The Development of Leadership in Model Youth Football Coaches

by

Kurtis Desmond Edward Pankow

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
University of Alberta

Abstract

This study examined how model youth football coaches developed their leadership styles. Six model youth football coaches (*M* age = 46 years, *SD* = 6), and one athlete from each stage of the coaches' careers (early, middle, recent; *n* = 18, *M* age = 24 years, *SD* = 4) were purposefully sampled. Each participant completed an initial semi-structured interview. Coach interviews focused on their leadership behaviours and factors that contributed to their development as leaders. Athlete interviews focused on their former coaches' leadership behaviours. The coaches then participated in second interviews to further explore factors that contributed to their development as leaders. Data analysis was informed by Thorne's (2016) interpretive description methodology. Results were organised in two sections. The first section presents the coaches' and athletes' perspectives of the coaches' leadership styles, based on the charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic (CIP) model of outstanding leadership (Mumford, 2006). The majority of the coach behaviours as reported by coaches and athletes aligned with a pragmatic leadership style. However, none of the coaches or athletes reported behaviours that aligned entirely with one style, and each coach demonstrated some mixed leadership behaviours from each style. The second section presents factors that contributed to the development of outstanding leadership in model football coaches. Role models; networks of coaches; experience and reflection; and formal, non-formal, and informal learning were identified as factors that contributed to the development of outstanding leadership. Practical implications that arose from these findings are discussed, including the utility of teaching coaches about a range of leadership behaviours and styles, and creating mentorship and networking opportunities for coaches to develop their leadership.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Kurtis Pankow. The research project completed as part of this thesis received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, The Development of Outstanding Leadership in Youth Football Coaches, No. Pro00069113, December 6, 2016.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to Ashton Dickson, who is one of the best leaders and teammates I have ever known.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my committee, and special thanks to my supervisor, Nick Holt, for their support and guidance throughout this project. Thank you to the current CASA lab for their endless help and support, to Kacey for her continued guidance even after graduating, and to all the coaches I have had and worked with for inspiring me to pursue this research. Finally, thank you to my family for your continuous love, support, and encouragement, no matter where in the country I live.

Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

Youth sport coaches have an important influence on athletes' development in sport (Horn, 2008). Coach education programs – and the study of coaching development – tend to focus on technical and tactical knowledge (e.g., Erickson, Bruner, MacDonald, & Côté, 2008; Lemyre, Trudel, & Durand-Bush, 2007) rather than how coaches learn to *lead* athletes. Leadership is more than technical and tactical knowledge, and involves both knowing "where the group or team is going" as well as "providing the direction and resources to help it get there" (Weinberg & Gould, 2007, p. 206). Studying how outstanding leaders develop their leadership qualities can help inform education programs and on-going leader development training (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014). The current study focused on understanding leadership among model youth football coaches in order to shed more light on leadership in youth sport.

There is a strong body of literature looking at how the developmental experiences of coaches contribute to their 'coaching knowledge'. These experiences include participation in coach education programs, knowledge gained from playing experience, mentoring, and learning from other coaches (Erickson, Côté, & Fraser-Thomas, 2007; Lemyre et al., 2007). However, as Lemyre et al. (2007) pointed out, the majority of coach development research has focused on "high performance" coaches (i.e., university level and above) and less attention has been given to youth sport coaches (although a body of research has emerged; e.g., Camiré, Trudel, & Forneris, 2014; Stephenson & Jowett, 2009). Continued research is needed to examine the common experiences that contribute

to the development of youth sport coaches in order to better inform coach education (Lemyre et al., 2007).

This thesis was designed to expand upon previous research that has examined the general developmental activities of coaches and the experiences that contributed to their general coaching knowledge (e.g., Carter & Bloom, 2009; Erickson et al., 2007; Lemyre et al., 2007). More specifically, this study focused on the development of ***leadership*** among youth sport coaches. Following recent advice in the management literature (Day et al., 2014) that highlighted a need to understand the developmental experiences of 'good' leaders, this study examined the experiences that contributed to the development of model youth football coaches' ***leadership style*** (i.e., "relatively stable patterns of behaviour displayed by leaders"; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003, p. 569; see Appendix A for a collection of key terms). Football coaches are in a fairly unique leadership position compared to other youth sport coaches, as they typically have a larger coaching staff and more players on their roster (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). This means that there may be more opportunities for them to demonstrate leadership behaviours, and a broader variety of experiences for them to develop from. Hence, youth football coaches provided an ideal opportunity to understand coach leadership in a youth sport context.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the development of leadership among model youth football coaches. Two research questions were addressed: (a) What leadership style best described these coaches? (b) What events and experiences contributed to the development of their leadership style? To address this purpose and the

research questions, model youth football coaches and athletes from three stages of the coaches' careers (early, middle, recent) were purposefully sampled. A qualitative approach was used, informed by Thorne's (2016) interpretive description methodology. The analysis was informed by the charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic (CIP) model of outstanding leadership (Mumford, 2006).

CHAPTER 2:

LITERATURE REVIEW

Origins of Leadership Research

Leadership research has a rich and storied history. As early as the 1920s, psychology and management researchers searched for the so-called 'great-man' traits (i.e., personal, social, and physical characteristics) that great leaders possessed (Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2009; House & Aditya, 1997). While research on leader traits and behaviours continued throughout the 20th century, researchers began to focus more on the interactions between these traits and leaders' experiences (e.g., how the environment impacts leader effectiveness; e.g., House, 1971), the outcomes of leadership behaviours on followers (e.g., Diebig, Bormannn, & Rowold, 2016), and developing theories of leadership (e.g., Bass, 1985).

Leadership research in sport psychology has followed a similar path to the broader fields of leadership research in psychology and management. For instance, early sport psychology research focused on identifying traits and personality profiles of elite coaches (e.g., Hendry, 1968) and progressed to using concepts from behavioural psychology to understand the phenomenon of leadership (e.g., Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Smoll & Smith, 1989; Zhang, Jensen, & Mann, 1997). Recent trends include the continued examination of athlete outcomes and coach leadership behaviours (e.g., Petitpas, Cornelius, Van Raalte, & Jones, 2005; Sullivan, Paquette, Holt, & Bloom, 2012; Vella, Oades, & Crowe, 2013) and the development of leadership among athletes (e.g., Mead & Gilson, 2016). Furthermore, and of relevance to the proposed study, there is

growing interest in the developmental experiences of coaches (e.g., Camiré, et al., 2014; Carter & Bloom, 2009; Erickson et al., 2007).

Coaching Behaviours and Athlete Outcomes

Research has focused on youth coaches' behaviours and how they influence their relationships with athletes and athletes' psychosocial development. For example, coaches who exhibit high levels of positive reinforcement and skill instruction, and avoid using punishment, have athletes who report high levels of satisfaction with their teammates, motivation, low anxiety, and low attrition rates (Barnett, Smith & Smoll, 1992; Smith, Smoll, & Barnett, 1995; Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1979; Smoll, Smith, Barnett, & Everett, 1993). Other influential research in sport psychology has used Chelladurai's Multidimensional Model of Sport Leadership (MMSL; Chelladurai, 1990; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The model describes how leader, follower, and contextual factors interact with three domains of leader behaviours (the actual behaviour shown by the leader, the behaviour desired by the athletes, and the behaviour required by the situation) to contribute to follower performance and satisfaction. The Leadership Scale for Sport (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) was created to evaluate the MMSL and has been used to examine the coach-athlete relationship (e.g., Norman & French, 2013, Vella et al., 2013) and athletes' developmental experiences (e.g., Vella et al., 2013).

The important work of Smith and Smoll and their colleagues (e.g., Barnett et al., 1992; Smith et al., 1979; Smith et al., 1995; Smoll et al., 1993), research using Chelladurai's MMSL (Chelladurai, 1990; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), has revealed a great deal about coach behaviours in sport settings. However, this line of research has

focused on the coaches' behaviours and the outcomes of these behaviours, rather than how coaches learn or develop leadership.

Developmental Experiences of High Performance Coaches

A number of studies have examined the career development of high performance coaches. For example, Erickson et al. (2007) examined experiences that contributed to coach development via interviews with 19 head coaches of university team (n = 10) and individual (n = 9) sports. Minimum amounts of certain experiences (e.g., playing the sport they now coach, interaction with a mentor coach, and leadership opportunities for team sport coaches only) were deemed necessary, but were not sufficient, to become a high performance coach. Furthermore, coach development was characterised by five stages, each delineated by important milestones. The stages were diversified early sport participation (when coaches were aged approximately 6-12 years), competitive sport participation (13-18 years), highly competitive sport participation and introduction to coaching (19-23 years), part-time early coaching (24-28 years), and high performance head coaching (29 years and older). For team sport coaches, being a team captain in the sport they currently coached or a captain in another sport during the competitive sport participation period provided important leadership opportunities. Erickson and colleagues concluded that experience as an athlete in the sport one coaches, formal coach education, and mentorship are important experiences associated with the development of high performance coaches.

In a study of the development of coaching knowledge in six university level coaches (from the sports of basketball, volleyball, and ice hockey), Carter and Bloom (2009) investigated how coaches learned to coach at a level of sport above what they

played (i.e., the university coaches had never played university level sport). The results showed that coaches had all played sport during their childhood, which sparked an interest in sport, although three of the coaches played different sports during their childhood compared to the sport they coached at university. All coaches started their coaching career around the time they began university (typically also when their playing careers ended). Coaches identified personal factors that contributed to their career pathways (communication, open-mindedness, and passion for coaching). Coaching knowledge was acquired through previous playing experiences, via university education, from their early coaching experiences, and learning from/observing other coaches. Four coaches regularly attending coach education clinics and claimed they were a useful source of knowledge, whereas two coaches said such clinics held little value, as they believed the sessions did not have the depth to address the complexity of high performance coaching. Hence, this study revealed there are a variety of different sources of knowledge acquisition in coach development.

In a study involving successful high performance coaches from high school softball, community college football, and NCAA volleyball programs, Gilbert, Côté, and Mallet (2006) explored factors that contributed to the coaches' development. Playing experience as a starter in their sport was found to be a common factor among these coaches, although few of the coaches reported being in a formal leadership position as an athlete (i.e., a captain). Regardless of their sport, these coaches spent the majority of their coaching-related time each year in training sessions with athletes (e.g., practices). Other major areas that the coaches invested time in were their team's competition periods (e.g., games) and administrative duties. The community college football coaches in this study

invested over twice as much time into their coach development activities compared to the high school softball coaches, and almost four times more than the NCAA volleyball coaches. However, the authors note that the coach development activities they explored were limited to formal education opportunities, and speculated that elite NCAA coaches may feel less pressure to attend coach development sessions due to the opportunities they have to develop their coaching knowledge through a network of colleagues (e.g., NCAA coaches would have a larger, full-time coaching staff, and coaching colleagues at their institution). Nonetheless, this study suggests there may be some unique elements of coaching football (e.g., as evidenced by the amount of time devoted to the sport by community college football coaches compared to other coaches) that warrant further investigation.

Developmental Experiences of Youth Sport Coaches

As Lemyre et al. (2007) observed, there has been a tendency in the literature to "see studies on elite coaches as best coaching practice and, therefore, apply them to all coaches, including youth sport coaches" (p. 192). However, coaches at different levels (e.g., youth sport coaches), may have different needs and responsibilities to other coaches (e.g., high performance coaches). Coaches may employ different types of strategies depending on the level they coach at and these strategies may change as their career progresses (Bloom, Schinke, & Salmela, 1997). Hence, it remains important to understand the development of youth sport coaches, and the study of model youth sport coaches may provide some insights for best practices for youth sport coach development.

Lemyre et al. (2007) used semi-structured interviews to investigate how 36 youth sport coaches from soccer, ice hockey, and baseball developed their coaching knowledge.

Formal coach education programs were only one of a range of opportunities and experiences through which they gained knowledge. Most coaches identified previous experience playing, coaching, or both, as contributing to their coaching knowledge. Hence, Lemyre et al. suggested that the development of youth coaches' knowledge goes far beyond their participation in formal coach education programs. That is, while coach education programs may provide coaches with the 'basic knowledge' required to coach (e.g., technical skills, rules of competition), coaches learn about the other components of coaching through practical and previous experience. Interestingly, the coaches also claimed to be unwilling to collaborate and share ideas with other 'rival' coaches, because they did not want to risk losing their competitive advantage. However, previous experience as players, assistant coaches, or instructors provided coaches with sport-specific knowledge and initiated them into the subculture of their respective sports.

Similarly, a study based on interviews with 13 youth soccer coaches in the United Kingdom found that formal coach education, social learning (i.e., informal learning through interactions with other coaches), and reflective practices contributed to the development of coaching knowledge (Stephenson & Jowett, 2009). Both inexperienced and experienced coaches relied on social networks of coaches as part of their development. Inexperienced coaches would use their network to address specific questions, whereas the more experienced coaches relied on their network as more of a general 'sounding board' to discuss ideas. Reflective practice was typically not used until later in the coaches' careers, as inexperienced coaches did not understand how or why to use reflective techniques. Results also showed that young and inexperienced coaches typically adopted the practices of 'mentor' coaches without question.

To understand more about the 'complex learning situations' that influence the acquisition of coaching knowledge, Wright, Trudel, and Culver (2007) conducted interviews with 35 competitive level youth ice hockey coaches across a variety of age groups, from novice (six and seven year olds) to midget (15-17 year olds). The authors identified seven learning situations that impacted the coaches' development, which were categorised as mediated (i.e., learning from another person) or unmediated (i.e., self-directed learning). Mediated learning situations were national coaching certification programs, coaching clinics, and formal mentoring from other coaches. The coaches claimed that having experience with a variety of mentor coaches as a player was important for them to develop their coaching knowledge. Unmediated learning situations were books and videos, personal experiences (e.g., playing hockey, coaching hockey, their family life, or their career), interactions with other coaches, and using internet resources. The coaches identified their interactions with other coaches as being distinct from (albeit similar to) formal mentorship. Wright et al. also found that most coaches were reluctant to share information with coaches outside of their organization, and instead would exchange ideas with elite level coaches or other coaches within their own organizations. Despite this, some participants suggested that learning from coaches at the same competitive level but from different organizations could be highly beneficial to coach development.

Of particular relevance to the current study, some researchers have identified model youth sport coaches to examine factors associated with their coaching practices. Gould, Collins, Lauer, and Chung (2007) conducted semi-structured interviews with 10 high school football coaches who were finalists for the NFL 'Coach of the Year'

program, a national award given to youth football coaches in the United States. To be considered for the award, a coach is required to receive a nomination from any of their former athletes now playing in the NFL. Gould and colleagues examined how these coaches developed life skills in their athletes. Two main categories of strategies were identified: effective coaching strategies and player development strategies. Effective coaching strategies included building respectful relationships with their athletes, setting and enforcing team standards and accountability practices, and respectfully working with other adults (i.e., officials, parents, and assistant coaches). Player development strategies included performance enhancement strategies such as goal setting and team building, and teaching life skills through things such as discussing positive skills and values, emphasizing the importance of academics, and using mentors to teach about how to transfer life skills from football to other areas of their lives. The authors concluded that these coaches had well thought-out and articulated strategies for working with athletes.

In an investigation of the development of strategies coaches use to promote positive youth development (PYD), Camiré et al. (2014) interviewed 16 model high school sport coaches. Several of these coaches had also won provincial-level awards for coaching excellence. The findings showed that these model coaches were characterised by an openness to learning and they intentionally sought out and took advantage of opportunities to develop knowledge about how to promote PYD. Formal and informal/social learning (e.g., role modelling, parenting) contributed to the development of coaching strategies used to promote PYD. Camiré et al. also suggested that the development of a coaching philosophy and practices based on facilitating PYD was a process that evolved over time through reflection on experiences.

As Camiré et al. (2014) noted, reflection on experiences contributed to the development of model youth sport coaches. Several authors have further examined various aspects of reflection in youth sport coaching. For example, Gilbert and Trudel (2002) used a multiple case study approach to understand how six model youth sport coaches (three from each hockey and soccer) use reflection to improve their coaching. The authors identified a six-stage process in reflection that involved coaches having 'coaching issues' (e.g., the team struggled with a skill in competition), framing their role, identifying the issue and understanding how the issue 'fits' within their role framing, developing a strategy to address the issue, implementing the strategy, and evaluating the impact of the strategy. The examples discussed by the coaches in this study often centered on developing sport-specific technical knowledge through this process, such as generating new drills to address deficiencies in certain areas of team performance.

Several of the aforementioned studies (e.g., Lemyre et al., 2007; Stephenson & Jowett, 2009; Wright et al., 2007) show that youth sport coaches learn about coaching from a range of sources. Nelson, Cushion, and Potrac (2006) presented a framework that proposed coaches learn in three types of situations: formal, non-formal, and informal. Formal learning situations are programs that require candidates to meet admission criteria and included standardised material delivered by specialists (e.g., university coaching courses and large-scale coach education programs). Non-formal learning situations are organised educational activities delivered outside of the formal system that are normally short-term, voluntary, and have few prerequisites (e.g., conferences, seminars). Such non-formal learning situations can address topics not covered in formal courses and provide opportunities for coaches to interact with other coaches (Wright et al., 2007). Informal

learning situations are opportunities coaches have to acquire knowledge throughout their lives and can include previous life experiences, interactions with peer coaches, reading books, and using the internet (Camiré et al., 2014). As Nelson and colleagues' framework suggests, a range of learning situations can influence coach development.

Using this model, Winchester, Culver, and Camiré (2013) found that a variety of formal, non-formal, and informal learning situations influence the development of coaching knowledge in Canadian high school teacher-coaches. The formal learning opportunities most of these teacher-coaches reported were a part of a national coaching certification program. However, some of the coaches felt that, if they had previous high-level playing experience in the sport they were coaching, these formal coach education situations were not worthwhile. Non-formal learning situations reported by the teacher-coaches included coaching clinics and courses, which often involved observation of elite coaches. The informal opportunities noted by Winchester et al. (2013) seemed to involve aspects of reflection on experience found in model youth sport coaches by Gilbert and Trudel (2002), as well as interactions with people outside of sport (e.g., the coaches' parents), reading, and using internet resources. The authors also identified both planned and unplanned interactions with other coaches as a source of gaining coaching knowledge. However, neither this study, Nelson et al.'s (2006) framework, nor the existing literature on the development of youth sport coaches (e.g., Camiré et al., 2014; Lemyre et al., 2007; Wright et al., 2007), has adequately examined leadership among youth sport coaches. The current study was designed to address this gap in the literature.

Coach Leadership Research in Sport

Contemporary leadership research in sport has been driven by the Transformational Leadership Theory (TFL; Bass, 1985). Briefly, TFL is a follower-centred approach that requires a leader to move their followers to support a future-oriented vision, "beyond immediate self-interests through idealised influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualised consideration" (Bass, 1999, p. 11). Transformational leaders have a future-oriented vision, act as role models for the group, and encourage followers to provide their own solutions to problems. TFL is currently the most widely adopted style of leadership in the broader field of leadership literature (Dinh et al., 2014), and has also been championed as the ideal style of leadership in youth sport (Turnnidge & Côté, 2016).

In one study designed to understand the development of TFL in coaches, three former top-tier or international level soccer managers (i.e., coaches) were interviewed to identify how they developed and used TFL behaviours, and how they perceived integrity in their sport (Mills & Boardley, 2016). Results showed that each of the coaches had different motivations for beginning coaching, such as staying involved in sport, following the path of a role model coach, or simply being thrust into the role. Each coach blended TFL behaviours with non-TFL behaviours. The coaches also identified unique/individual experiences that influenced their leadership behaviours such as positive interactions with other coaches, negative interactions with other coaches, and self-reflection on their playing experience. The coaches approached the integrity of the game differently (i.e., some were willing to 'bend' the rules to win while others were not). Interestingly, the coaches expressed that, over the course of their careers, they found it was important to be

able to adapt their leadership to different situations. This indicates that the coach leadership development occurs over the course of a career. Limitations of this study were that athlete perspectives were not considered and only a single style of leadership (TFL) was examined.

In a study of coach TFL behaviours and athlete outcomes, 455 male and female adolescent soccer players completed surveys about their coaches' behaviours using the Differentiated Transformational Leadership Inventory for Youth Sport (Vella et al., 2013). Athletes who perceived that their coaches exhibited higher degrees of TFL behaviours had greater positive experiences and experienced greater social development than athletes of coaches who they perceived displayed relatively fewer TFL behaviours. Results also revealed a correlation between athletes' positive personal and social experiences and team success.

Further investigation into coach leadership explored how coach education and context (i.e., high performance, participation) influence coach efficacy and leadership behaviours (Sullivan et al., 2012). Youth sport coaches from both high performance (n = 110) and participation (n = 62) settings completed the Coaching Efficacy Scale (Myers, Feltz, & Wolfe, 2008) and the Revised Leadership Scale for Sport (Zhang et al.,1997), as well as a demographic survey about coach education. It was found that coach education was positively correlated with coach efficacy and leadership behaviours, and that these findings were consistent across both levels of competition. The authors discussed coaching context (i.e., level of competition, coach experience) as a mediator for coach efficacy and leadership behaviours (i.e., coaches may coach at a level of competition they feel most efficacious and at which they believe their leadership behaviours fit best).

However, the authors noted that factors beyond efficacy and education, which may also influence leadership behaviours of coaches, were not accounted for in their study (e.g., previous playing experience, other leadership experiences).

Vidic and Burton (2011) performed a study to examine correlates between coaches' leadership styles and athlete motivation and leadership development. The athletes ($N = 132$) were from a high school military institute, received a minimum of one year of formal leadership training, and completed surveys about their experiences. Data revealed that leaders who encouraged personal improvement in their athletes had more motivated followers over leaders who promoted outperforming others. The results also showed that coaches who created intentional leadership opportunities for their athletes saw greater leadership development in their athletes when compared to coaches who did not create intentional leadership opportunities. Whereas this study shows the impact of leadership styles on leadership development in followers, it did not address how these opportunities contribute to development of leadership behaviours and styles among coaches themselves.

It is vital to understand how leaders develop so we might better inform leadership initiatives and create opportunities to develop leader education programs (Day et al., 2014). Exploring the development of outstanding leadership in model youth sport coaches will allow us to learn from top leaders in the youth sport setting and apply the findings to coach education programs (cf. Lemyre et al., 2007). Using the charismatic ideological pragmatic (CIP) model of outstanding leadership (Mumford, 2006) will also add to our understanding of coach leadership in sport, expanding the use of theory in coach leadership and contributing to the growth of leadership research in youth sport.

Charismatic Ideological Pragmatic (CIP) Model of Outstanding Leadership

The current study was informed by Mumford's (2006) CIP model of outstanding leadership. This model focuses on the mental model a leader creates through which they make sense of the world around them (i.e., 'sense-making'; Mumford, 2006) as opposed to the action-outcome focus of TFL. Charismatic leadership involves a positive future-oriented vision communicated through leader charisma. Charismatic leaders share many behaviours with TFL leaders (e.g., communicating a future-oriented vision through leader charisma, individual consideration of follower needs) which has led to charismatic and transformational leadership styles often being combined as 'charismatic' leadership (Mumford, 2006). The combined style involves using positive leader actions to achieve positive follower outcomes with a future-oriented vision (Mumford, 2006). A contemporary example of a charismatic leader is Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, who campaigned with the slogan 'Sunny Ways'. This was intended to communicate a positive, optimistic view of the future for Canadians through positive leader actions.

Ideological leaders seek to influence their followers through communicating a vision of a romanticised past and striving to restore idealised past conditions. Ideological leaders focus on the personal values or beliefs of themselves and their followers, and these typically stem from negative personal events that would act as an 'anchoring event' for their world view (Strange & Mumford, 2002). These leaders usually have a limited world view, and often ignore or incorrectly interpret views that contradict their beliefs (Strange & Mumford, 2002). This results in ideological leaders surrounding themselves with those who share in their beliefs. The product of this is often shared leadership and

discussion focused on actions necessary to reach the shared goals of the group, with no debate around the nature of their goals (Strange & Mumford, 2002). Donald Trump is an example of an ideological leader. His campaign slogan, 'Make America Great Again', clearly communicated an idealised past, and appealed to the deeply held values and beliefs of his followers.

