University of Alberta

Coach Leadership: An Analysis of Leadership Theory and how Reflection can lead to Improved Coach Practices

by

Richard Klimushko

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 & Recreation

Fall 2010
Edmonton, Alberta

Examining Committee

James Denison, Faculty of Physical Education & Recreation, University of Alberta

William Strean, Faculty of Physical Education & Recreation, University of Alberta

Paul Newton, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to understand the process of leadership in coaching football as it related to my personal experiences as a football coach. The results are based on the analysis of my coach narratives over a two-year period of coaching with a collegiate and high school level football team. Through a comprehensive literature review I have illustrated the development of leadership theory, from theories of transactional to more modern conceptions of transformational leadership. This study shows how coaching practices are rooted in coaches' need to develop and establish a credible image that enables them to rely on preferred practices. It is through the process of reflection that I am able to identify and understand the motives underlying my practices that leads to a deepening awareness and to more transformational leader behaviors. In linking leadership to coaching I present an innovative approach to more effective coach leadership practices.

Acknowledgements

I would especially like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Jim Denison for the opportunity to write my Master's thesis in coaching and for all of his patience, expertise and support in helping the development of this study.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Paul Newton for his insightful perspective, ideas and constructive comments in the production of this thesis.

Additionally, I want to express my appreciation to Dr. Billy Strean whose knowledge and appraisal of this work helped to refine the ideas expressed in it.

I want to also thank the members of the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation at the University of Alberta and the Coaches Research Group for their influence and assistance.

I want to thank the support of my family and friends, without whose help, support and assistance this project would not have been possible. Furthermore, I'd like to thank Ms. Christina Engels for her ongoing support, care and consideration throughout the development of this project.

Last, but not least, I want to thank the Alberta Wildlife, Sport and Recreation Society for their financial assistance in providing me with a Coaching Research scholarship.

Thank you!

The role of the leader is important because people tend to look for support, guidance and direction in a variety of different environments. It was understood that changes in history are the result of great leaders who have helped to shape society in specific ways. Some examples of leaders who have influenced history in a positive way are Gandhi, John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr. When leadership goes wrong or its motives are corrupt the consequences to humanity can be devastating, illustrated by such examples as Josef Stalin, Adolph Hitler and Suddam Hussein.

In sport, effective leadership has become synonymous with winning championships. Coaches with winning records are deemed great leaders, often relying on the control and manipulation of their followers to achieve their ends. Athlete development has come to be overshadowed by performance-based results, and so methods of coach leadership have come to reflect a single-minded emphasis on winning. As successful performances have become big business, coach leadership has resulted in the prioritization of practices specifically designed to secure the ends of winning. The result has been that the athletes' needs have been overlooked, leading them to be treated as objects by coaches who structure activities for the attainment of performance objectives.

My aim for leadership is to improve athletes' performances but to do so through a more ethical mode of coaching behavior. Where the practice of coach leadership has tended to focus on performance-based results, it has given little regard for the consequences on the athlete. Although it has yet to be adequately addressed in the literature, a common practice dilemma coaches experience is the

tension between winning and athlete development (Cassidy et al., 2009; Murray & Mann, 2007). For the majority of coaches, and most certainly those at the more elite levels, winning has taken precedence over the development of the athlete which reflects the values of today's society. However, the evolution of leadership over the past Century has led to new modes that combine athlete development with winning helping to mediate this tension through leadership that is considerate of the athletes in focusing their attention on improved performance.

Modern leadership is moving towards a more holistic approach to the development of athletes advocating their treatment in more ethical ways. The main difference between modern perspectives and traditional leadership has to do with the emphasis they place on the athlete and the development of the interpersonal relationship between leader and follower. Through improving coaches' aptitude and awareness for their athletes' needs, they can be led to engage in more mature behaviors and to more effective forms of leadership. As most coaches think of performance in narrow ways that link it to winning, they have acquired little patience to invest in the practices that benefit individual team members. Instead, they seek the team performances outcomes that will lead to the development of a credible coaching front (Jones, 2006b). In heightening a coach's reputation, the front has been perceived to be an indication of coaching effectiveness and ability leading to rewards and opportunities at increasingly advanced levels of coaching. The inherent desire to compete and win leads coaches to aspire to these more elite levels of sport keeping them perpetually locked into the performance to establish and maintain a credible persona. A coach

who is able to break out of this cycle and to forego the immediate gratification of winning, to focus more directly on the development of their athletes, will stimulate transformations in both themselves and their players. It is through such a philosophy of athlete consideration that will ultimately lead to new heights of athletic potential and performance to exceed levels attained through traditional modes of leadership.

Despite increased interest and attention towards understanding leadership in coaching, there remains a disparity between the theoretical research models and their practical application to sports coaching. Although these divergent perspectives have resulted in over 130 definitions of what leadership actually is, according to Vealey (2005) leadership is the social, psychological, and behavioral processes working to influence an individual or a group of individuals towards the achievement of a specific goal or outcome. As a football coach's primary function is to extract the greatest effort and performance from groups of individuals to meet specified performance objectives, leadership is considered to be a central feature in the coaching process. It goes without saying that the duties of team organization, management and athlete development are important in coaching but can be seen to be smaller components of the leadership process. The question of leadership then resides in the way a leader influences his or her followers towards achieving a desired end. For the purposes of this thesis, the process of leadership will be applied to the sport of contact football and how football coaches can employ modes of leadership that result in the heightened performances associated with transformational leadership. This thesis represents a comprehensive review

of leadership theory from the beginning of the 20th century and illustrates its development from early transactional theories to more modern conceptions of transformational leadership. The various theories have tended to examine leadership from the perspective of the leader, the situation, or the follower. It is the development of transformational leadership that has systematically incorporated all three perspectives into theories of effective leadership.

The beginning of the 20th century saw the rise of the 'Great Man' theory of leadership and led to trait and behavioral approaches. When it was found that leader characteristics alone were not enough to account for effective leadership, situational approaches added the perspective of the situational context and looked at how these impacted on leadership performance. Interactional models began to include the perspective of the athlete, which is indicated through measures of subordinate satisfaction as a factor of effective leadership. Two important notions arising from early research directly attributable to effective leadership are the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration (Chemers & Rice, 1974). Initiating structure represents the managerial aspects of leadership and typically refers to the instruction, organization and development of individual techniques, team systems and tactics. On the other hand, consideration refers to the interpersonal relations existing between the leader and subordinates and is characterized in coaching as concern for the mental, emotional and physical well being of the athletes. These dimensions were foundational components in the development of early leadership theory and represent initial attempts to explain the basis of transactional leadership.

The natural development of leadership has led to the emergence of more modern theories referred to as transformational leadership. Transformational leadership, having once thought to be based on the influence of leader charisma, moves from conceptions of charismatic leadership towards the more considerate and athlete-centred perspectives of servant, ethical, inner and moral forms of leadership. Together, transactional and transformational theories represent the range of leadership development and their juxtaposition makes it apparent that the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership is a leader's relative emphasis on the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. Transactional leaders mainly focus on initiating structures to secure performance objectives by exchanging production goals for rewards. In turn, transformational leaders emphasize the growth and development of their players and teams through combining athlete consideration with initiating structure and assume improved performances to be the result of such a philosophy. Through the analysis of leadership across a continuum from transactional to transformational, I utilize the trend in these models to highlight where successive leadership research should be focused in augmenting coach leadership.

In establishing the most salient components of effective leadership, I outline how my own coaching practices reflect theoretical perspectives and how they can lead the coach to more effective modes of leadership. It is my intention in this thesis to illustrate the usefulness of reflective practices in coaching by showing how this process can provide the bridge between theory and practice to result in coaches engaging in more effective forms of leadership. To conduct my

analysis, I relied on my detailed journal entries that I used as a coach to monitor and evaluate how my practices were affecting player satisfaction, motivation and performance. These journal entries then provided the empirical material in the construction of two personal narratives reflecting my experiences as a coach of a collegiate football team and then, as a coach of a high school football team. Having been reconstructed from my journal entries the coaching narratives highlight the most relevant episodes and insights from my experiences with leadership through the football seasons of 2007 and 2008. Each of these narratives is followed by an analysis and discussion elucidating their relevance to the broader scope of the leadership literature. Through these personal narratives, I provide a cogent example that frames my experiences for the reader to illustrate my own process of growth and development as a leader while being a football coach.

In my analysis, I specifically discuss how these narratives relate to leadership research and how theory may explain the manifestation of specific forms of leadership behaviors on the football field. It was through my own playing and coaching experiences combined with recent academic graduate coursework in ethics, social theory, coach education, and sport psychology that led to my growing curiosity and awareness into the issues of coach leadership. Furthermore, I intend to show how the process of reflection impacts on coach leadership practices to result in an increased consideration for athletes' needs and consequently, in transformational leadership. In analyzing the range of leadership models and operationalizing their most salient qualities, I utilize this knowledge

in my own personal narratives to show how theoretical conceptions of effective practice can lead to novel coach leadership. As I will argue, by supplementing coaching practices with the process of reflection, coaches can increase their capacity to be considerate of their players' needs leading to the potential for transformational leadership.

As I alluded to, part of my insight and interest into coach leadership is derived from my experiences as a collegiate football player. It was based on my participation on a team that ended up winning a Canadian national championship that left an indelible impression on me. It was after my second season that the university administration decided that football was a financial strain on the school's budget and announced plans to cancel the program. In these first two seasons our teams was very good, winning over seventy percent of our games and competing each season for the provincial championship. I would even go so far as to say that during those two years of university football, those teams were the most talented that I had been associated with. However, although not as athletic, it was the group from my third season that was the best team that I had ever played on. We still had many very good players but it was the attitude of cohesiveness and unity that we shared that separated us from all the other teams.

Years later, after my playing career was over and I was working as a teacher, I felt disillusioned by the attitude of my colleagues in that it differed markedly from the one I had acquired in my experiences on a championship winning team. Where I seemed concerned for the greater good of the school community other teachers seemed to be focused on their personal needs for salary

and wage increases, their allotted planning time and vacation days, their status, seniority, their class size, etc. They just seemed to focus more on extraneous issues regarding their personal condition than they did on the needs and requirements of the children they taught. In speaking with a colleague who was also a teammate on that championship team, he stated "Sometimes I think playing on that team was a curse. We work harder for our schools than anybody else and the more we do the more other teachers expect from us. While we stay at work late to run their committees and coach their sports teams they're at home sipping martinis on the couch." It was the atmosphere of altruism of altruism pervading that championship team that led its members to work selflessly for the good of the group without regard for the personal gains made through transactional relations. However, it was when I tried to apply this same attitude learned in football to the 9-5 work-world that elucidated its transactional nature and its basis in the rational egoism perpetuating individual self-interests.

As friends, colleagues, fellow coaches, and former teammates, when we are together we would sometimes talk about what was different on that championship team. The conversation always seems to come down to the fact that players on that team cared about each other more than we had in playing for others teams, sometimes more than we did for our own families. On most other teams that I had played for the focus of team members was similar to that of my teaching colleagues where each member was attentive to his personal statistics, his playing time, his rank and status relative to others, the impressions he made on the coaches, etc. Their relationship to others and their sport were characterized by

the transactions of exchanging effort and performances for their coach's approval. But during that championship year when they cancelled our program, each member of this team was forced to overlook their personal needs and the transactions securing them. That team underwent a transformation, from focusing on concerns of the self to focusing on the concerns of the team required to save the football program. Each members' personal concerns related to the football team disappeared because, at least temporarily, there was no team. As we were led to overlook our own personal interests to save the team we began to cultivate a team atmosphere of altruism to characterize this team and carrying us to a national championship.

That is not to say that initiating structures were not an integral component of the success of that team. Most of our coaches had played at advanced levels of football and had several years coaching and combined this with their professional careers as teachers. Each year they would make the pilgrimage to the Pittsburgh Steelers training camp of the National Football League where they would upgrade their knowledge in the latest systems, techniques and tactics. Our head coach alone had almost 30 years of coaching experience and was one of only a few NCCP Level IV accredited coaches in Canada. He was a very good leader and he did not try to impose his will over the changes affecting his team as a result of the adversity it faced through budgetary cuts. However, all the teams I had played for were well coached, but in our championship season it was our concerted effort to save the program that left us with more will than skill. What made this team different was the selfless attitude

of each member to overlook their own self-interests for the good of the group and it is this consideration for the other that is perpetuated by theories of transformational leadership. My aim for this study is to try to understand and contextualize this experience through an examination of theory applied to practice via the process of reflection and writing. I hope this allows me to better understand what is meant by effective leadership to result in the improved leadership practices of football coaches and extends to positive impacts on the players' experiences and performance.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Theories of Leadership Characteristics

The first theories of leadership were based on the theory of the 'Great Man' and asserted that the history of the world was shaped by great men whose decision making skills were responsible for the movement of society in a certain direction (Bass, 1985). The Great Man theory was based on the idea that men were born into 'great' family lines where specific leadership traits were inherited and passed down from one generation to the next. Accordingly, the only limiting factor of this theory was in the capacity of the ruling classes to procreate in providing society with a new generation of offspring having an aptitude for leadership (Bass, 1981). Examples of this can be traced back to feudal systems in which the ruling class or monarchy were granted power that was then passed down through successive generations keeping leadership within the hands of these elite. Some examples of power being granted and sustained by political families in more recent times are seen in such cases as the Russian Czar's of the Romanov family, the British Royal family, and the American Bush family. Proponents of this theory believed that it was possible to distinguish these great men from the rest of society through an investigation of their innate predispositions manifesting as observable leadership behaviours across a variety of situational contexts (Weinberg & Gould, 2007). The idea that specific and identifiable characteristics responsible for effective leadership were passed down through family lines led to the 'trait theory' of leadership.

Trait theory researchers sought to identify specific physical and personality traits of recognizable and established leaders (Case, 1998). Since early notions emphasized that the aptitude for leadership was inherited across family lines it perpetuated the dominant belief that great leaders were born and not made. The consensus held that all leaders should display a common set of traits and once identified, they could be applied to leaders across a wide range of contextual settings where qualities of leadership could then be manipulated to increase leader effectiveness (Weinberg & Gould, 2007). For example, the effective sports coach or physical educator was typically defined as displaying an authoritarian profile and was characterized as someone who was inflexible, exerted control over subordinates, and was emotionally guarded and domineering (Murray & Mann, 2006). Other leadership styles included the democratic coach where athletes' opinions were obtained and decisions were made with respect to these perspectives to increase follower approval. Lastly, the laissez-faire style of leadership represents a lack of leadership because subordinates are allowed to perform without much interaction from a leader. Researchers studying the differences between leadership styles felt that once they identified the most appropriate style for a particular context, leaders could then be led to modify their style accordingly. Support for trait theory lost its hold after World War II when it was discovered that, although many traits seemed to be conducive to leadership, their presence or absence could not predict successful leadership (Weinberg & Gould, 2007). Researchers also came to the realization that effective leadership

could not be determined solely by a leader's traits (Horn, 2004), and this failure to develop consistency in their conclusions led to behavioral theories of leadership.

Behavioral theories quickly gained prominence since the basic tenets of trait theory could not be substantiated. Researchers of the behavioral approach to leadership were not concerned with what a leader is, but instead focused their study specifically on what a leader does (Williams, 2006). This approach emerged as a result of management studies in the non-sport setting from the universities of Ohio State and Michigan in the 1940's and 1950's. Researchers at Ohio State developed the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to measure and assess leader behavior. The Ohio State studies found two behaviors related to group effectiveness and accounted for 82% of all leaders' behaviors that were labeled 'consideration' and 'initiating structure' (Murray & Mann, 2006; Chemers & Rice, 1974). Consideration is represented by the interpersonal relationship between the leader and follower. It is characterized by positive leader-subordinate interaction, which includes the respect and attention to the other's feelings, and it is based on trust (Murray & Mann, 2006). Leaders found to be high in 'consideration' demonstrated good rapport and communication with subordinates while exhibiting characteristics of trust, friendship, respect and warmth. On the other hand, initiating structure refers to the managerial aspects related to the development and implementation of practices and procedures aimed at the attainment of group goals and includes instructing, scheduling, guiding and directing activities (Williams, 2006). Leaders who displayed behavior high in 'initiating structure' were primarily concerned with the outcomes of production

and performance. They emphasized procedural methods of establishing rules and regulations related to the development of an organisational structure in guiding members towards performance objectives (Weinberg & Gould, 2007). Similarly, studies at the University of Michigan also identified two prominent leader behaviors which were labeled 'production centered' and 'employee centered' (Murray & Mann, 2006) and are analogues of the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration, respectively (Chemers & Rice, 1974). This and other research concluded that most leaders engaged in combinations of these two dimensions but that the most successful leaders tended to rate high in their use of both of these behaviors.

Consistently, research on leadership in sports also held that sport leaders relied, to some degree, on both dimensions of consideration and initiating structure or, were both 'athlete' and 'production' centered. In a study of the American collegiate coach John Wooden from the University of California, Los Angeles, one of the most successful basketball coaches in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) history and winner of 10 National Championships, Tharp and Gallimore (1976) used the Coaching Behavior Recording Form to observe the coach's behavior. In their analysis the amount of time spent on each type of coaching behavior was broken down into the following categories: 50.3% were related to instructional behavior, 12.7% were hustling players to intensify instruction, 6.9% praise and encouragement, 8% scolding and re-instruction, and 6.7% were statements of displeasure (Tharp & Gallimore, 1976). Regarding these categories of behavior, it is noteworthy to point out that the combination of

instruction, hustling to intensify instruction, and praise and encouragement represent the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration.

In a similar study, Bloom, Crumpton, and Anderson (1999) used the Revised Coaching Behavior Form to study the behaviors of another successful NCAA basketball coach, Jerry Tarkanian from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. In their research they found that Tarkanian's profile was similar to that of John Wooden: 29% tactical instruction, 16% hustles, 13.9% technical instruction, 13.6% praise & encouragement, 6% scolds, and 5.7% representing modeling, criticism, reinstruction, humour and punishment (Bloom, Crumpton, & Anderson, 1999). Again, these categories of tactical and technical instruction, hustle, and praise and encouragement can be distilled into the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. An overview of the behavioral profiles of Wooden and Tarkanian indicate that conservative estimates of initiating structure accounted for over 63% of all coaching behaviors and consideration accounted for a little over 13% of the overt behaviors of these coaches. The disparity in the distribution of these two dimensions may be accounted for by Bloom, Crumpton, and Anderson's (1999) analysis that elite level coaches expect their players to exhibit pre-requisite levels of ability and so accordingly adjust the emphasis to the cognitive and tactical aspects of their sport. Both John Wooden and Jerry Tarkanian demonstrated a heavy emphasis on initiating structures but also display a tendency to overlook the leadership dimension of consideration. It should be noted that the analysis and distribution of behaviors reflect overt coaching behaviors on the practice floor and did not include behavior the coaches may have

engaged in before or after practice, in team meetings, in the locker room, or in other interactions with players.

The study of trait and behavioral theories of leadership brought these two dimensions of consideration and initiating structure to the attention of researchers as effective leadership behaviors and brought to light an area in which coaching may impact on the level of group dynamics. However, behavioral and trait theories were thought to be too one-dimensional in nature as they focused narrowly on either traits or behaviors and did not account for the variability of the sport setting. This led to more situational perspectives in the study of leadership.

Situational Theories of Leadership

Researchers of situational approaches began to consider not only the leader's perspective but also how leader behavior was influenced by the situational context or setting of competition (Murray & Mann, 2006). The various situational theories each have a different perspective regarding how the situation effects the leader's actions but underlying each of them is the basic premise that leader characteristics alone are unable to account for all aspects of leader effectiveness (Horn, 2004).

One such theory was House's (1971) Path-Goal theory of leadership, which regards the psychological states of the subordinates as a leader-dependent variable. It focuses on a leader's actions and how these influence the affective and cognitive states of member behavior in meeting performance objectives (House & Dressler, 1974). The major premise behind this model is that the leader's primary goal is to provide initiating structure to subordinates that define the goals of the

group and then outline the most effective path to reach this goal (Bass, 1981). In the leadership of subordinates, behaviors are considered to be effective to the extent that they minimize obstacles and distractions standing between subordinates and goal attainment. In motivating athletes, the leader uses contingent reinforcement, providing rewards when subordinates perform in-line with team goals and using punishment if the actions of athletes do not meet pre-determined goals.

This theory poses two propositions that increase follower satisfaction and hence, leader effectiveness. These are, (a) how clearly the leader can define the path for goal attainment and (b) leader behaviors, to increase motivation, are specific to the situation in which they occur and their congruence leads to increased subordinate satisfaction and consequently, to increased performance (House & Dressler, 1974). In addition, the theory postulates that members will view leader behaviors as relevant to the extent that these behaviors lead followers to immediate or future satisfaction. That is, if members view leader behavior as influencing individual and team performance in a positive manner, they will then perceive this behavior as appropriate and follow leader instructions. However, when performance goals are obvious and the leader continues to define and enforce the path-goal through initiating behaviors, subordinates will perceive such behavior as coercive and controlling and this will eventually lead to decreased compliance and member satisfaction. Avolio and Bass (1988) identified that when reinforcement is perceived by leaders to be manipulation, the result is negative

impacts on performance. However, House and Dressler (1974) found that the more dissatisfying the task, the more members resent initiating behaviors.

This model implies that the leader functions to enhance the psychological states of subordinates by providing coaching, support, guidance and contingent rewards in exchange for subordinate performance and satisfaction (Murray & Mann, 2003). The path-goal model ascribes only to the aspects of initiating structure. It overlooks the effects that consideration may have on athletes' performances, such as reducing stress associated with competition (Murray & Mann, 2003). Furthermore, because the path-goal theory relies on the exchange of contingent rewards to sustain subordinate motivation, it has come to epitomize early conceptions of leadership theory or, what has since come to be termed transactional leadership (Weinberg & Gould, 2003). Transactional models of leadership are based on an exchange relationship between coach and athlete, where rewards are provided for the service that is consistent with the goals of the leader and organization (Murray & Mann, 2006).

Another situational theory is Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Life-Cycle model which is based on the notion that leadership behavior should be the result of the maturity level of athlete or follower (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Maturity in this model is operationalized to be the capacity to take personal responsibility in directing one's own action and behaviors (Murray & Mann, 2006). It is composed of the two subordinate variables: (a) motivation to perform a task well and (b) the ability to perform the task. In reference to these variables, Ansel (2003) differentiates between 'job' and 'psychological maturity,' which can

be seen to be synonymous with the motivation and ability to perform a task well (Smoll & Smith, 1989). In their research, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) found that the relationship between leader behaviors and those of their followers were based on three variables: (a) quality of direction and guidance a leader provides, (b) the quality of socio-emotional support provided by the leader, and (c) the maturity level demonstrated by followers as they perform the task. Within this theory, leader effectiveness is partially determined by the interaction of the three variables of the leader-follower relationship (Ansel, 2003), which includes the subordinate's maturity level, the initiating structure, and the consideration provided by the leader. The model holds that, if leader behavior is appropriate in matching the needs required by the specific maturity level of subordinates, then the congruence that results will lead to good performances. Furthermore, as subordinate maturity increases, the leadership style should reflect this through a decrease in task or initiating behaviors with a subsequent increase in considerate behaviors. As maturity levels continue to increase, there should follow a gradual decline in the quantity of considerate behaviors so that the coach establishes a position as consultant, providing members with increased independence and responsibility for their performances (Bass, 1981). Research comparing the path-goal and life-cycle theories has led to inconclusive results and showed the two to be contradictory (Murray & Mann, 2003). These theories were eventually were replaced by the more comprehensive contingency theory.

The Contingency Model of Effective Leadership is based on work started by Fred Fiedler in 1951 at the University of Illinois and came to epitomize

situational theories of leadership (Chemers & Rice, 1974). In his operalization Fielder (1967) used the descriptors of 'task oriented' and 'relationship oriented' to describe the important leadership behaviors. The task-oriented leader focuses on meeting objectives and getting the task done through developing schedules and practice plans and identifies these as reference points of performance. In turn, the relationship-oriented leader seeks to connect with subordinates on an interpersonal level to develop and maintain positive lines of communication (Weinberg & Gould, 2007). As previously indicated, leaders use a combination of styles and their preferences for one or the other are based on pre-dispositional characteristics (Fiedler, 1967). The main premise of the contingency model is that effective leadership is dependent on the situational context in which such behaviors occur (Fiedler, 1967; Korman, 1974). It is assumed that a task-oriented leader focuses on goal attainment and the achievement of goals whereas a relationship-orientated leader will try to gain favour through the development and reinforcement of interpersonal relations. Research for the model is based on the scale of Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scores, which evaluate leadership on the basis of individuals' assessment of their least liked colleague at work. A high LPC is indicative of a relationship-orientation whereas a low LPC demonstrates a task-orientation of leadership (Chemers & Rice, 1974). Validity of the LPC scale was inconsistent and weak until Fiedler related scores to situational variables in his contingency model (Korman, 1974).

