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The purpose of this study was to examine the differences of student-athletes’ preferred leadership behavior for their coaches based on gender, competition level, task dependence, and task variability. Four hundred and eight male and female student-athletes from four NCAA Division I and six NCAA Division II universities expressed their preferences using the Revised Leadership Scale for Sport (Zhang, Jensen, & Mann, 1997). A repeated measures MANOVA was performed on the preference scores among the variables of gender, competition level, task dependence, and task variability. The MANOVA also computed interactions. Fisher’s LSDs were performed on all significant interactions. Among genders, male student-athletes showed significantly greater preferences for autocratic (p = .0209) and social support behaviors (p = .0271). Female student-athletes had significantly greater preferences for situational consideration (p = .0383) and training and instruction behaviors (p = .0478). There was a significant gender by task variability interaction for autocratic (p = .0170) and democratic behaviors (p = .0226). Independent sport student-athletes showed significantly greater preferences for democratic (p = < .0001), positive feedback (p = < .0001), situational consideration (p = .0005), and social support behaviors (p = .0001). No significant differences in student-athletes’ preferences were found based on competition level. The results demonstrated differences in behavior preferences based on student-athlete characteristics of gender, task dependence, and task variability. Further investigations are needed to provide a full understanding of sport leadership behavior among NCAA Division I and Division II intercollegiate student-athletes.
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What type of leadership behaviors do student-athletes prefer from their coaches? Do the characteristics of gender, competition level, or type of sport influence student-athlete behavior preferences? While these or similar questions are frequently discussed in sport leadership, for the most part, they remain unanswered (Case, 1987). The lack of answers to these questions results from the complexity inherent in the questions and the fact that attempts to answer them have been sporadic and often peripheral (Chelladurai, 1984).

Investigations focusing on student-athlete preferences for coaching behavior may yield as much information about effective coaching as that gained from coaches themselves. Researchers examining student-athletes have revealed significant differences in behavior preferences based on variables such as gender and the type of sport the student-athlete is participating in. These findings have contributed to the understanding of the sport leadership dyad of the coach and student-athlete but have not provided conclusive answers. It appears the amount of research devoted to sport leadership does not correspond with the growth of the sport environment.

Building on the previous research and models used in studying sport leadership (Fielder, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977; House, 1971; Osborne & Hunt, 1975), Chelladurai (1979, 1990) has suggested that a multidimensional model provides a more robust explanation of effective coaching. In his model, Chelladurai proposed that there are different dimensions to coaching behavior and three different states of coaching behavior which must be considered. He delineated the three different states of coaching behavior as (a) actual leader behaviors, (b) required leader behaviors, and (c) leader behaviors preferred by the student-athlete. The basic tenet of the model is that student-athlete performance and satisfaction are functions of the congruence between actual and required behaviors and the leader behaviors preferred by the student-athlete. Chelladurai (1979, 1990) further suggested that various antecedents, which may influence the behaviors, include situational, leader, and member characteristics.

Past applications of the multidimensional model of leadership and its associated scales to the intercollegiate setting have yielded some interesting but incomplete results. These results have demonstrated differences in behavior preferences based on student-athletes’ gender and type of sport. However, the relationship between preferred leadership behavior and competition level has to date received limited investigation.

During their revision of the Leadership Scale for Sport (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), Zhang, Jensen, and Mann (1997) noted that there had been little to no research on differences in preferred leadership behaviors of student-athletes that may be attributable to competition level. These researchers point to the need to study this variable with particular attention given to NCAA student-athletes. This study attempted to address this need.
The purpose of this present study was to examine the differences in behavior preferences using the conceptual framework of the multidimensional model of leadership to confirm and extend past investigations. In particular, the purpose was to investigate differences among student-athletes’ preferred leadership behavior for their coaches based on gender of the student-athletes, and the competition levels, task dependence, and task variability of the sports in which they were engaged. The student-athletes expressed their preferences using the Revised Leadership Scale for Sport (Zhang et al., 1997).

