement, signified higher perceived competence and greater satisfaction, respectively. Millard (1992) conducted a second study utilizing the CBAS to assess the overt coaching behaviors of high school varsity and junior varsity soccer coaches ($M = 29$, $F = 29$). Upon statistically controlling for years of experience coaching, past athletic participation, and age, results indicated that the male coaches engaged significantly more frequently in "Keeping Control"

($p = .001$) and "General Technical Instruction" ($p = .04$), and less frequently in "General Encouragement" ($p = .04$) than the female coaches ($p = .35$).

The second model of sports leadership is a normative model developed by Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) regarding decision styles in coaching. They assessed, in a variety of situations, the amount of decision-making participation preferred by athletes and the extent allowed by coaches. They found that the males preferred their coach to be more autocratic and to provide more social support. A study by Gordon (1988) compared the decision-making styles and coaching effectiveness ratings of 161 male Canadian university level soccer athletes and their coaches. Findings suggested that: (a) both coaches and athletes felt that the coaches should always have the most input into the decisions that need to be made, (b) coaches preferred both autocratic or consultative decision-styles more than athletes, and (c) congruence in decision-style preferences enhances athlete satisfaction. A confounding variable in this study was the administration of the study questionnaires by the coaches.

Chelladurai and Carron (1978) developed a third model entitled the Multidimensional Model. This model considers group performance and member satisfaction to be a result of

the relation and congruence of three states of leader behavior: (a) required, (b) preferred, and (c) actual (Chelladurai, 1990).

Assessment of behavior in the multidimensional model requires three types of behavior: (a) required leader behavior, (b) the leader behavior preferred by the members, and (c) the actual leader behavior. Required leader behavior includes the demands and constraints of situational characteristics. The formal organizational structure sets the parameters for sport and its relation to the larger system, as well as social and cultural norms (Chelladurai, 1990). This model also points to the fact that the contingencies of the situation influence the required leader behaviors (Chelladurai, 1990).

Kouzes and Posner (1987) developed the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) to evaluate an observable set of practices in leadership performance and effectiveness. They focused on how ordinary people lead others in accomplishing extraordinary things. Kouzes and Posner claim in their LPI Facilitator's Guide that "leadership is not a mythical quality that only a select few are born with; it's a set of behaviors that both experienced and prospective leaders can use to turn challenging opportunities into remarkable successes" (p. 3).

Kouzes and Posner's (1987) 30-item LPI includes five scales of essential practices of leadership, each of which consists of two strategies:

1. Challenging the Process
 - A. Search for opportunities
 - B. Experiment and take risks
2. Inspiring a shared vision
 - A. Envision the future
 - B. Enlist others
3. Enabling others to act
 - A. Foster collaboration
 - B. Strengthen others
4. Modeling the way
 - A. Set the example
 - B. Plan small wins
5. Encouraging the heart
 - A. Recognize contributions
 - B. Celebrate accomplishments. (p. 310)

Kouzes and Posner developed these scales after studying leaders who performed at their best in a situation and developed an intended change. The sample for the current version of the LPI consists of 1,567 managers and executives. For the LPI-Self, only 12% of the respondents were female (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

Early versions of the LPI originated from information provided on a questionnaire by leaders' accounts of their "personal best leadership experiences." Two studies used this questionnaire of Kouzes and Posner's with the population of athletic coaches. One study by Elliot (1990) surveyed 195 NCAA Division I head football coaches regarding their leadership practices and personal best leadership

experience. Despite finding that "communicating the vision and inspiring others to that vision were essential for coaches to achieve their personal best" (p. 32), the study exhibited an extremely low response rate of 14%. The other study, by Mitchelson (1995) examined the leadership practices and strategies of 60 respected recreation, sport, leisure, and lifestyle leaders, also using the "Personal Best Leadership Experience" questionnaire. The most significant finding of this study was that "each of the sixty respondents brought about change in their organizations . . . in all cases the leaders were change agents" (p. 7).

Two studies assessed the role of the coach and the relation to leadership behaviors. An article by Priest (1990) purported "effective leadership is facilitated through a democratic management style" (p. 56). Therefore, the involvement of team members may elicit an environment of community and collaboration. Through the cooperation of team members and the coach, success is a potential outcome. The second article by DeMarco and McCullick (1997) investigated the leadership behaviors exhibited by expert coaches:

- extensive, specialized knowledge
- organize knowledge hierarchically
- highly perceptive and superior problem solvers
- exhibit automaticity during analysis and instruction
- develop self-monitoring skills. (pp. 37-39)

These two articles describe both the roles and leadership behaviors of coaches.

Summary

This review of literature has detailed the field of leadership in relation to coaching. The ultimate success and satisfaction of athletes rely upon the leadership behaviors of the coach. Instruments used to assess leadership, along with those in sports, were discussed. As a result of each of these areas cited in this chapter, the researcher pulls them together in the present study. The Leadership Practices Inventory is the instrument of choice, as it permits multi-rater feedback. Its introduction into the field of athletic coaching allows for further investigation of the declining population of female coaches, in relation to their male counterparts, and their athletes.

The next chapter describes the methodology used by this researcher as she investigated the perceived leadership behaviors of coaches, athletes' observations, and satisfaction with those behaviors.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

Chapters I and II stated the purpose of the study, identified research questions, and reviewed the pertinent research literature to provide a foundation. As previously mentioned, effective leadership in the domain of athletic coaching requires input from both coaches and athletes. This study addresses coaches' self-perceived leadership behaviors, as well as athletes' preferences and satisfaction with those behaviors. The results contribute to the literature of coaches at the community college level and their professional development.

Chapter III delineates the design and methodology used to achieve this objective. Specific areas discussed include design, samples, procedure, instrumentation, data collection strategies, statistical analysis, and Human Subjects procedures.

Methodology

Design

This study was descriptive and correlational in nature. The primary instruments utilized in this investigation included Kouzes and Posner's (1987) Leadership Practices Inventory (Self and Observer versions) and Chelladurai et al.'s (1988) Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (see Appendix B).

Samples

The present study included two samples. The first consisted of California community college head coaches. Criteria for the coaching sample were threefold: (a) those employed full-time by the community college, (b) coaches of team sports, identified by Bollig and Summer's (1997) *NCAA Manual* which had a male and female equivalent: softball, baseball, men's and women's basketball, men's and women's soccer, men's and women's volleyball, and men's and women's water polo, and (c) those in colleges with four or more full-time head coaches in the aforementioned sports. The second sample consisted of athletes ($n = 280$) from the men's and women's soccer teams of the head soccer coaches ($n = 29$) included in the total coaching sample ($N = 225$).

The researcher conducted a preliminary study to decipher the number of full-time head coaches, utilizing

Beazley's (1997) *Blue Book of College Athletics*. The *Blue Book* provided a complete list of the 106 community colleges in California, including the conferences and specific contact names and numbers for each school. The researcher contacted all 106 community colleges by telephone and compiled a list of the head coaches in each of the team sports. A representative from each college advised whether the coaches were either adjunct faculty (i.e., part-time) or employed full-time by the community college. Only 2 of the 106 schools refused to offer this employment information. Further delineation of the community colleges included those with four or more full-time coaches of the specified team sports, in order to ensure a higher response rate from each community college. This preliminary investigation produced a subject pool of 68 community colleges and 225 head coaches (146 male, and 79 female). See Appendix C for a detailed description of the coaching sample.

Procedure

This study consisted of mailings of the instruments, demographic questionnaires, and informed consent agreements to community college coaches and athletes. Despite the utilization of LPI data collection and feedback in a workshop setting, the researcher chose to mail the instruments

and feedback to the coaches and athletes. Three steps were taken to justify this course of action: (a) the researcher received permission from the authors to use and mail the instruments, (b) the authors sent the researcher a number of examples of previous studies using the instruments and mailing format, and (c) the researcher presented the study in person at a number of the southern California colleges.

The men's and women's soccer coaches included in the study completed and returned the demographic questionnaire, informed consent agreement, and the LPI: Self. In addition, the soccer coaches submitted a list of the names and addresses of the players on their current roster for the researcher to contact the athletes directly. To further ensure confidentiality and anonymity, the athletes did not put their names on the forms and returned them directly to the researcher. Although the coaches were informed as to what the athletes would be asked to complete, the direct contact of the athletes, ensured: (a) the coaches would not know which of their athletes actually participated in the study, and (b) the players would not become potential victims of backlash if the coaches were not aware of the athletes' participation.

The researcher provided a printout of results to all soccer coaches and other coaches who requested it. Feedback

included a 14-page detailed account of findings. The researcher also followed this up with a debriefing interview, either in person or on the telephone.

Instrumentation

Due to the lack of reliable and consistent instruments to assess coaching leadership in sports, the present study utilizes the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS). The LPI has both a Self (LPI-S) and Observer (LPI-O) version in which coaches can rate themselves, and athletes can rate the coach, respectively. Complete versions of these instruments are in Appendices D, E, and F. These instruments were particularly appropriate for the population under consideration. The brevity and face validity of the instruments made them conducive to: (a) the limited time each subject had to participate, and (b) group administration. Appendix G contains a copy of the demographic questionnaire given to coaches, which includes seven questions regarding: (a) gender, (b) race/ethnicity, (c) number of years coached, (d) the sport coached, (e) subject(s) taught, (f) win/loss record, and (g) a qualitative question. The qualitative question asks "In your experience, why are fewer female coaches hired to coach women's teams than male coaches?"

The responses of coaches on this subject provides the foundation for answering Research Question 4: "What are some reasons given by coaches for the deficit in the number of female coaches hired to coach women's teams?" Appendix H contains a copy of the demographic questionnaire given to athletes which includes questions regarding: (a) gender, (b) age, (c) race/ethnicity, (d) playing position, (e) number of years played, and (f) present playing status.

Leadership Practices Inventory

The LPI-S consisted of 30 behaviorally based items. Each statement was assigned to a 10-point Likert scale: (1) Almost Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Seldom, (4) Once in a While, (5) Occasionally, (6) Sometimes, (7) Fairly Often, (8) Usually, (9) Very Frequently, and (10) Almost Always. The higher the value, the more frequently the leader engaged in the behavior. The LPI-O also contained 30 behaviorally based items in which the observer (i.e., athlete) evaluated the frequency of behaviors exhibited by the leader (i.e., coach). The LPI-O also used the Likert scale format previously described.

Kouzes and Posner (1987) developed both versions of the LPI after examining the leadership behaviors of 1,567 managers and executives. The 30-item inventories examined

leadership behavior according to five practices, each of which consists of two basic strategies.

Kouzes and Posner purported that the internal reliabilities range from 0.69 to 0.85 on the LPI-S, and from 0.78 to 0.90 on the LPI-O. Test-retest reliability from a convenience sample of M.B.A. students averaged better than 0.93. According to the authors, the LPI has both face and predictive validity.

Scale of Athlete Satisfaction

Chelladurai (1984) developed the 18-item Scale of Athlete Satisfaction to assess athletes' satisfaction with the leadership of the coach, their individual performance, team performance, and overall involvement. A Likert scale format includes the following seven options: (1) Extremely Dissatisfied, (2) Dissatisfied, (3) Slightly Dissatisfied, (4) Neutral, (5) Slightly Satisfied, (6) Satisfied, and (7) Extremely Satisfied. Alpha reliability coefficients of the Leadership and Personal Outcomes factors were 0.95 and 0.86, respectively. Assessment of satisfaction requires a comparison of athletes' satisfaction ratings from the SAS compared to the congruence of coaches' and athletes' perceptions of leadership behaviors. The present study hopes to further the investigation by Berson (1996) regarding

student-athlete satisfaction. This study investigates soccer student-athletes' satisfaction with leadership. The central thrust of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership is that the congruence of perceived and preferred leadership enhances member satisfaction (Rierner & Chelladurai, 1995). The present study is an attempt to corroborate this basic tenant of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership utilizing the LPI (see Figure 1).

Data Collection Strategies

The *Blue Book of College Athletics* (Beazley, 1997) provided the sample data through names and addresses of the colleges, as well as phone and fax numbers. Delimitations for the samples included: community colleges in California with four or more head coaches of team sports, with a male and female equivalent.

Each participant, athlete or coach, received a packet of information. Included in the packet to soccer coaches was a request for the names and addresses of the players on their current roster. The researcher informed the coaches about what their athletes would complete. However, as the investigator contacted the athletes directly, the coaches did not know whether their athletes participated or not. Each head coach received a packet including:

Figure 1. Multidimensional model of leadership.

1. An introductory letter (see Appendix I),
2. A demographic questionnaire (see Appendix G),
3. A consent form (see Appendix J),
4. The LPI-S and response sheet (see Appendix D),
5. An endorsement letter from Dr. Joanne Fortunato
(see Appendix K),
6. A stamped return envelope.

Each head soccer coach ($n = 27$) received a packet including:

1. An introductory letter (see Appendix L),
2. A demographic questionnaire (see Appendix G),
3. A consent form (see Appendix M),
4. The LPI-S and response sheet (see Appendix D),
5. A request for the coach to return a current team
roster,
6. An endorsement letter from Dr. Joanne Fortunato
(see Appendix K),
7. A stamped return envelope.

