

2013

Perceptions of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction in a Sample of High School Athletic Directors in the United States

Colin J. Turey
University of North Florida

Suggested Citation

Turey, Colin J., "Perceptions of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction in a Sample of High School Athletic Directors in the United States" (2013). *UNF Theses and Dissertations*. 459.
<http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/459>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 2013 All Rights Reserved

Perceptions of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction in a Sample of High
School Athletic Directors in the United States

by

Colin J. Turey

A dissertation submitted to the Department of Educational Leadership
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorate of Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

August, 2013

Copyright by
Colin J. Turey
2013

Dedication

Dedicated to all of those who have influenced my life: my wife, Kara, my mother, my father, my friends from cohort 13, specifically a lifelong friend Rick Kane, and all of the other people who have supported me throughout this journey.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my wife, Kara, and daughter, Kennedy. Without their continued support this study would not have been possible.

I am indebted to Dr. Larry Daniel (chair of my committee) for all of his teachings over these past few years. Without his sharing of knowledge and encouragement I would not have been able to continue the pursuit of my doctorate.

Lastly, I would like to thank my remaining committee members: Drs. Joel Beam, Jennifer Kane, and Newton Jackson. Your commitment to ensuring that I continue the pursuit of a lifelong dream is appreciated beyond words.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Abstract.....	x
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Research Variables.....	5
Statement and Significance of the Problem.....	9
Purpose of the Study	10
Limitations of the Study.....	11
Assumptions.....	11
Definition of Terms and Variables.....	12
Organization of the Study.....	13
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature.....	14
Leadership Defined.....	14
Leadership Theories.....	17
Athletic Director Roles and Responsibilities.....	27
Leadership Research in Sport Management.....	35
Transformational, Transactional, Passive/Avoidant and Job Satisfaction...	39
Conceptual Framework.....	44
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.....	46
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.....	47
Summary.....	49
Chapter 3: Methods and Procedures.....	50
Research Questions.....	50
Research Design.....	51

Sample.....	53
Instrumentation.....	53
Data Collection.....	56
Variables.....	58
Data Analysis.....	59
Conclusion.....	61
Chapter 4: Results.....	63
Descriptive Statistics.....	64
Canonical Correlation Analysis.....	65
Canonical Commonality Analysis.....	71
Answers to the Research Questions.....	77
Summary.....	81
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	82
Discussion Relative to the Research Questions.....	85
Research Question 1.....	85
Research Question 2.....	87
Research Question 3.....	88
Research Question 4.....	89
Research Question 5.....	89
Research Question 6.....	90
Research Question 7.....	91
Research Question 8.....	92
Discussion Relative to Previous Research and Theoretical Literature.....	93
Recommendations for Practice and Research.....	97
Conclusion.....	101

Appendix A. Email – Pre-Notification.....	103
Appendix B. Email – Study Invitation.....	104
Appendix C. Email – Follow-Up.....	105
Appendix D. Web Survey MSQ Permission.....	106
Appendix E. Web Survey MLQ Permission.....	107
Appendix F. IRB Approval.....	109
Appendix G. MLQ Sample Instrument.....	110
Appendix H. MSQ Sample Instrument.....	113

List of Tables

Table 1. Porter-O'Grady and Malloch's Eight Leadership Theories with..... Descriptions	19
Table 2. Selected Studies Supporting Validity and Reliability of MSQ..... Short Form Scores	55
Table 3. Selected Studies Supporting Validity and Reliability of MLQ..... Scores	56
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for MLQ and MSQ Scores.....	64
Table 5. Bivariate Correlations for MLQ and MSQ Subscales.....	65
Table 6. Eigenvalues and Canonical Correlations.....	66
Table 7. Dimension Reduction Analysis.....	67
Table 8. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Dependent Variables.....	67
Table 9. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Dependent Variables.....	67
Table 10. Correlations Between Dependent and Canonical Variables..... (Canonical Structure Coefficients)	68
Table 11. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables.....	70
Table 12. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables.....	70
Table 13. Correlations Between Predictor and Canonical Variables..... (Canonical Structure Coefficients)	70
Table 14. Regression Analysis Using All Predictors.....	73
Table 15. Regression Analysis Using Transactional and..... Transformational as Predictors	73
Table 16. Regression Analysis Using Transformational and..... Passive/Avoidant as Predictors	73
Table 17. Regression Analysis Using Transactional and..... Passive/Avoidant as Predictors	74

Table 18. Regression Analysis Using Only Transformational as a..... Predictor	74
Table 19. Regression Analysis Using Only Transactional as a Predictor	74
Table 20. Regression Analysis Using Only Passive /Avoidant as a..... Predictor	75
Table 21. Prediction of the Dependent Composite Scores Using..... Alternative Predictor Variable Combinations	76
Table 22. Commonality Matrix.....	77

ABSTRACT

The present study examined how athletic directors perceive their leadership roles in interscholastic athletics and the relationship of their leadership styles to their job satisfaction. The conceptual framework of this study was Bass and Avolio's (1994) *full range leadership model*, also known as the transformational-transactional leadership model, which consists of 9 factors—5 transformational behaviors: idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration; 2 transactional behaviors: contingent reward and management-by-exception (active); 2 passive/avoidant behaviors: management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire. These 9 factors are measured by the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The study was also informed by Chelladurai's multidimensional model of leadership in sport which focuses on transformational effects of sport leaders on individual satisfaction and group performance. The study was significant in that the effects of transformational leadership on individuals in sporting organizations have not been fully explored in previous research.

Both the MLQ and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) served as data collection tools. A sample of 500 athletic directors from across the United States was invited to participate in an electronic survey. Usable data were returned by 55 (11%) of the original sample. Participants self-assessed their leadership styles via the MLQ and job satisfaction via the MSQ. Data were

analyzed via canonical correlation analysis followed by canonical commonality analysis. One canonical root was interpreted ($R_c^2 = .22$; $p < .05$). Canonical structure coefficients indicated that Transformational and Passive/Avoidant Leadership made major contributions to the predictor canonical variate; the dependent canonical variate was defined by both Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction. Canonical commonality analysis indicated that Transformational Leadership had the largest unique variance partition; the largest common variance partition was shared by Transformational and Passive/Avoidant. The analysis also indicated two variable suppressor effects. There was a moderate correlation between athletic directors' leadership styles and their job satisfaction; however, the directionality of the relationships of the variables in the leadership set with satisfaction was unexpected: (a) the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction was found to be negative, and (b) the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership and job satisfaction was positive.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Over the past few decades, research regarding high school athletic director perceptions of leadership styles and job satisfaction has been limited. Young, Edmonson, and Slate (2010) stated that research reviewing specific leadership styles of high school athletic directors is almost nonexistent. Seefeldt, Ewing, and Walk (1993, p. 7) have defined interscholastic youth sports programs as “the organized interschool sports participation of boys and girls at the middle, junior high, and senior high school levels.” Seefeldt et al. noted further that interscholastic sports, governed in the United States by the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS) as well as 50 state associations plus the District of Columbia, represent over 10 million student athletes. The main focus of the NFHS is “to provide rules, regulations, policies and guidelines” (p. 7) for all athletic directors to follow in order to implement a successful interscholastic program. High school educators and sports managers (e.g., athletic directors) are continually challenged with combining their expertise with a view toward providing programs that concentrate on meeting stated objectives.

High school athletic programs are frequently a major part of community identity, and Graves (2010) noted that major political and fiscal decisions, including decisions about school closures and mergers, are often tied to a community’s attitudes about their high school athletic programs. Moreover, despite the conflicts that sometimes occur between athletic programs and the

academic mission of high schools, a body of research supports the notion that participation in high school sports is positively related to student academic success and decision to attend college (e.g., Dagaz, 2012; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Phillips & Schafer, 1971; Rehberg & Schafer, 1968).

Read (2000) noted that because of the large number of students who are involved in athletics and the increasing abundance of duties under athletic directors' control, interscholastic athletic directors must exercise numerous leadership behaviors effectively. Further, with increase in the number of students participating in high school sports, the role of the athletic director will likely become more significant. Recent statistics show that student membership in the National Federation for High School Sports for the 2005-2006 school year rose by 141,195 over the total members in 2004-2005 to 7,159,904, and over half (53.5%) of students enrolled in high schools in 2005-2006 participated in athletics (Kanaby, 2006).

The need for athletic directors to possess strong leadership skills is evidenced by the large number of student athletes participating in competition across the nation. Athletic directors must exhibit leadership styles that create a positive climate within their athletic departments and must effectively clarify objectives of their athletic programs to school staff and the public (Barnhill, 1998; Stewart, 2008). Yusof (2002) argued that athletic directors' transformational leadership behaviors should directly affect their coaches' job satisfaction. Additionally, Kim (2009) addressed the importance of transformational and

transactional leadership behaviors of NCAA Division II athletic directors as perceived by their coaches. These previous studies present a valid framework justifying studies of leadership and perception of satisfaction among athletic directors.

Bolman and Deal (2003) stated that a good leader must possess the qualities of vision, commitment, and strength. Good leaders must also be able to make decisions effectively. In fact, Owens (2001) described decision making as “the heart of the organization and administration” (p. 264). Athletic directors must make decisions on a daily basis and must be able to represent the best interests of their student athletes and the school’s administration when making those decisions.

The demand for increasing excellence in athletics within educational organizations is yet another reason to focus on the importance of athletic directors’ leadership (Jensen & Overman, 2003). Indeed, as Kent and Chelladurai (2001) have noted, coaches, their staff, and athletes represent the operating or technical core of the [sporting] enterprise (Chelladurai, 1985; Mintzberg, 1979). The efficiency and effectiveness of the operating core is largely dependent on the managerial elements that support the operating core and shield it from environmental turbulence.” (p. 139)

Additionally, Kent and Chelladurai (2001) noted that athletic directors must effectively manage resources. Resource management includes making budget assessments, setting standards for sportsmanship, facilitating the education of

student athletes, and determining which coaches to hire to lead each sports team.

The athletic director's role in the decision making process is very stressful, and a lot of pressure arises from various external sources (Coy & Masterson, 2007; Hoch, 2000; Judge & Judge, 2009; Martin, Kelley, & Eklund, 1999; Ryska, 2002). Judge and Judge (2009, p. 39) noted that the interscholastic athletic director, facing constant deadlines from local and state organizations and daily interactions with staff, superiors, athletes, parents, and the community, is constantly subjected to sources of stress. According to Carter and Cunningham (1997), these sources of stress include demands from specific policies and from special interest groups; increasing intervention and accountability from federal, state, and local governments; increased public expectations of schools and school athletics; and specific social and economic problems in the community. Samier (2002) argued that, in response to these sources of pressure, leaders must actively engage in solving problems to continue effective organizational functioning.

The following portions of Chapter One will break down transformational leadership, transactional leadership, passive/avoidant leadership and job satisfaction into sub-categories.

Research Variables

Transformational Leadership

Over the past two decades, researchers have devoted an increasing level of attention to the variable of transformational leadership. Yukl (1989) posited that transformational leaders bring changes in the attitudes and behaviors of organizational members and induce commitment toward the organization's mission and goals. Transformational leadership has been deemed as especially important in fields focused on service to the public (Wright, Moynihan, & Pandey, 2012). Armstrong-Doherty (1995) noted that sports administrators should have an ability to motivate organizational members to accomplish higher goals and to voluntarily step forward to take extra roles for the organization in today's consistently changing and complicated environment in sports. Although it is common to regard transformational leadership as simply leader charisma (a leadership trait identified as significant at least as early as Weber, 1947), Bass (1985) stated that transformational leadership theory investigates the leadership behaviors that generate significant organizational outcomes, such as increased expectations, strengthened motives to achieve, and improved overall performance. Bass (1999) also claimed that transformational leadership has a positive impact on followers' job satisfaction even though transactional leadership alone cannot result in job satisfaction.

Researchers have shown that transformational leaders enhance followers' commitment to the organization as well as loyalty of the followers within that

organization (Bass, 1999). Doherty and Danylchuck (1996) found that the transformational leadership of athletic directors in Canadian universities was positively related to coaches' satisfaction and to extra effort displayed by the coaches. Geist (2001) investigated NCAA Division II athletic directors' perceptions of transformational leadership and found that the athletic directors assessed superiors' transformational leadership more favorably than middle managers assessed the directors' leadership. In the same vein, Geist found a statistically significant difference between middle managers and athletic directors' perceived opinions about their own transformational leadership, with directors' perceptions being more favorable.

Transactional Leadership

Many times, transactional leadership is viewed as an exchange process in which the leader provides rewards to followers in the form of pay or prestige in exchange for work done by the follower (Burns, 1978). Also referred to as "contingent reward leadership, transactional leadership is considered to be both an active and positive exchange between the leader and follower" (Brymer & Gray, 2006, p. 14). According to Burns (1978), transactional leaders motivate subordinates by providing rewards which appeal to the subordinates' self-interests. This observation is supported by Cleveland (1985) who stated that leaders often promote a new idea or initiative only after a large number of constituents already favor it. Cleveland (1985) further stated that leadership then is not simply a matter of what a leader does but of what occurs in a relationship.

Likewise, Burns (1978) argued that any relationship based on self-interest that exists between the leader and subordinate in transactional leadership is not permanent considering that the leader and the follower are not united together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose. Moreover, Bolman and Deal (2003) asserted that it is commonplace to equate leadership with position, but this viewpoint inappropriately relegates all those in the “lowerarchy” to the passive role of follower (p. 338).

Passive/Avoidant Leadership

Bass and Avolio (1995) stated that, leadership may also take the form of passive or avoidant “management-by-exception” in which the leader intervenes with subordinates’ work or behaviors only when things go wrong. As Densten and Gray (1998) have illustrated, management-by-exception can be studied both quantitatively and qualitatively. Although Bass and Avolio (1995) maintained that management-by-exception may be systematic and transactional in nature, the passive form of management-by-exception is more reactive and lacks consistency of approach within similar situations. Passive leaders tend to avoid specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing goals and standards to be met by followers. Passive/avoidant leadership is similar in style to laissez-faire leadership, which, according to Bass (1985), is considered to be “no leadership.” Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, and Asland (2007) even suggested that passive/avoidant, laissez-faire leadership may be destructive in

nature, resulting in workplace stressors, bullying tendencies, and various forms of psychological distress.

Job Satisfaction

House and Wigdor (1967) stated that job satisfaction is a function of the perceived characteristics of a job in relation to an individual's frame of reference.

Smith and Kendall (1963) noted that job satisfaction is not an absolute phenomenon but rather is relative to the alternatives available to the individual.

Locke (1976) noted that one's level of job satisfaction is a factor of the discrepancy between one's intended and one's actual performance.

Consequently, job satisfaction is often regarded as being directly related to worker productivity (Shikdar & Das, 2003). The few extant studies conducted on job satisfaction in sport settings by authors such as Pruijn and Boucher (1995), Wallace and Weese (1995), and Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) have yielded conflicting results and shown little support for the impact of transformational leadership behaviors on subordinates' outcome behaviors and attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, commitment, and performance). However, Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) examined the relationship between coaches' job satisfaction and the leadership behaviors of athletic directors at several Ontario universities and discovered that coaches' job satisfaction, perceived leadership effectiveness, and extra effort were positively impacted by the transformational leadership behaviors of their athletic directors. Reflecting on these and other related studies, Yusof (1998) observed that the conflicting findings obtained from transformational

leadership studies conducted in sport settings suggest that more research is needed to test this theory in sport settings.

Statement and Significance of the Problem

The present study investigated high school athletic directors' self reported leadership styles and the extent to which these styles are related to job satisfaction. Specifically, the leadership styles investigated in the present study were Transformational, Transactional, and Passive/Avoidant as measured by the subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Additionally, the subscales of Extrinsic Motivation and Intrinsic Motivation were measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Vocational Psychology Research, 2002). According to Lowe, Kroeck, and Silvasubramaniam (1996), transformational leaders become a source of inspiration to others through their commitment to those who work with them, their perseverance to a mission, their willingness to take risks, and their strong desire to achieve. Chelladurai (2007) noted that transformational leadership's influences on individuals in sporting organizations have not been fully captured by researchers. Thus, it is important to assess high school athletic directors' own knowledge regarding which leadership styles are most necessary to their success and most highly related to the high school athletic director's job satisfaction.

Bass and Riggio (2006) observed that whereas transformational leaders develop and grow their followers' leadership capabilities primarily by listening to their individual needs, empowering them, and matching their goals and

objectives with an organizational vision, transactional leaders tend to lead primarily through social exchange (e.g., financial rewards and direct incentives). Kent and Chelladurai (2001) concluded that studies about transformational leadership in sports and the application of transformational leadership theory within sport settings have been very limited. Further, transformational and transactional leadership behaviors in the field of sport have not been sufficiently researched, although there are a few extant studies (e.g., Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996; Geist, 2001; Rowold, 2006). Consequently, the present study was conceptualized with the following question, in mind: What do high school athletic directors perceive as their leadership styles, and are these styles related to their job satisfaction?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present study was to examine the degree to which high school athletic directors' perceived leadership styles are related to their perceived job satisfaction. The study utilized the conceptual framework of Bass and Avolio's (1994) full range leadership model. Bass and Avolio (1994) stated that the full range leadership model is based on more than 100 years of leadership research. The model identifies both transactional and transformational behaviors. The full range of leadership model also identifies transactional behaviors, which include laissez-faire (passive/avoidant), management-by-exception and contingent reward. The transformational behaviors include individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation,

inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. The study utilized a correlational design, and the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1990) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form; Vocational Psychology Research, 2002) were used as the primary data collection tools.

Limitations of the Study

The present study included the administration of an electronic mail survey to a random sample of 500 athletic directors using email addresses provided by Clell Wade Directory. Limitations of the study include a sample size of 55, a possibility of inaccurate email addresses provided by the Clell Wade Directory, self-reported bias of the participants (e.g., social desirability of response), and the possibility that any athletic director might, against study's directions, have allowed for an assistant or coach to respond to his/her emails.

Assumptions

For the purposes of the present study, it was assumed that:

1. The random sample of 500 athletic directors from across the United States of America was representative of all athletic directors serving in high school athletics.
2. The participants' knowledge of varying leadership styles and job satisfaction components measured by the instrumentation used in the

present study was relatively representative of the knowledge of these components in the population from which the sample was selected.

Definition of Terms and Variables

Leadership:

For the purposes of the present study, leadership was defined as managing group work with appropriate control and organization (Fiedler, 1967).

