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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The successes of a school's many varied programs and activities are a direct reflection of the expectations and perceptions of the leadership of that school. A school's leadership, however, consists of many ingredients, persons, and parts that are ultimately pulled together by a solidifying source whose responsibility it is to make these parts operate as one productive, organized, motivational, yet humanistic organ of the school environment. That solidifying source is the building principal.

Regardless of the school activity, whether its focus is the band, a school dance, a school play, the bus schedule, the cafeteria, a chorus recital, the custodians, discipline problems, teacher or student strikes, teacher assignments, parent conferences, condition of the school building, Parent-Teacher and Student Association meetings, the instructional curriculum, or the athletic programs, the building principal's concerns and responsibilities are vast. He is concerned with the success or positive imaging of each school event whether that event is instructional or extracurricular. The ultimate goal in the overall scheme of things in the school is to make these particular parts and events work together to produce a caring, sharing, healthy, productive, and knowledgeable young person who can participate successfully in society.
While the foregoing list of the principal's responsibilities mentioned the athletic program last, its placement in the list perhaps directly contrasts its placement in the overall scheme of things in the school environment. Principals would not want any teacher, event sponsor, or advisor to feel that their school activity is any less important than any other in the school, but facts and figures do speak for themselves.

The athletic program employs and involves a larger segment of the school's population than any other singular event in the school other than instruction. When considered even more critically, the athletic program itself is usually dominated by football, the sport that not only demands greater student and staff participation, but also generates more revenue than any other program in many schools. While it is but one facet of the school's overall program, it is a program that requires the direct supervision of the school principal.

The only other individual whose leadership role most nearly parallels that of the building principal, in terms of school visibility, high public relations exposure, and direct community contact, is the head football coach. Like the principal, the football coach must establish a positive rapport with many other school agencies and departments: i.e., guidance and counseling personnel, the faculty, parents, and the community, but of all the special relationships which surround the head football coach, his relationship and interaction with the building principal and his assistant football coaches are crucial. Support from these two groups bears heavily on the effectiveness and
efficiency of the overall football program. Philosophical differences between and among these groups can destroy the harmony and unity needed to support the effectiveness of the football program.

The question may be asked at this juncture: What attributes of a football program make the program effective and/or efficient? Fuoss and Troppmann (1981) stated:

A coach...is concerned with effectively and efficiently achieving organization or program objectives and goals. Succinctly, 'effectiveness' is 'doing the right things' and 'efficiency' is 'doing things right.' Effectiveness means making the right choices in terms of desired results and goals...Efficiency is the proper utilization of all resources including people, methods, money, material, and machinery (p. 89).

When the effectiveness and efficiency of a football program are working together in the manner suggested by Fuoss and Troppmann, the natural by-product should be a winning season. In general, the winning season is regarded by many as a barometer of even the coaching ability of the head football coach.

The Purpose of the Study

Even when an athletic program has the necessary ingredients of effectiveness and efficiency in place, winners, nevertheless, continue to be winners, and, it seems, losers continue to be losers.

The building principal, the head football coach, and the assistant coaches come to their jobs with specific points of view in their understanding and judgments of what they perceive socially as the role
of the football coach and ultimately his propensity toward winning and losing. With preconceived expectations in place, each of these groups views the head football coach as a leader acting in concert with the athletes but, more importantly, interacting with an established leadership structure (in the person of the building principal) and an established support structure (in the persons of the assistant coaches). Along with the head football coach, these leadership support structures or, for the purpose of this paper, these status groups have a vested interest in the outcome of athletic contests. They may accept or reject the head football coach's right to lead or the head football coach's leadership style, based on how they perceive the role of head football coach. Because of the nature of their involvement the members of these status groups are in a position to evaluate the head coach's leadership style, and they may act in support of the football program or take some other stance.

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether variation in winning among different schools is dependent on the nature of the leadership style of the head football coach whether that leadership style is of the Initiation structure or the Consideration structure. "Initiation refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in a relationship between the leader and members of the group"
The study was designed to control for major measurable factors and variables in the three status groups and to investigate their perception of the relationship of the coach's leadership style to winning.

Statement of the Problem

Everyone loves a winner. When a football team is winning, pride flourishes and becomes contagious, spreading itself throughout the school and the community at large. Even with such enthusiasm flooding the school, coaches are often sent conflicting signals about the expectations of their program.

According to Sabock (1985), "coaches are hired with the understanding that their first responsibility is to teach classes all day, every day, and the coaching responsibilities are to be fulfilled above and beyond this" (p. 5). While this is true philosophically, many coaches feel, and perhaps rightly so, that if they do not produce winning seasons, they will eventually be fired from their coaching position. Sabock further stated that "coaches live in a world in which success (winning) is the goal, but they work in a setting where academic...development of students is supposed to be the primary objective...This situation produces a real dilemma: fulfilling their role as teacher and at the same time doing what they must in order to survive as coaches--winning and satisfying the public" (p. 27).

If all coaches were to be brutally honest when asked which aspect of their job is most important to them, many would have to admit that
winning football games is at least equally as important (if not more important) as their responsibilities in the classroom. For this reason, many head football coaches often establish leadership styles within their programs with winning as the primary focus. It is perplexing then to those who must work so closely with the losing head football coach (the building principal and the assistant coaches, in particular) why losing coaches continue to lose even when the effectiveness and efficiency aspects of their program are functioning within reasonable guidelines.

Significance of the Study

While many athletic programs purport to exist because they present the opportunity to involve students in character building activities, exposure to the importance of being a team player, and promoting the value of good sportsmanship, the ultimate desire of the football coach is to win football games.

The implications of winning are far-reaching for the coach, the community, and the athlete alike. For the coach, the intense desire to win can flow easily from him to the players. The coach's attitude regarding winning, fair play, and ethics, however, is key. Should he feel that teaching players to win within the parameters of good ethics and a respect for the rules of the game are important, then everyone benefits. This is especially true when he equates winning to a desire to strive for excellence. A danger exists, however, when the coach's attitude is to win at any cost, ethics and fair play notwithstanding.
Winning teams in many communities accomplish a lot of positive situations: (1) they promote parent involvement in the school; (2) they encourage the participation of students who may not excel at academics but find some self-esteem in athletics; (3) they promote school and community pride; (4) they allow for the awarding of athletic scholarships for many of the team's players who may otherwise not have the opportunity for college or further education; (5) they also accomplish the more noble character-building values mentioned above; and (6) they provide the vehicle through which the coach can enjoy some job security. Therefore, based on the implications previously discussed, winning is significant to the coach, the player, the school, and the community as well.

School administrators are interested in putting together a coaching staff that can win football games. For them it is important to be able to predict the success of a program from a determination of the coach's credentials and also from their interaction with the coach chosen to head the program. If the administrator can have in place a barometer to help him predict the success of the athletic program, it will be a useful tool.

Definition of Terms

To facilitate the reading of the remainder of this thesis, the author offers the following definition of terms.

1. Leadership Style: The nature of the manner in which a leader relates to those subordinate to him in an organization.
2. **Initiation Structure:** The leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done.

3. **Consideration Structure:** Behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leader and members of the group.

**Research Questions**

The subjects of this study consisted of 18 building principals, 18 assistant coaches, and 18 head football coaches. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), an instrument used to gather information on leadership perception, was given to each of the subjects. The explanation stated on the front of the instrument itself described the LBDQ as a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of a supervisor but did not ask the respondent to judge whether the behavior was desirable or undesirable. The function of the LBDQ was not to test ability. It simply asked the respondent to describe, as accurately as possible, the behavior of the respondent's supervisor.

