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LEADERSHIP

Packianathan Chelladurai

Prologue

Although every scholar of renown has researched and written on several topics, that scholar is likely to be identified with a singular work. I am personally proud of inspiring and initiating several new lines of research in sport management; yet I am most often identified with the Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML) that I developed. This is particularly true in the field of sport and exercise psychology more so than in sport management. In fact, several textbooks in sport psychology have included a section on the Multidimensional Model (e.g., Jowett and Lavallee, 2007; LeUnes, 2008; Weinberg and Gould, 2015). Similarly, my Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS), developed in conjunction with the Multidimensional Model, has been quite popular with researchers around the world. Its significance is highlighted by the fact that the 1980 publication detailing the development of the scale (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1980) is included as one of the essential readings in sport psychology twenty-five years later (reprinted as Chelladurai and Saleh, 2007).

The little theorizing I have done on leadership has been based on my own experiences as a player and coach. I tended to favour some theories of leadership because they related to some of my experiences and explained/justified my actions as a coach. In turn, I offered an integrated model of leadership, once again reflecting my background in coaching. That one’s experiences and the thinking associated with those experiences can lead to theorizing is supported by Albert Einstein’s statement that ‘the whole of science is nothing more than a refinement of everyday thinking’ and Kurt Lewin’s view that ‘there is nothing so practical as a good theory’.

Multidimensional Model of Leadership

The Multidimensional Model of Leadership (Chelladurai, 1978, 1993; Chelladurai and Carron, 1978) is illustrated in Figure 12.1a. The model incorporates three sets of antecedent factors (situational characteristics, member characteristics, and leader characteristics) influencing three states of leader behaviours (required, preferred and actual), and the congruence among them is expected to result in higher levels of performance of and satisfaction among members.
Required behaviour

The situational characteristics (Box 1 in Figure 12.1a) that influence required behaviour (Box 4) include the goals of the group, the type of task (e.g., individual versus team, closed or self-paced versus open or externally paced tasks) and the social and cultural context of the group. It must be noted that these situational characteristics may prescribe certain leader behaviours (i.e., what ought to be done) or proscribe certain behaviours (i.e., what ought not to be done). The leader is also cognizant of the nature of the members of the group that he or she is leading and thus their characteristics would also influence what is required in the situation as indicated by the dotted line from Box 3 to Box 4.

Preferred behaviour

Member preferences for specific forms of leader behaviours (i.e., preferred behaviours, Box 6) are influenced by member characteristics. These include individual difference factors (Box 3)
such as task relevant ability, and personality traits and needs (e.g., need for achievement, need for affiliation, cognitive structure, attitude towards authority). In addition, as individual members are aware of the situational demands and constraints, their preferences are likely to be influenced by situational characteristics as well (dotted arrow from Box 1 to Box 6).

**Actual behaviour**

The third and final state of leader behaviour is the leader’s actual behaviour (Box 5). While the leader’s personal characteristics of personality, ability, experience and so on (Box 2) are likely to influence actual leader behaviour, the leader is also expected to be attuned to, and accommodate the requirements of, the situation (Box 4) and preferences of members (Box 6).

**Outcomes**

In my original formulation of the model, I included performance and satisfaction of the members as the outcome variables. Given that the primary goal of an athletic team is to enhance performance so as to secure victories against opponents in organised competitions, it is only reasonable to include performance as a primary outcome of the leadership model. But this global notion of performance can be broken down into individual performance and team performance. We can also consider improvements in performances at the individual or team level as outcomes.

As individuals freely engage in prolonged and agonistic training, their satisfaction with their experiences in such pursuits is a critical outcome variable. And the facets of such satisfaction may relate to their own performance, the team’s performance, the leadership provided by the coach and the interactions among team members, and so on. Riemer and I (Riemer and Chelladurai, 1998) developed the *Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire* (ASQ), which measures fifteen facets of athlete satisfaction – individual performance, team performance, ability utilisation, strategy, personal treatment, training and instruction, team task/social contribution, ethics, team integration, personal dedication, budget, medical personnel, academic support services and external agents. Readers should recognise that some of the facets listed above do not relate to coaching, *per se* (e.g., budget, medical personnel, academic support services), but refer to decisions by superior authorities. It must also be noted that the inclusion of performance and satisfaction in the multidimensional model does not preclude consideration of other team-related outcomes as indicated by our facets of satisfaction.

