All streams flow to the sea
because it is lower than they are.
Humility gives it its power...

-Lao Tzu

University of Alberta

The Qualities of an Exemplary Coach: A Case Study of Coach Clare
Drake

by

Howie Draper

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation

©Howie Draper
Fall, 2013
Edmonton, Alberta

For his profound influence on each and every one of us, this thesis is dedicated to:

Clare Drake

Abstract

This case study explores the coaching behavior of Clare Drake, an exemplary university hockey coach. The research identified qualities contributing to his influence. Data included written documentation; three informal conversational style interviews and one semi-structured interview with the case; as well as semi-structured interviews with eight past players, captains and/or coaches representing three distinct eras of coaching at the University of Alberta (1959-68, 1969-78, 1979-89). Transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985) was used to frame the inquiry. It may be that Clare Drake's humility was the linchpin of the remaining four qualities and therefore an important ingredient contributing to the success and influence that he had on his players, teams and his sport. This research supports extant literature in the area of transformational leadership in sport as well as more recent findings linking humility to effective leadership behavior (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012).

Acknowledgements

To the many professors of the University of Alberta Physical Education Faculty who not only shared knowledge but also a compelling enthusiasm in each of their areas of expertise, I would like to thank you for making this journey both interesting and enlightening. It is easy to see why the Faculty is considered among the best of its kind in the world.

I would also like to thank the staff on the fourth floor of the East Van Vliet Building, in particular Ann Jordan, for patience and guidance in helping me navigate my way through the nooks and crannies of the graduate process. Your contribution to the Faculty is both detailed, thorough and leaves us all, undergrads, grads and coaches feeling that we are truly cared for.

A special thanks to the past players and coaches from Golden Bears Hockey for sharing their time and experiences with me in an effort to better understand my topic. I also want to show my deep appreciation for the unique part that all of you played in contributing to the foundation of success that so many of us after you have benefited from.

I would also like to thank Jim Denison, Nick Holt and Dan Mason for sitting on my committee. Your outstanding support and direction are greatly appreciated.

If the number of supervisors is any indication of how difficult a student can be, I have been an extremely tough one! I would like to show my gratitude to all of those who have taken on my case. Firstly, to Dan Syrotuik, thanks for your eternal optimism and open demeanor. You are the epitomy of collegiality and our faculty will miss you as you move on to the next phase of your life. To Ian Reade, as my supervisor, athletic director, mentor and friend, a thanks for showing faith in me that is beyond measure. Finally, to Wendy Rodgers, my final supervisor, thanks for helping me discover a topic that I can truly say that I am passionate about. You have been inspiring, motivating, individually considerate and intellectual stimulating. The more I learned about transformational leaders, the more I understood that one sat before me every Thursday at 2:30pm.

I would like to thank the various coaching staffs and players that have comprised the Pandas' Hockey Team over the last 5 years. Without your patience, understanding and willingness to help shoulder the load, this undertaking would not have been possible. You all inspire me to greater heights.

I would like to thank my family. To my sister Shelley, you have always supported me through thick and thin be it as my protector in the playground when we were kids or as my counselor in the many peaks and valleys of life, you have always been there for me. To my Mom and Dad, Louise and Blaine, you taught me how to work hard, have humility and respect others.

Whatever I have become, I owe to you. And to my own children, Stephanie, Jack and Ben, thanks for understanding that working through my thesis meant that time with you might be limited somewhat. I am proud of who you are becoming.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Fahreen. Your belief in me, your encouragement and support, your guidance and wisdom, and, most importantly, your love over the past six years, will take a lifetime to repay. I'm looking forward to trying my best to make that happen.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Overview

Introduction

Clare Drake does not appear to have been an ordinary leader. Drager

(2007) summarizes some of Clare Drake's accomplishments as a hockey coach in

the following excerpt.

> It is no small coincidence that Ken Hitchcock calls his mentor the "John
> Wooden of Canadian hockey." Like Wooden, Drake posted a coaching
> record of dominance and excellence almost unmatched in his game. He
> won 697 of the 1030 games he coached in the CIAU, an exceedingly
> healthy career winning percentage of .695. When he retired from the
> University of Alberta in 1989 he held the North American record for wins
> by any coach of amateur hockey at any level. He won seventeen Canada
> West conference championships and six CIAU national championships.
> He was conference coach of the year three times and twice named CIAU
> coach of the year. He spent two full-time seasons in the NHL as an
> assistant coach with Winnipeg, and parts of other seasons consulting with
> San Jose, Dallas, Vancouver, Calgary and Edmonton. He coached
> numerous amateur teams that represented Canada internationally, most
> notably winning gold at the 1981 Winter Universiade, gold at the 1984
> Spengler Cup, bronze at the 1987 Winter Universiade and leading Canada
> to a heartbreaking sixth place at the 1980 Winter Olympics. He holds two
> undergraduate degrees (Physical Education from UBC and Education from
> the U of A, where he is a professor emeritus in the Faculty of Physical
> Education. He's a member of the Yorkton (Saskatchewan) Sports Hall of
> Fame, the Edmonton Sports Hall of Fame, the Alberta Sports Hall of Fame
> and the Canadian Sports Hall of Fame. The latest feather in his cap came
> in 2006, when he was given the Geoff Gowan Award by the Coaching
> Association of Canada to honor his lifetime contribution to coaching
> development (p. 24, quotation marks and parenthesis in original
> document).

Coach Drake was similar to other leaders in that he possessed the

responsibility of uniting the individuals in his charge for the purpose of achieving

a common goal (Yukl, 2010). He somehow accomplished this task season after

season for close to 30 years with very few exceptions. But leaders that can help a

group achieve its goals would not be atypical in most domains. Indeed, one could likely find many examples of this nature in the area of leadership. Coach Drake differed from the average leader, indeed the *above average* leader, in that his role extended beyond the mere collective achievements of those that followed him to the development of those followers as individuals.

As is typical of current leadership dogma in the domain of sport coaching, Clare Drake was also expected to play a part in the personal development of each of the men who he led, not unlike a teacher who imparts curricular knowledge to his/her students while also passing on life skills and values that will ultimately serve to help them become positively functioning and contributing individuals within and for the greater society. Behavior of this nature might be expected given the academic context in which Coach Drake was situated. His motivation, however, appears to have been driven more by his personal values than by what was demanded by his profession. Regardless, it is clear that he played a knowing role in the development of his players, but this fact in and of itself did not necessarily set him apart from the rest of his coaching peers.

Many would say that Clare Drake wasn't an ordinary hockey coach either. Like all coaches, his role was significant in that from it he could exert a considerable amount of influence, not only on the athletic performance, but also on the emotional and psychosocial well being (Horn, 2008) of the young people in his charge. Case in point, he was able to assume the head coaching position of the Golden Bears Football Team and, with little experience in the sport, help lead the team to a national championship *in the same year* that his Golden Bear Hockey

Team won a national championship. Clearly, there is more to his leadership or coaching ability than his knowledge of techniques, tactics and systems. He and the teams he coached enjoyed more achievements and successful outcomes than the average team, but this also doesn't alone make him an outlier in the hockey world.

What truly sets Clare Drake apart from other leaders and coaches is that he did all of these things in an extraordinary way and to an extraordinary level. He has developed individuals, teams, and programs in a fashion that has been demonstrated to be ahead of his time. Many of the men that he has coached have gone on to become leaders in the community in multiple domains (table 1). His teams at the U of A maintained a level of excellence that influences Golden Bear teams today, fostered by coaches who once played for him.

Beyond his role at the U of A, his influence on techniques, tactics and coaching practices endure in coaches currently leading hockey teams at the highest levels throughout North America and into Europe (table 1). Ken Hitchcock of the NHL's Philadelphia Flyers indicates that once innovative tactics introduced within the Golden Bear Hockey Program became commonplace in the NHL - some are still being utilized today. This influence was put into motion through clinics and presentations facilitated by Coach Drake and his peers within the hockey community. He was a driving force behind coaching development in Canada and one of the earliest contributors to the development of the National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP). Indeed, as this study nears completion,

Coach Drake has been awarded the Order of Canada for his commitment to developing young coaches and the game of hockey in his country.

Table 1

Drake's Influence on the Hockey Community	Drake's influence on Golden Bear Hockey Players
• Mike Babcock – Detroit Red Wings and Men's Olympic Team • Ken Hitchcock – Philadelphia Flyers and Stanley Cup Winner • Dave King – Hockey Canada • Bob Nicholson – Hockey Canada • Ken Dryden – Montreal Canadians • Melody Davidson – Women's Olympic Team • Tom Renney – Detroit Red Wings • Kevin Lowe – President Edmonton Oilers • Wayne Fleming – Hockey Canada • Glenn Anderson – Edmonton Oilers	• Kevin Primeau – Austrian Professional League • Ian Herbers – Golden Bears • Chief Wilton Littlechild – Member of Parliament • Dr. George Kingston – Japan Ice Hockey Federation • Rick Carriere – Edmonton Oilers • Bill Moores – Edmonton Oilers • Dan Peacocke – Concordia College • Serge Lajoie – Grant MacEwan College • Rob Daum – Austrian Professional League • Dr. Randy Gregg – Sport Medicine

I played my first four years as a Golden Bear hockey player under Coach Drake. At that time the competitive level, the commitment to excellence, and the 'team first' attitude that prevailed in each of the players that came before and after was compelling. Their stares were sharp, serious, focused and, despite the variance in physical proportion and appearance, when they played the game, each seemed to play with the same passion and determination to an extent that I had

never experienced before. I was so impressed by what I saw in fact that I wanted more than anything to be a part of it. To say that Clare Drake and the Golden Bear Hockey Program influenced me would be an understatement.

I am now the head coach of the University of Alberta Women's Hockey Team. In this capacity, I have led program from inception into its 17th season. The main stimulus for accepting the position back in 1997 was in thinking that I would have the chance to have a positive influence on young adults' lives, just as Coach Drake had on mine. In developing the program, I have done my best to emulate much of the model provided by Coach. I have surrounded myself with good people and provide them the opportunity to lead. I have done my best to model values that were instilled within me as a player and I have tried to remain open to new ideas and continual learning and growth.

After having left the Golden Bear Hockey Program, I reflected often on how fortunate I was to have had Clare Drake for a coach. I don't know that I fully understood or appreciated Coach while I was playing for him (a feeling that seemed to be typical of most of those that I interviewed), however, I have since come to believe that he endeavored to help his players become better people, students and athletes. This represents a difference between leadership in coaching at the university level and leadership in corporate, military or human service domains. A university coach's responsibility extends beyond the achievement of group objectives to include the individual development of those being led. Despite this distinction, the terms coaching and leadership will be used

interchangeably in this paper, as will the ideas of leadership effectiveness and coaching effectiveness.

Yukl (2010) suggests, "criteria selected to evaluate leadership effectiveness reflect a researcher's explicit or implicit conception of leadership" (p. 9). For example, effectiveness has been indicated in terms of group performance enhancement, follower satisfaction, team or organizational outcomes, follower attitudes and perceptions, assessments of superiors and/or a leader's promotions, selections and/or dismissals (Yukl, 2010). Closer to the theme of this study - coaching leadership - Chelladurai (1994) measures effectiveness by the degree to which a leader's actual behavior is congruent with the coaching behavior desired by his/her athlete(s) and the behavior that is required by the situation in which they are situated.

Based on what has been said thus far, Clare Drake presents a strong model of an effective leader and/or coach. His influence on Golden Bear hockey players, the program in which they played and within the game of hockey worldwide has been transformational. Very little research exists currently on coaches that have been effective to his extent and that have had the widespread influence that he has had on his sport. This study will examine the transformative qualities of Coach Clare Drake from his own perspective and those of his former players. Most particularly, it will consider the individual qualities that he possessed, the coaching style that he demonstrated and the personal values and philosophies that he espoused: factors that may have collectively contributed to

his transformational behavior and perhaps, ultimately, the legacy that he left on his players, on the Golden Bear program, and on the game of hockey.

Purpose

Clare Drake presents an exemplary model of leadership worthy of further examination. This case study will explore his leadership qualities in an attempt to inform coaching behavior at all levels. Peshkin (as cited in Stake, 2003) articulates the duality of case study research to present the case itself so it can be read with interest, but also so it can contribute to a larger class of knowledge, in this case, coaching and leadership. This study will primarily focus on the case of Coach Drake, but in doing so, strive to fulfill the underlying *agenda* or purpose of learning more about Coach Drake's transformational coaching style and how to influence players, teams, and the sport of hockey in general.

Justification

Leadership effectiveness has received considerable attention from researchers since the 1950s. Researchers keen on adding information to further the quality of military, public service, and/or industry leadership have focused on the traits and behaviors that are typical of effective leaders (Horn, 1992). More recent literature has reflected the recognition that leadership may not be a unidirectional phenomenon (Horn, 2008). More likely its effectiveness is shaped by the situation or context within which it is executed. Variables such as follower characteristics, the nature of work performed, the type of group or organization, and the nature of the external environment are now thought to moderate the

relationship between traits and behaviors and the resulting effectiveness of leaders (Yukl, 2010).

Recently, significant attention has been paid to charismatic leadership models such as transformational leadership theory (Yukl, 2010). This genre of literature suggests that transformational leaders (a) influence their followers to recognize a higher purpose in their individual and group roles, (b) encourage the alignment of individual goals with those of the group, (c) encourage individual and group creativity and empowerment, and (d) display individually considerate behaviors with those that they lead (Bass, 1985). Through behavior of this nature, transformational leaders are thought to elevate subordinate performance beyond original expectations. The similarities between the coaching model and achievements presented by Coach Drake and that of transformational leadership theory create a compelling focus for the current study.

Most recent research literature relevant to coaching behavior and its resulting effectiveness reflects the dynamic nature of the coach-athlete relationship and the coach-team environment (Chelladurai, 1979, 1980; Horn, 2008; Smoll & Smith, 1989) advanced by situational leadership theorists. More recently, transformational leadership theory has been incorporated into current situational models to reflect the significance of transformational characteristics and the role that they play in modifying athlete satisfaction and performance (Chelladurai, 2006).

Theorists have done much to inform us of the qualities and conditions thought to enhance coaching effectiveness in varying domains. They have

accumulated this knowledge primarily through the use of measurement tools and questionnaires designed to identify and/or quantify coach behavior and athlete outcomes. Quantitative research of this nature has been important in helping draw attention to the number and type of coach characteristics that contribute to effectiveness and our ability to evaluate it. It has also illuminated the complexities that exist within the coach-athlete relationship and coach environments in general.

But the need to define and measure within quantitative study, limits what can be discovered about these complex and diverse relationships. The very multidimensionality of the coaching environment begs for increased focus on specific real life coaching situations so that we might both understand the applicability and assess the relevance of proposed coaching theories, while identifying new complexities for further investigation (Stake, 2003). Much can be revealed through the examination of coaching exemplars such as Coach Drake, that have proven to be extraordinary in their effectiveness in coaching, developing athletes/people and positively influencing the sport in which they are involved.

Though some qualitative research in the area of sport coaching exists (e.g., Vallee & Bloom, 2005), very little (if any) of the literature has identified and explored cases that have displayed the breadth and enduring influence comparable to that of Clare Drake. Further, the interpretations that I might draw from my own experience as a player, captain, and mentee of Coach Drake, and as a current coach at the university level, might prove valuable to other amateur coaches who

hope to improve their own ability to develop their athletes and optimize their

performance.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Leadership

The role that leadership plays in individual and group performance has long been recognized. One need only thumb through a history text to learn that effective leaders have often times been at the center of triumphant military campaigns, positive corporate growth, social change and cultural shifts. In recognition of the significance that leaders play in performance outcomes, researchers from varied disciplines have attempted to determine the characteristics, behaviors and processes that form the foundation of effective leadership. Sport leadership and, perhaps more specifically, sport coaching is one discipline that seeks to discover the essence of leadership albeit relatively late in the game in comparison to military, business and educational contexts. This section will first define leadership and then broadly summarize the development of leadership theory from early conceptions to present day research attending specifically to theories prevalent in sport coaching literature. It will then highlight key areas of focus as related to the literature presented and conclude with a discussion on the relevance of the current case study.

Definition of Leadership

Since the first half of the previous century, numerous researchers have offered varied definitions of leadership (Yukl, 2010). Given the complexity of the construct itself and the varied meanings that it might have for researchers who each bring their individual perspectives and unique areas of interest to the

argument, little agreement has been reached as to how best to define leadership (Yukl, 2010). The only common ground found by scientists is that leadership is a process where influence is exerted over others with the purpose of guiding, providing structure and facilitating activities and relationships in a group or organization. In this light, Yukl defines leadership as "the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (2010, pg. 8).

Yukl's definition serves the current case of Clare Drake, the head coach of a men's university hockey team, well. A coach's ability to sell a vision for the team or program (process of influencing others) and his/her ability to communicate a plan and its relevance towards the achievement of that vision (understand and agree what needs to be done and how to do it) is important to the effectiveness of the group. He/she must also be able to create an environment that will enhance the abilities of each individual team-member and his/her capacity to contribute to the collective (process of facilitating individual and collective efforts), while helping to foster prioritization of group goals before those of the individual (accomplishing shared objectives) so that each unique part works in harmony with the other, culminating in the efficient functioning of the larger group. More specifically, this definition of leadership encompasses many dimensions of coaches' leadership behavior including but not limited to goal setting, communication, decision making, teaching techniques, type and

frequency of feedback given in practices and games, disciplining techniques and the type of relationships established with athletes (Horn, 2008).

Leadership Theories

Early forays into leadership theory focused primarily on universal leader characteristics such as traits, skills and/or behaviors (Horn, 1992). These characteristics were thought to contribute to the overall effectiveness of all leaders that possessed them and subsequently on the performance and/or satisfaction of those that they led regardless of context. As time passed, theorists came to realize that the presence of such characteristics in a leader although significant, would not guarantee effectiveness from situation to situation. This realization shifted leadership research to that of situational traits and/or behaviors that help make a leader successful in one situation, while not necessarily in another (Cox, 1998).

More recent theories have tended towards the interactional nature of the relationship among the leader, the follower, and the situation in which these two entities are housed. Current research has shifted from focusing on the leader as the sole orchestrator of successful individual and/or group performance to one that includes contextual factors that influence leadership processes such as characteristics of followers, the nature of the work performed by the group, the type of organization and the nature of the external environment (Yukl, 2010). This section will explore some of the prevailing theories as viewed through the lenses of the following four conceptual theories: trait, universal behavior, situational, integrative, transactional and transformational theories (Bass, 1985; Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986; Yukl, 2010).

Trait Theories of Effective Leadership

Traits might be thought of as learned or inherited individual attributes such as physical appearance, cognitive ability, personality, temperament, needs, motives, and values whereas skill might be considered as a learned or acquired ability to do something (technical, interpersonal or conceptual) in an effective manner. Based on the assumption that traits and/or skills predict a person's ability to attain, and be effective, in a position of leadership, early leadership researchers compared leaders to non-leaders, effective leadership to ineffective leadership or examined attributes of emergent leaders in newly formed groups in order to determine characteristics or personality traits common to all effective leaders (Weinberg & Gould, 1999; Yukl, 2010). Proponents of trait theory argued that certain individuals possess traits or skills that render them effective leaders regardless of the context in which they are situated.

Earlier research presented by Stodgill (1948) disputed the notion that a leader's success could be predicted by the traits and/or skills that he/she possesses. In his review of 124 studies conducted over a period of 40 years, Stodgill (1948) identified the emergence of a number of common leader traits such as intelligence, alertness to the needs of others, understanding of the task, initiative and persistence in dealing with problems, self-confidence and desire to accept responsibility and occupy a position of dominance/control that may enhance the achievement of group goals. His research failed, however, to present conclusive evidence that a person must possess specific traits in order to become a

successful leader. Rather, the importance of each trait depended on the situation and no trait was shown to predict leadership success in all situations.

Although relatively limited, trait theory research in the sport domain as compared to industrial, educational and other formal organizational contexts (Horn, 1992) produced similar findings. One such study by Penman, Hastad, and Cords (1974) that supported the trait theory, found that the degree of authoritarianism in interscholastic male football and basketball head coaches positively correlated with coaching success as measured in win-loss percentages. Another study suggested that successful coaches were tough-minded, authoritarian, willing to bear the pressure of fans and the media, emotionally mature, independent in their thinking and realistic in their perspective (Ogilvie & Tutko, 1966).

Walsh and Carron (1977) further examined this typical representation of the successful coach in their studies using the Machiavellian (Mach) Scale (Christie and Geis 1970). In this comparison of volunteer youth hockey coaches to non-coaching teachers in Canada, they found minimal variation in behaviors indicative of high Mach profile (lack of caring for people, emotionless, hard-minded, and willing to do whatever is necessary to win) and found no relationship between levels of authoritarianism and team performance success. This was consistent with earlier research as cited in Iso-Ahola & Hatfield (1986), weakening the emphasis on trait theory and providing sport scientists reason to focus on other leadership models such as those found in universal behavior and situational-trait theories.

Despite its limitations, the literature is clear in the need for research about leader traits., although possessing certain traits will not guarantee leadership effectiveness (Stodgill, 1948). Further, traits and skills have been shown to be a factor of both learning and heredity (Arvey, Zhang, Avolio, & Krueger, 2007; Bouchard, Lykken, McGue, Segal, & Tellegen, 1990), suggesting at least some leader attributes can be modified to fit varying situations. Indeed the notion of filling ones "leadership toolbox" with a variety of tools from which a leader can draw is an attractive one given the complexity of the leadership environment (Chelladurai, 1978; Horn, 2008; Jowett & Poczwardowski, 2007).

Universal Behavior theories of Effective Leadership

The one-dimensional nature of trait theory and its weak relationship to leadership effectiveness gave way to increased research in the area of behavior characteristics or, more specifically, *what leaders do* (Williams, 2006). Indicative of this movement were a series of studies performed by psychologists in the 1950s known as the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Yukl, 2010). This body of research identified and measured the frequency of sets of behaviors that were contextually relevant to leaders. Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), Ohio State researchers identified two independent categories into which leader behavior typically falls: consideration, and initiating structure (Weinberg & Gould, 1999).

Behaviors relevant to consideration focus primarily on concern for the follower and the interpersonal relationships that exist between the leader and follower (Yukl, 2010). Friendship, mutual trust, respect, support and warmth

were identified as characteristics typical of a leader who is considerate and these people tend to have good rapport and communication with others (Weinberg & Gould, 1999). Leaders high in initiating structure are more task focused. They develop strong methods of people and procedural management with the main purpose of achieving group goals and objectives. These leaders are active in directing group activities, communicating, scheduling, and experimenting with new ideas (Weinberg & Gould, 1999, p. 190). Successful leaders tend to score high in both consideration and initiating structure indicating a compatibility despite their distinctive nature.

Similar literature on behavioral characteristics common to successful leaders emerged out of the University of Michigan at roughly the same time as that of Ohio State. The Michigan leadership studies focused primarily on the identification of relationships among leader behavior, group processes, and measures of group performance (Yukl, 2010). These studies indicated three categories of leadership behavior that would help differentiate effective from ineffective managers: task-oriented behavior, relations-oriented behavior and participative leadership. Task-oriented behavior and relations-oriented behavior would very closely resemble the initiating structure and consideration categories (respectively) of the Ohio State research differing only in that the Michigan studies included a broader range of behaviors. Task behaviors that have been found to be particularly relevant for effective leadership are short-term planning, clarifying roles and objectives and monitoring operations and performance while

specific relations behaviors have focused on the support, recognition and development of followers by their leader (Yukl, 2010).

New to the Michigan research was the inclusion of participative leadership as a behavior closely linked with effective management practices. Leaders behaving in this way include subordinates in supervision and decision-making through the use of group meetings where communication, cooperation and conflict resolution might be enhanced among group entities (Yukl, 2010). Despite the sharing of responsibility noted in these studies, the literature clearly stated that the ultimate responsibility for group decisions and the resulting outcomes was held by its' leaders. The advent of these two bodies of work represented an important step in leadership research as it meant that scientists could measure or quantify a leader's behavior and then compare tendencies between successful and unsuccessful leaders (Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986).

Inspired by the Ohio and Michigan leadership studies, sport researchers interested in behavior theory adopted similar methods to identify behaviors most typical of team leaders in the sport environment. One such study utilized an adapted version of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) - a series of 150 questions designed to measure the degree of task orientation and interpersonal orientation exhibited by a leader – shifting relevance of the Ohio study findings from a business context to one of sport. The questionnaire was administered to 160 hockey players aged twelve to eighteen in an attempt to identify behaviors typical of Canadian hockey coaches (Danielson, Zelhart, & Drake, 1975). Eight classifications of coaching behavior emerged as a result of

this research, namely: competitive training (motivation to train hard and win), initiation (emphasizing problem-solving and non-critical innovation), interpersonal team operations (emphasizing cooperation to optimize team functioning), representation (representing team to media, fans and other outsiders), organized communication (organization of communication efforts), social (behaviors in a social content), recognition (feedback given to individual players and team) and general excitement (arousal and motivation of players in a non-directive manner). As in the Ohio and Michigan studies, Danielson and his colleagues (1975) succeeded in identifying general behaviors that were typical of leaders albeit in the realm of sport. Unfortunately, all studies of this nature failed to tie these behaviors to leadership outcomes falling short of identifying the behaviors that would predict leadership effectiveness.

Additional studies compared coaching behavior to subordinate outcomes. One such study performed by Swartz (1973) examined college football teams in the mid-western United States in an attempt to link predominant coaching behaviors classified into laissez-faire, autocratic and democratic styles to coaching success (based on team win/loss records). Swartz concluded that coaching styles failed to significantly predict coach success or the lack thereof. Findings such as these within and beyond the sport domain represented a failing of universal behavior theory. Behavior theory sparked optimism that effective coaching behaviors could be learned, however, its inability to link specific behaviors to coaching effectiveness gave scientists cause to speculate that

leadership effectiveness might be more complex than originally thought (Cox, 1998; Yukl, 2010).

It was becoming apparent that select behaviors were more effective in some situations and less in others (Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986). Mudra (1965) compared the teaching-style behaviors of coaches in major college football programs in the US to those in smaller community colleges. In his study, he found that the coaches in major colleges were more likely to possess stimulus-response (teaching-by-habit) teaching styles while those in smaller colleges were more likely to possess a more gestalt (understanding the whole and it's significance in relation to other parts) oriented approach. In discussing these findings, Mudra (1965) suggested that the coaches might have changed their behaviors to better suit the situations in which they were coaching. Indeed, as suggested by Yukl (2008) "it is now obvious that the relevance of the specific behaviors in each meta-category varies with the nature of the leadership situation" (p. 79). Further, to examine coaching effectiveness, one must consider both the interaction between the coaching behaviors and the situation in which they are being utilized (Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986).

Situational Theories of Leadership

Situational leadership theories fall under the common assumption that leadership effectiveness is not determined solely by the traits or behaviors exhibited by a leader (Horn, 1992, p. 182). Rather, situational variables such as follower characteristics, the nature of work performed, the type of group or organization and the nature of the external environment are thought to moderate

the relationship between leader attributes (traits, skills or behaviors) and leader effectiveness (Yukl, 2010). In other words, the context within which a leader displays his/her traits, skills or behaviors will in large part determine the effectiveness of the leader as measured in follower(s) satisfaction and/or performance.

Early forays into situational research linked leader traits with situation-specific contexts. These contingency theories posit that a leader will be effective if his/her personal characteristics and/or behaviors fit the context in which he/she is situated. Fiedler and Chemers' (1974) Contingency Theory of Leadership suggested that group effectiveness is dependent on two factors: "the personality of the leader and the degree to which the situation gives the leader power, control, and influence over the situation" (Cox, 1998, p. 312). Fiedler (1967) dichotomized leaders' personality traits into those that prioritize either relationship building or task completion. Similar to earlier trait representations of consideration or initiating structure, Fiedler's relationship motivation and task motivation refer to the degree in which leaders emphasize the quality of interpersonal relationships with subordinates versus his/her concern with the accomplishment of the task (Cox, 1998).

The degree to which leaders' personalities were categorized as relationship or task motivated was measured by using the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) scale, which quantifies the leader's empathy for his/her least preferred team member. Those demonstrating little empathy tended to be higher in task motivation while those who showed higher degrees of empathy towards

these subordinates were determined to be higher in relationship motivation (Cox, 1998). From another perspective, relationship or person-oriented leaders were of the feeling that each team member is of equal worthiness while the task-oriented leader would demonstrate a clear feeling that some are more worthy than others (Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986).