Pragmatic leaders are those who address problems as they come, and focus on communicating the facts about the present to their followers (Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001). They do not communicate a vision of past conditions or future ideals, but set out to resolve current issues facing the group so they might achieve their goals. Pragmatic leader have a deep understanding of the social system they are operating within, and will use rational thought and logical arguments to influence their followers. Their behaviours change to address the complexity of the current issues they face (Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001). Pragmatic leaders are often viewed as having expertise in their field, and rely on their expertise to inform their decisions. Two highly visible examples of pragmatic leaders are Elon Musk and Bill Gates. Both are focused on addressing current global issues (i.e., Musk addressing the ongoing resource drain of the Earth, Gates focusing on healthcare issues in underdeveloped countries), and use rational argument to persuade their followers to join the cause.

Based on early CIP research, Mumford, Antes, Caughron, and Friedrich (2008) outlined 24 propositions (Appendix B) explaining how the environment, a person's colleagues, and an individual's experiences influence the emergence and effectiveness of CIP leadership. The 24 propositions for CIP leadership development range from the impact of goal consensus and goal conflict on leadership emergence to the impact of

opportunities and threats in an individual's workplace on leadership effectiveness. While acknowledging that each of these 24 propositions may not be used in a single study, Mumford et al. (2008) laid a framework for understanding outstanding leadership development.

Research Using Mumford's Model of Outstanding Leadership

Employing a 'life narrative' method, Ligon, Hunter, and Mumford (2008) studied 120 20th century leaders' biographies with the intent of understanding how different experiences contributed to the development of specific leadership styles. The leaders were categorised as charismatic, ideological, or pragmatic, and within these groups were subdivided by orientation, as either a socialised or personalised leader (for 20 socialised and 20 personalised leaders of each of the three styles). A socialised leader listens to input from the group and always has the best intentions of the group at heart, while personalised leaders are controlling and only consider their personal outcomes (Ligon et al., 2008). Leaders were classified as belonging to a single style and orientation based upon the evaluation of a publically available biographical summary. Those who displayed mixed leadership were omitted from reported results. Results showed that various styles and orientations of leadership were associated with specific life experiences (i.e., ideological leaders experienced more 'anchoring' events, or experiences that reaffirmed their personal beliefs, than other leaders). Data also revealed that experiences from leaders' youth and adolescence heavily influenced the style they would maintain for much of their life (e.g., choosing to return to school after being reprimanded for doing so by his parents in fourth grade influenced the development of ideological leadership of

Fidel Castro). This research highlights the importance of understanding leaders' life experiences, so we can better understand their current leadership behaviours and styles.

In another study of outstanding leaders using the CIP model, researchers analysed biographies and 'key' speeches of 93 leaders from the 20th and 21st centuries (Griffith, Connelly, Thiel, & Johnson, 2015). The results showed that each style of CIP leadership was associated with the use of different emotional tactics and appeals. For example, charismatic and ideological leaders often appealed to large groups, whereas pragmatic leaders were more likely to use emotional pulls with small groups or intimate audiences. Similarly, the types of emotional displays made by these leaders were often consistent with their leadership style, such as charismatic leaders' use of positive emotional tactics and ideological leaders' use of negative emotional tactics. This study provided some insight into the behaviours each style of leader might use.

In a study with university students, groups were given a participation, change management, structural, and consideration problem to solve in a two-hour period (Bedell-Avers, Hunter, & Mumford, 2009). Students made notes of their group's problem solving process, which were later analysed by the researchers, while also being directly observed by the research team. Consistent with Mumford et al.'s (2008) propositions, each style was found to be effective in certain situations (i.e., charismatic leaders performed better when addressing social issues, ideological leaders were best at addressing structural issues, and pragmatic leaders were adept in each situation except increasing follower participation). Ideological leaders made poor followers and quality leaders, while pragmatic leaders were strong in either role. Interestingly, charismatic leaders were found to produce higher quality solutions when they were a follower, and not the group leader.

Those without a clearly defined leadership style produced poor solutions when designated as leader, but made excellent followers.

To explore CIP leadership in a sport setting, a review of championship-winning NCAA (n = 29) and NFL (n = 25) football coaches' biographies was conducted (Hunter, Cushenbery, Thoroughgood, Johnson, & Ligon, 2011). Coaches were assigned a leadership style by the researchers based upon brief biographical readings. The authors evaluated 10 behaviours from the CIP model that the coaches displayed, and compared them to the behaviours they would expect based upon the coaches' assigned leadership styles (these areas were used in the current study; see Appendix C). Data showed that more NCAA coaches aligned with charismatic styles than NFL coaches (i.e., of the NCAA coaches, 16 were charismatic, 6 were ideological, and 7 were pragmatic; of the NFL coaches, 8 were charismatic, 8 were ideological, and 9 were pragmatic), and that the assigned styles were mostly predictive of the behaviours the coaches used. The authors suggested the distribution of leadership styles could be due to the fact that amateur athletes may be more open to charismatic guidance than professional athletes, as charismatic leaders are more likely to emerge in populations with low self-clarity (i.e., college-aged athletes are still developing a sense of self). Nonetheless, whereas charismatic leadership was more common in NCAA coaches, ideological and pragmatic leadership styles are also present and should not be ignored when exploring leadership in youth coaches. The authors stated that their methods did not allow for the consideration of 'mixed' leadership styles (i.e., regular use of behaviours from two or more different styles). It is plausible that a sample of youth football coaches will not all use the same leadership style, and some may use mixed leadership.

Following Mumford's (2006) initial work and the literature that has emerged since, our understanding of the effectiveness and development of CIP leadership has grown. While used mostly in leadership and management fields, outstanding leadership and the CIP model provide an intriguing way to approach leadership in sport. Not only is the CIP model transferable to leadership research in sport settings (e.g., Hunter et al., 2011), it adds new dimensions to the study of sport leadership, which has been dominated by TFL (Cruickshank & Collins, 2016). Therefore, the current study expanded our current understanding of leadership development and leadership in youth sport. To reiterate, the purpose of this study was to examine the development of leadership among model youth football coaches. Two research questions were addressed: (a) What leadership style best describes these coaches? (b) What events and experiences contributed to the development of their leadership style?

CHAPTER 3:

METHOD

Methodology

Parry, Mumford, Bower, and Watts (2014) suggested that qualitative research approaches may be useful for exploring the experiences that contribute to the development of leaders. As such, an interpretive description (ID) methodology (Thorne, 2016) informed this study. Although originally proposed as a method for understanding phenomena in nursing sciences (see Thorne, Kirkham, & MacDonald-Emes, 1997), ID has successfully been used in sport psychology research (e.g., Neely, Dunn, McHugh, & Holt, 2016). Appropriate use of ID requires the research to have an applied focus, as well as the use of multiple data sources to understand and explain a phenomenon (Thorne, Kirkham, O'Flynn-MaGee, 2004). ID also requires an understanding and acceptance of existing research in the field, so new advances can be related to what has previously been explored (Thorne, 2016; Thorne et al., 1997). In the case of this study, the researcher used existing research (from both sport psychology and management literatures) to establish the context and rationale.

Paradigmatic Approach

The paradigmatic approach to this study was interpretive (Sparkes, 1992). Ontologically, interpretivists believe that while individuals construct their own unique reality, there are 'shared' experiences among these realities. The epistemology of an interpretivist acknowledges that people will create unique subjective meanings to understand their experience, and that knowledge will be co-created by the researcher and the participants. In this research, exploring the individual meanings coaches have given to experiences that developed leadership allowed the researcher to uncover some of the

shared aspects of leadership development through analysis. This guided the researcher towards the co-creation of knowledge required to understand shared experiences of leadership development in youth sport coaches.

Participants

Using extreme case and theory-based sampling (Patton, 2002), six youth football coaches who had won provincial 'Coach of the Year' awards (following Camiré et al., 2014; Gould et al., 2007) as a head coach, and fit the description of a model youth sport coach as defined by Gilbert and Trudel (2004), were recruited. A model youth sport coach is someone who:

> (a) has demonstrated interest in learning about the theory and practice of coaching; (b) was respected in the local sporting community for their commitment to youth sport; (c) was considered a good leader, teacher, and organizer; and (d) kept winning in perspective and encouraged children to respect the rules of the game, competitors, and officials (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004, p. 25).

Head coaches were selected as they are the primary leader among a coaching staff, and oversee the entire team. Award-winning model coaches were selected, as the combination of criteria ensured that the coaches are successful in terms of on-field production but also in the areas of leadership and athlete personal and social development (Camiré et al., 2014). The coaches ranged in age from 41-56 years old (M = 46, SD = 6) and had been coaching for 18-30 years (M = 24, SD = 4). All of the coaches held at least a bachelor's degree, and two held Master's degrees.

Athletes who played for the head coaches in the early, middle, and recent stages of their coaching careers also participated in this study (n = 18 athletes). The athlete

participants ranged in age from 20-35 years old (M = 24, SD = 4), and had known their coach for anywhere from three to 19 years (M = 11, SD = 5). Including athletes allowed follower perspectives on leader behaviours to be compared and contrasted with the accounts of the coaches and other athlete participants from other stages of the coach's career.

Recruitment

Prior to recruitment, Research Ethics Board approval was obtained. The researcher directly contacted four coaches who they identified as having met the sampling criteria and provided them with the appropriate information letter (Appendix D). The remaining two coaches were identified using a key informant (e.g., another coach; Camiré et al., 2014; Gilbert & Trudel, 2004). In these cases, the informant was provided with the definition of a model coach, and was asked to identify model coaches from a publically available database of award-winning coaches (Appendix E). Informants provided recruitment information about the study to potential participants, who then contacted the researcher with their intention to participate. The information letter provided to coaches outlined the purpose of the study, and explained why they were contacted.

Participating coaches were then asked to nominate athletes (a snowball sampling recruitment strategy; Patton, 2002). In this case, coaches were asked to send information letters (Appendix F) to three athletes (one from each of the early, middle, and most recent stages of the coaches' careers) they identified as information-rich sources. The athlete information letter emphasised that the athletes' participation in the study was voluntary, and would remain confidential. In particular, it was made clear that the head coach in

question would not be informed of the athletes' decision to participate/not participate in the research, and that the athletes would not be identifiable in the study. Interested athletes then contacted the researcher to schedule interviews.

Data Collection

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, which were scheduled at a time and place that was convenient for the participants. Thirty interviews were conducted in total (i.e., six initial interviews with coaches, six follow-up interviews with coaches, and 18 interviews with athletes). Of the initial interviews with coaches, two were conducted at the Child and Adolescent Sport and Activity (CASA) Lab at the University of Alberta and four were conducted in person at the participant's workplace or a neutral location (e.g., a meeting room at an athletic facility). These interviews lasted from 30-70 minutes (M = 46 minutes, SD = 14). Of the follow-up interviews with coaches, one was conducted at the participant's workplace, and the remaining five were conducted via telephone or Skype due to the limited availability of the coaches. These follow-up interviews lasted 13-20 minutes (M = 15 minutes, SD = 3), and were completed 4-6 weeks following their first interview, which provided sufficient time to initially analyse data from the first interviews (see Neely et al., 2016; Neely & Holt, 2014).

The athlete participants each participated in one interview, for a total of 18 athlete interviews. Ten interviews were conducted in person at the CASA lab. Two interviews were conducted at a neutral location, and the remaining six were conducted via telephone or Skype due to geographical constraints. These interviews ranged from 19-36 minutes (M = 27 minutes, SD = 6). Combined, the interviews with coaches and

athletes generated a total of 232 pages of data (125,228 words). Before beginning data collection, participants provided informed consent through the informed consent form (Appendix G) or, in the case of phone or Skype interviews, provided verbal consent and returned the signed consent form at a later date. Forms were kept in a secure filing cabinet in a locked office. Following interviews, a brief journal entry was recorded to capture the researcher's insights on the current interview. Coaches and athletes were recruited until adequate data saturation to address the research questions was reached (Mayan, 2009).

Interview Guide

Coach interview guide. The coach interview guide (Appendix H) was designed to include several domains relating to leadership behaviours and development in a way that encouraged participants to express their own personal experiences, thoughts, and beliefs on the subject. It consisted of four sections; an introduction, two sets of 'main' questions, and summary questions. The first section began with conversational questions to build rapport (Patton, 2002), followed by the collection of demographic information. The second section involved exploratory questions regarding leadership development, based on findings of previous coach development research (e.g., Erickson et al., 2007; Lemyre et al., 2007). The third section explored the coaches' behaviours, based on findings of previous CIP research, which is consistent with Thorne et al.'s (1997) recommendation to use theoretically guided data collection techniques when using ID. That is, the 10 leader behaviours used by Hunter et al. (2011) were used and, when necessary, adapted to be more relevant to sport (e.g., the question 'to what extent does the leader: Spend his time trying to convince/motivate the entire team and coaching staff, key

members of the team, or elite members of the team?' was framed as 'Who do you talk to when trying to motivate the team?'). The final section of the interview guide was a summary section, when the participants were given the opportunity to expand upon any areas they felt necessary, and provide advice (e.g., additional questions to ask in future interviews) to the researcher moving forward.

Athlete interview guide. The athlete interview guide (Appendix I) was developed similarly to the coach interview guide. As the athlete participants would not be able to speak to the factors that contributed to the development of the coaches' leadership, this section was not included. Instead, the athlete interview guide consisted of three sections; an introduction, one set of 'main' questions, and a summary section. Like the coach interview guide, the first section of the athlete interview guide began with conversational questions to build rapport with the participant (Patton, 2002), followed by the collection of demographic information. The second section included the same content as the behaviours section of the coach interview guide, rephrased to be applicable to the athlete participants (e.g., the question from the coach interview guide 'Who do you talk to when trying to motivate the team?' was rephrased as 'Who did/do they [the coach] talk with when they tried/try to motivate the team?'). The third and final section included a summary question, and participants were given the opportunity to clarify or expand upon anything that was discussed, as well as add new information and provide advice (e.g., additional questions to ask) to the researcher moving forward.

Prior to beginning the research, the interview guides were reviewed by students in the CASA lab and members of the supervisory committee. Pilot interviews were performed with one coach and one athlete (who were not included in the final sample) to

ensure that the interview guide adequately explored the development of leadership and leadership behaviours of youth sport coaches. Following the pilot interviews, minor revisions were made to improve the interview guides before beginning data collection (e.g., 'How do you set your goals?' was changed to 'What do you focus on when setting your goals?').

Data Analysis

All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Twenty-five interviews were transcribed by the researcher and five were transcribed by a professional transcription company. Upon initial transcribing, names were removed and participants were assigned a pseudonym. The data analysis process began once the first interview was transcribed, and continued as an iterative process throughout the study. ID does not prescribe a specific design for conducting data analysis. Rather, Thorne (2016) encouraged the researcher to use whatever method of analysis best suits the task at hand. Thus, analyses of the data for this study were conducted in two distinct phases; deductive and inductive.

Deductive Analysis. The deductive analysis was designed to produce data in response to research question number one (i.e., what leadership style best described these coaches?). To complete the deductive phase, the data set from the coaches and their athlete participants (excluding the second coach interviews) were analysed using a directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Directed content analysis allows the researcher to begin with a structure or theory (i.e., the leader behaviours outlined by Hunter et al., 2011) and identify the data that 'fits' this structure. In the context of this analysis, this meant reviewing each of the coaches' and athletes' transcripts and

extracting data that aligned with the Hunter et al. framework of 10 leadership behaviours. Data aligning with a specific behaviour were extracted from the transcripts and then coded as the 'type' of behaviour reflected. For example, a coach may have expressed that he did not worry about what happened the previous week, or which team he might play in the championship game, but instead he focused on the immediate opponent. This would be identified as a 'time frame,' and coded as 'present-oriented' (a pragmatic behaviour). This process was repeated for each behaviour in every transcript from the coaches and athletes (excluding the coaches' second interviews, as additional data regarding behaviours were not explicitly obtained during this interview).

The next step in the (deductive) analysis involved the coding of the coaches' leadership behaviours into a leadership style (i.e., charismatic, ideological, or pragmatic). This coding of leadership style proved challenging because it was apparent that the coaches' self-reported behaviours did not align 'neatly' with one style. Furthermore, the athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behaviours did not align neatly with one style, and there were some (albeit limited) differences within each coach-athletes dataset. As a result, the coaches were coded as a leadership style based on the majority of types of behaviours that were reported (i.e., five or more behaviours consistent with one style). For example, if a coach reported six (of 10) behaviours associated with a pragmatic style, the coach was coded as 'mostly pragmatic.' If three or more behaviours of another style were reported, the coach was coded as having a 'mix' of that style as well. For example, if a coach demonstrated six pragmatic behaviours and three ideological behaviours, the coach was coded as 'mostly pragmatic with ideological mix.'

The final step in the (deductive) analysis of the leadership behaviours and styles involved creating different ways to represent the data. Writing is considered part of the analytic process in ID because it allows the researcher to become further immersed in the data and provides the opportunity to ensure that the researcher's conceptualization of the findings 'hold together' (Thorne, 2016). Accordingly, 'complete' individual profiles of the coaches' leadership styles, using data and quotes from the athletes and coaches, were written. These profiles included examples of the data used to determine each specific leadership behaviour. The profiles were reviewed multiple times by the researcher and supervisor.

Given that the profiles were extremely long it was not feasible to present them in their entirety in the results section (they have been included in Appendix J and, upon submitting this study for publication in the future, would be made available as an additional data file). Rather, in order to facilitate the representation of the profiles, summaries of the coach and athlete perspectives were created, along with data displays (Miles & Huberman, 1994), which are included in the results. Data displays are visually formatted representations that present information systematically and involve ways of organizing and representing data that facilitates descriptive conclusion drawing, and "are a major avenue to valid qualitative analysis" (p. 11). The data displays were summaries of the coding decisions relating to each of the 10 behaviours in the Hunter et al. (2011) framework based on the responses of the coaches and their athletes. These displays also facilitated the interpretations of the leadership styles identified (based on the coding of the majority of the behaviours reported across the coaches and athletes).

Inductive Analysis. The second phase of the analysis was inductive and designed to create themes that depicted factors that influenced the development of each coach's leadership style to produce data in response to research question number two (i.e., what events and experiences contributed to the development of their leadership style?). This process was conducted only with the coach data, as the athlete participants could not speak to the personal factors that their coach believed was significant to their leadership development. The inductive portion of the analysis involved latent content analysis (Mayan, 2009). First, broad and inclusive initial coding of the coach interviews (e.g., including concepts of 'coaches' and 'colleagues' under a broad code of 'role models') was done to identify the factors that contributed to leadership development in the coaches. Following initial coding of the first three coach interviews, the data were then discussed with the researcher's supervisor, which led to the creation a coding schema for the remainder of the data. After finishing the initial coding and content analysis, the coded data were categorised into groups of like-coded data.

After creating the categories, the data were discussed with the researcher's supervisor and colleagues to ensure internal (i.e., coded data 'fit' with the description of the category) and external (i.e., the categories were distinct and clear) homogeneity (Mayan, 2009). Consideration was given to previous research in coach development (e.g., Camiré et al., 2014; Erickson et al., 2007; Lemyre et al., 2007) to help identify potential links between categories, and the categories were expanded to create broader, inclusive themes (e.g., the categories of 'positive role models' and 'negative role models' were combined within the theme of 'role models'). These themes were also discussed with the

researcher's supervisor. Four themes were identified through this process, which are presented in the results.

Second Interview Protocol

Within four weeks of completing transcription and primary coding of the initial interviews, coaches were contacted via email and asked to schedule a brief follow-up interview (following Neely et al., 2016; Neely & Holt, 2014). During the second interview the participants were asked to comment on the initial coding of the data and clarify and expand upon any ambiguous or unique items from the initial interview. Another important element of the second interview involved obtaining coaches' perceptions of their overall leadership style. Coaches were not informed of which style they had been initially coded. Instead, they were provided a summary of each leadership style from the CIP model (Mumford, 2006) before the interview, which included examples of college and NFL coaches Hunter et al. (2011) identified as belonging to each style. The coaches were asked during the interview which style they believed best suited them. Five coaches (Wade, Ryan, Craig, Bob, and Sandy) said they used leadership styles that were consistent with the researcher's coding of their *majority* style. One coach (Adam) said he used leadership styles that were not consistent with the researcher's coding. That is, Adam thought he was an ideological leader, but the researcher coded him as a mostly pragmatic leader.

All of the coaches said the four themes that had emerged from the initial inductive analysis (role models, networks of coaches, experience and reflection, and formal and informal learning) were the factors that were most important in their development as leaders. None of the coaches suggested the inclusion or removal of any themes, although

several further reinforced the importance of certain factors in the development of their leadership (e.g., one coach made an effort to emphasise the importance of reflection with experience, as he strongly believed in active reflection).

Conceptual Claim

Following the analysis of all of the data, a conceptual claim was created. According to Thorne (2016), a conceptual claim should "capture the important elements within the phenomenon in a manner that can be readily grasped, appreciated, and remembered in the applied practice context" (p. 188). The conceptual claim underwent several iterations in consultation with the researcher's supervisor, until they arrived at the claim presented in the discussion.

Methodological Rigour

Methodological rigour is essential to improve the quality of a research project, and the researcher used several methods to ensure the quality of this thesis work that also align with the ID methodology. Consistent with Mayan's (2009) views on methodological rigour, the researcher closely monitored the appropriateness of the proposed methods (sampling, interview guide, analysis, etc.) to attempt to ensure that it was the best fit for this project. A lack of willingness to change or modify a research project's methods indicates that the research is forcing their data to create their desired results, while being open to change indicates that the researcher is 'listening' to the data (Mayan, 2009). An example of this was changing some early coding of the coaches' leadership profiles after discussions with the researcher's supervisor to avoid 'forcing' the coaches into one style of leadership and, instead, reflecting the 'mixes' of leadership behaviours that were apparent in the data.

Keeping with ID methodology, data collection and analysis occurred concurrently, which kept the researcher constantly immersed in various aspects of the study (Thorne, 2016). Multiple perspectives were considered when analysing data (Mayan, 2009) by discussing the analysis with the researcher's supervisor after each step of the analytic process (i.e., coding, creating categories, creating themes, and writing; Thorne et al., 2004). Conducting second interviews with the coaches also contributed to enhancing the researcher's understanding of the data and their feedback helped inform the analysis as it progressed. Additionally, the data obtained via the second interviews enhanced data saturation. Combined, each of these steps made incremental contributions to enhancing the overall rigour and quality of the study (Mayan, 2009).

CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS

The results are presented in two sections. The first section presents an overview of each coach's leadership profile (i.e., the results from the deductive analysis) based on the data derived from the interviews with the coaches and then the data derived from the interviews with their athletes. The second section details the four factors that contributed to the coaches' development as leaders (i.e., the results from the inductive analysis), based entirely on data derived from the interviews with the coaches only.

Section 1: Leadership Behaviours and Styles

Data from coaches and athletes (see Tables 1-7 for summaries) showed that the majority of reported behaviours were associated with a pragmatic leadership style. However, there were inconsistencies that suggested coaches did not entirely or neatly 'fit' with a particular leadership style per se. Using the *majority* of reported behaviours, the coaches were assigned an overall style. If *three or more* behaviours of another style were reported, the coach was coded as having a 'mix' of that style as well. With this as the guide, two coaches were coded as having a mostly pragmatic leadership style (Wade, Adam), two as having a mostly pragmatic style with a mix of ideological (Ryan, Craig), one as a mostly pragmatic style mixed with charismatic (Bob), and one as having a mostly charismatic style with an ideological mix (Sandy). The coaches appeared to change some of their leadership behaviours over time, however their *majority* styles appeared to be reported fairly consistently by their athletes as at least a part of their style (e.g., Ryan identified as mostly pragmatic with an ideological mix, and each of his athlete participants reported him using at least three pragmatic behaviours).