Through his research Fiedler identified three major factors of leaders in their ability to influence others. These were (a) the relationship between the leader

and followers, (b) task nature and the level of role clarity or ambiguity and, (c) formal power of the leader to influence and manipulate subordinates (Chemers & Rice, 1974). Of these three factors, Fiedler (1967) made the contention that the leader-member relationship is the single most important dimension of leader behavior and task/role clarity is identified as the second most important. It should be evident that these dimensions of the leader-member relationship and task nature are analogous to consideration and initiating structure and, although they are operationalized as new or unique concepts, they continue to persist in the literature in various forms as important elements in the leadership process. However, it was during this period that these same dimensions were being disregarded in leadership studies as Smoll and Smith (1989) stated "by the 1960's it was concluded that initiating structure and consideration themselves were insufficient to unravel the complexities of leadership" (p. 1523). These leadership dimensions became marginalized in the face of newer theories of leadership, where Fiedler emphasized that the maintenance of a favorable situation was dependent on matching a leader's personal disposition to specific situations (Ansel, 2003). Fiedler's (1967) focus on 'leader matching,' where leaders were selected and 'matched' to situations consistent with their leadership style (Bass, 1981), may have prevented him from further investigating the relevance of initiating structure and consideration.

Fiedler (1967) felt that the leader's style was a relatively fixed and stable characteristic and that leader-training initiatives would do little to modify such behavior through short-term interventions (Chemers & Rice, 1974; Murray &

Mann, 2006). Fiedler overlooked any potential gains to be had through an analysis and understanding of the leader's practices and, instead he opted to fit the leader to the situation most conducive to his or her particular leadership style, thinking that the leader could not change but the situational context could. There were insurmountable problems regarding the measurement of the contingency model because of the seemingly endless number of potential situations that the model could not account for, as well as the many other salient leader behaviors that could not be accounted for in the specifications of the model (Chemers & Rice, 1974). Fiedler's model attempted to give credibility to the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure by incorporating them within the demands and constraints provided by the situation as well as through indices of subordinate satisfaction. However, attempts to apply situational theories to sports resulted in minimal success and led researchers to conclude that the sporting context provided unique challenges to leadership that may go beyond the scope of general leadership theory (Horn, 2008). This insight led to the development of sport-oriented approaches of leadership to account for the specific demands sport settings may provide.

Models of Sport-based Interactional Leadership

Interactional approaches to leadership are based on three beliefs: leadership cannot be predicted based on personality traits alone, effective leadership behavior is specific to the situation, and leadership styles can be modified (Horn, 2002). Earlier models of leadership were based on research conducted in industry, education and the military, so Chelladurai (1978)

developed the multidimensional model of leadership specifically for the context of sport. This theory gave equal emphasis to the three factors of actual leader behavior, athletes' preferred behavior, and required behavior specific to the situation (Ansel, 2003). The model predicts that if the leader's actual behavior is congruent with the preferred behaviors, as indicated through the athletes' responses, then this leader behavior would then be seen as appropriate to the specific situation, and thereby increase member satisfaction and performance (Chelladurai & Reimer, 1998). In this model, 'actual leader behavior' is based on the responses of the athlete. The 'preferred behavior' was determined by the athletes' preferences for a specific behavior, and the 'required behavior' was the average of all athletes' preferred behaviors within a specific context. However, Chelladurai (1993) noted that the athletes and leaders are both socialized through similar experiences causing them to expect and prefer certain types of behaviors that they perceive will lead to improved performance. So, 'preferred behavior' identified by the athletes may be the result of socialization rather than reflecting the actual preferences of the manner the athletes want to be coached in.

Along with the multidimensional model, Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) developed the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) and used it to measure the three aspects of actual, preferred, and required leader behavior (Chelladurai & Reimer, 1998). The LSS was developed to measure sport leadership behaviors that took into account the athlete's perceptions of the leader's behaviors, their preferences for specific behaviors, and the coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1980). The LSS was actually developed from existing

educational and military research questionnaires. It uses forty-one items grouped into five components of leader behavior which are: (a) Training and Instruction, (b) Autocratic Behavior, (c) Democratic Behavior, (d) Social Support, and (e) Positive Feedback (Weinberg & Gould, 2003). These amount to one task, two decisions, and two motivational factors, where autocratic and democratic behavior refer to the decision style of the coach with the other's being indicative of overt coach behaviors (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). Of these factors, training and instruction can be seen to be consistent with initiating structure as it relates to how well a coach is able to teach subordinates the techniques necessary to accomplish task goals. Social support and positive feedback are congruent with consideration as they relate to coach behaviors in providing attention to the feelings and needs of individual athletes. Autocratic and democratic behaviors refer to the decision style of the coach and are based on the coach's perception of the athlete's needs in combination within a specific context (Fiedler, 1967). That is, sometimes athletes require a more autocratic coaching style when the task is not well defined, or a more democratic one when the task is well defined but player interaction and cohesion are low or 'unfavorable.' Deciding on an appropriate leadership style requires that a coach is considerate of the needs of the athlete if he or she expects improved performances.

Chelladurai and Saleh's (1980) LSS and its five components of leader behavior not only highlight the relevance of the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure, but also demonstrate an attempt to diminish the disparity between them by increasing consideration as a salient and more equal cohort with

initiating structure. However, the LSS failed to show internal consistency among certain behavioral dimensions and has only shown a weak relationship between measures of outcome variables of performance and satisfaction (Jowett, 2005). Chelladurai (1993) has concluded that from the lack of reliable support for subscale structures, the coaching behaviors may be highly related to one another and suggests that 'purer forms' of measurement and leadership need to be developed for sport (Chelladurai & Reimer, 1998). Although it did not develop into the preeminent model of leadership, the multidimensional approach begins to show a definite trend towards increasing the relative importance of consideration for the athlete by making them a more central concern in the leadership process. Providing a competing example of an interactional model is the mediational model, which further emphasizes a central focus on and increasing concern for the athlete by including a more comprehensive analysis of player perspectives in their analysis.

Smoll and Smith's (1989) mediational model of leadership began to look more closely at how situational factors regarding coach behaviors affect athletes and how these behaviors are mediated by players' perceptions of them (Horn, 2004). Smoll and Smith recognized the need to go beyond behavioral and situational factors. They held that the cognitive and emotional processes of the athletes with regard to leader behavior were equally as important as overt coaching behaviors were in the prediction of leader effectiveness (Ansel, 2003). The mediational model was developed in reaction to the multitude of factors affecting coach leadership. It was also an important advance for leadership

research in going beyond evaluative perceptions of leadership behavior by using direct observation and assessment by the athlete, coach and researcher in their analysis of leader behavior (Jowett, Paull, Pensgaard, Hoegmer, & Riise, 2005). This advance was thought to be significant because earlier research had shown that coaches were unaware of the extent to which they engaged in particular behaviors (Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1978) and it engaged the leader in a process of self-examination and reflection.

The mediational approach measures actual leader's behaviors, players' perceptions of those behaviors and players' recall of those behaviors. These three factors are moderated by the three antecedents of coach and player individual difference variables and the situational context (Chelladurai, 1993). The model uses the Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) to assess actual coach behavior through the direct observation by a researcher and the coach's self-perception and player's self-perception of actual behavior. The CBAS was developed over several years in the observation of soccer, basketball, baseball and football coaches, and researchers went to great lengths to analyze and code relevant leader behaviors. It includes all behavioral categories of Chelladurai and Saleh's (1980) LSS and was categorized into twelve dimensions of coaching behavior that were classified as being either reactive or spontaneous (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). Reactive behaviors are behaviors that are in direct response to an incident immediately after it occurs on the field. Spontaneous behaviors are not preceded by a specific incident but are comments the coach makes in a general sense. The CBAS has shown sufficient range to account for relevant coaching

behaviors, as catalogued through researcher coding and observation (Smoll & Smith, 1989). This model focuses attention on the players' attitudes towards their coach, teammates, and experiences as the critical outcomes affecting performance and was the first model to emphasize the importance of the athlete's perspectives in evaluating and analyzing leader effectiveness. Also, their research showed that the coaching behaviors of providing the athletes with support and instruction were positively and significantly related to athletes' attitudes towards their coach, their teammates, and their sport (Chelladurai, 1993). This model recognized that the dimension of athlete support and instructiveness had a significant impact on leadership effectiveness and highlights the importance of coaches' consideration for their athletes.

Although the mediational model is more comprehensive than preceding ones, the correlations between actual coach behaviors, coach's self-assessment and player evaluations were found to be weak and inconsistent. However, the congruence between player perceptions and direct observation led researcher's to conclude that coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors were flawed and that coaches were unaware of the extent to which they engaged in certain behaviors (Chelladurai, 1993). As a result, Smith and Smoll (1989) highlighted reflective practices on the part of the coach as a method of affecting leadership in making the leader more flexible by increasing their sensitivity to situational cues. The multidimensional (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) and mediational (Smoll & Smith, 1989) models have proven to be advances in leadership theory through the inclusion of situational variables for effective leadership. However, both the LSS

and CBAS provided theoretical models of effective leadership that were found to be insufficient to uncover the central issues of interpersonal leadership, which is a domain that remains mostly ignored in the research literature (Jowett, 2003). Nevertheless, in the evolution of leadership theory, both models increasingly emphasize consideration for the athlete and demonstrate how the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure continue to reemerge as prominent factors of effective leadership.

Transactional Leadership

Through an analysis of the evolution of leadership theory from the Great Man to the trait and behavioral theory and leading to situational to interactional models, it is important to note that these are all based on exchange relationships between leader and follower and so, are representative of transactional modes of leadership. The study of transactional leadership received increased attention after WWII and led into the latter part of the century. Transactional leadership is based on a system of contingent reinforcement where subordinates receive rewards or punishment congruent with their levels of effort and performance. The transactional leader also uses management-by-exception in both a passive and active manner to increase player performances. In the active form, management by exception is where the leader makes an effort to observe performance mistakes and takes immediate action to correct them. In the passive form, the leader does not engage actively to uncover mistakes but instead takes corrective action only if overall goals are not met (Hater & Bass, 1988).

Passive management by exception can be seen to easily convert into laissez-faire leadership, in which no corrective action is taken, and is the avoidance or absence of any form of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The factors of transactional leadership were shown to be reasonably effective in meeting the performance goals of the group (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Through these relationships of exchange between the leader and follower, something of value is traded for something the other values. The coach defines the rules and roles expected of each athlete, and in return for their compliance and effort, the athlete receives increased playing time, higher status, and more rewards than players less able to meet leader objectives (Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995). Transactional leadership is considered to be a rational approach because exchange relationships represent how a supervisor is expected to deal with subordinates (Avolio & Bass, 1988). Transactional leadership and contingent reinforcement are consistent with the worldview of economic rationalism, asserting that individuals are acting rationally when they seek the best interests of the self without considering the needs of others (Northouse, 2007). The transactional coach is concerned with the development and well-being of followers only to the extent that such consideration helps them accomplish their egoistic goals of winning, increased status and advancement, and so they are said to be inauthentic. According to Bass and Steidlemeier (1999), the inauthentic leader is deceptive and manipulative and seeks to maintain the parent-child like relations common in many coach-athlete relationships.

However, more recent studies of leadership have focused on transformational approaches, which attempt to go beyond these transactional relationships in seeking to create a transformation in the psychological, cognitive, and physical functioning of the athlete. Transformational leaders are motivated by a genuine care and concern for the athlete's well-being and development, even to the extent that they are willing to forego personal gain and endure risk (Hoption, Phelan, & Barling, 2008). The authentic leader is not deluded by self-interest but acts out of a genuine consideration for the other through adherence to an optimistic vision for the future of the athlete, their team, and society as a whole. Authentic and inauthentic forms of leadership can also be classified as being either transformational or pseudo-transformational, respectively (Avolio & Bass, 2002). In the transformational form, behavior is altruistic in serving the needs of others and develops and empowers followers. In the pseudo-transformational form, behavior is characterized by egoism and seeks to accomplish the self-serving ends of the leader relying heavily on the control and punishment of subordinates through a transactional relationship (Avolio & Bass, 2002). Transformational leadership is considered to be an emotional approach as it attempts to meet the deeper, emotional needs of the athlete for achievement and self-fulfillment (Bass, 1998) and I will now turn my discussion to these alternate theories of leadership.

Charismatic Leadership

Charisma is the ability of a leader to influence followers; it is thought to be an innate quality that is reserved to a select few and, is God-given (Burns,

1978). Charisma does not necessarily work on whole groups but at the level of leader-subordinate interaction (Murray & Mann, 2006) through the creation of an idealized vision of the goal or objective that makes subordinate tasks more meaningful. According to Boul and Bryson (1988), the "effects of charismatic leaders is that they intimately and unusually are involved in the creation of a new or different 'world'… that is cognitively, emotionally, behaviorally, and consequently 'real' for followers" (p. 12). This vision in the image of a better 'world' or state works by developing a sense of pride, faith and respect for the leader (Hater & Bass, 1988). Through this process, the leader raises the expectations and collective efforts of subordinates that ultimately manifests in heightened individual performance and potential (Avolio & Bass, 1988). Theoretically, charismatic leaders set high standards of what one must be willing to become in an environment based on trust, respect and consideration resulting in productivity and service (Murray & Mann, 2006). The effects associated with charismatic leadership are seen in decreasing follower resistance to change and in the compliance, commitment and loyalty of athlete's that result in the realization of a leader's vision (Avolio & Bass, 1988). It is here that we can draw on the distinction between an authentic or inauthentic transformational charismatic leader, where the authentic leader is motivated by the needs of the group or, is altruistic, and the inauthentic transformational leader is characterized by self-serving needs and is egoistic.

The major shortcomings in measuring the effects of charismatic leadership are that exceptional team performances may affect player perceptions

and lead to higher attributions of charisma to a leader that may or may not actually exist. Research into charisma has supported the claim that it is not necessarily something displayed by the leader but instead has been operationalized as a trait ascribed to a leader by individual followers; someone has charisma because we perceive them to have it (Avolio & Bass, 1988). Also, as noted by Graham (1988), charismatic leadership may lead to dependence or blind faith in the leader at the expense of developing independence, autonomy and empowerment in followers. That is, an egoistic leader concerned with the self-interests of power, status, and winning may exploit his or her influence for the attainment and gratification of these desires. According to Graham (1995), "Charismatic leadership, as traditionally understood, encourages … blind faith in the authority of the (charismatic) leader" and that, "Bass counts Hitler as a most charismatic and transformational leader" (p. 50). This identification and submission to the leader works to make followers dependent on the leader and inhibits the development of autonomy outside of the leader's influence.

In original conceptions of charismatic leadership Burns (1978) operationalized its impacts to be a result of the charisma and intellectual stimulation the leader affected on followers. Intellectual stimulation leads to the creation of an idealized vision of the future, where charisma inspires awe in subordinates affecting perceptions of leader credibility and increasing the likelihood that subordinates will adopt this vision. In turn, charisma may also help to accomplish the self-serving ends of the leader and perpetuate selfishness and narcissistic desire for continual approval (Hollander & Offerman, 1990). During a

short competitive season it is unlikely that athletes are able to recognize the underlying motives of the coach, as the players attention and focus are pre-occupied with fulfilling immediate task demands. Although, members eventually recognize the coach's use of manipulation ultimately leading to diminished motivation, loyalty and commitment to task goals (Sims & Brinkmann, 2002). Through its ability to inspire subordinates to achieve above and beyond the usual levels of performance, Bass (1985) operationalized charismatic leadership to be transformational when it was determined that an intellectually stimulating leader could be perceived to be charismatic (Keller, 1992). In early conceptions of transformational leadership, charisma was thought to be its underlying basis but the term has now become synonymous with leadership that has, in some way, impacted on subordinates to change their perspectives on their sporting lives and their roles within it. Eventually, according to Keller (2006), "Charismatic leadership and intellectual simulation were combined to form the single variable called transformational leadership" (p. 205) and with this, I now turn my attention to modern conceptualizations of transformational leadership.

Transformational Leadership

Bass and Steidlemeier (1999) stated that, "Authentic transformational leadership … expand[s] [the] domain of effective freedom, the horizon of conscience and the scope for altruistic intention" (p. 193). And according to Avolio and Bass (1988), "Burns (1978) conceptualized a transformational leader as one who motivates followers to work for transcendental goals instead of immediate self-interests and for achievement and self-actualization instead of

safety and security" (p. 33). Transformational leadership is concerned with the transformation occurring in the perspectives of both the leader and followers. By acting as a teacher, mentor and role model, the transformational leader activates higher-order needs of esteem and self-actualization in team and organization members (Keller, 1992). Transformational leadership is not a separate approach from transactional modes but is seen to have significant add-on effects to transactional leadership (Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995). According to Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995), "Bass's (1985) 'augmentation hypothesis' states that components of transformational leadership should predict performance and satisfaction outcomes beyond what can be accounted for by the transactional scales alone, but not vice versa" (p. 496). In other words, the augmentation hypothesis asserts that transformational builds on transactional leadership but transactional cannot build on the effects of transformational. Transactional modes are important in the early stages of leadership to focus followers on the task but once the leader achieves a certain level of change in followers, they move beyond these simple exchange relationships as a means to improve performance.

To measure transformational leadership Bass (1985) created the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in which transformational factors were drawn from the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), originally developed to measure initiating structure and consideration in earlier studies of leadership (Keller, 1992). The MLQ measures the degree of transformational and transactional leadership exhibited through a list of seventy-three questions asking subordinates to assess leader characteristics and behavior

and has been used successfully in several studies of transformational leadership (Koh et al., 1995). According to Avolio and Bass (1988), "Transformational leaders strive to … increase follower confidence and self-esteem by showing consideration" (p. 36) and illustrates how the dimension of consideration, thought to be insufficient to explain the complexities of leadership in the 1960's, has been resilient in the evolution of effective leadership theory.

In Bass's (1985) original conceptualization of transformational leadership it was based on the interaction of the three factors of charisma, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation (Bycio et al., 1995) but these have since become the '4'I's' of transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The 4'I's are: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration and these represent the source of transformational leadership's effectiveness. Idealized influence occurs when a leader acts in ways that are considerate to others and so becomes a role model for followers to emulate. Inspirational motivation is the leader's ability to create an attractive vision of the future that followers will accept as meaningful and challenging to their experience. Intellectual stimulation is the creation of an environment where subordinates are stimulated to be innovative and to think creatively in solving problems related to performance. Lastly, individualized consideration is where the leader promotes the achievement and growth of individual members by paying attention to their unique and distinct needs. Implementation of the 4'I's goes beyond exchange relationships and requires leaders to behave in ways that

perpetuate considerate behaviors leading to superior performances when compared with transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

With respect to the 4'I's of transformational leadership, the factors of idealized influence and individualized consideration are characterized as the positive interaction between leader and follower and respect for the needs of the other (Murray & Mann, 2006) and are both contained within the broader dimension of consideration. Keller (1992) highlights this congruence in stating that, "… substantial correlation between transformational leadership and consideration … raise the question as to whether transformational leadership is really different from the participative, relations-oriented leader behavior that have been in the literature for decades" (p. 499). Several researchers have pointed to the strong correlation between consideration for subordinates and the potential of a leader in transformational leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Bass & Steidlemeier, 1999; Fairholm, 2003; Graham, 1988; Hoption et al., 2008; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Kuhnert, 1994; Northouse, 2007). In addition, inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation refer to those leader behaviors outlining the goals of the team, the path to challenge player performances, and closely resembles the dimension of initiating structure.

Transformational leadership is a refinement of transactional leadership imposing on it the dimension of consideration that moves leadership towards recognition of the athlete's needs and experiences in the leadership process. Transactional emphasizes follower perceptions and expectations about leader behavior. Transformational leadership shifts attention to the motives underlying

subordinate behavior (Hollander & Offerman, 1990) and emphasizes consideration for others. In this approach, transformational leadership appeals to both the rational and emotional aspects of subordinate motivation shifting the focus from security and affiliation to achievement and self-actualization (Koh et al., 1995). It is through this shift in attention from selfish, egoistic concerns of the players to a more selfless and altruistic nature of the team, that transformational leadership can result in meeting the objectives of the team. It is through becoming attentive to the needs of others and overlooking personal interests where the process of reflection can become a credible practice. According to Bass (1994), "leadership and total quality efforts must be developed in concert to maximize individual, team and organizational effectiveness" (p.123). Reflection can provide the process of focusing a leader's attention away from their selfish concerns for power, status and control and onto task demands leading to follower development through the ideal of transformational leadership. This shift in attention forces coaches to recognize and examine the transactional nature of their relationships with athletes leading to expanding perspectives and the potential for transformational leadership.

According to Burns's (1978), leadership theories are a continuum where one extreme represents transactional leadership and it gradually moves towards transformational leadership at the other. Along this continuum there are many intermediate styles of leadership with transformational approaches representing a form of leadership that is based on the consideration of followers' needs before those of the leader. This requires a transformational leader to overlook the natural

tendency to view one's self as the centre of existence (Nesti, 2004) and to focus on considering the needs of subordinates. According to Avolio and Bass (2002), "True transformational leadership … convert[s] followers into leaders … broaden[s] and enlarge[s] the interests of those they lead … [and] motivate[s] them to go beyond individual self-interests for the good of the group" (p. 1). The emphasis of transformational leadership is on the consideration and care of subordinates that can be augmented by engaging in reflective practices (Calderhead, 1998; Van Manen, 1991). One feature determining whether leadership results in transactional or transformational practices is derived by the leader's motives to act either egoistically or altruistically. In recognizing the leader's need to be altruistic, Greenleaf (1998) developed the model of servant leadership where the leader's role is one of service to his or her followers.

Servant Leadership

The premise behind servant leadership is that true leadership arises from the desire to serve others in a way that helps followers develop their attributes and potential abilities (Greenleaf, 1998). In sincere service to others, the leader sets aside self-interest and provides the example of behavior for followers to emulate in working towards organizational objectives (Johnson, 2005). The emphasis of servant leadership in nurturing and developing individuals through care and consideration is based on an ethic of altruism (Brown & Trevino, 2006) and so, elucidate the evolution of leadership towards the transformational end of the leadership continuum. The servant approach recognizes that traditional leadership

models tended to treat followers as objects in meeting performance objectives as defined by a self-serving leader (Greenleaf, 1998).

Consistent with notions of transformational leadership, servant leadership opposes the ideals of rational egoism and individual self-interest, opting instead to emphasize that a leader's sole motivation should be the growth and development of subordinates. Greenleaf (1998) envisioned this to be accomplished through the leader's ethical use of power and identified three forms of power: coercive, manipulative and persuasive. In the coercive form, a leader holds power over others and is transactional in their use of contingent reinforcement to influence people. Manipulative power is where the leader uses "plausible rationalizations" to influence the actions, beliefs and behaviors of subordinates despite the fact that they may not fully understand the full implications of those rationalizations (Greenleaf, 1998, p. 84). Manipulative power can be transformational if it considers followers' needs and leads them toward personal growth. It can also be inauthentic if it is motivated by the personal interests of the leader and so, is both transactional and transformational. The last dimension is persuasive power, which Greenleaf (1998) refers to as a process "that does not allow either coercion or manipulation in any form" (p. 85). Persuasion takes place when leaders consider their followers and allow them to use their own internal standards of morality in determining the rightness of a behavior, belief or action. It is the servant leader's intention to influence his or her athletes through modeling altruistic behavior that leads athletes to overlook personal interests and replace them with a commitment to the goals of the team. According to Bycio et al. (1995), "transformational

leaders typically hold a sense of moral obligation to the organization as an end value, which is in turn, adopted by subordinates" (p. 477). Through this approach, the followers are persuaded towards actions or behaviors through the leader's example and then are free from the constraints of leadership to choose whether or not the goal is worthwhile to commit to.

Greenleaf's (1998) three forms of power demonstrate how a leader is led to overlook personal interests through increasingly advanced stages of transformational leadership behavior. According to Burns (1978), "To control things … is an act of power, not leadership, for things have no motives. Power wielders may treat people as things. Leaders may not" (p. 18). Servant leadership adheres to this sentiment and seeks to serve, rather than to control followers. Treating followers as 'things' or, as a means for the ends of the leader has its basis in rational egoism and is further perpetuated by 'economic imperialism,' asserting that, "money and material possessions be the primary criterion to measure success and failure in every sphere of human life, and therefore be valued more than anything else in society" (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998, p. 136). As sport leadership evolved from the Industrial Revolution and its model of supervision through exchange relationships, coaching has come to reflect this ideal of transactional leadership by placing emphasis on the outcomes of winning, performance and profits (Morgan, 2002). Such an emphasis causes leaders to neglect the interests of their followers where, according to Kanungo and Mendonca (1998) "the focus on self is an … extreme expression of individualistic psychology … now supported and corrupted by consumerism" (p. 136). Through

such a perspective, leadership only gave consideration to others' needs when research recognized that athlete performances were constrained by the exchanges associated with transactional leadership (Chelladurai, 1978; Hater & Bass, 1988; Smoll & Smith, 1989). The ideals of transactional leadership are reflected and perpetuated by the dominant society and give license to modes of leadership lacking consideration for the athlete and treating them as a means to a leader's ends for power and acquisition. However, at the heart of transformational and servant leadership is a genuine concern and consideration for the athlete's needs for growth and development.