**Congruence hypothesis**

A critical thrust within the multidimensional model is the hypothesis that the congruence among the three states of leader behaviour would lead to performance and satisfaction. That is, the leader/coach is expected to balance the requirements of the situation, preferences of the members, and his or her personal inclinations in behaviour towards the members. The model also includes feedback from performance and satisfaction back towards actual leadership. That is, the coach is likely to alter her or his leader behaviours based on the feedback related to performance and satisfaction. If the coach perceives performance to be lower than expected, the coach may become more focused on task accomplishment and engage in task-oriented behaviours. If the members are seen to be less cohesive and disjointed, the coach may begin to engage in those behaviours that foster warm interpersonal interactions between the leader and members, and among the members.
Why the interest in leadership

As noted, my experience as a player, referee and coach in basketball while in India provided the impetus to study the phenomenon of leadership in sports. Although I had been quite a successful coach at the university level, I had very little knowledge about the psychological aspects of athletics. When I began my graduate studies at the University of Western Ontario, I started reading about coaching of athletic teams. My teachers were very critical of coaches who were demanding and autocratic. However, this view was inconsistent with the presence of several successful coaches who were authoritarian in their treatment of their teams and their players. Further, as a coach I had been quite demanding and autocratic myself. My teams were successful, and my players liked me and respected me. This disconnect between what was taught and what was happening in everyday life triggered my interests in the study of leadership.

As Bandura (2005) noted, ‘Discontent with the adequacy of existing theoretical explanations provides the impetus to search for conceptual schemes that can offer better explanations and solutions to phenomena of import’ (p. 10). As the existing models of leadership in sports did not explain the observed phenomenon adequately, I was looking for better explanations.

Genesis of the model

As I was doing my doctoral work, I was quite excited about studying the existing leadership models. Of most interest to me was Fiedler’s (1967) Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness because some of the tenets of the theory were consistent with my own experiences as a basketball coach. The elements of situational favourableness (leader–member relations, task-structure and position power) are really applicable to coaching an athletic team, and I had enjoyed all of them in my coaching career. His proposition that task-oriented leaders would be more effective in more favourable situations is certainly true in the case of athletic coaching. Another theory that related to my coaching experience was House’s (1971; House and Dessler, 1974) Path-goal Theory of Leadership. The theory posits that the main role of a leader is to clarify the goals of the group, the path to achieve those goals and to facilitate members’ efforts towards those goals. Such facilitation involves enhancing the abilities of members and providing social support during the effort phase. This is what coaches do during those prolonged and arduous training sessions. The third theory that reflected the coaching situation was Osborn and Hunt’s (1975) Adaptive-Reactive Theory, which stipulates that a successful leader is one who adapts to the requirements of the situation and reacts to member preferences. Typically, a coach is operating within the confines of a larger institution (e.g., an educational institution, a national sports organisation, a professional sports franchise) that has its own requirements. In addition, the athletes being coached may have their own preferences, which at times may contravene the regulations of the larger institution. The coach has to adapt to these regulations of the higher unit and react positively to member preferences. In sum, I was able to reflect back on my own experiences and relate them to the principles enunciated by these three theories.

