Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations

Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations, and Graduate Capstone Projects

2006

Athletics donors' preferences for an athletics director's leadership characteristics and behaviors

Brian D. Wickstrom

Follow this and additional works at: http://commons.emich.edu/theses

Part of the Higher Education Administration Commons

Athletics Donors' Preferences for an Athletics Director's

Leadership Characteristics and Behaviors

by

Brian D. Wickstrom

Dissertation

Submitted to the Department of Leadership and Counseling

Eastern Michigan University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Dissertation Committee:

Helen Ditzhazy, PhD, Chair

Jackie Tracy, PhD

David Anderson, PhD

Robert Carpenter, PhD

Jack Minzey, EdD

February 15, 2006

Ypsilanti, MI

Approval

Athletics Donors' Preferences for an Athletics Director's

Leadership Characteristics and Behaviors

Brian D. Wickstrom

APPROVED:

_____   _____

Helen Ditzhazy, PhD   Date
Dissertation Chair

_____   _____

Dr. Jaclynn Tracy, PhD   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____

Dr. David Anderson, PhD   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____

Dr. Robert Carpenter, PhD   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____

Dr. Jack Minzey, PhD   Date
Committee Member

_____   _____

Dr. Robert Holkeboer, PhD   Date

Associate Vice President of Graduate Studies and Research

Dedication

I dedicate this to my identical twin brother, Kevin, for years of being my best friend and sharing thousands of hours of practice both at the high school and college level. Nobody could ask for a better best friend.

Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the help of many people. First, I am deeply thankful for three years plus of working with Dr. Helen Ditzhazy. She has supported my passion and focus of study since my first semester in the program. To Dr. Jackie Tracy and Dr. David Anderson, whose guidance and areas of expertise have not only helped me develop credibility on the academic side of campus, but each of whom has touched a part of me personally, and I will be forever grateful.

I am forever indebted to Dr. Jack Minzey for providing guidance well before I ever relocated from Santa Clara, California, to Ypsilanti, Michigan. He has been a long-time supporter both for me and someone very close to me. The doors that he and I talked about opening by my going through this program have already begun to open.

I am very appreciative of all of the time Dr. Robert Carpenter has invested in me as a doctoral student and throughout this dissertation process. His background, demeanor, and passion for touching the lives of students beyond the classroom will always be vividly remembered.

A special thanks to Bonney Brandt, Doug Gnodtke, and Eric Morrison for their assistance in the survey process of this study. An enormous thank you to my sister Cindy for her hours and hours of reading, editing, modifying, and deleting during this writing process. Without a single complaint, she was always willing to do one more review.

I am very grateful to Mike Alden for his willingness to be my mentor as I worked under his direction at the University of Missouri. I am even more grateful for his continuing to mentor me through every step of my career as I've moved on to other institutions. As my

number one priority, I will always keep a commitment to creating the best possible experience for student athletes.

A deep-hearted thanks to Suzy Merchant for allowing me to be a part of her basketball program the past three years to witness her genuine caring for student athletes, both as players and as young women.

I would like to thank my mom and dad, Cindy, John, Betsy, Andrea, and Elena for their continual love and support during my athletic, academic, and professional steps in life.

Most important, I want to thank and acknowledge Jesus Christ for continually blessing me in life and giving me the strength to overcome challenges on a weekly, daily, and hourly basis.

Abstract

NCAA Division-IA intercollegiate athletics has become a big business with equally big expenses. Today's intercollegiate athletics departments are feeling the state budget cuts, the strain to maximize donor support in order to balance the budget, and the challenge of chasing the ongoing goal of providing the best student athlete experience possible to young men and women across the country.

It is absolutely critical today for intercollegiate athletics departments to run successful fundraising campaigns. Leadership has been shown to be one of the most significant factors in the successful development efforts of an intercollegiate athletics department. Research has shown that when athletics departments use the traditional top-down approach to leadership that is not inclusive of all involved, the department's finances suffer. Therefore, finding alternative leadership styles to enhance development efforts is more critical than ever. In theory, the transformational leadership style offers many of the qualities needed for athletics directors to run successful financial campaigns; however, there is minimal research on the leadership characteristics needed to sustain successful development and fundraising initiatives. Therefore, the primary research questions asked in this study pertain to how various leadership styles, and the transformational leadership style in particular, affect a donor's willingness to contribute to a university's athletics department.

To address these questions, a correlational research design using survey questions was designed to ask donors to respond to questions pertaining to an Athletic Director's (AD) behavior, philosophy, and actions. The donors were asked to rate on a scale of 1-5 whether they preferred a stated characteristic or behavior. In addition to this set of questions pertaining to leadership styles, donors were asked seven demographic questions and an

additional question to determine the relationship between a donor's inclination to support the program and his or her preference for transformational leadership characteristics in the AD's leadership style.

The responses to the survey questions and their relationship to the demographic data were analyzed. A strong preference was found by the seven different donor constituencies for an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style. In addition, the analysis revealed an overwhelming response that donors who shared similar values with an athletic director who used a transformational leadership style were more inclined to continue contributing to the athletics program.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter is divided into four sections: (a) section one includes the background of the study, (b) section two covers the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study, (c) section three covers methodology, and (d) section four is devoted to variables and terminology. The background of the study includes a discussion of the rising costs of intercollegiate athletics, the role of the athletics director, and the increasing role of donor support and fundraising. The next section includes a summary of the issues surrounding leadership and fundraising in college athletics departments, with a proposed solution to the problem; and a projected significance of the results. The methodology section includes a brief summary of research design, study population, and apparatus used in the research. The final section covers the limitations and delimitations of the study, the independent and dependent variables, and a definition of key terms.

Today's intercollegiate athletics departments are feeling the strain more than ever to maximize donor support in order to continue providing the highest quality athletics programs for students and college sports fans. When examining the factors that influence donor support, the leadership style of the school's athletics director ranks high. By using a survey based on a correlation-quantitative analysis research design, this study sought to discern whether donors preferred an Athletic Director who utilizes a transformational leadership style and hypothesizes that this can increase donors' inclination to donate.

Transformational leadership refers to a leadership style characterized by the "Four 'I's": (a) idealized influence or charisma, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994). It involves inspiring trust and eliciting support for the fulfillment of collective goals (Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass &

Avolio, 1994; Bennis, 1989a). Robert Keller's (1995) research supports the hypothesis that transformational leadership should help accomplish department-wide goals and increase employee satisfaction in order to achieve goals. In college athletics, that is maximizing the student-athlete experience. Given the documented ability of transformational leaders to influence stakeholder groups, transformational leadership should have a tremendous impact on maximizing the philanthropic gifts to the Intercollegiate Athletics Department (IAD) (Bass, 1999). When the IAD is structured so that the Director of Athletics Development reports to the Director of Athletics (AD), a natural connection is formed between the transformational leadership opportunity of the AD and successful fundraising in a Division-IA institution.

Background of the Study

The Rising Costs of Intercollegiate Athletics

NCAA Division-IA intercollegiate athletics has become a big business with equally big expenses. The average NCAA Division-IA IAD expense budget has increased 110% over the past decade from $13 million for the 1993 fiscal year to $27.3 million dollars for the 2003 fiscal year (Fulks, 2003). Between 1995 and 2001, the budgets of intercollegiate athletics departments (IADs) in Division I schools rose more than twice as fast as the overall university budget (Frank, 2004). Of the eleven NCAA Division-IA conferences and the group of independents, only four conferences (Big 12, Big 10, Mountain West, SEC) reported an average net profit for their conference members for the 2001-2002 academic year (Fulks, 2003). The overall NCAA Division-IA average, excluding institutional support, was a net loss of $600,000 for the same academic year. Only three of the six Bowl Championship

Series Conferences reported an average net profit for member schools. Without that revenue, even those three fortunate conferences would have probably been operating at a loss. Typical non-philanthropic revenue sources for a Division-IA IAD include the following:

- Ticket revenue

- Sponsorships

- Licensing fees

- NCAA Championship revenues

- Media rights

- Rent

- Conference guarantees

- Miscellaneous revenue

What Contributes to the Rise in Costs?