Passive/Avoidant Leadership:

Passive/avoidant leadership is similar to “laissez-faire” leadership styles – or “no leadership.” Both types of behavior have negative impacts on followers and associates (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Transformational Leadership:

Transformational leadership is a leadership style that transcends the need for direct tangible rewards and appeals instead to the followers' higher order needs, inspiring them to act in the best interest of the organization rather than according to their own self interests (Bass, 1998).

Transactional Leadership:

Transactional leadership is a reward-driven behavior, where the follower behaves in such a manner as to elicit rewards or support from the leader (Field & Herold, 1997).

Job Satisfaction:

Job satisfaction is defined as “simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs” (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

Organization of the Study

The present study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 has provided an introduction to the study, including the statement of the problem, purpose statement, definitions, limitations, and assumptions. Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature pertaining to general leadership styles, job satisfaction and specifically the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 2000) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by the University of Minnesota's Department of Vocational Psychology Research. Chapter 3 includes a presentation of the research methods of the study, research design and data analysis. Chapter 4 presents the results of the investigation. Finally, Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the results as well as recommendations for additional research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of the literature and research related to the purpose of the study. This literature review focuses on a general review of the literature on leadership and job satisfaction. Where available, literature on leadership among high school athletic directors will be introduced into the discussion; otherwise, general findings in the literature will be interpreted in light of the role of the high school athletic director. The literature review includes seven major sections: (a) leadership defined, (b) leadership theories, (c) athletic director roles and responsibilities, (d) leadership research in sport management, (e) transformational, transactional, passive/avoidant leadership and job satisfaction, (f) the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), (g) the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), and (h) summary.

Leadership Defined

Leadership is a term that can be found throughout all workplaces and is defined in a variety of ways. Leadership, for example, may be defined as managing group work with appropriate control and organization (Fiedler, 1967). Fiedler's simple definition of leadership will serve as a broad definition for purposes of the present study; however, more specialized definitions related to the constructs of interest will also be presented. Sugarmann (1999) illustrated the complexity of understanding leadership by quoting Jamie Williams, former member of the San Francisco 49ers: "Leadership is like gravity. You know it's

there, you know it exists, but how do you define it?" (p. 67). Researchers have been debating this for years. Currently, researchers disagree on definitions of leadership considering that leadership is a complicated phenomenon based on the interactions among the leader, the follower, and the situation (Nahavandi, 2012). Researchers have pointed out that leadership, and the study of this phenomenon, has roots in the beginning of civilization (Stone & Patterson, 2005). Workplaces, work environments, worker motivations, leaders, managers, leadership styles, and a myriad of other work-related variables have been studied for almost two centuries. Reflecting on the increased importance of leadership in professional and popular literature, Bass and Riggio (2006), noted:

There has been an explosion of interest in leadership. Each day stories appear in newspapers discussing instances of successful leadership, as well as significant failures of leadership. The stories usually concern world class and national politicians and statesmen, chief executive officers (CEO) of business and industry, directors of government and health care agencies, or generals and admirals. But sometimes the story is about an ordinary citizen who shows the persistent leadership to organize what is needed to get the job done. (pp. 1-2)

The Industrial Revolution created a paradigm shift to a new theory of leadership in which "common" people gained power by virtue of their skills (Clawson, 1999). The term leadership became a more powerful term to those already holding high society positions. Morgan (1997, p. 17), stated that Max Weber "observed the parallels between mechanization of industry and the proliferation of bureaucratic forms of organization." One could infer that as technological advances came to fruition so did bureaucracies. As the mechanistic view of leadership began to wane in popularity, the emerging

theorists encouraged leaders to recognize that humans were not machines and could not be treated as such (Stone & Patterson, 2005). Thus, a post-bureaucratic shift in the mid-1940's moved toward everyone in an organization taking responsibility for the organization's success or failure (Heckscher & Donnellon, 1994). In addition, researchers during this period began to examine the relationship between leader behavior and such outcomes as follower satisfaction level, organizational productivity, and profitability. In the years that followed, theorists such as Hawthorne, Maslow, and Herzberg would all make contributions to leadership theory and its definition. Some researchers paid attention to the leader's personal traits whereas others focused on the relationship between leaders and followers or on situational factors that influence leadership behavior (Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G, 2008).

Another definition of leadership presented by Roach and Behling (1984) focused on leadership as the procedure of guiding an organized team toward achieving its objectives. This definition is accepted by any sports team that wins a championship or achieves its team goal. The support for this definition was continued when Watkins and Rikard (1991) defined leadership as the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward achievement of organizational goals. Leadership is also defined as "influence dynamics" among leaders and followers who attempt to bring true organizational changes that reflect their common goals (Rost, 1993). The old philosophy of control-oriented leadership has given way to a broader conceptualization in which leaders are

evaluated by “soft” elements of leadership qualities in addition to their “hard” management skills (Daft, 1999).

Bolman and Deal (2003) stated that leadership is universally offered as a panacea for almost any social problem (p. 336). Within the athletic arena, leadership is a term used to describe any event which coaches, staff members, administrators, and athletic directors go above and beyond their normal work day. If leaders lose their legitimacy then they lose their capacity to lead (Bolman & Deal, 2003). For example, a high school athletic director may have authority but not necessarily leadership. Additionally, a manager is also not necessarily a leader. Many managers do not know how to lead. Managers do things right whereas leaders do the right thing (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). It is very important for high school athletic directors to understand the distinction between the terms *leader* and *manager* because high school athletic directors will not be successful leaders if they cannot distinguish differences in leading and managing.

Leadership Theories

Theories of leadership have evolved over a number of decades, and debate over the exact nature of leadership continues. According to Young et al. (2010, Educational Leadership Traits Section), the documentation of educational leadership traits for high school athletic directors is scarce. However, it was recently noted that traits of organization, roles and responsibilities, and job satisfaction of high school athletic directors are prevalent in previous research (Young et al., 2010). Since the 20th century, many theories of leadership have

been proffered. Leadership theories can be grouped into one of eight theory categories (Porter-O'Grady & Malloch, 2010). As shown in Table 1, these eight categories are "Great Man" theories, trait theories, contingency theory, situational theories, behavioral theories, participative theories, management theories, and relationship theories. Research that reflected one or more of these eight major theories regularly emerged over the course of concentrated study of leadership during the entirety of the Industrial Age (Bass, 1990). Porter-O'Grady and Malloch (2010) stated that at the end of the Industrial Age, the influence of complex thinking changed much of the foundation of the consideration of human interaction and leadership behavior. As science evolved in the various areas of neurology and neuro-biology, an immediate impact on the understanding of human thought, motivation, and action was created.

Trait Theory

Certain traits are associated with proficient leadership, and identifying people with the "correct" traits is synonymous with identifying people who have leadership potential (Shead, 2010). Trait theory takes on the assumption that leaders are born with leadership traits or not, an assumption that is deemed untenable by many. For example, it is possible for individuals to change their character traits for the better or the worse (e.g., someone who is known for being deceitful can learn to become honest and vice-versa, Shead, 2010). Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) touted the importance of leadership traits while simultaneously

Table 1

Porter-O'Grady and Malloch's (2010) Eight Leadership Theories with Descriptions

Theory	Description
"Great Man" Theory	Leaders are born, not made.
Trait Theory	Leadership consists of a set of inherent leadership qualities.
Contingency Theory	Environmental factors influence particular styles of leadership.
Situational Theory	Leaders choose the best course of action based on the situation they find themselves.
Behavioral Theory	Leadership as the learned action of leaders obtained through teaching and observation.
Participative Theory	Ideal leadership is that which takes the input and participation of others into consideration.
Management Theory	Leadership is transactional, focusing on the role of supervision, structure, and performance.
Relationship Theory	Leadership is transformational, emphasizing the relations and interactions between leaders and followers and focusing on motivating individuals and groups to perform at their highest potential.

acknowledging the limits of trait theory: Leaders do not have to be great men or women by being intellectual geniuses or omniscient prophets to succeed, but they do need to have the "right stuff," and this stuff is not equally present in all people (p. 59).

Trait leadership theories were largely popular in the 1940's. Stogdill (1974) referred to the "Great Man" theory, which stated that leaders are different from followers due to common leader traits. Additionally, Turner and Chappell (1999) supported Stogdill's (1974) claim about leaders being different from followers by explaining that leaders are born into being great leaders and not made into great leaders. It is noteworthy, according to trait theorists, that leadership traits refer to repetitive patterns in a person's behavior (Hogan, 1991). Further, leaders' traits are shown through hard work, friendliness, conscientiousness, and willingness to take on responsibility rather than personality, ambition, and physical makeup, such as height (Stogdill, 1974). Researchers have built a body of evidence showing that effective managers have traits such as energy and drive, self-confidence, and highly effective communication skills (Turner & Chappell, 1999).

Behavioral Theory

The behavioral approach to leadership was heavily studied between the 1940s and 1960s. During this time period, researchers from the University of Michigan and The Ohio State University affirmed that leader behaviors can be explained within two independent factors called consideration and initiating structure (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957). According to The Ohio State researchers, the term consideration applies to the degree to which leaders show support and friendship towards followers, whereas the term *initiating structure* applies to the manner in which leaders stress the importance of achieving goals

and tasks. The behavioral studies conducted by the University of Michigan researchers found that effective group performance was related to four dimensions of leadership behaviors: support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). Further, leaders' support behaviors were positively related to concern for subordinates, whereas interaction facilitation was focused on reconciling relational conflicts among group members. In sum, goal emphasis and work facilitation are job-centered dimensions, but leader support and interaction facilitation are employee-centered dimensions (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). Various scholars (e.g., Hughes et al., 2008; Smither, London, Flautt, Vargas, & Kucine, 2003) have claimed, considering certain leadership behaviors are adopted for effective leadership, that leadership prowess can be developed. For example, leaders can learn to change their behaviors via reflection, organizational development systems, 360-degree feedback, and other similar processes (McCauley, Ruderman, Ohlott, & Morrow, 1994).

Situational Theories

Situational leadership theories focus on the development of the followers and the styles of each leader being exhibited. The situational leadership model combines task and people into a two-by-two chart, which shows four possible leadership styles: telling, selling, participating, and delegating (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 2001). Situational leadership theory is well suited to the study of leadership within the sport/athletic arena (Kremer & Scully, 1994; Smoll &

Smith, 1989). Hersey and Blanchard's four styles suggest that leaders should put greater or less focus on the task in question and/or the relationship between the leader and the follower, depending on the development level of the follower.

The four styles are as follows:

1. "Leadership through participation" (S1) involves having a high relationship with one's subordinates with low tasks involved. This leader-driven style is used when followers are able but unwilling or insecure to accomplish the task at hand. Sugarmann (1999) stated that leading by example is paramount to becoming known as a great leader. Hersey and Blanchard (2001) identified the first stage of situational leadership as "telling and directing." The leader in this stage is said to have high task focus and low relationship focus whereas followers are said to have low competence, low commitment, and inability or insecurity. Hersey and Blanchard stated that when the followers cannot do the job and are unwilling or afraid to try, then the leader takes a highly directive role, telling them what to do but without a great deal of concern for the relationship. The leader may also provide a working structure, both for the job and in terms of how the person is controlled. The leader may first find out why the person is not motivated and if there are any limitations in ability. These two factors may be linked, for example, when followers believe they are less capable than they should be or are in a state of denial. Followers may also lack self-confidence as a result. If the leader focused more on the relationship,

followers may become confused about what must be done and what is optional. The leader thus maintains a clear 'do-this' position to ensure all required actions are clear.

2. Leadership through “selling and coaching” (S2), a second leader driven strategy, is exemplified when there is a high relationship value with followers and the tasks level is high (Hersey & Blanchard, 2001). The follower is considered to have some competence and a variable level of commitment. Although unable to take the responsibility for the task, the follower is willing or motivated. When the follower can do the job, at least to some extent, but perhaps is over-confident about their ability in this, then telling the follower what to do may be demotivating or lead to resistance. The leader thus needs to sell another way of working, coaching, explaining, and clarifying decisions. The leader thus spends time listening and advising and, where appropriate, helping the follower to gain necessary skills through coaching methods.
3. The third style of leadership, “participating and supporting” (S3), is a follower-led strategy. Hersey and Blanchard observed that this leader has low task focus and high relationship focus. However, the follower has high competence, a variable commitment, and is able but unwilling or insecure. When the follower can do the job, but is refusing to do it or otherwise showing insufficient commitment, the leader need not worry about showing the follower what to do, and instead is concerned with finding out

why the follower is refusing and then prompting cooperation. There is less excuse here for followers to be reticent about their ability, and the key to encouraging followers centers very much about motivation. If the causes for inaction are found, they can be addressed by the leader. The leader thus spends time listening, praising, and otherwise making the followers feel good when they show the necessary commitment.

4. The fourth style, leadership through “delegation” (S4), is a follower-led strategy used when there is minimal relationship with followers and a low task requirement. The style is used when followers are able and willing or motivated to accomplish the tasks at hand (Hershey & Blanchard, 2001).

Hersey and Blanchard’s situational leadership concept provides supporting information that, in order to become an effective leader, one must consider all four styles within the situational leadership model. When the followers can do the job and are motivated to do it, then the leader can basically leave them to it, largely trusting them to get on with the job although the leader acknowledges the need to keep a relatively distant eye on things to ensure everything is going according to plans. Smoll and Smith’s (1989) “mediational model of leadership” focused on situational factors within coaching and sport leadership settings and identified evaluation of cognitive processes and leader and follower behavior as the key to determining desirable leadership actions.

Relationship Theories

Relationship theories focus on the strength of leader-follower relationships as the focus of leadership. Relational leaders inspire followers both to maximize personal potential and to view their actions as part of the larger organizational purpose (Porter-O'Grady & Malloch, 2010). Relationship theories generally focus on both transactional and transformational elements of leadership (Bass, 1998). These two elements are points along a continuum of leadership behavior (Bass, 1985). Bass (1998) described transformational leadership as behavior that transcends the need for rewards and appeals to the followers' higher order needs, inspiring them to act in the best interest of the organization rather than their own self-interest. Thus, leaders must possess high ethical and moral standards in order to provide the highest reward to the organization. One might infer that even the most ethically and morally charged athletic director cannot consistently provide the highest rewards to the organization that he/she represents. However, ethics and morals are two very important characteristics in an individual when determining the type of leader one might become.

Leadership styles are known to change based on situational factors, and thus a transformational leader could utilize the transactional style of leadership and vice versa. Generally, personality and character traits can provide some information to determine the likelihood that a given person will be either a transformational or transactional leader; in particular, extraversion has been shown to be positive, although weak, correlate of transformational leadership

(Bono & Judge, 2004). It is likely that extraverts will tend to exhibit inspirational leadership (e.g., having an optimistic view of the future) (Bono & Judge, 2004). Extraverts also tend to score high on intellectual stimulation, as they are more likely than introverts to embrace new ideas and seek out and enjoy change.

Transformational leadership is universally applicable (Bass, 1998). Bass stated that, regardless of culture, transformational leaders inspire followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group or organization. Followers become motivated to expend greater effort than would usually be expected. For example, if an athletic director exemplified Bass' transformational leadership model, coaches in the school would offer up all that they have to support the athletic director and school for which they work. Excellence in sport leadership is acquired by people who have a strong sense of vision, who have passion for the work of the organization, and who are able to get people to commit to the necessary actions so that their vision becomes a reality (Sugarmann, 1999). Further, great leaders excel in the arts of communication, motivation, mutual respect, instilling confidence and enthusiasm, and showing credibility and integrity on a consistent basis.

Building on their work on transactional and transformational leadership theories, Avolio and Bass (1991) conceptualized a "full range leadership theory" (FRLT) represented by nine factors, including five transformational leadership factors, three transactional leadership factors, and one nonleadership or laissez-faire leadership factor (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Jens &

Schlotz, 2009). Jens and Schlotz (2009) defined the nine FRLT factors as follows:

The first of the transformational factors is inspirational motivation. Central to this factor of transformational leadership is the articulation and representation of a vision. If followers have a positive attitude concerning the future as a result of leadership behavior, they will be motivated to perform well. Next, idealized influence (attributed) relies on the attribution of charisma to be a leader, idealized influence (behavior) emphasizes a collective sense of mission and values, as well as acting on these values. As another factor of transformational leadership, intellectual stimulation includes leader behaviors such as challenging the assumptions of followers' beliefs. Individualized consideration contains the consideration of individual needs and the development of followers' individual strengths. As a transactional leadership factor, contingent reward entitles a task-oriented leadership behavior that provides followers with rewards (materialistic or psychological) depending on the fulfillment of certain tasks. In active management by exception, the leader watches and searches actively for deviations from the rules and standards in order to avoid divergent behavior. Management by exception, passive describes a leader who intervenes only after errors have been detected or after standards have been violated. An absolutely passive leadership style is laissez-faire, which is basically defined as the absence of leadership. (pp. 36-37)

Antonakis and House (2004) proposed that an additional dimension be added to the FRLT model, namely "instrumental leadership," which they defined as a class of leadership behaviors concerning the enactment of leader expert knowledge toward the fulfillment of organizational-level and follower task performance (p. 2).

Athletic Director Roles and Responsibilities

The focus on the athletic director as an employee, leader, and representative of interscholastic athletics is needed to understand the gravity of where the role of the athletic director comes from and what it has become today. The importance of the role of an effective athletic director cannot be

underestimated; however, Koehler and Giebel (1997) stated that some incumbents have approached the role in a lackadaisical fashion that has led to pejorative stereotypes:

Some teachers regard athletic directors as former coaches who are killing time between their last game and their first day of retirement. Many are characterized as likable but ineffective geezers who slap backs, make schedules, and tap the keg at the annual staff picnic. Other teachers see them as personable disciplinarians who know how to “ride herd” on perhaps the most headstrong group of people in the building—the coaching staff. Unfortunately, each of these perceptions in some schools is true. That’s what makes it so difficult for the rest of us to convince the educational community that athletic directors are among the most important people in the school system. (p. vi)

Young et al., (2010) surmised that the athletic director position was created to improve control over the ever increasing demands of running an athletic program. Indeed, high school athletic administration as a distinct field developed slowly and gradually (Keller & Forsythe, 1984, pp. 1-2). In reality the first directors of athletics were superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and assistant superintendents. Early on, the roles of athletic administrators were carefully circumscribed. For example, 60 years ago, intercollegiate athletic directors were in charge of (a) hiring and firing personnel, (b) scheduling competitions, (c) overseeing the budget, (d) program planning, (e) working with others giving direction and vision, (f) clerical activities, (g) alumni publications, and (h) fund raising (Loveless, 1953). Several decades later, Parkhouse and Lapin (1980) were the first to break down the role of the interscholastic athletic director into five much broader administrative functions: (a) organization, (b) decision making and problem solving, (c) planning, (d) communication, and (e)

evaluation. Today's athletic director position is becoming so demanding that job descriptions are changing regularly (Appenzeller, 2003). In fact, most high school athletic directors do not have the luxury of devoting their whole working day to this job (Masteralexis, Barr, & Hums, 2012). Most high school athletic directors also teach, coach, or perform other administrative duties in addition to their role as high school athletic director (Masteralexis et al., 2012). In years past, the leadership ability of athletic directors was assumed because of their previous athletic success, but this assumption is not now as widely held (Davis, 2002).