Results from the administration of the LBDQ to the members of the three status groups were expected to answer these research questions:

1. Will there be a significant relationship between the consideration leadership style of the head football coach and his win/loss record?

2. Will there be a significant relationship between the initiation leadership style of the head football coach and his win/loss record?
3. Will the factors of age, teaching experience, further training, and status of the respondents have a significant relationship to the coach's win/loss record?

Assumptions

There were three assumptions made in the approach to this study:

1. Head football coaches who were perceived by the three status groups (the building principal, the head football coach, and the assistant coaches) as coaches who exhibit an initiation leadership style will show fewer wins on their win/loss records.

2. Head football coaches who were perceived by the three status groups (the building principal, the head football coach, and the assistant coaches) as coaches who exhibit a consideration leadership style will show more wins on their win/loss records.

3. Other factors such as age, teaching experience, further training, and status of the respondent will have a significant relationship to the coach's win/loss record.

Limitations

This study was limited to three status groups: (1) building principals, (2) the head football coaches, and (3) the assistant coaches in secondary schools in a metropolitan Atlanta school system. Each group was given four weeks in which to complete and return the
Summary

This study investigated the relationship between the leadership style of the head football coach and his propensity toward winning football games as perceived by three status groups: (1) the building principals, (2) the head coaches, and (3) the assistant coaches. The researcher felt that each of these groups held certain responsibilities in relation to the football team and that these responsibilities gave them a viable stake and interest in the football team, thus qualifying them to make judgments about the causes for the outcome of the games.

Since winning in a football program is analogous to success, winning is the measurement used in this study to gauge the success of the athletic organization in the school called the football team. The relationship of success to the nature of the leadership style of leaders in the organization has been the focus of several studies for the last three decades. A review of the literature on the definitions of leadership, leadership behaviors and theories, and their relationship to success is discussed in Chapter II.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

According to Bass (1981), the word 'leadership' did not appear until the first half of the nineteenth century in writings about political influence and control of British Parliament. In a synonymy of the word 'leadership,' the term, 'influence,' is perhaps the strongest expression the language has to offer as an appropriate analogy.

Although its definitions are perhaps as varied as are its roles, the definitions of leadership, for the purposes of this paper, focus on the process of using influence. As Chelladurai and Carron (1978, p. 15) have suggested, in leader-subordinate interactions there is reciprocal influence: the leader exerts influence on the subordinate (or group) and the subordinate (or group), in turn, influences the leader. Stogdill (1968) stated succinctly: "Leadership is the process of influencing group activities toward goal setting and goal achievement" (p. 47), while Dubin (1963) wrote that "leadership is the exercise of authority and the making of decisions" (p. 144).

This discussion of the exchange of influence among and between the leader and the group pointed to leadership as more a dynamic process rather than an isolated action. A similar conclusion was presented in the writings of Filley and House (1969):

Leadership...is a process whereby one person exerts social influence over the members of a group. A leader, then, is a person with power over others who exercises this power for the purpose of influencing their behavior (p. 391).
These aspects of leadership, the process, and the behaviors exhibited during that process are the focus of this paper.

Leadership: A Matter Of Traits

While researchers have, in recent years, moved away from defining leadership in terms of personality traits (such as intelligence, height, weight, social poise, dominance, etc.) to an emphasis on leader behaviors, Fleishman and Peters (1961) pointed out that the personality correlates of leader behavior cannot be completely ignored (p. 127). Kuehl, DiMarco, and Wimes (1975) proposed that an individual's leadership orientation is strongly influenced by certain facets of his personality (p. 143). It seems apparent that certain styles of leaders have related personality features or what Batlis and Green (1979) conceptualized as personality variables functioning as "antecedents" of leadership style.

Reilly (1975) suggested that the critical judgment which must be made is whether or not these "antecedents" are actually related to a leadership definition or whether they are concomitants of other factors which are in reality the basis for defining leadership. This question is ultimately the most important question of leadership. Lists of personalized characteristics of leaders have meaning only when they have predictive value for leadership relative to other men who possess these same characteristics, according to Reilly, and these characteristics of leaders must be related to the characteristics of leadership if they are to be significant determinants of the making of leaders. If the
relationship cannot be signified, then what is being measured are the characteristics of people rather than those of leaders.

Another note of qualification should be interjected before the trait orientation is summarily dismissed. For example, in Fieldler's (1967) Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness, traits of the leader are incorporated and viewed as critical considerations. Similarly, as reported by Chelladurai and Carron (1978) in reference to other studies by House (1971), House & Mitchell (1974) and Vroom & Mann (1960), the personality characteristics of the leader as well as those of subordinates should be included in any analysis of leadership. The attempts to identify a universal set of traits that characterizes a leader, however, have proved futile.

Behaviors As Dimensions of Leadership

Research began to focus on the behaviors of leaders in studies carried out at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan in the 1950's. These important studies shifted the focus from studying the personality traits of the leader to the relationship between specific leader behavior patterns and criteria such as subordinate satisfaction and performance. The researchers in the Ohio and Michigan studies were "interested in understanding the construct of leadership itself (i.e., both effective and ineffective) and not in simply determining a description of outstanding leaders" (Chelladurai and Carron, p. 8).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), originally constructed by Hemphill and Coons (Stodgill and Coons, 1957) and refined
by Halpin and Winer (1957), was selected to aid this researcher in the area of studying the leadership role perception of secondary football coaches in an attempt to ascertain a relationship between leadership style and winning.

The LBDQ, as described by Halpin and Winer, is composed of a series of short, descriptive statements of ways in which leaders may behave. When administered the LBDQ, the members of a leader's group indicate the frequency with which the leader engages in each form of behavior by checking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never.

Halpin (1957), in the manual for the LBDQ, stated that responses are scored on two dimensions of leader behavior. For each dimension, the scores from the several group members are then averaged to yield an index of the leader's behavior in respect to that dimension (p. 1).

As a result of their work with the United States Air Force, Halpin and Winer (1957) reported that two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior had developed: Initiating Structure and Consideration Structure. These dimensions were identified on the basis of a factor analysis of the responses of 300 B-29 crew members who described the leader behavior of their 52 aircraft commanders.

During the 1950's, when the Ohio State Studies were being conducted, the research showed that if a group of leaders was observed and compared with a group of non-leaders, the two groups would differ on leader behavior and not personality traits. The studies consistently...
pointed out these two main behavior characteristics of the leaders—initiation and consideration.

Each dimension is explained as follows:

Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group (Halpin, 1957, p. 1).

Fleishman (1953) explained that items in the consideration dimension were concerned with the extent to which the leader was considerate of his workers' feelings. It reflected the "human relations" aspects of group leadership. "Items in the initiation structure dimension reflected the extent to which the leader defined or facilitated group interactions toward goal attainment" (p. 6).

In the following items, grouped according to the dimension on which they are scored, Halpin and Winer (1957) illustrated the two dimensions as follows:

Initiation Structure
1. He makes his attitudes clear to the crew.
2. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
3. He maintains definite standards of performance.

Consideration Structure
1. He is easy to understand.
2. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the crew.
3. He gets crew approval on important matters before going ahead (p. 20).

It should be noted that there are some very direct parallels between the constructs of initiation and consideration presented in the
LBDQ and those skills and constructs noted in several other studies which will be discussed below.