Skyrocketing expense budgets can be attributed to a variety of environmental pressures. Competition is fierce as well as the drive for continuous performance improvement. This necessitates the construction of cutting-edge athletics facilities as the institution competes in the "arms race of college athletics" (Suggs, 2003, p. 1). There are also the costs of complying with governmental and National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) regulations, the mushrooming contract costs of top coaching staffs, and the increased costs of maintaining if not increasing graduation rates of student athletes. Expenses are typically related to the following:

- Salaries

- Scholarships

- Equipment

- Travel

- Publications

- Contractual obligations

- Recruiting

- Miscellaneous expenses

The soaring costs of maintaining elite athletics teams are placing increasing pressure on administrators, specifically athletics directors, to generate revenues.

The Role of the Athletics Director

The "Old School" AD

The "old school" career path of a college athletics director (AD) often reflected a former student athlete or coach who had completed a successful career as an athlete or coach. The head football coach, for example, would record numerous victories on the gridiron; when he became tired of putting in long hours, twelve months a year, he would step into the role of AD. The success of this individual in his or her past role as an athlete or coach would provide instant credibility in the college athletics field. The acclaimed former athlete or coach would be seen as a "natural" to step in to run the athletics program. The popularity of the "old school" AD was derived from his or her former performance and familiarity to constituents. He was given complete control because of his charisma and popularity.

The AD's responsibilities were primarily to fund the existing programs and allow the IAD to maintain the athletics teams while contributing to the institution's mission and guidelines. The AD was also held accountable for operating within the NCAA rules and regulations, although the number of rules was minimal compared with the volume produced in the world of big business today.

The "New School" AD

Due to the complex nature of IADs today, institutional presidents hire search firms and/or put together inclusive search committees to match the experiences of qualified candidates with institutional needs. Corporate business backgrounds, public relations expertise, law degrees, and business development experience are commonly sought characteristics of some of the ADs hired today. A coaching background no longer appears to be a prerequisite. In 2000, the University of Michigan hired businessman and President of the United States Olympic Committee, Bill Martin, to take its IAD from the red into the black. In 2004, Colorado State University hired bank president Mark Driscol from the private sector to sit in the number one spot in athletics on the Fort Collins campus.

Today, every decision made by an AD is examined under the public's microscope, particularly those having to do with how money is spent. This is very different from the days when an AD had complete autonomy.

*Responsibilitie*s.

The twenty-first century AD also has a much more demanding, complex set of responsibilities than in the past. She/he is responsible for cost control, compliance with continually changing NCAA legislation, fundraising, recruiting of student athletes, and overseeing the coaching staffs. The AD is also responsible for organizing and motivating employees, complying with institutional, NCAA, and federal rules and regulations, and directing all operations of the department. And, of course, the AD must never lose sight of winning the expected number of yearly contests.

Increasingly, the ADs success is measured by the fulfillment of traditional business or educational leadership objectives, in addition to demonstrating ongoing success in the arena

of intercollegiate athletics. ADs today carry the weight of responsibility when it comes to keeping the department financially solvent. Mike Alden, AD at the University of Missouri, is a good example of what it takes to keep an IAD in the black with all of the below mentioned options. When expenses exceed revenues, it is up to the AD to determine the best course of action.

Options for Athletics Departments That Are in the Red

While some high-profile teams thrive, nearly 75% of the largest intercollegiate athletics programs operate in the red (Raiborn, 1990). The end result is ever-expanding costs of operations for IADs. For the most part, the AD has four options to avoid reducing programs: (a) obtain additional resources from the institution, (b) increase operating revenue, (c) increase fundraising, and/or (d) cut expenses.

Obtain Additional Resources from the Institution

If the institution is already experiencing reductions in support from the state and federal government and allowable tuition increases are barely sufficient to allow the institution to keep its doors open, additional funding from the institution is no longer an option.

Increase Operating Revenue

Increasing revenue in an IAD can be a difficult task that is out of an AD's control. If an institution resides in a saturated market for entertainment, athletics from other institutions, or professional sports teams, increasing the number of fans and/or market share is a hard income factor to rely on. It is not a fiscally sound practice to only count on increasing revenue via sponsorship and ticket sales while making a commitment to 18-22-year-olds about a sound student-athlete experience.

Increase Fundraising

Today's fundraising in intercollegiate athletics is a rapidly increasing model for a number of institutions because it has proven to stabilize operating budgets and generate a robust source of income. The alumni bases of institutions continue to grow each year when new classes of graduates join the work force. With athletics events being a common gathering point when the students are on campus or when the alumni come back for football games in the fall or basketball games in the winter, the IAD gets to tell its story and educate all of those fans each time they come to campus, pick up a broadcast on the radio or television, or read an article in the local print media. In addition, they have the local, year-round fan base.

Cut Expenses

Cutting expenses in an IAD is no different than if a major corporation such as IBM would downsize. The options are to cut staff and benefits, cut sports budgets, and/or eliminate sports. All of these options portray a negative picture for an IAD. Parents have entrusted the institution to provide the best student-athlete experience for their children. These young men and women are on college campuses to compete in an activity that they enjoy and to complete a college degree. When an IAD cuts expenses that can potentially detract from the experience that the coaches promised these student athletes during the recruiting process, the institution loses credibility.

Of these four options, fundraising has been very effective; therefore it tends to be the one most often selected by IADs. The following provides some background on fundraising for college athletics departments today and in the past.

The Increasing Role of Donor Support

In universities, as in most non-profit organizations, private donations account for a much greater proportion of revenues than corporations and remain a major source of revenue in an atmosphere of accelerating athletics costs. In fact, the share of revenues coming from private donations has risen substantially in the past 30 years to "become a consistent factor in the funding of many athletics programs" (Verner, Hecht, & Fansler, 1998, p. 124). In the elite NCAA Division I-A, private donations account for approximately 15% of funding (Verner et al., 1998). After tripling from 5% in 1965, this figure has remained fairly stable since 1990.

Brief History of Fundraising for Athletics

Fundraising in college athletics has existed for decades. In the early years of athletics fundraising, people would donate money for a specific purpose. The football team might need new uniforms or the team might need new equipment. If a sports team wanted to attend an "away" contest and the budget was not sufficient to cover the additional expenses, the department would hold a car wash or some other minimal, short-term, revenue-generating event. Fundraising activities of this type were usually headed by a small sport-specific booster group. The group might rally around an event every football season with the "cause of the season" as the focal point. The private support served to enhance the department's budget, but it did not generate a profit for the department.

Traditionally, managing an IAD was accomplished through a top-down, hierarchical structure, reflecting the bureaucratic model that has historically governed business organizations (Bennis, 1989). The AD made all the decisions and sent the messages

downward to his staff. The flow of communication was entirely unidirectional from leader to subordinates.

Fundraising for Athletics Today

The historically simplistic model of fundraising is outmoded and inadequate for addressing today's complex array of expenses. Now, as a percentage of an IAD's operating budget, fundraising has been forced to increase dramatically to keep the programs afloat. The increased focus on athletics, in conjunction with the greater number of student athletes allowed to participate, magnifies the importance of targeted fundraising in college athletics.

Historically, university development offices were housed in a central campus location to meet all of the institution's fundraising needs. As a result of the imperative nature of athletics department development activities, athletics programs now often have their own development staffs housed under the department's umbrella.

The athletics development staff is typically composed of one or more development officers. Development officers' tasks include building and furthering relationships with individuals who have contributed in the past, prospecting for new contributors, and cultivating or identifying potential contributors who have some relationship with the department but have not provided any financial support. The athletics development department may receive contributions that are considered as either "designated" or "undesignated." Designated contributions are earmarked for a specific project or program. Supporters of athletics programs range from the annual $50 donor to the individual who makes seven-figure plus gifts to the department.