Today, those in athletic director positions are getting more training and education in management and administrative leadership, both of which are important to success in the role. However, *leader* is a broader term than *manager*; people need not be in management positions to be leaders (Pedersen, Parks, Quarterman, & Thibault, 2011). A manager is someone who plans, budgets, staffs, organizes, controls, and problem solves, whereas a leader is someone who sets direction, aligns people, motivates, and inspires.

High school athletic directors frequently employ both management and leadership concepts in the creation of programs that teach their student athletes leadership skills. One example of this type of program was used to establish athletic leadership for Wheeler High School's football team in Valparaiso, Indiana. Using the acronym L.E.A.D.E.R.S.H.I.P., Snodgrass (2004) built a curriculum based on 10 core values: Influence, Integrity, Communication,

Attitude, Courage, Sacrifice, Goals, Servant-Hood, Vision, and Perseverance.

Snodgrass observed that giving students an opportunity to understand what leadership is all about and how leadership is applied in everyday life allowed the football players at Wheeler High School in Valparaiso, Indiana, to become stronger individuals in the classroom, community, and field.

Considering all of the duties required of athletic directors, they must be good leaders with the ability to delegate (Barnhill, 1998). Athletic directors' job descriptions will continue to evolve as the requirements for managing a successful program evolve. One sample written job description of an athletic director for a small private school in Florida indicated that their athletic director would perform the standard duties of enforcing Florida High School Athletic Association (FHSAA) policies and procedures, hire and fire coaches, ensure school policies are followed, and promote a high quality sportsmanship environment (Ford, 2005). A second athletic director job description, taken from the Dublin, Ohio, Public Schools (2005), highlights the athletic director's responsibility to recruit quality coaches, fundraise, ensure student-athlete eligibility, supervise athletic contests and athletic officials, and arrange for transportation.

Through examination of the two brief job descriptions cited above, it becomes apparent how important the athletic director position is to the success of interscholastic athletics. Athletic directors share many of the same responsibilities regardless of the population or location of the school in which

they are employed. High school athletic directors are vital to ensuring that the climate of the athletic program which they direct will stay positive and energized. The athletic director as a leader is an integral part of the school system. Year by year, the job descriptions of athletic directors have become more complex, and over time, the following responsibilities have been added to the athletic director's job description: (a) purchasing and distribution of equipment, supplies, and uniforms; (b) planning and scheduling for the use of facilities; (c) public relations; (d) fund-raising; (e) assuring legal and medical protection is available for coaches and student-athletes; (f) compliance with national and state policies and procedures; (g) administration of events; (h) completion of the goals and objectives of the school; and (i) implementation and management of media events (Smith, 1993).

These increasing responsibilities make it highly unlikely that just one individual can effectively manage a successful interscholastic athletic program, especially at a large school with a comprehensive athletic program (Hoch, 2002). Athletic directors must be willing to put the time and effort into getting the job done. In order to do so, a high school athletic director must regularly rely upon his/her support staff, such as coaches and other administrators at the school (Barnhill, 1998).

If the athletic director fails at delegating and managing the tasks necessary to lead a successful athletic program, his/her coaches will begin to lose faith in the athletic director's ability to lead. The many responsibilities that

an athletic director assumes when taking a position within the administration are largely dictated by the athletic director's fellow administrators. At the collegiate level, the athletic director's position is supported by many other administrators such as the director of development, dean of students, director of advising, director of admissions, and director of college recruitment to name a few. The director of development will help the athletic director with fundraising for athletics, the dean of students assists the athletic director with student-athlete disciplinary issues, the director of admissions assists the athletic director in qualifying the students for eligibility, and the director of college recruitment assists the athletic director in qualifying student athletes for college recruitment. With all of these administrators working together, the leadership within the school is strong and successful. Nevertheless, the staff available to high school athletic directors is usually much smaller and less specialized; hence, athletic directors must have a range of skills and know how to maximize the efforts of all those under their authority.

The athletic director's ability to recruit co-workers to assist in leading the department of athletics as well as the institution itself is characteristic of a transformational leader. Bass (1997) affirmed transformational leadership is universally applicable. Regardless of culture, transformational leaders inspire followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group or organization. In order for this to occur, the transformational leader must possess at least seven specific characteristics to inspire followers (Parks & Quarterman,

2003). These characteristics include, first, trusting his or her subordinates and making use of employees' energy and talent. The key to productive relationships is mutual trust. Second, leaders should develop a vision for employees to follow. Third, leaders should inspire others to remain calm and to act intelligently under pressure. Fourth, leaders should become experts at what they do, knowing that employees are much more likely to follow a leader who radiates confidence, is intuitive, and continues to master the profession. Fifth, leaders should invite dissent and be willing to consider a variety of opinions. Sixth, leaders should focus on what is important and reach elegant, simple answers to complex problems by keeping the details to themselves. Lastly, leaders should embrace a certain amount of risk-taking. Risk encourages employees to take chances and readily accept error as part of their work routine.

Although it is important that any leader become an effective manager, being an effective manager and an effective leader are two different matters. Hersey and Blanchard (2001) stated that, management is the process of working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational goals (p. 9). In addition, Hersey and Blanchard (2001) defined leadership as the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in effort toward goal achievement in a given situation (p. 78). Some theorists have suggested that both management and leadership are necessary to those who seek professional management in high school athletics and other sport careers. Many athletic directors find themselves primarily functioning as managers focused on

interactive activities such as planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting in order to accomplish the goals and objectives of the organization or institution (Parks & Quarterman, 2003). Conversely, other athletic directors consider themselves as leaders in some capacity.

As previously noted, two possible leadership styles of high school athletic directors nationwide are transformational and transactional. Bass (1985) acknowledged that, transactional leaders think primarily in terms of compliance with processes. The transactional athletic director believes a coach will get rewarded if he/she follows directions and orders. Bass identified two factors as composing transactional leadership. Leaders can transact with followers by (a) rewarding effort contractually, telling followers what to do to gain rewards and punishing undesired action, and (b) giving extra feedback and promotions for good work. Such transactions are referred to as contingent reward (CR) leadership. Transactional leadership is described as a reward-driven behavior, where the follower behaves in such a manner as to elicit rewards or support from the leader (Field & Herold, 1997). Bass (1985) observed that transactional leaders are administrators who manage by exception. The athletic director operating from this perspective will regularly observe the performances of the coaching staff but implement measures of correction only when mistakes or failure to comply with the goals, mission, and values of the institution occur (Parks & Quarterman, 2003). In this scenario, the athletic director would have

minimal contact with the staff unless something goes wrong. Laissez-faire leadership may also exist as a strategy within a larger transactional leadership approach. However, this style is not very frequently seen among the staff and administration of a successful interscholastic athletic program as it means little or no leadership or contact is made by the athletic director with the staff members (Parks & Quarterman, 2003).

Leadership Research in Sport Management

The most noted scholar in the field of sports management is Packianathan Chelladurai. Chelladurai and his colleagues have created a model of leadership in sport that is considered multi-dimensional. The model (Chelladurai, 1980) emphasizes the appropriate combination of three characteristics: the leader, the situation, and the members. The model also illustrates three levels of leadership: required, preferred, and actual leadership. In describing the model, Chelladurai (1980) claimed that congruence between preferred and perceived leadership significantly affects team outcomes and member satisfaction. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) explained three decision making leadership styles within this model. The model defines proper leadership styles as determined by taking into consideration both environmental factors and followers' perceptions of the leader; hence, the model is prescriptive at least to some degree. The three decision making styles are autocratic, delegative, and participative. An autocratic decision style is characterized by the leader making decisions without any other assistance. In the delegative style, leaders transfer their decision making powers

to the followers. Finally, the participative decision style combines the previous two extreme leadership styles with the result that both leaders and followers are able to contribute to decisions.

Chelladurai and his colleagues (e.g., Chelladurai, 1980, 2007; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1978; Reimer & Chelladurai, 1995) stated that, the differing leadership behaviors are necessary characteristics of the leader (e.g., athletic director). The theory of transformational and transactional leadership states that the leader should display varying types of transformational and transactional traits in order to find the right fit for the situation that arises. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) model stresses the importance of “fit” or “alignment,” with high levels of satisfaction (a multifaceted construct which includes satisfaction with individual performance, team performance, and type of leadership) and performance accurately predicted when there is congruence between actual, required, and preferred behaviors. The central thrust of the multidimensional model of leadership was affirmed as the congruence of perceived and preferred leadership enhances member satisfaction (Reimer & Chelladurai, 1995). Therefore, when discrepancies occur, leaders are faced with selecting one of three actions—(a) to carry on without making significant changes and to expect (or encourage) others to be more accommodating; (b) to remove barriers (e.g., fire coaching staff who are creating disharmony); or (c) to be more flexible, which may prove decidedly difficult for controlling, authoritarian coaches (Crust & Lawrence, 2006).

Transformational leadership is very important in sport, considering that a sport leader's transformational leadership can move followers from being relaxed and uninvolved to being dedicated and committed (Chelladurai, 2007). As the world becomes increasingly turbulent, leaders in sport organizations need to possess transformational leadership characteristics in order to achieve better organizational outcomes (Lim & Cromartie, 2001). Chelladurai (2007) referred to this as the "congruence hypothesis"—actions of the leader may vary based on the level of congruence among preferred, actual, and required behaviors. A range of behaviors is needed specific to leader and member characteristics as well as situational characteristics and desired outcomes. Furthermore, Lim and Cromartie (2001) claimed that, because the sport industry can be greatly affected by various transformational contextual issues such as diversity, ethics (e.g., game fixing, sportsmanship), league changes, and gender issues, sport leaders should ideally possess transformational leadership characteristics as well as transactional leadership characteristics.

Traditionally, theories of leadership have largely focused on the leadership provided by those at the top of an organization's hierarchy. However, "top-down" approaches often overlook the reality that there are other sources of leadership that influence individuals in an organization (Dachler, 1988). Organizational members are likely to be influenced by their immediate supervisors as much as by anybody else, if not more, as it is a formal requirement of the supervisor to influence his or her immediate subordinates (Kent & Chelladurai, 2003). Reimer

and Chelladurai (1995) found that the two dimensions of training and instruction and positive feedback reflect the situational requirements whereas the remaining three dimensions of democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, and social support are attuned to member preferences.

Geist (2001) conducted research in order to examine differences in the perceptions of the athletic director's transformational leadership behaviors using the perspective of the athletic directors themselves as well as the perspective of the middle managers. Athletic directors were more likely to consider themselves as transformational leaders than the middle managers who assessed them. Sport leaders should exert more effort to understand their followers by approaching them in a collegial and supportive manner with the goal of improving organizational effectiveness (Geist, 2001).

Vallee and Bloom (2005) conducted a qualitative study to investigate factors that lead to the success of athletic coaches in a Canadian collegiate sport setting. Coaching success was best explained by characteristics of transformational leadership. The researchers emphasized that the leaders were visionaries, motivators, goal-setters, and organized leaders who were able to achieve success by gaining commitment and enthusiasm from their followers, and by having them buy into their vision (Vallee & Bloom, 2005, p. 193). Likewise, Chelladurai (2007) noted, "the transformational leader influences the situation and the members as well as subordinate leaders" in an effort to achieve desired outcomes (p. 131).

Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) investigated coaches' perceived assessment of the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors of athletic administrators in Ontario universities. Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) showed that the coaches were more satisfied with the administrators' transformational leadership characteristics and the contingent reward component of transactional leadership than with the management-by-exception component of transactional leadership. The administrators' transformational leadership behaviors were positively related to the coaches perceived leadership effectiveness and their initiatives to exert extra effort overall, compared to their transactional leadership behaviors (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). Specifically, the study's results emphasized the importance of a leader's active effort to interact with followers.

Transformational, Transactional, and Passive/Avoidant Leadership and Job Satisfaction

In the present study, transformational and transactional leadership styles were utilized as precursors to an athletic director's job satisfaction. Bass (1990) argued that, follower job satisfaction is one of the most directly impacted and important outcomes of leadership. A number of researchers (e.g., Krug, 2003; McElroy, Morrow, & Rude, 2001) have agreed that a leader's behavior is critical to employee job satisfaction, which, in turn, has a substantial influence on various organizational outcomes. Most job satisfaction studies at the secondary school level have focused on teachers, rather than school administrators or other

leaders (e.g., athletic directors); however, findings of the teacher studies may be relevant and thus are cited here. There is very little evidence supporting relationships among athletic directors' job satisfaction, performance, and leadership styles; however, job satisfaction problems often seen in the business world would also be present in the highly visible, competitive world of athletics (Green & Reese, 2006). Davis (1981—as cited in Green & Reese, 2006) surveyed 246 public school teacher/coaches to determine their job satisfaction levels. Davis' survey identified relationships with coworkers and challenging work as being more valuable than resource adequacy or financial rewards in determining a worker's job satisfaction. The investigator further reported that work climate, morale, and communication patterns also affected overall job satisfaction.

If transformational leadership behaviors are indeed related to job satisfaction and job commitment of subordinates in the sport setting, perhaps sport administrators may be able to motivate subordinates to achieve higher goals and to do more for the organization even in the face of scarce resources (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995). The ability of sport administrators to motivate subordinates to perform work beyond the minimum levels specified by the organization is important in sport today in view of the increasing costs of operating athletic programs and the declining revenues faced by most athletic departments. Nevertheless, Yusof (1998) concluded that the few studies conducted in sport settings by authors such as Pruijn and Boucher (1995),

Wallace and Weese (1995), and Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) have obtained conflicting results and showed little consistent support of the impact of transformational leadership behaviors on subordinates' outcome such as job satisfaction, commitment, or performance. The relationship between coaches' job satisfaction and the leadership behaviors of athletic directors at several Ontario universities was examined by Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) who discovered that coaches' job satisfaction, perceived leadership effectiveness, and extra effort were positively related to transformational leadership behaviors of their athletic directors. Additionally, Yusof (1998) argued that, because job satisfaction has been shown to be positively related with high subordinate 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 (p. 173).

Job satisfaction research provides evidence to suggest that selected personal characteristics of an individual may be related to work and job satisfaction (Bedeian, Farris, & Kacmar 1992; Gibson & Klein, 1970; Kasperson, 1982). The personal characteristics on which data are collected on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire are age, gender, and years of experience. Research has shown that as people become more mature, job satisfaction tends to increase (Gibson & Klien, 1970; Janson & Martin, 1982). The extant literature also supports job satisfaction as differing by gender, but results are mixed. Whereas some research has indicated males are more satisfied with their jobs

(Varca, Shaffer, & McCauley, 1983), other researchers, such as Hodson (1989) and Kelly (1989), have reported that females are more satisfied with their jobs. Job satisfaction has been found as having virtually no relationship to years of experience (Bedeian et al., 1992; O'Rielly & Roberts, 1975).

Spector (1997) noted that job satisfaction is a topic of wide interest to both people who work in organizations and people who study them. In fact, it is the most frequently studied variable in organizational behavior research. Job satisfaction is defined as simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs (Spector, 1997). It is the extent to which people like (are satisfied with) or dislike (are dissatisfied with) their jobs. Most studies of job satisfaction in education have tended to focus on teachers (Green & Reese, 2006). Much less attention has been paid to the effects of a stressful environment on the leadership effectiveness and satisfaction of high school coaches and other athletic administrators, particularly those serving in a dual or multi-role capacity.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) created the Motivational-Hygiene Theory (M-H Theory) which introduces two factors that involve job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The two factors were referred to as intrinsic factors, called motivators, and extrinsic factors, called hygienes. Motivators were believed to lead to job satisfaction, and hygienes to job dissatisfaction. Motivator factors of job satisfaction include achievement, recognition, the work itself, and the intrinsic interest of the job; hygiene factors of the job include pay, job security,

working conditions, policy and administration, and relationships with peers and supervisors (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Throughout the 1960's the M-H Theory was researched and became well known as a plausible model for determining job satisfaction.

There is not an abundance of data to support a relationship between job satisfaction and leadership styles. Vroom (1967) began discussing his ideas in the form of a concept called expectancy theory. This theory was later developed by Porter and Lawler (1968) who defined job satisfaction as an individual's attitude about work roles and their relationship to worker motivation (Vroom, 1967). Porter and Lawler (1968) established a connection between employees' motivation and their expectancies. Motivation is possible only when there is a clear relationship between work performance (effort) and work results (goal attainment). According to Cinar, Bektas, and Aslan (2011), Porter and Lawler (1968) were among the first to advocate for structuring the work environment so that effective performance would lead to both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, which would in turn produce overall job satisfaction.

Consider first the negative relationship found between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. The link between transformational leadership and satisfaction has been found in previous studies; however, the relationship is generally found to be positive. Research on transformational leadership and job satisfaction, show's a positive relationship between nurses exhibiting

transformational leadership styles and their job satisfaction (Medley & Larochelle, 1995).

Conceptual Framework

In the present study, it was postulated that transformational and transactional leadership would serve as a precursor to self-perceived job satisfaction of high school athletic directors. Avolio and Bass's (1991) full range leadership model (or transactional-transformational model) provided the conceptual underpinnings of the study. As previously noted, the full range leadership model focuses on the impact of both transactional and transformational leadership styles on follower outcomes. The model also accounts for the effects of laissez-faire leadership behaviors which, in effect are evidence of lack of leadership. This conceptual framework is appropriate for studying leadership styles of athletic directors for at least three reasons. First, it has been established that the full-range leadership model is universally applicable (Bass, 1998); hence, it would follow that it would be a useful model for studying athletic directors' leadership styles just as it has been used to study leaders in multiple other settings. Second, the model is useful in that instrumentation (i.e., the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; Avolio & Bass, 1991) for testing the major constructs of the model has been developed via psychometric integrity and applied research studies over many years. Third the model is highly consistent with other theoretical models that have been developed specifically within the domain of leadership in sport settings.