Table 1
Overview of Coaches' Current Leadership Style Profiles: Self-Perceptions

	Wade	Ryan	Craig	Adam	Bob	Sandy
Time Frame and Outcomes Sought						
Time Frame	Present (P)	Past (I) and present (P)	Past and present (P)	Present (P)	Future (C)	Future (C)
Type of outcome expected	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P) and transcendent (I)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)	Positive (C) and transcendent (I)
Number of outcomes	Variable (P)	Variable (P)	Few (I)	Variable (P)	Few (I)	Few (I)
Motivation and Appeals						
Type of experience used	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)
Focus of motivation	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	External (C/P)	Internal (I)
Emotional appeals	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Negative (I)
People to motivate	Masses (C)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Masses (C)
Crisis, Causes, and Control						
Views of crisis	Ordered (C)	Isolated (P)	Isolated (P)	Isolated (P)	Isolated (P)	Ordered (C)
Cause of outcomes	Interactive (P)	Interactive (P)	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)
Level of control	Selective (P)	Selective (P)	High (C)	Selective (P)	Selective (P)	Selective (P)
Predominant Leadership Style						
	Mostly pragmatic	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix	Mostly pragmatic	Mostly pragmatic with charismatic mix	Mostly charismatic with ideological mix
Change in Style Over Time*						
Early	P & C	Mix	Mix	Mix	I & C	Mix
Middle	P & I	P & I	Mix	P & C	Mix	Mix
Recent	P & I	P & I	P & C	P & I	C & I	Mix

Note. Interpretations provided in this table are based on the coaches' self-reported data and therefore represent coaches' perceptions of their own current leadership behaviours. The letters in brackets represent the style associated with the corresponding behaviour (i.e., C is charismatic, I is ideological, and P is pragmatic). * This section represents the athletes' perceptions of their coaches' overall styles.

Summaries of Individual Profiles

In this section, a brief summary of each coach's leadership behaviours is provided using data displays and a short written overview, first from each coach's data and then from the athletes' data. Complete individual profiles, created based on coaches' and their athletes' responses, are included in Appendix J. These profiles also include examples of data extracts used to support the interpretations about each coach's leadership behaviour.

Wade's leadership behaviours and style. Wade's self-reported current behaviours appeared to align most closely with a pragmatic leadership style, because he reported seven behaviours that are associated with a pragmatic style (see Tables 1 and 2). He displayed a *present oriented time frame*, sought *malleable* and a *variable number of outcomes*, used an *internal focus in model construction*, and made *rational appeals* to his athletes (all behaviours consistent with a pragmatic leadership style). These self-reported behaviours were generally consistent with the findings derived from the interviews with athlete participants (see Table 2) from different stages of Wade's coaching career (Marcus, an athlete from the 'early' stage of Wade's coaching career; Ty, an athlete from the 'middle' stage of Wade's coaching career; and Blake, from the 'recent' stage of Wade's coaching career).

Whereas Wade's overall leadership style did not appear to change significantly over time, some differences between Wade's self-perceptions and the perceptions of his athletes on specific behaviours were reported. For example, Wade seemed to report an *ordered view of crisis situations* over the course of his coaching career, whereas Ty and Blake recalled him having a more *chaotic view of crisis situations* in the middle and recent stages of his career. Wade claimed to use *positive and negative experiences* when

interacting with athletes, something that each the athlete participants agreed with, but noted had varied over time. Wade appeared to believe that both *people and situations interact to cause an outcome*, and that he had a *selective level of control* over these outcomes, whereas all of the athlete participants reported that he communicated *people as the cause of outcomes* and that the team had a *high level of control* over their outcomes. Each of the athlete participants remembered Wade relying on his captains, or *base cadre,* to motivate the team, while Wade claimed he *motivated the masses* (i.e., the team).

Table 2

Overview of Wade's Leadership Style Profiles: Coach and Athlete Perceptions

Behaviours	Early (Marcus)	Middle (Ty)	Recent (Blake)	Wade
Time Frame and Outcomes Sought				
Time frame	Present (P)	Past (I) and present (P)	Present (P)	Present (P)
Type of outcome expected	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)
Number of outcomes	Variable (P)	Variable (P)	Variable (P)	Variable (P)
Motivation and Appeals				
Type of experience used	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)
Focus of motivation	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)
Emotional appeals	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)
People to motivate	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Masses (C)
Crisis, Causes and Control				
Views of crisis	Ordered (C)	Chaotic (I)	Chaotic (I)	Ordered (C)
Cause of outcomes	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)	Interactive (P)
Level of control	High (C)	High (C)	High (C)	Selective (P)
Overall Leadership Style	Mostly pragmatic with charismatic mix	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix	Mostly Pragmatic

The information in the columns represents the behaviours that each participant reported.

Ryan's leadership behaviours and style. Analysis of the data indicated that Ryan's current self-reported behaviours aligned with a pragmatic leadership style, with a

mix of ideological. He reported eight behaviours that are associated with a pragmatic style, and four behaviours that are associated with an ideological style (see Tables 1 and 3). Ryan reported using *positive and negative experiences* to motivate his athletes and appeared to use *rational persuasion* to motivate his athletes, both of which reflected a pragmatic leadership style. Ryan's athlete participants (Ben, from the early stage of Ryan's coaching career; Nate, from the middle stage of Ryan's coaching career; and Alex, from the most recent stage of Ryan's coaching career) were consistent in their recollection of these behaviours. Ryan and his athlete participants also discussed that Ryan used an *internal* focus in motivation, and relied on his *base cadre* to communicate with the team. These reflected an ideological leadership style.

Variance existed between what Ryan reported and what Ben, Nate, and Alex recalled. For example, Ryan reported that he used a used a mix of a *past oriented time frame* and a *present oriented time frame,* although each of his athlete participants recalled him using a more *present oriented time frame*. Ryan claimed to look for a *variable number* of outcomes, however Ben and Alex recalled him looking for *few* outcomes. Ryan reported expecting both *malleable* and *transcendent* outcomes, whereas Ben thought Ryan looked for *positive* outcomes, and Nate and Alex recalled Ryan looking for only *malleable* outcomes. All of his athlete participants recalled that Ryan communicated *people as the cause of outcomes*, but Ryan expressed that *people and situations* interacted to cause an outcome. Ben and Nate reported that Ryan communicated a *high* level of control to his athletes, while both Ryan and Alex believed Ryan communicated a *selective* level of control.

Table 3

Overview of Ryan's Leadership Style Profiles: Coach and Athlete Perceptions

Behaviours	Early (Ben)	Middle (Nate)	Recent (Alex)	Ryan
Time Frame and Outcomes Sought				
Time frame	Present (P)	Present (P)	Present (P)	Past (I) and present (P)
Type of outcome expected	Positive (C)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P) and transcendent (I)
Number of outcomes	Few (I)	Variable (P)	Few (I)	Variable (P)
Motivation and Appeals				
Type of experience used	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)
Focus of motivation	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)
Emotional appeals	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)
People to motivate	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)
Crisis, Causes and Control				
Views of crisis	Ordered (C)	Chaotic (I)	Chaotic (I)	Isolated (P)
Cause of outcomes	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)	Interactive (P)
Level of control	High (C)	High (C)	Selective (P)	Selective (P)
Overall Leadership Style	Mixed	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix

The information in the columns represents the behaviours that each participant reported.

Craig's leadership behaviours and style. Following analysis, it seemed that Craig's self-reported current behaviours represented a mix of ideological and pragmatic leadership styles. He reported five behaviours that are associated with a pragmatic style, and four behaviours associated with an ideological style (see Tables 1 and 4). His athlete participants (Mark, from the early stage of Craig's coaching career; Bryan, from the middle stage of Craig's coaching career; and Pat, from the most recent stage of Craig's coaching career) appeared to report some of Craig's behaviours similarly to how Craig described them. The data that were consistent across participants and reflected a

pragmatic leadership style were that Craig used *positive and negative experiences* to motivate his athletes, and that Craig used *rational persuasion* to motivate his athletes. There also appeared to be consensus that Craig looked for a *few outcomes* and had an *internal focus in motivation*, both of which indicate an ideological leadership style. The only behaviour that there was consensus on which seemed to demonstrate a charismatic leadership style was that Craig communicated that *people were in control* of their outcomes.

There were also behaviours for which there was a lack of consensus among participants. These included Craig's view of crisis, which Craig reported as *isolated*, Bryan reported as *chaotic*, and Mark and Pat reported as *ordered*; the level of control he communicated, which Craig, Mark and Bryan claimed was *high*, although Pat felt it was *selective*; the time frame he used, that was reported as *past and present oriented* by Craig, *past oriented* by Mark, *future oriented* by Bryan, and present oriented by Pat; the type of outcomes he sought, which each participant claimed were *malleable* except Pat, who reported that Craig sought *positive* outcomes; and the people he motivated, which Pat reported as being the *masses* while the remaining participants claimed Craig relied on his *base cadre*.

Table 4

Overview of Craig's Leadership Style Profiles: Coach and Athlete Perceptions

Behaviours	Early (Mark)	Middle (Bryan)	Recent (Pat)	Craig
Time Frame and Outcomes Sought				
Time frame	Past (I)	Future (C)	Present (P)	Past (I) and present (P)
Type of outcome expected	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)	Positive (C)	Malleable (P)
Number of outcomes	Few (I)	Few (I)	Few (I)	Few (I)
Motivation and Appeals				
Type of experience used	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)
Focus of motivation	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)
Emotional appeals	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)
People to motivate	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Masses (C)	Base cadre (I)
Crisis, Causes and Control				
Views of crisis	Ordered (C)	Chaotic (I)	Ordered (C)	Isolated (P)
Cause of outcomes	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)
Level of control	High (C)	High (C)	Selective (P)	High (C)
Overall Leadership Style	Mixed	Mixed	Mostly pragmatic and charismatic	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix

The information in the columns represents the behaviours that each participant reported.

Adam's leadership behaviours and style. The researcher's interpretations of the data indicated that Adam current self-reported behaviours were mostly consistent with a pragmatic leadership style. He reported seven behaviours that are associated with a pragmatic style (see Tables 1 and 5). Adam claimed to use a *present oriented time frame*; he appeared to seek a *variable* number of *malleable outcomes*; use *positive and negative experiences* to motivate his team; communicated a *selective level of control* to his athletes; demonstrated an *isolated view of crisis*; and used *rational persuasion* to encourage his athletes. These behaviours are consistent with a pragmatic leadership style. He claimed to have an *internal focus in motivation* and appeared to *communicate with his*

base cadre, both of which are consistent with ideological leadership. The only behaviour Adam appeared to demonstrate consistent with a charismatic leadership style was communicating that *people were in control* of their outcomes.

Adam's athlete participants (Max, from the early stage of Adam's coaching career; Rob, from the middle stage of Adam's coaching career; and Dan, from the most recent stage of Adam's coaching career) appeared to perceive Adam's behaviours differently amongst themselves, as well as differently from what Adam reported in some cases. For example, Max reported that Adam mixed a *past and future oriented time frame*, while Rob felt that Adam used a *present oriented time frame*, and Dan felt Adam used a *past oriented time frame*.

Table 5

Overview of Adam's Leadership Style Profiles: Coach and Athlete Perceptions

Behaviours	Early (Max)	Middle (Rob)	Recent (Dan)	Adam
Time Frame and Outcomes Sought				
Time frame	Past (I) and future (C)	Present (P)	Past (I)	Present (P)
Type of outcome expected	Transcendent (I)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)	Malleable (P)
Number of outcomes	Variable (P)	Variable (P)	Variable (P)	Variable (P)
Motivation and Appeals				
Type of experience used	Positive (C)	Positive (C)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)
Focus of motivation	Internal (I)	External (C/P)	External (C/P)	Internal (I)
Emotional appeals	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Negative (I)	Rational (P)
People to motivate	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)	Base cadre (I)
Crisis, Causes and Control				
Views of crisis	Isolated (P)	Ordered (C)	Chaotic (I)	Isolated (P)
Cause of outcomes	People (C)	People (C)	Interactive (P)	People (C)
Level of control	High (C)	Selective (P)	Selective (P)	Selective (P)
Overall Leadership Style	Mixed	Mostly pragmatic with charismatic mix	Mostly pragmatic with ideological mix	Mostly pragmatic

The information in the columns represents the behaviours that each participant reported.

Bob's leadership behaviours and style. Bob was the fifth coach to be profiled, and the analysis of his interview seemed to indicate behaviours that presented a mix of mostly pragmatic leadership with a charismatic mix. He reported six behaviours that are associated with a pragmatic style, and three behaviours associated with a charismatic style (see Tables 1 and 6). Consistent with a charismatic leadership style, Bob appeared to use a *future oriented time frame*; had an *external focus in motivation* (a behaviour shared between charismatic and pragmatic leadership styles); and communicated that *people were the cause* of their outcomes. His behaviours that reflected an ideological leadership style were that he sought *few outcomes*, and expressed a preference in

communicating with his *base cadre*. The behaviours he exhibited that reflected a pragmatic leadership style were using *positive and negative experiences* with his athletes, looking for *malleable outcomes*, communicating a *selective level of control* to his team, and using *rational persuasion* in lieu of emotional appeals.

His athlete participants (Hugh, from the early stage of Bob's coaching career; Carl, from the middle stage of Bob's coaching career; and Matt, from the most recent stage of Bob's coaching career) appeared to recall Bob's leadership as more ideological than what he appeared to report. For example, each of the athlete participants appeared to report that Bob used *a past oriented time frame*, and at least two of the athlete participants reported that Bob looked for *transcendent outcomes*; that he had a *chaotic view of crisis*, and that he used an *internal focus in motivation*.

Table 6

Overview of Bob's Leadership Style Profiles: Coach and Athlete Perceptions

Behaviours	Early (Hugh)	Middle (Carl)	Recent (Matt)	Bob
Time Frame and Outcomes Sought				
Time frame	Past (I)	Past (I)	Past (I)	Future (C)
Type of outcome expected	Transcendent (I)	Malleable (P)	Transcendent (I)	Malleable (P)
Number of outcomes	Few (I)	Few (I)	Few (I)	Few (I)
Motivation and Appeals				
Type of experience used	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive and negative (P)
Focus of motivation	External (C/P)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	External (C/P)
Emotional appeals	Negative (I)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)	Rational (P)
People to motivate	Masses (C)	Masses (C)	Masses (C)	Base cadre (I)
Crisis, Causes and Control				
Views of crisis	Chaotic (I)	Chaotic (I)	Ordered (C)	Isolated (P)
Cause of outcomes	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)
Level of control	High (C)	High (C)	High (C)	Selective (P)
Overall Leadership Style	Mostly ideological with charismatic mix	Mixed	Mostly charismatic and ideological	Mostly pragmatic with charismatic mix

The information in the columns represents the behaviours that each participant reported.

Sandy's leadership behaviours and style. Sandy was the sixth coach to be profiled, and the researcher's analysis showed that Sandy used mostly charismatic leadership, with an ideological mix. He reported five behaviours associated with a charismatic style, and four behaviours associated with an ideological style (See Tables 1 and 7). There was some variation among his athlete participants (Kye, from the early stage of Sandy's coaching career; Logan, from the middle stage of Sandy's coaching career; and Cole, from the most recent stage of Sandy's coaching career). Sandy claimed to use a *future oriented time frame*; appeared to view *people as the cause* of outcomes; communicated with the *masses*; and had an *ordered view of crisis*, all of which represent

a charismatic leadership style. Although his athlete participants varied between believing Sandy used a *past* or *present oriented time frame*, they were mostly consistent in their opinions of his other behaviours that reflected a charismatic leadership style.

Consistent with a more ideological leadership style, Sandy expressed that he sought *few outcomes* each year; demonstrated an *internal focus in motivation*; and used *negative emotional appeals* to his athletes. It also appeared that Sandy sought both *positive* and *transcendent outcomes*, which reflected a mix of charismatic and ideological leadership styles. The athlete participants varied more widely in their recollection of these behaviours. Sandy also expressed some behaviours that indicated a pragmatic leadership style; he claimed to have a *selective level of control* over outcomes; and use both *positive and negative experiences* to motivate his athletes, both of which were recalled fairly consistently by his athlete participants.

Table 7

Overview of Sandy's Leadership Style Profiles: Coach and Athlete Perceptions

Behaviours	Early (Kye)	Middle (Logan)	Recent (Cole)	Sandy
Time Frame and Outcomes Sought				
Time frame	Past (I) and present (P)	Present (P)	Past (I) and present (P)	Future (C)
Type of outcome expected	Positive (C) and transcendent (I)	Transcendent (I)	Positive (C)	Positive (C) and transcendent (I)
Number of outcomes	Few (I)	Few (I)	Variable (P)	Few (I)
Motivation and Appeals				
Type of experience used	Positive (C)	Positive and negative (P)	Positive (C)	Positive and negative (P)
Focus of motivation	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)	Internal (I)
Emotional appeals	Rational (P)	Positive (C)	Negative (I)	Negative (I)
People to motivate	Masses (C)	Masses (C)	Base cadre (I)	Masses (C)
Crisis, Causes and Control				
Views of crisis	Ordered (C) and chaotic (I)	Isolated (P)	Ordered (C)	Ordered (C)
Cause of outcomes	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)	People (C)
Level of control	Selective (P)	High (C)	Selective (P)	Selective (P)
Overall Leadership Style	Mixed	Mixed	Mixed	Mostly charismatic with ideological mix

The information in the columns represents the behaviours that each participant reported.

Section 2: Factors Associated with the Development of Outstanding Leadership

In this section, the four factors that all of the coaches claimed influenced their development as leaders are discussed. These factors were role models, networks of coaches, leadership experience and reflection, and formal, non-formal, and informal learning opportunities. These factors were based entirely from data provided by coaches and were consistent regardless of leadership style.

Role models

All coaches said that role models in and out of sport contributed to their development as leaders. Interestingly, they reported that both positive and negative role models influenced them. In terms of positive role models, Ryan discussed how "guys like [coach A] in high school, [coach B] at [university], were guys that I just looked up to and thought, 'If there [are] people I could be like, those are the guys I want to be like'" (interview 1). Both of these role models came from his time as a player, which indicated that even before he began coaching, role models influenced his leadership development. Adam also said that his high school coach was a major influence on not only his development as a leader, but also on his decision to begin coaching. He said that after his time playing for his high school coach, he "got a little, a real understanding [of football]… that's where the passion came from, wanting to coach" (interview 1). Wade emphasised that the positive role models made an important contribution to his development. He was asked if it was important to have positive role models and said that when he moved to a new team "I had really strong coaches, it was, to me, it was like, 'Oh, this is how it should be.' So, yeah… for sure it was important" (interview 2). Likewise, Sandy said that positive role models influenced his development. He gave an

example of how his “grade six teacher actually used to come to my high school football games… which I thought was really cool and something that I tried to emulate when I started coaching and teaching” (interview 2).

All of the coaches also said they had a ‘negative’ role model, or someone that demonstrated ways they did not want to lead. Craig discussed role models from his playing, coaching, and early professional career and said that when he observed these leaders, “there’s things you say, ‘I like that, I don’t like that.’ Or, ‘here’s what I like, but I don’t ever want to coach this certain way’” (interview 1). Here, the discussion of what Craig did and did not like from his former coaches or colleagues reflected that role models were not always positive. Bob discussed having negative role models, and said that when he started coaching, one of the coaches he worked with did “a number of things that… at the high school level that I just didn’t think were successful for players” (interview 1). Similarly, Wade mentioned coaches he had later in his playing career and said:

> I didn't think they were hardworking, knowledgeable, or treated the kids well, and… it was something like I swore I would never do. I swore I would never let down the kids as best I could by doing the opposite [of what those coaches did] (interview 2).

Sandy explained that, although he went on to coach and work with excellent role models, it was his experience with a negative role model inspired him to begin coaching. He said simply, “the reason I got into coaching in the first place was my high school coach wasn’t great” (interview 1). Hence, the negative role models were important because they

inspired the coaches *not* to behave in certain ways, while the positive role models provided a model of the behaviours to which these coaches aspired.

Networks of coaches

Another area that appeared to contribute to the coaches' development as leaders were networks of coaches. These networks consisted of coaches in football and other sports and appeared to be relied upon when the coaches transitioned to a new coaching position. Wade gave an example of when he relied on his network when he became head coach of a new team and said:

> I had to figure out, how do you lead that many people in the right direction to get where you want to go? So I had to do a lot of, like immediately I called all my friends that were head coaches and said, "I'll buy you lunch, can we sit down and go over stuff?" I met with a number of different head coaches… I spent a lot of time picking brains of people to know what I needed to do (interview 1).

At this stage in his career, having never been a head coach before, it seemed important for Wade to use a network of other coaches to help guide him. Similarly, Bob reflected on a time early in his coaching career when the team he was coaching struggled and said, "you just go through that phase as a coach where you question yourself, and I think that for sure that year was a lot of questioning and you sort of rely on colleagues a lot" (interview 1). In his follow up interview, when discussing the idea of networks of coaches, Adam gave an account of a recent experience when he happened to meet a former coaching colleague in public and almost immediately asked him for advice. Adam said after exchanging pleasantries, "it didn't take long for me to say, 'Hey, [coach], so I'm teaching these guys… yadda yadda…' in the middle of Starbucks" (interview 2). Sandy

said that using a network of coaches was crucial to his development, “whether it be discussions informally or talking with some different people about things that they do to get better” (interview 2). Ryan felt that he was fortunate to be able to rely on his network of coaches to help him develop. He said “I've been very lucky and I think it's been very important in terms of my development to be around those guys and to be able to have those honest conversations” (interview 2). Craig also said that a large part of his development has come from these discussions. He offered a recent example of using his network of coaches to discuss and refine leadership, and said:

> A buddy of mine phoned me yesterday. He’s coaching rugby in [city]. This is a guy I’ve known forever and he said, “I know you’ve coached for years. What help can you give me?” So we talked, it was mostly about leadership and it like it was that type of stuff and he had some ideas too… (interview 1).

This quote from Craig showed that not only did the coaches rely on their networks for their own development, but that they became part of a network for other coaches as their careers continued. As each of the quotes demonstrate, networks of other coaches seemed to be important for the coaches’ reported leadership development, and were either engaged when needed, or engaged in passing when the opportunity was presented.

Experience and reflection

Coaches said that their leadership experiences in and out of sport, and reflecting on these experiences, contributed to their development as leaders. Craig said “the experience that influenced me the most is not the number of years that I've coached, but my role in how I've coached and how I've had to adapt to those [different roles]” (interview 2). Craig’s quote indicated that experience in different leadership capacities

within the sport setting was an important factor in his development. Adam reflected on his employment across different settings and said, “I've been in oil, gas, wheat, agriculture, and healthcare... I was working in so many different environments well what I learned was leadership is no different, whatever industry you're in, no matter what level you're at” (interview 1). Sandy admitted that he did not always have the experience to make the best decision possible, especially early in his career. He reflected that “in the last 20 years, we [Sandy and his coaching staff] have made some mistakes. And owning it and being upfront about it and not being afraid to fail, I think, is important too in leadership sometimes” (interview 1). Similarly, Wade said that “the more you practice and make mistakes and learn and things go wrong, because you're gonna learn from those things, the better that you're going to become” (interview 1). Each of these quotes illustrated a different capacity in which leaders can gain experience, from changing roles as a coach, being exposed to a variety of leadership settings outside of sport, or simply reflecting on one’s mistakes as a leader from past seasons.

Bob said that experience is vital, because “there [are] a lot of challenges that you’re just not prepared for as a first year coach” (interview 1). The unifying element to these experiences appeared to be that ‘lessons’ in leadership were only developed after the coach had reflected upon their experience. Ryan perhaps illustrated this best when he said “I think you have to be not only reflective, but critically reflective of yourself every year… I don't think you can have true growth unless you're critically reflective” (interview 2). Combined with reflection, the coaches believed that gaining experience as a leader both in and out of sport was vital to their development.