The Role of Today's Athletics Director in Fundraising

The AD's role in fundraising is to determine the department's top priorities, publicly relay these choices to the community, and build close relationships with top donors. Due to the importance of philanthropic support, as well as other revenue sources, ADs are also expected to play a key role in generating philanthropic donations, as well as other streams of revenue such as sponsorships and license fees. To assure that his or her department thrives, the AD must be able to establish congruence between the IAD's administrative staff, the external relations staff, the coaches, and the donors. In the new world of "big business" college athletics, a successful AD must have each group in the department on the same page and striving for the same goals.

The AD also has final say as to allocation of the philanthropic contributions received. Contributions designated for a specific sport or project can provide financial support that may allow the coach or administrator for that area additional flexibility in that year's planning and operations. The undesignated gifts provide the department with additional financial resources to be allocated, as the AD feels appropriate, to support either the overall department operations or specific programs. Whether an AD is successful in these endeavors has a lot to do with leadership style.

Trends in leadership styles are still being set by the business world. For example, transformational leadership emerged as a prominent theme in business during the competitive and unpredictable economic climate that marked the 1970s and 1980s (Yukl, 1989). The current environment in which athletics departments occupy increasing prominence on college campuses while directors face pressures to generate revenues has its parallel in those years of organizational upheaval. There is some evidence from professional (Ristow, Amos, &

Staude, 1999) and Olympic sports (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2004) that the qualities of

transformational leadership produce positive outcomes, particularly at times of upheaval,

thus supporting Yukl's assertion that charismatic leaders have the power to transform and

revitalize organizations (1989).

How Transformational Leadership Can Strengthen Development

Transformational leadership can positively impact the development efforts of an

intercollegiate athletics department in a variety of ways. It can be valuable for uniting

disparate groups in the pursuit of mutually attractive goals (Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass &

Avolio, 1994). Additionally, donor loyalty is enhanced as a result of the individualized

consideration that is one of the hallmarks of transformational leadership

(Sargeant, 2001).

Statement of the Problem

It is absolutely critical today for intercollegiate athletics departments to run successful

fundraising campaigns in order to maintain their standing in the academic community.

Leadership has been shown to be one of the most significant factors in the successful

development efforts of an intercollegiate athletics department. Research has shown that when

athletics departments use the traditional top-down approach to leadership that is not inclusive

of all involved, the department's finances suffer. Therefore, finding alternative leadership

styles that will enhance development efforts is more critical than ever. In theory,

transformational leadership style offers many of the qualities needed for athletics directors to

run successful financial campaigns; however, there is minimal research on the leadership

characteristics needed to sustain a successful intercollegiate athletics program economically,

i.e., development and fundraising. Solid, objective research is needed to demonstrate the need for such leadership.

Purpose of the Study

The overarching purpose of this study was to add to the body of research on leadership styles in college athletics departments. It was also to determine whether an AD's use of transformational leadership style would have a positive impact on fundraising within a Division I-A IAD. This study was designed to examine donor preferences for an AD's characteristics and behaviors. The study further sought to tie donor's preferences of an AD's characteristics and behaviors to continued philanthropic support for the department of athletics.

When finalizing the focus of the study, seven categories were derived. The groups were alumni, former student athletes, football season ticket holders, men's basketball season ticket holders, donors living within a 50-mile radius of the central campus, donors who attend women's sporting events on campus, and donors who interact at least 12 times in an academic year directly with the AD. Mike Alden, AD at the University of Missouri, has previously led the athletics programs at Texas State University, held an administrative leadership position at Arizona State University, and held an external administrative position at New Mexico; he reiterated the importance of the selected groups, "These seven groups collectively represent a strong voice around the state of Missouri. He reiterated that these groups provide an accurate pulse of the supporters of the University of Missouri Athletics program" (personal communication 10/31/05).

Joe Parker, Associate Athletics Director at the University of Michigan, also has managed fundraising at four NCAA Division I-A institutions including Michigan, Washington State University, the University of Texas, and the University of Oklahoma. After review of the selected groups included in the study, Joe Parker affirmed this classification of respondents, saying, "I am confident the seven groups identified are the primary support constituencies for intercollegiate athletic departments. In general, these groups are deeply committed to the quality of the student athlete experience and are receptive to appeals for support" (personal communication November 1, 2005).

Methodology and Research Design

Based on a correlational research design, this study used a customized survey to explore the donor's preferences of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style on donor's choices to support or not support a given institution's athletics department. Existing variables such as demographics were examined to determine their association with leadership style preferences as opposed to manipulating variables as in an experimental design. The participants of this study included the top 100 active donors of the University of Michigan (Big Ten Conference) IAD and the University of Missouri (Big Twelve Conference) IAD. Descriptive statistics were utilized to describe the respondents' answers, and then analyses were conducted to determine the numbers of participants in each of the categories addressed by the research questions. Inferential statistics were performed if there were a sufficient number of participants in each category.

Limitations

By design, this study was limited to a select population. By virtue of being composed of

only major donors to the athletics programs of Division I-A institutions, the findings may not

be generalized to donors at other levels or to donors to Division II or Division III athletics

programs. In addition, findings of this study may not be representative of donors to other

Division I-A institutional conferences.

Delimitations

There are 119 institutions competing at the NCAA Division IA level. There are

several hundred institutions competing at the NCAA Division IAA, IAAA, II, and III levels.

This study was be restricted to two institutions from two of the six Bowl Championship

Series Conferences.

Independent and Dependent Variables

The independent variables for this study were the characteristics of active donors to a

Division I-A intercollegiate athletics program. The dependent variables were donors'

preferences for transformational leadership qualities in an AD.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

1. Division I-A: Division I-A refers to the most elite and competitive division of

   intercollegiate athletics. Financial and performance pressures are greatest in this

division.

2. Bowl Championship Series: Established before the 1998 football season to determine the National Champion while maintaining the integrity of the existing bowl system.

3. Big Ten Conference (Big Ten): Athletic conference founded in 1896 with seven charter members. Current members include Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Northwestern, Ohio State, Penn State, Purdue, and Wisconsin.

4. Big Twelve Conference (Big Twelve): Athletic Conference founded in 1994 with eight teams from the Big Eight Conference merged with four teams from the Southwest Conference. Current members include Baylor, Colorado, Iowa State, Kansas, Kansas State, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, Texas, Texas A & M, and Texas Tech.

5. IAD: This acronym refers to an intercollegiate athletics department (IAD).

6. AD: This acronym refers to an intercollegiate athletics director (AD).

7. Active donor: This is an individual who has donated money to the IAD within the past twelve months.

8. Transformational leadership: This term refers to a leadership style characterized by the "Four 'I's": (a) idealized influence or charisma, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

9. Transactional leadership: This is a leadership style based on exchanges between leaders and followers.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether they were alumni of the institution to which they donate? DO top alumni and non-alumni donors to athletics programs at Division-1A colleges differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership?

2. Is there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether they were former student athletes? Do top former student athlete and non-former student athlete donors to athletics programs differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership?

3. Is there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether they were football season ticket holders? Do top football season ticket holders and non-season football ticket holder donors to athletics programs at Division-1A colleges differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership?

4. Is there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether they were men's basketball season ticket holders? Do top basketball season ticket holders and non-season basketball ticket holder donors to

athletics programs at Division-1A colleges differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership?

5. Is there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether they lived in the local community (within a 50-mile radius of the central campus)? Do top local community member (donors who live within a 50-mile radius of the central campus) and non-local community member (do not live within a 50-mile radius of the central campus) donors to athletics programs at Division-1A colleges differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership?

