INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UNITED STATES SPORTS ACADEMY

THE ASSOCIATION OF PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS WITH SUBORDINATE JOB SATISFACTION AT SELECTED NCAA DIVISION III MIDWEST COLLEGE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENTS

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the
United States Sports Academy in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Sport Management

By:

William J. Kuchler

Chair: Richard L. DeSchriver

Daphne, Alabama

July, 2001

UNITED STATES SPORTS ACADEMY

Approval
of a dissertation submitted by

William John Kuchler

Richard L. DeSchriver, Ph.D.
Chair, Dissertation Committee

7/24/01
Date

Cynthia E. Ryder
Cynthia E. Ryder, Ed.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

24 July 2001
Date

Richard C. Bell, Ed.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

24 July 2001
Date

Cynthia E. Ryder
Cynthia E. Ryder, Ed.D.
Vice President for Academic Affairs

28 July 2001
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the help of my committee, Dr. Richard Bell, Dr. Cynthia Ryder and Dr. Richard DeSchriver. Dr. DeSchriver was especially encouraging and demanding during each conversation and review. I thank these professionals for sticking with me through this arduous task. Ann Penke and the library staff at Lakeland College were most resourceful and helpful finding information for me. And, an enormous amount of gratitude is extended to Dr. Keith Striggow, my friend and mentor. He provided constant encouragement and without his vision of the value in climbing this mountain, I may never have reached the top.

DEDICATION

The accomplishment of a doctoral degree and this dissertation is dedicated to my parents. My mother and father encouraged me, each in their own way, to seek more education. Dad especially supported me in my love for sports. My only wish would be that they could have seen the completion. I know they are both in heaven smiling with pride that their "jock" son is now Dr. Bill!

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

Abstract

The purpose of this study of selected Division III athletic programs at private colleges in the Midwest was to address the association between head coaches' job satisfaction, assessed by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and perceptions of athletic directors' leadership behavior measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory. A statistically significant association was found between coaches' perceptions of the ADs' leadership and coaches' satisfaction. Significant association was established for the degree of agreement of each groups' perceptions with coaches' satisfaction. No statistically significant association surfaced between ADs' self perception and coaches' satisfaction Top dissatisfiers were extrinsic factors, which included supervisory behavior. Recommendations included that athletic directors become attuned to perceptions of coaches, improving communication between groups regarding the expectations of leadership behavior.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Leadership continues to be a popular topic for analysis and debate. American culture has been obsessed with the development of future leaders as well as the enshrinement of successful leaders. The subculture of sport has long been viewed as a primary environment for the incubation and nurturing of tomorrow's leaders

The limited research interest in sport leadership contrasts with the heated discussions in the media and among fans about athletic leadership (Reimer and Chelladurai, 1995). Most definitions of leadership contain a reference to the behavioral process of influencing individuals or groups toward set goals. Inherent within this definition is the idea that the leadership process is interpersonal in nature (Chelladurai, 1980). In this view, leadership clearly entails more than wielding power, exercising authority or managing tasks.

The realm of sport management has embraced the leadership theory models developed in business by adapting the concepts to athletic administration. Leadership in sport received increasing inspection during the past twenty years, yet the scope of that inspection was surprisingly narrow. Several studies (Branch, 1990, Snyder, 1990, Soucie, 1994, Weese, 1996, and Yusof, 1998) have addressed leadership behavior and its relationship to organizational effectiveness or subordinate job satisfaction. However, all of these researchers focused on large NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic programs.

If one supports the view that leadership behaviors can be learned then the environments in which this nurturing takes place need to be explored. One suggestion is that leaders are typically developed successfully in all societies largely through first learning to be good followers. One cannot understand the processes of leadership in its many variations

without examining the relationships leaders have had with followers (Clark & Clark, 1990). Sport, within the American culture, has a decided emphasis on participation in sport events by youth and young adults organized and managed by adults. In this view, it appears that most examples of leader-follower dyads within sport would have an emphasis on an adult-child relationship that reflects an imbalance of power and provide less opportunity to willingly choose to follow. Clark and Clark (1990) commented that the few and feeble attempts to incorporate leadership training into secondary schools is isolated in extracurricular activities. One could then extrapolate this thought into the argument that one purpose of sport within the educational system is to provide a training ground for the leaders of tomorrow, albeit an inadequate training ground. It could be hypothesized that leadership training within sport contributes to the athletic administrator perceiving an obvious imbalance of power based on positional authority, which could lead to an authoritarian and benevolent dictator leadership style.

The debate over selection processes of athletic directors is fundamental to the development of this leadership research problem in sports. Fitzgerald, Sagaria and Nelson (1994) posited a work history, or an array of occupational experiences, typical for athletic directors. The normative career trajectory is derived from the sequentially ordered, common positions that begin with a single or fixed portal and culminate in a single top position. It has been noted, sport management often has been staffed by those who have entered athletic administration through the player-coach-manager route. Thus the sport manager is assumed to have the 'jock' mentality. Reinforcing this 'jock' mentality perception and a normative career pattern have been such typical practices as promoting a retired coach to athletic director regardless of aptitude or training (Williams and Miller, 1983). The common

assumption is that participation in the player-coach dyad, that including leader-follower experiences, prepares coaches with successful leadership behaviors applicable to the administrator-coach relationship. This researcher contends the common assumption that leadership preparation for an athletic director can be accomplished through the above suggested career pattern is a false assumption.

Conclusions from Fitzgerald, et. al. (1994) indicated the athletic director position, unlike most occupations, had as its portal not as a first job, but rather a significant socializing co-curricular experience which cultivated leadership skills and athletic abilities and provided at least a glimpse into collegiate athletic administration. This socializing experience was found to limit leadership experiences just as the normative progression of positions limits the types and styles of leadership experienced. If this socializing experience has been within similar environments coupled with a dearth of formal preparation in sport management, the question arises regarding the understanding of situational leadership on the part of athletic administrators. Williams and Miller (1983) supported this underlying thesis that athletic administrators have come from the university of hard knocks – climbing from coaches and teachers to administrators. Yet, one needs to return to the premise that leadership experiences within the career pattern, prior to the athletic administration position, all involve an adult-minor relationship dissimilar to the administrator/coach dyad. Few of today's athletic administrators, particularly at the Division III level, have degrees in sport administration. On-the-job training and trial and error management are considered to be the typical preparation for being an athletic director (Quarterman, 1992).

There appeared to be a strong suggestion that athletic directors need business acumen and intricate management skills (Cuneen, 1992 and Williams & Miller, 1983) which assumes

the formal presentation of leadership techniques within graduate management curricula. Only Slack (1996) made direct reference to leadership skills as being part of the management strategy. If the accumulation of undergraduate and/or graduate degrees in sport or business administration is the suggested preparation route for qualified sport administrators, the review of those holding these positions indicates a contradiction to this suggestion.

Armstrong (1993) in a study of leadership in NCAA Division III institutions, suggested it is possible the athletic director does not know how to be a leader. He/she may have been chosen for his/her outstanding coaching record or longevity of service. There is agreement by Armstrong (1993) with the normative career path by suggesting many athletic directors are former basketball and football coaches whose leadership is behaviorally oriented.

If there has been little specific training in sport management for most collegiate athletic directors, and the attempts to incorporate leadership training have been isolated within extracurricular activities (Clark & Clark, 1990), and these leadership training experiences have involved primarily an adult/youth relationship; this researcher then begs the question about the understanding by athletic administrators of needed leadership skills.

A second part of the problem to be investigated involves subordinate job satisfaction and the relationship to the athletic director's leadership behavior. Yukl (1989) discovered transformational leaders versus transactional leaders often engaged in the following behaviors; articulating a vision of the future of the organization, providing a model that is consistent with that vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals, and providing individualized support.

There has been a demonstrated relationship that transformational leaders tend to be

positively related to higher performance and greater job satisfaction among employees of business and industrial organizations (Yusof, 1998). The results of Yusof's (1998) study on NCAA Division III institutions indicated a statistically significant relationship between highly transformational athletic directors and coaches more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. "Specifically, since job satisfaction has been shown to be positively related with subordinates' performance, low job turnover, low absenteeism, and high productivity, athletic directors who are transformational will make a significant difference in terms of their organization's performance and effectiveness" (Yusof, 1998, p174).

In summary, it is the belief of this researcher that where the athletic director's perception of his/her positive leadership behavior is incongruent with the subordinate's perception of the administrator's leadership behavior, there will be a corresponding relationship to lower job satisfaction on the part of the subordinate. In other words, greater difference in perception of leadership behavior is one factor leading to a lack of job satisfaction on the part of the subordinate. If leadership behavior can be taught as proposed by Kouzes and Posner (1987) and Clark and Clark (1990) then becoming more proficient in transformational leadership behavior by an athletic director could lead to greater job satisfaction, commitment and performance on the part of the coaching staff.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived leadership behavior and subordinate job satisfaction. This relationship was examined between athletic directors and head coaches within selected NCAA Division III, intercollegiate athletic departments.

Sub-problems

The problem poses five sub-problems:

1. To determine by statistical analysis of selected athletic directors and selected subordinate responses the degree of agreed perception about leadership behaviors.
2. To determine by statistical analysis the degree of job satisfaction for selected head coaches who are the subordinate staff members.
3. To determine by statistical analysis the association between subordinate job satisfaction responses and the observer (subordinate) perceived leadership behaviors of each of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.
4. To determine by statistical analysis the association between subordinate job satisfaction responses and the athletic director self-perceived leadership behaviors of each of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.
5. To determine by statistical analysis the association between subordinate job satisfaction responses and the extent of agreement between the self-perceived and observer perceived leadership behaviors of each of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Research Hypotheses

It was postulated that the following hypotheses will be supported by the results of the current study.

1. There was a statistically significant correlation between the athletic director's perceived leadership behavior scores and the subordinate's observed perception scores for all of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.
2. There was a statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job

satisfaction and the self-perceived athletic director's leadership behavior for all of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

3. There was a statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and the athletic director's leadership behavior as perceived by the subordinate for all of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

4. There was a statistically significant association between the subordinate's job satisfaction level and the extent of agreement between the self-perceived leadership behavior of athletic directors and the subordinate's perception of leadership for all of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Null Hypotheses

The following four research null hypotheses were developed from the problem and sub-problems.

Ho 1. There was no statistically significant correlation between the athletic director's perception score and the subordinate's observed perception score of any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Ho 2. There was no statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and the self-perceived athletic director's leadership behavior for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Ho 3. There was no statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and the athletic director's leadership behavior as perceived by the subordinate for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Ho 4 There was no statistically significant association between the subordinate's job satisfaction level and the extent of agreement between the self-perceived leadership behavior

of athletic directors and the subordinate's perception of leadership for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following expert definitions are offered:

Athletic Director – The individual responsible for planning, organizing, leading, and evaluating a program of intercollegiate athletics (Linam, 1999).

Job Satisfaction – Is a function of what one wants from their job and what one perceives the job as offering. Results when a job fulfills the attainment of individual values and standards (Weiss, et. al., 1977).

Leader – A person who motivates others to struggle for shared aspirations (Kouzes and Posner, 1987).

Leadership – A collection of actions and behaviors that mobilize others to want to struggle for shared aspirations (Kouzes and Posner, (1987).

Leadership Style - The actions and responses of the athletic director as he/she plans, organizes, leads, and evaluates a program of intercollegiate athletics (Branch, 1990).

Transactional Leadership – That behavior which exchanges short term, extrinsic rewards for a promise of performance (Burns, 1978).

Transformational Leadership – That behavior which develops and changes potential, alters awareness, introduces vision and mission and generally transforms an organization and its members (Bass, 1990).

Scope of the Study

This study involved the athletic directors and selected head coaches in four NCAA collegiate athletic conferences, the Midwest Collegiate Conference, the Lake Michigan

Northern Illinois – Iowa Conference, and the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin. These institutions are located in Wisconsin, Illinois and Iowa.

The instruments selected to collect data, were the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and a demographic survey. The LPI-Self was mailed to each athletic director at each institution by February 12, 2001. The LPI-Other was also mailed by the same date to head coaches at each institution as identified from the Blue Book of College Athletics for Senior, Junior and Community Colleges (Beazley, 2000). A pre-stamped, self addressed envelope was enclosed with each inventory as an effort to encourage more individuals to complete and return the information as requested. Athletic directors were given a phone call within one week of the mailing to check on the arrival of the material and to encourage completion of the questionnaires for the study.

A follow-up letter was sent to those athletic directors and head coaches who had not returned the inventory within three weeks. A follow-up phone call was made to those athletic directors who had not responded after four weeks. A final deadline for receipt of materials was established six weeks after the first mailing. All data collected by that time was included in the study. The data was compiled and analyzed using Microsoft Excel.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made regarding this study:

1. The athletic director and head coach respondents clearly understood the language of the inventory.
2. The athletic director and head coach respondents answered the inventories honestly and completely.
3. All data collected were compiled from all subjects in the same manner.

Limitations

The following items were identified as limitations for this study;

1. This study of Midwest, NCAA Division III, private colleges and universities was not generalizable to other levels of NCAA membership.
2. This study of Midwest, NCAA Division III, private colleges and universities was not generalizable to other intercollegiate athletic conferences.
3. The findings of this study were confined to the athletic directors and matching head coaches who returned the inventories.
4. The findings of this study could be affected by a lack of control over the environment in which the respondents completed the inventories.
5. There were a small number of respondents from the pool of coaches. Only 86 of 230 coaches responded (37.4%).
6. Not all coaches who responded had respective athletic directors who responded.

Significance of the Study

The data collected from this study may provide needed feedback to non-scholarship college and university athletic directors and may encourage them to seek greater understanding of leadership behaviors through formal leadership training in sport administration graduate programs or leadership seminars. Data collected in this study could enable athletic directors to become more innovative, experimental and communicative with their coaching staff by encouraging feedback on applied leadership behavior and gaining a better understanding on how the behavior is received by members of the coaching staff.

Four year, private school, NCAA Division III institutions have a different mission than do the NCAA Division I institutions. Athletic directors and coaches must strive to meet

a variety of student-athlete goals, many differing from the student-athletes at Division I institutions.

Job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness are linked closely to proper application of leadership behavior (Yusof, 1998). Therefore, for program effectiveness to result, more than managerial tasks need to be supervised by the athletic director. It takes well trained and properly educated administrators to contribute to the successful goal attainment by staff members. Perhaps the results of this study can affect the selection criteria for Division III athletic directors emphasizing the importance of formal leadership training and graduate degrees in sport administration for the successful athletic director. By studying a comparison of the perceived leadership behaviors of athletic directors and the subordinate's perceived leadership behavior, sport management professionals may be able to offer prescriptive advice in the best interest of the entire staff for applied situational leader behavior. It is also possible this study will inspire others to look more closely at leadership within Division III, small college athletic departments.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

> The word leadership is a sophisticated, modern concept. In earlier times, words meaning "head of state", "military commander", "princeps", "proconsul", "chief", or "king" were common in most societies; these words differentiated the ruler from other members of society. A preoccupation with leadership, as opposed to headship based on inheritance, usurpation, or appointment, occurred predominantly in countries with an Anglo-Saxon heritage. Although the Oxford English Dictionary noted the appearance of the word "leader" in the English language as early as the year 1300, the word "leadership" did not appear until the first half of the nineteenth century in writings about political influence and control of British Parliament. And the word did not appear in the most other modern languages until recent times (Bass, 1990, p 11).

There have been almost as many different definitions and descriptions as persons who have attempted to define the elusive concept of leadership. An early description was given by Stogdill (1948) when he shares that leadership implies activity, movement, getting work done. The leader is a person who occupies a position of responsibility in coordinating the activities of the members of the group in their task of attaining a common goal. Yet, Stogdill continues that one must be careful to distinguish between the leader and the figure-head. Most definitions of leadership involve an influence process, but the numerous definitions of leadership which have been proposed appear to have little else in common (Yukl, 1989). In a study of leadership in sports organizations, Chelladurai (1980) described the leadership process as inherently interpersonal in nature and distinguishes itself from the other functions of managers that do not entail a high degree of interaction with subordinates. Bass (1990), summarized the concept of leadership as the focus of group processes inducing compliance through the exercise of influence in the form of behaviors, persuasion, power so to influence goals and achievement of goals.

The emphasis on leader behavior theory promoted the belief that leaders are made, not born, in contrast to leadership trait theory, which emphasized the opposite belief. While theorists from these schools of thought debated the best leadership style or the best leadership traits, a derivative of behavioral theory, situational theorists, asserted that the one-best-style approach ignores the powerful situational determinants of leader effectiveness. Situational leadership theory proposed the idea that the effectiveness of a particular style of leader behavior depends on the situation. As situations change, different styles become more effective (Bass, 1990).

The review of literature will follow the history of leadership theory, which has led to today's paradigms. This historical review will explain the development of leadership theory, the development of transformational and transactional leadership descriptions out of which developed situational leadership theory. The importance of leadership to the organizational effectiveness, and the role of job satisfaction to the effective outcomes for organizations also emerged from the study of these leadership behaviors.