The ethical use of power reflects authentic transformational leadership, and through individual consideration, caring, and attention, it encourages the development of individual followers. According to Greenleaf (1998), " something of unconditioned uniqueness is prepared to show through in every person. It is the process of drawing it forth with which each of us needs to be concerned" (p. 65). The ideal of servant leadership perpetuates service and a consideration for followers' needs that it highlights as the process of uncovering each athlete's potential or 'unconditioned uniqueness'. According to Kavussanu and Roberts (2001), our growth is achieved through our social interactions with others and is characterized by a consideration and sensitivity to their needs. It is through developing an increased sensibility to the needs of the athlete that a coach's practices can lead to transformational leadership. It is through reflection that we begin to recognize how our actions impact on others and shifts the focus from egocentric needs for power and control to the physical, emotional and

psychological needs of our athletes (Van Manen, 1991). Nurturing an increased sensibility towards others leads to transformational practices and to more ethical and moral forms of leadership, which is now where I turn my attention.

Ethical Leadership

According to Evans (1998), "[the] requirement of genuine leadership is the impulse to articulate, defend and live by certain high principles of ethical conduct" (p. ix). Dalla Costa (1998) stated, "ethics are … en route to becoming a strategic imperative" and that, "… technical excellence without moral excellence can lead to serious problems" (pp. 4, 113-4). In Burns' (1978) development of transformational leadership, ethics played a central role in the transformational process (Northouse, 2007) where, to be 'ethical' implies that there is a persistent belief in what is good and right, as opposed to what is procedurally or legally right (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998). Ethical leadership is based on the idea that organizations functioning on higher moral planes will show subsequent increases in individual, team and organizational performances. This type of leadership is transformational because it relies on the ethical use of power through the consideration of others that is meant to empower rather than to control subordinates to result in the capacity for self-governance (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998). Kanungo and Mendonca (1998) outlined that the role of the leader is to sustain and perpetuate an idealized vision of a higher ethical standard based on moral principles of personal integrity, legitimacy and credibility. The development of a common vision represents the effects of inspirational motivation of the transformational leader and is analogous to the effects of initiating structure

that leaders engage in to focus the attention of athletes on a task. The difference in the initiating structure of the transactional and transformational leader is that, the transformational leader implements such practices from an ethical perspective, which effectively incorporates initiating structure with a consideration for the athlete. Speaking on the subject of leader consideration for their charges, Fairholm (2003) used the concept of 'love' to refer to the deep concern for the well-being of the other, which constitutes the 'basis of ethical leadership' (p. 140). The basis of ethical leadership is essentially consideration for the other and the leader's demonstrated capacity to overlook personal self-interests. According to Turner et al. (2002), transformational leaders "were more likely to value goals to go beyond immediate self-interests and to foresee the benefits of actions that serve the collective good" (p. 306). In other words, the ethical leader ascribes to altruistic principles serving the greater good of the team over their own. Ethical leadership represents a part of the evolution of leadership theories towards transformational modes emphasizing consideration for the athlete.

In terms of ethical leadership, Armstrong (2001) stated "behavior of this 'higher plane' will result in a positive, rich and fulfilling experience for the athlete. The transformational leadership style raise both leader and subordinate to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 45). In providing the example of this 'higher plane,' ethical leaders inspire and motivate athletes to be considerate of teammates as well as the superordinate goals of the team. Brown and Trevino (2006) identified four dimensions that comprise ethical leadership: character/integrity, altruism, collective motivation, and empowerment. Each of

these dimensions is developed by the leader to encourage and nurture the growth of the follower by perpetuating considerate behaviors. According to Brown and Trevino (2006), "Ethical leaders are a source of guidance because their… credibility draws attention to their modeled behavior" (p. 597). As followers internalize and imitate the leader's high standards for considerate behavior, their ideals of personal relationships are ultimately transformed from those based on transactions to ones reflecting altruism and consideration. It is an effect that is similar to the transformations produced by the 4'I's, except that the effects of ethical behavior on subordinate motivation is more pronounced and intense (Hollander & Offerman, 1990) and may be accounted for by the increased emphasis on consideration. As Dalla Costa (1998) stated, "In its most reduced form, to be ethical is to be compassionately aware of the other … (and) orients us to make choices and behave in ways that honour the physical, emotional and spiritual reality of the other person" (p. 122). To have compassion for and show concern and sensitivity for how our actions impact on others, represents the influence of consideration in the leadership process.

In developing this sensibility to be considerate of others a leader must engage in the work that leads them to become more aware of the developmental needs of subordinates. According to Dalla Costa (1998), "an ethical orientation is of substantial value because it exercises the very skills of discernment and judgment that managers need to unravel the deepening paradox of competition and success" (p.11). Through reflection coaches are provided with a process that may heighten their ability to incorporate a consideration for others into their

practice hastening their engagement in transformational leadership. As Fairholm (2003) stated that love is the basis of ethical leadership, he went on to say, "moral leadership is a process, not just an objective. It is love in action" (141). As love can be seen to represent the most extreme form of consideration for another, it is also the ideal of moral behavior and the epitome of transformational leadership.

Moral Leadership

According to Sparks (2001), "Transformational leadership can evolve into moral relationship by raising the level of human conduct and ethical behavior of both the leader and those being led" (p. 513). Ciulla (1998) stated that, "leadership is a distinct kind of moral relationship with people" (p. 83) and, Johnson (2005) added, "Moral commitments are at the heart of transformational leadership" (p.158). Transformational leadership is, at its extreme, moral leadership because the ideals of morality have their basis in a consideration for others causing one to overlook their own self-interests in serving the greater good of the team (Burns, 1985).

In the underlying tension between egoism and altruism, which determines whether leadership is transactional or transformational (Turner et al., 2002), leaders must be cognizant of their motives so that their practices do not lead to unintended consequences that constrain the long-term development of the athlete. According to Fairholm (2003), "Moral judgment … is part of the self-analysis leaders engage in as they observe and reflect on their actions and judgments of events" (p. 146) where Van Manen (1991) characterized morality as the ability for principled action or 'tact' that resulted from reflection. Dalla Costa (1998) stated

that such moral behavior that considers the other "requires reflection as well as feeling, responsibility … [and] love" (p. 121). It is in heightening our ability to recognize how our leadership impacts on the physical, emotional and psychological well-being of our athletes' that should inevitably lead to coaching practices that more directly reflect athletes' needs through a consideration of them.

Moreover, it is only through a genuine desire to improve the conditions leading to growth in the athlete that leaders will produce teams that reflect and personify attributes of altruism resulting in heightened performances. According to Dalla Costa (1998), "if companies adopt moral rectitude to be more successful, then the motivation for correctness is contaminated with the very self-interest that ethics are supposed to mitigate" (p.113). Fairholm (2003) pointed out that in relying on the ideals of altruism, it transforms leader and follower to engage in higher levels of meaning, cognition and performance. As transformational modes of leadership require the leader to overlook their personal needs for power the increased reliance on internal norms and controls of conducting oneself has led to the development of inner leadership.

Inner Leadership

Attempting to synthesize the ideals of authentic transformational leadership, Fairholm (2003) developed the model of inner leadership. The main idea behind inner leadership is that the leader or coach functions from a morally mature perspective manifesting in a consideration for followers. According to Fairholm (2003), the leader "model[s] … desired service behavior … [that]

underline the importance of service in their contacts with those with whom they interact" (p. 156) highlighting that desired service overlooks selfish concerns in return for team goals. Additionally, he stated that, "[f]ollower commitment comes after leaders demonstrate their moral code by their actions to institute procedures, techniques and work processes that consider moral factors" (Fairholm, 2003, p.140). This model of leadership eschews control and manipulation in return for the development of followers through leader consideration that works to increase follower commitment to the task.

The model of inner leadership connects the ideals of inspiration and intuition with the concept of self-reflection requiring coaches to be more critical of their practices. According to Fairholm (2003), inner leadership "entails a deep level of self-knowledge and listening, irrespective of reality or social and cultural conditioning. Through intuition we learn what is right, how to live and work with integrity, and how to express our true selves" (p.176). It is through a process of searching and questioning our practices that leads to new levels of growth and engaging in alternate forms of leadership practice.

Fairholm (2003) added that, inner leadership is characterized by leader self-analysis in combination with a consideration or "a concern for growth and transformation of followers to the end that followers will want to use more of their innate talent and intelligence in doing the communal work" (pp. 154-5). It is through a leader's ability to become more considerate of his or her athletes manifesting in coach practices that promotes performances beyond existing levels of potential. Inner leadership represents a transformational model at the extreme

end of the leadership continuum that elucidates the dimension of consideration within a tradition of leadership that typically emphasizes initiating structures and a basis in transactional leadership.

In the evolution towards transformational forms of leadership it is evident that, in order for the leader to be transformational they must develop the capacity to show consideration for the needs of their athletes and overcome the tendency to focus on their own self-interests (Nesti, 2003). According to Turner et al. (2002), "organizational researchers interested in the moral potential of leadership have portrayed it as a basic tension between altruism and egoism" (p. 305). It is in mediating this tension that consideration for the athletes can lead to more effective forms of leadership. As Calderhead (1989) has illustrated, reflective practices can provide the means that lead to more considerate practices and so, theoretically, should lead a coach to engage in transformational leadership. It is in mediating the tension between a leader's self interests and athlete development that reflection can be essential to encouraging the consideration of transformational leadership.

Reflective Practices for Coaches

My literature review highlights some of the more enduring theories of leadership but is not exhaustive. However, it does make it apparent that there are many differing perspectives in the literature providing a wide range of theories for use by coaches in trying to become better leaders. Through my thesis research, I wanted to find out what kind of leader I was and what strategies and methods I was relying on as a football coach. It was in finding out about what leadership I

was using that reflection showed itself to be a useful process in my practices as a coach. The process of reflection can help other coaches to become more informed leaders in their field of practice. Accordingly, Gilbert and Trudel (2004) noted that sport coaches frequently reported being engaged in a "constant struggle" or tension in trying to balance the goal of winning with athlete development (p. 34). Van Manen (1991) commented on reflective practices that, "in [a] more self-conscious mode … there comes into play a noticeable tension between the conventional I or self and the reflective I that holds the spontaneous conversational nature of intuitive acting at a distance" (p. 519). It is in this distancing that enables coaches to recognize where their practices may be perpetuating their own self-interests and be undermining the athletes' needs for development. In this next section I intend to show how reflective practices may help to overcome the self-interests that perpetuates a focus on a technical rationality and initiating structure and lead coaches to overlook their personal needs in return for athlete consideration.

One reason for renewed interest in reflection in the modern era is based on the work of Schön (1987), whose notion of reflection was based on a consideration and attention to one's professional development in providing a "dialogue of thinking and doing through which [the coach] become[s] more skillful" (p. 31). According to Cushion (2006), reflection is "the ongoing process of critically examining current and past practice as a method of improving future practice and increasing knowledge" (p. 135). Moon (2004) defined it as "the means by which awareness of experience is recognized and is made explicit and

generalizable to other situations" (p. 158). Reflection is a method of improving one's professional practice through thinking about one's actions and analyzing how these impact on those under their leadership. According to Van Manen (1991) "Thoughtful reflection discovers where unreflective action was 'thoughtless,' without tact" (p. 532) or inconsiderate of others. Cassidy, Potrac, and McKenzie (2006) stated, "coach education programs have… tended to prioritize knowledge related to the technical, tactical, and bio-scientific aspects of sporting performance" (p. 154). As these authoritative technologies have been prioritized, it has resulted in the systemic marginalization of alternate practices in coaching. The process of reflection can lead a coach into a deeper level of awareness about practices that results in questioning the motives and assumptions underlying their leadership.

For the purposes of this thesis, I will only point out three of the main types of reflection known as 'reflection-in-action', 'reflection-on-action' and 'retrospective reflection-on-action' with the caveat that there are many forms of engaging in reflective practice (McAlpine & Weston, 2002). According to Cassidy, Jones, and Potrac (2009), coaches engage in 'reflection-in-action' when they are involved in a reflection of their actions and decisions 'in the moment' or more simply, "thinking about what they are doing, even while doing it" (p. 19). Reflection-on-action is that which occurs outside the 'moment' of the event but follows closely thereafter or, "within the action-present, but not in the midst of activity" (Gilbert & Trudel, 2001, p. 30). This occurs as the process of keeping notes or a journal about events on a day-to-day, semi-daily or even a weekly

basis. Lastly, retrospective reflection-on-action is "reflection outside of the action present" and refers to the thinking that occurs after the game, practice or season has ended when the coach is no longer able to influence or change the result and includes reflection on journal entries (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006, p. 120). Reflection-in and reflection-on-action are both considered to be methods of learning through experience, where retrospective reflection-on-action is a method of learning from experience (Gilbert & Trudel, 2001). It is this last method of retrospective reflection that is thought to provide sufficient time and space for a coach to reflect on practice bringing about the opportunity for growth, development and change (Van Manen, 1991).

One viable means of retrospective reflection for coaches is through the writing of a narrative (Cassidy et al., 2009), in which coaches engage in writing stories about their professional experience that leads them to deconstruct and analyze the significance of events that occur in their practice (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004). This method of reflection provides two opportunities for learning as, according to Moon (2004), in the process of writing and re-writing of our "personal reflections, we shape and model the contents of our reflection in different ways and learn also from the process itself … [leading to] secondary learning" (p. 80). In my case, the empirical material of my journal shows some superficial levels of reflection that examines persistent issues in my practice. However, it was through reflecting on and analyzing these journal entries for the construction of my narratives, that led to a more critical view of the episodes of practice. Further, in the analysis of these narratives I was led to an even greater

insight and surprised to find that most dilemmas in my practice of leadership could be reduced to my desire to advance my own cause. Narrative writing should be seen as an effective mode of coach reflection that can provide insight into practices that eventually leads to questioning dominant practices of leadership and the motives underlying them. As Strean, Senecal, Howlett, and Burgess (1997) have noted, most coaches remain unaware of the underlying assumptions of their practice perpetuating traditional forms of leadership that reflective practices can help mitigate against. Debate over the use of reflection and one's ability to effectively engage in this process as a means to develop skills and expert knowledge, is based on the notion that many coaches lack the experience required for effective reflection (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006). That is, they do not have the background knowledge to draw on that allows them to know which events are significant to reflect on to aid future practice (McAlpine & Weston, 2002). However, McAlpine and Weston noted that the variability in which professionals are able to effectively engage in reflection is not merely a function of their level of experience. According to Kruse (1997), the difference in being able to reflect beyond a superficial level is the ability to focus attention on key issues.

> As Kruse (1997) stated: [W]hat separates teachers at an individual level in their reflective practice is their focus. Some teachers appear to be able to, in a consistent and sustained manner, focus their reflective activity on one aspect of their work, curriculum, instruction, students or interpersonal work skills … Teachers who are less focused in their reflective activity concentrate … on issues of control as it relates to student conduct, time

> management and school politics. Their reflection is cyclical in nature, never resolving the issues that plague them" (p. 56).

Issues of control are what inexperienced coaches tend to focus on through prioritizing initiating structures, whereas expert coaches are able to pinpoint the more significant issues for reflection based on their experience and understanding of the relevant issues affecting player performances. According to Ciulla (1998), "Leaders cannot empower people unless they have the moral courage to be honest and sincere in their intention to change the power relationships that they have with their followers" (p. 83). Reflection can lead to the increased consideration for athletes' needs resulting in the practice of transformational leadership. Since consideration has traditionally been the dimension missing from the practice of leadership (Bass, 1985), coaches have tended to emphasize authoritative technologies that have been shown to be counterproductive to the performances of their athletes (Hater & Bass, 1988).

Researchers tend to agree that community based groups or mentorship programs that promote reflective practices through the sharing of experiences would be instrumental in adding to the knowledge base of younger, more inexperienced coaches (Cassidy et al., 2009; Cushion, Armour & Jones, 2003). However, within the structure of elite sport, such communities of practice are rarely feasible and are inconsistent with the ideals of competition in sport. According to Gilbert and Trudel (2004), "[w]hen winning at all costs drives coaches, isolationalism takes root and coaches see other coaches as enemies-not partners … [and] refrains coaches from engaging with other coaches … while

searching for solutions to common problems" (p. 169-70). This focus on the bottom line of winning and acquisition in sport is a product of the ethical egoism and the authoritative technologies perpetuated through transactional forms of leadership. Where outcomes are emphasized there is a further reliance on these initiating structures that stress winning, efficiency and acquisition to marginalize other forms of practice. According to Van Manen (1991), "[a]s [coaches] are expected to treat the job … more and more technically, [they are] less and less able to reflect on the meaning, purpose and significance of the [sporting] experiences of [their athletes]" (p. 511). It is this same performance based mentality that coaches become dependent on a technical rationality to guide their practices, becoming increasingly unaware of the needs of their athletes and so less likely to demonstrate consideration for them.

Reflection can have impacts on coaching both through initiating structures and consideration, as Calderhead (1989) stated, reflection "has been justified on grounds ranging from moral responsibility to technical effectiveness" (p. 45). According to Pollard (2008), "[t]he conception of reflective … practitioner … draws particular attention to the aims, values and social consequences of [one's actions]" (pp. 4, 5). This element of making coaches more conscious of how their actions and behaviors impact on others is the embodiment of consideration and is an aptitude that can aid in the practice of coach leadership. Van Manen (1991) referred to reflection as increasing the aptitude for principled actions or 'tact,' which, "implies sensitivity … is always sincere and truthful, never deceitful or misleading" (p. 519). The process of reflection encourages a consideration of the

other by informing how actions impact on those around them and is closely aligned to transformational leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Bass & Steidlemeier, 1999; Fairholm, 2003; Graham, 1988; Hoption, Phelan & Barling, 2008; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998; Keller, 1992; Kouzes & Pozner, 2003; Kuhnert, 1994; Northouse, 2007).

This increasing awareness of how our actions impact on others is consistent with a deeper consideration for the well-being of others. Again, in using the notion of 'tact' Van Manen (1991) stated "the basis of tact is … thoughtfulness" and is the aptitude "to be able to take other people's feelings into account … having a feel for what other people require … [and is] an expression of thoughtfulness that involves … an active sensitivity toward the subjectivity of the other" (p. 531). This ability to be 'tactful' or considerate of the other is a mediation of the underlying tension between egoism and altruism that distinguishes the transactional from the transformational leader. Van Manen (1991) stated succinctly that, such consideration or "[t]houghtfulness is the product of self-reflexive reflection on human experience" (p. 522), and the process of reflection can lead to consideration for others to culminate in transformational leadership of the coach.

In her own process of reflection in her role as a teacher, Hartog (2002) showed how reflection led to a shift in consciousness that made her more considerate of her students, stating, "[m]y attention … has shifted from attending to ... my own thoughts and projects … [to] their needs … as learners … [and] I am engaged in a process of reflection that is deeply attuned to their needs … and

to my own [practices], as I seek to facilitate their learning" (p. 239). In this passage, Hartog demonstrated how her practices increasingly reflect the needs of her students as a result of her reflections and her ability to overcome self-centred concerns of curriculum delivery. Through this same process, coaches can become more attentive to their athletes' needs that manifests as consideration and transformational leadership. In heightening their consideration for the athlete, coaches' practices will more accurately reflect athlete needs thereby informing their implementation and practice of initiating structures and lead to new heights of performance through transformational leadership.

Summary

The results of my literature review make it apparent that there are many theories of leadership but that researchers are unaware of how coaches are using them to become better leaders. It is through my own reflective practices that I demonstrate how these theories can lead to more informed leaders in the subculture of coaching football. As I outlined, situational models were the first theories to look beyond the impacts of only the leader to include the perspective of the leader acting within a specific situational context. It was Fiedler (1967) who identified that all three of, the leader, the situation and the follower were equally important factors to leadership success. From this point onwards, all theories of leadership were embedded with an increasing emphasis or consideration for the role of the follower in the leadership process. Transformational leadership continued along this trend by heavily favoring the followers perspective through the 4I's in an attempt to exceed levels of

performance reached through transactional leadership alone (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). As noted previously, the '4'I's (intellectual stimulation, idealized influence, individual consideration and inspirational motivation) are a further refinement on the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration and so, do not represent significant deviations from these concepts (Keller, 1992).

Research on transformational leadership and the 4I's present an idyllic alternative to transactional theories yet have failed to lead to practical applications to sports coaching since their inception over 20 years ago. Also, researchers have demonstrated that the 4I's are congruent with the original leadership dimensions of initiating structure (Bass, 1985) and consideration (Keller, 1992) and so, do not represent significant aberrations of these constructs. In its most reduced form, initiating structure is congruent with transactional leadership because of its focus on the aspects of training, performance and management of the athletes giving little regard for their needs as individuals (Bass, 1985). It is the emphasis on performance-based results that perpetuate transactional modes of leadership through coach socialization ultimately constraining athlete performances. In turn, consideration is identical to transformational leadership representing the same interpersonal dimension of effective leadership first identified in the 1940's (Keller, 1992).

As indicated in my literature review, it is the process of reflection that provides the means for coaches to develop the capacity to be considerate of their athletes' needs (Calderhead, 1989; Van Manen, 1991). Reflective practices can help coaches apply theoretical concepts of transformational leadership to practice

by increasing their ability to meet their athletes' needs. As such, the question this thesis will focus on is, **how did the process of reflection impact on my coaching practices to affect how I engage in leadership?** In examining this question, I relied on my personal experiences as a collegiate and high school level football coach. It was through the secondary learning provided in the process of writing, reading and rereading my journal entries to construct personal narratives that heightened my awareness to my athletes' needs. These journal entries then become the empirical material for my narratives reflecting significant episodes to become the basis of my analysis of leadership. In the next chapter I discuss my rationale and methodology, which specifically addresses the issue of coach leadership through an investigation of the events of my personal narratives, via reflection, to provide a cohesive and developmental account of my leadership experiences in coaching football.

Chapter Three: Method

Qualitative Research and the Narrative Turn

Existing literature on leadership in sport has mostly focused on quantitative methodologies where the impacts of the researcher are absent from the presentation of results and seem to occupy an objective and almost omniscient point of view. However, Denison and Markula (2005) believed that this area of research could benefit greatly from an alternate form of representation from the qualitative paradigm to illuminate current research leading to a heightened understanding. One of the major proponents in challenging the realist tradition in qualitative research and looking at alternate ways of representation was Norman Denzin (1994), whose appeal for diminishing the disparity between researcher and subject led to more authentic and 'real' versions of the social landscape. According to Denison and Rinehart (2000), Denzin was "dissatisfied with the 'progress' made in researching and studying human social relations" and that "[Denzin] felt social science had come up short" (p. 1). The result of this work as well as a few other transitions in the methods of qualitative research writing led to what Bochner (2001) called the 'narrative turn,' marked by a shift from scientific, positivist writing to more subjective, interpretive forms and include what Denzin (1994) described as the central positioning of the researcher in the text through the use of personal experience. This form of ethnographic writing used personal experiences in narratives and has come to represent socially meaningful texts that led to a growing number of various methods for the representation of qualitative research and the analysis of social issues.

Evolution of Narrative Methods

As part of this emerging field in qualitative research and its representation, Bochner and Ellis (1996) were among the first social scientists to explore these alternate methods of ethnographic writing (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The result was the presentation of scientific theories as storied forms of writing which led towards the specific method of an autoethnography. According to Ellis (1999), "[a]utoethnography is an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple layers of consciousness" and that "look[s] inward, exposing a vulnerable self that is moved by and may move through cultural interpretations" (p. 673). The autoethnographic method was a way to heighten and centralize the influence of the writer as they became both researcher and researched through incorporating personal experiences into the text. As Richardson (2000) noted, "autoethnography … are highly personalized, revealing texts in which authors tell stories about their own lived experiences, relating the personal to the cultural" (p.11). These texts take on many forms in impacting the reader and have become embedded forms within the qualitative field as valid ways of representing sociological research.