**Dimensional Parallels**

Research by Bales (1958) on leadership behaviors paralleled to a great degree the Halpin and Winer research which yielded the idea of initiation and consideration. In studying leadership, Bales reported that two different types of leaders almost always emerged in a group: a task specialist and a socioemotional leader. Where the task leader tends to be disliked by the group members, the socioemotional leader is the best liked. The behavior of the socioemotional leader tends to fill in the gaps not attended to or created by the task leader. This person behaves in ways that reduce conflict, relieve tension, and preserve group unity.

Bales concluded that the evidence seems to indicate that groups have two basic kinds of needs: (1) movement toward task completion or goal attainment and (2) maintenance of group harmony and satisfaction. It appears that individuals who play different roles emerge in groups to meet these needs. He also suggested that it seems reasonable that such needs also have to be met in groups with appointed or official leaders (p. 485).

**The Path-Goal Theory**

One of the groups whose perception this research seeks to expose in relation to the head football coach is that of the assistant coaches...
because of their subordinate role to the head coach. Since the researcher has chosen to limit this study to leader behaviors, a discussion of the Path-Goal Theory (House, 1971) is included in this chapter, because it focuses on the needs and goals of the subordinates as well as the leader.

According to House, a basic assumption in the Path-Goal Theory is that subordinates are directly oriented toward those rewards offered by the organization and its environment. As the subordinate moves along the organizational path to his goal (the rewards), the strategic function of the leader is "...to provide...the coaching, guidance, support and rewards necessary for effective and satisfying performance that would otherwise be lacking in the environment" (p. 31).

The subordinate has an expectancy that effort leads to a more effective performance. In turn, that effective performance is expected to lead to rewards.

One major proposition of the Path-Goal Theory is that the leader's function is a supplemental one. The behavior/motivational function of a leader is directed toward clarifying the relationship between the behavior of the subordinate and his/her goals. The nature of this responsibility was outlined by House and Dessler (1974) who stated that:

"...The motivational functional of the leader consists of increasing personal pay-offs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, and making the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route (p. 31)."
The second major proposition of the Path-Goal theory, according to House and Dessler, is that "the optimal leader behavior which will lead to effective accomplishment of this motivational function is a product of the situation in which the leader operates" (p. 31). In this context, the researchers proposed two classes of situational variables which would have an influence on the optimal behavior for a leader: (1) the characteristics of the subordinate and (2) the environmental demands and pressures that subordinates must cope with in order to successfully carry out their task and satisfy their needs. (See Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Path-Goal Theory of Leadership](From Chelladurai and Carron, 1978.)

From a societal perspective French and Raven (1960) reported that leadership is a structure of value. The value is the base of the relationship between leader and follower. This is the socially connective element of the interaction process which defines people who possess a value and people who desire a value, according to these researchers. They purport that the value becomes concretely translated into a resource. The stability of the relationship is directly related to the continued possession of the resource and the continued desire for that same resource. Involved is the follower's perception that the
leader will share a portion of his resources whether they be power, prestige, or skill (pp. 259-269).

Max Weber (1964) indicated that the right to leadership rests on a socially legitimate claim to both the right to lead and the right to expect compliance. He stressed the meaning and significance of legitimacy for systems of authority and leadership when he stated:

"It is an induction from experience that no system of authority voluntarily limits itself to the appeal of material or affectual or real motives as a basis for guaranteeing its continuance. In addition every such system attempts to establish and to cultivate the belief in its 'legitimacy'. But according to the kind of legitimacy which is claimed, the type of obedience, the kind of administrative staff developed to guarantee it, and the mode of exercising authority, will all differ fundamentally (p. 325).

While the basis for this right may vary, the similarity between all of the sources of leadership power and potential lie in the "perceived possession of rewards desired and sanctions to be avoided. Measures of reward and sanctions, however, are not the only rationalization which needs to be considered here. It is in the more sophisticated areas of personal virtue, wisdom, knowledge, and understanding that legitimacy of resources is refined and rationalized" (Lipset, 1960, pp. 64-79).

The Situational Leadership Theory

Another theory which focuses upon the appropriate behaviors of leaders in specific situations is the Situational Leadership Theory of Hersey and Blanchard (1977). The major tenets of the theory were expressed as follows:
As the level of maturity of their followers continues to increase in terms of accomplishing a specific task, leaders should begin to reduce their task behavior and increase relationship behavior until the individual or group reaches a moderate level of maturity. As the individual or group begins to move into an above average level of maturity, it becomes appropriate for leaders to decrease not only task behavior but also relationship behavior (p. 163). (See Figure 2.)

### EFFECTIVE STYLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIOR (High)</th>
<th>TASK BEHAVIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Relationship and Low Task</td>
<td>HIGH - MATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship and Low Task</td>
<td>MODERATE - MATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship and High Task</td>
<td>LOW - MATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Relationship and High Task</td>
<td>HIGH - IMMATURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Situational Leadership Theory

(From Chelladurai and Carron, 1978.)

The terms 'task behavior' and 'relationship behavior' here again correspond to the two traditional dimensions of leader behavior which
have repeatedly arisen in the literature—namely, initiation structure and consideration structure.

The Situational Leadership theory centers almost entirely upon the maturity of the individual and/or group. Maturity was defined as "the capacity to set high but attainable goals (achievement motivation), willingness and ability to take responsibility, and education and/or experience of an individual or a group" (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977, p.161). These researchers also emphasized that the variables which comprise maturity should only be considered insofar as they relate to the specific task to be performed.

Another dominant line of research in the task-relationship tradition is Fieldler's Contingency Theory (See Figure 3). Fieldler (1967) proposed that the situation determines what pattern of leader behavior is most effective. Fieldler suggested that "favorable" or "unfavorable" situations are best for the task-oriented leader while situations in the mid-range of favorability are best for the relationship-oriented leader. Bass (1981) defines the "favorable" situation as one where "the leader is esteemed by the group to be led, if the task to be done is structured, clear, simple, and easy to solve, and if the leader has legitimacy and power due to position" (p. 32). The most effective placement involves matching the leader to task- or relationship-oriented situations.

Fieldler (1967) suggested that the self-esteem of task-oriented individuals is closely related to whether or not they perceive themselves as doing a good job. Although such individuals may attempt
to enhance interpersonal relationships in groups they lead, they do so in order to accomplish their primary objective to be successful in the task (Cratty, 1981, p. 239).

![Diagram](image)

**Nature of the Situation**

Cratty further stated Fieldler's theory that leadership effectiveness is dependent upon the interaction between the relative rigidity or structure of the social context in which the power is exerted and the degree to which the leader is task- or people-oriented. Data obtained by Fieldler based on this model suggest that the highly task-oriented leader is effective with two basic situations: "(1) when the task structure is very loose and/or unfavorable, and (2) when the task structure is very rigid and favorable. A leader who is oriented toward human values is most effective when the structure of the situation is intermediate in favorableness, not too loosely or too tightly organized. Thus, the overall implication is that both task-motivated as well as human-relationship-oriented individuals may be
effective leaders, provided they are placed in, or match, the correct situations" (Cratty, 1981, p. 239).

The Contingency Model of Leadership

To determine the leader's orientation, Fieldler (1967) developed several measurement scales the most successful of which is called the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale. The respondent to the LPC is to describe the person with whom he/she could work least well. A high score means that even the least-preferred coworker is viewed in a favorable light while a low score means the coworker is viewed quite negatively. According to Fieldler, a high LPC score is obtained by a relationship-oriented person whereas a low LPC score reflects a task-oriented leader. Correct placement then involves either matching the leader, based on the LPC score, to the right situation or changing the situation (p. 40).