Each athlete ($n = 270$) received a packet including:

1. An introductory letter (see Appendix N),
2. A demographic questionnaire (see Appendix H),
3. A consent form (see Appendix O),
4. The SAS (see Appendix F),
5. The LPI-O and response sheet (see Appendix E).

The researcher asked coaches and athletes to participate in the completion of the LPI-S and LPI-O, respectively, while only the athletes completed the SAS. The researcher assured the athletes that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. Each participating head coach completed the LPI-S, while only the participating head coaches of the men's and women's soccer teams included a list of the names and addresses of the players on their current roster.

This investigation involved the participants answering the survey after an initial mailing in May 1998, and one week later, a reminder postcard and fax (see Appendices P, Q, and R). The researcher conducted a follow-up mailing in September 1998, and a reminder postcard one week later. The seasons of the sports included in the study required the two mailings. The researcher included various incentives for the coaches and athletes in their packets. Finally, each of the coach's packets included the endorsement of the study from Dr. Joanne Fortunato, the Commissioner of the California Commission on Athletics (see Appendix K).

Data Analysis

For statistical analyses, the researcher utilized the Mystat: Statistical Applications, DOS Edition (1990)

computer program and the software provided by Kouzes and Posner International.

The researcher produced both composite and individual practices scores for the LPI-S for the variables discussed in Research Question 1. For the gender related Research Question 2, the researcher utilized the Spearman rank correlation coefficient to compare the LPI-S and LPI-O scores. In addition, the LPI scoring software provided agreement scores (H = High, M = Moderate, L = Low) to assess congruence of coaches' and athletes' scores on the LPI (S and O), respectively. For Research Question 3, the researcher produced an overall Satisfaction score for each athlete and team to compare with congruence scores provided by the LPI Scoring software and the correlation coefficients from Research Question 2. Finally, the researcher tallied and graphically presented the qualitative responses from Research Question 4 and the athlete's score on the SAS. The narrative, tables, and figures in Chapter IV addresses these.

Human Subjects

In order to ensure confidentiality, athletes put the name of their coach, rather than their own, on the response sheet. Respondents returned all completed inventories

directly to the researcher. They are kept in a locked filing cabinet for a period of 5 years and available only to the investigator.

- Each participant received an explanation of the research study and an opportunity to ask questions of the researcher.
- Each participant read and signed a consent form prior to the completion of the questionnaire(s).
- The researcher ensured confidentiality, anonymity, and protection of responses.
- Finally, this study received full approval of the Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects.

Summary

The survey questionnaire method utilized was appropriate for this particular study due to the face validity and brevity of the instruments. Such qualities made the instruments conducive to the time the subjects had to participate, as well as group administration of the instruments.

The research design utilized three instruments: (a) the LPI-S, (b) the LPI-O, and (c) the SAS. The coaches in the study completed the first inventory, while the athletes completed the other two. The first mailing to coaches requested their completion of the LPI-S and the names and

addresses of athletes on the rosters of only the soccer coaches. Athletes received the second mailing containing the LPI-O and the SAS that they returned directly to the researcher.

Regarding the first mailing to 225 full-time coaches from the 106 community colleges in California, 129 responded ($M = 72, F = 57$), with a response rate of 57%. Of the 29 soccer coaches surveyed, 18 responded ($M = 12, F = 6$). The mailing to men's and women's soccer athletes elicited a 55% response rate, in which 155 athletes ($M = 93, F = 62$) of the 280 surveyed responded.

This chapter introduced the parameters of design and methodology to investigate the effectiveness of coaching practices based on the (in)congruence of athletes' observations and satisfaction. In addition, the inclusion of the SAS further validated the voice of the athlete in terms of leadership preferences. The methodology section intimated the design of the investigation, the development of the experimental sample, and the procedures and analysis of data.

Chapter IV includes the analysis of the data collected during this study and its overall results.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

In the previous chapters, the researcher discussed the statement of the issue, review of the literature, and the research design. This background provided the foundation for the current analysis of the data collected. The purpose of the study was to compare community college coaches' perceptions of their leadership behaviors with athletes' perceptions of those same behaviors. A second factor examined was the satisfaction of athletes. The study utilized two survey instruments: (a) the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) which assessed leadership behavioral practices, and (b) the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS) which examined athlete satisfaction. Respondents included 129 full-time California community college coaches of team sports and 154 soccer athletes; both groups completed a version of the LPI, while only the athletes completed the SAS.

Response Frequencies

Coaches returned 129 of the 225 surveys sent, making the response rate 57%. The majority of coaches who responded: (a) had over 10 years of experience, (b) were white, and (c) were P.E. and Health instructors. A detailed summary of the subjects taught by the responding coaches can be found in Appendix S. Delineated by gender, of the 146 male coaches surveyed, 72 responded; 57 of the 79 female coaches surveyed responded. Therefore, more female coaches responded to the survey than male coaches ($F = 72.2\%$, $M = 49.3\%$). The athletes returned 154 of the 280 surveys sent, making the response rate 55%. The majority of athletes who responded were: (a) male, (b) 17-19 years old, (c) with over 10 years of playing experience, and (d) either white or Hispanic. Again delineated by gender, of the 141 male athletes surveyed, 92 responded; while only 62 of the 139 female athletes responded ($M = 65.2\%$, $F = 45.0\%$). Overall, more female coaches and male athletes responded to the surveys.

Tables 1 and 2 provide the characteristics of the samples.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Sample: Coaches (N = 129)

Category	Number	Percent
Gender		
Male	72	49.3
Female	57	72.2
Years of experience		
0-2	6	4.7
3-5	13	10.1
6-0	31	24.0
10+	79	61.2
Ethnicity		
White	102	79.1
Hispanic	12	9.3
Black	9	7.1
Asian	2	2.0
Hawaiian	1	.9
Filipino	1	.9
Korean	1	.9
Italian	1	.9
Coaches by sport		
Softball	24	.18
Baseball	24	.18
M. soccer	8	.06
W. soccer	10	.08
M. basketball	19	.14
W. basketball	21	.17
M. volleyball	1	.01
W. volleyball	19	.14
M. water polo	3	.02
W. water polo	3	.02
Subject areas taught		
Activity courses	144	.50
Health	43	.15
Physical Education	42	.14
Fitness/Physical Conditioning	34	.12
Physical Education Theory courses	14	.05
Other curriculum areas	12	.04

Table 2

Characteristics of the Sample: Athletes (N = 154)

Category	Number	Percent
Gender		
Male	92	65.2
Female	62	45.0
Age		
17-19	92	60.1
20-22	49	32.0
23+	12	8.4
Years of experience		
0-2	22	15.1
3-5	8	5.2
6-9	21	14.1
10+	100	66.2
Ethnicity		
White	84	55.0
Hispanic	55	36.5
Black	5	3.3
Asian	5	3.3
Indian	2	1.3
American Indian	1	.6
Arabic	1	.6

Research Question #1A

Research Question 1A: Are the leadership behaviors on the LPI-S more similar or dissimilar between male and female coaches?

A comparison of the overall mean scores (on a scale of 60 possible) for male and female coaches on the five leadership practices of Modeling, Encouraging, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring is graphically displayed in Figure 2. The responses of male and female coaches on the LPI-S indicate more similarities than differences. One significant difference in the overall mean scores is on the Encouraging scale where the overall mean score of the male coaches is 48.97, while the female coaches' overall mean score is 51.02. On the other scales, mean scores for the male and female coaches were within a single point difference. Overall, the means on four of the five LPI scales were very similar for male and female coaches. Such a finding suggests that male and female coaches are similar in terms of their Modeling, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring practices, but differ in Encouraging practices. According to the LPI, these Encouraging practices include: (a) leaders recognizing contributions, (b) allowing members to share in the rewards of their efforts, (c) celebrating accomplishments, and (d) making people feel like heroes.

When analyzing the frequency with which coaches rated themselves as engaging in these types of behaviors, female coaches rated themselves higher than the male coaches. Therefore, this finding gives coaches feedback on the frequency that they engage in all 5 behaviors (especially Encouraging ones) in order to adjust future leadership practices.

Figure 2. Male and female coaches' leadership practices.

Research Question #1B

Research Question 1B: Are the leadership behaviors on the LPI-S, more similar or dissimilar between coaches from different sports?

Table 3 displays coaching leadership practices by sport (baseball, basketball, soccer, softball, volleyball, and water polo). The sports were not broken down by gender due to the low response rates in a few of the sports. More specifically, there was only one male volleyball coach who responded (and he also coached a women's volleyball team). In addition, only three female and three male water polo coaches responded.

Table 3

Coaching Leadership Practices by Sport

	Leadership practices				
Sport	Modeling	Encouraging	Challenging	Enabling	Inspiring
Baseball	51.82	49.27	46.05	49.73	43.82
Basketball	52.62	50.90	47.48	49.81	46.33
Soccer	49.61	46.56	43.72	48.89	43.67
Softball	50.79	50.79	45.79	49.83	44.08
Volleyball	52.35	52.05	47.15	51.30	45.50
Water polo	53.50	53.83	51.17	50.33	48.83

Table 3 indicates that the greatest disparity in mean scores occurs between soccer and water polo coaches. The

differences in overall mean scores between the water polo and soccer coaches on the scales of Modeling, Encouraging, Challenging, and Inspiring are 3.89, 7.27, 7.45, and 5.16, respectively. The findings related to the water polo coaches must be taken with caution, due to the low number of respondents ($n = 6$). Replication of these findings with a larger sample is necessary before generalizing to a larger population. On the Enabling scale, the greatest disparity (2.41) is between the volleyball and soccer coaches.

Similarities in coaching leadership practice mean scores by sport include basketball coaches with both softball and volleyball coaches. Basketball coaches most closely resemble volleyball coaches on the Modeling, Challenging, and Inspiring scales; while they almost exactly match softball coaches on the Encouraging and Enabling scales.

Overall, the leadership behaviors on the LPI-S are more similar between coaches from different sports. The smallest discrepancy in mean scores on the LPI-S was exhibited on the Enabling scale, with only a 2.41 total point difference between the lowest and highest mean scores. Scores on the Modeling scale were next in proximity, with only 3.01 mean points difference, followed closely by the Inspiring scale, which had only a 5.16 mean point difference in overall

coaches' ratings between sports. The final two scales, Encouraging and Challenging, resulted in 7.27 and 7.45 respectively mean point differences by sport.

Therefore, the findings suggest that male and female (baseball, basketball, soccer, softball, volleyball, and water polo) coaches are more similar than different on the leadership behaviors depicted on the LPI-S. The greatest similarity existed in the Enabling and Modeling scales, followed closely by the Inspiring scale, with the least similarity on the Encouraging and Challenging scales.

Research Question #2

Research Question 2: How do coaches' and athletes' ratings of leadership practices relate to the gender of the athletes?

Results on the leadership practices tend along gender lines (i.e., female athlete-female coach, male athlete-male coach). They must, therefore, be taken with a small amount of skepticism, as cross-gender comparison groups in the coaching domain are lacking. In this study, for example, the low number of comparison groups (female athlete-male coach) forced the researcher to focus more closely upon the same gender comparison groups. Secondly, in the domain of coaching, there are even fewer male athlete-female coach

groups to compare for cross-gender analysis. Therefore, those scales which indicate the strongest relationships among the same gender athlete/coach groups will be the concentration in the present analysis.

Research Question #2A

Research Question 2A: How do female athletes' observations compare to their coaches' perceptions?

Figure 3 exhibits the responses of the female soccer coaches' perceptions of their own behavior on the 5 LPI scales and female soccer athletes' observations of their coaches' behaviors on the same scales. The resulting pattern is one of the female coaches rating themselves lower on all 5 LPI scales, while their athletes rated them higher on all scales.

The greatest discrepancy between the coaches' perceptions and athlete observations is on the Inspiring scale. Female coaches' mean rating of this leadership practice (38.33) was almost 13 points lower than the female athletes' observations of their coaches exhibiting this behavior (51). The Challenging scale produced nearly a 9 point difference in coaches' (41.33) and athletes' (50.17) responses. The three remaining scales (Modeling, Encouraging, and Enabling) exemplified differences of 6.00, 5.17, and 5.66 points,

respectively, between coaches' and athletes' responses on the scales.

Figure 3. Female soccer coaches' and athletes' responses of leadership practices.

However, the points of interest from this analysis are:
 (a) the female coaches' low perceptual ratings of their behavior on the 5 LPI scales, and (b) the female athletes' high observational ratings of their coaches on the same 5 scales.

Table 4 depicts another form of analysis comparing the means of the 5 LPI scales between female coaches and female athletes as well as between male coaches and female athletes. According to Table 4, the strongest Spearman Rho negative correlation is on the scale of Inspiring. Female athletes and their coaches were in the greatest disagreement on this scale ($r = -0.61$), which indicated high scores for one group were accompanied by low scores for the other group. The Enabling scale also indicates a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.49$). A slight negative correlation between athletes' observer scores and coaches' self scores presented itself on the Challenging scale ($r = -0.22$). Finally, on the scales of Modeling and Encouraging, only a slight positive correlation was indicated ($r = 0.13$, $r = 0.14$, respectively).