A sub-category that has evolved to gain considerable attention is the method of narrative inquiry. Narrative inquiry is similar to autoethnography in its positioning of the researcher as central to the events but is different in that it relies on a more formal process in the collection, shaping and representation of data (Clandinin & Murphy, 2007). According to Chase (2005), "[n]arrative inquiry is an amalgam of interdisciplinary analytic lenses, diverse disciplinary approaches, and both traditional and innovative methods … all revolving around an interest in biographical particulars as narrated by the one who lives them" (p. 651). It was through the research of Jean Clandinin (1985) and

her analysis in the field of teachers' professional development, which emphasized that the acquisition of professional knowledge was highly personal and reinforced the significance of personalized accounts in illuminating their experiences (Elbaz-Luwisch, 2007). Narrative inquiry is making sense of events through retrospection that enables a level of analysis not afforded to the researcher while living in the moment. According to Morgan-Fleming (2007), "[n]arrative inquiry allows access to professional craft and experiential knowledge otherwise invisible to those outside the occupation, allowing for the complexities of life in these professions to be preserved in the research product" (p. 355). The added insights provided by narrative inquiry make it an important adjunct to qualitative methodologies. However, its formal methodology still holds to traditional notions of representing research perpetuated by scientific inquiry.

As more of a digression from the structure of the realist tradition and in the interest of reaching wider audiences, Richardson (2002) was a key figure in promoting more evocative forms of writing in the social sciences. Regarding the emerging aesthetic to replace scientific forms of writing, Richardson stated "[q]ualitative writers … can eschew the questionable meta-narrative of scientific objectivity and still have plenty to say as situated speaker, subjectively engaged in knowing/telling about the world as they perceive it" (p. 11). Through advocating a style that included the construction of a 'plot' and holding back interpretation to allow the reader to experience events through evocative writing that met "literary criteria of coherence, verisimilitude, and interest," the reader was forced from a passive role to active participant in the story (Richardson, 2000, p.11). It is through the shift from realist forms of representation to more interpretive, qualitative methods that laid the foundation and provided the fertile ground for the

emergence and evolution of the narrative method. This narrative turn in the social sciences was followed closely by its emergence in the field of sport research.

Narrative Methods in Sport

By the time alternate methods of writing were gaining credibility, the field of social science was primed for a new methodology that could articulate its socially embedded landscape that was being constrained by the objective distancing of quantitative methodology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). According to Sparkes (2000), "[the] traditional view of social sciences is premised in 'imagining the self,' viewing it as a contaminant, transcending it, denying it, protecting its vulnerability" (p. 30). Such realist perspectives did not allow for adequate exploration of the athletic environment or, of the social forces affecting it. As the narrative method gained credibility as an alternative to scientific writing, athletes or coaches could now maintain a central role in their stories reflecting a more accurate account for the reader. These 'truer' representations afforded the reader more perceptive renderings of the athletic experience that led to questioning traditional practices and to exploring alternate realities. On this, Sparkes (2000) stated that "writing is now to be seen as a method of inquiry, a way of finding out about yourself and your topic: Writing is also a way of 'knowing' – a method of discovery and analysis … Form and content are inseparable" (p. 22). It is through this process of constructing and re-constructing narratives that the sport researcher is faced with the significant issues that contain the essence of lived experience.

In their chapter on 'Sport and the Personal Narrative' Denison and Markula (2005) made an appealing case for the role of narratives in understanding the social implications of sport. For Denison and Markula, the researcher as writer is seen to add to

the credibility of the research topic not just by placing themselves within the text but also, by being open to how the writer's opinions and biases affect it. The realist perspective would argue that this admittance is a weakness because it opens up the possibility for criticisms for alternative representations. However, it is this feature that is also a strength in recognizing that this method does not close itself off to other possible interpretations of the same or similar problem but claims only to highlight one version of it. According to Denison and Markula (2005), "narrative goes far beyond cold-hearted description … and involves more than what is directly observable to the human eye to create a more fleshed-out, visceral portrait of the 'real'" (p. 168). Through the use of thick description, that could only be the result of first-hand experiences, narratives provide a deeper level of meaning forcing the reader into a heightened sense of a broader social reality.

Furthermore, in his account of 'Writing a 'true' sports story' Denison (2002) compares the process of writing directly to that of running when he stated, "(g)ood writing like good running has to meet certain standards. And I see now that writing a good story involves rings of subjectivity just like running a fast mile actually takes more will than skill" (p. 131). Through form that merges the researched with the researcher's personal experience, Denison (2002) provides a compelling argument for the use of narrative to tell a 'true story' and how this does not necessarily include an accurate description of events and facts but "[a]ctually, probably precludes it" (p. 133). Denison (2002) added that qualitative methods provide for a deeper level of analysis: "[a] true sports story would reveal other questions, doubts and concerns … [t]houghts … that would've remained private and hidden, maybe even unconscious" (p. 134) and through narratives, are allowed to become central in the representation of research. Other authors

using storied forms of writing in sport, as a method to elucidate the salient issues, include Eleanor Miller's (2000) article 'Dis' examining the affects of physical activity in children, and Toni Bruce's (2000) look at being a female sports reporter in a male locker room and how issues of sexism continue to persist in these predominantly male environments. Also, Tosha Tsang's (2000) experience of being a Canadian-Chinese female Olympic rower and her analysis of identity in sport through writing a series of five short stories. These stories include 'Hairy Legs' and 'A Face of Difference' that are contrasting stories of the construction of female identity and cultural standards of beauty. 'Becoming Chinese' and 'My Relations' are two other examples also exploring identity but about how racial and cultural identities are constructed. The personal experience narratives take the reader in to experience the thoughts, emotions and sensibilities of the author leaving one with an indelible experience and provide the reader with new realizations.

According to Gilbert and Trudel (2006), the construction of narratives represents a 'retrospective reflection-on-action' that is, making sense of past experiences and enabling a coach to bring to light the more salient issues of one's practice. Through the narrative method the sport researcher is provided, for example, with a legitimate method in helping to uncover the social complexities of competition and sport. In constructing personal narratives, one is forced to deal with issues that normally remain hidden and are forced to the periphery through traditional methods of inquiry. Narratives allow the athletic experience to make apparent its socially embeddedness that lead to insights revealing their social reality and provide a useful vehicle for the coach in exploring lived experience.

Narrative Writing in Coaching

Through its ability to provide insight into social processes, narratives have become an effective method in illuminating the issues affecting coaches in the world of sport. For example, Jones's (2006) construction of a personal experience narrative on the maintenance of a 'front' reflects the typical game day practices of a semi-professional soccer coach. It gives us a glimpse into the complex dynamics of the performance of the leadership role and how one's coaching practices are influenced by the constraints of the dominant culture. In another example by Markula and Martin (2007) on 'gaining respect in the field' of coaching, the authors provide valuable insights through the research story into how the ethics of a coaching staff can influence coach leadership through its impact on athlete respect to ultimately affect performance.

In Jones's (2006) example, readers are taken into the thoughts, emotions and insecurities of the coach and how his ability to perform this role is predicated on achieving and maintaining a level of respect from his players through impression management. This example portrays a style of leadership that is hierarchical; it starts and ends with the coach. In order to meet performance objectives set out by the organization, the coach feels it necessary to embody a form of leadership that is a performance, bordering on manipulation, to command the respect of his players. In trying to maintain 'face' in front of his athletes the coach demonstrates how dominant practices are rationalized as necessary for the efficient functioning of the team through the assured compliance of his players. Markula and Martin (2007) provided two narratives presented as individual vignettes each followed by a brief discussion of how these events impact on the coach. The first vignette portrays a leadership style of a coaching staff, how it is interpreted from the perspective of the players and how their respect for their coach is

affected by the lack of ethics practiced through this style to ultimately impact on their attitudes and performance.

Their second vignette also explores the effects of coach leadership but does so through the perspective of the coach in his relationship with a specific athlete on the team. In it we see how the ethical disposition of both coach and athlete work to compromise the relationship that ultimately leads to bad decision-making and poor performances. Through their examples, Markula and Martin (2007) provided the reader with a tangible experience into how coach leadership, absent of ethical or moral obligations, undermines the performance of the individual and the teams through the debilitating affects of compromised social relations. It is through the use of the narrative method that the reader is brought into the experiences of the athlete and coach leading to greater insight into how leadership impacts on athlete performance.

Through my experience as a football coach, that spans almost two decades and includes immersion in coaching environments from the junior school to professional levels, I continue to seek to understand the significance of my own experiences stimulating my interest in the field of coach leadership. It is in the interest of being able to answer the question of my leadership experiences and how they relate to one another in the bigger picture of my sporting reality in football, that I have chosen to use narratives as the method of understanding my experiences.

Narratives to Provide Insight into Personal Experience

Through the examples provided by Jones (2006) and Markula and Martin (2007), in which research is represented through narratives, I have chosen to use these as templates for the representation of my own research in seeking to understand my

leadership experiences as a football coach embedded within a sociological perspective. In my literature review, I provided a comprehensive account of the development of leadership theory over the past century that elucidates the overall trend in leadership research towards more considerate forms of transformational leadership. Through the creation of personal narratives in my thesis, I analyzed the significant episodes related to my leadership practices as a coach in an investigative attempt to link transformational leadership theory to my day-to-day practices of coaching football.

In constructing these personal narratives I draw from my current experiences, over successive seasons as a football coach, to provide a first-person account of coach leadership in addressing my research question. Through my recent graduate work in ethics, power relations, coaching knowledges, and sport psychology that have contributed to my understanding of the issues affecting coach leadership, I have acquired the basis to articulate the significance of my coaching experiences. Through these developing perspectives my personal narratives have been continually informed by my academic development in social science research, as well as my past coaching and playing experiences. In the construction and analysis of my narratives I intended to relate my most meaningful experiences to the leadership research to articulate an understanding of where theory and practice may merge and illustrate the potential opportunity for alternative modes of leadership. According to Morgan-Fleming (2007), "[n]arrative inquiry allows access to professional craft and experiential knowledge otherwise invisible to those outside the occupation, allowing for the complexities of life in these professions to be preserved in the research product" (p. 355). Through the use of my personal

narratives acquired through coaching football I hoped to present a cogent example for the reader that is an insightful perspective into the culture of football and coach leadership.

Through my personal narratives I developed a greater understanding of the issues effecting leadership. It was the result of my experiences as a collegiate football player and the alienation I felt through the traditional forms of my coach's leadership that led me to question these practices as I had unwittingly adopted their use in my practices with my athletes when I became a coach. Ultimately, my questioning led to my growing interest in coach leadership because the model I had learned as a player and practiced as a coach seemed to constrain my ability to meet the needs of my athletes. My growing opposition to the traditional leadership of authoritarian and controlling coach practices (Murray & Mann, 2006) that had been imposed on me as a player made me want to explore my own practices of leadership. It was this search that led to my investigation of leadership theory and to the alternate forms of practice challenging the dominant perspectives of leadership in football. By constructing personal narratives to elucidate my experiences as a football coach, I intended to show how leadership may be augmented by the process of reflection leading to improved forms of coach leadership that personify the ideals of transformational leadership.

Journal Entries to Personal Narratives

As a coach making observations on the practice field I was in a position of participant as observer (Wragg, 1999). My proximity to these experiences has helped me to create a salient example of events for the reader to illuminate the issues affecting coach leadership. In occupying dual perspectives as both a former player and current coach in a position of power, I am provided with the opportunity and responsibility to provide an

accurate account of the leader's role in trying to accentuate athletic performances in football players and their teams. In the construction of these narratives, I selected significant events to illustrate the relevant issues of coach leadership that provide meaning as they reflect the range of my experiences as a former player, coach, teacher and graduate student. Cunliffe, Luhman, and Boje (2004) referred to this as 'narrative temporality' where chronological recounting of events is replaced by the use of the most significant episodes to elucidate the meaningful issues in one's practice. Through the use of this 'narrative temporality' I am able to focus on the most relevant issues of my experience as they relate to coach leadership.

My first narrative is constructed from the journal entries that I kept as part of my regular practice in my experience as an assistant football coach on a university team in 2007. By recording my observations in a journal on a daily or semi-daily basis I monitored the effectiveness of my practices that I was implementing as a coach to influence player development and performance. These entries then provided the underlying framework for the construction of my personal narratives. In constructing these personal narratives to elucidate relevant episodes related to my leadership of the athletes, I have provided an analysis that links coach practices with more modern conceptions of leadership. Through the discussion of my narratives I have illustrated new perspectives on how coaches can lead their athletes more effectively through perpetuating the ideals of transformational leadership.

The second and final narrative is a reflection of my practices as the defensive coordinator/assistant head coach on a high school football team in 2008 and taken from the journal entries that I increasingly relied on as part of my regular practice. Although

the level of football was lower and provided fewer opportunities to observe elite coaching practices, the position allowed for a greater breadth of opportunity and responsibility to teach and influence young football players and to monitor the effects of my practice. Through this increased latitude and opportunity, aided by my reflections on the previous season, I was able to distance myself from my coaching practices leading me to new insights of their impacts on my athletes in comparison to the observations I was making about them. In the recognition that my practices did not represent the best interests of my athletes, I was led to question their underlying assumptions and to consider alternate forms of practice. These two coaching narratives are constructed from journal entries provided over successive seasons in coaching football and were continually informed by my reflections on coaching experiences, graduate work and leadership research leading to an even greater depth in my reflections.

Through creating personal experience narratives I have attempted to understand how my socialisation in coaching football perpetuated certain preferred forms of practice that inhibited my engagement in alternate forms of leadership. It is through the juxtaposition of my experiences of consecutive years in coaching that I present a coherent story of my evolving growth in coach leadership to illuminate how reflection led me to improved leadership practices. Through my reflections, I was led to investigate and challenge existing practices of leadership and to understand how coaches may bring about heightened performances in their players through adhering to the ideals of transformational leadership.

Analysis

While in the midst of researching and constructing my literature review, the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration continually re-emerged as relevant factors of effective leadership. Although these specific terms were not consistently applied to similar concepts in competing theories of leadership, they remained underlying elements. These dimensions tended to be couched in other terms such as 'production' and 'employee centered,' 'task-role clarity' and 'leader-member relationship.' They were also the basis for Chelladurai and Reimer's (1980) 'five factors of effective leadership,' that included 'training & instruction,' 'social support,' 'positive feedback,' 'autocratic,' and 'democratic behaviors.' Furthermore, the '4I's' of transformational leadership (inspirational motivation, idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) were also consistent with the leadership dimensions of initiating structure and consideration (Bass, 1985; Keller, 1992). The consistent thread linking all theories of leadership, are the underlying basis of initiating structure and consideration.

Descriptions in the research literature and my own experiences in football, made me aware that my own practices were heavily based on initiating structure, that is, the technical and tactical aspects of instruction. In addition, a majority of practices I had seen other coaches use were also consistent with the leadership dimension of initiating structure. In the coaching studies on John Wooden and Jerry Tarkanian, the researchers' extensive description of behaviors illustrate that initiating structure comprised over 73 percent of their coaching behaviors while just over 13 percent of their behaviors equated to consideration. However, when analyzing my own coach leadership practices, I had difficulty in identifying the dimension of consideration. In recognizing that consideration was an important yet ambiguous component of effective leadership, I looked for

examples of it in my journal entries. As a result it became a focal point in the analysis of my narratives.

Through the use of my personal experience narratives, I created points of reference in the analysis of my coaching to show how the dimensions of leadership have impacted on the practices I used on my athletes. According to Cassidy, Jones and Potrac (2004) the construction of narratives provide a means for the coach to reflect on behavior that can lead to new and innovative practices. Schön (1987) characterized reflection as a consideration and concentration on the development of one's professional craft, where Van Manen (1991) stated, "[t]houghtful reflection discovers where unreflective action was 'thoughtless'" (p. 532). It is through this ability to make individuals more 'thoughtful' or considerate on their behavior that reflection provides the objective perspective in showing coaches how their practices affect the performances of their athletes through critical observation. According to Gilbert and Trudel (2006), narrative construction consists of retrospective reflection-on-action or "reflection outside of the action present" and refers to the thinking that occurs after the game, practice or season has ended (p. 120). Through the analysis of my narratives, I demonstrate how I was led to the heightened awareness of my inadequacies as a coach that hastened my search for alternate forms of practice.

It is through the increasing awareness that accompanies reflection that coaches can develop the capacity to become more aware of the long-held beliefs around coach practices (Calderhead, 1989; Cushion, 2006; McAlpine & Weston, 2002; Moon, 2004; Schön, 1987; Van Manen, 1991). According to Calderhead (1989), "[r]eflection is a moral as well as a rational process … of becoming aware of one's context, of the

influence of societal and ideological constraints … and gaining control over the direction of these influences (p. 49). Reflection provides the space in time where coaches are then able to analyze, observe and critique their own practices to determine where discrepancies exist between performance and practice, or more simply identifies where they have been 'thoughtless.' Through the analysis of my personal narratives, I will demonstrate how the reflective process informed my practices as a coach by provoking me to consider the lived social reality of the players under my leadership, and spurring my attempts to secure more effective forms of leadership. The model of transformational leadership leads coaches to increased consideration for their athletes that more directly perpetuates a focus on the superordinate goals of the team. It is by decreasing coaches' focus on their self-centred concerns for winning, acquisition and status that athletes are, in turn, encouraged to lessen their own focus on extrinsic rewards as the superordinate goals of the team become the primary focus of each member's attention. This leads back to the results of my literature review as I will show how overlooking self-interests results in performances that surpass those based on exchange relationships and result in the heightened performances associated with transformational leadership.

Evaluation Criteria

In speaking on the legitimacy of the narrative method, Delgado (1989) stated, "[s]tories humanize us. They emphasize our differences in ways that can ultimately bring us closer together. They allow us to see how the world looks from behind someone else's spectacles. They challenge us to … ask 'could I have been missing something all along?'" (p. 2440). The effective personal narrative is a useful tool in leading us to new insights for recognizing new solutions to long-standing problems. The use of new storied

forms of writing brings with it the question of credibility and the need for criteria on which to provide us with some basis of maintaining reliability. According to Sparkes (2002) "[w]hen it comes to telling alternate tales, orthodox 'scientific' views of validity (and reliability and generalizability), based on positivistic epistemological assumptions that adhere to correspondence notions of truth, make little sense" (p. 201). Sparkes went on to give a comprehensive listing of validity criteria based on a wide range of social science researchers (Leiblich, et al., 1998; Ellis, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Richardson, 2000). Each of these researchers are centred on the aesthetic literary conventions of representation that are realistic accounts of events but reflect very advanced modes of representing alternate forms of research (Denison & Markula, 2005).

As a result of the work of these social scientists, Denison and Markula (2005) have developed a set of judgment criteria for the narrative method that "encourages students to experiment with new ways of writing" (p. 180). In their experience, they have found that effective social scientific writing for students should show clear evidence that it:

1) Clearly captures the lived experiences, sights and sounds of the subject's life.
2) Provides a story that is emotionally captivating and doesn't just tell about the experiences of characters but shows these through description.
3) Uses clear exposition to depict the meaning these activities hold for the subject of the story, and why they behave and act the way they do.
4) Includes an identifiable subject, theme, plot or storyline. It must also consider a specific issue in the narrative to connect to larger social issues.

(Denison & Markula, 2005, p. 180)

Denison and Markula ended by stating that such a writing style should contain "truthful" statements that impress upon the reader a sense that they have, or could have, just experienced these events. It is this element of verisimilitude that is the defining feature between the realist convention and these new storied forms of writing. In comparing the traditional ways of scientific writing with new interpretive forms, Sparkes (2002) stated, "[o]ne verifies by eventual appeal to procedures for establishing formal and empirical truth, whereas the other does not establish truth but verisimilitude" (p. 205).

In ascribing to the criteria set out by Denison and Markula (2005) I created narrative pieces that uphold these standards of social science research. Through creating narratives that vividly portray the depth of my personal experiences as a coach, I intended to capture a level of verisimilitude to resonate deeply with the reader as a truly lived experience of contact football. By layering my narratives to illustrate my growth as a coach along with the use of thick description, I hoped to create a palpable experience in the awareness of my audience through this work. In my follow up analysis, I intended to show the sociological significance these events had on me as a coach as I experienced them in football sporting culture. Last, I connect my reflections to the broader issues of coach leadership in illustrating its effectiveness as a method to augment coaching practice through heightening the awareness of the coach to the lived experiences of the athletes.

Through the personal narrative, we are not simply given an objective listing of events, but are instead provided with a look into the subjective meanings that these social processes have on the subjects of their study. In the narratives, the researcher and researched are one and the same (Chase, 2005), which helps to identify possible

constraints that dominant practices have on these subjects (Personal Narratives Group, 1989). In my personal narrative I captured for the reader, the subtleties of coaching in the subculture of football, as I perceived them to have affected me as coach, researcher and leader. In aspiring to meet the judgment criteria provided by Denison and Markula (2005), I created personal narratives that provide an effective and appropriate method of representing and illuminating the sociological perspectives of coach leadership.

Chapter Four: Narrative I

Analysis I

Thursday, September 13th

The coach sometimes gives me the linebackers (LB's) to work with but it's only when he gets preoccupied with other team issues that he'll turn to me and say "run 'em." As a coach, I have always carried plans and a repertoire of drills on flip cards during practice but it's been so long since I had the chance to coach that I haven't kept up with these this season. But this day I was thrown back into coaching and when I had to fill in quickly by running some drills, I fumbled around and was unorganized. A problem with not being the main coach is that the players are unsure of what your role is; are you a helper, coach, grad assistant? They have no expectations of you and you have to work hard to prove yourself and to gain their respect. The problem with my performance today was that I may have taken a step back with the players as I wasn't as prepared as I should've been, but I feel this could have been prevented had I been given a few minutes notice to scribble down a few drills.

Monday, September 17th

I approached the Head Coach (HC) and asked if I could take more responsibility in coaching the LB's and he was very open and said that I could be the 'point guy' and that he would back me up. I had a renewed sense of purpose on the team as I NOW had some influence but was skeptical about my ability to have an impact because by this point in the season individual skills by unit coaches was limited to only a few minutes a day as system development became the primary focus. Later in practice during

conditioning a player questioned one of the coaches about his sprint time. The o-line coach stepped in and yelled at the player telling him to "get your ass down here and don't argue. That's bullshit!"

Tuesday, September 18th

Even though I've taken over the LB's I can't help but feel that a certain tempo has already been established and that the players are lazy … there is an established routine and I don't feel it's my place to assert myself to try and change this attitude. I'm very frustrated as a coach … they're teaching match techniques in a zone scheme and I'm trying to teach a different technique, one I feel is the 'right' technique but they have become set in their way of doing things. The players are reluctant to change and are not willing to listen to me beyond superficial drills and technique. I thought with me coaching the LB's things would become more consistent but that's not been the case as other coaches are stepping in to coach my guys when they see the HC is not around.

Tuesday, September 25th

It was a particularly hard day and by the time I got to practice the HC had already started to coach the LB's. After running the bags he asked me, 'is there anything you want to add?' I declined and was a little sucky because I felt he was sending a message to the players, that I was a part-time coach. I did feel a little better about the fact that he'd at least asked me if I wanted to add anything. When the whistle blew to signal the end of individual period the Defensive Coordinator (DC) was yelling at me from across the field asking me if I had my tackling drills ready. I didn't notice him at first and may be why he

was screaming at me by the time I noticed him. He seemed so frenzied and it irritated me so I only nodded back at him with a glare. I guess he noticed by my reaction that I wasn't pleased and he seemed to catch himself, jogged right over to me and asked me how my day was. It made me feel better just for him to ask and to stop yelling at me and when he inquired again I assured him that my tackling drill was prepared and ready for the next part of practice.

Thursday, September 27th

When I arrived here in late August I was told that my duties would be to assist the head coach with coaching the LB's but this amounted to little more than retrieving footballs and setting up agility bags. I was disappointed but felt that once the staff gained some trust in me they would give me more responsibility. However, it's now almost the end of September and I feel like I've had little influence on this team. I feel really alienated and not part of this staff and a little disrespected. I spend hours watching our game film and grading the LB's every week and then I'm not even able to correct those mistakes in practice. I've tried to wait patiently and have worked hard to do a good job but I just feel like my effort, any effort, goes unnoticed. I'm not being paid and I'm here everyday without fail and I'm just not being given any respect and thinking about quitting."

Tuesday, October 2nd

As I walked by the offensive coordinator (OC) and said 'hi' he said nothing in return. He was staring straight ahead and had this blank look on his face that showed he

had a lot on his mind. I couldn't help but think that, if he didn't have time to return a simple greeting with me how must his players feel? During games his players looked confused and most of what they did on offense just seemed like window dressing, too many frills. This is his first year coaching at any level and although his experience is based on a successful professional career it seems that this has not prepared him for the position of OC.

Wednesday, October 3rd

There was an instance during our conditioning period when a comment made by one of the players was deemed disrespectful by the coach running the drill. The coach became very angry quickly and reprimanded the player by yelling at him in front of his teammates. It was an awkward situation, for the players as well as for myself, as a coach within earshot. When I asked the coach about the incident he said the player had questioned why they had to do a certain conditioning drill and the coach said he 'wouldn't stand for 'that'' and that he would 'call him out' for such behavior.