6. Is there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether they attended women's sporting events? Do top donors who attended women's sporting events compared with top donors who did not attend women's sporting events at Division-1A colleges differ in their preference an AD utilizing transformational leadership?

7. Is there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether they interacted regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director? Do donors who interact regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director compared with donors who do not interact regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director at Division-1A colleges differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership?

Research Hypotheses

1. Alumni and non-alumni of the institution to which they donate will differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

2. Former student athletes and non-former student athletes of the institution to which they donate will differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

3. Football season ticket holders and football non-season ticket holders will differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

4. Men's basketball season ticket holders and non-basketball season ticket holders will differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

5. Donors who live in the local community (within a 50-mile radius of the central campus) and donors who do not live in the local community will differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

6. Donors who attend women's sporting events and donors who do not attend women's sporting events will differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

7. Donors who interact regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director and donors who do not interact regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director will differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

Significance of the Study

Fundraising has become a critical component of operating revenue for a successful IAD. Understanding how a donor's preference for an AD's use of transformational leadership style can influence donor behavior has the potential to dramatically raise the level of fundraising success. Despite a large body of research documenting the preferences of organizational stakeholders for transformational leadership and the subsequent impact of leadership style on productivity and profitability, there is very little research on leadership style in college athletics. The findings of this study can be used by college and university presidents to establish leadership style criteria when conducting a search for an AD. In addition, the information gained from this study will assist current leaders of IADs in evaluating their own leadership behavior and the impact it has on fundraising procedures and outcomes in order to stabilize operating budgets and maximize the student-athlete experience.

Summary

This chapter provided a brief introduction to the issues pertaining to some of the current day challenges in operating an IAD, including the following: (a) the background of funding the operations of an IAD including the role of the AD, characteristics of transformational leadership, fundraising and current day obstacles, (b) the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study, and (c) the methodology and research design including the limitations, delimitations, and definition of the terms. Chapter 2 will be a review of the literature. Chapter 3 will present the expanded methodology and design of the study. In

Chapter 4, the data will be presented and analyzed, and in Chapter 5, results will be presented

and recommendations for further study will be discussed.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Since the middle of the 17th century, American colleges and universities have been dependent on the private, voluntary support of numerous stakeholder groups (Stutler & Calvario, 1996). In recent years, expenditures on intercollegiate athletic programs have soared dramatically. Between 1995 and 2001, the budgets of intercollegiate athletic departments (IADs) in Division I schools rose more than twice as rapidly as the overall university budget (Frank, 2004). Although a few elite athletic programs unquestionably benefit from impressive revenues brought in by high profile teams, many others are likely to have athletic expenses that outweigh financial rewards. Even if the financial benefits of an athletic program outweigh its expenditures, escalating costs subject even administrators whose program are "in the black" to generate revenues.

Colleges and universities have had to rely on multiple channels for obtaining funds to support intercollegiate athletic programs: sponsorships, ticket revenue, conference revenue generated by bowl games and NCAA Tournament appearances by conference members, and fundraising efforts aimed at private and corporate entities. Nonprofit organizations, in general, obtain a far greater share of their revenues from private donors than corporations. Their contributions are especially vital in the arena of intercollegiate sports:

Since the mid-1960s, private donations have been an increasing part of the funding for intercollegiate athletics. Not only has the absolute dollar amount increased, but the proportion of revenue from private donors has tripled. The portion of intercollegiate athletics revenue that comes from private donations has not only increased over the

last 30 years, but has also become a consistent factor in the funding of many athletics

programs. (Verner et al., 1998, p. 124)

In the elite NCAA Division I-A, private donations account for roughly 15% of

funding (Verner et al., 1998). Tripling from 5% in 1965, this figure has remained fairly stable

since 1990. Private donations remain a key source of revenue in an atmosphere of

accelerating athletic costs.

The increasingly competitive environment that intercollegiate athletics programs face

may be viewed as analogous to the competitive and unpredictable economic conditions that

spurred interest in new models of business leadership during the 1970s and early 1980s

(Yukl, 1989). Ironically, although athletic departments occupy increasingly more prominent

positions on college campuses, there has been minimal research into the leadership qualities

needed to create and sustain a successful intercollegiate athletics program. This study seeks

to determine a relationship between transformational leadership and fundraising success in a

Division I-A athletic program. This chapter will begin with a discussion of leadership

theories and research, followed by evaluation of leadership practices in athletic department

settings, research on donor behavior, and the relationship between donor behavior and

intercollegiate athletic programs.

Leadership Theory and Practice

Research on leadership in organizational settings became a prominent topic during

the twentieth century (Yukl, 1989). Although the systematic study of organizational

leadership is a relatively new endeavor, exploring the characteristics of successful leaders has

fascinated philosophers and historians for centuries.

Contemporary leadership theorists often invoke ancient sources. In a discussion on leadership, Peter Senge turned to Plato and Confucius. Although those classical thinkers had very different philosophical outlooks, both were renowned for their integrity. Asked his views on good leadership, Senge began, "For me personally, the oldest stream of important thinking is at least 2,500 to 3,000 years old. It has to do with trying to understand the imperatives or requirements in terms of personal development, cultivation, or maturity if one is in a position of leadership" (Senge, Heifitz, & Torbert, 2000, p. 57).

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) saw Plato and Confucius as the ideal embodiment of authentic transformational leadership:

Both Socrates and Confucius base their approach upon authentic inspirational motivation. Each proposes a transcendent vision of fulfillment, justice, and peace based upon the right ordering of relationships. Each is transcendent and grasps the "beyond in our midst," a better future. Each transforms by invitation, not by coercion. Each manifests constancy between word and deed. (Bass & Steadlmeier, 1999, p. 191)

The idea that a vision of transformation, commitment to justice, the power to engage supporters by inspiration rather than force, and the integrity shown by congruency between words and actions are hallmarks of excellent leadership has become a prominent theme in organizational literature (Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Burns, 1978; Bennis, 1989a, 1989b; Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1990, 2001, 2003a). The business environment of the 1970s was marked by rampant job dissatisfaction and growing awareness that American industry was losing its competitive advantage in a rapidly changing global economy (Bennis, 1989b). Leadership and organization theorists such as Warren

Bennis, James MacGregor Burns, Robert Greenleaf, and Rosabeth Moss Kanter envisioned new models of leadership that contrasted radically with the traditional bureaucratic system of command and control. With the realization that maintaining the status quo was no longer a viable option, "management researchers suddenly became very interested in charismatic leadership and the transformation and revitalization of organizations" (Yukl, 1989, p. 269). Jay Conger, also representative of a new vision of leadership, commented that conventional management literature was suffused with a "Machiavellian quality" that exhorted managers to protect and expand their power base. He added, "At the same time a small but increasing number of management theorists have begun to explore the idea that organizational effectiveness also depends on the sharing of power—that the distribution of power is more important than the hoarding of power" (Conger, 1989, p. 17).

Servant Leadership

The most dramatic departure from the "stereotype of the all-powerful executive" (Conger, 1989, p. 17) is Greenleaf's (1977) model of servant leadership. In a paradigm shift from the traditional leader and follower roles, the servant leader gives priority to the needs and wishes of followers. In this altruistic conception of leadership, the leader gains trust and complicity by showing respect for the value and dignity of all constituents. Through an intrinsic desire to serve, the servant leader aspires to lead primarily by persuasion (emanating from the followers' trust) and by example, which entails "constancy between word and deed" (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999, p. 191).

Senge (1990) drew on Greenleaf's (1977) depiction of servant leadership to devise a model of *stewardship* for organizational leadership. According to Senge (1990), stewardship works on two levels: the leaders' sense of stewardship for their followers, as well as for the

mission that drives the organization. The first type of stewardship emanates from acute awareness of the impact that the leader's actions can have on others. Senge contended that this vulnerability is greater in an environment in which members are strongly committed to shared visions and goals. This recognition should, in this model, naturally imbue leaders with a sense of responsibility. The second type of stewardship emanates from a leader's sense of purpose and dedication to the larger mission of the enterprise.

