COMPARING LEADERSHIP SCORES OF COLLEGIATE LEVEL BASKETBALL PLAYERS AND ARMY RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) STUDENTS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Education

Liberty University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Lawrence A. Braue

March 2008
Comparing Leadership Scores of Collegiate Level Basketball Players and Army Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) Students

by Lawrence A. Braue

APPROVED:

COMMITTEE CHAIR
Karen L. Parker, Ed.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS
Samuel J. Smith, Ed.D.
Eric Cohu, Ed.D.

CHAIR, GRADUATE STUDIES
Scott B. Watson, Ph.D.
Abstract

Lawrence A. Braue. COMPARING LEADERSHIP SCORES OF COLLEGIATE LEVEL BASKETBALL PLAYERS AND ARMY RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) STUDENTS (Under the direction of Dr. Karen Parker) School of Education, January, 2008.

This study examined the differences in the transformational leadership practices of collegiate level basketball teams and students from an Army Reserve Officers Training Program as measured by Kouzes and Posner’s Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) (2006). The purpose was to determine if ROTC students with formal leadership training obtained higher leadership scores on the SLPI than the basketball players who had not received formal leadership training. The study compared the overall mean scores of ROTC students who had participated in at least one year of formal leadership training and the players from a university men’s and women’s basketball team who had not participated in any formalized leadership training. The study also examined the difference in mean scores within each of the five leadership constructs (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, Encourage). The results of the study revealed that the overall leadership score of the ROTC students was significantly higher than the basketball players. Leadership scores for the ROTC students were also higher in the constructs of Model, Challenge, and Enable. There were no statistical differences in the Inspire and Encourage constructs. It is also noted that there was no statistical difference in the leadership scores of male and female participants in this study. Results of the study suggest that formal leadership
training could result in higher leadership scores for college students. Suggestions for further research are included in this study.
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Chapter One

Introduction to the Study

This dissertation was designed to examine the leadership practices of two distinct university student cohorts. The study was based on the results of leadership surveys administered to a group of student-athletes and a group of Army Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) students. Although these two groups are very distinct campus organizations, student-athletes and ROTC students are very similar in nature. Both groups attend college and similar academic pursuits. They have similar personal interests, social lives and attend college to enjoy college life. In addition, athletes and ROTC students are motivated, disciplined and possess an exceptional work ethic. The only major difference between the two groups is the nature of their college extracurricular activity. The first chapter of this dissertation will discuss the background of the study and will state the problem. In addition, the significance of the study will be discussed along with the methodology used for this research.

Background of the Study

Over the past three decades college sports have grown into a large multi-million dollar enterprise. Although college sports have not yet attained the popularity of professional sports, the attractiveness of college athletics continues to grow among sports enthusiasts in the United States. Each year, college football dominates television screens across America on Saturday afternoons enhancing the growth of the industry. The Bowl Championship Series (BCS) has further spurred interest in college football by creating a championship system that places additional publicity and excitement into the game.
This increased fervor has also increased bowl related revenues. University teams who are selected to play in one of the BCS bowl games receive large monetary awards. In March, all television sets are tuned into college basketball’s NCAA tournament called “March Madness.” Those university teams who successfully make it to the “Final Four” are rewarded handsomely with large monetary sums which filter down to the athletic department.

Universities benefit financially from a strong athletic program. Recently, the University of North Carolina Tar Heel basketball team was named the most valuable college basketball team worth $26 million (Schwartz, 2008). The National Collegiate Athletic Association which governs college athletics operates a budget in excess of $550 million dollars per year (NCAA, 2007a). Schools receive funds from the NCAA and the media based on the success of their athletic teams.

Many universities rely on money generated by the athletic department to fund projects and programs on campus. Athletic Directors are responsible for building strong athletic programs that generate revenue for the university and leadership has become a critical ingredient in the program building process (Dupuis, Boom, & Loughead, 2006). More universities are adopting the philosophy that you must spend money to make money. Each year, more universities extend multi-million dollar contracts to head football coaches in order to build a winning team. Recently, Iowa State University hired a new head football coach extending him a 5 year, $6 million dollar contract. Shortly after this announcement, Iowa State women’s basketball coach Bill Fennelly received a 12 year contract extension worth $10.6 million. This is an exorbitant amount of money
for college athletics. However, the potential return on that investment could be two or three fold if the teams are successful.

Leadership is a vital component of organizational success at all levels (Bass, 1990). As collegiate athletics continues to grow as an industry, the need for leadership at the team level becomes more important. Not only is the coach’s leadership central to the success of the team, but also leadership provided by players can enhance team performance (Loughead & Hardy, 2005). By examining successful college basketball programs one will discover head coaches with exemplary leadership ability. Coaches such as John Wooden at UCLA, Mike Krzyzewski at Duke University, Rick Pitino at the University of Louisville, and Dean Smith at the University of North Carolina have demonstrated how leadership can build successful, financially lucrative basketball programs.

Since leadership is important for team success, leadership development should be an integral part of a team’s winning philosophy. Unfortunately, leadership development programs are rare within university athletic departments. Recently, Baylor University established only the sixth comprehensive athlete leadership development program in the nation and the first in the Big 12 Conference (Baylor, 2007). Despite the relevance of leadership training for team success, most universities are not investing resources in the development of student-athlete-leaders. Most universities are relying on the head coach to provide the leadership necessary to propel the organization to the winning circle. This approach has proven to be narrow strategy when trying to build a successful program over the long term.
A vast majority of these universities have partnership agreements with smaller universities and colleges in the same region. For example, Iowa State University has a partnership agreement with Drake University and Grandview College. These two partnership schools utilize the same leadership curriculum as Iowa State University. The use of partnership agreements increases the number of universities with access to leadership curriculum nearly three-fold. ROTC programs provide a proven leadership program that has produced quality leaders such as former Secretary of State Colin Powell and Sam Walton, founder of Wal-Mart. Leadership at all levels could greatly enhance the teamwork and development of a winning athletic program.

Leadership behavior has been widely studied for several decades. The preponderance of leadership development research has surrounded the business community. There are considerably less empirical data concerning the impact of leadership training on college students or college athletes (Posner & Brodsky, 1992). Additional research linking leadership development to athlete performance is warranted considering the growth of college athletics as an industry.
Problem Statement

The research problem was to examine the differences in transformational leadership practices between collegiate level men’s and woman’s basketball teams and students from an Army Reserve Officers Training Program as measured by the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Kouzes and Posner’s theoretical leadership framework supports the assertion that leadership is a set of practices that are learned and observed by others. (Kouzes & Pozner, 2006). Leadership is a set of skills that people can develop and improve over time through practice and observer feedback. Through extensive research, Kouzes and Posner developed the Five Practices of an Exemplary Leader Model which consists of: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. This theory allows organizations to develop programs to improve leadership skills using this model and the LPI assessment tool (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

The SLPI is a tool intended to evaluate an individual’s leadership skills. It will recognize strong areas of leadership as well as areas that need to be developed by the leader (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). Kouzes and Posner believe it is important for organizations to properly assess leader skills, provide feedback to the leader, and develop ways to improve the leader’s practice of leadership.

The independent variable for this study was the structured leadership training available to Army ROTC students versus the unstructured leadership training available to student athletes. The ROTC students in this study have participated in a formal leadership development program with a prescribed leadership curriculum. The basketball
players in this study have not participated in any formal leadership training. The variable of past leadership training will be investigated to determine its impact on the student’s five transformational leadership practices.

This research will also examine gender to determine if there is a significant difference in leadership scores among men and women. Current leadership studies regarding leadership and gender have returned conflicting results. Several studies indicate that leadership practices differ between men and women (Adams & Keim, 2002; Rand, 2004). Other studies have shown that there is no significant difference between men and women with regard to leadership practices (Posner & Brodsky, 1994).

**Research Questions**

1. Will Army ROTC students who have received at least one year of formalized leadership training demonstrate stronger leadership scores than the basketball players who have not received formalized leadership training?

   **Null Hypothesis:** There will be no significant statistical difference in the overall leadership scores of ROTC students and basketball players.

2. Will Army ROTC students who have received at least one year of formalized leadership training demonstrate stronger leadership scores within each of the five leadership practices: Modeling, Inspiring, Challenging, Enabling, and Encouraging than basketball players who have not received formalized leadership training?

   **Null Hypothesis:** There will be no significant statistical difference in the leadership scores within the five leadership practices of the ROTC students and the basketball players.
3. Will there be a significant difference in leadership scores between male and female participants in this study?

*Null Hypothesis*: There will be no significant statistical difference in the leadership scores of the male and female participants.

*Professional Significance of the Study*

Athletics continues to generate large revenues for colleges and universities across the country. Generous television contracts and apparel agreements from companies such as Nike and Under Armor present financially lucrative opportunities for universities to generate income for academic programs. The National Collegiate Athletic Association manages a budget of $550 million with 95% of the revenues coming from national television contracts (NCAA, 2007b). Winning college sports teams attract profitable television contracts placing enormous pressure on athletic directors and coaches to produce winning teams. Athletic directors and coaches who fail to produce quickly find themselves unemployed. Producing winning teams has become a critical component of college athletics.

Current research demonstrates that leadership is essential in athletics. Whether one is discussing basketball teams or major corporations, the success or failure of the organization is largely dependent on the perceived quality of the person at the top (Bennis, 2003). Universities pay athletic directors and coaches large salaries in order to build winning athletic programs. Coaches recruit talented players who have the skills and ability to make teams better. However, the leadership factor is largely ignored when building winning teams (Loughead & Hardy, 2005) and only a few athletic departments in the nation train their athletes in leadership (Baylor, 2007).
Since leadership training has been proven to improve athletic organizations, university athletic departments could benefit by investing in leadership training. Rather than develop internal leadership training teams, which may not be cost effective, athletic departments could outsource leadership training. By outsourcing, athletic departments could continue to focus on recruiting and revenues.

The United States Army ROTC offers two years of comprehensive leadership training for college students without incurring an obligation to serve in the military. These leadership courses are available to all student-athletes on campus regardless of their academic status. The curriculum is standardized across all ROTC programs in the nation. The curriculum provides values-based instruction that focuses on the components of teamwork. Unfortunately, many athletic departments fail to see how valuable the ROTC program can be for training athlete-leaders. The fact that the curriculum is organized around a military structure inhibits athletes from participating in the training.

This study was designed to examine the potential value of formalized leadership training to student-athletes. The research was designed to measure the leadership scores of basketball players with no formal leadership training and ROTC students with at least one year of ROTC training. The study examined the variable of gender to determine if there was a significant difference in leadership scores of men and women participants. Measuring leadership scores may demonstrate a linkage between formal leadership training and higher leadership scores.

Data showing that ROTC students have higher leadership scores may prompt athletic departments to consider utilizing ROTC programs to teach leadership practices to student-athletes. If value is found in ROTC training, athletic departments could forge a
partnership with ROTC programs to develop athlete-leaders, thus enhancing the performance of the athletic teams. This training would be at no expense to the athletic department, and students could receive academic credit for the training. There would be virtually no risk associated with taking ROTC classes since the first two years of the program require no military commitment.

ROTC training also provides a teamwork application that could enhance athlete’s ability to work as a member of a team in something other than a sport. This added dimension will allow the athlete to focus solely on leadership enhancement without the distraction of the technical aspects of their particular sport.

The study also examined the difference in leadership scores between male and female participants. Differences in leadership scores based on gender will aid the researcher in understanding current data and forming ideas for further research.

**Overview of Methodology**

The basic design of this investigation is a causal-comparative study to determine the differences in transformational leadership practices of collegiate level basketball players and Army ROTC cadets. This study used the Kouzes and Posner Student Leadership Practices Inventory, Second Edition (2006), to measure leadership scores. This survey is based on the conceptual leadership framework designed by Kouzes and Posner (2002) to examine five practices of exemplary leadership which includes; Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart.

Leaders who “model the way” are clear about their values and beliefs and conduct themselves in a manner consistent with those values and beliefs (Kouzes & Posner,
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2002). The United States Army refers to this practice as “leading by example”. Leaders who “inspire a shared vision” demonstrate the ability to visualize a direction and desired end state for an organization or a project. Their ability enlist the support of others in that endeavor is an essential component of this leadership practice (Kouzes & Posner).

Individuals who are not afraid to prompt change within an organization demonstrate the ability to “challenge the process.” These leaders are always seeking ways to improve and grow the organization. Challenging the process requires a willingness on the leaders part to assume a level of risk when making changes or seeking innovative ways to do things (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

According to Kouzes and Posner (2002), empowerment is the fourth essential leadership practice and is referred to as “enabling others to act”. Leaders must share power with others in order for this practice to be effective. By sharing power, the leader provides both responsibility and authority to the worker establishing a relationship of mutual trust.

The final practice requires leaders to recognize individuals and demonstrate genuine appreciation to the employee’s contributions to the team’s success. By “encouraging the heart” the leader creates a positive work environment which enhances the worker’s motivation to excel and perform strongly (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

The five practices of exemplary leadership were designed by Kouzes and Posner (2006) to classify actions performed by leaders that have been proven to be effective. The SLPI uses questions designed to assess the student in each of the five practices. The survey consists of thirty multiple-choice questions with six questions addressing each of
the five leadership practices. The survey uses a five point Likert-type scale which address the frequency that students engage in the certain behavior.