Fiedler and Chemers' (1974) theory further considered the degree to which the situation gave the leader control and influence over the environment in which he/she was situated. According to the theory, this *situational favorableness* would ultimately depend on three sub-factors: leader-member relations, task structure, and leader position power. Leader-member relations refer to the degree in which the leader is favored by the follower (good versus poor relations) potentially influenced by factors such as coach expertise and/or propensity to meet the interpersonal needs of the follower. Task structure refers to the degree of structure present in the situation (structured or unstructured) while leader position power is represented by the strength or authority present in the leadership position (strong or weak). Leader position power was considered strong if coach policies were strongly supported and/or endorsed by the organization in which the group was situated.

Considering these three sub-factors of situational favorableness together, Fiedler and Chemers (1974) identified eight potential coaching situations ranging from very favorable to moderately favorable to very unfavorable. The relationship between leader personality styles and coaching situations and the resulting success or non-success of the group in which they were embedded were

examined ultimately culminating in Fiedler's contingency model for leadership (1974). The model predicted that certain personality styles would be most effective in specific situations. For example, leadership styles that were more task oriented would best fit situations that were either very favorable or very unfavorable, while relationship-oriented leaders would be best suited to situations of moderate favorableness.

The work done by Fiedler and Chemers (1974) provided a significant contribution to the coaching literature as it gave credence to the examination of situational variables as determining factors necessary to leadership effectiveness. The theory was weak, however, in it's over generalization of coaching situations and a resulting inability by other researchers to effectively classify every situation using their model (Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986). As well, the leader personality traits that characterized the task and relationship orientations of the contingency model (1974) drew from core personality dispositions that could not easily be altered by an individual. This narrowed the model's scope somewhat as it implied that effective leaders could not be trained. Rather, the leader had to be matched to a situation that would identify with his/her personality orientation or the situation itself had to be altered to suit the leader's style of leadership (Cox, 1998), neither of which necessarily propose an optimistic view for coach development and/or group achievement.

In contrast to Fiedler and Chemers' (1974) contingency model for leadership, other situational-specific theories have been presented that suggest the study of leader behavior and it's interaction with the context in which it is situated

might best lend itself to the advancement of leadership effectiveness. This

"*situational-behavioral perspective*" (Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986, p. 235) states

that effective leadership is based less on the personality of the coach and more on

the flexibility of a coach to adapt his/her behaviors to best suit the needs of their

group and the individuals that comprise it. As well, this line of thought supports

the assumption that effective coach behaviors can be learned. Therefore, if coach

behaviors can be learned, they are more malleable and may be altered to suit a

variety of different situations within the same coaching environment or from one

environment to another.

One such theory drawing from the situational-behavioral perspective is

path-goal theory, proposed by House (1971). House attempted to explain how

leader behavior influences the satisfaction and performance of subordinates.

Drawing from expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), he suggested that these

outcomes are dependent on a follower's belief that his/her task is achievable

relative to the amount of work required, and that completion of the task will bring

recognition, personal satisfaction or other desirable outcomes while avoiding

undesirable outcomes (Yukl, 2010). The role of the leader, therefore, is to

provide for his/her followers' needs, which is necessary to increase satisfaction

and task performance. Followers will view leader behaviors as relevant to the

extent that they lead to immediate or future satisfaction.

Leaders meet their subordinates' needs through the following behaviors:

supportive leadership, directive leadership, participative leadership and

achievement-oriented leadership (House, 1971). Supportive leadership represents

behavior similar to that of the consideration category presented in the Ohio studies, such as caring about follower well-being and creating a friendly climate. Correspondingly, directive leadership echoes that of the Ohio studies' initiating structure, which comprises leadership behaviors such as providing clear expectations, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and providing appropriate procedures and guidelines for subordinates to follow. Participative leadership involves a leader's behavior of seeking follower input and opinions in the leadership process thereby enhancing a sense of ownership and commitment to the task while increasing follower self-confidence and satisfaction. A leader who sets challenging goals, seeks a high level of performance from subordinates and emphasizes excellence while exhibiting confidence in their ability to achieve high standards in performance would be indicative of one who demonstrates achievement-oriented leadership behavior. House and Mitchell (1974) added participative leadership and achievement-oriented leadership to supportive and directive, but failed to provide significant research to support this addition. It should be noted, however, that these two classifications would become more prominent in leadership research in the decades to come.

Central to the path-goal theory is the notion that a leader must adapt his/her behaviors to meet the individual needs and personalities of his/her followers, as well as the changing nature of the task requirements faced by the followers in the work place. From a sport perspective, an athlete with a high need for affiliation requires a supportive leader while a high achievement-oriented athlete might be more likely to achieve his/her athletic goal under the guidance of

a more directive style of leadership (Carron, 1980). The leader linking his/her

behavior to meet the unique needs of each follower will increase the probability

of satisfaction and, therefore, follower performance.

In terms of task requirements, path-goal theory places work activities into

three general categories: routineness versus variability, dependence versus

interdependence and inherent satisfaction versus non-satisfaction (House &

Mitchell, 1974). Each of these variables is likely to influence a follower's

preference for a particular style of leadership behavior, thereby influencing the

impact of the leader on his/her satisfaction (Yukl, 2010). Again, utilizing the

sport domain as an example, if the nature of the sport activity is overly routine as

might be evident in training stroke technique in swimming, then supportive

leadership may prove to be necessary as it may help minimize the unpleasant

aspects of the practice activity. In a sporting environment that is highly complex

and variable (such as hockey), a more directive style of leadership might be more

effective in increasing athlete satisfaction, as it would help to decrease role

ambiguity, thereby increasing performance expectancy and effort, while at the

same time increasing follower satisfaction. In individual sports where

interdependence among teammates is minimal (i.e., bowling), a less directive

style might be more appropriate whereas the opposite might be more applicable to

a sport environment where interdependence is critical to success, ; it might benefit

from greater structure in procedure and communication. Indeed, athletes that

prefer team sports also indicate a preference for leader behavior directed toward

improving performance through training procedures (Chelladurai and Saleh,

1980), such as those found within directive-oriented leadership proposed by House and Mitchell (1974).

Path-goal theory has provided an important step in guiding researchers toward potentially relevant situational variables (Yukl, 2010), specifically as they serve to mediate the relationship between leader behavior and follower satisfaction and performance. However, the categorizations of leadership behavior were too ambiguous for researchers interested in more accurately identifying the specific behaviors influencing follower outcomes. Additionally, minimal success was found in the small amount of research that was conducted with respect to path-goal theory and its application for sport, perhaps due in part to the unique nature of the sport environment as compared to those of industry and education (Horne, 1992; Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986). Despite the lack of interest in path-goal and theories like it, models of this nature would come to influence further forays into coaching effectiveness as evidenced Chelladurai's (1978) multi-dimensional model of sport leadership to be discussed later.

Another theory embedded in the situational-behavior perspective tied leader behavior to the maturity level of subordinates (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Hersey and Blanchard's *life cycle theory* offered that a leader has a role to play in the development of follower skills and confidence (Yukl, 2010). Like other behavior theories, Hersey and Blanchard (1969) conceptualized leadership behavior into relationship orientation and task orientation; however, they suggested that the maturity level of the follower would dictate the ideal combination of the two leadership styles (Cox, 1998). Maturity level was defined

in terms of the capacity to set and obtain goals, the willingness and ability to assume responsibility, and the followers' education and/or experience in relation to the task (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969).

The model suggests that a follower's required need for task orientation behavior (i.e., directive in defining roles, clarifying standards and procedures, and monitoring progress on attainment of objectives) starts high initially, during low maturity levels, and steadily declines as the follower matures (i.e., skills and procedures necessary for successful performance are developed) over time, eventually requiring very low levels upon task mastery. At the same time, relationship-oriented leader behavior (i.e., supportive, consultative, rewarding behaviors) might be required less at initial stages, then increase and peak through moderate stages of maturity. As the follower becomes more confident, self-motivated and self-sufficient in performance, less relationship-oriented behavior is necessary at higher levels of maturity similar to that of task-orientation.

Chelladurai and Carron (1977) applied the life cycle concept to the sporting domain using elementary, junior-high, high school, college, and professional athletes as the designations of maturity level. In their paper they proposed that elementary and junior-high athletes may require a low task orientation and a high relationship orientation; that high school athletes might need high levels of both task and relationship orientation; that college level athletes might require lowered relationship and high task-oriented behaviors; while the professional athlete may respond best to low levels in both orientations.

Case (1987) further modified the life cycle model in his field test of 399 basketball players from successful teams at varying levels of competition. Case used the LBDQ with the players to determine the task and relationship orientation of their coaches' (n=40) behavior. Coach behaviors were then compared to athlete maturity categorized into one of the four following levels from low maturity to high maturity: junior-high school, high school, college (community), and American Athletic Union (large college). Similar to Chelladurai and Carron's (1977) findings, task behavior of successful coaches was low at junior-high school and A.A.U. levels, and high for high school and small college levels. The opposite pattern existed with respect to relationship-oriented behavior (Case, 1987).

Findings in life cycle research clearly demonstrate the need for the matching of appropriate leadership styles to specific age categories due to the continually changing maturity levels and needs of athletes throughout their competitive life cycles (Iso-Ahola, 1986, p. 237). What's more, situational-behavioral leadership theories in general further identified the need for leaders to better understand the requirements of their followers, and the contexts in which they were situated with the intent of adapting their leader behavior for optimum effect. The necessary flexibility of the coach to adapt to the varying situations created by a given individual or group was becoming more apparent. Further, evidence now existed that effective coaching skill might be trainable due to the malleable nature of human behavior and the growing understanding of these situational variables. Unfortunately, the theories were far from exhaustive and

attempts to apply them to sport contexts resulted in minimal success (Horn, 1992, p. 183). As well, situational-behavioral theories oversimplified this relationship, failing to identify the interactional nature between more than one leadership behavior nor an indication of how these behaviors worked (Yukl, 2010).

Sport scientists attempted to narrow the scope to some degree by looking at specific coaching behaviors and their impact on successful teams. Studies by Tharp and Gallimore (1976) and Bloom, Crumpton and Anderson (1999), attempted to quantify the behaviors of two successful NCAA basketball coaches (John Wooden and Jerry Tarkanian, respectively). Using the Coaching Behavior Recording Form (Tharp & Gallimore, 1976), observers identified, timed and categorized game and practice behaviors as exhibited by these coaches. General categories used to examine this behavior included instructional behavior, hustling players to intensify instruction, praise and encouragement, scolding and re-instruction, and statements of displeasure. Bloom et al., (1999) increased the explicitness of the instructional behavior construct into technical and tactical instruction.

General findings from both studies suggested that successful coaches at this level tended to emphasize instructional types of behavior, indicative of a coach that spends significantly more time initiating structure (task-orientation). This seemed to support the modified life cycle model of coaching behavior as proposed by Case (1987), which indicated a need for a relatively high task-orientation by leaders for athletes at this competitive level. Tharp and Gallimore (1976) also offered that some athletes received greater amounts of criticism in

comparison to others, while some received more praise. This finding seemed to be in line with situational-behavior theory, which proposed the necessity for coaches to treat individual athletes in accordance with their unique needs (Iso-Ahola, 1986). Interestingly, and contrary to Case's findings, the praise and encouragement (i.e., relationship or consideration) category of coaching behavior was relatively low for both coaches though it should be noted that both coaches' time with athletes outside of the gym was not recorded which might have altered their profiles somewhat. Bloom et al. (1999) discovered that Tarkanian placed a greater emphasis on tactical instruction (29%) as compared to technical instruction (13.9%). Given that his athletes were competing at an elite level of basketball, he might have purposefully provided more instruction in the area of cognitive and tactical aspects of the sport assuming that his players had already consolidated and refined most of the technical skills of the game (Bloom et al. 1999; Klimushko, 2011).

 As mentioned earlier, trait and behavioral theories both play a small part in the identification and/or the facilitation of effective leadership. Situational-behavioral theories have increased the consideration of interactions between people and their situational constraints. Unfortunately, behavior theorists tended to emphasize the identification of single behavioral characteristics of effective leaders at the expense of considering the development and influence of patterns of any number of behaviors demonstrated together in one context. As Yukl (2010) suggests:

 It is likely that specific behaviors interact in complex ways, and that
 leadership effectiveness cannot be understood unless these interactions are

studied. For example, monitoring is useful for discovering problems, but unless something is done to solve the problems, monitoring will not contribute to leader effectiveness. Planning is likely to be ineffective unless it is based on timely, accurate information gathered from monitoring, consulting and networking, and developing plans is pointless unless the leader also influences people to support and implement them (p. 80).

Integrative Theories of Leadership

As an answer to this gap in the leadership literature, Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977) and Smoll and Smith's (1989) mediational model of leadership incorporated three central elements, coach behaviors, players' perceptions and recollections of coach behaviors, and player's evaluative reactions, to explain coaching effectiveness. In brief, situational factors such as the nature of the sport, practice sessions versus games, previous team success/failure, current status in competitions, level of competition and interpersonal attraction within the team, influence these three central elements. Individual variables such as coach goals/motives, behavioral intentions, instrumentalities, perceived coaching norms and role conception, inferred player motives, self-monitoring, and coach gender influence coaching behavior while player perception and recall as well as evaluative reactions can be influenced by variables such as player age, gender, perceived coaching norms, valence of coach behaviors sport-specific achievement motives, competitive trait anxiety, general self-esteem and athletic self-esteem.

Central to this theory as proposed by Smith et. al, (1977) was the significance of the players' perceptions, recollections of, and evaluative reactions to their coach's behavior. In other words, how a player cognitively constructs a coach's behavior might hold greater importance to the leader-follower

relationship, and eventual effectiveness, than the observed coach behavior itself (Chelladurai, 2007). For example, a coach may provide the same verbal reinforcement for what he/she perceives to be strong skill execution by two separate players. Assuming that the message (verbal and non-verbal) was relayed in a consistent manner to each player, one player might perceive this message to be a positive indication of how the coach feels about his/her performance and therefore repeat the performance, but the other player might perceive the coach's message to be negative and therefore respond accordingly. Each player in this scenario will bring differing individual variables to the situation and therefore will perceive the coach's intent in a unique way. Each player's evaluative reaction will influence how the coach perceives that player's attitude, which, in turn, will influence the coaches' future behavior. As indicated in some of the earlier situational-behavioral theories discussed in this literature review, it would, therefore, be in the best interest of coaches to attempt to better understand what variables might be brought to bare on each player in his/her charge and how best to provide reinforcement to optimize player response.

Additional contributions stemming from work done by Smith, Smoll and Curtis (1979) lie in the support for coach training and its benefit in increasing coaching effectiveness and player satisfaction. In their examination of coach behavior, trainability, and participant outcomes, Smith et al. (1979), asked American little league baseball players (n=500) from 34 teams of different competitive levels to rate their coaches' behaviors using the CBAS-PBS (Coaching Behavior Assessment System – Perceived Behavior Scale). Their

coaches (*n*=34) were asked to rate their own behavior using the same scale, 18 of whom also received training and subsequent feedback of their coaching behavior throughout the season based on independent observer ratings using the CBAS (Coaching Behavior Assessment System) (Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977).

Behaviors in the CBAS utilize two general categories: reactive behavior (coach response to a specific player behavior such as a poor or good execution) or spontaneous behavior (that which is initiated by the coach). Reactive behaviors are further divided into the following sub-categories: responses to desirable performance (reinforcement or nonreinforcement), responses to mistakes (mistake-contingent encouragement, mistake-contingent technical instruction, punishment, punitive technical instruction or ignoring), and responses to misbehavior (keeping control). Spontaneous behaviors are further divided into game-related behaviors (general technical instruction, general encouragement or organization) and game-irrelevant behavior (general communication).

Smith, Smoll, and Curtis (1979) found that the experimental group of coaches improved their coaching behavior based on assessments derived from the CBAS as well as perceptions provided by their athletes. They also found that athletes coached by the experimental group were more likely to express satisfaction with their sport experience, their teammates, and their coach than those players coached by the control group. It was also apparent that the youth from the experimental group were more likely to experience an increase in self-esteem, particularly in cases where the participant's self-esteem was relatively low initially.

Further research done by Barnett, Smoll, and Smith (1992) lent support to these earlier studies specifically as they relate to the positive psychological impact that positive coach-player interactions will have on young athletes and on the trainability of ideal coaching behaviors. Also relevant to this literature are guidelines for coaching youth athletes (Smith & Smoll, 1997) that has helped guide leadership development in the sport domain. Another important finding emerging from Smith, Smoll, and their colleagues' work was the consistency that existed between a coach's behavior, his/her goals, and his/her perceptions of the tools necessary to achieve those goals. This finding provided rationale for the assessment of coach goals as a means to monitor coach training and development (Chelladurai, 2008).

Drawing from the work of Smith and Smoll and other situational-behavioral theories, Chelladurai (1978) developed the multi-dimensional model of leadership as a next step in the specification and identification of leadership behavior effectiveness. Horn (2008) states, "This framework provides a comprehensive working model that specifies an outline of the antecedent factors that affect or determine the coach's behavior as well as the way in which the coach's behavior can affect the performance and psychosocial growth and development of the athletes" (p. 243). In other words, the multi-dimensional model moved further away from the notion of a leader acting as the sole determinant of team performance and athlete satisfaction toward that of a reciprocal relationship among the three aspects of coach behavior, athlete preferred behavior, and behavior prescribed by the context (Chelladurai, 1978).

Chelladurai (1978) posited that coaching effectiveness and the subsequent effect on athlete performance and satisfaction relies upon the degree of congruency inherent between each of the three aspects of required leader behavior, preferred leader behavior, and actual leader behavior. The behavior required by the leader draws from the expectations, values, norms, goals and/or type of task (e.g., individual versus team, closed versus open) of the organization within which the coach is situated. For example, the behaviors necessary for coaching a professional hockey team may differ from those necessary within a university hockey environment. The prime objective of professional sport is to generate revenue. As revenue is often tied to a team's win/loss record a coach may be best suited to select behaviors which would make winning more probable at the expense of individual development as might be best suited for a university hockey environment. Hence, a leader's required behavior is mediated by the characteristics inherent to the situation, and, to a lesser degree, by the characteristics of the members of the sport context.

Age, gender, experience, ability related to the task, and personality variables such as the need for achievement, affiliation, or cognitive structure influence the degree to which an athlete prefers coaching behaviors such as instruction and guidance, social support, and feedback (Weinberg & Gould, 1999). Just as required behavior is influenced by member characteristics, preferred behavior may be influenced by requirements present in the situation (Chelladurai, 2007). A coach that exhibits behavior congruent with that preferred by his/her athlete increases the likelihood that the athlete will be satisfied. For

example, Chelladurai and Carron (1983) measured preferred coaching behaviors among four groups of male basketball players categorized into early high school, high school junior, high school senior, and university level players. Their findings indicated increasing preference for leadership behavior that was socially supportive and autocratic. To explain this relationship, the authors offered that an athlete's increased desire for autocratic behavior might be indicative of the autocratic nature of sport generally. Those who remain in sport and progress through the various competitive levels may become socialized into preferring to secede more control to coaches (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). It may also be that athletes who prefer to retain higher levels of personal responsibility may be more likely to be removed from rosters as the competitive level increases over time (Horn, 1992).

The actual behaviors exhibited by the coach are largely affected by his/her personality, expertise, and experience, but are also shaped by the requirements of the situation and the athletes' preferred behaviors (Chelladurai, 1978, 2007). Further, a coach's actual behavior can be influenced via a feedback loop based on his/her perception of the athlete's performance and the athlete's level of satisfaction. For example, Chelladurai (2007) indicates that a coach may be more likely to enhance his/her task-oriented behavior in response to low levels of performance and increase relationship-oriented behaviors when low levels of athlete satisfaction are evident.

In order to test the constructs of the multi-dimensional model of leadership, Chelladurai and Saleh (1978, 1980) developed the Leadership Scale

for Sport (LSS). This 40 item questionnaire represented five dimensions of leadership behavior: (1) training and instruction, (2) democratic behavior, (3) autocratic behavior, (4) social support, and (5) positive feedback/rewarding behavior. Training and instruction along with positive feedback/rewarding behavior represents a coach's task-oriented behavior, democratic and autocratic behaviors relate to decision-making style, and social support refers to relationship-oriented behaviors of the coach. Three separate versions of the LSS are used to measure athletes' preferences for specific leader behaviors (measurement of the model's preferred behavior), athletes' perceptions of their coaches' leader behaviors, and coaches' perceptions of their own behavior (measurement of actual behavior) (Chelladurai, 2007).

The multi-dimensional model (Chelladurai, 1978, 1980), and Smith and Smoll's (1989) meditational model are the predominant leadership frameworks used to investigate coaching behaviors over the last three decades (Horn, 2008). The most salient feature of these models is the assumption that coaching behavior does not dictate successful performance outcomes and athlete satisfaction in a vacuum. Whether a coach's behavior is effective or not depends to varying degrees on characteristics prevalent within his/her sport or organizational situation while at the same time being shaped by the preferences, perceptions, and attributions of the athletes being coached. These models fall short, however, of capturing the essence of leadership that might serve to influence an athlete's evolution from the pursuit of pleasure to that of excellence (Chelladurai, 2007; Keating, 1964). As Chelladurai (2007) states, "The leadership influences or

behaviors that facilitate this metamorphic process are not fully captured by the existing instruments of leadership in sports" (p. 126). Bass's (1985) transformational leadership theory has attempted to bring into greater focus the leader behaviors that influence the transformation of his/her followers.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership Theory

Early forays into leadership theory focused primarily on models that emphasized some form of social contract or exchange between the leader and his/her followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006).   This relationship was thought to be at the core of effective leadership behavior in groups and organizations (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). The leader articulates the goal and/or expected behavior to the followers, and the followers receive agreed upon compensation, reward, and or punishment for meeting the expectation. Burns (1978) labeled this form of leadership as transactional. Bass (1985) added to his work by identifying three forms of transactional leadership behavior: contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception. Contingent reward or the pre-determined arrangement (which may be assigned by the leader or mutually agreed upon) of material reinforcement in exchange for satisfactory performance between a leader and a follower, has been found to be the most constructive, followed by active management by exception then by passive management by exception. In the active form of management by exception, the leader actively monitors the follower with the purpose of identifying deviations from the originally identified standard (due to below satisfactory performance, errors or mistakes) and imposing corrective action when deviations occur (Bass &

Riggio, 2006). In the passive form, the leader waits passively for such deviances to occur and then takes corrective action - waiting for information to come to him/her that might identify sub-standard or problem performances (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

In its contingent reward form, researchers agree that the transactional model is effective in helping followers meet agreed upon expectations (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al, 2003). Indeed, research has shown a positive correlation between contingent reward behavior exhibited by leaders and the commitment, satisfaction, and performance of respective followers (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Hunt & Schuler, 1976; Podsakoff, Todor, Grover, & Huber, 1984). In the sport domain, this might be supported by Chelladurai's (1978) multi-dimensional model of leadership providing that the coach's actual behavior is congruent with that which is preferred by the athlete and required by the situation.

The leader-follower exchange model falls short, however, in explaining performances that go above and beyond expectations as they account for only small deviations in performance outcomes (Burns, 1978; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bryman, 1992 as cited in Avolio et al., 2009). They tend to meet the expectations of their superiors rather than making an extra effort to exceed them (Bass, 1985). Followers of transactional leaders may lack the intrinsic motivation to reach beyond what is expected of them (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In response to this information, Burns (1978) posited transforming leaders as those that would inspire others to reach beyond expectations - a theory later supported and

expanded by Bass (1985) and other researchers studying various forms of charismatic leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Bass's (1985) transformational leadership model adds to the leadership literature to account for leader behaviors that motivates followers to move beyond their self-interest in favor of the group's vision, goals and values, thereby elevating individual and group performance to greater heights (Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Bass's (1985) model differs from Burns's, however; as he believed that the transformational behaviors of transformational leaders augment their transactional behaviors rather than simply categorizing a leader as being one or the other. As an extension of this idea, Aviolo and Bass (1991) placed leadership behavior on a continuum that they called the Full Range of Leadership Model that moves from laissez faire leadership (least effective), to passive management by exception, then active management by exception, contingent reward, and, finally, transformational leadership (most effective) (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Bass and Riggio (2006) also suggested that transformational leadership might have a stronger influence on those organizations that are new and/or in a state of turmoil whereas transactional leadership might best be suited for more stable and highly functioning groups.

Further to Bass's (1985) theory, his book, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, describes transformational leadership behavior as one that addresses a follower's sense of self-worth thereby encouraging commitment levels beyond those motivated by the traditional transactional exchange (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Followers are motivated to a greater degree to do more than what

is expected of them and possibly more than what they originally believed

themselves to be capable of (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Further, transformational

leaders challenge their followers to be creative in finding solutions to problems

and develop leadership ability within the group through empowerment and,

subsequently, "coaching, mentoring, and provision of both challenge and support"

(Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 4).

Through the use of "factor analyses, observations, interviews and

descriptions of a follower's ideal leader" (Bass et al., 2003, p. 208), researchers

began to provide more explicit detail in regard to the behaviors exhibited by

transformational leaders. Avolio, Bass, & Jung (1999), and Antonakis (2001),

using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Avolio and Bass

(MLQ-Form 5X; 2002) identified four separate components of transformational

leadership: Idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation,

and individualized consideration (Bass et al., 2003).

Idealized influence is constructed by both a leader's behavior as well as

the elements that a follower attributes to him/her. The follower admires, respects,

and trusts the leader as a result of the leader's consistency in behavior, high

standards of ethical and moral conduct, openness to share risk and consideration

of his/her needs before the leader's own. The leader becomes a role model that

the follower identifies with and wants to emulate attributing extraordinary

capabilities, persistence and determination to his/her leader (Bass & Riggio, 2006;

Bass et al., 2003). Important to the transformational leader's role is the

development of a shared vision, which encourages the follower to consider an

attractive future state. Personal values and interests are aligned with those of the collective, which result in an acceptance of the group's ultimate purpose.

The behavior of the transformational leader motivates and inspires his/her followers by providing challenge and meaning to their work. He/she displays enthusiasm and optimism while arousing both individual and team spirit. "Leaders get followers involved in envisioning attractive future states which they ultimately can envision for themselves" (Bass et al., 2003, p. 208). Expectations are communicated clearly and followers are intrinsically motivated to meet them. The transformational leader also demonstrates a commitment to the goals and the shared vision of the group. These behaviors comprise the inspirational motivation component of transformational leadership, which, when combined with idealized influence, is known as charismatic-inspirational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al., 2003).

The third component is intellectual stimulation. A transformational leader encourages his/her followers to come up with creative and/or alternative ways to solve problems without fear of individual or public criticism if they differ from his/her own views. He/she stimulates his/her "follower's to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways" (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 7). These alternate solutions are solicited from the followers who are included in the process of finding solutions and addressing problems (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al, 2003).

Finally, individualized consideration is displayed through a leader's attention to the individual needs of each follower. He/she acts as a coach and/or

mentor in an effort to contribute to the follower's need for growth or achievement with an emphasis on developing individuals to successively higher levels of potential. Followers are not judged based on their individual differences and are treated in a way that is reflective of these differences or, in other words, a way that might be different from person to person. For example, some may require more encouragement, some more strict standards, some more autonomy and some an increased amount of encouragement (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Two-way communication is encouraged through effective listening and seeking the opinions and thoughts of each follower. The leader looks for opportunities to engage followers on a more personal level, demonstrating that he/she has concern for them as people. The leader assigns tasks and monitors his/her followers' progress within these roles in order to provide additional direction and support where required without making them feel that they are being micromanaged (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass et al, 2003).

Since Bass (1985) advanced Burns' original theory, transformational leadership has received significant attention from researchers keen on adding support to the theory (Arthur, Woodman, Ong, & Hardy, 2011; Bass et al, 2003; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Hater & Bass, 1988; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Seltzer & Bass, 1990; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004), substance to the theoretical structure (Mandell & Pherwani, 2003; Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Milner, 2002), and/or explanations as to how, why and to what degree a transformational leader's behaviors have an effect on his/her followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005; Shin

& Zhou, 2012; Charbonneau, Barling, & Kelloway; 2001). In addition, various fields have been represented in the literature over the last two decades, primarily the areas of business, military, health care, and education (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Research pertaining to transformational leadership in the area of sport and, more specifically, the discipline of coaching is less evident (Rowald, 2006). Rowald states that, "Given the high impact transformational leadership has on important outcomes such as performance and followers' satisfaction, the limited numbers of empirical research (in sport) studies is surprising" (2006, p. 315).

More recently, sport research has begun to increase its focus on leadership in the areas of sport management and coaching. Current literature supports the effectiveness of the transformational model as it relates to sport leadership. Davis (2002) found a significant association between National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) coaches' perceived levels of job satisfaction and perception that their athletic directors exhibited transformational behaviors. In their review of the literature on transformational leadership, organizational culture, and organizational effectiveness, Lim and Cromartie (2001) stated that highly transformational leaders had a positive impact on organizational culture exhibiting behaviors that fostered culture building. Organizational culture has been linked to increased staff alignment, heightened consensus related to strategic direction, increased employee productivity and levels of commitment and, ultimately, stronger organizational effectiveness (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991; Lim & Cromartie, 2001). Hsu, Bell, and Cheng (2002) agreed but stressed that the relationship between transformational leadership and

organizational effectiveness is an indirect one. Finally, In his study of general managers and/or owners of five professional sports organizations from the MLB, NFL and NBA, Frontiera (2010) pointed to the transformational nature of these leaders and their successful efforts in transforming low performing organizations into high performing ones.