Senge (1990) endowed the concept of steward leadership with pragmatism that is missing from Greenleaf's (1977) idealistic model. To Senge (1990), leaders who relinquish autocratic power in favor of stewardship are committed to change, not out of a vague sense of philanthropy, but from a genuine belief that the transformation of organizations will increase productivity, ultimately leading to greater organizational success and personal satisfaction.

Transformational and Transactional Leadership

Burns (1978) was the first theorist to use the term *transforming* in the context of leadership. Burns claimed that a leader must possess strong moral integrity, which transforms the experience of both leader and follower. Transformational leaders inspire their followers in a way that ideally enables both parties: "the result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (Burns, p. 4).

Burns (1978) contrasted transformational leadership with transactional leadership. Transactional leadership is contingent on an exchange between leader and follower. Whereas transformational leaders inspire others by invoking ideals and values such as justice, equality, and peace, transactional leaders typically appeal to the self-interests of their followers.

Additionally, transactional leadership is based on formally mandated authority that stratifies positions and governs the interactions of superiors and subordinates. Transformational leaders can come from any level of the organization. Senge (1990) stressed that in a learning organization, leadership is independent of titles. Transformational leadership involves the multidirectional flow of communication and ideas, which means that organizational members can influence peers and superiors as well as subordinates. Similarly, Ron Heifeitz, in discussion with Senge, emphasized the importance of distinguishing leadership from formal authority. Recognizing that critical distinction facilitates the identification of individuals who exercise leadership at all organizational levels (Senge et al., 2000).

One way of framing the difference between transformational leadership and transactional leadership is to say that transactional leaders appeal to the lower levels of Maslow's (1968) needs hierarchy such as food, shelter, and safety while transformational leaders appeal to the uniquely human higher needs. Exalting self-esteem and self-actualization as the highest human needs, human resource theorist Mahesh (1993) asserted that personal and professional development are linked. According to Mahesh, "Quality of performance is best when an individual is intrinsically motivated towards self-actualization through achievement of mastery and self-esteem in his or her chosen field of endeavor" (p. 66).

Bass (1999) proposed that Burns (1978) intended transformational leadership to go even beyond that level "by describing the transforming leader as one who not only moved followers up on Maslow's hierarchy, but also moved them to transcend their own self-interests, presumably their own self-realization" (p. 12). The idea that altruism and good citizenship behaviors of exemplary transformational leaders are consistent with the highest

level of human realization may also serve to satisfy those who criticize Maslow for alleged self-centeredness.

In the past two decades, the term *transformational leadership* has become ubiquitous in the literature. Even when the term is not used explicitly, there is growing consensus that the qualities of effective leadership involve the ability to inspire and motivate others to higher performance beyond the promise of extrinsic rewards or threat of punishment.

At roughly the same time that Burns (1978) presented his model of transformational leadership, Bennis published *The Unconscious Conspiracy*. Bennis decried the social and organizational forces that constrain the ability of leaders to transform organizations and work to preserve a flawed and outmoded status quo. A decade later, Bennis (1989b) expanded and refined his insights on leadership. Emphasizing the vital importance of transcending obstacles to the process of positive change, Bennis presented four competencies he considered essential to good leadership:

1. *Management of attention*: the ability to conceive and realize a vision.

2. *Management of meaning*: the ability to communicate the vision to others to engage their support.

3. *Management of trust*: maintaining consistency and integrity.

4. *Management of self*: possessing high self-regard and being able to view mistakes as opportunities.

In his recent work, Bennis emphasized the important role of the leader in creating a culture that captures the realities of the world in which it operates (Bernhut, 2001, p. 37). To distinguish the "organizational ecology" of the 21st century, Bennis used the metaphor of an analogue versus a digital society. The traditional linear, hierarchical industrial bureaucracy

was appropriate for the relative stability of an analogue society. A global society characterized by "galloping technology…rapid change, and complexity" demands a "non-linear-discontinuous" or digital organization, that is, a dynamic, flexible, nonhierarchical organization that reflects the vision of a leader who is capable of inspiring "the kind of spirit, purpose and passion that's needed today" (Bernhut, 2001, p. 37). To describe the analogue world of organizations, Bennis devised the acronym COP: Control, Order, and Predict. In sharp contrast, the acronym for the digital world is ACE: Align, Create, and Empower.

Visionaries like Bennis recognized that the analogue bureaucracy had reached a state of stagnation by the 1970s and 1980s. Bennis recently stated that "the very core of what leadership is all about" involves "creating the social architecture that can in turn create intellectual capital" (Bernhut, 2001, p. 37). Consistent with Senge (1990), Bennis viewed "developing leaders and building a learning environment" as essential aspects of creating intellectual capital (Bernhut, 2001, p. 37). Two decades ago, Kanter (1983) referred to leaders capable of creating the type of social architecture that creates intellectual capital as *change masters.* Change masters are individuals with innovative ideas that extend beyond the routine practices of the organization. They are capable of forming their ideas into a vision. Change masters thrive in "integrative environments that support innovation, encourage the building of coalitions and teams to support and implement visions" (p. 28). Both Bennis (1989b) and Kanter (1983) recognized that just as leaders influence the culture of the organization, organizational culture may either facilitate or inhibit change.

Kanter (1983) outlined five "major building blocks" or "forces" that exist in an environment where changes occur to enhance the organization's ability to confront new challenges (p. 21). The first involves "*departures from tradition,*" which typically take place

at the grassroots level (p. 21). These activities may be introduced by innovative or entrepreneurial organization members (a frequent occurrence in organizations that welcome creativity), or they may occur accidentally in the absence of contingency planning (p. 21).

The second force is a *"crisis" or "galvanizing event"* (p. 22). In the context of fundraising in the IAD, this may involve a decline in donations, major changes to the athletics department, or the increasing costs and increasing competition for donors that characterize the current environment.

The third force delineated by Kanter (1983) is "*strategic decisions"* (p. 23). Kanter noted that this point in the change process has been a prominent focus of attention: "This is the point at which leaders enter, and strategies are developed" (p. 23) to apply the innovations to solving the problems that emerged from the crisis situation. Leaders and organizations that embrace innovation and change have an advantage in the successful application of strategic planning.

The fourth force calls for individual *"prime movers"* (p. 23). These are people who are committed to the change process and willing to exert effort to realize it through, even when enthusiasm begins to wane. Kanter used the term "idea champion" for these dedicated individuals, stating, "Empowering champions is one way leaders solidify commitment to a new strategy" (p. 23). Prime movers must be especially adept at the communication skills that are essential for inspiring and enlisting the commitment of others (Bennis, 1989b; Conger, 1991; Senge, 1990). Kanter (1983) emphasized that the messages they convey must be authentic expressions of the prime movers' strong commitment and they must be communicated forcefully and persistently to be effective.

Kanter's (1983) final force is *action vehicles:*

The last critical force for guiding productive change involves making sure there are

mechanisms that allow the new action possibilities to be expressed. The actions

implied by the changes cannot reside on the level of ideas, as abstractions, but must

be concretized in actual procedures or structures or communication channels or

appraisal measures or work methods or rewards. (Kanter, 1983, p. 25)

Once these mechanisms for change are put into operation, they create *"momentum"*

and *"critical mass"* (Kanter, 1983, p. 26). As more people within the organization use the

new practices, they become embedded in the organizational structure. Ideally, the outcome is

a transformed organization with heightened capability for productivity. In Senge's (1990)

vision, this predicts both higher levels of organizational success and personal satisfaction.