Results from the researcher's effort to control for same gender comparisons (i.e., female athlete-female coach), are depicted in Table 5. Three main differences surfaced in the comparisons of female coaches and their athletes, rather than male and female coaches and their athletes (as depicted in Table 4). First, the Modeling scale changed to a strong correlation ($r = 0.60$), where previously it was only a slight positive correlation ($r = 0.13$). Second, the Challenging scale changed from a low negative correlation of

Table 4

Male and Female Soccer Coaches' and Female Athletes' Responses on the Five Leadership Practices

	Modeling		Encouraging		Challenging		Enabling		Inspiring	
Coach	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer
Female coaches										
1	52	57	55	55	50	52	45	56	45	53
2	40	58	22	54	29	50	44	56	24	53
3	49	56	49	51	42	50	51	56	39	50
4	52	50	54	47	45	45	52	43	42	48
5	52	55	50	51	45	50	48	52	44	47
6	50	55	51	54	37	54	46	57	36	55
Male coaches										
7	40	45	45	46	47	41	42	44	48	43
8	40	54	32	54	39	49	53	54	44	43
9	57	X	50	X	51	X	55	X	51	X
10	49	X	46	X	42	X	48	X	43	X
Mean	49.10	53.63	44.90	51.50	42.20	48.88	49.40	52.25	41.60	49.00
SD	6.03	4.14	10.04	3.42	6.11	4.09	4.53	5.63	7.47	4.57
Median	49.5	55	49.5	52.5	43.5	43.5	49.5	55	43.5	49
Minimum	40	45	22	46	29	29	42	43	24	43
Maximum	57	57	54	55	51	55	57	57	51	55
Correlation	0.13		0.14		-0.22		-0.49		-0.61	

Note. Coaches: $n = 10$; $F = 6$, $M = 4$.

Table 5

Female Soccer Coaches' and Female Athletes' Responses on the Five Leadership Practices

	Modeling		Encouraging		Challenging		Enabling		Inspiring	
Coach	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer
Female coaches/female athletes										
1	52	57	55	55	50	52	45	56	45	53
2	40	58	22	54	29	50	44	56	24	53
3	49	56	49	51	42	50	51	56	39	50
4	52	50	54	47	45	45	52	43	42	48
5	52	55	50	51	45	50	48	52	44	47
6	50	55	51	54	37	54	46	57	36	55
Mean	49.17	55.17	46.83	52	41.33	50.17	47.67	53.33	38.33	51
SD	4.67	2.79	12.38	2.97	7.39	2.99	3.27	5.35	7.76	3.16
Median	51	55.5	50.5	52.5	43.5	50	47	56	40.5	51.5
Minimum	52	58	55	55	50	54	52	57	45	55
Maximum	52	58	55	55	50	54	52	57	45	55
Correlation	0.60		0.17		-0.01		-0.49		-0.44	

$r = -0.22$, to almost no relationship ($r = -0.01$). Finally, athletes' perceptions compared to those of their female coaches on the Inspiring scale went from a strong negative correlation of $r = -0.61$, to a moderate negative correlation of $r = -0.44$.

By controlling for gender of the coach: (a) female athletes were more in agreement with their (female) coaches on the Modeling scale than when combined with male coaches, (b) on the Inspiring scale there was less disagreement between female athletes and female coaches, and (c) there was no relationship on the Challenging scales. In other words, female athletes' and female coaches' perceptions on Modeling behaviors are very similar; they are dissimilar on Inspiring behaviors; and they have no relationship on Challenging behaviors. Therefore, when female coaches rated themselves as practicing Modeling behaviors (i.e., setting an example, achieving small wins, and creating opportunities for victory), the female athletes agreed.

Research Question #2B

Research Question 2B: How do male athletes' observations compare to their coaches' perceptions?

Figure 4 illustrates the difference in mean scores between male coaches and male athletes on the 5 LPI scales.

Figure 4. Male soccer coaches' and athletes' responses of leadership practices.

The greatest discrepancy is the 6.20 point difference on the Enabling scale, where coaches rated themselves 49.5 and athletes rated the coaches 43.3. The Challenging and Inspiring scales indicated a difference of about 5 points (5.22 and 5.03, respectively). Finally, the Modeling and Encouraging scales exhibited mean score differences of 3.93 and 3.32. Overall, the pattern presented in the figure is most noteworthy. While the female coaches rated themselves lower than their athletes (as seen in Figure 3), the opposite is true of the male coaches and athletes. On all 5 scales, the male coaches rated themselves higher than their athletes. Much can be learned from these two figures (3 and 4): what coaches believed they were practicing was not what their athletes observed to be true.

Comparisons of same gender male comparisons (i.e., male athlete-male coach) are depicted in Table 6. An interesting finding is that athletes' and coaches' perceptions indicate a high positive correlation ($r = 0.84$) on the Enabling scale. Such a strong relationship signifies the agreement of athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behaviors, with himself actually practicing. Conversely, the Modeling scale indicates a strong negative correlation ($r = -0.76$), potentially signifying a lack of agreement in perspectives of coaching behaviors. A moderate negative correlation what

Table 6

Male Soccer Coaches' and Male Athletes' Responses on the Five Leadership Practices
(n = 8; all M)

	Modeling		Encouraging		Challenging		Enabling		Inspiring	
Coach	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer	Self	Observer
Male coaches/male athletes										
1	54	46	52	46	53	30	57	48	46	36
2	57	41	43	34	48	35	44	32	40	34
3	54	47	42	44	49	44	43	41	50	44
4	44	49	44	47	39	43	52	44	34	46
5	50	50	56	48	43	45	55	50	48	46
6	51	41	54	41	47	37	53	45	51	40
7	56	35	55	35	45	32	40	30	52	35
8	46	51	39	36	36	41	43	36	40	46
Mean	51.5	45.00	48.00	41.38	45.00	38.38	49.50	41.88	46.25	40.88
SD	4.66	5.53	6.99	5.71	5.53	5.71	5.61	6.08	6.20	5.28
Median	52.5	46.5	48	42.5	46	39	50.5	42.5	48.5	42
Minimum	44	35	38	34	36	30	43	32	34	34
Maximum	57	51	56	48	53	45	57	50	52	46
Correlation	-0.76		0.33		-0.43		0.84		-0.14	

the coach sees ($r = -0.43$) accompanies the Challenging scale; while the Encouraging scale indicates a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.33$). Finally, on the Inspiring scale, coaches' perceptions have only a slight negative correlation with those of the athletes ($r = -0.14$).

Figure 5 provides a supplemental means to analyze the Spearman Rho correlations found in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Kouzes and Posner (1987) maintained that self (coaches) and observer (athletes) scores ranking at or above the 70th percentile are considered to be "high"; a "low" score is one at or below the 30th percentile; and a score that falls between these ranges is considered moderate. The LPI scoring software package then analyzes and compares these values for the coaches and athletes to produce an "Agreement" score, which is depicted in Figure 5. This figure delineates the amount of agreement between athletes and coaches with a High (H), Moderate (M), or Low (L) value. As evidenced by this figure, female athletes are in agreement with their coaches (male and female) with the following frequencies: (a) H = 17, (b) M = 18, and (c) L = 5; female athletes were in agreement with their female coaches: (a) H = 15, (b) M = 14, (c) L = 1; and finally, male athletes agreed with their male coaches: (a) H = 4, (b) M = 17, and (c) L = 19.

Figure 5. Coach/athlete agreement on LPI scales.

Research Question #3

Research Question 3: How is athlete satisfaction related to congruence between the perceptions of coaches and athletes regarding leadership behavior?

On the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS), athletes' overall mean scores were computed and rated on a scale of: (a) 91-108 Extremely Satisfied, (b) 73-90 Satisfied, (c) 55-71 Slightly Satisfied, (d) 37-54 Neutral, (e) 19-36 Slightly Dissatisfied, and (f) 0-18 Dissatisfied. The results are exhibited in Table 8, which groups the athletes into three

main categories: (a) Male athlete/Male coach, (b) Female athlete/Male coach, and (c) Female athlete/Female coach.

Table 7

Soccer Athlete Satisfaction Scores

Gender	Overall mean score	Degree of satisfaction
Male Athlete/Male Coach	74.21	Satisfied
Female Athlete/Male Coach	80.19	Satisfied
Female Athlete/ Female Coach	90.89	Extremely satisfied

Each category of athlete and coach's overall mean score for satisfaction is given, along with the appropriate satisfaction rating. The mean scores for the first two categories place the groupings into the area of "Satisfied," with the male athlete/male coach score of 74.21 and the female athlete/male coach of 80.19. A note of concern is necessary in comparing the satisfaction of female athletes with their coaches. As evidenced by Table 4, only four male coaches (of women's soccer teams) responded to the survey; only 2 of these coaches have Observer ratings. Therefore, the low number of athletes ($n = 16$) responding in this category may be a confounding factor in looking at the satisfaction results. The third group of female athlete/female coach indicated an "Extremely Satisfied" rating (90.89).

The female athletes' rating of "Extremely Satisfied" is corroborated by the information in Figure 5. According to this figure, there was more congruence between female athletes and their coaches (male and female), than between male athletes and their (male) coaches. In relating Figure 5 and Table 7, female athletes exhibit both more congruence with their coaches, as well as more satisfaction.

Research Question #4

Research Question 4: What are some reasons given by coaches for the deficit in the number of female coaches hired to coach women's teams? This particular research question surfaced due to the researcher's desire to further investigate possible reasons for the lack of female community college coaches. Coaches' firsthand knowledge is of vital importance to add to the body of knowledge in the coaching literature. The majority of studies that have discussed the roles of women in coaching have focused on the NCAA levels. Therefore, the present study adds to the literature by investigating coaching at the community college level.

Table 8 presents the results of the qualitative research question posed to the coaching sample surveyed: "In your experience, why are fewer coaches hired to coach

Table 8

Community College Coaching Sample: Qualitative Responses

Heading	Actual response	Frequency		
		Male	Female	Total
Hiring/ Leadership	Good Old Boys	1	10	11
Availability	Small pool of coaches	20	14	34
Experience	More exp. male coaches	15	17	32
Time	Women have less time	6	6	12
Interest/ Motivation	Female lack of interest	6	5	11
Family/ Career	Family obligations	1	9	10
Lack of Qual- fications	Lack of credentials	6	2	8
Money/Jobs	Lack of pay	1	4	5
Fear	Title IX	2	1	3
Other	Men as adjunct coaches	2	0	2

women's teams than male coaches?" (see Appendix T for a detailed summary of results). Guba and Lincoln (1985) described the process of inductive analysis as "the best means to 'make sense' of the data in ways that will facilitate the continuing unfolding of the inquiry, and, second, lead to a maximal understanding of the phenomenon being studied" (p. 224). More specifically, this inductive analysis involves two subprocesses: (a) *Unitizing* – A coding operation that identifies information units to be isolated from text, and (b) *Categorizing* – A coding operation that categorizes the units identified by unitizing into those that are similar in meaning. This process is called the "constant comparative method" by Glaser and Strauss (1967). This method requires constant revision and modification until all units are placed into an appropriate category.

As a result of these two subprocesses, the researcher identified 13 categories: (a) Hiring Committee/Leadership, (b) Availability, (c) Experience, (d) Time, (e) Interest/Motivation, (f) Family/Career, (g) Lack of Qualifications, (h) Money/Jobs, (i) Fear, (j) Gender Issues, (k) Discipline/Ethics, (l) Burnout, and (m) Other (see Appendix S for detailed findings). Table 8 is broken down into response frequencies: Male, Female, and Total.

In the first construct of "Hiring Committee/Leadership" the following reasons received the largest responses:

(a) "Good Old Boys" (female = 10, male = 1), followed closely by (b) "Male Athletic Directors hiring males/friends" (n = 8; female = 6, male = 2).

In the second construct of "Availability," three main reasons received the majority of responses: (a) "Smaller pool of qualified coaches" (n = 34; female = 14, male = 20), the largest response grouping accounted for 14% of the overall responses in the table; (b) "Less women in coaching/more men in coaching" (n = 21; female = 7, male = 14); and (c) "Fewer female applicants/more male applicants" (n = 18; female = 9, male = 9). In other words, a greater degree of men contend that there are fewer women (more men) in coaching; while men and women feel that less women (more men) apply.

The largest response area in the third category of "Experience" was in "More experienced male coaches/Less experienced female coaches" (n = 32; female = 17, male = 15). This construct paralleled men and women coaches' responses regarding a smaller pool of qualified female applicants, followed by less women in coaching; and, therefore, having less experience in the field.

Twelve total responses of "women having less time for coaching" (female = 6, male = 6) were tallied in the category of "Time." The fifth category of "Interest/Motivation" indicated the highest responses ($n = 11$) in the area of "Female lack of interest/more male interest" (female = 5, male = 6). In following, 10 coaches (female = 9, male = 1) indicated that "Family obligations/Children are a priority" was the most important area under the heading "Family/Career."

Under the category of "Lack of qualifications," 6 male coaches and 2 female coaches ($n = 8$) believed "Lack of credentials/preparation/licenses/degree" were the main reasons for fewer women hired to coach than men. In the category of "Money/Jobs," female coaches ($n = 4$) believed "Lack of Pay" was a reason for fewer females in coaching (as compared to one male responding); while more males ($n = 4$; females $n = 0$) saw the "Lack of full-time positions" as a more reasonable explanation.