Leadership is currently defined with a cornucopia of phrases and terms. Much of the formal study and research on leadership was conducted within the corporate realm. Yet, an increasing interest in sport, as an arena in which leadership can easily be observed, along with the thought that sport is a breeding ground for tomorrow's leaders, generated a growing, yet diverse body of contemporary research, including; (Chelladurai, et. al., 1980, 1983, 1987. 1990, 1991; Doherty, 1996, 1997; Branch, 1990; Snyder, 1990; Soucie, 1994; and Yusof, 1998), among others.

The limited research interest in sport leadership contrasts with the heated discussions in the media and among fans about athletic leadership (Reimer and Chelladurai, 1995).

Leadership entails more than wielding power, exercising authority or management of tasks. A clarification of the nature of effective athletic leadership may be of value to a variety of persons within and outside every intercollegiate athletic organization. The current social, political, and economic pressures require that athletic departments do more with less (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995; Snyder, 1990). Athletic departments may benefit from leadership which brings subordinates on board with the leader's and organization's vision and motivates them to pursue higher goals (Doherty and Danylchuk, 1996).

The new leader must draw on many qualities in order to be effective. The new leader must be a visionary, be willing to take risks and be adaptable to change. The new leader must exemplify the values, goals and culture of the organization and be willing to delegate authority and emphasize innovation. Leaders must empower others and distribute leadership across all levels of the organization. The new leader is one who energizes people to action and transforms organizational members into agents of change (Van Seters and Field, 1990). Developing effective leaders for the future begins with a review of the past.

Brungardt (1996) suggested that nearly all theories can be classified into five general approaches: trait, behavioral, situational, power-influence, and transformational. Brungardt continued by describing the approach of each theory. The trait approach emphasizes the personal attributes of leaders while behavioral theories identify different styles of leadership on group performance. The power-influence approach explains leadership in terms of the amount, type and use of power tactics and a transformational view emphasizes the leader's role in the creation of organizational culture. Situational leadership theory can be thought of as the newest development in the field as an effort to integrate different approaches (Brungardt, 1996).

At the turn of the 20th century, the prevailing belief was that leaders were born, not made (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Successful leaders were thought to possess physical or personality characteristics that differentiated leaders from followers. Trait theory was examined in an effort to pinpoint the traits and characteristics of successful leaders with the intent to then identify future leaders via these traits.

The personality era of leadership included the first formal leadership theories, namely the Great Man period and the Trait period (Van Seters and Field, 1990). For many, history was shaped by the leadership of great men. Without Moses, the Jews would have remained in Egypt and without Winston Churchill the British would have given up in 1940 (Bass, 1990). Cawthorn (1996) suggested revisiting the great man theory of leadership, also referred to as trait theory. He argued the plethora of data accumulated by the behavioral sciences to explain leadership failed to penetrate the mystery of leadership. While the cause-effect relationship remains unclear, there is increasing evidence that biological and psychological forces ingrained in our evolutionary legacy may be determinants of one's ability to lead (Cawthorn, 1996). The implication was that both nature and nurture are factors in developing leadership. In this view, circumstances meet those people with innate advantages for leadership and great leaders emerge in response to those circumstances (Cawthorn, 1996). Cawthon (1996) created an argument that the ability to lead is directly linked to one's personality. Managers tend to favor maintenance of the status quo while leaders seek to transform what is into what should be. It is postulated that leaders have more in common with artists than they do with managers, and so, Cawthon (1996) assumed that only great people are worthy of the drama of leadership's power. It has been suggested during this period (Van Seters and Field, 1990) that a person who copied the personalities and behaviors of these great men would become a

strong leader.

Leadership theory was advanced only slightly in the Trait period, when attempts were made to remove the links with specific individuals and simply to develop a number of general traits which would enhance leadership potential and performance (Van Seters and Field, 1990). Trait theory suggestd that certain traits can increase the likelihood of a leader's effectiveness (Gordon, 1995). The concept of personality appealed to several early theorists, who sought to explain why some persons are better able than are others to exercise leadership. Personality theorists tended to regard leadership as a one-way effect. That is, leaders possess qualities that make them different from subordinates. But these theorists did not consider the extent to which leaders and followers have interactive effects on results (Bass, 1990). Key leader traits emphasized during this time, and by contemporary proponents of trait theory, included: drive, leadership motivation, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability and knowledge of the business (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). In addition, Gordon (1995) noted that during the first half of the twentieth century many studies on leader traits supported the assertion that leaders were born, by showing that leaders differed from nonleaders in characteristics such as; intelligence, initiative, persistence, self-confidence, desire to accept responsibility, and a preference for a position of control and dominance.

It is noted by several researchers (Armstrong, 1990 and Linam, 1999) that while certain traits or personality characteristics may help or hinder leadership, research has been unable to support the trait theory. Bass (1990) stated that studying leader behavioral traits is a very incomplete view of leadership, since this approach leaves out the dynamic relationship between leaders and followers as well as the situation in which leadership is found. The pure trait theory fell into disfavor as Stogdill's (1948) critique concluded both the person and the

situation had to be included to explain the emergence of leadership.

It can also be argued that the major capacities and competencies of leadership can be learned. Whatever natural endowments are brought to the role of leadership, they can be enhanced. In this view, nurture is far more important than nature in determining who becomes a successful leader (Bennis & Namus, 1985). Drucker (1996) postulated that leadership can be learned and does not follow a particular personality type. He continued to explain his research on the topic by saying that all the effective leaders he encountered knew four simple things; 1) the only definition of a leader is someone who has followers, 2) he or she is someone whose followers do the right thing, 3) leaders are highly visible, they set examples, 4) leadership is not rank privileges, titles or money, it is accepting responsibility (Drucker, 1996).

Another approach toward explaining leadership began during World War II as part of the effort to develop better military leaders. Behavioral styles theory had an early focus on leader behavior instead of personality traits. Researchers began to identify patterns of behavior, called leadership style, which enabled leaders to effectively influence others. This led to support for the belief there was one best style of leadership usually chosen from three classic styles: autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire.

The behavioral era of leadership searched for effective leader behaviors or styles, and were conducted primarily by the University of Michigan and the Ohio State University, beginning in the 1950s (Linam, 1999). The behavior approach emphasizes what leaders and managers actually do on the job, and the relationship of behavior to managerial effectiveness. while the possession of specific personality traits may be helpful, it was generally accepted that there was no one set of traits necessary to be a leader (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). A

lack of evidence supporting trait theory led to further research of leadership. Armstrong (1993) also made reference to the significant contributions of the early studies of leadership which came from the Ohio State University in the late 1950s. The Ohio State University studies focused their approach on the attitudinal aspect of leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988).

The study of leader behavior led to the description of two basic dimensions: initiating structure and consideration (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). Initiating structure referred to the degree to which a leader structures his or her own role and subordinate roles to help accomplish the group goal. Whereas, consideration referred to the degree to which the leader addressed individuals' needs (Gordon, 1995). Initiating structure and consideration are further described by Armstrong (1993) when he noted that initiating structure referred to the pattern of working relations with the group established by the leader. It included structure of organization, methods of communication, and line procedure. Consideration, on the other hand, was the working relationship between leader and follower. It suggested mutual trust, respect, and friendship as patterns of general behavior between leader and follower.

Findings in this line of research have been contradictory and inconclusive in the United States, except for the generally positive relationship found between consideration and subordinate satisfaction (Yukl, 1989). Linam (1999) further agreed that research indicated leaders who initiate structure for subordinates are generally rated highly by superiors and have higher producing work groups than leaders who are low on initiating structure; and that leaders who are high on the consideration dimension, have more satisfied employees. Yukl (1989) commented that after 35 years of research on participative leadership, we are left with the conclusion it sometimes results in higher satisfaction and performance and other times

does not. However, this conclusion is in sharp contrast to the findings from descriptive case studies of effective managers. Participation and empowerment of subordinates is an integral part of the leadership style found to be characteristic of effective managers in this research (e.g., Bradford & Cohen, 1985; Kanter, 1979; Kouzes & Posner, 1988; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; as cited in Yukl, 1990).

The emphasis on leader behavior theory emphasized the belief that leaders are made, not born, in contrast to leadership trait theory, which emphasized the opposite belief. While theorists from these schools of thought debated the best leadership style or the best leadership traits, a derivative of behavioral theory, situational theorists, asserted that the one-best-style approach ignores the powerful situational determinants of leader effectiveness. Situational leadership theory proposed the idea that the effectiveness of a particular style of leader behavior depends on the situation. As situations change, different styles become more effective (Bass, 1990).

Contingency or situational theories differ from the earlier trait and behavioral theories in asserting that no single way of leading works in all situations. Most contingency theories share the assumption that leader effectiveness is a function of an appropriate matching of explicitly defined situational conditions and the appropriate leader behavior and/or attributes (Linam, 1990). Effective managers diagnose the situation, identify the leadership style that will be most effective, and then determine if they can implement the required style (Gordon, 1995). The situational approach emphasizes the importance of contextual factors such as the leader's authority and discretion, the nature of the work performed by the leader's unit, the attributes of subordinates, and the nature of the external environment (Yukl, 1989). A well-known original situational theorist was Fiedler (1967, as cited in Armstrong, 1993). His

contingency model was constructed so the leader's style, the nature of the group, and the particular situation all combine in affecting the performance and satisfaction of the group. There is little or no room for change, either on the part of the leader or in the dynamics of the situation, according to Fiedler (1986). A leader will be either people-oriented or task-oriented.

One of the older situational theories, McGregor's Theory X – Theory Y formulation calls for a leadership style based on individuals' assumptions about other individuals. Theory X managers assume people are lazy, extrinsically motivated, incapable of self-discipline or self-control, and want security and no responsibility in their jobs (Gordon, 1995). Highly hierarchical organizations develop from this philosophy. Whereas, Theory Y managers assume people do inherently like work, want to do the right thing, are intrinsically motivated, exert self-control, and seek responsibility (Gordon, 1995). More recently, a third approach to organizational development (Theory Z), has been developed by William Ouchi (Yandrick, 1997). Theory Z rejects the inherent goodness or badness of a particular intervention for employee/organization situation, but instead, integrates solutions based on meeting the interests of both the organization and the individual. Theory Z organizations are characterized by a commonly shared culture, a strong organizational philosophy, and display unusually high rates of psychological success and well-being. In addition, these organizations have very low turnover, consensual decision-making, as well as employees who simply enjoy working together (Ouchi & Price, 1993).

Later situational theorists developed models which suggested the leader behaves differently, depending on the situation. A leader's effectiveness hinged on the appropriateness of his or her leadership style. Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard (1988) further

developed the three dimensional approach of leader, subordinate and situation. Within their model the emphasis was on the choice of the leadership style chosen. Effectiveness of the style depended on its appropriateness to the situation and the level of readiness of the subordinate. They believed it was the place of the leader to identify the changes and alter his or her style, accordingly (Armstrong, 1993).

Additional contingency theories have arisen, but further explanation of all theories would become redundant for explanation purposes of this study. A few other contingency theories noted were Leadership Substitutes Theory by Kerr and Jermier (1978, as cited in Yukl, 1989), the House Path – Goal Theory by House (1971, as cited in Linam, 1999), and Normantive Decision Theory by Vroom and Yetton (1973, as cited in Yukl, 1989).

In the 1980s, management researchers became more interested in charismatic leadership and the transformation and revitalization of organizations. In the face of increasing economic challenge from foreign companies many companies in the United States acknowledged the need to make major changes in the way things were done. Burns (1978, as cited in Bass, 1990) introduced a new paradigm of the transformational leader as opposed to the transactional leader. The transformational leader asks followers to transcend their own self interests for the good of the group, organization, or society; to consider their longer-term needs to develop themselves, rather than their needs of the moment; and to become more aware of what is really important (Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership refers to the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization's mission, objectives, and strategies. Transformational leadership involves influence by a leader on subordinates, but the effect of the influence is to empower subordinates to participate in the process of transforming the

organization. Thus, transformational leadership is usually viewed as a shared process, involving the actions of leaders at different levels and in different sub units of an organization, not just those of the leader (Yukl, 1989). Transformational leadership may be exhibited by anyone in the organization. Yukl (1989) explained it might involve people influencing peers or superiors as well as subordinates. Transformational leadership is contrasted with transactional leadership in which followers are motivated by appealing to their self-interests. In addition, transformational leadership is differentiated from influence based on bureaucratic authority.

Transactional leadership involves a leader-subordinate exchange relationship in which the subordinate receives some reward related to lower-order needs of security, affiliation, and recognition, in return for compliance with leader expectations (Doherty and Danylchuk, 1996). A transforming leadership then is described as a relationship in which the leader encourages a subordinate to maximize his or her potential in the pursuit of higher-order needs of achievement, self-actualization and group goals. These transforming approaches to leadership propose that leaders who demonstrate genuine charisma, vision, empowerment and intellectual stimulation can have such an effect on subordinates.

Work by James Kouzes and Barry Posner (1987) focused on innovation, change, motivation and inspiration may be included in what can be called the "new leadership" (Doherty and Danylchuk, 1990).

Kouzes' and Posner's Characteristics of the Transformational Leader

Kouzes and Posner (1987) interviewed leaders from around the country in an effort to determine how thy accomplished extraordinary things. They outlined five fundamental

leadership practices of these individuals:

1. Challenging the process: The leader does not accept the status quo. He/She is willing to consider a better way of doing things.

2. Inspiring a shared vision: The transformational leader has a dream and inspires the group with that dream or vision.

3. Enabling others to act: The leader knows he/she is only as effective as the work of the group. They will "empower" others to become powerful actors as well.

4. Modeling the way: Simply put, the transformational leader must practice what they preach. He/She must lead by example.

5. Encouraging the heart: Followers are more effective if they are frequently encouraged and praised. Recognition of worthy accomplishment is absolutely necessary in the transformational leadership model.

These contemporary researchers in transformational leadership used the above five practices to design the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). This instrument has been used to identify characteristics of transformational leadership in individuals. This instrument will be discussed later and used in this study. Table 1 indicates the means and standard deviation of the LPI for the sample used during original research (Kouzes and Posner, 1987). A comparison of the LPI – self and the LPI – other inventories is shown in Table 2. There was a considerable difference between frequency scores of managers and those of their subordinates on both the enabling others to act and challenging the process dimensions ($p<.01$). There was no statistical significant difference between self and other scores on the remaining three factors (inspiring a shared vision, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart).

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviation for Original Research on Leadership Practices Inventory conducted by Kouzes and Posner.

Leadership Behavior	Mean	s.d.
Challenging the Process	22.63	3.85
Inspiring a Shared Vision	20.08	4.86
Enabling Others to Act	23.96	3.95
Modeling the Way	22.42	3.90
Encouraging the Heart	22.23	4.72

Table 2

t Tests of Differences Between Scores on the LPI-Self and LPI-Other for Kouzes and Posners' Original Research.

	LPI - Self		LPI - Other		t
Leadership Behavior	Mean	s.d.	mean	s.d.	
Challenging the Process	23.12	3.20	22.41	4.04	2.64[a]
Inspiring a Shared Vision	20.05	4.07	19.86	5.04	0.55
Enabling Others to Act	24.94	2.43	23.47	4.23	5.36[a]
Modeling the Way	22.71	3.29	22.25	4.08	1.66
Encouraging the Heart	22.72	3.82	21.92	4.92	2.41

[a] $p < .01$

Kouzes and Posner (1987) found both transactional and transformational leadership styles were positively associated with leader effectiveness. However, transformational

leadership factors, particularly those of individual consideration, were more highly related than transactional factors to satisfaction and success. This would suggest that accomplishment of task is not the single criterion which should determine leader effectiveness (Armstrong, 1993).

Armstrong (1993) summarized the literature presenting the athletic director as a leader in much the same way as the successful coach. There were a number of generally accepted qualities that enabled an athletic director to administer effectively. Much of the early literature concerning leadership and the athletic director (Frost, Lockhart and Marshall, 1988; Horine, 1985; Jensen, 1988, cited in Armstrong, 1993) appeared to focus on leader characteristics. These included an emphasis on the athletic director having a vision for the department, one who is not afraid to take risks, ambitious, reliable, fair, high intensity, enthusiastic, consistent decision making, and a desire to lead. Earlier approaches regarding leadership measurement have been a major focus of sport management leadership research. To a large degree leaders have been perceived to be the causal agents who determine the success or failure of an organization (Soucie, 1994). Interestingly, Slack (1997) expressed the belief that the popular press continues to describe leadership abilities of coaches and team managers in terms of the traits they exhibit. A pessimistic view of leadership research is shared by Slack (1997) when he suggested that we have become lost in a labyrinth with endless definitions, countless articles and never ending polemics. "As far as leadership studies go, it seems that more and more has been studied about less and less, to end up ironically with a group of researchers studying everything about nothing" (Slack, 1997, p 301).