Thursday, October 4th

The practice is loose and seems focused and I noticed that after winning our last game the players and coaches interact a lot more frequently. Talking to one experienced coach about general stuff, he told me that you can't coach kids the way you did even 10 years ago … 'kids nowadays grow up in a rewards-based society.' I asked him if he thought kids were spoiled today and he said 'no, just that you can't coach them like you used to be able to and get in their faces … 75% won't respond to this type of treatment.'

When I mentioned that players and coaches were interacting a lot more with each other he said “winning cures all ills” and that “when you’re winning, everything’s good.”

Sunday, October 7th

After winning our second game in a row the defensive coaches seem to have become more protective by being more assertive than in previous weeks. The preparatory defensive meetings that used to be an open discussion type of forum, where I felt that I could at least have some input, have become dominated by one or two of the longer serving coaches.

Monday, October 8th

I have to admit that every once in awhile I suffer pangs of egocentricity like, for example, when I picked up a copy of the program and found my name absent from the coaching staff list I was disappointed. I was giving up my time to coach with this team and arrived on-time everyday to accept my duties with enthusiasm, regardless of how small or unimportant. It’s becoming apparent to me that I am really critical of the processes of other coaches and to how focusing on their mistakes makes me blind and uncritical of my own. I now realize that in being critical of others and hypersensitive to all of their flaws I’m becoming a little less perceptive to my own.

Wednesday, October 10th

I had a conversation with a couple coaches in talking about ‘core values,’ which the HC talked about frequently to all the players and was on page 1 of every playbook.

They were 4 qualities that represented the ideals the coaches felt would lead their players to success on the field and included, ‘work hard’ and ‘never give up.’ When I asked, both coaches felt they were a good idea but mentioned they were not enforced strictly enough and eluded to when some players had broken the rules they were not reprimanded by the HC. I asked them if they had to distill these core values into one term or concept what would it be? The first coach said, “don’t let your teammates down.” The second coach agreed but admitted he might reword it and that he used the rule of “be respectful.”

Thursday, October 11th

In traveling to an away game by bus we stopped for a quick practice at a football field in which the players were flat, lacked energy and seemed really unfocussed. The practice before a game is always a little loose and most coaches don’t do any coaching. As one said, ‘just let them play and work things out in their own minds.’ Afterwards, we stopped to eat at a buffet and had a conversation at the coaches’ table about how some coaches are motivators and others are strategists, while the thing that seemed to be most important was that the coach should be sincere to his personality.

Saturday, October 13th

Getting on the bus after a road loss we’re all not feeling good about ourselves as this game almost assuredly put us out of the playoffs. On the way home I had an interesting talk with the longest serving member of the coaching staff about all the problems with this team. He said discipline was one of the biggest issues and a major reason why we are losing. He also said that it comes from the top-down and as long as

the head coach did not stress discipline and was indecisive about key issues the team would not win.

Monday, October 15th

In a coaches' discussion about what went wrong in our loss we talked a lot about 'blatant favoritism' on behalf of the officials, making calls against but not for us, calling contact on receivers, too many turnovers, key players making mistakes, bad penalties, the refs (again), our travel schedule, the experience and age of our opponents, their lack of ethical play, and how we didn't have any big play guys. At the end someone brought up our lack of leadership on the team. The room went quiet and after a brief silence we moved on to discussions of our opponents for the upcoming week.

Tuesday, October16th

I wait for the LB's almost everyday to complete their warm-up, standing there with footballs in my hands to show that I'm ready to go but they're just lazy. I guess I shouldn't expect too much because that's what the HC allowed them to do. I should probably be a little more vociferous but I just don't feel it's my place. In our coaches' meetings we often talked about what the players are lacking; skills, leadership, experience, yet we've never really talked about what we, as coaches, can do better.

Wednesday, October 17th

The coaches don't talk much of where their practices failed the athletes but only about how the players just didn't get it, couldn't do it in a game or weren't athletic

enough. It seems once you've done things a certain way for long enough you just come to see it as the only way. The prep information the coaches give to the players is too much and it's not surprising to me that we're still making alignment mistakes on special teams, in this, the tenth week since the start of camp.

Friday, October 19th

The practice was a typical Friday with a focus on the special teams. What was atypical was that the HC allowed the graduating players to say a few things to the rest of the members regarding their experiences on the team. Most of these speeches centred on how these guys felt this team were like their family and how happy they were to have played football. Several were very emotional and even cried during their speeches.

Saturday, October 20th

Immediately after losing our final game of the season the coaches sat in the office and began to talk about rebuilding the team for next season. They talked about the new recruits we needed to bring in to change the culture of this team, to fill voids and bring in leadership. Most of the talk centred around bringing in things from outside the program to improve performances while little was said about how we could change the things that remained, like the practices of the coaches.

Tuesday, October 23rd

We had a coaches meeting about how to overcome this season but it turned out to be about recruiting. Some coaches talked about our team's leadership and how that was a

weak component. Most of the ensuing discussion led back to the recruiting of key players and how finding the right player who showed this or that quality would lead our team to future performance success. In all the talk about leadership there was never any mention that maybe it was coaching where we lacked leadership.

Saturday, October 27th

In our final evaluation meeting of the season we focused on evaluating the play of our athletes over the last season. We then did positional evaluations and used summary sheets highlighting the physical, mental and psychological skills deemed necessary to each specific position. I felt that we seemed to get bogged down in a lot of insignificant details that I just didn't feel were addressing the athletes' needs. I felt we needed to look within the coaches' room and work from there, where the other coaches seemed to be intent on bringing in new players and people from outside this team as the key to solving all of our problems.

Discussion I

This coaching narrative exemplifies the day-to-day operations on a typical collegiate football team. It is through reflection that I attempt to understand the processes of leadership as it affected this team and me. Through this analysis I hope to show how leadership is the result of the preferred modes of practice perpetuated by a coach's immersion in the subculture of football. The process of reflection led me to recognize that my coaching practices were not representing the needs of my athletes but my own needs to advance my own cause. It is in this way that coaches are socialized to rely on preferred forms of practice through their immersion in the culture of their sport (Jones, 2006a) that

may lead to the marginalization of alternative forms of leadership. According to Gilbert and Trudel (2006), one means of reflecting on the critical incidents of one's professional practice is to write about them and my journal provided the empirical material for the construction of my coach narrative. Writing in my journal engaged me in a process of reflection-on-action (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006) but it was through retrospective reflection on them for the construction of my narratives when I began to realize that issues in my coach leadership were rooted in the preferred practices that preserve the coach's position of power and control (Denison, 2002). In the discussion that follows, I will highlight how egoistic needs to maintain a front leads a coach to engage in impression management and preferred practices that perpetuate forms of control and transactional leadership. In addition, I hope to demonstrate how the process of reflection encouraged me to overlook my personal needs for power as a coach to culminate in a consideration for my athletes' needs and to improved practices of leadership.

Right from the opening paragraph of my narrative, I, the coach being studied, was highly focused on my own advancement as I tried to acquire a legitimate status as an assistant coach on this team. By this point I had been attending practices for almost four weeks but had been given little opportunity to establish my persona as a coach. As I stated in my narrative dated September 13th, "A problem with not being the main coach is that the players are unsure of what your role is; are you a helper, coach, grad assistant? They have no expectations of you and you have to work hard to prove yourself and to gain their respect." My dilemma here was with gaining the respect of the athletes which seemed to preclude my need to plan and implement appropriate practice structures in augmenting their athletic performances. According to Jones (2006b), one of the major

concerns of coaches is that of developing a 'coaching front,' which is "the process of establishing and maintaining a desirable coaching identity" (Jones, Armour, & Potrac 2002, p. 40). This socially constructed front is a result of the egocentric perspective of the coach to establish a credible identity and to protect this social persona (Jones, 2006b). In establishing myself on this team as a knowledgeable coach, I focused on the development of my front because I believed my credibility would result from a successful performance rather than being based on my ability as a positional coach. According to Jones (2006b), coaching is "a performance aimed at managing the impression of others" (p. 1013). I saw that establishing this front was the means of influencing my players and getting them to comply with the training demands I imposed on them.

Through reflection, I realized that struggling to establish a coaching front was diverting my focus away from developing the practices for the improvement of my athletes and onto my self-centred concerns. For example, on October 8th I wrote, "when I picked up a copy of the (gameday) program and found my name absent from the coaching staff list I was disappointed. I was giving up my time to coach … and arrived on-time everyday to accept my duties … regardless of how small or unimportant." Although I felt at the time that I was clearly being patient and mature, I realized through my reflections that I expected my efforts to be reciprocated by being given the status of assistant coach on this team. It was as a result of my immersion in the subculture of football and its basis in transactional leadership that led me to the belief that a front was more important in establishing my identity as a legitimate coach than my actual practices as a coach (Jones, 2004; Jones et al., 2002). The creation of this front is seen as coach behaviors that manipulate the athletes' impressions of them that then enable the coach to

impose the necessary control strategies towards the accomplishment of team goals (Jones, 2004; Jones, Hughes, & Kingston, 2008).

An example of this form of leadership with the control and transactional exchange between coach and athlete is seen in my narrative in the two separate incidents when coaches publicly berated their players for questioning their authority. In the examples from my narrative dated October 3rd and September 17th, respectively, the coaches used public reprimands of "calling a player out" and telling another to "get your ass down here and don't argue" to establish their coaching fronts. By establishing such authoritative fronts, they were then able to use these, through fear of reprimands, to control their athletes on future occasions. According to Jones et al. (2002), individuals are "constrained to define themselves in congruence with the statuses, roles and relationships that they are awarded by the social order" (p. 39). This form of leadership is consistent with coach practices in modern sport and is even accepted as the preferred form of leadership (Jones & Standage, 2006; Murray & Mann, 2007; Weinberg & Gould, 2003).

In acquiring the coaching front, a credible persona is presented by football coaches that allows them to more easily manipulate athletes in the practices towards attaining performance objectives. According to Megean and Vallerand (2003), people emit controlling behaviors when there is a high level of stress and pressure as a result of external performance objectives. This is demonstrated by the fact that it was after losing our first three games in the season that these two incidents occurred. According to Jones et al. (2002), the establishment of an authoritative front is believed by many coaches' to be a credible method of re-establishing order and exhorting athletes to improved performance and motivation. By establishing and maintaining a credible front, coaches

are able to exert pressure on their athletes to follow the practices imposed upon them and to behave in ways that coaches believe will bring about organizational objectives.

However, this front essentially becomes a strategy of control that is used to perpetuate the agenda set by the leader or head coach of the team. According to Markula and Martin (2007), "power originates from an individual's desire to advance their own cause" (p. 53) and in my practice this manifested in the need to establish a coaching front. Once I established a coaching front, it allowed me to impose my practices on and manipulate my athletes towards the attainment of performance objectives. Similarly, when I had not established a front, it made me reluctant to influence or to impose my practices on my athletes. On Tuesday September 18th, after just taking over the role of LB coach I stated that, "Even though I've taken over the LB's I can't help but feel … that the players are lazy … and I don't feel it's my place to assert myself to try and change this attitude." Although I had now taken over as an assistant coach, I felt I had done little to establish my persona as a credible coach making me reluctant to impose my practices on these players.

According to Wrapp (1967), "Self-esteem of teachers [and coaches] is constantly at risk and one means for protection … [is] to take the organization as an object of desire and control" (p. 36). It is through the control that a coaching front provides which would allow me to impose my practices on the athletes. In another example from my narrative dated the same day, I stated that, "I'm trying to teach a little different technique, one that I feel is the 'right' technique but they have become set in their way of doing things. The players are reluctant to change and are not willing to listen to me beyond superficial drills and technique." As a coach who failed to establish a credible front, I was now left with a

group of athletes who would only perform the basic drills I would set for them and looked to more senior coaches when it came to system and tactical instruction. Had I been successful in establishing my front, the initiating structures of my practices would have been my means of guiding these athletes towards goal attainment resulting in a systemic form of control of my athletes.

But this form of transactional leadership and its control strategies can be counterproductive to the performances of team members (Hater & Bass, 1988; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998; Lombardo, 1987; Megean & Vallerand, 2003). As Kanungo and Mendonca (1998) stated, "control strategies impel followers to place self-interests before those of others" (p. 141). Thus, when control is used as the form of leadership on a team, it induces members to act in their own self-interests undermining the goals of the team (Megean & Vallerand, 2003). In using preferred practices that perpetuate control strategies, football coaches rely on transactional forms of leadership as their means of extracting improved performances from their players (Jones et al., 2002). According to Strean et al. (1997), "reflection allows us to question assumptions and practices that seem to make our own [coaching] lives easier … but actually work against our best long-term interests" (p. 254). Reflection forces us to question relied upon practices causing us to seek alternative modes of practice. It was through my reflections that I was allowed to see how the overriding desire to establish a front was compromising my goals for player development through perpetuating transactional leadership practices.

Although the coaches on this team relied on transactional forms of control in their leadership, there was still the underlying realization that overlooking personal self-interests was beneficial to the accomplishment of team goals. In a discussion with one of

the longest serving members of the coaching staff on Wednesday October the 10th, he stated that the team's "core values" could be merged into the single statement of "don't let your teammates down." In a separate conversation on October 4th the same coach mentioned that today's athlete was brought up in a "rewards based society" and that "you can't coach them like you used to be able to and get in their faces." Ironically, this coach recognized the fact that the players needed to focus on and serve the interests of the team, yet he failed to realize how his own preferred practices were controlling his athletes and undermining the loyalty and commitment he was trying to secure from them. My own example of this is seen in my desire to gain the status afforded by a credible coaching position as I stated on September 27th, " I was told my duties would be to assist the HC with coaching the LB's but this amounted to little more than retrieving footballs and setting up agility bags … I feel … disrespected … I spend hours watching our game film … and then I'm not even able to correct those mistakes in practice." Throughout this part of my narrative I am entirely focused on self-centred concerns and this reflection has allowed me to recognize it was this egoistic perspective that was constraining my ability to meet the needs of my athletes. As long as I was focused on issues of myself, I was overlooking the needs of my athletes as well as remaining unaware to the process perpetuating my egocentric perspective (Van Manen, 1991). According to Van Manen (1991), "Thoughtful reflection discovers where unreflective action was 'thoughtless'" (p. 532) and it was through this process that I was allowed to see where I was 'thoughtless' or inconsiderate of the needs of my athletes and focusing on advancing my own cause.

In leadership literature, the use of control based on an exchange relationship between the leader and follower has been characterized as transactional leadership

(Avolino & Bass, 1988; Dvir, Eden, Avolino & Shamir, 2002; Hollander & Offerman, 1990; Johnson, 2005; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998; Yammarino & Bass, 1990) and it is the dominant form of leadership in modern sport (Murray & Mann, 2006). Transactional leadership perpetuates the use of control strategies through the prioritization of initiating structures over consideration for the athletes' needs (Armstrong, 1991). Illustrating the transactional basis of leadership on this team is my relationship with the HC and how after having traveled a great distance to volunteer my time with his team, he gave little consideration to my situation by failing to provide a legitimate coaching role for me. Instead, he assigned me to follow him around as his assistant, "setting up agility bags and retrieving footballs" and to be ready when he became too busy or occupied with another issue and then would turn to me and say "run 'em." Even his failure to introduce me to the team shows a lack of consideration that one would assume extends to all subordinates that he views as providing little utility to his team objectives of winning. The fact that he was caught up in initiating structures of planning, scheduling and organizing, shows how he prioritized a technical rationality over a consideration of individual team members. According to Megean and Vallerand (2003), "a coaches … actual behavior [is] shaped by the coaching context within which they operate" (p. 895) and it was likely due to the HC's immersion in the subculture of football that encouraged his practice of transactional leadership and its focus on initiating structures.

In the construction of my narrative it became apparent that I was not an innocent bystander in the transactional leadership of this team and its exchange relationships but was actively engaged in its processes. In my frustration to acquire legitimate coaching status, this narrative demonstrates how I am involved in an exchange with the HC as I

seek to trade my time, services and complying with team rules in return for increased status on the team. As I stated on September 27th, "I've tried to wait patiently and have worked hard to do a good job but I just feel like my effort, any effort, goes unnoticed. I'm not being paid and I'm here everyday … I'm just not being given any respect and thinking about quitting." After just over a month of helping out with the coaching duties on this team I expect my efforts to be reciprocated through an improvement in my responsibility and coaching status. It is apparent from the start of my narrative that I had always expected to trade my effort and commitment to team goals for an increase in my responsibility and status on the team. The transactional nature of my relationship manifests in my overbearing desire to establish a credible persona, leaving me to focus on my egoistic concerns, while the athletes' needs become marginalized (Jones, 2006a).

According to Fairholm (1997), "The biggest problem with managers [and leaders] is that their egos get in the way of effective leadership" (p. 18). This happened with me, as I remained fixed on satisfying egoistic concerns for status and power. As outlined in the opening paragraph of my narrative, it is when my efforts 'go unnoticed' and so are not reciprocated that I am left feeling 'alienated … not a part of this coaching staff' that further heightens my egoistic perspective to constrain my ability to effectively lead my athletes. It was through the construction of my narrative and reflecting on my experiences that I was able to see the underlying reasons for my actions and my singular focus on my needs. According to Moon (2004), "In making a representation of personal reflections, we shape and model the content of our reflection in different ways and learn also from the process itself … [that results in] secondary learning" (p. 80). It was not only in reflecting on my journal entries but in the retrospective analysis required for the

construction of my narrative that led to a deepening awareness and understanding of how preferred practices were constraining my practice of leadership.

In leadership research it was demonstrated that the dimension of initiating structure accounted for almost 70 percent of an elite coach's practices, where consideration accounted for just 13 percent of the same coach's behaviors (Bloom, Crumpton & Anderson, 1999; Tharp & Gallimore, 1976). It is the competitive environment of sports and its emphasis on winning that has kept coaches focused on initiating structures and a technical rationality (Cassidy et al., 2006; Denison, 2007; Van Manen, 1991). This further legitimates the controls perpetuated by transactional leadership. Among this coaching staff, it was the reliance on a technical rationality and its view as the preferred practice that prevented us, as coaches, from recognizing the potential to improve performances through the critical self-analysis that reflection provides (Van Manen, 1991). By perpetuating preferred forms of practice, initiating structures work to undermine the growth of coaches and are legitimated through professional coach models that emphasize winning (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004; Jones, 2004).

According to Argyris (1983), "The distancing syndrome continues a particular set of organizational self-protective features and ensures that only certain skills will be rewarded" (p. 133). Reflection has led me to see the unintended consequences of my coaching that resulted in questioning some of my long-held beliefs about practice (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004). This led me to the recognition of how my own experiences as a player and coach in football led me to rely on a preferred set of practices that was now limiting my development as a coach. It is in this singular performance-based perspective of

holding winning as the ultimate reason for competition that has left coaches to rely on a technical rationality and unaware of the potential of alternative modes of leadership. Reflection can be a means for making coaches aware of alternative perspectives in their attempts to correct dilemmas of practice and to become more effective leaders (Calderhead, 1998; Cushion, 2006; Schön, 1987; Van Manen, 1991). According to Van Manen (1991), "As the teacher [and coach] is expected to treat the job … more and more technically, the teacher is less and less able to reflect on the meaning, purpose and significance of the educational experience of students" (p. 511). As a coach, I have found that as I rely on a technical rationality, I become dependant on its practices, further embedding myself within the dominant culture and becoming increasingly insensitive to the needs of my athletes' (Cassidy et al., 2006; Van Manen, 1991).

In contrast to their predominant use of transactional leadership, there were instances when these coaches engaged in transformational behaviors characterized by a consideration for individual member needs (Dvir et al., 2002; Purvanova, Bono, & Dzieweczynski, 2006). In my narrative when these coaches showed consideration towards me, it had a very positive effect on my motivation and commitment to the goals of the team while simultaneously diverting my attention away from my egoistic needs to develop a front. In my narrative from September 25th when I had come late to practice and the HC had already stepped in to coach my group, I was immediately upset that he was undermining my newly appointed position as linebacker coach. In this moment I was immediately led to act defensively, while focusing on myself, and to act "sucky" but this was diffused almost instantly when the HC asked me "is there anything you want to add?" It was in his little act of consideration that he made me feel that he valued my input

and the contribution I was making as a member of his staff. It is the dimension of consideration that is the difference between transactional and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). According to Purvanova et al. (2006), "Transformational leadership should result in more engaged, more devoted and less self-consumed employees" (p. 4). It was the HC's act of consideration that led to an instant transformation in my attitude by placing the focus of my attention on the concerns of the team and away from myself.

Following this example, on the same day the defensive coordinator was yelling at me from across the field to ask whether I had a drill prepared for the next portion of practice. It was after a particularly "hard day" and so when "I nodded back at him with a glare … he seemed to catch himself, jogged right over to me and asked me how my day was." After some small talk the DC then asked me again if I had a drill prepared for the next portion of practice and "I assured him that my tackling drill was prepared and ready for the next part of practice." Even though I knew in my mind while he engaged me in small talk that he might only care about my day to the extent that it helped him achieve his goals of preparing the defense it did not seem to matter to me. All that mattered was that he had shown concern for me and this act of consideration relieved any self-centredness as it inspired me to contribute to the team and to do a proficient job in my portion of the drill. As I noted on September 25th, his consideration "made me feel better" and again, almost instantly, it transformed my attitude about my role on this team increasing my commitment to its goals. After these incidents had left me feeling upset, defensive and focusing on myself, it was the coaches' consideration that led me to overlook my own concerns for a coaching front, status and power. Furthermore, it made me focus on my role on the team and towards an increasing consideration for the athletes'

needs. According to Hoption et al. (2008), "Individual consideration should foster commitment because leaders signal they are not only interested in the collective but in each individual's personal growth" (p. 51). The consideration of these two superior coaches made me feel like a credible member of the coaching staff and increased my commitment to the goals of the team by making my self-interests a secondary concern.

According to Argyris (1983), "professionals have developed a strategy to protect themselves from pressure and from feelings of failure … distancing them from any responsibility for the internal system of the organization" (p.129). Through reflecting on my narrative I realized that part of my preferred practice was to place blame outside of myself and to focus on the inadequacies of others. From my narrative dated Monday October 8th, I wrote, "It's becoming apparent to me that … in being critical of others and hypersensitive to all of their flaws I'm becoming less and less perceptive to my own." Reflective practices enable coaches to see the failings of their practices and to work towards improving them (Calderhead, 1998; Cushion, 2006; Moon, 2004; Pollard, 2008; Schön, 1987; Van Manen, 1991). As Gilbert and Trudel (2005) stated, "A reflective practitioner will internalize challenging practice dilemmas, seeing them as deficiencies in his professional practice as opposed to externalizing them as deficiencies of others, or placing them beyond [the] realm of personal control" (p. 1209). Reflection led me to question the underlying basis of my practices and how they perpetuated selfish concerns and became a preferred mode of practice (Kruse, 1997). Through the realization that my practices were perpetuating a selfish concern for status and control, I began to recognize how this focus inhibited my professional development by overlooking the needs of my athletes. According to Nesti (2004), "the all encompassing focus on self … can never

result in true community" (p. 11) and in placing my needs before those of my athletes I would never guide them to heightened performances. Leadership that is based on transactional power relations that seek to satisfy a leader's position undermines the long-term development of its members by constraining the potential for transformational performances.

Another example of placing the blame on others is seen after I took over the responsibility for the LB's and I blamed their poor performances on the HC. On September 18th, I stated that, "… they're just lazy. I guess I shouldn't expect too much because that's what the HC allowed them to do. I should probably be a little more vociferous but I just don't feel it's my place." In this instance it was a lot easier for me to blame the poor work ethic of the LB's on the HC than it was to work towards overcoming this deficit. However, as Jones (2006a) stated, "proficient coaches held themselves accountable regarding problems of performance and believe solutions may arise within their capabilities" (p. 153). Blaming my inadequacies on others and not seeing myself and my practices as part of the problem prevented me from becoming part of the solution. It was through reflection that I began to recognize that blaming others for inadequacies in performance were likely due to my insecurity and the desire to preserve my status and credibility (Schön, 1987).

In the example of my narrative, I spent weeks complaining and worrying about establishing a coaching front so that when the opportunity to coach finally arrived I was unprepared for it. On Thursday September 13th, I stated, "As a coach I have always carried plans and a repertoire of drills on flip cards during practice but it's been so long since I had the chance to coach that I haven't kept up with these this season." After

coaching the players through a sequence of drills on this day, I made a reference to the development of my coaching front, as I stated, "I may have taken a step back today with the players as I wasn't as prepared as I should have been but I feel this could have been prevented had I been given a few minutes notice to scribble down a few drills." This comment about 'taking a step back' is in reference to my ability to establish a front through coaching and how my poor performance in the drills had undermined its development. Furthermore, by this point in the season, I had been attending practices for 23 days and after my failed coaching performance my reaction was to blame the HC because he did not give me 'five minutes notice.' Not only does my egocentric perspective lead me away from my skillful development as a coach but it also leads me to defensiveness in placing blame on others for my inadequacies as a coach (Argryis, 1983; Schön, 1987). Reflection led to the realization that my practices were focused on satisfying my needs as a coach-leader and hastened me to become more considerate of my athletes' needs and to engage in alternate forms of coach leadership.