First, it was hypothesized that differences in behavior preferences related to gender would be likely to occur. This was based on Chelladurai’s (1980) suggestion that preferred leader behavior was influenced by member characteristics. Second, it was hypothesized that NCAA Division I and Division II student-athletes’ leader behavior preferences would differ. This relates to the differences in NCAA standards between Division I and Division II institutions and Chelladurai’s (1980) assumption that situational characteristics influence preferred behavior. Lastly, results of previous research with athletes (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1978; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Terry, 1984; Terry & Howe, 1984) demonstrating significant differences in behavior preferences lead to the hypothesis that differences would occur among the variables of task dependence and task variability.

The dependent variables for this study were the six coaching leadership behavior dimensions as measured by the RLSS (Zhang et al., 1997) (Table 1). Among the independent variables, competition level referred to the NCAA classification of member institutions. Task dependence referred to the degree of interaction a student-athlete has with others during execution of the task (Chelladurai, 1979). An independent sport does not require interaction among teammates for successful completion of the task. Independent sports in the study included golf, tennis, and track/cross country. An interdependent sport requires efficient interaction among teammates for successful completion of the task. Interdependent sports in the study included baseball, basketball, soccer, and volleyball.

Task variability referred to the degree the environment changes and the extent to which the student-athlete responds to these changes (Chelladurai, 1979). An open sport requires the student-athlete to respond to objects that move in space. Open sports in the study included baseball, basketball, tennis, soccer, and volleyball. A closed sport requires the student-athlete to perform in an environment with relatively unchanging stimuli. Closed sports in the study included golf and track/cross country.

The delimitations of this study were as follows: (a) subjects were college age males and females, ranging from 18-25 years of age; (b) subjects were included on the official team roster in their sport; (c) subjects were full-time students, currently registered for at least twelve class credit hours during the semester; and (d) the student-athletes in this study were an experimentally accessible population.
Generalizations cannot be made regarding interdependent/closed sports because of the absence of these sports in many institutions and in this study. Results from this study may only be generalized to other populations having similar intercollegiate student-athletes. Situational variables such as institutional size, sport popularity, and sport environment might have acted as confounding variables in the study.

Method

Participants
Five hundred and nine student-athletes from four NCAA Division I and six NCAA Division II universities in the southeastern United States were invited to participate. A total of 408 student-athletes completed the RLSS for a completion rate of 80%. The rate was affected by changes in team rosters as a result of graduation or voluntary leave. The sample consisted of (a) 179 male and 229 female student-athletes, (b) 171 student-athletes participated at Division I universities and 237 student-athletes participated at Division II universities, (c) 293 student-athletes involved in open variability sports and 115 student-athletes involved in closed variability sports, and (d) 172 student-athletes engaged in independent sports and 236 student-athletes engaged in interdependent sports.