Formal, non-formal, and informal education

Each of the coaches believed that formal (e.g., taking a certificate program, course, or degree), non-formal (e.g., attending a coaching clinic), and informal (e.g., reading, self-directed research) learning opportunities were important for their development. For example, Ryan gave examples of informal and formal learning, respectively, impacting his leadership and said, "I've read many books about leadership. I went through the Master's …program and learned about principles of leadership," (interview 1). Bob demonstrated the utility of informal learning and claimed that leadership is "a skill that takes a lot of time, it takes a lot of work and I think there's research to it… I did a lot of research and I read a lot of articles, I read a lot of books on successful coaches and successful people" (interview 1). Craig also demonstrated the importance of informal and non-formal learning and said that he had learned about leadership by having "read leadership books. I've read. I've gone to talks. I've heard… [the] same thing in work, hearing people that are leaders and they talk about leadership and mentorship" (interview 1).

In reference to a non-formal learning opportunity, Sandy explained this when he said "I learned in a course a long time ago, it was a leadership course… [what he learned was] you just have your goal, and you don't worry about the things that are gonna get in the way of that goal" (interview 1). Adam discussed the importance of taking non-formal courses to find out what "you need to learn. It's holding people accountable, having a focus, 'What are my key success factors? What are the key things?'" (interview 1). Wade discussed that much of his informal learning would explore individual topics such as "how do you get your players to be good people, how do you get to that, that they're

getting something out of the season more than just the wins and losses" (interview 1). As these quotes demonstrate, the coaches believed that formal, non-formal, and informal learning were important factors in their ongoing development as leaders.

CHAPTER 5:

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the development of leadership among model youth football coaches. The first research question was: What leadership style best described these coaches? The second research question was: What events and experiences contributed to the development of their leadership style? The conceptual claims (Thorne, 2016) arising from this study are twofold. First, pragmatic leadership behaviours were most widely reported by coaches and athletes. However, no coach neatly 'fit' one particular style. Second, regardless of the leadership behaviours and style, four themes were associated with the development of the coaches' leadership. These themes were role models; networks of coaches; leadership experience and reflection; and formal, non-formal, and informal learning opportunities.

There is a growing body of literature that has focused on the development of coaches' coaching knowledge (e.g., Camiré et al., 2014; Carter & Bloom, 2009; Erickson et al., 2007). However, there remains little published work to date that has explored leadership development in youth sport coaches, and recent work in the area of youth sport leadership has been dominated by TFL (e.g., Turnnidge & Côté, 2016; Vella et al., 2013). As outlined in the leadership literature, there is a need to consider other models of leadership to further our understanding of the subject (Hunter et al., 2011). Hence, the current study makes a contribution to the youth sport coaching literature by adopting a little-used model of leadership and examining the leadership behaviours and styles of model youth sport coaches, along with the factors that contributed to the development of their leadership.

Leadership Behaviours and Styles

In Hunter et al.'s (2011) study of CIP leadership styles based on the biographies of 29 NCAA and 25 NFL coaches, more NCAA coaches than NFL coaches had charismatic styles (i.e., of the NCAA coaches, 16 were charismatic, 6 were ideological, and 7 were pragmatic; of the NFL coaches, 8 were charismatic, 8 were ideological, and 9 were pragmatic). Hunter et al. speculated that the dominance of charismatic leadership styles among the NCAA coaches may be because amateur (college) athletes may be more open to charismatic guidance than professional athletes. In general, the findings of the current study do not support Hunter et al.'s findings with NCAA coaches, because while no coach exclusively 'fit' with a specific CIP leadership style, the majority of the reported behaviours (from coaches and athletes) aligned with a pragmatic style.

This different finding raises the question of why NCAA coaches would predominantly have a different approach to the model youth football coaches in the current study. Hunter et al. (2011) suggested that charismatic leaders are more likely to emerge in populations with low self-clarity (i.e., college-aged athletes are still developing a sense of self). That explanation would not hold for the current study because the coaches dealt with adolescent athletes, who would likely be in the early stages of developing their identities (Steinberg & Morris, 2001). A key issue, as Hunter et al. (2011) alluded to in speculating on the differences between NCAA and NFL coaches, is that the environment is an extremely important factor consider in terms of leadership effectiveness (Mumford et al., 2008).

More specifically, Mumford et al. (2008) proposed that the environment, a person's colleagues, and an individual's experiences influence the emergence and

effectiveness of CIP leadership. In the current study, the environment (i.e., the youth football context) and the 'colleagues' (i.e., other coaches and adolescent athletes), along with the coaches' personal experiences may all play a role in the emergence and effectiveness of leadership. As Mumford et al. (2008) argued, pragmatic leaders may be better able to perform in 'stable' conditions when compared to charismatic and ideological leaders. In the region where the current study was conducted, youth football programs are separated by age and not ability, and compete in the same league each season. The programs are also inclusive and volunteer-based, making it unlikely that the coaches or players would face the threat of being replaced if the team underperformed. This means that the competitive environment the coaches in this study participated in would have been relatively stable, which would offer support for the emergence and effectiveness of pragmatic leadership. Mumford et al. (2008) also argued that pragmatic leaders are more effective when there is little organizational conflict. In youth football, head coaches often coach similar groups of athletes each year, and are able to select their own coaching staff with little external pressure. The potential familiarity with one's colleagues could limit conflict within the team, which would again support the emergence and effectiveness of pragmatic leadership among the coaches in this study.

The fact that all coaches had a mix of behaviours associated with different styles may be partly explained by the fact that pragmatic leadership behaviours were most frequently reported. Pragmatic leaders change their behaviours to address the complexity of the current issues they face (Griffith et al., 2015; Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001). Hence, it may be that most of the coaches in the current study were, in general, pragmatic but engaged in different types of behaviours (i.e., from different leadership styles)

depending on the issues they faced. For instance, it was notable that in the theme of 'people to motivate' no coaches reported behaviours consistent with a pragmatic style (see Table 1). Rather, four coaches used their base cadre to motivate athletes (an ideological behaviour) and two coaches attempted to motivate the entire team (a charismatic behaviour).

In the Hunter et al. (2011) study, pragmatic coaches would motivate by reaching 'elites' (i.e., the most skilled members of the team). A possible explanation for the reliance on the base cadre in the current study is that the coaches who expressed that they relied on their captains may have selected the elites to be their team captains. This would mean that the coaches put their elites in a leadership position and relied on them to communicate with the team, resulting in that behaviour being interpreted by the researcher as the coach relying upon their base cadre, instead of relying on their elites as would be expected of a more pragmatic leader. In the case of coaches who expressed that they relied on the other coaches (who are still considered base cadre), it may have been that the age or maturity of the athletes prevented the coach from being able to rely on the athletes themselves as a means of communicating with the team. However, the idea of pragmatic behaviours being prevalent due to the 'adaptability' of this leadership style would be consistent with research by Mills and Boardley (2016), who found that expert soccer managers adapted their leadership behaviours over the course of their careers.

The athlete participants' reports of their coaches' leadership behaviours are somewhat unique to the current study in that athletes' perspectives were not considered in Hunter et al.'s (2011) study of coach leadership styles. The findings from the athletes from the current study raise two interesting discussion points. First, the athletes were

sampled from the early, middle, and most recent stages of the coaches' careers, and therefore the athletes' responses may provide some insights into the consistency and/or change in the coaches' leadership over time. Each of the athlete participants reported at least three behaviours consistent with their coach's reported majority style. This could indicate that the coaches 'developed' or refined their majority style as their career progressed, but that aspects of that style were present early on. This would be consistent with previous research, which has found coaches may develop and change some leadership behaviours over their career (Mills & Boardley, 2016). The idea of changing leadership styles over the course of a coach's career is not consistent with broader leadership research, which has found that historically notable outstanding leaders typically experience events that establish their overall leadership style during adolescence/early adulthood (Ligon et al., 2008). It could be that the coaches did not have enough leadership opportunities early in their life to have developed their style at a similar time to those studied by Ligon et al.

Second, there were some differences between the athletes' perspectives and the coaches' perspectives of their leadership behaviours. For example, several of the coaches in this study reported having a selective level of control over the outcome of a season. However, oftentimes their athlete participants would report that the coaches communicated a high level of control to the team. This could represent a discrepancy between the coaches' mental models (i.e., that they can only control select things) and what the coaches felt was important to communicate to the team (i.e., that the team was in total control). It could also be a simple matter of the athlete interpreting the coach's message as something different than what the coach intended. Differences in athletes'

and coaches' reports of coach behaviours are not uncommon. In a study exploring the relationship between coach, athlete, and observer perceptions of coaching behaviours related to the motivational environment, Smith et al. (2016) found that coach and athlete perceptions of some coach behaviours were negatively correlated. That is, if a coach reported the use of certain behaviours, the athletes were less likely to report the coach using those behaviours (e.g., a coach reporting the use of autonomy supportive behaviours was negatively correlated with the athlete reporting autonomy supportive behaviours from the coach). This shows that there is potential for athletes (and observers) to interpret coaching behaviours differently from what the coach intended.

Finally, in terms of coding leadership styles based on the reported behaviours, it is worth considering how leadership styles have been coded in other studies using the CIP model. In the current study, the leader's behaviours were evaluated and their predominant style was interpreted based on the majority of their identified behaviours. This meant that the coaches were able to be identified as 'mixes' of leadership styles depending on the combinations of reported behaviours. Previous studies using the CIP model have assigned leaders an overall style based upon brief biographical readings, and have omitted participants who had mixed leadership styles (Hunter et al., 2011; Ligon et al., 2008). By not including potentially 'mixed' style leaders, and prescribing a style, previous research has underexplored what appears to be a common phenomenon in mixed leadership styles. This issue arose in Mills and Boardley's (2016) study with soccer managers they identified as TFL leaders. The authors found that each of these renowned 'TFL' managers used a mix of TFL and non-TFL behaviours, but did not explore if there were other leadership styles that might have better described what these managers did.

Similarly, Hunter et al. (2011) did not find that NCAA and NFL coaches always demonstrated behaviours consistent with one of charismatic, ideological, or pragmatic leadership. This means that, although it may be easier to 'fit' coaches to a particular style, coaches do not appear to demonstrate leadership behaviours that are entirely consistent with one particular leadership style.

Factors Associated with the Development of Outstanding Leadership

The findings regarding the development of leadership revealed that, regardless of the coaches' leadership style, four main themes were reported. These themes were role models, networks of coaches, experience, and formal, non-formal, and informal learning opportunities. At a general level, these findings support a growing body of literature showing that the developmental experiences of coaches are primarily based a range of social interactions and personal learning endeavours (e.g., Carter & Bloom, 2009; Erickson et al., 2007; Gilbert & Trudel, 2005; Lemyre et al., 2007; Stephenson & Jowett, 2009). For example, as Lemyre et al. (2007) noted, youth sport coaches' knowledge goes far beyond their involvement in formal coach education programs. In fact, the current study shows that the factors associated with the leadership development of model youth football coaches rarely included formal coach education courses.

Coaches reported having both positive and negative role models. For instance, Wade, Ryan, Adam, and Sandy said that role model coaches influenced them when they were high school football players themselves and, for Adam and Sandy, motivated them to be involved in coaching. Positive role models were discussed by the participants in this study as being highly influential in their development, especially late in their playing career and early in their coaching career. These 'positive' role models continued to serve

as examples of what a ‘good’ coach should do throughout the careers of the participants in this study. Pursuing coaching due to the influence of mentor coaches is consistent with some recent leadership literature among elite soccer managers (Mills & Boardley, 2016). Coach development literature has also demonstrated the importance of having mentors and role models, as both a player and a coach, in both acquiring coaching knowledge and personal development. For example, Gould et al. (2007) found that award winning coaches served as role models and mentors for athletes, and Camiré et al. (2014) found that coaches learned to facilitate PYD through watching and emulating coaches they had as players. Similarly, youth soccer coaches expressed that having a mentor coach (i.e., a role model) early in their career was important for their development as coaches (Stephenson & Jowett, 2009).

Participants also discussed having negative role models in their experiences as players and coaches. The coaches expressed that they made an effort to avoid coaching like their negative role models. Stephenson and Jowett (2009) found that young coaches often adopted the practices of their mentor coaches without question. However, they did not explicitly explore the influence of negative role models on the development of their participants, and the idea of negative role models appears to be underexplored in coach development literature. In may be that negative role models provide a point of contrast (i.e., when compared to positive role models) that helped the coaches in the current study understand more about how they wanted to ‘be’ as leaders. However, the necessity of these negative role models remains unclear, and they should not be considered an essential part of coach leadership development based upon these findings.

Networks of coaches were important factors in the development of leadership. These networks seemed most useful when coaches were transitioning to a new role, but coaches also relied on networks as their careers progressed. Several other studies have found that coaches in various sports, in different countries, and at different levels of competition, relied upon networks of other coaches with experience to help guide them, and these experienced coaches helped them acquire coaching knowledge (e.g., Carter & Bloom, 2009; Stoszkowski & Collins, 2016; Winchester et al., 2013). As the current findings suggest, these networks may be used differently depending on the stage of a coach's career. Similarly, Stephenson and Jowett (2009) found that youth soccer coaches often relied on informal interactions with other coaches to address specific areas of their coaching knowledge early in their careers, whereas these networks were used for general conversations about coaching by more experienced coaches. Thus, networks of coaches may serve different purposes at different stages of a coach's career.

In the context of the current study, these networks of coaches appeared to resemble communities of practice (CoPs). Communities of practice, broadly, are networks of likeminded individuals who rely upon each other to share knowledge and develop expertise in their field (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). The findings of the current study indicated that leadership may be one area of personal development that CoPs can contribute to in coaches. In one study with high performance coaches, formal monthly meetings were held with female coaches at an NCAA university to establish a CoP (Bertram, Culver, & Gilbert, 2017). These coaches expressed that not only was the CoP helpful in their day-to-day employment as coaches and in improving their coaching knowledge, but it also helped in their personal development.

The current study demonstrated that leadership experiences, and reflection on these experiences, were important factors in the development of leadership. The experiences that the coaches discussed as being important were from a variety of areas of their lives, including their experiences as a coach and experiences gained through their professional careers (it should be noted that none of the participants were full-time professional youth coaches and all were employed in another capacity beyond their youth coaching role). Research by Erickson et al., (2007) found that leadership experience was an important factor in team sport university coaches' general coaching development, although the context of 'leadership experience' they explored was limited to the coaches' experiences as an athlete. Similarly, other research involving coaches from different sports, in different countries, has found that playing experience contributes to coach development (e.g., Gilbert et al., 2006; Gilbert, Lichtenwaldt, Gilbert, Zelezny, & Côté, 2009; Mills & Boardley, 2016). The findings of the current study suggest that the utility of leadership experience may transcend context, and other forms of leadership experience (outside of the sporting domain) may contribute to the development of leadership in model youth football coaches.

Coaches reported that reflecting on their leadership experiences was vital for them to improve. This is consistent with literature exploring the development of coaching knowledge, which has discussed reflection as an important part of coach development for some time (e.g., Gilbert & Trudel, 2002; Gilbert & Trudel, 2005). Gilbert and Trudel (2002) proposed that reflection on experience is a six step process, and a vital way through which model youth sport coaches learn to coach in both hockey and soccer. A recent grounded theory of coach development among youth soccer coaches found that

reflecting on decisions was a key part to the coaches' development (Stodter & Cushion, 2017), which would correlate to the fifth and sixth steps of Gilbert and Trudel's (2002) findings. Similarly, other research had found that although the coaches may express that experience was their most prominent source of coaching knowledge, it was not experience alone that contributed to the coaches' development. Rather, it is reflection on these experiences that leads to the development of the coaches' knowledge (e.g., Erickson et al., 2008; Stephenson & Jowett, 2009; Winchester et al., 2013).

Formal, non-formal, and informal learning opportunities were the fourth factor that the coaches in this study identified as influencing their leadership development. Formal learning opportunities were discussed by the participants as completing post-secondary degrees, and all of the coaches claimed interactions with other coaches at coaching clinics was a source of non-formal learning. The participants also discussed that informal learning opportunities, such as reading and the use of online resources, were important factors as well. This is consistent with several previous studies, which have found that coach development is a complex process that involves a variety of learning opportunities (e.g., Camiré et al., 2014; Erickson et al., 2007; Lemyre et al., 2007; Wright et al., 2007).

Interestingly, coach education was not discussed as a way of developing leadership. This could be because formal coach education in the context of Canadian football does not focus on leadership development in coaches, instead emphasizing the complex technical and tactical knowledge required by the sport. For example, the 'community novice coach' level of football coaching certification offered in Canada (the first level of certification) covers the essentials of coaching each position, and *may*

include a basic tactical component ("Community novice coach," n.d.). This conflicts with the findings of Gilbert et al. (2006), who found that community college football coaches invest more time in formal coach development programs than high school softball or NCAA volleyball coaches (albeit still a relatively small amount of time compared to the remainder of the coaches' annual activities). The difference in findings could be due to the differences in football coach education courses between Canada and the United States, which are less structured and often not mandatory in Canada. However, the current findings are consistent with other aspects of previous research, which has also found that a variety of formal, non-formal, and informal learning opportunities, such as post-secondary education, interacting with other coaches at coaching conferences, and self-directed reading, may influence coach development (e.g., Camiré et al., 2014; Carter & Bloom, 2009; Erickson et al., 2008; Lemyre et al., 2007; Stoszkowski & Collins, 2016; Winchester et al., 2013).

The amount of formal, non-formal and informal learning that the coaches in the current study underwent indicated a strong openness to learning. Formal, non-formal and informal learning involve an individual taking part in typically voluntary formal (e.g., a post-secondary degree), non-formal (e.g., a coaching clinic), or informal learning opportunities (e.g., self-directed research). An openness to learning was identified by Camiré et al. (2014) as a unifying element among model youth sport coaches. The current study supports the notion that model youth sport coaches may be able to be identified by an openness to a variety of learning opportunities.

Limitations and Strengths

Several limitations must be considered when evaluating the contributions this study may offer to the literature. First, this study relied on self-report data only (whether from coaches or athletes) in the absence of any behavioural observations of the coaches. Observations would have provided another source of data to triangulate the findings and would have provided insight into the consistency between the coaches' self-reports of their current style and the behaviours they display while coaching. Second, whereas the inclusion of athletes from three stages of the coaches' careers gave some insights into how the coaches' leadership behaviours and styles *may* have changed, they do not depict change over time per se. The three athletes from each phase of the coaches' careers may have had their unique views of the coaches that are not necessarily representative of the majority of views from athletes during a particular phase of the coaches' careers. Furthermore, given the sampling approach (i.e., coaches were asked to nominate athletes), those athletes with the most favourable views of the coaches' may have participated in this study. In the future, longitudinal studies that follow coaches over time and include the perceptions of a range of athletes from different phases of their careers, while complex and time-consuming, would make a valuable contribution to the literature.

Third, the second interview revealed some inconsistencies between the researcher's coding and one of the coaches' overall self-perceptions of their leadership. Adam was coded as a mostly pragmatic leader based on his behaviours, although he expressed an affinity for the description of ideological leadership. Recently, Smith and McGannon (2017) discussed the use of any form of member checking (the second interview could be construed as a form of member checking) as a measure of the validity

of a researcher's findings. They argued that member checks are a reflection of the researcher's and participants' social realities, the same as an initial interview. This means that individuals may want to portray themselves in a manner that they believe is more favourable once they discover how the data has been analysed, and how they believe they may be 'compared' to others. As it related to this study, this means that the coaches may have expressed favour for a style of leadership that they aspired to emulate, or an affinity for one of the example coaches used, instead of reflecting on the leadership style that would be most consistent with their behaviours.

This study was focused on leadership styles among football coaches, which was important because researchers have highlighted that there may be differences in coach development across different sports (Erickson et al., 2007). There may be some unique aspects of leadership in football that are not present in other sports. For instance, football coaches often have a large roster of players (a youth football team may have 30-50 players) and a large coaching staff (a youth football team may have 4-12 assistant coaches). Football coaches are required to lead both the players and the coaches in two essentially separate units (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). Coaches in other sports may not have such high leadership demands. Indeed, a study by Erickson et al. (2007) suggested that team sport coaches have more leadership experience than individual sport coaches, as the individual sport coaches may have had less opportunities for formal leadership as athletes, due to the structure of individual sports. Hence, football coaches provided an ideal opportunity to study leadership, but the findings may not apply to coaches in other settings that possibly do not have the same 'type' of leadership demands. For example, a

head coach in youth hockey or youth soccer may only have 12-18 players, and may have one or two assistant coaches, meaning they have fewer followers to manage.

Other strengths of this study include the sampling strategy, which permitted the recruitment of model youth football coaches who had received provincial 'Coach of the Year' awards. Furthermore, the recruitment of athletes from three phases of their coaching careers added additional insights into coach leadership and provided opportunities for data triangulation. Although second interviews may present issues such as discrepancies between the researcher's coding and the participants' self-perceptions, they did provide opportunities for the coaches to comment on the interpretations of the data and coding of their leadership styles and further added to data saturation.

Practical Implications

The findings of this study may have several practical implications. First, each of the coaches appeared to have a mix of different leadership behaviours. No one coach exactly fit a particular style (although they could be coded into one predominant style or a mix of styles), despite each coach having been recognised as a model coach, and having won a provincial 'Coach of the Year' award. Pragmatic behaviours were the most commonly used behaviours among coaches in this study, and pragmatic leaders are known to adapt their behaviours to suit their context (Mumford & van Doorn, 2001). From a practical perspective, this questions whether it is appropriate to promote a single set of 'model' leadership behaviours. As Côté and Gilbert (2009) noted in their definition of coach effectiveness and expertise, coaches work in complex social environments and require a variety of sources of knowledge. Coach leadership, then, may require a mix of different leadership behaviours that are applied depending on the contextual

circumstances (e.g., age of athletes, level of competition) and, possibly, personal characteristics of a particular coach. This means that there may be merit in teaching coaches about a range of leadership styles and behaviours, and providing coaches with opportunities to explore what works best in the context of their coaching.

Reflective exercises to increase self-awareness of a coach's leadership behaviours may be an effective training approach, rather than trying to 'force' a coach into a particular style. The idea of providing guidelines for coaches instead of prescribing behaviours has received attention in general coach development literature (e.g., Bertram & Gilbert, 2011), and these findings indicate that it may also be appropriate for leadership development initiatives with coaches.

Another important practical implication is that there may be merit in creating formal mentoring (i.e., role modelling) opportunities and CoPs for coaches to learn about and develop their leadership. As the findings in this study indicated, it may be important for the mentoring opportunities and CoPs to include coaches from the same sport *and* from different sports (e.g., Bertram et al., 2017). However, there may also be benefit to encouraging coaches to create *non-formal* CoPs, as the coaches in the current study expressed that their networking was often relied upon when the need arose, and not through regularly scheduled meetings.

Finally, the findings revealed that although the coaches in this study underwent formal, non-formal, and informal learning to develop their leadership, none of the coaches discussed any aspect of leadership being taught in current coach education courses. Formal football education courses in Canada are often not mandatory for coaches, and at the lower levels of certification, these courses focus almost exclusively

on the essential technical and tactical knowledge coaches require to coach a specific aspect of the game. There may be merit in including leadership sections in formal coach education programs, as previous research has shown that many coaches participate in formal coach education and see it as an ideal source of gaining knowledge (Erickson et al., 2008). This would give coach educators an established means of communicating leadership practices to coaches.

Conclusion

This study used a model of outstanding leadership (CIP; Mumford, 2006) that has not been extensively used in the youth sport coaching literature previously. The CIP model includes three styles of leadership, and by using it as a framework for analysis it became clear that coaches possessed a mix of leadership styles. Nonetheless, behaviours associated with the pragmatic leadership style were the most frequently reported across the coaches and athletes, and therefore there may be merit in exploring a broader range of leadership styles in a youth sport setting than what has previously been used. Additionally, this study revealed a range of consistent themes, regardless of leadership style, that contributed to the leadership of outstanding youth football coaches. These themes may provide useful guidelines for continuing and improving coach leadership development initiatives in the future.