The results of my reflections were consistent with those of Hartog (2002) who, in her educational research found that "my attention … shifted from attending to … my own thoughts and projects … [to] their needs … as students" (p. 239). In this same manner, reflection made me aware of how I was continually being led to think about myself in the incessant desire to establish a coaching front. I realized that I was failing to consider the needs of my athletes because I was focusing on my own needs for power and control. This led me to an investigation of my coaching practices and to alternate perspectives of transformational leadership that encouraged a greater consideration of my athletes (Calderhead, 1989; Moon, 2004; Schön, 1987; Van Manen, 1991).

My growth as a coach and leader is demonstrated through the evolution of my narrative, as I move from being highly focused on my own needs at the start of the season, to beginning to think more deliberately about the athletes' needs and whether our practices as coaches were serving them near the end of the season. As I stated on Saturday October 27th, "I felt that we seemed to get bogged down in a lot of insignificant details that I just didn't feel were addressing the athletes' needs." Although I was embedded within this football subculture, my reflections were providing an objective perspective and distancing me from the practices that had been constraining my development as a coach (Cushion, 2006; Gilbert & Trudel, 2006). As reflection provided this external point of reference, I became less constrained by preferred practices and more inclined to engage in alternate perspectives that may have been in opposition to relied upon practices. It was becoming most important for me that the practices I used reflected the athletes' needs for performance, growth and development and it made me seek practices outside the constraints of a dominant ideology. It was reflection that led to the realization that my egoistic concerns to advance my own cause occupied the majority of my attention and perpetuated my use of preferred forms of practice. As I became more critical of my practices and their unintended consequences, it led me to consider their underlying assumptions and how they were constraining my ability to meet the performance needs of my athletes. In reference to her practices as a teacher, Hartog (2002) stated, "I am engaged in a process of reflection that is deeply attuned to their needs and processes as learners 'in the moment,' and to my own, as I seek to facilitate their learning and the learning relationship we create together" (p. 239). In a consistent manner, the process of reflection led to leadership practices that were informed by my

athletes through a consideration for their needs. In forcing me to look beyond my own self-interests for status, power, and control, reflection led me to question assumptions I took for granted, it allowed me to merge my coaching practices with athlete consideration and led me to the practice of transformational leadership.

Chapter Five: Narrative II

Analysis II

This second narrative provides a contrast to my first because I took on a greater leadership role as the defensive coordinator of a high school junior football team. In my first narrative, I outlined how I was engaged in the creation of a coaching front and how this occupied the majority of my energy and attention as a coach. I also pointed out how acts of consideration by superiors had led me to overlook my personal concerns for developing a front to result in more focused attention to team goals. It is in mediating this tension in coaching, between satisfying the concerns of the coach and those of the members of the team that I draw out in my second narrative. It was through the process of reflection that led me to question my long-standing beliefs about coach leadership and to begin my search for alternate forms of practice.

Thursday, September 18th

Near the end of practice the coaches began to give me a run-down of some of the kids, telling me how this kid was a natural, and this other kid didn't have the tools to be a football player and how another had "pulled shoot" in their last game by faking an injury after giving up a touchdown (TD). The next day one of the coaches saw him playing basketball in the gym with no ill effects and they were laughing about it now. It made me wonder why these guys were coaching when after only a few weeks into the season they'd already given up on many of these players.

Friday, September 19th

I've been going to practice now for a few days and as the newly appointed defensive coordinator (DC) I don't want to shake things up too much and want to show respect for the coaches' hard work in the first few weeks of the season. At practice the defensive backs' (DB's) coach told me he was running a cover-3, cover-1 and man-to-man defense but during practices all I had seen was man coverage. In my experience this is the defense that every inexperienced coach runs, from elementary through high school aged sports and my first goal will be to get rid of this man-to-man scheme.

Monday, September 22nd

When I returned to practice today, the DB coach was away and there was another young coach, Bob. I quickly realized that he was a young kid who graduated from this high school only last year and this was his first season as a coach. I liked his loyalty and commitment to his school and appreciated that he'd come to coach when they had no one else and so I didn't want to just impose my defense on him. I tried hard to listen to his concerns and opinions about what he thought the defense should run. At one point he pulled out a folder of the defenses he had been trying to implement and it turned out to be a grab bag of defensive systems with no consistency or vision of where it was all leading. I got the sense that this was his defense and he didn't want it messed with which was in contrast to the HC's message to, "Do whatever you want."

Thursday, September 25th

On Thursdays after a game the players don't have practice but instead meet in one of the school classrooms to watch the game film. Prior to the meeting I told the HC I'd

like to introduce a new defense: a basic 4-4 scheme, with 4 defensive linemen (DL), 4 linebackers (LB's) and 4 DB's. By this point I'd heard and seen enough to know that someone needed to take control of the defense and instill a system that was simple enough to keep the players from being confused.

Friday, September 26th

I started practice by lining the players up in pairs face to face and went through the instructions for step and punch and then had the players' perform it. I then explained a punch from two feet again, punch and stretch, to get-offs using a swim technique, walkthrough first, then a run. As I walked around observing players I was also observing coaches and noticed that the other three coaches had really started to instruct 'way too much.' I didn't like looking over and seeing players just listening to coaches and I kept flipping sides so that each player had only a short time to accomplish 10 repetitions. I don't think the coaches got the hint because I still came close to asking them to shut up. I figured that next time they would understand the speed and efficiency required in drills.

Monday, September 29th

One of the biggest hurdles in installing a new defense is in overcoming the habits of the old scheme, both for the players and coaches. I have to blame myself because I still haven't given out a playbook for the defense. Nearing the end of practice the HC set up a hitting drill, where one player had possession of the ball and the players in front would block the opposition in order to advance the ball forward. Prior to this drill, I didn't see coaches teaching any of these relevant techniques and during it they just resorted to the

use of catch phrases like ‘beat the block,’ ‘tackle aggressively’ and ‘block your man forever.’ It’s starting to become clear that these coaches don’t know how to teach techniques yet they still seem well versed in football jargon.

Tuesday, September 30th

Tonight’s practice went a little better as I worked more with the entire defense than I had previously. I felt that in being one of only two defensive coaches, I got a lot of work done: pursuit drill, pattern recognition, pass drills and form tackling. The players need lots of work but slowly I am seeing small improvements. I felt it was good that Bob worked with me at practice, for the most part listening and watching. I’m trying to work with him because he seems keen on learning and has had limited opportunities to learn.

Wednesday, October 1st

I’ve been around for a little over a week and I have come to the conclusion that these coaches never taught any basic skills to these players. In our last game we had difficulty in the secondary, especially with one corner. It was not necessarily in his play but in his slumping body language after he made a mistake for a TD that showed that he was on the edge of quitting or, what the other coaches had called ‘pulling shoot.’ As he tried to slink past me on the sidelines I intercepted him and making the effort to speak calmly, I asked, “what happened on that play?” With his eyes averted and a crackling voice he said, “I didn’t see (my man) go out there” into the flat. After a slight pause and a little thought I said, “it’s okay, now you know what to look for before coming in to play the edge of the defense.” He looked up a bit relieved and said “okay.”

Thursday, October 2nd

After yesterday's 20-nothing loss, I find myself becoming a little more obsessed about football, thinking about it into the night and first thing when I get up in the morning. I'm thinking about strategies for our next game and who our best players on defense will be. We may have lost the game by three TD's but we were tied 0-0 after the first half. As we were walking off the field at halftime the HC came up to me and said, "that was the best the defense has looked all year long, keep it going!" I feel it is at this point after seeing small increments of improvement that my mind is racing forward and envisioning the potential success this team could have if I just pushed a little harder. The only thing is that I can't help feeling that its becoming more about the satisfaction of my own ego than it is about the players'. I know from playing football in college that I am competitive but it's when I'm not thinking about my players but about how I can make myself look better through the play of MY defense that I have to be careful.

Friday, October 3rd

At practice the HC and I had a brief discussion about what he'd seen on film. At one point, he flat out told me "you need to teach your players how to tackle better on defense." I couldn't help but feel offended by his comment because in my short time here I had worked very hard to focus on skill development and felt that I was getting very little support in coaching from him or the other coaches. This is frustrating because I was just beginning to feel good about what we were accomplishing and now I feel like the HC is trying to manage me.

The last drill in practice was 'Oklahoma' with two players on offense trying to advance the ball to a five-yard mark while the two defenders try to prevent their forward progress by tackling the ball carrier. The HC explained the drill from the defensive perspective and proceeded to show how to shed the block of the offensive player. He used a demonstration by stepping in the drill and then, after telling an offensive player to push on him as hard as he could he threw the player to the ground and bellowed, "That's how you do it!" I got the distinct impression that this performance was directed at me, to show me he was the boss and that he knew his stuff.

Monday, October 6th

Even though today was supposed to have an emphasis on the defense, the HC decided to change it at the last minute. After being told I would get " 20 minutes of individual time" the HC told me he would be taking players from the defense to work in his offense. I have already resigned myself to expect this type of inconsistency from the HC and to remain focused on coaching the athletes and not to worry about the extra stuff.

Tuesday, October 7th

Tonight's practice was a marked improvement over Monday but I should expect that because Mondays are installation days where players have to think about what they're doing. I also finally handed out a defensive playbook and it was two pages in length. It is my hope that once the players understand this base defense it will be easy to make adjustments to a 'cut,' 'cloud' or a 'zone-man' combination defense.

Thursday, October 9th

Last night was our worst loss of the season 72-0. It was really frustrating for me because at some point during the game the HC and OL coach started to substitute players on the DL without me knowing about it. A few plays later, the other team ran for an uncontested 46 yard TD. After that play, they stopped subbing in players and I was happy they got the message without me having to tell them to get the F*** off my defense. The offense hasn't scored a point all season long and now they want to run the defense with the HC telling me what I need to do for them to improve! I don't know how I should navigate this line and it would be easy for me to blame the coaching staff for the lack of consistency and knowledge but I have to take responsibility for the defense when we play poorly if I am going to take the credit when we play well.

Friday, October 10th

By the time I arrived at practice, I found out that the HC had thrown a temper tantrum and walked off the field when a couple of players showed up late. In the end, I thought it turned out to be a productive practice because I was able to teach some very specific skills to different positions. I started with a scrimmage using only half lines and worked with the OL and DL using step, punch and stretch and get offs with a rip and swim technique. After that we went into some one-on-one pass rush techniques for the offense. I got the sense that the guys really liked it, as they were eager to do multiple repetitions. I then worked a productive defensive systems period as I put in a 'cut' coverage that left our corners in the flats with our halfbacks replacing into the deep thirds.

I then ran a special teams punt return drill and it looked really good for their first time at it.

Monday, October 13th

It's been a few days since our devastating loss and a couple days since I watched the game film. It literally made me sick to watch it and I grew mad at players for doing the things they were doing, like playing man coverage techniques in our zone defense. It was also the realization that I was the one responsible for coaching these kids and if they still didn't have the techniques down it was my fault. My first inclination was to criticize the play of a few specific players who made the same mistakes over and over again but I've decided to address the defense as a unit to reinforce our techniques and alignments.

Tuesday, October 14th

In speaking to our DB coach today I realized he didn't know that we had switched the defense to play almost exclusively zone. I'd forgotten that he hadn't been around much in the past couple of weeks and was not here when I'd introduced it as our new base defense. I should have spoken to him but when I first met him he told me he'd played football in the States on a scholarship and I figured that when he'd returned that he'd have picked up on the fact that the defense was now called 'blue' (zone) instead of being called 'cover 1' (man).

Wednesday, October 15th

Tonight our team received its first win of the season 14-7. It was also the first offensive points we've scored all season long. After giving up a touchdown on our opponents' first drive from scrimmage, the defense played very well and shut them down for the rest of the game. I started a new safety in the game and it was a player we'd taken from the offense that the HC had said had "too much attitude." He was definitely rough around the edges but he deserved a shot and he was the difference in the game today.

Thursday, October 16th

During film session I was explaining a technique to the players but almost in mid-sentence I caught myself in giving too much detail. I realized that I wasn't coaching a university team but a last place junior team that had just won its first game of the season. I was impressed with our defense but I had to keep it simple. I am realizing that the players don't want to be corrected on every play, maybe they don't want to learn as much about football as I want to teach them and maybe they just need to be patted on the back once in a while.

Friday, October17th

Tonight I added a couple adjustments and when a player didn't know what to do I reacted abruptly with him. I feel it is at these times, where I feel my ego grabbing hold and I'm trying to add too much complexity that I get frustrated with the players. Sometimes I can't help but think about moving up in the coaching ladder and it's initiating structures which I see as my means to getting there. Instead of coaching for the players it becomes more about my selfish desire to perpetuate my persona as a coach. This also

protects me if we lose because I can say it's not my fault and blame it on other things like the players and how they just didn't get it, they weren't good enough, bad calls by the refs or a bad HC.

Monday, October 20th

I'm frustrated because the HC seems to need to control everything on this team. I was the only defensive coach at practice and took the entire defense through a progression of drills: bags, step and punch, step-punch get off, with a rip and swim, then deflect drill and ended with form and angle tackling drills. I had hoped that by this time in the season the players would all be proficient at doing these drills yet I still had to provide some basic cues to a few of the players.

Tuesday, October 21st

I think it may be the way I run drills, in return for reps, speed and efficiency, that I move and speak quickly and when kids miss directions I yell and blame them for not paying attention and don't see it as my own coaching inadequacies. But I'm trying to be more considerate of my players so when one of them got all displaced during a punt drill, at first, I reacted abruptly and screamed, "you can't do that, close the seam …" and then I quickly caught myself and apologized and told the whole group that I missed lunch and that I'd calm down. We all chuckled a little and did a couple more repetitions.

Thursday, October 23rd

By the time I arrived on the field they were doing a window drill with one offensive player carrying the ball across from a defender; the offensive player tries to get across the line and the defensive player tries to prevent it. This drill has two players competing and so there are about 34 others watching. The HC then announced we were starting with the defense, which put me on the spot and so I quickly scrambled to get my scouting sheets out to do some formation recognition but I felt rushed and I hadn't organized my coaching notes.

Friday, October 24th

I'm trying to step out and do some different drills and add a twist to practice because I noticed that some players are a little bored of doing the same drills. I'm unsure what the players think of my coaching style and I think that I may be a little too aggressive or high strung for this level. I've been working on becoming more patient and sensitive to these players but I sense that they don't want or need all of the instruction and teaching. So I'm trying to back off a bit. We finished with punt but it was frustrating because several guys were missing since the last time and so I had to re-teach it.

Monday, October 27th

I got upset with a couple of players during drills because we've been doing them for over a month and they should know them by now. We also ran punt and I used a couple of odd formations to make sure we all knew our assignments.

Tuesday, October 28th

Many players were missing from practice today and the ones there didn't seem to know what they were doing. I feel their complacency was my fault because I had yelled at some players in the first drill when guys were not paying attention. It started when the HC neglected to inform me of the structure of practice and then, after calling out several names, turned to me and said, "okay coach, tell 'em what you want them to do." I got upset because I had to jump up and perform while other coaches were giving their comments on technique that were inconsistent with the system I had implemented.

Wednesday, October 29th

We lost our playoff game tonight 12 – 8 despite that the defense played very well. It's hard to lose when you only give up twelve points. I'm happy with the progress of our players though, and the team in general but can't help thinking how good we could have been if we'd done more of the small things right. I have to take responsibility because the other team beat us using a centre-guard gimmick play and I didn't cover it despite having noted it during film. Later on in the evening I received a call from the HC asking my opinion about some of the award winners on the team. After a brief discussion he went on to tell me how grateful he was for my time in coaching and that he'd hoped I had fun. I told him that I learned a lot from the experience and thanked him for the opportunity to coach the defense. This was a departure from the way the HC had acted during the season and I was grateful that he called.

Discussion II

Through my reflection I was led to the realization that the practices I had learned as a player and used as a coach were not informed by observations about my athletes but were based on preferred practices. With this understanding I began to question my long-held beliefs about practice and to search for alternate perspectives on coach leadership. According to Burns (1978), "Leadership is inseparable from followers' needs and goals" (p. 19) where a singular focus on winning has led many leaders to neglect the needs of their athletes (Murray & Mann, 2007). In my practices as a coach, I was taught to consider the needs of my athletes only to the point that it affected my coaching goals of efficiency, productivity and performance (Bass, 1985). My concerns for the athlete as a positional coach only went as far as delivering the specific techniques that would enable them to function effectively within the team system. Bowie (1991) has pointed out, behavior that considers the needs of others over one's own should be reduced to enlightened self-interest, where Burns (1978) "saw [that the] hopes for society rested on … man's capacity for [such] enlightened self-interest" (p. 144). It is in such enlightened self-interests, of putting the athletes needs before those of the coach, that is the underlying basis of transformational leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1994; Burns, 1978; Hoption et al., 2008; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998; Northouse, 2007; Vealey, 2005).

According to Avolio and Bass (1994), "evidence is clear that a leader that is able to consider the needs of others … can be identified as … transformational" (p.205). Through their organisational socialization (Jones, 2006a) into institutional forms of practice, coaches are deluded to engage in preferred forms of leadership that seek to satisfy personal needs of a leader for power and control that causes them to overlook the needs of their athletes (Argyris, 1983; Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2004). Leadership that

puts the athletes' needs before those of the coach should result in the heightened performances associated with transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kark, Boas, & Gilad, 2003; Purvanova et al., 2006; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). In research on elite coaches Vallée and Bloom (2005) demonstrated that a coaching philosophy based on a consideration for athlete growth and development resulted in wining and successful performances. By ascribing to a mode of leadership that prioritizes long-term consideration for the athletes needs, coaches can cultivate an environment that allows for the emergence of transformational leadership and the heightened performances of their athletes (Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

Under the assumption that a coaching front helps to develop successful teams, coaches are forced to keep their attention focused on the self-centred concern for impression management making athletes' needs a secondary importance (Potrac, Jones, & Armour, 2002). As much as I would have liked to believe that my reflections on previous seasons in football had provided the insight to prevent me from focusing on my selfish concerns for a front, my narrative demonstrated otherwise. An example from Thursday October 2nd occurred at halftime in a 0-0 tie when the HC praised me in front of the other members of the coaching staff in stating emphatically "that was the best the defense has looked all year, keep it going!" Almost unconsciously his words went straight to my head and I began to fixate on my own coaching persona manifesting in my desire to further perpetuate my front. As I stated in my narrative the same day:

> I find myself becoming … more obsessed about football, thinking about it into the night and first thing when I get up in the morning … thinking about strategies for our next game … I feel it is at this point, after seeing small increments of improvement that my mind is racing forward and envisioning the potential success this team could have if I just pushed a little harder.

It was in the desire to heighten my image as a credible coach that my focus, influenced by the HC's praise, shifted from athlete development to perpetuating my own coaching front. As my ego was fed by the HC's praise, it reinforced the natural tendency to place my selfish interests at the centre of my attention (Nesti, 2004; Van Manen, 1991). As I worked through the initiating structures in my head I was going to implement to make the football team's defense, my system and myself look good, I was drawing my attention away from the requirements of my players. According to Megean and Vallerand (2003), "People become ego-involved then emit controlling behavior" (p. 895). As I began to incorporate more initiating structures into my practice, it became increasingly important to impose my practices and control on my athletes. As I stated on October 2nd, "I can't help feeling that it is becoming more about the satisfaction of my own ego than it is about the players … It's when I'm not thinking about my players but about how I can make myself look better through the play of MY defense that I have to be careful." It is when my concerns as the coach and leader precede athletes' needs that leadership practices based on control through impression management result.

It is for similar reasons that researchers have advocated minimal ego-involvement in the practice of leadership for the improvement of athlete performances (Megean & Vallerand, 2003). Based on the reflections from previous seasons, I was beginning to question the underlying motives of my practice as to whether they were based on self-centred concerns of mine as a coach or on the selfless consideration of my athletes. As Megean and Vallerand (2003) wrote, "[a] state of high ego-involvement … lead[s] teachers [and coaches] to focus on outcomes, forget their students inner-experiences and become more controlling" (p. 896). The praise I received from the HC made me seek

future performance-based results that would bring about personal rewards of increased status and the recognition of other coaches. By increasing my focus on initiating structures of system complexity, I was seeking to satisfy underlying egoistic motives that compromised my ability to focus on and effectively lead my athletes as the DC of this team.

According to Wrapp (1967), effective leadership is not about satisfying the needs of the leader but about accomplishing the goals and objectives of the organization resulting in commitments that override personal interests. In the same manner my focus on outcome goals led me to overlook the needs of my players. By adopting an attitude of consideration, I was able to temper my tendency to focus on myself and engaged in practices that reflected the needs of my athletes. An example of how I began to do this, was my consideration of others as seen in my narrative dated Friday September 19th while I was beginning the process of implementing a new defensive system on this team. I noted, "as the newly appointed DC I don't want to shake things up too much and want to show respect for the coaches' hard work in the first few weeks of the season." Although I had been told by the HC to "Do whatever you want," my approach had been first to consider the efforts of these coaches rather than disregarding what they had done and then to begin the process of trying to construct a sound defensive scheme. I believe this example shows my consideration for the assistant coaches and helped contribute to their willingness to contribute to the team objectives I set (Westre & Weiss, 1991). According to Graham (1998), "Leader consideration may engender interpersonal loyalty and a moral obligation to fulfill or exceed role expectations above and beyond promised payoffs (of transactional leadership)" (p. 49). Reflection over the past season led me to

become attuned to the desire of my assistants to establish and maintain their coaching fronts. In understanding these needs, I was able to allow them to preserve their fronts by being a sensitive and considerate leader while I sought their assistance in implementing a new defensive scheme. My past reflections on the previous season informed my practices and led me to treat these assistant coaches with the consideration that would assist their transition from one system and lead to their commitment to my defensive scheme and objectives.

A similar example showing consideration for others is seen in my narrative on Monday September 22nd when I first met with the young coach in charge of the defense before I arrived. He was very insecure about the schemes he had been trying to instill until this point in the season and, as I noted,

> I quickly realized … this was his first season as a coach. I liked his loyalty and commitment to his school and appreciated that he'd come to coach when they had no one else and so I didn't want to just impose my defense on him. I tried hard to listen to his concerns and opinions about what he thought the defense should run.

My consideration here is clearly demonstrated because even with having more than 20 years of football experience over this coach, I openly engaged him in a discussion about the situation as if we were equal colleagues and encouraged his input despite the fact that I had been given the power to do what I considered to be necessary. According to Hartog (2002), "The shift from mental ego to mature ego involves a change in our relationship to power. Power for the mental ego is associated with 'power over' others, whereas power at the stage of a mature ego involves 'power with' others (p. 235). In my consideration for the young coach, I was beginning to demonstrate a transformation in the

way I used power, from the selfish concern to perpetuate my own needs to a consideration for followers' needs that was based on the altruistic motive of leading the team to improved performances. Even in this instance, where I had to overcome this coach's defensiveness to his scheme and practices, I had been able to gain his followership through an empathetic and considerate approach for his position rather than imposing my methods through my ascribed power.