The SLPI has sound psychometric properties and has been proven reliable. Reliability demonstrates the degree to which the survey contains measurement errors causing scores to be different for causes not related to the individual taking the survey. According to Kouzes and Posner (2006), the leadership practices scale is internally reliable. This means that the practices are strongly correlated with each other. Validity means that the survey measures what it claims to measure. The validity for this survey has been shown to have good face validity and predictive validity (Kouzes & Posner). Reviews of the survey found in the Mental Measurements Yearbook database confirmed the validity and reliability of the survey.

The study took place at a large, state university in the state of Iowa. The university has approximately 25,000 students obtaining undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate degrees. The university has a very large athletic program and is a member of the National Collegiate Association’s (NCAA) Big 12 Conference. The Big 12 Conference provides administrative oversight for over 4,500 student-athletes at these twelve universities (Big 12 Website, 2007).

In order to conduct the survey, this researcher obtained approval from the university Athletic Department, the Military Science Department, the men’s basketball coach and the women’s basketball coach. The approval letter and research proposal were submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University and Liberty University. Approval was granted prior to conducting any surveys.
Student-athletes from the university men’s and women’s basketball programs, along with student from the Army ROTC department participated in this study. The sample population for this study was twenty-eight basketball players (15 male and 13 female) and thirty ROTC students (18 male and 12 female). The ROTC students participating in this study had participated in at least one year of formal leadership training. The basketball players had not participated in any formal leadership training.

Basketball players were selected for this study due to the intimacy of the team setting. The coach-to-player ratio is lower than most sports enabling basketball players to receive individualized instruction from coaches and thus they are more likely to have informal mentoring from the coaching staff. This could potentially increase the likelihood of the athletes having higher leadership scores. The SLPI survey was administered to both men’s and women’s basketball teams on separate occasions before team meetings. A simple random sample of ROTC cadets took this survey after a leadership laboratory.

Data were collected using the SLPI survey. Each survey contained specific pre-survey instructions and students were given ample time to complete the survey. Each student received a pre-survey instruction sheet, a survey, a pencil and a manila envelope. Each cohort was given the same verbal instructions prior to the survey. Completion of the survey by the student was strictly voluntary. Students not wishing to fill out the survey simply placed the blank survey in the manila envelope and returned it to the researcher. This researcher collected the surveys and prepared them for data analysis.

Data were collected and entered into the SLPI software in order to obtain leadership scores for each student and each group. The software produced individual and
group summary reports that enabled the researcher to compare raw scores for each of the five leadership practices. The software allowed for groupings based on desired student data and information. The software does not provide a report format that compares group scores or mean scores. Individual group reports must be run to analyze and compare raw group scores.

Using Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS) software for analysis, independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare the mean scores of the groups involved in this study. Based on Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance, equal variance was assumed for all group comparisons. First, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the overall SLPI leadership scores of the ROTC students who had received leadership training and the basketball players who had not received training. The overall score provided a composite score of all thirty questions involving the five leadership constructs. The independent sample t-test demonstrated if there was a significant statistical difference in leadership scores. T-values that were significant at the .05 level were considered statistically different.

Five additional independent sample t-tests were conducted using SPSS software for analysis. SPSS provides the ability to compare data using a variety of statistical methods. T-tests were conducted on the SLPI scores for each of the cohorts studied (ROTC students and basketball players) by leadership practice (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage). The same statistical process that was used to compare overall scores was used for each of the five leadership practices.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to identify the potential differences in overall leadership scores between male and female participants without consideration.
of the leadership training variable. Equal variance was assumed for this procedure. The same procedure was then used to compare the mean scores for each of the five leadership practices (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage). The independent sample t-test identified those constructs in which there was a statistical difference between male and female participants. T-values that were significant at the .05 level were considered statistically different. Chapter three provides a detailed account of the methodology used in this study.

**Summary**

This chapter is designed to provide the reader with an introduction and overview of the study. The first chapter of this dissertation provided a background of the study, a statement of the research problem, and the professional significance of the study. In addition, this chapter provided an overview of the methodology that was used to obtain the results shown in chapter four.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Army Leadership Model or Leadership Framework**: Comprehensive leadership model developed by the Army to teach and develop leaders. Consists of sixteen leadership dimensions (Mental, Physical, Emotional, Interpersonal, Conceptual, Technical, Tactical, Communicating, Decision Making, Motivating, Planning, Executing, Assessing, Developing, Building, and Learning) and seven Army values (Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, and Personal Courage.)

**Army Reserve Officer’s Training Corps (ROTC)**: Program offered on university and college campuses across the nation that provides leadership training and a source for commissioning into the United States Army as a Second Lieutenant.
Leadership Dimensions: Sixteen behaviors identified by the United States Army that are exhibited by leaders. The Army uses these 16 dimensions to evaluate and assess the leadership ability and potential of its leaders.

Leadership Development Program (LDP): A comprehensive program that utilizes situational leadership exercises and comprehensive feedback mechanisms which enable students to apply leadership theory and skills learned in the classroom. Students are placed in leadership roles and given tasks and missions to execute. Students are then evaluated using a system of written counseling forms. These forms provide detailed feedback which is designed to improve student’s self-awareness while leading others.

Military Science: The official title of the Army ROTC department.

Military Science and Leadership (MSL) I: First year or freshman year of Military Science or ROTC. MSL I Curriculum is designed to teach basic Army values, fundamental skills and attributes as well as basic military skills.

Military Science and Leadership (MSL) II: Second year or sophomore year of Military Science or ROTC. MSL II curriculum is designed to build upon MSL I knowledge. It is more comprehensive in nature and incorporates tactical and technical military skills.

Military Science and Leadership (MSL) III: Third year or junior year of Military Science or ROTC. This year is designed to prepare students to participate in the Leadership Development and Assessment Course (LDAC) at Fort Lewis, Washington. Only students who are legally contracted to become Army officers are allowed to enroll in this course.

Military Science and Leadership (MSL) IV: Fourth year or senior year of Military Science or ROTC. This year is designed to prepare students who successfully completed the Leadership Development and Assessment Course (LDAC) for service as an Army
lieutenant. Only legally contracted cadets who have completed or will complete LDAC are able to enroll in this course.

National Collegiate Athletic Association: A voluntary organization through which the nation's colleges and universities govern their athletics programs. It is comprised of institutions, conferences, organizations and individuals committed to the best interests, education and athletics participation of student-athletes.

Transformational Leadership: Influencing people by providing purpose, direction and motivation while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization.
This chapter will provide a review of literature that examines the theoretical and related research surrounding transformational leadership and leadership development training. Several key topics will be examined such as defining transformational leadership, leadership in society and athletics, leadership and organizational success, leadership models in the military and athletics, formal and informal leadership training, and the measurement of leadership using the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI). The review will place special emphasis on theories and research involving college athletes and military personnel.

Leadership is important in every aspect of our world today (Kellett, 1999; Bennis, 2007, Bass; 1990, Kouses & Posner, 2003). From the beginning of time, leadership has played a critical role in the shaping of our society. Leadership has always been important and it has never been more important than it is today, (Bennis, 2007) particularly as a key component in the success or failure of an organization (Bass, 1990). Successful military operations rely on effective leaders (Bass, 1990). Unfortunately, many organizations overlook the importance of leadership and fail to capitalize on this critical component. Many people do not realize how significant leadership is to their organization.

Leadership is no less important in collegiate athletics (Dupuis et al., 2006). According to coaches and athletes alike, leadership is a critical factor in successful athletic teams (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1998; Dupuis et al., 2006). College athletics
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has become big business. The 2007 total operating revenue for the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) totaled $564 million dollars with $508 million dollars coming from television and marketing fees. Division I athletics received the majority of the budget bringing in a total of $332 million dollars (NCAA, 2007b). Schools that produce winning athletic teams receive more money from the NCAA than those schools who do not win.

In order to receive additional funds, university athletic directors attempt to build successful athletic programs and develop championship teams. These athletic directors recognize the need for transformational leaders to achieve success. However, most athletic directors focus on the head coach to provide the leadership necessary to transform the team. In a recent study on transformational leaders, researchers found that these leaders greatly improved follower behaviors such as “performance and innovation” (Boerner, Silke, Eisenbeiss, & Griesser, 2007). Transformational leaders inspire followers to achieve excellence by aligning individual goals with organizational goals (Boerner et. al).

Leadership Studies in Athletics

According to Dupuis, Bloom and Loughead (2006), the majority of leadership research in athletics has focused on the coach. This seems logical since the coach is the team leader. Coaches develop strategies and provide guidance and direction for the players. However, athletes are also considered another source of leadership within teams and these leaders can fill formal and informal leadership roles (Loughead & Hardy, 2005). Frequently, coaches select an individual on the team to fill the role of team captain. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the team captain is an effective leader.
Commonly among team sports, it is necessary for several team members to provide leadership for the team. Depending on the circumstances, a new team member may provide the leadership necessary to propel the team to victory. Although leader behaviors and cohesion has received little empirical consideration among athletes, leadership behavior on athletic teams has been linked with team cohesion (Shields, Gardner, Bredemeier, & Bostro, 1997). Cohesive teams perform better in competition and tend to win more games. The role that leadership plays in team cohesiveness has been largely overlooked by many athletic coaches.

Defining Leadership

In order to examine the role of leadership in college athletics, it necessary to develop a working definition of leadership. To date, there has been very little agreement on a comprehensive definition of leadership (Kellett, 1999; Bennis, 1991, Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Bennis (2007) remarked, “I do not know that we will ever have an all-encompassing theory of leadership any more than we have a genuine theory of medicine” (n.p.). The type of leadership that will be examined in this study is transformational leadership. According to Bennis and Nanus (1985), transformational leadership encourages change that benefits leaders and followers. It enables leaders and followers to unite energies to achieve a common goal.

When discussing leadership and leader development it is important to include the United States Army. The United States Army has a long tradition of developing leaders through formal and informal training methods. The Army provides a solid leadership development framework within higher education’s Military Science (ROTC) curriculum. The Army provides a credible leadership model for developing leaders such as General
Colin Powell. Army leader development methods are relevant to leadership development within collegiate athletics.

Although many researchers have developed definitions for the purpose of studying the leadership phenomenon, the United States Army provides a comprehensive working definition of transformational leadership that can be applied universally. In Field Manual 22-100, the Army states that “leadership is influencing people by providing purpose, direction and motivation while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization” (DA, 1999, p. 1-4). This definition can easily be applied to college athletics. For the purposes of this study, the terms “transformational leadership” and leadership will be used interchangeably.

The Army recognized the importance of transformational leadership as means for achieving success in a team oriented organization. Transformational leaders apply team building concepts “within a spectrum of established competencies to achieve successful mission accomplishment” (DA, 2006a, p. 1-1). The national security of the United States hinges on the success of the Armed Forces as an organization.

Transformational Leadership, Organizational Success, Cohesion, and Team Performance

Currently, very little is understood about the linkage between transformational leadership and organizational success (Kark, Chen, Chamir, 2003; Yukl, 1999). Leading researchers, Kouzes and Posner (2002), have focused the majority of their research on transformational leadership and the five practices of an exemplary leader. However, very little research has been conducted investigating the connection between transformational leadership and team performance (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler, 2004).
With the dramatic growth of college sports, it seems prudent that additional research in this area be conducted. Those who faithfully follow college athletics will undoubtedly state that leadership affects the outcome of the game, thus connecting leadership with organizational success.

Recently, there has been some attempt to connect team performance with transformational leadership (Bass, 1990; Yammarino, 1996). Unfortunately, the precise linkage between team dynamics and leadership skills have not been specifically outlined (Dionne et al., 2004). This is an area of study that should be pursued. Understanding how a team functions with regard to specific leadership behaviors will assist the coach with player recruitment.

Although little is known about the link between leadership and athletic team performance, there is a clear link between transformational leadership and organizational leadership (Boerner et al., 2007). It is known that transformational leaders provide both “meaning and understanding” motivating their followers to exceed performance expectations (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass, 1985). College athletes have the ability to exhibit transformational leadership behaviors directly impacting the future of the organization. Players who inspire confidence in fellow team members and provide a hope for the future success of the team can change an organization from the inside out.

Over the past three years, a young player by the name of LeBron James provided the transformational leadership necessary to transform the Cleveland Cavaliers professional basketball team. During the 2002-2003 season, Cleveland was the worst team in the Eastern Conference of the National Basketball Association (NBA) ending the year with a record of seventeen wins and sixty-five losses. In 2006-2007 season,
Cleveland reached the NBA finals with fifty-two wins and thirty-two losses. Although they lost in the championship finals to the San Antonio Spurs, LeBron James proved that the transformational leadership of one player can have a significant impact on the success of an organization.

 Linking the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership, the Army Leadership Model, and Collegiate Athletics

Over the past two decades, Kouzes and Posner have studied transformational leadership (2002). Through their research they developed the “five practices of exemplary leaders” to describe the behaviors associated with transformational leadership. These practices consist of modeling the way (Modeling), inspiring a shared vision (Inspiring), challenging the process (Challenging), enabling others to act (Enabling), and encouraging the heart (Encouraging). These are all separate constructs that effect transformational leadership.