Appendix A

Table 8

Definitions of key terms

Term	Definition
Model Coach	Someone who "(a) demonstrated interest in learning about the theory and practice of coaching; (b) was respected in the local sporting community for their commitment to youth sport; (c) was considered a good leader, teacher, and organizer; and (d) kept winning in perspective and encouraged children to respect the rules of the game, competitors, and officials" (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004, p. 25)."
Leadership	Knowing "where the group or team is going" as well as providing the direction and resources to help it get there" (Weinberg & Gould, 2007, p. 206)
Leadership Behaviour	The actions a leader employs to influence followers towards achieving the group's goals (Barrow, 1977)
Leadership Style	"Relatively stable patterns of behaviour displayed by leaders" (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003, p. 569)

Appendix B

Table 9

Mumford et al.'s (2008) influences of outstanding leadership

Level of Influence	Number	Proposition
Individual	1	At the individual level, the emergence and performance of pragmatic leaders will be more strongly influenced by expertise and cognitive skills than charismatic and ideological leaders, and will, vis-à-vis expertise requirements, evidence greater domain specificity
	2	At the individual level, social skills will exert a stronger influence on the emergence and performance of charismatic and ideological leaders than pragmatic leaders.
	3	At the individual level, the emergence and performance of charismatic and ideological leaders will require low psychological distance and high contact between leaders and followers, whereas the emergence and performance of pragmatic leaders will require high psychological distance and more limited contact with followers.
	4	At the individual level, charismatic and ideological leaders will emerge in vulnerable populations, whereas

		pragmatic leaders will emerge in autonomous, high-achieving populations.
	5	At the individual level, the performance of charismatic and ideological leaders will depend on the quality of the prescriptive mental model underlying the vision being articulated, whereas the performance of pragmatic leaders will depend on the skills and capabilities of the followers they recruit as much as the prescriptive mental model of the leader.
	6	At the individual level, charismatic leaders are more likely to emerge and perform effectively when the pursuit of opportunities is crucial, whereas ideological leaders are more likely to emerge and perform effectively when the removal of threats is crucial.
	7	At the individual level, self-sacrifice and sustained personal commitment to a vision will be more important to the emergence and performance of ideological leaders than charismatic and pragmatic leaders.
Group	8	At the group level, ideological leaders will emerge under conditions where trust is low; however, the performance of ideological leaders will require high levels of interpersonal trust in the leader.

9 At the group level, the emergence and performance of charismatic leaders will depend on high levels of trust.

10 At the group level, perceptions of process, procedural, and distributive justice will prove more important to the emergence and performance of pragmatic leaders than interpersonal trust.

11 At the group level, the emergence and performance of ideological leaders will depend on high levels of group cohesion.

12 At the group level, the emergence of charismatic leaders will be linked to low levels of cohesion, whereas the performance of charismatic leaders will depend on the leader creating high levels of cohesion.

13 At the group level, the emergence of pragmatic leaders will depend on some minimal level of cohesion, whereas the performance of pragmatic leaders will not depend on high levels of cohesion.

14 At the group level, high levels of interdependence will contribute to the emergence and performance of charismatic and ideological leaders, whereas low levels of interdependence will contribute to the emergence and performance of pragmatic leaders.

15 At the group level, the emergence and performance of ideological but not charismatic leaders will be influenced by shared leadership.

16 At the organizational level, emergence and performance will vary as a function of the amount of chaos in organizational operations, with pragmatic leaders emerging and performing well in stable settings, charismatic leaders emerging and performing well in ordered settings, and ideological leaders emerging and performing well in highly chaotic settings.

17 At the organizational level, organizational complexity will facilitate the emergence and performance of pragmatic and charismatic leaders but not ideological leaders.

Organizational

18 At the organizational level, professionalism will facilitate the emergence and performance of pragmatic leaders and inhibit the emergence and performance of charismatic and ideological leaders.

19 At the organizational level, charismatic and ideological leaders will emerge and prove more effective in organizations evidencing high levels of political conflict, whereas pragmatic leaders will emerge and prove more effective in organizations evidencing low levels of political conflict.

	20	At the organizational level, a strong organizational culture will promote the emergence and performance of ideological leaders and inhibit the emergence and performance of charismatic leaders advocating culturally inconsistent visions.
	21	At the environmental level, the emergence of ideological leaders will be facilitated by collectivist cultures, whereas the emergence of charismatic and pragmatic leaders will be facilitated by individualistic cultures.
	22	At the environmental level, social disruption and the failure of extant institutions will promote the emergence of ideological leaders.
Environmental	23	At the environmental level, conditions of social and technological change will contribute to the emergence and performance of charismatic leaders.
	24	At the environmental level, when institutions are subject to viable elite control, pragmatic leaders will emerge and perform effectively under conditions of goal consensus, whereas charismatic leaders will emerge and perform effectively under conditions of goal conflict.

Appendix C

Table 10

Hunter et al.'s (2011) framework to identify outstanding leadership styles in football coaches.

Area	Question type	Leadership Style		
		Charismatic	Ideological	Pragmatic
Time frame	To what extent does the leader: Use a future-, past-, or present-oriented time-frame?	Future	Past	Present
Type of experience used	To what extent does the leader: Discuss positive, negative, or both types of prior experiences when interacting with (e.g., motivating) subordinates?	Positive	Negative	Both
Nature of outcomes sought	To what extent does the leader: Seek positive, transcendent (e.g., going beyond normal bounds or expectations), or malleable outcomes?	Positive	Transcendent	Malleable

Number of outcomes sought	To what extent does the leader: Seek multiple, few, or variable outcomes?	Multiple	Few	Variable
Focus in model construction	To what extent does the leader: Discuss external or internal influences/factors when motivating/coaching subordinates?	External	Internal	External
Locus of causation	To what extent does the leader: View people, situations, or a combination of both as the cause of outcomes?	People	Situations	Interactive
Controllability of causation	To what extent does the leader: Discuss how he and his subordinates have a high, low, or selective degree of control over their destiny?	High	Low	Selective
Targets of influence	To what extent does the leader: Spend his time	Masses	Base cadre	Elites

	trying to convince/motivate the entire team and coaching staff, key members of the team, or elite members of the team?			
Crisis conditions	To what extent does the leader: View the situation as ordered, chaotic, or localised?	Ordered	Chaotic	Localised
Use of emotions	To what extent does the leader: Use emotional appeals or rational persuasion to motivate and engage followers?	Positive appeals	Negative appeals	Rational persuasion

Appendix D
Coach Information Letter

Study Title: **The Development of Outstanding Leadership in Award-Winning Model Youth Football Coaches**

Investigator:	**Supervisor:**
Kurtis Pankow Child and Adolescent Sport and Activity Lab Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation University of Alberta Tel: (780) 492-9296 E-mail: pankow@ualberta.ca	Dr. Nicholas L. Holt Professor and Associate Dean – Research Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation University of Alberta Tel: (780) 492-7386 E-mail: nick.holt@ualberta.ca

Dear Coach,

We are conducting a study to examine how award-winning model youth football coaches developed as leaders. You are invited to participate in this study based on your reception of a provincial 'Coach of the Year' award, and that you fit the description of a model coach.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be invited to complete an individual interview lasting approximately 30-60 minutes. You will be asked about your thoughts and experiences pertaining to your leadership as a coach, and the experiences leading to your development as a leader. The interview will be with Kurtis Pankow at either the Child and Adolescent Sport and Activity lab on the University of Alberta campus, or a location of your convenience if you reside outside of Edmonton.

Interviews will be audio recorded. These recordings will be transcribed verbatim and a copy of your transcript will be sent to you. You will be able to remove any information you do not want included in the study, clarify meaning, and further elaborate on any point. A summary of the findings of the study will be emailed to you when analysis is complete. At this point you will be able to provide feedback (this will take approximately 15 minutes).

Therefore, the total time commitment for this study is approximately **45-75 minutes**.

Benefits
There are no direct benefits to you as an individual. However, the information you provide may help to identify and improve current practices associated with developing leadership in youth sport coaches.

Risks
It is highly unlikely there are any risks associated with this study. However, if any question makes you uncomfortable in any way, you do not have to answer it. If at any time during the interview you want to stop, you may inform the interviewer and the interview will be stopped.

Freedom to Withdraw
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. This means that you do not have to participate in the study. There are no negative consequences if you choose not to participate. All of your data, including personal contact information, will be deleted upon request. If you wish to withdraw from the study, please contact the person who interviewed you within four weeks after your initial interview.

Anonymity and Confidentiality
Following the transcription of the interview's audio recording, any personal information will be removed, and all names will be replaced with pseudonyms. Any information that you provide will remain confidential. All electronic data will be stored on a password protected computer within a locked office. Hard copies of data will be securely stored in a locked file cabinet within a locked office. Only the researcher and the supervisory committee will have access to the data collected. The data will be kept for five years post publication, after which everything will be destroyed. Once we have finished the study we will present the results at conferences and in an academic journal. No identifying information (e.g., names, locations) will be included in any results presented in academic settings.

This study has been approved by the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board. Any questions you may have about this study may be directed to Kurtis Pankow by email (pankow@ualberta.ca). Questions about your rights as a research participant may be directed to the University of Alberta Research Ethics Office at (780) 492-2615. This office has no direct involvement with this project.

If you would like to participate in this study,
please contact please contact Kurtis Pankow at pankow@ualberta.ca

Many thanks,

Kurtis Pankow
Master's Student
Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
University of Alberta

Appendix E

Informant Contact Letter

Hello,

My name is Kurtis Pankow. I am a Master's student at the University of Alberta, and I am conducting a study on the leadership and leadership development in youth football coaches. Specifically, I would like to interview coaches who have:

a) Won a provincial-level 'Coach of the Year' award, and
b) Fit the definition of a 'model' coach (see below).

A model coach is someone who:
Demonstrates interest in learning about the theory and practice of coaching; is respected in the local sporting community for their commitment to youth sport; is considered a good leader, teacher, and organizer; and keeps winning in perspective and encourages children to respect the rules of the game, competitors, and officials.

Please provide the attached information letter to any coaches who have won a provincial 'Coach of the Year' award and you feel fit the above description of a model coach.

Thank you for your time,

Kurtis Pankow
Master's Student,
Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
University of Alberta

Appendix F
Athlete Information Letter

Study Title: **The Development of Outstanding Leadership in Award-Winning Model Youth Football Coaches**

Investigator:	**Supervisor:**
Kurtis Pankow Child and Adolescent Sport and Activity Lab Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation University of Alberta Tel: (780) 492-9296 E-mail: pankow@ualberta.ca	Dr. Nicholas L. Holt Professor and Associate Dean – Research Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation University of Alberta Tel: (780) 492-7386 E-mail: nick.holt@ualberta.ca

Hello,

We are conducting a study to examine how award-winning model youth football coaches developed as leaders. You are invited to participate in this study based on your former coach's recommendation of your ability to speak about their leadership when you were an athlete on their team.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be invited to complete an individual interview lasting approximately 30-60 minutes. You will be asked about your thoughts and experiences pertaining to your former coaches' leadership, and your thoughts about coach leadership. The interview will be with Kurtis Pankow at either the Child and Adolescent Sport and Activity lab on the University of Alberta campus, or a location of your convenience if you reside outside of Edmonton. Phone or Skype interviews may also be arranged if an in-person meeting is not possible.

Interviews will be audio recorded. These recordings will be transcribed verbatim and a copy of your transcript will be sent to you. You will be able to remove any information you do not want included in the study, clarify meaning, and further elaborate on any point. A summary of the findings of the study will be emailed to you when analysis is complete. At this point you will be able to provide feedback (this will take approximately 15 minutes).

Therefore, the total time commitment for this study is approximately **45-75 minutes**.

Benefits
There are no direct benefits to you as an individual. However, the information you provide may help to identify and improve current practices associated with developing leadership in youth sport coaches.

Risks
It is highly unlikely there are any risks associated with this study. However, if any question makes you uncomfortable in any way, you do not have to answer it. If at any time during the interview you want to stop, you may inform the interviewer and the interview will be stopped.

Freedom to Withdraw
Participation in this study is completely voluntary. This means that you do not have to participate in the study. There are no negative consequences if you choose not to participate. All of your data, including personal contact information, will be deleted upon request. If you wish to withdraw from the study, please contact the person who interviewed you within four weeks after your initial interview.

Anonymity and Confidentiality
Following the transcription of the interview's audio recording, any personal information will be removed, and all names will be replaced with pseudonyms. Any information that you provide will remain confidential. All electronic data will be stored on a password protected computer within a locked office. Hard copies of data will be securely stored in a locked file cabinet within a locked office. Only the researcher and the supervisory committee will have access to the data collected. The data will be kept for five years post publication, after which everything will be destroyed. Once we have finished the study we will present the results at conferences and in an academic journal. No identifying information (e.g., names, locations) will be included in any results presented in academic settings.

This study has been approved by the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board. Any questions you may have about this study may be directed to Kurtis Pankow by email (pankow@ualberta.ca). Questions about your rights as a research participant may be directed to the University of Alberta Research Ethics Office at (780) 492-2615. This office has no direct involvement with this project.

If you would like to participate in this study,
please contact please contact Kurtis Pankow at pankow@ualberta.ca

Many thanks,

Kurtis Pankow
Master's Student
Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
University of Alberta

Appendix G
Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Title of Project: The Development of Outstanding Leadership in Award-Winning Model Youth Football Coaches		
Investigator:	**Supervisor:**	
Kurtis Pankow Child and Adolescent Sport and Activity Lab Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation University of Alberta Tel: (780) 492-9296	Dr. Nicholas L. Holt Professor and Associate Dean – Research Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation University of Alberta Tel: (780) 492-7386	
Do you understand that you have been asked to take part in a research study?	Yes	No
Have you read and received a copy of the attached information letter?	Yes	No
Do you understand the benefits and risks involved in taking part in this research study?	Yes	No
Do you understand that you are free to contact the researcher to ask questions and discuss this study?	Yes	No
Do you understand that you are free to refuse participation, or to withdraw from the study up to four weeks after your interview, without consequence?	Yes	No
Do you understand the issues of confidentiality and do you understand who will have access to your information?	Yes	No
I agree to take part in this study:	**YES**	**NO**

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix H

Coach Interview Guide

Preamble

I am doing this study to gain a better understanding of how youth sport coaches learn to lead their teams. When I say 'lead' or 'leadership', I mean the 'soft skills' you use as a coach, like motivating your athletes. With this research I am hoping to improve coach education programs by highlighting how top youth sport coaches use leadership in their coaching practice.

We are looking for your insights, experiences, and opinions about how you lead and why you lead that way. There are no right or wrong answers here. Your participation will remain anonymous and everything you say will be confidential. Any names you give will be removed, along with your name, your team, and any other identifying information.

This interview is meant to be a conversation rather than a strict 'question and answer' format. So don't worry about going 'off topic' or talking about things I did not specifically ask about. We want to know everything that might help us understand how youth sport coaches learn leadership. The interview should run for 45-75 minutes, but we can continue the interview for as long as you would like.

Opening Questions

When it comes to publishing this research, I need to be able to describe my participants in broad demographic terms. Any identifying information (teams, players, etc.) will be removed to ensure confidentiality.

- Could you tell me a bit about your background in sport?
- How long have you been coaching?
- Why did you get involved in coaching?
- What is the highest level of education you've completed (e.g., high school, university/college, graduate school)?
- How old are you?

Main Questions

Leadership Development

- What does leadership mean to you?
- How did you learn about leadership? (Courses, books, etc.)
- What stands out to you as a major experience/event that has influenced your leadership?
    - Repeat for other events and experiences
- [If not addressed in previous response] What experiences/events stand out to you from your time as an athlete that influence how you lead as a coach now?
- [If not addressed in previous responses] Are you a parent? If so, can you tell me if parenting has influenced your leadership style?
- Can you tell me about some people who influenced your leadership?
- [If not addressed in previous responses] Can you tell me about a coach who influenced your leadership style?
- [If not addressed in previous responses] How did your parents play a role in developing your leadership?
- Leadership is thought of as something we are always learning about and developing. How has your leadership evolved since you started coaching?
    - Probe about each stage of career (first 3 seasons, middle stage, most recent 3 seasons)

Leadership Behaviours

- What kind of things do you say to motivate your athletes?
- Who do you talk to when trying to motivate the team?
- How do you set expectations for your team? Can you give me some examples of your expectations?
- Can you give me some examples of the goals you set for your team?
- What do you focus on when setting your goals?
- How do you determine what goals are appropriate for your team?

- What do you credit for the outcome when something (positive or negative) happens?

- Can you give me an example of a time when you talked with your team about what it would take for you to make playoffs or win a championship?

Summary Questions

- To wrap things up: What do you think your athletes would say about you as a leader at each stage of your career?

- Do you have any advice or suggestions for things I should be asking about?

- Is there anything we touched on or that you have thought of that you would like to talk more about?

Appendix I

Athlete Interview Guide

Preamble

I am doing this study to gain a better understanding of how youth sport coaches learn to lead their teams. When I say 'lead' or 'leadership', I mean the 'soft skills' they use as a coach, like motivating the team. With this research I am hoping to improve coach education programs by highlighting how top youth sport coaches use leadership in their coaching practice.

I am looking for your insights, experiences, and opinions about how your coach leads and leadership in sport. There are no right or wrong answers here. Your participation will remain anonymous and everything you say will be confidential. Any names you give will be removed, along with your name, your team, and any other identifying information. This interview is meant to be a conversation rather than a strict 'question and answer' format. So don't worry about going 'off topic' or talking about things I did not specifically ask about. We want to know everything that might help us understand how youth sport coaches learn to lead. The interview should run for 30-60 minutes, but we can continue the interview for as long as you would like.

Opening Questions

When it comes to publishing this research, I need to be able to describe my participants in broad demographic terms. Any identifying information (teams, players, etc.) will be removed to ensure confidentiality.

- Could you tell me a bit about your background in sport?

- What is the highest level of education you've completed (e.g., high school, university/college, graduate school)?

- How old are you?

Main Questions

Leadership Development

- What does leadership mean to you?

- Many people think of leadership as something we are always learning about and developing. What do you think of that?

- Do you think your coach's leadership has evolved since they started coaching? If so, how?

Leadership Behaviours

- Can you describe your coach's philosophy?

- When things go well, what did/does your coach see as the cause of team success?

- How did/does your coach deal with a 'crisis' on the team? [Note: if participant is unclear, suggest things such as losing a star player, travel disruptions, etc.]

- What sort of things did/does your coach focus on communicating when they had/have to motivate your team?

- Who did/do they talk with when they tried/try to motivate the team? (Whole team, captains, etc.)

- Can you describe the goals that your coach set for your team?
    - Probe for specific examples

- How do you think your coach set goals for a season? (Or, what do you base these goals on?) [Note: if participant is unclear, suggest things such as team potential, past results, or current situation]

- How, if at all, did/do these goals change as the season goes on?

Summary Questions

- To wrap things up: What would you say about your coach as a leader when you were on their team?

- Is there anything we touched on or that you have thought of that you would like to talk more about?

- Do you have any advice or suggestions for things I should be asking about?

Appendix J
Leadership Profiles

Wade

Time Frame and Outcomes Sought

When asked about how he set goals, Wade responded by saying, "… you use self-evaluation as a program, not just yourself, but 'where are we right now in our development overall?'" This suggested that Wade used a present oriented time frame, a behaviour that reflected a pragmatic leadership style, because he was focused on what the state of the team was at the time he evaluated the program. Athlete participants' comments about Wade's approach to goal setting were consistent, which suggests there was little change in his approach to goal setting over time. For example, Marcus said that "[Wade] based it [the team's goals] on where we were…" Similarly, Ty recalled that "[Wade] definitely is like 'one game at a time.'" Blake echoed this sentiment, saying that "[Wade] is just 'fresh goals fresh game.'" Again, these quotes reflected a present oriented time frame, meaning that Wade is focused on the team's current situation, and is not overly concerned with past performances or future potential.

There was also evidence that Wade looked for a variable number of outcomes, a behaviour also consistent with a pragmatic leadership style. For instance, Wade acknowledged that his goals changed year to year in number and scope, and said "you have to say, 'If this is our biggest goal, how do we get there?' So you have to come up with a plan to get there, to get that." This was consistently remembered by his athletes. Early in Wade's career, Marcus remembered that "Like, if we wanted to win the city championship or if we wanted to win provincial championships, so we'd know our goal, and then he'd kind of outline for us what we needed to do in order to get there," which

highlighted having a variable number of goals. Ty remembered this as well, and said, “So [the goals] might be for [one team], its pass rush. Maybe for [another team], its stop the run…” When Blake was asked about the goals Wade would set, he stated that recently, “Yeah we set some goals in the meetings, like certain rushing yards, passing yards” that would change weekly, which appeared highlight Wade looked for a variable number of outcomes.

Another consistent behaviour recalled by the athlete participants and Wade was that Wade sought malleable, or tangible, process-oriented outcomes. This is another reflection of a pragmatic leadership style. Wade reflected that “So my goals were always process goals that I had for the guys. And those changed over time.” This seemed to point to malleable outcomes, as he was focused on finding tangible goals to guide the team. To this end, Marcus stated “…we'd have a long term goal and short term goals to reach it,” Ty reiterated this idea, and said that “[Wade] would be like, ‘we do these three things, we win the game.’ Right?” Blake seemed to recall this behaviour as well, and he claimed “…[Wade] analyzes what’s in the game ahead of us and he says, ‘We can capitalize here, let’s make a goal of that.’” All of the athlete participants reflected on ways in which Wade would focus on process-oriented goals, or malleable outcomes.

Motivation and Appeals

In terms of motivating his athletes, Wade claimed to use both positive and negative experiences to motivate his athletes on an individual basis, and said it was important to mix both because “some [athletes] thrive on a kick in the butt, some need to have a pat on the back, you know?” This again suggests a pragmatic leadership style, as pragmatic leaders use positive and negative experiences as ways of motivating their

followers. This also appeared to be consistent over time, as each of the athlete participants recalled Wade using both positive and negative experiences to motivate his athletes. Marcus recognised that Wade used both types of experiences as motivational tools, but stressed that Wade was never unreasonable with his use of negative experiences. He stated that when an athlete made a mistake, "I don't think he [Wade] ever unfairly singled them out" when mistakes are made. Ty agreed that Wade used both positive and negative approaches to motivation. He said, "Not that he's super negative but like he always had to frame things in like, he had to actively work to be constructive and positive towards people." Blake seemed to think that it was important for Wade to use both positive and negative experiences, and said "I mean he doesn't give me that air of absolute fear of disrespect, like disappointing [him]… but I think [Wade's] definitely, I think he's just right" in his use of both types of experience.

Wade seemed to report that he used internal factors to motivate his athletes, a behaviour that is proposed to reflect an ideological leadership style. Internal factors can relate to things such as people in the group, or the goals set by the group. For example, he said, "The biggest thing in that is, you know, you try to sell it [by saying] 'at the very least do it for your friends and teammates...'". In this example, Wade tried to motivate the athletes by appealing to factors internal to the team (i.e., friends, teammates) to encourage them to work hard in training sessions, as opposed to external factors such as winning a trophy later on. The athlete participants reported similar behaviours over Wade's career. For example, Marcus said that early on in Wade's career, "... I think that [the message was] if things went bad we kind of got to fix it together…" which demonstrated a focus on factors internal to the group as the issues to be addressed. Ty

also discussed Wade's focus on internal factors, and said that within Wade's expectation, "[Wade] has all these things that he like always alludes to it but basically, he doesn't want any excuses. You got to give 100% effort." Similar to Marcus' statement, Ty seemed to believe that Wade used internal factors such as effort and personal accountability as motivational factors. Blake articulated that in his experience, the message Wade communicated to his athletes "… is just, 'OK yeah I gotta make my plays,'" for the team to be successful. This seemed to be further indication that Wade used internal factors to motivate his athletes, as the focus in Blake's example was internal to the athlete.