But, I was also uncomfortable with these theories because each one of them emphasised only one of the three aspects of leadership – the leader (Fiedler’s Contingency Theory), the members (House’s Path-goal Theory) and the situation (Osborn and Hunt’s Adaptive-Reactive Theory). This discomfort was the stimulant for me to think of amalgamating these three approaches into a single model, resulting in the MML.
Applications and extensions of the model

Current status of the Multidimensional Model

My MML continues to be recognised as ‘one of the most significant models of sporting leadership and has generated extensive empirical attention’ (Fletcher and Roberts, 2013; p. 90). As noted, leading psychology textbooks include the model in their treatise on leadership in sports (e.g., Weinberg and Gould, 2015). The incorporation of transformational leadership into the MML has begun to have an impact on sport leadership. For example, Din and Paskevich (2013) labelled my approach as Chelladurai’s Pursuit of Excellence in Sport Model and have incorporated it into their integrated research model of Olympic podium performance.

While the MML has relevance to this day, much of the research regarding the multidimensional model of leadership has been largely descriptive wherein the influence of selected antecedent variables on preferred and/or perceived leadership have been investigated. Such antecedent variables have included individual difference factors such as gender (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1978; Garba, 2011; Liukkonen and Salminen, 1990; Serpa, Pataco and Santos, 1991); personality and psychological characteristics (Chelladurai and Carron, 1981; Erle, 1981; Horn et al., 2011); age, experience and maturity (Chelladurai and Carron, 1983; Erle, 1981; Serpa, 1990); and ability (Liukkonen and Salminen, 1990; Garland and Barry, 1988; Toros, Türksoy and Doğaner, 2013). The situational characteristics examined have included organisational goals (Erle, 1981); task type (Chelladurai, 1978; Garba, 2011; Kim, Lee and Lee, 1990; Liukkonen and Salminen, 1990; Serpa, 1990); culture (Chelladurai et al., 1988; Chelladurai et al., 1987; Terry, 1984); and the distinction between offensive and defensive squads in football (Riemer and Chelladurai, 1995). The statistical procedures in these studies have been largely correlational and/or analysis of variance procedures.

Another approach has been the study of congruence between the perceived and preferred leadership and its effect on one of the consequences specified in the model, such as satisfaction with leadership, team performance and/or individual performance (Chelladurai, 1978, 1984; Chelladurai et al., 1988; Schlieshman, 1987; Weiss and Friedrichs, 1986). The general conclusion emerging from these studies is that ‘athletes are satisfied with leadership to the extent that the coach emphasises (a) training and instruction that enhances the ability and coordinated effort by members, which in turn contributes to task accomplishment; and (b) positive feedback that recognizes and rewards good performance’ (Chelladurai, 1993, p. 654). The attempts to relate leadership to performance have been limited (e.g., Chelladurai, 1978; Gordon, 1988; Serpa, Pateo and Santos, 1991; Weiss and Friedrichs, 1986).

One of the difficulties with respect to the Multidimensional Model is in operationalising the required behaviour. That would explain why only one study included required leader behaviour along with actual and preferred leader behaviours (Chelladurai, 1978). My approach was to treat the mean preferences of all basketball players included in the study as the required behaviour and the mean of the perceptions of players of a particular team as the actual behaviour. The hypothesis that congruence between required behaviour and actual behaviour would be related to performance was not supported. That could have been a function of the low number of teams \((n = 10)\) in the study. Overall, the model has not been subjected to strict empirical verification in its entirety.

Transformational leadership in the Multidimensional Model

Given that athletics is the pursuit of excellence and that athletes are constantly striving to improve their performance capabilities, one could conclude that they are in the transformational mode.
Accordingly, coaches are constantly attempting to enhance their charges' beliefs, self-esteem, self-confidence, self-discipline and ultimately their performances. These are the essential effects of transformational leadership. So, one can say that coaches are in the business of transforming their athletes. In other words, all of coaching is based on transformational leadership.

Accordingly, I incorporated the notion of transformational leadership on the Multidimensional Model (Chelladurai, 2007), as shown in Figure 12.1b. In those cases where there is a chief coach and several assistant coaches, the chief coach can be seen as influencing/transforming not only the athletes but also the assistants who, in turn, interact with the athletes. In the absence of assistants between the coach and the athletes, the transformational process would take the form of the coach altering member characteristics as well as the situational characteristics as indicated by the arrows from leader characteristics (Box 2) to situational characteristics (Box 1) and member characteristics (Box 3).