Kouzes and Posner provide a useful model for examining leadership within college athletics. The five practices outlined by Kouzes and Posner also complement the components of the Army Leadership Model. The compatibility of the two models enable the use of the Army’s model for leader development and the Kouzes and Posner model for assessing leadership skills.

Modeling the Way requires the leader to clarify personal values and align behaviors with shared values. People normally follow those leaders who demonstrate strong values and beliefs about matters of principle (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). An individual who wishes to lead must have strong core values to guide them during the decision making process. Kouzes and Posner state that “people want to believe in
something larger than themselves. What we’re saying is this: people can not fully commit to an organization or movement that does not fit with their own beliefs” (p. 51).

Modeling the way requires leaders to set the example for subordinates. They must show others by their own example that they are committed to the organization or the cause. Setting the example requires the leader to build shared values within the organization. Institutionally shared values provide people with common ground for the organization establishing a framework for employees to operate within (Campbell & Dardis, 2004; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Modeling the way compares closely with aspects of the United States Army’s Leadership Model. This model is also known as the “Be, Know, Do” Model. The “Be” aspect of the “Be, Know, Do” leadership framework of the United States Army states that leaders demonstrate character through behavior (DA, 1999). The “Know” aspect of the model identifies the skills leaders must possess to be successful. The “Do” component distinguishes those actions that leaders must perform to develop subordinates and improve the organization (DA, 1999). The “Be, Know, Do” (BKD) model of leadership identifies common values and personal attributes required for effective leadership (Campbell & Dardis, 2004). These fundamental qualities enable the leader to set the example for subordinates within the organization. They are inherent qualities and not qualities that can be practiced at will.

The United States Army operates under a set of seven core values; loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage. These values are imbued into each officer and enlisted soldier which creates a common identity or common bond for all members of the organization (Campbell & Dardis, 2004; DA, 1999). “Army
values remind us and tell the rest of the world, the civilian government we serve, the
nation we protect, even our enemies, who we are and what we stand for” (DA, 1999, p. 2-2). According to research, organizations with strong shared values outperform other
organizations by a huge margin (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

In addition to the seven core values, the Army has three leadership attributes that
are identified as key leadership qualities that leaders must have to set the example. These
include mental ability, physical strength, and emotional stability. These attributes largely
determine a person’s actions or behaviors while in a leadership role (Campbell & Dardis,
2004). These actions determine whether or not a leader models the way for their
subordinates.

Collegiate athletics inspires a culture of modeling the way. Coaches and team
leaders establish values regarding personal conduct, work ethic and cooperation. A
recent study suggested that players designated as “team captain” found that the most
powerful way to lead the team was to lead by example (Dupuis et al., 2006).

The second practice of exemplary leaders is the ability to Inspire a Shared Vision.
“To inspire a shared vision, you envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling
possibilities, and you enlist others in the dreams by appealing to shared aspirations”
(Kouzes & Posner, 2003, p. 43). Leaders envision a desired future for an organization
and then generate a clear, compelling message to share with others in the organization.
They connect with others by creating a shared meaning (Bennis, 2006). Leaders energize
and inspire others to join the quest for a better future for the organization. Leaders must
believe the message themselves before they are able to inspire others to follow (Bennis,
Vision provides purpose and meaning for employees (Stanley, 1999). People want to be a part of something bigger than themselves and a credible leader with a well communicated vision can establish the support necessary to succeed (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Inspiring a shared vision is linked directly to modeling the way. A leader must establish credibility by modeling the way. Trust must be established before people will follow the leader’s vision. Once the leader establishes credibility and trust, others are more inclined to accept and share the vision of the leader.

The United States Army identified two essential influencing actions used by leaders to establish a shared vision (DA, 1999). Leaders must be effective communicators and must be able to inspire and guide subordinates to mission accomplishment (1999). In the corporate world, communication skills are essential when establishing a new path for an organization. Employees want to know what direction the company is headed. They have a vested interest in the path the company leadership has chosen to take. Leaders who cannot clearly communicate organizational goals will lack the ability to obtain the followership necessary to achieve the vision.

Gilbert and Trudel (2005) suggest that a shared vision between the coach and players is essential for team cooperation and success. Team leaders must also inspire a shared vision among other players. This inspires confidence in the team’s ability to achieve the goals established for the season. Most teams envision winning the championship game and use that vision as a source of inspiration throughout the year. Coaches and team players use that vision to establish goals and objectives for the team to strive to achieve. Inspiring a shared vision provides purpose for the team’s journey.
The third practice of exemplary leaders is to Challenge the Process. To challenge the process you must “search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve, and you experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from your mistakes” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003, p. 85). Leaders must consistently look for ways to improve the organization they lead (Kouzes & Posner, 2004). They must become masters of organizational change (Cardin & McNeese-Smith, 2005). Innovative leaders show initiative and they encourage others to do the same (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Over time, the status quo is not healthy for an organization. Organizations frequently grow complacent allowing competitors to gain the advantage. Organizations must continually find new ways to improve operations and advance organizational practices (Mahoney, 2001).

Challenging the process relates closely to Modeling the Way and Inspiring a Shared Vision. Before a person is able to change an organization they must be credible and they must have a vision for the future. Leaders must communicate openly and honestly with those involved in the change (Payroll Managers Report, 2007). Initiating change is difficult, even for a credible leader. Initiating change is extremely difficult because most organizations resist efforts to change the status quo (Johnson-Cramer, Parise, & Cross, 2007). People grow comfortable with the way the organization operates and tend to push back against change realizing that it may have a direct impact on their current lifestyle.

At some point in time, all organizations must make changes. History demonstrates that as the society changes, organizations much change to remain competitive. According to the Gartner Research Group, ninety percent of the companies
surveyed underwent considerable organizational change (Mahoney, 2001). Bruce Barkus, the executive vice president of operations for Family Dollar Stores, noticed a cumbersome leadership structure in his organization that inhibited swift communication. Barkus made innovative changes to the organizational structure integrating new technologies to increase profits. Barkus (2004) stated that “the changes we made to our business were necessary to remain competitive” (p. 58). Challenging the process is a necessary practice for exemplary leaders.

Challenging the process within the Army Leadership Model requires that a leader combine the conceptual skills with assessing actions in the operating realm (DA, 1999). Leaders must have the ability to assess plans and operations to determine the need for improvement. The Army developed the After Action Review to enable leaders to systematically assess current operations and find innovative ways to improve efficiency. Leaders must have the conceptual ability to develop those innovative changes which make the organization better (DA).

It is essential that teams have players who are willing to challenge the process. Players frequently recognize when practice strategies fail to achieve the desired results on the field or the court. Athlete-leaders must be willing to address these issues with the coach in order to recommend necessary adjustments that will enhance success during the game. Challenging the process is an important leadership practice for collegiate athletes.

The fourth practice of exemplary leaders is Enabling Others to Act. By enabling others to act, “you foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust, and you strengthen others by sharing power and discretion” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003, p. 77). Enabling others to act is often referred to as empowerment or shared decision-
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Allowing employees or workers to be involved in the decision-making process makes the organization more effective and improves employee satisfaction (Short & Greer, 2002). A climate of trust is essential to successful collaboration among groups. Trust is a major predictor of individual’s satisfaction with their company (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Enabling others to act involves developing the skills and competencies of the follower and placing trust in their abilities. Leaders must provide opportunities for the follower to demonstrate initiative and make decisions that effect the organization (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). “Sharing power and sharing information are prerequisites for collegial organizations” (Bennis, 2004, p. 27).

Army leaders empower subordinate leaders to accomplish critical missions. Twenty-two year old lieutenants are given the authority and responsibility to make decisions that could result in the loss of life. Lieutenants who graduated from college less than a year ago are leading combat patrols in the streets of Iraq. These officers are empowered to make decisions. This demonstrates the Army’s trust in that lieutenant’s ability.

Athletic coaches must empower players in order to achieve success during competition. During athletic competition, athletes must make split decisions which will affect the outcome of the game. Players who do not feel empowered will hesitate at vital decision points during a game failing to capitalize on key opportunities. A player who is not empowered to make decisions will be unable to develop the conceptual skills necessary to make quick decisions. On the court, “a leader’s ability to think, to react
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Accordingly, to do things without instruction, and to react to voices on the court is of paramount importance” (Kryzyzewski & Phillips, 2000, p. 121).

The fifth practice of exemplary leaders is the ability to “Encourage the Heart”. By encouraging the heart the leader “recognizes contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003, p. 93). Positive feedback is essential for maintaining morale in an organization. People want to know if their performance is good or bad. Followers frequently associate a lack of feedback with the leader’s dissatisfaction in their performance (Kouzes & Posner). The United States Army mandates that the leader provide periodic feedback to soldiers within the organization through developmental counseling (DA, 1999). This counseling allows the leader to reinforce positive behavior and correct negative behaviors (DA).

The influencing action of motivation combined with the improving action of development are used within the Army Leadership Framework to Encourage the Heart. Encouragement is a key component of motivating soldiers. Soldier development hinges on a leader’s ability to lift up their subordinates through encouragement and recognition (DA, 1999)

Encouraging the heart involves the relational aspect of leadership. It considers the importance of human relationships, and team unity. According to Tony Condianni of Toshiba America Information Systems, “encouraging the heart is the most important leadership practice because it’s the most personal” (Kouzes, 1999, p. 64). To be effective, a leader must take the time to know and understand people (Krzyzewski & Phillips, 2000).
Athletes must encourage and support one another in order to effectively build team unity. Anytime a player positively contributes to the success of the team, other players will demonstrate some type of verbal or physical encouragement. This type of encouragement is motivational and can help change the momentum of the team’s play during a game. Players on a team must form a strong bond. Players who demonstrate the ability to encourage the heart will build a strong, cohesive unit and will enhance the effectiveness of the team.

The five practices of exemplary leaders can easily be applied in nearly every leadership setting. It is an effective conceptual framework for examining the leadership practices of college students to include student-athletes. Players that demonstrate these practices will positively impact their team during competition.

*Leadership Development*

It is commonly thought that people are born with leadership traits or characteristics and that leadership is an inherent behavior, not a learned behavior. Many people associate a charismatic personality with leadership ability. However, there is no empirical evidence to support this notion. In fact, leaders are made, not born (Bennis, 2006; Drucker, 1996). Leadership is a skill that must be taught and developed.

Despite the importance of leadership in our society today (Bass; 1990; Bennis, 2007; Kellett, 1999; Kouses & Posner, 2003), the vast majority of universities do not provide formal leadership training programs (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Even though many universities purport leadership development in mission and vision statements, most institutions put minimal effort into leadership training programs (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt).
Fortunately, colleges and universities are steadily providing more leadership development opportunities for students. Approximately eight hundred leadership development programs exist in colleges and universities nationally (Schwartz, Axtman, & Freeman, 1998). However, this large number of programs is deceiving. Although some programs involve an academic major or minor, many of the programs consist only of classes or workshops. Another concern noted was the fact that the effectiveness of these programs is not well documented (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Without evidence of success it is extremely difficult to determine how much leadership students are actually learning.

Although formal leadership training programs are just starting to gain popularity, nearly all college students have been exposed to informal leadership training. Anyone who has ever been mentored in school or at a job has been exposed to informal leadership training. The family unit also provides an important source of informal leadership training. Parents model behavior and mentor their children by providing character development. Children also learn leadership skills from observing older siblings. Students who participate in organized athletics are exposed to a greater degree of informal leadership training (Giacobbi, Roper, Whitney, & Butryn, 2002). Coaches provide informal leadership training by modeling behavior, setting and enforcing standards, providing emotional support and life skills guidance.

The vast majority of team sports involve instruction by a head coach or assistant coaches. A study that involved former University of California Los Angeles basketball coach John Wooden, found that over the course of fifteen practices, over fifty percent of Coach Wooden’s behaviors were instructional in nature. The majority of Wooden’s
positive statements were followed by instruction (Giacobbi et al., 2002). Coach Wooden’s mentoring and positive reinforcement provides a form of informal leadership development that is common in college athletics.

The majority of empirical data involving formal leadership development programs revolve around the business community. Only a few studies have been conducted involving the impact of leadership training on college student leadership development (Posner & Brodsky, 1992). However, one study was conducted by the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) that reported clear evidence that student participation in leadership development programs improved the student’s leadership skills and ability (Cress, Astin, Zimmerman-Oster, & Burkhardt, 2001). Since the investigation only used leadership programs at ten institutions of higher learning, one must be careful not to generalize the results of the study.

Although limited in its scope, the study identified individual leadership outcomes from the leadership training. The study reported that sixty-two percent of those surveyed demonstrated an improved ability to develop a vision and fifty-two percent reported an improved likelihood of sharing power (Cress et al., 2001). While these are modest results, there is evidence that leadership can be learned. This experiment also demonstrates a further need for study in this area.

Although transformational leadership has been linked to team performance (Bass, 1990) and the importance of leadership in sport has been acknowledged by athletes and coaches (Dupuis et al., 2006), research has failed to examine formal athlete leaders and their behaviors (2006). In addition, the majority of university athletic departments do not provide formalized leadership training specifically for their athletes. Most athletic
departments rely on existing university leadership programs to provide leader training to student-athletes in order to improve their leadership skills.