Bass (1981) summarized to a great degree the extensive body of literature on the Contingency Theory (which was a major research focus in the 1970's) when he reported that the most elusive aspect of the LPC has been construct validity, as most attempts to correlate the LPC with personality variables or behavioral observations have not been fruitful (p. 32). Rice (1978) re-examined some of the previous research and concluded that some of the specific meanings of LPC are still uncertain; however, the task versus relationship dimensions are clearly present in LPC scores (pp. 1199-1237).
As was mentioned earlier, another set of studies took place at the same time as the Ohio State and the University of Michigan research. Katz, Maccoby, and Morse (1950) found that employee-centered supervisors had greater productivity than production-centered supervisors (p. 64). Vroom and Yetton (1973) summarized the findings of other studies as to the characteristics of more effective leaders when he reported that "they have supportive relationships with subordinates, use group supervision and decision making, and have high performance goals" (p. 67). These principal findings emerged into a model proposed by Likert (1967) in which he advocated a "participative" style versus "authoritarian" and "exploitative-authoritarian" styles of leadership (p. 86).

As mentioned earlier, there seems to be a conceptual overlap among various leadership approaches accounting for an orientation toward people and an orientation toward a job task. A brief mention of the following studies reveals that other research made such comparisons to leadership approaches: Yukl (1971) concluded that Initiating Structure is very similar to autocratic supervision (pp. 4-440) while Bales (1958) compared employee-orientation to the Consideration Structure and to democratic leadership (pp. 34-39). Blake and Mouton (1964) paralleled the two structures noting as principal dimensions--concern for people and concern for production (p. 75). Hersey and Blanchard (1977) have proposed very similar models based upon task and relationship dimensions (p. 165).
Bass (1981) listed the words used by a number of theorists which seem to reflect the overlap in the two main dimensions, some of which are reproduced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Related and/or Authoritarian, Autocratic</th>
<th>Person-Related and/or Equalitarian, Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian, autocratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production-oriented</td>
<td>Employee-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>Employee emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path-Goal structuring, modifying goals, enabling achievement</td>
<td>Direct need satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal achievement-oriented</td>
<td>Group maintenance-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory X</td>
<td>Theory Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive, persuasive</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;9, 1&quot; (production, not employee concerned)</td>
<td>&quot;1, 9&quot; (employee, not production concerned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>Non-punitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High performance, technical, close in supervision</td>
<td>Supportive, group methods, general in supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant, formal, aloof, cold</td>
<td>Close, informal, warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, technical</td>
<td>Human relations-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work facilitative, goal emphasizing</td>
<td>Interaction facilitative, supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Nondirective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task, self-oriented</td>
<td>Interaction-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>Relations-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive, directive</td>
<td>Joint decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order, achievement, personal enhancement</td>
<td>Personal attraction, security and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision centralization, initiation</td>
<td>Considerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional, perscriptive</td>
<td>People-centered, supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive, negotiative (manipulative), persuasive</td>
<td>Consultative, participative, delegative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrewarding</td>
<td>Rewarding (pp. 289-90).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democratic/Human Relations Leadership

The human relations school of leadership developed out of a group of studies being performed at the Hawthorne Western Electric Plant
during the 1920's and the 1930's, as reported by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1947). This work, coupled with that of Chester I. Barnard (1938) and Elton Mayo (1945), formed the base of a new direction of research. The question became one of discovering ways in which the social environment could be manipulated for the purpose of increasing productivity.

Perrow (1972) summarized the thought of the human relations school when he stated that:

...Good leadership is generally described as democratic rather than authoritarian, employee-centered rather than production-centered, concerned with human relations rather than with bureaucratic rules, and so on. It is hypothesized that good leadership will lead to high morale, and high morale will lead to increased effort resulting in higher production. It will also reduce turnover (leaving the organization) and absenteeism, thus raising productivity by minimizing both training time and the disruption caused by absent workers (p. 106).

Leadership Behaviors Associated with Coaching

The concept of leadership has generally been dealt with theoretically and examined in an empirical context almost exclusively by industrial psychologists. Within physical education and athletics, the interest in leadership has been oriented toward a very specific class of leaders: coaches.

Carron (1978) reported that the role behaviors of coaches generally "included the maintaining of a high level of influence/control while demonstrating only minimal levels of affection and social interaction (p. 58)." According to the research of Williams and Youssef (1972):
Relatively predictable conditions surround a large percentage of sports competitions, which seem to reflect in the familiar 'coaching stereotype.' Athletic contests are visible, involve stress, and require vigorous training beforehand. Thus a rather rigid role is often assigned to the coach—one who drives for excellence and conditioning and who otherwise presents a tough and relatively inflexible front to both the team and its followers (p. 3).

Chelladurai and Carron reported that the importance of identifying relevant dimensions of leader behavior in the athletic context was exemplified in the research of Danielson, Zelhart and Drake (1975) and Chelladurai and Saleh (1978). Chelladurai and Carron reported the Danielson et al study and, because of its significance to this study, it is described below.

These researchers modified 140 of the 150 original LBDQ items and administered this questionnaire to 160 junior and senior high school hockey players, ages 12 to 18 years. The respondents were required to indicate whether the behavior described was characteristic of their coach. Eight dimensions of leader behavior exhibited by the coaches of junior and senior high school players were extracted: competitive training, initiation, interpersonal team operation, social, representation, organized communication, recognition, and general excitement. The description for each of these dimensions is outlined in a reproduction of their MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING OF COMMONLY PERCEIVED COACHING BEHAVIORS in Table 1.

The main finding of Danielson et al was that commonly perceived behaviors in hockey coaching are mainly of a communicative nature with surprisingly little emphasis on domination. It was pointed out that
### TABLE 1

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING OF COMMONLY PERCEIVED COACHING BEHAVIORS
(From Danielson, Zelhart and Drake, 1975. Used with permission.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION NAME</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Competitive training        | - Behavior concerned with motivation of athletes to train harder  
|                                | - Emphasis on winning via better training and performance  
|                                | - Little emphasis on behaviors involving coach-athlete relationship and individual and group participation in decision making                                                                                                                                                          |
| 2. Initiation                  | - Behaviors involving an open approach to problem solving using new methods  
|                                | - Little emphasis on organization in the form of equipment provision  
|                                | - Little emphasis on criticism of performance                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 3. Interpersonal team operation| - Coordination of team members in an attempt to facilitate cooperation at possible expense of protocol  
|                                | - Behaviors concerned with getting members to interact so that the team functions efficiently  
|                                | - Little emphasis on consistency of performance, organization, or team morale                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 4. Social                      | - Socially oriented behavior outside the athletic situation  
|                                | - Little emphasis on consistency of performance, organization, or team morale                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 5. Representation              | - Behaviors concerned with representing the team favorably in contacts with outsiders                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 6. Organized communication      | - Behaviors concerned with either organization or communication with no concern for interpersonal support  
|                                | - Little emphasis on either criticism or reward                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 7. Recognition                 | - Behaviors concerned with feedback and reinforcement of both performance and team participation in decision making  
|                                | - Little emphasis on winning, socialization, or team interaction                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 8. General excitement          | - Arousing behaviors involving disorganized approach to team operation  
|                                | - Little emphasis on recognition or team integration                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

(Taken from Chelladurai and Carron, 1978.)
this finding contradicts Hendry's (1972) contention that coaching behavior is characterized by dominance, aggression, and authoritarianism (Chelladurai and Carron, p. 17).

