

JUSTIFICATIONS AND PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF LEADERSHIP  
ACADEMIES WITHIN COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Lauren D. Bifulco

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration).

Chapel Hill  
2008

Approved by

Advisor: Barbara Osborne, Esq.

Committee: Dr. Edgar Shields

Committee: Shelley Johnson

Committee: Dr. Elizabeth Hedgpeth

© 2008  
Lauren D. Bifulco  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## **ABSTRACT**

LAUREN D. BIFULCO: Justifications and Perceived Effectiveness of Leadership  
Academies on Collegiate Athletics  
(Under the direction of Barbara Osborne, Esq.)

The purpose of this study was to establish justifications for leadership academies and examine the effectiveness of athletic leadership academies in fostering good character from the perceptions of head coaches and administrators currently at institutions with Peak Performance leadership academies. The participants were athletic administrators and head coaches at seven Jeff Janssen Sport Leadership Academies; the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, University of Pittsburgh, Yale University, Illinois University, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem State University, and Baylor University. The instrument was a survey created by the researcher with factors that the respondents rated on a Likert scale of one to five. The highest ranked justifications for leadership academies were the need for good character development for leaders and the importance of the responsibilities of team captains. The components of the leadership academies that were found most valuable were the mission statement, the educational programs and workshops offered for student athletes, and the idea of continuing education for student athletes. The results found one significant finding of the difference of means between male and female respondents for the provisional value of the leadership academies. The significance in the non-significant findings is that the idea and programs of the leadership academies are not as well projected as originally believed.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to acknowledge my advisor, Barbara Osborne, Esq., along with my committee members, Dr. Edgar Shields, Shelley Johnson, and Dr. Elizabeth Hedgpeth, for all of their help and dedication to this project. A special thank you goes out to the Jeff Janssen Sport Leadership Academies and Jeff Janssen for help with my research and final thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Leadership Academies.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Research Questions.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Assumptions.....	6
Limitations.....	7
Delimitations.....	7
Significance of the Study.....	7
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Definition of Leadership.....	9
Leadership Education.....	10
Leadership Theories and Programs.....	12
Leadership Theories Applied in Athletics.....	15
The Need for Leadership Education.....	20
III METHODOLOGY.....	25
Selection of Population.....	25
Development of Survey Instrument.....	25
Methodology.....	26
Procedure and Survey Distribution.....	27
Statistical Analysis.....	28
IV RESULTS.....	29
Descriptive Summary Statistics.....	30
Research Question One.....	31
Research Question Two.....	35
Research Question Three.....	38
Research Question Four.....	39
Inferential Test Results.....	42
Research Question Five.....	42
Research Question Six.....	50

V	DISCUSSION.....	57
	Discussion.....	57
	Descriptive Statistics Discussion.....	58
	Survey Question: Justifications for Leadership Academies.....	59
	Survey Question: Value of Leadership Academies.....	59
	Inferential Statistics Discussion.....	62
	Research Question Five.....	62
	Research Question Six.....	63
	Summary.....	64
	Future Research.....	66
	Conclusion.....	69
	APPENDICES.....	71
	A. Janssen Peak Performance Team Captain’s Leadership Model© Description.....	71
	B. Janssen Peak Performance Team Captain’s Leadership Self Evaluation©.....	72
	C. Janssen Peak Performance Team Captain’s Leadership Evaluation©.....	73
	D. Survey.....	74
	REFERENCES.....	76

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Sports represented in survey.....	30
2 Ranking of importance by factor.....	32
3 Mean and Median for individual factors.....	33
4 Open Ended Response: Factors also considered important.....	34
5 Ranking of factors by importance.....	36
6 Mean and Median for individual factors.....	37
7 Open Ended Response: Other impact components.....	38
8 Ranking of factors by importance.....	40
9 Mean and Median for individual factors.....	41
10 Open Ended Answers to Question 3.....	42
11 Means of Overall Factors for Female and Male Sports.....	44
12 Comparison of Means for Internal Values.....	45
13 Comparison of Means for External Values.....	46
14 Comparison of Means for Organizational Values.....	47
15 Comparison of Means for Provision Values.....	48
16 Comparison of Means for Impact on Athletic Department.....	49
17 Comparison of Means for Impact on University.....	50
18 Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for Internal Values.....	51
19 Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for External Values.....	52
20 Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for Organizational Values.....	53
21 Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for Provision Values.....	54

22 Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the Impact on the Athletic Department.....	55
23 Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the Impact on the University.....	56



## CHAPTER I

### Introduction

Leadership has become a hot button issue in society over the past decade. The importance of leadership as a characteristic has grown from a bonus to a must. Yet the quest to define what leadership is or how it is learned is still being examined. Character building, career skills, or future preparation can only bring an individual to limited potential; it is the determination to change and impact the world that drives a leader and truly defines potential. With innovative tactics emerging throughout academia in order to educate students on leadership and self understanding, it became an imperative topic for those on university campuses that seem to be held to the utmost standards: student-athletes.

In an effort to legitimize and provide a proper role for college athletics within the university and college life, the Knight Commission was formed following a decade of corruption within college athletics in the 1980's. The integrity of college athletics and athletes was being questioned and the character of the individuals was tainted. According to the Knight Commission, 109 colleges and universities were censured, sanctioned or on probation by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in the 1980's and graduation rates were plummeting under 30% for men's basketball and football programs across the country (Knight Foundation, 2001, p.9). The members of the Knight Commission initiated a change; a change in the focus, priorities, character and relationships within college athletics to place more emphasis on integrity of individuals and of the system as a whole.

While much of the focus of the Knight Commission has been on “academic transgressions, a financial arms race, and commercialization,” the underlying point was that there needed to be a change in the mindset of the individuals involved with college athletics (Knight Foundation, 2001, p. 14). Education of not only the mind but character became a concept that needed to be introduced into collegiate athletes. Sports have always been viewed as a venue in which character is built and matured (Rudd & Stoll 2004).

Student-athlete leadership does not stop on the field. Captains are not the only team members being held to leadership standards and coaches are not the only ones in leadership position anymore. Leadership is necessary on the field, in the classroom, and within the community. Student-athletes are a major connection between the reputation of the university and the community at large, as athletics is the front door to the university, making leadership an essential trait. To a student-athlete, leadership entails learning how to not only impact those around you, but be able to lead oneself in order to be more effective in the community (Rudd & Stoll 2004). When leadership fails, communities tend to react. Because student-athletes are in the spotlight, being able to control behavioral issues becomes one of the biggest responsibilities an athlete takes on in his or her freshman year. Leadership education can be considered a crucial step in order to best educate student-athletes on how to live to their potential, on and off the field.

Student-athlete misconduct represents a failure in one’s ability to make a decision, take responsibility for it, and be held accountable for it. At the Division I level, student-athletes are held to a different standard than much of the student body. Because of what they stand for, their actions are critically analyzed and they are often crucified because of their own decisions. Without leadership education, many student-athletes are never taught the

accountability or decision making needed to avoid misconduct issues. Their time constraints and heavy training loads make it easier to fall susceptible to academic pressures. The competition that drives them on the fields and courts make it hard to resist the fight. Overall, the student-athlete faces pressures that the average student body member does not, creating a need for strong guidance and support through the means of coaches and administrators within athletic departments.

The connection between leadership skills and misconduct is a relationship that institutions across the country have begun to look at. The more student-athletes understand their actions and their effects on others, the more they will begin to take responsibility. Leadership academies not only provide other opportunities for student-athletes to become involved, they also will provide a foundation for incoming athletes to better understand themselves and hopefully make the transition into college life easier. Life skills are important to learn at all stages of life and leadership academies can establish a curriculum that allows for character development and growth as well as the ability to evaluate situations and consequences. The education that a leadership academy can provide for a student-athlete is invaluable: the ability to think before acting, on and off the field, in hopes of preventing misconduct, misunderstanding, and peer troubles before they occur.

### Leadership Academies

Jeff Janssen, through his work with the Janssen Sports Leadership Center, seeks to serve just that. Janssen hopes to develop leadership academies at collegiate institutions across the nation to provide character and moral education to student-athletes, giving them the opportunity to communicate freely amongst their peers, coaches, and administrators about topics outside of the field or court.

There are three main reasons why Janssen feels that student-athletes are a population where targeted leadership education can benefit character development. Student-athletes face unique demands that other members of the student population do not encounter on a day to day basis. Being a part of a team includes greater time management, discipline, and other factors that are associated with being an athlete. Secondly, the time of a student-athlete is valuable and constrained because of their constant commitments to practices, academics, travel, and other team responsibilities. Being able to specifically target time periods where athletes are available is important to maintain interest and accessibility. Lastly, a student-athlete has a much higher exposure rate than the average student body member due to their presence on an athletic team. Scrutinized under the public eye, student-athletes require a greater understanding of their consequences in order to prevent behavior that could make the front page of the news paper (Janssen, Interview, 2007).

Through his leadership academies, Janssen hopes to not only broaden the skill sets that athletes develop throughout their experiences, but give them the confidence to apply their skills to the workforce as well. Athletes learn teamwork, discipline, control, respect, organization, time management and many other valuable traits while being a part of a team but often times do not know how to apply these traits to decisions outside of athletics. The leadership academies and programs give student-athletes the chance to learn, among their peers, how to develop and foster the ability to adapt in their lives after college athletics.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to establish justifications for leadership academies and examine the effectiveness of athletic leadership academies in fostering good character from the perceptions of head coaches and administrators currently at institutions with Janssen

Sports Leadership Center leadership academies. This study will examine the current leadership academies at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, the University of Pittsburgh, Yale University, Illinois University, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem State University, and Baylor University. Perceived need for such academies within collegiate athletics as well as the perceived value and effectiveness of the existing leadership academies will be assessed. By addressing the perceived need for leadership academies in collegiate athletics, the study will also establish a value of these academies which could benefit other NCAA institutions that may be considering establishing a leadership academy.

### Research Questions

Because of the emergence of leadership within athletics as a major focus for many NCAA programs, this study will answer the following questions:

Research Question 1: What are the justifications for student-athlete leadership academies?

Research Question 2: To what extent are the leadership programs having an impact on student-athlete good character development?

Research Question 3: What are the current attitudes towards leadership education within overall collegiate athletics?

Research Question 4: What are the perceived benefits of leadership academies to the Athletics department, student-athlete, and University overall?

Research Question 5: Is there a difference on the associated factors between a male sport and a female sport?

Research Question 6: Is there a difference on the associated factors between male and female respondents?

### Definition of terms

1. National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA): a voluntary association for about 1,200 collegiate institutions that organizes, controls, monitors and enforces rules and policies for athletics programs in the United States.
2. Student-Athlete: A student who is enrolled in an institution for credit who also is a member of a university Varsity athletic team.
3. Administrator: A staff member of the athletic department whom is at a level of Director or Assistant/Associate Athletics Director.
4. Coaches: Current head coaches at participating Universities.
5. Good Character: A person who consistently makes decisions that would be considered good and seen in a positive light.
6. Perceived Value: The opinions of coaches and administrators surveyed towards the worth and significance of conducting a leadership academy at their own NCAA institution.
7. Perceived Need: The opinions of coaches and administrators surveyed towards the necessity and desire for leadership academies at the collegiate level in order to develop character and improve student-athlete well being.