Burns, Bennis, Kanter, and Senge made significant contributions to theoretical

perspectives of transformational or change leadership. Bass and Avolio (1994)

operationalized Burns' (1978) concept of transformational leadership into four dimensions

for the purpose of evaluating leader behavior. Labeled the *"Four I's,"* the dimensions of

transformational leadership are as follows:

1. *Idealized influence or charisma:* the display of behaviors that elicit admiration,

   respect, and trust from followers;

2. *Inspirational motivation:* the ability to communicate a vision and gain the support

   needed to see it through to realization;

3. *Intellectual stimulation:* soliciting new ideas and promoting creative thinking and

   innovation among followers;

4. *Individualized consideration:* active listening and understanding followers' needs for

   growth and recognition.

The instrument that evolved from the work of Bass and Avolio is the Multifactor

Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which includes the dimensions of both transformational

and transactional leadership (Bass, 1999). Transactional leadership, which is based on

exchange, can take several forms. The leader may express clear expectations and/or

directions for what is expected of followers and specify the rewards they receive in return.

Another form is whereby "the leader monitors the follower's performance and takes

corrective action if the follower fails to meet standards" (Bass, 1999, p. 11). In its passive

form, the leader waits for a problem to surface before taking action. The least effective form

of transactional leaderships is *laissez-faire*, in which the leader essentially "avoids taking any

action" (p. 11).

There is some evidence of a romanticized view of transformational leadership in the

literature. Although transformational leadership is often equated with empowering

leadership, the style of transformational leaders can be directive or participatory (Bass,

1999). Similarly, Bass and Avolio (1994) recognized that there is no such thing as "pure"

transformational leadership or a "pure" transactional culture. The responsibilities of effective

leadership necessitate both types of behavior. Bass and Avolio view effective transactional

components as a foundation for building a transformational culture.

Expanding on this idea, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) stated that "The best of leadership is both transformational and transactional. Transformational leadership augments the effectiveness of transactional leadership; it does not replace transactional leadership" (p. 189). Dedication to the values of transformational leadership does not preclude the need for making pragmatic decisions. Although they clearly prefer transformational leadership, Bass and Steidlmeier acknowledge that most leaders have a range of attributes reflecting both transactional and transformational aspects of leadership. The operational framework for assessing leadership behavior classifies leaders according to which style tends to predominate in their actions (Bass, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1994). The same is true of organizational cultures that simultaneously have transformational and transactional components. The relationship between the leader and the organization is bi-directional: the dynamic interaction between the two influences the nature of the organizational culture and the leader's ability to engage in transformational behaviors. Bennis (1989b) understood that a rigid, autocratic culture exerts a powerful negative influence on the actions of individuals who seek to transform it.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) distinguished between authentic and inauthentic transformational leadership. Authentic transformational leaders exemplify honesty and integrity. Indeed honesty has been cited by managers as the prime quality they seek or admire in leaders (Kouzes & Posner, 1990). In a series of nationwide surveys, honesty consistently emerged as the top quality of a respected leader. Demonstrating the mutual effect on the interactions of leaders and followers, Kouzes and Posner noted that the leader's trust in others was equally important for gaining support. Good leaders evoke trust and credibility by following through on their promises and acting according to their stated values and beliefs.

Their guiding philosophical principle is leadership by example as opposed to leadership by directive.

There are also pseudo-transformational leaders who typically rationalize self-serving actions by professing they benefit the organization. Although they may view their actions as honest and elicit trust from subordinates, the behavior of pseudo-transformational leaders is inauthentic and inconsistent (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). In essence, it is the antithesis of credible leadership (Kouzes & Pozner, 1990).

The actions of a self-indulgent leader can never work for the organizational good. According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), organizational culture evolves from the actions of the behavior modeled within it. The actions of an ethical leader create a strong, ethical, organizational culture that reflects mutual trust at all levels of the organization.

Next to honesty, competence emerged as the second most admired leadership attribute (Kouzes & Posner, 1990). Competence denotes that the leader is capable, productive, and efficient. This underscores the importance of recognizing both transactional and transformative aspects of leadership. Competence involves transactional aspects of leadership. It also involves expertise in leadership skills, which tends more toward the transformational aspects of leadership. As depicted by Kouzes and Posner (1990), leadership expertise entails demonstrating the "ability to challenge, inspire, enable and encourage," which provides tangible evidence of capable leadership (p. 30).

Kanungo (2001) used the philosophical concept of "*teleological*" and "*deontological*" (p. 258) ethics to describe transaction and transformational leadership respectively. According to teleological ethics, a leader's decisions have no inherent moral status: the moral value is contingent on the outcome. From a utilitarian perspective, actions

are justified if they benefit a significant number of people. According to deontological ethics, a leader's actions have intrinsic moral status. They are derived from altruistic motives, although Kanungo employs the term *"mutual altruism"* (p. 260) to describe transactional leadership that combines self-interest and utilitarian motives. Despite recognition that a transactional leader's action can produce beneficial results, Kanungo clearly favored leadership based on moral values over leadership based on contingency theory. This perspective is consistent with the philosophical principles of Burns (1978) and Greenleaf (1977). However, many advocates of transformational leadership assume a more pragmatic approach that is ultimately more suitable to the realities of operating in a competitive and uncertain business environment (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Kanter, 1983; Senge, 1990).

Leadership versus Management

The terms *transactional* and *transformational* are sometimes used to describe the behaviors of managers and leaders respectively. To an extent, the transactional components of leadership reflect traditional managerial duties (Bass & Avolio, 1994). However, transactional leadership denotes a style of leading others, whereas management refers to an organizational role or position. As Yukl (1989) observed, one can be a manager without subordinates, such as a financial manager. Conversely, a leader may have no formal title. There is a debate in the literature on whether management and leadership are two distinct entities or whether they simply reflect behavioral actions that sometimes overlap.

Some authors take the view that management and leadership are inherently different (Bennis, 1989a; Kotter, 1990; Zaleznik, 2004). Zaleznik (2004) is the most adamant proponent of this perspective. Zaleznik viewed managers and leaders as two very different

types of individuals guided by dramatically different philosophical perspectives. The outlook of a manager is grounded in rational theories of organizational efficiency. From this approach, exercising leadership involves exerting authority over employees in designated roles for the purpose of achieving short-term organizational goals. These goals are dictated by necessity or external decree; therefore, managers display neither passion nor commitment in achieving managerial goals. In contrast, vision, commitment, and passion are hallmarks of exemplary leaders (Bennis, 1989a, 1989b; Kotter, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 2001).

According to Zaleznik (1977/2004), the distinction between managers and leaders emanates from their views of the self in the world. Simply stated, leaders expand their vision whereas managers narrow it:

Managers see themselves as conservators and regulators of an existing order of affairs with which they personally identify and from which they gain rewards. A manager's sense of self-worth is enhanced by perpetuating and strengthening existing institutions: He or she is performing a role that is in harmony with the ideals of duty and responsibility. (Zaleznik, 1977/2004, p. 79)

Kotter (1990) described the universe of the manager as consistent and orderly, while a leader is driven by a powerful vision for change. In Kotter's model, leaders see things in terms of long-range vision and are capable of developing strategies to achieve it. Leaders unite people by communicating their vision and organizing stakeholders in teamwork and coalition building. Leaders have the capacity to inspire and motivate people, even when confronted by structural barriers to positive transformation. Whereas management is based on rational decision-making, leadership is rooted in intangible human emotions (Bennis, 1989a; Kotter, 1990).

All sources agree that *communicating* a vision is an essential part of good leadership. In describing the rhetoric of effective leadership, Conger (1991) contrasted two speeches made by top executives. A speech made by Apple CEO Steve Jobs was a powerful expression of his personal vision for the company's future direction. In contrast, a speech made by another executive was a "straightforward exposition on the company's operating goals, budgets, and policies—devoid of a more visionary and emotionally appealing purpose and instead focused on static operating details" (Conger, 1991, p. 33). Zaleznik (1977/2004) would probably characterize this speech as the words of a manager acting in a leadership role. Rhetoric is an essential tool for a leader capable of inspiring and motivating others, particularly in the pursuit of challenging or difficult goals.