Only 3 coaches contended that "Title IX issues/Compliance" ($n = 1$ female, $n = 2$ males) in the category of "Fear" explained the lack of female coaches. In addition, very few coaches attributed the deficit in the number of female coaches to "Gender issues." In this category, only 8 coaches responded (5 men and 3 women). Male coaches also

dominated the responses relating to "Discipline/Ethics," with 3 responses (male) to none (female). In the area of "Burnout," only 2 coaches (1 male, 1 female) responded to this area as contributing to the lack of females in coaching.

The final category of "Other," male coaches reasoned the decline of females in coaching was due to a deficiency or weakness, while female coaches related reasons to factual explanations. For example, men responded to the open-ended question with: (a) "Men are more willing to work as part-time/Adjunct coaches" ($n = 2$ males), (b) "Men work better in a 'team coaching' situation" ($n = 1$ male), and (c) "Lack of strength" ($n = 1$ male). On the other hand, women coaches replied with more factual (rather than relative) explanations: (a) "Women have had negative experiences" ($n = 1$ female), (b) "[Women] have to wait for men to retire" ($n = 1$ female), and (c) "Level of commitment" ($n = 1$ female).

The responses given in this final category not only reflect the history of men and women in the field of coaching but also hope for the future. The female coaches surveyed felt that they had to react to the actions of men (e.g., "Men perceived to have more knowledge," and "[Women] have to wait for men to retire"). Such responses only serve to justify the male coaches' place in an already

male-dominated profession. However, hope lies in the four areas in which male and female coaches were in most agreement: (a) Fewer female applicants/more male applicants ($M = 9, F = 9$), (b) More/less experienced male/female coaches ($M = 15, F = 17$), (c) Women have less time for coaching ($M = 6, F = 6$), and (d) Female lack of interest/more male interest ($M = 6, F = 5$). Therefore, the male and female coaches surveyed believed that strides need to be made in the areas of availability, experience, time, and interest/motivation in order for female coaches to maintain their wavering foothold in coaching.

Instrumentation

This study consisted of mailings of the instruments, demographic questionnaires, and informed consent agreements to community college coaches and athletes. Despite the utilization of LPI data collection and feedback in a workshop setting, the researcher chose to mail the instruments and feedback to the coaches and athletes. This was done due to the lack of time and resources required for a workshop setting. However, the researcher presented the study in person to coaches and athletes at 7 of the 17 community colleges surveyed.

The responses from coaches received appeared valid, in that they were filled out completely and thoughtfully. Only about 10 of the coaches did not respond at all to the qualitative question in the demographic questionnaire.

The mailing of the instruments was necessary for this particular study due to its exploratory nature. However, future studies should consider utilizing the workshop setting, if only to give results to coaches and athletes. The presence of the researcher as a facilitator could ensure confidentiality, as well as an environment that elicits communication and rapport building.

A final administrative concern was the confusion of some of the athletes regarding the leader they were to rate on the LPI: Observer. Despite the researcher's instructions for the athletes to rate the head coach, two athletes rated their team captains, and one athlete rated the assistant coach. Therefore, future administration of the LPI: Observer instrument needs a clear and repeated delineation of the leader to be rated.

Summary

The findings of the study of leadership practices of California community college coaches and athletes revealed many interesting comparisons and considerations.

Findings Related to the Research Hypotheses

The leadership behaviors on the LPI: Self indicated more similarities than differences between male and female coaches. The male and female coaches' mean scores on the Modeling, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring scales were within 1 point. This indicates that coaches' self-ratings of their Modeling, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring leadership practices were not gender based. However, the remaining scale, Encouraging, is the exception. The overall mean score of the male coaches was 48.97, while the female coaches overall mean score was 51.02. Kouzes and Posner (1987) believed the "Encouraging the heart" leadership practice to involve leaders: (a) recognizing contributions, (b) allowing members to share in the rewards of their efforts, (c) celebrating accomplishments, and (d) making people feel like heroes. In applying these specific aspects of the Encouraging to the coaching sample, female coaches rated themselves (51.02) higher on this scale than the male coaches (48.97). Therefore, this may be an area in which male coaches could improve, as the other four scales did not indicate differences based on gender.

The leadership behaviors depicted on the LPI: Self suggested more similarities than differences between coaches from different sports. Basketball coaches' ratings on the

scales most closely resembled those of softball and volleyball coaches. On the Modeling and Challenging scales, the basketball coaches means were 52.62 and 47.48, while the volleyball coaches almost exactly matched those with means of 52.35 and 47.15, respectively. Likewise, on the Encouraging and Enabling scales, the basketball coaches' means were 50.9 and 49.81; while the softball coaches' means were even closer in comparison, with means of 50.79 and 49.83, respectively. The final scale, Inspiring, exhibited mean scores for these three coaching groups within 2.25 points of one another: the basketball coaches' mean score was 46.33, the volleyball coaches' mean score was 45.5, and the softball coaches' mean score was 44.08. This finding suggests that the coaches of these three team sports are very similar in their Modeling, Encouraging, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring leadership practices.

The greatest disparity in mean scores occurred between the soccer and water polo coaches surveyed, where the water polo coaches rated themselves higher on all 5 scales. A note of caution was raised due to the low number of water polo coaches responding ($n = 6$).

The ratings of leadership practices were affected by the gender of athletes and coaches. Female coaches rated themselves lower (LPI-S) than their athletes (LPI-O) on all

5 LPI scales. The greatest discrepancy between female coaches' perceptions and athletes' observations was on the Inspiring scale, which revealed a 13-point difference in mean scores. Such a finding connotes a high difference in coach and athlete perceptions on the Inspiring coaching practices. Kouzes and Posner (1987) contended that these include leaders: (a) believing that they can make a difference, (b) envisioning the future, (c) enlisting others in their dreams, and (d) getting others to see exciting possibilities for the future. Therefore, as applied to the specific findings, female athletes believed their coaches engaged in these behaviors (51) to a much greater degree than the female coaches self-ratings exhibited. Spearman Rho correlations indicated a strong positive correlation ($r = 0.60$) between female coaches and female athletes on the Modeling scale. In other words, athletes rated their coaches, and coaches rated themselves, as engaging in Modeling leadership practices. On the other hand, the Enabling scale revealed a moderate negative correlation (-0.49). This indicated that athletes' high ratings did not coincide with female coaches' low self-ratings. The final two scales, Encouraging and Challenging, indicated the ratings of athletes and coaches to be independent of each other.

Male athletes' observations, compared to their coaches' perceptions, rated their coaches lower than the coaches rated themselves on all 5 scales. The greatest discrepancy in responses was on the Enabling scale, where coaches rated themselves a mean score of 49.5 and athletes rated their coaches 43.3. Both the Challenging and Inspiring scales indicated less of a difference with scores of 5.22 and 5.03. The final two scales, Modeling (3.93) and Encouraging (3.32), revealed only slight differences. Spearman rho correlations displayed a strong positive correlation on the Enabling scale ($r = 0.84$). In other words, there is a direct relationship between athletes' ratings of coaches and coaches' self-ratings on the Enabling scale. A slight positive correlation ($r = 0.33$) on the Encouraging scale, suggesting a weak relationship between athletes' observations and coaches' perceptions. Three negative correlations also surfaced between male athletes' LPI-O scores and male coaches' LPI-S scores on the following scales: (a) Modeling ($r = -0.76$), (b) Challenging ($r = -0.43$), and (c) Inspiring ($r = -0.14$). These negative correlations suggest an inverse relationship between coaches' self-ratings and athletes' ratings of their coaches on the Modeling, Challenging, and Inspiring scales. Therefore, coaches' high ratings indicate low ratings by athletes.

Athlete satisfaction is related to congruence between the perceptions of female coaches and athletes regarding leadership behavior. Female athletes were "Satisfied" and in most agreement with male and female coaches; while they were "Extremely Satisfied" and in a great deal of agreement with only female coaches. On the other hand, male athletes were "Satisfied" yet in low agreement with their male coaches. These results must be taken with caution as male athlete-female coach comparisons are lacking in the coaching domain. More research needs to be done regarding cross-gender comparison groups (i.e., male athletes and female coaches, female athletes and male coaches) in the coaching domain. Male coaches of female athletes is much more common than female coaches of male athletes. Therefore, further research is needed in order to validate the results of the present study.

The qualitative question, regarding reasons given by coaches concerning the deficit in the number of female coaches, yielded responses in 13 areas. Under the heading of "Hiring Committee/Leadership" the largest response category was "Good Old Boys" ($n = 11$; $M = 1$, $F = 10$) as the reason for such few female coaches. Such a finding suggests that female coaches believe that a male-dominated network is in place, while male coaches barely acknowledge its

existence. The greatest number of responses fell into the category of "Availability," in which 34 coaches ($M = 20$, $F = 14$) responded that it was due to the "Smaller pool of qualified coaches." This was the largest response grouping, and accounted for 14% of the overall responses ($n = 248$) given. The second largest response was "More experienced male coaches/ less experienced female coaches" ($n = 32$; $M = 15$, $F = 17$). The following two responses received the next highest response rates, also in the area of "Availability": (a) "less women in coaching/ more men in coaching" ($n = 21$; $M = 14$, $F = 7$), and (b) "Fewer female applicants/ more male applicants" ($n = 18$; $M = 9$, $F = 9$).

All research hypotheses and their findings have been addressed in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains a discussion and summarization of the findings of the study, limitations, applications, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Nature and Purpose of the Study

Community college coaches and athletes completed Kouzes and Posner's (1987) Leadership Practices Inventory to assess the impact of the congruence of leadership practice ratings upon athlete satisfaction. The dearth of research studies conducted on community college athletics necessitated the development of this study. Two samples were taken from Spring and Fall 1998 sports: (a) 225 full-time head coaches of team sports in which there was a male and female equivalent in California community colleges, and (b) 280 male and female soccer athletes. The athlete sample also completed Chelladurai et al's (1988) Scale of Athlete Satisfaction. Coaches returned 129 of the 225 surveys sent, making the response rate 57% ($M = 72$, $F = 57$). The athletes returned 155 of the 280 surveys sent, making the response rate 55% ($M = 92$, $F = 63$).

The present study is exploratory in nature, as it is the first to implement the Leadership Practices Inventory with coaches and athletes at the community college level. The major focus of this study is leadership and team development through an investigation of: (a) the employment of leadership practices by community college coaches, and (b) the impact of coach and athlete assessments of those leadership practices upon athlete satisfaction. In addition, the study attempts to: (a) increase coaches' self-analysis, exploration, and reflection, (b) improve leaders' knowledge and confidence in their coaching abilities, (c) find means to increase their effectiveness, and (d) allow coaches to view their own leadership style through the eyes of their athletes.

Summary of Findings

Research Question 1A

The leadership behaviors on the LPI: Self indicated more similarities than differences between male and female coaches. The researcher concluded that because the male and female coaches' ratings on the Modeling, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring scales were so similar, these particular leadership practices were not gender-based.

However, the final scale of "Encouraging" did differ between male and female coaches. Results showed that female coaches: (a) recognize contributions, (b) allow members to share in rewards of their efforts, (c) celebrate accomplishments, and (d) make people feel like heroes to a greater extent than the male coaches surveyed.

Research Question 1B

The leadership practices between coaches from different sports also showed more similarities than differences. The most similarity occurred between basketball, softball, and volleyball coaches. Actually, on all 5 scales, coaches from these three sports almost exactly matched one another. This suggests that the coaches of these team sports are very similar in their Modeling, Encouraging, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring leadership practices.

In terms of difference, the soccer and water polo coaches showed the largest difference in scores. The water polo coaches rated themselves higher on all 5 scales. However, the comparison of any group to the water polo coaches needs to include a note of caution. A total of 6 coaches of water polo teams responded to the survey, 1 of which coached both men's and women's water polo. Therefore, in order to generalize beyond the results in the present study, future

studies must replicate the findings with a greater number of coaches in all sports for comparison.

Research Question 2A

The ratings of leadership practices are affected by the gender of athletes and coaches. Female coaches rated themselves lower (LPI-S) than their athletes (LPI-O) on all 5 LPI scales. The largest difference between female coaches' and athletes' ratings was on the Inspiring scale. The athletes believed their coaches: (a) believe that they can make a difference, (b) envision the future, (c) enlist others in their dreams, and (d) get others to see exciting possibilities for the future, more than their coaches. For example, regarding "Inspiring a shared vision," athletes rated their coaches much higher than the coaches rated themselves on the question "Is enthusiastic and positive about future."

Female athletes' ratings on the Enabling scale also did not agree with their coaches. Female athletes believed that their coaches engaged in the following, more than their coaches' self-ratings indicated: (a) foster collaboration, (b) actively involve others, (c) believe mutual respect sustains extraordinary efforts, and (d) strengthen others. One of the "Enabling others to act" questions on the LPI,

for which the athletes ratings were higher than their coaches, is "Treats people with dignity and respect."

In terms of agreement, the Modeling scale displayed the closest agreement between athletes' and coaches' ratings.

These "Modeling the Way" leadership practices include:

(a) creating standards of excellence, (b) setting an example for others to follow, (c) allowing others to achieve small wins, and (d) creating opportunities for victory.