Wade appeared to use rational persuasion as a motivational tool, which is consistent with a pragmatic leadership style. He said, "I think the biggest thing is you need to be able to, not convince them, but allow them to understand the sense of urgency of what they're doing." Here, the notion of a 'sense of urgency' reflects rational persuasion because it is not an emotional appeal about how great winning would feel, or how poor losing would feel. Instead, Wade articulated the urgency, or reality, of the situation to his athletes. The use of rational persuasion was something all three athlete participants commented on, which suggested that it was a consistent behaviour Wade demonstrated throughout his career. Referring to Wade's early career, Marcus recalled that after winning a regional championship, Wade's message "… would have been like, 'Enjoy this, but tomorrow we're getting back to work' kind of thing," to prepare for the next stage. This reflects rational persuasion as Wade did not focus extensively on a positive appeal to the feeling of winning, or a negative appeal to what losing the next game would feel like, but rather communicates the fact that there is another game to play.

Likewise, Ty seemed to recall that Wade did not try and use positive appeals to things like winning championships, or negative appeals like not being the worst team to motivate his athletes. Ty said that Wade was focused on the task at hand, and that he discussed "… just being accountable and all that. That's what I think is like his, what he wants, I guess." Similarly, Blake said that Wade's messaging with his athletes was simply, "do your job," which again seemed to reflect rational persuasion, as there was no indication of positive or negative emotional appeals.

In terms of his focus of communication, Wade expressed behaviours consistent with a charismatic leadership style and claimed that he communicated with the masses (i.e., the whole team), and said, "… I always included our coaches, our parents, our admin, and the players…" when he outlined his expectations and goals for a season. Interestingly, the athletes recalled that Wade used a behaviour that reflected an ideological leadership style, and focused on communication with his base cadre, or other leaders in the team. Marcus remembered that Wade would often communicate through his captains when the team was performing poorly. He said, "… [Wade] would talk to players, like the captains, and sort of help them get excited or pick themselves back up so they could help the team get back up." When Ty discussed his experiences with Wade, Ty articulated that Wade relied on his captains to act as a liaison between himself and the team. Ty recalled when some athletes disagreed with part of a practice that "…we as leaders were getting feedback that they were not happy with it … So then that's when, the point where you're like, 'OK, well we got to talk [with Wade] about it.'" Blake also remembered that "it was definitely… His captains" that Wade relied on to communicate with the team. As indicated, the athlete participants appeared to recall that Wade relied on

his base cadre to communicate with the team, although Wade expressed his communication was with the masses.

Crisis, Causes, and Control

When crisis situations were discussed, Wade appeared to have an ordered view, meaning he felt he had a structure in place to rectify issues that may arise throughout a leader's tenure. An ordered view of crisis is associated with a charismatic leadership style. He gave an example of a star player violating team rules, and explained, "… he [the athlete] made a bad choice in the hallway before a game where we were playing our biggest rival that night, and he was our best player. He sat and watched that whole game without playing a single play." In this case, sitting the player for the game was the established consequence (or team rule) for their action. However, the athlete participants had varying views on Wade's behaviours in crisis situations. Marcus claimed that early in Wade's career, "if someone messed up or made a mistake… he very much focused it on the team" and what was in place to address issues, which seemed to allude to of an ordered view of crisis. However, Ty seemed to think that Wade had a more chaotic view of crisis, and claimed "… if something goes wrong a couple times in a row, that's what really kind of sets him off…" This appeared to highlight that Ty believed Wade may not have been prepared for specific crisis situations, or that Wade may have only had a chaotic view of crisis in situations for which there were not established rules. Similar to Ty, Blake also recalled Wade having a chaotic view of crisis, and said, "There are definitely times when he'd see that injured list at the start of a meeting… and you can see him like, 'Oh shit,' or stuff like that," which again appeared to illustrate Wade not being prepared for this type of crisis situation.

Another area where Wade shared behaviours that appeared to differ from his athletes' perceptions was the factors that contribute to cause an outcome. Wade seemed to think of situations from the perspective of a pragmatic leadership style, and claimed that "there's too many factors, yes. It's always going to be a combination of things," which indicated an interaction between people and situations as the cause of outcomes. Interestingly, Wade's athlete participants said that he focused on people as the cause of outcomes, which is indicative of a charismatic leadership style. Marcus claimed that early in Wade's career, Wade's philosophy was "'You reap what you sow,' you know, 'if you put the work in now at the beginning of the season and you really commit to this then at the end of the season we can do something,'" which expressed a focus on people as the cause of outcomes. Ty said that after a win, "… he [Wade] would attribute it to the preparation and the players" which also seemed to indicate Wade believed people were the cause of outcomes. Blake recounted that more recently, "… his [Wade's] philosophy was he definitely relied on some talent" to win games. Again, this suggests that Blake appeared to believe Wade relied on people to achieve outcomes.

When Wade discussed the level of control he had over outcomes, he again appeared to demonstrate a behaviour consistent with a pragmatic leadership style, in that he thought he had a selective level of control over outcomes. Wade said some things are outside of the control of the coach (e.g., personnel issues such as injuries and match-ups), whereas other things are controllable (e.g., coaching decisions such as play calling). Wade illustrated this when he said, "So if you look at the same outcome [of different seasons], what happened to cause it is always going to be different... was it coaching? Was it system? Was it personnel? Was it a combination?" However, the message that

Wade communicated to his athletes appeared to reflect a more charismatic leadership style, as the athlete participants seemed to think that Wade communicated that they had a high level of control over the outcome of their season. For example, Marcus said that "… when he told us we could win, or we could do something… we then believed we could do that as well." Ty reiterated this sentiment, and said that after a win, Wade would "…really showcase the efforts and the execution and I guess allude to the preparation" of the team when Wade conducted post-game meetings. This also appeared to show that Wade communicated a high level of control over outcomes to his athletes. Blake recalled that even after a close loss, Wade would discuss "… what we did well here, and then what we're gonna work on … and just what we're gonna do about it… that put some confidence in the players," which again seemed to demonstrate that the athlete participants felt that Wade suggested that the athletes could control their outcomes.

Overall, Wade seemed to report behaviours that align most closely with a pragmatic leadership style. However, there were some elements of charismatic leadership (e.g., having an ordered view of crisis), and some differences of opinion between Wade and his athlete participants.

Ryan

Time Frame and Outcomes Sought

Ryan articulated that he used a mix of past and present oriented time frames, depending on the situation. This indicated a mix of ideological and pragmatic leadership styles respectively. For example, he said that, "I think motivation, we talk about that we're standing on the shoulders of giants kind of thing, that we didn't just fall on this spot. People brought us up to this point." This quote illustrated his use of a past oriented time frame, because he is focused on the contributions of those who have worked to help them in the past. However, when he described his process of planning and goal setting with his athletes, Ryan expressed that a "[First year] coming in is going to have different goals than say [veteran player], and … we can change his [the first year athlete's] goals year in and year out so it matches with his abilities," which appeared to indicate a present oriented time frame because Ryan claimed to set goals based on the athlete's current ability level. His athletes seemed to remember unanimously that Ryan used a present oriented time frame. Ben said that before the season started "… I don't know what his [Ryan's] goals would have been because he had never seen the full team. But I think coming out of those first few games, it was like, 'Okay, well we, we'll compete in this league.'" Nate remembered Ryan would focus his efforts on preparing the team for the game they had to play. He demonstrated this by saying that Ryan would "watch film and say, 'Okay, this is a play we should be able to get X amount of yards on based on defense alignment. If we catch them in this, this is what we should see.'" Alex found that even when they discussed life outside of football, Ryan displayed a present oriented time frame. Alex recalled a conversation he had with Ryan "about doing all this planning and

going to study overseas and stuff, all this stuff that was five or ten years down the road and [Ryan was] being really conscious of [Alex] having to think of right now." The athlete participants all appear to recall ways in which Ryan would focus them on current issues facing the team or themselves, indicating that they perceived that Ryan used a present oriented time frame, a reflection of a pragmatic leadership style.

Ryan appeared to express a distinctly pragmatic behaviour and sought a variable number of outcomes. Ryan claimed that he felt that his goals were tailored to fit each athlete, and said that "I think it's just having those conversations with your athletes and saying … 'What are we going to hold ourselves to? What does a solid game for us look like in terms of statistics?'" This appeared to be a behaviour that the athlete participants recalled differently. Ben recalled that early on, Ryan's goal setting process wasn't always clear, "So it would be tough to say what the goals as the team were. But it was always like, 'We can beat anyone that we can play.'" This could be a reflection of an ideological leadership style where a single outcome is sought, as opposed to a Ryan lacking direction. Nate appeared to think that Ryan demonstrated an ideological leadership style and looked for a few, or a single goal. Nate claimed that each game "…we would have, not stats, but objective goals… we had a clear understanding of what our goal was." Most recently, Alex seemed to think that Ryan sought a variable number of outcomes. Alex said Ryan would start each season by discussing "… a couple things that were like, 'This is what we're going to be really good at,'" and that these changed each season. This appeared to reflect a more pragmatic leadership style, as the number of outcomes sought varied every year.

When discussing goal setting, Ryan again seemed to express behaviour consistent with a pragmatic leadership style and appeared to look for malleable outcomes. Ryan said "I think it [goal setting] is understanding your athletes, I think it's, you know, [athlete] is never gonna run a 4.5, so what are his individual goals?" There was some variance in what the athlete participants recalled in this area. Ben said "I think the goal was always to win provincials," which would indicate a more positive outcome, which is associated with a charismatic leadership style. Nate remembered that Ryan would set a malleable goal for each game. He said Ryan's goals would be "Like, 'Okay, this game, as a running back crew, we want to get X number of yards this game.'" From Nate's perspective, it seemed that Ryan looked for malleable outcomes, which would reflect a more pragmatic leadership style. Alex also recalled that Ryan sought malleable outcomes, and said that Ryan would "give us, we'd get a score card every week, how we did" in reaching the goals that had been set, clearly demonstrating malleable outcomes.

Motivation and Appeals

Although he felt it was important, Ryan claimed it was difficult to use positive and negative experiences with athletes, and stated, "it takes work to live that as a coach. It's easy to be, to slap guys on the back and say 'Good job,' but to actually coach them and coach them hard. You need to hold them to that high standard." This appeared to indicate a pragmatic leadership style, as pragmatic leaders are known to mix positive and negative experiences as forms of motivation. This was something that each of his athlete participants seemed to recall as well. For example, Ben claimed that Ryan would use both positive and negative experiences to motivate the team, but Ben said he would have a "… very difficult time imagining him [Ryan], like for the duration of the season, being the

drill sergeant coach. Like, ‘What's your name?’ ‘Oh, I'm Timmy.’ ‘I don't give [an expletive] what your name is, get up and run laps.’” Similarly, Nate expressed that Ryan used mostly positive experiences, and acknowledged that he felt it was necessary for Ryan to use negative experiences in some situations. Nate said Ryan “took more of a human approach, if that makes sense… He didn't always snap, but when he did, you knew it was for a reason.” Alex also expressed that Ryan used positive and negative experiences, and said “[Ryan] was always, he was a good critical evaluator… he'd be tough on us too, which I always appreciated…” This seemed to indicate that not only did the athlete participants perceive that Ryan used both positive and negative experiences as forms of motivation, but that they may have believed it was necessary for Ryan to combine both aspects to be an effective coach.

Ryan and his athlete participants all appeared to express that Ryan used an internal focus in model construction when communicating with his athletes. This is thought to represent an ideological leadership style. Ryan said that to motivate his athletes, “One thing I preach is, ‘For each other.’ Being able to look the teammate beside you in the eye and know that they gave full effort in everything they're doing.” This showed an internal focus in model construction as Ryan leveraged relationships within the team as means of motivating his athletes. Ben recalled that when the team was successful, “That success was always measured as a team project” by Ryan, which also appeared to indicate an internal focus on the team as the focus of motivation. Nate claimed that Ryan would talk with the athletes in each position, and Nate felt that “he [Ryan] instilled that confidence where, you know, ‘Yeah, it's gonna go on our shoulders and we're gonna go as far as we can take us.’” Alex said that Ryan took a personal

approach to motivation, and claimed, “I think he tries to be really in tune with what you're motivated towards,” which may have demonstrated Ryan’s focus on internal, individual factors as ways of motivating his athletes.

Ryan appeared to express the use of rational persuasion with his athletes, as opposed to positive or negative emotional appeals. For example, he discussed the importance of having players “… [buy] into their role. Some guys are going to be lifetime scout guys, some guys are going to be lifetime starters.” This shows that Ryan made rational appeals to an athlete’s ability and attempted to frame their role within the team as being significant, which aligns with a pragmatic leadership style. His athlete participants recounted his behaviour in a similar manner. Ben said that after a blowout win, “he [Ryan] comes in and was like, ‘Our best players are always going to be our best players.’ And that was it, in terms of how he addressed the fact that two of us combined for 42 points…” Ben recalled that Ryan went on to discuss the team’s execution and effort in the game. This appeared to reflect rational persuasion as Ryan did not talk about how good the win felt, or how difficult the game would have been without their stars, but focused on the team as a whole and what it took to win that day. Nate discussed how Ryan would not focus on positive or negative appeals to why it was important to do things a certain way, but felt that “He [Ryan] always told us he will trust us. Like he always said, at least to me it was always like, ‘I trust where you're going. I'll trust your eyes.’” As this quote shows, Ryan communicated belief in his athlete’s ability to execute the play that was appropriate, and did not focus on appealing to Nate’s emotions. Alex talked about how “[Ryan] would always talk about coaching tape moments,” to motivate the group, “… where if he was running a coaching clinic this is a piece from a game he

could show, and here's the drill we did in practice." This reflected rational persuasion, as it showed that Ryan connected the athlete's work with their outcomes, instead of focusing on the positive appeal of how great the play was, or a negative appeal to how poorly the play could have gone if the athlete's had not executed properly.

Ryan's focus of communication among the team was remembered by himself and his athlete participants as being mostly centered on the captains. This reflected an ideological leadership style, as it represented communication with the base cadre, or other leaders. For example, Ryan said "…I would talk to the leaders, number one. I would talk to the guys I've developed that trust with." Ben recalled this as well, and said that when things were going wrong, "… he [Ryan] had conversations with kind of the core leadership of the team…" Nate reflected that when things weren't going well, "He [Ryan] would talk to me," one of the leaders on the team. Alex, a captain for one of Ryan's teams, recalled a scenario where Ryan had some personal difficulties, and said that "I ended up having a conversation with him after the game, and the conversation after that," which seemed to again indicate Ryan relying on his leaders, or base cadre, to communicate with his athletes.

Crisis, Causes, and Control

Ryan appeared to have an isolated view of crisis situations, meaning he would seek out relevant information from multiple sources and evaluate each issue independently. This is characteristic of a pragmatic leadership style. Ryan talked about his experiences with a difficult recent season, and said that it is important to know "what are the other groups seeing, what is the [defensive] coach seeing? That would help formulate my plan going forward I guess." His athlete participants appeared to recognize

this isolated view of crisis across each stage of his career. Ben said that after a difficult game in which the team displayed poor physical fitness, Ryan evaluated the game and their practices and took "that weakness that we had and making it a strength, no problem." Similarly, Nate seemed to think that Ryan had an isolated view of crisis situations. He said that when the team lost several games in a row, Ryan would evaluate "every single detail… not only because he wants to make us better, but because he understands that as a leader he has to look at those nuances…" Alex claimed that after losing by a wide margin, "one thing [Ryan did] was getting back to really good fundamentals… really basic stuff. I think that was a good feature of things that we did, because it kind of resets you." Each of the athlete participants' quotes appeared to indicate an isolated view of crisis, as Ryan appeared to identify issues that needed to be addressed in order for the team to move forward.

Ryan appeared to believe that people and situations interact to cause an outcome, and said "I think as a team if something catastrophic happens, there are many reasons why a [losing] season happens… Is it personnel, structure, coaching? What is it?" This is a reflection of a pragmatic leadership style, as he indicates that people as well as the situation can lead to a particular outcome. His athletes reported that Ryan viewed people as the cause of an outcome. Ben recalled that Ryan would focus on the team's effort and commitment in practice as the reason for the team's success. Ben said that after a win, Ryan would tell the team "'we won the game because we did the little things, because you guys worked hard in practices and stuff.'" Nate said that "He [Ryan] would kinda preach that the team is kinda going to go how the [specific position] goes," indicating that they were able to influence their outcome regardless of the situation. Alex agreed, and

reflected that when he discussed his long term goals with Ryan, the focus was not on what issues could arise, but rather, "he [Ryan] was like, 'Okay, how are we going to do that? What do I need to do to help you get there?'" This seemed to indicate that the message the athlete participants received from Ryan was that people would be the reason for their own success.

In terms of how much control was to be had over the outcome of a season, Ryan appeared to show a pragmatic leadership style and indicated a selective level of control over outcomes. Again reflecting on a difficult recent season, he said "When you're failing, I think it's important to look at every aspect of the team…" to determine what issues can be addressed to change the outcome in the future. This showed that he appeared to believe some things are outside of his control as coach, and that he should only focus on what is within his control. Ben remembered a game against a dominant team, and seemed to believe that Ryan communicated a selective level of control to his athletes. Ben recalled, "at that point [half time] it was resigned that we would lose. Everybody in the room knew how good this team was. But he wasn't bent out of shape or moving off from how he's motivated us in the past" and claimed Ryan's message centered on playing to the best of the team's ability and not worrying about what the team could not control. However, Nate spoke again about Ryan trusting his athletes, and said that "you could feel that he trusted you. And having a coach say that he trusts you… it instills that confidence in you" that the athletes can control the outcome of their games. Nate appeared to believe that Ryan communicated a high level of control to his athletes, and that Ryan gave them the confidence to believe that they controlled the outcomes of their games. Alex articulated that in his recent experience, Ryan's message was more

selective in the level of control he communicated. For example, Alex remembered a conversation around his long term goals where Ryan said, "'It'll work out… don't plan every piece of it because it's never going to work out exactly the way you set it up… You kind of have to just let go and let things happen.'"

It seemed that Ryan's reported behaviours mostly reflected a pragmatic leadership style, excluding his dependence on his base cadre to communicate with the team (a behaviour used by ideological leaders). There were some differences between what Ryan and his athlete participants reported, although the reported behaviours remain reasonably consistent with Hunter et al.'s (2011) findings of pragmatic leaders. The athlete participants appeared to recall Ryan's behaviours fairly consistently, again suggesting that these behaviours may have been developed early in his career.

Craig

Time Frame and Outcomes Sought

Craig appeared to demonstrate mixed leadership in his time frame, combining pragmatic and ideological leadership styles by using both past and present focused time frames. Craig said his goal setting required "looking at what we've done so far, where the guys are, where our team's at… and then set a path from there." This indicated a mix of a past and present focused time frame, as he was concerned with the past performances and current ability of his team and athletes, but not future expectation. The athlete participants each reported that Craig used a different time frame. Mark articulated that Craig's goals "were based off of our previous matches," which illustrated a past oriented time frame. Oppositely, Bryan recalled that Craig would set the team's goals based upon their potential. For example, Bryan said one season, Craig's goal was based on his evaluation of the team's potential. Bryan said Craig's message was "'I think we can do this, we have a really talented team.'" Pat recalled that Craig's focus was more in the present, and said that "on the field, halftime… even during the pregame warm up… he'll tell you, you have to do your job," which indicated that Craig's focus was always on the task at hand.

It seemed that Craig used an ideological leadership style in the number of outcomes he looked for each season, and claimed he looked for a few outcomes. To this end, Craig said his goals were simply doing "the fundamental things that need to do that will get us there…" indicating that he looked for a few things to be done very well. This was recalled consistently by his athlete participants. For example, Mark said "in high school, the goal was to win obviously." Bryan discussed how Craig would set a small

number of goals for the team, but stressed that “they weren't low goals, but they were realistic goals.” Pat also felt that Craig set a few goals, although Pat stressed that the goals were not always clear. Pat claimed that goal setting “wasn't, that wasn't really his [Craig’s] focus I would say.” All of these quotes appeared to illustrate how Craig would set a small number of goals for the team.

Craig appeared to look for malleable outcomes, which would indicate a pragmatic leadership style. However, he admitted that he may not have always been clear enough in defining these goals. Craig reflected that he set malleable goals like “the number of sacks, the number of tackles” although he said that he did not “… know if we did as good of a job we, well me, of setting [clear] objectives” for the team. Mark seemed to believe that Craig clearly set malleable goals, “like get two or three touchdowns a game and be up a touchdown at the half every time or something like that… So they were ones that we could really rally behind.” Bryan discussed how Craig would set malleable positional goals and gave examples of goals “to like, get one or two fumbles a game.” Pat appeared to recall that Craig set positive goals, but said that he felt “… that's an area he could work on, was more tangible goals, more just numericised (sic) goals.” The athlete participants’ quotes seemed to demonstrate that Craig mostly set malleable goals, although Pat felt that Craig could have set more malleable goals as opposed to positive goals that could not be measured.

Motivation and Appeals

Craig seemed to demonstrate another behaviour that would indicate a pragmatic leadership style, and claimed to use both positive and negative experiences to motivate his athletes. He said it was important “to understand what motivates different people” so

the coach can know when and how to use either type of experience with different athletes. His athlete participants all appeared to recall this behaviour similarly. Mark said Craig used both types of experiences, and that it was vital for him to do so because "… all kids are different, the ages are different, and to be able to coach different groups of kids, whether they're different ages or different positions, you kind of have to switch the way you coach them." Bryan recalled that "I think [Craig] pushed guys like that out of their comfort zone, but not so drastically that they felt in any kind of trouble or anything like that." Pat seemed to think that although Craig used both positive and negative experiences, Craig was mostly positive experiences in his messaging. Pat expressed that perhaps Craig could be more balanced in his approach. Pat said, "I'm not saying that he needs to have outbursts, I do think that he needs to call people out more" and use more negative experiences as motivation when appropriate for certain players. The athlete participants appeared to not only perceive that Craig used both positive and negative experiences with his athletes, but that it was important for him to do so in order to reach all of the athletes.

Craig appeared to have an internal focus in model construction, a behaviour associated with an ideological leadership style. When asked to reflect on how he motivated his athletes, Craig said "when I think of, you know, different ways that I've motivated over my time as a coach, for the most part it's actually been being very clear with what the expectations are…" and holding the team to a specific standard. This demonstrates an internal focus as he is using factors internal to the group to motivate them. His athletes appeared to recall this as well. Mark recalled that Crag's messaging "was more so like… 'This is the game that you love, these are your brothers, go out and

do what you do,' kind of thing." Bryan appeared to remember a similar message from Craig, and said Craig would discuss "the group of guys, I think it was just kind of how we all meshed together, our chemistry" to pick the team up after they had lost a close game. Pat said Craig's message "kind of goes back to the trusting of the players… stick to the game plan and we do our jobs and execute well, that's the reason we were successful." Each of the quotes from the athlete participants illustrated how Craig would focus on internal factors to motivate his teams.

Craig seemed to use rational persuasion to motivate his athletes, a behaviour consistent with a pragmatic leadership style. For example, Craig said after his team fell behind in a close game, he "was just very positive like, 'Here we go guys. We got this. We've been in this situation. We know this situation. Let's get out there and let's get that score back.'" This indicated that Craig remained level and did not appeal to feelings of victory or loss, and chose to focus on the reality that there was a game to finish. His athlete participants also appeared to recall Craig's use of rational persuasion consistently. Mark recounted that Craig's message "… wouldn't be a pick me up. It would be more of a, 'We know what we're doing. This is what we're doing wrong and this is where we need to be.'" Bryan said Craig's message was not emotional, but that "it was more, 'I know you guys can do this, so let's get out there and [expletive] do it…' Never really long and eloquent and drawn out or anything, but I don't think we ever really needed that." Pat claimed that Craig's use of rational persuasion lead Craig to be a level and steady presence for their team. Pat recalled that opposite to an emotional coach, "his [Craig's] calm direction is easy to buy into. He just tells you what to do and you do it, and that's

about it." As the athlete participants indicated, Craig chose to focus on the task at hand in each scenario, as opposed to making emotional appeals.