It seems that researchers agree that there is relevance for transformational leadership as it relates to the coach-athlete and coach-team relationships. In their effort to determine if intrinsic motivation acted as a mediator between coach transformational behaviors and athlete performance, Charbonneau, Barling, and Kelloway (2001) asked 168 university and college athletes competing at the NCAA level to rate their coaches' leadership styles and their own motivation at the mid-point of their seasons. They then had the same coaches rate their athletes' skill level and improvement at the end of the same season. A positive relationship was identified linking the coaches' transformational leadership behaviors to the increased performance of their athletes through intrinsic motivation (Charbonneau et al., 2001).

Vallee and Bloom (2005) performed semi-structured, open-ended interviews with five expert Canadian female university coaches employed in the Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS) league. Findings induced a conceptual model of coaching that identifies four main categories common to expert coaches and their efforts to develop and/or maintain consistent high performance in their respective programs: vision (goals, direction and coaching philosophy), individual growth (life skills and empowerment), organizational skills (planning,

management and administration), and coaches' attributes (coaches' commitment to learning and coaches' characteristics) (Vallee & Bloom, 2005). In the same article, Vallee and Bloom (2005) admitted that their model very strongly resembled the transformational leadership model.

In 2006, Chelladurai altered his multi-dimensional model to include transformational leadership theory at the organizational level (e.g., teams sports such as hockey where a coach oversees other coaches who have specialized responsibilities with athletes), and at the coach-athlete dyad level. In a hierarchal setting, transformational leadership was hypothesized to indirectly influence required behavior, actual behavior, and preferred behavior levels of the model through a direct effect on the three antecedents: setting characteristics, member characteristics, and leader characteristics. Similarly, transformational characteristics of the coach will directly shape both situational and member characteristics ultimately having an indirect effect on both required behavior and preferred behavior while having a direct influence on his/her own behavior with the athlete.

Summary

A number of leadership theories have existed. Research in leader effectiveness has evolved from considering primarily trait and behavioral qualities to including contextual factors present within the situation. This trend has been reflected in sport coaching leadership theory. Transformational leadership is a relatively recent model that is thought to enhance follower satisfaction and commitment to the organization while moving them to exceed expected

performance levels (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006). It may prove to be a

useful framework for studying the influence of Clare Drake, who appears to have

demonstrated similar outcomes with the players and teams that he has led.

Chapter 3

Methods

Research Paradigm

Markula and Silk (2011) point to the importance of selecting a paradigmatic approach that best reflects a study's purpose. "Paradigms provide the orientations towards how researchers see the world (ontology), and the various judgments about knowledge and how to gain it (epistemology)" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 24). It is these assumptions that will guide navigation through research methodology and, ultimately, method selection and dissemination of knowledge to be discovered, supported, or disproven.

This study will pull from the humanistic interpretive paradigm that considers all knowledge to be subjective (Markula, 2011). "The interpretive researcher's main aim is to understand the participant's subjective experiences and through these experiences, interpret the participant's meanings" (p. 34). The ontological perspective of the interpretive paradigm asserts that one or more meaning(s) or reality(s) provide one truth.

The study will draw from the interpretations of multiple participants and the individual meanings that they attribute to Clare Drake's coaching behaviors. The hope is that this knowledge will help inform further research in the area of coaching effectiveness.

Case Studies

The focus of a case study is on an object such as a person or program that can be bounded in time and activity (Creswell, 2003; Mayan, 2009; Stake, 1995).

Its' purpose is to understand *the case*, its individual complexities and the contexts that influence it (Markula & Silk, 2011; Stake, 1995). Case studies can draw from qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methodologies (Creswell, 2003), however, as the sample size is operationally quite small, they are not often used to form generalizations such as is common in traditional quantitative research (Stake, 1995).

More fittingly, case studies are qualitative in nature. With the primary purpose of maximizing what can be learned from the case, the researcher observes, interviews, and/or analyzes written documentation on the subject to obtain knowledge that is both rich and deep in understanding (Creswell, 2003; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995). The traditional empirical practice of controlling variables to prove or disprove hypothesized truths limits what can be known of the case or its environment (Markula & Silk, 2011; Stake, 1995). For this reason, the qualitative researcher, to varying degrees, frees the subject to lead the inquiry so that unforeseen meanings might be revealed.

To help guide the selection of methods to be used in qualitative case study, Stake (1995) identifies three designs: intrinsic, instrumental and collective. An intrinsic case study bares the intent of understanding a specific case because "we have an intrinsic interest in the case" (Stake, 1995, p. 2). Markula & Silk (2011) identify examples such as "an athlete, fitness centre, coaching session, fitness class, sport club, sport organization,…almost anything that is a specific case…" (p. 156). When one case is examined in an effort to understand an entity that is external to it, an instrumental case study is utilized. A collective case study

considers a number of cases that together prove instrumental to learning about something beyond the cases themselves. As Stake (1995) suggests, the more intrinsic the case study, the more the researcher determines and pursues issues critical to the case (p. 4).

My interests lie in the personal and professional traits and behaviors displayed by Coach Clare Drake that may have been transformational and the prevailing coaching style he used prior to his retirement. The study then will take the form of an intrinsic case study as, "…it is not undertaken primarily because the case represents other cases or because it illustrates a particular trait or problem, but because, in all its particularity *and* ordinariness, this case itself is of interest" (Stake, 2003, p. 136). This exploration will hopefully contribute to the greater understanding of coaching effectiveness, however, the primary intent of this study is to better understand Coach Drake's transformational behavior and specific influence.

Case studies in sport.

Qualitative case study in sport science research has been used primarily in the area of sport management (Markula & Silk, 2011). However, more recent literature indicates an increasing attempt to better understand the psychological constructs that affect athletes, coaches, or team development by closely examining the lived experience of the individual. For example, using the perspectives of three interrelated cases - an elite Australian Rules Football player, a therapist, and his supervisor - Thompson and Anderson (2012) described the season long journey and subsequent benefit of moving from a traditional

cognitive-behavioral intervention technique to one that employs Buddhist psychotherapy methodology. In another article, sport psychologist, Heil (2012), interpreted his own personal experience with pain stemming from an injury as a long distance athlete performing in Division 1 college athletics in the US 20 years earlier. Heil is able to provide a unique perspective detailing his biological, physiological, and psychological sensations experienced from the moment his injury is incurred through the course of treatment that he receives in the several hours that follow.   In his words, "Because this is a personal account reported by a professional, it offers a relatively unique blending of perspectives and bridges the gap between observer and athlete" (p. 541).

Case studies in coaching.

Studies such as Heil (2012) and Thompson and Anderson (2012) examine the nature of social psychological phenomena more holistically than traditional empirical study. Though limited in generalizability, the case researcher's practice of describing the case in its entirety helps the reader understand the complexities at work within. Further, the interpretive viewpoint taken by the researcher gives the reader the freedom to interpret his/her own meaning from the data presented (Stake, 2003) that might be most applicable to his/her personal coaching environment.

This notion underpins the necessity for qualitative case study in the area of coaching. As has been demonstrated, literature in the area of sport coaching has come to consider more intently the significance that contextual variables have on coaching effectiveness. The complexities that exist within the coach-athlete

relationship may be too vast and too varied to be examined via quantitative methodology that seeks to observe behavior of a three-dimensional nature through a one-dimensional lens.

Early studies in the coaching realm have focused on identifying and/or quantifying coaching traits (Penman, Hastad, & Cords, 1974; Stodgill, 1948), behaviors (Bloom, Crumpton & Anderson, 1999; Danielson, Zelhart, & Drake, 1976; Mudra, 1965; Swartz, 1973; Tharp & Gallimore, 1976), and more recently, situational (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; House, 1971; Smoll & Smith, 1989) variables with the purpose of supporting or refuting theorized leadership models and/or demonstrating the relationships that multitudes of antecedents, mediators, or modifiers, might have on leadership effectiveness.

More recently a number of researchers have turned to qualitative study to explore various dimensions of effective coaching. Though relatively small in number, there are, however, a few case studies of coaches. Lorimer and Holland-Smith (2012), for example, examined a high-level climbing/kayaking coach using an inductive thematic analysis with the intrinsic intent of learning the influences that served to initiate and maintain his involvement in coaching. They utilized a biographical research paradigm, otherwise known as narrative research (Patton, 2002), or life-story (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2003), to explore their case's subjective reality with the purpose of "identifying and understanding the integration, connection and movement between the past, present and future, and the various patterns, decisions and turning points that have shaped [its] individual

narratives" (Lorimer & Holland, 2012, p. 573). The study identified a coach's formative experiences with key individuals (parents, uncle, and school teacher) throughout his life as making significant motivational contributions toward his participation and coaching in outdoor adventure activity.

Another recent article explored the cases of two elite female athletes who left their sports early due to demotivation circumstances attributed to coach inexperience, number of coaches influencing them over their careers, sociolinguistic issues, and communication variances from coach to coach (Kristiansen, Tomten, Hanstad & Roberts, 2012). This collective case study used both in-depth interviews and a focus group interview with the intent of learning more about issues related to coaching, coach education, and the development of female athletes. Kristianson et al.'s work underlined the importance of healthy interpersonal communication patterns between coaches and their athletes and their effect on athlete motivation.

Though examples are evident within the extant literature, it is clear that more qualitative research is necessary. As Flyvberg (2006) notes, "A scientific discipline without a large number of thoroughly executed case studies is a discipline without systematic production of exemplars, and a discipline without exemplars is an ineffective one" (p. 219). More particularly, case study research that considers exemplary coaches may provide important insights for sport psychologists and, indeed, coaches looking to enhance their own leadership behavior within their individual contexts.

Clare Drake as a case study.

Clare Drake was selected for this study because he is an exemplary coach. In 1985, he earned the distinction of becoming the 'winningest' coach in amateur hockey at any level with 697 wins in 1030 games for a winning percentage of .695. Only two men have surpassed that record since that time, the most recent in 2012. He led his University of Alberta men's teams to six national championships and 17 conference championships. As head coach of both the men's hockey and men's football teams in 1967-68 season, he led his teams to gold in both sports. He was honored by his coaching peers as league coach of the year two times at the national level and four times in his conference. As coach of five separate Canadian national teams (three FISU Games, one Olympic Games, and one Spengler Cup) he has helped lead his players to two gold medals, one silver medal, and one bronze.

Coach Drake is also highly respected as an innovator and teacher of technical, tactical, and coaching principles in hockey. The following excerpt exemplifies the respect that he holds in the North American hockey community:

> Clare Drake stands alone as the "dean" of Canadian intercollegiate hockey coaches. The Canadian Interuniversity Rookie of the Year Award bears his name and Hockey Canada's first National Coaching Certification Program, based extensively on his written coaching philosophy, bears his imprint (Johnston & Walter, 2007, p. 95).

Most recently, he was appointed as a member of the Order of Canada, which is among the highest civilian honors in the country, recognizing a lifetime of outstanding achievement, and dedication to community and service to the nation.

For these reasons, Clare Drake provides a strong case to be explored. Stake (1995) suggests that in order to get the richest data, cases should not be selected based on their typicality, as small samplings will not be effectively generalized to the larger population. Rather, cases should be selected in order to maximize what can be learned of the phenomenon in consideration with the hope of illustrating "matters we overlook in typical cases" (p. 4). Clare Drake presents a unique representative of the coaching domain due to his exceptional success as a hockey coach at the university and elite amateur levels. It is hoped that an in-depth exploration of his qualities and coaching style might ultimately help to inform our understanding of coaching effectiveness.

The Current Case and Theory

Qualitative inquiry is commonly conducted outside of predetermined frameworks or theories in favor of capturing new and potentially distinct themes that might emerge through the research process (Mayan, 2009). In the preclusion of preexisting theoretical conceptualizations, qualitative researchers hope to ensure the relevance and validity of their findings (Sandelowski, 1993). Sandelowski (1993), however, argues that theory may enter qualitative research in one or more points within the qualitative process to "set the scene for a study, to justify the focus of and/or the techniques used to conduct the study, and to organize, analyze, interpret, and/or provide a context for the data" (p. 214) that are collected and reconstructed. She goes on to assert that researchers enter a research project with the perspectives of their discipline and related theoretical orientations. Similarly, Markula and Silk (2011) support a need for researchers to

be aware of the theoretical assumptions on which the research purpose is based. In their words, "Even a descriptive, intrinsic case study is done for a purpose and, thus, the researcher cannot avoid articulation with a theoretical position and paradigmatic inclination underpinning the research project" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 157).

Clare Drake is an exemplary case to study because of the high degree of success that he and his teams displayed over the years that he coached as well as the enduring influence that he has had on the Golden Bears Program and the general hockey community. Though a number of variables may have contributed to the Golden Bears' achievements during his tenure, one of the more salient features that he possessed was the ability to lead his players to perform beyond expectations – an outcome of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). Interestingly, this theory appears to be congruent with both my own experience and interpretation of the behaviors demonstrated by Coach Drake, as well as the *exceptional* performances achieved by those that he led. In line with Sandelowski's (1993) assertions provided earlier in this section, transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985) presents a practical model in which to frame this study. The following section will outline the procedures used to collect data.

Procedures

Data collection.

Stake (1995) identifies three possible sources of data collection most relevant to the case study: observation, interview, and written documentation. He asserts, however, that data gathering "begins before there is commitment to do the

study: back-grounding, acquaintance with other cases, first impressions…Many of these early impressions will later be refined or replaced, but the pool of data includes the earliest of impressions" (p. 49). In many respects, I began gathering data upon first joining the Golden Bears. Unwittingly of course, as it would not be possible to foresee eventual employment at the University of Alberta as a hockey coach embarking on a masters thesis focused on Clare Drake as a case study. But as an athlete in his program, I had the opportunity to reflect on observations and experience his style from the perspectives of a newcomer, a veteran player and assistant captain, as well as a coach mentee.

Observation.

According to Stake (1995), observations lead to greater understandings of the case. Mayan (2009) provides four types of observer roles (complete observer, observer as a participant, participant as an observer, and complete participant) that may be placed on a continuum moving from those that might be considered "outsiders" to those considered to be "insiders" (p. 80). She further asserts that insiders have the benefit of familiarity and, therefore might be able to gather information that an outsider might not be privy to. I was able to observe Coach Drake from a variety of perspectives within the Golden Bear culture: as a new player coming into the program, a non-captain for three years, and as a captain in my fourth year. Additionally, I had the opportunity to have him as a mentor upon graduating and joining the coaching community. In essence, I had lived the experience of having Clare Drake as a coach for four seasons, and as a mentor for over 20 years; a benefit that should help provide insight into Clare Drake that

might not be obtainable by those outside of the Golden Bear culture. My observations may be compared with those of other former Golden Bears to add validity to the interpretations made about Clare Drake's coaching behavior.

Written documentation.

A third source of data collection included written documentation that consisted of a biographical account of Clare Drake (Drager, 2007), two published books that included philosophical and practical information shared by him (Johnston & Walter, 2007; Salmela, 1996), and the 'toughness list' (see Appendix F) which consisted of team expectations created by staff and players. Drager's (2007) biography provided historical and contextual information collected through primary source interviews as well as additional sources of written documentation. His biography also served to provide further interpretations of the case and the cultural perspective within which Coach Drake was situated (Markula & Silk, 2011). The remaining documentation was drawn from Johnston and Walter (2007) and Salmela (1996) both of which reported open-ended interviews with coaches. These publications provided further information with respect to Clare Drake and the values, beliefs and assumptions that help to define the Golden Bear organizational culture.

Interviews: Clare Drake.

Clare Drake and his coaching style, qualities, and/or behaviors represent the essence of what is being explored in this case study, particularly those that might be congruent with Bass' (1985) transformational leadership theory. To begin the data collection segment of the study, three informal conversational

interviews were conducted with the purpose of offering maximum flexibility to pursue emergent themes within the area of Coach Drake's coaching philosophies and practices (Patton, 2002). This interview method was also used to help maintain the friendly intimacy between him and I, given that a long-standing, ongoing relationship existed between us. Notes were taken during the conversations and an electronic recording device was utilized with the participant's approval. Information gathered was later reviewed and responses were considered with the intent of revisiting or deepening the discussion of topics in subsequent interviews (Patton, 2002).

Potential topics for discussion were determined prior to each interview (see Appendix C). These topics consisted of themes adopted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-form 5X) (Avolio & Bass, 2002) with primary focus on the transformational theory components of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

A fourth interview was conducted with Coach Drake the following year, after eight interviews had been performed with separate men that played for him during his tenure at the U of A (see 'Secondary participants' section below). The nature of this interview was slightly different than the previous three. A semi-structured interview guide (provided in Appendix D) comprising open-ended questions was used with the intent of more in-depth examination of themes that emerged from his original interviews, the interviews of the eight secondary participants, and the theoretical constructs reviewed in the literature (Markula &

Silk, 2011). This interview guide was comparable to that of the secondary

participants. All interviews with Clare Drake ranged from 60 to 90 minutes, and

took place in his home. Interview days and times were arranged via telephone

from one to seven days in advance of the meetings.

Interview guide – secondary participants.

A semi-structured interview guide was used in the secondary participants'

as well as Clare Drake's final interview. This interview format allowed me "to be

an active participant in the interview situation and 'probe' further information or

discuss issues that [emerged] during the interview situation" (Markula & Silk,

2011, p. 85) while ensuring that desired information would be collected given the

time constraints presented (Patton, 2002). As mentioned earlier, questions for the

secondary participants were developed that captured some of the concepts

emerging from the first three conversational interviews with Clare Drake (e.g.,

Were you or any individuals on your team singled out for critique?). I then

categorized such questions into one of the four general components of

transformational leadership theory: idealized influence, inspirational motivation,

intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Additional questions

added were adapted from Avolio and Bass (2002) Multifactor Leadership

Questionnaire (form 5X) to further investigate the transformational qualities of

Clare Drake in each of the four transformational categories (e.g., Do you feel that

Coach Drake took into consideration your individual needs as a player and/or

person or did he treat everyone the same?).

Interviews began informally to "catch up" with each secondary

participant, as previous relationships had already been established. I then

introduced the topic and how the information gathered would be used. The intent

in both instances was to "put both the interviewer and the participant at ease"

(Mayan, 2009, p. 68) and reestablish rapport. Thanking the participants for their

time and insight concluded the interviews along with a request for permission for

future contact should further information and/or clarification be required (Mayan,

2009).

The essential content of the interview guide for the secondary participants

(provided in Appendix E) and Clare Drake (provided in Appendix D) were as

follows. The first five questions of the interview guide consisted of relatively

simple questions designed to gather contextual information while displaying

interest in the participants and the information they were about to provide

(Mayan, 2009). These questions also served to help reorient the participant into

the context of interest (Patton, 2002) (e.g., How did you come to play hockey at

the University of Alberta?). Idealized influence and inspirational motivation

consisted of seven questions each, while four questions were prepared for

intellectual stimulation and six for individualized consideration. As noted,

however, this portion of the interview guide may have been altered dependent on

the participant being interviewed (i.e., player versus captain, captain versus

assistant coach) or to draw deeper meaning out of issues arising during a specific

interview or from previous interviews. Two open-ended questions were added to

the end of the interview guide to allow for further information that might emerge

63

(e.g., Is there anything else that you'd like to touch on that might give me an idea as to what the experience was like playing [or coaching] under Coach Drake?).

Two members of my supervisory committee as well as an additional faculty member well versed in the area of leadership theory reviewed the original interview guide. A pilot interview (Markula & Silk, 2011; Patton, 2002) was then conducted with a fellow coach who also had the opportunity to play under Clare Drake. No changes were made in either case.

Sample selection - secondary participants.

Stake (1995) indicates, "much of what we cannot observe for ourselves has been or is being observed by others" (p. 64). As my time as a player with Coach Drake was limited to a four-year period that culminated in his retirement in the spring of 1989, secondary participants were selected to provide insight into his behavior that would have been observed in the years preceding mine as a Golden Bear (see 'Sample' section).

Secondary interview participants played under him for periods ranging from 1 to 5 years, typically within one of three 10-year eras (1959-1968; 1669-1978; 1979-1989). Four of these participants became captains in their time with the Bears, and five eventually acted as assistant coaches under Clare Drake for periods ranging from 1 to 11 years.

In line with current literature on qualitative research methodology, these participants constituted a purposeful sample. Markula and Silk (2011) state, "In qualitative research, samples are selected, not randomly to ensure objectivity as in quantitative research, but purposefully to seek answers to a specific research

question" (p. 93). To best understand Clare Drake and his style of leadership it was determined that interview participants must have played for him.

Further, Mayan (2009) states, "the aim in qualitative sampling…is to understand the phenomenon of interest in-depth" (p. 61), while Patton (2002) stresses the importance of finding "information rich" (p. 46) cases to best learn about issues of central importance. In line with this thinking, I made the assumption that those who helped Clare Drake lead the team might bring more depth and richness to the case (Markula & Silk, 2011; Mayan, 2009; Patton, 2002), specifically as it relates to his personal characteristics and leadership behavior. His captains and/or assistant coaches would have had the opportunity to experience the case on three levels of leader-follower engagement (as players, captains, and coaches) thereby offering significantly greater depth to the data.

The majority of Clare Drake's follower accounts are positive. This is known to be the case based on my past and present interactions with many Golden Bears players and program graduates. Further, current membership in the larger coaching community has provided the opportunity to interact with a number of coaches that attribute significant respect to Coach Drake for the influence that he has had on them, and the sport in general. In addition, published documentation referenced in this paper (Drager, 2007; Johnston & Walter, 2007, Salmela, 1996) suggests a positive influence on those that he coached. It is reasonable to assume, however, that atypical cases exist or that some of those he coached were not satisfied with his coaching style. In this light, two players considered representative of this group were selected for inclusion in the sample. I knew

these players and I was aware of their dissatisfaction with Clare Drake as a coach. This "deviant case sampling" (Patton, 2002, p. 243) provides further clarity and depth as it relates to the case of Clare Drake and his leadership behavior.

All participants were previously known to me and selected based on my prior knowledge of their having played for Clare Drake, having acted as a captain under him, having coached with him, and/or having had an experience that might be considered unsatisfactory relative to the accepted norm. Following are descriptions for the secondary participants. *Participants (P)* are classified as *supporters (S),* those who had a positive experience under Clare Drake or, *dissenters (D),* those who had a negative experience. In order to protect the anonymity of the secondary participants, playing years have been classified into eras: 1959-68, 1969-78 and 1979-89.

P1-S
- Current age of participant – 53 years
- Current occupation – coach
- Playing era – 1979-1989
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 5
- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 3
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 2
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 1

P2-S
- Current age of participant – 54 years
- Current occupation – business
- Playing era – 1969-1978
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 3
- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 3
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 2
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 2

P3-S
- Current age of participant – 70 years
- Current occupation –business
- Playing era – 1959-1968
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 5

- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 5
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 2
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 5

P4-S

- Current age of participant – 57 years
- Current occupation – coach
- Playing era – 1969-1978
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 4
- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 4
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 2
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 1

P5-S

- Current age of participant – 64 years
- Current occupation – coach
- Playing era – 1969-1978
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 1
- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 1
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 0
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 11

P6-S

- Current age of participant – 59 years
- Current occupation – business
- Playing era – 1969-1978
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 4
- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 4
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 1
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 0

P7-D

- Current age of participant – 51 years
- Current occupation – business
- Playing era – 1979-1989
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 2.5
- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 1.5
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 0
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 0

P8-D

- Current age of participant – 49 years
- Current occupation – construction
- Playing era – 1979-1989
- Number of seasons with Golden Bears – 5
- Season(s) as a player under Clare Drake – 4
- Years as captain or assistant captain – 0
- Year(s) as an assistant coach under Clare Drake – 0

All secondary interview participants were contacted separately via email explaining the purpose of the study and were asked to take part. All eight responded in the affirmative, at which time contact was made over the phone with the intent of providing further information where necessary, as well as determining a meeting time and place to conduct the interview. Interview durations varied between 60 to 120 minutes.

Ethical considerations.

All study procedures were approved by a University Research Ethics Board (Notification of Approval included in Appendix F). In line with ethical principles presented by Markula & Silk (2011, p. 14), study participants were presented with an informed consent document prior to their interviews outlining the purpose of the study, information related to the interview process, use and storage of data, possible risks/benefits incurred through their participation, and their rights as voluntary participants. Final results, interpretations, and discussions were provided to the participants to ensure that their individual meanings were captured as they had intended.

Analysis

For the purpose of data analysis, the generic steps proposed by Creswell (2003) for qualitative study were adopted. His steps include the interpretation and presentation of data and as follows: (1) organize and prepare data, (2) read through all the data, (3) detailed analysis with coding, (4) use of coding to describe the setting or people as well as categories or themes, (5) advance how the description and themes will be represented in the narrative, and (6) make

interpretation or meaning of the data (p. 191). For the purpose of this section, steps one through four will be discussed.

Researchers often recommend that the researcher transcribe his/her own data (Markula & Silk, 2011; Mayan, 2009; Patton, 1995) although Mayan (2009) alludes to the necessity at times to use other means such as a hired transcriber. With time as a limiting factor, I was able to transcribe 7 of 12 interviews independently and left the remaining 5 to a transcriber. All transcriptions were performed verbatim (Markula & Silk, 2011; Patton, 2002) and a confidentiality agreement was completed with the owner of the transcribing company prior to turning over data files.

All data were reviewed twice with the intent of becoming familiar with the information and to begin to identify potential meanings, patterns, or thoughts for more consideration. Notes were written in the margins for the purpose of future reference and possible interpretations (Creswell, 2003; Mayan, 2009). A more detailed analysis was then performed that included a coding process.

Categories were selected to help organize data collection and coding. This process is supported by Stake (1995) as he indicates, "The main decisions as to what to look for, thus the coding categories, and the potential correspondences, will usually be made before data are collected" (p. 84). The categories used for this study were drawn from transformational leadership theory (i.e., individualized consideration, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation) (Bass, 1985). This theoretical model was selected due in part to the relevance that it has to the case, and because its constructs can be

related in some manner to all current theories in the leadership area. The first

stage of coding therefore was to highlight the data that fit into these four

categories.

Emerging themes were then highlighted within each of these categories.

Stake (1995) suggests that, while coding, the researcher searches for patterns or

consistencies within certain conditions. As the intent was to explore the essence

of Clare Drake and his coaching style, commonalities were sought among

interpretations shared by him, his followers, and the researcher. Stake also offers,

> Often, the patterns will be known in advance, drawn from the research
> questions, serving as a template for the analysis. Sometimes, the patterns
> will emerge unexpectedly from the analysis" (p. 78).

Though the components of transformational leadership were used in part to help

categorize the line of inquiry, I endeavored to remain open to the multiple

perspectives provided by the participants with the intent of capturing emerging

themes specific to Clare Drake's leadership (Creswell, 2003; Stake, 1995) that

were not consistent with the transformational leadership model categories. A

final coding stage involved the creation of subcategories to further separate out

the "distinct ideas or perspectives within one category" (Mayan, 2009, p. 95).

Chapter 4

Results

As has been mentioned, Clare Drake may have displayed characteristics typical of Bass' (1985) transformational leadership model. This section will explore the extent to which he was indeed transformational.

Transformational Leadership

Bass and Riggio (2006) state that transformational leaders employ one or more of the four main components of transformational leadership theory to achieve superior results by their followers: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. It may be that behavior similar to these contributed to the extraordinary success of CD's Golden Bear teams and to the significant influence that he had on the sport of hockey at all levels. This section will identify characteristics of Coach Drake's leadership style that may or may not reflect those typical of transformational leaders.

Idealized influence (II).

The component of idealized influence, where followers want to emulate leaders they trust, admire and respect, is key to transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In essence, the leaders "behave in ways that allow them to serve as role models for their followers" (p. 6). The data collected from the players and coaches that worked under Clare Drake strongly suggest that he displayed behaviors and qualities typical of II. Data were examined in categories relative to the following II attributes: charismatic behavior, extraordinary capabilities, moral/ethical behavior and leader as a role model.

Charismatic personality.

According to Webster's Dictionary, charisma can be defined as:

1) a personal magic of leadership arousing special popular loyalty or enthusiasm for a public figure (such as a political leader), or
2) a special magnetic charm or appeal.