Specifically, the multidimensional model of leadership in sport (Chelladurai, 1980, 2007; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001) serves as a secondary model for illustrating how Avolio and Bass's model is applicable to the specific sample (i.e., athletic directors) selected for the present study.

Athletic directors are one group of individuals along with coaches, athletes, and other relevant staff constituting the "operating or technical core of the [sport] enterprise" (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001, p. 139). The multidimensional leadership model provides conceptual understanding of the linkages among leader behaviors and decisions, situational characteristics, member satisfaction, and group performance. Sports administrators should certainly be interested in investigating the usefulness of the transformational leadership theory in sports settings (Chelladurai, 2007; Yusof, 2002). Specifically, if transformational leadership behaviors are indeed related to subordinates' job satisfaction in sports settings, perhaps sport administrators may be able to motivate subordinates to achieve higher goals and to do more for the organization with fewer resources. Additionally, the ability of sports administrators to motivate subordinates to perform work beyond the minimum levels required by the organization is important in sports today, especially in intercollegiate athletics in the United States, where most programs are being burdened with increasing costs of running such programs and declining revenues (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995). These burdensome situations may lead to diminished job performance, reduced organizational commitment, and even a decline in job satisfaction. Researchers

such as Farkas and Tetrick (1989), Mathieu (1991), and Schappe (1998) have agreed that organizational commitment and job satisfaction must be considered together because the two factors reciprocally affect each other which, in turn, results in a high correlation between the two concepts (Kim, 2009). Kim (2009) also stated that current research has found that employees who feel more satisfied with their jobs will likely have a higher level of commitment to the organization. Further, high job performance can result in internal or external rewards which, in turn, will naturally boost job satisfaction (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire has been established as the key instrument for measuring transformational leadership and related constructs (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Through its use in over 300 research studies, including dissertations and theses, the MLQ has yielded scores indicating strong estimates of validity and reliability. The popular six-factor model for the MLQ resulted from detailed construct validity studies using factor analytic methods. A study conducted by Antonakis, et al. (2003) supported the nine-factor leadership model and its stability in homogenous situations. Reliability estimates for scores on the MLQ subscales have typically ranged from moderate to good across the various studies.

In addition, Dumdum, Lowe, and Avolio (2003) conducted a meta-analytic study to determine whether the various scores of the MLQ are related to

measures of follower satisfaction with the leader. All the other facets of Transformational Leadership, as well as Contingent Rewards, generated high positive correlations with follower satisfaction, ranging from $r = .73$ to $r = .90$. Conversely, Dumdum et al. found that the factors of Management-by-Exception (Passive) and Laissez-Faire Leadership were negatively related to follower satisfaction, with correlations ranging from $r = -.46$ to $r = -.53$. Management by Exception (Active) was only negligibly related to satisfaction with the leader. The meta-analytic results also established whether or not these facets of the MLQ correlated appreciably with measures of perceived leadership effectiveness. In this instance, the facets of Transformational Leadership, together with Contingent Reward, correlated highly and in a positive direction with leadership effectiveness; correlations ranged from $r = .55$ to $r = .68$. Again, Management-by-Exception (Passive) and Laissez-Faire Leadership were negatively and moderately related to leadership effectiveness, with correlations of approximately $r = -.40$. Finally, Management-by-Exception (Active) was unrelated to leadership effectiveness (correlations of approximately $r = .00$). These correlations were higher when subjective measures, rather than objective indices, were utilized to gauge leadership effectiveness.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Vocational Psychology Research, 2002) was created in 1967 as part of the Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation and has become a widely used instrument to evaluate

job satisfaction. The MSQ short form consists of 20 questions focusing on intrinsic and extrinsic reinforcement factors of employee attitude. The short form is scored on three scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The MSQ has been widely used in studies exploring client vocational needs, in counseling follow-up studies, and in generating information about correlates of job satisfaction.

The MSQ is a gender neutral, self administered inventory that is written on a fifth-grade reading level. The MSQ can be used in an individual or group setting, and standardized instructions for administration are provided in the test manual (Vocational Psychology Research, 2002). The 1967 revision of the MSQ (originally copyrighted in 1963) uses a standard five-point response scale. Response choices are *Very Satisfied*, *Satisfied*, *N (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied)*, *Dissatisfied*, and *Very Dissatisfied*. This response format was found to have a ceiling effect which caused the scale score distributions to be negatively skewed. The 1977 version adjusted for this by changing the response options to *Not Satisfied*, *Somewhat Satisfied*, *Satisfied*, *Very Satisfied*, and *Extremely Satisfied*. This modification resulted in a symmetrical scale score distribution that centered on the *satisfied* category and evidenced larger item variance. Although researchers often prefer the 1967 format, the normative data for the 1967 version of the MSQ is more limited. Thus, the 1977 version is recommended for prediction studies or for comparisons within organizations where normative data is unnecessary (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1977).

Summary

This chapter has featured a review of literature supporting the linkage between high school athletic directors' leadership traits and their job satisfaction. The literature indicates a dearth of information regarding the leadership experiences and practices of high school athletic directors and the relationship of their leadership styles to their job satisfaction. The purpose of the present study was to determine how high school athletic directors view their leadership styles in relation to their job satisfaction. Avolio and Bass' (1991) full-range leadership model served as the framework for investigating these relationships, and the multidimensional model of leadership in sport (Chelladurai, 1980, 2007) further informed the study's research hypotheses. The extant research on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire support the usefulness of these tools for investigating the constructs of interest.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter is a description of the steps taken to research transformational leadership, transactional leadership, situational leadership, and job satisfaction amongst high school athletic directors. This chapter will be discussed in eight sections: (a) Research Questions; (b) Research Design; (c) Sample; (d) Instrumentation; (e) Data Collection; (f) Variables; (g) Data Analysis; and (h) Conclusions.

Research Questions

One primary research question was proposed for investigation and subjected to empirical testing in the present study:

RQ1: Will there be a statistically significant relationship between the dependent variable set of satisfaction variables (intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction) and the predictor variable set of leadership styles (transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant) for a national sample of athletic directors?

Assuming that the primary research question (RQ1) would be supported, seven additional secondary research questions were also proposed for investigation and subjected to empirical testing:

RQ2: Will transactional leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

RQ3: Will transformational leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

RQ4: Will passive/avoidant leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

RQ5: Will transactional leadership share in common with transformational leadership the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

RQ6: Will transactional leadership share in common with passive/avoidant the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

RQ7: Will transformational leadership share in common with passive/avoidant the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

RQ8: Will transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant leaders share in common an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Research Design

The purpose of the present study was to examine how athletic directors view their leadership styles of transactional, transformational or passive/avoidant and their relationship to intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction. The study used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-short form) to collect and analyze data. Bass and Avolio (1990) developed the Multifactor Leadership

Questionnaire as a quantitative measure of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership. The MLQ test manual presents strong evidence for validity of the MLQ scores. Bass, Avolio, and Jung (1999) noted that, for the last 25 years, the MLQ has been the principal means by which we were able to reliably differentiate highly effective from ineffective leaders in our research in military, government, educational, manufacturing, high technology, church, correctional, hospital, and volunteer organizations. Bass, Avolio, and Jung (1999) also noted that the MLQ has been used in over 300 research studies, doctoral dissertations, and master's theses. The MLQ has been used with a wide variety of rater and ratee groups. Construct validity evidence based on factor analyses has yielded a six-factor model explaining dimensions of the MLQ. In addition, a study conducted by Antonakis (2001) supported the viability of the nine-factor MLQ leadership model and its stability in homogenous situations. In addition, Antonakis noted that reliability estimates for the MLQ subscale scores ranged from moderate to good.

Bass and Avolio's Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-short form) which distinguishes transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership traits was utilized for the present study. Additionally, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short-form) was employed to measure athletic directors' job satisfaction. The MSQ short form includes 20 items using a Likert-type response format in which the subject will select from *very dissatisfied*, *dissatisfied*, *not satisfied*, *satisfied*, and *very satisfied*. The present study

focused upon correlations between scores on the two surveys. Canonical correlation was utilized to examine these relationships. Additionally, the study employed canonical commonality analysis to further explore the effects of individual leadership style variables used as predictors of the MSQ responses.

Sample

The sample consisted of 500 athletic directors from across the United States of America. Random sampling methodology called sampling without replacement was used by the Clell Wade Directory organization to determine a sample of 500 high school athletic directors for the study. This random sample was provided by the Clell Wade Directory organization as an intact list.

Instrumentation

The present study incorporated the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) created by Bass and Avolio to classify the leadership styles of the sample. The study also utilized the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) created by the University of Minnesota's Vocational Psychology Research program to classify the job satisfaction of the sample. Permission was granted by the University of Minnesota's Vocational Psychology Research program to utilize the short-form of the MSQ (see Appendix E) for the present study. The 20-item short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967). These authors reported that the internal consistency reliability coefficients for scores on the MSQ short-form ranged from 0.77 to 0.92. In the final section of the questionnaire, the participants were asked

to respond to items pertaining to demographic information such as age, gender, number of years at present job, official job title, number of years in career field, number of years in present school, teaching and administrative duties, and athletic affiliation. Each participant completed the 20-item job satisfaction questionnaire *with an answer selected from a 5-point continuum ranging from 1 very dissatisfied to 5 very satisfied*. Each of the 20 MSQ statements related to how the participant felt about his/her present job as a high school athletic director.

Permission was received from Mind Garden, Inc. to utilize the MLQ (see Appendix D). The MLQ short-form consists of 45 items that each athletic director responded to using a Likert-type scale ranging from 0 *not at all*, 1 *once in a while*, 2 *sometimes*, 3 *fairly often*, to 4 *frequently, if not always*. Validity and reliability are two constructs used to indicate the degree of confidence one can place in scores on a research instrument. Both the MLQ and MSQ have been the focus of numerous validity and reliability investigations. A variety of studies providing psychometric data to support validity and reliability of MSQ Short Form and MLQ scores are presented, respectively, in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

Selected Studies Supporting Validity and Reliability of MSQ Short Form Scores

Study	Validity Evidence	Reliability Evidence
Buitendach & Rothmann (2009)	Factor analysis results supported viability of intrinsic and extrinsic factors.	Alpha reliability coefficients for the extrinsic, intrinsic, and general scales, respectively, were .82, .79 and .86.
Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, (1981)	Reviewed a variety of past studies finding support for the intrinsic and extrinsic factors.	
Dhammika, Ahmad, & Sam, (2012).	Factor analysis results supported a 2-factor solution in which 17 of the 20 MSQ items appropriately identified with intrinsic and extrinsic factors.	Alpha reliability coefficients for extrinsic and intrinsic subscales, respectively, were .79 and .64.
Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, & Landau, (1993).	Intuitive judgment panels and Q-sorting supported intrinsic and extrinsic scales. Some items were classified into the opposite factor.	
Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, (1966).	Divergent validity evidence substantiated by presentation of low correlations between MSQ scores and a measure of "satisfactoriness"	
Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, (1967).		Internal consistency coefficients for intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction scores ranged from .77 to .92. General satisfaction stability coefficients were .89 for one week score comparisons and .70 for one year score comparisons.

Table 3

Selected Studies Supporting Validity and Reliability of MLQ Scores

Study	Validity Evidence	Reliability Evidence
Antonakis (2001)	Confirmatory factor analysis provided consistent evidence supporting the 9-factor full range leadership model across 18 independent samples.	Alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .63 to .92.
Bass and Avolio (1995)	Alternative factor solutions indicated the 9-factor full range leadership model best fit data from a large standardization sample.	Alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .74 to .94.
Muenjohn and Armstrong (2008)	Confirmatory factor analysis provided evidence to support the 9-factor full range leadership model.	Full scale alpha reliability coefficients of .86 and .87 were found, respectively, for English and Thai versions of the MLQ.
Tepper and Percy (1994)	Two confirmatory factory analytic structures confirmed both transactional and transformational leadership scales. In one study, charismatic and inspirational leadership scales converged to capture a global conceptualization of charismatic leadership.	

Data Collection

The data were collected in the spring of 2012. The sample was created by using a random sampling of athletic directors within the United States who have membership with the National Federation of High School Sports (NFHS).

Each survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete for a total of 20 minutes. Demographic items were also included in the questionnaire. The research setting was the athletic director's place of employment or any other location used by the athletic director to access the survey via email/Internet technology.

Instructions for completing the instruments were provided to the participants via an introductory email (see Appendix A) on January 16, 2012. Anderson and Gansneder (1995) recommended that internet and e-mail survey follow-up timelines be relatively short when compared to postal mail surveys due to the increased speed of internet and shortened timeframe of survey response rates. After a period of about 30 days, a follow-up email letter which contained the link to the MLQ and MSQ questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) was sent to participants on February 13th, then on February 26th, and then on March 2, 2012. Additionally, the participants received a final follow up email (see Appendix C) on March 3, 2012. Participants were informed that by completing the questionnaire, they were giving consent to have their responses used for a doctoral research project.

The completed MSQ and MLQ questionnaires were submitted electronically to Mindgarden who prepared data spreadsheets with all variables specified at the item level. Each participant received a copy of his or her MSQ and MLQ with scores via email as a means for learning about his or her own leadership styles and characteristics. The sample size was $n = 72$, and, of those 72 respondents, 55 provided usable data. This accounts for an 11% response

rate. A study by Tse et al. (1995) indicated that email survey response rates typically range from 6% to 75%; hence, the present results were within this range. As illustrated in one study (Leece, et al., 2004), researchers should not assume that the widespread availability and potential ease of Internet-based surveys will translate into higher response rates.

Variables

The dependent variables of the MSQ in this study reflected the 20 statements of job satisfaction calculated by the Likert-type scales assessing the participants' self-ratings of how *very dissatisfied*, *dissatisfied*, *neutral*, *satisfied*, or *very satisfied*. Descriptive variables from the MSQ included gender, years of education completed, present job title, and time in current position. For the descriptive data analyses using SPSS, gender was coded into two categories: 1 = male and 2 = female. Years in school completed was coded into four categories: 1 = Grade School; 2 = High School; 3 = College; and 4 = Graduate School. Time in current position was coded into four categories of years: 1 = 0 (months) to 5 (years); 2 = 5 (years) to 10 (years); 3 = 10 (years) to 15 (years); and 4 = 15 (years) to 20 (years). The predictor variables from the MLQ in this study reflected the forty-five statements of leadership styles calculated by the Likert-type scales assessing the participants self-ratings of how each leadership style is not at all used, used once in a while, sometimes used, fairly often used, or frequently, if not always used. The MLQ included 3 subscales (Transactional,

Transformational, and Passive/Avoidant) and the MSQ short-form included 2 subscales (Intrinsic and Extrinsic).

Data Analysis

Canonical correlation analysis followed by commonality analysis was used to analyze the data gathered in the present study. Due to the inferential nature of canonical correlation, this study is considered parametric. However, the commonality analysis is a descriptive follow up to parametric testing. Canonical correlation examines complex relationships among two variable sets; however, the unique contribution of any one variable to the analysis can often be difficult to decipher. A procedure known as commonality analysis (Seibold & McPhee, 1978) can be useful in partitioning explained variance into common and unique components to determine how much variance is unique to a single predictor and how much is shared by two or more of the predictors in a set.

According to Beaton (1973), commonality analysis is an attempt to understand the relative predictive power of the regressor variables, both individually and in combination. Commonality analysis, also known as element analysis and component analysis, provides the researcher with information regarding the variance explained by each of the measured variables and the common contribution from one or more of the other variables (Beaton, 1973; Frederick, 1999).

In this present case, the population of interest is high school athletic directors from across the United States of America. From this given population a

random sampling without replacement of 500 high school athletic directors was selected. For each independent variable, commonality analysis indicates how much of the variance of the dependent variable is unique to the predictor and how much of the predictor's explanatory power is common to or also available from one or more of the other predictor variables (Thompson, 1985). Daniel (1989) stated that commonality analysis is particularly useful in social science research involving multivariate data sets with at least one predictor at the interval level of scale, because, unlike many analyses of variance techniques, it does not require that all the independent variables be converted to the nominal level of scale. Nimon (2010) noted further that, by computing commonality coefficients, a predictor's contribution to a regression effect can be related to the other predictor variables in the model. Such information can be useful for uncovering complex relationships and for informing theory.

The canonical correlation analysis conducted for data in the present study allowed for examination of the relationships among the predictor variables (i.e., athletic directors' leadership styles) and their job satisfaction. The canonical correlation analysis was followed with a commonality analysis to determine the common and unique contributions of the predictor variables in explaining the variance in the dependent variable set. In order to do this, Capraro's (2000) step by step process for running a commonality analysis (CA) was followed. The first step in running a CA is examining the findings of a canonical correlation analysis (CCA). Canonical function coefficients are then be used to weight the original

dependent variables which are summed for each canonical solution to form the canonical variate for that set.

The next step is to run several multiple regression analyses for each composite using all of the possible combinations of predictor variables. Capraro (2000) noted that the final step is to add or subtract relevant regression (e.g., R^2) effects to calculate the unique and common variance components for each predictor variable on each composite. The number of components in an analysis will equal (2^k-1) , where k = number of predictor variables in the set. Because there are three predictor variables in the present study the number of components will be 7 (i.e., $2^3 - 1$).

Limitations of the study include a sample size of 55, a possibility of inaccurate email addresses provided by the Clell Wade Directory, self-reported bias of the participants (e.g., social desirability of response), and the possibility that any athletic director might, against study's directions, have allowed for an assistant or coach to respond to his/her emails.

Conclusion

Examining the correlations between leadership traits and job satisfaction will allow for the testing of the research questions regarding whether variance in athletic directors' satisfaction with their position can be uniquely explained by measures of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant leadership, or, conversely, whether variance explained by these measures is common to any two or all three of the predictors.

Items from Bass and Avolio's (1990) Multi-factor Leadership

Questionnaire (MLQ short-form) that are applicable to the leadership styles of high school athletic directors nation-wide were selected for the MLQ short-form. Additionally, the study utilized the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short-form). The MSQ short-form included 20 variables measured on a Likert-type scale from which the subject selected a response of *very dissatisfied*, *dissatisfied*, *not satisfied*, *satisfied*, or *very satisfied*. Correlational methods were used to examine variance shared between scores on the two surveys. Additionally, commonality analysis was used to examine common and unique contributions of the MLQ short-form subscale scores in explaining the variance in the MSQ short-form subscale scores. The random sampling without replacement consisted of 500 athletic directors from across the United States of America. The high school athletic directors' names and email addresses were obtained from the Clell Wade Directory through random sampling methodology. Chapter 4 presents a discussion of the data and results of the study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Chapter 4 presents the results of the quantitative data analysis relative to the research questions posited for investigation in the present study. Data were collected using instruments that measured transformational leadership, transactional leadership, passive/avoidant leadership, and job satisfaction. The final sample size based on respondents who electronically returned questionnaires was $n = 72$, and, of these 72, usable data were available for 55 participants. Hence, 11% (55 of 500) of the original sample were included in the study. Tse et al. (1995) stated that response rates for email surveys typically vary from a low of 6% to a high of 35-40%. Kiesler and Sproull (1986) added that response rates can also reach a high of 75%.