Empowering Leadership

According to Conger (1989), empowering leaders share one defining characteristic: "a strong underlying belief in their subordinates' abilities" (p. 18). As a result, they engage in actions that support and enhance their subordinates' sense of self-efficacy. Conger drew on Bandura (1986) for his portrayal of empowering leadership behaviors. Conger (1989) presented a series of illustrations describing specific empowering behaviors. These included the following: (a) providing an atmosphere that facilitates positive emotional support, especially through the use of drama or play; (b) rewarding and encouraging achievements in visible and personal ways; (c) expressing confidence in the abilities of subordinates; (d) promoting initiative and responsibility; and (e) capitalizing on success.

Reflecting Bandura (1986), Conger (1989) emphasized that the most effective method of enhancing self-efficacy is increasing employees' opportunities for mastery experiences. Empowering leaders understand the need to learn strategies for helping their constituents

discover and build on their strengths and abilities. Ultimately, this benefits the whole organization.

Organizational theorists seek to define empowerment in ways that can be operationalized to improve individual and organizational performance. According to Conger and Kanungo (1988), empowerment can be interpreted in two different ways. In one model, empowerment is a "*relational construct,*" (p. 472) primarily "used to describe the perceived power or control that an individual actor or organizational subunit has over others" (p. 472). This power is derived from the actor's ability to provide the organization with a valuable resource. At the interpersonal level, the main sources of power are considered to be the formal authority of the individual and his or her personal attributes (referent power). Individuals who possess this power have greater probability of attaining their attended goals.

Empowerment can also be construed as a "*motivational construct*" (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). In this sense, power "refers to an intrinsic need for self-determination…or a belief in personal self-efficacy" (p. 473). Conger and Kanungo noted that the organization may either increase or undermine the efficacy perceptions of organization members. Therefore, they recommended the adoption of management strategies that heighten and reinforce efficacy beliefs. The reciprocal relationship of individual actions and organizational culture is acknowledged by numerous sources (Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bennis, 1989b; Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The proper balance and use of empowerment can foster the success of an organization.

Leadership in Athletic Environments

Professional Sports

The second major force in Kanter's (1983) model of change leadership is a crisis or galvanizing event. When South African athletic teams returned to the global arena after years of being barred from international competition, they quickly realized that the level of competition had risen dramatically (Ristow et al., 1999). Since losing before a sold-out stadium crowd in 1991, the South African cricket team has become one of the world's most successful teams. Acknowledging that "there is more to the success than simply the talent of the players" (p. 1), Ristow et al. attributed much of this success to transformational leadership practices implemented by the United Cricket Board of South Africa.

Ristow et al. (1999) assessed the effects of transformational and transactional leadership on the effectiveness of eight of the eleven unions affiliated with the United Cricket Board by surveying the CEO of each union. The authors found a significant positive correlation between organizational effectiveness and three dimensions of transformational leadership: idealized influence, individualized consideration, and inspiration. Management-by-exception was the only transactional leadership factor to reach significance. Overall, the body of leadership research has found management-by-exception to range from "slightly effective" to "slightly ineffective" depending on the situation (Bass, 1999). Ristow et al. (1999) classified the effects of transactional leadership on performance as minimal. As a group, the CEOs exhibited high levels of transformational leadership, which translated into high levels of organizational effectiveness.

Kellett (1999) interviewed 12 head coaches from the Australian Football League in a detailed examination of how professional coaches view leadership. The most intriguing

finding was that the coaches eschewed the term "leader" or "leadership." When queried on the topic, their answers were vague. They understood that people see coaches as leaders, but this was clearly not how they viewed themselves. Only two coaches defined leadership specifically, and both preferred the term "people management."

In strong contrast to the lack of clarity about their own leadership, Kellett (1999) noted that the coaches were quite articulate in describing their players as leaders and detailing the leadership qualities that characterized different players. This should not be surprising, as the coaches cited empowerment as central to their professional roles. They described the four key tasks of coaching as empowerment, communication, planning, and providing a supportive environment. Each of these tasks was interrelated and associated with the development of the players and assistant coaches. In analyzing their responses, Kellett emphasized, "It is telling that coaches themselves did not feel comfortable with the term 'leadership'" (p. 166).

Kellett (1999) proposed two reasons the coaches avoided the term "leadership" to describe their jobs. The first is that they found the concept too vague (expressed by at least one participant) to describe the multidimensional task realities of coaching. More important, some coaches seemed to associate leadership with autocratic behavior, which is antithetical to the connotation of "coaching" behavior in organizational literature. Critics of bureaucratic leadership frequently evoke the metaphor of a coach to describe the leadership role. In Senge's (1990) model, the *leader as teacher* assumes the role of a coach, facilitator, or guide. In the teaching role, the leader challenges assumptions and behavioral patterns that inhibit positive change with the goal of helping organizational members develop more accurate, perceptive, and empowering views of reality. This role is consistent with the ways coaches

described their interactions with athletes and coaching assistants to facilitate their self-development.

Kellett (1999) acknowledged that "In a general sense, empowerment and facilitation as described by coaches here are implicated in the Four I's of transformational leadership" (p. 166). More specifically, their depictions of coaching are congruent with Conger's (1989) model of empowering leadership. Kellett (1999) concluded the following:

If a model of leadership or management were to be developed from what these coaches have said, that model looks very different from models currently in vogue. The model would concern itself with facilitating self-management, career development, and independent decision-making by staff. It would describe management of people in terms that reference humor, quality of social interaction, and expertise in the relevant phases of job execution. (Kellett, 1999, p. 166)

Olympic Sport Organizations

Since 1984, the 36 Canadian National Sport Organizations (NSOs) have been engaged in a process that strongly reflects Kanter's (1983) organizational change dynamics. Since the government enacted the "Best Ever" program for the purpose of maximizing performances at the 1988 Calgary Olympics, researchers have engaged in a 12-year longitudinal study of the radical change process. Such "real time" studies are rare in the literature (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2004). Amis et al. used case studies of six NSOs to gain in-depth insight into the complex dynamics of internal change. They compared and contrasted the six NSO's by analyzing three core dynamics of change (interests, power, and capacity) in order to study differences and similarities in each organization. Of the six

organizations, three successfully managed change, whereas three organizations showed poor capacity for change management.

The category of "interests" with the strongest impact on the change process involved the allocation of resources to different activities sponsored by the NSO and the role of individual participants in decision-making. Of particular note, Amis et al. (2004) stated, "It is apparent that leaders of those organizations that managed to make the transformation to a more professional, bureaucratic form went to greater lengths to accommodate the interests of different groups within the organization" (p. 183). (The term "bureaucratic" in this context denotes a cohesive organization capable of setting and achieving goals). In the NSO that proved most successful in satisfying the interests of diverse groups, the leaders actively enlisted the participation of different subunits in a manner consistent with creating a strong organizational culture (Scott, 1997).

An interesting finding was that the three successful NSOs had dramatically different power structures; the decisive factor was that the distribution or concentration of power was appropriate for that particular organization (Amis et al., 2004). One NSO was characterized by distributed leadership and participatory decision-making that was perceived by organization members as democratic and fair. In contrast, a second NSO had a power structure that was concentrated in the office of the Director General. In this case, volunteers (who wielded considerable power within the NSOs) were willing to relinquish power to a team of professionals they endowed with the ability to produce successful change. In the third organization, volunteers nominally embraced the change process but were reluctant to relinquish power. Gradually, a shift occurred that placed power in the hands of the professional executives.

The foremost finding was that "A vital feature of those organizations that proved capable of change was the emergence of a strong leadership figure able to create a vision of the organization's future state" (Amis et al., 2004, p. 189). Amis et al. attributed transformational leadership qualities to those charismatic leaders who successfully managed the dynamics of change. Thus despite differences in the distribution of power in the successful NSOs, the leaders of these three organizations possessed both a clear vision for the future of the organization and the technical skills to enlist the support of others in achieving it.