### Assumptions

1. Coaches and Administrators were honest in their opinions when answering the survey questions.
2. Coaches and Administrators were knowledgeable of the perspective leadership academies and the missions and purposes.

### Limitations

1. This study measured perceptions of individuals involved with collegiate athletics. Perceptions are directly related to opinions and therefore can be open to interpretation.
2. The current leadership academies are in different years of establishment and therefore the perceptions of the subjects may be skewed based upon their limited exposure to the program.
3. Because the coaches and administrators surveyed are at institutions with leadership academies, they may be more biased about the value of this type of education for student-athletes.

### Delimitations

1. This study was limited to the seven (7) institutions with Janssen Sport Leadership Center Leadership Academies: University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, University of Pittsburgh, Yale University, Illinois University, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem State University, and Baylor University.
2. Not all administrators within the athletics department were surveyed. Only administrators at the Director or Associate/Assistant Director were surveyed.
3. Due to the nature of this study, an absolute need or value for a leadership academy cannot be established. All data is based upon perceptions of coaches and administrators surveyed.

### Significance of Study

The desire to have strong, capable leaders within collegiate athletics has become a hot topic within the NCAA. The word captain is no longer the only depiction of a leader; each

member of a team is responsible to themselves as well as their teammates, requiring leadership to encompass all aspects of a team. Leadership conferences sponsored by the NCAA occur each year allowing coaches, players, and administrators to debate and discuss the values, rules and expectations that good leadership entails. At the same time, the ideal of the student-athlete is being debated. Student-athlete misconduct not only shines a negative light on the individuals, but on the University as well.

The implications of an established leadership academy are twofold: a leadership academy directly benefits the student-athletes, coaches, and administrators at an institution because of the education it provides as well as benefits the overall institution in a public relation medium. To the community at large outside of the athletics department, a commitment to character development on the part of an Athletics Department demonstrates high morals and values that the community at large can appreciate and find more morally acceptable.

This study will help eliminate the gap that there currently is in research concerning leadership education in collegiate athletics. The published studies found are concerned mostly with the leadership relationships on an athletic team such as coach to athlete, captain to team, or starter to bench player. The information found in this study will provide insight on the demand for character development for college athletes in order to benefit the individual, the team, and the university as a whole. This study may also establish a value for such leadership academies, providing arguments for or against future institutions spending money on a program similar to those already in place.



## CHAPTER II

### Literature Review

#### Definition of Leadership

Leadership in an organization can affect the overall success or failure of an organization. Leaders have the ability to control different aspects of the organization dealing with communication, establishment and upholding of rules, motivation, and team work. Leadership ability is becoming a necessity for people to advance within organizations because employers are looking for the one key individual who can boost motivation, success, and productivity within the overall company to a new level. Effective leadership is imperative to be successful in today's society: employers are placing more emphasis on resumes that include previous athletic experience, leadership roles such as Class Presidents, and past job responsibilities.

The definition of leadership is forever evolving. Chelladurai and Sale (1980) describe leadership as a behavioral process with a purpose of motivating and influencing group members to work towards a common goal. While followers and other team members always play a role within leadership, the emphasis of leadership is placed on the leader, captain, or person in control of the situation.

Throughout the literature, leadership is divided into two types, or categories, that are deemed necessary for effective leadership (Hadden, 2003; Chelladurai and Saleh, 1980; Dobosz and Beaty, 1999; House, 1971; Shields and Gardner, 1997). These two categories are task oriented leadership and people oriented leadership. A task oriented leader tends to

focus on the situation at hand and the goal in mind for the completion of the project. On the other hand, people oriented leadership often deals with the relationships that occur, such as the relationship between teammates or a coach and player.

### Leadership Education

Student-athlete leadership education is the main focus of this study; however it is important to identify other avenues for leadership education that are present in other populations. The most obvious of these institutions are the military academies and training programs such as ROTC. There are academic programs across the country that have begun to make classes and even degrees out of leadership education, capitalizing on the importance of understanding leadership and being a successful leader. These types of leadership training consider the topic from different angles, providing alternate view points and approaches towards similar ideas.

The battlefield has always been viewed as an arena where honor rises above all. Yet the military provides much more than honor: individuals learn honor, respect, teamwork and a hard work ethic among other traits that are desired in leaders. Seemingly, many of the responsibilities in the military are task oriented. However, studies show that there are fundamental elements learned on the battlefield that are essential to being a successful leader such as trust, honesty, ethics, commitment and communication (Angulo, 2001; Doty & Gerdes, 2000; Yeakey, 2000).

Mike Krzyzewski, head coach of Duke University basketball, comments in his book *Leading With the Heart: Coach K's Successful Strategies for Basketball, Business, and Life* about how leadership is based on trust and honesty in relationships on the team (2000). This notion of honesty is also represented in the West Point Code of Honor: "a cadet will not lie,

cheat, or steal nor tolerate those who do” (Hadden, 2003 & Robinson, 1996). The similarity between athletic teams and the military is represented through this idea of trust in order to empower and motivate followers. According to Angulo (2001), mutual respect, confidence and competence are important in order to foster an effective environment for followers and leaders.

Military academies are often believed to have autocratic or directive styles of leadership instead of motivational or charismatic styles (Hadden, 2003). Autocratic leadership is not preferred in the military. Moreover, the military believes that leaders are not born but that leadership can be taught. Hence the current model of ranks in the military of plebes; they learn to follow directions before learning how to initiate orders (Hadden, 2003). Learning how to follow is the essential basis for learning how to be a leader and the military perfects this through their educational process. The roots of West Point’s effective leadership are ideals and moral principles such as justice and loyalty, which are not authoritative in nature (Hadden, 2003).

Military academies are the original form of a leadership academy, preparing individuals for all facets of leadership from the role of the follower to the role of the leader. Each member learns how to take orders, give orders and hold high amounts of responsibility while also learning the values of trust, dignity, morality, honor and justice – all necessary to understand for effective leadership. These models have begun to be transformed into other areas of leadership education, such as on the athletic field. Athletics teams are similar to military units: there are coaches who take on similar roles to generals, captains to organize the troops, and followers or players to make the system work. Because of these similarities, it would seem that leadership education is not only effective in athletics, but it is imperative

for student-athletes to learn how to be effective leaders in order to have the highest character possible.

### Leadership Theories and Programs

When a leader works to influence a group towards a common goal, they are most effectively operating with task oriented leadership. Delegating work and responsibilities, providing professional development and training, establishing goals and direction for the group, as well as communication of the overall plan are all behaviors that effective task oriented leaders perform well (Hadden, 2003; Shields et al, 1997). In order to be a successful leader, task-oriented behaviors must be executed with expertise because members of a team or company are more likely to follow a leader who is perceived as having more knowledge than the rest of the group and are able to make decisions quickly and effectively (Hadden 2003).

In his book *Leadership in Organizations*, Yukl discusses the importance of people-oriented leadership (1998). Traits such as supportive, friendly, and helpful are important for leaders to possess, as well as the ability to show confidence in other team members by listening and understanding their ideas and concerns (Yukl, 1998). People oriented leaders have the ability to empower their followers, giving them opportunities to succeed and rewarding them for good work. Task oriented behaviors balance relationship oriented leaders by giving them a basis and knowledge of the job and how to run the business while allowing the leader to be approachable and respected by their own subordinates or peers.

Chelladurai and Saleh created Chelladurai's Multidimensional Model of Leadership in order to address the perceived preferences of coaching behaviors. A meta-analysis study was conducted and group members were found to prefer democratic leadership and behaviors

over autocratic leadership, and individuals also prefer training and positive feedback over social support from a coach (Hadden, 2003; Chelladurai and Selah, 1980). This model and results support the fact that an effective leader is both task oriented and people oriented. Positive feedback is relationship oriented in nature while instruction and training are much more task based.

James MacGregor Burns discusses in his book *Leadership* two types of leadership that are found in politics and have been associated with leadership in general over the past few decades (1978). Transactional leadership is when the leader takes an initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of value, “leaders approach followers with an eye toward exchanging” (Burns, 1978, p. 4). On the other hand there is transformational leadership, which is based on paradigm shifts in beliefs, needs, and values of followers. Burns states that “the result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (1978, p. 4).

Burns (1978) further breaks down transactional leaders into different levels. He suggests that the transactions between leaders and followers range from more obvious relationships such as getting jobs in exchange for political votes to the less obvious of exchanges of trust and respect (Burns, 1978). This can be directly applied to leaders within athletics. On the most basic level, a player is rewarded with playing time by a coach if he or she performs well and works hard. However, captains are always searching for respect and trust from other players and peers which are often achieved through less concrete means. Developing transactional leadership capability is necessary for student-athletes off the field

as well. Setting goals and finding the means to achieve them through exchanges with other people are situations that occur in the workforce on a daily basis.

Transformational leadership goes beyond task oriented behaviors such as goals, rewards and punishments. Burns refers to the values of transformational leaders as “end values,” values which can not be exchanged in a transactional environment (1978). The ultimate achievement of a transformational leader is to empower and unite followers in order to change and influence their goals and beliefs (Burns, 1978). Hopefully through this process a leader is able to enable followers to have higher levels of performance than previously believed at the beginning of the relationship.

One of the most recent pushes for leadership education is the development of the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond in Richmond, Virginia. Jepson was founded on the idea that there is a current gap in higher education: “All too often, institutions focus on imparting career skills, or talk about preparing future leaders, without developing a true understanding of leadership—the knowledge, ability, and conviction to drive change” (*Jepson school of leadership studies*, 2007, p.1). By combining rigorous academic opportunities and hands-on experience with professional and personal service and civic engagement, Jepson provides the only undergraduate degree of its kind: a B.A. in Leadership Studies.

The purpose of Jepson and other programs similar in nature is to provide students with the ability to make decisions, drive change, and to “see and approach the world in clear and creative ways” (*Jepson school of leadership studies*, 2007, p. 1). Small class sizes, group work, and mentoring opportunities give individuals the chance to develop as well as learn

about themselves as leaders and leaders around them. Jepson utilizes leadership histories and theories to provide a base for growth and understanding about leadership.

While Jepson is the epitome of an academic leadership development and education program, leadership development does not have to stop inside the classroom. Many of these theories can be directly applied to athletics and the student-athletes that take the field every day.

### Leadership Theories Applied in Athletics

Transformational leadership appears in athletics through motivating factors by captains and coaches. Student-athletes often have much more exposure to transformational situations because of their role on the team and in the university setting. This is part of the reason why student-athletes are very desirable to employers in the workplace.

The overall theme of transformational leadership is communication. Communication in transformational leadership is particularly important since it must go beyond clearly communicating tasks to followers or giving rewards for good performance, and articulate a leader's vision for the future. Transformational leadership focuses both on the transmission and meaning of the message, not transmission alone (Hadden, 2003).

Transformational leaders must be able to listen as well as interpret followers in order to gain trust and successfully understand the collective needs and desires of the group.

Sports and the athletic playing field serve as a way in which student-athletes can develop and grow, especially when it comes to leadership skills and character awareness. Sellers discusses the fact that athletes often have greater self-discipline, work ethic, persistence and drive (1988). These traits help make athletes successful on and off the field while in college, as well as helping them prepare for the working world and today's unstable economy. The environment that athletics establishes is one that fosters growth in these areas

and serves as an arena to enhance leadership and other life skills necessary to be successful (Hadden, 2003; Dobosz, 1999; Ryan, 1989).