In other words, charisma is an intangible quality that draws people to the person that exhibits it. Despite varied interpretations of what *charisma* is, all but two of the players and coaches interviewed felt that he exhibited qualities that might be considered charismatic. Those interviewed used terms such as "attraction," "magnetism," "commanded attention," and "his knowledge took us over" suggesting that CD did indeed have some qualities that might be considered charismatic.

CD's response below would suggest that there was no purposeful intent to behave in a charismatic way as well as uncertainty as to whether his followers found him to be charismatic or not.

CD   It's hard for me to say if I was charismatic. I don't know. I hope so. I hope there was, uh, some part of that. You know, I think that they're not drawn so much to me as to the program and the chance to be with a winning environment or whatever.

CD felt that players were more attracted to the success that the program had demonstrated rather than to him directly which certainly might be the case. In addition this finding points to humility in that he deflects his success to the institution in which he is situated, a finding discussed later in this section.

Extraordinary capabilities.

The data strongly supports that CD's players and coaches attributed extraordinary capabilities, persistence and determination to him. Most comments

of this nature focused on his superior knowledge of hockey and his ability to

transfer this knowledge to his players:

P7-D   You know, coach Drake is a hockey person, has a hockey mind of stuff
        that he gets credit for no question. I mean the guy, you know, we have
        lived, breathed, and clearly delivered uh with respect to the team's
        performance. So you know, for the game, for the preparation, for practice
        I mean, you know, stood out by far

Another player suggests that players were, at first, compelled to follow CD

because of this knowledge and the success that his teams had achieved previously.

P2-S   He gets a lot of opportunity to[pass on his knowledge] because he's got,
        at that point he had such a reputation, right? So you give him a lot of
        slack 'cause you're rookies. 'Not quite sure what he means there but I'm
        sure he's got a plan, right?'

        In the excerpt that follows, CD seems to agree with this participant's view

that players were likely drawn to the success of the program first and were

compelled to follow him based on this success.

CD   I think if you're involved with people that generate an aura of
        success…like if they've built up a program or a style or a system or a
        philosophy that you find, or that a person finds amenable to their own
        philosophy or it maybe changes their philosophy that's probably
        something that would lead you to believe that this is something that you,
        "…this is probably a good thing. This person has something going here
        and why don't I follow it for awhile or watch it and see what happens and
        if there is something that seems to be, to generate success or generate
        leadership qualities or whatever you want to talk about, then maybe it's
        something worthwhile noting in this kind of a setting."

        Once again, it is evident that CD believes that players were compelled to

follow him more for the program's achievements rather than is own. That he

seems to separate the program's success from that of his own is interesting in that

the two are effectively inseparable. It would be naïve to think that he did not have

a significant influence on the players and teams that he coached at some level given that the program's success was realized during his time.

Moral/ethical behavior.

Transformational leaders that display II are trusted by their followers to do the right thing. High standards of moral and ethical conduct are modeled, and in the desire to emulate the leader, follower commitment to the goals and/or vision of the group are increased (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Most of Coach Drake's players appeared to support the notion that he showed high standards of ethical and moral conduct and, therefore, provided a strong ethical and moral model for his players to follow. For example:

P5-S   He was such a great example because I don't want to win if I'm not doing it fairly. It's not good for your athletes, it's not good for yourself and for me and, even at the NHL level, I want to win in a fair way. And that comes from him.

Leader as a role model.

Indicative of II, through such modeling of positive moral behavior and commitment to the values of the group or organization, leaders create an environment that encourages followers to align their own values and morals with those of the organization (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The data very strongly support the notion that CD acted with integrity or that his actions matched his words. CD's comments indicate that he was aware of the importance of modeling that which he espoused and therefore acted accordingly. Furthermore, players felt that there might have been an influence on their own core values. Perhaps more specifically, the environment that he created helped to nurture values already in place for the most part.

P6-S   I think the Bears' values more aligned with mine when I first got there. I came from a background of very hard work and, uh, and respect and, uh, so I think that, you know, our values as an 18-year-old aligned well. I think that, uh, he just helped 'em enter, uh, a lot of pretty solid values that already, you know had instilled.

With respect to having an influence on his players' values, once again CD indicates that he felt this process to be important.

CD   If I had influenced them? I really hope so and if I were to guess, I'd have to say 'yes'. Uh, I think I'm talking to former players and spending social time with former players and that…you can recognize the fact that you did have an influence…the influence for them to follow the guidelines that we set, you know, some of those things that were in the guidelines.

Inspirational Motivation (IM).

"Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their follower's work" (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 7) through the articulation of a compelling vision of the future, high expectations and clearly communicated, meaningful roles. When demonstrated by the transformational leader, IM behaviors help to create commitment and motivation toward the cause of the collective good (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Zohar, 2002). They also serve to arouse team spirit through the leader's demonstration of optimism and enthusiasm.

Consideration of inspirational motivation was divided into six separate categories: articulating a vision, meaningful roles, challenging followers, optimism/enthusiasm, arousing team spirit, motivating followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Articulating a shared vision.

A large factor contributing to IM is a leader's ability to develop and articulate a shared vision, which ultimately encourages the follower to consider an attractive future state (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Though it appears that the players felt that CD had a vision, there was little support in the data for CD explicitly communicating what it was.

P8-D   Oh, yeah. No I think he had a, he had a vision, he, um, I think he, you know, he thought things out of course, you know, um, I wouldn't say that he would necessarily tell you what his vision was, or express that to you, but you know, you always had a sense of direction, you know? I wouldn't say that it was a win at all costs but I, I would say that there was the ultimate goal, right, was to win.

The data suggests strongly that the vision under CD was to win hockey games and, ultimately, a National Championship. Interestingly, this did not seem to be communicated directly by CD at any point throughout the players' careers. More so, it appears that this vision of success was implicitly communicated within the culture of the Golden Bear Hockey Program itself.

P6-S   But I don't think he'd…we never had meetings where he said at the beginning of the year, 'say, look, here it is'. Um, it was just that the program was so wrought with tradition…I think there was a vision that was just, it was there. I mean, you just had to live up to the expectations of the program, you know?

It may be that veteran players perpetuated this vision of success, which was then embraced and internalized by new recruits.

P4-S   It [the vision] was passed a little bit through them [veteran players] and then it was just, you know, sort of through the things that, you know, I guess through the code of vision I guess, being that your vision was to win everything.

Whether explicit or implicit, his players were correct in their perception that at least part of CD's vision was to be successful from an outcome perspective as his comment below might suggest.

CD   I think each season you look at the group that you're gonna have with you, the returning players and the incoming players, and you kinda set your vision. Your vision's almost always to be successful in your league and hopefully advance to playoffs and that sort of thing.

CD seemed to weave aspects of what he expected of his players and his values into his vision. The players indicate quite clearly that there were often messages regarding the values and expectations that he expected the players to adhere to. CD's comment below supports this.

CD   I think you communicate the visions with the players when you outline your team philosophy about these things. You know, "we wanna do certain things a certain way and be good in this area and be consistent and hardworking and all those things."

Providing meaningful roles.

The transformational leader who demonstrates IM links followers' work roles to a compelling vision for the organization, making their work more meaningful and thereby increasing the followers' intrinsic motivation potential (Zhu, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2009). Bass and Riggio (2006), state that one of the behaviors typical of IM is the provision of meaning and challenge to followers' work. Wang et al. (2005) suggest that those who are intrinsically motivated to fulfill a collective vision may be more inclined to go above and beyond their assigned roles to help the workplace achieve it's goals – therefore increasing the likelihood that the group will perform above expectations.

In the game of hockey, roles are assigned to an individual or unit of players relative to the position that they play (goalie, defenseman, or forward) and/or the skill sets that they possess. Examples of traditional roles assigned to individual players in hockey might be "goal scorer", "play maker", "energy player", "defensive specialist", "enforcer", "checker" and/or "shut down player".

In terms of small groups within the team, roles are often delineated based on the offensive potency and/or level of collective skill and/or specific traits of a 3 man unit of forwards ("first line" comprised of offensively gifted players/goal scorers/play makers through the "fourth line" which usually is comprised of either players that are defensive specialists or those that possess a lesser degree of individual and/or collective skill). The individual and/or group's ability to execute its respective role is often associated with the success of the team as a whole, which may, in turn, give meaning or purpose to those individuals and/or units assigned to the varying roles.

Beyond the positions that they played, CD's players suggest that there was no explicit articulation of what their traditional hockey roles were as members of the team. Players seemed to feel that he might have had an idea as to what roles they might best fill, though this was communicated by the game situations that he utilized rather than through explicit communication

As CD indicates below, his intent was not to give specific roles to players as he felt that this might limit their development. The player comment that follows corroborates this intent.

CD   But we never did as much, uh, we didn't have, uh…like I read in the paper sometimes where they've got a, you know, a "shut-down line" so-to-

speak, and a "shut-down-defense", a "puck-moving defenseman", I mean, I wanted our players to be able to do all those things. And, uh, I think that's positive for them, uh, well and I think players probably do, but, I think if you talk about those things in that capacity then players may start to feel like, you know, that they're just limited to that and they don't want to push themselves to become better. Like the ideal situation to me is to have a player as versatile as he can be and feel proficient in almost all the areas, and give them a chance to play in all areas.

P1-S   …so I don't ever remember Coach Drake or Billy in my time playing there, or even, even coaching where they ever sat down with guys and said, "OK this is your role". My guess would be that they're a little bit like me that rather than just sort of pigeon hole guys and, you know, to go overboard and define 'em goals which then becomes sort of limits. I think they would rather have, you know, [everyone] be as good as you can in every aspect of the game

In the following quote, CD further demonstrates his philosophy that all

players should play as much as possible within reason. He also indicates the

importance of ice time for the skill and psychosocial development of lesser skilled

players as well as for the spirit of the team.

CD   If you can bring those players that are perceived as being your second tier group of players…third and fourth liners and defensemen…if you can bring them along as far as you can, give them opportunities to play and develop the skills then your team is going to be successful because it's the ability of some coaches to bring that group of players that's on the lower end of the spectrum, so to-speak, bring them along then you're way ahead of the game. Plus, I think it's a very important thing for, uh, an important thing for the spirit of the team, you know. It would make the players feel a part of it.

Challenging followers.

The expectation of CD that all his players learn all aspects of the game and

contribute in all situations might have been considered a challenge for his players

to move beyond the role expectations that they held for themselves.   It is also

clear that CD's players did not feel that he was necessarily inspirational in his

presentation, or that he inspired them by giving motivational speeches as might be

imagined when considering inspirational leaders. Rather, his method of

motivating players seemed to be revealed in the degree to which he challenged

them and held them to an extremely high standard of execution. A leader who

uses IM challenges his/her followers to higher levels of performance (Bass &

Riggio, 2006). The following excerpt from the data indicates his players'

perception that this is in fact what CD did.

P5-S   He held people to a higher standard and it wasn't acceptable to not
        execute. I remember a number of times where if a guy did something
        wrong, he came to the box and it was made clear and not in a harsh way,
        but in a firm way that the guy knew, 'I better not do it again. I can't throw
        the puck to the middle there. That's all there is to it.' But you just knew,
        in practices, you had to execute things properly and that everybody was
        being helped to that higher standard. In terms of standing up in the
        dressing room and making a talk, an inspirational, emotional talk, I didn't
        see that. But his teams in almost every situation that I saw didn't need it.
        They were just so well prepared. And, it once again, it comes back to his
        expectations, his standards he set and that he was unrelenting in practice.
        You executed properly, that was all there was to it.

Further to the vision category, this comment seems to indicate that, though

winning was an important expectation that had become embedded in the program,

CD explicitly placed a very high degree of importance on the execution of the

team game plan.

   Displaying optimism and enthusiasm.

   Leaders who demonstrate IM display a high degree of enthusiasm towards

the task and optimism that the group will achieve its goals. Bass and Riggio

(2006) suggest that the transformational leader uses IM to express his/her

confidence that the team will achieve its goals, leading to higher levels of team

potency (or the group's collective belief in its ability to succeed). The data

strongly support the notion that CD was an optimistic coach, however, he may not

have been overtly enthusiastic. Following is an example of the responses

provided by his players in this category

P2-S   It never got negative and it never got overly positive and you win the
championship and it's like, "well, yeah I'm really happy but that's what
we were supposed to do you know. We lost the championship game, it's
OK well that's too bad but we'll get better." Very consistent. No highs
and lows, no negatives no real positives.

The data very strongly supported the notion that Clare Drake was

consistent in how he expressed himself emotionally. Most players indicated that

he was calm, rarely seemed to be highly stressed, very rarely raised his voice

and/or used expletives when he spoke. In this, he wouldn't have seemed overly

enthusiastic. Following is an example of the players' experiences in this category.

P7-D   I also found it, um, what I liked about it is that, um, he wasn't, uh, and
again, I think this, this speaks to his understanding, is that he wasn't a kick
the can kind guy. So when he did, I mean it meant something, and he did,
right? I mean, most of the time it was very analytical, theoretical,
observational versus emotional.

Once again, CD's comments in the area support his players' perceptions.

CD   For the most part, I've tried to be optimistic and I think for the most part I
had to because optimism is a great motivator. You know, and I mention
that to the players, you know, as part of our philosophical approach, that
optimism is important.

I would say I displayed my optimism in sort of a controlled manner and
tried to tie in a little bit of an optimistic approach to everything we were
doing. So if we, you know, 'if we can build ourselves the skills and ability
to execute this particular phase of our game that it's going to really be a
big plus for us.'

Motivating followers.

Similar to II, the data involving IM supports the idea that CD was not

overtly motivational in terms of direct interaction with his players. In other

words, his observable behavior at any given moment wouldn't be considered to be

inspirational or "rah, rah" in nature. What appears to be supported, however, is that he encouraged and modeled the values, beliefs and responsibilities of the Golden Bear Program continually, which might have moved his players to consider the higher purpose involved in their role or mission.

In consideration of the motivating factors for CD's players, a number of motivators emerged from the data: the desire for more or the threat of losing playing time, the desire for personal/team achievement, the desire to please their coach, innovation, a desire to contribute to something bigger than self, and/or the desire to feel a part of the team. Of those players who were dissatisfied, one felt that his playing time was not seemingly linked to his preparation or performance per se and found this to be demotivating.

P7-D   I mean obviously, I think what motivated me in the end was obviously, uh, or the sport…was ice time. You know, obviously any time in that scenario you can imagine, I mean again looking back if you're in a scenario where you're constantly being, uh or feel like you're being, uh, berated is a hard term, but under criticism, when you have the opposite then it feels good. When you gain ice time as a result of it, it feels good. Um, I always, you know, sort of did the same thing cause like everybody as far as getting myself ready and motivated to play, but there were times I recall because I felt that it was a bit of a crap shoot as to whether the week's practice would contribute to me having the opportunity to play or not. So you get to a scenario that I really felt I couldn't control the outcome and so the motivational part became tough. Not a strong real motivator per se, like as in something I could point to. It was all self-motivation.

CD's interviews revealed his use of both transactional behavior (execution/effort in exchange for playing time) and transformational behavior (tying values to success) to motivate his athletes. Following are examples of each:

CD   …going back to these expectations, if guys aren't doing what you'd like to see them do, you make decisions for them and that sort of thing, maybe sit

them out a game or two or whatever. Well we didn't do that very much, but motivating them by gaining the trust of the players, like having them say to themselves, "This guy believes in something and he does what he says. He backs it up by, you know, "If it's a question about discipline type of thing or whatever then I can trust that what he says he's gonna do, that he's gonna do it."

So just being consistent in your actions towards the players, that motivates them I think. I think it motivated them. But along with some talks on your philosophy going back to some of the things that you believe in and, uh, talking about them maybe before a game or a series about, "This is something that has carried the Bear Program and a lot of tough situations and here we are faced with another situation and we have to dig down and do these things consistently and that'll make a big difference for us." So little things like that, I guess, drawing attention for the players just some of the things that the program believes in and the coaches believe in and we would like them to do.

CD also introduced goal setting as a technique that might have contributed

to the players' motivation, though one player questioned its usefulness.

CD   I got into goal setting later like I'd say halfway through my coaching career [mid-70s]. Some of those things came into play you know. Yeah, I don't know if you remember. I came across one of those sheets we had that we gave out and asked the players to fill in things that they thought they could accomplish. I think we had team goals for sure before we had individual's.

Intellectual Stimulation.

Leaders exhibit IS when they encourage their followers to consider

creative ways to solve traditional problems and challenge assumptions on how

work has been performed in the past. Follower input is encouraged in an open

environment where thoughts and/or ideas are not criticized publically. Though

creative approaches are openly solicited, transformational leaders continue to

emphasize the rationality of the solutions presented (Bass & Riggio, 2006).   The

findings in this component have been divided into two categories: Encouraging

creativity/innovation and soliciting follower input.

Encouraging creativity and/or innovation.

Central to the IS component is the leader's encouragement of his/her followers to approach problems in a creative way (Bass & Riggio, 2006). According to Bass and Riggio (2006), the successes that are experienced serve to instill pride in the group's actions and its ability to overcome obstacles when a joint effort is undertaken. As a result, each individual's commitment to the group is reinforced thereby increasing the potential for goal attainment.

The data indicates little support for CD having explicitly articulated the encouragement of his players to be creative while he coached them, at least as it relates to their on-ice performing. More prevalent is that CD fostered a strong adherence to team system play. Some felt that creativity might be considered allowable but only if it didn't veer away from the structure imposed on the team. Following is an example provided by one of his players:

P5-S   …his teams always had great structure and so it was important that you played within that structure. But when it got to the decision making, in terms of being creative, you were encouraged to do that. And he always distinguished between being creative and freelancing [which is] just being that you're doing it outside of what the structure calls for.

Contrary to his players' thoughts, CD recalls suggesting that players try to do things a little differently although it is uncertain to which situations CD is referring specifically. He does support his players' feeling that creativity was only considered appropriate if it was done within the structures developed for the team.

CD   Oh we talked about individual players that are working on skills, uh, we did talk specifically about trying to do things a little differently once in a

while as long as everybody else that you were with knew what you were trying to do.

More closely related to transformational leadership theory is a leader's encouragement of his/her followers to think in a creative way or to challenge existing assumptions and find innovative solutions to old problems. CD suggests that the behavior modeled by him and his coaches might have encouraged players to be creative or look at things in a different way.

CD   I think we did [encourage creativity] by trying new things. I think we introduced some different things in the game even in the sense of tactics and that, so that's being creative.

Indeed, it would appear that the systems and tactics introduced to his players were non-conventional and that CD was often introducing new ideas to his team in an effort to either improve the ability for his team to compete and/or to maintain his players' interest. This seemed to be strongly supported in the statements provided by his followers. Following is an example:

P2-S   He did [encourage creativity]. He was always trying to do different things and new systems and always thinking, you know, you're 19 [wins] and 3 [losses] or whatever; we won 10 games and [he is] trying to think how we can get a better power play. [How are we] gonna do this better? So he was always trying to improve. We were more receivers of that information. It wasn't like we would have a meeting with the players and say what can we do better on the power play. So we always knew he was just, he was always on the leading edge and you'd come to practice thinking, "What are we going to do different today?"

Soliciting follower input.

Leaders that display IS, encourage followers to share their thoughts, opinions and ideas fostering an environment that is open and free of public criticism and, thereby, fostering creativity. Behavior of this nature plays a part in increasing the task and social cohesion within work groups and organizations

(Bass & Riggio, (2006). The data suggests that the degree to which input was solicited increased as followers moved through roles as new players to captains to coaches. Though there is some mention of non-captains being given the opportunity to provide input, it seems that newer players would be less frequently called upon to provide input. In the following excerpt, CD feels that input was encouraged from all players in team meetings or smaller group settings. He also indicates an awareness of the usefulness in seeking their input.

CD   I think we encouraged [input from players] but I think that there's reluctance on the part of players initially when they're with a team to, you know, put things in. But we did, we did encourage, uh, at player meetings, them to bring things forward. And in particular with the captains meetings which we maybe had, about the last six or seven years I was coaching, had them on a more regular basis and that was their job was to bring the problems to the team and some of the things that they thought we could do better or do differently so we encouraged it that way. Part of that of course is that sometimes if the players are bringing it, it's coming from a different perspective but it's also coming from a different, uh, buy in. Its something that they feel is important and that makes a big difference, you know.

Further, as P5-S indicates, all players were involved in helping to determine and define what was to be expected of each individual on the team:

P5-S   So even the toughness list, we used to do that all the time. There was a whole process around getting all the stuff, writing it up, showing it to the captains, the captains would take it back to the team, "Are we prepared to live with this, yes, we are, okay" and now that becomes a, its very clear the players' list of [expectations] so now they're committed to [them]. And now our job as coaches is to hold them accountable for that toughness list. That was one way that we came up with in terms of taking commitment to a higher level, to ownership.

Specific to the latter portion of the previous comment made by CD, captains were more frequently asked to provide input in relation to team affairs. Together, CD's and his players' interviews indicate that captains might provide

input in the areas of travel logistics, discipline issues, and were encouraged to

bring needs or concerns regarding specific players and/or the team. CD also

indicates that, in his captains meetings, he might have invited input in the area of

system play for an upcoming opponent though this didn't seem to be supported by

any of his players.

In the following excerpt, one of his players who later became a coach

under CD shares an experience when the team's captains approached the coaches

to discuss a collective issue regarding one player who was not reflecting the

team's values.

P4-S   Then being a captain with the Bears, you were involved with some of
        these difficult times and difficult decisions. You know, he involved us.
        When I was a captain as well, you know, we were involved in minor
        things, but this was a fairly major (one). They came to us and he was such
        a negative influence that the guys wanted to get rid of him. They wanted
        to send him home.

CD's comments support the notion that he encouraged his captains to come to him

with team issues.

CD   I think we did...you know, in talking about the captains' roles. But I didn't
        want them to be seen by the other players as kind of reporters or gossip
        reporters or whatever. But if there was something that they felt was
        detracting from the, you know, the bonding of the team or whatever,
        "Bring it to me and I'd like to talk to the team about it." Or sometimes, I
        think we'd done it where, you know, "I think you're right and you guys
        recognize that that's happening and I'd like you guys to meet as a team."
        Which is quite possibly better, cause then the other players don't think,
        "Well these guys went running to the coach, brought up some of these
        weaknesses that we have or inefficiencies that we have and now he's
        going to come down here and jump on us."

Perhaps more applicable to individualized consideration (the following

component) is the notion that CD is concerned about the possibility of his captains

losing the trust or respect of the rest of the team should they be pegged as "gossip

reporters." More relevant to IS, however, it seems like CD's solicitation of innovative ideas and creative solutions to problems was left for the members of his coaching staff. His players who eventually became coaches state very strongly that he was open to their opinions and ideas particularly in the area of the team's system play.

P1-S   [As a coach] certainly open debate and I think that was welcomed, you know, and it was always clear with both Clare and [another coach] that he had some final say but, uh, input is really actively sought and, "How'd you see this," right? So it's just the idea of getting multiple perspectives and those perspectives were appreciated. And, uh, honestly in all the time I coached there I never ever felt like something I suggested wasn't taken or whatever. I never felt slighted in the least, right, it was always sort of set up in a way where it was just perspective. We need perspectives, right, you get multiple perspectives and ultimately somebody's in charge of putting all those perspectives together and has to make a decision.

It appears to have been important for CD to seek his assistant coaches to provide input and then to genuinely take their comments into consideration.

CD   You want to encourage your assistants to always challenge your ideas. [An assistant coach] can't say, you know, "Yes, yes, that's right, okay," and do it that way. And that's where it becomes tough, well not tough if you're a good listener. But some people are so "I" bound that they can't listen and then they're not eventually going to be a good, I think, as good leader, motivator or coach or whatever.

Individualized Consideration.

The essence of individualized consideration (IC) lies within the follower's belief that his/her personal needs for achievement and growth are being considered. The leader encourages two-way communication and interactions are personalized such that the follower believes that the leader cares about him/her as a person. Leaders treat followers as ends not just means (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

For the purpose of analyzing the extent to which CD demonstrated behavior typical of IC, the following categories were considered: communication with followers, recognition/acceptance of individual differences and empowerment.

Communication.

CD relied to a greater degree on communication with small groups and/or the larger team than direct individual-level. Although CD's personal relationships and communication became stronger with those that did become leaders, it was evident that interactions became more personalized as players moved through their careers and beyond the program.

P4-S   Um, it [the relationship] just sort of evolved. You know, at first it was very interesting at first to be a player and then to be a captain and start to realize that he wasn't as, kind of, distant and intimidating. You could get a little bit closer to him that way. And then with the Olympic team, and again being a captain there was another opportunity to see a different side of him and behind the scenes type of thing. And then as an assistant coach…we'd talk for an hour, an hour and a half, about the game. And, uh, that was kind of a ritual and that was pretty neat to sit and have a beer with him. Cause, you know, all that time as a player you never got a chance to do that.

Recognition and acceptance of individual differences.

Transformational leaders that utilize IC, recognize, accept and attend to the individual differences of each follower, providing individualized treatment with the purpose of helping the follower maximize his/her potential (Bass & Riggio, 2006). For the most part, there appeared to be support for CD providing IC. They feel that he had the ability to determine what each player's needs were and treat them in a way that was congruent with these needs. There also seems to be some support in terms of his acceptance and/or respect for who they were and

what they brought to the group, particularly for those who were with the team

longer.

P1-S   I do think he had a sense of, uh, you know, each player's individuality in a
        sense and stuff too. Uh, and I say that more from knowing him as a coach,
        as in like, in my relationship with him in coaching, uh, because, you know,
        just going on what I sensed as a player, you know, I didn't have a strong
        sense of that…it was probably the opposite. It was that he wanted to treat
        everybody the, you know, the same, would have the same approach to
        everybody and stuff too. But you know getting to know him afterwards
        and seeing the inner workings of some of the coaching as an assistant
        coach there, there's no question that, you know, we had lots of discussions
        about individuals, right? And, uh, approach to individuals and, you know,
        what's it gonna take to get this out of this guy or that sort of thing, right?

P7-D   I never felt I got, you know, and maybe this is rightfully so, but there was,
        um I didn't get any consideration for what I felt was a lot harder of an
        educational load. Not in what I had to do but the amount I had to do. So
        there were many times our labs would run till 5:00. I would scramble to
        get ready for the 5:15 I think it was at that time, literally had to make it
        across campus and all that and always got, you know, reprimanded in
        some respect…and then secondly as I said is that, um, I just felt in
        comparison to others, um, we weren't making necessarily the same
        mistakes but everybody made mistakes and I just felt there was a different
        kind of tolerance for those mistakes.

Empowerment.

Yukl (2010) defines empowerment as "the perception by members of an

organization that they have the opportunity to determine their work roles,

accomplish meaningful work, and influence important events" (p. 87).

Empowerment is an important aspect of IC as it provides followers opportunity to

act autonomously within progressively challenging roles as delegated by the

leader (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Data indicate that there might have been a small degree of empowerment

of newer players under CD though this kind of behavior was more evident as

players moved into positions of leadership (i.e., captains and coaches). CD

seemed to delegate increasingly challenging opportunities for individual players

as they progressed through their careers, giving them tools they would require to

succeed.

P2-S   You know, you'd get asked for input a little bit but really he was in charge
        so did he empower you? Certainly as a player I wouldn't have noticed it,
        maybe a little bit more coaching but, uh, any decisions that were made
        were his with your input. Well, but that's the leadership role. I mean look
        at the guys that are that have graduated that I played with and you look at
        them and they're all, you know, in their own ways they're leaders…I think
        it started there is that, you know, he was a leader by letting you, giving
        you the message and executing it but…you having to figure out the stuff.
        You know…he was a technical coach, but he allowed you, he gave you
        that responsibility to figure it out.

        CD recognized the value in empowering his leadership group to make

some decisions. He also recognized that there was a benefit to the personal

development of individuals. Following are data showing that CD displayed

increasingly greater emphasis on the empowerment of team leaders (captains in

particular) specifically in the area of managing team discipline issues:

P7-D   I wouldn't say formal discipline, but certainly the team looked after, was
        looked to, to take care of the team off ice per se. I think there was sort of
        this implied, you know, the team has to, through the captains if nothing
        else, need to resolve this issue, resolve the concern. So whether it be late
        nights, or what have you on the road, things like that, so we'd police
        ourselves and we know the boundaries were understood.

        CD supported his players' comments:

CD   Sometimes you'd recognize that, uh, a coach, maybe an assistant coach or
        maybe it could be a player, uh, a captain or assistant coach that you felt
        maybe had a good rapport with a player that was having some
        problems…it could be in anything, maybe in skills development or maybe
        just in attitude…you might get a hold of one of the captains or one of the
        players who you know is a pretty good friend of the player and, uh, have
        him spend some time with that player… 'Cause a lot of players, uh, it's
        easier for them to accept, uh, advice and encouragement from a teammate
        or perhaps an assistant coach rather than the head coach…

The relationships that evolved between CD and those that eventually became his assistant coaches were most indicative of mentor-mentee relationships. In most cases, these relationships became long-term and shifted in emphasis from those that were primarily focused on group success to those that more directly considered the growth and development of the individuals. The empowerment included providing his assistant coaches the opportunity to expand their knowledge and skill.