Craig claimed to focus his communication on his base cadre, which demonstrates an ideological leadership style. He said when he needed to address and issue with the team, he would speak "with a group of coaches or with captains or things like that… the leaders on the team…" to get an idea of what the next steps should be to rectify the issue. There appeared to be some discrepancies between what his athlete participants communicated. Mark claimed Craig would meet with "the leaders of the team, captains, because they can emphasize that throughout their positional groups…" in these scenarios, something that Bryan recalled as well. He claimed that "he [Craig] would definitely talk to the captains a lot" when the team was going through a difficult period. Pat, however, thought that Craig communicated "a message that's given to everyone" when the team was down, indicating a focus on the masses, which is consistent with a charismatic leadership style.

Crisis, Causes, and Control

Another area where Craig's reported behaviours appeared to differ from what his athlete participants reported was his view of crisis situations. Craig appeared to have an isolated view of crisis, which is consistent with a pragmatic leadership style. He said he would talk to the leadership group on the team "to get a better pulse … The other thing I would do… [was] talk to other coaches even who have been in this situation before" to understand the best way to proceed when the team was in a difficult situation, which demonstrated that he would use multiple sources of information to inform his decision. Mark appeared to recall Craig having a more ordered view of crisis, which reflected a

charismatic leadership style. Mark said when a starter got hurt, Craig was very calm. Mark reflected "I think when injuries happened, it wasn't like, it's not like it was the end of the world or anything, it was just like, 'Get back at it, next guy in,' kind of thing." Bryan appeared to recall that Craig had a chaotic view of some crisis situations. He said Craig would never blame the team, although his demeanour reflected that Craig felt "more like a disappointment in himself it seemed like" when things went wrong, which indicated that Craig felt unprepared to respond to the situation. Pat seemed to think that, much like what Mark recalled, Craig had an ordered view of crisis situations. Pat said "I think he does a good job dealing with it, because… he doesn't really change himself… in front of us last season he doesn't really change his approach." This demonstrated that Pat perceived Craig as being confident in the system the team had in place to deal with issues that arose.

My analysis seemed to show that Craig viewed people as the cause of outcomes, which would reflect a charismatic leadership style. Craig claimed that after a loss he reflected on "what more could we have done as coaches… what could we have done better?" This quote appeared to highlight Craig's belief that the coaches could have done more to prepare the team for their game. The athlete participants all appeared to report that Craig communicated that people had control over their outcomes. Mark seemed to believe that from Craig's perspective, people were the cause of their outcomes. He remembered that "he believes in his players, that trust, and personable, and like makes that connection" with his players that instills confidence in the team that they are capable of influencing their outcomes. Bryan seemed to think that Craig also communicated that people controlled their own outcomes, and said before a playoff game, "Like they [the

coaches] spent a lot of time doing the film and that stuff, so it was like, 'We've prepared for this, you guys are prepared for this. You know what to do, get out there and do it.'" Similarly, Pat said that Craig's central philosophy was "… it's on you to make the most out of it [your opportunities]. It's on the player to make the most of it." Again, this indicated that the athlete participant's perceived that Craig believed that they could influence their own outcomes.

Another behaviour Craig appeared to use that his athlete participants also seemed to report consistently was communicating a high level of control to the team, indicative of a charismatic leadership style. Craig reflected on a loss and said, "I wouldn't say they were a better team but they were a good team and it was a good match up… We watched the film enough, we got out-coached. How could we have approached that?" This indicated a high level of control as he believed that had the coaches done more, the team would have won the game. Mark recalled at the end of a championship game the team had "a two minute drive, and we're talking on the sideline and it was just complete trust. [Craig said] 'You know what we're doing, this is what we have to do,' kind of thing. And then we did it." Bryan recalled that even when athletes were "… struggling being out there, you were doing a bad job, he wouldn't just cut you right away, he'd pull you to the side and be like, 'Hey, it's okay. Just try changing this up'" which appeared to show that Craig believed that if the players made those changes, they would be successful. Pat said Craig communicated a high level of control to his players through demonstrating "…confidence in his plan, confidence in his guys, and if we're good it's because we all did our jobs in that system. And that's it… it's pretty clear cut" that players were responsible for what happened in a game or through a season.

Craig appeared to represent a mix of predominantly ideological and pragmatic leadership styles, although there was again variation in the behaviours that were recalled by his athlete participants. Much like Wade and Ryan, there appeared to be no consistent pattern of change between the athletes that could be considered to concretely represent change over time.

Adam

Time Frame and Outcomes Sought

It appeared that Adam used a present focused time frame with his team, a behaviour that reflects a pragmatic leadership style. Adam said to set goals for the team, "you know, you have to have a realistic understanding of where the team lies," which demonstrated a focus on the team's current ability, and not past performance or future potential. Interestingly, the athlete participants recalled Adam's use of time frame differently. Although Max claimed Adam was highly reflective, and that "he [Adam] looked back at [poor seasons], and he'd use those as learning experiences so he could give us the tools to prevent it from happening again," he also said that Adam looked ahead and would begin each season by "looking at, 'What do I do with my team, what do I expect of them, what do I want to see?'" This indicated a mix of past and future oriented time frames, which represented a mix of ideological and charismatic leadership styles, respectively. Similar to what Adam expressed, Rob recalled that Adam used a present oriented time frame. Rob discussed how after a loss, Adam would shift the team's focus towards their upcoming game, and not "dwell [on the loss] and get all upset and [give the team] a bag run or whatever." Dan seemed to indicate that Adam used a past oriented time frame. Dan recalled a specific speech before a championship game, and said Adam discussed "all the hard work that was put in the week prior or weeks prior… he'd mention how hard we had worked and how much time we put in… the whole season prior to that [championship] game." These quotes revealed that Adam may have used each of the time frames while coaching the different teams, but that different time frames may have resonated with different athletes.

Another behaviour that Adam displayed consistent with a pragmatic leadership style was the number of outcomes he sought. He claimed to seek a variable number of outcomes based on the individual, and said "You can't ask the average kid and the superstar of the team to do the same things. So I think it's… knowing what that much looks like." This was a behaviour his athlete participants seemed to recall consistently as well. For example, Max said that looking for variable outcomes reflected Adam's "ability to adapt and learn people, and figure out what works for one person compared to another." Rob recounted that Adam's goals were variable based on the situation. He recalled that the "goals that we would have looked at, like week to week, playing this opponent and not that opponent." Dan also discussed how Adam would set a variable number of goals each season, and reflected that at the start of each year Adam "just said, 'Here's the direction we need, let's get them to [work towards] this," and that was the extent of his goal setting.

Adam seemed to look for malleable outcomes, a behaviour that demonstrated a pragmatic leadership style. He claimed malleable goals were important for a team to achieve their larger goal because to"…be successful, it takes a whole lot of steps in between [starting and reaching your goals], and you've gotta be clear what those steps are and make sure that you're addressing them as you go, one step at a time." Two of Adam's athlete participants expressed this as well. Max talked about the type of goals Adam would set and said, "… I feel that he [Adam] really excels at making sure things are detailed so everybody around him knows exactly what he's thinking and what his expectations are…" Similarly, Rob thought that Adam would focus on the team "… getting better and having those small achievements that are attainable I think." It

appeared that these athletes both recalled Adam setting tangible, malleable outcomes for the team. However, Dan recalled that Adam would look for transcendent outcomes, or outcomes that focus on leaving a legacy as opposed to winning a championship (positive outcome) or scoring so many points per game (malleable outcome). Dan said Adam would focus on things "…that are going to help us and continue on from whatever legacy we decide to leave as our last year with this team." This indicated that Dan perceived Adam being focused on a more transcendent outcome like leaving a legacy, as opposed to positive or malleable goals.

Motivation and Appeals

When discussing the types of experience he would use to motivate his athletes, Adam expressed another behaviour consistent with a pragmatic leadership style and claimed to use both positive and negative experiences with his athletes. He claimed this was important, because "in terms of motivating them [the athletes], it's pushing the buttons at the right time, and telling them things at the right times," to maximize the impact of the type of experience used. Adam's athlete participants recall him being mostly positive. Max recalled that "[Adam] got very excited, and a lot of times his message was, when I dealt with him, was all about fun, and he kept the fun in the game," regardless of how things were going for the team. Rob also remembered Adam taking a positive approach, and said, "I know that he could at times get worked up trying to motivate us, but it wasn't in the way that he would be screaming a negative vibe kind of thing." Both Max and Rob expressed how Adam would use positive experiences, and neither discussed Adam using negative experiences. Dan did discuss Adam's use of negative experiences, but focused mostly on positive experiences such as how Adam

would end each year with an event to "send them [the graduating players] off with a good taste in their mouth about the team and their experiences…"

Adam appeared to use an internal focus in model construction, which is theorised to indicate ideological leadership. He said when he discussed with his athletes what it would take for the team to be successful, "The phrase I use is, 'Commitment to the commitment'" to emphasize the team working together to achieve their goals. While Max appeared to recall that Adam used an internal focus, Rob and Dan seemed to think Adam used an external focus. Max indicated that Adam would motivate the team by discussing "…the work and dedication and commitment of the players." This indicated an internal focus as Adam reportedly focused on the effort of the team as the source of his motivation. Rob thought that Adam's message was "… you always have to strive to get better because everyone else is. If you want to be a champion you can never stop, you just have to keep moving forward" which demonstrated a focus on external factors like outworking opponents and winning championships. Similarly, Dan gave an example of a pregame speech Adam delivered that referred to "the 1974 Super Bowl with the Steelers and… how the team came together, how they persevered, how they were getting beat" and came back to win. This showed an external focus, as Adam used an example outside of the team to try and motivate his players.

Adam seemed to use rational persuasion as opposed to positive or negative appeals and said his approach to motivation is, "Yeah, I don't flower it up at all. It's like, 'Hey, this is what we talked about. This is what we talked about… if you do this, this will happen, and we'll be successful.'" This indicated a pragmatic leadership style, as it seemed that Adam was using facts to appeal to his team, as opposed to making positive

or negative emotional appeals. Max and Rob appeared to also recall that Adam would use rational persuasion, although Dan seemed to believe that Adam made negative emotional appeals. Max said, “the two messages that I got out of a lot of experiences with him, were, you know, ‘You gotta go out there and work hard, but you also have to have fun. You have to execute the things that we've spent so much time working on.” Similarly, Rob said “he [Adam] would put it that it [Adam’s expectations] would be doing your best every day. Just coming to the field and giving your best effort.” Both Max and Rob appeared to discuss Adam using rational persuasion, as both athlete participants discussed how Adam would focus on what is necessary to be successful, and not the feeling of winning or losing. Interestingly, Dan gave a very specific example of how Adam would motivate the team each week, using “little excerpts out of news articles saying what the other head coach had said about our team and how they were going to beat us… and he'd kind of get you fired up a little.” This appeared to demonstrate a negative emotional appeal, as Dan recounted how Adam would try to use negative messaging from others to motivate the team.

Adam claimed that he would focus on his base cadre to communicate with the team, which suggested an ideological leadership style. Specifically, he claimed to rely on the leadership team of his coaches and said he would “use the other coaches as feedback [on the team’s state] obviously, and I think a lot of them, I use my staff…” Although Max recounted his experience differently, Rob and Dan both recalled that Adam would rely on the base cadre as well. Max appeared to remember that Adam would communicate mostly with the masses, and said “… I always remember him coming in and trying to get a bunch of, you know, 40 young kids trying to get amped up in the

freezing cold and play in a football game…" Rob seemed to remember Adam communicating with his captains and coaches, and claimed, "We did have a leadership group among the players that he designated, and he would meet with us just to kind of relay a message, but I think it was, he would talk more with the other assistant coaches…"Dan recalled that Adam would rely on his coaches. Dan said, "He [Adam] gave a direction and he showed the other coaches what he wanted, and other than that he let the other coaches coach." While Max indicates his experience involved Adam addressing the whole team, a charismatic behaviour, Rob and Dan appeared to remember that Adam would depend on his leadership groups, be it captains or coaches, to communicate his message to the rest of the team, demonstrating an ideological leadership style.

Crisis, Causes, and Control

Adam appeared to have an isolated view of crisis, a behaviour that indicated a pragmatic leadership style. He said when things go wrong, it is important to ask a number of people, "you know, 'Alright, what's happening here? Are our expectations too high? Are we pushing them too hard? Are they not responding for certain reasons?' So you get an understanding…" of the issues. This showed how Adam would consider multiple factors from multiple sources of information to help make his decision in how to proceed. Each of the athlete participants appeared to recall Adam's behaviour differently. Although Max did not offer a sport-specific example, he discussed a time where he was struggling and Adam "was able to use his experiences of things in his own life when things weren't going well, what he did and how it might apply to my life and how I might be able to implement them…" This appeared to demonstrate Adam using all available

information to help Max move forward, which suggested an isolated view of crisis. Rob appeared to believe that Adam had an ordered view, and said that Adam would be prepared and "… just did what he could…" within the structure the team had in place. Dan, however, appeared to recall Adam having a chaotic view of crisis, and recounted that when things went wrong, "He'd [Adam] kind of lose his temper; you'd see him and he'd get red and he'd start yelling." This appeared to be consistent with an ideological leadership style, as Dan's recollection indicated that he believed Adam did not feel comfortable with the structure in place to rectify the issue at hand.

My analysis of the data indicated that Adam viewed people as the cause of outcomes, a behaviour consistent with a charismatic leadership style. He emphasised this when he said his post-championship speech would resemble "'we knew we could do it, but we knew we had to commit to the commitment. And you guys went out, stayed on course, and that's why that trophy is sitting here right now,'" to emphasize that holding to the team's philosophy is the reason for team success. Max and Rob seemed to recall this behaviour as well, although Dan appeared to remember Adam's behaviour differently. Max simply said "He [Adam] made sure every single guy in that room knew that they were a huge part of the team's success." Rob gave an example of Adam's speech before an important game, and explained that Adam's message would be "Don't worry about the possibility of failure, just go out and do your best." These quotes indicated that the athlete participants recall that they believed Adam communicated that they were the sole reason for that happened. Dan recalled that "each year that we had kind of moved up [an age level] was a recurring kind of scenario… that seemed to be always the building year" in

Adam's mind, indicating that Dan may have interpreted Adam's message as situations and people interact to cause an outcome.

Adam appeared to suggest that he had a selective level of control (a behaviour that represents a pragmatic leadership style), and his athlete participants mostly agreed. Adam said that when things do not go the team's way, "Well it's got to be controllable [for him to worry]. If it's controllable then there's consequences to it, or activities that can change that. If it's not in your control you just have to accept that." However, Max felt that Adam communicated a high level of control, and that Adam ensured "that everybody was ready and had the details they needed to succeed." Rob appeared to recall Adam communicating a selective level of control, and said that Adam would tell his athletes that even though they could not control everything, "belief was a big thing. Just that if something bad happens, just believe that we're ready for the game." Similarly, Dan recalled that every time he would move up an age level, Adam's message "would be, 'It's a building year, we know that. For the guys who were here last year and had kind of a crappy year… let's try to go five and three or six and two.'" This indicated a selective level of control, as Adam communicated that they could only reach a certain record with the team's situation.

Adam appeared to represent a mostly pragmatic leadership style, although he did use some ideological behaviours (i.e., an internal focus in motivation and communicating with his base cadre). His athlete participants did not always report his behaviours in the same way, but there is not enough evidence to suggest that these discrepancies represent a change in behaviour.

Bob

Time Frame and Outcomes Sought

Bob appeared to use a future oriented time frame, a behaviour that represented a charismatic leadership style. He said that when a coach is trying to change the direction a team is going, "you can sit and talk about it [the team's past performances]… but it ain't gonna change what's happened…our focus doesn't need to be on what happened, [but] to where we're headed." This demonstrated a clear focus on outlining future directions for the team. Interestingly, each of his athlete participants appeared to believe that Bob used a past oriented time frame. Hugh said that Bob would reflect on past wins to decide how the team needed to proceed, and that Bob communicated that the team needed to "just keep doing what we're doing." When Carl was asked about Bob's goal setting, he said that Bob's goals were based on "the success of how we were" in previous seasons. Matt claimed that most recently, Bob's expectations were set based on "how he [Bob] was when he played. And I think a lot of times coaches will just pick what worked for them." Each of the athlete participants' quotes indicate that Bob used a past oriented time frame, as he is depending on his previous experience to create a vision for the team.

Bob claimed to look for a few individual goals, which indicated an ideological leadership style. He demonstrated this when he said "So for you as a player what do you want your proficiency rating to look like… or whatever it was. For some guys it was no missed tackles. So each player, it [their goal] sort of varied," which showed that he looked for a single goal for each player. The athlete participants varied in their recollection of the number of outcomes Bob sought. Hugh recalled that Bob only had a single goal, and said, "early in his [Bob's] career there was only one mission, one thing in

mind" each season, which reflected having a single goal for the team. Carl recalled that Bob demonstrated a pragmatic leadership style and looked for a variable number of outcomes that were often individual. Carl recalled that he would have goal setting "conversations with [Bob] as a player, [and] it was, 'Okay, this is my team goal, this is what I want to achieve with the team, and this is something I want to achieve for myself.'" which indicated that Bob set a few goals with each player. Like Hugh, Matt indicated that Bob sought a few outcomes, and recalled that "He [Bob] just wanted us to get off the ball, low pad level, hit people in the mouth, and that was it. So very, very one track mind." This showed that Bob only looked for a small number of things from his athletes.

Bob appeared to look for malleable outcomes, a behaviour associated with a pragmatic leadership style. He said he preferred to set "specific goals that were measurable. 'We want so many turnovers, we want these types of things.'" The athlete participants varied in their view of the outcomes Bob sought. Hugh seemed to think that Bob sought transcendent outcomes, and discussed Bob's mission to recreate the identity of the program he took over. Hugh recalled that when Bob took over the team, Bob's approach "was just kind of, 'There's a new sheriff in town, there's a new standard in town, and we're going to hold ourselves to that standard.'" However, Carl recalled that Bob sought malleable outcomes, and said, "we would all have our individual goals, if that was to have 50 tackles or 1000 rushing yards, whatever it may be." Similar to Hugh, Matt seemed to think that Bob wanted transcendent outcomes, and tried to create a new identity around the team which "was pretty much to dominate. It was to be [known as] physically dominant." While it appeared that Carl recalled Bob reflecting a pragmatic

leadership style and setting malleable, tangible goals, Hugh and Matt appeared to recall Bob setting loftier, transcendent goals consistent with an ideological leadership style.

Motivation and Appeals

Bob seemed to demonstrate the use of positive and negative experiences, which indicated a pragmatic leadership style. He claimed that some athletes "love the light, they want to be out in the light and they want to be praised, and… some kids are highly motivated when they get called out negatively." His athlete participants recalled this as well. Although Hugh did recall that Bob used positive and negative experiences to motivate the team, he said that at the time, Bob was an "explosion of emotion and none of it being controlled, kind of all over the place, you never knew where it was going to go" and if it would be a positive or negative tirade. Carl worried that Bob's actions may be misinterpreted as overtly negative, and said "He [Bob] comes off as, like I said, rugged and rough or whatever, but… he does have a soft heart for the people he works with and the players he coaches as well." Matt stressed that recently, it was rare to see Bob use negative experiences, but admitted that it did happen. He recalled that "… if you get on his [Bob's] nerves enough he'll get to a point where he's fed up with you. But if you do the work and you keep working and do the drills, he's very patient" and preferred to focus on positives with his athletes.

Although Bob claimed to motivate his athletes on an individual basis, it appeared to be based mostly upon external factors, which indicates a charismatic or pragmatic leadership style. He claimed that his motivational tactics usually involving some form of public acknowledgement. For example, he said, "if you're the player of the week then you're the captain the following week, [for some athletes] it was t-shirts, [for other

athletes] it was recognition" through social media. All of the examples Bob gave reflected a reliance on factors external to the team as sources of motivation. Hugh recalled Bob's behaviour in a similar manner, and said that with Bob "initially, there was never an intrinsic motivation to anything that he did. It was wins and losses were all that mattered." Carl and Matt, however, appeared to believe that Bob used an internal focus. Carl said that Bob always communicated the importance of "working, working as a team" to achieve their individual and team goals as his focus for motivation. Matt said that he received a similar message from Bob before games, and said that "He [Bob] was just like, 'Do your job, just go out there, execute, you know what to do.' And that was it" for a pregame speech. Carl and Matt's recollections indicated an internal focus as Bob discussed internal qualities to the team as the reason for their success, while Hugh explicitly states that Bob's focus was not intrinsic.

Upon analysis it seemed that Bob used rational persuasion with his athletes, a behaviour associated with a pragmatic leadership style. Bob claimed that when he had to change things with an athlete, he preferred to "… be direct [in his messaging], and I'm gonna come up and… we have a conversation and we figure it out, or we fix it." Hugh said that Bob would often make negative emotional appeals, and recalled that before a game, "he [Bob] gives, you know, this big, kind of '[expletive] the world,' kind of pregame speech, a clipboard got broken, another team's t-shirt got torn, you know, he was all jacked on emotion" and trying to use negative appeals to motivate his athletes. Carl recalled Bob being far more rational, and claimed Bob took a matter-of-fact approach to his pre-game talks. Carl said Bob would discuss how the team "had to do certain things, whether that's play physical or create turnovers … To win, put ourselves in good

situations if that's field position or with turnovers…" Similarly, Matt indicated that Bob was rational, and recalled that before a game, Bob "wasn't really [emotional], he just kind of laid low, told us to do what we [had to] do, and he'd go away." This indicated rational persuasion as Bob focused on what needed to be done, as opposed to the feeling of success or failure.

Bob seemed to report a behaviour consistent with an ideological leadership style and demonstrated communication with his base cadre. He recounted a season where "our leadership was lacking from a player standpoint… I recall that season a lot of it was conversations with our athletic director." This indicated a preference in communicating with his base cadre, as when he could not rely on the leadership core within the team (i.e., captains), he turned to another leader he worked with (his athletic director). Interestingly, each of the athlete participants reflected that Bob communicated with the masses. Hugh said that Bob addressed the whole team, and recalled that he was so captivating that "you felt like he was talking directly to you." Carl simply reflected that before a game, "I think he [Bob] was trying to convey his message over to the whole team." Matt echoed this sentiment and said that "when he [Bob] motivated you, there was never, it never felt like a single person, it felt like all of us." As these quotes illustrate, the athlete participants' appeared to perceive Bob's message as being delivered to the masses (a behaviour employed by charismatic leaders), despite the fact that Bob seemed to report communicating with his base cadre.

Crisis, Causes, and Control

Bob appeared to have an isolated view of crisis, which is consistent with a pragmatic leadership style. He gave a recent example of an athlete acting out and said "I

understood that things were happening with this kid… how do we build his confidence up so he doesn't do these things? … there's other things happening with this kid at home, or in life, or what have you." This showed that Bob considered multiple sources of information before acting on an incident. Hugh articulated that Bob's view of crisis had changed over time. He recalled that "early in his [Bob's] career I think it was a lot more of the breaking of the clipboard, the kicking of the garbage can… the emotional explosions of his frustration…" This appeared to indicate a chaotic view of crisis, which reflected an ideological leadership style. Hugh went on to say that in his recent experiences around Bob, he had noted that Bob seemed to have a more ordered view. He said Bob's recent response to crisis "was just, you know, 'Our next guy is ready to go. We've done everything we can to get him ready and you guys are going to do great together.'" Carl recounted that although Bob's immediate response was to have a chaotic view, Bob would eventually isolate the incident and evaluate the information he had. Carl said when a player got injured, Bob "… was really upset, he was really down, like 'Why can't we ever get a break?' That kind of thing. But then he would adapt, right? He would adapt to, 'Okay, what's our best scenario?'" and evaluate what the team could do next, indicating a mix of ideological and pragmatic leadership styles. Matt indicated that Bob exclusively had an ordered view of crisis, and said Bob "was just always calm. And there was always, like if there was an injury it was just, 'Okay, we're going to be fine. Don't worry.'" This demonstrated an ordered view of crisis as Bob felt that there were structures in place to deal with the issues, and did not panic or assess the situation before moving forward.