Fitzgerald, Sagaria and Nelson (1994) posited a work history, or an array of

occupational experiences, typical for athletic directors. The normative career trajectory is derived from the sequentially ordered, common positions that begin with a single or fixed portal and culminate in a single top position. It has been noted that sport management often has been staffed by those who have entered athletic administration through the player-coach-manager route.

In the Fitzgerald, et. al. (1994) study it was found that 94.5% of the respondents had experienced career patterns that followed the linear time sequence of positions outlined above by advancing in the normative pattern from player to coach to administrator. In addition, the dominant tendency was for an individual to develop a career in institutions similar to the institution in which he or she held an athletic administration position. Through limited exposure, this may imply, the inculcation of a circumscribed cache of leadership behaviors.

Several studies (Cuneen, 1992, Quarterman, 1992, Slack, 1996, and Williams & Miller, 1983) concluded there is an identifiable portfolio of knowledge essential for the preparation of athletic administration. Yet, Cuneen (1992) reported that an incongruous aspect of athletic administration was the trend of assigning the directorate of multi-million-dollar businesses to individuals with little or no formal professional preparation in athletic administration. The previous argument was supported by Cuneen's (1992) findings that the traditional route to administrative responsibility within sport had been through service in the coaching network. Thus, few of today's athletic administrators have degrees in sport administration, and, it seems reasonable to conclude that on-the-job training and trial-and-error management are considered to be the typical preparation for being an athletic director (Quarterman, 1992).

Quarterman (1992) reported an investigation that described the career paths, past experiences and educational backgrounds of athletic directors at small, private colleges and universities. Undergraduate degrees in health and/or physical education were the entry-level academic credentials held by 69% of the athletic directors while half held graduate degrees in health and/or physical education. In addition, within collegiate institutions identified as historically black colleges and universities only 2 of 127 respondents held graduate or undergraduate degrees in sport administration.

The leadership profile of athletic directors was one predominantly transformational as opposed to transactional or nonleadership behavior in a study by Doherty and Danylchuk (1996). This may not be surprising in light of the need for athletic directors to be more creative and visionary in order to ensure success of the intercollegiate programs in an environment of increasing economic, social and political pressure. This pressure to do more with less would demand innovative and inspiring leadership that encourages subordinates to share in the pursuit of organizational success (Doherty and Danylchuk, 1996). This finding contrasted with the perceived autocratic, hands on style of leadership associated with leaders described popularly with the use of characteristics and personality traits. The perspective that athletic directors are more predisposed to task accomplishments than to promoting good interpersonal relationships with their subordinates was supported by Branch (1990). Yet, he warned that the findings of his study could not be generalized to other divisions within the NCAA because each division within the NCAA is distinct in its level of competition, budget, and scholarship restrictions, which makes comparisons across divisions difficult and generalizations to other divisions statistically invalid (Branch, 1990).

In an extensive review of literature regarding effective managerial leadership in sport

organizations, Soucie (1994) concluded that an apparent consistent finding is that considerate-supportive behavior has a positive effect on subordinate satisfaction. This supported the findings of Snyder (1990) that the degree of consideration shown by athletic administrators was highly correlated with job satisfaction, particularly satisfaction with work and satisfaction with supervision. Employee job satisfaction has a long history as an outcome measure of leadership studies, dating back to the leader behavior studies emerging out of the University of Michigan and The Ohio State University. Employee satisfaction remains one of the most important and frequently measured indicators of a leader's impact (Wallace and Weese, 1995). These researchers continued on with a definition of job satisfaction as a function of what one wants from their job and what one perceives the job as offering. Gordon (1995) added that satisfaction results when a job fulfills or facilitates the attainment of individual values and standards and dissatisfaction occurs when the job is seen as blocking such attainment. Using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Butler and Cantrell (1997) showed statistically significant effects of perceived leadership behavior on job satisfaction. Also in support of a positive relationship between leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction was Snyder (1990) finding that athletic directors were perceived by coaches as responsible for the degree of administrative support in the work place and strongly influencing the morale of the coaches. Also Kushnell and Newton (1986) concluded that leadership style is the significant determinant of subject satisfaction. Participants were highly dissatisfied when an authoritarian style of leadership dominated their group. In fact, this dissatisfaction permeates all areas of subjects' evaluations – satisfaction with their leader, their own performance, and their task groups' decisions (Kushnell and Newton, 1986).

Wallace and Weese (1995) encouraged additional research on the topic of

transformational leadership and employee job satisfaction. Though in their study no statistically significant differences in employee job satisfaction existed between the YMCA organizations led by high transformational leaders and those led by low transformational leaders.

A contrasting conclusion is offered by Yusof (1998), resulting from a study of NCAA Division III institutions. Results showed that there was a statistically significant relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors with the job satisfaction of coaches. Specifically, the more the athletic directors were perceived as engaging in transformational leadership behaviors, the higher the job satisfaction of the coaches. Yusof (1998) continued by suggesting the need for more transformational leaders in sport settings, since job satisfaction had been shown to be positively related with high subordinates' performance, low job turnover, low absenteeism, and higher productivity. Athletic directors who are transformational will make a significant difference in terms of their organization's performance and effectiveness (Yusof, 1998).

As far as participatory leadership is concerned, Yukl (1989) stated, "After 35 years of research on participation, we are left with the conclusion that participative leadership sometimes results in higher satisfaction, decision acceptance, effort, and performance, and at other times it does not" (p. 86, as cited in Soucie, 1994).

Leadership Practices Inventory

Kouzes and Posner (1987) began leadership research in the early 1980s with an intent to dispel the two popular myths about leadership: that leadership was a quality people were born with and that only a select few can lead successfully. During their research a long and short form of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was developed. The inventory was

administered to more than 3,000 managers and their direct subordinates. Various analyses suggested that the LPI has sound psychometric properties (Kouzes and Posner, 1987). There are differences between respondents' self-scores and scores provided by others about the respondents, which is a similar phenomenon of many psychological inventories.

The purpose of the LPI inventory was to measure the perception of transformational leadership possessed by leaders (Armstrong, 1990). What was discovered through the original research was a consistent pattern of leader behavior that created extraordinary results. Five distinct practices were identified. They are (Kouzes and Posner, 1997):

Challenging the Process. Leaders search for opportunities to change the status quo. They look for innovative ways to improve the organization. In doing so, they experiment and take risks. And because leaders know that risk taking involves mistakes and failures they accept the inevitable disappointments as learning opportunities.

Inspiring a Shared Vision. Leaders passionately believe that they can make a difference. They envision the future, creating an ideal and unique image of what the organization can become. Through their magnetism and quiet persuasion, leaders enlist others in their dreams. They breathe life into their visions and get people to see exciting possibilities for the future.

Enabling Others to Act. Leaders foster collaboration and build spirited teams. They actively involve others. Leaders understand that mutual respect is what sustains extraordinary efforts; they strive to create an atmosphere of trust and human dignity. They strengthen others, making each person feel capable and powerful.

Modeling the Way. Leaders establish principles concerning the way people (constituents, colleagues, and customers alike) should be treated and the way goals should be

pursued. They create standards of excellence and then set an example for others to follow. Because the prospect of complex change can overwhelm people and stifle action, they set interim goals so that people can achieve small wins as they work toward larger objectives. They unravel bureaucracy when it impedes action; they put up signposts when people are unsure of where to go or how to get there; and they create opportunities for victory.

Encouraging the Heart. Accomplishing extraordinary things in organizations is hard work. To keep hope and determination alive, leaders recognize contributions that individuals make. In every winning team, the members need to share in the rewards of their efforts, so leaders celebrate accomplishments. They make people feel like heroes.

By virtue of their formal role in sport organizations, athletic administrators are responsible for empowering coaches to establish goals and a vision, and for motivating those coaches toward achieving the goals and vision. The effective transformational leader "transforms" people and organizations to change them in mind and spirit; enlarge their vision; clarify purposes; make behavior congruent with beliefs and values; and bring about permanent, self-perpetuating and momentum building changes (Lim & Cromartie, 2001). Pasternak (1994) suggested that improving employee satisfaction may be the single most important thing a company can do to improve its performance and improve its bottom line.

Transformational leadership has been positively correlated with how effective the leader is perceived by subordinates, how much effort subordinates say they will expend for the leader, how satisfied the subordinates are with the leader, and how well subordinates perform as rated by the leader (Hater and Bass, 1988). Leaders and subordinates do not always agree in their assessments of effective leadership performance. Self-appraisals of performance tended to be more lenient, more biased, and less variable than superior, peer, or

subordinate appraisals. Self-rates perceive themselves as engaging in a greater frequency of desirable behaviors than do outside sources assessing the same behaviors. This difference in perception may be considered important since member perceptions may be the perceptions that are related to organizational outcomes (Kolb, 1995).

When conducting research comparing self and other ratings one could expect, as previously mentioned, self-ratings to be higher. Singer and Beardsley (1990) shared that it has been found that actors tend to attribute their own actions to situational factors, whereas observers are more inclined to make dispositional attributions. They concluded that employees hold more stringent criteria for effective leadership than supervisors. In a comparison of self-ratings with other forms of ratings Lane and Herriot (1990) found that self-ratings tended to show more leniency, less variability and less discriminant validity. In other words, accuracy in the assessment of one's own abilities should not be expected, since such assessment may serve a self-enhancing function (Lane and Harriot, 1990).

Kolb (1995) added that while a leader might believe her or his behavior is reasonable, even admirable, in light of existing external organizational constraints, a subordinate (observer) assumes that the leader's behavior is a result of individual personality traits and does not consider the mitigating effect of external circumstances. Implications from the Kolb (1995) study revealed that subordinate observations of managerial behavior have been found to be better indicators for performance improvement than self-assessment. Armstrong (1993) found similar outcomes of self versus other ratings when applying Kouzes' and Posner's LPI to athletic directors and head coaches. The ratings for athletic director self-ratings were higher than the observer-ratings from head coaches, and coaches' self-ratings were higher than observer-ratings from assistant coaches.

When self versus other ratings are applied to transformational leadership studies transformational leadership added to the prediction of subordinates' ratings of leader effectiveness and satisfaction beyond that of transactional leadership (Hater and Bass, 1988). An interesting conclusion by Hater and Bass (1988) applicable to the study of leadership with intercollegiate athletic departments is that although transformational and transactional leaders both display varying amounts of participative decision styles, transformational leadership would seem to be congruent with a better educated work force.

A second part of the problem to be investigated involves subordinate job satisfaction and the relationship to the athletic director's leadership behavior. Yukl (1989) discovered transformational leaders often engaged in the following behaviors; articulating a vision of the future of the organization, providing a model that is consistent with that vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals, and providing individualized support. This corresponds with the leadership behavior commitments used in Kouzes and Posner's (1987) leadership model; 1) Challenging the process, 2) Inspiring a shared vision, 3) Enabling others to act, 4) Modeling the way, and 5) Encouraging the heart.

There has been a demonstrated relationship that transformational leaders tend to be positively correlated to higher performance and greater job satisfaction among employees of business and industrial organizations (Yusof, 1998). In a meta-analysis of the relationship between leadership behavior and employee job satisfaction, Butler and Cantrell (1997), reported a generally positive association between consideration behavior and job satisfaction. Yusof (1998) continued to report that the few studies within sport settings have reported conflicting results between transformational leadership and job satisfaction, commitment or performance. Several studies (Reimer & Chelladurai, 1995, and Schliesman, 1984) involved

the typical coach-player dyad. The results of Yusof's (1998) study on NCAA Division III institutions indicated a statistically significant relationship between highly transformational athletic directors and coaches more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. "Specifically, since job satisfaction has been shown to be positively related with subordinates' performance, low job turnover, low absenteeism, and high productivity, athletic directors who are transformational will make a significant difference in terms of their organization's performance and effectiveness" (Yusof, 1998, p174). Several studies (Butler & Cantrell, 1997; Medley & Larochelle, 1995; and Packard & Kauppi, 1999) suggested a positive relationship between leadership behavior and employee job satisfaction in other occupations. In the field of rehabilitation workers where heavy workloads and limited resources can result in high stress levels, Packard and Kauppi (1999) concluded that supervisors can be more effective in increasing their subordinates' job satisfaction by enhancing the relationship dimensions of their leadership. Within the nursing profession, Medley and Larochelle (1995), found a similar association between transformational leadership behavior and staff nurses' job satisfaction. In addition there was indication of the relationship dimensions of leadership behavior promoting retention and preventing turnover.

Hater and Bass (1988) concluded that although transformational and transactional leaders both display varying amounts of participative decision styles, transformational leaders would seem to be congruent with a better educated work force. There can be little disagreement that a NCAA Division III coaching staff is a highly educated work force. As has been shown (Austin, 1975 and Quarterman, 1992) most athletic directors and coaches within colleges and universities hold a graduate degree. Lim and Cromartie (2001) suggested that ineffective leadership in any organization seems to be a major cause of diminishing the

organization's productivity. Weese (1996) concluded that high transformational leaders possess strong organizational cultures and culture-building activities to a greater extent than other leaders do.

It would appear highly educated intercollegiate athletic coaches, who usually find themselves working in stress filled circumstances with limited resources should reveal greater job satisfaction when influenced by transformational leadership behavior, if the study reflects the predominant literature.

It is the belief of this researcher that where the athletic director's perception of his/her positive leadership behavior is incongruent with the subordinate's perception of the administrator's leadership behavior, there will be a corresponding association with lower job satisfaction on the part of the subordinate. In other words, this incongruent understanding of leadership behavior can be seen as one factor leading to a lack of job satisfaction on the part of the subordinate. If this study holds true to the review of literature, one should expect to find self-assessments of leadership behavior to be more favorable to other assessments, either subordinate or superordinate. One could expect a higher association between subordinate's job satisfaction and those qualities of transformational leadership included in Kouze and Posners' model of leadership. If leadership behavior can be taught as proposed by Kouzes and Posner (1987) and Clark and Clark (1990) then becoming more proficient in transformational leadership behavior by an athletic director could lead to greater job satisfaction, commitment and performance on the part of the coaching staff.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived leadership behavior and subordinate job satisfaction. This relationship will be examined between athletic directors and head coaches within selected NCAA Division III, intercollegiate athletic departments.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects in this study were the athletic directors and selected head coaches from private institutions within four NCAA Division III athletic conferences located in the Midwest: The Midwest Conference, The Lake Michigan Conference, The Northern Illinois – Iowa Conference and the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin (Appendix A). There were 30 member institutions within these four intercollegiate athletic conferences whose athletic director and head coaches were mailed the study materials. Head coaches at each institution were selected from those listed in the Blue Book of College Athletics for Senior, Junior and Community Colleges (Beazley, 2000). The first criteria for selection was to identify four of men's and four women's sports. Then an attempt was made to select an equal, or close to equal, number of male and female coaches. The researcher was most familiar with the Division III philosophy promoted by these institutions because of past and present administrative, coaching and teaching experience at similar institutions of higher learning. The author had a distinct interest in the leadership behavior of athletic directors at Division III institutions.

Instrumentation

The three instruments used in the study were the Leadership Practices Inventory

(LPI), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and a demographic profile created by the author based upon a similar profile in the literature (Linam, 1999).

Leadership Practices Inventory

The Leadership Practices Inventory was developed, employed and validated by two leadership experts, James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D. (Kouzes and Posner, 1997). The Leadership Practices Inventory consists of an LPI-Self instrument (Appendix B), to be completed by the leader participating in the research, and an LPI-Observer instrument (Appendix C) completed by people who directly observe and are influenced by the leader's behavior.

Each instrument contained thirty behavioral statements addressing five distinct practices. Assessment of each behavioral statement was rated on a 10 point Likert scale ranging from a low rating of 1 (Almost Never) to a high rating of 10 (Almost Always). The five distinct leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model are; 1) Challenging the Process, 2) Inspiring a Shared Vision, 3) Enabling Others to Act, 4) Modeling the Way, and, 5) Encouraging the Heart (Kouzes and Posner, 1997).

Original research produced internal reliabilities on the LPI-Self that ranged from .69 to .85 and on the LPI-Observer from .78 to .90 (Kouzes and Posner, 1997). Scores on the LPI show significant test-retest reliability at levels greater than .90 coefficients (Kouzes and Posner, 1997).

The LPI was used in a study of the state of Ohio's community leaders conducted by Garee Earnst, as reported in Kouzes and Posner (1997). Internal reliabilities for the LPI ranged from .57 to .80 for the five leadership practices. In an additional study, as reported by Kouzes and Posner (1997), on managers and employees of Mexican companies, internal

reliabilities for the five leadership scales ranged from .81 to .89. The study by Armstrong (1993) regarding transformational leadership in NCAA Division III colleges applied the LPI to athletic directors and head coaches, but did not report internal reliability for the subjects participating in that study.