*United States Army ROTC Leadership Development Program*

Schwartz, Axman, and Freeman (1998) noted that there are nearly eight hundred formal leadership programs at institutions of higher education across the country. As mentioned earlier, these programs vary in composition and intensity. These numbers do not include the Leadership Development Programs found within Army Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) Programs. The United States Army ROTC Program provides a comprehensive leadership development program that has been training leaders for nearly one hundred years. Unlike the United States Military Academy, ROTC programs are located on university campuses across the nation and allow college students to participate without any military commitment.

Although the United States Army has been training leaders at colleges and universities since 1819, the signing of the National Defense Act of 1916 officially created the Army Reserve Officers Training Corps (Coumbe & Harford, 1996). Army ROTC was specifically designed to provide leadership training for college students desiring to serve as officers in the Army. College students who complete ROTC training are commissioned into the Army as Second Lieutenants. Army ROTC is currently the largest producer of Army officers among all commissioning sources (Coumbe & Harford).

Today, the Army has emplaced two hundred and seventy-three programs at colleges and universities across the nation, to include Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Guam (Coumbe & Harford, 1996). Unfortunately, because of the military nature of the training, most colleges and universities do not include it among the on-campus leadership
training programs. The Army’s leadership development framework offers a wide variety of leadership development tools that can be applied to a civilian setting. While the leadership development setting revolves around military operations, nearly all leadership applications can be related to the civilian environment. Frequently, anti-military biases at institutions of higher education hamper university students from reaping the benefits of the ROTC leadership program.

When examined closely, the Army Leadership Model appears to be compatible with competitive sports. Values, attributes, skills, and actions are easily translated from a military setting to a sport setting. The United States military’s mission is to fight and win our nation’s wars. The Army has specific rules of engagement that must be followed in order to win justly. Likewise, the mission of the athletic team is to win the game or match. Sports have specific rules that must be followed so that the team wins fairly. Military leadership development could prove to be beneficial to athletic teams.

*Military Science (ROTC) Program of Instruction*

Leadership development in Military Science or ROTC is a two-phased program with two distinct components. It is a progressive leadership development program that is sequentially organized (USACC, 2006a). Phase one of the leadership curriculum is called the Basic Leader Course. This program is directed to academic freshman and sophomore students. It consists of classroom instruction and experiential leadership opportunities. Each classroom instructional period is followed by a leadership laboratory where students put into practice the concepts learned in the classroom. The Basic Course is open to all college students desiring to learn leadership.
First year students taking Military Science courses will be introduced to leadership theory and leadership application through the Military Science and Leadership (MSL) I instructional series. Students are introduced the United States Army Leadership Model which is commonly referred to as the “Be, Know, Do” model of leadership. “Embracing a leadership role involves developing all aspects of yourself: your character, your competence, and your actions” (USACC, 2006a, p. 5). The curriculum clearly delineates the differences between leadership and management.

MSL I curriculum provides a strong understanding of the Army Leadership Model or the “Be, Know, Do” Model. The Army Leadership Model categorizes critical elements of leader behavior in three leadership components with seven Army values and sixteen leadership dimensions. Values and attributes comprise the “Be” component of the leadership model. The “Know” component consists of four leader skills or competencies and the “DO” element contains nine specific leader actions (Campbell & Dardis, 2004; DA, 1999).

MSL I curriculum focuses a large portion of the classroom instruction on the values and attributes of a leader. The values and attributes outlined in the Army Leadership Model define positive character elements. The importance of character in leadership is addressed by teaching the seven Army values: Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, and Personal Courage. These values form the foundation of a military leader and provide a basis for moral, ethical and practical decision making (DA, 1999; USACC, 2006a).

Character development has been an overt goal of school athletic programs for many years (Beller, 2002). Competitive sports provide an excellent opportunity for
individuals to learn values such as honesty, selfless service, and ethical behavior (2002). “Character, who you are, contributes significantly to how you act. Character helps you know what’s right and do what’s right” (DA, 1999, p. 2-2).

Character is applicable in military operations and in every area of life. Athletes must also possess character. Athletics at every level has been damaged by athletes or coaches with poor character. Recently, the Florida State University football program suspended nearly two dozen players from the team just prior to the 2007 Music City Bowl game. Players were suspended for cheating on an online exam. Undoubtedly, this contributed to Florida State’s loss to Kentucky in that game.

There is a clear lack of sportsmanship in athletics today. “In addition to the general incivility of poor sportsmanship, educators say athletes are losing sight of the ideals of athletics: fair play, honesty, and mutual respect” (Jacobson, 2004, p. A37.). MSL I curriculum provides ROTC students with a clear understanding of the Army values and how those values relate to all aspects of life.

There are three key leadership attributes that are defined during the first year of ROTC. These are the mental, physical, and emotional attributes of leadership. These attributes refer to the person’s “fundamental qualities or characteristics” and may be inherent or learned qualities (DA, 1999). The model does acknowledge that some attributes are unique to each individual and are unchangeable. However, many attributes can be learned or changed. These attributes further define who a person is as a leader (Campbell & Dardis, 2004).

Mental attributes refer to the intellectual capacity and strength of the individual. It addresses the will, initiative, confidence, judgment and self-discipline of the individual
Leaders who demonstrate these behaviors, particularly under stressful situations are considered to be mentally strong. Athletes must also demonstrate strong mental attributes in order to impact the performance of the team. Athletes must possess the will and desire to win. This allows them to push themselves mentally and physically during training sessions. According to college coaches, successful athletes demonstrate confidence, drive, and determination (Giacobbi et al., 2002).

The second major attribute for successful leaders is physical strength. Leaders must be physically strong and have the stamina to persevere through any situation (Peters, 2005). Followers need a leader with a strong presence. A leader with strong presence will breed confidence among subordinates (DA, 1999; USACC, 2006a). Athletic competition requires that players are physically fit and able to endure the rigors of competition. Those who lead the team must be able to propel the team when other’s strength begins to fail. Those leaders who have physically prepared themselves will have the strength to endure physical challenges setting the example for other team members to follow.

The final leadership attribute in the Army Leadership Model is emotional strength. Leaders must demonstrate self-control at all times, particularly in stressful situations. It is essential to maintain a positive attitude during difficult circumstances. Leaders who panic during unfavorable conditions destroy the confidence of their followers. Duke University basketball coach, Mike Krzyzewski, teaches emotional control during practices. He simulates stressful game situations which enable the Duke players to practice composure under pressure (Krzyzewski & Phillips, 2000).
In addition to remaining calm in stressful situations, emotional control requires leaders to control their temper during the heat of battle. Anger causes the leader to lose proper perspective and act foolishly or hastily (DA, 1999). Players who lose their temper during competition can cause irreparable harm to the team through penalties. Emotional control is necessary for all athletes, both leaders and followers.

The “Know” component of the Army Leadership Model defines the “know how” and “know what” for a leader (Campbell & Dardis, 2004). While leaders must have good character to be credible, they must be skilled and competent in order to accomplish the mission or goal. Leaders of character are well liked; leaders of character who are competent are respected.

During MSL I instruction, students will learn about the four leadership skills identified in the Army Leadership Model which consist of interpersonal skills, conceptual skills, technical skills and tactical skills. The instruction utilizes lecture and practical application exercises to assist students in understanding and developing these skills (USACC, 2006a).

Leadership is often about inspiring and motivating others to accomplish a goal. Leaders must have strong interpersonal skills in order to foster strong working relationships and influence followers. A leader’s effectiveness often hinges on their ability to talk to others in an appropriate manner (Maxwell, 2001; DA, 1999). Providing guidance and counsel is a crucial relational aspect in the realm of leadership (Campbell & Dardis, 2004). It is not always what you say to someone, it is how you say it that matters. Leaders must present good verbal and non-verbal communication skills as well as be effective listeners (DA, 1999).
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The need for strong interpersonal skills is seen in each of Kouzes and Posner’s five practices of exemplary leaders. Team sports require athletes with strong interpersonal skills. Interpersonal skills enhance the leader’s ability to build and maintain team cohesion, enabling the team to be more successful in competition (Shields et al., 1997; Voight & Callahan, 2001).

Conceptual skills are equally important to a leader’s effectiveness. “Conceptual skills enable you to handle ideas productively and require critical reasoning, ethical reasoning, creative thinking and reflective thinking” (USACC, 2006, p. 26). Through a series of instructional modules, practical exercises, and scenario examinations the ROTC curriculum attempts to guide students through the development of conceptual thinking skills (USACC, 2007a). Although conceptual skills are difficult to teach, the coursework provides a basis of understanding for each student. It provides strategies for improving thinking and reasoning skills. Thinking and reasoning skills are critical to effective leadership. Critical reasoning and creative thinking are tied closely to problem solving abilities (USACC, 2005).

Leaders must be able to overcome situations that could prevent the organization from being successful. Conceptual thinking is closely linked to an individual’s character. Ethical reasoning is essential for demonstrating good judgment when making decisions. Errors in judgment with regard to moral or ethical decisions can destroy the leader and the organization. Lapses in ethical judgment create scandals such as the Enron or WorldCom debacles which stole the livelihoods of thousands of people (Bennis, 2007). Even with a strong emphasis on character, the Army is not immune to the sting of scandals. Recently, a Lieutenant General lied to cover up the death of Army Ranger Pat
Comparing Leadership Scores

Tillman creating a major military scandal. However, leadership development must continue to emphasize morals, values and ethics in order to limit the spread of organizational scandals.

Conceptual skills are no less important in the athletic world. Athletes must be able to think critically and solve problems, both on and off the field. Coach Kryzyzewski (2000) emphasizes the importance of a player’s ability to think quickly and conceptually on the court. Conceptual thinking enables a player to bypass obstacles emplaced by the opposing team.

The link between conceptual thinking and ethical reasoning is critical in college sports. Today, reports of unethical and immoral behavior are rampant in college and professional sports. Point shaving, steroid use, and recruiting scandals have rocked the athletic world causing financial losses. The NCAA provides strict regulatory guidance and oversight to ensure athletic programs do not cheat (NCAA, 2007c). Training athletes to think conceptually would benefit the teams and the players themselves.

Military Science curriculum addresses the critical need of leaders to be technically and tactically sound. This means that the leader has requisite job-related skills and the expertise to employ the necessary resources to be successful. In the military it means that the leader has good fundamental soldier skills and understands how to employ troops and equipment on the battlefield in order to with the battle (DA, 1999). Student understanding of technical and tactical skills is not limited to military application (USACC, 2007a).

College athletes must have good technical and tactical skills in order to lead the team to victory. For example, college basketball players must have good ball handling
skills and shooting techniques to be effective on the court. The player must also understand and apply strategies and tactics to win the game. Technical and tactical skills are leadership dimensions that work exceptionally well within the athletic framework.

The leadership dimensions within the “Know” component are not mutually exclusive. A leader will be less effective if there is a deficiency in one of the dimensions (USACC, 2006). For example, a technically and technically competent leader who has poor interpersonal skills may be unable to motivate subordinates to accomplish the task. Teaching Military Science students how to combine these four dimensions is a major learning objective for the course curriculum (USACC, 2007b).

Freshmen students in Military Science classes will examine the nine specific leader actions that comprise the “Do” component of the Leadership Model (USACC, 2007b). Leaders can have tremendous character and be extremely skilled and competent, but unless they place those skills into action, they will never lead. The nine actions are communicating, decision making, motivating, planning, executing, assessing, developing, building, and learning (DA, 1999).

Communication skills are vital to effective leadership. In the Army Leadership Model, this dimension refers to the leader’s ability to communicate messages using verbal and written communication forms (USACC, 2005). Military Science students will learn to articulate thoughts and ideas in both verbal and written form. Students will practice providing guidance in clear and concise oral and written forms (USACC, 2007b).

Clearly communicating guidance or direction to subordinates is critical to an Army leader. A poorly communicated message could cost the life of a soldier or a noncombatant civilian. Communication is also necessary in college athletics. Athletes
must be able to communicate plays or strategies in verbal and non-verbal ways. Miscommunication can cause the team to lose the game. A football quarterback who is unable to clearly articulate a play in the huddle will create confusion on the field of play usually resulting in a costly mistake.

The decision making dimension is linked closely to the conceptual dimension. Critical thinking is necessary for good decision making. ROTC students learn to utilize certain processes to formulate sound decisions. First year students are introduced to the “Military Decision Making Process” which provides logical, sequential steps to help students solve problems and make sound decisions based on information available (DA, 2005). Although the Military Science curriculum will not teach a student what decision to make, it does provide a process to help them make a decision. Making split second decisions requires strong conceptual skills. When decisions need to be made quickly, students do not have the time to walk through the deliberate decision making process. ROTC students are taught how to abbreviate that process in order to make sound on the spot decisions (USACC, 2007b).

Decision making is a dimension that is applicable to people in all settings. The concepts outlined in the MSL I curriculum are beneficial for all college students. Student-athletes would benefit greatly by utilizing the deliberate and abbreviated decision making processes to enhance their effectiveness as players.