Another study was conducted by Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) whose findings indicated some direct parallels to the Danielson et al study and which also contributed to the body of knowledge on the dimensions of behavior that have been discussed earlier in this chapter. In the study, which examined the relationship between the leader behavior preferred and the type of sport preferred, male and female undergraduate students were tested using terms drawn and modified from the LBDQ. When the results were analyzed, a total of five different dimensions of preferred leadership behavior were identified by Chelladurai and Saleh: training behavior, autocratic behavior, democratic behavior, social support, and rewarding behavior.

The list reproduced below outlines and defines what they have termed: LEADER BEHAVIOR DIMENSIONS IN SPORT:

"Training Behavior. Behavior aimed at improving the performance level of the athletes by emphasizing and facilitating hard and strenuous training, and clarifying the relationships among the members.

Autocratic Behavior. Tendency of the coach to set himself (herself) apart from the athletes, and to make all decisions by himself (herself).

Democratic Behavior. Behavior of the coach which allows greater participation by the athletes in deciding on group goals, practice methods, and game tactics and strategies."
Social Support. Behavior of the coach indicating his (her) concern for individual athletes and their welfare, and for positive group atmosphere.

Rewarding Behavior. Behavior of the coach which provides reinforcement for an athlete by recognizing and rewarding good performance" (p. 19).

Chelladurai and Carron reported that there are some direct parallels between the Danielson et al and Chelladurai and Saleh findings. For example, the dimensions of training behavior, social support, and rewarding behavior obtained by Chelladurai and Saleh are directly analogous to the Danielson et al dimensions of competitive training, social, and recognition, respectively. The remaining two factors (autocratic and democratic behavior) in the Chelladurai and Saleh study reflect decision style preferred (pp. 18-20).

SUMMARY

Influence is perhaps the greatest determinant of leadership. It was believed by many that such influence was possible in leader/subordinate situations because of some physical or personal traits all leaders apparently share, but upon closer inspection, the majority of recent research has supported the theory that one's propensity to lead was determined more by a set of exhibited behaviors rather than by personal characteristics.

The literature is replete with studies on the subject of leadership, but it appears that none offers any theory that is definitive. The picture painted in the literature of the researched leader is a confusing one. There does not appear to be any set of
personal characteristics that can, across the board, predict that one will become a leader. Some of the results from many studies are convincing but are not reliable in either the selection of leaders or the prediction of leadership success.

The two dominant structures of leadership that have emerged from the literature are Initiation and Consideration. Paralleling those constructs are other behaviors which are similar in meaning but which are identified by such denotations as: task-specialist vs. socioemotional leader; task behavior vs. relationship behavior; task-oriented vs. relationship-oriented; employee-centered vs. production-centered; and authoritarian vs. participative.

It appears that, even if a leader is authoritarian or nonauthoritarian, the performance of the group could be either successful or unsuccessful. By the same token, it appears that a leader can be a relationship- or people-oriented leader, friendly with warm feelings exhibited toward the group, and success may still elude him, by some accounts, because such leadership was wrong for the situation. It was also indicated in the literature that many follow leaders because of rewards that could result from such following. In other words, that leader clears the path for the follower to attain his/her goals. Such a leader, who can offer rewards and reinforcements, strengthens his ability to accomplish group tasks.

The implications of all this research and its bearing in the athletic context have yielded very similar findings. The dimensions of Initiation and Consideration are paralleled in the limited studies that
have been researched on team play and coaching. Either appears to be a means to the end of winning, but both appear to be necessary.

An analysis of the data presented in Chapter V revealed the significance of this literature on this study. The theoretical framework of this study is presented in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study investigated the theory that variation in winning is dependent on the nature of the leadership style of the head football coach even when controlling for factors such as age, formal training, experience, and status of the principal, the head coach, and the assistant coach. Further it examined the extent of the relationship of these variables to leadership style (whether of a consideration or initiation construct) and, subsequently, to each other. The theory proposed by the researcher is that there is a directly proportionate relationship between the winning records of a football team and the leadership style of the head football coach.

There is a body of knowledge--the concepts, principles, and functions of administration or management--that is prerequisite for coaching. There continues to be a proliferation of materials and information relevant to offensive and defensive systems of play, tactics and strategies, drills, and analyses of mechanics and techniques of football team skills. Although this knowledge is important, it contributes primarily to only one dimension, a technical knowledge of the sport.

Communicating a technical body of knowledge is only part of the total responsibility of the football coach and his staff. All of those who supervise, watch, teach, and participate in the game need to be aware that coaching deals primarily with people. While there exists a veritable plethora of studies done in the fields of psychology,
veritable plethora of studies done in the fields of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and other disciplines, for many coaches, knowledge of the complex dynamics of human behavior still seems to be lacking.

According to Fuoss and Troppmann (1981):

Athletic coaching is an applied social science that involves an extra dimension, the interaction with people and the knowledge of how to influence them...To be effective, a coach must develop competencies in skills of at least four types: technical skills, conceptual skills, managerial... skills, and interpersonal skills (pp. 4-5).

Coaches who realize that they must merge their interpersonal or human skills with their technical and administrative skills in a wholistic approach to coaching are ready to positively affect their win/loss records.

Very few coaches, if interviewed, would freely admit they lack in either dimension of such a wholistic approach to coaching. Their effectiveness would have to be approached empirically to have any real validity outside of general personal opinions.

Definition of Variables

The following terms are operationally defined for use in this study to provide clarity and understanding of the variables used in this study. The relationship of these variables is presented in Figure 4.
### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE (Input)</th>
<th>INTERVENING VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES (Output)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>Consideration and Initiation</td>
<td>Winning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Relationship between Variables**

**Independent Variables**

*Leadership style* is defined as the extent to which the head coach's behavior varies from degrees of consideration to initiation as rated by the principal, head coach, and assistant coach in items on the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

**Intervening Variables**

*Consideration* is defined as the extent to which the head coach's leadership behavior is perceived as supporting team members. The typical item is: "3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group."

*Initiation* is defined as the extent to which the head coach's leadership behavior is perceived as directing the activity of the team. The typical item is: "11. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned."
Dependent Variable

Winning is defined as being victorious, or outscoring one's opponent in an athletic match.

Other Factors

Age is defined as the annual life span varying from 0 years to a person's present chronological years of existence.

Teaching experience is defined as the number of years from one to twenty-nine or more that an individual has been working as a certified educator in the school system.

Formal training is defined as the extent to which one has received college training beyond the Bachelors degree to graduate work beyond a Masters degree.

Assumptions Linking the Variables

The researcher assumes that the leadership style of the head coach has a direct relationship to the number of games won during a football season. Therefore, the degree to which the head coach's leadership style falls into the Consideration construct or the Initiation construct makes a difference in the percentage of games won.

Coaches whose leadership style falls into the Consideration construct are perceived as those who find time to listen to the opinions and concerns of others or to make it pleasant for all members to feel an integral part of the group. On the other hand, head coaches whose leadership style falls into the initiation construct are perceived to be
"rather dominant...to express aggression easily and are not interested in the dependency of others" (Hendry, 1972).

The assumption of the researcher is that coaches whose leadership style falls into the Consideration construct are more likely to have a winning season, because that leadership style will ultimately elicit a more cooperative, companionable, or considerate atmosphere in the group, therefore providing the incentive for increased effort by the group at game times. Conversely, where initiation is the dominant construct, the group may tend to be less cooperative or less companionable and, therefore, less likely to give their best effort for winning at game time.

Assumptions can also be made with regard to the perception of the head coach by the building principal. Since the building principal has a superior role to the head coach, the way the head coach's leadership style is perceived by the building principal directly impacts the degree to which the principal will lend subjective administrative support to the football program. Some support is given to any program and is expected based on the daily requirements in the operation of the school and its extracurricular activities, but building principals have the power to grant some "extras" that are not required of the administrator. The principal can affect such extras as the procurement of desired equipment or the permission for fundraisers to be held to help the football program. The administrator can also control the coach's
teaching assignments, thereby impacting the time the head coach can allot to running his football program.

Assistant coaches have a subordinate role to the coach and, in many cases, regard the head coach as a mentor, especially those assistant coaches who aspire to a head coaching position. The way the assistant coach perceives the head coach would generally affect the assistant coach himself rather than the head coach at all. Theoretically, the assistant coach has much to lose or to gain by working in that position. A coaching supplement, valuable technical knowledge of the sport, visibility, experience, and recommendations from the head coach are perquisites of the position. Based on how well he executes his position or, conversely, how poorly he executes his position, he can be retained on the coaching staff or dismissed. Regardless of how the leadership style of the head coach is perceived by the assistant, if it adversely affects his job performance, it may ultimately affect his longevity in that job. The assistant coach's persistence in his job, whether the head coach's leadership style falls in either the Consideration or the Initiation construct, must bear in mind his goal for involvement in the game and hold his emotions in check.

Cratty (1981) reported that whether or not a leader exerts "fate control" over his subordinates is important. Fate control means that the leader can manipulate the subordinates in rather absolute ways. The leader's knowledge of the task as compared to the subordinate's, as well
as the emotional control he or she may exert as leader, is also important.

The researcher assumes also that certain coaching assignments may call for a strict, task-oriented head coach while others may call for a more people-oriented coach. It is when the need is not matched with the appropriate leadership style that subsequent losses are experienced.

The Instrument

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) provides a technique whereby group members may describe the leader behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations. The LBDQ contains items each of which describes a specific way in which a leader may behave. The respondent indicates the frequency with which he perceives the leader to engage in each type of behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never.

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and his leadership style.

2. There is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and consideration.

3. There is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and initiation.
**Data Analysis**

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSx) was used to conduct a correlational data analysis in order to examine the above-listed hypotheses.

**Summary**

This chapter discussed the theoretical framework upon which the study was based. The variables, leadership style, consideration, initiation, and winning, were discussed and defined. In addition to these variables, the other factors which could possibly affect the respondent's perception of leadership were presented: formal training, age, teaching experience, and status of the respondent.

The theoretical assumptions of the researcher and the null hypotheses to be accepted or rejected as a result of the statistical findings were also discussed. The next chapter presents the research methodology used in the study.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine and determine the effects of a head coach's leadership style on winning football games. The research procedures utilized are presented in this chapter. They are divided into the following sections: (1) Type of Study, (2) Description and Population of the Study, (3) Administration of the Instrument, and (4) Data Analysis.

Type of Study

This study involved the descriptive method of research. It was designed to describe "what exists" with respect to the variables in the study. Specifically, it was correlational because of concern in determining the extent of the relationships between the variables.

The data in this study represent information collected as a result of administering the LBDQ to a group of building principals, head football coaches, and assistant football coaches.

This study was conducted in a metropolitan Atlanta school district in 18 high schools which actively engage in athletic competition. Each school is managed by a building principal and employs one head football coach and at least one assistant coach. A minimum of ten football games is played each season, and schools are designated to compete in regions that consist of schools with comparable average daily attendance rates.

The three status groups selected as participants for this study included the building principal, the head football coach, and an
assistant football coach at each school. Each respondent was administered the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire in order to rate the leadership style of the head football coach.

Description and Population of the Study

A total of 54 participants was selected for this study based on their positions in the 18 targeted high schools, whether they were building principals, head football coaches, or assistant football coaches. The researcher contacted each participant to secure his/her willingness to participate in the study during the Winter Quarter of 1990. Once the coaches agreed to participate in the study, a letter requesting permission to conduct the research was sent to the district office, and permission was granted.

Of the 54 participants, 30 were white males, 20 were black males, three were white females, and one was a black female. They ranged in age from 20 to 59 years of age. All respondents had been working in the field of education a minimum of one year and as many as 29 years or more. All of the respondents possessed a masters or higher level degree of educational training. Since the group of respondents was only three per leader, a table of random numbers was not used.

Administration of the Instrument

The LBDQ was distributed to each respondent during the first week of the Spring Quarter of 1990. The purpose of the questionnaire was explained, and each respondent was asked to complete it when the head football coach was not present. The head football coach was also asked
to complete the questionnaire in an individual setting when none of the others being polled was present.

The building principals and the assistant football coaches were assured anonymity, and, since each index score used to describe the head football coaches' behavior was derived by averaging the scores by which his group members described him, respondents were not even required to put their names on the front of the questionnaire. The only name required on the questionnaire blank was the name of the leader who was being described.

The respondents were told that they were to describe the approximate frequency with which the head football coach engaged in each of the behaviors specified in the questionnaire items. They were urged to answer all of the items, and, when they were not sure of an answer, they were instructed to select a response that most closely described the football coach's behavior.

Data Analysis

The primary methods and techniques of data analysis used in this study were accomplished through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSx). This included a correlational matrix which studied the relationships existing between the variables and which tested the hypotheses. It also included a factor analysis which determined the inter-correlations of the variables.

The above procedure was only possible after all answer sheets were collected from the respondents and processed for use with the SPSSx
software program. Processing included the following: (1) having values assigned to each response: for example, answers A, B, C, D, and E were valued at 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1, respectively; (2) then placing factors regarding age, teaching experience, formal training, respondent status, winning percentages of each school in the study, school hierarchy according to winning percentage, and respondent number into categories, and subsequently keying all data onto a disk. The disk containing that data was used to yield the correlational analyses shown in the tables in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

It was proposed that the percent of wins by the head coach would be related to his consideration or initiation styles of leadership or to the other variables of the principal and assistant coach. The data with respect to these variables are reported in the order of the hypotheses. The overall results show that the variation in the percent of wins among the coaches is not related to their consideration or initiation styles of leadership or to the other variables.

Hypothesis I states that there is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and his leadership style. The data with respect to variation in percent of winning by head coaches and mean scores on leadership style are shown in Table 2. In the table the mean scores vary 2.00 to 3.00 points. The calculated F probability value is .70 which is above the .05 level of significance. Hence, the variation in the mean leadership score is about the same and not significantly different at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis II states that there is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and consideration. The data with respect to variation in percent of winning by head coaches and mean scores on consideration are shown in Table 3. In the table the mean scores vary 39.00 to 43.33. The calculated F probability value is .43
which is above the .05 level of significance. Hence, the variation in
the mean consideration score is about the same and not significantly
different at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

TABLE 2
PERCENT OF WINNING BY LEADERSHIP STYLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT WINNING GROUP</th>
<th>PERSON COUNT</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78.0000</td>
<td>4.5826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82.0833</td>
<td>8.2952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78.5556</td>
<td>9.3956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82.0000</td>
<td>8.0994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82.2727</td>
<td>12.0921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.8571</td>
<td>9.8222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.6667</td>
<td>8.2624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80.6667</td>
<td>9.2716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F PROBABILITY: .7033

HYPOTHESIS 1 - There is no significant difference between the head
football coach's win/loss record and his leadership style.

EXPLANATION OF TABLE 2.

Schools were grouped according to their winning percentages, and
there were three persons participating from each school. Group 1
contained one school with three persons responding to the questionnaire
while Groups 4, 6, and 7 each contained two schools with a total of six
persons responding to the questionnaire. Group 4 contained three
schools which had nine persons responding while Group 2 and Group 5
contained four schools with a total of 12 persons responding.
The winning percentages which defined each are as follows:

Group 1 won 10%; Group 2 won 40%; Group 3 won 50-55%; Group 4 won 60%; Group 5 won 67-73%; Group 6 won 77-80%; and Group 7 won 92-93% of their games.

CONCLUSION OF FINDINGS IN TABLE 2.

The mean scores on leadership style shown here only vary 2.00 to 3.00 points. The calculated F probability is .70 which is above the .05 level of significance. Since the variation in the mean leadership score is about the same, there is no significant difference between winning and leadership style.

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: PERCENT WINNING
BY LEADER CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT WINNING GROUP</th>
<th>PERSON COUNT</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.0000</td>
<td>3.6056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.3333</td>
<td>4.2923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.0000</td>
<td>5.8523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41.5000</td>
<td>5.7184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.5455</td>
<td>6.5934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.5714</td>
<td>4.7909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.8333</td>
<td>5.3821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.9259</td>
<td>5.4283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F PROBABILITY: .4307

HYPOTHESIS 2 - There is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and consideration.
EXPLANATION OF TABLE 3.

Schools were grouped according to their winning percentages and there were three persons participating from each school. Group 1 contained one school with three persons responding to the questionnaire while Groups 4, 6 and 7 each contained two schools with a total of six persons responding to the questionnaire. Group 4 contained three schools which had nine persons responding while Group 2 and Group 5 contained four schools with a total of 12 persons responding.

The winning percentages which defined each are as follows: Group 1 won 10%; Group 2 won 40%; Group 3 won 50-55%; Group 4 won 60%; Group 5 won 67-73%; Group 6 won 77-80%; and Group 7 won 92-93% of their games.

CONCLUSION OF FINDINGS IN TABLE 3.

The mean scores on consideration vary 39.00 to 43.33. The calculated F probability is .43 which is above the .05 level of significance. Since the variation in the mean consideration score is about the same, there is no significant difference between a consideration leadership style and winning.
Hypothesis III states that there is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and initiation. The data with respect to variations in percent of winning by head coaches and mean scores on initiation are shown in Table 4. In the table the mean scores vary 39.00 to 41.72. The calculated F probability value is .60 which is above the .05 level of significance. Hence, the variation in the mean initiation score is about the same and not significantly different at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Correlation Analysis

When the mean scores on initiation and consideration were used to test the hypotheses, there were no significant differences with the percent of wins. Mean scores are the average for the group, and individual variation is suppressed. If the individual variation on consideration and initiation is correlated with the percent of wins, a logical question is: Would there be any significant relationships? Further, would the age, the teaching experience, further training, and status of the respondents (whether principal, head coach, or assistant coach) make a significant relationship to winning by the head coach?

The data with respect to these variables are shown in the correlation matrix (Table 5). In the correlation matrix consideration is correlated with wins by -.04931 while initiation has a much higher correlation of .084. However, both correlations are not significant at the .05 level since they are not higher than .231 which is the probability level. Similarly, age, teaching experience, formal training, and
status of the respondents are not significantly related to winning.

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: PERCENT WINNING BY LEADER INITIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENT WINNING GROUP</th>
<th>PERSON COUNT</th>
<th>INITIATION MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.0000</td>
<td>2.6458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7500</td>
<td>4.6539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.5556</td>
<td>4.9526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.5000</td>
<td>3.7283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.7273</td>
<td>6.1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.2857</td>
<td>5.4072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.8333</td>
<td>3.3714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39.7407</td>
<td>4.8299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F PROBABILITY: .6014

HYPOTHESIS 3 - There is no significance difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and initiation.

EXPLANATION OF TABLE 4.

Schools were grouped according to their winning percentages, and there were three persons participating from each school. Group 1 contained one school with three persons responding to the questionnaire while Groups 4, 6, and 7 each contained two schools with a total of six persons responding to the questionnaire. Group 4 contained three schools which had nine persons responding while Group 2 and Group 5 contained four schools with a total of 12 persons responding.

The winning percentages which defined each are as follows: Group 1 won 10%; Group 2 won 40%; Group 3 won 50-55%; Group 4 won 60%;
Group 5 won 67-73%; Group 6 won 77-80%; and Group 7 won 92-93% of their games.

CONCLUSION OF FINDINGS IN TABLE 4.

The mean scores on the Initiation mean vary 39.00 to 41.72. The F probability value is .60 which is above the .05 level of significance. Since the variation in the mean initiation score is about the same, there is no significant difference between initiation leadership style and winning.

Factor Analysis

In the correlation matrix initiation was closely related to winning although it was not significant. Therefore, the researcher investigated whether initiation would be placed in the same group as wins because of its close relationship in the correlation matrix. The method chosen to test this relationship was factor analysis, because factor analysis placed the variables in commonalities or bonding when they are interacting simultaneously. The data are shown in Table 6.
# TABLE 5

## CORRELATION MATRIX OF PERCENT WINNING AND OTHER VARIABLES

![Image](image-url)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>INITIATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TEACHING EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>FORMAL TRAINING</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>WINNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIATION</td>
<td>.63255</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.18282</td>
<td>.07548</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>.26658</td>
<td>.19969</td>
<td>.23473</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMAL TRAINING</td>
<td>.16574</td>
<td>.18703</td>
<td>.39825</td>
<td>.54974</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>.16870</td>
<td>.28914</td>
<td>-.09829</td>
<td>.04422</td>
<td>-.23693</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINNING</td>
<td>-.04931</td>
<td>.08393</td>
<td>.04433</td>
<td>.10120</td>
<td>-.09103</td>
<td>-.01253</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probability at .05 Level = .231 (N=50)

**CONCLUSION OF FINDINGS IN TABLE 5.**

While Consideration and Initiation show high correlations with the other variables, both Consideration and Initiation have correlations of -.04931 and .8393, respectively, with winning which are not significant at the .05 level.
TABLE 6
FACTOR ANALYSIS OF PERCENT OF WINS
AND ALL OTHER VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FACTOR I</th>
<th>FACTOR II</th>
<th>FACTOR III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training</td>
<td>.87063</td>
<td>.00847</td>
<td>-.14875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>.70511</td>
<td>.23662</td>
<td>.15314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.65957</td>
<td>-.00052</td>
<td>.04069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>.17392</td>
<td>.84857</td>
<td>.06710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.27469</td>
<td>.78937</td>
<td>-.10727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>-.36388</td>
<td>.62763</td>
<td>.05096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning</td>
<td>.03029</td>
<td>-.00030</td>
<td>.98784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HYPOTHESIS 3 - The factors of age, teaching experience, further training, and status of the respondents have significant relationship to the coach's win/loss record.

CONCLUSION OF FINDINGS IN TABLE 6.

This factor analysis places all variables in commonalities. Formal training, teaching experience, and age are placed in Factor I because of their high loading as shown by the correlation coefficient in Table 5. Initiation, consideration, and status are placed in Factor II because of their lower loading as shown by the correlation coefficient in Table 5. Winning, however, is placed in Factor III, because it is independent of variables in both Factor I and Factor II with a correlation coefficient loading of .98784.
In the table the variables, formal training, teaching experience, and age, are placed in Factor I because of their high loading as shown by the correlation coefficient. Initiation, consideration, and status are placed in Factor II because of their lower loading rate than in Factor I and III. However, winning is placed in Factor III, because it is independent of both Factor I and II, and it has a correlation coefficient loading of .98784.

Data Interpretation

Overall in the findings of this study, all of the hypotheses were accepted and further analysis of correlation of analysis showed a slight, but insignificant relationship between initiation and winning. However, in the factor analysis winning was placed independently of all other variables.

The attempt to explain winning by the leadership characteristics of the coach did not produce significant results. Since there were variations in winning (10%-93%), these wins and losses have to be explained by other factors. The most probable explanation may lie in the talent of the players. Team A with a winning percentage of 10 had a very small squad of players (23) who were not too talented or experienced. Conversely, Team B, with a winning percentage of 93, had these advantages: (1) they had a large squad of players (55) who were powerfully built; (2) they had a lot of talent in various positions; and (3) they had a high experience level. Further, there were other situational factors. For example, the school which won only 10% of its games had a new head coach who had no previous relationship with his
players nor his coaching staff, whereas the coach that won 93% of the games had a veteran head coach and veteran players, and his assistant coaches had been with him for a minimum of five years.

Another probable major reason is that the players are more influenced by the head coach's behavior than the principal and assistant coaches. Therefore, their opinion about the leadership behavior of the head coach might have made a difference in their winning or losing. Further studies are required to investigate these probable variables as influencing winning.

Summary

This chapter included a summarization of the null hypotheses between winning and leadership style: consideration and initiation. The analysis of variance showed no significant relationship between winning and each of the variables presented. Correlational and factor analysis also produced no significant relationship between winning, the leadership variables, and the characteristics of the respondents. Several reasons were suggested as to the probable causes of winning such as the talent of the players on their own, the situational factors, and the leadership behavior of the head coaches. It is suggested that these other factors should be examined in further studies.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This investigation was based on the premise that variations in winning among different schools are dependent on the nature of the leadership style of the head football coach for that school. It was theorized that there is a directly proportionate relationship between the winning records of a football team and the leadership style of the head football coach.

Research in the area of leadership suggests that leadership is a direct use of influence and power in a relationship where one has been allowed the right to lead and others have agreed to be led. This premise is the case whether the leader is appointed or emerges from the group as the leader.

The literature exposes two distinct categories of leadership styles: (1) a people-oriented dimension and (2) a task-oriented dimension. While the terminology describing these dimensions varies somewhat in the literature, many researchers have accepted the premise that they parallel the constructs of Consideration and Initiation which were identified in research in the 1950's.

This study revealed a Consideration leadership construct to be one where friendship, mutual trust, respect for, and warmth toward the subordinate is demonstrated. The Initiation construct, on the other hand, was reported to delineate the relationship between the leader and the members of the group and to determine the effectiveness of that
relationship as the leader established patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done.

The literature indicated that, while it is important for leaders to remember the human element in their positions (Consideration), in many situations a task-oriented leader is needed to get the job done (Initiation). The answer to the approach may be situational or contingent upon pre-existing or developing factors.

The researcher's purpose was to determine which leadership style was most predictive of winning football games. To investigate this question empirically, the study was conducted using a correlational type of descriptive research design. Results from the assessment of 54 respondents to items on the LBDQ were collected and evaluated. All data were subjected to factor analysis and correlations.

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and his leadership style. This hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis II. There is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and consideration. This hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis III. There is no significant difference between the head football coach's win/loss record and initiation. This hypothesis was accepted.

Findings

The findings presented in the correlation matrix provided evidence that while Initiation had a much higher correlation to winning, .084,
than Consideration at -.04931, both of the correlations were not significant at the .05 level.

A factor analysis of winning showed it to be independent of Consideration and Initiation. Winning had a correlation coefficient loading of .98784 and shared no commonalities with any of the other variables.

Conclusions

Based on the results analyzed in Chapter V, the conclusions reached are presented below.

Since each of the hypotheses formulated for this study was accepted, leadership style is not believed to affect the winning percentage of secondary football coaches. Winners are winners, and losers are losers for some other reasons outside of the variables presented in this study.

Limitations

This study had four limitations which affect the findings and conclusions mentioned above. They are presented below:

1. Team members did not complete the LBDQ. The opinions of the team members may well have yielded different results from those received from the status groups.

2. The study did not control for other variables such as: (a) squad size; (b) squad number; (c) the tenure of the head coach
with the team; and (d) the tenure of the assistant coaches with the team.

3. The percentage of players who participated in other sports besides football may be a factor which affects their performance in football.

4. An evaluation of player talent at each key position may reveal that player personnel needs repositioning.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Team members should be participants in rating the head coach on the LBDQ along with members of the status groups identified in this study.

2. Controls that take into consideration other factors not treated in this study should be included. Some of the other factors which should be studied are: (a) squad size; (b) physical condition of the team (prowess); (c) number of players on the teams; (d) tenure of the head coach and the assistants; (e) cross-sport participation of football players; and (f) player talent.

3. The study should be conducted over a longer period of time to encompass more than one football season.

Studies which would incorporate the above recommendations would provide additional insight and knowledge concerning winning and
leadership styles as well as attitudes and other dynamics which affect them both.
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LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

Name of Leader Being Described

Name of Group Which He/She Leads

Your Name

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

1. Does personal favors for group members. A B C D E
2. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group. A B C D E
3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
4. Tries out his/her new ideas with the group. A B C D E
5. Acts as the real leader of the group. A B C D E
6. Is easy to understand. A B C D E
7. Rules with an iron hand. A B C D E
8. Finds time to listen to group members. A B C D E
9. Criticizes poor work. A B C D E
10. Gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E
11. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned. A B C D E
12. Keeps to himself/herself. A B C D E
13. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members. A B C D E
14. Assigns group members to particular tasks. A B C D E
15. Is the spokesperson of the group. A B C D E
16. Schedules the work to be done. A B C D E
17. Maintains definite standards of performance. A B C D E
18. Refuses to explain his/her actions. A B C D E
19. Keeps the group informed.
20. Acts without consulting the group.
21. Backs up the members in their actions.
22. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.
23. Treats all group members as his/her equals.
24. Encourages the use of uniform procedures.
25. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.
26. Is willing to make changes.
27. Makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members.
28. Is friendly and approachable.
29. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
30. Fails to take necessary action.
31. Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.
32. Lets group members know what is expected of them.
33. Speaks as the representative of the group.
34. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
35. Sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.
36. Lets other people take away his/her leadership in the group.
37. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members.
38. Gets group approval in important matters before going ahead.
39. Sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.
40. Keeps the group working together as a team.
41. What is your age group?
   A  B  C  D  E
   20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60 or over
42. Teaching Experience: (include present year)
   A  B  C  D  E
   1-7 8-14 15-21 22-28 29 and over
43. Formal Training:
   A  B  C
   Bachelors  Masters  Graduate work beyond
               Master's Degree