P2-S   He'd give you the responsibility as a…I never really coach before, played lots, played under some great guys but never coached before then all of a sudden you're in charge of the power play. So, yeah, it was real rewarding, intimidating…and he would never, both of them would never leave you hanging, right? They would give you enough tools…and then that sort of just carried on with the coaching then. You know, as I became, you know, basically we worked more and more together. You know, I got more input into the thing.

In many cases, mentorship of assistant coaches continued beyond their affiliation with the Golden Bear Hockey Program. As well, his relationships with these followers became far more personalized which is most indicative of a mentor-mentee situation and, in transformational terms, individual consideration:

P5-S   Even when I went along further in my coaching career and that kind of stuff, he always felt, he was the first person that kept trying to push me to do more, in terms of pro hockey, "…be a head coach…do this…you can do it…you're better than this guy." You know, all those things that were really positive…but, uh, he could not have been more supportive and encouraging to, "Keep stepping up," you know, "What more can you do? Don't stop." (Our relationship) has evolved that, just a mutual respect for each other that kind of, not many situations where you come across where you have that kind of a relationship over time, now over forty years. So you go from, where you played for him and continued as a young coach and then, now, I mean, the situations I've been in the NHL, and now, what I wanted to hear from him, he wants to hear from me now. What we're doing in the NHL now, how does it apply, so it's a very special relationship, but very much now, best friends, still a father figure, but best friends.

Further to the development of leaders within a group, Bass and Riggio (2006)

suggest that individually considerate leaders transfer knowledge that will help

followers develop the ability and capacity to lead.

Clare Drake appears to have displayed characteristics indicative of a

transformational leader (Bass, 1985). The model he provided was charismatic and

followers felt that their values aligned with his. His players were motivated by his

understated optimism, clear identification of expectations and the high standard

that he held them to. His innovative behavior and the increasing encouragement

of input as players moved through their careers were intellectually stimulating and

he was considerate of the needs of his players. In addition to these findings, five

qualities emerged that may also have contributed to his success and influence (a)

humility, (b) innovation, (c) communication, (d) building relationships of

significance, and (e) building organizational culture. In an effort to capture a

more complete image of Clare Drake's leadership style, I decided to pursue these

qualities, which are presented in the remainder of this section.

Building Organizational Culture

An organization can be defined as "a number of people interacting with

each other for the purpose of accomplishing some goal in their defined

environment" (Schein, 1983, p. 13). Schein (1983) posits that organizational

culture evolves through the interaction between individual group members as well

as the interaction of the group as a whole with its external environment. By

experiencing and eventually overcoming obstacles that might deter the

accomplishment of goals, patterns of assumptions, beliefs and values emerge

which are considered to be valid in terms of organizational success. These patterns of thought are ultimately "taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to problems" (Schein, 1983, p. 14). More simply, organizational culture can be described as "the way we do things around here" or the values that hold an organization together (Frontiera, 2010, p. 71).

Schein (1992) gives three identifying levels of organizational culture: artifacts, values, and underlying assumptions. The first and outer level, artifacts, is the outward expression or superficial presentation of the group's culture. It can consist of member behavior, written and spoken language, vision statements and/or team slogans. It should be noted that this level might not illustrate the deeper manifestation of the organization's culture. Deeper cultural meaning is more likely to exist when these behaviors are repeated consistently. Consistent patterns of behavior provide evidence that a more complex level of culture exists beneath the artifact level.

Values represent the next level of culture. They are represented in the beliefs of one or more members as to how best to respond to a new issue, task, or problem (Schein, 1992). Behavior at this level is therefore tied to conscious reflection on the values espoused by the individual or group. The third and deepest level of organizational culture then consists of "shared solutions to problems which work well enough to be taken for granted – to the point where they drop out of awareness, become unconscious assumptions, and are taught to new members as a reality and as the correct way to view things" (Schein, 1983, p.

15). Each member within the culture holds these basic assumptions with little variation from individual to individual.

Schein (1983) points to the founding leader as a major driver in the formation of organizational culture for it is shaped by his/her ideas, beliefs, values and assumptions through use of positive/negative reinforcement and modeling. He adds that this culture reflects a complex interaction between "(1) the assumptions and theories that founders bring to the group initially and (2) what the group learns subsequently from its own experiences" (p. 14). Further to a leader's ability to embed values or assumptions into a group's culture, Schein (1983) proposes a number of varying mechanisms ranging from more or less explicit to more or less implicit (p. 22). Of the ten that he presents in his article, he identifies three that he poses to have the greatest degree of potency and deems to be the most revealing when determining how the members of an organization learned the right and proper things to do: (a) Deliberate role modeling, teaching and coaching by leaders; (b) what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control; and (c) leader reactions to critical incidents and organizational crises.

Founding organizational culture.

Indeed, the culture of the Golden Bear Hockey Program was and continues to be a strong one. It is reasonable to assume that CD was the founder of this culture, at least as it exists in its modern day form (1958 to present). As he was never an assistant coach and only played briefly at the U of A, it would have been unlikely for him to be influenced significantly by coaches that preceded him there. He brought his own set of beliefs, values and assumptions when he stepped into

the organization in 1958 and certainly would have played the primary part in

embedding them into its existing culture – beliefs that very likely exist to this day

given that in 23 of the past 24 years since his retirement the Bears have been

coached by individuals that played under CD during his tenure. This section will

provide information emerging from the data that suggest CD influenced the

development of a strong organizational culture in the Golden Bears Program.

CD   And, uh, by stressing some of the things in the guidelines, like, uh, always
       keeping in mind that one of the most important building blocks for you is
       being able to work hard, hard work, being industrious is one of the key
       things. The idea that, uh, you know, we used to call it the "agony of
       repetition". You have to do some things several times. Anyway, just
       gradually building a culture of hard work and, uh, attention to detail and
       uh, development and the importance of execution. It's important for any
       coach to develop within his team, that culture of learning and culture of
       teamwork and supporting each other and culture of sharing things, you
       know, sharing the puck and, uh, so all those things make up the
       environment.

       Modeling organizational culture.

       CD was a value-oriented coach who communicated his values regularly

via written material, verbal presentation (to the group primarily) and role

modeling. Following are two quotes that are indicative of comments made by his

players in this regard. The first emphasizes his philosophy that team goals

supersede the goals of each individual team member, and that there was an

expectation that players earn their opportunity to play in games by outworking

and/or outperforming teammates. The second quote shows the high degree of

expectation that CD had of his players.

P5-S   It was really important to him that people cooperate and we always had
       with the Bears a cooperate-compete model. You were expected to
       cooperate with guys that you were actually competing with for ice time the
       next weekend. And he made it very clear that you cooperate first and that

you're working with somebody and you go to compete [with another player] for ice time second.

P8-D   There was high expectation to be the best you could be. It wasn't verbal, no, no I think it was, uh, certainly a mastery of skill, um you know, there was high expectation to be proficient and the best you could be at what you were doing

His behavior matched the values that he espoused and he demanded the

same from the men on this team. As mentioned, team values and expectations

were articulated in written form. Again, the quotation that CD adopted from John

Wooden, "It's amazing what can be accomplished when no-one cares who gets

the credit" has become the mantra for the Golden Bear Hockey program (Drager,

2007) and the Golden Bear toughness list (Appendix A) was utilized to identify

behavior expected of players during games. The following quote suggests that his

players' demonstration of these values were expected and those who didn't "buy-

in" either lost opportunity to play or were released.

P4-S   He had the ability to create this atmosphere and this whole thing. And the guys that weren't buying in, they weren't there. That was the thing too. It didn't matter how good you were, you know. That was irrelevant. You didn't, you weren't playing [in games] and playing for the Bears and, you know, you weren't around very long.

It was also mentioned earlier that CD strongly believed in role modeling,

which Schein (1983) identifies along with teaching and coaching as important

mechanisms used by leaders to embed beliefs into a culture. In a passage taken

from his biography, CD identifies his philosophy in this area.

As a coach, one of my major beliefs is that the example I set by my actions is the most powerful and positive influence I have. As coaches we are role models for our athletes. Our treatment of them, our planning, our reaction to adversity, to victory or defeat, will, to a large measure, be copied by our athletes. As coaches we enjoy a privileged position in the lives of our athletes. We have an entry point into the lives of our players that offers

the potential to affect them profoundly. Therefore we have an obligation to use our influence in a positive, ethical manner (Clare Drake in Drager, 2007, p. 173).

Schein (1983) suggests that when the members of the group demonstrate values consistently and the adherence to them results in success, they become basic assumptions that pass out of conscious thought, and are then transferred on to new members. In the following excerpt, one player remembers a situation where older players consoled a younger player after he had been singled out in practice and goes on to mention the role that the team had in helping pass on the culture.

P2-S   You know, you feel bad and we'll go console him afterwards, but…we would never stray from [CD's] message. You know, "He's doing that…to make you better, to help us get better and, uh, and win the championship," right?…and subtly Clare told the team to look after that. You know, the guy's got a problem, you know,…whatever it had to do with, um, playing or working hard in practice or be out too late. That wasn't, Clare had the general thing there, [but] the players looked after the rest...

The passage supports the notion that the older players understood the assumptions underlying CD's behavior and they recognize that the message sent to the younger player would ultimately help him improve. In their communication the older players pass on the values and/or assumptions of the culture to the younger player. Very likely, this enhanced the new player's acceptance and internalization of CD's values and/or assumptions and, therefore, contributed to the propagation of the culture.

CD discusses his feeling on returning players passing on their experience to younger players in the passage below.

CD   Sometimes you'd recognize that, uh, a coach, maybe an assistant coach or maybe it could be a player, uh, a captain or assistant coach that you felt

maybe had a good rapport with a player that was having some problems. It could be in anything, maybe in skills development or maybe just in attitude. You might get a hold of one of the captains or one of the players who you know is a pretty good friend of the player and, uh, have him spend some time with that player, because a lot of players, uh, it's easier for them to accept, uh, advice and encouragement from a teammate or perhaps an assistant coach rather than the head coach.

CD's comment also suggests that he purposefully encouraged veteran players to pass on the values and assumptions of the Golden Bear culture. Indeed, his enlistment of returnees to share these beliefs with new members on the team appears to be an important intent on behalf of the coach. As mentioned previously, CD chose to limit his individual communication with players either because he wasn't comfortable in one-to-one interactions of this nature or because he felt it necessary to maintain a distance from them. Using returning players to bridge this gap may have been his key to transferring this type of information and fostering the culture of the organization that he led.

True to his philosophy on role modeling mentioned earlier in this paper, CD also encouraged players to model values such as work ethic and execution.

CD   I had a little meeting with the returning players and I told them what I believed their importance was in the aspect of the camp. If there were veteran players and players that were going to look up to them as guys who had mastered the ability to play in the league before, and so it's up to them to role model what it takes to play at that level. And we had really good success with that because we had really good captains, they were mostly captains or veteran players and we got great performance and support from that. So that goes back to the role modeling, probably one of the most important things, you know, that keeps things going.

Developing leaders.

Based on the data presented, it is apparent that intent existed to develop leaders. The following passage shows how this might have been the case.

P5-S You know, what, I think first of all he made it very clear that there was an expectation that you could lead and that leadership had to come from a lot of different places. And then, I think, I remember in even choosing captains every year, he would give a list of criteria on what it takes to be a captain and then he'd leave it with the players for a bit and then we'd vote on captains. But very clearly directing the players…so he made it very clear that, uh, first of all the leadership is important and secondly, what are the criteria of leadership and that it was your responsibility as a team to get the people that best fit this criteria. "Don't short change the process." Then he'd make it clear to his captains, I always felt he made it clear to his captains that your number one criteria as a captain is to take care of your own play first. It's hard to speak with credibility unless you can take care of your own play. But when you have good people and they're expected, everyone knows that you're expected to lead and, uh, they've been through a process where there's been insistence on execution, good habits and all these things, and, you know, good people in position of leadership and that kind of stuff, it all seems to just flow…and the expectation, it was kind of built in [to the Program] that as you went along your leadership role was expected to pick up. And so guys are, as they move along in their years they're saying, "Well, it's getting to be my turn, what does that guy do?" So in some ways it's a kind of an informal process. But, inherent in some of the good things that happened, you know.

This participant's comments clearly indicate that players were expected to develop as leaders through their years with the Golden Bears and that a process existed through which leadership and its importance in team success was learned. In his comments below, CD echoes the notion that he intended to develop leadership skill in the men that he coached.

CD Well, I guess that in itself is intent. You're telling those guys, you're telling that particular segment of your returning players that I look at them as leaders. I want them to be good role models and I look at them as leaders. But I don't think at that time there was a lot of formalized, uh, discussion with them about the things they could do, just show what it takes to play at that level and have a positive attitude and a very good work ethic and, uh, you know, and they did that and some of the [young] players said to me afterwards that, "You guys worked so hard I felt that I had to jump my game up if I wanted to stick around."

The comment provided by the following participant offers that meetings often occurred between CD and his captains for the point of sharing information and, thereby, strengthening the culture.

P7-D   So he always would have meetings with the captain, right, and have discussions with the captain, especially if things weren't going well or if we had a shitty practice, and the captains were asked to go across the rink to the coaches' room. So he looked at that being a conduit. So part of his coaching was to give appreciation to the team for the systems, the game, the skills and then through the captains in terms of what the expectation was. So he used them very much, that's par, and that was their role, right, I mean very much so.

Though there is some disagreement among participants as to the frequency of these types of meetings, it is certain that communication of this nature existed between CD and his captains. Further, It is apparent that CD was highly influential in the development of the culture that existed within the Golden Bear Hockey program. Based on his own comments and those of the men that played for him, it would seem that he purposely set about building a strong culture or, at the very least, passing on values that he believed to be important for individual and team success.

Innovation

In 1955, he was already beginning to separate himself from the run-of-the-mill, or maybe even the above-average, Canadian hockey coach. His continuous drive to improve, to welcome the unfamiliar in hope of finding a better way, set him apart from the huge majority of his colleagues….The coming decades would see him introduce many innovations to Canadian university hockey, from where they would eventually find their way into the pro leagues (Drager, 2007, p. 57).

Innovation appears to be another quality possessed by CD that is strongly supported in the data. Drager's (2007) passage cited above, and indeed the phrase he uses to describe CD in the title of his biography, *"Hockey's Quiet*

Revolutionary; Clare Drake, the Coaches' Coach" suggest the significance in which both humility and innovation play in defining CD's leadership style. Four sub-themes relating to CD's innovative behavior emerge from the data: (a) ahead of his time, (b), life long learner (c) sharer of information, and (d) innovation as a form of influence. Supportive information follows in the remainder of this section.

Ahead of his time.

In line with the written material mentioned above, all interview participants made mention of CD's innovative nature. Most perceived him to be an innovative thinker, often bringing new system play, teaching techniques or methods of preparation relative to experiences with previous teams. One player who later became an assistant coach compared him to a mad professor drawing diagrams at the board as he and his assistant coaches discussed alternative ways to improve their team's performance. Another participant, who later became a coach with CD, articulates his sense of how sessions such as these moved the team into unchartered territories relative to other teams in their league and potentially other levels of hockey in Canada.

P5-S   I think we were always thinking outside the box. I think even some of the stuff we had done on the power play, certainly the stuff on the penalty killing. Nobody in the eighties was playing an aggressive box it was pretty static all the way up to that time and then a lot of that came from Clare and I working together. We might have three or four forechecking systems, right, and depending on situations and being able to adapt to them, you know? Now teams are starting to use two or three forechecking systems which, for years, they used one…So I think all the way along he was doing that, thinking outside the box and he encouraged me to do it.

Lifelong Learner.

CD was a life-long learner. He sought knowledge from various sources including his assistant coaches, others in the coaching community locally, nationally and internationally, various reading materials, as well as non-traditional resources available within the academic environments in which he was positioned. Following is an example provided by an assistant coach after being asked how much input he had in the creative process.

P1-S   …certainly open debate and I think that was welcomed, you know, and it
        was always clear with both Clare and (another coach) that he had some
        final say but, uh, input is really actively sought and, "How'd you see this,"
        right? So it's just the idea of getting multiple perspectives and those
        perspectives were appreciated.

In the following excerpt from his book, Drager (2007) describes CD's practice of utilizing resources from within the academic environment of the high school in which he taught physical education and coached the track & field team. What is noteworthy is that he sought this involvement in 1955 pre-dating what is now a common practice of utilizing science to benefit sport performance.

> A true appreciator of the fresh perspective, he asked for volunteers from
> the school staff to help with some of his coaching responsibilities. Here
> again his innovative streak showed itself. Reasoning correctly that a
> physics expert would understand matters such as trajectory and velocity,
> he accepted [a] physics teacher['s]…offer of help and assigned him to the
> throwers on the track and field team (p. 58).

Drager also highlights CD's adoption of the 1950's techniques and tactics he observed internationally as a staff member in charge of scouting for the Penticton Vee's - eventual 1955 world champions.

> Drake saw that in spite of their "lack of hockey know-how" they were
> inventive, adapting the game from their own perspective. He saw things
> worth trying in a Canadian context…(p. 56).

It would seem that the essence of CD's innovation stems from his desire to continually learn and grow as a coach. As suggested in the previous quote, he is a keen observer that learns as much from how others do things as he might from what he gathers from various written publications. He then analyzes the information to determine if it is relevant to his own coaching style and/or situation. If he feels that the information is useful, he attempts to apply it accordingly. An example of CD's own interpretation of this behavior is provided below. In the first excerpt, he makes note of what he might gather from others. In the second quote, he mentions how he approaches learning from printed material.

CD   This person has something going here and why don't I follow it for awhile or watch it and see what happens and if there is something that seems to be, uh, to generate success or generate, uh, leadership qualities or whatever you want to talk about, like you know, then maybe it's something worthwhile noting in this kind of a setting. I think it's a good thing to do. I'm sure its been done before probably by other people but everybody has a little unique perspective on things…

CD   I've always been a pretty avid reader, you know, and I like to read books about people that I consider to be successful not necessarily in the area of coaching but successful and, uh, it's amazing to me how often there are, uh, commonalities that go through some of these things. And you find out things you agree with….But I would analyze something in [those] words and, uh, try to say to myself, 'How does that fit into my thoughts? Was that close to what I thought or did?' And then I use that as a kind of a hook for me to say, 'Oh, that was good, I'm glad I did that,' and I would keep that and I would recommend that to people to use.

CD adds his philosophy on the importance of listening as a key to learning. As one of the pioneers in coaching development in Canada, CD gathered, shared and discussed ideas with other coaches, some looking to enhance

the game, some looking to enhance their team's performance and others just

hoping to become better coaches (Drager, 2007, p. 76-78).

CD   Listening, listening, which is the same as reading something, and so you
      listen, and listening is so important all the time, and at, uh, coaching
      clinics and coaching sessions or whatever but making sure that you're
      listening and analyzing in your own mind….and I guess the other thing
      maybe that influenced me and maybe influenced the guys you were talking
      about that appreciated some of the things that I did was that I was quite
      ready to, uh, if we came up with not a new idea, maybe, because not many
      ideas are brand new but a new way of doing something, and, uh, then I
      tried to, at clinics especially, I tried to pass that information on – to share
      it…

      Sharing information.

      While clinics of this nature served to help CD analyze his own coaching

technique and stimulate his innovative thinking, they also provided a forum in

which he could share his ideas, his experiences and his knowledge with others.

His propensity toward passing on his innovations to anyone interested, including

opposing teams' coaches, was truly unique as supported by one of his coaches in

the following quote.

P5-S   And his ability to, you know that saying that we have in the dressing
       room, "It's amazing what can be accomplished when no-one cares who
       gets the credit," well it's all about sharing. And so when you think about
       the way that he shared, not only with me and all of the coaches that were
       fortunate to be under him, but at all of those coaching clinics and he
       shared stuff that I often thought that, "Wow, that we'd developed that and
       why would you share that," you know?

       Further to these findings, the following data as provided by CD indicates

that it was his intent to share the knowledge with other coaches, not only to help

them improve their own ability to coach their teams, but to enhance the game

itself on a larger scale.

CD   You know, some guys will find something, a little magic bullet that
        they've got and they keep it under their hat sort of thing. But if you share
        it, you got a good chance to get the idea tested by other people. If they try
        it and they find it successful, the more people that do that, then the idea is
        a little sounder.

        CD's opponents agree. In this statement a rival coach of a team in the

same conference as the Golden Bears provides his interpretation of this quality.

        These hockey concepts might seem to be obvious, but they're only
        obvious because Clare Drake used them and emphasized them and shared
        them. To me, he's the pope of hockey, Billy's the archbishop and the rest
        of us are just their disciples. They would beat you, and all you had to do
        was ask them how they'd done it. It didn't matter that you were playing
        again the next night. They'd share everything (As quoted in Drager, 2007,
        p. 105).

        Innovation as influence.

        Those who played and coached under CD were directly influenced by his

innovative approach to the game of hockey. Following is an example of how he

influenced his players to think laterally.

P1-S   Oh, yeah [CD influenced me to think outside of the box]. Just the whole
        idea of system play, right? So before that, you know, there was maybe
        some rudimentary system stuff but it was pretty routine stuff, you know,
        its old-school hockey and wingers up and down the wing and, uh, you
        know, defensemen with pretty simple roles. And so, the whole integrated
        team play idea certainly came from CD and I think that the, you know, the
        thing that when people were saying he was way ahead of his time, you
        know, I was playing with him at that time. I like that. It certainly had a
        big influence on me and how I thought about the game and how I
        understood the game and it continues to be the thing that I like to do the
        most. I like playing with ideas and I like doing different things and trying
        different things and new approaches to the game.

        As alluded to in this excerpt, the data strongly support that CD's

accumulated knowledge and innovative behavior presented an attractive quality

for his players and coaches. Further, these qualities compelled them to embrace

innovation and creativity (individual consideration) and align their values with

his. All of CD's innovations were not entirely new ideas. The innovation seems to exist within his propensity to use information from other areas and apply them to his own coaching situation in a time and sport where status quo might have presented a more acceptable method of leadership or instruction. Moreover, his willingness to share his ideas with other coaches seems to have presented a new line of thought certainly in the hockey community of the day. This finding, at least in part, may have contributed to the profound influence that he seems to have had on his players, coaches and the larger hockey coaching fraternity.

Communication

This section considers CD's communication with his players and coaches as it relates to the following outcomes: (a) relationship building with players and coaches, (b) transferring knowledge (teaching), and (c) transferring values and expectations.

Relationship building with players and coaches.

As players advanced from their first to fourth or fifth years and/or became captains and then assistant coaches, interpersonal communication increased. More specifically, interpersonal communication was more likely to increase depending on if players were (a) later in their careers as compared to early in their careers, (b) captains as compared to non-captains, or (c) coaches as compared to players. For players early in their careers, one to one communication was limited primarily to training and instruction with very little if any social support as supported by the following statements:

P1-S   Uh, back then [early 80's] it was, you know, most of the communication was pretty much about hockey, you know.

P2-S   You know, he was very, very technical, um, and he was an okay communicator, but I don't think that was his real strength.

P7-D   I don't recall one on ones with Clare.

As players moved through their eligibility, some players felt that the relationship with CD improved. The following quote is provided by a participant who played three years with the Bears in the 1970s under CD without advancing to the position of captain or coach. His account supports the general feeling of most of those interviewed.

P6-S   …you never really got to know him, um, you never really knew what he was thinking at times…I felt like I had a connection with the guy and I felt like I was, you know, in the latter part of my career, that I was certainly an important part of his hockey team not withstanding, you know?

Despite the lack of interpersonal communication, the message was generally conveyed to players that their contributions were valued. It is evident, however, that not all of his players shared this perception. The following participant who played four years for CD in the 1980s suggests that his relationship with CD lacked clarity and, therefore, the connection that was evident with that of the previous participant.

P8-S   Yeah, I don't think that his communication skills were that strong so it, he wasn't always clear, um maybe [with] what he was trying to say…I used to take it personally. I used to think that we didn't get along. Then I wasn't sure what was wrong, um, in our relationship…

Interestingly, this player goes on to indicate how the relationship between the two of them changed after he was finished with the Bears, suggesting the lack of relationship orientation might have been a practical behavior that CD felt was necessary to an effective coach-player dyad.

P8-S   I had a better relationship with him when I wasn't playing anymore. And I found that funny so I thought maybe, you know, I felt in the end, I felt, "Okay, you know, I realize that maybe it wasn't a personal thing, it was just, um, how he sees your role and how he tries to make you fit in the team." And, uh, but you can still take it quite personally when you're playing right?

Data provided by CD supports the assumption that he felt it necessary to maintain a distance between himself and his players at least earlier on in the relationship.

CD   When you're starting out as a coach and starting with, you know, with new players even if you've been coaching for a while, uh, you try to keep a sort of a line between the player and coach. And, uh, and I think when I started coaching, I mean I know when I started coaching…that, uh, I try to be, uh, a little more autocratic and the players, well I think they accepted the fact that that's where I was at that time, but I kept more of a distance between even the players which is good at a certain time. But after you've been with a team for a while maybe in the second and third year whatever or when players if there's a lot of returning players and you like to keep things much more, I don't know, family oriented I guess you'd say.

As stated earlier, CD appeared to personalize his interactions more with his captains and coaches then he did with those who were not brought into his leadership group, and more so with his coaches than with his captains. The following two quotes lend support to this finding. The first response is from a player who moved from non-captain, to captain and eventually into a position as an assistant coach. The second quote is from CD who indicates a stronger relationship orientation with captains and coaches.

P4-S   Um, it [the relationship] just sort of evolved. You know… it was very interesting at first to be a player and then to be a captain and start to realize that he wasn't as, kind of, distant and intimidating. You could get a little bit closer to him that way….And then as an assistant coach, we'd talk for an hour, an hour and a half, about the game. And, uh, that was kind of a ritual and that was pretty neat to sit and have a beer with him. Cause, you know, all that time as a player you never got a chance to do that.

CD   But I think that that's something that kind of happens naturally in the course of coaching. The players set that up more than anybody just by virtue of the fact that, "Oh, we don't know this guy very well and have only respect [for] what his teams have done and so we're going to respect him for a while and if he loses our respect, we'll change." So you keep that and…you go into when you know players well and, uh, or especially with captains' groups you may spend a little more time with them and, uh, and that changes in to more of a co-worker sort of thing, you know?

Interestingly, in the above quote CD suggests that his players also played a part in the development of the relationship. His response alludes to communication being a two-way-street where both parties must first develop trust in the other before true openness can exist.

Transferring knowledge.

It was mentioned earlier that CD's communication behavior was *unique*. It is clear that one to one communication was at times limited, however, despite this apparent limitation, his teams excelled consistently over the period of time that he coached at the U of A. Further, it would appear that the players interviewed were satisfied with their experience in general. Even the dissenters expressed that they enjoyed their experience with the team, their teammates, and other aspects of CD's traits and/or behaviors, such as his extensive knowledge of the game, his innovation and his ability to prepare players to perform. Given this evidence, one can extrapolate a clear effectiveness in his ability to transfer knowledge of techniques and tactics critical to successful competitive performance. Further, one can assume that he must have also effectively communicated the values that he felt were necessary for positive athlete behavior and team cohesion.

It appears that CD was most comfortable and effective communicating with the larger group than with his players individually. To transfer his knowledge, he would provide players with written material and/or address them in meetings or group settings.

CD   I used to put a lot of things down on sheets and put them on the dressing room wall. I hoped that the players looked at them once in a while, but, uh, I'm not sure how much. But I still kind of believe in that, uh, like with guys that don't believe in seeing things in written form are saying that there's a complete part of learning that we're going to throw out the window and, uh, that can't help us at all.

A player also alludes to CD's ability to break down information so it was clear.

P8-D   I think that he just broke everything down to the point where, you know, this is what you need to do. And, um, you know, I guess he approached it pretty much to, you know, we had, uh, we always had our little motivational sheets, and we had, uh, you know, our little rules to live by…

Further to CD's preference of communicating with the larger group rather than the individual, the data show that he would often address corrective information meant for one or two individuals to the entire group.

P1-S   I can't honestly sort of think back to anytime where in front of the, in front of the team he really singled anyone out, you know? Um, it was much more related to, uh, I think, you know, guys were often guilty by association. You know, he was talking about a certain situation, you know that something had to change and you know, one of those scenarios where everyone on the team knows what he is talking about…But he addresses the whole group. He addresses a specific situation to the whole group

In the following quote, CD indicates that his method of communicating corrective feedback was a purposeful behavior in consideration of the players' feelings.

CD   I think, well we try to point out [criticisms] as kind of an overall fault of the team, because I think that makes them feel that they're not being picked on individually.