The respondents reported their perceptions of high school athletic director leadership and job satisfaction by responding to items on the the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ short-form), created by Bass and Avolio (1995), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ short-form), created by Vocational Psychology Association (2002). The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software was used to conduct the analyses.

The data analyses for the present study are divided into three sections. The first section contains results of the descriptive statistics. In the second section, canonical correlation results are reported to examine the relationship between the predictor set of leadership style variables (measured by the MLQ)

and the dependent set of job satisfaction variables (measured by the MSQ). In the third section, results of regression analyses to compute canonical commonality coefficients are presented and used to examine common and unique effects of the predictor variables within the canonical analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

The means and standard deviations for the two criterion (dependent) variables (i.e., MSQ Intrinsic, MSQ Extrinsic) and the three predictor variables (i.e., MLQ Transformational, MLQ Transactional, and MLQ Passive/Avoidant) are presented in Table 4. Simple bivariate correlations between each pair of the variables are presented in Table 5.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for MLQ and MSQ Subscales

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
MLQ Transformational	15.7127	1.81547	55
MLQ Transactional	4.7545	.95313	55
MLQ Passive/Avoidant	1.5309	.86664	55
MSQ Intrinsic	25.2000	4.99407	55
MSQ Extrinsic	13.5091	3.27659	55
Valid N (listwise)			55

Table 5

*Bivariate Correlations for MLQ and MSQ Subscales**

	TF	TA	PA	MSQI
MLQ Transformational (TF)				
MLQ Transactional (TA)	.387			
MLQ Passive/Avoidant (PA)	-.394	.094		
MSQ Intrinsic (MSQI)	-.351	-.115	.255	
MSQ Extrinsic (MSQE)	-.426	-.003	.283	.770

*Note: *n = 55.*

Canonical Correlation Analysis

Canonical correlation analysis was used to determine the extent of the relationship between the predictor variable set of leadership style variables (MLQ Transformational, MLQ Transactional, and MLQ Passive/Avoidant subscales) and the dependent variable set of job satisfaction variables (MSQ Intrinsic and MSQ Extrinsic subscales), and to test the present study's first research question. The eigenvalues and canonical correlation coefficients yielded by the canonical correlation analysis are presented in Table 6. Because the dependent variable set was the smaller of the two variable sets included in the analysis and consisted of two variables, two canonical roots were yielded by the analysis. The dimension reduction analysis, including tests for statistical significance for the two roots, is presented in Table 7. Root 1 ($R_c^2 = .22$; $p < .05$) accounted for a

moderate amount of shared variance (i.e., 22%) between the two variable sets. Root 2 ($R_c^2 = .04$) accounted for a negligible proportion of the shared variance (i.e., 4%) and was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). Hence, only Root 1 was interpreted.

Canonical correlation results are best interpreted by determining how individual variables contributed to the overall canonical results. Two sets of coefficients, canonical function coefficients and canonical structure coefficients, may be used for this purpose. Canonical function coefficients, similar to regression unstandardized (a and b) and standardized (β) weights, indicate the actual statistical weights applied to the original variables in a given set when calculating the canonical variate for the set. Unstandardized (raw score) and standardized function coefficients for the dependent variables included in the canonical correlation analysis for research question 1 are presented, respectively, in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 6

Eigenvalues and Canonical Correlations

Root No.	Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlations	Squared Correlations
1	.27967	.46749	.21855
2	.04505	.20762	.04311

Table 7

Dimension Reduction Analysis

Roots	Wilks' λ	F	Hypothesis Degrees of Freedom	Error Degrees of Freedom	Significance of F
1 to 2	.74777	2.60704	6.00	100.00	.022
2 to 2	.95689	1.14876	2.00	51.00	.325

Table 8

Raw Canonical Coefficients for Dependent Variables

Variable	Root 1	Root 2
MSQIntri	-.01342	-.31355
MSQExtri	.32066	.35494

Table 9

Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Dependent Variables

Variable	Root 1	Root 2
MSQIntri	-.06701	-1.56587
MSQExtri	1.05069	1.16298

Canonical function coefficients are useful when development of predictive equations is the focus on a canonical analysis. Function coefficients can provide the researcher with estimates of how strongly each variable is weighted in the predictive analysis. For example, the standardized function coefficients for Root

1 show that the MSQ Extrinsic variable is weighted heavily (coefficient = 1.05) in the predictive equation whereas the MSQ Intrinsic variable has a near zero standardized function weight (coefficient = -.07) and is therefore relatively unimportant in the predictive equation. However, despite their usefulness in prediction, the function coefficients do not address correlations of the original variables with the canonical variate, and this determination is important in studies, such as the present study, where correlation (rather than prediction) is the focus of the canonical analysis. These correlations are assessed via canonical structure coefficients (r_s), which, because they are absolute correlations, are not affected appreciably due to correlations (i.e., “collinearity”) among the variables within a variable set. Structure coefficients for the dependent variables are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Correlations Between Dependent and Canonical Variables (Canonical Structure Coefficients)

Variable	Root 1	Root 2
MSQIntri	.74202	-.67038
MSQExtri	.99909	-.04276

An examination of the Root 1 structure coefficients indicates that both the Extrinsic and Intrinsic Satisfaction scales of the MSQ are highly correlated with the dependent canonical variate. The structure coefficient (r_s) for the Extrinsic scale is nearly perfect (.999), indicating that it is essentially synonymous with the

canonical variate, and the Intrinsic scale ($r_s = .742$) is also contributing appreciably to the canonical variate.

Unstandardized (raw score) and standardized function coefficients for the canonical predictor variables (MLQ subscale scores) are presented, respectively, in Tables 11 and 12. An analysis of the standardized coefficients for Root 1 indicates that the Transformational subscale score is most highly contributing to the predictive equation for defining the canonical variate (coefficient = $-.98$). The negative value of this function coefficient indicates that it is inversely related to the other variables in the predictor variable set and to the variables comprising the opposite (dependent) canonical variate. The Transactional subscale score (coefficient = $.37$) is contributing to a lesser degree to the predictor variable canonical variate but in a positive direction. The Passive/Avoidant subscale score (coefficient = $.21$), also positively correlated with the canonical variate, is contributing the least.

Canonical structure coefficients for the predictor variables are presented in Table 13. The Transformational subscale score is highly and negatively correlated with the canonical variate ($r_s = -.91$), and the Passive/Avoidant subscale score is correlated to a lesser but noteworthy degree in a positive direction ($r_s = .60$). The Transactional score is only negligibly related to the canonical variate ($r_s = .01$), and, hence, is rather unimportant in defining the variate.

Table 11

Raw Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables

Variable	Root 1	Root 2
Transformational	-.54023	-.20652
Transactional	.39193	1.10618
Passive/Avoidant	.20552	-.67552

Table 12

Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables

Variable	Root 1	Root 2
Transformational	-.98078	-.37493
Transactional	.37355	1.05433
Passive/Avoidant	.17811	-.58543

Table 13

Correlations Between Predictor Variables and Canonical Variables (Structure Coefficients)

Variable	Root 1	Root 2
Transformational	-.90651	.26390
Transactional	.01081	.85431
Passive/Avoidant	.60003	-.33857

Canonical Commonality Analysis

Canonical commonality analysis is a follow up procedure to canonical correlation that allows the researcher to determine the degree to which variance accounted for by a set of predictor variables is unique to any one predictor variable or shared in common by two or more predictors (Seibold & McPhee, 1978). Nimon (2010) noted that commonality analysis was popularized in the 1960s as a method of partitioning variance (R^2), and, therefore, commonality analysis provides a method to determine the variance accounted for by the respective predictor variable sets. In conducting a canonical commonality analysis, a series of predictive equations is computed using all possible subsets of predictors. The number (n) of equations is a function of the number of predictor variables (k):

$$n = 2^k - 1.$$

Commonality equations are then used to partition out the variance unique to each predictor and shared in common with other predictors (Beaton, 1973). Results permit the researcher to assess the degree to which each predictor variable uniquely interacts with the dependent variable set and, simultaneously, the degree to which the variance explained in the dependent variable set is shared between two or more predictor variables.

In the present study, the three MLQ subscale scores (e.g., Transformational, Transactional, Passive/Avoidant), which had served as the predictor variables in the prior canonical correlation analysis, were the focus of

the commonality analysis. The canonical commonality analysis was conducted using the SPSS multiple linear regression procedure. Because multiple linear regression allows for only one dependent variable, it was necessary to use the dependent canonical variate (comprised of the weighted composite of MSQ Intrinsic and MSQ Extrinsic) as the dependent variable in the series of multiple linear regression analyses used to develop the predictive equations used in the commonality analysis. The “compute” function available in SPSS was used to calculate the value of the first dependent canonical variate (V_1) for each case using the raw score canonical function coefficients (see Table 8):

$$V_1 = [(MSQI) (-.01342)] + [(MSQE) (.32066)].$$

V_1 (“MSQCanonVariable”) served as the dependent variable for the regression analyses, and the three predictors were used separately and in combination to conduct regressions using all possible subsets (seven regression analyses in all). Table 14 presents the full model multiple regression results (three predictors). The resultant multiple R^2 is .219, which is the same as the value of R_c^2 for Root 1 of the canonical correlation analysis (see Table 6). Each of the remaining regression analyses (Tables 15 through 20) reflects a smaller amount of explained variance, with multiple R^2 values ranging from a high of .213 (using Transactional and Transformational as predictors as reported in Table 15) to a low of .000 (using only Transactional as a predictors as reported in Table 19). The amount of variance explained in each model is generally consistent with understandings about variable relationships derived from the simple

correlations and canonical function and structure coefficients presented earlier in this chapter.

Table 14

Regression Analysis Using All Predictors

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>
1	.467 ^a	.219

^aPredictors: (Constant), Transformational, Transactional; Dependent Variable: MSQCanonVariable (V_1)

Table 15

Regression Analysis Using Transactional and Transformational as Predictors

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>
1	.462 ^a	.213

^aPredictors: (Constant), Transformational, Transactional; Dependent Variable: MSQCanonVariable (V_1)

Table 16

Regression Analysis Using Transformational and Passive/Avoidant as Predictors

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>
1	.441 ^a	.195

^aPredictors: (Constant), Transformational, Passive/Avoidant; Dependent Variable: MSQCanonVariable (V_1)

Table 17

Regression Analysis Using Transactional and Passive/Avoidant as Predictors

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>
1	.281 ^a	.079

^aPredictors: (Constant), Transactional, Passive/Avoidant; Dependent Variable: MSQCanonVariable (V_1)

Table 18

Regression Analysis Using Only Transformational as a Predictor

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>
1	.425 ^a	.180

^aPredictors: (Constant), Transformational; Dependent Variable: MSQCanonVariable (V_1)

Table 19

Regression Analysis Using Only Transactional as a Predictor

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>
1	.000 ^a	.000

^aPredictors: (Constant), Transactional; Dependent Variable: MSQCanonVariable (V_1)

Table 20

Regression Analysis Using Only Passive/Avoidant as a Predictor

Model	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>
1	.281 ^a	.079

^aPredictors: (Constant), Transformational; Dependent Variable: MSQCanonVariable (V_1)

Table 21 presents a summary of the results of the seven foregoing multiple regression analyses used in the commonality analysis. Unique and common variance partitions (see Table 22) were calculated from using these regression results. The results in Table 22 indicate that the majority of the variance is accounted for by two of the seven variance partitions: the unique variance explained by Transformational (.14, or 14%) and the variance common to Transformational and Passive/Avoidant (.07, or 7%). All other common and unique variance partitions are relatively small (near zero). Interestingly, negative commonality coefficients are found for the variance partition shared by the Transformational and Transactional variables as well as the variance partition shared by all three predictor variables. On the surface, these values are counterintuitive, considering that it would be impossible for two variables to share less than 0% of commonness in explaining the dependent variable. However, these negative commonality are due to what are commonly called “suppressor” effects. Nimon (2010), using an explanation previously provided by Pedhazur (1997), stated that negative commonality coefficients occur in the presence of

suppression or when predictors affect each other in the opposite direction.

Negative commonality coefficients indicate that one variable actually confounds the predictive power of another (Beaton, 1973). Frederick (1999) noted that a negative commonality coefficient should simply be interpreted as a zero.

Capraro and Capraro (2001) disagreed with this interpretation, insisting that the magnitude of a suppressor effect indicates the relative “power” (i.e., variance explained) that is achieved by including the confounding variable in the analysis.

Table 21

Prediction of the Dependent Composite Scores Using Alternate Predictor

Variable Combinations

Predictor Set	Variable (s) in set	R^2
1	Transformational	.180
2	Transactional	.000
3	Passive/Avoidant	.079
4	1, 2 (TF, TA)	.213
5	1, 3 (TF, PA)	.195
6	2, 3 (TA, PA)	.079
7	All (1, 2, 3) (TF, TA, PA)	.219

Table 22

Commonality Matrix

Variance Partitions	Coefficient	% Total
Unique to TF (1)	.219-.079=	.140
Unique to TA (2)	.219-.195=	.024
Unique PA (3)	.219-.213=	.006
Common to TF and TA (1 and 2)*	.195-.079+.079-.219=	-.024
Common to TF and PA (1 and 3)	.213-.000+.079-.219=	.073
Common to TA and PA (2 and 3)	.213-.180+.195-.219=	.009
Common to ALL (1,2,and 3)*	.180+.000+.079-.213-.195-.079+.219=	-.009

*Suppressor Effects

Answers to the Research Questions

One primary research question was posited for investigation in this present study, namely:

RQ1: Will there be a statistically significant relationship between the dependent variable set of satisfaction variables (intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction) and the predictor variable set of leadership styles (transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant) for a national sample of athletic directors?

Results of the canonical correlation analysis yielded one statistically significant ($p < .05$) canonical root that indicated shared variance (R_c^2) of .22 (22%) between the two variable sets. The second canonical root indicated a negligible amount of correlation and was not statistically significant; hence, it was not interpreted. The answer to RQ1 is yes; a moderate degree of correlations were found between the two variable sets for canonical root 1, and that correlation was statistically significant.

Seven additional research questions were also investigated to determine the degree to which unique and common variance partitions would contribute to the overall statistically significant relationship found between the leadership and satisfaction variables determined via canonical correlation analysis. Each of these questions, along with the answer to the question based on the canonical commonality analysis follows:

RQ2: Will transactional leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

For canonical root 1, the unique variance attributable to Transactional Leadership was negligible (.02, or 2%). This variance partition was not calculated for canonical root 2 considering that root 2 was not interpreted.

RQ3: Will transformational leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

For canonical root 1, the unique variance attributable to Transformational Leadership was appreciable (.14, or 14%). This variance partition was not calculated for canonical root 2 considering that root 2 was not interpreted.

RQ4: Will passive/avoidant leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

For canonical root 1, the unique variance attributable to Passive/Avoidant Leadership was negligible (.006, or 0.6%). This variance partition was not calculated for canonical root 2 considering that root 2 was not interpreted.

RQ5: Will transactional leadership share in common with transformational leadership the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

For canonical root 1, the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite shared by Transactional and Transformational Leadership was negligible. The commonality coefficient for this variance partition was $-.024$, indicating the presence of a suppressor effect. This variance partition was not calculated for canonical root 2 considering that root 2 was not interpreted.

RQ6: Will transactional leadership share in common with passive/avoidant the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

For canonical root 1, the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite shared by Transactional and

Passive/Avoidant Leadership was negligible. The commonality coefficient for this variance partition was .009, indicating a near zero effect. This variance partition was not calculated for canonical root 2 considering that root 2 was not interpreted.

RQ7: Will transformational leadership share in common with passive/avoidant the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

For canonical root 1, the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite shared by Transformational and Passive/Avoidant leadership was appreciable. The commonality coefficient for this variance partition was .073 (7.3%). This variance partition was not calculated for canonical root 2 considering that root 2 was not interpreted.

RQ8: Will transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant leaders share in common an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

For canonical root 1, the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite variate shared by all predictors (Transactional, Transformational, and Passive/Avoidant Leadership) was negligible. The commonality coefficient for this variance partition was -.009, indicating the presence of a regression suppressor effect. This variance partition was not calculated for canonical root 2 considering that root 2 was not interpreted.

Summary

The results of the present study indicated that there was a moderate, statistically significant relationship between leadership style and intrinsic/extrinsic job satisfaction. Transformational leadership was negatively associated with job satisfaction whereas passive/avoidant literature was positively related to satisfaction. The effect of transactional leadership was negligible. Canonical commonality analysis corroborated the results of the original canonical analysis, indicating that the majority of the explained variance in job satisfaction was due to (a) the unique effect of transformational leadership and (b) the common effect of transformational and passive/avoidant leadership. Chapter 5 presents a discussion of these findings.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between high school athletic directors' perceived leadership styles and their perceived job satisfaction. The study utilized a correlational design, and the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1990) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form; Vocational Psychology Research, 2002) served as the primary data collection tools. This chapter provides a discussion of the findings of the study as well as recommendations for practice and future research.

Conceptual Framework and Research Variables

The conceptual framework utilized for this study was Bass and Avolio's (1994) Full Range of Leadership Model. This model differentiates among transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership behaviors. The full range leadership model is also known as the transformational-transactional leadership model. The term "cutting-edge" leadership theory has also been used to describe the model (Robbins & Coulter, 2005). The theory suggests that leaders who are charismatic motivate employees by inspiring them, considering employees individually, and stimulating employees' intellectual needs; they are transformational leaders. The other category of leaders, transactional, refers to those leaders who specify tasks and monitor employees' performance to achieve the tasks by providing a reward system. The third category in this model is the

laissez-faire style of leadership or passive/avoidant as it is called in the MLQ short-form. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ short-form) as created by Bass and Avolio provides measures of nine factors that support their leadership model. There are five Transformational behaviors: Idealized Influence (Attributes), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational/Motivational, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration; two Transactional behaviors: Management-by-Exception (Active) and Contingent Reward; and two Passive/Avoidant behaviors: Management-by-Exception (Passive) and Laissez-Faire. The MLQ short-form was also used to measure the participants' satisfaction with their leadership, willingness to give extra effort, and their perceived leadership effectiveness as a high school athletic director. Although data were collected on all of these variables, only three MLQ variables were included in the predictor variable set and subjected to statistical analysis, namely Transformational, Transactional, and Passive/Avoidant.