Bob and each of the athlete participants seemed to indicate that Bob communicated that people were the cause of their outcomes. Bob illustrated this when he said all he asked of his athletes was"…just bring me those two things [attitude and effort], and we'll be fine, you'll be fine in life. Attitude and effort, it's all you gotta worry about." This reflected the idea of people as the cause, because his focus is on what the individual can do and not external factors. Hugh said that after a game, Bob would credit the team for their success and would say "you know, 'We set these goals this week and this is what you guys did to [reach] them and this [winning the game] is the result of it.'" Similarly, Carl recalled that after a loss, "I remember him [Bob] always saying, 'That's on us. That's on us as a coaching staff. We should have won, and we didn't do a good job of helping you guys win.'" Matt said that after a win "he [Bob] turned it back onto us and said it [the win] was all on us because we played well." Each of these quotes showed that the athlete participants believed that Bob was communicating people as the reason for their own outcomes.

Another behaviour Bob appeared to have that was consistent with a pragmatic leadership style was having a selective level of control over outcomes. He said that when he began coaching at a new program, "we just sort of focused in on ourselves… what resonated with me is you know, we only worry about ourselves… we have no control over who we play as opponents, we have no control over the rest…" Each of the athlete participants, however, felt that Bob communicated a high level of control. For example, Hugh said that Bob had an attitude of high control, and communicated to athletes that if "We do this things and winning will take care of itself, we do these things and the scholarship will take care of itself." Carl said that before a championship game, Bob

communicated a high level of control to the team and said that they could win, despite being largely outmatched. However, Carl said they had since discussed that “they knew we didn't have hope… the coaches, they knew… So he [Bob] would never express the thoughts he actually [had]” because, Carl said, Bob was worried it might negatively impact the athletes. Matt recalled that in film sessions “he'd [Bob] be there and just, ‘Yeah, you might have had a bad game, but I'm here to fix it,’” indicating that the athlete and coach had a high level of control over the outcome, as the focus was on them, and not other factors such as their opponents or officiating decisions.

Bob represented a mix of each leadership style, as one style did not clearly dominate the others. Perhaps most interestingly, the differences between what Bob claimed and what his athlete participants recalled were mostly behaviours that the athlete participants recalled as ideological. This could mean that what Bob reported was what he thought was the best course of action, and was different from what he demonstrated to his athletes. It could also reflect that he used mixed leadership, and it was mostly ideological behaviours that resonated with this sample of athletes.

Sandy

Time Frame and Outcomes Sought

Consistent with a charismatic leadership style, Sandy expressed a future oriented time frame. He said "we also do post season interviews where I ask… what they want to work on for next year, and what a good team goal and individual goal they're gonna have for themselves for the next year." This quote illustrated a future oriented approach, as he discussed the next season with his athletes. His athlete participants varied in their recollections of Sandy's time frame. Kye seemed to believe that Sandy used both a past and present oriented time frame. He said before games, Sandy's speeches revolved around "the work that we put in, what's at stake, those sorts of things," which showed both past (the work that had been put in) and present (what's at stake) time frames. Logan expressed that Sandy mostly used a present oriented time frame. Although he acknowledged that Sandy might occasionally use other time frames, Logan said that overall, "I think with the way that Sandy's attitude is, and who he is as a person, I think that he wants to really look at your potential" when setting goals with players. The focus on potential, or what can be accomplished, indicates a future oriented time frame, a behaviour that indicates charismatic leadership. Similar to Kye, Cole recalled that Sandy mixed past and present time frames and said before a game, Sandy "was like, 'You guys have done so much work this offseason, I've seen you do so much work this offseason, I can't wait to see you guys play because you guys are going to be unreal,'" which illustrated a focus on past effort. However, in the week leading up to the game, Cole recalled that Sandy ensured "We're not focusing on the team two weeks from now, we're focusing on who we play [this week] and what we're doing in practice today. So it was a

lot of like, goal oriented to now, and the present," which indicated a more present oriented time frame.

Sandy sought a few outcomes for his athletes, consistent with an ideological leadership style. He claimed to have "three things that are my goals for every year," and one or two goals for each athlete. Similarly, Kye said that each year there was one overarching goal that was set "at the beginning of the year, and reminding the kids of it" throughout the season was crucial to the team's success. Logan also appeared to recall that Sandy set few goals. He said that Sandy was clear with only one goal, which "would be obviously to set a precedent where we could be viewed as successful." Cole, however, appeared to think that Sandy set a variable number of goals, which was indicative of a pragmatic leadership style. Cole recalled that over the three seasons he played for Sandy, "we developed that relationship where he trusted us more, he became more 'consultative'" when setting goals with the team.

Sandy appeared to demonstrate a mix of charismatic and ideological leadership styles, and seemed to look for both positive and transcendent outcomes. Sandy said his three goals for each season that he "want[ed] to be competitive, want[ed] to produce kids for the next level, and I want[ed] to make sure that I'm producing good people." As Sandy indicated, he appeared to be looking for goals that were either positive like competing, or went beyond positive expectations, like creating "good people." Kye also indicated that Sandy sought positive and transcendent outcomes. He recalled that Sandy wanted to be competitive each season, but felt that Sandy's motivation was "to be able to produce people not only for our school, but for our society. And if we win games, great, but that's not the overall goal, I don't think it's ever been the goal." Logan appeared to

think that Sandy sought only transcendent outcomes, and said that Sandy "tried to get you to be your best. Not just in football, but in life." Cole, felt that Sandy's goals were positive, and said that "goal wise, we obviously wanted to win a ring. That was the big goal every year." This reflected positive outcomes as the focus is on winning, reflecting a more charismatic leadership style.

Motivation and Appeals

Another behaviour Sandy demonstrated that aligned with a pragmatic leadership style was the use of positive and negative experiences. Sandy said he used both types of experiences with his athlete because it is important to discover "… what makes each of them [the athletes] tick, 'cause one kid you can yell at, one kid you can't." While Logan and Cole appeared to agree with Sandy's claim, Kye recalled Sandy being positive. Kye claimed that even when things did not go well, Sandy "wants to make sure he's pointing out the areas where we did improve… he'll give you more compliments than he'll give you negatives, because at the end of the day we're trying to build up individuals, right?" This appeared to demonstrate a charismatic leadership style, as in this context, negatives are not using negative experiences, but rather areas for improvement, meaning Sandy's focus was on using positive experiences to build up weaknesses. Logan recalled that although Sandy was mostly positive, "if you're going to make a mistake, you're going to be an example, like, 'This is what's not to do,'" which indicated a mix of positive and negative experiences. Similar to Kye, Cole believed that Sandy was mostly positive. He discussed when he made a poor decision outside of football, and reflected that Sandy "always showed me respect in that way and it was easy to talk to him about it." Even

when Sandy could have made use of the negative experience, Cole reflected that he never felt as though Sandy was overtly negative.

Sandy appeared to use an internal focus in motivation, a behaviour theorised to indicate ideological leadership. He said that when he motivated his players, "playing for each other is always a big thing. Always reminding them who they represent, themselves first… their teammates…" This quote demonstrated Sandy's focus on the team as the source of motivation, and not external factors. This was a behaviour recalled by each of the athlete participants. Kye reflected that even after a loss Sandy would "point out positives in the game, 'That was a great job, this was a great job, you did a great job, you did this…'" Logan said that Sandy's message after a win would reflect that "'You were all working hard, this is a product of all of us. We are a team… there's nothing without a supporting cast.'" Similarly, Cole said that Sandy's message after a win would be, "'you guys all worked hard, everything you guys practiced for, that's what happens when we do it and we work for it.'" These quotes each demonstrated that Sandy would focus internally on the contribution of individuals as sources of motivation for the team.

It appeared that Sandy used negative emotional appeals, a behaviour that indicates ideological leadership. One example he gave was that his most prominent rule for his players was, "whatever decision you make as a player on the field, on the sidelines, off the field, in the classroom, whatever, in the community, ask yourself this one question; 'If I do this, will I let my teammates down?'" This represented a negative appeal to things like disappointment from respected peers and role models as a means of influencing his team. Interestingly, each of the athlete participants recalled Sandy using a different form of motivation. Kye seemed to think that Sandy would use rational persuasion, and

claimed that Sandy "manages the expectation of the kids and then… [the] kids know where we want to be," which helped to limit emotional swings in the athletes' pre-game state. Logan appeared to think that Sandy used positive emotional appeals, and recalled that before a game, "He's not necessarily saying, 'They're terrible, they're bad, you can beat them, blah blah blah.' He's saying, 'You guys are some of the best players in the province… This game is up to you.'" Oppositely, Cole seemed to believe that Sandy used negative emotional appeals. He claimed Sandy focused on a 'nobody believes in us' narrative. Specifically, he said that before a championship game, the opposing team had claimed in a news article that they expected to win. Cole recalled that "He [Sandy] actually posted the newspaper article in all of our lockers that week to get us fired up, and it worked. We came out that day, and [Sandy] was like, 'Everything is against us. We're the underdog again…'" Similar to Sandy's quote, Cole illustrated how Sandy would make negative appeals to try and motivate his team.

Sandy seemed to focus his communication on the whole group, and said that when things went poorly for the team, he would simply "talk to the kids a lot." This indicated a charismatic leadership style, as charismatic leaders will attempt to reach group consensus on issues they face. Kye also recalled Sandy relying on the group, and said that Sandy almost always "speaks to the team as a group. He doesn't speak to certain individuals…" Logan said that Sandy would speak with the group, and recalled that Sandy was "able to get down onto a personal level with his players, not just when it's high, but when it's extremely low.'" Cole appeared to think Sandy reflected an ideological leadership style and communicated mostly with his base cadre. Cole said when making a decision for the team, "we had like, a big talking circle almost, with the

captains and all the coaches," which demonstrated that Sandy relied on his leadership, or base cadre, to communicate with the team.

Crisis, Causes, and Control

Sandy seemed to have an ordered view of crisis, which indicated a charismatic leadership style. When faced with a difficult situation involving an athlete, he said that he had a set of rules for himself where he would "try to meet in the middle with that as much as you can and any ethical decision you're making, what's best for the group? But also, do we wanna leave that one kid behind?" Kye appeared to think that Sandy's approach to crisis was a mix of ordered and chaotic, indicating charismatic and ideological leadership styles. Kye said that Sandy typically was comfortable with the systems they have in place, but claimed he had "witnessed when that doesn't happen. Heat of the moment during a game, you know, the headset comes off, gets ripped off, he's angry, right?" Logan appeared to recall that Sandy had an isolated view of crisis, which would represent a pragmatic leadership style. This was demonstrated through a story Logan told of a difficult season, where after several consecutive losses he called a team meeting with the coaches and players where "we sat there for like an hour and a half, just talking it out," to try and decide how the team should deal with their season. Cole felt that Sandy had some loose rules in place to deal with a crisis, and recalled that Sandy dealt with each situation independently. Cole discussed an issue where some team members were violating school policy and "it was their first time doing something wrong, and so… his situation to resolve that" was different than how Sandy had dealt with another player who "had screwed up many times before and that was his last straw." This indicated an ordered

view of crisis, as Sandy did not ask for input or consult others before proceeding with his decision.

Sandy seemed to display another charismatic behaviour and viewed people as the cause of outcomes. He claimed that when things go poorly for the team, he asks his athletes to think about "Just that what are you gonna do to make things better? It's easy to sit and point fingers at other kids, what are you gonna do?" Sandy's focus on what people could contribute to improve their situation seemed to indicate that his belief that the athletes on the team have some impact on their outcomes. Each of the athlete participants reflected this as well. Kye said that "The kids know that when the game is over and say we lost by 14, the kids know why… I think, for him, he doesn't want to sit there and beat a dead horse with these kids," and instead would then focus on what each of them could do to help change the outcome of the next game. Logan claimed that his favourite aspect about playing for Sandy was that "he preached like, 'If you are successful, or you bring an attitude of success to football, it's going to translate over to your life.'" Cole said that after the team lost a game for which three players were suspended, Sandy's message was "'We can't blame this game on them. It's not their fault we lost this, we still very much could have won this game. Don't be pointing the fingers at them, because it's still on us.'" Each of the athlete participants' quotes appeared to indicate that in some way, regardless of the situation, people are in control of their own outcomes.

It appeared that, on a personal level, Sandy viewed his level of control as selective, which indicated a pragmatic leadership style. He reflected that when working with young athletes, "sometimes you have to realize that you're just part of the success, and you're sometimes just part of the failure…" and that there is only so much one

individual can control. Kye and Cole both indicated that they believed Sandy communicated a selective level of control, while Logan felt Sandy communicated a high level of control to his athletes. Kye recalled that Sandy's message during a difficult season was that the "coaching staff [understood] that we weren't going to win a ton of games this year… but we're going to be working with your kids to get them as much experience as possible…" in their later seasons. Logan told a story about a halftime speech Sandy delivered, and said that Sandy's message was "'Guys, this is our game. We can beat them. You guys just have to get this… If you guys go out and execute to the best, to what we know is your best, there's no way you will lose.'" Much like what Sandy and Kye reflected, Cole believed that within Sandy's goal setting his message "was basically, like he said, 'Focus on what we can control.' So if we can't control it, it was kind of, like, don't worry about it," which indicated a selective level of control was communicated by Sandy.

Sandy seemed to represent a mix of mostly ideological and charismatic leadership, and although his athlete participants did not report identical behaviours, they seemed to report his overall style as being similar to what Sandy reported.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., & Chan, A. (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi experimental studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 764-784. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.006

Barnett, N. P., Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1992). Effects of enhancing coach-athlete relationships on youth sport attrition. *The Sport Psychologist*, *6*, 111-127. doi:10.1123/tsp.6.2.111

Barrow, J. C. (1977). The variables of leadership: A review and conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, *2*, 231-251. doi:10.5465/AMR.1977.4409046

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

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

Bedell-Avers, K. E., Hunter, S. T., & Mumford, M. D. (2008). Conditions of problem-solving and the performance of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders: A comparative experimental study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 89-106. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.12.006

Bertram, R., Culver, D. M., & Gilbert, W. (2017). A university sport coach community of

practice: Using a value creation framework to explore learning and social interactions. *International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching, 12*, 287-302. doi:10.1177/1747954117710503

Bertram, R., & Gilbert, W. (2011). Learning communities as continuing professional development for coaches. *Journal of Coaching Education, 4*(2), 40-61. doi:10.1123/jce.4.2.40

Bloom, G. A., Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1997). The development of communication skills by elite basketball coaches. *Coaching and Sport Science Journal, 2*(3), 3-10.

Camiré, M., Trudel, P., & Forneris, T. (2014). Examining how model youth sport coaches learn to facilitate positive youth development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *19*, 1-17. doi:10.1080/17408989.2012.726975

Carter, A. D., & Bloom, G. A. (2009). Coaching knowledge and success: Going beyond athletic experiences. *Journal of Sport Behaviour*, *32*, 419-437.

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

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

Community novice coach. [Web page]. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.coach.ca/football-p154485

Côté, J., & Gilbert, W. D. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *International Journal of Sport Sciences & Coaching, 4,* 307-323. doi:10.1260/174795409789623892

Cruickshank, A., & Collins, D. (2016). Advancing leadership in sport: Time to take off the blinkers? *Sports Medicine*, *46,* 1199-1204. doi:10.1007/s40279-016-0513-1.

Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 63-82. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004

Diebig, M., Bormann, K. C., & Rowold, J. (2016). A double-edged sword: Relationship between full-range leadership behaviours and followers' hair cortisol level. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27,* 684-696. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.04.001

Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 36-62. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.005

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 569-591. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569.

Erickson, K., Bruner, M. W., MacDonald, D. J., & Côté, J. (2008). Gaining insight into actual and preferred sources of coaching knowledge. *International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching, 3,* 527-538. doi:10.1260/174795408787186468

Erickson, K., Côté, J., & Fraser-Thomas, J. (2007). Sport experiences, milestones, and

educational activities associated with high-performance coaches' development. *The Sport Psychologist*, *2*, 302-316. doi:10.1123/tsp.21.3.302

Gilbert, W. D., Côté, J., & Mallet, C. (2006). Developmental paths and activities of successful sport coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 1*, 69-76. doi:10.1260/174795406776338526

Gilbert, W. D., Lichtenwaldt, L., Gilbert, J., Zelezny, L., & Côté, J. (2009). Developmental profiles of successful high school coaches. *International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching, 4*, 415-431. doi:10.1260/174795409789623928

Gilbert, W. D., & Trudel, P. (2002). Learning to coach through experience: Reflection in model youth sport coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21*, 16-34. doi:10.1123/jtpe.21.1.16

Gilbert, W. D., & Trudel, P. (2004). Role of the coach: How model youth team sport coaches frame their role. *The Sport Psychologist*, *18*, 21-43. doi:10.1123/tsp.18.1.21

Gilbert, W. D., & Trudel, P. (2005). Learning to coach through experience: Conditions that influence reflection. *Physical Educator*, *62*, 32-43.

Gould, D., Collins, K., Lauer, L., & Chung, Y. (2007). Coaching life skills through football: A study of award winning high school coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *19*, 16-37. doi:10.1080/10413200601113786

Griffith, J., Connelly, S., Thiel, C., & Johnson, G. (2015). How outstanding leaders lead with affect: An examination of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*, 502-517. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.03.004

Hendry, L. B. (1968). Assessment of personality traits in the coach-swimmer relationship, and a preliminary examination of the father-figure stereotype. *American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, *39*, 543-551.

Horn, T. (2008). *Advances in Sport Psychology* (3rd ed.). Champagne, IL: Human Kinetics.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 321-339.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis?. *Journal of Management*, *23*, 409-473.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*, 1277-1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687

Hunter, S. T., Cushenbery, L., Thoroughgood, C., Johnson, J. E., & Ligon, G. S. (2011). First and ten leadership: A historiometric investigation of the CIP leadership model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 70-91. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.008

Lemyre, F., Trudel, P., & Durand-Bush, N. (2007). How youth-sport coaches learn to coach. *The Sport Psychologist*, *21*, 191-209. doi:10.1123/tsp.21.2.191

Ligon, G. S., Hunter, S. T., & Mumford, M. D. (2008). Development of outstanding leadership: A life narrative approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 312-334. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.03.005

Mayan, M. J. (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Mead, J., & Gilson, T. A. (2016). One high school basketball coach's self-study of

leadership development. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-19, [Published online April 25, 2016]. doi:10.1080/21640629.2016.1173447

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage.

Mills, J. P., & Boardley, I. D. (2016). Expert Premier League soccer managers' use of transformational leadership behaviours and attitude towards sport integrity: An intrinsic case study. *International journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 11*, 382-394. doi:10.1177/1747954116645011

Mumford, M. D. (2006) *Pathways to outstanding leadership: A comparative analysis of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Press.

Mumford, M. D., Antes, A. L., Caughron, J. J., & Friedrich, T. L. (2008). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: Multi-level influences on emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 144-160. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.002

Mumford, M. D., & Van Doorn, J. R. (2001). The leadership of pragmatism: Reconsidering Franklin in the age of charisma. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*, 279-309. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00080-7

Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L., & Wolfe, E. W. (2008). A confirmatory study of rating scale category effectiveness for the coaching efficacy scale. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *79*, 300-311. doi:10.1080/02701367.2008.10599493

Neely, K. C., Dunn, J. G., McHugh, T. L. F., & Holt, N. L. (2016). The deselection process in competitive female youth sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, *30*, 141-153. doi:10.1123/tsp.2015-0044

Neely, K. C., & Holt, N. L. (2014). Parents' perspectives on the benefits of sport

participation for young children. *The Sport Psychologist*, *28*, 255-268. doi:10.1123/tsp.2013-0094

Nelson, L. J., Cushion, C. J., & Potrac, P. (2006). Formal, nonformal, and informal coach learning: A holistic conceptualization. *International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching, 1*, 247-259. doi:10.1260/174795406778604627

Norman, L., & French, J. (2013). Understanding how high performance women athletes experience the coach-athlete relationship. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, *7*, 3-24.

Parry, K., Mumford, M. D., Bower, I., & Watts, L. L. (2014). Qualitative and historiometric methods in leadership research: A review of the first 25years of The Leadership Quarterly. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*, 132-151. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.006

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Petitpas, A. J., Cornelius, A. E., Van Raalte, J. L., & Jones, T. (2005). A framework for planning youth sport programs that foster psychosocial development. *The Sport Psychologist*, *19*, 63-80. doi:10.1123/tsp.19.1.63

Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1995). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 17,* 276-293. doi:10.1123/jsep.17.3.276

Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2017). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1-22. [Published online May 14, 2017]. doi:10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Barnett, N. P. (1995). Reduction of children's sport performance anxiety through social support and stress-reduction training for coaches. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *16*, 125-142. doi:10.1016/0193-3973(95)90020-9

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Curtis, B. (1979). Coach effectiveness training: A cognitive behavioural approach to enhancing relationship skills in youth sport coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, *1*, 59-75. doi:10.1123/jsp.1.1.59

Smith, N., Tessier, D., Tzioumakis, Y., Fabra, P., Quested, E., Appleton, P., … Duda, J. L. (2016). The relationship between observed and perceived assessments of the coach-created motivational environment and links to athlete motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *23*, 51-63. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.11.001

Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1989). Leadership behaviours in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *19*, 1522-1551.

Smoll, F. L., Smith, R. E., Barnett, N. P., & Everett, J. J. (1993). Enhancement of children's self-esteem through social support training for youth sport coaches. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 602-610. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb01462.x

Sparkes, A. C. (1992). The paradigm debate: An extended review and a celebration of difference. In A. C. Sparkes (Ed.), *Research in physical education and sport* (pp. 9-60). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 83-110. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.83

Stephenson, B., & Jowett, S. (2009). Factors that Influence the development of English youth soccer coaches. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, *3*, 3-14.

Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. J. (2017). What works in coach learning, how, and for whom? A grounded process of soccer coaches' professional learning. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 9*, 321-338. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2017.1283358

Stoszkowski, J., & Collins, D. (2016). Sources, topics, and use of knowledge by coaches. *Journal of Sport Sciences, 34*, 794-802. doi:10.1080/02640414.2015.1072279

Strange, J. L., & Mumford, M. D. (2002). The origins of vision: Charismatic versus ideological leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 343-377. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00125-X

Sullivan, P., Paquette, K. J., Holt, N. L., & Bloom, G. A. (2012). The relation of coaching context and coach education to coaching efficacy and perceived leadership behaviours in youth sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, *26*, 122-134. doi:10.1123/tsp.26.1.122:

Thorne, S. (2016). *Interpretive description: Qualitative Research for Applied Practice* (2nd ed). New York: Routledge.

Thorne, S., Kirkham, S. R., & MacDonald-Emes, J. (1997). Interpretive description: A noncategorical qualitative alternative for developing nursing knowledge. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *20*, 169-177. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(199704)20:2<169::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-I

Thorne, S., Kirkham, S. R., & O'Flynn-Magee, K. (2004). The analytic challenge in

interpretive description. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *3*, 1-11. doi:10.1177/1609406904003101

Turnnidge, J., & Côté, J. (2016). Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1-16. [Published online June 16, 2016]. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2016.1189948

Vella, S. A., Oades, L. G., & Crowe, T. P. (2013). The relationship between coach leadership, the coach–athlete relationship, team success, and the positive developmental experiences of adolescent soccer players. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *18*, 549-561. doi:10.1080/17408989.2012.726976

Vidic, Z., & Burton, D. (2011). Developing effective leaders: Motivational correlates of leadership styles. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *23*, 277-291. doi:10.1080/10413200.2010.546827

Weinberg, S. R., & Gould, D. (2007). *Foundations of Sport and Exercise Psychology* (5th ed.). Champagne, IL: Human Kinetics.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002*). Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Winchester, G., Culver, D., & Camiré, M. (2013) Understanding how Ontario high school teacher-coaches learn to coach. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 18,* 412-426. doi:0.1080/17408989.2012.690376

Wright, T., Trudel, P., & Culver, D. (2007). Learning how to coach: The different learning situations reported by youth ice hockey coaches. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 12,* 127-144. doi:10.1080/17408980701282019

Zhang, J., Jensen, B. E., & Mann, B. L. (1997). Modification and revision of the leadership scale for sport. *Journal of Sport Behaviour*, *20*, 105-128.