An example of demonstrating my consideration in dealing with the athletes is seen when I had to deal with a player who was struggling with his confidence. It was after he had made a costly mistake during a game that I saw him hang his head and show signs that he was frustrated or embarrassed and that he might quit by faking another injury. He was the same player that the other coaches had given up on long ago when, on my first day, they described to me how he had 'pulled shoot' and went on to laugh about it. I used this knowledge to inform my practices in how I would deal with him. I stated in my narrative dated Wednesday October 1st, "As he tried to slink past me on the sidelines I intercepted him and making the effort to speak calmly I asked, 'What happened on that play?' He said 'I didn't see (my man) go out there.' After a … little thought I said, 'it's okay, now you know what to look for'… He looked up in relief and said 'okay.'" Through this example I show the ability to become attuned to my athletes' needs and insecurities as a result of reflecting on my journal. According to Burns (1978), a leader's role is to "discern signs of dissatisfaction, deprivation and strain … and take initiative in making a connection with followers" (p. 38). Further, the research of Poczwardowski, Barott, and Henschen, (2002), noted that care and consideration for subordinates was indicated through the language participants used and emerged as a supportive category. It

is through the way I spoke to this player, in my carefully considered use of language and tone, that demonstrated one of the ways coaches can engage in practices that are considerate of others which can lead to transformational leadership. In years past, in a similar coaching scenario, my initial reaction would have been to reprimand the player for not carrying out his assignment in 'MY' defense and in making me look bad. It was through reflection that I was expanding my knowledge of coaching (McAlpine & Weston, 2002) and it was leading me to a consideration for the athlete and the potential of transformational leadership. According to Vealey (2005), "Empathy (is) the most basic and necessary interpersonal skill for [the] transformative leader … to gain trust and credibility of their athletes" (p. 93). In my ability to treat this and other players with individual consideration, I was increasing the potential and likelihood for the emergence of transformational leadership and the heightened performances of my athletes (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kark et al, 2003; Purvanova et al, 2006; Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

Another example of my developing consideration for my athletes was seen by my ability to reflect-in-action (McAlpine & Weston, 2002) or to catch myself and modify my practices while in the moment. On Tuesday October 21st, while in the middle of a drill I was able to check myself as I was getting upset at a player and I noted, "When one of (the players) got all displaced during a punt drill I reacted abruptly and screamed, 'you can't do that, close the seam!'… and then I quickly caught myself and apologized and told the whole group I'd missed lunch and that I'd calm down." This is a clear example of how I am showing transformations in the way I coach while in the act of coaching. I am slowly acquiring the skill to be critical of my practices in the moment, thus demonstrating my growth through the accompanying empathy I show to players as a result of my reflections

(Calderhead, 1989; Cushion, 2006; Kruse, 1997; McAlpine & Weston, 2002; Moon, 2004; Pollard, 2008; Van Manen, 1991). According to Calderhead (1989), "Reflection is viewed as a process of becoming aware of one's context, of the influence of societal or ideological constraints on previously taken for granted practices, and gaining control over the direction of these influences" (p. 44). My reflections were not only helping me to identify where my practices were inconsiderate of my athletes but were also forcing me to seek alternate forms of practice that may have been in opposition to those I had learned through my immersion in the dominant coaching culture. Just as using preferred practices had perpetuated a focus on myself, this self-transformation was allowing me to minimize my focus on egoistic concerns and to focus on the practices that promote greater satisfaction, motivation and efforts in my players and assistants.

Reflecting on my journal entries from current and previous seasons in coaching led to my heightened ability to critically analyze the significant issues in my coaching (Gilbert & Trudeau, 2006; Hartog, 2002; Moon, 2004). My deepening level of reflection slowly began to transform my coaching practices that questioned the long-held notions I had about coaching. According to Moon (2004), "depth of reflection is represented in a hierarchy of 'levels' … characterized by increasing flexibility and ability to manage the framing process in an open and flexible manner" (p. 102). As a result of these reflections, my practices late in the season began to demonstrate this greater awareness through flexibility and the modifications in my practice. For example, from my narrative on Friday October 17th I was not only questioning the outcomes of my practice but was also directly questioning the motives underlying them. As I stated, "I feel it is at these times, where I feel my ego grabbing hold and I'm trying to add too much complexity that I get

frustrated at the players … Instead of coaching for the players it becomes more about my selfish desire to perpetuate my persona as a coach." This example demonstrates how I am moving beyond superficial levels of technical reflection and beginning to think critically and question the motives of my practice and whose needs they are satisfying. As I began to understand the motives behind the practices I had acquired, it started to reflect in my leadership through the language that I used, how I treated my players, and the way I engaged in the use of initiating structures. According to Lombardo (1987), "the increased emphasis on external goods of sport make coach pedagogues reluctant to adopt alternative coach methods/practices because 'they do not satisfy ego-needs' … as thoroughly as do authoritative techniques" (p. 24). As reflection was allowing me to overlook my self-interests for performance outcomes, it enabled me to move outside of the preferred practices that secured my reliance on them and their mode of power relations.

It is through the implementation of initiating structures that coaches seek the attainment of performance objectives (Jones et al., 2004). The awareness I was developing through reflection was providing the insight to see where my practices were either being guided by egoism or altruism and how focusing on ego needs detracted from my leadership and the performances of my athletes. From my narrative on Tuesday October 21st I stated, "I think it may be the way I run drills sometimes, in return for reps, speed and efficiency, that I move and speak quickly and when kids miss directions I yell and blame them and don't see it as my own coaching inadequacies." This is an example of how, late in the season, I am reflecting more deeply on my practices and my mode of implementation as the reason why they may not be the most effective means in the

leadership of my athletes. These reflect the coaching techniques and routines that I had been trained in as a player and had come to rely on as a result of my socialisation in the subculture of football. Reflection was leading me to question this knowledge and to investigate the motives underlying such practices. According to Burns (1978), "theorists of leadership failed to consider the motivation of leaders and followers" (p. 23) and it is this insight that I am developing through reflection. Instead of seeing my problems with coaching as the inability of the players my consideration for them made me aware of my self-centered motives in blaming and reprimanding them for poor performances (Gilbert & Trudel, 2005).

Another example demonstrating how consideration for the athlete manifested in the structures of the drills and the manner in which I implemented them was shown in my narrative from Friday October 24th when I stated, "I'm trying to step out and do some different drills and add a twist to practices because I noticed some players are a little bored of the same drills." My observations about the athletes were providing the insights that the drills I had been relying on were making the players disinterested, demotivated and reduced their focus on performance goals. By choosing to incorporate alternate forms of practice based on the observations of my players I was including a consideration for their needs over my own needs as a coach to direct and control practices. According to Jones (2006a), "commitment to learner and learning has increasingly been recognized as fundamental to 'good coaching'"(p. 25) and it was through reflection and a consideration of my athletes that led to practices reflecting their needs which could ultimately lead them to improved performance. It is reflection that has allowed me to overcome the

tendency to be self-centered (Nesti, 2004; Van Manen, 1991) and to replace this with a consideration for my athletes.

In another example from my narrative dated Thursday October 16th, I stated, "I am realizing that the players don't want to be corrected on every play, maybe they don't want to learn as much about football as I want to teach them and maybe they just want to be patted on the back once in a while." My consideration and examination of my practices result in my becoming more informed of the athletes and how they are responding to my coaching. Since I am considering that they may not want all of the technical knowledge that I am giving them, I also reconsider my practices in providing less technical instruction. It is through the process of reflection that I am able to recognize that a modification of my practices was necessary which led to a transformation in the way that I coach as I work together with the athletes in trying to improve their performances.

According to McAlpine and Weston (2002), "it is the analysis of these multiple experiences through reflection which enables one to detect patterns that then lead to knowledge" (p. 63). By reflecting on my personal narratives I discovered that I was constantly engaged in the selfish desire to perpetuate my own image as a coach and it resulted in my being inconsiderate and overlooking the needs of my athletes. Reflection also resulted in transforming my coaching practices to include the dimension of consideration. Slowly, through my reflections on successive seasons I acquired new knowledge and the ability to begin to reflect-in-action (Mc Alpine & Weston, 2002), which was demonstrated by catching myself in the moment and discerning between the concern for my needs and those of my athletes. Reflective practices allowed me to escape

from the constraints of preferred practice that I had been trained were the most credible and effective means to attaining peak performances for my athletes. This knowledge led to the realization of how these preferred practices led to my defensiveness, fear and evasive behaviors in the leadership of my athletes which has come to characterize the leadership of modern sport coaches (Evans, 1998; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998). My reflection allowed for the acquisition of new knowledge that led me to incorporate consideration for my athletes' needs in my practices and to reflect the ethic of transformational leadership.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

Consideration of Leadership

Through the analysis of leadership in my literature review it is clear that perspectives on leadership have developed across a continuum from transactional to more modern theories of transformational leadership. Over the natural course of its development, leadership research has increasingly emphasized the dimension of consideration which has emerged as an integral component of transformational theories (Burns, 1985; Keller, 1992). As the demands of increased competition in sport has left coaches with few opportunities to investigate and experiment with theoretical ideals for more effective leadership, they remain bound to the traditional modes of transactional leadership (Cassidy et al, 2006; Jones et al., 2004). It is a result of coaches' immersion in the subculture of their sport that preferred practices are reproduced to eventually constrain their ability to engage in alternative forms of leadership (Argyris, 1983; Cassidy et al., 2009; Cassidy et al., 2006; Potrac et al., 2002). However, research has demonstrated that most coaches engage in both transactional and transformational leadership but are defined by the mode they predominantly use, which remains to be transactional (Murray & Mann, 2007; Weinberg & Gould, 2006). In supplementing the emphasis in modern coaching of initiating structure and its technical rationality (Cassidy et al., 2009; Lyle, 2002), the dimension of consideration can help lead coaches to the practice of transformational leadership.

As well as being shown to lead to performances above and beyond those reached through transactional methods (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Purvanova et al., 2006; Yammarino & Bass, 1990), transformational leadership has been strongly correlated to

the dimension of consideration (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Bass & Steidlemeier, 1999; Fairholm, 2003; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998; Keller, 1992; Kouzes & Posner, 2003). As I have indicated through my literature review and the construction and analysis of my coaching narratives, the consideration underlying theories of transformational leadership has always been part of the leadership process (Keller, 1992). The dilemma that seems to exist is: how do coaches engage in the transformational leadership practices that research is advocating will lead to improved practices and heightened performances of their athletes? Through my thesis it seems clear that the solution lies in having coaches incorporate greater proportions of consideration into their leadership practices. The dimension of consideration has gained increasing attention in research on leadership as the basis of effective leadership (Bass, 1998; Keller, 1992; Murray & Mann, 2006) and is associated with the heightened performances of transformational leadership (Jones et al., 2004). In using reflection to supplement leadership practices, coaches can increase their consideration for their athletes (Calderhead, 1989; Hartog, 2002; Keller, 1992; Moon, 2004; Schön, 1987; Van Manen, 1991) to result in the practice of transformational leadership.

The reflection in this thesis refers to critical reflection on the social and cultural contexts leading to self-transformation of coaches and their practices of leadership (Mallett, 2004). Critical reflection is different from the technical reflection that most coaches engage that focuses on the procedures and practices of attaining performance objectives (Cassidy et al., 2009). Critical reflection leads to the increased awareness of the coaching context by elucidating the impact of leaders' behaviors to result in a consideration for others (Van Manen, 1991). Schön (1983) defined reflection as a

concentration of professional practice to make one more skillful through increasing levels of consideration. In using reflection to aid her practices as a teacher, Hartog (2002) stated, “taking (the reflective) approach … enabled me to develop an ethic of care in the teaching and learning relationship I have with my students” (p. 242). It is this ethic of consideration that has remained absent from the process of leadership (Bass & Steidlemeier, 1999; Jowett, 2003) and through reflection coaches can improve their practices of coach leadership.

As I alluded to, the problem for coaches with regard to leadership that remains is the merging of transformational theory with current coaching practices and reducing the grip of transactional leadership acquired through coach socialisation in sport (Argyris, 1983; Cassidy et al., 2009; Tinning, 2010). According to Kruse (1997), “Reflection promises to be a transforming and enduring reality, absolutely essential …[to providing] the bridge between theory and practice” (p. 47). In my own reflections as a coach, I was led to transformational practices in mediating the disparity between what the research was advocating and the observations I was making about how I was leading and coaching my athletes. I found reflection on my coaching journal to be instrumental in increasing my awareness and consideration for my athletes as their needs began to inform my practices leading me towards transformational practices. I considered my athletes, not only in terms of their performances but also for their long-term personal development and their intrinsic satisfaction as a result of my reflections. As my narratives demonstrate, there is an evolution in my reflections from focusing on those practices to secure my self-interests as a coach to the practices that more directly reflect the needs of my athletes.

Reflection allowed me to focus on what my athletes required and forced me to overlook my needs for power and control in guiding all aspects of their development.

In referring to the need for coaches to control every facet of athlete training and development, Jones (2006a) called for "a shift in focus to what learners themselves bring to the learning situation rather than on the content the teacher is seeking to deliver" (p. 27).

It is this consideration, in a sensitivity to the athletes' needs, that has been missing from the leadership process and instead emphasizes the practices of initiating structures and a technical rationality (Bass and Steidlemeier, 1999; Jowett, 2003). Also, it is the dimension of consideration that has been strongly correlated to transformational leadership practices (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Bass & Steidlemeier, 1999; Fairholm, 2003; Graham, 1988; Hoption et al., 2008; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998; Keller, 1992; Kuhnert, 1994; Kouzes & Posner, 2003). If coaches intend to lead their athletes to performances beyond those experienced through the current practice of transactional leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Kark et al., 2003; Purvanova, et al., 2006; Yammarino & Bass, 1990), then they need to allow athlete consideration to inform their coaching practices (Hoption et al., 2008). In its ability to heighten the awareness of coaches on how preferred practices perpetuate hierarchical relationships of power (Cassidy et al., 2009), reflection, as I have shown through this project, can lead to increased coach engagement in athlete consideration (Calderhead, 1989; Moon, 2004; Van Manen, 1991).

Reflecting on Leadership

Through reflecting on successive seasons in coaching, I began to recognize that the leadership practices I had been relying on and writing about were based on the

preferred practices I had learned as a result of my immersion in the subculture of football (Argyris, 1983; Cassidy et al., 2009). This subculture emphasized a performance-based mentality and the acquisition of external rewards which shaped my thinking as a coach in a number of ways. For example, as a collegiate player my coach had always been very critical of my performances to the point where I felt every action I made was being criticized. He rarely, if ever, gave compliments and when I made a good play I was considered to be 'doing my job.' I spent five years as a collegiate player questioning my ability as a result of the close scrutiny I had been subjected to in my coach's pursuit of a perfect performance. It was not until after my final game as a senior that he finally told me how proud he was of me as a player, leader and role model for others on the team. It was this recognition about the limits of preferred practices (Mallett, 2004) that reflection helped to provide the opportunity for my professional growth as a coach (Kruse, 1997). It took five years and the end of my career as a football player to realize that my coach valued my performance. As a collegiate football coach, reflecting on my practices years later, I was becoming aware that I had reproduced the practices of my coach. Then I realized that in adopting the practices of my coach I was constraining my potential to lead and to coach my athletes in new and innovative ways (Jones, 2004; Strean et al., 1997) and so I began to consider alternative perspectives in the leadership of my athletes.

It was Schön (1987) who proposed that reflection emerged as an adjunct to practices as a technical rationality could not mediate all the inadequacies of performance. According to Van Manen (1991), "teachers' ability and inclination to reflect thoughtfully on the pedagogical nature of their lives with students are being atrophied by the objectifying and alienating conditions under which they work" (p. 5). It is this same

performance-based mentality that has limited the potential for coaches to engage in the process of reflection (Cassidy et al., 2009; Murray & Mann, 2007). Through my own immersion in the subculture of football, I was led to focus on outcomes which perpetuated the practices and resulted in my alienation and defensiveness due to the emphasis of performance objectives rather than the process of inquiry to improve practice (Schön, 1987). My socialisation to preferred practices never led me to a consideration for my athletes' physical, emotional and psychological needs but instead focused on winning. I was indoctrinated into a form of practice that was based on the delivery of technical knowledge to athletes in a prescribed set of progressions. In the preceding example of my coach, he was only interested in my well-being to the extent that it secured his goals for performance and this transactional process became the basis of my relations in the leadership of my athletes.

According to Cassidy et al. (2009), "It is the association, and at times tension, that exists between professionalism and technical expertise that can constrain coaches who aim to become reflective practitioners" (p. 22). This tension that exists between coaches' need for athlete development and the need for performance outcomes is the result of coaches' egotistical needs for winning (Duda, 1993; Nicholls, 1989). According to Turner et al., (2002), "organizational researchers … have portrayed (leadership) as a basic tension between altruism and egoism" (p. 305) where egoistic leaders focus on their own needs and altruistic leaders focus on the goals of the team. This tension is the result of a leader's single motivation of seeing the self as the centre of all things (Nesti, 2004; Van Manen, 1991). Egoism is the result of a self-centred perspective perpetuated by coaches' goals to win at all costs. Altruism is when coaches focus on the needs of their

athletes and the development of more than just their ability as athletes but as a complete person (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1998). Much of the tension that exists in the practice of coach leadership can be seen in the ambiguity between coaches' personal egotistical needs and their need for player performances and this has been identified as a persistent dilemma of practice (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004).

Based on the analysis of my coaching narratives, it is clear that as a coach my consideration for my athletes must overcome my egoistic needs if my leadership is to optimize their potential for heightened performances. Van Manen (1991) referred to the process of overcoming this tension as 'tact,' and stated "thoughtfulness incarnates itself as tactful action" (p. 521) where "Thoughtfulness is the product of self-reflective reflection on human experience" (p. 522). Van Manen's concept of tact is consistent with the leadership dimension of consideration where he stated that "To be tactful … is to be able to take other people's feelings into account … having a feel for what other people require … an active sensitivity toward the subjectivity of the other" (p. 531). Van Manen concluded that reflection led to the development of tact or sensitivity to the needs and requirements of others. It was this same sensibility of compassion, empathy or consideration that modern theories of leadership have espoused as the effective component in transformational leadership (Bass, 1998; Evans, 1998; Fairholm, 2003; Greenleaf, 1998; Johnson, 2005; Keller, 2006; Northouse, 2007; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). It is sensitivity or consideration for the other that is the critical factor for transformational leadership and it has been shown to be a by-product of the process of reflection (Calderhead, 1989; Hartog, 2003; Moon, 2004; Pollard, 2008; Schön, 1987; Van Manen, 1991). It was in this same manner that reflection on my journal entries led

me to a greater degree of consideration for my athletes resulting in my accelerated professional development in my practice of leadership as a coach (Pollard, 2008).

As Moon (2004) stated, "'depth' of reflection [is] represented in a hierarchy in levels of reflection" (p. 102) and it was as a result of reflecting on my journal entries and their use in constructing narratives that led me to become cognizant of my egoistic desire for control. According to Jones et al. (2004), "By focusing more closely on the experiences of learners, coaches might find themselves … to be more effective" (p. 102). Reflection encouraged a consideration for others that resulted to changes in the way I spoke to, coached and led my athletes. It is through reflection that I believe leaders are able to overlook their ego to allow their practices to become informed by the requirements of their athletes (Hartog, 2004; Tinning, 2010). As Van Manen (1991) stated about reflection, "in [a] more self-conscious mode … there comes into play a noticeable tension between the conversational I or self and the reflective I that holds the spontaneous conversational nature of intuitive acting at a distance" (p. 519). It is in refining the capacity to see the self on the periphery of events and not at its centre that reflection can be essential to effective leadership. Through reflection, this 'distancing' allows the leader to overcome the tendency to engage in the egoistic need for power and replace it with the altruism of working to meet the goals of followers as a result of reflection (Hartog, 2002; Moon, 2004; Pollard, 2008).

As I engaged in reflection it was the interpersonal relationships between my players and my attempts at controlling them that I began to register as counterproductive to my leadership. According to Kruse (1997), "Teachers [and coaches] who are less focused in their reflective activity concentrate on … issues of control. Their reflection is

cyclical in nature … they remain 'stuck' and searching for new ideas as they struggle to maintain professional self-esteem" (p. 56). My reflections were leading me to alternative practices that I had not considered until acquiring the insight that the practices I had come to rely on maintained my personal need to impose my practices on my athletes (Calderhead, 1989; Cushion, 2006; Moon, 2004; Cassidy et al., 2009; McAlpine & Weston, 2002). Having completed my career as a collegiate football player I began to rely on these practices as I transitioned into my new role as coach. As these methods became my preferred form of leadership I began to continue the cycle of power relations that my athletes would one day make their own, thus leading to a self-perpetuating cycle of control and domination. Through reflecting on my journal entries I realized that the practices I was using on my athletes were inconsistent with the observations I was making about them and led me to question their underlying assumptions (Calderhead, 1989; Schön, 1987; Van Manen, 1991).

According to Strean et al. (1997), reflection is critical, because it allows us to "question assumptions and practices that seem to make our own [coaching] lives easier … but [it] actually work[s] against our best long-term interests" (p. 254). Reflection allowed me to see how the practices I learned as a player and relied on as a coach to make my life easier, were actually leading me away from the needs of my athletes and the practices I needed to implement to improve their performances. Kruse (1997) stated, "the reflective process involved an emergent knowledge of self and the identification of professionally held beliefs" (p. 57). My process of reflection allowed me to identify how 'my beliefs' were placing my ego at the centre of my practice. It is this shift to a consideration for the other that the process of reflection led me to question the long-

standing beliefs underlying my practices and to engage in alternate methods of leadership. An example of this is seen through my use of progressions that I had learned as a player through the repetition of the same drills in the same sequence over a five-year career. As a coach, I reproduced these practices and relied on this same method of progressions administered in the same manner to teach my athletes' fundamental football techniques.

However, reflection provided the insight for me to make observations about my players and how, after weeks of doing the same drills, the players were becoming bored and ineffective in performing them. In previous seasons as a coach, I would always view their poor performance or inefficiency as a lack of focus or laziness but through reflection I began to see this as my inadequacy and inability as a coach to effectively capture the attention of my athletes (Cassidy et al., 2009). Reflection has led me to incorporate different techniques, like the use of random practice and modifying drill sequences to help alleviate the boredom of performing the same drills in the same sequence on a daily basis. Through my training as a player and socialisation as a coach, I had never learned or been taught to reflect on my experiences or those of my players as a means to inform practice or performances. As Tinning (2010) stated, "early researchers in learning … assumed a linear version of the learning process … and it is only recently that scholars … have been focusing attention on the learner" (p. 81). It was this same constructivist view of knowledge that had informed coaching knowledge and the practices used by my coach. Through my investigative analysis of the leadership literature combined with the process of reflection, I was led to more effective forms of leadership that was based on my athletes and meeting their physical, emotional, and psychological needs.

My reflections were leading me to become more innovative (Hellison & Templin, 1991) as I began to empathize the experiences of my athletes in concert with the structures I used to improve their performance. As I became open to a widening range of possibilities for practice, I began to move away from the systematic approach to coaching that I had become socialized into as a football player and coach (Argyris, 1983; Cassidy et al., 2009; Tinning, 2010). According to Jones et al. (2004), "It is a conscious, reflective self who is experiencing … what is important … at the same time as playing a role … [that] we can see the coach emerge in a caring, helpful and committed response" (p. 131). As a result of reflection, I developed a heightened awareness of my players' experiences leading me to become considerate of their needs and informing my practices to challenge my assumptions in coaching. According to Fairholm (2003), "The biggest problem with … leaders is that their egos get in the way of effective leadership" (p. 18) and reflection made me realize how my ego was leading me to focus on my own need to create my coaching front. The process of reflection led me to reduce the influence of my ego in my coaching practices, that was being advocated in emerging perspectives of transformational leadership, (Avolio, 1994; Fairholm, 2003; Megean & Vallerand, 2003) and to focus on the requirements for my athletes' performances. By considering my own needs less, I became more considerate of my athletes which also secured more time to devote to improving my practice of leadership.

According to Avolio and Bass (1994), "evidence is clear that a leader that is able to consider the needs of others … can be identified as … transformational" (p. 205) and through consideration for my players and assistants I began to engage in transformational leadership (Bass, 1978; Burns, 1985). Through my socialisation in the subculture of

football (Jones, 2006b) I was deluded to engage in the preferred practices that maintained my position at the top of the hierarchy of power by prioritizing my needs as a leader above those of my athletes (Jones et al., 2004). According to Wrapp (1967), effective leadership is not about satisfying the needs of a leader but about accomplishing the goals of the organization to result in commitments that override each member's personal interests. Through reflecting on my narratives I was able to overcome my egoistic affinity to engage in the preferred practices that systematically recreated the control and manipulation of my athletes (Jones, 2006a; Potrac et al., 2002).

It was my primary focus on the creation of my coaching front that continued my attention on my egoistic needs constraining the mediation of athlete performances through preferred practices based on hierarchical relations (Cassidy et al., 2004; Tinning, 2010). In my example as a coach, I overlooked the athletes' needs by failing to implement practices to improve their performance. Instead of being focused on where their abilities were lacking I engaged in a performance of impression management with the HC so I would be awarded the status of positional coach. As Armstrong (2001) noted, "Transformational leadership is not hierarchical but relational with transformations going in both directions" (p. 45). My reflections forced me to bring my attention back to the athletes and to focus on their needs instead of my own, to result in improved practices and a more relational mode of power. In pandering to the HC I was looking after my personal interests and overlooking those of my athletes and further embedding myself in the hierarchy of power relations to establish it as my preferred form of leadership. In reconstituting our relationships of power through emphasizing a consideration for the other, transformational leadership can help move leadership away from the cycle of

power and domination that characterizes most coach-athlete relationships (Murray & Mann, 2007).