The present study also focused on job satisfaction as measured by the intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The intrinsic factor consists of the following items: ability to keep busy all of the time, chance to work alone on the job, chance to do things differently from time to time, chance to be somebody in the community, being able to do things that don't go against my conscience, the way my job provides for steady employment, the chance to do things for other people, the chance to tell people what to do, the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities,

the chance to try my own methods of doing the job, and the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job. The extrinsic factor consists of the following items: the way my boss handles his/her workers, competence of my supervisor in making decisions, the way company policies are put into practice, my pay and the amount of work I do, the chance for advancement in this job, and the praise I get for doing the job.

Summary of the Procedures

Of the thousands of high school athletic directors across the United States, 500 were invited to participate in the present study. The high school athletic directors' names and email addresses were obtained from the Clell Wade Directory. The participants were contacted via email with instructions for completing the instruments sent via an introductory email (See appendix A) on January 16, 2012. After a period of about 30 days, a follow-up email letter which again contained the link to the MLQ and MSQ questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) was sent to participants on February 13, then on February 26, and then on March 2, 2012. Additionally, the participants received a final follow up email (see Appendix C) on March 3, 2012. Participants' consent was determined based on their survey submittal via the web link. Response rates were increased by follow up e-mails being sent every week to two weeks for four weeks. The researcher's information was provided to all participants in each e-mail that was sent (Appendices A, B, and C). Data were analyzed using canonical correlation analysis followed by canonical commonality analysis.

Discussion Relative to the Research Questions

Eight research questions were investigated. A brief summary of the results of each research question, along with explanation and discussion follows.

Research Question 1

Research question 1 tested whether there would be a statistically significant relationship between the dependent variable set of satisfaction variables (intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction) and the predictor variable set of leadership styles (transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant) for a national sample of athletic directors. Results indicated that a moderate degree of correlation existed between the two variable sets for canonical root 1 ($R_c^2 = .22$), and that the correlation was statistically significant ($p < .05$).

The results of this research question are not surprising as it was anticipated that a correlation would be found between the dependent variable set and the predictor variable set of leadership styles. However, the analysis of the canonical structure coefficients for this analysis indicated a finding that was not expected, namely that the directionality of the correlations between the predictor variables and their canonical variate was the reverse of what was expected. Both Transformational and Passive/Avoidant subscales of the MLQ were correlated with the predictor canonical variate; however, transformational was negatively correlated with the variate, and Passive/Avoidant was positively correlated with the variate. Considering that the dependent canonical variate

was defined by both the intrinsic and extrinsic MSQ variables, the finding for the predictor set is counterintuitive.

Although it would have been expected that participants perceiving themselves as high in passive/avoidant leadership would have found themselves less satisfied with their work and that participants perceiving themselves as high in transformational leadership would have been more satisfied, the converse was actually true. It was also interesting that Transactional Leadership had a near zero structure coefficient for its relationship with the predictor canonical variate, suggesting that this leadership style had little relationship with the participants' job satisfaction. One major difference in the present study and the extant scholarship serving as the conceptual framework for the study, is that the present study focused on participants' satisfaction with their own work whereas both the full range leadership model (Avolio & Bass, 1991) and the multidimensional model of leadership in sport (Chelladurai, 1980, 2007) have focused on follower satisfaction. The focus on the leader's own satisfaction may pose a challenge for the extant models of transformational leader behaviors. Whereas the focus of research on transformational leadership has been largely on follower effects, the satisfaction of followers may not necessarily be accompanied by the satisfaction of the leader. These inconsistencies suggest there may be usefulness in studying leadership styles and self-satisfaction in concert with variables such as leader stress and burnout. The body of research on these latter two variables

(e.g., Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1987; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) would serve to inform studies of this type.

Research Question 2

Research question 2 tested: Will transactional leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Results indicated that for canonical root 1, the unique variance attributable to Transactional Leadership was zero (.02, or 2%). This finding was consistent with the interpretation of this variable's contribution to the overall canonical results considering its near zero structure coefficient in that analysis. In essence, the Transactional Leadership variable provided very little contribution to the analysis overall; hence, its unique contribution to the analysis could not have possibly been appreciable; and the commonality analysis findings here substantiate this.

The results of this research question are fascinating because transactional leadership is viewed as an exchange process in which the leader provides rewards to followers in the form of pay or prestige in exchange for work done by the follower (Burns, 1978). Also, Brymer and Gray (2006, p. 14) referred to transactional leadership as "contingent reward leadership," in which both an active and positive exchange is made between the leader and follower. Leader transactional behaviors are generally associated with follower satisfaction, so it would follow that leaders who exhibit higher levels of transactional leadership would also find satisfaction in their own work. In essence, satisfied workers

would be thought to correlate with satisfied leaders (Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006). However, the present study's results indicated virtually no correlation between the leader's level of transactional behavior and their level of intrinsic or extrinsic satisfaction with their work. Hence, previously-mentioned cautions about the applicability of transformational leadership theory to the study of the leader's own satisfaction may be warranted.

Research Question 3

Research question 3 tested: Will transformational leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Results indicated that for canonical root 1, the unique variance attributable to Transformational Leadership was appreciable (.14 or 14%).

This finding was consistent with the expectation that transformational leadership would be most related to job satisfaction. Armstrong-Doherty (1995) noted that sports administrators should possess the ability to motivate organizational members to accomplish higher goals and to voluntarily step forward to take extra roles for the organization in today's consistently changing and complicated environment in sports. Hence, the finding that transformational leadership was the leadership variable that contributed most uniquely to the multivariate results is logical. However, when coupled with the findings associated with Research Question 1, it becomes clear that Transformational Leadership, though important in its contribution to the analysis, was negatively correlated with participants' job satisfaction. Additionally, as noted previously,

the positive effects of transformational leadership on follower satisfaction (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Chelladurai, 1980, 2007) may not necessarily carry over to leader satisfaction.

Research Question 4

Research question 4 tested: Will passive/avoidant leadership account for an appreciable amount of unique variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Results indicated the unique variance attributable to Passive/Avoidant Leadership was negligible (.006 or 0.6%). It is not surprising that the Passive/Avoidant Leadership variable offered very little unique contribution to the canonical correlation analysis. Generally speaking, Passive/Avoidant Leadership would be appropriately hypothesized as negatively related to Transformational Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2000; Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). Hence, the presence of Transformational Leadership would mean the absence of Passive/Avoidant Leadership, and vice-versa, as is supported by the present findings. These findings are consistent with the full range multifactor leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1991, and Bass & Avolio, 2000) and multidimensional leadership for sport (Chelladurai, 1980, 2007) models which served as conceptual frames for the present study.

Research Question 5

Research question 5 tested: Will transactional leadership share in common with transformational leadership the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Results indicated that the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite shared by Transactional and Transformational Leadership was negligible. The commonality coefficient for this variance partition was negative (-.024), indicating the presence of a variable suppressor effect. The results of this research question are confusing because of the presence of this suppressor effect (Capraro, 2000; Capraro & Capraro, 2001). The presence of the suppressor effect (Beaton, 1973; Nimon, 2010) indicates that the predictor variable of Transactional Leadership, as a result of its very low amount of unique predictive power, is actually confounding the predictive power of Transformational Leadership on the dependent variable composite. As Beaton (1973) has noted, suppressor effects generally indicate that the individual predictive power of either of the predictors sharing a suppressor effect is enhanced when the other variable is included in the analysis. Hence, even though the Transactional Leadership variable provided very little unique explanatory variance to the regression analysis, its presence may have served to enhance the predictive power of the Transformational Leadership variable.

Research Question 6

Research question 6 tested: Will transactional leadership share in common with passive/avoidant the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Results indicated that the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite shared by the Transactional Leadership and Passive/Avoidant Leadership variables was negligible. The commonality coefficient for this variance partition was .009, indicating a near zero effect.

The lack of overlap in the explanatory power of these variables suggests that they are, as designed, measuring very different aspects of the leader's behavior. In fact, an expected result of this analysis could be related somewhat appreciably, though negatively, or that the relationship would be negligible as shown in the present results. Consider that Transactional Leadership is based on an intentional "contingent reward" scenario in which coaches or followers are paid additional bonuses as a reward for achieving the mission set forth by the school or business department of that organization. By contrast, Passive/Avoidant leadership lacks intentionality: the leader intervenes with a follower's work only in cases in which something goes wrong (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

Research Question 7

Research question 7 tested: Will transformational leadership share in common with passive/avoidant the ability to account for an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Results indicated that the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite shared by Transformational

Leadership and Passive/Avoidant Leadership was appreciable. The canonical commonality coefficient for this variance partition was .073 (7.3%).

The results of this research question are interesting because the literature shows that transformational leadership styles and passive/avoidant leadership styles are at opposite ends of the leadership style spectrum. However, Bass (1999) stated that transformational leadership should have a positive impact on followers' job satisfaction. Because passive/avoidant leadership is the absence of leadership, it would follow that the two would be likely to correlate appreciably though inversely. Hence, the finding of an appreciable commonality coefficient for these two variables is intuitively consistent with Bass' theory (1999).

Research Question 8

Research question 8 tested: Will transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant leaders share in common an appreciable amount of variance in the dependent canonical variables?

Results indicated that the common variance partition attributable to variance in the dependent variable composite shared by Transactional, Transformational, and Passive/Avoidant Leadership was negligible. The commonality coefficient for this variance partition was -.009, indicating the presence of a suppressor effect. As previously noted, suppressor effects indicate that the presence of the variables in combination serve to enhance the overall predictive ability of one or more of the variables even though the individual contribution of the suppressing variable may be unappreciable.

Obviously, as indicated in the foregoing analyses, transformational had the strongest unique effect on the dependent variables; hence, the Transactional and Passive/Avoidant variables are having a suppressor effect on Transformational Leadership.

Discussion Relative to Previous Research and Theoretical Literature

The present study found a moderate correlation between athletic directors' leadership styles and their job satisfaction; however, the directionality of the relationships of the variables in the leadership set with satisfaction was unexpected. According to Hersey and Blanchard (2001), management is the process of working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational goals (p. 9). This organizational theory as created by Hersey and Blanchard is reinforced through Chelladurai's (2007) multi-dimensional model of leadership specifically designed for sport professionals. Moreover, the move toward more well defined job descriptions for athletic directors would suggest that transactional and transformation leader behaviors are expected from athletic directors. The most complete job description found in the literature was created by Smith (1993) and addressed in Chapter 2 of this study. None of these tasks would be completed without having a high school athletic director who is both organized as Hersey and Blanchard proposed and "fit" or "aligned" as Chelladurai stressed one should be. Hence, the present study's finding that transformational leadership is inversely related to satisfaction while

passive/avoidant leadership directly correlates with satisfaction is in contradiction to previous research findings.

Consider first the negative relationship found between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. The link between transformational leadership and satisfaction has been found in previous studies; however, the relationship is generally found to be positive. Research on transformational leadership and job satisfaction, show's a positive relationship between nurses exhibiting transformational leadership styles and their job satisfaction (Medley & Larochelle, 1995). Furthermore, transformational leadership is effective not only in business organizations, but also in athletic settings (Yusof & Shah, 2008). Hence, the previous research has with strong consistency found existence of a positive relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction.

The presence of a negative relationship may possibly be the result of several factors present in the data. First, the results could be an artifact of the sample employed in the study. Careful planning was utilized in the design of the present study to create a relatively large sample ($n = 500$) of intended participants; however, even after several attempts to follow up with non-respondents, the resulting sample who completed the questionnaires consisted of only 55 usable participants. Hence, 11% (55 of 500) of the original sample were included in the study. Tse et al. (1995) found that response rates for email surveys may sometimes be as low as 6%. Response rates can also reach a high of 75% (Kiesler & Sproull, 1986). It is possible that sample bias may have been

an issue. Second, the results could suggest that athletic directors who do attempt to maximize their role through transformational leadership behaviors may become discouraged when they do not see immediate or sustained results of their concerted efforts; hence, a transformational athletic director may have lower satisfaction than a passive/avoidant counterpart who has relatively low expectations. It is possible that athletic directors attempt to be transformational but have followers or senior administrators who do not respond well to this model of leadership, causing frustration for the transformational athletic director. Third it is possible that athletic directors who begin their positions as transformational leaders begin to move away from this model of leadership as a result of a lack in collegial support. Finally, because it is the principal who sets the overall leadership climate for the school, it may be possible that a transformational athletic director who serves with a less energetic principal suffers greatly from the tension caused by this lack of congruity that eventually results in diminished job satisfaction.

The present study also found a positive relationship between passive/avoidant leadership and job satisfaction. This finding was interesting considering that passive/avoidant leadership is generally thought to be a weak leadership style. There are several possible explanations for this finding. Passive/avoidant leaders may be satisfied because they do not expect much. Alternately, passive/avoidant leaders may be personally satisfied, but this may not necessarily mean that colleagues, athletes, or the school administration is

necessarily satisfied with the athletic director's efforts as a leader. Third, passive/avoidant leaders may fly under the radar and avoid conflict with others, resulting in more satisfaction; conversely, proactive transactional and transformational leaders may be more likely to confront conflict, leading to diminished satisfaction. Fourth, passive/avoidant leaders may not truly understand their leadership style choice as weak and thus have a high level of job satisfaction because less is asked of them. Finally, there is the possibility that the "old geezer" or "good old boy" stereotypes of the athletic director (Koehler & Giebel, 1997) are accurate, at least for some individuals filling the role.

The present study found that transactional leadership had virtually no relationship with satisfaction. The literature on contingent reward theory, the precursor to transactional leadership theory suggests that there should be a link between this type of leader behavior and satisfaction. Brymer and Gray (2006) suggested that transactional leader behavior can only work effectively when there is an active and positive relationship between leader and followers. This would suggest that transactional leaders would have satisfaction at least as regards to relationships with subordinates. However, the relationship between leader and followers within a contingent reward environment is not permanent (Burns, 1978). Rewards tend to be immediate and have short term influence on subordinates. Hence, whereas some athletic directors time the distribution of rewards to be frequent enough to keep subordinates happy, others may not be

as skilled with their timing or may have fewer resources to fuel a rewards program, resulting in lower satisfaction of both the leader and the subordinate. Similarly, the rewards that a principal uses to encourage the athletic director may lack timing or may be ill-suited to the athletic director's sense of self-satisfaction. Transactional athletic directors may become concerned or upset if the school's administration expects a lot of them, especially early in their tenure in a position without creating a reward and incentive structure to recognize progress made toward goals. Further, it is possible that at least some apparent transactional leaders actually are borderline passive/avoidant leaders; hence the fact that specific outcomes are expected of them may cause angst as their natural tendency may be to avoid interaction with the administration altogether other than when absolutely necessary.

Recommendations for Practice and Research

The results of the present study have implications for the profession of Inter-scholastic athletic directors. The results suggest that it would be useful for high school athletic directors to engage in more self-reflection about their leadership styles. High school athletic directors would benefit from professional development activities focused on learning to assess their leadership style and developing strategic plans in which they focus on the links between their own leader behaviors, their job satisfaction, and other important performance outcomes. Similarly, research may help determine the most commonly used leadership styles among athletic directors who are most effective in their roles.

Research in this area would help school administrators determine the degree to which athletic directors exhibit certain behaviors and whether these behaviors lead to increased job satisfaction.

Some effective ways to implement transactional leadership include offering better compensation packages to the athletic directors and their coaches and providing better resources or budgets to upgrade team operations and athletic training facilities (Kim, 2009). Transactional leadership cannot be replaced by transformational leadership (Bass, 1999). Rather, transformational leadership serves to augment the effects of transactional leadership. In the commonality results of the present study, it was found that transactional leadership, though it had little direct effect on job satisfaction, served to enhance the impact of transformational leadership on job satisfaction. This suppressor effect (Beaton, 1973) may be worthy of further study, and the present study should be replicated with a larger and more diverse sample to determine whether the canonical correlation and commonality results can be confirmed or alternately can be attributed to sample artifacts.

It is noteworthy that transformational leadership was shown to have the most unique effect on the dependent variables. Transformational leadership is indeed positively correlated with job satisfaction; however, it is important that the issue of directionality of this relationship be explored further. High school athletic directors are generally known to be more satisfied with their position as their administration allows them to transform and change the climate of high school

athletics in harmony with the school's overall model for success (Sugarmann, 1999). A sport leader's transformational leadership can transform followers from easy-going and relaxed individuals to dedicated, committed, and hardworking followers (Chelladurai, 2007). This style of leadership would be considered ideal in the transforming of a coaching staff to fit the school's model of success, thus leading to a very satisfied high school athletic director.

The results of passive/avoidant leadership variable may suggest a trend towards high school athletic directors being satisfied with avoiding leadership or merely managing daily tasks as required to provide a school with a general athletics program. If this is indeed a trend, it is incumbent upon school administrators to do a more effective job in hiring and evaluating athletic directors with the goal of providing direction and reinforcement to assure that the role does not become focused simply on mundane tasks. When necessary, principals need to have the courage to discipline or dismiss those high school athletic directors who fail to provide proper leadership to their coaching staff, volunteers, and subordinate administrators. According to Bass and Avolio (2004), passive/avoidant leadership (*laissez-faire* leadership or management-by-exception) has negative consequences for followers and associates. Failing to establish a more proactive view of one's own role may lead an athletic director to drive an otherwise successful program to mediocrity.

The present study's findings also have implications for ongoing professional development. It is recommended that leadership symposia be

provided to high school athletic directors, school administrators, and other leaders responsible for the success of the athletic program. Although programs of this type should be multi-faceted, it is crucial that professional development for athletic leaders help administrators develop and strive toward a specific model of success for their school. Athletic programs are not generic or standardized, and the goals of the athletic program must be consistent with the larger goals of the school. It is also important that all of the leaders in the school who share responsibility for the athletic program work toward common goals. Athletic directors are selected based on their experience and abilities to motivate their peers or followers to meet the goals of the school's athletic program.

Congruence of leadership styles across all the people who share leadership of the athletic program is essential. A transformational athletic director cannot be expected to produce a quality athletic program if the school principal has an opposite leadership approach that consists of motivation by intimidation, negativity, or reactive, passive/avoidant behaviors. Considering that high school athletic directors are an integral part of the daily operation of high schools and serve over 3 million students annually (Kanaby, 2006), it is essential that steps be taken to maximize the impact of these important professionals.