In the transformational process, coaches are expected to (a) incite the higher order needs of members (b) motivate them to perform beyond expectations, (c) express confidence in members, and (d) empower them (e.g., Bass, 1985). The coach creates a new Vision for the athlete or team as a great performer(s), convinces them of the viability of the vision and expresses confidence in them reaching that vision. Transformational leadership also involves Inspirational Communication where the coach inspires the athletes to extend themselves to achieve excellence, stimulates enthusiasm, builds confidence, instills pride, enhances morale, sets examples of courage and dedication and shares the hardships. In Intellectual Stimulation, the coach engages the intellect, thus enabling the athletes to see their activity in its totality and understand the scheme of things surrounding the performance. The coach also engages in Individualised and Supportive Leadership by bestowing individualised attention on the athletes. Personal Recognition is a critical component of transformational leadership. While the public, media and other athletes recognise better performances, the coach’s recognition takes centre stage in practice sessions where incremental improvements are achieved. Achievement of simple and specific practice goals are the bricks on which excellence is built. The coach needs to recognise those smaller achievements.

**Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS)**

Any theoretical model is only meaningful and useful if the constructs included in the model are measurable. Further, the model can be verified only if there are scales to measure the constructs contained in the model. Stated otherwise, anyone advancing a new model with new constructs has also the responsibility to develop scales to measure those new constructs. Accordingly, I developed the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS).

The development of the LSS is described in Chelladurai and Saleh (1978). In the first stage, I selected and modified ninety-nine items from existing leadership scales (i.e., LBDQ – Halpin, 1957; SBDQ – Fleishman, 1957a; LOQ – Fleishman, 1957b; LBDQ Form XII – Stogdill, 1963). The stem for the items was ‘The coach should . . . ’ with the response categories of ‘always’, ‘often’, ‘occasionally’, ‘seldom’ and ‘never’. The data from 160 Canadian university physical education students (equal number of males and females) were subjected to a principal components analysis with varimax (orthogonal) rotation. I selected a five-component solution (training, autocratic, democratic, social support and rewarding behaviours) as the most meaningful. The selected items \( n = 37 \) loaded high on the focal component (i.e., >.40) and loaded low on every other component (i.e., <.30).

As none of the selected items referred to the coaching behaviour of teaching skills and strategies, I added seven more items reflecting this behaviour for the second stage (Chelladurai and Saleh,
In addition, six more items reflecting social support were added. I also modified the response format to (a) always, (b) often – 75 per cent of the time, (c) occasionally – 50 per cent of the time, (d) seldom – 25 per cent of the time, to (e) never. This modified scale was administered to samples of 102 physical education students (45 males and 57 females) and 223 varsity athletes (all male). The students and athletes completed the preference version with the stem ‘I prefer my coach to . . .’ and the perception version with the stem ‘My coach . . .’ Once again, five factors were extracted from the principal components analysis with varimax rotation in each of the three data sets and the items that (a) had their highest loading on the same factor for all three solutions, and (b) loaded at least .30 in two of the solutions were selected. The forty retained items make up the current version of the scale and measure 

**Table 12.1** Dimensions of leader behaviour in sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and instruction</td>
<td>Coaching behaviour aimed at improving the athletes’ performance by emphasising and facilitating hard and strenuous training; instructing them in the skills, techniques and tactics of the sport; clarifying the relationship among the members; and by structuring and coordinating the members’ activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic behaviour</td>
<td>Coaching behaviour that allows greater participation by the athletes in decisions pertaining to group goals, practice methods, and game tactics and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic behaviour</td>
<td>Coaching behaviour that involves independent decision making and stresses personal authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Coaching behaviour characterised by a concern for the welfare of individual athletes, positive group atmosphere, and warm interpersonal relations with members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
<td>Coaching behaviour which reinforces an athlete by recognising and rewarding good performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While the derivation of the LSS dimensions was based on factor analysis of items collected from different existing scales and some self-generated items, later I provided a theoretical justification for the scales as follows (Chelladurai and Carron, 1981): Three of the dimensions of the LSS – training and instruction, positive feedback and social support – could be placed in juxtaposition with Porter and Lawler’s (1968) model of individual motivation. That is, training and instruction increase members’ ability and role perceptions, which are instrumental to improved performance. Positive feedback reflects equitable distribution of rewards based on performance, which is fundamental to feelings of equity and satisfaction. Social support becomes critical to the effort phase, which is much more prolonged and agonistic in athletics than in other spheres. The
remaining two dimensions refer to the manner in which the coach makes decisions that should be distinguished from the substance of those decisions.