Kouzes and Posner (1987) claimed the Leadership Practices Inventory was developed to empirically measure the conceptual framework developed in the case studies of manager's personal best experiences as leaders – times when they had accomplished something extraordinary in an organization. Various analyses suggested the LPI has sound psychometric properties (Kouzes and Posner, 1987). Barry Mitchelson in the Department of Physical Education and Sport Studies at the University of Alberta reported in his study of leadership practices of recreation leaders, "I could not find a more effective, yet accurate, method of presenting the data from this study. Therefore, I use the model with conviction and enthusiasm in my ongoing teaching and research and during consulting assignments" (Kouzes and Posner, 1997, p. 105).

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Appendix D) is an instrument that measures satisfaction with several different aspects of the work environment. It takes little time to administer (5 to 10 minutes for the short form); is easy to read; meets the accepted standards for reliability; and shows evidence of validity (Work Adjustment Project, 1967 [WAP]). One reason for choosing the MSQ was its ability to measure intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and, most importantly, general satisfaction.

The MSQ scales have adequate internal reliability. Hoyt reliability coefficients for the MSQ scales range from .59 to .97 (WAP, 1967). Test-retest correlation coefficients for the 21

MSQ scales range from .66 for the Co-workers scale, to .91 for the Working Conditions scale. The stability coefficient for the General Satisfaction scale was .89 (WAP, 1967). The short form Hoyt reliability coefficients ranged from .87 to .92 for the different groups on which the instrument was tested (WAP, 1967).

Demographic Profile

The demographic profile (Appendix E) was constructed by the researcher after reviewing similar surveys used by Armstrong (1993) and Linam (1999). The demographic factors were used to shed further light on the training, education and experience of athletic directors and the subordinates. An expert panel assessed the survey and minor changes were made. The expert panel consisted of four tenured faculty members at Lakeland College in Wisconsin, all holding earned doctoral degrees (see Appendix F).

Eighty six head coaches returned useable Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaires and a demographic profile. It was understood only head coaches participated in the study. Sixty (69.77%) were males while twenty-six (30.23%) were females. Age was reported in categories of five-year increments. See Appendix E to view the demographic profile. 51.16% (44) coaches were at or below the age of thirty-five, while another 31.39% (27) coaches were between 36-50 years of age. Only 17.44% (15) were age 50 or older.

Educational level of coaches was predominantly at the masters (58.14%) or bachelors degree (30.23%). Only 6 coaches (6.98%) had earned doctorates while four coaches (4.65%) reported having less than a bachelors degree. Male coaches (N=60) tended to be slightly more educated with 66.67% holding masters or Ph. D. degrees, while the other third had a bachelors degree or less. Whereas, no female coaches (N=26) held a Ph. D. degree nor had less than a bachelors level of education, but only 61.5% attained a masters degree with 38.5%

holding a bachelors degree.

There was a wide array of experience levels among the respondents. The range of years experience within the current coaching position was from the first year to 34 years coaching. The mean number of years at the current job was 5.3 years. When considering all years of experience within the coaching profession, the results increased somewhat. The range of total years within college coaching was from the first year experience to forty-five years of coaching experience. The mean number for total years of coaching experience was 9.2 years for all subjects.

Twenty (66.67%) of the athletic directors returned the demographic profile. Male athletic directors made up 75% (N=15) of the subjects while females were 25% (N=5). 70% (N=14) were at or above the age of forty-six and athletic directors in this study were all above thirty years of age. Only two (10%) had bachelors degrees, thirteen (65%) held masters degrees and five (25%) athletic directors earned doctorates. Interestingly, only three athletic directors had degrees included in an administration discipline. Six degrees were in education, three in physical education and two others in exercise science. Altogether 85% of the athletic directors did not have a degree in an administrative discipline.

The average years within the current director's chair was 7.4 years while this group of subjects had a mean number of 13.7 years total experience within athletic administration. This group of athletic directors ranged from their first year on the job to 23 years in the current position. 85% (17) of the administrators had participated in intercollegiate sports and, in addition, 85% had college coaching experience. The mean number of years that these athletic administrators had coached was 13.4. This coaching experience was greater than the average years (9.2) of total coaching experience for the head coach subjects.

Table 3

Summary of Demographic Data for Athletic Directors and Head Coaches

	Coaches (N=86)	Athletic Directors (N=20)
Males	60	15
Females	26	5
Years in Job		
Mean	5.3	7.4
Range	1 – 34	1 -23
Total years		
Mean	9.2	13.7
Range	1 –45	3 - 30
Age		
<26	5	0
26-30	17	0
31-35	22	2
36-40	11	3
41-45	9	1
46-50	7	6
51-55	4	2
56-60	7	6
>60	4	0
Education		
Other	4 (4.65%)	0 (0.0%)
BS	26 (30.23%)	2 (10%)
MS	50 (58.14%)	13 (65%)
Ph D	6 (6.98%)	5 (25%)

Procedures for Data Collection

First, the respective conference commissioners or presidents were contacted by letter(Appendix G). Phone calls were made within a week of sending the commissioner letter, to obtain approval and an endorsement of the study. Second, a letter of introduction

(Appendix H) was sent to each athletic director explaining the study and sharing the support of the conference commissioner.

Within one week of sending the athletic director the introductory letter each athletic director was sent a packet of information containing the Leadership Practices Inventory - Self research instrument. Each Athletic Director packet contained a letter of explanation (Appendix H) on how to complete the LPI-Self inventory, the demographic profile and a stamped return envelope. This letter also requested the athletic director to strongly encourage the staff members to complete the material.

At the same time the athletic director received his/her packet of information, selected head coaches from each institution, identified from the Blue Book of College Athletics for Senior, Junior and Community Colleges (Beazley, 2000), were sent individual packets containing a letter of explanation (Appendix J) on how to complete the various instruments, an LPI - Observer instrument, a Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a demographic profile and a stamped return envelope. These head coaches were selected with an attempt to have gender equity with regard to men's and women's sports first and then, gender equity with regard to the gender of the coach.

Within one week of mailing the material to the athletic director, a phone call to each athletic director was made to verify receipt of the materials and to encourage the coaches to complete the materials in a timely and useful manner. A follow up letter was sent to those athletic directors and head coaches who had not returned the survey materials within three weeks of the first mailing.

A final deadline for receipt of materials was established at six weeks from the first mailing of the instrument. Those completed instruments received within six weeks were to be

included in the study. An analysis of the collected data was then to be conducted using Microsoft Excel in Office 2000. A copy of the abstract for the study was offered to each participant and was mailed to each athletic director responding to the study.

The Leadership Practices Inventory - Self (LPI - Self) surveys were mailed to each of the thirty selected athletic directors. Of those, twenty (67%) were returned in a useable form. The Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI – Observer) were mailed to 230 selected head coaches who work directly with the athletic directors at the institutions within the study. Of the 230 mailed surveys, 75 (32.6%) LPI-Observer forms were returned, out of which 74 (32.1%) were useable.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was mailed to each of the head coaches in order to survey their level of job satisfaction. Athletic directors did not receive the MSQ. From the pool of 230 MSQ surveys mailed, a return of 86 (37.4%) useable surveys were received. All eighty-six of the MSQ surveys were compiled as part of the normative group in order to score and rank the results.

Because athletic directors at some institutions did not participate in the study while coaches from that institution did return the surveys a comparative athletic director-coach dyad could not result. The reverse of this relationship was also true for other institutions. Therefore, 63 combinations resulted in which an athletic director returned an LPI – Self along with a corresponding MSQ returned from a head coach from the same institution. These 63 combinations were used for the analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and athletic directors' self-perception of leadership behavior. In 74 cases, head coaches returned both a useable LPI – Observer and an MSQ survey. Therefore, for the relationship

between job satisfaction and head coaches' perception of the athletic director's leadership behavior a pool of 74 combinations resulted.

In order to analyze the relationship between job satisfaction and the difference between the athletic directors' and head coaches' perceptions of leadership, coaches needed to return the MSQ survey and the LPI – Observer while their respective athletic director needed to return the LPI – Self. There were fifty-four of these combinations.

Statistical Design and Analysis

The Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) asked questions for each leadership behavior from Kouzes and Posner's leadership model with a Likert scale from 1, as a low score, to 10, as a high score. Theoretically the range could then be from a high score of 60 to a low score of 6.

The LPI – self, was sent to each of the athletic directors at the colleges and universities within four intercollegiate athletic conferences. The LPI – observer was sent to selected head coaches at each of the same institutions. The LPI – observer and LPI - self had identical questions and Lickert scale.

A table (Appendix K) of descriptive data was generated for each leader behavior (i.e., Modeling the Way, Encouraging the Heart, etc.). This included for each athletic director and head coach combination (N=54) respective raw scores for the LPI, mean scores, standard deviations and correlation coefficients for each group for each leadership behavior. For each athletic director there was a self-reported perceived leadership behavior score and a coach perceived score for the leadership behavior. This compared raw scores for ratings on each leadership behavior and indicated the difference between the two perception scores. There resulted a set of paired data regarding the raw score for each of the leadership behaviors from

Kouzes and Posners' leadership model. Both the athletic director's self-rating score and the coaches' observer-rating score were considered independent variables in the relationship with job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Scoring the LPI was done manually per directions provided with the LPI facilitator guide (Kouzes and Posner, 1997).

Data regarding job satisfaction was gathered by use of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), short form. The MSQ – Short form is a 20-question inventory using a Likert scale of 1 to 5, very dissatisfied to very satisfied, respectively. Resulting satisfaction scales were: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and general satisfaction. For purposes of this study the general satisfaction scale was the significant scale.

The most meaningful scores to use in interpreting the MSQ are the percentile scores for each scale obtained from the most appropriate norm group for the individuals. Ordinarily, a percentile score of 75 or higher would be taken to represent a high degree of satisfaction; a percentile score of 25 or lower would indicate a low level of satisfaction; and, scores in the middle range of percentiles indicate average satisfaction (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1977).

The normative group most closely related to the population in the current study had a general satisfaction scale mean of 79.82 with a standard deviation of 11.82. The 75th percentile raw score is 87, the 25th percentile raw score is 74. Job satisfaction categories of high, average and low satisfaction groups were delineated by these divisions.

Appendix K also shows the job satisfaction level for each head coach, who provided an observer rating for their respective administrator. The groupings for job satisfaction categories were determined by an approximately equal number of respondents in the high level of satisfaction, in the average level of satisfaction and in the low level of satisfaction.

Each head coach (observer) was then assigned a general job satisfaction rating of high, average or low. The average of these scores was not important because each coach's satisfaction level will be considered against the self-reported leadership behavior score and against the observer reported leadership behavior score. A similar table was generated for each of the five leadership behaviors in Kouzes and Posners' leadership model. See Appendix K for each head coaches' job satisfaction rating.

Appendix K lists data to be applied to null hypothesis 1 for the leadership behavior of Challenging the Process and the other leadership behaviors. The athletic director self perceived score for each leadership behavior and the observer perceived score provided paired data for each athletic director/coach dyad for each leadership behavior. With two groups of ratio data it was appropriate to conduct a Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient test (r) to determine if there was a direct relationship between the pairs of information, that is, the athletic director's perceived score and the head coach's perceived score of the athletic director's leadership behavior. For 54 pairs of information at 52*df*, when $p < .05$, an r of at least 0.2732 was needed for statistical significance (Bruning & Kintz, Appendix G, 1997).

For null hypothesis 2 the data for athletic director's LPI – self ratings would be categorized into groups similar to; perceived scores <40, between 40-15, and >15. These categories are compared to satisfaction categories from the MSQ in high, average, or low satisfaction categories. Table 4 presents an example of raw data reflecting an association between the leadership behavior score for Challenging the Process as perceived by the athletic directors and the job satisfaction levels for corresponding coaches. AD self rating scores (column 1) could range from 6 to 60 and have been categorized into three groups. The

job satisfaction ratings result from taking a raw score from the MSQ and applying it to a percentile ranking resulting in a rating of high satisfaction, average satisfaction and low satisfaction. This three-category rating is applied so to arrive at nine relationship groups.

Table 4

Example of a Comparison of Self Rated Score and Satisfaction Level for the Leadership Behavior, Challenging the Process.

AD Self Rating	Satisfaction Level High	Ave	Low	n
<40	19	39	19	77
40-15	19	38	19	76
>15	19	39	19	77
Total	57	116	57	230

Satisfaction level was the dependent variable while the athletic director's LPI – self score was the independent variable. When there is frequency data comparing the effects of two variables, and there are more than two groups on either of the two variables, Chi-square analysis can be used to test the hypothesis of no association between the variables. When df = (3-1)(3-1) = 4, a Chi-square critical value greater than 9.50 is statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

This analysis was repeated for each of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model to determine the association between the self-perceived leadership score of the athletic director and the job satisfaction level of the head coaches.

For null hypothesis 3 the data for coaches' LPI – observer ratings would be categorized into groups such as, perceived scores <40, between 40-15, and >15. These

categories are compared to satisfaction categories from the MSQ in high, average, or low satisfaction categories. Table 5 presents an example of raw data reflecting an association between the leadership behavior score for Challenging the Process as perceived by the head coaches about the athletic director and the job satisfaction levels for corresponding coaches. Athletic director rating scores (column 1) could range from 6 to 60 and have been categorized into three groups. The job satisfaction ratings result from taking a raw score from the MSQ and applying it to a percentile ranking resulting in a rating of high satisfaction, average satisfaction and low satisfaction. This same three-category rating was applied so to arrive at nine relationship groups.

Table 5

Example of a Comparison of Observer Rated Score and Satisfaction Level for the Leadership Behavior, Challenging the Process.

AD Self Rating	Satisfaction Level High	Ave	Low	n
<40	19	39	19	77
40-15	19	38	19	76
>15	19	39	19	77
Total	57	116	57	230

Satisfaction level was the dependent variable while the athletic director's LPI – self score was the independent variable. When there is frequency data comparing the effects of two variables, and there are more than two groups on either of the two variables, a Chi-square analysis can be used to test the hypothesis of no association between the variables. With 4*df*, a Chi-square critical value greater than 9.50 was statistically significant at the $p <$

.05 level.

This analysis was repeated for each of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model to determine the association between the observer-perceived leadership score of the coaches about the athletic director and the job satisfaction level of the head coaches.

For null hypothesis 4 the data determining the difference between the LPI – self score and the coaches' LPI – observer ratings would be categorized into groups such as; extent of difference <2.00, between 2.00 and 1.00, and >1.00. These were compared to satisfaction categories from the MSQ in high, average, or low satisfaction categories. Table 6 presents an example of raw data reflecting an association between the extent of difference of perceived leadership scores for Challenging the Process about the athletic director, and the job satisfaction levels for corresponding coaches. The difference between perceived rating scores could fall into one of three groups, a difference greater than 2, a difference between 2.00 and 1.00, and, a difference less than 1.00. The job satisfaction ratings result from taking a raw score from the MSQ and applying it to a percentile ranking resulting in a rating of high satisfaction, average satisfaction and low satisfaction. Again, this same three-category rating is applied so to arrive at nine relationship groups. A Chi-square critical value greater than 9.50 was statistcally significant at the $p < .05$ level.

This analysis was repeated for each of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model to determine the association between the extent of difference of the perceived leadership scores about the athletic director and the job satisfaction level of the head coaches.

Table 6

An Example of Comparison of Satisfaction Level and the Extent of Difference between Self and Observer Ratings for the Leadership Behavior; Challenging the Process.

Difference Rating	Satisfaction Level High	Ave	Low	n
<2.0	19	39	19	77
2.0-1.0	19	38	19	76
>1.0	19	39	19	77
Total	57	116	57	230

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the association between perceived leadership behavior and subordinate job satisfaction within the relationship between athletic directors and head coaches at selected NCAA Division III, intercollegiate athletic departments. The subjects within this study were selected from thirty Midwestern private colleges all of which were members of the NCAA Division III.

There were twenty (67%) returned Leadership Practices Inventory - Self (LPI - Self) surveys which were useable. The Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (LPI – Observer) were mailed to 230 selected head coaches who work directly with the athletic directors at the institutions within the study. Seventy four (32.1%) of the LPI – Self surveys were returned in a useable form.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was mailed to each of the head coaches in order to survey their level of job satisfaction. Athletic directors did not receive the MSQ. A return of 86 (37.4%) useable surveys were received. All of which were compiled as part of the normative group in order to score and rank the results.

Scoring the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)

Scoring of the Leadership Practices Inventory was done manually as each of the surveys was received. The 30 questions on the survey were scored in 5 columns, each representing one of the 5 leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model. The total score for each column ranged from 6 to 60. Thus, each athletic director and head coach was assigned a raw score from 6 to 60 for each of the five leadership behaviors,

so the scores of the corresponding athletic director and head coaches from that institution could be matched.

Scoring the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

When the MSQ surveys were returned by mail each was checked for completeness and clearly marked with an identifying number. The 86 returned and complete surveys were then sent to Vocational Psychology Research at the University of Minnesota to be scored. Results for raw score, scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients and standard errors of measurement were calculated by Vocational Psychology Research and forwarded to the researcher. See Appendix L for Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire scoring report. This report clarifies which questions are factored into the intrinsic satisfaction scale, the extrinsic satisfaction scale and the general satisfaction scale.