Another player felt that in times when players were identified publicly for performing incorrectly in some way, it was typical of CD to stress that the reason for directing the group's attention to an individual's mistake was so that everyone could learn from it.

P6-S […he could use [a players error in practice] as a teaching opportunity, and then he would say, you know, "and again not to berate you, um but if everybody saw it…", he could use it as a teaching opportunity…you know, "To make note of [this player's] mistake here, but, um, let's have a look at that for a second…"...And so I always appreciated the fact that, you know, he never called you out in front of everybody else, that was not his style.

Though most of the study's participants express agreement with the above quote, the data indicate that some players perceived this behavior differently. These participants suggest that certain individuals were often singled out more in this manner than others. Another agrees that performances were corrected in this way but that the correction was provided in a critical rather than constructive manner.

P7-D So [the] scenario is simply, you run through the drill, I mean the drill gets stopped, you know, everybody's around and, um the coach would use you and then what he just saw as the reason or the thing not to do right in from of all the team, versus just kinda a flow or, "Hey, here's how we have to do this differently." What, you know, its just, it was in the delivery of the message. It was sort of critical versus explanatory I guess would say.

It should be noted that the participants suggest that one to one communication did exist with players but that exchanges of this nature rarely took place in formal meetings and occurred minimally in informal exchanges, which is consistent with my experience. Though infrequent, I remember CD providing corrective feedback in a brief, concise but positive manner and then moving on. I do not recall that any one on one meeting took place with the purpose of discussing anything at length or in depth. In the excerpt below, CD indicates that

although corrective information was provided to the team generally, there were

times where individual communication was necessary. In the quote, he continues

to stress the importance of ensuring that the information is imparted in a positive

way, suggesting sensitivity to the self-esteem of those that he coached.

CD   …eventually you have to talk to the player individually I think. You know, you say, "Howie, uh, you're not getting this in a way that we think will make a really positive thing for you and so we'd like you to maybe do a little extra…do some work on that." Isolate the problem and try to work on it. But not, gotta make sure you don't do it in a critical way, well it's an individual criticism that should be done in a positive sort of way….But you have to give it, its important. Maybe not criticism, constructive, constructive criticism is a good thing if delivered, if delivered in an, uh, appropriate manner.

Transferring values and expectations.

The following excerpt from the data provides an example of how CD

communicated his philosophies and expectations.

CD   But along with some talks on your philosophy going back to some of the things that you believe in and, uh, talking about them maybe before a game or a series about, "This is something that has carried the Bear Program and a lot of tough situations and here we are faced with another situation and we have to dig down and do these things consistently and that'll make a big difference for us." So little things like that, I guess, drawing attention for the players just some of the things that the program believes in and the coaches believe in and we would like them to do.

He was able to communicate these same values through his actions. The

consistent model that he presented was likely important in terms of his players'

ability to receive, understand, internalize, demonstrate and eventually pass on the

values themselves. Significantly, all the participants in the study felt that CD's

behavior consistently demonstrated the values that he espoused. The following

selection from the data provided by a dissenter exemplifies this perception.

P7-D   I think he adhered to them [his values] as, you know in terms of uh the commitment side. Um, work ethic, you know, kinda leaving it all out there, the classic cliché style ones, commitment, uh, passion, drive, readiness and all that good stuff. We heard those messages all the time.

CD had a clear purpose to be honest with his players in order to gain their trust.

Given the low levels of interpersonal communication that he displayed, this

behavior was likely critical to his coaching effectiveness.

CD   I think I tried to stay, I hope I tried to stay pretty clear to my philosophy cause I was, I really believe that it was important to walk the talk. Like, if you're talking about something you want to try and do that and that has such an effect on the trust quotient that you build up with your team.

        Whether it was the group presentations, the model that he displayed, or the

written material that he posted and passed out, it is clear that his players got the

message. Indeed, the congruency between the values that his players felt he

espoused and those that he self-reported show that his values were received.

More specifically, both CD and his players reported that the following values

were important to him: hard work, continual self-improvement, attention to detail

(execution), passion, honesty, sharing, team goals as a priority over individual

goals, optimism, fairness, and cooperation/teamwork. Following are examples

from the data that represent this congruency.

        The first excerpt is provided by CD, when asked how he created a learning

environment, he reveals values that are important to him. The same supporter

who first reveals some of CD's values when discussing CD's influence provides

the following two excerpts. He then later responds to a more direct question

regarding CD's values.

CD   …by stressing some of the things in the guidelines, like, uh, always keeping in mind that, uh, one of the most important building blocks for

you is, uh, being able to work hard, hard work, being industrious is one of the key things. Just gradually building a culture of hard work and, uh, attention to detail and, uh, development and the importance of execution…it's important for any coach to develop within his team, that culture of learning and culture of teamwork and supporting each other and culture of, uh, sharing things, you know, sharing the puck…

P5-S   …but to see him never swear, never raise his voice, but always to get his point across, always to have his team being the hardest working team, always to have his team be the most executing team was just amazing to me.

P5-S   Uh, certainly the work ethic. There was no question, and, uh, that was important for him and the passion and enthusiasm was critically important for him, uh, he didn't want guys that took away from the energy of the team he expected people to be energy givers not takers, kind of thing, all those years back that was made clear. Uh, he really valued things like honesty and integrity and, uh, and the kinds of things like the intentness that people had when they were involved on the ice and that kind of stuff. Uh, certainly initiative is something that he really valued. He expected his athletes to take initiative…. I just think he had all the things like the integrity, the honesty, the uh, it was really important to him that people cooperate.

Though the data suggest the majority of his players felt that CD's

expectations were clearly communicated, others may have benefitted from a more

explicit form of communication perhaps individualized specifically for them.

P7-D   But one thing was, and this really bothered me, was I never knew where I stood as a player, um, and I never ration…at that age we're not, you know, I mean you're obviously into university so your thought process becomes a little bit different, but I could never rationalize why I was the one, um, being singled out when I could look around and, I viewed that along with others, um, were doing the same things yet the other were getting a chance to uh, to fix it.

Interestingly, it seems that while some players had difficulty adapting to

CD's style of communication, others thrived.

P2-S   You know, he was very, very technical, um, and he was an okay communicator, but I don't think that was his real strength. But by the end of it you figured out, I mean he left it to you a little bit to put the pieces together. And as a first year player it takes you awhile to figure this out,

right? So, you know, it's more by osmosis and by the players around you and you all sort of figured it out but interestingly enough you're all trying to figure it out at the same time and boy does it, does it ever click in. And it's a kind of neat way to do it, right? Instead of him telling you he gives you enough to figure it out and then away you go which is a real neat process I think when I think back on it. A lot of responsibility on the players to figure that out. But I don't think he'd ever come out and specifically say, "You gotta do this…"

In summary, it is clear that CD was able to effectively communicate knowledge and expectations to most of his players. The success of his teams and the general satisfaction of those that played for him might be a product of his effectiveness in this area. In terms of the relationships that he had with his players, personalized communication increased as they moved from their first to last years and, for some, from player to captain to coach. Some players seemed to thrive under the style of communication exhibited by CD while others felt confused, singled out and that their relationship with him was weak. Further, evidence was provided that suggests that there was intent behind CD's communication behavior. In the following section it will be shown that he in fact was adept at building and maintaining strong relationships beyond that of his players that might have further contributed to team's success as well as the influence that he had on the game of hockey at a more global level.

Building Complimentary Relationships

For [Malcolm] Gladwell, connectors are those people, small in number yet great in influence, who have that "truly extraordinary knack of making friends and acquaintances." They differ from most others both in the quality of their friendships and the quantity of their acquaintances. They are *not* networkers, in the sense that they use relationships for gain, but are genuinely "gregarious and intensely social" people who intrinsically value interaction with their fellow human beings. Clare Drake is one of these people, and this aspect of his personality played a crucial role in his

growth as a coach and, ultimately, in the revolutionary influence he had on the Canadian game (Drager, 2007, p. 29).[1]

This quote from CD's biography, suggests that despite some communication limitations, he did exhibit a strong ability to develop strong enduring relationships with significant people that might have helped contribute to his ultimate success as a coach and far reaching influence as an expert in his field.

P1-S   And, uh, so I think, you know, when you're really trying to pinpoint some leadership stuff there I think you, you have to, uh, steer towards, you know, looking, try to look deeper into that whole relationship of things. How, what was it that allowed him to build such strong relationships with some key people and to, to attract and hold good people around him, too, right? And that's clearly a strength of his, right?

This section will highlight emerging data that display CD's ability to attract three people of significance to him and the roles they may have played in his career: Dolly Drake, Billy Moores, and Murray Smith.

Dolly Drake.

Dolly Drake, his wife, was a significant contributor to CD's life. The importance of this partnership is captured in a quote in Drager (2007) when CD expresses his appreciation, "…for her love, patience, guidance of our two daughters, and her sharing and understanding of the complexities of a coach's life" (p. 28). But Dolly Drake's influence seems to have extended beyond the personal relationship that she shared with CD. The data indicate that she might

---

[1] Drager refers to Malcolm Gladwell's novel, The Tipping Point. The book discusses the mysterious sociological changes that mark everyday life. Drager uses this reference to describe CD as an agent of social change in the hockey world.

have played a secondary role in the influence of CD's followers in three areas: (a)

providing a positive model of a strong, healthy relationship; (b) modeling the

value of family and; (c) helping to create an environment that fostered a sense of

individual consideration among players.

P3-S   …but family was really important to him…Dolly and him would create,
        there was always a Christmas, and two or three functions and I can always
        remember [his daughters], you know, being there, you were into the
        family. It was really important in terms of that. And, like, you know, uh,
        like I think Dolly was, you know, their relationship, the model was very
        good.

Though the current study suggested earlier that CD's communication

might have lacked a personal dimension, the data shows that the communication

between Dolly and CD's followers might have provided players with a sense of

being cared for. Drager (2007) indicates that there was a period where Dolly

Drake traveled often with the team (p. 90). Along with the team gatherings,

ample opportunity would have been provided for her to interact with CD's players

in these situations

> I don't know if it was by design, but Dolly did a lot to help the players feel
> like they belonged, like they mattered. She was always talking to us at
> team parties, especially the rookies, and she could sense who needed a pat
> on the back or a little encouragement. She was like a second mother to a
> lot of us. (as quoted in Drager, 2007, p. 90)

Despite these findings, it is obvious that Dolly Drake's influence would

only reach so far. As CD was at the top of the program's hierarchy, players

would be primarily looking to him for acceptance, validation that their

contribution to the program was significant, or that he cared about them as

individuals. Many players eventually came to believe that he was individually

considerate despite very little personalized interaction. It may be that they came

to understand the coaching persona was not indicative of who he was as a person outside of the confines of the team and game.

P1-S   …I mean he could, as a coach, can be quite strict, right and can be quite stern at times…yet then, so he's got that, that toughness part there and stuff too, and yet, with Dolly, you get this whole soft, softy side sort of a, um, stuff too…I think what was, was, came outta that for me is, is just, uh, just the fact that in terms of relationship and different relationships, you know, he uh, you, you can't be one dimensional sorta thing, you know, there's gotta be these different sides to you and stuff too. And I think that, you know, you sorta saw a different side. I've seen that a different side of, of Coach Drake when he's around Dolly a little bit and stuff too.

The interactions that his players would have observed in moments when he and Dolly were together may have helped them see a warmer, more caring person than what was initially perceived.

Bill Moores.

P1-S   And you know, it's, it's, it's hard to, for me anyway, uh, as much credit as I give coach Drake, I think I tie Billy Moores in to that as well you know, in terms of the whole, uh, the whole Bears picture for me. It is really the two of them together you know. Now you know coach Drake was the one that got it started and stuff too and set the foundation for it, but Bill was, you know, became such an integral part of it, it's often hard to separate, even, even in terms of the coaching and the team right? It's, uh, in my experiences, it's hard to actually separate what was Bill and what was coach Drake and stuff too.

The response provided by P1-S articulates a feeling common to most of CD's followers. The contribution of Bill Moores to the Golden Bear Hockey Program under CD was significant. All but three of the eight players interviewed would have played under CD when Moores was an assistant coach. With one exception all eight players brought him up without prompting. Indeed, it would appear that their partnership created a very strong leadership front that evolved

from a typical coach-assistant coach model to a co-coach one as supported in the

following statement by CD.

CD   I was very fortunate to get him to coach as an assistant. And he proved that for, uh, for about 11 years we worked together I guess. So we were virtually co-coaches by the end of my tenure there.

The data indicate that Bill Moores complemented CD in the following

areas: (a) consistent modeling of organizational values, (b) individual

consideration (Bass, 1985), and (c) player motivation. In the following quote, CD

describes how Bill held and exemplified the same values that he did and how he

may have demonstrated these qualities in a more overt way than he could:

CD   Like he was what I would call the perfect assistant or I should say associate [coach] you know, that's a better term for him, 'cause he knew all the things that I knew and he believed in the things that I believed in and so, it was, you know, it was just, it was just changing the name of the head coach and the players were getting, I think the players were getting the same or, in many cases better in certain cases….First of all he readily moved into the, uh, I won't call it a system, but the culture of the team in the year he played and he became a leader on the team and, uh, so he accepted things that we talked about and the, uh, leadership qualities he brought to the team, you know. Good passion and energy, work ethic, were really good qualities of his, and toughness! He was a tough little bugger. Uh, anyway, uh, yah, so he was a natural.

CD adds that Moores also brought a more individually considerate entity

to the leadership team than what he felt he could provide himself:

"Bill added a different touch to the team," says Clare. "The players found him more approachable than me and he encouraged them to play tougher, because of the kind of player he'd been. He was feistier than me, although he still insisted on discipline. We were a good complement to each other" (Drager, 2007, p. 104).

Certainly one to one, personalized communication seems to have been a

strength that Bill brought to the leader partnership that the two men shared. CD's

comment that Bill was found by the players to be more approachable suggests that

he saw this quality in him and recognized that the quality was one that was

necessary for the team's success. CD's players share this recognition.

P1-S   I think there was, uh, more my sense is that the, that Billy was probably
        more involved in that and that was more uh, uh, an approach that Billy
        would take and that, uh, would bring people I, uh, one on one away from
        the arena, away from the environment and have discussions. I think, you
        know, I, I'm sure coach Drake did that but I don't know that it was as, as
        much and maybe he just didn't need to either, right? Or just different,
        right? So again, you know, was that, uh, one of the reasons why, you
        know, Billy was there and part of that, part of the partnership and part of
        the team and, and Billy intended to handle more of that? Perhaps, you
        know, uh, Billy was good at it so it makes sense that that was the case.

P7-D   I mean I just always found I knew where I stood with Billy Moores….You
        know, Billy I always felt was a no bullshit guy but personable, so there
        was a, how to balance fun, but still um, you know, gain the respect….You
        know, that, 'cause I think coach sometimes didn't have the personal side
        that Billy did and the rapport that Billy had with the players….I just had a
        stronger, um, a stronger bond if you will with Billy as a coach than I did
        with coach Drake.

        Similar to that of his relationship with Dolly Drake, it seems that the

association with Bill Moores played a part in helping CD's players feel a higher

degree of individual consideration which would likely have contributed to

increasing their satisfaction with the program and their experience in it (Bass &

Riggio, 2006). Another participant in the current study suggests that Bill Moores

was the more open communicator of the two leaders and also found that he

brought more of a motivational element than CD might have. P8-D's comments

below certainly allude to the fact that Bill might have been more inspirational in

his approach:

P8-D   [CD] was very hard to read, uh, it was a good combination, I think, at U
        of A when I was playing with them because we had, we had Billy Moore,
        who was really, I don't know, he was the motivator, he was the guy that,
        to get you riled up and get you pumped. And uh and Coach Drake was

really the technical guy, you know he wasn't uh, I always found him hard to talk to, so, and hard to read.

Given the data as presented, a case can be made for the part that Bill Moores played in helping fill gaps that may have existed in the leadership style displayed by CD. Correspondingly, this may have helped to increase the transformational quality that the players attributed to both Bill Moores and CD individually.

Murray Smith.

Though not specifically mentioned by the interview participants, Dr. Murray Smith[2] may have been a significant contributor to the innovative quality exhibited by CD. Along with his experience as a coach and teacher, Smith earned a doctorate in Educational Psychology and moved on to full professor in the Department of Physical Education at the U of A in 1964. In the book by Johnston and Walter (2007) called *Simply the Best: Insights and Strategies from Great Hockey Coaches*, CD identifies Smith as one of his mentors at the University of Alberta. Following is an excerpt from CD on the subject.

> [Murray] and I bounced thoughts off each other so often and still do, and there have been so many things that he has said and thought that I think are wise and that I've adopted (p. 118).

Drager (2007) cites an article written by Smith in 1987 that captures the essence of a reciprocating respect accorded to CD. More specifically, Smith touches on the subject of CD's coaching philosophy.

---

[2] Refer to Drager (2007) p. 36 for a more complete review of Dr. Murray Smith's credentials.

> To say that he is predominantly rational (that is he relies on analysis and reason) does not mean he is unemotional. He is intent and frequently shows intense emotion. But his emotionality…is virtually either always positive (that is encouraging and rewarding), or directed at events, and not directed punishingly at players (p. 21).

Drager goes on to indicate that the two men have been close since 1953 and their relationship continues to this day. Quite obviously Smith and CD were close but more significant is the sharing of information that took place between them. As Drager puts it:

> Murray Smith's extensive research, and clinical experience from his own career as a coach, added substance to Drake's innately healthy instincts as a motivator and leader of young men….Drake cites Murray Smith as the source of many of his ideas in [the area of building teams] (p. 38).

As discussed earlier in this study, CD displayed passion for seeking and absorbing information to improve his own capacity to develop his program and the players in it. As a researcher, Smith would have been privy to educational and sport psychology innovation through 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. It seems likely that the relationship shared between Smith and CD provided a catalyst for many of CD's philosophical underpinnings and subsequent behaviors in the area of teaching and the psychological development of his athletes.

Humility

P1-S   …I think…the thing that ties into that and that made him really likeable and too was his humility. He was, he was a very, and is a very humble man for what he has accomplished and all he's done and I think he never, uh, you never felt like he, uh, put himself ahead of anyone else, right?

As the quotation from P1-S above suggests, the data is strong in support of CD possessing the trait of humility. Humility is defined as "the quality or condition of being humble [or displaying] a modest sense of one's own

importance, rank, etc." (Merriam-Webster's online dictionary, 2013). CD

displays his brand of humility by (a) deflecting praise to those around him, (b)

readily admitting personal limitations, (c) avoiding self-aggrandizements, and (d)

accepting roles assigned to him. Following are excerpts from the data that

support this finding.

Deflecting praise.

In his biographical account of CD's life as a coach, Drager (2007), best

reflects CD's tendency to recognize the part that others have played in the

accomplishments of the program:

> Clare Drake is the kind of man who only talks about his accomplishments
> when pressed. And when he does, he never utters the word "I." Drake
> doesn't use the hoary old "there's-no-I-in-team" cliché, he just lives it. If
> you can get the coach telling stories about seasons past, games or
> championships won and lost, new tactics or systems devised, he always
> says "we", never "I" (p. 23).

Drager continues by juxtaposing CD's behavior of deflecting praise with his

propensity to take responsibility for his failings and/or mistakes:

> Spend hours and hours in conversation with this man, and the only time
> you'll hear him say "I" is when he talks about the mistakes he's made.
> Mistakes: these he'll discuss at his own volition and without equivocation
> (p. 24).

Admitting personal limitations.

To further his point, Drager pulls a quote of CD's from a past Golden Bear

football player who played on the 1967 Vanier Cup championship team of which

CD acted as interim head coach for the season. The player reflects on CD's

training camp opening speech as the team's new head coach. The excerpt

provided below demonstrates both his willingness to openly express limitations as

well as the impression that this behavior had on his players:

> "Gentlemen, I'm not going to pretend that I know a lot about football. But I've surrounded myself with some really great assistants and we're going to work hard, have fun and play some good football this year." [The player] says this discourse struck the players as unusual in its honesty and humility – "not the kind of speech you hear from a head coach" – and it earned Drake, already respected as an assistant, instant credibility as the new boss (p. 82).

Avoiding self-aggrandizement.

In a time when it may have been more typical for a coach to possess a self-

aggrandized image or persona, the image projected by CD seemed to be quite the

opposite. Understated, non-charismatic, neither flashy nor larger-than-life are

typical representations as remembered by his players and coaches. Following is

one example from the data that would support this finding.

P2-S   …inspirational seems flashy and all that to me and that was never him. He was just always consistent and yet when you look at the body of work, holy shit. How did he ever, you know, you get guys now that win, Christ, win one Stanley Cup after coaching for 2 years and all of a sudden they come, they, they, and they're promoting themselves as the best thing that's ever happened to hockey you know. But you would never see that in him at all, very understated and yet again the body of work.

Similarly, CD displayed a small ego. As supported in the following quote,

players felt that he rarely placed himself above others in terms of significance or

importance. The participant below contrasts CD's personality with another coach

as he shares his memory of playing for both of them on the national team.

P4-S   I know that he was very grounded….He would have been, he's a great head coach, he's a great assistant coach, you know? Whatever role you would put him in, he would accept. Whereas [the other coach] wanted to be the head guy [of the team]. He had a big ego. You could kind of see it being played out where [he] wanted to be the head guy. And finally, in the end, they named Clare the head coach, just before [the event]. [The other

coach] was all pissed off. [The other coach] was up in the box and, you know, Clare was just Clare either way. Like, if it had gone the other way and [the other coach] was head coach and Clare was assistant, Clare would have been, "No problem, what can I do?"…he was the most humble guy and he would never take the credit.

Accepting assigned roles.

Indeed, CD's credo "It is amazing what can be accomplished when nobody cares who gets the credit", borrowed from UCLA basketball coach, John Wooden, alludes to the significance that he places on humility. Though CD didn't refer directly to this virtue in the interviews conducted with him, he often highlighted areas where he felt he could have been better, providing support for Drager's (2007) position stated earlier. Further, it was evident that he was uncomfortable talking about his strengths and accepting credit for the accomplishments of the program that he led. For example, when asked about role clarity, CD provides this response, which is typical of how he expresses his humility.

CD   Well, that's another area that so many, there's quite a few areas which I don't think I did a really great job at the beginning of my coaching career and (*chuckling*) maybe not that good at the end of it either…

Additionally, the following example expresses a congruency between CD's philosophy regarding an assistant coach's role and the previous statement shared by P4-S on the same topic. The comment is offered in response to the question of how he personally adjusted to assuming a support role, a position that he was rarely in over his career.

CD   When you go into the role of an assistant coach you got to recognize what your responsibilities are there. Your responsibilities are really to support the head coach with, uh, in everything, you know, and not speak against

him in anyway but just talk privately. If you want to incorporate any
ideas, just talk privately with the coach and see if he'll try things out.

As suggested by P4-S, CD's comment suggests a rationality that transcends the

personal gratification of an assistant coach's ego. When playing a supporting

role, one should offer input and feedback but only in a way that does not

compromise the authority of the head coach particularly in view of the players on

the team.

In summary, it is clear that CD was a humble man as supported in the

written material and the comments made by both CD and his players. His

humility has been demonstrated in how he deflects praise to those around him, his

propensity for openly admitting his own limitations, his avoidance of self-

promotion and his belief of role acceptance.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the leadership qualities possessed by Coach Clare Drake, an exemplary hockey coach. The success of the teams that he coached in university and international hockey levels, as well as the enduring influence that he appears to have had on his players and coaches in both domestic and international hockey communities present a unique model that begs further examination. An additional intent of this research is to further inform theorists interested in improving coaching effectiveness as well as coaches hoping to enhance their own influence.

The data provided through written documentation and interviews with Coach Drake and those that he led revealed five qualities that may have contributed to the success that he experienced with his players and teams, as well as the influence that he had on others in the hockey coaching community. These qualities were humility, innovation, communication, building partnerships of significance, and building organizational culture. Interestingly, humility as it is presented in current leadership literature (Collins, 2001; Morris, Brotheridge, & Urbanski, 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012), may present a significant contributing factor to the remaining four qualities. Furthermore, the exceptional nature of the success and influence that he had hint to qualities or behavior indicative of transformational leadership theory which closely resembles humble leadership. This section will discuss these findings.

Humility

The humility displayed by CD is an important trait that is well supported in the data. His avoidance of self-aggrandizement, steadfast adherence to the principles of teamwork, continual learning, and his inclination to openly attribute success to those around him while being aware of and openly admitting his personal limitations, exemplify the virtue of humility. Literature increasingly supports humility as a necessary construct in leader effectiveness (Collins, 2001; Morris, Brotheridge, & Urbanski, 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012). It may be that these and other qualities indicative of humility have contributed significantly to his influence in the hockey world as well as the enduring success of the Golden Bear Hockey program. Viewpoints such as those found in servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), and level 5 leadership (Collins, 2001) theories expound the positive outcomes of leader humility on follower development, motivation and subsequent performance at the individual and group levels. As these conceptualizations of leadership are newly introduced, I'll explain them briefly in the remainder of this section.

Servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977) originates from views that place ethical thought and behavior at the forefront of leader responsibility (Yukl, 2010). Research on ethical leadership has become more popular in light of the potential misuse of power that might be imparted by leaders on those that follow and in reaction to corporate and public service scandals oft publicized in our society today (Yukl, 2010). The essence of servant leadership prioritizes the development of the follower and organization by fostering teamwork, community, participative

decision-making, and ethical, compassionate behavior in view of accomplishing

shared objectives (Greenleaf, 1977). Servant leaders serve their subordinates by

"nurturing, defending, and empowering their followers" (Yukl, 2010). Humility

is one of many values emphasized in an effort to help people and foster

relationships of trust and cooperation.

The concept of humble leadership (Collins, 2001; Owens & Hekman,

2012) places the virtue of humility squarely in the forefront of leadership

effectiveness. Collins (2001) compared corporations that showed significant

market turnaround and ability to sustain these gains over a significant period of

time (greater than 15 years) with those that experienced similar transformations

but fell short of long-term sustainability. He concluded that leaders of great

companies, or *level 5 leaders* (ibid), were likely to build "enduring greatness

through a paradoxical combination of personal humility plus professional will" (p.

70). Collins (2001) also asserted that level 5 leaders led organizations that were

often their respective industry's benchmark performer and that these levels of

success endured beyond the leader's tenure. It appears that humility might be an

important aspect of leadership that produces enduring results, not dissimilar to

those of CD.

The successes of humble leaders make sense relative to the extant

leadership literature. Similar to relationship orientation (Fiedler & Chemers,

1974; Iso-Ahola & Hatfield, 1986; Yukl, 2010), consideration (Weinberg &

Gould, 1999) and individual considerate (Bass, 1985) behaviors presented in

universal behavioral and transformational leadership models, humble leaders

display increased compassion, prioritizing follower needs and development over their own (Collins, 2001). According to Morris, Brotheridge, and Urbanski (2005), humility predicts socially supportive behavior, participative decision making, and socialized power motivation, characteristics that yield follower trust, psychological freedom, task engagement, and openness to innovation (Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012).

It is evident that CD cared about the development of his players, his staff and others in the coaching community. His philosophy of playing most of his players regularly and in as many roles as possible indicates a commitment to the growth of each individual on his team. As well, the increasing responsibility and input into decision making asked of his captains and coaching staff indicates an understanding of the importance of developing leadership skills in those under him (Collins, 2001). His significant participation in Hockey Canada and NCCP coaching programs suggests that he had a concern for the development of coaches in Canada and perhaps the associated positive outcome that this involvement would have on young hockey players and Canadian hockey in general.

Though CD placed the needs of others above his own, it should be noted that most players new to the program did not consider his coaching style to be relationship-oriented. Rather, they felt that he was more task-oriented and less socially supportive. Indeed, the dissatisfaction of the two dissenters interviewed suggests that they might have benefitted from a greater interpersonal connection with him. It is impossible to guess, but players who required more of this

behavior from CD might have underperformed and or discontinued their involvement due to the dissatisfaction derived from their relationship with him.

The coaching literature does show some support for task orientation when coaching athletes of this caliber (Chelladurai & Carron, 1977) and maturity level (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) who are situated in a highly favorable environment (i.e., strong winning record, highly structured environment, and strong leader-position power) (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974) as would have been presented in the program at that time. Further, CD's propensity to lean towards task orientation behaviors is congruent with findings (Bloom et al., 1999; Tharp & Gallimore, 1976) derived from studying the behaviors of other successful coaches at the university level. As well, Sherman, Fuller, and Speed (2000), in comparing the preferred coaching behaviors of male and female Australian athletes (n = 312) aged 18 – 35, in single and dual gender sporting cultures (Australian rules football, netball and basketball), found that all those completing the LSS (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) preferred more positive feedback, and training and instruction, with social support being the least preferred. This study provides more recent evidence that young adult athletes prefer task orientation behavior as compared to that of social support; it should be noted, however, that Sherman et al. failed to indicate the specific competitive level of these athletes stating only that all were of a similar level.