Instrumentation
The Revised Leadership Scale for Sport (Zhang et al., 1997) was utilized to measure student-athletes' preferred leadership behavior of their coaches. The 60 leadership items contained in the RLSS are distributed among six dimensions of coaching leadership behavior: autocratic, democratic, positive feedback, situational consideration, social support, and training and instruction leader behaviors (Table 1). Construct validity was tested with a factor analysis of each RLSS version, student-athlete preference, student-athlete perception, and coach self-evaluation, during the revision process (Zhang et al.). A composite score was calculated for each of the behavior dimensions by summing the scores of the related items. Intercorrelations among the composite scores were below .30 indicating that the RLSS was close to being a multidimensional scale (Zhang et al.). Internal consistency measures were .93-.96 (democratic), .85-.93 (positive feedback), .81-.88 (situational consideration), .83-.91 (training and instruction), .81-.89 (social support), and .35-.59 (autocratic). Because of the low reliability for the autocratic behavior dimension, Zhang et al. suggested caution in using the findings from this dimension.
Table 1
Revised Leadership Scale for Sport Leader Behavior Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Dimension</th>
<th>Behavior Description</th>
<th>Sample Item from the RLSS Preference Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Limits involvement of student-athletes in decisions; use of commands and punishments; prescribes plans and methods for activities</td>
<td>“I prefer my coach to” Prescribe the methods to be followed; Plan for the team relatively independent of the athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Allows participation of student-athletes in decisions; involves respect and acceptance of student-athletes’ rights</td>
<td>Let the athletes set their own goals; Get input from the athletes at daily meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>Compliments student-athletes for performance and contribution; maintains motivational level of student-athletes</td>
<td>Congratulate an athlete after a good play; Reward an athlete as long as the athlete tries hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Consideration</td>
<td>Reflects situational factors in behavior; considers individual student-athletes’ maturity and skill level</td>
<td>Adapt coaching style to the situation: Coach to the level of the athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>Satisfies the interpersonal needs of student-athletes; provides for the welfare of student-athletes</td>
<td>Remain sensitive to the needs of the athletes; Help the athletes with their personal problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>Improves performance of student-athletes; plans, structures, and directs activities; instructs in skills, techniques, and tactics of the sport</td>
<td>Explain to each athlete the techniques and tactics of the sport; Clarify training priorities and work on them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RLSS directions were self-explanatory and indicated that responses to the 60 leadership items were to be made on a five-point Likert scale. Each item was preceded by the phrase “I prefer my coach to.” There were quantifications and frequency-related wordings for each choice on the scale. The scale consisted of: A = always (100% of the time), B = often (75% of the time), C = occasionally (50% of the time), D = seldom (25% of the time), and E = never (0% of the time). Responses were coded as follows: A = 5, B = 4, C = 3, D = 2, and E = 1.

Design and Procedure

The RLSS was administered on a team-by-team basis or several teams together in a classroom or teamroom provided by the institution. In two cases, one of the researchers collected the data. In the remaining eight cases, institutional athletic trainers collected the data. Team coaches were not required to or prohibited from being present during data collection. Data were collected over a span of two academic semesters during non-competitive and competitive periods to accommodate scheduling conflicts such as class, study hall, team practice, and conditioning sessions. During the competitive periods, data collection was performed during the first two weeks of practice, prior to the first competition.

The RLSS measured preferred leadership behavior based on the student-athletes’ personal preferences. Implications of student-athletes who had completed the RLSS discussing the instrument with other student-athletes selected to participate as a result of the cross-semester collection procedures should not have affected this study. Implications of data collection within non-competitive or competitive periods also should not have affected student-athlete behavior preferences.

The directions asked each participant to answer the items with an honest and spontaneous response and to not use the instrument as an evaluation of their present coach or any other coach. Respondents who participated in more than one sport were to express their behavior preferences for the sport in which they were randomly chosen. The voluntary nature of participation and confidentiality of the responses were discussed with all participants. The participants completed informed consent forms and were given a copy. Participants were debriefed following completion of the scale as to the implication of the findings.

Individual student-athlete preference scores for the six dimensions of coaching behavior were derived by summing the scores for all of the items in a particular dimension and then dividing by the number of items in that subscale (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). To determine whether there were differences among the variables of gender, competition level, task dependence, and task variability, a repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed with the six behavior dimensions. Wilks’ Lambda was used as the multivariate test of significance. A univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed to determine
the source of any significance indicated by the Wilks’ Lambda test. The MANOVA also computed gender by level, gender by task dependence, gender by task variability, level by task dependence, and level by task variability interactions. A Fisher’s LSD was performed for all significant interactions. An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used in the analyses.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics were calculated for gender, competition level, task dependence, and task variability for the six dimensions of leader behavior as measured by the RLSS. The results of the statistical analyses using the MANOVA (Table 2) and ANOVAs demonstrated that statistically significant differences did occur for the variables of gender, task dependence, and task variability. However, no differences were found for competition level.