The scale score statistics are noted in Appendix M. For the purpose of this study the general satisfaction scale from the MSQ - short form was used as a measure of the head coaches' job satisfaction. The mean score was 78.28, standard deviation was 10.95 and standard error of measurement was 3.44. In addition, the Hoyt reliability for this scale on this group of 86 coaches was $r = 0.902$.

Each coach's MSQ was given a raw score for each of the three satisfaction scales; intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction. The general satisfaction scale, to be used in this study, had a range of 20 to100. According to the Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, et al., 1967, p4), "It is also possible to interpret MSQ raw scores for all scales by ranking them. These rankings indicate areas of relatively greater, or lesser, satisfaction." Table 7 indicates a summary of category for job satisfaction attained from the general satisfaction scale. See Appendix N for the table of mean scores for each question and

for each of the satisfaction scales. The high satisfaction group had a general satisfaction raw score of ≥84, while the average satisfaction raw scores ranged from 83 to 73, and the low satisfaction category had raw scores ≤ 72. The high satisfaction group consisted of 29 coaches, the average satisfaction group contained 30 coaches and the low satisfaction category had 27. This stratification of the scores into three levels was done to separate respondents to the MSQ into three groups of roughly equal size.

Table 7

Summary Table for Coach's MSQ Raw Scores

General Satisfaction Category	*n*
High Satisfaction Raw Score of ≥ 84	29
Average Satisfaction Raw Score of 83 to 73	30
Low Satisfaction Raw Score of ≤ 72	27
Total	86

The tables in Appendix K give a summary of the Athletic Director self rating for leadership behavior, as scored on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI – Self) A second summary category in the Appendix K tables indicates the head coaches' rating of the leadership behavior as scored on the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI – Observer). These tables include only those coaches and athletic directors for which there were corresponding Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) scores reported. Only if an athletic director and a coach from the same institution returned a Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) would they be included in the Appendix K tables. There were 54 such matches.

An interesting perspective when analyzing the twenty questions on the MSQ short form was to review which questions had the highest mean score, thus becoming satisfaction items and which questions had the lowest mean score, thus becoming dissatisfaction items. The six lowest mean scores (Appendix M, items 13, 14, 12, 5, 19, 6) all were from the extrinsic satisfaction scale. The first three; 1) my pay and the amount of work I do, 2) the chances for advancement on this job, and 3) the way company policies are put into practice, were work environment factors. The next three items; 1) the way my boss handles his/her workers, 2) the praise I get for doing a good job, and 3) the competence of my supervisor in making decisions, were all factors associated with supervision. All of these six dissatisfiers were part of the extrinsic satisfaction scale.

The responses with the highest mean scores were from the intrinsic satisfaction scale. See Appendix M, items 9, 16, 15, 1, 11, and 7 for the mean scores. The highest mean scores indicated these factors as the greatest satisfiers. The top three satisfiers were; 1) the chance to do things for other people, 2) the chance to try my own methods of doing the job, and 3) the freedom to use my own judgment.

Null Hypothesis One

Athletic director's perceptions of leadership may appear to be different from the perceptions of leadership of the coaches if one viewed the data as paired ranked data. An application of Pearson Product-Moment correlation indicates a statistically significant correlation at the $p < .05$ level for three of the leadership behaviors and no statistically significant correlation for the other two leadership behaviors (See table 8).

Table 8

Summary of Data for Leadership Behavior Raw Scores on LPI-Self and LPI-Other

Leadership Behavior	Athletic Director Range	Mean	s.d.	Coaches Range	Mean	s.d.	*r*
Challenging the Process	54-33	44.91	5.97	57-09	33.57	13.67	0.528
Inspiring a Shared Vision	55-34	45.15	6.08	60-09	33.93	15.27	0.447
Enabling Others to Act	58-40	49.56	4.63	60-06	40.37	12.62	0.134
Modeling the Way	57-43	50.43	4.46	60-06	38.56	14.63	0.167
Encouraging the Heart	59-37	48.70	5.71	60-06	34.28	15.54	0.333

critical value for statistical significance is $r = 0.273$

The resulting *r* value (0.528) for a Pearson Product-Moment correlation for the leadership behavior, Challenging the Process, indicated a statistical significance at the $p<.05$ level. There was also statistical significance ($r = 0.447$) between the athletic director scores for the perceived leadership behavior entitled Inspiring a Shared Vision, and the head coaches' corresponding scores for the observer perceived same leadership behavior. There was no statistically significance correlation ($r = 0.134$) between the athletic director scores for the perceived leadership behavior entitled Enabling Others to Act, and the head coaches' corresponding scores for the observer perceived same leadership behavior. The fourth leadership practice within Kouzes and Posners' leadership model was Modeling the Way. And there was not a statistically significant correlation ($r = 0.167$) between the perceptions of Modeling the Way leadership behavior. The fifth of the leadership behaviors within Kouzes and Posner's leadership model was Encouraging the Heart for which there was a statistically significant correlation ($r = 0.333$) between the athletic directors' perceptions and the head coaches' perceptions of this leadership practice at the $p<.05$ level.

By taking a different perspective on this data, that is, by categorizing the raw scores into high, middle and low groupings for both the athletic director scores and the head coach scores, there resulted a positive association for four of the five leadership behaviors. Only the leadership behavior of Modeling the Way showed no statistical significance at $p < .05$. A statistical significant association exists for 4*df*, when $p < .05$ at a Chi-square critical value above 9.50. It therefore resulted in acceptance of the first null hypothesis for Modeling the Way and rejection of the hypothesis for the other four leadership behaviors. Table 9 shows the Chi-square analysis for the leadership practice of Challenging the Process. A statistically significant association ($X^2 = 30.443$ @ 4*df*, $p = < .05$) existed that the perceptions of leadership practices for the two groups will be in the similar categories of high, middle or low perception that the athletic director was practicing this leadership behavior.

Table 9

Comparison of Leadership Behavior Perception Raw Scores for Challenging the Process

AD Perceived Score	Coach Perceived Score ≥40	26-39	≤25	n
≥ 50	14	1	1	16
40 to 49	3	11	7	21
≤39	1	9	7	17
Totals	18	21	15	54

$X^2 = 30.443$ @ 4*df*, $p < .001$

Analysis of the perceptions for the leadership behavior of Inspiring a Shared Vision is shown in Table 10. The Chi-square analysis for the leadership practice of Inspiring a Shared Vision resulted in a statistically significant association ($X^2 = 9.758$ @ 4*df*, $p < .05$) for the

perceptions of leadership practices for each group within the similar categories of high, middle or low perception that the athletic director is practicing this leadership behavior.

Table 10

Comparison of Leadership Behavior Perception Raw Scores for Inspiring a Shared Vision

AD Perceived Score	Coach Perceived Score ≥46	24-45	≤23	n
≥ 49	10	6	2	18
42 to 48	6	5	9	20
≤41	2	7	7	16
Totals	18	18	18	54

$X^2 = 9.758$ @ 4*df*, $.01 > p < .05$

Chi-square analysis of the perceptions for the leadership behavior of Enabling Others to Act is shown in Table 11. The Chi-square analysis for the leadership practice of Enabling Others to Act, resulted in a statistically significant association ($X^2 = 10.444$ @ 4*df*, $p < .05$) for the perceptions of leadership practices for each group within the similar categories of high, middle or low perception that the athletic director is practicing this leadership behavior.

Analysis of the perceptions for the leadership behavior of Modeling the Way is shown in Table 12. The Chi-square analysis for the leadership practice of Modeling the Way did not result in a statistically significant association ($X^2 = 9.067$ @ 4*df*, $p > .05$) for the perceptions of leadership practices for each group within the similar categories of high, middle or low perception that the athletic director is practicing this leadership behavior.

Table 11

Comparison of Leadership Behavior Perception Raw Scores for Enabling Others to Act

AD Perceived Score	Coach Perceived Score >48	34-47	≤33	n
≥ 53	7	6	6	19
48 to 52	4	9	1	14
≤47	9	3	9	21
Totals	20	18	16	54

$X^2 = 10.444$ @ 4*df*, .01 > p < .05

Table 12

Comparison of Leadership Behavior Perception Raw Scores for Modeling the Way

AD Perceived Score	Coach Perceived Score ≥49	32-48	≤31	n
≥ 52	11	8	3	22
47 to 51	2	4	8	14
≤46	5	5	8	18
Totals	18	17	19	54

$X^2 = 9.067$ @ 4*df*, ns

The Chi-square analysis for the leadership practice of Encouraging the Heart (Table 13) resulted in a statistically significant association ($X^2 = 9.633$ @ 4*df*, p = < .05) for the perceptions of leadership practices for each group within the similar categories of high, middle or low perception that the athletic director is practicing this leadership behavior.

Table 14 summarizes Chi-square values for null-hypothesis one regarding the association of perceptions of leadership behavior by the two groups. The Chi-square

Table 13

Comparison of Leadership Behavior Perception Raw Scores for Encouraging the Heart

AD Perceived Score	Coach Perceived Score ≥46	28-45	≤27	n
≥ 52	10	6	2	18
47 to 51	3	8	10	21
≤46	4	5	6	15
Totals	17	19	18	54

$X^2 = 9.632$ @ 4*df*, .01 > p < .05

Table 14

Summary of Chi-square Values for Null-hypothesis One

Leadership Behavior	Chi-square value
Challenging the Process	30.44
Inspiring a Share Vision	9.76
Enabling Others to Act	10.44
Modeling the Way	9.07
Encouraging the Heart	9.63

Chi-square critical value is ≥ 9.50, at 4df, p < .05

values indicated a statistically significant association between the athletic directors' perceptions and the head coaches' perceptions when considered in categories of high, medium or low exhibition of the leadership behavior. There was no statistically significant association for the leadership behavior of Modeling the Way.

Null Hypothesis Two

Null hypothesis two stated that there was no statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and the self-perceived athletic director's leadership behavior for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

This grouping of athletic directors and head coaches was determined by matching the coaches who returned a MSQ survey with their athletic director who returned an LPI – Self survey. Thereby, creating a match between the athletic director's self-perceived score for the leadership behavior and the subordinate's (head coach) job satisfaction rating. There were 63 combinations which fit this description. LPI rank score categories were determined by selecting scores which divided the total into three groups of approximately equal size. This was done separately for each of the five leadership practices.

The first of the leadership practices was Challenging the Process. Results from Table 15 indicated no statistically significant association ($X^2 = 7.5479$ @ $4df$, $p > .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the athletic directors' perception of the leadership behavior, challenging the process. Chi-square critical values needed to be greater than 9.50 for statistical significance at $4df$ when $p < .05$ for each of the leadership behaviors.

The second of the leadership practices was Inspiring a Shared Vision. Results from Table 16 indicated an association which was not statistically significant ($X^2 = 4.4058$ @ $4df$, $p > 05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the athletic directors' perception of the leadership behavior, Inspiring a Shared Vision.

The third of the leadership practices, Enabling Others to Act. Results from Table 17 indicated there was not a statistically significant level of association ($X^2 = 5.3260$ @ $4df$, $p >$

.05) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the athletic directors' perception of the leadership behavior, Enabling Others to Act.

Table 15

Distribution of Athletic Director Perception Score of Leadership Behavior to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Challenging the Process.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 50	9	4	3	16
49 to 40	7	11	9	27
≤ 39	4	6	10	20
n	20	21	22	63

$X^2 = 7.5479$ @ 4*df*, ns

Table 16

Distribution of Athletic Director Perception Score of Leadership Behavior to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Inspiring a Shared Vision.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 49	9	9	4	22
48 to 43	6	7	9	22
≤ 42	5	5	9	19
n	20	21	22	63

$X^2 = 4.4058$ @ 4*df*, ns

Table 17

Distribution of Athletic Director Perception Score of Leadership Behavior to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Enabling Others to Act.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 52	7	11	7	25
51 to 48	3	5	8	16
≤ 47	10	5	7	22
n	20	21	22	63

$X^2 = 5.3260$ @ 4*df*, ns

Results (Table 18) for the fourth of the leadership practices, Modeling the Way indicated no statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 3.8408$ @ 4*df*, $p > .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the athletic directors' perception of the leadership behavior, Modeling the Way.

Table 18

Distribution of Athletic Director Perception Score of Leadership Behavior to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Modeling the Way.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 53	10	5	8	23
52 to 48	6	9	6	21
≤ 47	4	7	8	19
n	20	21	22	63

$\chi^2 = 3.8408$ @ 4*df*, ns

Table 19 shows results for the fifth of the leadership practices, Encouraging the Heart, indicated no statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 7.6892$ @ $4df$, $p > .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the athletic directors' perception of the leadership behavior, Encouraging the Heart.

Table 19

Distribution of Athletic Director Perception Score of Leadership Behavior to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Encouraging the Heart.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 51	10	6	6	22
50 to 47	4	12	8	24
≤ 46	6	3	8	17
n	20	21	22	63

$\chi^2 = 7.6892$ @ $4df$, ns

None of the Chi-square values (Table 20) were statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level. This resulted in the acceptance of the second null hypothesis. That is, there will be no significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and the athletic director's self-perception of leadership behavior for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Table 20 indicates a summary of Chi-square values for null-hypothesis two regarding the association of the athletic directors' perception of leadership behavior and the head coaches' job satisfaction levels. The Chi-square values indicated a statistically nonsignificant

association between the athletic directors' perceptions of leadership behavior and the head coaches' job satisfaction.

Table 20

Summary of Chi-square Values for Null-hypothesis Two

Leadership Behavior	X^2 value
Challenging the Process	7.55
Inspiring a Share Vision	4.41
Enabling Others to Act	5.33
Modeling the Way	3.84
Encouraging the Heart	7.69

Chi-square critical value is ≥ 9.50, at $4df$, $p < .05$

Null Hypothesis Three

The third null hypothesis within this study stated there was no statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and the athletic director's leadership behavior as perceived by the subordinate for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

This grouping of athletic directors and head coaches was determined by matching the job satisfaction for those coaches who returned a MSQ survey and an LPI – Observer survey relative to their relationship with their respective athletic director. There were 74 such combinations considered for this hypothesis. Each of the five leadership practices was then considered.

Results (Table 21) for the first of the leadership practices, Challenging the Process, between head coaches' job satisfaction and the head coach's perception of the athletic

director's leadership behavior, indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 25.1278$ @4*df*, $p < .05$). Chi-square critical values needed to be greater than 9.50 for statistical significance at 4*df* when $p < .05$. This is the critical value for analysis of each of the leadership behaviors considered in null hypothesis three.

Table 21

Distribution of Coaches' Perception Score for Leadership Behavior of the Athletic Director to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Challenging the Process.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 41	18	4	3	25
40 to 27	6	12	9	27
≤ 26	2	8	12	22
n	26	24	24	74

$\chi^2 = 25.1278$ @4*df*, $p < .001$

The second of the leadership practices was Inspiring a Shared Vision. Results from Table 22 indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 24.7548$ @ 4*df*, $p < .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the head coach's perception of the athletic director's leadership behavior.

The third of the leadership practices was Enabling Others to Act. Results from Table 23 indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 12.0758$ @ 4*df*, $p < .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the head coach's perception of the athletic director's leadership behavior, Enabling Others to Act.

Table 22

Distribution of Coaches' Perception Score for Leadership Behavior of the Athletic Director to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Inspiring a Shared Vision.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 45	16	5	3	24
44 to 26	8	12	6	26
≤ 25	2	7	15	24
n	26	24	24	74

$\chi^2 = 24.7548$ @ 4*df*, $p < .001$

Table 23

Distribution of Coaches' Perception Score for Leadership Behavior of the Athletic Director to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Enabling Others to Act.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 49	14	6	3	23
48 to 35	8	9	9	26
≤ 34	4	9	12	25
n	26	24	24	74

$\chi^2 = 12.0758$ @ 4*df*, $.01 > p < .05$

The fourth of the leadership practices, Modeling the Way had results (Table 24) that indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 31.1942$ @ 4*df*, $p < .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the head coach's perception of the athletic director's leadership behavior.

Table 24

Distribution of Coaches' Perception Score for Leadership Behavior of the Athletic Director to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Modeling the Way.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 49	17	4	3	24
48 to 33	8	12	5	25
≤ 32	1	8	16	25
n	26	24	24	74

$\chi^2 = 31.1942$ @ 4*df*, p = < .001

Results from Table 25 for the fifth of the leadership practices, Encouraging the Heart, indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 30.4061$ @ 4*df*, $p < .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the head coach's perception of the athletic director's leadership behavior, Encouraging the Heart.

Table 25

Distribution of Coaches' Perception Score for Leadership Behavior of the Athletic Director to Head Coach Job Satisfaction Rating for Encouraging the Heart.

LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≥ 43	18	3	3	24
42 to 29	6	13	7	26
≤ 28	2	8	14	24
n	26	24	24	74

$\chi^2 = 30.4061$ @ 4*df*, $p < .001$

All of the Chi-square values (Table 26) were statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level. This resulted in the rejection of the third null hypothesis. That is, there will be no significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction and the athletic director's leadership behavior as perceived by the subordinate for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Table 26 indicates a summary of Chi-square values for null-hypothesis three regarding the association of the head coaches' perception of the leadership behavior and the head coaches' job satisfaction levels. The Chi-square values indicated a statistically significant association between the head coaches' perceptions of the leadership behavior and the head coaches' job satisfaction.

Table 26

Summary of Chi-square Values for Null-hypothesis Three

Leadership Behavior	Chi-square value
Challenging the Process	25.13
Inspiring a Share Vision	24.75
Enabling Others to Act	12.08
Modeling the Way	31.19
Encouraging the Heart	30.41

Chi-square critical value is ≥ 9.50, at $4df$, $p < .05$

Null Hypothesis Four

Null hypothesis four proposes that there will be no statistically significant association between the subordinate's job satisfaction level and the extent of agreement between the self-perceived leadership behavior of athletic directors and the subordinate's perception of

leadership for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model. This group was compiled by matching those coaches who returned both the LPI – Observer survey and the MSQ survey, with their respective athletic director who returned an LPI – Self survey. There were 54 such combinations and these combination scores are noted in Appendix K. The difference score for perception of the leadership behavior was determined by subtracting the head coach's raw score from the athletic director's raw score for the selected leadership behavior.

The extent of agreement for the leadership practice of challenging the process (see Appendix K) ranged from a negative nine (-9) to a positive thirty-six (36). Any negative difference score indicated the head coach had a higher perceived score for that leadership practice than did the athletic director. This was taken as an indication of strong agreement by the head coach that the athletic director was exhibiting the particular leadership practice. For the purpose of this study, the smaller the number, even into negative numbers, indicated a greater agreement. A larger positive number indicated less agreement of the perception of the given leadership practice. Grouping of difference ranked scores was by choosing the lowest third, middle third and highest third for each leadership behavior. The range for each of the five leadership practices varied.

Results from Table 27 indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 14.116$ @ $4df$, $p < .05$) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the extent of difference for the perception of the leadership practice Challenging the Process between the head coaches and athletic directors. Chi-square critical values needed to be greater than 9.50 for statistical significance at $4df$ when $p < .05$. This is the critical value for analysis of each of the leadership behaviors considered in null hypothesis four.

Table 27

Distribution of Coaches' Job Satisfaction Rating to the Extent of Perception Difference Score for Challenging the Process.

Difference LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≤ 7	11	4	4	19
8 to 18	6	5	7	18
≥ 19	0	8	9	17
n	17	17	20	54

$\chi^2 = 14.116$ @ 4*df*, .001 > p < .01

Results from Table 28 indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 15.228$ @ 4*df*, p < .05) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the extent of difference for the perception of the leadership practice Inspiring a Shared Vision between the head coaches and athletic directors.

Results from Table 29 indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 23.312$ @ 4*df*, p = < .05) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the extent of difference for the perception of the leadership practice Enabling Others to Act between the head coaches and athletic directors.

Results from Table 30 indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 18.423$ @ 4*df*, p < .05) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the extent of difference for the perception of the leadership practice Modeling the Way between the head coaches and athletic directors.

Table 28

Distribution of Coaches' Job Satisfaction Rating to the Extent of Perception Difference Score for Inspiring a Shared Vision.

Difference LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≤ 4	10	4	3	17
5 to 17	7	6	6	19
≥ 18	0	7	11	18
n	17	17	20	54

$\chi^2 = 15.228$ @ 4*df*, .001 > p < .01

Table 29

Distribution of Coaches' Job Satisfaction Rating to the Extent of Perception Difference Score for Enabling Others to Act.

Difference LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≤ 3	13	4	1	18
4 to 14	3	7	8	18
≥ 15	1	6	11	18
n	17	17	20	54

$\chi^2 = 23.312$ @ 4*df*, p < .001

Results from Table 31 indicated a statistically significant association ($\chi^2 = 18.759$ @ 4*df*, p < .05) between head coaches' job satisfaction and the extent of difference for the

perception of the leadership practice Encouraging the Heart between the head coaches and athletic directors.

Table 30

Distribution of Coaches' Job Satisfaction Rating to the Extent of Perception Difference Score for Modeling the Way.

Difference LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≤ 3	11	5	2	18
4 to 20	6	6	6	18
≥ 21	0	6	12	18
n	17	17	20	54

$\chi^2 = 18.423$ @ 4*df*, $.001 > p < .01$

Table 31

Distribution of Coaches' Job Satisfaction Rating to the Extent of Perception Difference Score for Encouraging the Heart.

Difference LPI Rank Score	Job Satisfaction Rating High	Average	Low	Totals
≤ 5	12	3	3	18
6 to 23	5	6	7	18
≥ 24	0	8	10	18
n	17	17	20	54

$\chi^2 = 18.759$ @ 4*df*, $p < .001$

All of the Chi-square values (Table 32) were statistically significant at the $p<.05$ level. This resulted in the rejection of the fourth null hypothesis. That is, there will be no significant association between the subordinate's job satisfaction level and the extent of agreement between the self-perceived leadership behavior of athletic directors and the subordinate's perception of leadership for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model.

Table 32 indicated a summary of Chi-square values for null-hypothesis four regarding the association of the extent of agreement between head coaches' and athletic directors' perceptions of the leadership behavior and the head coaches' job satisfaction levels. The Chi-square values indicated a statistically significant association between the extent of agreement of the perceptions of the leadership behavior and the head coaches' job satisfaction.

Table 32

Summary of Chi-square Values for Null-hypothesis Four

Leadership Behavior	Chi-square value
Challenging the Process	14.12
Inspiring a Share Vision	15.23
Enabling Others to Act	23.31
Modeling the Way	18.42
Encouraging the Heart	18.76

Chi-square critical value is ≥ 9.50, at $4df$, $p < .05$

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The debate over selection processes of athletic directors is fundamental to the development of this leadership research problem in sports. It has been noted that sport management often has been staffed by those who have entered athletic administration through the player, coach, manager route. Thus the sport manager is assumed to have the 'jock' mentality. Reinforcing this 'jock' mentality perception and a normative career pattern have been such typical practices as promoting a retired coach to athletic director regardless of aptitude or training (Williams and Miller, 1983). The common assumption has been that participation in the player-coach dyad, including leader-follower experiences, prepares coaches with successful leadership behaviors applicable to the administrator-coach relationship. This researcher contends this is a false assumption suggesting leadership preparation for an athletic director can be accomplished through the above suggested career pattern.

Cuneen (1992) found the traditional route to administrative responsibility within sport had been through service in the coaching network. In a study of leadership in NCAA Division III institutions, Armstrong (1993) suggested it is possible the athletic director does not know how to be a leader. He/She may have been chosen for his/her outstanding coaching record or longevity of service.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived leadership behavior and subordinate job satisfaction. This relationship was examined

between athletic directors and head coaches within selected NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletic departments.

The first null-hypothesis suggested there would be no statistically significant correlation between the athletic director's perception score and the subordinate's perception score for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model. This null-hypothesis was rejected for the leadership behaviors of, 1) Challenging the Process, 2) Inspiring a Shared Vision, and 3) Encouraging the Heart. There was then a resulting acceptance of the research hypothesis that there was a statistically significant correlation for these three leadership behaviors. The first null-hypothesis was accepted for the leadership behaviors of Enabling Others to Act and Modeling the Way because there was no statistically significant correlation for these leadership behaviors. Correlation values (Table 8) supported this conclusion.

The second null-hypothesis stated there was no statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction level and the self-perceived athletic director's leadership behavior for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model. Chi-square analysis (Table 20) revealed no statistically significant association for any of the five leadership behaviors. Therefore the null-hypothesis was accepted for each leadership behavior.

Null-hypothesis number three proposed there was no statistically significant association between the level of subordinate's job satisfaction level and the athletic director's leadership behavior as perceived by the subordinate for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model. Chi-square analysis (Table 26) revealed there was a statistically significant association, for all five leadership behaviors, between the

head coaches' perception of leadership behaviors and the head coaches' job satisfaction level. Therefore, the research hypothesis that would propound a statistically significant association would exist was thus accepted.

The final null-hypothesis suggested there was no statistically significant association between the subordinate's job satisfaction level and the extent of agreement between the self-perceived leadership behavior of the athletic director and the subordinate's perception of leadership for any of the five leadership behaviors within the Kouzes and Posner leadership model. The null-hypothesis was rejected because Chi-square analysis (Table 32) indicated a statistically significant association for all five leadership behaviors. The alternative research hypothesis was thus accepted.

Discussion

The demographic information gathered for this group of subjects, i.e., the athletic directors, appeared to coincide with the literature's suggested career pattern. Seventeen (85%) of the athletic directors within this study participated as a college level student athlete and 85% also served as college coaches before becoming athletic administrators. This follows the player, coach, manager career pattern often noted for athletic administration.

Additionally, only three (15%) of the athletic directors within the study self-reported academic degrees related to any administrative discipline. Assuming academic programs for administration are where the topic of leadership would be presented within formal education, there was a dearth of formal leadership training within this group of administrators. Again, reinforcing the idea of leadership training dependent on experiences within extra-curricular activities, as suggested by Clark and Clark (1990).

Leadership behavior may be viewed differently by coaches and athletic administrators. This can result in some misconceptions about what degree of each leadership behavior that may be displayed by the administrator. There did not appear to be a direct linear relationship between the assessment of leadership behavior for the athletic directors and the head coaches for all the five leadership behavior categories. Correlation coefficients ranged from $r = 0.528$ for Challenging the Process to $r = 0.134$ for Enabling Others to Act. This might be regarded as disagreement of how coaches and athletic administrators view the demonstration of some of these five leadership behaviors.

However, if one categorized the assessments into a high, medium and low assessment of the leadership behavior, a greater agreement results. There appeared to be a statistically significant association for Challenging the Process ($\chi^2 = 30.443$). There was a less, yet still statistically significant association for leadership behaviors of Inspiring a Shared Vision ($\chi^2 = 9.758$), Enabling Others to Act ($\chi^2 = 10.444$) and Encouraging the Heart ($\chi^2 = 9.632$). While there was not a significant association for the leadership behavior of Modeling the Way ($\chi^2 = 9.067$). Critical value for Chi-square was significant at $\chi^2 \geq 9.50$ for $4df$, $p < .05$.

Head coaches and athletic administrators appeared to have similar groupings of what constitutes these behaviors but were missing a direct relationship. This may have been the result of different expectations between the athletic directors and the head coaches for the leadership behaviors, suggesting the athletic directors could become more attuned to the perceptions of their coaching staff. To sit in the director's chair and assume the coaching staff has similar ideas of leadership because they arrived through the same career pattern may not be accurate.

Leadership behavior and job satisfaction has a long research association. A positive relationship between considerate-supportive leadership behavior and subordinate satisfaction has been continuously noted (Soucie, 1994; Snyder, 1990; Butler & Cantrell, 1997; Yusof, 1998). Job satisfaction has been shown to be positively related to subordinates' high job performance, low job turnover, low absenteeism, and high productivity. Athletic directors who are more transformational, exhibiting considerate leadership behavior, will make a significant difference in terms of their organization's performance and effectiveness (Yusof, 1998).

The results of this study agreed with the literature when considering the head coaches' perceptions of leadership as an accurate assessment of supervisory leadership. Yet, the association between athletic directors' perceptions of their leadership behavior and head coaches' job satisfaction was not statistically significant. When considering how the athletic directors perceived their leadership behavior there was no statistically significant association with the coaches' job satisfaction for any of the five leadership behaviors. Thus, athletic directors need to be cautious about believing their coaching staff to have high job satisfaction if the athletic director perceives a positive display of considerate leadership behavior. What the athletic director believes they are doing for leadership may not have a meaningful association to the coaches' job satisfaction.

A much more confident position may be taken when connecting the leadership behavior perceptions of the head coaches to their job satisfaction. There were statistically significant levels of association for all five leadership behaviors as perceived by head coaches with those coaches' job satisfaction. Chi-square results (Table 26) ranged from a

high of $\chi^2 = 31.194$ for Modeling the Way to a low of $\chi^2 = 12.076$ for Enabling Others to Act. Chi-square critical value was significant at $\chi^2 \geq 9.50$ for $4df$, $p < .05$.

Thus athletic directors would be encouraged to become more aware of what their coaching staffs think about their leadership behavior. This could be done through formal and informal assessment methods, but could, be an important tool for knowing the pulse of a satisfied, peak performing coaching staff.

Another consideration within this study was to find the association of head coaches' job satisfaction to the extent of perceived agreement between athletic directors and head coaches of the athletic director's leadership behavior. Results indicated that the greater the difference between how the athletic director and the head coach perceived the leadership behavior, toward the coaches' perceived disagreement, the less likely there would be higher job satisfaction.

There was a significant association between job satisfaction and the extent of perceived difference for each of the five leadership behaviors. The Chi-square values ranged from a high of $\chi^2 = 23.312$ for Enabling Others to Act to a low of $\chi^2 = 14.116$ for Challenging the Process. Again Chi-square critical value was significant at $\chi^2 \geq 9.50$ for $4df$, $p < .05$.

Caution must be taken when trying to consider causation of the perceived agreement. Yet, there has been some attention given to self versus other assessments (Hater & Bass, 1988; Kolb, 1995; Singer & Beardsley, 1990; Lane & Harriot, 1990). Self-rates perceived themselves as engaging in a greater frequency of desirable behaviors than do outside sources assessing the same behaviors. This difference in perception may be considered important since member perceptions may be the perceptions that are related to organizational outcomes (Kolb, 1995). Lane and Harriot (1990) concluded that accuracy in the assessment of one's

own abilities should not be expected, since such assessment may serve a self-enhancing function.

Again, athletic directors could be advised to be in touch with the perceptions of their coaching staff regarding the assessment of leadership behavior. Results of this study indicated an association between the extent of agreement of perceived leadership behavior and the coaches' job satisfaction.

A review of the questions on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) revealed interesting results. Consideration of job satisfiers and dissatisfiers was not part of the original study design, but looking at each item on the MSQ and its possible influence on perceived job satisfaction may add to the association between job satisfaction and the head coach's perceived leadership behavior of the athletic director. Of the six most often noted dissatisfiers (Appendix M, items 13, 14, 12, 5, 19, 6), all were from the extrinsic satisfaction scale. The first three; 1) My pay and the amount of work I do, 2) The chances for advancement on this job, and 3) The way company policies are put into practice all are factors within the work environment. The next three items were all directly related to supervision; 1) The way my boss handles his/her workers, 2) The praise I get for doing a good job, and 3) The competence of my supervisor in making decisions. Though further study about this pattern needs to be conducted, there appeared to be a pattern of items that may influence the level of job satisfaction for head coaches, namely, factors attributed to extrinsic satisfaction such as supervisory leadership behavior.

Possibly, job satisfaction contains two separate and independent dimensions as suggested by Tietjen and Myers (1998). Maybe the opposite of job satisfaction is not dissatisfaction, but rather a simple lack of satisfaction. Connecting the three dissatisfiers

within this study dealing with supervisory leadership behavior to this idea, could result in a relationship of removing dissatisfiers through different leadership behavior to the point of having no job dissatisfaction.

Waitley (1998, p14) proposed that employee satisfaction is powered by the working environment. The working environment is powered by management stewardship which is powered by invisible leadership. And, invisible leadership is exercising the vision to change the role from commander to coach, from manager to mentor, from director to delegator – from one who demands respect to one who facilitates self-respect. A kick in the pants, transactional leadership, gets the job done. However, it affects no lasting positive change within the subordinate (Tietjen and Myers, 1998). There is a need for increased considerate behavior, an aspect of transformational leadership, which has the potential for positively affecting satisfaction.

Recommendations

Many athletic administrators attain the position by coming through a career pattern from player to assistant coach to head coach to athletic director. Leadership training through the coaching ranks, or within the coach-player dyad, is thought to emphasize a more autocratic style. Results of this study indicated a positive association between job satisfaction of head coaches and the coaches' perception of five leadership behaviors associated with transformational leadership. Working from a premise that higher job satisfaction is a component of better job performance and greater organizational effectiveness, an athletic director should then become more aware of their coaches' perception of the leadership behavior. If leadership behavior can be taught as proposed by Kouzes and Posner (1987) and Clark and Clark (1990) then becoming more proficient in transformational leadership

behavior by an athletic director could lead to greater job satisfaction, commitment and performance on the part of the coaching staff. Or, at least, result in a reduction of job dissatisfaction.

1) It is a recommendation of the researcher that athletic directors within the Division III level of intercollegiate athletics attune themselves with what their coaching staff perceives about their leadership behavior. This will be a more accurate assessment of the association between leadership and head coaches' job satisfaction then their self-perception.

2) In addition, it is recommended that athletic directors avail themselves of the occasions to get leadership training within the professional development opportunities offered by their institutions.