Army leadership requires the leader to motivate subordinates to accomplish the mission. The Army definition of leadership is to “provide purpose, direction and motivation”. First year Military Science students learn the fundamentals of motivation and learn various motivation theories and techniques (USACC, 2007b). Although the
curriculum provides few opportunities for practical application, various ROTC activities such as physical training and leadership laboratory allow students to practice motivational techniques learned in the classroom.

Motivation plays a significant role in the momentum of an athletic competition. The motivational skills of a key player or a coach can change the complexion of an important game. Some players are naturally motivational. Their intensity motivates their teammates. However, when the team is playing poorly, and the key motivational player is out of the game, other players need to be able fill the role of motivator. Teaching athletes about motivation and how to motivate can enhance team performance.

Leadership is associated with action and leaders must be able to “make things happen.” Military Science curriculum clearly explains the important triad found in the Army Leadership Model (USACC, 2005). Students are taught that leaders must plan and execute the mission or event and then carefully assess the results (2005).

Planning is often a skill associated with managers. Planning is a dimension that can be learned by any aspiring leader. A plan is a map for completing a project or campaign (USACC, 2006a). Military Science curriculum enables first year students an opportunity to explore the deliberate planning process. The Army uses a seven step procedure called “Troop Leading Procedures” and a process called the “Military Decision Making Process” to provide a systematic approach to plan development (DA, 1999, 2006b).

Planning and preparing is essential in all facets of life. College students must conduct planning in order to complete assignments, projects or research papers. Student-athletes may be required to plan workout sessions or plan team events. The
methodologies used by Army planners are easily adapted to any vocation, to include academics. Students potentially reap long term benefits from this course of study.

Once a student learns how to plan an event or project, the student must be able to implement or execute the plan. The Army Leadership Model requires leaders to act. The most detailed plan will be ineffective if the leader never attempts to implement the plan. The dimension of execution is simply putting into action the steps or procedures laid out in the plan (DA, 1999). Although students will not actually execute a plan, they will analyze case studies to gain a better understanding of the process.

Executing plans is a part of every business or vocation. Coaches meticulously plan game strategies and players must be able to execute those plans. A leader must be able to be able to visualize the planning concept and motivate players on the field or court to carry out the plan. A leader who is able to execute a plan and successfully complete the mission will gain credibility and inspire others (Maxwell, 2001).

Assessing the results after an event is not merely reflecting on what happened. Military Science curriculum provides students with a comprehensive process for analyzing the planning process and the implementation of the plan. Students are taught the After Action Review process which enables the leader to engage in a discussion with those involved in the event to determine what happened and why (DA, 1993, 2002). According to Peter Senge, the After Action Review is “arguably one of the most successful organizational learning methods yet devised” (NW Link, 2007, n.p.).

The After Action Review is a process that every organization can use to examine the effectiveness of organizational processes and procedures. The After Action Review could easily be adapted to athletic events. Most coaches utilize game films and team
meetings to determine how the team won or lost. The use of the After Action Review provides a proven procedure for analyzing events (NW Link, 2007). The process would enable coaches to formalize the game analysis process. Military Science students gain a working knowledge of this procedure during classroom instruction. Students later apply this process during the experiential learning portion of the course.

Finally, the MSL I curriculum educates students in the improving actions used by leaders to develop the organization. Leaders must develop individuals, build teamwork and seek personal betterment (Campbell & Dardis, 2004; DA, 1999; USACC, 2007a, b). These actions work together to improve organizational effectiveness. People are generally the strength of any organization. The Army could not win the nation’s wars without people. Developing one’s self and those around them should be a priority for a leader. Research shows that athletic coaches want players to have a “perfect attitude toward personal development” (Giaccobbi, Whitney, Roper, & Butryn, 2002, p. 169). Athletes must continually strive to improve their own performance as well as the performance of their teammates.

Students who enroll in ROTC leadership classes participate in a leadership laboratory and a leadership field training exercise. During the practicum students practice both leadership and followership skills. Students are assigned to play various roles within the organizational structure and required to utilize skills and concepts learned during classroom instruction. Freshmen are integrated with different year groups within the ROTC structure (USACC, 2005).

In addition to learning the Army Leadership Model, students will learn time management techniques, stress management, military rank structure, goal setting, health
and fitness, and public speaking techniques (USACC, 2006a). The curriculum is
designed to teach students how to lead themselves, so that they may be effective leading
others.

Military Science and Leadership (MSL) II classes are designed for second year
college students. Although there is nothing to preclude students in other year groups
from taking the course, the curriculum is progressive in nature and designed to build
upon the knowledge learned in MSL I classes. The MSL II curriculum takes students
deeper into the Army Leadership Model. This year emphasizes team-building, leadership
theories, personal communication skills, team goal-setting and time management skills
(USACC, 2006b). Students will also begin to learn military small unit tactics. Small unit
tactics give students a leadership venue to use for practicing leadership techniques
(USACC, 2005).

The MSL II program of instruction can be useful for college students pursuing a
variety of careers. The curriculum and leadership laboratory provide numerous
leadership opportunities for sophomores with instructional feedback from instructors
(USACC, 2005). Students who do not desire to pursue a career in the military are limited
to MSL I and MSL II instruction or the “Basic Leadership Course”.

Students wishing to pursue a career in the military must sign a formal contract
with the United States Army in order to begin the ROTC Advance Course. Advance
course instruction is designed to develop students into Army platoon leaders. The
program contains a classroom instructional component and an experiential learning
component (USACC, 2005). Classroom instruction builds upon previous learning
teaching students advanced leadership techniques.
Advance Course students are placed in leadership roles with varying levels of responsibility. Students are rotated through the leadership opportunities receiving a formal evaluation after the completion of each leadership role (USACC, 2005). The leadership scenarios prepare young leaders for duty in Iraq and Afghanistan. This training is not available to college athletes unless they are prepared to serve in the military. However, under certain circumstances, the Professor of Military Science may authorize a non-contracted student to take Advance Course classes.

**Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI)**

There is substantial support for the theoretical framework of the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). These researchers conducted extensive qualitative and quantitative studies in order to ascertain the leadership practices that define an exemplary leader. Through this research, they discovered five specific practices that defined transformational leadership. Research has shown that those who engage in the five practices are more effective in their leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2003).

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was developed as an instrument for measuring leadership practices and has been an extensively used in the realm of leadership development (Fields & Herold, 1997). The LPI has been used to examine leadership practices within business and academic communities incorporating the five specific leadership behaviors used by exemplary leaders. Several major businesses such as Levi Straus, Motorola and IBM have effectively used the LPI in order to start leadership development programs within their organization (Adams & Keim, 2002).
In order to study the leadership practices of college students, Kouzes and Posner developed the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) (2003). The LPI was adjusted slightly to be more applicable for student usage. Even though the LPI has seldom been used to measure leadership practices in college athletics, the LPI has been used to study campus-based organizations, housing units and Greek organizations (Adams & Keim, 2002). While the inventory was not specifically designed to measure transformational leadership, research found that the LPI is effective when measuring both transformational and transactional leadership (Fields & Herold, 1997).

**Related Research**

The Leadership Practices Inventory has proven to be an effective measurement tool for studying leadership. Studies have demonstrated that the psychometric properties of the LPI are sound and that the tool is very useful. In a study conducted at the University of Alabama, researchers concluded “The items appear to provide evidence that supports the sub-dimensions related to leadership, as purported by the creators of the instrument” (Young, 2004, n.p.). Young goes on to say:

The findings and conclusions of this study regarding the psychometric properties of the LPI did suggest some support for the belief that the LPI self-report was a reliable and adequately valid instrument when used to measure the self-perceived leadership practices of graduate students in the educational leadership program at the University of Alabama. (n.p.)

Adams and Keim (2002) conducted a study that examined the leadership practices of student leaders in a Greek-affiliated organizations at three public universities.
Researchers used the SLPI to study 232 undergraduate students active in sorority and fraternity leadership roles. The purpose of the study was to determine if there were differences in the leadership practices of men and women in these organizations. The research determined that there was no significant difference in the leadership scores of men and women in the sub-categories of Modeling, Inspiring and Encouraging. However, women produced higher leadership scores in the areas of Challenging and Enabling (Adams & Keim, 2002). The researchers concluded that women were more comfortable than men when promoting change in an organization. Greek sorority women also engage in empowerment more often than men. Women tended to take a more collaborative approach to leadership than men leading researchers to believe that gender may play a factor in company training strategies (Adams & Keim).

Another study conducted at the University of New Brunswick (Canada) determined that the demographic variable of gender did play a role in leadership practices. Two hundred and sixty incoming and new student leaders took the self-assessment LPI and each leader received three observer LPI assessments. This study showed that there was a difference between males and females in all leadership practices with the exception of Challenging. The study also demonstrated that females self-reported that they engaged in Enabling, Modeling, and Encouraging far more often than their male counterparts (Rand, 2004).

However, Posner and Brodsky (1994) conducted a study of fraternity and sorority presidents that had different results. These researchers determined that there was no statistical difference in the leadership practices of the men and women in this study. The
conflicting results of these studies provides sufficient motive for further research comparing the leadership practices of men and women.

Posner and Brodsky (1993) also conducted a study of 333 Resident Assistants (RA) at six public universities using the SLPI. The purpose of the study was to determine the leadership effectiveness of the Resident Assistants based on self-assessments and constituent assessments. The LPI showed that Resident Assistants scored much higher on the Enabling practice than the other four practices. It also determined that the most effective Resident Assistants scored high in all five practices.

Research using the SLPI has shown that leadership is not a genetic trait, but rather it is a learned behavior. In a study involving the “LeadersShape” program at the University of Georgia, Pugh (2000) utilized a test-retest model to determine if the LeaderShape program was effective. Pugh found that the SLPI scores improved over a ten-week period of student participation. The most significant changes occurred in the Challenging, Inspiring, and Encouraging practices (2000). The study did not examine differences in gender or race. This study provides credence to the notion that leadership is a learned behavior rather than an inherent characteristic of the human personality.

Another LeaderShape study further validates the theory that leadership is a learned behavior and that leadership development programs can strengthen leadership practices. In a longitudinal study which assessed participants before and after a six-month leadership development program found conclusive evidence to support formal leader education (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). The researchers used the Attributional Style Questionnaire and the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire.
Although the LPI was not used in this study, the two questionnaires used did measure most of the same leadership practices that are found in the LPI.

This study reported data that supports leadership education. Students with leadership education reported affirmative individual results. The study reported that 54% of participants had “an improved likelihood of sharing power”; 62% had an “increased desire for change”; 57% demonstrated an improved ability to provide vision; and 54% showed “improved conflict resolution skills” (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Leadership development efforts increased college student’s ability to create organizational vision. Empirical evidence shows that leader training programs do develop knowledge, skills and values that are consistent with the objectives of these programs.

The fact that leadership training improves leadership abilities should be a cue that more leader development programs are needed on college campuses. Universities do not need to fund programs such as LeaderShape on campus when the local Army ROTC program offers a more comprehensive program at no additional cost to the university.

In 2003, a study was conducted comparing the perceived leadership practices of two Army ROTC programs at two different New England Universities. One of the universities was a military academy in Vermont and one was a traditional university the city of Boston. This study determined that there was no statistical difference between the students at the two universities in any of the five practices (Warren, 2003). The results of this study could demonstrate that the standardized leadership curriculum instituted by the United States Army Cadet Command produces consistent results at all colleges and universities.
Summary

Although little research has been conducted to specifically link transformational leadership with team performance, research does indicate a link between leadership and organizational effectiveness (Boerner et al., 2007). Research clearly indicates that leadership skills are improved by leadership development training (Pugh, 2000; Warren, 2003; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Leadership is an important contributor to the success of athletic teams. Despite the importance of leadership in sports, university athletic programs rarely train their athletes in the fundamentals of leadership.

Formal leadership training would be highly beneficial to college athletes and could improve team cohesiveness and team success. The majority of colleges and universities have various degrees of formal leadership training available to students on campus (Schwartz et al., 1998). Unfortunately, the effectiveness of these programs has not been carefully evaluated (Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999.)

Army ROTC programs across the country provide comprehensive leadership development programs that have a proven success rate. Unfortunately, these programs are underutilized by student-athletes on college campuses. The Military Science curriculum provides a leadership model that is compatible with competitive sports and athletes could benefit from this instruction. The findings of this literature review indicate that Army ROTC could provide critical leadership instruction which would enhance student-athlete leadership skills.
Chapter Three
Methodology

*General Perspective*

This chapter describes the methodology, instrumentation, and procedures used in this quantitative study. A detailed description of the participants and research questions will also be described. This quantitative investigation will examine the difference in the leadership scores of two college student cohorts using the Kouzes and Posner’s Student Leadership Practices Inventory, Second Edition. One cohort in this study will have received at least one year of formal leadership training while the other group has received no formal leadership training.

*Research Context*

This study took place at a large, state university in Iowa during the fall semester of 2007. The university has approximately 25,000 students enrolled and provides 96 bachelors degree programs, one professional degree, 117 masters programs and 83 doctoral programs (ISU Fact Book, 2006-2007). Various departments within the school provide leadership training. However, the university lacks a comprehensive leadership development program with the exception of Army ROTC.