Leadership education and character development for student-athletes are becoming increasingly more important as the workforce begins to place emphasis on leadership ability in order to obtain and retain jobs, as well as improved performance and promotion capability. Collegiate athletes have experiences that many other students do not encounter throughout their college careers. According to Howard (1998), former athletes comes with a grouping of traits that many employers would do almost anything for, such as perseverance, clutch performance, organizational skills, and time management, diversity, mental strength, and intelligence. Athletes also have the ability to work in a team while also demonstrating leadership skills, something that is becoming more and more attractive to many employers in today's economy. Gale (2002) points out that companies who tend to have networks of leaders spread throughout their organizations are more likely to be successful instead of having just one main leader.

College is a time when student-athletes struggle with the pressures of academics, athletics and social peers. According to Mary E. Howard-Hamilton and Julie A. Sina in their article, *How college affects student athletes*, there is a need for the policies of the athletic department to be in line with those of the university (2001). This relationship fosters better communication between professors and the student-athlete services staff, allowing for better monitoring of student-athletes. Traditionally there is not a very favorable relationship between academia and the athletic department. The more open an athletics department is towards the ideas and opinions of the academia, the more likely professors are to help



student-athletes whom may be struggling to adjust to college (Howard-Hamilton and Sina, 2001).

According to the article, collaborative efforts of the university community and the college would help assist monitoring student-athletes in order to prevent any issues both in the academic setting as well as psychosocial problems. The article also discusses the importance of communication concerning student expectations, matriculation concerns and developmental issues. The faculty of universities should have responsibility in the challenging and development of student-athletes throughout their college career. Placing too much emphasis on the athletic part of student-athletes not only limits such individuals but also adds pressure that is not needed, especially in the first few years (Howard-Hamilton and Sina, 2001).

Leadership within athletics has been analyzed and studied through a variety of means. The most common studies found are on relationships between coaches and athletes. The role of the coach is one of influence, power, mentoring and education. Relationships between athletes and captains have also been addressed in the most current research on leadership in athletics. Captains are supposed to be the mediator between the team and the coach, therefore a captain must not only embody the traits of a leader such as trust and honesty, they must also understand what to do with the information they are given. Players often approach their captains with issues they cannot approach their coach with, and it is imperative that a captain have the knowledge base and interpersonal skills to make the right decision concerning action. However, a captain cannot have this knowledge base without understanding their own personal character and leadership identity (Howard-Hamilton and Sina, 2001).

In the article *Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory* by Komives, Mainella, Owen, Osteen, and Longerbeam (2005), the importance of collaboration and relationships within leadership was studied by interviewing thirteen individual participants in a three stage process. The purpose of the study was to discover what goes into an individual's leadership identity. The first interview was narrative, subjects were required to reflect back on their youth in order to describe how they had become people they are. The second interview functioned as a way to identify how the students worked with others and explored their current attitudes and experiences with leadership. The last interview explored how the participants' attitudes towards leadership had changed over time and why (Komives, et. al., 2005).

The study found that there are four developmental influences: adult influence, peer influences, meaningful involvement, and reflective learning. Adults were often the first to notice a participant's leadership potential. Same aged peers served as friends while older peers often served as role models. The more group experience an individual had, the more interaction they had with followers and collaborations. Early involvements in life often served as ways for individuals to support others while also forwarding their own stance. Lastly, journaling or structured reflective learning concerning leadership allowed for individual's to look more accurately at their ideas concerning leadership (Komives, et. al., 2005).

The study also found that deepening self-awareness, building self confidence, establishing interpersonal efficacy, applying new skills, and expanding motivations all add to developing one's self. Group interaction and learning from group membership are two important factors also found that help individuals process and learn from group experiences.

It is also important for individuals to have a change in the way they view themselves with others, followed by a broadening view of leadership. Each stage transitioned into a new stage, allowing a leadership identity to overtime take place. As participants progressed throughout the study, their views of leadership shifted from hierarchical to collaborative and relationship based (Komives, et. al., 2005).

Another tool used to help student-athletes discover their leadership identity is the idea of 360 degree feedback. Jeff Janssen Peak Performance Team Leadership Evaluation© is an instrument that is used in the field of leadership education in collegiate athletics (Appendix A-C). The tool is used to help student-athletes in assessing their leadership effectiveness through the perceptions of their peers and coaches. Following the completion of the tool, student-athletes create action plans to identify strengths and define areas for improvement.

Shelley Johnson (2006) found significant differences in the effects of gender, source of evaluations, and sport on the perceived leadership abilities of student-athletes at a large, NCAA Division I, state institution. She utilized Janssen's Peak Performance Team Leadership Evaluation to provide 360-degree feedback for the student-athletes on 24 out of 28 sports at the school. She also included 61 coaches, totaling 239 participants for her study. Her purpose was "to examine the effects of gender, source of evaluation and sport on perceived leadership ability of student-athletes on Olympic Sports at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill" (Johnson, 2006, p.63). Her findings show that leadership perception varies significantly when concerning vocal leadership between males and females, as well as a significant finding in the perception of leadership ability between male team sports and male individual sports (Johnson, 2006). 360 degree feedback is a useful tool to help current leaders understand their own leadership roles and capabilities,

However leadership in athletics does not start with coaching and end with athletic captains. According to Chelladurai's Leadership model, "Chelladurai's leadership model conceptualizes leadership as an interactional process (1980). That is, he argues that leader effectiveness in sport is contingent on situational characteristics of both the leader and the group members (Chelladurai et al, 1980). Thus, effective leadership can and will vary depending on the characteristics of the athletes and constraints of the situation (Barrow, 1977, p. 211). There are four main components of effective leadership in this model: qualities of effective leaders, leadership style, situational factors, and member characteristics (pg 216). The qualities found most often in effective leaders are intelligence, assertion, empathy, intrinsic motivation, flexibility, ambition, self-confidence, and optimism. The two styles of leadership are democratic and autocratic. Democratic leadership on an athletic team means that the decisions are athlete-oriented and are often group decisions, being very cooperative in nature. Autocratic leadership is extremely win oriented, focused more on outcomes and is a much more structured model than democratic leadership (Barrow, 1977).

#### The Need for Leadership Education

Grossman, Gieck, Freedman and Fang (1993) analyze the importance of prevention programming and leadership education in their manuscript *The Athletic Prevention Programming and Leadership Education (APPLE) Model: Developing Substance Abuse Prevention Programs*. There is a strong connection between the Athletic Department mission and actions of student-athletes; the more consistent the actions throughout the athletic department, the more in line the student-athletes will behave. According to the article, student-athletes may resort to alcohol and other drugs because of academic, social,

and athletic pressures. Alcohol and drugs may be believed to help an athlete compete or help them relax following competition.

Drug and alcohol abuse are major factors behind student-athlete misconduct and are becoming a hot topic in collegiate athletics. Because of this, drug and alcohol prevention programs among athletic departments are on the rise. The Athletic Prevention Programming and Leadership Education (APPLE) Model was created for the University of Virginia's athletic department. The model consists of seven segments: recruitment practices, expectations and attitudes, education programs, policies, drug testing, discipline, referral and counseling (Grossman, et al, 1993). This model requires active participation from administrators and coaches, forming the leadership education necessary to help dictate the core, or policies. The APPLE model thrives on the belief that in order for a prevention program to function, the mission and policies must also be in line with that of the university and the athletic department (Grossman, et al, 1993).

While drugs and alcohol are not the only reason for student-athlete misconduct; it is important to note the type of education that student-athletes are undergoing in order to understand their decision making behavior. If student-athletes are making correct decisions concerning drugs and alcohol, they may be less likely to engage in misconduct on and off the field (Grossman, et al, 1993). A prevention model like the APPLE model gives responsibility to administrators and coaches as well as athletes. Leadership education is not something that only student-athletes should engage in. The more educated the entire department is concerning these issues, the more likely it is for everyone, including student-athletes, to follow policies concerning the issues (Grossman, et al, 1993).

Carodine, Almond, and Gratto (2001) discuss the need for effective student-athlete services in order to help adjusting athletes continue to be successful in and out of the classroom in their article, *College student-athlete success both in and out of the classroom*. The major components of student-athlete services are personal development, career development, and academic counseling. Examples of successful student-athlete services include orientation, career and life skills development, career planning and placement, CHAMPS/Life Skills, academic advising, and monitoring eligibility (Carodine, et al, 2001).

Orientation fosters a smoother transition into college life, giving the student-athlete a chance to learn about facilities, activities and campus regulations as well as ask any questions that they may have. Career and life skills development as well as planning and placement actively show the athlete that their future is just as important as their current ability. These services give the student-athlete the chance to explore career ideas and help network before it is too late in their college years. The CHAMPS/Life Skills (Challenging Athletic Minds for Personal Success) programs focus on enhancing an athletes' postsecondary experience. The program is designed to help athletes complete their college degree as well as develop skills that will be necessary throughout life after college and athletics (Carodine, et al, 2001). The first component of a CHAMPS/Life Skills program is a commitment to academic excellence, the second is the commitment to athletic excellence, the third is a commitment to personal development, and the fourth is a commitment to career development. Finally, academic advising and monitoring eligibility are important services for student-athletes because the services provided by these institutions allow athletes to stay on track towards graduation as well as future careers. Academic advisors help manage student-athlete schedules and

registration, while eligibility monitors make sure athletes are taking required course loads as well as GPA requirements (Carodine, et al, 2001).

Student-athlete services are the backbone to developing strong leaders and character development for student-athletes. The stronger the support that athletes have from the athletic department, the more influences the department can have on an athlete. A student-athlete who has a supportive department as well as ample resources to draw upon has more information to make better decisions concerning themselves outside of the athletic field (Carodine, et al, 2001).

“If sports are supposed to build character, recent evidence suggests that college athletics is falling down on the job. Consider this summer, during which at least 25 college athletes have made headlines for various off-field violations” (Wolverton, 2006, p. 1).

Wolverton’s article addresses the work of Sharon K. Stoll, a University of Idaho professor of physical education and director of Center for Ethical Theory and Honor in Competition and Sport. Stoll’s measurements depict a sharp decline in athletes’ moral reasoning; team sport athletes such as lacrosse and ice hockey perform worse than non-team sport athletes such as golf or tennis (Wolverton, 2006). She also found that female athletes score higher than men in her category of morals. Her belief for these trends lies in the competitive upbringing of athletes in their youth. “From an early age, many elite players are trained to view their opponents as obstacles to overcome rather than honorable individuals” (Wolverton, 2006, p. 1). Athletes are not encouraged to think for themselves and often believe that they can get away with their wrong actions.

Stoll has established a curriculum to help develop and teach players how to improve their moral reasoning, hopefully resulting in better decisions on and off the field. Dubbed

“Winning with Character,” her course is designed in such a way that forces players to reflect on their own personal character while also addressing the types of influences that others may have on their lives (Wolverton, 2006, p.1). By addressing these two components, a forum is created to discuss how they make and should make decisions. Topics of discussion include guns, gangs, drugs, date rape, and how to become responsible citizens as well as hypothetical discussions on moral dilemmas (Wolverton, 2006). Coaches are also actively encouraged to participate, creating another relationship between player and coach that is out of the norm compared to the on field coaching that is typical.