**Gender**

The Wilks’ Lambda was significant for the variable of gender $F(5, 394) = 7.08, p < .0001$. Univariate analysis revealed male student-athletes had significantly greater preferences for autocratic $F(1, 398) = 5.38, p = .0209$ and social support behaviors $F(1, 398) = 4.92, p = .0271$ and female student-athletes had significantly greater preferences for situational consideration $F(1, 398) = 4.32, p = .0383$ and training and instruction behaviors $F(1, 398) = 3.94, p = .0478$. The MANOVA produced a significant gender by task variability interaction $F(5, 394) = 3.58, p = .0035$. The ANOVA showed a significant interaction for autocratic behavior $F(1, 398) = 5.74, p = .0170$. Fisher’s LSDs revealed male closed sport student-athletes gave higher ratings to autocratic behavior than did female closed sport student-athletes $t(400) = 15.625, p < 0.05$. The ANOVA also demonstrated a significant interaction for democratic behavior $F(1, 398) = 5.24, p = .0226$. Fisher’s LSDs showed female closed sport student-athletes gave higher ratings to democratic behavior than did male closed sport student-athletes $t(400) = 2.296, p < 0.05$ and male open sport student-athletes gave higher ratings to democratic behavior than did female open sport student-athletes $t(400) = 3.55, p < 0.05$ and male closed sport student-athletes $t(400) = 4.61, p < 0.05$ (Table 2).

**Competition Level**

The Wilks’ Lambda was not significant for the variable of competition level $F(5, 394) = 1.25, p = .2832$. 
Table 2
MANOVA for Gender, Competition Level, Task Dependence, and Task Variability Among Autocratic, Democratic, Positive Feedback, Situational Consideration, Social Support, and Training and Instruction Leader Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (G)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.08**</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level (L)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.2832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task dependence (TD)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.37**</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task variability (TV)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.0870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G X L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.0842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G X TD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.8312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G X TV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.58*</td>
<td>.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L X TD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.4611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L X TV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.7633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .005, **p < .0001
Task Dependence
The Wilks’ Lambda was significant for the variable of task dependence $F(5, 394) = 7.37$, $p = < .0001$. The ANOVA demonstrated independent sport student-athletes had significantly greater preferences for democratic $F(1, 398) = 43.83$, $p = < .0001$, positive feedback $F(1, 398) = 19.22$, $p < .0001$, situational consideration $F(1, 398) = 12.46$, $p = .0005$, and social support behaviors $F(1, 398) = 14.66$, $p = .0001$ (Table 2).

Task Variability
The Wilks’ Lambda did not produce significant findings for the variable of task variability $F(5, 394) = 1.94$, $p = .0870$.

Discussion

Gender

Autocratic Behavior. The results of this study indicated significantly higher preferences for autocratic leader behaviors among male student-athletes. There is also a significant gender by task variability interaction. Male closed sport student-athletes gave higher ratings to autocratic behavior than did female closed sport student-athletes. These results confirm the findings of past investigations based on gender. Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) and Terry (1984) found that male physical education majors and elite athletes had a significantly higher preference for autocratic leader behavior. Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) suggested different behaviors for a coach based on the gender composition of the team. Chelladurai (1990) and Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) suggested that autocratic leader behavior referred to the extent a coach stresses her or his authority and limits involvement of student-athletes in decisions.

Democratic Behavior. This study revealed a significant gender by task variability interaction for democratic leader behavior. Post-hoc testing produced several significant differences among male and female student-athletes’ behavior preferences. Democratic leader behavior referred to the amount of participation a coach permits student-athletes in decision-making (Chelladurai, 1990; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