Army ROTC provides a comprehensive leadership curriculum that is offered to all college students on campus. Students may take the first two years of ROTC without incurring a military obligation. Those students who wish to further develop their leadership skills may enroll in the ROTC Advance Course which requires two additional years of fairly intense leadership training. Students choosing to enroll in this course
will incur a military obligation upon completion of the program. Each student must sign an official contract with the Army stating their willingness to serve on active duty or in the reserve component as a lieutenant.

This university possesses a Division I athletics program which functions as a part of the National Collegiate Athletic Association’s Big 12 Conference. The NCAA consists of thousands of student-athletes from universities all across the nation. The Big 12 Conference consists of twelve universities from the states of Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma and Texas. The Big 12 alone sponsors 21 sports and consists of over 4,500 student athletes (Big 12 Website, 2007). The Iowa State University athletic department consists of approximately 400 student-athletes participating in 7 men’s sports and 11 women’s sports (ISU Factbook 2006-2007). Some sports provide more revenue to the university than other sports. Football, men’s basketball, and women’s basketball are the primary revenue earning sports at Iowa State University.

The university has a highly successful men’s and women’s basketball program. Both teams have enjoyed various levels of success in the NCAA over the past two decades. In 2006, the women’s team finished second in the Big 12 and participated in the NCAA tournament. The men’s team is in the process of rebuilding its program finishing the 2006 season with a losing record. The team has a new head coach and new coaching staff.

The university’s athletic department does not provide formal leadership training for its athletes. The Academic Services Department provides limited life-skills training
for athletes and offers limited team-building activities for the teams. Athletes must seek leadership development outside of the athletic department.

Prior to conducting any research, a research proposal was submitted to the Institutional Review Board at Iowa State University and Liberty University. Approval was granted by the Institutional Review Boards subject to the approval of the Athletic Department, the men’s basketball coach, the women’s basketball coach, and the chair of the Military Science Department.

Research Participants

The population for this study consisted of eighty-five Army ROTC cadets and 30 collegiate basketball players. The sample for this study was thirty Army ROTC cadets (n=30) and twenty-eight collegiate basketball players (n=28). The group of thirty Army ROTC cadets (n=30) consisted of twelve female cadets and eighteen male cadets. Since the Army ROTC program has sixty-nine male cadets and sixteen female cadets, the male cadets were be selected by a simple random sample. Fifty-four of the sixty-nine male cadets have participated in at least one year of formalized ROTC training. Only these fifty-four cadets were selected to participate in the simple random sample. The names of the fifty-four remaining male cadets were placed in a drum and eighteen names were selected. Twelve of the sixteen female cadets have participated in at least one year of ROTC leadership training. Those twelve female cadets were selected to participate in the survey. First year cadets, or freshmen cadets, did not participate in the survey. The second group consisted of thirty basketball players, (n=30). This sample was comprised of thirteen female players and fifteen male players. Groups were fixed and intact.
A pre-survey instruction sheet (Appendix A) was provided with each survey in order to gather additional pertinent background information on each subject. The pre-instruction survey gathered the following information: gender, the number of years participating in a formal leadership training program, whether the participant is a basketball player or ROTC student, and number of years as a college student.

**Instruments Used in Data Collection**

This study used the Kouzes and Posner Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI), Second Edition, 2006 (Appendix B). This survey is based on the conceptual leadership framework designed by Kouzes and Posner (2002) to examine five practices of exemplary leadership which includes: Model the Way (Model), Inspire a Shared Vision (Inspire), Challenge the Process (Challenge), Enable Others to Act (Enable), and Encourage the Heart (Encourage). “There is considerable empirical support for the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership” (p. 1) as an instrument for measuring transformational leadership. “The LPI was developed through a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative research methods and studies” (p. 1). This measuring tool has been administered to over 350,000 people across multiple subjects, organizations and backgrounds (Kouzes & Posner).

This survey consisted of thirty multiple-choice questions describing various leadership behaviors and actions. There were six questions for each of the five leadership practices.

Questions designed to measure Modeling the Way addressed practices such as setting a personal example and following through with promises. Modeling questions also addressed the leader’s ability to solicit feedback, build consensus, and align
principles and actions. Modeling questions (see Table 1) addressed the leader’s functionality in the realm of values and principles (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

In order to determine proficiency in the practice of Inspiring a Shared Vision, survey questions addressed the leader’s ability to communicate clearly about the future of the organization (see Table 2). Inspire questions assessed the student’s likelihood to find common ground with others while maintaining a positive attitude and communication style (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Survey questions measuring the leadership practices of Challenging the Process assessed the leader’s ability to develop skills, set goals, experiment and take initiative (see Table 3). These questions examined whether the leader seeks improvement within the organization by using innovative procedures or processes (Kouses & Posner, 2006).

Table 1.
Survey Questions Pertaining to Model the Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Model Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sets a personal example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aligns others with principles and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Follows through on promises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gets feedback about actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Builds consensus on values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Talks about values and principles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.

#### Survey Questions Pertaining to Inspire a Shared Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Inspire Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Looks ahead and communicates the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Describes ideal capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Talks about vision of the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Finds common ground with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Is an upbeat and positive communicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Communicates purpose and meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.

#### Survey Questions Pertaining to Challenge the Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Challenge Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develops skills and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Helps others take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Keeps current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Asks “What can we learn from our mistakes?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sets goals and makes plans for projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Takes initiative in experimenting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey questions regarding the leadership practice of Enabling Others to Act focused on the leader’s ability to empower and support peers or subordinates in the accomplishment of their mission or task (see Table 4). The survey measured the leader’s ability to foster cooperative relationships, actively listen to others, support the decisions of others, and provide leadership opportunities to others (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

The survey questions measuring the leadership practice of Encouraging the Heart concentrated on the leader’s ability to lift others up and encourage them (see Table 5). The survey questions assessed the leader’s ability to demonstrate support and appreciation, show public recognition, celebrate accomplishments and creatively recognize people (Kouzes & Postern, 2006).

Table 4.
Survey Questions Pertaining to Enable Others to Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Enable Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fosters cooperative relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Actively listens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Treats others with respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Supports decisions that others make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gives others freedom of choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Provides leadership opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

Survey Questions Pertaining to Encourage the Heart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Encourage Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Praises people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Encourages others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Provides support and appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Publicly recognizes alignment with values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Celebrates accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Creatively recognizes people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey used a five-point, Likert-type scale: (1) rarely or seldom; (2) once in a while; (3) sometimes; (4) often; and (5) very frequently or almost always (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). Kouzes and Posner (2002) provide several different versions of the LPI for different subject groups. This study utilized the student version of the LPI which accommodates high school and college students.

The SLPI has sound psychometric properties. Internal reliability is measured by the Cronbach’s Alpha. Reliability of the study shows that there is a positive correlation between SLPI scores and effectiveness assessments (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). The reliability coefficients for the SLPI are as follows: Model = .68; Inspire = .79; Challenge = .66; Enable = .70; and Encourage = .80 (Kouzes & Posner).

The validity of the survey has proven to be strong. Validity demonstrates that a survey measures what it claims to report. The survey has excellent face validity and predictive validity. Numerous meta-reviews of leadership development instruments have
been carried out which supported the reliability and validity of the survey (Kouzes & Posner, 2002):

Validity is also determined empirically. Factor analysis is used to determine the extent to which the instrument measures common or different content areas. The result from various analyses reveal that the LPI contains five factors, the items within each factor corresponding more among themselves than they do with the other factors. For example, responses to the thirty leadership behavior items were subjected to a principle factoring method with iteration and varimax rotation. Five factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounting for 60.5 percent of the variance. Five interpretable factors were obtained consistent with the five subscales of the LPI – although a few of item-factor loadings share some common variance across more than one factor. The stability of the five factor solution was tested by factor-analyzing the data from different subsamples. In each case, the factor structure was essentially similar to the one involving the entire sample. (p.14)

Additional sources found in the Mental Measurements Yearbook database note the effectiveness of the SLPI. One review stated, “There is good evidence to support the reliability and validity of the LPI. The conceptual scheme on which the LPI is based is elegant and the test items have excellent face validity as well as psychometric validity. Factor analyses and multiple regressions provide strong support for both the structural and concurrent validity of the LPI” (Leong, 1995, n.p.). In a review, John Enger (1999) stated that “The LPI represents well-
thought-out instrumentation for administration and interpretation. Reliability and validity evidence is presented and represents high levels by any standards. Subsequent analysis based on a large sample produced a factor structure consistent with the original 5-factor scale” (n.p).

The LPI is considered to be one of the best instruments for measuring leadership. In an assessment of eighteen leadership instruments, the LPI was considered to have the soundest psychometric properties and be the easiest to use (Huber, Maas, McCloskey, Goode, & Watson, 2000).

Data from the questionnaire was collected and entered into the SLPI scoring software version 3.3. This software summarized the data and generated a SLPI Feedback Reports. These reports generated individual self-assessment scores and observer assessment scores. For the purposes of this study, only the self-assessment scores were used.

Individual and group reports generated by the SLPI software provided the researcher with an assessment score in each category of the five leadership practices. Group reports averaged the score of each subject by category. SLPI software allowed the researcher to group subjects in a variety of ways in order to produce group reports that were entered into SPSS for further analysis.

**Procedures**

The researcher collected data by administering SLPI surveys to the men’s basketball team, the women’s basketball team, and a sample of students in Army ROTC. The three groups were surveyed at separate times and separate locations. This researcher received permission to conduct the survey from the athletic director, the men’s head
coach, the women’s head coach and the department chair of the Military Sciences department.

Players were administered the survey before team meetings, and the ROTC students were surveyed during a leadership laboratory. The men’s team was surveyed in the locker room prior to the daily team meeting. One male athlete was absent from the initial administration of the survey. This researcher administered the survey the following day to that player. The same instructions and procedures were used with this player. Each player has a workspace next to their locker where they were able to sit and take the survey.

The women’s team conducted the survey prior to a team meeting in the coach’s conference room. Two female athletes were absent for the initial administration of the survey. These two athletes took the survey the following day in the coach’s conference room. The exact same instructions and procedures were used to conduct the survey.

The ROTC cadets took the survey in two separate groups. One group took the survey after the completion of leadership laboratory in the ROTC classroom. The second group of students completed the survey at a designated time during the following day. The second group was administered the survey in the ROTC conference room. Both groups were give the same instructions and the survey was conducted the same for both groups.

Students took the survey on a voluntary basis. Students gave their consent to participate by filling out the survey, placing the survey in the brown envelope and returning it to the researcher. Students who did not wish to participate placed a blank
survey in the envelope and returned it to the researcher. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at both universities involved in the research.

Students were provided a paper copy of the SLPI survey (Appendix B), a pre-survey instruction sheet (Appendix A), a brown envelope and a writing utensil. Each survey was labeled to identify the group being surveyed. For example, the women’s basketball team was labeled WBB with a number of 1-13 on the top of the survey. Men’s basketball team was labeled MBB and the ROTC students were simply labeled ROTC. Students were given one hour to complete the survey. The researcher read the pre-survey instructions to the students prior to the administration of the survey. Upon completing the survey, the subjects placed the survey and instruction sheet in the brown envelope and returned it to the researcher.

Data collected from the survey were entered into the SLPI software and reports were generated. Data from the reports were converted to Microsoft Excel and entered into SPSS. Independent sample t-tests were conducted to analyze the data.

**Data Analysis**

**Data Organization**

Data were organized using the SLPI software. The SLPI software provided the raw leadership scores by leadership practice for each individual surveyed. The software produced a “Student LPI Feedback Report” which provided a total score for each of the five practices as well as summary of each individual practice. The software enabled the researcher to group the raw scores in a variety of ways while providing the standard deviation for each group score. The pre-survey instruction sheet showed that no athletes had participated in any formal leadership training. The scores were then grouped by
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cohort, and cohort and gender. Data from the SLPI was converted into Microsoft Excel and entered into Statistical Packages for Social Science SPSS software for analysis. SPSS provides the ability to compare data using a variety of statistical methods.

Statistical Procedures

Using SPSS, a t-test was deemed to be the most effective way to compare the mean scores of the groups involved in this study. More specifically, independent sample t-tests were used to compare the various group scores. Independent sample t-tests compare the mean scores of two independent groups such as ROTC students and basketball players. The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance was used to determine if the variances from the samples were different. The p-values from this test indicated that variances for all comparisons were equal.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the overall SLPI leadership scores of the ROTC students who had received leadership training and the basketball players who had not received training. The overall score provided a composite score of all thirty questions involving the five leadership constructs. The SPSS generated descriptive statistics for the two groups followed by the Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances. This test for equality of variance showed that the variances were not significant. The final data chart produced by SPSS showed the independent sample t-test. The independent sample t-test demonstrated if there was a significant statistical difference in leadership scores. T-values that were significant at the .05 level were considered statistically different.

Five independent sample t-tests were conducted on the SLPI scores for each of the cohorts studied (ROTC students and basketball players) by leadership practice
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(Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage). Based on Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance, equal variance was assumed on all constructs. The independent sample t-test identified those constructs in which there was a statistical difference between ROTC students and basketball players. $T$-values that were significant at the .05 level were considered statistically different.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to identify the potential differences in overall leadership scores between male and female participants without consideration of the leadership training variable. Equal variance was assumed for this procedure.