Through the analysis of my narratives it is apparent that as I began to reflect on my journal entries I became aware of how the dilemmas in my coaching were the result of my egoistic need to advance my own cause in the development of my coaching front (Jones, 2006b). In comparison, the notes of my second narrative begin to reflect a growing sensitivity to the players and assistant coaches of this high school football team. As a result of the knowledge gained through reflecting on my previous season in coaching (Moon, 2004), I demonstrated my growth as I replaced egoistic needs with the altruism of meeting the overall goals of the team. For example, my increasing consideration was demonstrated by changes in my pedagogical practices as a coach as I started to consider the experiences of my athletes in the planning and implementation of drills. This came as a result of reflecting on my notes from the previous season where it became clear that, as coaches, we had rarely considered the needs of the athletes in the development of practice plans.

According to Van Manen (1991), "Thoughtful reflection discovers where unreflective action was 'thoughtless'" (p. 532) and it was in this way that retrospective reflection-on-action led to the transformation in my coach and leadership practices. In forcing me to question the assumptions underlying my practices, reflection led to the openness to engage in alternative forms of leadership that more accurately reflected the athletes' needs. It also led to transforming my practices, from their sole basis in a technical rationality to increasingly incorporate the dimension of consideration that hastened my development as an effective leader. Reflection can be a valuable tool in

supplementing coaches' current practices through increasing their consideration for their athletes. It is not just in their capacity to reflect on technical aspects of performance, as these already constitute the major focus of coach education programs (Jones et al., 2003) and the socialization of coaches in their sport (Cassidy et al., 2009). However, by increasing coaches' awareness of the social impacts their practices have on their athletes, consideration can influence team development and augment the current emphasis in coaching on the scientization of practice. Reflection can lead coaches to improved practices and the heightened performances of their athletes and teams by incorporating the dimension of athlete consideration that personifies the ideals of transformational leadership.

Limitations and Future Directions

Significant implications for coach practices that emerged from this project are that it maps a process by which future coaches can learn, develop and improve in their practice of leadership. In showing how reflection led me away from focusing on my egoistic concerns as a leader to the altruistic concern for team members, I provide a template on which coaches can base their reflections. By focusing more deliberately on the interpersonal relationships they construct with their athletes, coaches can be led away from technical reflection to the more complex levels of critical reflection. Furthermore, such a template can make coaches aware that identifying inadequacies is a requisite level of self-knowledge that enables them to engage in more mature forms of behavior. By narrowing the focus of their reflections to the relevant issues, coaches can circumvent the preliminary stages of learning, leading more rapidly to transformational leadership.

In addition, occupying the objective perspective of researcher allowed me to engage in a more intricate mode of reflection that helped me to achieve a deeper level of analysis. In working to construct a narrative I was led through increasingly complex stages of critical reflection. Through this process, I found that that I was rediscovering my purpose for coaching football in the first place. It was the positive experiences I had playing football, through the acquisition of new skills that led to using complex systems and tactics, along with the camaraderie with fellow players that resulted in my desire to coach professionally. The analysis of my narratives forced me to deconstruct my practices and led to the recognition that my initial motives had been replaced somewhere along the way, by the demands of the football subculture and its emphasis on winning. Through working with narratives I was led back to my true passion for coaching in my desire to develop complex skills and abilities in players leading them to positive athletic experiences.

As I became aware of how my practices were perpetuating performance-based results I realized it was negatively affecting my athletes' experiences. This resulted in me having to rethink my leadership practices and their underlying motives. In working with a quantitative methodology and a subjective set of numbers, I would not have been led to the deepening awareness that resulted from exploring the basis of my practice. Through an analysis of formal or empirical data provided by surveys or questionnaires, my biases and inconsistencies would have remained absent, hidden, and even unconscious to my analysis. By forcing me to occupy a central position in my research, I was made vulnerable as the object of my own subjectivity, heightening the significance the results of my study had on me, as both researcher and researched. This has been a very positive

process in expanding my professional development as a coach and providing a reference point for continued growth and understanding of my practices.

Future directions for leadership research should include an investigation of its theories in connection with hierarchical relations of power. In the discussion of my narratives I demonstrated how my focus on developing a coaching front prompted forms of leadership based on the preferred practice of transactional leadership. It was through reflection that I was able to objectify the processes of my coach leadership practices and begin to recognize how my egoistic motives to control and direct all aspects of athlete development reinforced my reliance on preferred practices.

However, I have not gone too deeply into theories of power and instead I have focused on the natural progression of leadership theory and how its development led to transformational forms of leadership. This has led to an investigation of the knowledge underlying my coaching practices and to how preferred practices perpetuate a culture of egoism constraining innovations in coach leadership. More specifically, I have illustrated how critical reflection led me, as a coach, to the increased awareness for my athletes' needs and how this knowledge began to inform my practices leading me to transformational forms of leadership as a football coach.

Future studies exploring leadership might consider how the reflective process can elucidate underlying motives of the leader as being based in the egotistical need for power that perpetuates transactional leadership and its cycle of domination. In relating transactional leadership and egoism with Foucault's (1988) disciplinary technologies and transformational leadership, and altruism to the concept of freedom, we might be able to

map the process whereby 'technologies of self,' or reflection, is the process leading to the practice of freedom and to loosening the constraints of power and domination.

What is needed is a process that can lead a coach to more ethical practices and to occupying increasingly complex levels of transformational leadership. The first step is for coaches to keep a journal highlighting the significant incidents occurring as a result of their practices as a coach. These incidents are then subjected to an ideology critique (Strean, 1997) to reveal inherent biases and uncritically accepted practices that form the basis of coaches' practices. The ideology critique is used as a method to uncover alternate practices that coaches can use to improve how they lead their athletes.

Tripp (1993) proposed a four-step process to analyze critical incidents, that includes: (1) describing an incident and ascribing meaning to it within the dominant perspective; (2) studying the perspectives for inconsistencies, contradictions or omissions; (3) explaining why the dominant perspective ignored aberrations and determine who benefits and who is disadvantaged; and (4) imagining a new, alternative structure or process that is more rational than that put forth by the dominant view. This process enabled teachers to reflect on the critical incidents in their practices and so determine the underlying motives for their behaviors and help consider alternate perspectives. According to Strean (1997) this process can be applied to a coach's reflections on the critical incidents in their practice and lead to exploring alternate modes of coaching behavior. The process was applied to three common practice dilemmas of (1) allocating playing time by aptitude, (2) using exercise as punishment, and (3) using physical skill drills removed from game contexts. At the end of the problem-solving

process the result is behaviors that deviate from dominant ideology and practices that treat athletes in more ethical ways and lead to transformational leadership.

I believe that coaches can benefit from an ideology critique but have found that the process can be simplified. For example, through the results of my study we know the development of leadership over the last Century has led to more ethical forms of leadership behavior. We also know from the coaching literature that most coaches spend a great deal of their time on the development of a 'coaching front' with coach researchers advocating practices that direct more effort and attention to meeting athlete needs (Jones, 2006b). In the four-steps outlined by Tripp (1993), the reflective process was not well defined and so it was necessary to include steps (2) and (3) in the process. However, these steps are no longer necessary, as the results of my study have identified that inconsistencies and dominant practices exist because of a coach's desire to preserve power through a credible image or 'front.' These preferred practices are tied to power relations between coaches and athletes that help coaches maintain their privileged positions that perpetuate the hierarchical structure of power.

Through my research I found that I could help coach leadership practices by providing them with a modified version of an ideology critique involving a two-step process. These are: (1) describe incidents and identify how they could be perceived as an attempt to advance your own cause, and (2) imagine an alternative process or practices that optimize athlete attention on their development. Through combining these two steps with the practice of leadership, coaches can engage in more considerate behaviors for their athletes' needs that result in increased development and performance. In applying

these two steps to an analysis of a critical incident occurring in my practice I illustrate how the process may be simplified.

Case Study: Yelling at a Player for Making a Mistake

(1) A common practice for many coaches is to yell at players to correct errors and to emphasize the importance of using a specific technique, skill or strategy. As a coach, I yell to communicate my point and reinforce a specific tactic. But I also know that when a player makes a mistake it reflects on the coach and can indicate ineffective practices. Yelling at a player is a demonstrable way for the coach to show that the player executed an action contrary to the way they were instructed to do so by the coach. Yelling at a player is a way save face and to maintain a coaching front.

(2) In order to optimize my athletes' attention on their own development I need to address the error without diverting their attention to focus on an aspect of my behavior, like through yelling at them. By speaking calmly, we create a dialogue about the event on the field analyzing the cues that could have helped lead to better performance. By focusing their attention on the skill and refraining from creating diversions, athletes can focus on error correction and are prevented from the feelings of insecurity, defensiveness and failure that can accompany a coach's reprimands.

In bringing all of this together, I found that I could help coaches by going through this simple two-step process that accounts for inconsistencies and biases in preferred forms of practice. By highlighting how practices were based on creating an idealized image and thus, perpetuating hierarchical relations of power between the coach and athlete, this process can lead coaches to more ethical coaching behaviors. In using this

modified ideology critique coaches can be led to more mature and transformational forms of leadership behavior.

References

Abernathy, B., Farrow, D., & Barry, J. (2003). Constraints and issues in the development of a general theory of expert perceptual-motor performance. In J. Starkes and A. Ericsson (Eds.), *Expert performance in sport: Advances in research and sport expertise* (pp. 359-364), Human Kinetics.

Ansel, M. (2003). Leadership in sport: A matter of style. In B. Cummings (Ed.), *Sport psychology: From theory to practice* (4th ed., pp. 233-276). San Francisco, CA: Sage.

Argyris, (1983). Action science and intervention. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 19 (2), 115-135.

Armstrong, S. (2001). Are you a 'transformational' coach? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance,* 72 (3), 44-48.

Avolio, B. (1994). Transformational leadership. In B. Bass & B. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 122-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J. Hunt, R. Baliga, P. Datchler, & C. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging Leadership Vistas (*pp. 29-50). D.C. Heath.

Avolio, B., and Bass, B. (1994). Moral development in leadership. In B. Bass & B. Avolio (Eds.), Transformational leadership. *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2002). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership: Cases of transactional and transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

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

Bass, B. (1998). The ethics of transformational leadership. In J. Ciulla (Ed.), *Ethics, the heart of leadership* (pp. 169-192). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Bass, B., & Steidlemeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181-218.

Bloom, G., Crumpton, R., & Anderson, J. (1999). A systematical examination of the teaching behaviors of an expert basketball coach. *Human Kinetics*, 13, 157-70.

Bochner, A. (2001). Narrative's virtues. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7, 131-57.

Bochner A., & Ellis, C. (1996). Talking over ethnography. In C. Ellis & A. Bochner (Eds.), *Composing ethnography: Alternate forms of qualitative writing* (pp. 13-45). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Boul, K., & Bryson, J. (1988). Phenomenological and structural approach. In J. Hunt, R. Baliga, P. Datchler, & C. Schriesheim, (Eds.), *Emerging Leadership Vistas* (pp.12-26). D.C. Heath.

Bowie, N. (1991). Challenging the egoistic paradigm. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 1(1), 1-22.

Brown, M., & Trevino, L. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595-616.

Bruce, T. (2000). Never let the bastards see you cry. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17, 69-74.

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

Bycio, B., Hackett, R., & Allen, J. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 80 (4), 468-78.

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5 (1), 43-51.

Case, R. (1998). Leader member exchange theory and sport: possible applications. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21(4), 387-95.

Cassidy, T., Jones, R., & Potrac, P. (2004). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural & pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. London: Routledge.

Cassidy, T., Jones, R., & Potrac, P. (2009). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural & pedagogical foundations of coaching practice* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Cassidy, T., Potrac, P., & McKenzie, A. (2006). Evaluating and reflecting upon a coach education initiative: The CoDe of Rugby. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 145-161.

Clandinin, J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teacher's classroom images. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 15 (4), 361-85.

Clandinin, J., & Murphy, S. (2007). Looking Ahead: Conversations with Eliot Mishler, Don Polkinghorne, and Amia Lieblich. In J. Clandinin (Ed.) *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology (*pp. 632-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chase, S. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 651-679). London: Sage.

Chelladurai, P. (1978). *A contingency model of leadership in athletics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, Canada.

Chelladurai, P. (1993). Leadership. In R. Singer, M. Murphey, & K. Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of research in sport psychology* (647-76). New York: Macmillan.

Chelladurai, P., & Carron, A. (1983). Athletic maturity and preferred leadership. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 5 (4), 371-380.

Chelladurai, P., & Reimer, H., (1998). Measurement of leadership in sport. In J.L. Duda's (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 227-256). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technologies.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S.D. (1980). Dimension of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 33-45.

Chemers, M. & Rice, R. (1974). A theoretical and empirical examination of Fiedler's contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In J. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.) *Contingency approaches to leadership* (pp. 91-124). Southern Illinois: University Press.

Ciulla, J. (1998). Leadership and the problems of bogus empowerment. In J. Ciulla's (Ed.), *Ethics, the heart of leadership (pp. 63-86)*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Cunliffe, A., Luhman, J., & Boje, D. (2004). Narrative temporality: Implications for organization study. *Organization Studies*, 25 (2), 261-86.

Cushion, C. (2006). Mentoring: Harnessing the power of experience. In R. Jones's (Ed.), *The sports coach as educator: Re-conceptualising sports coaching* (pp. 128-44). London: Routledge.

Cushion, C., Armour, K., & Jones, R. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest,* 55, 215-230.

Dalla Costa, J. (1998). *The ethical imperative: Why moral leadership is good business*. Toronto: Harper Collins.

Denison, J. (2002). Writing a "true" sports story. *Auto/Biography*, X (1-2) (pp. 131-38). A British sociological association study group journal.

Denison, J. (2007). Social theory for sports coaches: A Foucauldian reading of one athlete's poor performance. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 2(4), 369-83.

Denison, J. & Markula, P. (2005). Sport and the personal narrative. In D. Andrews, D. Mason, & M. Silk, (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods in Sports Studies* (pp. 165-184). Oxford: Berg.

Denison, J., & Rinehart, R. (2000). Introduction: Imagining sociological narratives. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 17(1),* 1-4.

Denzin, N. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 500-15). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., pp. 933-958). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Delgado, R. (1989). Story telling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, 87(8), 2411-2441.

Duda, J. (1998). *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolino, B., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal,* 45 (4), 735-744.

Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2007). Studying teachers' lives and experience: Narrative inquiry into K-12 teaching. In J. Clandinin's (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 357-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C. (1999). Heartful autoethnography, *Qualitative Health Research*, 9 (5), 669-83.

Ellis, C. (2000). Creating criteria. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6, 273-77.

Evans, R. (1998). *Moral leadership*. Toronto: McGrawHill.

Fairholm, G. (1997). *Capturing the heart of leadership: Spirituality and community in the new American workplace.* West Port, Connecticut: Praeger.

Fairholm, G. (2003). *The techniques of inner leadership: Making inner leadership work.* Connecticut: Praeger.

Fiedler, F. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (2001). Learning to coach through experience: Reflection in model youth sport coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21,16-34.

Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (2004). Role of the coach: How model youth team sport coaches frame their roles. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 21-43.

Gilbert, W. & Trudel, P. (2005). Learning to coach through experience: Conditions that influence reflection. *Physical Educator,* 62 (1), 1201-.

Gilbert, W. & Trudel, P. (2006). The coach as reflective practitioner. In R. Jones's (Ed.), *The sports coach as educator: Re-conceptualising sports coaching* (pp. 113-27). London: Routledge.

Graham, J. (1988). Transformational leadership: Fostering follower autonomy, not automatic followers. In J. Hunt, R. Baliga, P. Datchler, & C. Schriesheim, (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 73-9). D.C. Heath.

Graham, J. (1995). Leadership, moral development, and citizenship behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly,* 5 (1), 43-54.

Greenleaf, R. (1998). *The power of servant leadership*. L. Spears (Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Hartog, M. (2002). Becoming a reflective practitioner: A continuing professional development strategy through humanistic action research. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 11 (3), 233-43.

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

Hellison, D., & Templin, T. (1991). A reflective approach to teaching physical education. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1982). Leadership style: Attitudes and behavior. *Training and Development Journal*, 36 (5), 50-52.

Hollander, E. & Offerman, L. (1990). Relational features of organizational leadership and followership. In K. Clark & M. Clark's (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership* (pp. 83-89). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Hoption, C., Phelan, J., & Barling, J. (2008). Transformational leadership in sport. In M. Beauchamp & M. Eys (Eds.), *Group Dynamics in exercise and sport psychology* (pp. 45-61). London: Routledge.

Horn, T. (2002). Coaching effectiveness in the sport domain. In T. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in sport psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 309-54). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Horn, T. (2004). Developmental perspectives on self-perceptions in children and adolescents. In M. Weiss (Ed.), *Developmental sport and exercise psychology: A lifespan perspective* (pp. 101-143). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Horn, T. (2008). Coaching effectiveness in the sport domain. In T. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in sport psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 239-68). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

House, R. (1971). A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-38.

House, R. & Dressler, G., (1974). The path-goal theory of leadership: Some Post Hoc and A Priori tests. In J. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.), *Contingency Approaches to Leadership* (pp. 29-62). Southern Illinois: University Press.

Johnson, C. (2005). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jones, R. (2006a). *The sports coach as educator: Reconceptualising sports coaching*. Park Square: Routledge.

Jones, R. (2006b). Dilemmas, maintaining "face," and paranoia: An average coaching life. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12 (5), 1012-1021.

Jones, R., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2002). Understanding the coaching process: A framework for social analysis. *Quest,* 54, 34-48.

Jones, R., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledges: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society,* 8 (2), 213-229.

Jones, R., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2004). *Sports coaching cultures: From practice to theory*. London: Routledge.

Jones, R., Hughes, M., & Kingston, K., (2008). *An introduction to sports coaching: From science and theory to practice.* London: Routledge.

Jones, R., & Standage, M. (2006). First among equals: Shared leadership in the coaching context. In R. Jones (Ed.), *The sports coach as educator: Reconceptualising sports coaching* (pp. 65-76). Park Square: Routledge.

Jowett, S. (2003). When the honeymoon is over: A case study of a coach-athlete relationship in crisis. *The Sport Psychologist*, 17, 444-460.

Jowett, S. (2005). On enhancing and repairing the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett and M. Jones (Eds.), *The psychology of coaching* (pp. 14-26). Leicester: British Psychological Society.

Jowett, S., Paull, G., Pensgaard, A., Hoegmo, P. & Riise, H. (2005). Coach-athlete relationship. In J. Taylor & G. Wilson's (Eds.), *Applying sport psychology: Four perspectives* (pp. 151-70). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Kanungo, R., & Mendonca, M. (1998). Ethical leadership in three dimensions. *Journal of Human Values*, 4(2), 133-48.

Kark, R., Boas, S., & Gilad, C. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 88(2), 246-255.

Kavussanu, M., & Roberts, G. (2001). Moral functioning in sport: An achievement goal perspective. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 23 (1), 37-54.

Keller, R. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performances of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management*, 18 (3), 489-501.

Keller, R. (2006). Transformational leadership, initiating structure, and substitutes for leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, (1), 202-210.

Koh, W., Steers, R. & Terborg, J. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership in teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319-33.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Korman, A. (1974). Contingency approaches to leadership: An overview. In J. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.), *Contingency Approaches to Leadership* (pp. 189-196). Southern Illinois: University Press.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2003). *Encouraging the heart: A leaders guide to rewarding and recognizing others.* John Wiley & Sons.

Kuhnert, K. (1994). Transforming leadership: Developing people through delegation. In B. Bass & B. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 12-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kruse, S. (1997). Reflective activity in practice: Vignettes of teachers' deliberative work. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 31 (1), 46-60.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R. & Zilber, R. (1998). *Narrative Research*. London: Sage.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 163- 188). London: Sage.

Lombardo, B. (1987). *The humanistic coach: From theory to practice.* Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas

Lyle, J. (2002). *Sport concepts: A framework for coaches' behaviour.* London: Routledge.

Mallett, C. (2004). Reflective practices in teaching and coaching: Using reflective journals to enhance performance. In J. Wright, D MacDonald, & L. Burrows (Eds.), *Critical inquiry and problem-solving in physical education* (pp. 147-158). London: Routledge.

Markula, P., & Martin, M. (2007). Ethical coaching: Gaining respect in the field. In J. Denison (Ed.), *Coaching knowledges* (pp. 51-82). London: A & C Black.

Megean, G., & Vallerand, R. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Sciences,* 21, 883-904.

McAlpine, L., & Weston, C. (2002). Reflection: Issues related to improving professors' teaching and students learning. In N. Hativa & P. Goodyear (Eds.), *Teacher thinking, beliefs and knowledge in higher education*, (pp. 59-78). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Klumer Academic Publishing.

Miller, E. (2000). Dis. *Sociology of Sport Journal,* 17, 75-80.

Moon, J. (2004). *A handbook of reflection and experiential learning: Theory and practice.* London: Routledge–Falmer.

Morgan, W. (2002). Social criticism as moral criticism: A Habermasian take on sports. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues,* 26 (3), 281-99.

Morgan-Fleming, B. (2007). Narrative inquiry in the professions. In J. Clandinin's (Ed.) *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 355-57). Sage.

Murray, M., & Mann, B. (2003). Leadership effectiveness. In J.M. Williams (Ed.) *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (4th ed., pp. 89-117). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Murray, M., & Mann, B. (2006). Leadership effectiveness. In J.M. Williams (Ed.) *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (5th ed., pp. 109-136). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Nesti, M. (2004). *Existential psychology and sport: Theory and application.* London: Routledge.

Nicholls, J. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Northouse, P. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Personal Narratives Group (1989). *Women's lives: Feminist theory and personal narratives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Poczwardowski, A., Barott, J., & Henschen, K. (2002). The athlete and coach: Their relationship and its meaning. Results of an Interpretive Study. *International Journal of Sport and Psychology*, 33, 116-140.

Pollard, A. (2008). Reflective teaching: Evidence informed professional practice (3rd ed.). London: Continuum Publishing.

Potrac, P., Jones, R., & Armour, K. (2002). 'It's all about getting respect': The coaching behaviors of an expert English soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society,* 7 (2), 183-202.

Purvanova, R., Bono, J., & Dzieweczynski, J. (2006). Transformational leadership, job characteristics, and organized citizenship performance. *Human Performance*, 19(1), 1-22.

Richardson, L. (2000). New writing practices in qualitative research. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17, 5-20.

Richardson, L. (2002). Poetic representation of interviews. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 877-892). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jassey-Bass.

Sims, R. & Brinkmann, J. (2002). Leaders as role models: The case of John Guttfreind at Solomon Brothers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35 (4), 327-39.

Smith, R., Smoll, F., & Curtis, B. (1978). Coaching behaviors in little league baseball, in F. Smoll & R. Smith's (Ed's), *Psychological perspectives in youth sports* (pp. 173-202). Washington: Hemisphere.

Smoll, F. & Smith, R. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19(18), 1522-1551.

Sparks, W. (2001). Leadership visited: Integrity, character, morality-more than perspiration or inspiration? *Quest*, 53, 507-21.

Sparkes, A. (2000). Autoethnography and Narratives of Self. *Sociology of Sports Journal*, 21-43.

Sparkes, A. (2002). *Telling Tales and Physical Activity: A Qualitative Journey.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Strean, W. (1997). Ideology critique: Improving instruction by thinking about your thinking. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance,* 68(4), 53-56.

Strean, W., Senecal, K., Howlett, S., & Burgess, J. (1997). Applied Research-Xs and Os and what the coach knows: Improving team strategy through critical thinking. *The Sport Psychologist,* 11(3), 243-256.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1976). What a coach can teach a teacher. *Psychology Today*, 9, 74-8.

Tinning, R. (2010). *Pedagogy and human movement: Theory, practice and research.* New York: Routledge.

Tripp, D. (1993) *Critical incidents in teaching: Developing professional judgment.* New York: Routledge.

Tsang, T. (2000). Let me tell you a story: A narrative exploration of identity in high performance sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17, 44-59

Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, C., & Milner, V. (2002). Transformational leadership and moral reasoning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (2), 304-11.

Vallée, C., & Bloom, G. (2005). Building a successful university program: Key and common elements of expert coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology,* 17, 179-196.

Van Manen, M. (1991). Reflectivity and the pedagogical moment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 23 (6),* 507-36.

Vealey, R. (2005). *Coaching for the inner edge*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Weinberg, R., & Gould, D. (2003). *Foundations of Sport and Exercise Psychology* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Weinberg, R., & Gould, D. (2007). *Foundations of Sport and Exercise Psychology* (4th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Westre, K., & Weiss, M. (1991). The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and group cohesion in high school football teams. *The Sport Psychologists,* 5, 41-54.

Williams, J. (2006). *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Wrapp, E. (1967). Good managers don't make policy decisions: Rather, they give their organization a sense of direction, and they are masters at developing opportunities. *Harvard Business Review*, 45 (5), 91-99.

Wragg, E. (1999). *An introduction to classroom observation* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Yammarino, F., & Bass, R. (1990). Transformational leadership: Multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations*, 43 (10), 975-95.