Finally, more research is needed in general on leadership issues among high school athletics administrators. Although significant studies have been done in transformational leadership development (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1994) in a variety of fields, few studies have been done on leadership development in high

school athletics administration. Much can potentially be learned from this population, and additional research has the potential to lead to improved practices in this field. It is imperative that more studies are conducted on the leadership styles of high school athletic directors and their role in sports management.

Conclusion

The present study examined research questions regarding the relationship between transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership styles and job satisfaction within the context of high school athletic directors. Two unanticipated findings of the present study warrant further investigation. The relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction was found to be negative, and the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership and job satisfaction was positive. As previously noted, future studies should examine the relationship between passive/avoidant leadership and satisfaction using larger and more diverse samples to determine if artifacts of the present study's respondent sample biased the outcomes. Additional research on leadership and job satisfaction and how they relate to the successes of high school athletic directors and their programs is needed, and studies focused on the study of the variables along with work factors such as stress and burnout are also warranted.

The relationship between leadership (transactional, transformational, or passive/avoidant) and job satisfaction needs to be further investigated. In the present study, job satisfaction was found to have a near zero relationship with

transactional leadership. Future studies across leaders in various professional fields are needed to determine with more certainty whether transactional leadership and leader job satisfaction are directly related. It would be ideal to validate whether or not this finding is consistent across all careers and not just high school athletic directors. Further, the present study did not analyze leadership (transformational, transactional, passive/avoidant) in relation to demographic variables such as gender, race, and years of experience, but concentrated on self reporting of leadership and how it associates with job satisfaction. Future studies need to compare multiple demographic variables and the degree to which they are related to leadership style (transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant) in high school athletic directors. The present study was limited by the size of the sample. Future studies utilizing larger and more diverse samples are needed. Larger samples would likely yield more stable findings relative to the relationships among job satisfaction, leadership style, and other related variables. Another future study worthy of exploration would be the analysis of ethics and its relationship, if any, to leadership style.

Appendix A

Pre-Notification Email

10/26/2011

Dear High School Athletic Director,

This email is intended to introduce myself and a research proposal in which you have been randomly selected to participate in. My name is Colin Turey and I am a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership with a Sports Management and Psychology track at the University of North Florida. Along with Dr. Larry Daniel from the University of North Florida, I am currently collecting data for my research study on high school athletic director's leadership styles and job satisfaction.

In a very short amount of time you will be receiving another email which contains the internet links that connect you to two brief web surveys each of which are ten minutes or less to complete. It is my hope that you will kindly participate in this research project. Please note that participation in the study is voluntary and should you choose not to complete the surveys no one will know. Your participation is greatly appreciated and for agreeing to participate I will gladly send you a copy of the research results via email once the research has been completed.

If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to call me at _____, or email me at _____. You may also contact my committee chair, Dr. Larry Daniel via email at _____ or by phone at _____.

If you have any research rights questions please contact Dr. Katherine Kasten, UNF's Institutional Review Board,

Sincerely,

Colin Turey, M.S.
Ed.D candidate
University of North Florida

Dr. Larry Daniel
Dean of the College of Education
University of North Florida

Appendix B
Study Invitation Email

11/15/11

Dear High School Athletic Director,

We are conducting research on high school athletic director's leadership styles and job satisfaction. The focus is to determine which leadership style if any presents a correlation with job satisfaction. Your completion of the surveys will provide us with the necessary data to determine whether or not intrinsic or extrinsic factors of job satisfaction show a correlation to leadership styles such as transactional, transformational, or passive/avoidant.

The study is being conducted by Colin Turey and Dr. Larry Daniel from the University of North Florida. Participation in the study is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any point without penalty and may refuse to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable. By completing the online survey, you consent to participation. Although respondents receive no personal benefit or reward for their participation, your responses will contribute to the expanding educational leadership and high school athletics fields. It is expected that each survey will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete. You can access the questionnaires by clicking on the following links:

<http://www.mindgarden.com/login/118667/113603>

If you are not able to click on the link due to some technical difficulty, then please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Please be assured that the survey software in this study allows for anonymous collection of data (email addresses will not be linked to respondents). Although every effort will be made to ensure confidentiality, no guarantee of internet security can be given, as transmission of emails can be intercepted and IP addresses are identifiable. The results of this study will not be linked to any one individual or high school and any discussion of the results will be done as group data. We will send a copy of the research shortly after the study has completed.

If you have any questions concerning your research rights at any time, please contact either Colin Turey at _____ or Dr. Larry Daniel at _____. You may also contact Dr. Katherine Kasten, _____ UNF's Institutional Review Board, _____. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Colin Turey, M.S.
Ed..D. candidate
University of North Florida

Dr. Larry Daniel
Dean of the College of Education
University of North Florida

Appendix C
Follow Up Email Letter

12/15/11

Dear High School Athletic Director,

This email is intended as a follow up to my previous study invitations. My name is Colin Turey and I am a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership with a Sports Management and Psychology track at the University of North Florida. Along with Dr. Larry Daniel from the University of North Florida, I am currently collecting data for my research study on high school athletic director's leadership styles and job satisfaction.

It is my hope that you will kindly participate in this research project. Please note that participation in the study is voluntary and should you choose not to complete the surveys no one will know. Your participation is greatly appreciated and for agreeing to participate I will gladly send you a copy of the research results via email once the research has been completed.

Please click the link or copy and paste into your browser:

<http://www.mindgarden.com/login/118667/113603>

If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to call me at _____, or email me at _____. You may also contact my committee chair, Dr. Larry Daniel via email at _____ or by phone at _____

If you have any research rights questions please contact Dr. Katherine Kasten, UNF's Institutional Review Board,

Sincerely,

Colin Turey, M.S.
Ed.D candidate
University of North Florida

Dr. Larry Daniel
Dean of the College of Education
University of North Florida

Appendix D
Permission to use MSQ survey

Colin:

Since you already purchased the MSQ in printed form and presumably have not used them, you may have our permission to administer up to 500 electronically as requested below. Be sure to reproduce our copyright on the electronic copies, followed by "Reproduced with permission."

After you have sent the appropriate number of electronic MSQs, please shred that number of copies of the printed version.

Dave Weiss

Appendix E
Permission to use MLQ survey

Hello Colin,

1/12/2012

This is acknowledgment that we received payment for Invoice 25263
(copy of paid invoice attached).

I have updated our records with your new phone number and mailing address.

Best regards,

Chris

Mind Garden, Inc.

Appendix F

IRB Permission to conduct the study



Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
 1 UNF Drive
 Jacksonville, FL 32224-2665
 904-620-2455 FAX 904-620-2457
 Equal Opportunity/Equal Access/Affirmative Action Institution

UNF IRB Number: <u>11-110</u> Approval Date: <u>12-21-2011</u> Expiration Date: <u>Exempt - None</u> Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB <i>KLC</i>

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 21, 2011

TO: Mr. Colin Turey

VIA: Dr. Larry Daniel
 Educational Leadership

FROM: Dr. Katherine Kasten, Chairperson
 On behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Review by the UNF Institutional Review Board IRB#11-110:
 "Perceptions of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction: A Study of High School Athletic Directors in the United States, Using the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)"

This is to advise you that your project, "Perceptions of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction: A Study of High School Athletic Directors in the United States, Using the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)" was reviewed on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board and has been declared Exempt, Category 2." Therefore, this project requires no further IRB oversight unless substantive changes are made.

This approval applies to your project in the form and content as submitted to the IRB for review. Any variations or modifications to the approved protocol and/or informed consent forms that might increase risk to human participants must be submitted to the IRB prior to implementing the changes. Please see the [UNF Standard Operating Procedures](#) for additional information about what types of changes might elevate risk to human participants. Any unanticipated problems involving risk and any occurrence of serious harm to subjects and others shall be reported promptly to the IRB within 3 business days.

As you may know, **CITI Course Completion Reports are valid for 3 years**. Your completion report is valid through 10/18/2014. If your completion report expires within the next 60 days or has expired, please take CITI's refresher course and contact us to let us know you have completed that training. If you need to complete the refresher course, please do so by following this link: <http://www.citiprogram.org/>.

Should you have any questions regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact Kayla Champaigne at 904-620-2312, or K.Champaigne@unf.edu.

Appendix G

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Leader Form

My Name: _____ Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale: Sample

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts 0 1 2 3 4
2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate 0 1 2 3 4
3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious..... 0 1 2 3 4
4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards ..01234
5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise0 1 2 3 4
6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs 0 1 2 3 4
7. I am absent when needed 0 1 2 3 4
8. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems 0 1 2 3 4
9. I talk optimistically about the future 0 1 2 3 4
10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me 0 1 2 3 4
11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets0 1 2 3 4
12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action0 1 2 3 4

Use the Following Rating Scale: SAMPLE

	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, If not always
	0	1	2	3	4
13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	0	1	2	3	4
14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	0	1	2	3	4
15. I spend time teaching and coaching	0	1	2	3	4
16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved...	0	1	2	3	4
17. I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."	0	1	2	3	4
18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group	0	1	2	3	4
19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group	0	1	2	3	4
20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action	0	1	2	3	4
21. I act in ways that build others' respect for me	0	1	2	3	4
22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures	0	1	2	3	4
23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	0	1	2	3	4
24. I keep track of all mistakes	0	1	2	3	4
25. I display a sense of power and confidence	0	1	2	3	4
26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future	0	1	2	3	4
27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards	0	1	2	3	4
28. I avoid making decisions	0	1	2	3	4
29. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others .	0	1	2	3	4
30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles	0	1	2	3	4
31. I help others to develop their strengths	0	1	2	3	4
32. I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	0	1	2	3	4
33. I delay responding to urgent questions	0	1	2	3	4

34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.....0 1 2 3 4

Use the Following Rating Scale: SAMPLE

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, If not always
0	1	2	3	4

35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations 0 1 2 3 4

36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved 0 1 2 3 4

37. I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs 0 1 2 3 4

38. I use methods of leadership that are satisfying 0 1 2 3 4

39. I get others to do more than they expected to do..... 0 1 2 3 4

40. I am effective in representing others to higher authority 0 1 2 3 4

41. I work with others in a satisfactory way 0 1 2 3 4

42. I heighten others' desire to succeed 0 1 2 3 4

43. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements 0 1 2 3 4

44. I increase others' willingness to try harder 0 1 2 3 4

45. I lead a group that is effective 0 1 2 3 4

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.

It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If you need to reproduce the MLQ, please contact Mind Garden www.mindgarden.com. Mind Garden is a registered trademark of Mind Garden, Inc.

Appendix H

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.
1. Being able to keep busy all the time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The chance to work alone on the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The chance to do different things from time to time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The way my job provides for steady employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The chance to do things for other people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. The chance to tell people what to do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. The way company policies are put into practice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. My pay and the amount of work I do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. The chances for advancement on this job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. The freedom to use my own judgment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. The working conditions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. The praise I get for doing a good job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Very Dissat.	Dissat.	N	Sat.	Very Sat.

Name _____ Today's Date _____ 19____
Please Print

1. Check one: Male Female

2. When were you born? _____ 19____

3. Circle the number of years of schooling you completed:

4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Grade School					High School				College				Graduate or Professional School			

4. What is your present job called? _____

5. What do you do on your present job? _____

6. How long have you been on your present job? _____ years _____ months

7. What would you call your **occupation**, your usual line of work? _____

8. How long have you been in this line of work? _____ years _____ months

References

- Anderson, S. E., & Gansneder, B. M. (1995). Using electronic mail surveys and computer monitored data for studying computer-mediated communication systems. *Social Science Computer Review*, 13(1), 33-46.
doi: [10.1177/089443939501300103](https://doi.org/10.1177/089443939501300103)
- Antonakis, J. (2001). The validity of the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership model as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5X). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (University Microfilms No. 3000380).
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261-295.
doi: [10.1016/S1048-9843\(03\)00030-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4)
- Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2004, June). *On instrumental leadership: Beyond transactions and transformations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Gallup Leadership Institute Summit, Omaha, NE. Retrieved from http://www.spbkbd.com/english/art_english/art_26_030211.pdf
- Appenzeller, H. (2003). *Managing sport and risk management strategies* (2nd ed.). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Armstrong-Doherty, A. (1995). Athletic directors' perceptions of environmental control over inter-university athletics. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 75-95.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range leadership development program: Basic and advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio, & Associates.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-463.
- Barnhill, R. M. (1998). An assessment of the leadership skills of athletic directors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(8), 2785.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
doi: [10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130-139.
doi: [10.1037//0003-066X.52.2.130](https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.52.2.130)
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
doi: [10.1080/135943299398410](https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410)
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5x-short)*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sampler set*. Retrieved from <http://www.mindgarden.com>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership (2nd ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates..
- Beaton, A. E. (1973, March). *Commonality*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED111829)
- Bedeian, A. G., Farris, G. R. & Kacmar, K. M. (1992). Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 40(1), 33-48.
doi: [10.1016/0001-8791\(92\)90045-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(92)90045-2)

- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 901–910.
doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901)
- Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 11*, 238-263.
doi: [10.2307/2391247](https://doi.org/10.2307/2391247)
- Brymer, E., & Gray, T. (2006). Effective leadership: Transformational or transactional? *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education, 10*(2), 13-19.
- Buitendach, J. H., & Rothmann, S. (2009). The validation of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire in selected organisations in South Africa. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management, 7*, 1-8.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Capraro, R. M. (2000, November). *Commonality and the common man: Understanding variance contributions to overall canonical correlation effects*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Bowling Green, KY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED449232)
- Capraro, R. M., & Capraro, M. M. (2001). Commonality analysis: Understanding variance contributions to overall canonical correlation effects of attitude toward mathematics on geometry achievement. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints, 27*(2), 16-23.
- Carter, G. R., & Cunningham, W. G. (1997). *The American school superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chelladurai, P. (1980). Leadership in sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 5*(4), 226-231.

- Chelladurai, P. (2007). Leadership in sports. In G. Tenenbaum & R.C. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 113-135). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
doi: [10.1002/9781118270011.ch5](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118270011.ch5)
- Chelladurai, P., & Haggerty, T. R. (1978). A normative model of decision styles in coaching. *Athletic Administrator*, 13(1), 6-9.
- Cinar, O., Bektas, C., & Aslan, E., (2011). A motivation study on the effectiveness of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. *Journal of Economics and Management*. 16 (690-695).
- Clawson, J. G. (1999). *Level three leadership: Getting below the surface*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cleveland, F. (1985). *The knowledge executive: Leading in an information society*. New York, NY: Dutton.
- Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Coy, B., & Masterson, G. (2007). Hiring a winning coach & coping with stress. *Coach and Athletic Director*, 76(9), 32-35.
- Crust, L., & Lawrence, I. (2006). A review of leadership in sport: Implications for football management. *Online Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8(4).
- Dachler, H. P. (1988). Constraints on the emergence of new vistas in leadership and management research: An epistemological overview. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schreishelm (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 261-286). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Daft, R. L. (1999). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Dryden Press.
- Dagaz, M. C. (2012). Learning from the band: Trust, acceptance, and self-confidence. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 41, 432-461.
doi: [10.1177/0891241612447813](https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241612447813)
- Daniel, L. G. (1989, March). *Commonality analysis with multivariate data sets*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314483)

- Davis, D. (2002). An analysis of the perceived leadership styles and levels of satisfaction of selected junior college athletic directors and head coaches. *The Sport Journal*, 5(2).
- Densten, I. L., & Gray, J. H. (1998). The case for using both latent and manifest variables to investigate management-by-exception. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 3, 80-92.
- Dhammika, K. A. S., Ahmad, F. B., & Sam, T. L. (2012). Job satisfaction, commitment and performance: Testing the goodness of measures of three employee outcomes. *South Asia Journal of Management*, 19(2), 7-22.
- Doherty, A. J., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 292-309.
- Dublin Public Schools, (2005). Director of athletics job description. Dublin, OH: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.dublinschools.net/JobDescriptionsAdmin.aspx>
- Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational leadership: The road ahead* (pp. 35-66). Oxford, England: Elsevier Press.
- Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14(1), 10-43.
doi: [10.1177/0743558499141003](https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558499141003)
- Farkas, S. J., & Tetrick, L. E. (1989). A three-wave longitudinal analysis of the causal ordering of satisfaction and commitment on turnover decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 855-868.
doi: [10.1037//0021-9010.74.6.855](https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.74.6.855)
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Field, D. L., & Herold, D. M. (1997). Using the leadership practices inventory to measure transformational and transactional leadership. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 569-580.

- Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37(1), 1-6.
doi: [10.1037/h0056314](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056314)
- Ford, C. (2005). *Athletic director's job description*. Melbourne, FL: Holy Trinity Episcopal Academy.
- Frederick, B. N. (1999). Partitioning variance in the multivariate case: A step-by-step guide to canonical commonality analysis. In B. Thompson (Ed.), *Advances in social sciences methodology* (Vol. 5, pp. 305-318). Stanford, CT: JAI Press.
- Geist, A. L. (2001). *Leadership and followship in NCAA Division athletic directors*. (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).
- Gibson, J. L., & Klein, S. M. (1970). Employee attitudes as a function of age and length of service: A re-conceptualization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 13, 411-425.
- Graves, B. (2010). The collision of athletics and consolidation. *School Administrator*, 67(5), 24-29.
- Green, G., & Reese, S. A. (2006). Job satisfaction among high school athletic administrators. *Education*, 127, 318-320.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1987). A work-nonwork interactive perspective of stress and its consequences. *Organizational Behavior Management*, 8(2), 37-60.
doi: [10.1300/J075v08n02_04](https://doi.org/10.1300/J075v08n02_04)
- Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of leader behavior descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its descriptions and measurement* (pp. 39-51). Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.
- Heckscher, C., & Donnellon, A. (Eds.). (1994). *The post-bureaucratic organization: New perspectives on organizational change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (8th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hoch, D. (2000). Understanding and assisting your athletic director. *Principal Leadership*, 1(2), 44-45.
- Hoch, D. (2002). The athletic director as middle management. *Coach and Athletic Director*, 71(6), 4-5.
- Hodson, R. (1989). Gender differences in job satisfaction: Why aren't women more dissatisfied? *The Sociological Quarterly*, 30, 385-399.
doi: [10.1111/j.1533-8525.1989.tb01527.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1989.tb01527.x)
- Hogan, R. (1991). Personality and personality assessment. In M. D. Dunnette & L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 873–919). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology*, 20, 369–390.
doi: [10.1111/j.1744-6570.1967.tb02440.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1967.tb02440.x)
- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R., & Curphy, G. (2008). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Janson, P., & Martin, J. K. (1982). Job satisfaction and age: A test of two views. *Social Forces*, 60, 1089-1102.
doi: [10.2307/2577879](https://doi.org/10.2307/2577879)
- Jens, R., & Schlotz, W. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership and followers' chronic stress. *Leadership Review*, 9, 35-48.
- Jensen, C. R., & Overman, S. J. (2003). *Administration and management of physical education and athletic programs* (4th ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Judge, L. W., & Judge, I. L. (2009). Understanding the occupational stress of interscholastic athletic directors. *ICHPER-SD Journal of Research in Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport & Dance*, 4(2), 37-44.
- Kanaby, R. (2006). Participation in high school sports increases again; confirms NFHS commitment to stronger leadership. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration*, 1-47.