Relative to decision-making, CD clearly involved his players but to varying degrees. Yukl (2010) provides a continuum of decision procedures that leaders might use that range from no influence by followers to high influence:

1. Autocratic Decision – the leader makes the decision independently with no influence from others.

2. Consultation – the leader seeks input from followers and then makes decision independently based on information received

3. Joint Decision – the leader makes the decision along with his/her followers; influence is equal for the leader and followers.

4. Delegation – the leader gives an individual or group responsibility for making the decision and is involved only in setting parameters and possibly providing approval before the decision is implemented.

Yukl (2010) adds that participative behavior on the part of the leader increases the likelihood of decision quality, decision acceptance, satisfaction with the decision process, and the development of participant skills. These outcomes are supported in the humble leadership literature (Collins, 2001; Morris, Brotheridge, & Urbanski, 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012). As indicated in the data, CD demonstrated consultative behavior in having all his players provide input on captain selections thereby increasing the quality, acceptance, and satisfaction of his eventual decision, while also (and as suggested by P5-S) helping them develop their own leadership skills. The inclusive development of the toughness list exemplified joint decision-making and would have served all of the participative outcomes, in particular the acceptance of group expectations. CD's participative style increased with captains and assistant coaches. He delegated extra responsibility to his captains in handling some discipline issues and had them consult on decisions regarding logistics involving travel, team meals, etc. His

assistant coaches experienced a high degree of: consultative behavior as input was openly encouraged; joint decision making in relation to the use of system play and personnel issues; and delegation in bench management and, small and/or full group skill instruction.

It should be noted, however, that though participative behavior was evident, newer players, and those who did not move into formal leadership roles (i.e., captains and assistant coaches) perceived him to be more autocratic in nature. It is possible that the limited interpersonal connection that he had with non-captains and newer players contributed to this perception. None-the-less, it appears that the majority of his players were satisfied with their experience and team outcomes would indicate that performance was strong. Chelladurai, Haggerty, and Baxter (1985) suggested that both male and female athletes playing basketball in Canadian universities prefer autocratic behavior more so than participative. Furthermore, the complexities involved in team sport, where interdependency among teammates is high and time pressures prevail, preclude a high degree of democratic decision-making during training and competition (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983; Owens & Hekman, 2012

Still, participative behavior was exhibited in CD's coaching style and, interestingly, in a time when some researchers (Ogilvie & Tutko, 1966; Penman, Hastad, & Cords, 1974) believed that successful leaders were thought to exhibit primarily authoritarian characteristics. Indeed, the traditional (and at times, current) conception of a male coach in male sport conjures images of a loud, militaristic leader with a whistle in one hand and a clipboard in the other, running

his/her athletes through rote skill and/or conditioning exercises, while fostering a "my way or the high way" decision-making philosophy. Though the picture of CD blowing a whistle and demanding that his players perform drills repetitively isn't far off the mark, the engagement of his athletes in decision-making, albeit small and mostly consultative in nature, might have been ahead of his time. CD's desire for professional improvement and his search for innovative ways to enhance the performance of his athletes are well represented in the data. So too is the openness in which he sought input from those around him towards the accomplishment of such outcomes. In addition, his proximity to people such as Murray Smith, who would have been well versed in nuances offered in sport and physical education research, would have provided an accessible source of new knowledge from which he could draw.   Still, he might not have benefited from this rich resource had he not been conscious of his own limitations and modest enough to ask for assistance from those around him as might be typical of a humble leader (Collins, 2001; Morris, Brotheridge, & Urbanski, 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012).

Humility and innovation.

The data support that CD was a lifelong learner and open to new thoughts and ideas. As noted in the preceding section, the innovations that he brought to the game and coaching were ahead of his time. More important to the influence that he had on the hockey world was his desire to share information not only with those in his program, but to his coaching peers and opponents. It may be that his humble nature contributed to this quality.

Morris, Brotheridge, and Urbanski (2005) provide three dimensions in their definition of humility that are useful in demonstrating how CD's humble nature might have contributed to his innovative behavior. *Self-awareness* or a willingness and/or ability to objectively assess one's own abilities and limitations; *openness*, which suggests being open to new ideas and a willingness to learn from others; and *transcendence*, which is an acceptance that we are one small part of a much larger scheme which leads to a greater appreciation for others and the positive worth that they possess. From my own recollections as a player, CD seemed to be aware that he was imperfect and understood that perfection was unattainable. This is corroborated by the data collected through the interviews. I clearly remember that he wanted us to strive to be the best that we could be in whatever we did (which was usually directed towards our execution of the techniques, tactics and systems that he taught us, but not solely) and not accepting less. He often encouraged us to try to be a "bit better every day" as hockey players. The suggestion of course was that we should understand that there is always room to improve and, although perfection is unlikely to ever be attained, the act of striving for it is of primary importance.

This labor toward perfection seems to be at the core of his personal philosophy at least as it relates to his belief in continual learning. The awareness of his limitations and his subsequent desire to improve as a coach likely contributed to the *openness* that he exhibited to new ideas and input from others (Morris et al., 2005). CD's motivation didn't seem to be solely focused on his own development or any form of personal gain. His willingness to share the

information and knowledge that he accumulated through his quest for innovation

suggest that his purpose *transcended* that of personal growth to a one of a higher

level (Morris et al., 2005).

Indeed, sharing information with opposing coaches would not be

indicative of a coach that pursued knowledge so that his teams could be more

successful than others or in an effort to receive personal accolades. As CD

suggests, his desire to share was as much about getting his own ideas out so that

they could be tested, improved, proven, and/or disproven as it was about helping

others grow. In essence, he seemed to be powered by a need to see the sport itself

improve for the benefit of everyone. With this being the case, it is easy to see

how his influence would be compelling for other coaches in the greater hockey

community and to the players and coaches on his own team.

Humility and communication.

"Good communication skills are among the most important ingredients

contributing to performance enhancement and the personal growth of sport and

exercise participants" (Weinberg & Gould, 1999). LaVoi (2007) goes further in

her description of the significance that communication holds in the relationship

between a coach and an athlete.

> Communication is also the vehicle for developing the coach-athlete
> relationship; it transmits care, concern respect, and trust. The formation,
> development, maintenance, and dissolution of the coach-athlete
> relationship also occur through communication processes (p. 30).

One of the more intriguing findings emerging from the data pertains to

CD's style of communication. Though some of the participants in the study felt

that his communication skills were weak, his teams managed to perform at a

consistently high level and more athletes seemed satisfied with his coaching behavior than those who were not. Indeed, the outcomes that the players experienced would indicate that he must have been competent in the transfer of knowledge, values, and expectations to those that he led. In fact, his ability to transfer content is supported by all of the participants interviewed.

It is apparent, however, that CD's communication with his players was not often personalized, and one to one communication was infrequent. Jowett and Poczwardowski (2007) propose that the quality and quantity of communication directly contributes to relationships that are both harmonious and stable. Therefore, it is likely that CD's impersonal communication style contributed to a feeling of disconnectedness, particularly earlier on in their careers. For those study participants who presented as dissenters, it seems likely that CD's inability to present strong interpersonal communication contributed to a dissatisfaction in their relationship with him which certainly might have contributed to a diminished experience on their part.

For example, it is clear that P7-D felt that the amount of correction that he received under CD was disproportionate to the mistakes that he made in practices and games relative to teammates who made similar errors. This participant goes on to share that the amount of game or playing time (whether or not he was in the line-up for a game or the amount of playing time that he received when in the line-up) that CD gave him did not seem to be tied to his effort or performance in team practice. Jowett and Paczwardowski (2007) might suggest that P7-D's perception of CD's decisions and his associated interpretations might have

contributed to a decreased satisfaction with his experience, negative affect, possibly diminished motivation and performance (intrapersonal outcome); a dissatisfaction with his and his coach's relationship (interpersonal outcome) and a lack of role clarity (group outcome). The argument might be made that this player could have benefited from a higher degree of interpersonal communication with CD. In their integrated research model of coach-athlete relationships, Jowett and Paczwardowski (2007) postulate, "a coach and an athlete who have formed a relationship based on respect and trust are more likely to experience positive feelings such as satisfaction and happiness as opposed to despair and distress" (p. 11). CD might have been more explicit in communicating the reason for his decisions regarding P7-D's playing time or perhaps more direct in communicating his player's specific role on the team. Because the nature of the coach-athlete relationship is reciprocally related to the consequent outcomes (Jowett & Paczwardowski, 2007), stronger interpersonal communication directed from CD to the player might have ultimately increased the likelihood of P7-D communicating with him with the intent of determining what he might change to get into the line-up.

From a slightly different perspective, it is clear that P7-D found CD's communication style inadequate relative to some of the other players interviewed. In consideration of Chelladurai and Saleh's multi-dimensional model (1980), it may be that the style of communication preferred by this player was not congruent with CD's behavior, which may have led to a decrease in his satisfaction and performance. This is in line with situational leadership models indicating that

coaching behavior in part is mediated by situational factors, including those that are presented by the athletes being coached (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Horn, 2008; Smith and Smoll, & Hunt, 1977). Further, DeVito (1986) posits that communication is complex in nature as it involves the interplay of both individuals' perceptions of self, other, and the relationship. Though it is evident that personalized communication was not a behavior typical of CD's coaching style, to suggest that the responsibility of becoming closer with his players relied solely on him might be oversimplifying the nature of dyadic relationships generally.

Indeed, Jowett and Poczwardowski (2007) suggest that coach and athlete individual characteristics, the wider social-cultural-sport context in which they are situated and characteristics of the relationship itself, all ultimately influence the quality and quantity of interpersonal communication within the dyad. Fittingly, they include relationship duration as a contributing characteristic. The data show that relationships with CD's players improved as they moved through the program, particularly when they evolved into positions of leadership, or became his assistant coaches. It stands to reason that the longer players spent with CD, the more likely that they would come to understand his communication style and subsequently what he wanted from them and vice versa. Greater exposure to him as a role model may have helped them see that he did care about them, which might have contributed to their improved relationship satisfaction. Perhaps more significantly, greater exposure to CD's communication style, as transferred through those that might buffer and/or help contextualize his intended messages

(such as assistant coaches, captains, and veteran players) might also have had a positive effect on their satisfaction. The fact that P7-D only spent one season under CD clearly would have limited the development of a stronger relationship between them. Then again, it may be that his release from the team may have contributed to an enduring dissatisfaction with CD in general.

CD's humility plays a part in how he transferred information to his players as well. His feeling that others might be better suited to deliver messages to the players is indicative of a man who recognizes personal limitations and weaknesses (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012). For the betterment of the group and/or the individual requiring attention, he enlisted veterans and other leaders to take on responsibility in this regard. Interestingly, the humility that might have led to empowering players in this way may have not only have served to improve the psychosocial wellbeing of his athletes, but may very well have contributed to the development of a strong organizational culture. This idea will be explored further in the following section.

Humility and building organizational culture.

It is significant that the organizational values as recounted by his players match those that CD indicated to be important for the success of the team. Clearly, CD modeled the values that he espoused which would have played a part in helping develop the trust relevant to the relationships that he had with his players, despite the limited interpersonal communication initiated by him. Further, he encouraged his returning players to model behavior and pass on these same values to younger players. Ultimately, it is believed that these beliefs and values

became underlying cultural expectations that dropped out of awareness and were passed on organically from year to year (Schein, 1992), some that continue to this day within the Golden Bear culture.

Humility underpins the values at the core of the Golden Bear organization. Continual learning or striving to be the best one can be, sharing, cooperation, commitment to contributing to the greater group, and the prioritization of team over individual goals all suggest the notion that virtue exists in rising above one's self-importance in the effort to serve (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002) and contribute to others' success before one's own (Morris et al., 2005). Humility of this nature is also represented in the team's adopted motto "It's amazing what can be accomplished when no one cares who gets the credit" (Wooden, 2006). As an outer representation of program culture (Schein, 1992) this quote provides further insight into the foundational significance of humility within the Golden Bear program.

Additional literature on humility and leadership (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012) suggests that humble leaders actively seek out, recruit, and develop future leaders who can challenge their own methods and ideas, bring strengths to fill gaps resulting from their own limitations, and become successors for the purpose of propagating organizational success. CD's behavior appears to be congruent with that presented in the literature. Though recruitment of new players to the team was not explicitly discussed, data presented suggests that CD certainly brought returning players into his leadership group

(i.e., captains and assistant coaches) that he felt exemplified his own values, and wished to instill into the organization.

The development of leaders in the Golden Bear program is another salient factor that points to the greater influence that CD has had beyond the U of A. His philosophy adheres to the notion that leaders can be developed if provided with the opportunity and resources necessary to be successful. Additionally, CD felt that he displayed intent to help grow these qualities within the Golden Bear program by asking returning players to model the values and expectations embedded within. Furthermore, he incrementally provided meaningful responsibility to his captains and assistant coaches (particularly), and encouraged them to challenge themselves when they were with the program. This behavior continued beyond the graduation of players or coaches who continued in the field of coaching. In many ways, he acted as a mentor to them, which is indicative of both humble leaders (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012) and transformational leaders (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006). According to these theories, behavior of this nature would have contributed to his players' and coaches' motivation to perform beyond normal expectations.

Leaders were developed within the organizational culture, though evidence also suggests that if players failed to embrace the values presented by the team, they would be released, or would leave on their own accord. As mentioned by P4-S, "…the guys that weren't buying in, they weren't there…It didn't matter how good you were…". This dynamic is somewhat unique to the sport leadership domain in that coaches at the high performance level often have

the luxury of shaping the culture of the group through the recruitment and/or release of players. Important to this point is that CD prioritized the embodiment of team values to skill. This core belief paired with the ability to be selective in who would be in the group and who would not, would have contributed to the development and maintenance of the Golden Bear organizational culture.

According to Collins (2001), behavior of this nature is congruent with level 5 leaders. Such leaders not only demonstrate humility in action but also "inspired standards" (p. 72). Mediocrity within the organization is not acceptable. Along with this strong commitment to the values and expectations of the organization, level 5 leaders are willing to make difficult decisions for the group's best interest (Collins, 2001). For those followers not committed to striving for excellence, as P4-S suggests in the above quote, membership on the team might be short lived.

Though CD demanded execution similar to that of a level 5 leader, it's interesting to note that he also indicated a preference not to release players if it could be helped. He would rather work with them in an attempt to bring them into line. This behavior is perhaps more representative of a transformational leader who seeks to align his followers' values with those of the organization (i.e., idealized influence) while displaying individual consideration (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006), or a sincere compassion for his athletes and a desire to see them develop and eventually succeed.

CD's humility may very well have had an impact on those that he led, though, Owens and Hekman (2012) might suggest that humility on its own would

not necessarily predict his influence on player satisfaction and performance. According to their model, humble behavior effectiveness is contingent on the presence of organizational learning culture. In other words, an environment that is intellectually stimulating (Bass, 1985), where creativity is encouraged, input is invited and never criticized, and continual learning is fostered (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012), is necessary for positive follower outcomes. This thinking is congruent with theories that tie athlete outcomes to situational contingencies (Chelladurai, 1978, 2006; Smith & Smoll, 1997; Horn, 2008). CD's ability to bring the aforementioned values into his relationships with his players and others might have further contributed to his ability to find success in coaching as will be discussed in the following section.

Humility and building complementary relationships.

As mentioned earlier, humble leaders are more likely to objectively assess their own strengths and weaknesses (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012). They seek individuals who possess qualities or strengths to fill in gaps that result from their personal limitations as leaders (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005). Furthermore, as Owens and Hekman (2012) found, "In contrast to 'nonhumble' leaders, who were sometimes described as suspicious toward and threatened by exceptionally intelligent or talented followers because they were worried these followers might 'outshine' them… humble leaders instead were intent on pushing their followers into the spotlight" (p. 797).

Though CD was most likely influenced by many people in his life, the data strongly suggests that Dolly Drake, Bill Moores, and Murray Smith

significantly contributed to the success and influence that he had. Dolly Drake

brought an increased sense of family or caring to the organization. Bill Moores

also brought individual consideration within the daily confines of the program

itself due to his ability and/or tendency to communicate freely with the players

and more effectively build interpersonal relationships. Murray Smith appears to

have acted as a strong contributor to CD's innovative behavior particularly in the

area of coaching development and sport psychology.

It is likely that CD's humility played a part in helping to attract these

people to him. It may also have served, however, as a contributing factor toward

the maintenance of the relationships that he built with them. Using the example

of his introductory meeting with the Bears football team as cited in Drager's

(2007) biography, the open admission of his limitation in coaching football, and

his immediate reference to the strong coaching staff assembled around him,

seemingly served to be a compelling feature for the players on the team. The

statement also made it clear that he would be drawing from the more experienced

coaches around him. In both cases, it is likely that CD's comment would have

helped to build relational trust and loyalty while serving to impart a sense of

responsibility and accountability among his players and assistant coaches. Owens

and Hekman (2012) suggest that the dyadic relationship between the humble

leader and his/her follower is more likely to consistently improve over time as

compared to relationships with non-humble leaders. Without the idealized

interpretation of the leader that might be associated with the start of the

relationship and a potential let down when the follower discovers the leader's

imperfections, the "humble leader-follower dyadic relationship may follow a steadier, upward path, marked by increasing trust, mutual respect, and loyalty, rather than the suggested leader-follower relational stages of honeymoon, disillusionment, and (hopefully) reconciliation" (Owens & Hekman, 2012, p. 807). Hence, strong bonds were developed and nurtured between Coach and the three mentioned. His habit of recognizing their contributions openly would have further served to bind them to him.

It would be naïve to suggest, however, that CD drew only from these individuals during his time at the U of A. That these three emerge prominently out of the data would suggest that they might have been more central to CD's contributions as a coach. CD, however, would have likely accessed knowledge and assistance from many others within the University of Alberta and the hockey community at large. Indeed, it appears that CD's nature was to learn from anyone that he might come into contact with and any situation that he might be involved in. For example, CD mentions that he was able to learn from skilled players by observing how they executed their skills. Owens and Hekman (2012) state that "Humble leaders were described as students of their followers' strengths, and thus they were experts on the 'human capital' around them" (p. 797). Indeed, it would seem that CD benefited greatly from the contributions of others.

Paradoxically, CD seems to have displayed strong relationship building skills with the three mentioned as well as his coaching peers, despite not demonstrating the same with the majority of his players while they played under him. In fact, all study participants suggest that their relationship with him became

more personal when they left the program. This may be an indication that the quality and quantity of his communication with his players represented a behavior that he chose, not necessarily a deficiency in ability. The data suggests that his players interpreted this to be the case. Some suggest that his leadership style may have been indicative of those typical to his generation. Others guess that he wanted to maintain a more definitive line between himself and his players to reduce the difficulty and perhaps bias (or perceived bias) in decision-making.

Whatever the case, it seems likely that this style represented a conscious choice made by CD rather than an inconsistency or inability. Quite possibly, the ability to build relationships may have been a strength for CD though one that he chose not to impart to most of his current players. The data suggest that he regrets not having worked to build stronger relationships with his players in the years that he coached. Indeed, adopting a greater emphasis on the development of interpersonal communication and stronger relationships with his players may very well have increased his effectiveness as a leader.

Humility and transformational leadership.

As mentioned elsewhere in this paper, the transformational leadership model (Bass, 1985) has provided a framework to help guide the examination of the phenomenon at the center of this case study. In this light, results seem to indicate a strong congruence between CD's leadership style and that of transformational leadership theory. More specifically, his leadership behavior resembled all of the four components offered by Avolio and Bass (1991) with some exceptions. Most notable among these deviations was an understated

personality or lack of overt charisma and implicit communication of the organization's vision - characteristics indicative of idealized influence and inspirational motivation and/or the charismatic quality of transformational leaders (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Given the humility that was characteristic of CD's personality, it makes sense that he would be more understated in these areas. Although humility has not specifically been discussed in transformational leadership literature, researchers have found that idealized influence may be attributed to a leader who makes self-sacrifices to benefit his/her followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Yukl, 2010). Indeed, in their laboratory study examining follower perception of an imaginary leader, van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg (2005) found that followers attributed charismatic qualities to the leader when told that he/she was making self-sacrifice in the interest of the group. It might be argued that CD's tendency to attribute responsibility for his achievements to those around him was regarded by his players as self-sacrificial behavior. Certainly, for some followers, it was an endearing quality, one that drew people to him, and one that some could identify with, which is the essence of charisma and idealized influence. Similarly, Morris et al. (2005) draw comparisons with humility and idealized influence highlighting that both transformational and humble leaders "act as role models for employees by engaging in ethical and moral conduct, sharing risks and considering the needs of other before self" (p. 1340) leading to follower admiration, respect and trust and a wish to emulate the leader. Essentially CD's humility might be considered a charismatic quality in itself.

Another of CD's characteristics that emerged strongly from the data was his propensity to share his knowledge with other coaches. It seems that his passion for the game of hockey, his thirst for learning and innovation, and his desire to contribute to the development of the sport on a larger scale ranked as highly in his list of priorities as the success of his own program. Similar to the discussion concerning his humility, it may be that CD's desire to share information with other coaches in the hockey world, and, in particular with those coaches whose teams the Golden Bears competed against, was a form of self-sacrifice. Many coaches might think twice about handing opponents their methods for success for fear of losing the upper hand and, subsequently, their jobs.

In consideration of the context within which CD was employed, however, this behavior of sharing might have been more easily enacted. Given that he coached in a time and place where the longevity of one's coaching position might not be as dependent on team wins as might be typical in a professional sport setting, his openness to sharing his innovations might not have been hindered by the pressure to win. Further, CD coached primarily within an institution for higher learning where a high degree of value is attached to the development of the individual and the advancement of knowledge for the greater good of our society. As he alludes to in the interviews, his intent was to build on knowledge that already existed in the hockey community through the consideration of methods current to the time, developing creative alternatives and then passing on information to those in the coaching field. His hope was to have these alternative

methods tried by other coaches for the purpose of being proven or disproven, and perhaps made better for the advancement of the game in general. Fittingly, this process mirrors that of a researcher who intends to contribute to society by way of scientific enquiry and publication of findings.

The commitment to *higher values* certainly seems to have been displayed through CD's openness to pass on his knowledge to the larger hockey community and may have contributed to the charismatic quality and, perhaps as it relates to transformational leadership, the idealized influence that he exhibited. House & Howell (1992) indicate that charismatic leadership can be either socialized or personalized. In its socialized form, the charismatic leader is committed to the altruistic consideration of collective interests and the development of individuals within the group. The personalized charismatic leader seeks to elevate his/her own personal objectives potentially using the manipulation of the follower as a means to that end. Bass and Riggio (2006) add that authentic transformational leaders act in a way that moves beyond their own self-interests for utilitarian or moral reasons.

> If utilitarian, their objective is to benefit their group or its individual members, their organization, or society, as well as themselves, and to meet the challenges of the task or mission. If a matter of moral principles, the objective is to do the right thing, to do what fits principles of morality, responsibility, sense of discipline, and respect for authority, customs, rules, and traditions of a society (p.14).

It might be argued that CD's behavior of sharing was selfless in nature (socialized charismatic), done to benefit the greater hockey society (utilitarian act) and was morally right (moral act) and, through this, was both transformational and humble in nature. This model that he presented to his players might have "demonstrated

high standards of ethical and moral conduct" (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 6) for his followers contributing to their desire to emulate him.

Morris et al., (2005) also compare the intellectual stimulation of the transformational leader (Bass, 1985) to the participative decision-making behavior of the humble leader (Owens & Hekman, 2012). In both theories, follower input is encouraged and nurtured with the intent of building trusting relationships, determining creative solutions to preexisting problems, and contributing to follower development. Though CD encouraged varying degrees of input as players moved through their careers at the U of A, he did not explicitly encourage them to be creative. More strongly indicated was that a strong adherence to his tactics and game systems were paramount before any creativity might be considered allowable, and that creativity was only permitted if within the boundaries dictated by them.

Though at first glance this behavior might not be typical of intellectual stimulation, Bass & Riggio (2006) indicate that leaders need to consider situational contingencies when emphasizing the rationality of creative action. In team sport, and particularly one that is as quickly paced as hockey, adherence to system play, positioning and/or team play principles in competition makes sense because the success of the unit is dependent on each teammate knowing that the others will be in a certain position at a critical time relative to the situation. This adherence to structure would increase the speed at which decisions and subsequent actions might take place increasing the likelihood of a unit's offensive or defensive efficiency. In other words, creativity might be effective in certain

situations while irrational and counter-effective in others. The assertion that coaching behavior (in this case the encouragement of creativity) must be congruent with the requirements of the situation (team sport) is consistent with Chelladurai's (1978) multi-dimensional leadership model. Similarly, Owens and Hekman (2012) indicate that where extreme threat and/or time pressure exists, greater autocratic behavior and greater adherence to predefined patterns or structure might predominate.

Though CD may not have explicitly encouraged his players to think outside of the box, the persistent model of innovative behavior that he presented very likely served to stimulate his players intellectually while also fostering an organizational learning culture (Owens & Hekman, 2012). The evidence would suggest that he did influence and/or stimulate creative thinking through the innovative teaching techniques, tactics and system play that he introduced often to the group. This modeling behavior has been recognized as intellectual stimulation in previous literature. Devilbiss and Siebold (1987), examined behavior of commanding generals in the US Military who implemented organizational change for the betterment of their respective areas. In their discussion, they suggested that one of the generals exhibited intellectual stimulation behavior early in the restructuring process by simply opening himself up to thinking beyond conventional organization and thought in his area of responsibility.

Similar to that of the other transformational components, individual consideration seems to have been more implied than explicit, particularly with players who were relatively new to the team. As mentioned elsewhere, it is likely

that CD chose not to emphasize interpersonal communication with his players earlier on in their careers. This choice may have been generational and/or practical in nature. It is obvious, however, that some players required a greater degree of interpersonal communication. CD's behavior in this area might have contributed to the dissatisfaction of some (such as P7-D and P8-D) and may have had a negative impact on their resulting performance. It is interesting to note that both of CD's dissenters played for him in the last third of his coaching career. It may be that his decision to hold to communication and relationship patterns more typical of previous generations might have led to newer generations of players attributing lower levels of individually considerate behavior to him. Regardless, it is evident that as players moved through their careers and into positions of leadership, they perceived CD to display qualities typical of a leader who is individually considerate.

Humble leaders place the needs of the organization and the follower ahead of their own (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012), which is consistent with individual consideration of the transformational leader. They assume a mentorship role with their followers for the purpose of developing followers to successively higher levels of competency (Morris et al., 2005). As mentioned earlier, CD seems to have purposefully groomed players and coaches by empowering them to take on increasing amounts of responsibility both on and off the ice. This sense of purpose was demonstrated through CD's philosophy of playing as many players as he could in as many game situations as possible. In so doing, players would develop the skills necessary to be increasingly effective and

ultimately lead in key on-ice situations. As players moved through their careers they came to understand that their turn would come to step forward and lead. This process of leadership development eventually became embedded within the culture of the program. For those that continued into coaching roles, this mentorship from CD would become more formal and carry on into their coaching careers outside of the Golden Bear Hockey program. The provision of opportunity, empowerment, and ongoing support seems to exemplify the compassion that CD had for those that he led which likely contributed to the perception that he was an individually considerate coach.

In reflection, it is clear that CD displayed behaviors that were transformational and that he possessed other qualities that may also have contributed to his effectiveness and influence as a coach. It should be noted however, that much of what we have learned through this examination might not necessarily be directly transferable to current coaching situations. More recently, coaches are encouraged to be more individually considerate and/or relationship oriented than what might have been typical in CD's time at the U of A. The merit of having diversity within groups might supersede the tendency to have athletes conform to a specific prototype, perhaps creating room for greater individual growth and/or levels of performance and satisfaction. At the same time, today's athletes might desire coaching styles that encourage individuality and therefore demand a more interpersonal relationship with their coach in order to develop trust that their coaches understand their individual needs.

What is most compelling, however, is the notion that humility might underpin the aforementioned qualities of transformational leaders and those that emerged from this study. Humility as a focus in leadership literature is relatively new and little if any research has been performed in the area of humility in sport coaching. Further exploration is necessary to determine if there is a relationship between coaching effectiveness and humility in the sport domain, and how humility might be developed.