Overall, Stoll found that when athletes are given more individual responsibility, they are more likely to score higher on her moral reasoning tests. Athletes such as golfers who have to mark their own penalties or tennis players who call their own lines score much higher than basketball or football players who blindly listen to a coach call out plays from the sidelines. She also believes that contact sports offer more situations in which athletes can vary from the rules: “football players can hold an opponent's breastplate, or lacrosse players can jab a competitor with a stick” (Wolverton, 2006, p. 1).

Moral and character education is vital to a student-athlete experience. Stoll discovered the dependent nature of team sport athletes on their coaches and their lack of ability to make moral decisions off the field. Through character and leadership education, these athletes can reevaluate themselves as well as their influence and effect on others, internalizing the consequences that their actions may have before they actually commit these acts.



## CHAPTER III

### Methodology

#### Selection of Population

The population of intercollegiate athletics leadership academies is the work of Janssen Sports Leadership Center. Although other college and university athletics departments may address leadership education in a variety of ways, surveying subjects from only Janssen established programs will allow for consistency across all institutions. The subjects surveyed in this study are from the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, University of Pittsburgh, Yale University, Illinois University, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem State University, and Baylor University. The individuals surveyed at each institution are either coaches or athletic administrators. Head coaches of NCAA championship sponsored sports and administrators at the Assistant/Associate Athletics Director or Athletics Director level comprise the population of subjects. By creating a population, this study draws stronger overall conclusions towards the idea of leadership academies and the results are better able to be generalized to all NCAA membership.

#### Development of Survey Instrument

This study measured the perceptions of leadership academies from the viewpoint of coaches and athletic administrators at seven of Jeff Janssen's Sports Leadership Center leadership academy institutions: University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, University of Pittsburgh, Yale University, Illinois University, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem State University, and Baylor University. The survey instrument used in this study focuses on

the perceptions of coaches and athletic administrators towards the value and effectiveness of their respective athletic leadership academy. Previous studies used instruments to measure student-athletes' perceived leadership ability as reported by themselves, their teammates, and coaches (Johnson, 2006). However, no study had been developed to analyze the perceived effectiveness of these leadership academies in order to establish a need for such institutions at other members of the NCAA.

### Methodology

The instrument created for this study was distributed to every head coach and administrator of the seven (7) participating universities. The survey included demographic information on gender, position of the individual (either head coach or administrator), as well as gender of the sport coached. This information was used in order to establish relationships to be used in independent samples t-tests.

The first part of the survey asks participants to assign importance on a scale from lowest priority (1) to highest priority (5) on justifications for establishing or having a student-athlete leadership education/development program. There are ten (10) factors listed ranging from certain pressures to moral and ethical responsibilities. The results from these factors were used to answer the research question number one; what are the justifications for student-athlete leadership academies? The section ended with an open ended question, giving participants the chance to give qualitative data towards the research question as well.

The second part of the survey addressed research question two: to what extent are the leadership programs having an impact on student-athlete good character development? Participants are asked to give their perceptions on the value of certain components of the leadership academy on a scale from lowest (1) to highest (5). These components include

programs for both student-athletes and coaches as well as advantages that the leadership academy may provide for universities. The open ended question allowed for participants to include more qualitative data in order to give a better understanding to which components of the leadership academies have value.

Part three of the survey addressed research questions three and four: What are the current attitudes towards leadership education within overall collegiate athletics and, what are the perceived benefits of leadership academies to the Athletics department, student-athlete, and University overall? Participants were asked to give a level of impact that certain factors of the leadership academy may have on community and university relations. Participants are given another chance to provide qualitative data with an open ended question.

The survey was validated by leadership experts at three other institutions that are not a part of the Janssen Peak Performance Program (leadership experts at three other institutions which do not host leadership academies administered by the Janssen Sports Leadership Center). These experts were asked to critique the survey as well as provide suggestions and recommend changes to be made. This feedback strengthened the survey as well as validated it to be distributed to the seven (7) participating universities in the study. The survey was also reviewed by Jeff Janssen and Shelley Johnson to provide surface validity.

#### Procedure and Survey Distribution

Email addresses for all head coaches and athletics administrators in the population were gathered by looking at the university websites. All emails not obtained through this means were found through calling administrative assistants at the participating schools. The survey was distributed via Survey Monkey in the second week of January in order to reach

the population at a time that was assumed likely to produce the highest response rate. The survey remained open and available between January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 through February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008. Two reminders were sent to subjects that had not completed the survey via email after the first and second weeks of the process. The data from the survey was compiled to create an overall examination of attitudes concerning leadership education from the point of view of administrators and coaches at the seven institutions in the study. SPSS software was used to analyze the data.

### Statistical Analysis

The data was analyzed using two analysis methods. Descriptive statistics were compiled with the responses from all subjects at the seven institutions surveyed. A comparison of means from the answers to the survey was done for each statement, providing percentages of the population who disagreed or agreed with the statements. The data collected from the survey was used to assess if the leadership academies in the four studied institutions are valued, effective, and necessary to help develop the characters of student-athletes and relationships within the athletic department.

The second phase of analysis used independent samples t-tests to determine if there were mean differences between gender of sport coached and effectiveness, attitudes, needs, and justifications of leadership academies. Independent samples t-tests were also used to determine if there were mean differences between gender of head coach or administer to the same factors as well.

## CHAPTER IV

### Results

The purpose of this study is to establish justifications for leadership academies and examine the effectiveness of athletic leadership academies in fostering good character from the perceptions of head coaches and administrators currently at institutions with Peak Performance leadership academies.

The survey instrument used in this study addressed the perceptions of coaches and athletic administrators towards the value and effectiveness of their respective athletic leadership academy. The participants were selected from the leadership academies that were addressed throughout the study: the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill, the University of Pittsburgh, Yale University, Illinois University, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem State University, and Baylor University. A total of 185 participants were surveyed, and 54 participants completed the survey, resulting in a 29% response rate.

Part I addresses the overall justifications for leadership academies within college athletics including the pressures and stress factors that student-athletes face as well as the opportunities that they have that other student body members do not. Part II focuses on the perceived need for leadership and character education for student-athletes in their collegiate years. Part III addresses the level to which coaches and administrators are aware of their leadership academy missions and if they perceive that the academy is effective in their stated mission. Parts IV and V will look at the attitudes towards leadership academies and if they have an overall value to the university as a whole.

## Descriptive Statistics Summary

Fifty-four out of 185 participants completed the survey. Of these, 33 participants were male (61.1%) and 21 were female (38.9%). Twenty-three (42.6%) of the participants were athletic administrators and 31 (57.4%) participants were head coaches. The head coaches represented both male and female sports. Seven of the 31 (23%) coaches coached a male sport, 21 (67.7%) coached a female sport, and 2 (6%) coaches coached a co-ed sport. One participant opted to not respond to this question. Coaches were asked to identify which sport they coached, and the following sports were reported: baseball (2), volleyball (5), swimming and diving (1), basketball (2), softball (2), tennis (2), rowing (1), field hockey (2), golf (5), cross country (2), soccer (3), and women's gymnastics (1). The majority of sports represented by the respondents were Olympic sport programs, with only two basketball coaches and two baseball coaches (13%) representing revenue producing sports (Table 2).

**Table 1.**

<i>Sports represented in survey</i>		
	# of coaches	% of total
Baseball	2	7%
Volleyball	5	18%
Swimming	1	4%
Basketball	2	7%
Softball	2	7%
Tennis	2	7%
Rowing	1	4%
Field Hockey	2	7%
Golf	5	18%
Cross Country	2	7%
Soccer	3	11%
Women's Gymnastics	1	4%

The second section of the survey asked the participants to rate on a scale from 1 (no importance) to 5 (high importance) what degree of importance each of the following factors are in justifying having a leadership education/development program for student-athletes. There were nine factors addressed: student-athlete (SA) time demands, SA exposure to the public, pressure to have high standards of character, special academic treatment that SAs receive, attractiveness of SA to employers, application of skills learned to outside experience, need to make ethical decisions on and off the field, control of SA misconduct, the importance of good character in leaders, and the responsibilities of team captains.

Overall, the importance of good character in leaders was ranked by 37 participants at a high importance factor in the justifications for leadership academies resulting in 75.5% of the answers for that particular factor (Table 2). A high degree of importance was also indicated for three other factors: the importance of good character in leaders (70.8%), the need to make ethical decisions on and off the field (59.2%) and the pressure to have high standards of character (55.1%). These four factors are perceived as the most importance justifications for having leadership academies for student-athletes to participate in. Table 2 depicts the factors and their rankings of importance level for each individual one by the participants who chose to answer the question.

**Table 2.***Ranking of importance by factor*

	1 (no importance)	2	3 (neutral)	4	5 (high importance)	Response Count
Good character in leaders	0% (0)	0% (0)	2.0% (1)	22.4% (11)	75.5% (37)	49
Responsibilities of team captains	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.3% (3)	22.9% (11)	70.8% (34)	48
Ethical decisions	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.1% (3)	34.7% (17)	59.2% (29)	49
Pressure of character	0% (0)	2.0% (1)	6.1% (3)	36.7% (18)	55.1% (27)	49
Application of skills	0% (0)	0% (0)	8.2% (4)	46.9% (23)	44.9% (22)	49
Control of SA misconduct	2.0% (1)	6.1% (3)	18.4% (9)	44.9% (22)	28.6% (14)	49
SA time demands	4.1% (2)	6.1% (3)	28.6% (14)	40.8% (20)	20.4% (10)	49
Attractiveness of SA to employers	2.0% (1)	8.2% (4)	10.2% (5)	61.2% (30)	18.4% (9)	49
Exposure	0% (0)	14.3% (7)	24.5% (12)	44.9% (22)	16.3% (8)	49
Special treatment	37.5% (18)	6.3% (3)	50.0% (24)	6.4% (3)	0% (0)	48



**Table 3.***Mean and Median for individual factors*

	Mean	Median
Good character in leaders	3.67	4
Responsibilities of team captains	4.65	5
Ethical decisions on and off the field	4.53	5
Pressure to have high standards of character	4.45	4
Application of skills	4.37	4
Control of SA misconduct	3.9	4
SA time demands	3.67	4
Attractiveness of SA to employers	3.86	4
SA exposure	3.76	4
Special academic treatment for SA	2.25	3

Participants were also given the opportunity to answer an open ended question: what other factors can be considered important in justifying the need for a leadership development program?

**Table 4.**

*Open Ended Response: Factors also considered Important*

---

1	The development of student-athletes for preparation for life after college
2	player/coach relationships understanding the true nature of leadership providing support among fellow athletes
3	Team performance
4	Utmost commitment to the welfare of the program
5	confidence building for students - decision making skills
6	the impact that good leaders have on decisions made by all members of the team
7	Society not providing an opportunity to gain leadership experience as a young child through high school. This is primarily due to organized sports at such an early age where adults involved in youth sports are not providing an environment to grow in leadership due to their own leadership style, inexperience as a coach, etc.
8	Enhance ability of team to be successful.
9	We feel it is important to our team success and the success of our athletes after their athletic careers to help develop their leadership skills.
10	Having athletes discover their leadership qualities. Enhance their communications with other leaders from other sports.
11	There is nothing more important than personal and team leadership both in the success of the team and the success of the athlete after their college days are over.