The analysis showed female closed sport student-athletes gave higher ratings to democratic behavior than did male closed sport student-athletes. These results confirm past studies. Chelladurai and Arnott (1985), Chelladurai and Saleh (1978), Erle (1981), and Terry (1984) identified significant differences among male and female physical education majors, university, intramural, and elite athletes’ preferences for leader behavior and decision styles. These researchers suggested that female athletes preferred a democratic leader and male athletes preferred an autocratic leader.
In contrast, the significant gender by task variability interaction also demonstrated male open sport student-athletes gave higher ratings to democratic behavior than did female open sport student-athletes. This finding is in contradiction to the higher preferences for autocratic behavior demonstrated among male student-athletes in this study. Last, the interaction revealed male open sport student-athletes gave higher ratings to democratic behavior than did male closed sport student-athletes. These results appear to confirm the findings of past studies. Riemer and Chelladurai (1995) found that open sport student-athletes had a significantly higher preference for democratic behaviors. Riemer and Chelladurai (1995) suggested that movements of opponents during play dictated open sport student-athletes’ tasks, which required the coach to display democratic leader behavior.

*Situational Consideration Behavior.* The data from this study demonstrated a significantly higher preference for situational consideration leader behavior among female student-athletes. Because few researchers have utilized the RLSS (Zhang et al., 1997) beyond the revision process, a comparison of findings with past investigations is difficult.

Zhang et al. (1997) stated that situational consideration leader behavior referred to the degree to which a coach reflected situational factors in her or his behavior. Coaches who demonstrate these behaviors consider factors such as the time, environment, and individual student-athletes in setting goals and methods to reach the goals.

Researchers have shown that female student-athletes have significant preferences for participating in decision-making (Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985). Chelladurai and Arnott (1985) found a significant relationship between female university basketball athletes and the influence of situational differences in decision-making. The findings suggested a participatory decision style approach by coaches of female teams with consideration for situational characteristics, such as information and interpersonal relations among the team.

*Social Support Behavior.* This study demonstrated a significantly higher preference for social support leader behavior among male student-athletes. These results confirm the findings of past investigations based on gender. Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) found that male athletes had a significantly higher preference for social support leader behavior. Social support leader behavior referred to the extent coaches involve themselves in satisfying the interpersonal needs of student-athletes (Chelladurai, 1990; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The psychological supports are independent of student-athletes physical activities.

*Training and Instruction Behavior.* The data from this study demonstrated a significantly higher preference for training and instruction leader behavior among female student-athletes. The finding appears to support the results of past studies. Chelladurai (1979) and Chelladurai and Carron (1983) found that university student-athletes had significantly higher preferences for training and instruction behaviors than did high school midget, junior, and senior student-athletes.
Training and instruction leader behavior is perhaps the most important function of a coach, improving the performance level of student-athletes (Chelladurai, 1990; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). These behaviors center on physical improvement of student-athletes through instruction in skills, techniques, and tactics of the particular sport.

Examination of student-athletes preferences based on gender have demonstrated inconclusive findings. Researchers have found significant differences among preferences and decision styles attributable to gender (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1978; Erle, 1981; Terry, 1984). Others have demonstrated male and female athletes’ overall preference for behaviors appeared similar (Chelladurai, Haggerty, and Baxter, 1989; Massimo, 1980; Terry & Howe, 1984). The incongruence of the results of this study among male and female student-athletes’ preferences suggests the need for additional research.

Competition Level

The researchers expected to see differences among student-athlete behavior preferences based on competition level. The expectation of differences between Division I and Division II student-athletes’ preferences for leadership behavior arose from the fact that there are significant differences in NCAA standards (NCAA Division I and II Manual) in regards to sports sponsorship, scheduling, and financial aid. These differences in standards may very well lead to different types of student-athletes enrolling at Division I versus Division II institutions. The lack of significant findings failed to support this belief.

Task Dependence

Democratic Behavior. This study demonstrated a significantly higher preference for democratic leader behavior among independent sport student-athletes. The significant findings for the democratic behavior dimension support past investigations of preferred leader behavior based on task dependence. Terry (1984) and Terry and Howe (1984) found that elite, club, and university independent sport athletes had a significantly higher preference for democratic leader behavior. However, the results are in contrast to those of Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) in which they found no significant differences in university physical education majors’ preferences for democratic leader behavior based on task dependence.