If indeed the idea of humility as a construct has merit, then can coaches learn how to be humble? Owens and Hekman (2012) suggest that leader humility might positively influence follower behavior only if the leader is perceived to be sincere in his/her demonstration of it. Humility might not be as simple as a tool that one can learn how to wield, particularly by those who are predisposed to personality types that may not typically be characterized by humility (e.g., narcissism). Clearly, CD's behavior was authentically humble. It should be noted, however, that he was not asked directly if he intended to act in this way. Once again, further research might focus on the trainability of humility and the relationship that it might have ultimately on athlete satisfaction and performance. If it is indeed trainable, then coaches looking to expand their coaching effectiveness might benefit from acquiring this quality.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

The current study explored the coaching qualities of Clare Drake, an exemplary hockey coach at the University of Alberta for close to 30 seasons. The study's aim was to examine his transformational behavior and other qualities that might have led to his influence on the extraordinary success of the athletes and Golden Bears Hockey Teams that he coached, as well as the enduring influence that he had on the game of hockey on a larger scale. The data collected included interviews with eight of his players, captains and/or coaches from varying eras and were triangulated with written documentation as well as my own personal memories and interpretations as both a player and captain under Coach Drake for four seasons leading up to his retirement in 1989. Transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985) was used to frame the inquiry, as his teams appeared to perform consistently beyond expectations; an outcome believed to be related to transformational leadership.

Clare Drake demonstrated five qualities that were significant to his coaching behavior and/or influence: humility, innovation, communication, ability to build organizational culture, and ability to develop relationships of significance. The data strongly indicates that he was humble and innovative and that he was effective in his ability to build lasting relationships of significance and a strong organizational culture. His communication style and ability to build relationships with his players, however, was less cogent.

Recent literature in the area of leadership effectiveness posits that humility is a significant leader characteristic that contributes to outstanding organizational transformations that endure (Collins, 2001; Morris et al., 2005; Owens & Hekman, 2012). It may be that Clare Drake's humility was the linchpin of the remaining four qualities and therefore an important ingredient contributing to the success and influence that he experienced. This finding adds support to the extant literature on humility and leadership. The notion of humility seems to weave its way through transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1985) displaying particular relevance to the behavioral components of intellectual stimulation and individual consideration; the two areas that most separate transactional from transformational leader behavior and, concurrently, group performance beyond expectations (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In their paper exploring humility and its potential relevance to effective leadership behavior, Morris et al. (2005) suggest that this quality "may be required for a leader to engage in true transformational leadership" (p. 1340). In addition, Oyer (2011) found a strong positive correlation between confidence, humility and leadership effectiveness as measured using transformational leadership theory. Though literature exists in this area (e.g., Berendt, Christofi, Kasibhatla, Malindretos, & Maruffi, 2012; de Vries, 2012; Fredman & Langbert, 2000; Reave, 2005), it is minimal.

Strengths and Limitations

The primary intent of this case study was to explore Clare Drake, in particular, his coaching characteristics and style. Focusing on an exemplary case of this nature provides opportunity to add to current literature on effective

coaching practice. As well, developing coaches might benefit from gazing into the lived experiences, memories, and interpretations of both Clare Drake and his players. Despite these potential strengths, it should be noted that case studies do not provide a strong platform on which to make generalizations (Stake, 1995) from one coach and/or context to another.

Another strength lies in the perspectives offered by me as the researcher. The study is unique in that I personally experienced the case as a player, a captain, and as a coach mentee. The opportunity to participate with the case from these multiple perspectives, gives the study a strength that is rare in qualitative literature. Similar to the ethnographic method, I had the opportunity to view the case from the emic view or from within the culture rather than from the etic or from the outside (Mayan, 2009). Given that I was not a formal observer during most of my interactions with the case, the likelihood that CD would have inadvertently altered the behavior of the subject or context under scrutiny (Patton, 2002) would be negligible.

In the same light, however, it should be noted that subjectivity would be evident in the determination of transformational leadership as a theory in which to frame the development of the interview guide, as well as in the selection of which qualities on which to focus, discuss and the subsequent interpretations made. As Mayan (2009) indicates:

> Research is never undirected. Research is not free-standing. There are many possible agendas; it is important to know yours and what consistently constitutes it. It is important to seek to know but at the same time situate this knowing as tenuous (p. 138).

For me, the experience playing under Clare Drake has positively influenced my personal values and approach to life, work, and relationships. It would be naïve to think that personal bias did not appear in places throughout this process despite best intentions.

Smoll and Smith (1989) indicate that the effectiveness of a coach's behavior on the performance and satisfaction of his/her athletes are as perceived by those that he/she coaches. In this, the selection of past players to provide personal accounts of his coaching qualities is strength for this study. Further, the players selected were for the most part eventual captains and/or coaches with Clare Drake and thereby would have spent the most time with him and come to know him better than those new to the program and/or not elevated to positions of leadership. Patton (2002) does remind us, however, that the retrospective nature of interviews in qualitative inquiry may lend itself to recall-error. It is also possible that their individual interpretations of his behavior at that time may have evolved over time due in part to their ongoing personal experience within and beyond that of the Golden Bear fraternity.

Future Directions

This case study explored the leadership style of Clare Drake, a successful hockey coach who worked with university athletes from 1958 until 1989. Given the high degree of contextual complexity inherent within the coach-athlete dyad, further study of a similar nature might provide insight into the traits and behaviors of exemplar coaches and their relationship within varying situational contexts. Research of this kind would contribute to advancing knowledge in the area by

providing a lens through which the lived coaching experience might be viewed for the purpose of validating and/or challenging current coaching theory. Further, it would paint a portrait for current coaches intent on developing their abilities in like and/or varied contexts.

Humility emerged strongly from the data collected in this study. The virtue, or possibly the practice, of humility has received growing attention in the context of leadership over the last decade (Owens & Hekman, 2012). Despite the suggested value that this quality might bring, very little empirical research has focused on the validation of its significance in relation to leadership in organizations and/or its specific contribution to the leadership process. Future study might attempt to build on the extant literature by replicating those studies already performed (Collins, 2001; Owens & Hekman, 2012) within a wider array of domains to validate earlier findings.

Humility itself has proven to be a difficult trait to measure. Currently, "no widely recognized measure of humility exists" (Morris et al. 2005, p. 1343). As first steps, further research might focus on continuing to move toward the development of a universally accepted definition of humility and a reliable and valid method to measure it (Morris et al., 2005).

In this paper, I propose that humility might have contributed to the innovation, communication, building organizational culture, relationship development and transformational qualities displayed by Clare Drake. Future research might more closely consider the extent to which humility mediates and/or moderates a leader's effectiveness in these areas particularly in the area of

team sport. Further, academic literature related to humble leadership and its application to coaching team sport is negligible at best, and inquiry into the part that humility might play in the development of coach-athlete/team relationships, athlete development and subsequent satisfaction and performance would be beneficial

  This study has only begun to scratch the surface of Clare Drake's coaching behavior and leadership qualities. Further qualitative research might be undertaken to more deeply explore each of the qualities that he exhibited. The intent being to gain insight into how he came to these behaviors, the extent to which the situational context shaped these qualities, and perhaps the significance that the behavior played in the development or growth of those that he coached.

References

Antonakis, J. (2001). *The validity of the transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership model as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University, Minneapolis, MN.

Arthur, C. A., Woodman, T., Ong, C. W., Hardy, L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2011). The role of athlete narcissism in moderating the relationship between coaches' transformational leader behaviors and athlete motivation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 33,* 3-19.

Arvery, R. D., Zhang, Z., Avolio, B. J., & Krueger, R. F. (2007). Developmental and genetic determinants of leadership role occupancy among women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92 (3),* 693-706.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development: Basic and advanced manuals.* Binghamton, NY: Authors.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X).* Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. (1999). Reexamining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 7,* 441-462.

Avolio, B., Waldman, D., & Yammarino, F. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four Is of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15, 9-16.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 421-429.

Barnett, N. P., Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1992). Effects of goal-setting on achievement in archery. *Research Quarterly, 50*, 328-332.

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

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional/transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52,* 130-139.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88(2),* 207-218.

Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.) New York: Psychology Press.

Bass, B. M. & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 181-217.

Berendt, C. J., Christofi, A., Kasibhatla, K. M., Malindretos, J., & Maruffi, B. (2012). Transformational leadership: Lessons in management for today. *International Business Research, 5(10)*, 227-232.

Bloom, G., Crumpton, R., & Anderson, J. (1999). A systematical examination of the teaching behaviors of an expert basketball coach. *Human Kinetics, 13,* 157-170.

Bouchard, T., Lykken, D. T., McGue, A., Segal, N. L., & Tellegen, A. (1990).

Sources of human psychological differences: The Minnesota study of twins

reared apart. *Science, 250,* 223-228.

Brawley, L. R., Carron, A. V., & Widmeyer, W. N. (1993). The influence of the

group and its cohesiveness on perceptions of group-related variables.

Journal of Sport & Excerecise Psychology, 15, 245-260.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations.*

London/Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

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

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's

(1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 468-478.

Carron, A. V. (1980). *Social psychology of sport.* Ithaca, NY: Mouvement

Publications.

Case, B. (1987). Leadership behavior in sport: A field test of the situational

leadership theory. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 18*, 256-268.

Charbonneau, D., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Transformational

leadership and sports performance: The mediating role of intrinsic

motivation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31,* 1521-1534.

Chelladurai, P. A. (1978). *A contingency model of leadership in athletics.*

Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, Department of

Management Sciences, Ontario, Canada.

Chelladurai, P. A., & Carron, A. V. (1983). Athletic maturity and preferred

leadership. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 5(4)*, 371-380.

Chelladurai, P. A., (2006). *Management of human resources in sport and

recreation* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Chelladurai, P. A., (2007). Leadership in Sports. In G. Tenebaum & R. C.

Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 113-135).

Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Chelladurai, P. A., & Carron, A. V. (1977). A reanalysis of formal structure in

sport. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 2*, 9-14.

Chelladurai, P., Haggerty, T. R., & Baxter, P. R. (1985). Decision style choices

of university basketball coaches and players. *Journal of Sport & Exercise

Psychology, 11*, 201-215.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimension of leader behaviour in sports:

Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of sport Psychology, 2*, 33-45.

Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in machiavillianism*. New York, NY:

Academic Press.

Collins, J. (2001). Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve.

Harvard Business Review, *79(1)*, 67-77.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed

methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cox, R. H. (1998). *Sport psychology: Concepts and applications*. (4th ed.).

McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

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

Davis, D. J. (2002). An analysis of the perceived leadership styles and levels of satisfaction of selected junior college athletic directors and head coaches. *Sport Journal, 5(2),* 27-33.

Devilbiss, M. C., & Siebold, G. L. (1987). *Values and commitment in U.S. Army combat units*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Atlanta, GA.

DeVito, J. A. (1986). *The interpersonal communication book*. (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

de Vries, R. E. (2012). Personality predictors of leadership styles and the self-other agreement problem. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*, 809-821.

Drager, D. (2007). *Clare Drake, the coaches' coach: Hockey's quiet revolutionary*. Edmonton, AB: Corporate Identity Inc. and the Faculty of Physical Education & Recreation, University of Alberta.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *The Academy of Management Journal, 45(4),* 735-744.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fiedler, F. E., & Chemers, M. M. (1974). *Leadership and effective management*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co.

Flyvberg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case study research.

    Qualitative inquiry, 12(2), 219-245.

Friedman, H. H., & Langbert, M. (2000). Abraham as a transformational leader.

    Journal of leadership & Organizational Studies, 7(2), 88-95.

Frontiera, J. (2010). Leadership and organizational culture transformation in

    professional sport. *Journal of leadership and organizational studies, 17(1)*,

    71-86.

Gladwell, M. (2000). *The Tipping Point*. New York City: Little, Brown, and

    Company.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of

    legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf , R. K., & Spears, L. C. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the

    nature of legitimate power and greatness.* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluation and subordinates'

    perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of

    Applied Psychology, 73,* 695-702.

Heil, J. (2012). Pain on the run: Injury, pain and performance in a distance runner.

    Sport Psychologist, 26(4), 540-553.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training

    and Developmental Journal, 23*, 26-34.

Horn, T. S. (1992). *Advances in sport psychology*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Horn, T. S. (2008). *Advances in sport psychology*. (3rd ed.). Champaign: Human

    Kinetics.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly 16*, 321-328.

House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 3(2)*, 81-108.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business, 3*, 81-98.

Hsu, C., Bell, R. C., & Cheng, K. (2002). Transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness in recreational sports/fitness programs. *Sport Journal, 5(2).*

Humility. (2013). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary* (11th ed.). Retrieved from http://www.m-w.com/dicionary /humility.

Hunt, J. G., & Schuler, R. S. (1976). *Leader reward and sanctions: Behavior relations criteria in a large public utility*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Hatfield, B. (1986). *Psychology of sports: A social psychological approach.* Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

Johnston, M., & Walter, R. (2007). *Simply the best: Insights and strategies from great hockey coaches.* (2nd ed.). Surrey: Heritage House Publishing Company Ltd.

Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M., & Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledge: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society, 8(2)*, 213-229.

Jowett, S., & Poczwardowski, A. (2007). Understanding the coach-athlete relationship. In Jowett, S. &, Lavallee, D. (Eds.), *Social Psychology in Sport* (pp. 3-14). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Keating, J. W. (1964). Sportsmanship as a moral category. *Ethics, 75*, 25-35.

Klimushko, R. (2010). *Coach leadership: An analysis of leadership theory and how reflection can lead to improved coach practices.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Kristiansen, E., Tomten, S. E., Hanstad, D. V., & Roberts, G. C. (2012). Coaching communication issues with elite female athletes: Two Norwegian case studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 22*, 156-167.

LaVoi, N. M. (2007). Interpersonal communication and conflict in the coach-athlete relationship. In Jowett, S. & Lavallee, D., (Eds.), *Social Psychology in Sport* (pp. 29-40). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Lim, J. Y., & Cromartie, F. (2001). Transformational leadership, organizational culture and organizational effectiveness in sport organizations. *Sport Journal, 4(2),* 6-10.

Lorimer, R., & Holland-Smith, D. (2012). Why coach? A case study of the prominent influences on a top-level UK outdoor adventure coach. *The Sport Psychologist, 26*, 571-583.

Mandell, B., & Pherwani, S. (2003). Relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style: A gender comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17(3),* 387-404.

Markula, P., & Silk, M. (2011). *Qualitative research for physical culture.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Morris, J. A., Brotheridge, C.M., & Urbanski, J. C. (2005). Bringing humility to leadership: Antecedents and consequences of leader humility. *Human Relations, 58(10)*, 1323-1350.

Mudra, D. E. (1965). A critical analysis of football coaching practices in light of selected group of learning principles. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.

Ogilvie, B. C., & Tutko, T. A. (1966). *Problem athletes and how to handle them.* London: Palham Books.

Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 55(4)*, 787-818.

Oyer, B. J. (2011). The relationship between principals' confidence, humility, and effectiveness: A study of teacher perceptions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Penman, K., Hastad, D., & Cords, W. (1974). Success of the authoritarian coach. *Journal of Social Psychology, 92,* 155-156.

Peshkin, A. (1985). From title to title: The evolution of perspective in naturalistic

inquiry. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 16*, 214-224.

Podsakoff, P. M., Todor, W. D., Grover, R. A., & Huber, V. L. (1984).

Situational moderators of leader reward behavior and punishment behaviors:

Fact or fiction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34,* 21-

63.

Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual values and practices related to leadership

effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly 16*, 655-687.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership

on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership

types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(5),* 635-674.

Rowald, J. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership in martial arts.

Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 18, 312-325.

Salmela, J. H. (1996). *Great Job Coach! Getting the Edge from Proven Winners.*

Ottawa, ON: Potentium The Coaching Network.

Sandelowski, M. (1993). Theory unmasked: The uses and guises of theory in

qualitative research. *Research in Nursing & Health, 16,* 213-218.

Schein, E. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture.

Organizational Dynamics, X, 13-28.

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership,* (2nd ed.). San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seltzer, J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation

and consideration. *Journal of Management, 16,* 693-703.

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal, 46(6),* 703-714.

Sherman, C. A., Fuller, R., & Speed, H., D. (2000). Gender comparisons of preferred coaching behaviors in Australian sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 23(4)*, 389-406.

Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (1997). Coaching the coaches: Youth sports as a scientific and applied behavioral setting. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 6(1),* 16-21.

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

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

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Hunt, E. (1977). A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly, 48*, 401-407.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stake, R. E. (2003). Case Studies. In Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S. *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.) (p. 134-163). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of

the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus

servant leadership: a difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization*

Development Journal, 25(4), 349-361.

Swartz, J. L. (1973). Analysis of leadership styles of college level head football

coaches from five midwestern states. Unpublished doctoral dissertation,

University of Northern Colorado.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1976). What a coach can teach a teacher. *Psychology*

today, 9, 74-78.

Thompson, C., & Andersen, M. B. (2012). Moving towards Buddhist

psychotherapy in sport: A case study. *The Sport Psychologist, 26*, 624-643.

Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, V., & Milner, C. (2002).

Transformational leadership and moral reasoning. *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 87(2), 304-311.

Vallee, C. N., & Bloom, G. A. (2005). Building a successful university program:

Key and common elements of expert coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport*

Psychology, 17, 179-196.

Van Kippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and

leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 90 (1), 25-37.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Walsh, J. M., & Carron, A. V. (1977). Attributes of volunteer coaches. Paper

    presented at the Annual meeting of the Canadian Assocation of Sport

    Scheinces, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-

    member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between

    transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational

    citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 48(3),* 420-432.

Wang, G., Oh, I., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert A. E. (2011). Transformational

    leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic

    review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management, 36(2),*

    223-270.

Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (1999). *Foundations of sport and exercise*

    psychology. (2nd ed.). Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Williams, J. (2006). *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak*

    performance (5th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Wooden, J. R. (2004). *They call me coach*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-

    Hall.

Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Moderating role of follower

    characteristics with transformational leadership and follower work

    engagement. *Group & Organization Management, 34(5*), 590-619.

Zohar, D. (2002). The effects of leadership dimensions, safety climate, and

assigned priorities on minor injuries in work groups. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, 23, 75-92.

Appendix A

Oral Consent Script - Primary Participant

Coach, I would like to thank you again for agreeing to be the subject for my research. You seem to have had a remarkable influence on so many people from the players that you've coached to others out there in the hockey world. I'd like to explore your coaching style and philosophies with the hope of learning more about what made you so influential in these people's lives.

In accordance with the conditions indicated in the ethics approval granted to me by the University (of Alberta), I need to let you know that I am going to ask you questions relating to you, your leadership and coaching style and that you do not have to answer any question that you are not comfortable answering. You also have the right to end the interview at any time should you choose to do so.

With your permission, I will use a recording device to capture our discussion. All the audio information captured will be stored on my computer and will be password protected. Any printed representation of the discussions that we have will be filed in a locked cabinet in my office and/or home.

If you are okay with everything that has been said, please indicate it now so that I will have a record of it on my recording device.

Appendix B

Written Consent Form - Secondary Participants

Informed Consent

You are invited to be a subject in a research project entitled "Coach Clare Drake: A case study of exemplary leadership". Howie Draper, Masters of Arts Student at the University of Alberta, in the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation will be the principal investigator. Dr. Wendy Rodgers will act as the investigators supervisor.

Purpose

The aim of this study is to examine the philosophies, values, coaching style and behaviors of a highly successful hockey coach (Clare Drake) and compare these findings with current literature in the area of group leadership and/or sport coaching. The research will hopefully provide a positive model of leadership for young coaches to consider in their respective coaching environments.

Interview Process:

The researcher will ask varied questions to guide discussion pertaining to your perception of Coach Drake's coaching philosophy, his values, his behaviors, relationship to you as a coach, his coaching style, etc. The interview should take between 60-90 minutes. The interview will take place at a mutually agreeable location or by phone and will be recorded with an audio recording device.

Following the interview, the information that you provide will be used to help support some of the thoughts that Coach Drake has already provided in a series of interviews conducted prior to this point. The sum of this information will be compared with current theories and/or models in the area of leadership.

It is our hope that this research will be published. Prior to this point, you will be given the opportunity to:

a)   review the completed work to ensure that your thoughts were expressed accurately and;
b)   withdraw any information that you no longer want to have included.
* Please note that the last point at which your information can be withdrawn will be July 31, 2012.

The resulting body of work will be available to local, provincial and, potentially, national and international sport organizations.

Risks

Although any personal risk on your behalf is unlikely, some topics of discussion may make you feel uncomfortable on some level. Should this be the case, you may choose not to continue the line of discussion or not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will be given the opportunity to withdraw any information that you've provided at any point during or following your interview.

Benefits

By taking part in this study you will be honoring Coach Drake and his legacy as a strong leader and coach in the hockey community. As well, you will be helping to contribute to the positive growth and development of coaches in various sports.

Confidentiality

You have the choice to withhold any data that you provide at any time throughout the course of the project up to July 31, 2012 after which point the information will be released for review. In a timely manner throughout the course of the research project, you will be given information that is relevant to your decision to continue or withdraw from participation. All records will be kept in the primary investigator's office in a locked file cabinet and/or in a password protected computer system.

It is your choice whether or not you would like to be openly cited in the study or remain anonymous.

Your Rights and Information About Your Consent

Participation in this research is voluntary. You may discontinue the interview and/or withdraw from the study at any time.

If you have further questions regarding the study or the use of the data that you provide, you are encouraged to ask the primary investigator, Howie Draper.

By signing this sheet, you certify that you have read this form and that all of your questions have
been answered.

_____   _____
Signature of Participant   Date

Appendix C

Clare Drake Possible Discussion Topics

Interview 1: July 6, 2011,

- Opinion of what makes coach effective
- Coaching values and philosophy.
    - Did it change over time?
- Coaching style.
- Motivation for coaching.
- Key areas he purposefully tried to help athletes develop in.

Interview 2: July 8, 2011

- Vision for the team and program
- Teaching tactics and techniques
- Coaching roles
- Player roles
- Did he ever felt that he had to compromise values or philosophy

Interview 3: August 23, 2011

- Discuss John Layton as a leader as he has just passed away
- Are leaders created or born?
- What qualities was he looking for in selecting players. How did he identify these?
- Who were his role models and why did he admire them?

Appendix D

Follow-up Interview Guide – Clare Drake

September 4, 2012

Follow up interview

Idealized Influence (Charisma)

1. Would you say that you were a charismatic coach? Describe?
2. Did you remember having a vision for the program? Did the vision change from team to team?
3. Would you say that this was communicated to your players and/or coaches in some way?
4. Do you feel that you influenced your players in some way?
    a. How do you feel that you did this?
5. Do you feel that your players shared your values?

Inspirational Motivation

6. Was there ever a time when you felt that your team exceeded its expectations?
7. How often would you say that your players:
    a. Met your expectations?
    b. Exceeded your expectations?
    c. Didn't live up to your expectations?
8. How did you motivate your players?
9. Would you say that you inspired your players in any way?
10. Did you feel that the team's goals were shared by all of your players?
11. Would you say that you were an optimistic or pessimistic coach?

Intellectual Stimulation

12. Did you ever encourage your players to be creative in any way or to think outside of the box?
    a. What about your coaching staff?
13. How did you feel about input from your players? Did you encourage this in anyway?
14. Would you say that you empowered your players to make decisions in anyway? How about your coaching staff or other members or your team staff?
15. Did you encourage your players to think about the game of hockey or how they played it in a different way?

Individualized Consideration

16. How would you describe your relationships with your players in general?
17. Do you feel that your relationship with each player was the same or different?
18. Do you feel that you considered the individual needs of each player or do you feel that you treated everyone the same?
19. Did you ever delegate a task or responsibility to a player?
20. Would you say that you were consistent in your behavior from player to player? (eg. In discipline, delegation, communication…)
21. Did you assess the progress of each player on your team?
    a. How did you do this?
    b. How were your assessments communicated to the players?
22. In what way(s) did you provide feedback for your players?
    a. How about negative feedback?
23. In my interviews with some of your players, the term "Black Aces" came up a few times. Can you tell me about the Black Aces?

Appendix E

Interview Guide – Secondary Participants

Introductory/demographical questions

24. What is your age?
25. What is your current occupation?
26. What years did you play for the Golden Bears? Were they all under Coach Drake?
27. Can you give me a little history on where you've been since you played for the Bears?
28. How did you come to play hockey at the University of Alberta?

Idealized Influence (Charisma)

29. Would you say that Coach Drake was a charismatic coach? Describe?
30. Did you get the sense that Coach Drake had a vision for the team? If so, in what way did he communicate the vision?
31. Did Coach Drake influence you in any way? If yes, in what ways did he influence you?
32. Can you tell me what morals and/or values you felt were important to Coach Drake?
33. Do you feel that your values changed in any way as a result of playing under Coach Drake?
34. Were you committed to the team and it's vision under Coach Drake? What about the rest of the team?
35. Were there some that didn't? Any ideas as to why they might not have?

Inspirational Motivation

36. Was there ever a time when you felt that your team exceeded its expectations?
37. Did you have a clear understanding of the expectations that Coach Drake had of you as a player?
    a. Can you tell me what some of them were?
38. What motivated you as a player under Coach Drake?
39. Was Coach Drake an inspiration to you? Can you expand on your answer?
40. Was Coach Drake an inspiration to the team as a whole?
41. Did you feel that the goals of the team were shared by everyone?
42. Would you say that Coach Drake was more optimistic or pessimistic?

Intellectual Stimulation

43. Would you say that Coach Drake ever encouraged you to be creative or to think about new ways to approach a problem as a player or student? (on the ice, in the classroom, in the game)?
44. Did you feel that your input was valued or considered important as a player?
45. To what extent were you and/or your teammates empowered to make decisions or act independently?
46. Did Coach Drake encourage you to think about the game of hockey or how you played it in a different way?

Individualized Consideration

47. Describe the relationship that you had with Coach Drake.
48. How consistent was Coach Drake in his interaction and behavior with each team-member? (eg. In discipline, delegation, communication..?)
49. Do you feel that Coach Drake took into consideration your individual needs as a player and/or person or did he treat everyone the same?
50. Did Coach Drake ever delegate a task or responsibility to you as a player?
51. How was your progress assessed?
    a. Did you feel as though you were monitored or regularly checked?
52. Were you or any individuals on your team singled out for critique?
    a. What did that look like?
    b. How did it make you and/or others on the team feel?

Closing Questions:

53. Is there anything else that you'd like to touch on that might give me an idea as to what the experience was like playing or coaching under Coach Drake?
54. Is there anything that you'd like to add that would describe Coach Drake's leadership style?

Appendix F

Notification of Approval

Date:	September 14, 2011
Study ID:	Pro00024439
Principal Investigator:	Howie Draper
Study Supervisor:	Wendy Rodgers
Study Title:	Coach Clare Drake; A case study in exemplary leadership
Approval Expiry Date:	September 12, 2012

	Approval Date	Approved Document
Approved Consent Form:	9/14/2011	Informed Consent - Primary Participant.docx
	9/14/2011	Informed Consent - Secondary Participants.docx

Thank you for submitting the above study to the Research Ethics Board 1.

Your application has been reviewed and approved on behalf of the committee.

A renewal report must be submitted next year prior to the expiry of this approval

if your study still requires ethics approval.

If you do not renew on or before the renewal expiry date, you will have to re-submit an ethics application.

Approval by the Research Ethics Board does not encompass authorization to access the staff, students,

facilities or resources of local institutions for the purposes of the research.

Sincerely,

Dr. William Dunn   Chair, Research Ethics Board 1

Note: This correspondence includes an electronic signature (validation and approval via an online system).

Appendix G

Golden Bears Toughness List

1. Do all the small Bear things:
   - Be first to the puck – win one on one battles all over the ice.
   - **COMPETE**
   - Block shots anytime – first minute/last minute.
   - Finish checks – punish – never turn away –hold pins.
   - Drive to the net with & without the puck.
   - Fight thru screens – never accept.
   - Take a hit to make a play.
   - Pop pucks out – dump pucks in.
   - Shoot to score – low or high.
   - Strong on puck.
   - Faceoffs – be mentally prepared & know your responsibilities.

2. Initiate – set the tone – be proactive – want the puck – call for the puck – all over the ice "talk".

3. Never back away from a challenge – meet it head on. **Never be intimidated.**

4. Come to the rink prepared to practice and play 100%. Play through personal problems ie.) school, girlfriends, be enthusiastic even if your having a bad day because it only takes one person to bring down 10 others.

5. Playing through adversity – don't allow crowd, officiating, travel, etc. affect you. Be positive and optimistic in good times and tough times.

6. Never show you are hurt or stay down on the ice.

7. Know the systems – execute them at top speed – be disciplined in their execution – no freelancing – flexibility.

8. Be patient and consistent – know that we need to work hard for 60 minutes – outwork the opponent – out think the opponent.

9. Fire in your eyes – emotional control – don't retaliate or become frustrated.

10. Confident in ability to handle any situation off or on the ice.

11. Think about how much you **love** to play the game & when the puck is dropped play it with a passion (like its your last game).

   "If you think you can or you think you can't – YOU'RE RIGHT"