---

### *Research Question Two*

What components of leadership academies are most valuable to athletic administrators and head coaches?

Part II measured the degree that athletics directors and coaches valued the following components of the leadership program: mission of the leadership program, educational programs and workshops, outside speakers and events, providing a unique opportunity for student-athletes, continuing education through all years in college, providing a pleasant experience for student-athletes, recruiting advantage, organization of the structure of the program, and programs for coaches and administrators (Table 3).

Overall, the mission of the leadership program is valued at a high level (5) by 25 of the participants (51.0%). Other factors that were perceived at a high value level were educational programs and workshops (46.9%), continuing education throughout all years in college (46.9%) and programs for coaches and administrators (38.8%). Participants felt that the leadership academy was neutral (44.9%) in providing a recruiting advantage for coaches.

**Table 5.***Ranking of factors by importance*

	1 (no value)	2	3 (neutral)	4	5 (high value)	Response Count
Mission	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (7)	34.7% (17)	51.0% (25)	49
Educational programs	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	12.2% (6)	40.8% (20)	46.9% (23)	49
Continuing education	4.1% (2)	2.0% (1)	16.3% (8)	30.6% (15)	46.9% (23)	49
Unique opportunity	0.0% (0)	4.1% (2)	12.2% (6)	42.9% (21)	40.8% (20)	49
Programs for administration	2.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	22.4% (11)	36.7% (18)	38.8% (19)	49
Speakers and events	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.3% (8)	51.0% (25)	32.7% (16)	49
Organization of program	0.0% (0)	4.1% (2)	20.4% (10)	46.9 % (23)	28.6% (14)	49
Providing a pleasant experience	6.1% (3)	6.1% (3)	14.3% (7)	46.9% (23)	26.5% (13)	49
A recruiting advantage	4.1% (2)	2.0% (1)	44.9% (22)	34.7% (17)	14.3% (7)	49

**Table 6.***Mean and median for individual factors*


---

	Mean	Median
Mission	4.39	5
Educational programs		
	4.38	4
Continuing education		
	4.2	4
Unique opportunity		
	4.49	4
Programs for coaches and administrators		
	4.22	4
Speakers and events		
	4.19	4
Organization of the structure of the program		
	4.07	4
Providing a pleasant experience		
	3.87	4
A recruiting advantage		
	3.61	3

---

Additional responses were given in an open ended question: what other components of the leadership program have an impact on good character development in student-athletes? Table five (5) depicts the answers to the open ended question.

**Table 7.**

*Open Ended Response: Other impact components*

---

- 1 clearly explaining what is correct behavior and clearly explaining what is incorrect behavior with relevant examples

---

- 2 consistency and repetition of the message; interaction with SAs from throughout the department

---

- 3 Providing an opportunity for emerging leaders. If participants do not end up as a captain, they learn how to be strong leaders and/or followers in various situations.

---

- 4 Looking at all facets of being a leader.

---

- 5 One on one mentoring for key leaders

---

*Research Question Three*

What are the current attitudes towards leadership education within the overall collegiate athletics and university?

Research question three was addressed through some of the factors in survey question three. The overall purpose of the question was to establish what the current attitudes towards leadership education in college athletics are in hopes of creating a need or desire for such programs in other institutions across the country. Attitudes towards individual factors were measured by the level of impact that participants ranked each factor.

Of the six factors that were ranked at the neutral level, only two are above 50%. The attitudes were dispersed throughout most of the results. Six of the eight total factors were most highly ranked at the neutral (3) level. Connecting the athletics department to the university (45.8%, n=22), university support of student-athletes (35.4%, n=17), recruiting

student-athletes who are more active student body members (50.0%, n=24), recruiting more talented student-athletes (54.2%, n=26), university public relations (36.2%, n=17), and development for the athletics department (29.2%, n=14) were the six factors with neutral rankings. This represents a relatively neutral attitude towards the impact of the leadership academy on connecting institutions. The two other factors, providing value to the overall university (43.8%, n=21) and community response and support of the athletics department (22.2%, n=16) were the only two factors that were averagely ranked higher at the four impact level ranking.

#### *Research Question Four*

What are the perceived benefits of leadership academies to the Athletics department, student-athlete, and University overall?

Sections of question number three on the survey also addressed research question four. Another purpose of survey question three was to establish the benefits of the leadership academy for the other institutions connected to such a program; the Athletics department, the university overall, and the student-athlete. By addressing the benefits for the student-athlete, the athletics department, and the university overall, the question provided feedback on the impact of leadership academies to the overall population. Eight factors were created and are demonstrated in the table below (Table 6). The factors ranged in content from the relationship between athletics and the university to the benefit of a leadership academy the overall athletics department.

**Table 8.***Ranking of factors by importance*

	1 (no impact)	2	3 (neutral)	4	5 (high impact)	Response Count
Providing value to the overall University	0.0% (0)	4.2% (2)	16.7% (8)	43.8% (21)	35.4% (17)	48
University support of SA	6.3% (3)	4.2% (2)	35.4% (17)	31.3% (15)	22.9% (11)	48
Community response and support of athletics	10.4% (5)	4.2% (2)	29.2% (14)	33.3% (16)	22.9% (11)	48
University Public Relations	6.4% (3)	8.5% (4)	36.2% (17)	31.9% (15)	17.0% (8)	47
Connecting the athletics dept. to the university	12.5% (6)	6.3% (3)	45.8% (22)	22.9% (11)	12.5% (6)	48
Development and fundraising for athletics	22.9% (11)	8.3% (4)	29.2% (14)	29.2% (14)	10.4% (5)	48
Recruiting more talented SA	14.6% (7)	6.3% (3)	54.2% (26)	18.8% (9)	6.3% (3)	48
Recruiting SA who are more active student body members	10.4% (5)	6.3% (3)	50.0% (24)	29.2% (14)	4.2% (2)	48



**Table 9.***Mean and median of individual factors*

	Mean	Median
Providing value to the		
overall University	4.15	4
University support of SA	3.66	4
Community response and		
support of athletics	3.59	4
University Public		
Relations	3.42	3
Connecting the athletics		
dept. to the university	3.24	3
Development and		
fundraising for athletics	3.08	3
Recruiting more talented		
SA	3.03	3
Recruiting SA who are		
more active student body		
members	3.15	3

**Table 10.**

*Open Ended Answers to Question 3*

---

1 This is Yale...it's different here!

---

2 It is encouraging coaches to interact

---

3 It is impacting the cohesiveness of the department but does not have a great impact outside the department yet

---

4 Provides student-athletes the opportunity to work with, learn from, and share experiences with other student-athletes from various teams in the university.

---

5 The success of our teams

---

6 I believe that it is having a very positive impact on the athletes and our teams.

---

**Inferential Test Results**

*Research Question Five*

Is there a relationship between gender of sport coached and the associated factors in this study?

In order to best address this research question, the twenty seven factors were grouped into six themed factors to be used in the t-tests run through SPSS. Once the new six factors were formed, the overall mean scores for each factor were computed. A one sample t-test was then performed in order to compare the means for females and males for each factor.

For question number one on the survey, the following factors were grouped into Factor One, or internal justifications; student-athletes time demands, student-athlete exposure to public, pressure to have high standards of character, special academic treatment that student-athletes receive, and attractiveness of student-athletes to employers. Factor Two for this purpose is labeled external justifications and the following factors are grouped together;

application of skills learned to outside experience, need to make ethical decisions on and off the field, control of student-athlete misconduct, importance of good character in leaders, responsibilities of team captains.

Factors three and four were made up of groupings from the second overall question on the survey. Factor three, or organizational values, is made up of the mission of the leadership program, educational programs and workshops, bringing in outside speakers, and organization of the structure of the program. Factor four, provision values, is comprised of providing a unique opportunity for student-athletes, continuing education throughout all years in college, providing a pleasant experience for student-athletes, a recruiting advantage, and programs for coaches and administrators.

Factors five, impact on athletic department, and factor six, impact on the university, are grouped from individual factors on question three of the survey. Factor five is comprised of recruiting student-athletes who are more active student body members, recruiting more talented student-athletes, community response and support of the athletics department, and development and fundraising for the athletics department. Factor six is made up of the grouping from connecting the athletics department to the university, university support of student-athletes, providing value to the overall university, and finally university public relations.

The scores from each individual factor grouped together were added in order to find a total sum for each new factor. This sum was then divided by the number of individual factors, resulting in the overall mean score for each new factor. This procedure was then completed for both female and male participant groups. The tables that demonstrate the

sums of scores for each individual factors as well as the overall sums of the new factors are available in appendix E.

For factor one, internal justifications, the female mean score was 3.48 and the male mean score was 3.54. For factor two, external justifications, the female mean score was 4.5 and the male mean score was 4.57. For factor three, organizational values, the female mean score was 4.22 and the male mean score was 4.26. Factor four, or provisional values, had a female mean score of 4.16 and a male mean score of 4.26. Factor five, impact on athletic department, had a female mean score of 3.68 and a male mean score of 2.87. Lastly factor six, impact on the university, had a female mean score of 3.36 and a male mean score of 3.39.

**Table 11.**

*Means of Overall Factors for Female and Male Sports*

Gender	1	2	3	4	5	6
<u>Female</u>	3.48	4.5	4.22	4.16	3.68	3.36
<u>Male</u>	3.54	4.57	4.26	4.14	2.87	2.39

After the overall means for each factor were computed, an individual mean for each participant for each factor was developed. The means for each participant were then inputted into SPSS and an independent samples t-test was run in order to compare the female and male (gender of the sport coached) means for each factor. A participant may be male who coaches a female sport and a female participant could coach a male sport.

**Table 12.***Comparison of Means for Internal Values**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor 1	Equal variances assumed	.030	.864	-.564	23	.578	-.16032	.28404	-.74789	.42726
	Equal variances not assumed			-.554	10.580	.591	-.16032	.28957	-.80077	.48013

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as coach of a female sport to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as a coach of a male sport. No significant difference was found ( $t(23) = -.564$ ,  $p = .578$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ) for the first factor related to internal values. The mean of a female sport ( $m = 3.4111$ ,  $sd = .63049$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the male sports ( $m = 3.5714$ ,  $sd = .65756$ ).

**Table 13.***Comparison of Means for External Values**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor2	Equal variances assumed	.456	.506	-.664	23	.513	-.12698	.19122	-.52256	.26859
	Equal variances not assumed			-.641	10.274	.535	-.12698	.19801	-.56658	.31261

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as coach of a female sport to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as a coach of a male sport. No significant difference was found ( $t(23) = -.664$ ,  $p = .513$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ) for the second factor related to external values. The mean of the female sports ( $m = 4.4444$ ,  $sd = .42040$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the male sports ( $m = 4.5714$ ,  $sd = .45356$ ).

**Table 14.***Comparison of Means for Organizational Values**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor3	Equal variances assumed	.009	.925	-.482	23	.634	-.13294	.27585	-.70358	.43771
	Equal variances not assumed			-.474	10.629	.645	-.13294	.28056	-.75308	.48721

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as coach of a female sport to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as a coach of a male sport. No significant difference was found ( $t(23) = -.482$ ,  $p = .634$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ) for the third factor related to organizational values. The mean of the female sports ( $m = 4.1528$ ,  $sd = .61321$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the male sports ( $m = 4.2857$ ,  $sd = .63621$ ).