**Psychometric properties of the LSS**

In the development stage reported earlier, the test–retest (after four weeks) reliability estimates derived from the data of fifty-three physical education students were .72 for training and instruction, .82 for democratic behaviour, .76 for autocratic behaviour, .71 for social support and .79 for positive feedback (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1980). These values were considered adequate (Nunnally, 1978). The internal consistency estimates reported by various authors were all well above .70, the usual cut-off point for all versions of the LSS (Chelladurai, 1990), except for autocratic behaviour with considerably lower estimates. In general, the alpha values are relatively higher for the perception version than for the preference version, although the items are identical with only a change in the stem. This is understandable as perceptions are likely to dominate when respondents report both their preferences and perceptions (White, Crino and Hatfield, 1985). Accordingly, it is expected that the expression of those perceptions is to be more consistent across the various items of a sub-scale than would be the case in the expression of preferences.

Recent research carried out in different national contexts and/or using LSS in different languages attests to the robustness of the psychometric properties of the LSS (e.g., Aristotelis, Kaloyan and Evangelos, 2013; Durujlal and Dhorup, 2012; Fletcher and Roberts, 2013; Kwon, Pyumb, Han and Ogasawara, 2011; Thon et al., 2012; Walach-Bista, 2013). Fletcher and Roberts (2013) noted, ‘the weak factorial invariance achieved when testing the LSS over four time points provides good evidence that the LSS is consistently measuring perceptions of leadership behavior over time’ (p. 100). Similarly, Kwon et al. (2011) tested the multi-group invariance of the LSS (without the dimension of autocratic behaviour) with middle and high school student-athletes in Japan and found that the configural, metric, scalar and factor variance-covariance to be invariant across the two groups.

The low alpha values for the sub-scale of autocratic behaviour in several studies are a continuing concern. The problem may be due to the five items in the scale representing distinct domains of behaviour (Chelladurai and Riemer, 1998). Two of the items refer to the aloofness of the coach (i.e., work relatively independent of the athletes; keep to him/herself), two refer to how the coach handles decisions (i.e., not explain his/her action; refuse to compromise a point) and one seems to deal with how the coach addresses players (i.e., speak in a manner not to be questioned). They certainly do not reflect autocratic behaviour in the traditional sense (i.e., the opposite end of the continuum from democratic behaviour). Further, the LSS does not tap into the transformational leadership that has been recently incorporated into the Multidimensional Model. The proposed dimensions of transformational leadership were described earlier. Future research needs to refine the existing sub-scales and develop new sub-scales to reflect transformational leadership.

**Revised leadership scale for sports (RLSS)**

I am aware of only one attempt to revise the LSS – that of Zhang, Jensen and Mann (1997). However, their modified version includes the original five dimensions, the instructions and the response format of the original LSS, as well as the same three versions. The only new dimension – **Situational Consideration Behaviours** – was described as behaviours ‘aimed at considering the situation factors (such as the time, individual, environment, team and game); setting up
individual goals and clarifying ways to reach the goals; differentiating coaching methods at different stages; and assigning an athlete to the right position’ (Zhang et al., 1997, pp. 109–10). I had noted elsewhere (Chelladurai, 2007, 2012) that the only new dimension in the revised scale is subsumed by the five dimensions of the original LSS. Accordingly, I suggested that parsimony would indicate the use of the shorter original LSS.