Five independent sample t-tests were conducted on the SLPI scores for male and female participants by leadership practice (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage). Based on Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance, equal variance was assumed on all constructs. The independent sample t-test identified those constructs in which there was a statistical difference between male and female participants. $T$-values that were significant at the .05 level were considered statistically different.

Summary

This chapter explains the methods used in this quantitative study of transformational leadership practices of collegiate basketball players and ROTC students. The methodology used for this study helped answer the research questions outlined in chapter one. The next chapter presents the results that were obtained from the research conducted in this study.
Chapter Four

Research Findings

As stated in the introductory chapter, the purpose of this study was to examine the differences in transformational leadership practices of collegiate level men’s and women’s basketball teams and students from an Army Reserve Officers Training Program as measured by Kouzes and Posner’s Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI). Of the four groups studied, two of the groups, male and female ROTC students have participated in at least one year of formalized leadership training. The pre-survey instructions showed that no athletes had participated in formal leadership training. The variable of past leadership training was examined regarding its impact on the students’ transformational leadership practices. This research also examined gender to determine if there is a significant difference in leadership scores among men and women. The research questions investigated in this study were:

1. Will Army ROTC students who have received at least one year of formalized leadership training demonstrate stronger overall leadership scores than the basketball players who have not received formalized leadership training?

2. Will Army ROTC students who have received at least one year of formalized leadership training demonstrate stronger leadership scores within each of the five leadership practices: Modeling, Inspiring, Challenging, Enabling, and Encouraging than basketball players who have not received formalized leadership training?
3. Will there be a significant difference in leadership scores between male and female participants in this study?

Descriptive Information

A total of 60 individuals were selected to participate in the study and a total of 58 individuals actually participated in this study. Only ROTC students had participated in at least one year of leadership training. The pre-survey student data and grouping data will be presented first. Men’s basketball players comprised 26% of the participants, women’s basketball players comprised 22% of the participants, male ROTC students consisted of 31% of the participants, and female ROTC students comprised 21% of participants (Table 6). Fifty-seven percent of the participants were males, while 43% were females (Table 7). Over half of the participants (52%) had at least one year of formalized leadership training (Table 8). Pre-survey data collection indicated that no basketball players had participated in any formalized leadership training.

Table 6.

Frequencies and Percentages of Participants by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.
Frequencies and Percentages by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.
Frequencies and Percentages by Leadership Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Results

The SLPI survey consists of five constructs, (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage). Scores for each construct could range from zero to 30. Table 9 provides descriptive analysis of the five constructs including the mean, standard deviation and the minimum and maximum scores for the entire survey sample.
Table 9.

Frequencies, Mean, Std. Deviation, Minimum, and Maximum of the Five Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Inspire</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Enable</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 1

The results of the research rejected the null hypothesis that there will be no significant statistical difference in the overall leadership scores of ROTC students and basketball players. An independent sample t-test was conducted to determine if the ROTC students who received formal leadership training produced higher overall leadership scores on the SLPI than the basketball players who did not receive formal leader training. The independent t-test was used to test the differences between the mean scores of the two groups. The mean score for the ROTC students with leadership training was 23.53 and the mean score for the basketball players without leadership training was 22.46. A t-value of 2.048 was significant at the .05 level indicating that the ROTC students who participated in at least one year of leadership training had significantly higher overall leadership scores than the basketball players who had not received leadership training. Table 10 represents the difference in overall leadership scores for those with training and those without training.
Table 10.
Difference in Overall Leadership Scores for ROTC Students With Training and Without Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.045*</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $\alpha < 0.05$.

Research Question 2

The results of this research rejected the null hypothesis that there would be no significant statistical difference in the leadership scores of ROTC students and basketball players in the practices of Modeling, Challenging, and Enabling. However, the results failed to reject the null hypothesis that there would be no significant statistical difference between ROTC students and basketball players in the practices of Inspiring and Encouraging. In order to examine what effect leadership training had on leadership scores within each of the five constructs, an independent t-test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference in leadership scores between ROTC students with leadership training and basketball players without leadership training. A t-test was run for each of the five constructs (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage) to compare mean scores of the two groups. Table 11 provides the t-test results for the five constructs.

Although the overall leadership score of the ROTC students with leadership training was statistically higher than the basketball players without leadership training,
Table 11.

Differences in Construct Leadership Scores for ROTC Students With Training and Without Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>2.487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.923</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at α < 0.05.

only three of the five constructs demonstrated a significant statistical difference in mean scores. Two of the constructs showed no statistical difference between the two groups. The Model construct mean score for the ROTC students with leadership training was 24.10 and the mean score for the basketball players without leadership training was
22.50. A $t$-value of 2.67 was significant at the .05 level indicating that the ROTC students who participated in at least one year of leadership training had significantly higher scores in the leadership practice of Model than the basketball players who had not received leadership training.

The Inspire construct mean score for the ROTC students with leadership training was 22.47 and the mean score for the basketball players without leadership training was 21.75. A $t$-value of .92 was not significant at the .05 level indicating that there is no statistical difference in the leadership practice of Inspire between the ROTC students who participated in at least one year of leadership training and the basketball players who did not participate in leadership training.

The Challenge construct mean score for the ROTC students with leadership training was 22.60 and the mean score for the basketball players without leadership training was 20.93. A $t$-value of 2.24 was significant at the .05 level indicating that the ROTC students who participated in at least one year of leadership training had significantly higher scores in the leadership practice of Challenge than the basketball players who had not received leadership training.

The Enable construct mean score for the ROTC students with leadership training was 25.17 and the mean score for the basketball players without leadership training was 23.46. A $t$-value of 2.54 was significant at the .05 level indicating that the ROTC students who participated in at least one year of leadership training had significantly higher scores in the leadership practice of Enable than the basketball players who had not received leadership training.
The Encourage construct mean score for the ROTC students with leadership training was 23.33 and the mean score for the basketball players without leadership training was 23.68. A $t$-value of -.40 was not significant at the .05 level indicating that there is no statistical difference in the leadership practice of Encourage between the ROTC students who participated in at least one year of leadership training and the basketball players who did not participate in leadership training.

Of the five leadership practices, the results of the $t$-tests indicate that there was a significant statistical difference in the practices of Model, Challenge, and Enable favoring ROTC. There were no statistical differences between the mean scores of the two groups in Inspire and Encourage.

**Research Question 3**

The results of this research failed to reject the null hypothesis that there would be no statistical difference in the leadership scores of male and female participants. In order to examine difference in overall leadership scores between male and female participants, an independent $t$-test was performed to determine if there was a significant statistical difference. $T$-tests were also performed for each of the five leadership constructs (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage) to determine if there was a significant statistical difference between the mean leadership scores of male and female participants within each construct. Equal variances were assumed for both analyses.

The overall mean score for the male participants was 22.96 and the mean score for the female participants was 23.09. A $t$-value of -.23 was not significant at the .05 level, indicating that there is no statistical difference in the overall leadership scores of male and female participants (see Table 12).
Table 12.

Differences in the Overall Leadership Scores for Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Model construct mean score for the male participants was 23.12 and the mean score for the female participants was 23.60. A t-value of -.75 was not significant at the .05 level indicating that there is no statistical difference between male and female participants in the leadership practice of Model the Way.

The Inspire construct mean score for the male participants was 22.42 and the mean score for the female participants was 21.72. A t-value of .90 was not significant at the .05 level indicating that there is no statistical difference between male and female participants in the leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision.

The Challenge construct mean score for the male participants was 22.27 and the mean score for the female participants was 21.16. A t-value of 1.44 was not significant at the .05 level indicating that there is no statistical difference between male and female participants in the leadership practice of Challenge the Process.

The Enable construct mean score for the male participants was 24.03 and the mean score for the female participants was 24.76. A t-value of -1.03 was not significant at the .05 level indicating that there is no statistical difference between male and female participants in the leadership practice of Enable Others to Act.
The Encourage construct mean score for the male participants was 22.97 and the mean score for the female participants was 24.20. A $t$-value of -1.44 was not significant at the .05 level indicating that there is no statistical difference between male and female participants in the leadership practice of Encouraging the Heart.

Table 13 provides the results of the $t$-test comparing the mean scores of male and female participants. The results of the six $t$-tests indicate that there was a no significant statistical difference between male and female participants in overall leadership scores or within any of the five leadership practices.

**Summary**

The data presented in this chapter were the result of three research questions presented in chapter one of this study. The statistical data from this study indicated that students who received formal leadership training demonstrated significantly higher overall leadership scores than those students without any formal leadership training. Within the constructs, those students exhibited significantly higher scores in three of the five leadership practices (Model, Challenge, Enable). Although not significant, students without any formal leadership training displayed higher leadership scores in the leadership practice of Encourage. The results of this study also showed that there was no statistical difference between male and female participants in overall leadership scores or in any of the five leadership practices. The next chapter will provide a detailed discussion of the findings presented in this chapter.
Table 13.

Differences in Construct Leadership Scores for Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.72</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five

Summary and Discussion

This chapter provides the reader with a summary and discussion of the findings of the study. This chapter will also provide conclusions and recommendations for current application of the results as well as recommendations for further research in this area.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in transformational leadership practices of collegiate men’s and women’s basketball teams and students from an Army Reserve Officers Training Program as measured by Kouzes and Posner’s Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) (2006). Four distinct groups were studied to determine the differences in leadership practices. The groups included collegiate level male basketball players, collegiate level female basketball players, male ROTC students and female ROTC students. All ROTC students had participated in a minimum of one year of formal leadership training. The study was designed to determine if past leadership training produced higher leadership scores among college students. The study also examined the variable of gender to determine if leadership practices differed between male and female students.

Review of Methodology

This study utilized the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) designed by James Kouzes and Barry Posner (2006) to examine the difference in leadership practices between basketball players and ROTC students. This survey is based on the conceptual leadership framework by Kouzes and Posner (2002) designed to examine five practices
of exemplary leadership which includes; Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage. Surveys were administered to each of the four cohorts consisting of 15 male basketball players, 13 female basketball players, 18 male ROTC students and 12 female ROTC students. Data were entered into the SLPI software and scoring reports were generated. The scoring reports were exported to Microsoft Excel and entered into SPSS for analysis. Reports generated mean scores for each of the five leadership practices. SPSS generated an overall mean score for each group being studied.

Independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare the mean scores of the groups in order to answer the three research questions stated in chapter one. The t-tests compared the overall leadership scores of the basketball players and ROTC students as well as the mean scores within each of the five leadership practices. An additional t-test was conducted to compare the leadership scores of the male and female participants.

Summary of the Results

This study was structured around two research questions which examined the impact of formalized leadership training on two distinct college student groups. The questions were designed to provide insight to the usefulness of leadership training within college athletics. A third research question was added to determine if there would be a significant difference in the leadership score of male and female students.

The first research question asked whether Army ROTC students who had received at least one year of formalized leadership training would demonstrate stronger overall leadership scores than the basketball players who had not received formalized leadership training. Pre-survey data collection indicated that no basketball players had received any formal leadership training. The findings suggest that formalized leadership training could
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potentially enhance the overall leadership scores of college students. However, a pre-test / post-test is needed to validate that statement. The results of the analysis (independent sample t-test) indicate that there is a statistically significant difference (t-test, 2-tailed, p-value < .05) in the overall leadership scores between the ROTC students and the basketball players. ROTC students with leadership training reported significantly higher leadership scores than the basketball players. Although the data reflected a statistically significant difference in the overall leadership score, significant differences were not reflected in each of the five leadership constructs.

The second research question asked whether the ROTC students with formalized leadership training would demonstrate stronger leadership scores in each of the five leadership practices (Model, Inspire, Challenge, Enable, and Encourage) than the basketball players without leadership training. Results indicated that leadership scores ROTC students were statistically higher in three of the five leadership constructs.

For the construct of Model, the results of the analysis (independent sample t-test) indicate that there is a statistically significant difference (t-test, 2-tailed, p-value < .05) within the leadership practice of Model. ROTC students demonstrated significantly higher leadership scores than basketball players in the Modeling practice.

The results of the analysis (independent sample t-test) of the practice of Challenge indicate that there is a statistically significant difference (t-test, 2-tailed, p-value < .05) within these two leadership practices. ROTC students had significantly higher leadership scores in Challenge than the basketball players.

The results of the analysis (independent sample t-test) of the practice of Enable indicate that there is a statistically significant difference (t-test, 2-tailed, p-value < .05)
within these two leadership practices. ROTC students had significantly higher leadership scores in Enable than the basketball players.

Two of the leadership constructs showed no difference between the two groups. The results of the analysis (independent sample t-test) of the Inspire and Encourage constructs indicate that there no statistical difference (t-test, 2-tailed, p-value <.05) between the ROTC students and the basketball players.

The final research question asked if there was a significant difference in the leadership scores of male and female participants. The results of the study showed that there was no statistical difference (t-test, 2-tailed, p-value <.05) between male and female participants in the overall leadership scores or within any of the five leadership constructs.