Positive Feedback Behavior. The significantly higher preferences for positive feedback leader behavior among independent sport student-athletes in this study contradict past studies. Investigating club, university, and elite athletes, Terry (1984) and Terry and Howe (1984) found that interdependent sport athletes had a significantly higher preference for positive feedback leader behavior. Terry (1984) suggested that interdependent sport student-athlete preferences for positive feedback might represent fulfillment of individual student-athlete
needs. In a group environment such as a team, individual student-athletes' interpersonal needs might go unfulfilled. The preference for positive feedback might fulfill the student-athletes' need for recognition and reward by earning praise from the coach. Terry (1984) proposed that independent sport student-athletes might share a closer relationship with their coach, making outward recognition and rewards for performance less necessary. Rakestraw and Weiss (1981) suggested the influence of a coach was peripheral among independent sport student-athletes. Chelladurai (1990) and Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) stated that positive feedback behaviors reflected the extent a coach expresses appreciation for the student-athletes' performance and contribution. These coaching behaviors maintain the motivational level of student-athletes.

Situational Consideration Behavior. The data from this study demonstrated a significantly higher preference for situational consideration leader behavior among independent sport student-athletes. Zhang et al. (1997) stated that situational consideration leader behavior referred to the degree to which a coach reflected situational factors in her or his behavior. Fielder (1967), Halprin and Winer (1957), and Hersey and Blanchard (1977) have described leadership behavior as consisting of two dimensions, consideration and initiating structure. Behaviors along the consideration dimension were interpersonal-oriented while behaviors within the initiating structure dimension were task-oriented.

Social Support Behavior. The results of this study indicated significantly higher preferences for social support leader behaviors among independent sport student-athletes. The findings confirm the results of past investigations based on task dependence. Terry (1984) and Terry and Howe (1984) demonstrated that independent sport athletes had a significantly higher preference for social support behavior. Terry (1984) suggested that the closeness of the student-athlete and coach relationship enabled the coach to play the role of confidant among the athletes. This role might make preferences for social support behavior more appropriate for the independent sport student-athlete. Chelladurai (1980) proposed that at the university level, a high structuring and high consideration leader behavior style seemed appropriate.

Task Variability

The results of this study indicated a significant gender by task variability interaction. The lack of other significant findings in behavior preferences among open and closed sport student-athletes contradicts past investigations. Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) found that university physical education majors engaged in closed sports had a significantly higher preference for training and instruction leader behavior. Riemer and Chelladurai (1995) revealed that university closed sport student-athletes had significantly higher preferences for democratic and social support leader behaviors. In support of past research, Terry and Howe (1984) failed
to identify any significant differences in club and university student-athletes’ preferences attributed to the variability of the task. The incongruence of the results of this study and past investigations on behavior preferences between open and closed sport student-athletes suggests the need for additional research.

Conclusions

The findings of this study suggest that student-athlete preferences for leadership behavior are influenced by gender and task dependence and task variability of their sport. The significant results appear to extend previous research findings in the sport environment. The lack of significant findings in behavior preferences based on competition level among the study participants suggests the need for further investigations.

A review of the literature suggests that there is a considerable gap between the importance assigned to sport leadership behavior and efforts to understand it (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). Fiedler (1967), Halprin and Winer (1957), and Hersey and Blanchard (1977) described leader behaviors as consisting of two dimensions, consideration and initiating structure. The unique aspects of the sport environment may demand leader behaviors other than consideration and initiating structure. If in fact the sport context is unique, it becomes necessary to identify the dimensions of leader behavior that are relevant to sport. Utilizing the multidimensional model of leadership, investigations of student-athletes’ preferences of leadership behavior of their coaches appear to be an important variable in the understanding of sport leadership behavior. Further research is necessary to provide a full understanding of sport leadership to enhance the relationship between the coach and student-athlete.
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