Epilogue

As indicated, the Multidimensional Model has not been tested in its entirety. This lapse is a direct result of the difficulty of measuring the excluded variable (i.e., required leadership) and assessing the congruence among the three states of leader behaviour. Thus, future studies should be focused on testing the model in its entirety, which would necessitate devising a method of estimating what is required behaviour in a given situation and measuring the degree of congruence among the three states of leader behaviour. In addition, it is also necessary that the LSS be revised to include more relevant dimensions of leader behaviours pertinent to the sporting context including various aspects of transformational leadership.

In summary, the formulation of the MML and the development of the LSS were a function of the dearth of literature on those topics and an urgent need for me to get a doctorate degree. Even though my work was simply an integration of streams of previous work, it is still satisfying and flattering that both the MML and the LSS have stood the test of time, continue to be popular with scholars and teachers and were the foundations of considerable research on leadership in sports. But the ground has just been scratched. There is so much work to be done in terms of refining the model and developing better and more comprehensive measures of leadership. As noted, better analytical techniques have to evolve to determine required leadership in a given situation and to measure congruence among the three states of leader behaviour.

Notes

1 This chapter is a reflection on the works of Chelladurai (1990, 2007, 2012) and Chelladurai and Saleh (1980).
2 At that time, I had to use the mainframe computer in my university, which occupied a fairly large room. That computer could not handle more than sixty items in a factor analysis. So I was forced to go the neighbouring university, where I did my doctorate. Even that computer could not carry out factor analysis of more than ninety-nine items. So I had to drop thirty-one items from the original list of 120 items. Further, confirmatory factor analysis was not available in the universities with which I was associated.
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Applying the Multidimensional Model of Leadership

Aubrey Kent

I came by my interest in leadership – and Chelladurai’s (Chella) Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML) – early in my studies. As an undergraduate at the University of Toronto, I studied with emeritus professor Juri Daniel, who introduced me to the concept of leading in organisations, and with whom I conducted my first research study, utilising the leader behaviour description questionnaire (LBDQ). From there, I was fortunate to work with several leading leadership...
scholars through my graduate studies, including Bob Boucher and Jim Weese at the University of Windsor, and Chella himself at the Ohio State University. Long a hotbed of cutting-edge leadership scholarship, Ohio State is also, ironically, where the LBDQ originated. My first published work emanated from my master’s thesis, which investigated the influence of leadership on the cultures and ultimate performance of sport governing bodies (Kent and Weese, 2000). From there, under Chella’s guidance, my investigations of leadership became more incisive as I became very interested in the MML tenet of ‘congruence’ and in the value of self-other analysis. Together, we endeavoured to understand the nature of how leadership interactions can have a ‘cascading’ effect on followers (Kent and Chelladurai, 2001, 2003).

While my interests have broadened to attitudes in a more general sense, leadership and the MML have remained central to my teaching of undergraduate and graduate students. Chella’s MML evolved to encapsulate the idea that a truly transformational leader can shape their antecedents – which is a central theme in teaching about the value of leadership to any organisation. I talk often about the congruence hypothesis and how leaders can work towards ensuring it by seeing the big picture impact of their management of antecedents, as defined by the MML. This leads to lessons in understanding the competitive environment (situation), the value of self-awareness and authenticity (leader), and all manner of discussions about understanding the person-side of organisations (group) such as personality, attitudes and group dynamics.

As for the future of the MML, I think that it remains as relevant and instructive today as it ever has – a testament to its quality. While the genesis of the MML was taking several mainstream leadership theories and representing them more holistically, an opportunity to break away from traditionally derivatived work exists in studying the possibility of distinct characteristics and/or impacts of leadership within certain sporting contexts. With the MML as a foundational theory for any sport management scholar to understand, indeed this work has already begun (e.g., Swanson and Kent, 2014).

Note

1 Aubrey Kent is with the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management at Temple University.
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