3) Furthermore, as institutions of higher learning at the Division III level of intercollegiate athletics select an athletic administrator, it is recommended the selection process include substantial consideration of leadership behavior of the appointee. Results of this study support the position of strong transformational leadership behavior as being associated with higher job satisfaction. And, in agreement with the literature, high job satisfaction is a component of greater organizational effectiveness. Therefore, effectiveness of the athletic department can be influenced by the leadership behavior of the athletic administrator as perceived by the coaching staff members.

4) Further study needs to be conducted regarding the directional causation within the association of leadership and job satisfaction. The influence of high levels of coaches' job satisfaction, intrinsic and/or extrinsic satisfaction, may affect perception of leadership behavior. Rather than to depend on an assumption of a directional causation of leadership behavior to job satisfaction, the opposite direction may also result. In other words, would

coaches with high intrinsic satisfaction perceive leadership behavior more favorably? Or, is the influence of the perceived leadership behavior the cause of job satisfaction?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin (CCIW)
Membership (8)

Augustana College
Carthage College
Elmhurst College
Illinois Wesleyan University
Millikin University
North Central College
North Park College
Wheaton College

Lake Michigan Conference (LMC)
Membership (7)

Concordia University
Edgewood College
Lakeland College
Maranatha Baptist Bible College
Marian College
Milwaukee School of Engineering
Wisconsin Lutheran College

Midwest Conference
Membership (10)

Beloit College
Carroll College
Grinnell College
Illinois College
Knox College
Lake Forest College
Lawrence University
Monmouth College
Ripon College
St. Norbert College

Northern Illinois – Iowa Conference
Membership (5)

Aurora University
Benedictine University
Concordia University
Eureka College
Rockford College

APPENDIX B

JAMES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

Your Name:_____

INSTRUCTIONS

Write your name in the blank above. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each carefully. Then look at the rating scale and decide *how frequently you engage 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 you *actually* engage in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you *typically* behave—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. *Make sure that you write your name on the response sheet in the blank marked "Your Name."* Transfer your responses and return the response sheet according to the instructions provided.

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

APPENDIX B

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.

APPENDIX B

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.

APPENDIX B

ISBN: 0-7879-0971-8

Printed in the United States of America

Published by:

Jossey-Bass Pfeiffer
350 Sansome Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104-1342
(415) 433-1740; Fax (415) 433-0499
(800) 274-4434; Fax (800) 569-0443

Visit our website at: http://www.pfeiffer.com

Outside of the United States, Pfeiffer products can be purchased from the following Simon & Schuster International Offices:

Prentice Hall Canada
PTR Division
1870 Birchmount Road
Scarborough, Ontario M1P 2J7
Canada
(800) 567-3800; Fax (800) 263-7733

Simon & Schuster (Asia) Pte Ltd
317 Alexandra Road
#04-01 IKEA Building
Singapore 159965
Asia
65 476 4688; Fax 65 378 0370

Prentice Hall
Campus 400
Maylands Avenue
Hemel Hempstead
Hertfordshire HP2 7EZ
United Kingdom
44(0) 1442 881891; Fax 44(0) 1442 882288

Prentice Hall Professional
Locked Bag 531
Frenchs Forest PO NSW 2068
Australia
61 2 9454 2200; Fax 61 2 9453 0089

Prentice Hall/Pfeiffer
P.O. Box 1636
Randburg 2125
South Africa
27 11 781 0780; Fax 27 11 781 0781

Printing 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3

This instrument is printed on acid-free, recycled stock that meets or exceeds the minimum GPO and EPA requirements for recycled paper.

APPENDIX C

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.

APPENDIX C

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.

APPENDIX C

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.

APPENDIX C

ISBN: 0–7879–0972–6

Printed in the United States of America

Published by:

Jossey-Bass Pfeiffer
350 Sansome Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104-1342
(415) 433-1740; Fax (415) 433-0499
(800) 274-4434; Fax (800) 569-0443

Visit our website at: http://www.pfeiffer.com

Printing 10 9 8 7 6 5

This instrument is printed on acid-free, recycled stock that meets or exceeds the minimum GPO and EPA requirements for recycled paper.

APPENDIX D

minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

(short-form)

SAMPLE

Vocational Psychology Research

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Campus

Department of Psychology
College of Liberal Arts

Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344
612-625-2818
Fax: 612-626-2079

January 19, 2001

William Kuchler
Lakeland College
P.O.Box 359
Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359

Dear William Kuchler:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 short version for use in your research.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research

APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF HEAD COACHES AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS

This profile is part of a study of the leadership behavior of athletic directors and the job satisfaction of head coaches in selected Midwestern NCAA Division III athletic conferences.

Please carefully complete the following by circling the correct response or filling in the blank for the appropriate response and mail it in the return envelope provided:

1. Age <26 26-30 31-35 36-40 41-45 46-50 51-55 56-60 >60

2. Gender Female_____Male _____

3. Highest degree completed Associate_____Bachelors_____

Masters_____Doctorate_____Other_____

4. Graduate degree major:_____

5. Did you participate in a varsity intercollegiate sport as a college athlete? YES NO

6. Total number of years as a head coach _____

7. Total number of years in athletic administration _____

8. Are you currently employed as an Athletic Director? YES NO

9. Are you currently employed as a Head Coach? YES NO

10. Are you a full-time employee at your institution?_____ Part-time employee at your institution?_____

11. How many years have you completed in your current position? _____

APPENDIX F

EXPERT PANEL FOR DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE REVIEW

Dr. Keith Striggow
Division Chair for General Studies
Lakeland College
P.O. Box 359
Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359

Dr. Sherrie Akinsanya
Division Chair for Education
Lakeland College
P.O. Box 359
Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359

Dr. G. Anthony Peffer
Dvision Chair for Social Science
Lakeland College
P.O. Box 359
Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359

Dr. Michael Devaney
Division Chair for Natural Science
Lakeland College
P.O. Box 359
Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359

APPENDIX G

January, 2001

Athletic Administrator
Conference Commissioner
College
Street
City, State, Zip

Dear Commissioners;

In an attempt to add insight and understanding to division III, private college athletics I am conducting research, as part of my doctoral studies, in the area of administrative leadership. I have spent 22 years within private colleges in the Midwest serving in many capacities for the betterment of the intercollegiate experience.

I am asking for your assistance and endorsement of this study utilizing the four conferences; Midwest Conference, College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, the Northern Illinois – Iowa Conference, and the Lake Michigan Conference as representative of private, division III institutions. The study will focus on the association between the self-perceived and observer perceived leadership behavior of the respective athletic administrators. These perceptions will then be matched with a measurement of head coaches' job satisfaction to see if there is any relationship.

Satisfaction with supervision is one element of organizational effectiveness, a positive outcome that each of our institutions continually addresses. It is my hope that the data collected from this study may provide needed feedback encouraging athletic administrators to seek greater understanding of leadership practices and to become more innovative, experimental and communicative with their respective coaching staff in that it can encourage feedback on applied leadership behavior.

Within the next week I plan to call you to discuss any questions you may have and again ask for your endorsement and support within your intercollegiate conference. In a most practical sense, the inclusion of data from the institutions in each of these conferences will enhance the value of this study. Be assured complete confidentiality will be maintained regarding all aspects of the study.

Respectfully,

William J. Kuchler
Assistant Professor of Exercise Science and Sport Studies
Lakeland College
Doctoral Candidate, United States Sports Academy

APPENDIX H
Introductory Letter to Athletic Directors

January, 2001

John or Jane Doe
Athletic Director
Midwest Private College
1000 College Ave.
University Town, USA 54321

Dear Athletic Director;

In an attempt to add insight and understanding to division III, private college athletics I am conducting research, as part of my doctoral studies, in the area of administrative leadership. I have spent 22 years of my professional life within private colleges in the Midwest serving in many capacities for the betterment of the intercollegiate experience.

Within the next week you will be receiving a research inventory seeking information about your perceived leadership behaviors. This study is unique to division III, private college athletic programs and your participation is most highly valued. Please note the enclosed letter of encouragement and endorsement from the conference commissioner from your athletic conference.

In addition, eight head coaches at your institution identified from the Blue Book of College Athletics will receive inventories seeking information about their perceptions of leadership behavior and about their job satisfaction. Please encourage these coaches to complete and return the inventories.

Since the study focuses on division III, private college athletic programs it is paramount that the data is as complete as possible. This study can add to the, much needed, research focused on this level of intercollegiate athletics. Your valuable input will add to the validity of the study.

It is my hope that the data collected from this study may provide needed feedback encouraging athletic administrators to seek greater understanding of leadership practices and to become more innovative, experimental and communicative with their respective coaching staff in that it can encourage feedback on applied leadership behavior.

Be assured complete confidentiality will be maintained regarding all aspects of the study.

Respectfully,

William J. Kuchler
Assistant Professor of Exercise Science and Sport Studies
Lakeland College
Doctoral Candidate, United States Sports Academy

APPENDIX I
Letter to Athletic Directors

January 1, 2001

Dear Athletic Director,

You are receiving this survey from a colleague who is conducting research about the leadership behavior of athletic directors and head coaches' job satisfaction. This research is being conducted with athletic directors and head coaches at the NCAA division III level specifically at institutions in the Lake Michigan Conference, the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, the Northern Illinois – Iowa Conference, and the Midwest Collegiate Conference.

Your participation in this research is important. Please complete the enclosed LPI inventory and a brief demographic profile. The inventory and profile are quite short and will require only a few minutes of your time.

Your response will be confidential. By returning the LPI inventory, and demographic profile, you will be consenting to the use of your information in the study. Please return your responses in the enclosed self-addressed and stamped envelope as soon as possible. I also ask for your assistance in encouraging the head coaches at your institution who are receiving material for this study to complete and return it as quickly as possible. The more material completed and submitted from your institution, the more complete the study will be.

The data collected will be used for a doctoral dissertation in sport management from the United States Sports Academy, Daphne, Alabama. This study is under the supervision of Dr. Cynthia Ryder, Director of Doctoral Studies. Your participation in this research is essential to the success of the study and to the understanding of leadership at division III athletic departments.

Thank you for your cooperation. Your assistance is very much appreciated! If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please direct your inquires to me at Lakeland College, PO Box 359, Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359, (920)565-1239 (office), or e-mail to: kuchlerw@lakeland.edu

Respectfully,

William J. Kuchler
Assistant Professor of Exercise Science and Sport Studies
Lakeland College
Doctoral Candidate, United States Sports Academy

APPENDIX J
Letter to Head Coaches

January 1, 2001

Dear Head Coach,

You are receiving this survey from a colleague who is conducting research about the leadership behavior of athletic directors and head coaches' job satisfaction. This research is being conducted with athletic directors and head coaches at the NCAA division III level specifically at institutions in the Lake Michigan Conference, the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin, the Northern Illinois – Iowa Conference, and the Midwest Collegiate Conference.

Your participation in this research is important. Please complete the enclosed LPI inventory, a brief demographic profile, and the MSQ. The inventories and profile are quite short and will require only a few minutes of your time.

Your response will be confidential. By returning the LPI and MSQ inventories, and demographic profile, you will be consenting to the use of your information in the study. Please return your responses in the enclosed self-addressed and stamped envelope as soon as possible. The more material completed and submitted from your institution, the more complete the study will be.

The data collected will be used for an doctoral dissertation in sport management from the United States Sports Academy, Daphne, Alabama. This study is under the supervision of Dr. Cynthia Ryder, Director of Doctoral Studies. Your participation in this research is essential to the success of the study and to the understanding of leadership at division III athletic departments.

Thank you for your cooperation. Your assistance is very much appreciated! If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please direct your inquires to me at Lakeland College, PO Box 359, Sheboygan, WI 53082-0359, (920)565-1239 (office), or e-mail to: kuchlerw@lakeland.edu

Respectfully,

William J. Kuchler
Assistant Professor of Exercise Science and Sport Studies
Lakeland College
Doctoral Candidate, United States Sports Academy

APPENDIX K

Leadership Behavior Raw Score Comparison Between Athletic Directors and Head Coaches for each of Five Leadership Behaviors

Table 1

Leadership Behavior Raw Score Comparison for Challenging the Process

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
1020-22	50	57	-7	H
1020-27	50	56	-6	H
1020-28	50	56	-6	H
760-762	53	55	-2	A
1060-61	52	55	-3	H
1060-68	52	53	-1	H
540-546	45	53	-8	H
750-753	47	52	-5	H
1020-24	50	49	1	A
1060-66	52	48	4	L
740-743	46	48	-2	H
1060-67	52	47	5	H
1030-38	38	47	-9	H
760-761	53	46	7	L
760-768	53	45	8	A
720-725	54	43	11	H
720-726	54	43	11	H
1060-63	52	43	9	H
810-817	47	38	9	H
740-745	46	38	8	A
1080-83	33	38	-5	L
1030-35	38	37	1	H
750-754	47	35	12	L
1050-53	39	35	4	L
1050-57	39	35	4	A
1070-77	37	34	3	A
1010-15	39	31	8	A
710-715	44	30	14	H
710-718	44	30	14	H
720-722	54	29	25	L
750-751	47	28	19	A
810-811	47	28	19	A
860-864	40	28	12	A
1010-17	39	28	11	A
820-823	49	27	22	L

(table continued)

APPENDIX K

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
540-541	45	27	18	L
860-866	40	27	13	L
830-835	39	27	12	L
730-735	38	27	11	L
810-816	47	25	22	A
1050-55	39	25	14	L
820-827	49	22	27	L
860-863	40	22	18	L
860-862	40	20	20	A
1010-12	39	20	19	L
720-721	54	18	36	A
730-736	38	18	20	L
520-521	45	16	29	L
730-738	38	14	24	L
1070-75	37	14	23	L
520-525	45	13	32	A
730-732	38	13	25	A
710-714	44	11	33	L
730-731	38	09	29	A
Mean =	44.907	33.574		
Std. Dev. =	5.969	13.672		
$r = 0.528$				

Table 2

Leadership Behavior Raw Score Comparison for Inspiring a Shared Vision

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
1060-61	55	60	-5	H
760-762	53	57	-4	A
1020-28	47	57	-10	H
750-753	49	56	-7	H
1020-22	47	56	-9	H
1020-27	47	56	-9	H
1060-63	55	53	2	H
540-546	39	53	-14	H
810-817	49	50	-1	H
760-761	53	48	5	L
1020-24	47	48	-1	A
1060-66	55	47	8	L

(table continued)

APPENDIX K

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
720-726	53	47	6	H
740-743	44	47	-3	H
1060-68	55	46	9	H
760-768	53	46	7	A
740-745	44	46	-2	A
1030-35	41	46	-5	H
1060-67	55	45	10	H
1030-38	41	45	-4	H
729-725	53	43	10	H
540-541	39	42	-3	L
1080-83	39	41	-2	L
750-754	49	37	12	L
1010-17	34	37	-3	A
860-863	43	35	8	L
860-866	43	35	8	L
1050-57	40	35	5	A
750-751	49	32	17	A
810-816	49	28	21	A
710-715	44	28	16	H
860-864	43	28	15	A
1070-77	35	28	7	A
710-718	44	27	17	H
810-811	49	26	23	A
1050-53	40	24	16	L
730-735	43	23	20	L
860-862	43	23	20	A
1010-15	34	23	11	A
830-835	38	22	16	L
820-823	46	21	25	L
730-732	43	20	23	A
820-827	46	19	27	L
720-722	53	17	36	L
520-525	41	16	25	A
720-721	53	15	38	A
1050-55	40	15	25	L
1070-75	35	15	20	L
1010-12	34	14	20	L
730-736	43	13	30	L
520-521	41	13	28	L
730-731	43	10	33	A
710-714	44	09	35	L

(table continued)

APPENDIX K

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
730-738	43	09	34	L
Mean =	45.148	33.926		
Std Dev. =	6.082	15.270		
$r = 0.447$				

Table 3

Leadership Behavior Raw Score Comparison for Enabling Others to Act

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
1060-61	47	60	-13	H
760-762	58	58	0	A
750-753	53	58	-5	H
1030-38	57	56	1	H
810-817	50	56	-6	H
1060-63	47	56	-9	H
540-546	50	55	-5	H
740-743	45	55	-10	H
1030-35	57	54	3	H
1060-66	47	53	-6	L
760-768	58	52	6	A
1050-57	48	52	-4	A
1020-28	40	52	-12	H
760-761	58	51	7	L
1010-17	49	50	-1	A
1060-68	47	49	-2	H
1020-27	40	49	-9	H
720-726	54	48	6	H
1060-67	47	48	-1	H
1020-24	40	48	-8	A
720-725	54	47	7	H
1070-77	53	47	6	A
750-754	53	47	6	L
810-811	50	45	5	A
1010-15	49	45	4	A
1020-22	40	45	-5	H
750-751	53	44	9	A
1080-83	57	42	15	L
1050-55	48	40	8	L
1050-53	48	38	10	L

(table continued)