Research Question 2B

Male athletes' observations did not compare to their coaches' perceptions in that the athletes rated their coaches lower than the coaches rated themselves on all 5 scales. Such a finding signifies a potential inflated perception by male coaches' regarding their actual leadership practices. Despite this discrepancy, male coaches and their athletes were in greatest agreement on the "Enabling Others to Act" scale. In other words, the perceptions of male coaches regarding their Enabling leadership practices strongly agreed with their athletes' observations. These "Enabling Others to Act" practices include: (a) fostering collaboration, (b) building spirited teams, (c) actively involving others, (d) believing mutual respect sustains extraordinary efforts, (e) striving to create an atmosphere

of trust and human dignity, (f) strengthening others, and (g) making each person feel capable and powerful.

However, male athletes and their coaches greatly disagreed on the Modeling scale. The male athletes did not observe their coaches carrying out the Modeling practices the coaches believed they were. In other words, the male athletes believed their coaches were able to foster collaboration and strengthen them, but they did not set an example to follow or allow them to achieve small wins. For example, a Modeling question on the LPI-O states "[coach] is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership." The male coaches surveyed believed that they are clear about their philosophy of leadership, while their athletes do not. Such feedback is inherently valuable to those male coaches who believe they are actually practicing these Modeling behaviors. The voice of the athlete is vital for coaches to learn to be as effective as possible.

Research Question 3

Female athlete satisfaction is related to congruence between the perceptions of female coaches and athletes regarding leadership behavior. In assessing athlete satisfaction, the researcher looked at the following soccer coach/athlete gender pairings: (a) male and female coaches/

female athletes, (b) female coaches/female athletes, and (c) male coaches/male athletes. Findings indicated that female athletes were "Satisfied" and in agreement with both male and female coaches, while they were "Extremely Satisfied" and in the most agreement with only female coaches. A note of caution is necessary, as the male coach/female athlete pairing contained a low number of coaches and athletes responding. Only four male coaches of female teams rated their own leadership practices, and only 16 of their athletes rated these coaches. Therefore, future studies need to further investigate the male coach/female athlete pairing category, as well as female coach/male athlete pairings.

Overall, there was more congruence between female athletes and their coaches (male and female), than between male athletes and their (male) coaches. These findings corroborate Chelladurai and Riemer's (1995) central tenant of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership which states that the congruence of perceived (actual) and preferred (observed) leadership enhances member satisfaction. Therefore, the actual leadership practices and those preferred by female athletes were in most congruence and led to their enhanced satisfaction.

Research Question 4

The qualitative question, regarding reasons given by coaches concerning the lack of number of female coaches, yielded responses in 13 areas. The greatest number of responses fell into the category of "Availability." The largest response grouping which accounted for 14% of the overall responses under this category was "Smaller pool of qualified coaches."

The second largest overall response category under the heading of "Experience" was "More experienced male coaches/less experienced female coaches." This finding makes sense, as a "smaller pool of qualified (female) coaches" would keep them from gaining valuable experience. Finally, such a result was corroborated by two other response categories under "Availability": (a) "Less women in coaching/More men in coaching", and (b) "Fewer female applicants/More male applicants."

Two important findings are those response categories dominated by the female coaches. The first response category of "Good Old Boys" fell under the heading "Hiring Committee/ Leadership", while the second response category of "Family Obligations/Children are a priority." This suggests that female coaches attributed the male-perpetuated system and the weight given to family obligations as two

main reasons for their lack of numbers in coaching. On the other hand, male coaches' responses on the qualitative question did not echo such attributes as essential or even as existent.

Perhaps at the community college level, female athletes need the types of practices the female coaches of the present study exhibited. For example, female coaches rated themselves 49.17 out of a possible 60 on the Modeling scale. In addition, the female athletes of these female coaches rated them even higher 55.17. This indicates the importance of both female coaches and athletes of the Modeling leadership practice. These results indicated a high level of agreement on the 5 LPI scales between the female coaches and athletes, along with the athletes rating themselves as "Extremely Satisfied."

Finally, the lack of responses under the heading of "Burnout" seems to suggest that coaches do not see it as a contributing factor to the overall lack of female coaches. Such a finding is contradictory to the literature that regards burnout as one of the main reasons for the lack of women in the coaching domain.

Implications for Community College Coaching System

The present study: (a) assesses coaches' leadership practices, (b) investigates athletes' preferences and satisfaction with those leadership practices, and (c) determines the congruence of these two analyses for search and hiring committees. Faculty recruitment, selection, and development can directly benefit from assessing how potential coaches' coaching styles fit with those players already in place, as well as the specific expectations of the community college. Search and hiring committees can utilize the results of coaches' LPI: Self ratings of their own leadership practices, as well as the athletes' LPI: Observer ratings of the coaches, to determine potential athlete satisfaction.

The findings related to gender differences are especially important in considering implications for the community college system. Female coaches rated themselves higher than male coaches on the Encouraging scale. This is important as the community college female athletes indicated a need for someone to set an example and plan small wins as they develop. In addition, male coaches overrated themselves and female coaches underrated themselves (as compared to their athletes) on all 5 LPI scales. Such a finding is essential for search and hiring committees to

consider when reviewing a coach for a position. For instance, a male coaching candidate may present himself much more favorably than a female candidate might, according to the study results.

There is a necessity to recruit, develop, and promote females in the coaching arena, especially at the community college level. The qualitative question in the study addressed the following issues: (a) Why so few women are in positions of leadership, and (b) What are the personal and institutional roots of gender differences in access to leadership roles. Responses by the community college coaches surveyed shed a great deal of light upon these inquiries. Overall, a smaller pool of qualified candidates, along with fewer female coaches applying for positions, keeps women from gaining as much coaching experience as men. However, male and female coaches' responses varied greatly in the areas of the "Good Old Boy" network and "Family Obligations." While female coaches believed these to be prominent reasons for fewer females in coaching, the male coaches responding barely acknowledged their presence.

In addition, coaches can utilize an instrument and procedure such as the one in the present study to recruit potential athletes. Coaches can rely upon the feedback from their own LPI and its results to see if there might be

conflicts with potential players. For example, a coach who scores high on the "Modeling the Way" scale will not have difficulty in the guidance of an athlete who has special academic needs. A coach high in this area: (a) follows through on promises and commitments, (b) ensures that goals, plans, milestones are set, and (c) makes progress toward goals one step at a time. In terms of satisfaction ratings of athletes, future athletes may gravitate toward coaches with high satisfaction ratings of current athletes. Overall, as athletes align themselves with a coach's strengths, the potential for satisfaction and effective leadership becomes more plausible.

Athlete/Coach Relationship and Instruments' Use in Leadership

Effective coaching requires self-reflection and examination of coaching behaviors and the review of observations by others (e.g., athletes). Coaching effectiveness and improvement necessitates soliciting and listening to the nearly 30,000 student-athletes competing annually in the intercollegiate athletics in California's community colleges.

The followers are the agents through which the leaders bring about social transformations. Burns (1978) explains that in transformational leadership the "leader looks for

potential motives of followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engage the full person of the follower" (p. 4). As coaches attempt to elicit such qualities from their athletes, they both reach a higher level. Burns further explains this concept in stating that "the result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and . . . leaders into moral agents" (p. 4).

Overall, the relationship itself and the feedback available to coaches by their athletes is invaluable. Athletes' feedback to their coaches regarding their preferred leadership practices and satisfaction with those practices allows for enhanced communication, greater effectiveness of coaching techniques, and increased quality of the coach-athlete relationship.

The procedure and instrument employed in the present study can also be a professional development tool. The self-examination and exploration provided by the LPI allows coaches to view their leadership practices through the eyes of their own athletes. For example, female coaches could potentially rate themselves more realistically with the feedback from their athletes. The overall implications of the study extend to improve the overall effectiveness of

community college coaches, athletes' potential experience in sports, and further improve the athlete-coach relationship.

Recommendations for Enhancement of Current Study

Two potential areas to improve the present study include: (a) a more appropriate secondary assessment tool, and (b) more cross-gender coach/athlete (i.e., male coach/female athlete and female coach/male athlete) comparison groups.

First, the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS) did not directly relate to the 5 specific Leadership Practices Inventory scales. The researcher attempted to compare the assessment tools after the data were collected. Further research is needed to see if there are other assessment tools that match the LPI more closely than the SAS. A more substantiated result may have been produced had such an investigation been done beforehand.

Second, opposite gender coach/athlete comparison groups may have strengthened the study's findings. Only 2 of the 4 male coach/female athlete pairings had observer results to compare to the female coach/female athlete and male coach/male athlete groups. In addition, according to Acosta and Carpenter (1988), "less than 1% of the coaches of men's teams are females" (p. 3). However, the researcher could

have sought out these few female coaches of male teams (not being restricted to those in California), to add to the data. For example, an article by Blum (1996) talked about Kerri McTiernan, the first woman ever to be head coach of a men's college basketball team. She coaches at Kingsborough Community College of the City University of New York.

Therefore, the researcher could have given her and her athletes the LPI, which would have provided invaluable data to the study. The researcher may also have found that male athletes would actually prefer to have a female coach, due to their need for Encouraging leadership behaviors, as found in the data from the present study. Despite this, in order to generalize past the findings of the present study, more investigation of opposite gender coach/athlete comparisons is necessary.

Recommendations for Further Research

The recommendations for further research include:

- (a) survey athletes from all sports, (b) collect materials from athletes in person, (c) repeat at the 4-year level, and (d) collect more qualitative data.

First, some of the richest data from the present study were in the area of comparison of coaches' (LPI-S) and athletes' (LPI-O) responses. However, the present study only

investigated data from soccer coaches and their athletes. This may have presented confounding results, as the soccer coaches and athletes could have been unique in their responses. Future studies should attempt to survey coaches and athletes from all sports under study. This would provide the researcher with data from a wider array of sports and potentially make it easier to weed out irregular responses or profiles.

Collaboration and reciprocation lie at the heart of the leader-follower relationship. The researcher's initial desire was to administer the Myers Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) to coaches and athletes in an attempt to assess the coach-athlete relationship. This instrument utilizes Jungian typology to assess people's preferences to four pairs of temperaments: (a) Extraversion vs. Introversion, (b) Intuition vs. Sensation, (c) Thinking vs. Feeling, and (d) Judging vs. Perceiving. However, an updated version of the instrument was not available at the time this study was undertaken. Instead, the researcher chose to utilize the LPI's versions to assess the relationship of the leaders (coaches) and followers (athletes) on the five scales of: Modeling, Encouraging, Challenging, Enabling, and Inspiring. The results gathered from this investigation allows for valuable feedback for coaches regarding their behavior, how

their athletes view that behavior, and whether they are satisfied. A further study utilizing the MBTI would yield results on the four Jungian types and provide valuable information for coaches and athletes. However, the LPI provides a unique strategy through its Self and Observer versions, to assess the athlete-coach relationship.

Second, the researcher was most successful in obtaining responses from athletes in person, despite the mail survey design of the study. In order to ensure validity, upon soliciting responses in person, the researcher simply read the same script sent to the athletes by mail. In addition, the researcher conducted the in-person data collection collectively, in order to avoid any potential individual instruction. Figure 6 presents the overall mean differences of athletes' responses collected by mail versus in person. As the figure shows, the results are parallel in nature. In addition, the in-person responses are below those of the mailed responses, which is opposite if a response set was present. Therefore, future studies may ensure a heightened response rate by collecting responses from athletes in person.

Figure 6. Comparison of athlete LPI mean scores: Mail and in person.

Future studies may consider repeating the research at the 4-year collegiate level. According to a study by Kanter and Lewis (1991), the significance of athletics in students' lives contributed to the completion of requirements for graduation and potential transfer to a 4-year college or university. Therefore, follow-up and comparison of 2- versus 4-year coaching leadership practices and athlete

preference and satisfaction would potentially extend the inquiries of the present study.

The findings from the qualitative portion of the study provided rich data to instill a need for further research. The investigation of reasons given by coaches regarding potential barriers for females in coaching adds to the body of knowledge for present and future coaches. The article by Everhart and Chelladurai (1998), provides an explanation for the underrepresentation of women in coaching. They observed that women, for various reasons, may not aspire to apply for these jobs. However, Acosta and Carpenter (1988) contended that these reasons have not been empirically verified. The present study, Coffman (1999), is a first step in achieving this verification. The critically important issue of potential barriers keeping women from applying for coaching jobs is addressed by the researcher. In addition, the results coincide with those found by Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) that coaches perceived working hours to be a potential barrier for both male and female coaches. Therefore, the present study is both an extension and verification of coaches' reasons why there are so few women in the field of coaching.

Summary

The present study provides a basis for leadership and team development of coaches at the community college level. As coaches are exposed to feedback regarding the effectiveness of their leadership practices and the effects on athlete satisfaction, they can make changes to improve themselves and the field of coaching. The exploratory nature of this study, the first to assess community college coaches and athletes using the LPI, suggests further inquiries can build on the foundation of the results presented here. Coaching, at all levels, can benefit from the potential for quality communication, improved athlete-coach relationships, and coaching effectiveness addressed in this study.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K. A. (1990). Instructional leaders for the 1990s: Improving the analysis of teaching. *Oregon School Study Council (OSSC) Bulletin*, 33(6), 1-33.

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (1988). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study - Eleven year update 1977-1988* (Report No. SP-031-806). Brooklyn, NY: Brooklyn College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 314 381)

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (1992). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study - Fifteen year update 1977-1992* (Report No. SP-034-188). Brooklyn, NY: Brooklyn College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 352 337)

Allen, J. B., & Howe, B. L. (1998). Player ability, coach feedback, and female adolescent athletes' perceived competence and satisfaction. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20, 280-299.

Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

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

Beazley, C. (Ed.) (1997). *Blue book of college athletics*. Montgomery, AL: Athletic Publishing Company.

Bernd, M. (1992). Shared decision making requires effective instructional leadership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 76 (540), 64-69.

Berson, J. S. (1996, February). *Student perceptions of the intercollegiate athletic program at a community college*. A paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Atlanta, GA.

Blum, D. E. (1996). Trailblazer. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 42(26), A35-A36.

Bollig, L., & Summers, J. G. (Eds.). (1997). *NCAA division I manual*. Overland Park, KS: National Collegiate Athletic Association.

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

Carron, A. V., & Bennett, B. B. (1977). Compatibility in the coach-athlete dyad. *Research Quarterly*, 48, 671-679.

Chell, J. (1995). *Introducing principals to the role of instructional leadership* (Report No. SSTA-RCR-95-14). Saskatchewan, Canada: Saskatchewan School Trustees Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391 222)

Chelladurai, P. (1984). Discrepancy between preferences and perceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6, 27-41.

Chelladurai, P. (1990). Leadership in sports: A review. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 21, 328-354.

Chelladurai, P., & Carron, A. V. (1978). *Leadership*. Ottawa: Sociology of Sport Monograph Series, Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

Chelladurai, P. & Haggerty, T. R. (1978). A normative model of decision styles in coaching. *Athletic Administrator*, 13, 6-9.

Chelladurai, P., Imamura, H., Yamaguchi, Y., Oinuma, Y., & Miyauchi, T. (1988). Sport leadership in a cross-national setting: The case of Japanese and Canadian university athletes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 10, 374-389.

Chelladurai, P., & Riemer, H. A. (1995). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17, 276-293.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sports. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sports Sciences*, 3, 85-92.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 34-45.

Chrislip, D. D., & Larson, C. E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chu, D. (1989). *The character of American higher education and intercollegiate sport*. New York: State University Press.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1996). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conway, J. (1991). Clarifying the coaching roles: Principal, department head, teacher. *NASSP Bulletin*, 75 (538), 16-23.

Cunard, R. F. (1990). Sharing instructional leadership: A view to strengthening the principal's position. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74(525), 30-34.

Curtis, B., Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (1979). Scrutinizing the skipper: A study of leadership behavior in the dugout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64(4), 391-400.

Danielson, R. R., Zelhart, P. F., & Drake, D. J. (1975). Multidimensional scaling and factor analysis of coaching behavior as perceived by high school hockey players. *Research Quarterly*, 46, 323-334.

DeMarco, G. M., Jr., & McCullick, B. A. (1997). Developing expertise in coaching: Learning from the legends. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 68 (3), 37-41.

Douge, B., & Hastie, P. (1993). Coach effectiveness. *Sport Science Review*, 2(2), 14-29.

Dwyer, J. J. M., & Fischer, D. G. (1988). Psychometric properties of the coach's version of Leadership Scale for Sports. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 67, 795-798.

Eaton, J. S. (Ed.). (1981). *New directions for community colleges: Women in community colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elliot, R. D. (1990). *Identifying and analyzing the practices utilized by coaches in achieving their "Personal Best" in coaching*. Unpublished master's thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Everhart, B., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Gender differences in preferences for coaching as an occupation: The role of self-efficacy, valence, and perceived barriers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69(2), 188-199.

Gardner, D. E., Shields, D. L. L., Bredemeier, B. J. L., & Bostrom, A. (1996). The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and team cohesion among baseball and softball players. *Journal of Psychology*, 131(2), 196-210.

Garmston, R., Linder, C., & Whitaker, J. (1993). Reflections on cognitive coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 51(2), 57-61.

Geltner, B. B. (1993, October). *Integrating formative portfolio assessment, reflective practice, and cognitive coaching into preservice preparation*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX.

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine/Atherton.

Gordon, S. (1988). Decision-making styles and coaching effectiveness in university soccer. *Canadian Journal of Sport Sciences*, 13 (1), 56-65.

Gould, D., Giannini, J., Krane, V., & Hodge, K. (1990). Educational needs of elite U.S. national team Pan American and Olympic coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 9, 322-344.

Greenlee, C. T. (1996). Clive of Portland: Soccer coach guides University of Portland men's and women's teams to record setting year. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 13(4), 20-21.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hart, L. B. (1980). *Moving up*. New York: AMACOM.

Hester, D., & Dunaway, D. (1991). NAGWS: Paths to advocacy, recruitment, and enhancement. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 62(3), 25-59.

Horne, T., & Carron, A. V. (1985). Compatibility in coach-athlete relationships. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 137-149.

Howe, B. (1993). Psychological skills and coaching. *Sport Science Review*, 2(2), 30-47.

Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1996). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience*. Chicago: Irwin.

Kanter, M., & Lewis, M. (1991, May). *A study of academic performance of student athletes in California's community colleges*. A report presented to the California Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement, Sacramento, CA.

Kellerman, B. (1984). *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kluka, D.A. (1992). Women, sport, and leadership: Paths through the Olympic movement. *International Council for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation*, 28(3), 4-8.

Knoppers, A. (1992). Explaining male dominance and sex segregation in coaching: Three approaches. *Quest*, 44, 210-227.

Knoppers, A., Meyer, B. B., Ewing, M., & Forrest, L. (1991). Opportunity and work behavior in college coaching. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 15(1), 1-20.

Koos, L. V. (1924). *The junior college*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Laughlin, N., & Laughlin, S. (1994). The relationship between the similarity in perceptions of teacher/coach leader behavior and evaluations of their effectiveness. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 22, 396-410.

LeDrew, J. E., & Zimmerman, C. (1994). Moving toward an acceptance of females in coaching. *The Physical Educator*, 51(1), 6-14.

Lee, G. V. (1991). Peer-assisted development of school leaders. *Journal of Staff Development*, 12(2), 14-18.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Critical requisites for transformational leadership: Needed research and discourse. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66(3), 176-181.

Makkabin, S. S., & Sprague, M. M. (1993, December). *The instructional coach: A new role in staff development*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Staff Development Council, Dallas, TX.

Millard, L. (1992). *Gender differences in overt coaching behaviors of high school soccer coaches*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Springfield College, Massachusetts.

Miller, J. B. (1986a). *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. B. (1986b). *What do we mean by relationships?* Unpublished manuscript, Wellesley College.

Mitchelson, E. B. (1995). The leadership practices and strategies of sixty respected recreation, sport, leisure, and lifestyle leaders. *Recreation Alberta*, 1(1), 15-24.

Olthoff, R. J. (1992). The principal as instructional coach: Providing quality education. *NASSP Bulletin*, 76(542), 6-12.

Ostrow, A. C. (Ed.). (1990). *Directory of psychological tests in the sport and exercise sciences*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.

Partridge, E. (1977). *A short etymological dictionary of modern English*. New York: Macmillan.

Pastore, D. L., & Judd, M. R. (1993). Gender differences in burnout among coaches of athletic teams at two year colleges. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 205-212.

Peng, H. (1997). *Comparison of preferred coaching leadership behaviors of basketball players at the NCAA Division III level*. Unpublished master's thesis, Wisconsin State University.

Perkins, D. N. (1991). Educating for insight. *Educational Leadership*, 49(2), 4-8.

Peter, S. A. (1994, November). *Emerging issues and opportunities perspective analysis*. A paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, San Diego, CA.

Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence: The leadership difference*. New York: Random House.

Priest, L. (1990, March). A time to plant: What administrators can do for coaches to increase retention rates. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, p. 56.

Priest, L., & Summerfield, L. M. (1995). Promoting gender equity in middle level and secondary school sports programs. *NASSP Bulletin*, 79(575), 52-56.

Pruitt, R. P. (1990, April). *A student perspective on leaders and leadership*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association, Detroit, MI.

Regan, H. B., & Brooks, G. H. (1995). *Out of women's experience: Creating relational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1995). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17, 276-293.

Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ). *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20, 127-156.

Roberts, J. (1991). Improving principals' instructional leadership through peer coaching. *Journal of Staff Development*, 12(4), 30-33.

Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.

Sagor, R., & Barnett, B. G. (1994). *The TQE principal: A transformed leader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. *Educational Leadership*, 53(6), 12-16.

Singer, R. N. (1977). Motivation in sport. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8, 1-22.

Slark, J., & Pham, N. (1991, August). *Rancho Santiago college student satisfaction survey: Research, planning, resource development report*. A report presented to Rancho Santiago Community College, Santa Ana, CA.

Thorngren, C. M. (1990, March). A time to reach out - Keeping the female coach in coaching. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, pp. 57-60.

Thornton, J. W., Jr. (1966). *The community junior college*. New York: Wiley.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1990). *The transformational leader*. New York: Wiley.

Trimble, S. (1994). A protege's guide to mentoring. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78(559), 46-48.

True, S. S. (1990, March). A time to become involved: Be part of the solution. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, pp. 48-49.

Walsh, M. R. (Ed.). (1987). *The psychology of women*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Walter, T. T. (1991). Peer coaching for strategic planning. *Educational Leadership*, 48(7), 42-43.

Weiss, M. R., & Friedrichs, W. D. (1986). The influence of leader behaviors, coach attributes, and institutional variables on performance and satisfaction of collegiate basketball teams. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8, 332-346.

Williams, J. M. (1993). *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (2nd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Witherspoon, R., & White, R. P. (1997). *Four essential ways that coaching can help executives* (Report No. ISBN-1-882197-26-7). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 405 478)

APPENDIX A

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL
15419 Banyan Lane
Monte Sereno, California 95030
Phone/FAX: (408) 354-9170

December 6, 1997

Ms. Jodi P. Coffman
 10033 Rio San Diego Drive #232
 San Diego, California 92108

Dear Jodi:

Thank you for your correspondence (dated December 4, 1997) requesting permission to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to use the instrument as outlined in your letter, at no charge, with the following understandings:

- (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 is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement be included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright © 1997 Kouzes Posner International, Inc. Used with permission."; and,
- (3) That one (1) *bound* 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.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you please so indicate by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it in the enclosed self-addressed, return envelope.. Information about additional studies, which you may find helpful, is also enclosed. Best wishes for every success with your research project. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Cordially,

Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.
 Managing Partner

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) _____ Date: 12-10-97

APPENDIX B

AUTHORIZATION TO USE SCALE

OF ATHLETE SATISFACTION

Sport, Fitness and Health Programs
School of Physical Activity
and Educational Services

344 Larkins Hall
337 West 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210-1284

Phone 614-292-2504
FAX 614-688-3432

January 13, 1998

Ms. Jody Coffman
10033 Rio San Diego Drive
San Diego, CA

FAX: (619) 755-1614

Dear Jody:

Thank you for your interest in my work.

You have my permission to use the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction in your dissertation research.

Let me wish you the best with your research. Please keep me posted of your research results.

Sincerely,

P. Chelladurai, Ph.D.
professor

APPENDIX C

DETAILED SAMPLE OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY

COLLEGE HEAD COACHES

[illegible]

[illegible]

			Softball	Baseball	W.Basket.	M.Basket.	W.Soccer	M.Soccer	W.Volley.	M.Volley.	W.W.Polo	M.W.Polo
FOOTHILL CONFERENCE (9)												
(N = 6)												
1. Antelope Valley			X	X	X	X			X			
2. Cerro Coso				X		X						
3. Chaffey					(6 Head Coaches / 0 Full - Time)							
4. College of the Desert				X								
5. Mt. San Jacinto				X		X						
										Female Coaches:	2	
										Male Coaches:	8	
										TOTAL COACHES:	10	
DATA FOR LPI:SELF:												
TOTAL FEMALE COACHES:			79									
TOTAL MALE COACHES*:			146									
* 3 Male Coaches Refused to Participate												
TOTAL COACHES:			225									
TOTAL SCHOOLS:			68									
DATA FOR LPI:OBSERVER:												
TOTAL COACHES OF WOMEN'S SOCCER TEAMS:					15							
TOTAL COACHES OF MEN'S SOCCER TEAMS:					12							
TOTAL COACHES OF BOTH MEN'S AND WOMEN'S												
SOCCER TEAMS:					2							
TOTAL COACHES:					29							

APPENDIX D

THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

INVENTORY: SELF

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

OBSERVER

Name of Leader: _____

INSTRUCTIONS

You are being asked by the leader whose name appears above to assess his or her leadership behaviors. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then look at the rating scale and decide *how frequently this leader engages in the behavior* described.

Here's the rating scale that you'll be using:

1 = Almost Never	6 = Sometimes
2 = Rarely	7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom	8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While	9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally	10 = Almost Always

In selecting each response, please be realistic about the extent to which the leader *actually* engages in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see this person behave or in terms of how you think he or she should behave. Answer in terms of how the leader *typically* behaves—on most days, on most projects, and with most people.

For each statement, decide on a rating and record it in the blank to the left of the statement. When you have responded to all thirty statements, turn to the response sheet on page 4. *Do not write your name on the response sheet.* Transfer your responses and return the response sheet according to the instructions provided.

For future reference, keep the portion of your LPI-Observer form that lists the thirty statements.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

To what extent do you typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the number that best applies to each statement and *record it in the blank to the left of the statement.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

- ___ 1. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.
- ___ 2. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
- ___ 3. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.
- ___ 4. I set a personal example of what I expect from others.
- ___ 5. I praise people for a job well done.
- ___ 6. I challenge people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.
- ___ 7. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.
- ___ 8. I actively listen to diverse points of view.
- ___ 9. I spend time and energy on making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards that we have agreed on.
- ___ 10. I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.
- ___ 11. I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.
- ___ 12. I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.
- ___ 13. I treat others with dignity and respect.
- ___ 14. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.
- ___ 15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

- ___ 16. I ask "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.
- ___ 17. I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.
- ___ 18. I support the decisions that people make on their own.
- ___ 19. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.
- ___ 20. I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.
- ___ 21. I experiment and take risks even when there is a chance of failure.
- ___ 22. I am contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.
- ___ 23. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
- ___ 24. I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.
- ___ 25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.
- ___ 26. I take the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.
- ___ 27. I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.
- ___ 28. I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.
- ___ 29. I make progress toward goals one step at a time.
- ___ 30. I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

Now turn to the response sheet and follow the instructions for transferring your responses.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

RESPONSE SHEET

Your Name: _____

Instructions: Write your name in the blank above. Separate this response sheet from the rest of the LPI by tearing along the perforated line. Transfer the ratings for the statements to the blanks provided *on this sheet*. Please notice that the numbers of the statements on this sheet are listed from *left to right*.

After you have transferred all ratings, return the form according to the "Important Further Instructions" below.

1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____	5. _____
6. _____	7. _____	8. _____	9. _____	10. _____
11. _____	12. _____	13. _____	14. _____	15. _____
16. _____	17. _____	18. _____	19. _____	20. _____
21. _____	22. _____	23. _____	24. _____	25. _____
26. _____	27. _____	28. _____	29. _____	30. _____

Important Further Instructions

After completing this response sheet, return it to:

_____ **Jodi P. Coffman** _____

_____ **10033 Rio San Diego Drive #232** _____

_____ **San Diego, CA 92108** _____

APPENDIX E

THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

INVENTORY: OBSERVER

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

OBSERVER

Name of Leader: _____

INSTRUCTIONS

You are being asked by the leader whose name appears above to assess his or her leadership behaviors. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then look at the rating scale and decide *how frequently this leader engages in the behavior described*.

Here's the rating scale that you'll be using:

1 = Almost Never	6 = Sometimes
2 = Rarely	7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom	8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While	9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally	10 = Almost Always

In selecting each response, please be realistic about the extent to which the leader *actually* engages in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see this person behave or in terms of how you think he or she should behave. Answer in terms of how the leader *typically* behaves—on most days, on most projects, and with most people.

For each statement, decide on a rating and record it in the blank to the left of the statement. When you have responded to all thirty statements, turn to the response sheet on page 4. *Do not write your name on the response sheet.* Transfer your responses and return the response sheet according to the instructions provided.

For future reference, keep the portion of your LPI-Observer form that lists the thirty statements.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

OBSERVER

To what extent does this person typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the number that best applies to each statement and record it in the blank to the left of the statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

He or She:

- ___ 1. Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her own skills and abilities.
- ___ 2. Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
- ___ 3. Develops cooperative relationships among the people he or she works with.
- ___ 4. Sets a personal example of what he or she expects from others.
- ___ 5. Praises people for a job well done.
- ___ 6. Challenges people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.
- ___ 7. Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.
- ___ 8. Actively listens to diverse points of view.
- ___ 9. Spends time and energy on making certain that the people he or she works with adhere to the principles and standards that have been agreed on.
- ___ 10. Makes it a point to let people know about his or her confidence in their abilities.
- ___ 11. Searches outside the formal boundaries of his or her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.
- ___ 12. Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.
- ___ 13. Treats others with dignity and respect.
- ___ 14. Follows through on the promises and commitments that he or she makes.
- ___ 15. Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of projects.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

He or She:

- ___ 16. Asks "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.
- ___ 17. Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.
- ___ 18. Supports the decisions that people make on their own.
- ___ 19. Is clear about his or her philosophy of leadership.
- ___ 20. Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.
- ___ 21. Experiments and takes risks even when there is a chance of failure.
- ___ 22. Is contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.
- ___ 23. Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
- ___ 24. Makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.
- ___ 25. Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.
- ___ 26. Takes the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.
- ___ 27. Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.
- ___ 28. Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.
- ___ 29. Makes progress toward goals one step at a time.
- ___ 30. Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

Now turn to the response sheet and follow the instructions for transferring your responses.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

OBSERVER

RESPONSE SHEET

Name of Leader: _____

Your Relationship to This Leader:

☐ Manager ☐ Direct Report ☐ Coworker ☐ Other

Instructions: If the leader's name does not appear in the blank above, please write it in. *Do not write your name on this sheet.* Separate the response sheet from the rest of the LPI by tearing along the perforated line. Transfer the ratings for the statements to the blanks provided *on this sheet*. Please notice that the numbers of the statements on this sheet are listed from *left to right*.

After you have transferred all ratings, return the form according to the "Important Further Instructions" below.

1. _____	2. _____	3. _____	4. _____	5. _____
6. _____	7. _____	8. _____	9. _____	10. _____
11. _____	12. _____	13. _____	14. _____	15. _____
16. _____	17. _____	18. _____	19. _____	20. _____
21. _____	22. _____	23. _____	24. _____	25. _____
26. _____	27. _____	28. _____	29. _____	30. _____

Important Further Instructions

After completing this response sheet, return it to:-

APPENDIX F

SCALE OF ATHLETE SATISFACTION

SCALE OF ATHLETE SATISFACTION

The statements below relate to different aspects of your team. Please indicate how satisfied you are with each by placing an "X" in the appropriate space. Please answer all items.

	EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED	DISSATISFIED	SLIGHTLY DISSATISFIED	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY SATISFIED	SATISFIED	EXTREMELY SATISFIED	
1. The way I am performing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.
2. The leadership provided by my coach	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.
3. The team spirit	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.
4. How my coach treats me	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.
5. My personal growth and development	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.
6. My Coach's ability to teach me	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.
7. How my team-mates treat me	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.
8. The guidance provided by my coach	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.
9. Team practices	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.
10. Respect and fair treatment I get from my coach	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.
11. The help I get from my team-mates	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.
12. The fun in playing and practicing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.
13. How my coach deals with problems	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.
14. How much I am learning about the game	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.
15. The attention I get from being an athlete	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.
16. The support I get from my coach	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.
17. My team's performance	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.
18. My fitness level	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.

The development and use of the scale is reported in:

Chelladurai, P., Imamura, H., Yamaguchi, Y., Oinuma, Y., & Miyauchi, T. (1988). Sport leadership in cross-national setting: The case of Japanese and Canadian university athletes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 10, 374-389.

APPENDIX G

COACH DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE: COACH

Please complete the following questions.

1. Gender:

- A. Male
- B. Female

2. Race/Ethnicity:

- A. White
- B. Hispanic
- C. Black
- D. Asian Pacific
- E. Other _____

2. Circle the number of years you have coached:

Community College

- A. 0 - 2 years
- B. 3 - 5 years
- C. 6 - 9 years
- D. 10 + years

Total years coaching

- A. 0 - 2 years
- B. 3 - 5 years
- C. 6 - 9 years
- D. 10 + years

3. Circle the sport you presently coach:

Women's

- A. Softball
- B. Basketball
- C. Soccer
- D. Volleyball
- E. Water Polo

Men's

- F. Baseball
- G. Basketball
- H. Soccer
- I. Volleyball
- J. Water Polo

5. What subject(s) do you teach? _____

6. What is your win/loss record for this season, or last season?

7. In your experience, why are fewer female coaches hired to coach women's teams than male coaches?

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

APPENDIX H

ATHLETE DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE: ATHLETE

Please complete the following questions.

1. Gender:

- A. Male
- B. Female

2. Age:

- A. 17 - 19 years
- B. 20 - 22 years
- C. 23 + years

3. Race/Ethnicity:

- A. White
- B. Hispanic
- C. Black
- D. Asian Pacific
- E. Other _____

4. What is your position?

- A. Forward
- B. Midfield
- C. Defense
- D. Goalkeeper

5. Circle the number of years you have played soccer:

Community College

- A. Freshman
- B. Sophomore
- C. Three or more years

Total years playing

- A. 0 - 2 years
- B. 3 - 5 years
- C. 6 - 9 years
- D. 10 + years

6. What is your present playing status?

- A. Starter
- B. Second String
- C. Injured
- D. Other _____

APPENDIX I

LETTER TO COACH

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

April 7, 1998

Dear Colleague:

Congratulations, you have been chosen to participate in a study of leadership practices and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of team in California community colleges.

Allow me to introduce myself, my name is Jodi Coffman. I am a Physical Education Instructor and coach of the Women's Soccer team at San Diego City College as well as a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at the University of San Diego. This research is for my dissertation, which I hope to complete by December, with your help.

Part of your incentive to participate will not only ensure your continued success as a coach, but also help you in areas such as: (1) leadership, (2) communication, and (3) the development of your personal philosophy of coaching. Your participation in the study will require you to fulfill these four simple tasks:

1. Complete the demographic questionnaire,
2. Read and sign the consent agreement,
3. Complete a questionnaire entitled The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Self,
4. Return the demographic questionnaire, consent agreement and response sheet in the envelope provided, by April 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, call me at home at (619) 280-1808, or e-mail me at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will send a reminder postcard to you if I have not received your envelope by April, 21.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jodi P. Coffman
enc.

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

August 24, 1998

Dear Colleague:

This is my second mailing of my study of leadership practices and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of team in California community colleges.

Allow me to re-introduce myself, my name is Jodi Coffman. I am a Physical Education Instructor and coach of the Women's Soccer team at San Diego City College as well as a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at the University of San Diego. This research is for my dissertation, which I hope to complete by December, with your help.

Part of your incentive to participate will not only ensure your continued success as a coach, but also help you in areas such as: (1) leadership, (2) communication, and (3) the development of your personal philosophy of coaching. Your participation in the study will require you to fulfill these four simple tasks:

1. Complete the demographic questionnaire,
2. Read and sign the consent agreement,
3. Complete a questionnaire entitled The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Self,
4. Return the demographic questionnaire, consent agreement and response sheet in the envelope provided, by September 7, 1998.

If you have any questions, call me at home at (619) 280-1808, or e-mail me at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will send a reminder postcard, if I have not received your envelope by September 7.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jodi P. Coffman
enc.

APPENDIX J

COACH CONSENT FORM

Coach: Consent Form

I have been invited to participate in a study of leadership behaviors and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of community college team sports. This research is being conducted by Jodi P. Coffman, a doctoral student at the University of San Diego.

If I decide to participate, I will be asked to complete a questionnaire entitled The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which assesses my leadership behaviors. Completion of the LPI will take me approximately 25 minutes.

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and neither my decision to participate or my responses themselves will be shared with my administrators, colleagues, or athletes. In addition, my position will not be affected as a result of my (non) participation or responses.

All of my responses will be kept confidential; no information will be shared with anyone associated with the team. Only group or aggregate data will be reported, no individual data will be released. To ensure my anonymity, my name will not be used on the questionnaire I complete and data will only be available to Jodi P. Coffman, the principal investigator. A copy of the findings based on my responses and those of my athletes will be sent to me if I wish.

If I have any questions, I can ask at this time. Should I have other questions later, I can phone Jodi P. Coffman any time at (619) 280-1808, or e-mail her at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will be given a copy of this form.

My signature indicates that I have decided to participate, having read the information above. My participation is voluntary.

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

APPENDIX K

ENDORSEMENT LETTER FROM

DR. FORTUNATO

COMMISSION ON ATHLETICS

**Community College
League of California**

DATE: March 2, 1998
TO: California Community College Coaches
FROM: Joanne A. Fortunato, Commissioner of Athletics
SUBJECT: Enclosed Survey

I have had a chance to review the enclosed study and questionnaire. The information that will be gathered will be very worthwhile to California's community colleges.

I encourage you to complete the questionnaire and return it to the address provided.

Thank you.

JAF:dw

JOANNE A. FORTUNATO
Commissioner of Athletics

TOM W. HARRIS, JR.
*Chairperson
Commission on Athletics*

COA phone: (916) 444-1600
COA fax: (916) 444-2616
Public information phone:
(916) 444-1699
Public information fax:
(916) 492-0877

2017 O Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-5285

APPENDIX L

LETTER TO SOCCER COACH

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

April 1, 1998

Dear Soccer Coach:

Congratulations, you have been chosen to participate in a study of leadership practices and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of team in California community colleges.

Allow me to introduce myself, my name is Jodi Coffman. I am a Physical Education Instructor and coach of the Women's Soccer team at San Diego City College as well as a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at the University of San Diego. This research is for my dissertation, which I hope to complete by December, with your help.