Discussion

Implications of the Study

The findings of the research indicate that formal leadership training could be an explanation for the higher leadership scores of the ROTC students. ROTC students who received formal leadership training demonstrated higher leadership scores than student-athletes who did not have formal leadership training. Although ROTC students and student-athletes have a different academic and career focus, they are not developmentally dissimilar. Both groups are college students studying within a variety of academic majors. The leadership training that ROTC students attend is available to student athletes. Research indicates that leadership training could enhance the leadership practices of the student-athlete and that leadership training could potentially enhance the athletic performance of the student-athlete.
The majority of the results of the study were extremely logical and expected. However, some of the results were slightly unanticipated but not unexplainable. The fact that ROTC students had higher overall leadership scores was not surprising. However, the fact that only three of the five leadership practices showed a statistically significant difference was somewhat unexpected. The study showed that there was no statistical difference in the practices of Inspire and Encourage. This requires the researcher to examine each of the practices as well as the ROTC curriculum to determine why there are statistical differences some, but not all of the practices. This is particularly interesting when ROTC students had higher overall leadership scores.

When examining the ROTC leadership curriculum and the nature of college basketball, the results seem completely logical. There is no indication that the ROTC curriculum should be altered in any way as a result of this study. Although ROTC students are taught to Inspire a Shared Vision, the practical application of this leadership practice is not emphasized because there is no centralized goal or focus for the vision.

ROTC may work in a team environment, but cadets must perform on an individual basis. The ROTC program has a centralized collective vision but reaching that vision is accomplished through decentralized performance. ROTC is more closely related to sports such as swimming or golf. In these types of sports, the performance of one athlete does not impact the performance of another athlete. A swimmer who swims poorly in an event will affect the team, but not another swimmer’s performance in another event. Therefore, it seems logical that simply learning about inspiring vision is not enough. There must be application of this process.
College basketball is a team sport. The team has a centralized vision and a centralized process to reach that vision. Players focus on winning games and winning a national championship. They all have the same focus and desired end-state to the season. The coach helps the players to shape that vision and maintain the focus throughout the season. In this type of team sport, one player’s performance will impact the outcome for all the players on the team. This leadership practices is learned informally from the coach and teams actively apply this principle all season long.

The fact that there was no statistical difference between ROTC students and basketball players in the leadership practice of Encourage is not surprising given the nature of college sports. Athletes naturally encourage other players. Athletes inherently understand that the performance of their teammates will directly affect the outcome of the game or match. Keeping teammates encouraged and motivated is necessary in reaching the team’s goal. Athletes do not need formal instruction to understand this principle.

The results of this study support previous research that identified the benefits of leadership development for organizations. Zimmerman-Oster and Burkhardt, (1999) noted that formal leadership training improved students’ ability to share power, develop vision, affect change and resolve conflict. The results of that longitudinal study found conclusive evidence to support formal leadership training.

The University of Georgia study involving the “LeaderShape” program found that leadership skills improved significantly over a ten week period of formal leadership training (Pugh, 2000). The test-retest model determined that the formal leadership program was effective. Evidence continues to mount that leadership is a skill or practice
that can be learned. This evidence may provide an impetus for athletic departments to encourage student-athletes to enroll in leadership development programs.

The fact that there was no significant statistical difference in the leadership scores of male and female participants was somewhat surprising given current research. Some past research has shown that leadership practices differ based on gender (Adams & Keim, 2002; Rand, 2004). However, the results of this study did support Posner and Brodskey’s (1994) findings in a study of fraternity and sorority presidents. Posner and Brodskey found that there were no statistical differences between men and women in any of the five leadership practices.

**Theoretical Implications**

In the review of literature it was noted that the majority of leadership research in athletics has focused on the coach (Dupuis et al., 2006). However, athletes are considered another source of leadership within teams and those athletes can fill both formal and informal leadership roles (Loughead & Hardy, 2005). There are implications within the realm of college athletics. It was also noted that even though little is known about the link between leadership and performance, there is a clear link between transformational leadership and organizational leadership (Boerner et al., 2007). Past research has shown that leadership is a critical factor in successful athletic teams (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1998; Dupuis et al., 2006).

This study revealed that students with leadership training demonstrated stronger leadership scores than students without leadership training. Enhancing student-athlete leadership practices could potentially enhance team success. Transformational leaders greatly improved follower behaviors such as “performance and innovation” (Boerner et
Coaches attempting to revive a failing athletic team may seek to train athletes in a formal leadership program in order to effectively transform the organization.

**Implications for Practice**

The results of this study and other studies regarding leadership development suggest that formal leadership training could benefit athletic programs. The leadership training administered by ROTC departments could potentially benefit university athletic departments. With college athletics becoming a multi-million dollar enterprise, enhancing student-athlete leadership should be a top priority. ROTC leadership training is available to student-athletes at no cost and can be applied toward the athlete’s graduation requirements. The results of this study indicate that leadership training could improve student-athlete leadership skills. University athletic departments could partner with ROTC departments to provide leadership training for student-athletes. ROTC departments possess the resources and the infrastructure to train large numbers of student-athletes. Additional students taking ROTC classes could enhance the quality of leadership training by providing students with opportunities to lead larger organizational groups.

Initiatives by university athletic departments, such as Baylor University, could be enhanced by partnering with the university ROTC department. By combining resources and training techniques, both programs could benefit from the partnership. Not only would leadership training benefit the athletic department, but it would also benefit student-athletes. The vast majority of college athletes will not compete on the professional level. Most will pursue careers in fields other than athletics. This training would benefit these athletes in any career field they chose to pursue.
Limitations of the Study

The research conducted in this dissertation was designed to determine if formal leadership training improves the leadership scores of college students thus warranting further investigation of the subject. Since the study involves a small number of student-athletes from only one college sport, it may be difficult to generalize the results across other sports and other university student groups. The relatively small sample prevents a thorough analysis of demographics such as academic standing, age, and number of years of leadership training.

As a result of the small population of female ROTC students, three female ROTC students with three years of leadership training were included in the sample. Only the first two years of ROTC leadership training is open to all college students. The third year of ROTC training is only available to students who plan to make the Army a career. These three students represented 10% of the overall sample population. By including ROTC students with a third year of leadership training, survey results could potentially be slightly higher as a result of the third year of leadership training. However, for this study, it was determined that the three students with a third year of training did not alter the results. Statistical analysis was conducted without the three females with three years of training and no differences were found in the results. By only including students with one or two years of ROTC training, it would better reflect the level of improvement that athletes could expect from participating in ROTC.

The leadership scores of the basketball players are compared with ROTC student scores. Although both groups are college students, both cohorts have a different college focus and different life goals. ROTC students study leadership in preparation for their
future roles as Army leaders. As an Army lieutenant, leadership is a critical job skill. Therefore, ROTC students would be more inclined to take a greater interest in their own leadership development.

Another factor to consider is the strong emphasis that ROTC places on becoming an effective leader. The leadership development program used in Army ROTC extrinsically motivates students to become better leaders. ROTC instructors drive students to be better leaders. Athletes receive passive, informal leadership training from their coaches. Leadership is not the primary focus of a coach. A coach emphasizes athletic performance rather than leadership.

Although leadership skills enhance athlete performance, those skills are less important than technical skills. An athlete’s perspective on leadership is much narrower in scope and plays a different role in the life of the student. These factors also make it difficult to generalize the results across a varied spectrum of students. The purpose of the study was to examine two specific student groups to determine if leader training improved leadership practices and to determine if further study in this area is needed.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Additional research is needed in the area of leadership and college athletics. This study clearly demonstrated that students with leadership training have higher leadership scores than students without leadership training. However, this study merely scratches the surface of potential studies within this field. In order to make better generalizations, this study should be replicated with larger sample populations. Larger samples would enable the researcher to examine demographics such as age, years in college, years of
leadership training, and type of sport. Expanding this study across universities as well as sports could enhance the visibility of leadership training within college athletics.

This study suggests that leadership training could improve leadership scores. However, it is necessary to determine if student-athlete leadership scores would be enhanced by participating in a year of ROTC leadership training. Using the test-retest model one could examine leadership scores before and after a year of ROTC instruction. Previous research by Pugh, (2000) supports the notion leadership instruction will improve the leadership scores of those within the formal program.

Further studies should be conducted to reveal if leadership training actually enhances athlete performance during the season. Examining a student-athlete’s performance before and after leadership training would demonstrate if leadership increases the player’s value as a team member.

Finally, it is recommended that this research be expanded to the team level by involving entire teams in leadership research. Since leadership is linked to team cohesion (Shields et al., 1997), researchers could determine if leadership training enhances team cohesion. These studies could be invaluable to athletic departments looking to enhance the effectiveness of their athletic programs.
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Appendix A

Pre-Survey Instructions

**KOUZES AND POSNER’S STUDENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY**

**Pre-Survey Instructions**
You have been asked to participate in a research study by taking a leadership survey. This survey was designed to measure the leadership practices of exemplary leaders as identified in Kouzes and Posner’s book “The Leadership Challenge”. Each student should have received one (1) Kouzes and Posner Student Leadership Practices Inventory, a pencil, and a plain brown envelope. This survey is completely voluntary. Each student will follow the instructions on the survey. Take as much time as you need to complete the survey. Once you complete the survey, place it in the brown envelope and seal the envelope. Give the envelope to the survey administrator. By completing the survey, you are giving your consent to participate in the research study. If you choose not to participate, place the blank survey in the envelope and return to the survey administrator. DO NOT PLACE YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THE SURVEY, OR PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION THAT COULD POSSIBLY LINK YOU TO THE SURVEY. HOWEVER, IF YOU DO WANT FEEDBACK FROM THE SURVEY YOU WILL NEED TO PLACE YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY. Data from this survey will kept in strictest confidentiality. If you choose to obtain the results of the survey, the results will be returned to you in a sealed envelope. Your individual results will not be published. The researcher will be the only one who has access to the survey data. There will be no identifiers gathered or included in this data. We will include nothing in the data that links you to the survey or this research.

**PLEASE CIRCLE THE ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**

1. WHAT IS YOUR GENDER?: **MALE** OR **FEMALE**

2. HAVE YOU PARTICIPATED IN **FORMAL** LEADERSHIP TRAINING FOR A YEAR OR MORE? **YES** OR **NO**

3. ARE YOU A **BASKETBALL PLAYER**? OR **ROTC CADET**?

4 IF YOU ARE A BASKETBALL PLAYER, HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU PLAYED COLLEGE BALL? **1** **2** **3** **4** **5**

5. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU SPENT IN COLLEGE **NOT INCLUDING** THE CURRENT ACADEMIC YEAR? **1** **2** **3** **4**

5. DO YOU HAVE PRIOR MILITARY SERVICE? **YES** **NO**

Please begin your survey.
Appendix B

STUDENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF

Your Name:

Instructions

On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then rate yourself in terms of how frequently you engage in the behavior described. This is not a test (there are no right or wrong answers). The usefulness of the feedback from this inventory will depend on how honest you are with yourself and how frequently you actually engage in each of these behaviors.

Consider each statement in the context of one student organization with which you are now (or have been most) involved with. This organization could be a club, team, chapter, group, unit, hall, program, project, and the like. As you respond to each statement, maintain a consistent perspective to your particular organization. The rating scale provides five choices. Circle the number that best applies to each statement:

(1) If you RARELY or SELDOM do what is described
(2) If you do what is described ONCE IN A WHILE
(3) If you SOMETIMES do what is described
(4) If you OFTEN do what is described
(5) If you VERY FREQUENTLY or ALMOST ALWAYS do what is described

In selecting the response, be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in the behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you typically behave.

For example, the first statement is “I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.” If you believe you do this once in a while, circle the number 2. If you believe you do this often, circle the number 4. Select and circle only one option (response number) for each statement.

Please respond to every statement. If you can’t respond to a statement (or feel that it doesn’t apply), circle a 1. When you have responded to all thirty statements, please turn to the response sheet on the back page and transfer your responses as instructed.
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## STUDENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF

How frequently do you typically engage in the following behaviors and actions? Circle the number to the right of each statement, using the scale below, that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 RARELY OR Seldom</th>
<th>2 Once in a while</th>
<th>3 Sometimes</th>
<th>4 Very often</th>
<th>5 Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I praise people for a job well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I spend time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed upon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I treat others with dignity and respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I find ways to get feedback about how my actions affect other people's performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I talk with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When things do not go as we expected, I ask, “What can we learn from this experience?”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I support the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I make it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I build consensus on an agreed-upon set of values for our organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I find ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I talk about the values and principles that guide my actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I speak with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transferring the Responses

After you have responded to the thirty statements on the previous two pages, please transfer your responses to the blanks below. This will make it easier to record and score your responses.

Notice that the numbers of the statements are listed horizontally across the page. Make sure that the number you assigned to each statement is transferred to the appropriate blank. Remember to fill in a response option (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) for every statement.

1. _____   2. _____   3. _____   4. _____   5. _____
26. _____  27. _____  28. _____  29. _____  30. _____

Further Instructions

Please write your name here: ________________________________

You should have received instructions to:
☐ Bring this page with you to the class (seminar or workshop) or
☐ Return this form to:

_____________________________________________________

If you are interested in feedback from other people, ask them to complete the Student LPI-Observer. This form provides perspectives on your leadership behaviors as perceived by other people.