APPENDIX K

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
540-541	50	37	13	L
820-827	51	36	15	L
1010-12	49	35	14	L
860-864	53	34	19	A
830-835	48	34	14	L
520-521	47	34	13	L
740-745	45	34	11	A
520-525	47	33	14	A
710-715	46	33	13	H
720-721	54	32	22	A
810-816	50	32	18	A
710-718	46	30	16	H
720-722	54	29	25	L
730-732	46	29	17	A
860-863	53	26	27	L
860-862	53	24	29	A
730-735	46	24	22	L
730-736	46	23	23	L
1070-75	53	22	31	L
860-866	53	21	32	L
730-731	46	21	25	A
710-714	46	16	30	L
730-738	46	06	40	L
Mean =	49.556	40.370		
Std Dev =	4.628	12.618		
$r = 0.134$				

Table 4

Leadership Behavior Raw Score Comparison for Modeling the Way

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
1060-61	53	60	-7	H
1020-28	43	59	-16	H
760-762	56	57	-1	A
750-753	52	57	-5	H
1060-63	53	56	-3	H
1020-27	43	56	-13	H
540-546	53	55	-2	H
1030-35	56	53	3	H
1060-68	53	53	0	H

(table continued)

APPENDIX K

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
810-817	48	53	-5	H
1080-83	53	52	1	L
740-743	47	52	-5	H
1020-22	43	52	-9	H
760-761	56	51	5	L
1060-66	53	49	4	L
1060-67	53	49	4	H
1050-57	43	49	-6	A
740-745	47	48	-1	A
1020-24	43	48	-5	A
1030-38	56	47	9	H
1010-15	53	47	6	A
720-725	57	46	11	H
540-541	53	46	7	L
1010-17	53	44	9	A
760-768	56	43	13	A
1050-53	43	42	1	L
710-715	51	41	10	H
1070-77	44	41	3	A
750-751	52	39	13	A
710-718	51	39	12	H
720-721	57	36	21	A
730-735	47	34	13	L
1010-12	53	32	21	L
810-811	48	32	16	A
750-754	52	31	21	L
710-714	51	31	20	L
720-722	57	30	27	L
1050-55	43	30	13	L
810-816	48	29	19	A
820-827	55	26	29	L
730-732	47	26	21	A
820-823	55	25	30	L
830-835	49	25	24	L
860-862	52	23	29	A
860-864	52	21	31	A
520-521	47	20	27	L
860-863	52	18	34	L
730-736	47	18	29	L
860-866	52	17	35	L
520-525	47	17	30	A

(table continued)

APPENDIX K

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
730-731	47	11	36	A
1070-75	44	08	36	L
730-738	47	06	41	L
Mean =	50.426	38.556		
Std Dev. =	4.462	14.630		
$r = 0.167$				

Table 5

Leadership Behavior Raw Score Comparison for Encouraging the Heart

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
1060-61	54	60	-6	H
540-546	40	59	-19	H
760-762	59	58	1	A
750-753	50	55	-5	H
1030-38	54	54	0	H
760-761	59	53	6	L
1060-63	54	53	1	H
1060-68	54	52	2	H
740-743	47	52	-5	H
1060-66	54	51	3	L
1020-28	42	51	-9	H
720-726	57	49	8	H
1060-67	54	49	5	H
1080-83	44	49	-5	L
1030-35	54	48	6	H
1020-22	42	48	-6	H
1010-15	50	46	4	A
720-725	57	43	14	H
1020-24	42	42	0	A
1020-27	42	42	0	H
760-768	59	41	18	A
750-751	50	39	11	A
1010-17	50	38	12	A
1070-77	47	38	09	A
750-754	50	37	13	L
1050-57	44	37	7	A
540-541	40	37	3	L
720-722	57	35	22	L

(table continued)

APPENDIX K

AD/Coach Number	AD Score	Coach Score	Difference	Job Sat. Rating
740-745	47	34	13	A
710-718	37	34	3	H
810-817	48	33	15	H
860-866	52	31	21	L
720-721	57	30	27	A
1010-12	50	29	21	L
860-862	52	28	24	A
830-835	51	28	23	L
860-863	52	24	28	L
810-811	48	23	25	A
1050-53	44	23	21	L
820-823	47	21	26	L
520-521	46	21	25	L
730-735	47	19	28	L
520-525	46	19	27	A
1050-55	44	19	25	L
710-715	37	18	19	H
860-864	52	17	35	A
1070-75	47	17	30	L
820-827	47	16	31	L
730-736	47	12	35	L
710-714	37	12	25	L
810-816	48	09	39	A
730-731	47	06	41	A
730-732	47	06	41	A
730-738	47	06	41	L
Mean =	48.704	34.278		
Std. Dev. =	5.709	15.539		

$r = 0.333$

APPENDIX L

MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(SHORT FORM)

Scoring Report

The following abbreviations are used:

Abbreviation	Scale	Scale Item Numbers					
IN	Intrinsic	1	2	3	4	7	8
	Satisfaction	9	10	11	15	16	20
EX	Extrinsic	5	6	12	13	14	19
	Satisfaction						
GS	General	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Satisfaction	7	8	9	10	11	12
		13	14	15	16	17	18
						19	20

An upper limit of blank (or misanswered) items has been specified. If the number of blank items is exceeded, the individual is eliminated from the scoring run. Blank responses that do not exceed the limit are set equal to the mean of the individual's other responses for that scale. These new item values are used tin determining scale statistics as well as the individual's scale scores.

IN has a limit of 2, EX a limit of 1, and GS a limit of 3 blank items per individual.

VOCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APPENDIX M

MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (Short Form)
Scale Score Statistics

Number of examinees = 86

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Hoyt Reliability	Standard Error of Measurement
IN	51.290	5.672	0.8440	2.240
EX	19.523	5.240	0.8512	2.022
GS	78.278	10.951	0.9016	3.435

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	4.419	0.659
2	4.313	0.691
3	4.360	0.684
4	3.930	0.851
5	3.291	1.273
6	3.488	1.290
7	4.360	0.853
8	4.070	1.071
9	4.547	0.567
10	3.814	0.695
11	4.395	0.724
12	3.256	0.945
13	2.860	1.170
14	3.163	1.083
15	4.430	0.744
16	4.500	0.732
17	3.570	1.000
18	3.895	0.970
19	3.465	1.124
20	4.151	0.940

VOCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

APPENDIX N

MSQ Scale Scores by Individual

Satisfaction Category Raw Scores

Identification Code for Individuals	General Satisfaction	Intrinsic Satisfaction	Extrinsic Satisfaction
511	80	52	21
521	70	45	15
525	74	46	19
532	85	56	20
534	64	44	12
535	59	43	10
541	71	45	19
546	95	59	27
553	79	52	19
554	77	54	17
555	91	59	24
714	66	46	14
715	89	58	23
716	68	46	16
718	84	58	18
721	74	47	20
722	70	46	17
725	87	56	21
726	88	56	23
731	75	58	10
732	78	50	20
735	65	47	13
736	69	54	10
738	53	42	06
743	87	55	25
745	78	52	20
751	76	48	20
752	82	50	25
753	90	56	25
754	72	49	17
755	82	55	19
756	80	50	22
757	87	54	25
761	68	44	18
762	82	52	24
768	77	55	19

(table continued)

APPENDIX N

Satisfaction Category Raw Scores

Identification Code for Individuals	General Satisfaction	Intrinsic Satisfaction	Extrinsic Satisfaction
774	97	59	28
777	95	56	29
811	76	49	21
816	75	55	14
817	96	59	27
823	58	40	14
827	66	47	12
831	93	59	24
835	72	50	15
843	99	60	29
851	83	56	21
854	92	55	28
861	74	50	17
862	83	54	21
863	48	34	09
864	74	50	15
866	72	50	14
872	73	48	18
875	68	48	16
877	84	54	24
882	72	51	12
884	78	52	17
888	78	52	19
1012	64	44	16
1015	77	49	20
1017	73	50	16
1022	88	55	27
1024	79	48	23
1027	90	57	23
1028	89	55	25
1032	90	57	24
1035	94	59	25
1038	93	60	25
1044	64	42	15
1048	75	48	20
1053	64	39	16
1055	69	47	16
1057	74	48	18
1058	70	44	18

(table continued)

APPENDIX N

Satisfaction Category Raw Scores

Identification Code for Individuals	General Satisfaction	Intrinsic Satisfaction	Extrinsic Satisfaction
1061	93	58	26
1063	84	56	20
1066	71	44	21
1067	86	56	24
1068	96	57	29
1075	67	51	10
1077	73	47	19
1083	69	45	18
1093	99	59	30
1094	90	60	17
1097	73	47	17

REFERENCES

Armstrong-Doherty, A.J. (1995). Athletic directors' perceptions of environmental control over interuniversity athletics. Sociology of Sport Journal, 12, 75-95.

Armstrong, S. (1993). A study of transformational leadership of athletic directors and head coaches in selected NCAA Division III colleges and universities in the Midwest. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, (11), 3811A.

Austin, D. (1975). Perceptions and needs of athletic directors. Athletic Administration, 10, 15-16.

Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership. (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Beazley, Chris (Ed.) (2000). The blue book of college athletics for senior, junior and community colleges. The 2000-2001 edition. Montgomery, AL: Athletic Publishing Company.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders – The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Branch, D. Jr. (1990). Athletic director leader behavior as a predictor of intercollegiate athletic organizational effectiveness. Journal of Sport Management, 4, 161-173.

Brungardt, C. (1996). The making of leaders: A review of the research in leadership development and education. The Journal of Leadership Studies, 3, 3, 81-95.

Bruning, J. L. & Kintz, B.L. (1997). Computational Handbook of Statistics (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

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

Butler, J. K. & Cantrell, R. S. (1997). Effects of perceived leadership behaviors on job satisfaction and productivity. Psychology Reports, 80, 976,978.

Cawthon, D. L. (1996). Leadership: The great man theory revisited. Business Horizons, 39, 3.

Chelladurai, P. (1980). Leadership in sports organizations. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Science, 5, 4, 226-231.

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

Chelladurai, P., & Carron, A. V. (1983). Athletic Maturity and preferred leadership. Journal of Sport Management, 5, 371-380.

Chelladurai, P. (1987). Multidimensionality and multiple perspectives of organizational effectiveness. Journal of Sport Management, 1, 37-47.

Chelladurai, P. (1990). Leadership. In Robert Singer, Milledge Murphey, & L. Keith Tennant (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Sport Psychology (pp647-671). New York; McMillan.

Chelladurai, P., & Haggerty, T.R. (1991). Measures of organizational effectiveness of canadian national sport organizations. Canadian Journal of Sport Science, 16, 2, 126-133.

Clark, K. E., & Clark, M. B. (1990). What is a leader? What is leadership? In K.E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), Measures of Leadership (pp. 30-34). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Cuneen, J. (1992). Graduate-level professional preparation for athletic directors. Journal of Sport Management, 6, 15-26.

Doherty, A. J. (1997). The effect of leader characteristics on the perceived transformational/transactional leadership and impact of interuniversity athletic administrators. Journal of Sport Management, 11, 275-285.

Doherty, A.J., & Danylchuk, K.E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. Journal of Sport Management, 10, 292-309.

Drucker, P. (1996). Not enough generals were killed! Forbes, 157, 104.

Fiedler, F. E. (1986). The contribution of cognitive resources and leader behavior to organizational performance. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 16, 6, 532-548.

Fitzgeral, M. P., Sagaria, M. A. D., and Nelson, B. (1994). Career patterns of athletic directors: Challenging the conventional wisdom. Journal of Sport Management, 8, 14-26.

Gordon, J. R. (1995). Organizational behavior: A diagnostic approach. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 4, 695-702.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1988). Management of organizational behavior. (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22, 375-403.

Kirkpatrick, W. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? Academy of Management Executive, 5, 2, 48-59.

Kolb, J. A. (1995). Leader behaviors affecting team performance: Similarities and differences between leader/member assessments. Journal of Business Communication, 32, 3, 233-249.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1997). Leadership practices inventory: Facilitator's guide. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

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

Kushell, E. & Newton, R. (1986). Gender, leadership style, and subordinate satisfaction: An experiment. Sex Roles, 14, 3-4, 203-209.

Lane, J., & Herriot, P. (1990). Self-ratings, supervisor ratings, positions and performance. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 63, 77+.

Lim, J. Y. & Cromartie, F. (2001). Transformational leadership, organizational culture and organizational effectiveness in sport organizations. The Sport Journal, 4, 9.

Linam, K. R. (1999). Leadership styles of collegiate athletic directors and head coaches' satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States Sports Academy, Mobile, Alabama.

Medley, F. & Larochell, D. R. (1995). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction. Nursing Management, 26, 9, 64-69.

Ouchi, W. G. & Price, R. L. (1993). Hierarchies, clans, and theory Z: A new perspective on organizational development. Organizational Dynamics, 22, 4, 62-71.

Packard, S. H. and Kauppi, D. R. (1999). Rehabilitation agency leadership style: Impact on subordinates' job satisfaction. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 43, 1, 5-12.

Pasternak, C. (1994). Work satisfaction linked to manager. HR Magazine, 39, 5, 27.

Quarterman, J. (1992). Characteristics of athletic directors of historically black colleges and universities. Journal of Sport Management, 6, 52-63.

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

Schliesman, E. S. (1984). Relationship between the congruence of preferred and actual leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with leadership. Journal of Sport Behavior, 10, 3, 157-166.

Singer, M.S., & Beardsley, C. (1990). Attributions about effective leadership and perceptions of actual leader behavior: A comparison between managers and subordinates. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 5, 3, 115-122.

Slack, Trevor (1997). Leadership and sport organizations. In Trevor Slack (Ed.), Understanding Sport Organizations: The Application of Organizational Theory (pp 287-307). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Slack, Trevor (1996). From the locker room to the board room: Changing the domain of sport management. Journal of Sport Management, 10, 97-105.

Snyder, C.J. (1990). The effects of leader behavior and organizational climate on intercollegiate coaches' job satisfaction. Journal of Sport Management, 4, 59-70.

Soucie, D. (1994). Effective managerial leadership in sport organizations. Journal of Sport Management, 8, 1-13.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. The Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.

Tietjen, M. A. & Myers, R. M. (1998). Motivation and job satisfaction. Management Decision, 36, 4, 226-231.

Van Seters, D., & Field, R. (1990). The evolution of leadership theory. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 3, 29-45.

Waitley, Denis, (1998). Relationship power. Executive Excellence, 15, 6, 14.

Wallace, M. & Weese, W. J. (1995). Leadership, organizational culture, and job satisfaction in Canadian YMCA organizations. Journal of Sport Management, 9, 182-193.

Weese, W.J. (1996). Do leadership and organizational culture really matter? Journal of Sport Management, 10, 197-206.

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H., (1977). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Work Adjustment Project, Industrial Relations Center; University of Minnesota.

Williams, J. M., & Miller, D. M. (1983). Intercollegiate athletic administration: Preparation patterns. Research Quarterly, 54, 4, 398-406.

Yandrick, R.M. (1997). Help employees reach for the stars. HR Magazine, 42, 1, 96-101.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. Journal of Management, 15, 2, 251-289.

Yusof, A. (1998). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors and coaches' job satisfaction. Journal of Sport Research, Early Winter, 170-174.

RESUME

William John Kuchler
1024 Main Avenue
Sheboygan, WI 53083

Ed. D. in Sport Management, July 2001
United States Sports Academy
Daphne, Alabama

MS Degree in Education
University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

BS Degree in Physical Education
Carroll College
Waukesha, Wisconsin

1988 to Present: Lakeland College, Sheboygan, Wisconsin
Coordinator of Exercise Science and Sport Studies Program
Tenured Assistant Professor in Sports Management
Men's Golf Coach, 9 years; Men's Basketball Coach, 4 years; Athletic Director, 3 years
Baseball Coach, 1 year; Men's Soccer Coach, 1 year

1985 to 1988: Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa
Athletic Director, 2 years; Men's Basketball Coach, 3 years

1981 to 1985: Mount Senario College, Ladysmith, Wisconsin
Chair and Assistant Professor in Physical Education; Athletic Director, 3years
Men's Basketball Coach, 4 years; Women's Basketball Coach, 1 year

1979 to 1980: Hamilton Basketball Association, Hamilton, New Zealand
Director of Coaching, 2 seasons

1976 to 1979: Carroll College, Waukesha, Wisconsin
Assistant Basketball Coach; Admissions Representative

Prior to 1976 Teacher: Physical Education Grades 1-8
YMCA Physical Director and Youth Director

Administrative, Committee and Event Vitae:
Member of NLCAA National Executive Committee, 1985 – 1988
Member of NAIA District 14 Executive Committee, 1993 – 1994
Lake Michigan Conference Women's Basketball Chair, 1991 – 1992
Lake Michigan Conference Golf Chair, 1992 – 1993
NAIA District 14 Golf Chair, 1992 – 1994
Director for NAIA District Golf Tournament, 1993
Director for LMC Conference Golf Tournament, 1994, 1999 & 2000
LMC "Coach of the Year" for Men's Golf, 1999