- Kasperson, C. J. (1982). Locus of control and job satisfaction. *Psychology Reports, 50*, 823-826.
- Keller, I. A., & Forsythe, C. E. (1984). *Administration of high school athletics* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kelly, J. D. (1989). Gender, pay and job satisfaction of faculty in journalism. *Journalism Quarterly, 66*, 446-452.
doi: [10.1177/107769908906600226](https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908906600226)
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 15*, 135-159.
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2003). Multiple sources of leadership and employee reactions in a state parks and recreation department. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 21*(1), 38-60.
- Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. S. (1986). Response effects in the electronic survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 50*, 402-413.
doi: [10.1086/268992](https://doi.org/10.1086/268992)
- Kim, H. (2009). *Transformational and transactional leadership of athletic directors and their impact on organizational outcomes perceived by head coaches at NCAA Division II intercollegiate institutions* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 2009).
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Review, 5*(2), 48-60.
doi: [10.5465/AME.1991.4274679](https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.1991.4274679)
- Koehler, M., & Giebel, N. (1997). *Athletic director's survival guide*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kremer, M. D., & Scully, D. M. (1994). *Psychology in sport*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Krug, J. A. (2003). Why do they keep leaving? *Harvard Business Review, 81*, 4-15.

- Leece P, Bhandari M, Sprague S, Swiontkowski, M .F., Schemitsch, E. H., Tornetta, P., III, Devereaux, P. J., & Guyatt G. H. (2004). Internet versus mailed questionnaires: A randomized comparison (2). *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 6(3), e38.
doi: [10.2196/jmir.6.3.e30](https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.6.3.e30)
- Lim, J. Y., & Cromartie, F. (2001). Transformational leadership, organizational culture and organizational effectiveness in sport organizations. *The Sport Journal*, 4(2), 111-169.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Loveless, J. C. (1953). Duties of the state directors of health and physical education. *Research Quarterly*, 24, 121-155.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, G., & Silvasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 385-426.
doi: [10.1016/S1048-9843\(96\)90027-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2)
- Martin, J. J., Kelley, B., & Eklund, R. C. (1999). A model of stress and burnout in male high school athletic directors. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 21(3), 280-294.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Masteralexis, L., Barr, C., & Hums, M. (2012) *Principles and practice of sport management* (4th ed.). Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning, LLC.
- Mathieu, J. E. (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 608-618.
doi: [10.1037//0021-9010.76.5.607](https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.76.5.607)
- McCauley, C. D., Ruderman, M. N., Ohlott, P. J., & Morrow, J. E. (1994). Assessing the developmental components of managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 544-560.
doi: [10.1037//0021-9010.79.4.544](https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.79.4.544)

- McElroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C., & Rude, S. N. (2001). Turnover and organizational performance: A comparative analysis of the effects of voluntary, involuntary, and reduction-in-force turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1294-1299.
doi: [10.1037//0021-9010.86.6.1294](https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.86.6.1294)
- Medley, F. & Laroche, D.R., (1995) Transformational leadership and job satisfaction, *Nurse Management, 26*(9), 64JJ-64LL,64NN.
doi: [10.1097/00006247-199509000-00017](https://doi.org/10.1097/00006247-199509000-00017)
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Muenjohn, N., & Armstrong, A. (2008). Evaluating the structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ): Capturing the leadership factors of transformational-transactional leadership. *Contemporary Management Review, 4*(1), 3-14.
- Nahavandi, A. (2012). *The art and science of leadership* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nimon, K. (2010). Regression commonality analysis: Demonstration of an SPSS solution. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints, 36*(1), 10-17.
- O'Reilly, C. A., III, & Roberts, K. H. (1975). Individual differences in personality, position in the organization and job satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 14*, 144-150.
doi: [10.1016/0030-5073\(75\)90017-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(75)90017-3)
- Owens, R. G. (2001). *Organizational behavior in education: Instructional leadership and school reform* (7th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Parks, J., & Quarterman, J. (2003). *Contemporary sport management* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Parkhouse, B. L., & Lapin, J. (1980). *The woman in athletic administration: Innovative management techniques for universities, colleges, junior colleges, high schools and state high school associations*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co.
- Pederson, P. M., Parks, J. B., Quarterman, J., and Thibault, L., (2011). *Contemporary sport management*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics

- Pedhazur, E.J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research*. Harcourt Brace: Orlando, FL
- Phillips, J. C., & Schafer, W. E. (1971). Consequences of participation in interscholastic sports. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 14, 328-338.
doi: [10.2307/1388646](https://doi.org/10.2307/1388646)
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). What job attitudes can tell us about employee motivation. *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), 118-126.
- Porter-O'Grady, T., & Malloch, K. (2010). *Innovation leadership: Creating the landscape of health care*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Prujin, G., & Boucher, R. (1995). The relationship of transactional and transformational leadership effectiveness of Dutch national sport organizations. *European Journal for Sport Management*, 72, 72-87.
- Read, D. (2000). Going pro: The proliferation of professional sport leagues is giving more athletes great dreams of a pro career. It's also giving high school and college athletic directors a new challenge. *Athletic Management*, 12(3), 20-27.
- Rehberg, R. A., & Schafer, W. E. (1968). Participation in interscholastic athletics and college expectations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, 732-740.
doi: [10.1086/224566](https://doi.org/10.1086/224566)
- Reimer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. P. (1995). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. Leadership and satisfaction in sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(3), 276-293.
- Roach, C. F., & Behling, O. (1984). Functionalism: Basis for alternate approach to the study of leadership. In J. G. Hunt, D. M. Hosking, C. A. Schriesheim, & R. Steward (Eds.), *Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership* (pp. 51-61). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2005). *Management (8th ed.)*, Pearson Education, Inc. Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
doi: [10.1002/pfi.4140440511](https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4140440511)

- Rowold, J. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership in martial arts. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 18*(4), 312-325.
doi: [10.1080/10413200600944082](https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200600944082)
- Ryska, T. A. (2002). Leadership styles and occupational stress among college athletic directors: The moderating effect of program goals. *The Journal of Psychology, 136*(2), 5-213.
doi: [10.1080/00223980209604150](https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980209604150)
- Samier, E. (2002). Managerial rationalization and the ethical disenchantment of education: A Weberian perspective on moral theory in modern educational organizations. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*, 589-603.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, O. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Landau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management, 19*, 385-417.
doi: [10.1016/0149-2063\(93\)90058-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063(93)90058-U)
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology, 132*(3), 277-290.
doi: [10.1080/00223989809599167](https://doi.org/10.1080/00223989809599167)
- Scott, D. K. (1997). A multiframe perspective of leadership and organizational climate in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 13*, 298-316.
- Seefeldt, V., Ewing, M., & Walk, S. (1993). *Overview of youth sports programs in the United States*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED360267)
- Seibold, D., & McPhee, R. (1978). Commonality analysis: A method for decomposing explained variance in multiple regression analyses. *Human Communications Research, 5*(4), 355-365.
doi: [10.1111/j.1468-2958.1979.tb00649.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1979.tb00649.x)
- Shead, M. (2010). *Leadership trait theory*. Retrieved from <http://www.leadership501.com/leadership-trait-theory/22/>

- Shikdar, A. A., & Das, B. (2003). A strategy for improving worker satisfaction and job attitudes in a repetitive industrial task: application of production standards and performance feedback. *Ergonomics*, *46*(5), 466–481.
doi: [10.1080/0014013021000057006](https://doi.org/10.1080/0014013021000057006)
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., & Asland, M. S. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 80-92.
doi: [10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80](https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80)
- Smith, P., & Kendall, L. M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *47*, 149–155.
doi: [10.1037/h0047060](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047060)
- Smith, R. A. (1993). The profile development and the self-assessed leadership skills of university athletic directors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *54*(11), 3956.
- Smither, J. W., London, M., Flautt, R., Vargas, Y., & Kucine, I. (2003). Can working with an executive coach improve multisource feedback ratings over time? A quasi-experimental field study. *Personnel Psychology*, *56*, 23–44.
doi: [10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00142.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00142.x)
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1989). Leadership behavior in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *19*, 1522-1551.
doi: [10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb01462.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb01462.x)
- Snodgrass, S. (2004). Building a high school leadership program. *Coach and Athletic Director*, *74*(4), 44-45.
- Spatkowski, T. J. (1988). A comparative study of perceived leadership behavior of selected North Carolina high school athletic directors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *49*(08), 2062.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stewart, C. (2008). Clarifying athletic program objectives: The foundation for coach evaluation and job satisfaction. *Coach & Athletic Director*, *78*(5), 39-41.
- Stogdill, R. (1974). *Handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.

- Stone, G., & Patterson, K. (2005). *The history of leadership focus*. Servent leadership research roundtable. Virginia Beach, VA: School of Leadership Studies. Retrieved from: http://regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2005/stone_history.pdf
- Sugarmann, K. (1999). *Winning the mental way: A practical guide to team building and mental training*. Burlingame, CA: Step up Publishing.
- Tepper, B. J., & Percy, P. M. (1994). Structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54, 734-744.
doi: [10.1177/0013164494054003020](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164494054003020)
- Thompson, B. (1985). Alternate methods for analyzing data from experiments. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 54, 50-55.
- Tse, A. C. B., Tse, K. C., Yin., C. H., Ting, C. B., Yi, K. W., Yee, K. P., & Hong., W. C. (1995). Comparing two methods of sending out questionnaires: E-mail versus mail. *Journal of the Market Research Society*. 37, 441-445.
- Turner, W., & Chappell, D. (1999). *The learning of love: A journey toward servant leadership*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys.
- Vallee, C. N., & Bloom, G. A. (2005). Building a successful program: Perspectives of expert Canadian female coaches of team sports. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17, 179-196.
- Varca, P. E., Shaffer, G. S., & McCauley, C. D. (1983). Sex differences in job satisfaction revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 348-353.
doi: [10.2307/255982](https://doi.org/10.2307/255982)
- Vocational Psychology Research. (2002). Retrieved from <http://www.psych.umn.edu/psylabs/vpr/default.htm>
- Vroom, V. H. (1967). *Work and motivation* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wallace, M., & Weese, W. J. (1995). Leadership, organizational culture, and job satisfaction in Canadian YMCA organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9(2), 182-193.
- Watkins, D. L., & Rikard, G. L. (1991). Perceptions of leader behaviors of athletic directors: Implications for change. *Physical Educator*, 48(1), 2-6.

- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Translated by A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1966). Instrumentation for the theory of work adjustment. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, 21*, pg.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, 22*, pg.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1977). *Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation 22: Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Wright, B. E., Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: Transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administration Review, 72*, 206-215.
doi: [10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x)
- Young, J., Edmonson, S., & Slate, J. (2010, June 16). *High school athletic directors and educational leadership traits: A conceptual analysis of the literature*. Retrieved from the Connexions Web site:
<http://cnx.org/content/m34613/1.1/>
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 251-289.
doi: [10.1177/014920638901500207](https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500207)
- Yun, S., Cox, J., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2006). The forgotten follower: A contingency model of leadership and follower self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 374-388.
doi: [10.1108/02683940610663141](https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610663141)
- Yusof, A. (1998). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviours of athletic directors and coaches' job satisfaction. *Physical Educator, 55*(4), 170-175.
- Yusof, A. (2002). Transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors and their effect on coaches' job satisfaction. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities, 10*(1) pg.

Yusof, A., & Shah, P.M., (2008). Transformational leadership and leadership substitutes in sports: Implications on coaches' job satisfaction. *International Bulletin of Business Administration*, 3, 17-29.

Colin J. Turey
Vita

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

EDUCATOR IN FLORIDA

2010 to present

Heritage High School, Palm Bay, FL

Teacher of biology and science research. In addition, I am the head varsity girls basketball coach. I serve on the Sports Medicine Academy collaboration team and assist in grant writing in order to support our field trips to a variety of Florida universities, which gives our students exposure to educational and field opportunities in sports medicine.

2008-2010

Southwest Middle School, Palm Bay, FL

Taught students with a range of abilities the Florida middle school science curriculum that ranges from scientific method through the systems of the human body. Received the Discovery Educator "STAR" Educator Award. Increased students' skills such as finding main idea, critical thinking, compare and contrast, and hands-on exploration through a variety of formative and summative assessments.

DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS

2005-2007

Holy Trinity Episcopal Academy, Melbourne, FL

Administered the athletic program for student-athletes in grades 7-12, in which our sports teams achieved District, Regional, and State Awards. Scheduled the Fall, Winter, and Spring athletic seasons for 18 sports teams. Organized the budget for each sports team coach. Provided leadership to coaching staff of 40. Balanced the policies and procedures of the Florida High School Athletic Association and our Academy's mission, vision and values. Coached the Men's and Women's Varsity Golf Program and Jr. High Boys Basketball team. Coached Florida Female Golf State Champion!

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF CAMPUS RECREATION

2001-2005

Department of Campus Recreation (University of North Florida), Jacksonville, FL
Hire, train, and supervised student workers for the Intramural Sports program. Administer the Intramural and Sports Clubs annual budget. Facilitated the practices for the NBA team the Orlando Magic, as well as the USA National Men's and Women's Basketball Teams. Hosted the Philadelphia Eagles (2005) for the Super Bowl. Facilitated the practices of the Gator Bowl teams, Virginia Tech (2002), the University of Notre Dame (2003), and West Virginia University

(2004, 2005). Managed an eight-week long Youth Sports and Fitness Camp, that hosted children ages 5 years to 14 years old.

ADJUNCT INSTRUCTOR

2001-2005

College of Education & Human Services, Univ. of North Florida Jacksonville, FL
Taught classes in physical education teacher education program and sport management program.

GRADUATE ASSISTANT

2000 to 2001

Department of Campus Recreation (Eastern Kentucky University), Richmond, KY
Planned and implemented Homecoming 5K run. Hired, trained and scheduled all Intramural Officials for the Fall, Winter, and Spring sports seasons. Supervised Wellness Center. Conducted soccer, flag football, and basketball officials clinics. Worked the Blue Grass State games as a flag football official.

UNIVERSITY TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- PEL 1511 Soccer 2002-2005
- PEL 1441 Racquetball 2002-2004
- PET 4910 Officiating Sport 2004
- PEO 3007 Selective Coaching Soccer 2003
- PET 4401 Administration of Physical Education and Sport 2002

EDUCATION

University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL

Doctor of Education, April 2013

Dissertation: *Perceptions of Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction in a Sample of High School Athletic Directors in the United States*

Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, KY

Master of Science in Recreation and Park Administration, 2001

University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL

Bachelor of Science in Community Health, 2000

Minor in Exercise Science

SERVICE

- Edit peer reviewed articles for *Recreational Sports Journal*, 2004-2007
- Officiated Youth and Adult League Basketball at a local YMCA, in Ponte Vedra, FL, 2001-2002
- Officiated Women's Varsity Basketball Team Scrimmages for Eastern Kentucky University, 2000

- Invited to Teach Teen Summit on Performance Enhancement Drugs, 2000
- Coach of Women's Flag Football team at Florida Institute of Technology, 1997

RECOGNITIONS

- 2012 First Team All Space Coast Coach of the Year, Girls Basketball (Heritage)
- 2006 Coach of State 1A Female Golf Champion (HTEA)
- 2001 Outstanding Graduate Student Award (EKU)
- 2000 Employee of the Semester in Recreation (UNF)
- 1999 Employee of the Semester in Recreation (UNF)
- 1998 Community Service Learning Award (BCC)
- 1996 Rookie Supervisor of the Year (UNF)
- 1996 Rookie Official of the Year (UNF)

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

- Integrated Marketing Committee, President's Office, University of North Florida, 2003-2005
- UNF Super Bowl Thirty-Nine Planning Committee, Division of Student Affairs, Department of Campus Recreation, University of North Florida, 2003-2005
- Men's and Women's Team USA Basketball Planning Committee, Division of Student Affairs, Department of Campus Recreation, University of North Florida, 2003-2005

MEMBERSHIP/AFFILIATION COMMITTEES

- SERA Graduate Student Leadership Committee, Southwest Educational Research Association, 2006-2007
- NIRSA Journal Editorial Board Committee, National Intramural Recreational Sports Association, 2004-2007
- NIRSA National Conference Host Committee, National Intramural Recreational Sports Association, National Conference Co-Chair for Theme Night, 2005
- NIRSA Facilities Committee, National Intramural Recreational Sports Association, 2001-2002

PUBLICATIONS

National Peer Reviewed

McChesney, J., Longacre, C., Turey, C. & McChesney, S. (May/June, 2004) Coping with Change. *Employee Services Management*, 24-26.

Jones, C., & Turey, C. (2002) Examining the relationship between adventure program offering and proximity to mountain adventure sites. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 26(2), 21-29.

PRESENTATIONS

National

Turey, C. (2004) Utilization of student athletic trainers at intramural sporting events. Presented at annual conference of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Turey, C. (2001) Exploring outdoor adventure program offerings at NIRSA institutions. Presented at annual conference of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association, Reno, Nevada.

Regional

Turey, C. (February, 2007). Part and partial correlations as a means to understand variable collinearity in regression analysis. Presented at annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, Texas.

Turey, C. (February, 2006). Exploring variable contributions via commonality analysis. Presented at annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, Texas.

State

McChesney, J. & Turey, C. (January, 2001). Marketing image and the recreation profession. Presented at annual conference of the Kentucky Recreation and Parks Society. Owensboro, KY.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS PAST AND PRESENT

- American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAPHERD)
- National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)
- Southwest Educational Research Association (SERA)
- Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA)