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ABSTRACT

SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY: A FIELD TEST

OF FOOTBALL COACHING IN THE

SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO SECONDARY SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION

by

Paul Henry Cochrane McMillan

The purpose of this study was to determine whether
the leadership effectiveness of football coaches is affected
by the degree of congruence between the variables leadership
style (S) and task-relevant ability (P).

A unique methodological approach, the Vertical Dyad
Design was incorporated to analyze the data yielded from
the instrumentation process. One hundred and fifteen
coach/player dyads were returned, representing an 87%
participation rate. The coaches were tapped for their
perception of the player's "task-relevant ability" utilizing
the Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APPA). The player's
were tapped for their perception of the coach's leadership
style and leadership effectiveness by the Coaching Style,
Coaching Appraisal instruments respectively.

Through analysis of variance (ONE-WAY and TWO-WAY),
it was revealed that Situational Leadership Theory was not
upheld in the high school football environment. Specifically,
it was found that: (1) leadership style did have a perceived
significant effect, contrary to SLT postulation; (2) where
the congruence match was 'ideal' the coach was not perceived

ii
as more effective than the 'non-ideal' matches; (3) coach's leadership effectiveness is not influenced by the degree of congruence; and, (4) in the quadrants where the coach was classified as having an 'ideal' leadership style by the rating player, he was not perceived to be more effective than coaches with other leadership styles.

Further analysis through the student's 't' test proved conclusively that, player's regardless of "task-relevant ability" perceived their coach as more effective if he exhibited a HIGH RELATIONSHIP [High Task/High Relationship (S2) or High Relationship/Low Task (S3)] leadership style. Furthermore, player's who perceived their coach as having a High Task/High Relationship (S2) leadership style, rated them as significantly more effective than coaches with other leadership styles.

The results of this study offered little support for the application of Situational Leadership Theory in the high school football environment. However, this study did lend support to the findings of studies authored by Chelladurai (1978), Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) and Bird (1978). A definite link has been established identifying the coach to be perceived as 'most effective' in the high school situation when a HIGH RELATIONSHIP, and more specifically, a High Task/High Relationship (S2) leadership style is exhibited. This link will help to guide further, investigation in the coaching realm.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

History has seen leadership research encompass the efforts of many, in an attempt to differentiate both its process and function. Stogdill, in his *Handbook of Leadership* (1974) demonstrated the complexity of leadership by devoting an entire chapter to the, "Definitions of Leadership". This comprehensive review forwarded various definitions ranging from a focus of group process to the initiation of structure (Stogdill, 1974: 7-16).

A review of leadership research reveals that most authors agree leadership to be the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation (Barrow, 1976; Ryckman and Daniel, 1978; Green and Nebeker, 1979). In Sherif and Sherif (1956), Piedler implies that leadership is the, function of leader-follower relations, the relative power of the leader to enforce sanctions, and the structure of the task ... as well as leader style. The leadership process thus can be seen as a function of the leader, the follower and other situational variables (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977).

Relating specifically to the sport environment Bondy (1970) defined leadership in terms of goal setting,
problem solving and goal achievement activities.

Bagley (1975) defined leadership "as an interpersonal situation in which one individual has influence over the other members of the group for the purpose of performing an assigned task (Bagley, 1975: 100)."

Sage (1973) indicated that for most American sports teams, the coach is viewed as the leader. The interpersonal relations between the coach and athlete constitute a very unique social relationship. Argyle and Kendon (1975) have noted that social encounters between individuals may be viewed as social performances which, in the same fashion as motor performances, may or may not be skilled. Sage further supported the leadership interactive process by stating:

"... that while it is not really known to what extent the success or failure of a team is due to the leadership competencies of the coach, there is little doubt that leadership is an important variable in team performance (Sage, 1973: 35)."

Carron and Chelladurai (1978), through an interpretation of the Lewinian model of behavior as a product of the person and the environment, suggested the coach's interpersonal behavior to be a product of three sets of forces:

1. situational or environmental;
2. the athlete's personality, preferences, need dispositions; and,
3. the coach's own personality, preferences, and need dispositions (Carron and Chelladurai, 1978: 44).
Therefore within any team concept there is the possibility of having a multitude of differing coach/player interactions. This study proposes to examine through Situational Leadership Theory (SLT), the relationship within the coach/player dyad and its resultant effect upon the perceived effectiveness of the coaches' ability to lead as rated by the player.

**Definition of Terms**

Situational Leadership Theory has evolved from extensive research and is based on the amount of direction (task behavior) and the amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader must provide given the situation and 'the level of maturity' of the follower or group.

**Task Behavior**

"... the extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavouring to establish well defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977: 103-4)."

**Relationship Behavior**

"... the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socio-emotional support, 'psychological strokes' and facilitating behaviors (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977: 104)."
Leadership Style

"... refers to the behavior pattern that the coach exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others as perceived by those others (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977: 103).

Leadership Style is operationalized as the most frequent score on the task-relationship aggregate of the Coaching Style instrument.

Task-Relevant Ability

Task-relevant ability is a reconceptualization of Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) 'task-relevant maturity' incorporating psychological and expertise dimensions. The psychological dimension assimilates the maturity criteria by representing the individual's motivation and willingness to perform a task. The expertise dimension represents the individual's ability to perform a given task.

Operationally, 'task-relevant ability' is defined as the Performance Quotient (PQ), which is measured by the Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APPA) instrument. Boucher (1980) identified the four levels as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_1 & \quad \text{Low} \\
P_2 & \quad \text{Moderate Low} \\
P_3 & \quad \text{Moderate High} \\
P_4 & \quad \text{High} \quad \text{(Boucher, 1980: 7)}
\end{align*}
\]

Congruence

This will represent the 'match' between the leader style and task-relevant ability as hypothesized by Hersey and Blanchard's SLT Model. As the task-relevant
ability of one's follower(s) develops along the continuum from Low ($P_1$) to High ($P_4$), the appropriate style of leadership is postulated to move accordingly, simulating a curvilinear relationship. Congruence represents the 'parallelness' between leader style and task-relevant ability, and is a function of the difference between task-relevant ability ($P$) and leadership style ($S$).

**Leader Effectiveness**

The effectiveness of a leader behavior style depends upon the situation in which it is used, and it follows that any of the basic styles may be effective or ineffective depending upon the situation. The difference between the effective and ineffective styles is often not the actual behavior of the leader but the appropriateness of this behavior to the environment in which it is used (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977).

Effectiveness will be measured by an adapted form of the Boucher Leadership Effectiveness Appraisal Form (LEA) (1980), called the Coaching Appraisal instrument. Effective leadership is defined as:

the total score of the nine dimensions of the Coaching Appraisal, of which the players perceive their coach as being primarily responsible for achieving group objectives as identified by those dimensions.

**Senior Football Team**

Consists of players who perform in the three affiliated senior leagues (Essex County Secondary Schools
Association ECSSA, Kent County Secondary Schools Association
KCSSA, and Windsor Secondary Schools Association WSSA) of
the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association
SWOSSA.

Background to the Problem

The impetus of leadership research in the past has
generally followed two areas of concentration. First, there
is the Ohio State leadership thrust which emphasized the two
orthogonal dimensions of 'Initiating Structure' and
'Consideration'. Initiating structure relates to the leader
clearly defining his/her role and letting the follower know
what is expected of them, while, consideration directly
reflects the well-being, status and recognition of the
follower. Secondly, the other research focus seems to have
concentrated on the attempt of establishing a contingency,
path-goal approach to leadership. That is, the leader
provides a path to obtain the necessary and desired goal.
Important in the above statements is the failure of these
research thrusts to delineate and deal with the performance
factor of the subordinate.

Situational Leadership Theory (SLT) as posited by
Hersey and Blanchard (1977) combines the 'Structure' and
'Consideration' dimensions of the Ohio State Studies
(Stogdill and Coons, 1957) with the Maturity-Immaturity
Theory of Argyris (1965). The resultant tri-dimensional
model extends the Ohio State four quadrant two dimensional
model integrating an effectiveness dimension. This effectiveness dimension is seen as the environment in which the leader is operating. (see Figure 1, 2)

The Ohio State study dimensions of 'Initiating Structure' and 'Consideration' are synonymous with Hersey and Blanchard's terms 'Task Behavior' and 'Relationship Behavior'. The essence of this theory revolves around the interplay among:

1. the amount of leadership direction;

2. the amount of socio-emotional support provided by the leader; and,

3. the "maturity" level that followers exhibit in a specific task (Boucher, 1980: 13).

The level of maturity is determined by an individual's ability to (a) set high but attainable goals; (b) the willingness and ability to take responsibility; (c) the education and/or experience relevant to the task at hand; and, (d) the general concept of maturity based on the ability and technical knowledge to do the task, in addition to the self-confidence to perform the required task (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977: 162-3).

Situational Leadership Theory holds that as the subordinates' maturity increases, leader behavior should be characterized by a decreasing emphasis on task structuring behaviors and an increasing emphasis on consideration type behaviors. As maturity continues to increase, there should be an eventual decrease in
Figure 1: The Ohio State Leadership Model

SOURCE: Ohio State Quadrants developed by the Ohio State Leadership Studies, Center for Business and Economic Research, College of Administrative Science, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Figure 2: Situational Leadership Theory

consideration used (Barrow, 1977: 236). Thus the theory revolves on the appropriateness or effectiveness of leadership styles according to the task-relevant maturity of the followers (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977: 164). Hersey and Blanchard consequently put forth a conceptual framework for appropriate leadership styles to be used as followers move from immaturity to maturity. The appropriate leadership style (style of leader) for given levels of follower maturity is portrayed by a curvilinear relationship in the four quadrants of leadership. In all instances the "maturity" that is referred to is in relationship to the task to be performed; therefore, in terms of follower maturity, it is not simply a question of being mature or immature, but a question of the degree. The Leadership Model appears in Figure 3.

**Statement of the Problem**

The situational leadership model posits a corresponding match between perceived leadership style of the leader by the follower (S), and the perceived task-relevant ability of the follower by the leader (P) in the leader/follower dyad, to determine effectiveness.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree to which congruence between perceived leadership style of the leader/coach (S), and the perceived task-relevant ability of the follower/player (P), will determine effectiveness of senior football coaches affiliated with
Figure 3: Situational Leadership Theory
(Incomplete Model)

the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association
(SWOSSA).

**Importance of the Study**

The search for a more thorough understanding of leadership effectiveness has been hampered by such methodological and conceptual problems as: neglect of many situational variables influential in leadership effectiveness; lack of precision in defining criteria of effectiveness; oversimplification of leadership; and propensity to express leadership findings in binary terms, e.g. effective/ineffective, high/low consideration or initiating structure (Barrow, 1977: 237).

Hersey and Blanchard have attempted to develop a conceptual model that enables an effective leadership style to be identified. By examining the leader/follower (coach/player) dyad within the football environment, findings of an implicative nature for the coach/practitioner may be discovered. The coach/player dyad methodology is part of a growing awareness that studies based on group rather than individual performance measures might not bear the same relationship to leader behavior as would individual measures (Boucher, 1980).

Recent SLT studies have found conflicting results, and the reason for such varied reports may have been influenced by methodological problems experienced by the researchers. The current study will operationalize "task-relevant maturity" differently to handle some of these problems. (see Chapter II, III)

Little has been done in the sporting athletic environment, especially using the unique coach/player
methodology. This study holds unlimited potential for the practising coach as to how he may be perceived as most effective, by his players in the football setting.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the leadership effectiveness of football coaches is affected by the degree of congruence between the variables leadership style (S) and task-relevant ability (P). In other words, the conceptual framework of Situational Leadership Theory is being investigated within a selected specific sport environment, the football team. Therefore the main research hypothesis studied is:

\[ H_1 \text{ - Leadership effectiveness of football coaches will co-vary with the congruence match between the coaches' leadership style (S) and the players' task-relevant ability (P).} \]

The degree of congruence between leadership style (S) and task-relevant ability (P) will be directly related to the perceived effectiveness rating. Consequently, it is postulated the greater the difference between task-relevant ability and leadership style, the lower the effectiveness rating should be. Conversely, the smaller the difference the higher the effectiveness rating should be. Figure 4 demonstrates an effectiveness rating based on the Degree of Congruence (C). Congruence 4 (C₄), represents the ideal match between perceived leadership style (S) and perceived task-relevant ability C(P). At the other end of the continuum, perceived leadership style (S) is three degrees
Figure 4: Effectiveness Rating by Degree of Congruency (C)

*represents an 'ideal' match
from the perceived task-relevant ability \((P)\), \((e.g., S_4 - P_1)\); represents the least congruent match and has a **Congruence 1** \((C_1)\) rating. The theory presents that effectiveness should be highest when the greatest degree of congruence exists between leadership style and task-relevant ability. Figure 5, emphasizes the ideal matches \((C_4)\) for each cell. Therefore the best matches are represented by \(S_1 - P_1, S_2 - P_2, S_3 - P_3, S_4 - P_4\). As a result the following hypotheses were also tested.

- **H02** - The effectiveness rating of coaches classified as **High Task/Low Relationship** \((S_1)\), by players classified as \(P_1\), will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles \((S_2, S_3, S_4)\).

- **H03** - Coaches classified as **High Task/Low Relationship** \((S_1)\) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as \(P_1\), than coaches with other leadership styles \((S_2, S_3, S_4)\).

- **H04** - The effectiveness rating of coaches classified as **High Relationship/Low Task** \((S_4)\), by players classified as \(P_4\), will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles \((S_1, S_2, S_3)\).

- **H05** - Coaches classified as **High Relationship/Low Task** \((S_4)\) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as \(P_4\), than coaches with other leadership styles \((S_1, S_2, S_3)\).
Figure 5: Leadership Style and Task-Relevant Ability Ideal Match Relationship

$H_{05}$ - The effectiveness rating of coaches classified as Low Relationship/Low Task ($S_4$), by players classified as $P_4$, will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles ($S_1$, $S_2$, $S_3$).

$H_{A5}$ - Coaches classified as Low Relationship/Low Task ($S_4$) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as $P_4$, than coaches with other leadership styles ($S_1$, $S_2$, $S_3$).

Limitations of the Study

This study has been limited to:

1. Coaches and football teams affiliated with the Associations of the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association (SWOSSA).

2. By the 'ex post facto' nature of the collection of the data on leadership (there is no direct experimental manipulation-control used by the experimenter).

3. By the measure of leader style ($S$), where the coach's perceived leadership style ($S$) is rated as the most frequent score on the Coaching Style instrument.

4. The selection of the six participating players based on experience, by the participating coaches.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will emphasize the literature considered to be imperative to the development of the study, and is divided into four main sections:

(1) The Evolution of Leadership Theory including (a) Leader Behavior Theories, (b) Situational and Reciprocal Causation Theories, (c) Leadership Effectiveness Theories, and, (d) Normative Leadership Theories; (2) Evaluation of Subordinate Performance; (3) Evaluation of Leadership Effectiveness; (4) Sport Related Literature; and, (5) Summary.

Evolution of Leadership Theory

Early attempts to delineate the essence of leadership focused on the personality characteristics of successful leaders. This 'great man' theory of leadership assumed that the individual achievements of great persons were the causal factors of progress (Carlyle, 1910). Thus many studies were designed to determine the leader's intellectual, social, emotional, physical, and personal make-up to discover if there existed universal traits to distinguish effective leaders from non-effective leaders.
Dowd (1936), as paraphrased by Fiedler (1974) maintained that:

"... there is no such thing as leadership by the masses. The individuals in every society possess different degrees of intelligence, energy, and moral force, and in whatever direction the masses may be influenced to go, they are always led by the superior few (Fiedler, 1974: 17)."

However Gibb (1954) refuted Dowd's comment indicating that the numerous studies of leaders had failed to find any consistent pattern of traits which characterize leaders.

As evidence relating to the 'great man' approach accumulated, it became evident that its closed system orientation could not be empirically supported. Analysis of the research indicated:

1. little success had been attained in attempts to select leaders in terms of traits;
2. that numerous traits differentiated leaders from followers;
3. that numerous traits demanded in a leader varied from one situation to another; and,
4. that the trait approach ignored the interaction between the leader and his group (Stogdill, 1974: 128).

Thus the general belief that all leaders had identical and similar trait dispositions was refuted. No longer did theorists support the tendency to expect a leader to be effective, regardless of the situation.

**Leader Behavior Theories**

The demise of the 'great man' approach to leadership shifted the emphasis from personality characteristics of the
leader to an investigation of what the leader actually does. As a result, to help establish a satisfactory theory of leadership, the Ohio State Center for Leadership Studies was founded under the direction of Carol Shartle.

Hemphill and Coons (1957), after extensive research developed the first form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), consisting of 150 items (ranked into nine hypothetical subscales). Halpin and Winer (1957), through extensive factor analytic design, produced two orthogonal dimensions of leader behavior identified as 'Consideration' and 'Initiation of Structure in Interaction'. It was found that the items and the subscales composed of the items, factored to measure two of the most important patterns of behavior, rather than nine, as originally hypothesized.

Further investigation resulted in a 40 item form to measure the two subscales of 'Consideration' and 'Initiating Structure' (Halpin, 1957). In addition, the 'Ideal LBDQ' (Hemphill, Seigel and Westie, 1951) and the 'Leadership Opinion Questionnaire' (Fleischman, 1957) were developed for measurement of expectancies about what a leader ought to do.

Research was initiated using these developed questionnaires to investigate the orthogonal dimensions of 'Initiating Structure' and 'Consideration'. Besco and Lawshe (1959) found that the relative effectiveness of foremen, as rated by superiors, was significantly related to
their consideration as described by both superiors and subordinates. Greenfield and Andrews (1961) suggested that the consideration and structure of teachers, positively related to the scores their pupils achieved on tests. Fleischman and Simmons (1970) went further indicating leaders to be rated as more effective when they scored high on both dimensions as ranked by the follower. Therefore from the perspective of the follower, 'Consideration' and 'Initiating Structure' interact to determine the perception of their leader's effectiveness.

Comparable to the leadership research at Ohio State, the Survey Research Center of University of Michigan investigated the relationships between working groups and their supervisors in varied settings. Kahn and Katz (1960) reported four reasons as to why high producing-groups differ from low-producing ones:

1. **Role Differentiation**—supervisors in high-producing groups typically do not perform the same tasks as do rank-and-file workers;

2. **Less Close Supervision**—close supervision reduces a worker's sense of independence, and thus his motivation;

3. **Employee-oriented**—in contrast to 'production-oriented' supervisors, 'high production' supervisors give serious attention to matters of employee motivation; and,

4. **Cohesion**—high-production group members showed a greater cohesiveness and pride in their jobs than the members of other groups.

Cartwright and Zander (1960) expanded on the basic two dimensions of the Michigan research, 'employee
orientation' and 'production orientation', and interpreted them as leader behavior dimensions of 'group maintenance' and 'group achievement' functions. Therefore the dimensions being investigated by the University of Michigan closely simulated those identified by the Ohio State studies. Consequently, the essence of behavior investigations increased the understanding of the process of leadership, but did little to distinguish what constituted effective leadership behavior.

Situational and Reciprocal Causation Theories

In an effort to provide a more 'open systems' approach, researchers began to investigate situational factors that may influence leader behavior. Stogdill and Hemphill (1949) postulated the situational approach to leadership to be understood as a product of the environment within which that particular leader behavior is exhibited. Efforts therefore were directed toward the work situation and the leader to determine the influence of this interaction upon leader effectiveness.

As a result a multitude of studies found a number of variables from the external environment to act upon leader behavior, mainly (1) subordinate behavior, (2) complexity of the task, (3) type of task, (4) technology of the task, (5) size of the task, (6) leader's style, (7) group influence and norms, (8) span of control, (9) external threat and stress,
(10) time demands, (11) organizational size, and, (12) organizational climate (Katzell, Barrett and Porter, 1961; Kipnis and Cosentino, 1969; Lanzetta and Hannah, 1969; Giselli and Siegel, 1972). Effective leadership therefore represented an axiom that was terribly difficult to pin-point.

Effective leadership can be explained in terms of a mutual influence process wherein an optimal ratio of benefits to costs for both leader and subordinates is achieved toward set goals (Barrow, 1977: 237). Effectiveness is a function of the leader's situational sensitivity and ability to adapt to changing conditions.

The effective manager then must be able, not only to respond differently to different individuals, but must himself be flexible enough to change with them as they and the situation change (Rubin and Goldman, 1968: 153).

Hollander and Julian (1969) indicated that the leader fulfills certain expectations held by subordinates, and subordinates reciprocate with performance and esteem for the leader. Chelladurai and Carron (1979) further supplemented this argument by inferring leadership, the exerting of influence, to occur either through the behavior of leaders or the resultant behavior of their subordinate.

The leader/subordinate interactive process often relates to leadership style as perceived by the subordinate. Hill in 1973, attempting to learn if subordinates perceive that their leaders would use the same style of leadership
for a variety of problems, found that, from the subordinate's view-point, managers can exhibit some kind of flexibility thus obviating the need to either replace the manager as the situation changes or to modify the situation. This flexible or adaptable approach (changing to the situation) sharply contrasts the leader behavior investigations of a universally optimal leadership style for all situations (Hollander and Julian, 1969; Marcus and House, 1973; Tannenbaum, Kallejian and Weschler, 1954).

Leadership Effectiveness Theories

Empirically tested theories of leadership effectiveness postulate complex interactions between numerous variables. Characteristic of this orientation is the assumption that a particular leadership style, used in the appropriate situation, will result in greater effectiveness than other leadership styles.

Fiedler's "Contingency Model of Leader Effectiveness" (1967), was one of the first situational theories to be advanced. This theory posits a contingent relationship between leadership performance and leadership measure referred to as the esteem for the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC). The resulting measured leadership style is then empirically developed, based on situational favorability which is classified by the use of three dichotomous dimensions:

1. the degree to which there are positive
feelings in the group (Group Atmosphere, GA);

2. the amount of structure in the task (Task Structure, TS); and,

3. the leader's power as a function of his position (Position Power, PP).

These three elements combine to form eight octants. Octant one (positive GA; high TS; high PP) is the most favorable and octant eight (negative GA; low TS; low PP) least favorable for the leader. Figure 6, the empirical model, postulates that low LPC leaders (task-oriented) will perform best in either very favorable or very unfavorable situations, and that high LPC leaders (interpersonal oriented) will perform better in situations which are intermediate in favorability.

Fiedler (1961) originally viewed LPC as a leadership trait or style measure, with high LPC leaders being interpersonally oriented and low LPC leaders task oriented. However, substantial empirical support did not exist for this interpretation, Fiedler therefore re-oriented his position toward a motivational synopsis (Fiedler, 1973).

Fiedler argued that LPC is a motivational index which corresponds to the leader's hierarchy of goals. The index consists of a primary and secondary matrix of goal establishment, allowing the leader to pursue his/her secondary goals upon satisfaction of the primary goals. Therefore, for the high LPC leader, interpersonal relations are primary and prominent, and self-enhancement (gained
Figure 6: Fiedler's Cube (eight octants)

through task-relevant behavior) are secondary. Conversely, for the low LPC leader, task accomplishment is a primary goal and good interpersonal relations are a secondary goal. Green and Nebeker (1976) supported this hierarchy when they found that in an unfavorable situation, the high LPC leader reliably engaged in considerate behavior in an attempt to cope. Conversely, the low LPC leader tended to initiate structure.

The Green and Nebeker study emphasizes the factor which moderates the behavior of the leader, that is the threat inherent in the situation and the concomitant stress to the leader (Fiedler, 1972). Therefore, it would seem reasonable that situations which threaten and stress the leader, as supported by Green and Nebeker, would cause him/her initially to seek the primary goals of his motivational schema.

Concerning strategies of leadership, Fiedler (1967) maintained the leader can be trained to modify interpersonal attitudes. However, a more practical approach would involve the training of leaders to diagnose the group-task situation and adopt the strategy which will capitalize on their particular leadership style, or, for tasks which increase their structure over time, deploy leader behavioral style ranging from that of democratic to an autocratic role. Thus, leadership style in this functioning contingency model is represented by the task-
person oriented dimensions and situational favorableness.

Whereas Fiedler's focus was on the leader's motivational orientation and the situational favorableness, the path-goal approach had its roots in a more general motivational theory called Expectancy Theory (Mitchell, 1974).

Expectancy theory holds that an individual's attitudes (satisfaction with supervision or job satisfaction) or behavior (leader behavior or job effort) can be predicted from: (1) the degree to which the job, or behavior, is seen as leading to various outcomes (expectancy) and,

(2) the evaluation of these outcomes (valences).

Thus, people are satisfied with their job if they think it leads to things that are highly valued, and they work hard if they believe that effort leads to things that are highly valued (Nebeker and Mitchell, 1974: 356).

The initial theoretical framework by Evans (1970) asserted leaders to be effective by making rewards available to subordinates, contingent upon the subordinate's accomplishment of specific goals. Essentially, the argument upheld that one of the strategic functions of the leader is to clarify for subordinates the path that leads to goal accomplishment and valued rewards. House (1971), and House and Mitchell (1974) extended this theoretical base to explain the effects of four specific types of leader behavior on the following three subordinate attitudes or expectations:

1. the satisfaction of subordinates;
2. their acceptance of the leader; and,

3. their expectations that effort will result in effective performance and that effective performance is the path to rewards (House and Mitchell, 1977: 365).

These four specific leader behaviors included:

1. **Supportive Leadership** referring to behavior including consideration to the needs of subordinates;
2. **Participative Leadership** which is characterized by the sharing of information between subordinates and superiors;
3. **Instrumental Leadership** featuring the planning and controlling of subordinate activity by the leader; and,
4. **Achievement-oriented Leadership** which is characterized by leaders who set challenging goals and expect subordinates to perform at their highest level.

The leader behaviors are bound by two propositional statements that suggest the leader's strategic functions are to enhance the subordinate's motivation to perform, their satisfaction with the job and their acceptance of the leader:

1. leader behavior is acceptable and satisfying to subordinates to the extent that the subordinates see such behavior as either an immediate source of satisfaction or as instrumental to future satisfaction; and;

2. that the leader's behavior will be motivational i.e. increase in effort, to the extent that (a) such behavior makes satisfaction of subordinate's and, (b) such behavior compliments the environment of subordinates by providing the coaching, guidance, support and rewards necessary for effective performance (House and Mitchell, 1974: 84).

As a result these strategic functions of the leader are considered to consist of:
1. recognizing and/or arousing subordinates' needs for outcomes over which the leader has some control;

2. increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment;

3. making the path to those payoffs easier to travel by coaching and direction;

4. helping subordinates clarify expectancies;

5. reducing frustrating barriers; and,

6. increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction contingent on effective performance.

Within the Path-Goal Theory there are two classes of situational variables asserted to be contingency factors that moderate the relation between the two variables, leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction. These factors of Path-Goal Theory framework are, (a) personal characteristics of subordinates, and (b) environmental pressures and demands which subordinates must deal with in order to accomplish work goals and satisfy needs. For example, Figure 7 demonstrates how the degree of structure in the task moderates the relationship between leaders' directive behavior and subordinates' job satisfaction.

These propositions and specification of situational contingencies provide a heuristic framework on which to base future research. Hopefully, this will lead to a more fully developed, explicitly formal theory (House and Mitchell, 1974: 88).
Figure 7: Hypothetical Relationship Between Directive Leadership and Subordinate Satisfaction with Task Structure as a Contingency Factor

Normative Leadership Theories

The last major orientation to leadership effectiveness research describes a normative base regarding what a leader should do to be effective in any situation. In overviewing the many and varying managerial typologies, two fundamental variables generally may be associated as the underlying theoretical components. Halpin and Winer (1957) suggested that most of the individual differences in leadership performance can be explained by positing 'initiating structure' and 'consideration'.

Bales (1953) in the study of small group behavior derived two types of leadership; (1) the Task Leader; and, (2) the Socio-Emotional Leader. This task and relationship dichotomy might reasonably be presented by the terms 'Task Orientation' and 'Relationships Orientation', which are fundamental and independent measures of managerial performance.

If 'Task Orientation' and 'Relationships Orientation' are treated as independent and continuous, the four type typology of Non-Normative leadership style is obtained. (see Figure 8) However, these four styles just identify types of leader behavior but do not purport one to be more effective than the other.

Reddin (1967) posited that each latent style will have two behavioral counterparts dependent upon an effectiveness dimension tending from less to more
Figure 8: Reddin's Latent Styles

effective. Thus a twelve style typology of four less
effective, four latent and four more effective types of
leadership are defined. Effectiveness would then appear
to be identified as the extent to which a manager's style,
his combination of tasks and relationships orientation,
fits the style demands of the job.

Reddin extended the concept of Blake and
Mouton's Managerial Grid (1964) through this effectiveness
dimension providing an evaluative framework for assessing
the appropriate use of task and relations oriented
behaviors. This permitted a comprehensive delineation
of situational factors which predict various leadership
styles to be effective or ineffective. (see Figure 9)

there is no best style of leadership; that
successful leaders are those who can adapt
their leader behavior to meet the needs of
their followers and the particular situation.
Effectiveness is dependent upon the leader,
the followers, and other situational elements
(Hersey and Blanchard, 1979: 96).

Yukl (1971) emphasized, normative leadership
theories direct how to increase leadership effectiveness
via situational sensitivity, behavioral flexibility
and analytical observation (1971: 415). While Reddin's
3-D Model provided an effectiveness dimension, Life-Cycle
Theory of Leadership, later to be called Situational
Leadership Theory (SLT), went further in supporting the
above statements.

Situational Leadership Theory is an outgrowth
Figure 9: 3-D Theory

of the Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model which attempted to integrate the concepts of leader style with the situational demands of a specific environment (see Figure 10). Thus when the leader's style is "appropriate" to a given environment as measured by results, it is termed effective; when his style is "inappropriate" to a given environment, it is termed ineffective.

Therefore the model depicted effectiveness to be determined by the interaction of the leader's style and environment (followers and other situational variables), it follows that any of the four styles in the Ohio State model may be effective or ineffective depending on the environment (Hersey and Blanchard, 1979).

SLT attempts to provide the leader with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of maturity of one's followers (Hersey and Blanchard, 1979). The emphasis is placed on the followers and as the level of maturity of one's followers continues to increase then the appropriate task-relationship behaviors must be adjusted accordingly, based on the SLT curvilinear function. The basic postulate emphasizes the "appropriate" leadership style to vary as the situation varies. Consequently, where High Task, Low Relationship (S1) leadership behavior would be appropriate, other leadership styles are posited to be less appropriate.
Figure 10: Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model

This can be accentuated by an individual, who in task-relevant terms is perceived to be of a M₂-maturity level and as a result the subsequent leadership style postulated to most "appropriate" for that individual is High Task, Low Relationship (S₁). The other leadership style possibilities, if experienced by this individual are thought to bring about less than maximal performance, or be less effective.

Hersey and Blanchard incorporate the effectiveness dimension in SLT to be the following:

If the effectiveness of a leader behavior style depends upon the situation in which it is used, it follows that any of the basic styles may be effective or ineffective depending on the situation. The difference between the effective and ineffective styles is often not the actual behavior of the leader but the appropriateness of this behavior to the environment. It is the interaction of the basic style with the environment that results in a degree of effectiveness or ineffectiveness (1977: 105).

Through the unification of the Tri-Dimensional Leadership Model and a continuum representing the relative maturity of the followers, Hersey and Blanchard put forth the completed model that appears in Figure 11.

SLT suggests that for an immature individual (or group) within the organization, a leader exhibiting High Task, Low Relationship behavior would expend much energy on structuring formal procedures and methods, setting goals and delineating the path for goal achievement.

Contrarily, individuals or groups considered
Figure 11: Situational Leadership Theory (Completed Model)

to be mature in task-relevant terms would experience greatest productivity if their leader provided a Low Relationship, Low Task atmosphere. The level of maturity, willingness, intrinsic motivation schema, and capacity to take responsibility, of the follower, portrays situations where an $S_4$ (Low-Low) leadership style is posited to be the most effective or "appropriate".

The "life-cycle" process can be conceptualized by an immature individual or group who respond to the High Task, Low Relationship style. As the individual matures the leader facilitates a more effective work rate by providing emotional support to shift to a High Task, High Relationship style. The follower continues to mature within the organization and the leader withdraws the more directive type behaviors to assimilate a High Relationship, Low Task behavior style. Finally, the completion is represented by the follower(s) ability to be self-directing and self-motivating. The leader then adopts (as previously mentioned) the Low Relationship, Low Task leadership style.

Although SLT is very recent, a number of scholarly investigations have returned ambiguous results (Smith, 1975; Damico, 1976; Beck, 1978; Vos Strache, 1978; Boucher, 1980). These findings present several research and methodological issues which must be contended with, in this research study. Primarily, these issues are as follows: (1) leader flexibility; (2) leader style
measurement; (3) measures of effectiveness; and, (4) the operationalization of "task-relevant maturity".

The question of leader flexibility has found increasing support to refute that leader style is largely a function of personality; instead investigation has identified leadership behavior to be a learned quality (Finch, 1976; Lyle, 1976). Studies investigating SLT theory have been based on the assumption, that the leader is able to manipulate his/her behavioral style (Smith, 1975; Vos Strachey, 1978; Beck, 1978).

The measure of leader style presents methodological issues of concern. Stogdill (1974) indicated that of the extensive leadership research, most used measures of self-report inventories to evaluate leadership style. However SLT measures leadership style through two unique instruments; (1) the LEAD SELF (leader's self-perception); and, (2) the LEAD OTHER (subordinate's perception of the leader). Dannehl (1970) found a discrepancy to exist between the leader's perception of their own behavior and their subordinates' perception, of that behavior.

As a result, an adapted form of the LEAD OTHER called the Coaching Style instrument, will be considered relevant for this study. This methodological problem will be dealt with further, in Chapter III.

Hersey and Blanchard use the term "style adaptability" in conjunction with effectiveness to analyze the
LEAD SELF and LEAD OTHER instruments. The matching of the hypothetical situation assumes the leader to have properly adapted his/her behavioral style; and thus be rated effective. However for the purposes of this study and academic rigor, an outside independent source of the measure of effectiveness will be used. The Leadership Effectiveness Appraisal (LEA) form (Boucher, 1980) was adapted for use, and the resulting Coaching Appraisal acquired the necessary data.

The most serious concern related to SLT is the term "task-relevant maturity" and the inability of the rater to distinguish between a person's capability to perform a task and his/her overall maturity. For this study "task-relevant maturity" has been reconceptualized as "task-relevant ability", and the rationale for this change appears in Chapter III.

Studies dealing directly with the empirical testing have returned inconclusive findings which magnify the above methodological concerns. Morris (1978) found through manipulating teaching styles while treating them synonymously with leadership style, increased performance of nursing students. Smith (1975) found partial support for the SLT model by using student achievement scores as an indirect measure of teacher effectiveness.

Damicco (1976) in an industrial setting tested SLT using supervisors and subordinates of intact work
units. Damico specifically stressed that the question of maturity is one that must be addressed, prior to reliable testing of SLT. Boucher (1980) concluded support for the contingency leadership approach. However, Boucher also demonstrated inconsistent findings in association with SLT theory, stating the High-Task/High Relationship ($S_2$) to be perceived as the most effective regardless of the task-relevant ability level of the subordinates, and, the High Relationship styles ($S_2, S_3$) perceived to be more effective than the Low Relationship styles ($S_1, S_4$) regardless of the subordinate task-relevant ability (1980: 172-3).

Situational Leadership is a theory grounded on logical argument, but what is necessary is empirical testing that will incorporate methodological concerns found in much of the recent scholarly investigations. This study attempted to undertake some of these concerns.

**Evaluation of Subordinate Performance**

Correlational studies of leadership and subordinate behavior have generally assumed that leadership behavior or style caused the observed subordinate behavior, and this has been repeatedly and critically noted (Korman, 1966; Vroom, 1964). Recent literature has suggested that leader behavior may also be a consequence of subordinate behavior. Therefore, for a complete understanding of 'leadership' it is essential that researchers investigate both leader and subordinate behaviors as they affect, and are affected by
each other.

Lowin and Craig (1968) and Farris and Lim (1969) are the most widely cited studies of subordinate behavior and its affect on leader behavior. Lowin and Craig found leader behavior to vary as a function of the subordinates' competence, while Farris and Lim found the subordinates' descriptions of leader behavior to differ significantly between the 'high performance' and the 'low performance' situations.

Hollander and Julian (1969) conceptualized leadership as a social influence process, which considers the mutuality, or explicit exchange nature, of the leader-follower relationship. Herold (1977) demonstrated that the role of leader skills and behaviors in explaining subordinate behavior and the occasional opposite relationship (subordinate behavior explaining leader behavior) are active within the same context, and in a given leader-subordinate relationship. Greene (1975) found subordinate performance to be an important determinant of consideration and initiating structure, in leader behaviors.

Literature has presented some evidence showing that leaders do exhibit behavioral flexibility. Fiedler and Chemers (1974) postulated that leaders tend to adjust their behaviors as the favorableness of the situation changes. Consequently, the leader would be more relationship oriented as the desired goal activity neared completion.
Heller (1971) proposed that leader behavior may be strongly affected by the characteristics of the task being performed. If the task required leader instruction, the task-emphasis would be considered desirable. Hill and Hughes (1974), found the complexity of the task to significantly influence the leader's task-emphasis orientation. A highly complex task caused the leader to utilize significantly more 'task emphasis' behaviors regardless of the performance of workers.

Porter, Lawler and Heckman (1975) felt that frameworks which are based solely on the analysis of the effects of various leader behaviors on subordinates are not likely to lead to a general theory of leadership effectiveness. As Rubin and Goldman point out, the effective manager then must be able, not only to respond differently to different individuals, but must himself be flexible enough to change with them as they and the situation change (1968: 153).

Leadership research must understand the leader-subordinate dyad and be prepared to account for how this interactive process takes place. Increasingly, leadership researchers are becoming aware that any analysis or study must account for leader-subordinate behavior and how they are affected by each other.

**Leadership Effectiveness**

Fleishman (1953) intimated, that leadership is to a great extent situational, and what is effective leadership
in one situation may be ineffective in another. Hill (1973) felt the growing acceptance of contingency theory toward a measure of leader effectiveness contended different leadership behaviors to be required in different situations in order to achieve effectiveness. Thus, the criteria on which the leader should be evaluated so as to distinguish 'effective' from 'ineffective' leaders becomes a complex problem.

Research originating from the Ohio State studies suggested effectiveness to be positively related with combined high measures of consideration and structure. The leader was depicted to display the capability of exhibiting these orthogonal dimensions simultaneously.

House's (1971) Path-Goal theory of leadership led several researchers to hypothesize that the relationships between leader behavior and subordinate outcomes is dependent upon the subordinates' perception of the utility of the leader's behaviors. Therefore, if the subordinate perceives supervisory initiating structure as clarifying the path by which desired outcomes can be obtained, initiating structure will be viewed favorably by the subordinate and leader perceived to be effective. Miles and Petty. (1977) support this hypothesis in finding leader initiating structure to be viewed as a pressure irritant and leader consideration as a general emollient in a study of professional employees in a
bureaucratic context.

Dessler and Valenzi (1977) found leader consideration to be significantly and positively related to subordinate satisfaction. The findings seem to warrant the conclusion that consideration is usually associated with higher employee satisfaction, and that it probably moderates the relationship between leader initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction (Schreisheim, House and Kerr, 1976).

Dansereau, Graen and Haga (1975) in measuring the relationship between task-complexity, leader style and performance and satisfaction, found that the strength and direction of the relationships between leader behavior and the criteria of performance and satisfaction may be contingent upon the kind of intra-group conflict being experienced by the relevant individuals within the groups. The employees within the same work group therefore have the capability to differ significantly in their individual amounts of substantive and affective conflict, implying leadership differentiation to be 'effective' as the leader must deal with subordinates whose needs are substantially different. Consequently, a pertinent research question involves determining the conditions under which certain leadership styles are related to increased effectiveness.

Situational Leadership Theory posits any of the four identified leadership styles to be 'effective', dependent upon its match with the member's "task-relevant maturity". The above literature serves to argumentatively
support leadership effectiveness to be situationally determined.

**Sport Related Literature**

The understanding of the complexities of leadership theory in the physical education/sport environment has pursued two major areas of concern: (1) the physical education setting; and, (2) the coach-athlete interpersonal behavior interaction. Dealing with the initial thrust, Olafson (1969) used the LBDQ to measure perceived leader behavior of physical education department chairmen in Big Ten Universities and selected Junior Colleges. Bondy (1970) studied the influence of several variables (sex, years of experience, position, etc.) on perceived leader behavior. Bagley (1975) using the Fiedler LPC scale in her investigation of graduate physical education departments found that leaders who established good interpersonal relationships were more successful than those who were task-oriented. Specifically, Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) found athletes in different types of sports (closed, open), and men and women, to expect varying degrees of supportive, training, and rewarding behaviors from their coaches. A closed sport was characterized by the degree of task variability to be deemed low, where the skills required are executed in an environment where the stimuli are relatively stable. On the other hand, an open environment constituted a high task variability. Chelladurai and Saleh emphasized two evaluated.
major findings: (1) that athletes in a closed sport environment preferred their coach to emphasize more training behavior than athletes in open sports; and, (2) that athletes in interdependent sports (team-oriented) preferred their coach to emphasize more training behavior than athletes in independent (individual) sports.

Much controversy has surrounded the appropriate behaviors to which a coach of a football team must adhere. Tutko and Richards (1971) have placed coaching styles on a continuum from 'hard-nosed' to 'nice-guy'. The coach, has been identified to vary his behavior from a rigid inflexible style to one that advocates an air of democracy. Swartz (1973) sampled 72 college coaches to assess four leadership styles: (1) laissez-faire; (2) democratic-cooperative; (3) autocratic-aggressive; and, (4) autocratic-submissive. The results indicated that regardless of the leadership style, any of the four were manifested by both those coaches deemed successful, or unsuccessful. Naylor (1976) considered the coach to be the formal leader or 'head man' of the group because he is appointed to the position by a higher authority. Therefore, the appointment as a formal leader has certain institutional expectations guiding his behavior in addition to the challenge of achieving authority of leadership with respect to his group's purposes. For this reason many coaches do not know the "appropriate" leadership style to utilize in their athletic situation. Dunphy (1978) summarized, "while cohesion has
been recognized as an important variable in determining successful athletic teams... little research has been done in the area of coaching leadership style (1978: 6)."

Danielson, Zelhart and Drake (1975) revealed eight dimensions of leader behavior to be exhibited by the coaches of junior and senior high school hockey players. Their main finding discovered that the 'commonly perceived' behaviors in hockey coaching are mainly of a communicative nature with emphasis on domination. Carron and Bennett (1977) found support for affection and control as having some importance in discriminating between compatible and incompatible dyads. If compatibility is to be a necessary composite of effective leader behavior, it is necessary that the situational demands match the actual behavior of both the coach and the athlete.

SLT posits that as the maturity level of one's follower(s) develops along the continuum from immature to mature, the "appropriate" style of leadership moves accordingly simulating a curvilinear relationship. To determine what leadership style is "appropriate" in a given situation, a leader must determine the maturity level of the individual or group in relation to a specific task that he/she is attempting to accomplish through their efforts.

Vos Strache (1978) partially rejected the Life-Cycle Theory (1972), as he found college basketball seniors to prefer a higher initiating structure, production
emphasis and superior orientation than juniors. If Life-Cycle Theory of SLT had been upheld, juniors should have been the group to prefer greater task emphasis.

Vos Strache's study highlights the methodological problem of measuring what is 'effective' and 'ineffective'. Widmann (1969) measured effectiveness by the percentages of games won. Vos Strache (1978) used an absolute, of games won versus games lost. These measures however, cannot be the sole criteria for determining a coach's effectiveness. The coach may not be successful in the won/lost column, but he/she may be 'effective' in terms of eliciting maximum performance from the athlete. Bird (1978) supplemented this argument by suggesting 'effective' leadership in the coaching situation to occur when the coach's behaviors lead to 'individual achievement motivation' on the part of the players.

Sage (1975) mentioned that most coaching research has concentrated on the actual coach being the measured independent variable effecting dependent variables of general personality, specific personality traits, social attitudes and/or value orientations. In order to try to clarify the coaching leadership question which has been emphasized by the previous literature, it becomes essential to rank the specificity of the leadership situation to a perceived measure of effectiveness, thus identifying the "appropriate" leadership style in a given situation.
Summary

Leadership theory has evolved from the 'great man' approach to 'situational' specificity. The 'great man' approach assumed the individual determined production achievement, however, the inability to support that all leaders had identical traits, gave way to the Ohio State emphasis. Essentially, the Ohio State Center for Leadership Studies identified the two orthogonal dimensions of leader behavior, 'Consideration' and 'Initiation of Structure in Interaction'. These were measured through the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

Leader behavior investigations gave way to a more 'open systems' approach in an attempt to investigate situational factors that may influence leader behavior. The main thrust of this era established 'effective' leadership to be a mutual influence process or, situational and reciprocal.

As a result the leadership effectiveness approach gave birth to Fiedler's "Contingency Model of Leader Effectiveness" positing a relationship to exist between leadership performance and leadership measurement which would be 'effective' or 'ineffective' based on situational favorability. Fiedler's motivational orientation and situational favorableness saw an evolution to House's Path-Goal theory emphasizing leader behavior to be based on: (1) subordinate satisfaction; (2) leader acceptance;
and, (3) effective performance as the path to reward. This orientation evolved to a normative base emphasizing the thrust of the behaviors a leader exhibits, may be differing in order to be 'effective' in any situation.

Consequently, Situational Leadership Theory is an outgrowth of Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid, the Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model, and Argyris' Maturity-Immaturity Theory. Thus the "appropriate" leadership style varies as the maturity level of the follower increases, providing for where there is an 'ideal match'. (Congruent leadership style and task-relevant maturity) the leader is postulated to be most 'effective'.

Situational leadership research is only in its adolescent stages, but many methodological questions have been raised for researchers to contend with. This study attempted to deal with these, consisting of: (1) leader flexibility; (2) leader style measurement; (3) measures of effectiveness; and, (4) the operationalization of "task relevant maturity". In addition, leadership research in the physical education/sport environment has been inconclusive at best.

With a lack of identification as to what is a most 'effective' leadership style, this study, using the unique coach/player dyad and an independent measure of the coach's effectiveness rating, attempted to clearly delineate the coach's "appropriate" leadership style behavior.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the overall procedure and rationale for the design of this study on Situational Leadership Theory and football coaching in the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association (SWOSSA). Main sections in this chapter will include the following:

1. Study Description; 2. Vertical Dyad Design; 3. Collection Procedure for the Data; 4. Instrumentation including (a) Coaching Style, (b) Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APPA), and, (c) Coaching Appraisal; and, 6. Statistical Procedures.

Study Description

Subjects sampled were members of senior interscholastic football teams competing within the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association (SWOSSA). The players were administered two instruments: (1) the Coaching Style instrument, to determine the coach's leadership style; and, (2) the Coaching Appraisal instrument, to determine the coach's effectiveness as perceived by the player.

The coach completed the Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APPA) instrument for each of the players who were administered the Coaching Style and Coaching Appraisal.
instruments. The design of this study is such that it was essential:

1. the players completing the Coaching Style and Coaching Appraisal instruments be represented according to experience. Thus, two players with one year experience, two players with two years experience, and two players with three or more years experience, plus their coach completed the six leader/member (coach/player) dyads on each team; and,

2. the coach complete an APPA instrument for each of the players who completed the Coaching Style and Coaching Appraisal instruments.

This study is unique in that it investigated the interaction between coach/player on an individual level. Therefore an overall measure of leadership was not important, but the identification of the coach/player vertical dyad imperative, for data analysis.

**Vertical Dyad Design**

Griffin (1979) in his study on task design determinants of effective leader behavior, developed a model suggesting leader behavior is more adequately described at the individual level. This study incorporates the unique methodology of the leader-subordinate vertical dyadic link.

Earlier research investigation attempted to find the 'one best' Average Leadership Style (ALS). The Ohio State leadership studies clearly illustrate this approach through the operationalization of the two basic dimensions 'consideration' and 'initiating structure', as measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Fleishman and Harris, 1962; Stogdill and Coons, 1957).
Using the LEDQ instrument the above two dimensions are assessed for a particular leader by having a sample of randomly selected members of his unit, describe selected actions of their leader in terms of how frequently the leader exhibited 'consideration' and 'initiating structure' behavior when the opportunity arose (Dansereau, Cashman and Graen, 1973: 186).

The Average Leadership Style (ALS) is based on two unproven assumptions about the leadership situation:

1. that the behavior of leaders toward their members tends to be sufficiently consistent overtime and homogenous among members. Thus the variance in behavior around the average leadership style is assumed to be both random and quite small both over time and over members of the unit; and,

2. that the members' perceptions, interpretations, and reactions to the leaders behavior are homogenous or at least randomly distributed within the unit (Dansereau, Cashman, and Graen, 1973: 185-6).

The use of the Average Leadership Style assumes that the arithmetic mean of the observations of randomly selected members yields an adequate assessment of the behavior of the leader. Therefore, for this averaging to accurately represent even the typical behavior of the leader, the leader must behave in essentially the same manner toward each of his members.

The Vertical Dyad Linkage (VDL) approach views the particular relationships between the leader and each of his individual members as the basic unit of analysis. The VDL approach makes the following assumptions about the
leadership situation:

1. that the individual member’s observations contain valid variance to be analyzed;

2. that the leader’s behavior is dependent upon the relationships between the leader and each of his members, allowing for the possibility that certain members may be more functionally inter-dependent from the leader than other members; and,

3. that the composition of the unit may be quite heterogenous regarding the members’ perceptions, interpretations; and reactions to the leader’s behavior (Dansereau, Cashman and Graen, 1973: 188).

Graen, Dansereau and Minami (1972) demonstrated that consistent and reliable relationships could be produced using the vertical dyad design approach. In this particular study the individual player’s report on behavior of his coach was compared to his leader’s (coach’s) report on the individual member’s (player’s) performance.

The Vertical Dyad allows for the case where each of the vertical dyadic relationships contained within a unit are radically different, as well as for the traditional case where each are essentially the same. The vertical dyad is the appropriate unit of analysis for examining leadership processes because it reflects the processes linking member and superior. The VDL approach reveals orderliness in the data that the average leadership style approach would have assumed a priori to be mainly error variance. However this orderliness revealed by the VDL approach could never have been extracted by using the ALS approach (Dansereau, Cashman and Graen, 1973: 197).

Therefore for the purposes of this study the VDL approach
was deemed appropriate.

**Collection Procedure for the Data**

Initially, the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association (SWOSSA) Board of Governors was approached for endorsement of the research study. Following their approval, the research study was submitted to the respective Research Committees of the Essex, Kent and Windsor Boards of Education. Upon this approval the necessary materials could be packaged for data collection and distribution. (see Appendices A through H)

Each of the twenty-two Head Football Coaches in SWOSSA were notified by letter, asking for their participation, and the participation of six of their senior football players. (see Appendix H, I) Instruments including a self-stamped-addressed envelope, were distributed to each of the consenting coaches. This package contained:

1. six envelopes to be distributed to six players, containing a Coaching Appraisal, and Coaching Style instrument, an instructional letter and a return envelope within which the completed instruments could be sealed for return to the coach; and, (see Appendices J, K, M, O)

2. one envelope containing six Ability to Perform Player Appraisal instruments, an instructional letter and the self-stamped-addressed envelope. (see Appendix J, N)

The data collection extended ten weeks from the original date of distribution of the packaged materials. Within this ten week period, two follow-up phone calls and visitations were made to the participating schools. Upon
receipt, the instruments were collated, dated, and prepared for computer analysis.

**Instrumentation**

For the purposes of the collection of data, three instruments were used; (1) the coaches' leadership style was measured by the Coaching Style instrument; (2) task-relevant ability of the player by the Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APPA); and, (3) the coaches' leadership effectiveness by the Coaching Appraisal instrument.

**Coaching Style**

The Coaching Style instrument is an adapted version of Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD OTHER instrument (1977). The LEAD OTHER and LEAD SELF are two specifically designed instruments used to obtain perception of leadership style. These instruments originated from the 12-item form comprising the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD), which was developed at the Center for Leadership Studies, Ohio State University.

LEAD SELF data was designed to measure three aspects of leader behavior: (1) style; (2) adaptability; and, (3) style adaptability measuring an individual's self-perception as to how he/she behaves as a leader. Thus the data may not reflect the individual's actual leadership style, depending on how his/her perception differs from the perception of others.

The LEAD OTHER instrument was modified to represent
the coach/player dyad more accurately, and thus for the purposes of this study the instrument was named *Coaching Style.* This instrument therefore obtained the player's (subordinate's) perception of his coach's leadership style. The modified *Coaching Style* instrument appears in Appendix M.

**Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APPA)**

The **Ability to Perform Appraisal (APA)** was unique to a study based on Situational Leadership Theory. Boucher (1980) used the APA to investigate the degree of congruency between the variables of leadership style and task-relevant ability affecting leadership effectiveness. Boucher used the APA, claiming the necessity to develop a scale that would be more discriminating than the Maturity Scale instrument used in previous SLT study (Hambleton, Hersey and Blanchard, 1977).

Beck (1978) found 'task-relevant maturity' to create identification problems in his study, and argued that the distinction between one's capacity to perform certain tasks and a person's overall maturity was often a difficult one for raters to make. Finch (1967) preferred to use the term 'performance' which is defined as a function of motivation and ability to execute a task. Boucher stated, "since motivation and ability are not appreciably different from willingness and ability, the shift does not create any substantive change in the operationalization of the theory.
(1980: 78)." Thus the small but significant change permits the identification of 'task-relevant ability' (motivation and ability) from 'task-relevant maturity' (willingness and ability) possible. (see Table 1)

The Ability to Perform Appraisal (APA) was an instrument developed to specifically obtain a valid measure of perceived task-relevant ability in the intramural/recreational sport environment. After an extensive three phase piloting procedure, ten dimensions of task specificity and their polarized semantic anchors were identified. (see Table 2)

The semantic anchors are placed on a scale of '1' indicating the lowest possible rating and, '8' indicating the highest. (see Figure 12) The completed instrument comprised of ten individual ratings are summed to yield a performance quotient (PQ) (Boucher, 1980). Beck (1979) suggests that this variable labelled 'performance quotient' (PQ), refers to an individual's capacity to perform in the same way that intelligence quotient (IQ) refers to an individual's capacity to learn. Boucher (1980) states, "the PQ facilitated the classification of subordinates into four 'ability to perform' categories," which is based on a totalled score.

\[
\begin{align*}
P_1 & \quad \text{Low (PQ = 50 to 174)} \\
P_2 & \quad \text{Moderate Low (PQ = 175 to 249)} \\
P_3 & \quad \text{Moderate High (PQ = 250 to 324)} \\
P_4 & \quad \text{High (PQ = 325 to 400)}
\end{align*}
\]
### TABLE 1

**DIMENSIONS OF MATURITY SCALE** AND **ABILITY TO PERFORM APPRAISAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATURITY SCALE*</th>
<th>APA**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Related Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding of Job Requirements</td>
<td>1. Previous Job Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meeting Job Deadlines</td>
<td>2. Knowledge of Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Past Job Experience</td>
<td>3. Ability to Solve Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Knowledge</td>
<td>4. Ability to Take Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Problem-Solving Ability</td>
<td>5. Follow Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ability to Take Responsibility</td>
<td>6. Motivation to Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Follow Through</td>
<td>7. Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement Motivation</td>
<td>8. Persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment</td>
<td>9. Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Persistence</td>
<td>10. Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Willingness to Take Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Work Attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Maturity Scale/Manager Rating Form. Copyright 1977, R.K. Hambleton, K.H. Blanchard, and P. Hersey
** Ability to Perform Appraisal, Copyright 1980, R. Boucher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Semantic Anchors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Previous Job Experience</td>
<td>High—Has Experience Relevant to the Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Does Not Have Relevant Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of Job</td>
<td>High—Has Necessary Job Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Does Not Have Necessary Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to Solve Problems</td>
<td>High—Able to Solve Problems Independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Unable to Solve Problems Independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to Take Responsibility</td>
<td>High—Can be Left Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Requires Close Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Follow Through</td>
<td>High—Checks to See Tasks Are Accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Seldom Bothers to Follow-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivation to Achieve</td>
<td>High—Has High Desire to Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Has Little Desire to Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commitment</td>
<td>High—Is Very Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Is Uncaring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Persistence</td>
<td>High—Won’t Quit Until Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Gives Up Easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Initiative</td>
<td>High—Seeks New Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Is Content With &quot;Status Quo&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Independence</td>
<td>High—Is Willing to Work on Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Is Unwilling to Work on Own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12: Ability to Perform Appraisal Graphic Rating Scale
In an effort to adapt the APA rating instrument, three highly knowledgeable and independent judges were asked to evaluate the APA and delimit the necessary criteria for its adaptability to player evaluation. The judges recommended four dimensional modifications:

1. Job Related Experience be changed to Football Related Experience;
2. Knowledge of Job be changed to Knowledge of Football;
3. Ability to Solve Problems be changed to Ability to Adjust to Game Conditions; and,
4. Follow Through be deleted and Coachability added.

The APA was designed initially to permit evaluation of a subordinate's perceived job responsibilities as rated by his direct superior. Thus, if an individual's job encompassed five responsibilities, he could be rated on each by his superior. The Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APP A) instrument, adapted for this study, as recommended by the independent panel of judges, evaluates the player based on his capability to perform football skills demanded by the specific position the athlete plays on the ten dimensions. (see Table 3, and Appendix N)

The adaptations for dimensions '1' and '2' recognize the task at hand to be football related. Thus, Job Related Experience was modified to Football Related Experience and Knowledge of Job modified to Knowledge of Football. Stogdill (1963) suggested the ability of a team to maintain a structure under stress and to apply pressure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Semantic Anchors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Football Related Experience</td>
<td>High—Has Football Relevant Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Does Not Have Football Relevant Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of Football</td>
<td>High—Has Necessary Football Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Does Not Have Necessary Football Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to Adjust to Game</td>
<td>High—Is Able to Adjust Independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Low—Is Unable to Adjust Independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to Take Responsibility</td>
<td>High—Can Be Left Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Requires Close Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coachability</td>
<td>High—Receives Instruction Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Refuses to Listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivation to Achieve</td>
<td>High—Has High Desire to Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Has Little Desire To Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commitment</td>
<td>High—Is Very Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Is Uncaring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Persistence</td>
<td>High—Won't Quit Until Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Gives Up Easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Initiative</td>
<td>High—Seeks New Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Is Content With &quot;Status Quo&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Independence</td>
<td>High—Is Willing To Work On Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low—Is Unwilling To Work Own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
upon its opponent is highly associated with its ability to move the ball. In addition, organizations seek to stimulate the application of effort, spirit and pressure toward the accomplishment of organizational objectives.

Within the competitive framework, situations arise which the athlete must be able to cope with, or adjust to. The independent panel of judges, in light of evidence supported by Stogdill (1963), modified Ability to Solve Problems, to Ability to Adjust to Game Conditions. Game Conditions are therefore represented by the ability to adjust independently or, the inability to adjust independently.

Of the ten initial dimensions, the independent panel of judges considered Follow Through to be difficult to adapt, to a football situation. In the APA, Follow Through referred to the subordinate checking to see if tasks were accomplished. As a result Follow Through was deemed unsuitable for the APPA instrument. The panel replaced Follow Through with Coachability and termed it as the perceived ability of the player to "refuse to listen", to "receive instruction well". Consequently, Follow Through was deleted and Coachability added. The completed instrument of the Ability to Perform Player Appraisal appears in Appendix N.
Coaching Appraisal

Korman (1966) felt one reason for the slow progress of leadership research has been the lack of identification of specific leader behaviors (1966: 164). Indeed, most leader effectiveness studies have been correlational studies in which some measure of leader behavior is correlated with some effectiveness criterion.

The Coaching Appraisal instrument is an outgrowth of the Leader Effectiveness Appraisal (LEA) instrument (Boucher, 1980). The instrument taps effectiveness from the player's perception based on dimensions relating specifically to leadership. These dimensions were established and based on the work of Yukl and Nemeroff (1979), through the leader effectiveness model as proposed by Yukl (1971), and subsequently revised and extended by him in 1979. This provided the necessary theoretical background to extensively factor analyze the Leader Effectiveness Appraisal (LEA) instrument (Boucher, 1980).

The dimensions are: (1) Consideration; (2) Direction; (3) Decision Participation; (4) Emphasis on Performance; (5) Performance Facilitation; (6) Autonomy Delegation; (7) Positive Reinforcement; (8) Interaction Facilitation; and, (9) Conflict Management. The definitions of each of the dimensions appear in Table 4.

Many coaching evaluation forms that have been published, have been based on self-evaluation rating forms. Greene (1975) developed a questionnaire with its
TABLE 4
LEADER EFFECTIVENESS APPRAISAL (LEA)*
DEFINITION OF DIMENSIONS

| Consideration | The extent to which your director is supportive, friendly and considerate towards staff members, looks out for your welfare, snows trust and appreciation and is open and honest with you. |
| Direction      | The extent to which your director informs staff members about their duties and job responsibilities, sets goals and establishes performance standards and provides staff members with necessary training and instruction. |
| Decision       | The extent to which your director consults with staff members and otherwise allows you to participate in making decisions, and the amount of influence over the director's decision that result from this participation. |
| Participation  | The extent to which your director emphasizes the importance of productivity and efficiency, encourages staff members to attain a high level of performance, crosses on your performance and informs you when it is not up to par. |
| Emphasis on Production | The extent to which your director obtains for staff members necessary supplies, materials, equipment, support services or other resources and eliminates problems in the work environment and other obstacles that interfere with the work. |
| Work Facilitation | The extent to which your director delegates responsibility and authority to subordinates and allows them autonomy in determining how to do your work. |
| Autonomy       | The extent to which your director provides recognition to a subordinate, passes recommendations for pay increases and promotions on subordinate performance and tries to provide additional rewards and benefits for effective performance. |
| Delegation     | The extent to which your director provides recognition to a subordinate, passes recommendations for pay increases and promotions on subordinate performance and tries to provide additional rewards and benefits for effective performance. |
**TABLE 4—Continued**

| Interaction - The extent to which your director emphasizes the importance of teamwork and encourages staff members to cooperate and be friendly with each other. |
| Conflict - The extent to which your director helps staff members settle conflicts and disagreements, restrains you from insulting or fighting with each other, and encourages you to resolve conflict in a constructive manner. |

The immediate purpose to obtain student-athlete opinions about coaches and athletic teams. Naylor (1976) in his analysis of determinants relating to football coaching effectiveness asked the coaches to self-rate their abilities on the following items:

1. Teaching knowledge of the game;
2. Teaching Ability;
3. Organizational Ability;
4. Ability to Motivate;
5. Interpersonal Relations with individual team members;
6. Ability to select and position personnel;
7. Effectiveness in terms of team performance during games;
8. Effectiveness in terms of making football an enjoyable experience for your players;
9. Effectiveness in terms of team morale;
10. Effectiveness in utilizing talents of assistant coaches; and,
11. Effectiveness in maintaining harmony on the coaching staff (Naylor, 1976: 75).

The independent panel of judges indicated similarities between the above instrument, the LEA, and the Coach Behavior Description Questionnaire (CBDQ) which identified nine dimensions of leader behavior upon which the coach was evaluated. The panel maintained the LEA instrument could be modified for the purposes of this study and measure the overall effectiveness of the coach as perceived by the player. The panel of judges recommended that Work Facili-
tation be modified to *Performance Facilitation*, and be
defined as, "the extent to which your coach obtains necessary
equipment for, and eliminates obstacles that interfere with
practice." Also *Emphasis on Production* was changed to
*Emphasis on Performance*. The adapted dimensions of the
*Coaching Appraisal* instrument appear in Table 5, and the
completed instrument appears in Appendix 0.

**Statistical Procedures**

Using the IBM 3031 computer at the University of
Windsor, a program was developed utilizing the Statistical
Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to perform the
following functions: (1) Descriptive Frequency Distributions;
(2) Crosstabulation; (3) Analysis of Variance;
(4) T-Test; (5) Pearson Correlation; and, (6) Post-Hoc
Multi-Comparison Tests.

**Descriptive Frequency Distributions**

The SPSS subprogram 'FREQUENCIES' was used to
compute the basic distributional characteristics of all
variables in the study. Scores, means, standard deviations,
ranges, and variances for all scores were obtained for the
115 coach/player dyads that constituted the data of this
study.

**Crosstabulation**

A Chi-square analysis was performed on the data
yielded by the 115 dyad responses. This analysis helped in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach is supportive, friendly and considerate towards players, looks out for your welfare, shows trust and appreciation and is open and honest with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach informs players about their duties and responsibilities, sets goals and establishes performance standards and provides players with necessary training and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Participation</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach consults with players and otherwise allows you to participate in making decisions, and the amount of influence over the coach's decision that result from this participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Performance</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach emphasizes the importance of productivity and efficiency, encourages players to attain a high level of performance, checks on your performance and informs you when it is not up to par.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Facilitation</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach obtains necessary equipment for, and eliminates obstacles that interfere with practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Delegation</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach delegates responsibility and authority to players and allows them to determine how to perform a skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach provides recognition to a player and tries to provide encouragement for effective performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Facilitation</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach emphasizes the importance of teamwork and encourages players to cooperate and be friendly with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>The extent to which your coach helps players settle conflicts and disagreements, restrains you from insulting or fighting with each other, and encourages you to resolve conflict in a constructive manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determination of the Coaching Style instrument’s construct validity, based on a comparison between expected response and actual response frequencies.

Analysis of Variance

The SPSS subprogram 'ANOVA' was used for both ONE-WAY and TWO-WAY analyses. Basically, a stepwise multiple regression, these programs could cope with unequal cell sizes and in most cases empty cells (Kim and Kohout; 1975).

The SPSS ONE-WAY computer program was used to determine whether the data from that of the respondents was significantly different from that which might be expected from the non-respondents. In specific terms, the variables of leadership style, task-relevant ability and leadership-effectiveness were analyzed by date of return.

To test hypotheses $H_02$ through $H_{05}$ the data was sorted by task-relevant ability class. An analysis of variance (ONE-WAY) was computed to determine if there were any significant differences between and among the task-relevant abilities on the dependent variable of leader effectiveness. In addition, a ONE-WAY analysis using leadership style as the independent variable and leader effectiveness as the dependent variable was computed, to determine if leadership style had any significant effect.

To test hypothesis $H_1$, a factorial analysis of variance (TWO-WAY) was computed. The purpose of this analysis was to determine if there were any significant
interaction effects between leadership style and task-relevant ability on the dependent variable.

**T-Test**

The SPSS (T-TEST) computer program was used as a preliminary investigative procedure to determine the significance of difference between the means of the dependent variable for MATCHES and NON-MATCHES. In addition, 'T-TEST' computer programs were executed for MORE CONGRUENT and LESS CONGRUENT, HIGH TASK and LOW TASK, HIGH RELATIONSHIP and LOW RELATIONSHIP groups on the dependent variable leader effectiveness and its comprising dimensions.

**Pearson Correlation**

The SPSS subprogram 'PEARSON CORR' computed Pearson product-moment correlations for pairs of variables. These are zero-order correlations because no controls for the influence of other variables are made. The zero-order matrices were executed for the scores of the APPA and the Coaching Appraisal. This procedure was completed to test for significant relationships between the various dimensions of the instruments. In measuring the strength of the relationship between two-interval level variables, the evaluation indicates a goodness of fit of a linear regression line to the data permitting discrimination qualities to be reported on the instruments.
Post Hoc Multi-Comparison Tests

The significant F-Ratios from the 'ANOVA' computations were tested by the SPSS computer program to determine the location of significance. The Scheffe test is considered to be a conservative with respect to Type I error. The Least Significant Difference and Duncan's Multiple Range Test were also used to help determine location of significance.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides an analysis of the data tapped from the instruments used in this study. The analysis is divided into three major sections consisting of: (1) Instrument Analysis including (a) Coaching Style-Leadership Style, (b) Ability to Perform Player Appraisal-Task Relevant Ability, and, (c) Coaching Appraisal-Leadership Effectiveness; (2) Hypothesis Testing; and, (3) Further In-Depth Analysis.

Of the twenty-two schools affiliated with SWOSSA, twenty-one participated (95%). A full complement of coach/player dyads were received from fourteen schools, or 67% of the participating schools. In total, 115 dyads were received completed, representing an 87% return rate with 95% coach participation, and an 87% player participation rate. (see Table 6)

Instrument Analysis

Since this study incorporated the data collection techniques of a survey procedure, it is necessary to determine within the analysis that: (1) the respondent data was not significantly different from that of the non-respondents; and, (2) the data yielded by the instruments is both valid and reliable. The returned data came in at a fairly regular
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ECSSA)</th>
<th>(KCSSA)</th>
<th>(WSSA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle River</td>
<td>Blenheim</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>Centennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Forster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGregor</td>
<td>Herman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leamington</td>
<td>Tecumseh</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>Wallaceburg</td>
<td>Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


and consistent pace over a nine week period. (see Figure 13)

However, in order to support that the data received was
similar to that of which might be expected from the
non-respondents, a series of statistical functions were
performed in accordance with the data gathered by each of the
instruments (e.g. Crosstabulation, Chi-Square, and Anova).

Coaching Style-Leadership Style.

Data for the independent variable leadership style
was gathered by the Coaching Style instrument, and player's
perceived their coach to be High Task/Low Relationship \( (S_1) \)
leaders in 48 cases or 41.7% of the total respondents;
High Task/High Relationship \( (S_2) \) leaders in 51 cases or
44.3%; High Relationship/Low Task \( (S_3) \) in 13 cases
or 11.3%; and, Low Relationship/Low Task \( (S_4) \) leaders in
3 cases or 2.6% of the total. (see Table 7)

Visual inspection of Figure 13, shows that there was
a consistent regular rate of return over the nine week period.
However, in order that this data could be considered to be
consistent with that which might be expected from the
non-respondents a SPSS subprogram CROSSTABS was performed.
The \( \chi^2 \) value for the computed table of leadership style by
week of return was 33.733 and not significant. (see Table 8)
Therefore it can be stated that leadership style did not
vary as the length of time for the returned instrument
increased. The data is representative of the perceived
leadership styles as rated by the 115 participating players,
as opposed to the 17 players who did not return the instruments.
Figure 13: Histogram, Week of Return by Number of Dyads
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Task/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
<td>$s_1$</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Task/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Relationship</td>
<td>$s_2$</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Relationship/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Task</td>
<td>$s_3$</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Task</td>
<td>$s_4$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8
LEADERSHIP STYLE BY WEEK OF RETURN
CROSSTABULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Apr 26</th>
<th>May 5</th>
<th>May 12</th>
<th>May 19</th>
<th>May 26</th>
<th>Jun 2</th>
<th>Jun 9</th>
<th>Jun 16</th>
<th>Jun 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Task/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Task/</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Relationship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Relationship/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Task</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship/</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Task</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ability to Perform Player Appraisal
Task-Relevant Ability

For the purposes of this study the Ability to Perform Player Appraisal (APPA) instrument was used to obtain the task-relevant ability levels of players in the SWOSSA senior football leagues. The APPA consists of ten dimensions relating to a psychological willingness to perform, and an ability to perform. These dimensions are summated to categorize an individual's capability to perform a task. Thus, the senior football coaches were asked to rate their players on five skill responsibilities that were specific to the position played by the athlete. The ratings were based on an eight point scale with three performance indicators and two semantic anchors at each end of the continuum.

Table 9, indicates the breakdown of APPA classifications for the 115 senior football players. Overall, the coaches rated their players as being Low (P₁) in only 1 case or 0.9% of the total; Moderate Low (P₂) in 10 cases or 8.7%, Moderate High in 57 cases or 49.6%; and High (P₄) in 47 cases or 40.9% of the total respondents.

Descriptive statistics of the completed APPA instruments for the 115 players reveals that the instrument appears to have attained a degree of discrimination in measuring task-relevant ability. (see Table 10) The range of 271 encompasses over 67% of the possible scale range. The kurtosis value of 1.51 indicates a slightly greater
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Low</td>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate High</td>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>$P_4$</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Returns</strong></td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Score</strong></td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Score</strong></td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Score</strong></td>
<td>311.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td>271.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance</strong></td>
<td>2115.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Error</strong></td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td>45.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kurtosis</strong></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skewness</strong></td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
peaking of the distributed scores in relation to the normal curve. The negative skewness value indicates that the majority of the scores assemble to the right of the mean in a graphed distribution, favoring the higher scores on the scale. Thus the tendency of the scores show a positive rater bias that is consistent with the findings of Boucher (1980), Damico (1976) and Smith (1975), in similar studies.

To determine the degree of interrelatedness of each of the ten dimensions of the APPA instrument a zero-order correlation matrix was generated using the SPSS subprogram PEARSON CORRELATION. The results of the analysis appear in Table 11. Only one zero-order coefficient was not significant at the .05 confidence level and all but one coefficient was significant at the .01 confidence level. Correlation coefficients ranging from .83 (Football Related Experience, Knowledge of Football) to .15 (Coachability, Football Related Experience) and with a great majority above .42, points out consistently strong relationships among the ten variables comprising the APPA instrument.

Therefore, not unlike Boucher (1980) it is possible that respondent bias in the form of "generosity error" and "halo effect" have filtered and confounded the ratings. This may be attributed to coaches perceiving their reputation to hinge on the production of good football players and also, the unique setting of the coach/player relationship. Selltiz (1976) described "generosity error" as the tendency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Football Related Experience</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of Football</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to Adjust</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to Take</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coachability</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivation to Achieve</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commitment</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Persistence</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Initiative</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Independence</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*_{p < .01}^*

**_{p < .05}^{**}
of the rater to overestimate the desirable qualities of subjects whom the rater knows well, has a perceived liking for, or with whom the rater shares a common goal. As a result "generosity error" appears to be quite evident in this administration of the APPA instrument.

To determine if the expected data from the non-respondents was not significantly different from that of the respondent data an analysis of variance (ONE-WAY) was computed using the appropriate SPSS subprogram. Treating the task-relevant class ranking as the dependent variable and week of return as the independent variable, a non-significant F-Ratio of 1.963 was yielded. (see Table 12) Therefore it can be concluded that there is no reason to believe that there is no difference between the respondent data and the data which might have been expected from the non-respondents.

Coaching Appraisal-Leadership Effectiveness

For the purposes of this study the Coaching Appraisal instrument was used to obtain the leadership effectiveness of the coaches as perceived by their players. Consisting of nine dimensions relating to the relationship behavior on the part of the coach and appropriate behaviors relating to task completion, the dimensions are summed to yield a score between nine and 72 that reflects the leader's relative effectiveness from the perception of each player.

Table 13, indicates descriptive statistics of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>43.85</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13
DESCRIPTION OF DATA OBTAINED FROM COACHING APPRAISAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Returns</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Score</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Score</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>55.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>59.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coaching Appraisal returns for the 21 participating coaches. Visual inspection reveals that the Coaching Appraisal instrument appears to have attained a reasonable degree of discrimination with respect to measuring relative leader effectiveness. The range of 35 encompasses about half the possible scale range. The mean score of 55.78 indicates a tendency not unlike the APPA instrument, of the rater to overestimate the desirable qualities of the subjects he is rating ("generosity error"). With the caveats above in mind the Coaching Appraisal can be considered to measure relative leadership effectiveness of the coach.

To determine the degree of interrelatedness of each of the nine dimensions of the Coaching Appraisal instrument a zero-order correlation matrix was generated using the appropriate SPSS subprogram and consistent with the procedures used for the APPA instrument dimensions. The results appear in Table 14.

All zero-order correlations were positive and most significant at the .05 confidence level. Only two coefficients were not significant at the .05 level. The correlation coefficients ranging from .53 (Positive Reinforcement, Consideration) to .18 (Emphasis on Performance, Consideration) indicate a relationship but not a consistently strong relationship among the nine dimensions. It appears that the previously mentioned "generosity error" is not considered to be as evident in this instance due to the lower overall coefficients that were generated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Emphasis on</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

**p < .05
Again to ensure that the respondent data was not significantly different from that of the non-respondents, an analysis of variance (ONE-WAY) was executed using the effectiveness score as the dependent variable and the week of return as the independent variable. The results appear in Table 15. The F-Ratio of 1.077 is not significant, and, therefore, supports the contention that the expected data of non-respondents would not have differed significantly from the data that was received from the respondents.

As can be seen from this section, the analyses of the variables by week of return for the 115 coach/player dyads did not show any significant fluctuation toward the end of the data collection period. The instruments used to obtain the data, (a) Coaching Style, (b) Ability to Perform Player Appraisal, and, (c) Coaching Appraisal appear to hold both construct validity and be indirectly reliable for the use intended in this study. Though the analyses done cannot be considered to be a strong respondent check, the semantically changed items for use in the football environment present no data to cause concern for the tapping qualities of each instrument.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The main research hypothesis of this study was stated as:

Leadership effectiveness of football coaches will co-vary with the congruency match between the coaches' leadership style (S) and the player's task-relevant ability (P).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>509.48</td>
<td>63.68</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6270.04</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6779.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The **Degree of Congruence** (C) was assigned relating to the ranking of the perceived APPA class and leadership style class. Of the 115 dyads, 18 cases or 15.7% of the total were found to be ranked as *Congruence 1* (C₁); 47 cases or 40.9% to be *Congruence 2* (C₂); 33 cases or 28.7% to be *Congruence 3* (C₃); and, 17 cases or 14.7% to be *Congruence 4* (C₄), the 'ideal match'. (see Table 16, 17)

To test the above hypothesis, the coach/player dyads were categorized into MATCHES and NON-MATCHES. The MATCHES represented those dyads with an ideal *Congruence 4* (C₄) rating, that is, the coach's perceived leadership style and the player's task-relevant ability were congruent. The NON-MATCHES were those coach/player dyads where leadership style and task-relevant ability were not congruent and thus had a *Congruence 1, 2, or 3* (C₁, C₂, C₃) rating.

Using the SPSS subprogram T-TEST, a student's "t" was computed to test whether or not the difference between the two means was significant. The results appear in Table 18 and result in rejection of the postulate that those coach/player dyads with an 'ideal' match (C₄), perceive their coach as more effective. In fact, the nine dimensions comprising the Leadership Effectiveness score possessed negative t-values for all but Decision Participation. (see Table 19) Thus preliminary evaluation shows that those dyads with an 'ideal' Congruence match, do not perceive their coach as more effective.

In addition, a TWO-WAY analysis of variance was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruence 1</td>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence 2</td>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence 3</td>
<td>$C_3$</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence 4</td>
<td>$C_4$</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches</td>
<td>Non-Matches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_1 - P_1$</td>
<td>$S_1 - P_2$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_2 - P_2$</td>
<td>$S_1 - P_3$</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_3 - P_3$</td>
<td>$S_1 - P_4$</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_4 - P_4$</td>
<td>$S_2 - P_3$</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$S_2 - P_4$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 17 | <strong>Total</strong> | 98 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>2-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matches</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.76</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Matches</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>T Value</td>
<td>2-Tailed Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
performed using leadership style and task-relevant ability as the independent variables and the leadership effectiveness score as the dependent variable. The results of the ANOVA appear in Table 20. Of interest is the effect of the interaction of the two independent variables on the dependent variable. The computed F-Ratio of 1.593 indicates that the interaction of the two independent variables does not have a significant effect on the dependent variable of leadership effectiveness.

The next section of the hypothesis testing focuses on each of the quadrants of the SLT Model, to ascertain the precision of Situational Leadership Theory with respect to the individual leadership styles.

Hypothesis $H_{02}$ was stated as follows: "the effectiveness rating of coaches classified as High Task/Low Relationship ($S_1$), by players classified as $P_1$, will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles ($S_2, S_3, S_4$)." However since only one player was categorized as Low ($P_1$) task-relevant ability, there is insufficient data to test the null hypothesis and accept the alternative that "coaches classified as High Task/High Relationship ($S_1$) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as $P_1$, than coaches with other leadership styles ($S_2, S_3, S_4$)."

Hypothesis $H_{03}$ was stated as follows: "the effectiveness rating of coaches classified as High Task/High
### TABLE 20

**TWO WAY ANOVA OF LEADERSHIP STYLE AND TASK-RELEVANT ABILITY ON LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>847.76</td>
<td>141.29</td>
<td>2.629**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>562.07</td>
<td>187.36</td>
<td>3.486**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>285.69</td>
<td>95.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way Interactions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>342.36</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style &amp; APA Class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>342.36</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1190.12</td>
<td>119.01</td>
<td>2.214**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5589.31</td>
<td>53.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6779.44</td>
<td>59.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.05**
Relationship \((S_2)\) by players classified as \(P_2\), will be no
different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles \((S_1, S_3, S_4)\)."
An analysis of variance using effectiveness as the dependent
variable and leadership style as the independent variable
the appropriate subprogram \textsc{One-Way} was computed. The results
appear in Table 21. The \(F\)-Ratio of 1.940 is not significant
and therefore \(H_{03}\) cannot be rejected. Statistical analysis
confirms that the alternative hypothesis states as:
"coaches classified as \underline{High Task/High Relationship} \((S_2)\)
will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as \(P_2\), than coaches with other leadership styles
\((S_1, S_3, S_4)\)" cannot be accepted.

Hypothesis \(H_{04}\) was stated as follows: "the effec-
tiveness rating of coaches classified as \underline{High Relationship/Low Task} \((S_3)\) by players classified as \(P_3\), will be no
different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles \((S_1, S_2, S_4)\)."
An analysis of variance using the identical procedure for
that which was done for the \underline{Moderate Low} \((P_2)\) category was
computed. The results appear in Table 22. The computed
\(F\)-Ratio of 2.503 approaches but is not significant at the
.05 confidence level. Thus \(H_{04}\) cannot be rejected or the
alternative hypothesis "coaches classified as \underline{High
Relationship/Low Task} \((S_3)\) will be rated significantly more
effective by players classified as \(P_3\), than coaches with
other leadership styles \((S_1, S_2, S_4)\)" be accepted.
### Table 21

**Leadership Effectiveness by Leadership Style for Moderate Low (P<sub>2</sub>) APPA Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>212.90</td>
<td>106.45</td>
<td>1.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>383.00</td>
<td>54.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>596.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 22
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS BY LEADERSHIP STYLE
FOR MODERATE HIGH (P<sub>3</sub>) APPA CLASSIFICATION
ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>479.12</td>
<td>159.71</td>
<td>2.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2744.00</td>
<td>63.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3223.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis H₀₅ was stated as follows: "the effectiveness rating of coaches classified as Low Task/Low Relationship (S₄) by players classified as P₄, will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles (S₁, S₂, S₃)." Again, an analysis of variance using leadership effectiveness as the dependent variable and leadership style as the independent variable was executed. The results appear in Table 23. The computed F-Ratio of 2.787 approaches but is not significant at the .05 confidence level. Thus H₀₅ cannot be rejected nor can the alternative hypothesis, "coaches classified as Low Relationship/Low Task (S₄) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as P₄, than coaches with other leadership styles (S₁, S₂, S₃)" be accepted.

Further In-Depth Analysis

The results found in this study have been the least supportive of any to date using Situational Leadership Theory as a basis for research investigation. However, the inability to reject the null hypotheses and support the alternatives is not something new to SLT investigation. Beck (1978) forwarded sixteen alternative hypotheses, but could only support five. This specific study has found it necessary to reject all alternate hypotheses, therefore in order to lend some explanation, a series of further statistical analyses were conducted to help delineate and question the problem.
TABLE 23
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS BY LEADERSHIP STYLE
FOR HIGH (P4) APPA CLASSIFICATION
ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>254.08</td>
<td>127.04</td>
<td>2.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2461.44</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2715.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the major interaction effect dealt with the degree of congruence, it was thought best to initially tackle the conceptual problem of congruence versus non-congruence. In analyzing Table 24, a CROSSTABS read-out of APPA class by degree of congruence, it was found that in 19 cases, players categorized as High (P_4), ranked their coach as possessing a High Task/Low Relationship (S_1) leadership style. In 20 cases they perceived their coach as having a High Task/High Relationship (S_2) leadership style. In the Moderate High (P_3) classification, these players ranked their coach as having a High Task/Low Relationship (S_1) leadership style in 25 cases and a High Task/High Relationship (S_2), also in 25 cases.

With this in mind the coach/player dyads were grouped into MORE CONGRUENT and LESS CONGRUENT categories. MORE CONGRUENT being defined as those with a Congruence 3 or 4 (C_3, C_4) rating and LESS CONGRUENT as those with a Congruence 1 or 2 (C_1, C_2) rating. The results appear in Table 25 for the dependent variable Leadership Effectiveness. Even though the MORE CONGRUENT had a higher effectiveness mean of 56.49, they were not significantly different from the LESS CONGRUENT group. The dimensional constitution of Effectiveness in Table 26, demonstrates that in six of the dimensions (Consideration, Decision Participation, Autonomy Delegation, Positive Reinforcement, Interaction Facilitation and Conflict Management) the MORE CONGRUENT group had higher mean scores. The LESS CONGRUENT group had higher means on
TABLE 24

APPA CLASSIFICATION BY DEGREE OF CONGRUENCE: CROSSTABULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Congruence 1</th>
<th>Congruence 2</th>
<th>Congruence 3</th>
<th>Congruence 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Pct</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Low</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate High</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>T-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Congruent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56.49</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Congruent</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55.22</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Participation</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Performance</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Facilitation</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Delegation</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Facilitation</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dimensions related to task performance (Direction, Emphasis on Performance, Performance Facilitation) resulting in the negative t-values. Thus the data determines very little support for the MORE CONGRUENT versus the LESS CONGRUENT in perceiving their coach to be more effective. However, the question arises from this data as to what type of leadership style, TASK versus RELATIONSHIP, that the player perceives as most effective.

The data was then grouped into those who perceived their coach to have HIGH TASK \((S_1, S_2)\) leadership styles and those who perceived their coach to have LOW TASK \((S_3, S_4)\) leadership styles. The results for Leadership Effectiveness appear in Table 27. Visual inspection shows that there is little difference between the means, but a trend emphasizes the HIGH TASK styles to be more effective. The dimensional constitution of effectiveness in Table 28, further justifies this statement. However the two dimensions which do record negative t-values remain consistent with the demands of a HIGH TASK style that would suppress scores on the dimensions of Decision Participation and Autonomy Delegation. From examination of the data it appears that those players who categorize their coach as HIGH TASK will perceive him as being slightly more effective.

The four quadrant leadership model was also divided into HIGH RELATIONSHIP \((S_2, S_3)\) and LOW RELATIONSHIP \((S_1, S_4)\) leadership styles. A student's t-test was again performed and the results for leadership effectiveness appear in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>2-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Task ($S_1$, $S_2$)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Task ($S_3$, $S_4$)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>T Value</td>
<td>2-Tailed Probability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>0.018**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Delegation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table compares the dimensions of leadership effectiveness between high task (HT) and low task (LT) conditions.
Table 29. For those players who perceived their coach as having HIGH RELATIONSHIP leadership styles, rated him to be significantly more effective than those players who perceived their coach as having LOW RELATIONSHIP leadership styles (p .01). Further investigation of the dimensions of leadership effectiveness indicated where the perceived differences could be found. (see Table 30) Significant at the .05 confidence level were the dimensions of Positive Reinforcement, Interaction Facilitation, and Conflict Management. Significant at the .01 confidence level were the dimensions of Consideration and Decision Participation. The negative t-values are consistent with the group-wise breakdown, in that, Direction and Emphasis on Performance are directly opposite of a relationships or consideration behavior orientation. Therefore the results prove within bounds, that coach's who are perceived to have HIGH RELATIONSHIP leadership styles, are also perceived to be more effective by their players than coaches with LOW RELATIONSHIP styles.

In attempting to further identify if any one leadership style was termed more effective than the others, an analysis of variance using leadership style as the independent variable and the total effectiveness score as the dependent variable, an F-Ratio of 3.344 was found to be significant at the .05 confidence level. The results of the analysis appear in Table 31. To determine which of the pairwise comparisons indicated significant differences, the conservative Scheffé multi-comparison test was used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>2-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Relationship</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57.84</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S₂, S₃)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Relationship</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53.65</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S₁, S₄)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>2-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.019**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.045**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.014**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

**p < .05
TABLE 31
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS BY LEADERSHIP STYLE
ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>562.00</td>
<td>187.33</td>
<td>3.344**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6217.49</td>
<td>56.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6779.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05
The results appear in Table 32.

The Scheffé procedure produced no significant results, but did establish the HIGH RELATIONSHIP leadership style tending toward more effective, especially High Task/High Relationship \( (S_2) \). Because Scheffé is recognized as conservative and prevents a Type I error occurrence, additional multi-comparison tests (Duncan and LSD) were performed. Both indicated the same results. The Least Significant Difference test demonstrated that High Task/High Relationship \( (S_2) \) was significantly different from High Task/Low Relationship \( (S_1) \) and Low Relationship/Low Task \( (S_4) \) leadership styles. (see Table 33)

The Duncan Multiple Range test confirmed this by indicating High Task/High Relationship \( (S_2) \) to be different than the three other leadership styles \( (S_1, S_3, S_4) \), but in the second subset of means, to be the same as High Relationship/Low Task \( (S_3) \). (see Table 34) Therefore, High Task/High Relationship \( (S_2) \) leadership style is significantly more effective than High Task/Low Relationship and Low Relationship/Low Task \( (S_4) \) leadership styles.

Thus, where SLT postulates no significantly effective leadership style, the data supports that regardless of a player's task-relevant ability they prefer and perceive High Task/High Relationship \( (S_2) \) leader behavior as more effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Styles</th>
<th>Difference Between Effectiveness Means</th>
<th>Scheffe P-Ratio</th>
<th>More Effective Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$S_2 - S_1$</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.055</td>
<td>$S_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_3 - S_1$</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>$S_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_1 - S_4$</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>2.268</td>
<td>$S_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_2 - S_3$</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>$S_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_2 - S_4$</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>5.484</td>
<td>$S_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_3 - S_4$</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>3.624</td>
<td>$S_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 33
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS BY LEADERSHIP STYLE
LSD MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>S₁</th>
<th>S₂</th>
<th>S₃</th>
<th>S₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.75</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05

S₁ - High Task/Low Relationship
S₂ - High Task/High Relationship
S₃ - High Relationship/Low Task
S₄ - Low Relationship/Low Task
TABLE 34
LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS BY LEADERSHIP STYLE
DUNCAN'S MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

Ranges for .05 Confidence Level

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>S_{4}^{**}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>S_{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>56.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ not significantly different

→ **p < .05
Summary

This chapter presented the results of this study. The data was presented in statistical format to permit analysis of (1) instrumentation; (2) hypothesis testing; and, (3) further in-depth analysis. One major research hypothesis and four null hypotheses with alternates were tested. The acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses established evidence to support or fail to support Situational Leadership Theory in the football environment. Finally, further in-depth analysis provided additional explanation for the data collected.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RESULTS-ANALYSIS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate Situational Leadership Theory and its application to the football environment in the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association (SWOMA). Furthermore, the hypotheses presented the avenue to determine if the degree of congruence (C), between the perceived leadership style of the coach (S), and the perceived task-relevant ability of the player (P) was directly related to the perceived leadership effectiveness rating, of SWOMA senior football coaches.

Summary

Chapter I, identified the problem and presented the background necessary for a conceptual understanding of the study. Situational Leadership Theory as proposed by Hersey and Blanchard (1977) emphasizes the trend of leadership research toward specificity. The extension of the Ohio State four quadrant model to incorporate an effectiveness dimension delineated the "appropriate" leadership style, which was determined by the level of maturity of the individual to perform a given task within the organization. A felt need for the study was developed because:
1. Leadership effectiveness research has been hampered by many methodological and conceptual problems with which this study attempted to deal with through, (a) the coach/player dyad, (b) the operationalization of "task-relevant maturity" to "task-relevant ability"; and, (c) the independent measure of effectiveness.

2. Situational Leadership has not been investigated in the football organizational setting.

3. Future studies in the coach/player relationship could be based on this study.

4. An effective model for leadership behavioral style in football coaching is provided.

The Review of Related Literature provided an in-depth commentary on leadership theory from the 'great man' approach to the present day situational approach. An emphasis on management theory supplemented, for the lay-coach, an opportunity to search out the origins and developments of leadership. In addition, empirical investigations relating to coaching evaluation and performance were also presented.

Methodologically, this study was unique to other studies researching the coach/athlete interactive process. Utilizing the Vertical Dyad Design (Vertical Dyad Linkage), each player evaluated his coach, and each coach evaluated the participating athlete, to create the coach/player dyadic unit. Thus the evaluation of Situational Leadership Theory (SLT) in the football environment, was based on
individual perception in conjunction with SLT's postulate that the "appropriate" leadership style exhibited by the leader is directly related to the "task-relevant maturity" of the member.

The data collected was subsequently analyzed using general descriptive frequencies, crosstabulation, chi-square, student "t" tests, pearson correlation, analysis of variance, and post hoc multi-comparison tests. These SPSS subprograms provided the necessary information with which to:

(1) test the hypotheses; (2) validate the instruments; and,
(3) explain the results. Table 35 presents the null and alternate hypotheses, with decisions regarding each.

Conclusions

From the results of the analysis of this study, the following can be concluded:

1. That the instruments used to collect the pertinent data for analyses caused no immediate concern for their tapping qualities.

2. That SLT applied to the high school football environment is not supported, specifically:

(a) leadership style did have a perceived significant effect, whereas, SLT postulates no one leadership style should be significantly more effective than the other;

(b) in three of the four leadership quadrants tested, those postulated as having the ideal "task-relevant ability" rating for the specific leadership quadrant (i.e. $S_2P_2$, $S_3P_3$, $S_4P_4$) did not rate that coach as having a significantly more effective leadership style;
### TABLE 35

**SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES AND DECISIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(H_1) - Leadership effectiveness of football coaches will co-vary with the congruence match between the coaches' leadership style ((S)) and the players' task-relevant ability ((P)).</td>
<td>Fail to Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H_{02}) - The effectiveness rating of coaches classified as High Task/Low Relationship ((S_1)), by players classified as (P_1), will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles ((S_2, S_3, S_4)).</td>
<td>Fail to Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H_{A2}) - Coaches classified as High Task/Low Relationship ((S_1)) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as (P_1) than coaches with other leadership styles ((S_2, S_3, S_4)).</td>
<td>Fail to Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H_{03}) - The effectiveness rating of coaches classified as High Task/High Relationship ((S_1)), by players classified as (P_2), will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles ((S_1, S_3, S_4)).</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H_{A3}) - Coaches classified as High Task/High Relationship ((S_2)) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as (P_2) than coaches with other leadership styles ((S_1, S_3, S_4)).</td>
<td>Fail to Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H\text{04}</td>
<td>The effectiveness rating of coaches classified as High Relationship/Low Task ($S_3$), by players classified as $P_3$, will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles ($S_1$, $S_2$, $S_4$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H\text{A4}</td>
<td>Coaches classified as High Relationship/Low Task ($S_3$) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as $P_3$, than coaches with other leadership styles ($S_1$, $S_2$, $S_4$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H\text{05}</td>
<td>The effectiveness rating of coaches classified as Low Relationship/Low Task ($S_4$), by players classified as $P_4$, will be no different than the effectiveness rating for coaches classified as having other leadership styles ($S_1$, $S_2$, $S_3$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H\text{A5}</td>
<td>Coaches classified as Low Relationship/Low Task ($S_4$) will be rated significantly more effective by players classified as $P_4$, than coaches with other leadership styles ($S_1$, $S_2$, $S_3$).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) the S₂ quadrant could not be tested because of insufficient data;

(d) player's who perceived their coach as having a High Task/High Relationship (S₂) leader style, rated him to be significantly more effective than those coaches having Low Relationship/Low Task (S₁) and High Task/Low Relationship (S₄) leadership styles; and,

(e) player's who perceived their coach to have a HIGH RELATIONSHIP (S₂, S₃) leadership style rated him to be significantly more effective than those coaches perceived as LOW RELATIONSHIP (S₁, S₄) leaders.

Statistical evidence therefore in this study refutes the claims of Situational Leadership Theory that (1) where the congruence match is 'ideal' the coach will be perceived to be more effective, (2) that leadership effectiveness is not influenced by the degree of congruency, and, (3) a coach classified with the 'ideal' leadership style of the rating player, will be perceived to be more effective than coaches rated as having other leadership styles.

Results-Analysis

In attempting to provide explanation for the results found, it would be beneficial to review the role that the coach plays in a team environment. The coach occupies a very powerful position, as he/she may determine who plays or who does not, may create rules which dictate "appropriate" team member behaviors, or, determine the level and nature of the interaction between the coach as leader, and other team members. Basically, the goals toward which the athlete
is striving should be, or are exemplified by the leader/coach. Therefore the desirability of identifying a style of coaching which may enhance both the growth of the participant and the frequency of team victory, is not difficult to understand.

Chelladurai (1978) has pointed out, any discussion of interpersonal behavior and its relationship to performance in the athletic context should consider three variables, the coach, the athlete, and the task. Team sport, especially football, has within it many numbers of plays and strategies. The task at hand could create role ambiguities as athletes practice for different plays and strategies.

Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) found team sport athletes to express greater preference for their coach to emphasize more training than individual sport athletes. The football environment stresses a crisis situation almost continually, practical and training sessions are structured around game preparation activities for the next opponent. As a result the coach must always be cognizant of coordinating strategy involvement with the prospective game situation, consequently, he may find little opportunity to de-emphasize the task situation.

Danielson, Zelhart and Drake (1975) suggested that such factors as team structure and level of competition may affect not only team cohesion, but also the coaching style which would foster team success. Bird (1978) indicated that
regardless of team success or division, coaches perceived themselves as being more task-oriented in contrast to players who saw these coaches as more socio-emotional. Bird concluded, the 'most effective' coaching style requires modification according to the level of skill or competition.

Coaching and leadership cannot be considered to be synonymous entities, however, this study emphasizing leadership as "the influence process" goes one step further in clarifying the coaching question posed by the previously mentioned literature. In attempting to identify the compatible coach/player dyad, Situational Leadership Theory measured perceived leadership style, leader effectiveness and player task-relevant ability. The data collected lent support to the studies of Chelladurai (1978) and Bird (1978).

Of consequence is the definite statement that a HIGH RELATIONSHIP leadership style ($S_2$, $S_3$) is significantly more effective than a LOW RELATIONSHIP style. A HIGH TASK ($S_1$, $S_2$) leadership style showed a tendency to be rated more effective than a LOW TASK ($S_3$, $S_4$) leadership style, but not significantly. The intertwining of these results disregards the 'Lombardi' myth of the task-master who is very autocratic and demand oriented. Indeed, where the coach exhibits a High Task/High Relationship ($S_2$) leader style he is perceived as significantly more effective than those who exhibited a LOW RELATIONSHIP ($S_1$, $S_4$) leadership style.

The results indicate if a coach is to utilize a leadership style in the senior high school football leagues
of SWOSSA, players will perceive their coach as 'most effective' when a High Task/High Relationship \((S_2)\) leadership style is used. Consequently, any coach who directs a team in a voluntary organization where there is no funding financially for the player, or coach, must seriously consider the leadership emphasis that he/she uses within the team's practice and game environment.

**Recommendations for High School Coaching in Football**

It is perceived in the high school environment that if a coach is to exhibit a preferential leadership style, then it would be in best interest to show one of HIGH RELATIONSHIP \((S_2, S_3)\). More significantly, if the coach is to exhibit a High Task/High Relationship \((S_2)\) leadership style, he will be perceived as 'more effective' than when utilizing HIGH TASK only leadership styles.

Task behavior has been related "to the extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers)." Relationship behavior has been related, "to the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers)." Therefore if a coach is to exhibit 'ideal' perceived leadership qualities he should place great emphasis on defining the roles to be performed by members of the team and stress an 'open system' where he can be approached by all players, irrespective of their experience or ability to
play the game.

It is important for the coach to be cognizant of the dimensions that constituted the Coaching Appraisal instrument. Though the dimensions can be grouped into relationship and task categories, each are unique and comprise important facets of the administration of an 'effective' leadership style. Thus, in dealings of team concerns, the coach should seek to optimize the identified dimensions, and also be aware of their slight but crucial conceptual differences. (see Table 36)

Chapter IV, reported 19 players having an APPA class of P₄, to perceive their coach as having a High Task/Low Relationship (S₁) leadership style. Of players ranked in Moderate High (P₃) APPA class, they perceived their coach to have an S₁ leadership style in 25 cases. These results only emphasize the nature of the coach to inherit the HIGH TASK leadership behavior that seems to be associated with the game of football. Statistical evidence indicates the evolution of leadership theory in coaching to have returned full circle, underscoring the importance of exhibiting a HIGH RELATIONSHIP leadership style.

Football should be an enjoyable experience for the athlete who is making a heavy time commitment, in order to participate. Perhaps, when coaching, it is imperative to place great weight on analyzing the leadership style used and be aware that high school participants prefer their coach to exhibit a HIGH RELATIONSHIP style.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 36</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COACHING APPRAISAL DIMENSIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Consideration | The extent to which your coach is supportive, friendly and considerate towards players, looks out for your welfare, shows trust and appreciation and is open and honest with you. |
| Direction | The extent to which your coach informs players about their duties and responsibilities, sets goals and establishes performance standards and provides players with necessary training and instruction. |
| Decision | The extent to which your coach consults with players and otherwise allows you to participate in making decisions, and the amount of influence over the coach's decision that result from this participation. |
| Participation | The extent to which your coach emphasizes the importance of productivity and efficiency, encourages players to attain a high level of performance, checks on your performance and informs you when it is not up to par. |
| Emphasis on Performance | The extent to which your coach obtains necessary equipment for, and eliminates obstacles that interfere with practice. |
| Performance Facilitation | The extent to which your coach delegates responsibility and authority to players and allows them to determine how to perform a skill. |
| Autonomy Delegation | The extent to which your coach provides recognition to a player and tries to provide encouragement for effective performance. |
| Positive Reinforcement | The extent to which your coach embraces the importance of teamwork and encourages players to cooperate and be friendly with each other. |
| Interaction Facilitation | The extent to which your coach helps players settle conflicts and disagreements, restrains you from insulting or fighting with each other, and encourages you to resolve conflict in a constructive manner. |
Recommendations for Future Research

This author believes that potential areas for research in coaching leadership are unlimited, and the following will present methods which would improve the findings of this study, or enhance significant findings in future research projects.

Methodological Concerns

1. In measuring "task-relevant ability" of the player, APPA class discrimination could be better achieved by the use of separate instruments. These instruments could scale an individual's perceived capabilities to perform a task based on: (a) a psychological basis; and, (b) an expertise basis, solely. A summated score on both instruments would probably give a more accurate reading on that person's ability to perform a task.

2. This study based its foundation on the interaction effect between leadership style and task-relevant ability (Degree of Congruence). Essential to this interaction is the player's perception of his coach's leadership style. In addition to the methodology established in this study, a verification of the Coaching Style instruments validity and reliability could be obtained by receiving the coach's self-perception of his/her leadership style. Thus, cross-reference validation for the variable leadership style could be executed.
Prospective Research Areas

1. Future research should encompass differing levels of competition. It would be of interest to determine if 'effective' coaching performances must be modified, dependent upon the level of competition. As a result studies of similar interest could be investigated in: (a) an amateur (junior football) setting; (b) the university (OUAA equivalent) setting; and, (c) the professional setting. Comparative study could be investigated involving participation of all levels of football played.

2. Comparative study between Canadian and American football organizations. Specifically, the American scholarship system modelling the professional role and Canadian university athletics modelling the amateur role. With the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union debating the introduction of the scholarship system, this research topic is of immediate concern.

3. In further delineating the nature of coaching, important consideration should be forwarded to investigating the High Task/High Relationship ($S_2$) leadership emphasis that appears to be associated with team play, and, the nature of RELATIONSHIP behavior associated both within and outside the task environment.
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Research Approval Committee
December 6, 1979

Mr. Dave Mistele, Director
Kent County Board of Education
McNaughton Avenue East
Chatham, Ontario

Dear Mr. Mistele:

This letter is to request your endorsement and support for two studies which are proposed by graduate students here in the Faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor. These two studies, which received the unanimous endorsement of the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association at the Board of Directors meeting on November 17, 1979, are listed below:

"The Organizational History of the Southwestern Ontario Secondary Schools Association (SWOSSA)" by Lance Bullock.


The organizational history of SWOSSA will replicate studies done previously by Paul Webb on "The Organizational History of the Ontario Federation of School Athletic Associations (OFSAA), 1948-1975," and "An Organizational History of the Windsor Secondary Schools Association (WSSA), 1928-1977," by Gary Howell. The methodology involved in this study would require review of the minutes and written records of SWOSSA and audio interviews with those who have been involved in the organization and administration of SWOSSA (secretaries, members of the Board of Directors and the delegates to annual meetings, convenors, etc.).

The second study on the task and relationship behaviour of football coaches and players by Paul McMillan would require audio interviews with the coaches and players throughout SWOSSA schools, and the completion of one or two written opinionnaires (requiring upwards of forty-five minutes). The audio interviews would be conducted on an individual basis and the written opinionnaires could also be filled in on a take-home basis, although it would be more desirable for practical and reliability considerations to have members of a football team fill them in as a group before or after school. This study is very descriptive in nature, and as the title indicates, compares and contrasts the way leaders (football coaches) and followers (players) view task behaviour and relationship behaviour. This study tests whether coaches and players see task behaviour and relationship behaviour in the same way and also whether these perceptions change with the development of the player. Results would be reported in group form and therefore individual coaches and players would remain anonymous.
Mr. Dave Mistle

December 6, 1979

I will be acting as advisor and chairman for the thesis committee for both of these Master of Human Kinetics students, and you and your board members could rest assured that the same professional vigilance which prevailed throughout the study for the Ministry of Education on The Role of Interschool Sports in the Secondary Schools of Ontario will prevail. Speaking personally, I am pleased to see that we have two additional excellent graduate students who are interested in conducting theses in the area of secondary school sports. These two particular projects have been suggested by former secretaries and presidents of SWOSSA and those involved in secondary school football, respectively. It is expected that we will have educators from the SWOSSA region serve on the theses committees for these students, as we anticipate the same symbiotic relationship between the university researchers and educators in SWOSSA which prevailed during our previous studies.

Thank you for considering this request for endorsement.

Sincerely,

Dick Moriarty, Ph.D.
Professor and Director of
Sports Institute for Research/
Change Agent Research (SIR/CAR)

DM: pb
INITIAL LETTERS TO COACHES AND PRINCIPALS
APPENDICES "H" AND "I"

APPENDIX "H"  LETTERS TO PRINCIPALS
(Essex County Only)

APPENDIX "I"  LETTER TO COACHES
(Windsor, and Kent County Only)
April 17th, 1980

Mr. G. Bezaire, Principal
Belle River District High School
333 South Street,
Belle River, Ontario
NOR 1A0

Dear Mr. Bezaire:

Presently, under the direction of Dr. Dick Moriarty, I am involved in the initial stages of a research project designed to help determine leadership styles of coaches in football. My position this past 79' football season, as an assistant coach with the University of Winsor Lancers, has interested me in such a study and I hope I can enlist your support and cooperation.

This study, has been approved by the Research Committees of Essex, Kent and Windsor, Boards of Education. In addition, the SWOSSA Board of Executive have given their full endorsement to the project.

Essentially, the coach will be asked to complete six appraisal forms of players on his team, selected on the basis of their experience in football. The six players, in turn, will be asked to complete leadership opinionnaires of their coach. Thus the total time spent involving completion of the instruments should take no longer than 40 minutes for each participant. I assure you, Mr. Bezaire, that the anonymity of the respondents will be maintained with the utmost of professional integrity.

Numerous coaches in SWOSSA have consented to participate and I sincerely hope that members of your school will also participate in this project. Mr. Bezaire, it would be greatly appreciated if you could forward the name of your Head Football Coach, and procedures regarding parental consent. If you have any questions, or your school does not wish to participate, please feel free to contact me:

1. c/o Dr. Dick Moriarty,
   The Faculty of Human Kinetics, or;

2. at my home phone number
   (519) 252-7891

Mr. Bezaire, I look forward to interacting with you on this project and I firmly believe, that through our combined effort, knowledge will be added to the dimensions of football coaching.

Respectfully yours,

Paul McMillan, Assistant Coach
Windsor, Ontario
April 15th, 1980

Mr. Bob Carlson, Head Football Coach
Tecumseh Secondary School
287 McNaughton Avenue, West,
Chatham, Ontario
N7L 1R8

Dear Mr. Carlson

Presently, I am involved in the initial stages of a research project designed to help determine leadership styles of coaches in football. My position this past 79’ football season, as an assistant coach with the University of Windsor Lancers, has interested me in such a study and I hope I can enlist your support and cooperation.

This study, which has been approved by both the SWOSSA Board of Executive, and your Board of Education, will take approximately 40 minutes of your time and 40 minutes of your player’s time.

Essentially, you will be asked to complete an appraisal form for each of the six players selected to complete leadership opinionnaires on your respective team. All data collected, of course, will be treated with the fullest of professional integrity.

The material to be used for this study should be ready for mailing, within the next 10 days. If you have any questions or do not wish to participate, please contact me:

1. c/o The Faculty of Human Kinetics
Windsor, Ontario

2. or, phone me at home
(519) 252-7891

I sincerely hope that you and your team members will participate on this project, and I look forward to interacting with you. I firmly believe this study will take steps toward adding a dimension to football coaching, through our combined effort.

Respectfully yours,

Paul McMillan, Assistant Coach
Windsor, Ontario
INITIAL PACKAGE LETTERS TO PLAYERS
AND COACHES
APPENDICES "J" TO "L"

APPENDIX "J" PACKAGE LETTERS TO COACHES
APPENDIX "K" PACKAGE LETTERS TO PLAYERS
APPENDIX "L" THANK YOU LETTER FOR PARTICIPATION
Mr. Bill Robinson, Head Football Coach  
John McGregor Secondary School  
300 Cecile Avenue  
CHATHAM, Ontario  
N7M 2C6

Dear Mr. Robinson

Following my letter of two weeks ago, I have forwarded this package of material which is essential for my data collection. Included in the package:

1. A manilla envelope for you, the coach.
2. A manilla envelope for each player (a total of six).
3. A return self-addressed, self-stamped envelope, which will encompass all collected materials.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could perform some administrative details for me. I ask of you, that you choose six players who represent varying levels of experience:

1. Two, with 1 year senior football experience,
2. Two, with 2 years senior football experience; and,
3. Two, with 3 or more years senior football experience.

Please distribute an envelope to each player, and ask him to complete the contained opinionnaires at home, and then return them to you for insertion into the RETURN PACKAGE.

Coach, I will ask you to complete your opinionnaires, filling one out for each player. As you will notice I have included categorizations of major skill-football responsibilities, and also an example of a completed instrument. Therefore in evaluating each player:

1. choose the position he plays most frequently,
2. look for the major skill responsibilities from the outline provided,
3. Place your name, your player's name, and school on each form.
4. Rank the player's ability to perform this specific task on each of the dimensions, from 1 to 8.

**Each dimension is related to how the player performs or attempts to perform this specific skill.**

**Note, you should have 10 rankings (vertical) for each of the skill responsibilities.**

**You should also have ranked 5 skill responsibilities.**

Coach, I assure you that anonymity will be kept to the utmost of my professional integrity. Identification of the coach-athlete dyad is necessary in order to collate the data for computer assignment. Once that assignment has been made all records of names and institutions will be destroyed. Again, I thank-you for your and your players' cooperation, and once this study has been completed I will forward you a copy of the results. Also I will greatly appreciate you collecting all materials and returning them in the provided envelope.
Respectfully yours,

Paul McMillan, Assistant Coach
The University of Windsor Lancers,
c/o Dr. Dick Moriarty,
The Faculty of Human Kinetics
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario.
N9B 3P4
April 29th, 1980

Dear Player:

First of all, thank-you for participating and secondly, don't be alarmed by all the paper. Included in this package are two forms, one which helps determine your coach's LEADERSHIP STYLE, and one which determines a perceived level of LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS.

To complete the forms:

1. Look at the COACHING STYLE form, read the instructions and look at the completed example (green paper).

2. Read each situation and answer like you think your coach would act. **you should have 12 circled responses

3. Now take out the COACHING APPRAISAL form, read the instructions and look at the completed example (yellow paper).

4. Circle one response for each dimension. Therefore read each sentence beginning with, "The extent to which....." and then go to the left and circle a number from 1 to 8.

5. Make sure you put your name and coach's name on the sheet. Don't worry, all results will be coded on a computer, then destroyed.

6. Place your answers (should be four pages) in the provided envelope, SEAL IT and then return it to your coach.

Again, thank-you for your help and I hope to see you in the future, either at one of your games or as a Windsor Lancer. Good Luck in your future endeavours.

Respectfully yours,

Paul McMillan, Assistant Coach
The University of Windsor Lancers
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
Mr. Brian Tayles, Head Football Coach
Centennial Secondary School
1400 Northwood Avenue
WINDSOR, Ontario
N8Y 4A6

Dear Mr. Tayles:

I have now completed my results for the study that you participated in last May/June. Within this package is an abridged version of my thesis. I hope you will find this reading informative. Again, thank-you for both your players' participation and of course yours. Wishing you the best in your future coaching endeavours.

Sincerely,

Paul McMillan,
The University of Windsor
COACHING STYLE: INSTRUMENT
AND SAMPLE COPY
APPENDIX "M"
The purpose of this rating form is to help you determine the leadership style of your coach.
Leadership style refers to the pattern of behaviors your coach uses in attempting to influence you.
Your task is to read the situation presented and interpret how your coach would react in that situation.

Please write your coach's name and your school, at the top of the Coaching Style Response Form.

***IMPORTANT also write YOUR NAME

1. Read each situation and corresponding set of answers, one at a time.

2. After reading each situation rate your coach's leadership style by circling the response that demonstrates how your coach would act in that situation.

3. Continue this process and answer the remaining situations.

4. Be sure to circle one response for each situation.

***REMEMBER you should have 12 circled responses,

ONE PER SITUATION
Coaching Style Response

**Situation:** Players on the team are not responding lately to the coaches' friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. The team's performance is declining rapidly.

Your coach would....
A. emphasize the use of consistent procedures and the necessity for good skilled play.
B. be available for discussion and would not push his involvement
c. talk with the players and then set goals.
D. intentionally not get involved.

**Situation:** The performance level of the team is increasing. The coach has been making sure that all team members were aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.

Your coach would....
A. engage in friendly interaction, but continue to make sure all team players are aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.
B. take no definite action.
C. do what could be done to make the team feel important and involved.
D. emphasize the importance of meeting commitments and performing to the best of our ability.

**Situation:** The team is unable to solve a problem. The coach normally leaves the team alone. Team performance and interpersonal relation (togetherness) have been good.

Your coach would....
A. work with the team and solve the problem together.
B. let the team work it out.
C. act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect the team.
D. encourage the team to work on the problem and be supportive of their efforts.

**Situation:** The coach is considering a change. The coach's players are good football players. The players respect the need for change.

Your coach would....
A. allow team involvement in developing the change, but would not be too directive.
B. announce changes and then implement with close supervision.
C. allow the team to formulate its own direction.
D. incorporate team recommendations but direct the change.
Situation: The performance of the team has been dropping as the season progresses. Players are becoming unconcerned about trying to meet the coach's objectives. Restructuring the role and responsibilities on the team has helped in the past. The players have continually needed reminding to perform to the best of their capabilities.

Your coach would....
A. allow the team to formulate its own direction.
B. incorporate team recommendations, but see that desired objectives are met.
C. redefine the role and responsibility of each player and supervise them carefully.
D. allow team involvement in determining roles and responsibilities and not be too directive.

Situation: Your coach is new and has stepped into a very successful and efficiently run team. The previous coach strictly controlled all matters involving the team. The new coach wants to maintain a successful situation but would like to begin to become more of a friend than the other coach.

Your coach would....
A. do what could be done to make the team feel important and involved.
B. emphasize the importance of performance.
C. intentionally not intervene.
D. get the team involved in decision-making, but see that objectives are met.

Situation: Your coach is considering a change that will be new to the team. Members of the team have made suggestions about what to change. The team has been successful and demonstrated it can succeed under many conditions.

Your coach would?....
A. define the change and watch over it closely.
B. participate with the team in developing the change but allow the team members to decide how to make the change.
C. be willing to make changes as recommended by the players, but maintain control of how the change is made.
D. avoid confrontation with the team; and leave things alone.

Situation: Team performance and camaraderie (spirit) is good. Your coach feels somewhat uneasy about his lack of influence on the team.

Your coach would....
A. leave the team alone.
B. discuss the situation with the team and then he would initiate necessary changes.
C. take steps to direct players to working toward better skilled performance.
D. be supportive in discussing the situation with the group but not too directive.
Situation: Your coach has been appointed by the convener of the league to head a committee that is far overdue in making recommendations to change your league. The committee is not clear on what it is supposed to do. Attendance at committee meetings is poor and their meetings turn into social gatherings. The people on the committee are good and have the ability to recommend changes.

Your coach would....
A. let the committee work out its problems.
B. incorporate committee recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
C. redefine the purpose of the committee and supervise carefully.
D. allow committee involvement in setting goals, but not push them.

Situation: Players who usually are able to take responsibility are not responding to the coaches' redefined ideals of good performance.

Your coach would....
A. allow team involvement in redefining performance levels, but would not take control.
B. redefine performance levels himself and implement them.
C. avoid confrontation with the player and not apply pressure, and thus leave the situation alone.
D. incorporate team recommendations, but see that the new standards are met.

Situation: Your coach has been transferred to another school. The previous coach at that school was uninvolved in the affairs of the team. However the team has adequately performed in the past and team morale is good.

Your coach would....
A. take steps to direct the players toward performing in a well-defined manner.
B. involve players in decision making and reinforce good inputs by the players.
C. discuss past performance with the team and then examine the need for new approaches.
D. leave the team as it was.

Situation: Recent happenings indicate internal difficulties among the players on the team. The team has a remarkable performance record. The players have effectively reached the coach's goals and worked together. All players are good athletes and well qualified.

Your coach would....
A. try out his solution with the team and examine the need for changes in the program.
B. allow the players to work it out themselves.
C. act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
D. participate in discussing the problem while providing support to the players.
Coaching Style Response

Situation: Players on the team are not responding lately to the coaches' friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. The team's performance is declining rapidly.

Your coach would:
A. emphasize the use of consistent procedures and the necessity for good skilled play.
B. be available for discussion and push his involvement.
C. talk with the players and then set goals.
D. intentionally not get involved.

Situation: The performance level of the team is increasing. The coach has been making sure that all team members were aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.

Your coach would:
A. engage in friendly interaction, but continue to make sure all team players are aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.
B. take no definite action.
C. do what could be done to make the team feel important and involved.
D. emphasize the importance of meeting commitments and performing to the best of our ability.

Situation: The team is unable to solve a problem. The coach normally leaves the team alone. Team performance and interpersonal relation (togetherness) have been good.

Your coach would:
A. work with the team and solve the problem together.
B. let the team work it out.
C. act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect the team.
D. encourage the team to work on the problem and be supportive of their efforts.

Situation: The coach is considering a change. The coach's players are good football players. The players respect the need for change.

Your coach would:
A. allow team involvement in developing the change, but would not be too directive.
B. announce changes and then implement with close supervision.
C. allow the team to formulate its own direction.
D. incorporate team recommendations but direct the change.
ABILITY TO PERFORM PLAYER APPRAISAL (APPA)
AND SAMPLE COPY
INCLUDES COACHES' MOTOR SKILL
FOOTBALL RESPONSIBILITIES
APPENDIX "N"
Ability to Perform

The purpose of this rating form is to help you determine the ability to perform levels of a player who plays for you. Ability to perform refers to the combination of psychological willingness and a football-related capability.

Since a person's ability to perform will depend upon the particular objective, your task will be to provide perceptions of the person's ability, that is, your player's capability to play football on the listed ten dimensions.

Directions

Please write your player's name and school at the top of the APA Response Sheet.

**IMPORTANT Please also list your name, it is critical to the design of the study. Professional integrity will be maintained and results will be listed anonymously.

1. Rate the player and his ability to play football according to the ten performance dimensions that are listed using the following scale:

   - Your ratings ranging from 1 to 8 should be placed on the Response Sheet.

   - To help you with your ratings, indicators of 'high' and 'low' performance for each dimension appear on the form.

   - Be sure to base your ratings on your observations of the person's behavior.

2. Be sure to respond to each dimension in order that a complete profile of your player be obtained.

*Adapted from Maturity Scale/Manager Rating Form. Copyright 1977, Ronald K. Hambleton, Kenneth H. Blanchard, Paul Hersey and Ability to Perform Appraisal, Robert Boucher, 1980.
### MAJOR SKILL RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Football Related Experience</td>
<td>Has Football Relevant Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of Football</td>
<td>Has Necessary Football Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to Adjust to Game Conditions</td>
<td>Is Able to Adjust Independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to Take Responsibility</td>
<td>Can be Left Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coachability</td>
<td>Receives Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivation To Achieve</td>
<td>Has High Desire To Achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commitment</td>
<td>Is Very Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Persistence</td>
<td>Won't Quit Until Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Initiative</td>
<td>Seeks New Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Independence</td>
<td>Is Willing To Work On Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Player Appraisal

#### Major Skill Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has Football Relevant Experience</td>
<td>Has Necessary Football Knowledge</td>
<td>Is Able to Adjust Independently</td>
<td>Can Be Left Alone</td>
<td>Receives Instruction Well</td>
<td>Has Desire To Achieve</td>
<td>Is Very Dedicated</td>
<td>Won't Quit Until Done</td>
<td>Seeks New Approaches</td>
<td>Is Willing To Work On Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn't Have Football Relevant Experience</td>
<td>Doesn't Have Necessary Football Knowledge</td>
<td>Is Unable to Adjust Independently</td>
<td>Requires Close Supervision</td>
<td>Refuses to Listen</td>
<td>Has Little Desire To Achieve</td>
<td>Is Uncaring</td>
<td>Gives Up Easily</td>
<td>Is Content With the &quot;Status Quo&quot;</td>
<td>Is Unwilling To Work On Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Player Name:** Paul McMillan

**School:** Windsor Secondary

---

**Your Name:** Murray Watson

---

*Notes from the Evaluation:

- The player's commitment is high, as indicated by the score of 8. This is reflected in his dedication and persistence in the game.
- His initiative is also noted to be strong, as he consistently seeks new approaches and is open to change.
- However, there is room for improvement in his independence, as he is willing to work on own projects.*
MAJOR SKILL-FOOTBALL RESPONSIBILITIES

CENTER
1. OFFENSIVE RUN BLOCK VERSUS DOWN-LINEMAN
2. OFFENSIVE RUN BLOCK VERSUS LINEBACKER
3. CROSS BLOCK WITH GUARDS
4. PASS PROTECTION BLOCKING
5. LONG SNAP FOR PUNTS-OR FIELD-GOALS

OFFENSIVE LINEMEN (GUARDS AND TACKLES)
1. OFFENSIVE RUN BLOCK VERSUS DOWN-LINEMAN
2. OFFENSIVE RUN BLOCK VERSUS LINEBACKER
3. CROSS BLOCK WITH GUARD-CENTER-TACKLE
4. PASS PROTECTION BLOCKING
5. PULLING GUARD ON SWEEP ACTION
6. PULLING TACKLE ON PITCH ACTION
7. TRAP BLOCKING (**GUARD TRAPS-**TACKLE DOWN BLOCKS)

OFFENSIVE END
1. DOWN BLOCK ON DOWN-LINEMAN ON INSIDE GAP OR OFF-TACKLE, WIDE PLAYS
2. BLOCKS LINEMAN OVER OR OUTSIDE OF HIM, ONE-YARD AWAY
3. DOUBLE TEAM BLOCKS WITH (A) TACKLE
   (B) WINGBACK
4. PASS PROTECTION BLOCKING
5. PASS ROUTE TECHNIQUES (SHARPNESS AND PRECISIONNESS OF ROUTES)
6. PASS RECEIVING ABILITY

RUNNING-BACKS
1. PASS PROTECTION BLOCKING (A) ON ROLL ACTION
   (B) ON DROP BACK ACTION
2. RUNS PERTINENT BACKFIELD ROUTES WITH APPROPRIATE FOOTWORK
3. PASS ROUTE TECHNIQUES
4. PASS RECEIVING ABILITY
5. SCREE-PLAY ACTION, AND FAKE ABILITIES
QUARTERBACK
1. READING DEFENCE-ABILITY
2. DESIGNED FOOTWORK FOR EACH SPECIFIC OFFENSIVE PLAY
3. PASSING ABILITY (A) ROLL-OUT ACTION
   (B) DROP-BACK ACTION
4. FAKING ABILITY
5. RUNNING ABILITY (A) ON DESIGNED OFFENSIVE PLAY
   (B) ON AN UNDETERMINED OFFENSIVE PLAY

DOWN-LINE-MEN
1. MEETS AND SHEDS BLOCKERS
2. ABILITY TO BREAK OR SPLIT POTENTIAL DOUBLE TEAM-BLOCK
3. ABILITY TO WARD-OFF AND TAKE-ON TRAPPING OFFENSIVE PLAYER
4. RUSHES THE PASSER MAINTAINING RESPONSIBILITY LANE
5. COMES HARD ON PUNT CHARGE
6. PIVOTING FROM SOLID DOWN BLOCK TO GET BACK INTO PLAY

LINEBACKERS
1. WARDS OFF BLOCKER
2. AGGRESSIVELY TAKES ON THE DOWN BLOCK
3. PURSUES RUNNING PLAYS UNDER CONTROL
4. REACTION TO DRAW AND SCREEN
5. COVERS HIS ZONE RESPONSIBILITY ON PASS COVERAGE
6. PERFORMS SOUND BLITZ TECHNIQUES
7. ABILITY TO SPLIT OR BREAK DOUBLE-TEAM BLOCK
8. MAN-TO-MAN COVERAGE ON PASS PROTECTION

DEEPBACKS
1. MEETS TO SHED BLOCKER OR USES FINESSE TO HANDLE DOWNFIELD BLOCKER
2. SUPPORTS ON RUN PLAYS
3. MAN-TO-MAN PASS COVERAGE
4. ABILITY TO OVER HIS ZONE RESPONSIBILITY ON PASS COVERAGE
5. PURSUES A RECEIVER ON A COMPLETED PASS IN FRONT OF HIM OR EITHER SIDE OF HIM

SPECIALISTS
1. PUNT RECEIVING ABILITY
2. BLOCKS ON PUNT RETURNS, KICK-OFF RETURNS, FIELD-GOALS
3. DOWN FIELD COVERAGE ON ALL SPECIAL TEAMS (A) FIELD-GOAL
   (B) PUNT
   (C) KICK-OFF
4. KICKING ABILITY (A) PUNT
   (B) FIELD-GOAL
   (C) KICK-OFF
COACHING APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT
AND SAMPLE COPY
APPENDIX "O"
Coaching Appraisal

The purpose of this rating form is to help you determine the perceived leadership effectiveness level of the coach for whom you play. Leadership effectiveness refers to how you feel your coach performs on the nine leadership dimensions. Thus in order to obtain a measure of your coach's effectiveness you must complete the following page by ranking him from '1' to '8' on each dimension, based on how you perceive (or think) of him.

Please write your coach's name (Head Coach) and your school at the top of the Coaching Response Sheet.

***IMPORTANT also write in, YOUR name.

1. Read the dimension headings and definitions one at a time.

2. After reading each dimension rate your coach's effectiveness by circling the most appropriate number on the '1' to '8' scale.

3. Continue this process and fill in the remaining dimensions.

4. Be sure to circle a rating response for each of the nine dimensions in order that a complete profile of your coach is provided.

**Remember you should have nine circled responses, one for each dimension.
### Coaching Response Sheet

**Dimensions**  | **Defined As**
---|---
A. Consideration | The extent to which your coach is supportive, friendly, and considerate towards players, looks out for your welfare, shows trust and appreciation and is open and honest with you.
B. Direction | The extent to which your coach informs players about their duties and responsibilities, sets goals and establishes performance standards and provides players with necessary training and instruction.
C. Decision Participation | The extent to which your coach consults with players and otherwise allows you to participate in making decisions and the amount of influence over the coach's decision that results from this participation.
D. Emphasis on Performance | The extent to which your coach emphasizes the importance of productivity and efficiency, encourages players to attain a high level of performance and informs you when it is not up to par.
E. Performance Facilitation | The extent to which your coach obtains necessary equipment for, and eliminates obstacles that interfere with practice.
F. Autonomy Delegation | The extent to which your coach delegates (gives) responsibility and authority to players and allows them to determine how to perform a skill.
G. Positive Reinforcement | The extent to which your coach provides recognition to a player and tries to provide encouragement for effective performance.
H. Interaction Facilitation | The extent to which your coach emphasizes the importance of teamwork and encourages players to cooperate and be friendly with each other.
I. Conflict Management | The extent to which your coach helps players settle conflicts and disagreements, restrains you from insulting or fighting with each other, and encourages you to resolve conflict in a constructive manner.

Based on the work of R. Boucher, 1980
## Player Appraisal

### MAJOR SKILL RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

**High** | **Moderate** | **Low**
--- | --- | ---
1. Does Not Have Football Experience | No Football Relevant Experience | Has Football Relevant Experience
2. Does Not Have Necessary Football Knowledge | Is Unable to Adjust Independently | Is Able to Adjust Independently
3. Requires Close Supervision | Cannot Be Left Alone | Can Be Left Alone
4. Refuses to Listen | Refuses to Tell | Receives Instructions
5. Has Little Desire To Achieve | Has Very High Desire To Achieve | Is Uncaring
6. Gives Up Easily | Won't Quit Until Done | Seeks New Approaches
7. Is Unwilling To Work On Own | Is Willing To Work On Own | Seeks New Approaches

### DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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