Part of your incentive to participate will not only ensure your continued success as a coach, but also help you in areas such as: (1) leadership, (2) communication, and (3) the development of your personal philosophy of coaching. Your participation in the study will require you to fulfill these five simple tasks:

1. Complete the demographic questionnaire,
2. Read and sign the consent agreement,
3. Complete the questionnaire - The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Self,
4. Include a list of the names and addresses of the players on your current roster, so the researcher can contact the players directly,
5. Return the demographic questionnaire, consent agreement, LPI: Self response sheet, and complete roster, in the envelope provided, by April 15, 1998.

If you have any questions, call me at home (619) 280-1808, or e-mail me at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will send a reminder if I have not received your envelope by April 7.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Jodi P. Coffman
enc.

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

August 24, 1998

Dear Soccer Coach:

This is my second mailing of my study of leadership practices and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of team in California community colleges.

Allow me to re-introduce myself, my name is Jodi Coffman. I am a Physical Education Instructor and coach of the Women's Soccer team at San Diego City College as well as a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at the University of San Diego. This research is for my dissertation, which I hope to complete by December, with your help.

Part of your incentive to participate will not only ensure your continued success as a coach, but also help you in areas such as: (1) leadership, (2) communication, and (3) the development of your personal philosophy of coaching. Your participation in the study will require you to fulfill these four simple tasks:

1. Complete the demographic questionnaire,
2. Read and sign the consent agreement,
3. Complete the questionnaire - The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Self,
4. Return the demographic questionnaire, consent agreement, and LPI: Self response sheet, in the envelope provided, by **September 7, 1998**.

With your permission, I would also like to survey your athletes. I will only need about twenty minutes to do this. I will be in contact with you to set up a time when this would be convenient for you.

If you have any questions, call me at home (619) 280-1808, or e-mail me at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will send a reminder if I have not received your envelope by September 7.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Jodi P. Coffman
enc.

APPENDIX M

SOCCER COACH CONSENT FORM

Soccer Coach: Consent Form

I have been invited to participate in a study of leadership behaviors and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of community college team sports. This research is being conducted by Jodi P. Coffman, a doctoral student at the University of San Diego.

If I decide to participate, I will be asked to complete a questionnaire entitled The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which will assess my leadership behaviors. Completion of the LPI will take me approximately 25 minutes.

I understand that my athletes will be asked to complete a version of the LPI, which will survey their perceptions of my leadership behaviors. They will also complete a short survey called the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS), assessing their satisfaction with the following: my leadership practices, their performance, the team's performance, and their overall involvement.

I will provide the researcher with the names and addresses of the players on my current roster, so the researcher can contact them directly. I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and neither my decision to participate or my responses themselves will be shared with my administrators, colleagues or athletes. In addition, my position will not be affected as a result of my (non) participation or responses.

All of my responses will be kept confidential; no information will be shared with anyone associated with the team. Only group or aggregate data will be reported, no individual data will be released. To ensure my anonymity, my name will not be used on the questionnaire I complete, and data will only be available to Jodi P. Coffman, the principal investigator. A copy of the findings will be sent to me if I wish.

If I have any questions, I can ask at this time. Should I have other questions later, I can phone Jodi P. Coffman any time at (619) 280-1808, or e-mail her at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will be given a copy of this form.

My signature indicates that I have decided to participate, having read the information above. My participation is voluntary.

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

APPENDIX N

LETTER TO ATHLETE

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

April 1, 1998

Dear Soccer Athlete:

I am a Physical Education Instructor and coach of the Women's Soccer team at San Diego City College and a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at the University of San Diego. To complete my dissertation study, I am researching leadership behaviors and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of team sports in which there is a male and female equivalent in California community colleges.

Participation in the study will require you to fulfill these four simple tasks:

1. Complete the demographic questionnaire,
2. Read and sign the consent agreement,
3. Complete two short questionnaire entitled The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Observer and the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS),
4. Place the demographic questionnaires, consent agreements, LPI response sheets, and SAS surveys in the envelope provided, seal it, and return it to the researcher.

If you have any questions, call me at home at (619) 280-1808, or e-mail me at jpcoffman@aol.com.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jodi P. Coffman
enc.

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

August 24, 1998

Dear Soccer Athlete:

I am a Physical Education Instructor and coach of the Women's Soccer team at San Diego City College and a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at the University of San Diego. To complete my dissertation study, I am researching leadership behaviors and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of team sports in which there is a male and female equivalent in California community colleges.

Participation in the study will require you to fulfill these four simple tasks:

1. Complete the demographic questionnaire,
2. Read and sign the consent agreement,
3. Complete two short questionnaire entitled The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): Observer and the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS),
4. Place the demographic questionnaires, consent agreements, LPI response sheets, and SAS surveys in the envelope provided, seal it, and return it to the researcher.
5. Return the demographic questionnaire, consent agreement, and LPI: Observer response sheet, in the envelope provided, by September 7, 1998.

If you have any questions, call me at home (619) 280-1808, or e-mail me at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will send a reminder if I have not received your envelope by September 7.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jodi P. Coffman
enc.

APPENDIX O

ATHLETE CONSENT FORM

Athlete: Consent Form

I have been invited to participate in a study of leadership behaviors and athlete satisfaction of full-time head coaches of community college team sports. This research is being conducted by Jodi P. Coffman, a doctoral student at the University of San Diego.

If I decide to participate, I will be asked to complete a version of the questionnaire entitled The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) assessing my perceptions of my coach's leadership behaviors. In addition, I will be asked to complete a short survey called the Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS), assessing my satisfaction with the following: my coach's leadership practices, my performance, my team's performance, and my overall involvement. The completion of the LPI: Other will take me approximately 25 minutes, and the SAS will take approximately 10 minutes.

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and neither my decision to participate or my responses will be shared with my coach or fellow teammates. In addition, my position on the team will not be jeopardized or affected as a result of my (non) participation or responses.

All of my responses will be kept confidential; no information will be shared with anyone associated with the team, including the coach. Only group or aggregate data will be reported, no individual data will be released. To ensure my anonymity, my name will not be used on the questionnaire(s) I complete, and data will only be available to Jodi P. Coffman, the principal investigator. A copy of the findings will be sent to me if I wish.

If I have any questions, I can ask at this time. Should I have questions later, I can phone Jodi P. Coffman any time at (619) 280-1808, or e-mail her at jpcoffman@aol.com.

I will be given a copy of this form.

My signature indicates that I have read the information above and decided to participate. My participation is voluntary.

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

APPENDIX P

REMINDER POSTCARD TO COACHES

REMINDER

Dear Coach,

It is my hope that you received my survey in the mail this past week. This is a reminder to complete the demographic questionnaire, consent form, and LPI: Self Response sheet. Please return them to me at the following address:

Jodi P. Coffman
10033 Rio San Diego Dr. #232
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 280-1808

Thank you for participating in this study.

NOTE: Please disregard the request (made in the Informed Consent Form) to include the names and addresses of players on your current roster.

REMINDER

Dear Coach,

It is my hope that you received my survey in the mail this past week. This is a reminder to complete the demographic questionnaire, consent form, and LPI: Self Response sheet. Please return them to me at the following address:

Jodi P. Coffman
10033 Rio San Diego Dr. #232
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 280-1808

Thank you for participating in this study.

APPENDIX Q

REMINDER POSTCARD TO ATHLETE

REMINDER

Dear Athlete,

It is my hope that you received my survey. This is a reminder to complete the demographic questionnaire, consent form, Scale of Athlete Satisfaction (SAS), and LPI: Observer Response sheet. Please return them to me at the following address:

Jodi P. Coffman
10033 Rio San Diego Dr. #232
San Diego, CA 92108
(619) 280-1808

Thank you for participating in this study.

APPENDIX R

REMINDER FAX TO COACHES

San Diego City College

1313 Twelfth Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4787 (619) 230-2400 FAX: 230-2063

ATTENTION: FULL-TIME COACHES...

Date: May 27, 1998

To: Full-time coaches of the following sports:

- Baseball
- Softball
- Men's and Women's Soccer
- Men's and Women's Basketball
- Men's and Women's Volleyball
- Men's and Women's Water Polo

From: Jodi P. Coffman
Head Women's Soccer Coach
San Diego City College

Re: Dissertation Study

Dear Coaches:

Just a reminder to please return the survey I sent to you before you leave for summer vacation. I am only asking the Men's and Women's soccer coaches to please include a roster with the names and addresses of their current players. Results of the study will be available for those coaches who participate.

If you have already completed and returned the information, please disregard this reminder. Finally, if you need an additional copy of any of the materials or have any questions, please feel free to contact me at:

Phone: (619) 280-1808
E-Mail: jpcoffman@aol.com
Fax: (619) 755-1614

Thank you for your participation in my study.

Sincerely,

Jodi P. Coffman

APPENDIX S

DETAILED SUMMARY OF SUBJECTS TAUGHT

Subjects taught by Coaches

Subject	Number of Coaches
Health	43
Physical Education	42
Fitness / Physical Conditioning	34
Physical Education Theory Courses	12
Athletic Success	8
Adaptive Physical Education	3
Exercise Science	2
Activity Courses	
Weight Training	31
Volleyball	19
Basketball	12
Tennis	12
First Aid / CPR	9
Swimming	9
Golf	8
Step Aerobics	7
Aerobics	7
Badminton	6
Baseball	6
Soccer	6
Softball	5
Aqua Aerobics	4
Sports Officiating	4
Bowling	3
Table Tennis	3
Lifeguard / WSI	2
Racquetball	1
Dance	1
Gymnastics	1
Archery	1
Self-Defense	1
Football	1
Other Curriculum Areas	
Speech	2
Criminal Justice	1
Sociology	1
Chicano Studies	1
Geography	1
U.S. History	1
Physical Geology	1
Ceramics	1
Psychology	1
English	1
Business	1

APPENDIX T

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH QUESTION RESULTS

**COMMUNITY COLLEGE COACHING SAMPLE
QUALITATIVE RESPONSES:
REASONS FOR LACK OF FEMALE COACHES**

Reasons		Frequency	Percentage	Percentage of Responses
A. Hiring Committee/ Leadership				
	Good Old Boys	1	10	11
	Male Athletic Directors hiring males / friends	2	6	8
	Women not recruited to apply for jobs / advertising / outreach	1	3	4
	Lack of female coaches' ability to network	1	2	3
	Few women in leadership position to do hiring	0	2	2
	Men hire men	0	2	2
	System bias	1	0	1
	Composition of hiring committees	0	1	1
	Hidden agendas of hiring committees	0	1	1
	Some committees are leery of hiring a lesbian	1	0	1
	Colleges do not make it a priority to hire women coaches	0	1	1
	Lack of mentoring	0	1	1
	The strongest leader gets hired, are presently more men	1	0	1
	Department Chairs are mostly male	0	1	1
B. Availability				
	Smaller pool of qualified coaches	20	14	34
	Less women in coaching / More men in coaching	14	7	21
	Fewer female applicants / More male applicants	9	9	18
	Men can coach female sports / but not vice versa	1	4	5
	Fewer females/women get into coaching	0	3	3
	Fewer female athletes	0	1	1
	Smaller pool of quality coaches	1	0	1
	Not as many sports as males	1	0	1
C. Experience				
	More/less experienced male/female coaches	15	17	32
	Women coach fewer years than men	0	1	1
	Men have more opportunities to play	0	1	1
	Lack of opportunity	1	1	2
D. Time				
	Women have less time for coaching	6	6	12
E. Interest / Motivation				
	Female lack of interest / More male interest	6	5	11
	Lack of aggressiveness to get the job	0	1	1
F. Family / Career				
	Family obligations / Children are a priority	1	9	10
	Women have gone into other professions	1	1	2
	Women have more choices to make between family and career	0	1	1
	Men have women to take care of their needs (i.e., home, children)	0	1	1
	Women are not career-oriented	0	1	1
G. Lack of Qualifications				
	Lack of credentials / preparation / licenses / degree	6	2	8

H. Money / Jobs				
	Lack of pay	1	4	5
	Lack of full-time positions	4	0	4
I. Fear				
	Title IX issues / Compliance	2	1	3
	By administration and individuals to take that step	0	1	1
J. Gender Issues				
	Homophobia	2	0	2
	Sexism	1	0	1
	Stigma / Prejudice	1	0	1
	Gender inequity	0	1	1
	Gender bias	1	0	1
	Discrimination	0	1	1
	Stereotypically a male profession	0	1	1
K. Discipline / Ethics				
	Discipline problems	1	0	1
	More discipline from males	1	0	1
	Less tolerant of ethical violations	1	0	1
L. Burnout				
	More burnout in female coaches	0	1	1
	Lower coaching life expectancy for women	1	0	1
M. Other				
	Men perceived to have more knowledge	1	3	4
	Depends on the level	1	1	2
	Men are more willing to work as part-time / adjunct coaches	2	0	2
	Women have had negative experiences	0	1	1
	Misconceptions	0	1	1
	Have to wait for men to retire	0	1	1
	Men work better in a "team coaching" situation	1	0	1
	Men are more flexible	0	1	1
	Lack of two separate (men's and women's) P.E. departments	1	0	1
	Women want to be friends with their players	1	0	1
	Lack of strength	1	0	1
	Level of commitment	0	1	1
Totals		114	134	248