**Table 15.***Comparison of Means for Provision Values**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Differen ce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor4	Equal variances assumed	.260	.615	.006	23	.996	.00159	.28840	-.59501	.59819
	Equal variances not assumed			.006	12.481	.995	.00159	.27160	-.58765	.59083

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as coach of a female sport to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as a coach of a male sport. No significant difference was found ( $t(23) = .006$ ,  $p = .996$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ) for the fourth factor related to provision values. The mean of the female sports ( $m = 4.1444$ ,  $sd = .66794$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the male sports ( $m = 4.1429$ ,  $sd = .58554$ ).



**Table 16.***Comparison of Means for Impact on Athletic Department**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Differen ce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor5	Equal variances assumed	1.245	.276	.138	23	.891	.07937	.57325	1.106 50	- 1.2652 3
	Equal variances not assumed			.168	17.206	.869	.07937	.47356	.9188 5	- 1.0775 8

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as coach of a female sport to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as a coach of a male sport. No significant difference was found ( $t(23) = .138$ ,  $p = .891$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ) for the fifth factor related to the impact on the athletic department. The mean of the female sports ( $m = 2.9722$ ,  $sd = 1.39824$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the male sports ( $m = 2.8929$ ,  $sd = .89974$ ).

**Table 17.***Comparison of Means for the Impact on University**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor6	Equal variances assumed	1.048	.317	-.300	23	.767	-.17857	.59446	1.40831	1.05117
	Equal variances not assumed			-.368	17.700	.717	-.17857	.48564	1.20010	.84296

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as coach of a female sport to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as a coach of a male sport. No significant difference was found ( $t(23) = -.300$ ,  $p = .767$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ) for the sixth factor related.... The mean of the female sports ( $m = 3.2500$ ,  $sd = 1.45521$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the male sports ( $m = 3.4286$ ,  $sd = .90960$ ).

*Research Question Six*

Is there a relationship between gender of coach or administrator and the associated factors in this study?

The twenty-seven overall factors were grouped in the same way as they were in order to address research question five. The survey participants were then grouped by gender; either male or female. This is different from research question five because of the fact that it is the gender of the participant, not the gender of the sport coached.

After the overall means for each factor were computed, an individual mean for each participant for each factor was developed. The means for each participant were then inputted into SPSS and an independent samples t-test was run in order to compare the female and male means for each factor.

**Table 18.**

*Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the Internal Values*

*Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differ- ence	Std. Error Differ- ence	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor1	Equal variances assumed	.507	.480	-.237	44	.814	-.04524	.19122	-.43061	.34014
	Equal variances not assumed			-.246	40.956	.807	-.04524	.18369	-.41622	.32575

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as female to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as male. No significant difference was found ( $t(44) = -.237$ ,  $p = .814$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ). The mean of the females ( $m = 3.2500$ ,  $sd = 1.45521$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the males ( $m = 3.5786$ ,  $sd = .67405$ ).

**Table 19.***Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the External Values**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differe nce	Std. Error Differe nce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor2	Equal variances assumed	1.340	.253	1.287	44	.205	.17698	.13748	-.10009	.45405
	Equal variances not assumed			1.323	39.60 2	.193	.17698	.13378	-.09348	.44745

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as female to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as male. No significant difference was found ( $t(44) = 1.287$ ,  $p = .205$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ). The mean of the females ( $m = 4.5556$ ,  $sd = .42040$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the males ( $m = 4.3786$ ,  $sd = .47559$ ).

**Table 20.***Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the Organizational Values**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differe nce	Std. Error Differe nce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor 3	Equal variances assumed	.219	.642	1.896	44	.064	.30456	.16060	-.01911	.62824
	Equal variances not assumed			1.873	34.88 1	.070	.30456	.16264	-.02565	.63478

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as female to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as male. No significant difference was found ( $t(44) = 1.896$ ,  $p = .064$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ). The mean of the females ( $m = 4.4028$ ,  $sd = .54999$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the males ( $m = 4.0982$ ,  $sd = .51970$ ).

**Table 21.***Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the Provision Values**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differe nce	Std. Error Differe nce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor4	Equal variances assumed	.866	.357	2.461	44	.018	.47778	.1941 5	.08650	.86905
	Equal variances not assumed			2.567	41.16 0	.014	.47778	.1861 2	.10195	.85360

An independent-samples t test comparing the mean scores of the female and male groups found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ( $t(44) = 2.461$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The mean of the female group was significantly higher ( $m = 4.2778$ ,  $sd = .56626$ ) than the male group ( $m = 3.800$ ,  $sd = .68638$ ).

**Table 22.***Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the Impact on the Athletic Dept**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differe nce	Std. Error Differe nce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor5	Equal variances assumed	.580	.450	1.364	44	.179	.44345	.32509	-.21172	1.09863
	Equal variances not assumed			1.296	30.35 7	.205	.44345	.34214	-.25494	1.14184

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as female to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as male. No significant difference was found ( $t(44) = 1.364$ ,  $p = .179$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ). The mean of the females ( $m = 3.2917$ ,  $sd = 1.22550$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the males ( $m = 2.8482$ ,  $sd = .97025$ ).

**Table 23.***Comparison of Means of Male and Female Participants for the Impact on the**Independent Samples Test*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differen ce	Std. Error Differen ce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
Factor6	Equal variances assumed	1.301	.260	.815	44	.420	.26786	.32869	-.39458	.93030
	Equal variances not assumed			.768	29.422	.449	.26786	.34888	-.44525	.98096

An independent samples t test was calculated comparing the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as female to the mean score of subjects who identified themselves as male. No significant difference was found ( $t(44) = .815$ ,  $p = .420$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ ). The mean of the females ( $m = 3.6250$ ,  $sd = 1.26389$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of the males ( $m = 3.3571$ ,  $sd = .96087$ ).



## CHAPTER V

### Discussion

The purpose of this study is establish justifications for leadership academies and examine the effectiveness of athletic leadership academies in fostering good character from the perceptions of head coaches and administrators currently at institutions with Peak Performance leadership academies.

Leadership continues to be a buzz word within collegiate athletics. Not only is leadership imperative on the field for good, consistent performance from student-athletes; it is the key ingredient for making better decisions off the field as well. According to Dick Baddour, Athletic Director for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the most important characteristic for a winning program is the leadership among student-athletes (Baddour, 2004). Shelly Johnson discusses the role that the leadership academy plays at the University of North Carolina, Jeff Janssen's flagship university:

It is based upon the premise that leaders are not born, that they are made - in the Vince Lombardi tradition – with effort and hard work. Leadership is a skill just like any physical skill: it may be systematically taught and mastered (Janssen, 2004). With the comprehensive scope and substantive depth of its curriculum, the Carolina Leadership provides the development programming not only throughout the course of a year but throughout a student-athletes' tenure. In short, there is a ready-made line of leaders. Now when a coach implores a student-athlete, "you're a leader; now lead," the student-athlete has the desire and the ability (Johnson, 2006).

While North Carolina is just one of Jeff Janssen's leadership academies, the above statement clearly addresses the perceived desire for a leadership academy. Student-athletes are thought to have the ability to become leaders through hard work and education.

The survey was sent to a total of 185 participants and 54 responded, resulting in a 29% response rate. The participants were given three weeks to complete the survey, with a reminder sent at the two week mark. Following the reminder email, the response rate nearly tripled as it reached the total of 54. Five respondents answered the demographic questions of the survey; however they did not complete the rest of the questions. These participant responses were not included in any of the reported data.

The relatively low response rate could have been due to multiple factors, first of which was the timing of the survey. The survey was sent out on January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2008 and closed on February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008. At first thought, this was seemingly the best time to conduct a survey in order to reach the most number of participants. However, this represents a difficult time in the semester for many athletic administrators and coaches; it is following winter break and the survey could have been filtered through SPAM or ignored due to other important situations that arose over the break. Secondly, due to the high status of some of the participating coaches, many individuals sent back emails saying they did not have the time to complete the survey. Perhaps if the survey had been organized over the summer, this would have allowed for ample time for in season coaches to participate.

#### *Descriptive Statistics Discussion*

Athletic administrators represented 42.6% (n=23) and head coaches represented 57.4% (n=31) of the total respondents (Table 1). Ideally the numbers would have been more effective if closer together with a larger sample, however this was a good representation compared to the number of administrators and coaches that the survey was sent out to. Most of the athletic administrators that responded to the survey were males (n=18), making only five female athletic administrators. The administrations at all participating schools tend to be

male dominated, which explains why there were a much larger amount of male administrators that responded to the survey. Of the coaches that answered the survey, the majority of them were female (n=16). This is partially due to the fact that the sports represented by the coaches were generally female Olympic sports -- of the total sports, only two basketball coaches and two baseball coaches responded.

*Survey Question: Justifications for Leadership Academies*

The factors that were ranked of the highest importance to justify the need for leadership academies in collegiate athletics were good character development for leaders (75.5%) and responsibilities of team captains (70.8%). These two factors ultimately were the main justifications for leadership academies out of the factors that were surveyed in addition to the open ended responses. Due to the structure of the leadership academies, after the freshman year of service, student-athletes are not required to be a part of the academy. Therefore, the coaches that truly value the program highly suggest to their juniors and seniors to be a part of the upper class programs and often nominate them for positions within these levels. This reasoning could possibly account for the high ranking of these two factors. Coaches and administrators that are supporters of the academies would support their captains and upperclassmen as they continued their leadership academy training, making the need for strong team captains and leadership important to these individuals.

The three factors within the first survey question that were rated with the next highest percentages for importance level were the pressure to have high standards of character (55.1%), application of skills learned to outside experience (44.9%), and the need to make ethical decisions on and off the field (59.2%). These three factors get at the core of the mission of leadership academies within college athletics. "As the nation's premier leadership

development program in collegiate athletics, the Carolina Leadership Academy develops, challenges, and supports student-athletes, coaches and staff in their continual quest to become world class leaders in athletics, academics and life” (CLA, 2008). The purpose of a leadership academy is to push student-athletes to understand their decision making skills and the consequences of their choices. These three factors address that need directly. Student-athletes are required to have high standards of character due to their place in the spotlight. They are often criticized on their transition to life after college athletics, and the leadership academy provides an opportunity for them to learn how to apply the skills they have learned.

The factor, special academic treatment for student-athletes, was different from the rest of the results from survey question one as 37.5% of the respondents ranked the factor at a (1) no importance level. Fifty percent of the respondents also rated the same factor at the (3) neutral level of importance, making 87% of the total responses to this factor neutral to no importance while the other factors were much more heavily weighted from the neutral to high importance levels. The phrasing of the factor to include the word special serves as a potential explanation for the negative response, or respondents possibly do not perceive leadership academies as academic training.

Outside of the four previous factors discussed, the other six factors were consistent with expectations. Time demands, exposure of student-athletes, attractiveness of student-athletes post college, and misconduct control all had median scores of four, demonstrating that they are believed to be additional justifications for leadership academies, however not the most important.

The respondents were asked to address any other factors that could be considered justifications for the need of a leadership academy in collegiate athletics. These factors

should be addressed in any other future research that should take place on this topic. There were three main themes addressed in the open ended responses. The first of which is the concept of team play and being the best individual in order to be a better overall team. This was not a theme that was addressed throughout the survey since the majority of the factors addressed more specific needs and justifications rather than team concepts. The second theme was the need for student-athletes to be prepared for life after college. This was supposed to be addressed through the factor originally titled “application of skills to outside experience,” yet perhaps because of the way that the factor was phrased it was misinterpreted. The last theme drawn out of the open ended answers was the relationship between players, as well as player-coach relationships.

*Survey Question: Value of Leadership Academies*

The purpose of this question was to outline the different aspects of leadership academy and establish their perceived value to head coaches and administrators. Overall, the factors were all believed to have a higher level of value (at the four or five ranking). The mission of the program was believed to have the highest overall value with 51% of the respondents ranking it at the five (high value) level. This could be due to the coaches and administrators having a solid idea of the mission and values of the program in order to sell the program to student-athletes as participants. Respondents also valued the educational programs (46.9%) and the idea of continuing education for student-athletes (46.9%). These components of a leadership academy are important for the student-athlete success after college and the results support the fact that the academies are believed to be providing an educational experience for the student-athletes involved.

The one factor that has the most surprising results is providing a recruiting advantage. While scores for this factor were across the board from no value to high value, most respondents felt neutral about the factor (44.9%). Because of the issue of leadership in college athletics today, it was believed that this factor would be ranked higher in value to coaches in order to attract student-athletes.

The respondents were asked to give additional components of the leadership academies that they felt were of value. One of the values was that the leadership academies provide situations for student-athletes to interact with other student-athletes, coaches, and administrators.

### Inferential Statistics Discussion

#### *Research question five*

In order to address the research question, is there a relationship between gender of sport coached and the associated factors in this study, the factors were grouped into six overall new categories. These new factors were run in a series of independent samples t-tests in order to establish if there were significant relationships. The null hypothesis states, there is no significant comparison between the gender of the sport coached and the six factors of this study.

While none of the comparisons of means were significantly relevant at the .05 alpha level, part of the explanation for the lack of significant findings could potentially be the low response rate. Also, there was a larger amount of female sports represented than male sports, creating an inequality in the sample size for each group.

Another consideration to look at in order to address the insignificant findings is the number of revenue producing sports compared to Olympic sports represented. At the

universities involved in the study, the only revenue producing sports are football and basketball, occasionally baseball (as in the case with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill). Out of the coaches that completed the survey, only two basketball coaches and two baseball coaches completed the survey. Olympic sport coaches are often more supportive of outside development for their student-athletes because they do not necessarily have the means to provide it themselves. Revenue producing sports may have the money and the access to do their own character development.

The null hypothesis was accepted: there is no significant comparison between the gender of sport coached and the overall six categorical factors addressed in this study.

#### *Research question six*

The same six categories were used as the main factors to be tested in order to answer the research question: is there a relationship between gender of coach or administrator and the associated factors in the study? The results of the independent samples t-tests that were run according to this research question have identified certain comparisons between male and female participant mean answers. The provision values relationship was significant ( $p = .018$ ) and demonstrates that there is a significant difference in the mean scores between the male respondents and the female respondents on these values. This suggests that males and females view the leadership academy components in different ways, believing that the academy provides different ideals for each group. The organizational values factor approaches significance at the .1 alpha level (.064) and suggests that there is potentially a significant relationship between male and female respondents and their mean scores for the organizational values of leadership academies. These two factors suggest that with more

respondents and a closer sample size of males compared to females, there could potentially be more significant relationships between male and female means.

The null hypothesis was accepted for all factors except the provisional factor, because there is no overall significant relationship between the male and female mean scores on the other five categorical factors. This means that there is no significant difference between the perceived values and benefits of the leadership academies of males and those of females whom participated in this study.

### Summary

The justifications that were believed to be of highest importance were the importance of good character in leaders, the responsibilities of team captains, the need for student-athletes to make ethical decisions on and off the field, and finally the pressure to have high standards of character. These factors are in line with the mission statements of the leadership academies at the respective universities. By having responsible student-athletes with good character whom also make ethical decisions on and off the field, coaches and administrators are maintaining the reputation of the university and the athletic department. The justification that was perceived as least important to the leadership academy was special academic treatment that student-athletes receive, which could potentially be due to the way that the factor was phrased. By negatively phrasing the factor with the word “special,” some respondents may not feel that the academic privileges that student-athletes received are above and beyond what other student body members do.

The components of the leadership academy that were perceived to have the highest value were the mission of the leadership program, the educational programs and workshops, continuing education throughout all of college, and the programming for coaches and



administrators offered. These are important for leadership academies because it shows that respondents value the foundation of the program between the mission and the programming offered, while also placing value on the administration. Leadership academies are often believed to benefit only the student-athlete, while in fact coaches and administrators can partake and reap the benefits of such a program as well. Overall, coaches and administrators were neutral about the leadership academy providing a recruiting advantage for their schools, a factor that was hypothesized to have more importance than actuality. Perhaps leadership education is a perk for a recruited athlete and it currently is not being used as a recruiting tool. When leadership academies and programs look to expand and grow, they may want to address this market and begin to frame the program in a way that could be used as a recruiting tool.

Overall, the majority of the factors in the last section were perceived to have a neutral attitude towards the impact of them on different aspects of the university and athletics department. This could support the idea that while the leadership academy seems to be perceived as an effective tool for developing student-athletes, it does not have an overall impact on the university or athletic department. Seventeen out of the 48 respondents to this survey question believed that the leadership academies at their respective schools added value to the overall university. On the other end of the spectrum, 22.9% (11 out of 48) believed that the leadership programs had no impact on development and fundraising for athletics. A possible explanation for this could be that many individuals are not aware of how a leadership academy is started. In at least two cases, leadership academies were started from funding of donors connected to the athletic department. However, the respondents in

the survey could believe that the implementation of a leadership academy provided no extra reason for donors to give money towards fundraising efforts.

Using independent samples t-tests, it was determined that there was only one statistically significant finding: the comparison of means between male and female perceptions on what leadership academies provide ( $p = .018$ ). However, other findings approached the significance level at the .01 level. The lack of statistically significant findings could be an effect from the low response rate and the disparity in the sample size of males and females. The leadership academies are perceived to be effective based upon the descriptive statistics collected and the attitudes overall seem to be relatively positive towards the effects and outcomes of the leadership programs. However, statistically this study can not demonstrate the effectiveness of such a program.

Section three of the survey is of most concern to the future of leadership academies in collegiate athletics. In order to continue to grow and develop at the institutions that presently have leadership academies, and to potentially begin at other universities and institutions, leadership academies need to focus on the relationships between their program and the overall university and athletics department. The support and funding necessary to maintain an effective program will come much easier if the mission of the leadership programs is well understood by other entities that could have an effect on the future of such a program.

Through the perceptions of administrators and coaches, it was apparent that there are needs that the leadership academy addresses. However, it should be noted that with a low response rate, it is possible that only respondents whom are supportive of a leadership program chose to take the time to complete the survey.

## Future Research

When future research is conducted on the effectiveness of leadership academies in collegiate athletics, measures need to be taken to ensure a larger response rate and a more evenly distributed sample size of males and females, as well as coaches and administrators. If possible, the survey should be conducted in person and onsite at the universities in order to provide a meeting or time and place to complete the survey, rather than leaving it up to the participant to take time and utilize the online system. A personal contact will potentially provide another reason to participate in the study.

Due to the influx of responses following a reminder email, more follow up emails or letters should be completed to continually remind people of the survey and the minimal time it takes to complete it. Also, the survey should remain open for longer than three weeks. The universities targeted in this study were at differently stages of their leadership academies and a longer survey would give respondents more time to look into the survey if they desired and they could have a better understanding of the program.

One future research topic would include taking the seven leadership academies by Jeff Janssen and doing a pre-test/post-test survey on student-athletes who participate in the leadership academy. This would address the justifications and effectiveness for leadership programs through the view point of the student-athlete, something that was not addressed in this study. By doing a pre-test/post-test, student-athletes would have had at minimum one year experience in the program and it would create a control in order to make sure that each participant had had at least a certain amount of experience. This type of study could also be run through a case study at individual schools in order to gain a better understanding of the attitudes and perceptions of different student-athletes.

Another interesting lead for research would be to take the seven schools addressed in this study and compare them to seven universities with similar demographics, sport programs, private or public status, majors and minors offered, and same number of students and student-athletes. By surveying the seven schools with leadership academies and the seven similar schools without, it could be used to determine the actual effectiveness of such a leadership development program. This would help universities understand if such a program actually has an effect on student-athletes or if it is the type of coaches and programs that the athletics department offers overall. Side by side comparisons of each school could be completed and effectiveness could be rated on similar factors as this study such as in the first two sections of the survey.

This type of study could be conducted at each individual school in order to establish the relative effectiveness for the schools. Once the individual school leadership academy effectiveness is established, research could address why a leadership academy is more effective at one school compared to another. This would allow the leadership education program to address what factors help make a program more effective; whether student-athletes buy into it more or if it is the administrators, what educational programs are more effective, or even what is perceived to be the biggest benefits of the program.

Following up an effectiveness study, a profile could be completed at each university with a leadership academy. This profile would include the program requirements, educational programs and speakers, meetings, and education that are provided to student-athletes. These profiles could be filed in order to be used by other institutions who may want to look into starting their own leadership academy. Since the actual program and varying levels are a part of Jeff Janssen's program, obviously copied programs would not be

permitted. However, the types of programs, speakers, and educational opportunities could be of interest to other individuals. These profiles would also help establish a common ground for the type of leadership education that is occurring, from leadership theory to leadership practices.

Lastly, a study needs to be conducted that will address the necessary human resources and financial needs necessary to start such a leadership program. If a university is looking to begin a leadership educational program for their student-athletes, they may not know if it is feasible at their universities. A study to address the financial backing necessary as well as the financial needs throughout the start up years (3-5 year plan) followed by a long term plan would help address what is necessary to begin a leadership program. Also, a university may not have the staffing or administrators that could handle the job responsibilities of a leadership academy. A study of the administrative needs would address what is absolutely necessary in order to staff a program as well as maintain it at a level that is still considered to be effective and worth the labor.

### Conclusion

The purpose of this study is establish justifications for leadership academies and examine the effectiveness of athletic leadership academies in fostering good character from the perceptions of head coaches and administrators currently at institutions with Peak Performance leadership academies. The information found in this study provided insight on the demand for character development for college athletes in order to benefit the individual, the team, and the university as a whole. This study also established a perceived value of the leadership academies, showing which factors and components of the programs are more important and beneficial over others.

The null hypothesis for research question five was accepted; there is no significant comparison between the gender of sport coached and the overall six categorical factors addressed in this study. The null hypothesis for research question six was accepted because there is no overall significant relationship between the male and female mean scores on the six categorical factors. This means that there is no significant difference between the perceived values and benefits of the leadership academies of males and those of females whom participated in this study. The majority of the significant findings of this study were found in the descriptive statistics section as certain factors were perceived to be more beneficial and important than other factors involved.

In conclusion, the current leadership academies in place through Jeff Janssen are perceived to be important and beneficial to student-athletes in their character development. However, the leadership academies are not perceived to have an overall impact on the university or athletics department. The need for future research exists to continue to establish an absolute value of such a program for collegiate athletics.

## APPENDIX A

### Janssen Peak Performance Team Captain's Leadership Model© Description

#### LEADERSHIP BY EXAMPLE

**1. Commitment**

- Self motivated, doesn't need someone watching over shoulder
- One of the hardest workers on the team
- Sport is a big priority for them, care, passionate
- Competitive

**2. Confidence**

- Believes in self, solid sense of self, comfortable with self, maturity
- Wants to perform in big moments
- Aggressively plays to win instead of not to lose
- Mentally and emotionally resilient following failure

**3. Composure**

- Able to manage emotions
- Plays and practices with enthusiasm, positive attitude
- Stays calm under pressure
- Tempers negative emotions

**4. Character**

- Does the right thing on and off the court/field
- Responsible, accountable, reliable, punctual
- Honest with coaches and teammates/trustworthy
- Treats teammates and coaches with respect – no gossip

#### VOCAL LEADERSHIP

**5. Encourager**

- A. Servant – put needs of team ahead of their own, team player
  - Takes the young kids under their wing
  - Does the dirty work
- B. Confidence Builder
  - Understands each teammates – knows their strengths, weaknesses, frustrations, fears
  - Helps teammates feel good about themselves – focuses on strengths/progress
  - Reaches out to struggling teammates and provides support and encouragement
- C. Refocuser
  - Emotionally intelligent to sense mood of team
  - Refocuses back on the present, positive, process
  - Purveyor of hope
- D. Team Builder
  - Establishes a common and compelling goal with teammates
  - Helps teammates understand and accept their roles
  - Helps teammates get to know each other and bond
- 6. Encourager – courage to confront**
  - Holds self and teammates accountable to high standards/demanding
  - Willing to constructively confront undisciplined teammates
  - Confront in the spirit to help/uphold standards, not belittle
  - Firm, fair, direct, honest
  - Stops gossip in tracks
  - Knows when to involve

*The Team Captain's Leadership Manual*

© Janssen Peak Performance • [www.jeffjanssen.com](http://www.jeffjanssen.com) • 1-888-721-TEAM

## APPENDIX B

### Janssen Peak Performance Team Captain's Leadership Self Evaluation©

Using a scale from one to five rate yourself on the following 24 questions.

**1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree**

Commitment	sd	d	n	a	s
I am one of the hardest workers on the team.....	1	2	3	4	5
I care passionately about the team’s success.....	1	2	3	4	5
I am a competitive person who wants to win.....	1	2	3	4	5
Confidence					
I believe in myself as a person and my ability to lead.....	1	2	3	4	5
I want to perform in pressure situations.....	1	2	3	4	5
I bounce back quickly following mistakes and errors.....	1	2	3	4	5
Composure					
I stay calm and composed in pressure situations.....	1	2	3	4	5
I stay focused when faced with distractions, obstacles, and adversity.....	1	2	3	4	5
I keep my anger and frustration under control.....	1	2	3	4	5
Character					
I consistently do the right thing on and off the court/field.....	1	2	3	4	5
I am honest and trustworthy.....	1	2	3	4	5
I treat my teammates, coaches, and others with respect.....	1	2	3	4	5
<b>LEADER BY EXAMPLE (add questions 1-12)</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>				
<hr/>					
Encourager – Servant					
I reach out to teammates when they need help.....	1	2	3	4	5
I take time to listen to teammates.....	1	2	3	4	5
Encourager – Confidence Builder					
I regularly encourage my teammates to do their best.....	1	2	3	4	5
I regularly compliment my teammates when they succeed.....	1	2	3	4	5
Encourager – Refocuser					
I communicate optimism and hope when the team is struggling.....	1	2	3	4	5
I know what to say to my teammates when they succeed.....	1	2	3	4	5
Encourager – Team Builder					
I have developed an effective relationship with each of my teammates.....	1	2	3	4	5
I am a team player who seeks to unify the team.....	1	2	3	4	5
Enforcer					
I hold my teammates accountable for following team rules and standards.....	1	2	3	4	5
I constructively confront my teammates when necessary.....	1	2	3	4	5
I am willing to address and minimize conflicts between teammates.....	1	2	3	4	5
I am firm, fair, and direct when dealing with conflicts and problems.....	1	2	3	4	5



## APPENDIX C

### Janssen Peak Performance Team Captain's Leadership Evaluation©

Using a scale from one to five rate the person listed on the following 24 questions.

**1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree**

	sd	d	n	a	s
<b>Commitment</b>					
is one of the hardest workers on the team.....	1	2	3	4	5
cares passionately about the team's success.....	1	2	3	4	5
is a competitive person who wants to win.....	1	2	3	4	5

<b>Confidence</b>					
believes in him/herself as a person and his/her ability to lead.....	1	2	3	4	5
wants to perform in pressure situations.....	1	2	3	4	5
bounces back quickly following mistakes and errors.....	1	2	3	4	5

<b>Composure</b>					
stays calm and composed in pressure situations.....	1	2	3	4	5
stays focused when faced with distractions, obstacles, and adversity.....	1	2	3	4	5
keeps his/her anger and frustration under control.....	1	2	3	4	5

<b>Character</b>					
consistently does the right thing on and off the court/field.....	1	2	3	4	5
is honest and trustworthy.....	1	2	3	4	5
treats his/her teammates, coaches, and others with respect.....	1	2	3	4	5

#### LEADER BY EXAMPLE (add questions 1-12)

**TOTAL**

<b>Encourager – Servant</b>					
reaches out to teammates when they need help.....	1	2	3	4	5
takes time to listen to teammates.....	1	2	3	4	5

<b>Encourager – Confidence Builder</b>					
regularly encourages his/her teammates to do their best.....	1	2	3	4	5
regularly compliments his/her teammates when they succeed.....	1	2	3	4	5

<b>Encourager – Refocuser</b>					
communicates optimism and hope when the team is struggling.....	1	2	3	4	5
knows what to say to his/her teammates when they succeed.....	1	2	3	4	5

<b>Encourager – Team Builder</b>					
has developed an effective relationship with each of his/her teammates.....	1	2	3	4	5
is a team player who seeks to unify the team.....	1	2	3	4	5

<b>Enforcer</b>					
holds his/her teammates accountable for following team rules and standards.....	1	2	3	4	5
constructively confronts my teammates when necessary.....	1	2	3	4	5
is willing to address and minimize conflicts between teammates.....	1	2	3	4	5
is firm, fair, and direct when dealing with conflicts and problems.....	1	2	3	4	5

#### VOCAL LEADER (add questions 1-24)

**TOTAL**

## APPENDIX D

### Survey

Gender:

Position: Head Coach or Administrator

If Coach, Gender of sport coached:

On a scale from 1 (lowest priority) to 5 (highest priority) with 3 being neutral, how important are each of the following factors in justifying having a leadership education/development program for student-athletes?

- Student-athlete time demands
- Student-athlete exposure to public
- Pressure to have high standards of character
- Special academic treatment that student-athletes receive
- Attractiveness of student-athletes to employers
- Application of skills learned to outside experience
- Need to make ethical decisions on and off the field
- Control of student-athlete misconduct
- Importance of good character in leaders
- Responsibilities of team captains

What other factors can be considered important in justifying the need for a leadership development program?

On a scale from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) with 3 being neutral, how do you value the following components of the leadership program?

- The mission of the leadership program
- Educational programs and workshops
- Bringing in outside speakers and events
- Providing a unique opportunity for student-athletes
- Continuing education throughout all years in college
- Providing a pleasant experience for student-athletes
- A recruiting advantage
- Organization of the structure of the program
- Programs for coaches and administrators

What other components of the leadership program have an impact on good character development in student-athletes?

On a scale from 1 to 5 with 3 being neutral, to what extent do you think the leadership program is having an impact on the following:

- Connecting the athletics department to the University
- University support of student-athletes
- Recruiting student-athletes who are more active student body members

- Recruiting more talented student-athletes
- Providing value to the overall University
- University public relations
- Community response and support of the athletics department
- Development and fundraising for the athletics department

Do you think that the leadership program is having an impact on anything else? If so, please explain.

## References

- Angulo, R.A. (2001). How do you define leadership? *Fire Engineering*, 154(7).
- Barrow, J. (1977). The variables of leadership. A review and conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 231-251.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- CLA (2008). *Carolina Leadership Academy*. Brochure.
- Carodine, K., Almond, K.F., & Cratto, K.K (2001). College student athlete success both in and out of the classroom. *New directions for student services*. 93, 19-33.
- Chelladurai, P. and Saleh, S.D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports. Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, pp.34-45.
- Dobosz, R.P., and Beaty, L.A. (1999). The relationship between athletic participation and high school students' leadership ability. *Adolescence*, 34(133), p.215.
- Doty, J. and Gerdes, D. (2000). Humility as a leadership attribute. *Military Review*, 80(5), p.89.
- Elche, K., Solace, W., & Adams-Gaston, J. (1997). An exploration of leadership characteristics in college athletics. *Counseling center: Office of vice president for student affairs - University of Maryland*.
- Gale, S.F. (2002). Building leaders at all levels. *Workforce*, October, pp.82-84.
- Grossman, S.J., Gluck, J., Freedman, A., & Fang, W.L. (1993). The athletic prevention programming and leadership education (APPLE) model: Developing substance abuse prevention programs. *Journal of athletic training*, 28, 137-144.
- Hadden, J. C. S. (2003). *A pilot study of the relationship between competitive athletic participation and transformational leadership ability: a communication perspective*. Thesis (M.S.)--Central Connecticut State University, 2003.
- House, R.J. (1971). Path goal theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, p.321.
- Howard-Hamilton, M.F., & Sina, J.A. (2001). How college affects student athletes. *New directions for student services*. 93, 35-45.
- Janssen, J. (2007). Personal interview. *Carolina Leadership Academy*.

- Johnson, S. H. (2006). *The effects of gender, source of evaluation and sport on perceived leadership abilities of student-athletes on Olympic sports at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. Thesis (M.A.)—University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2006.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2001). A call to action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education. Retrieved October 4, 2006 from *Knight Foundation* Web site at <http://www.knightfdn.org/>.
- Komives, S.R., Mainella, F.C., Owen, J.E., Osteen, L., & Longerbeam, S.D. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of college student development*. 46, 593-612.
- Krzyzewski, M. (2000). Leading with the heart: coach K's successful strategies for basketball, business, and life. New York, NY: Warner Books, Inc.
- Robinson, J. (1996). Coach to coach: business lessons from the locker room. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Ryan, F.J. (1989). Participation in intercollegiate athletics: affective outcome. *Journal of College Student Development*, March, 30, p.122.
- Sellers, P (1988). The Olympians of business. *Fortune*, 118(8), p.152.
- Shields, D.L.L. and Gardner, D.E. (1997). The relationship between leadership behaviors and group cohesion in team sports. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 131(2), p.196.
- Wolverton, B. (2006). Morality play: A U. of Idaho professor says college athletes are ethically impaired, but can be taught to think differently. *The Chronicle of Higher Education: Athletics*, 52(48), p.A32.
- Yeakey, G.W. Major (2002). Situational leadership. *Military Review*, 82(1), p.72.
- Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in Organizations. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.