Intercollegiate Athletic Departments

The degree to which leadership and management overlap is probably destined to remain a topic of debate in the organizational literature (Yukl, 1989). Authors who view management and leadership as distinctly different entities tend to place management within a narrow range of tasks and functions while endowing leaders with the vision to go beyond mundane activities and impact events on a grand scale (Bennis, 1999a; Kotter, 1990; Zaleznik, 1977/2004). Mintzberg (1980) saw management as more than the sum of duties and competencies. From that perspective, he created a model that classified ten managerial roles into three role categories:

1. Interpersonal roles (figurehead, leader, and liaison).

2. Informational roles (monitor, disseminator, and spokesperson).

3. Decision roles (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator).

To Mintzberg, leadership was an inherent part of managerial work. Similar in this regard, Kanter (1983) used the term *entrepreneur* to denote managers who act as prime movers in the process of organizational change.

There has been very little research on ADs in American universities. Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999) selected Mintzberg's (1980) model as a framework for exploring the work of Canadian intercollegiate athletic directors (ADs). Danylchuk and Chelladurai prefaced their study by noting that intercollegiate athletic departments ("IADs") have several features that distinguish them from conventional organizations. The first of these is as follows:

> These organizations are embedded into a larger system of universities: thus, the major educational ideals of a university serve to set the parameters within which intercollegiate athletics departments must operate. Within these guidelines, athletics departments are highly focused on the pursuit of excellence in physical activity. (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999, p. 149)

At the same time, IADs stand apart from the center of their host universities for the following reasons: (a) they are primarily engaged in extramural activities, (b) they generate interest and excitement in their communities, (c) they exist under pressure from the alumni and media to create and sustain a winning tradition, and (d) they are governed by leagues or conferences outside the university (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999). Additionally, IADs must answer to numerous stakeholders, including athletes, students, faculty and staff, alumni, media representatives, and the general community that often have disparate goals for the department. According to the authors, "Having to deal with these divergent expectations and pressures from influential and not-so-influential quarters makes managerial work in intercollegiate even more complex than typical organizations" (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, p. 150). Heightening the complexity of "managing the external constituencies," ADs must deal with "internal activities that are sometimes characterized by turmoil and dissension" (p. 150).

Allocation of resources and gender equity issues are prime examples. An additional feature that distinguishes IADs from departments in conventional work organizations is that in addition to managing staff, ADs are responsible for athletes whose student status involves unique concerns such as eligibility and discipline.

Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999) extended Mintzberg's (1980) model to capture the unique aspects of the AD's job. The result was a list of 19 managerial roles. Their study consisted of 42 ADs of intercollegiate athletics programs in the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU). Although the ADs were divided into two groups on the basis of their universities' total enrollment, number of sports sponsored by their departments, and years of experience, none of these factors affected the emphases they placed on the managerial roles. The six activities given highest priority by the respondents were as follows: (a) financial management, (b) leadership, (c) policymaking, (d) disturbance handling (responding to occurrences beyond one's immediate control), (e) revenue generation, and (f) athlete affairs. Danylchuk and Chelladurai noted that a U.S. study of ADs also found financial management to be the most important activity. Other studies have also awarded high priority to leadership.

Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999) observed that the top six managerial activities in their study differ substantially from those reported for other types of organizations. The key distinction lies in the fact that the most important managerial activities identified in studies of business organizations tend to be externally oriented, whereas the activities performed by the Athletic Directors were largely internally oriented (possibly owing to the fact that ADs operate within complex organizations while most managerial research focuses on the larger organization). Of particular relevance to the present study, the researchers noted that, "A striking feature of the six top-rated managerial activities is that they are consistent with each

other," and their importance originates from an environment characterized by financial

constraints (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, p. 161). In the case of the CIAU programs, the

financial pressures were caused by government cutbacks and tuition raises, which fall under

the heading of disturbance handling and served to increase the pressure to generate revenue

from external sources.

Implicitly making a case for transformational leadership, Danylchuk and Chelladurai

(1999) proposed that "These efforts at handling disturbances and revenue generation may

require the initiation of new and innovative projects and services, and changes in structure

and processes both at the developmental and league levels" (pp. 161-162). This calls the

leadership function of management into play, as the athletic directors must exert efforts to

inspire subordinates "to accept the transformation of the organizational structures and

processes" (p. 162).

Explicitly evoking transformational or empowering leadership, Danylchuk and

Chelladurai (1999) found it "disturbing from both the subordinates' and leaders'

perspectives" (p. 161) that the ADs assumed responsibility for most important managerial

activities and delegated only those tasks they deemed less important or routine. This implied

that the directors not only diminished their efficiency by attempting to take on a diverse array

of tasks, but also that they failed to develop the managerial capabilities of their subordinates.

Noting that "effective managers are those who develop their subordinates both emotionally

and cognitively by assigning more challenging and difficult tasks" (p. 163), Danylchuk and

Chelladurai found the behavior of the ADs inconsistent with the tenets of transformational

leadership. Although their results may not generalize to IADs in the US, managerial power in

the Canadian IADs resided almost exclusively "in the top position, the athletic director" (p. 163).

Doherty's (1997) study of transformational and transactional leadership characteristics encompassed both athletic directors and assistant athletic directors (ADDs) at 13 universities belonging to the Ontario Universities Athletic Association (OUAA) and the Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA). As in the study of Ristow et al. (1999), the MLQ was used to rate leader behaviors. Doherty (1997) selected head coaches (N = 114) to serve as the subordinate raters. The data analysis cross-referenced their responses with those of 13 ADs and 19 AADs.

Transformational leadership emerged as the dominant paradigm of the ADs and AADs, followed by transactional and laissez-faire leader behaviors (Doherty, 1997). In particular, female ADs and AADs and younger ADs and AADs were viewed as exhibiting the transformational leadership qualities of charisma, inspiration, and individualized consideration most often. In the same way, they were least often associated with management-by-exception. The effect for age is consistent with Bennis' assertion that in general, older leaders are less attuned to the realities of the digital world than their younger counterparts (Bernhut, 2001), who may be more predisposed to express "involved, developmental, and visionary behaviors," and more at ease with the "new leadership" (Doherty, 1997, p. 283).

Bass (1999) noted that several studies have found women to be more transformational in leadership style than men, although research findings on gender tended to be inconsistent (Doherty, 1997). Bass (1999) proposed that women might feel their actions are more closely scrutinized, thus they are more concerned with adopting the most effective leadership

practices. Based on the combined effects of gender and age, Doherty (1997) suggested that more aggressive recruitment of younger ADs and AADs may produce more transformational, and consequently more effective, leadership of athletic departments.

Transformational leadership is thought to contribute to job satisfaction by mechanisms such as providing the intellectual stimulation that acts as a buffer against burnout (Bass, 1999) and raising the self-esteem and self-concepts of subordinates (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Bass (1999) proposed that the latter effect arises through idealized influence, which acts to bridge the gap between the organization's mission and the individual self-concepts of organization members. Noting that there has been minimal research on the impact of transformational leadership on job satisfaction in athletic settings, Yusof (1998) explored the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction in a sample of NCAA Division III coaches (N = 308). The coaches included 165 males and 143 females representing ten sports from each participating institution: (a) men's soccer, (b) women's soccer, (c) field hockey, (d) ice hockey, (e) men's volleyball, (f) women's volleyball, (g) men's baseball, and (h) women's softball.

Yusof (1998) found a strong positive relationship between transformational leadership and the job satisfaction of the Division III coaches. The more the coaches perceived their athletic directors as engaging in transformational leadership behaviors, the higher their reported levels of job satisfaction were. Yusef proposed that the reduced absenteeism, lower turnover, and high productivity linked with higher job satisfaction in the business sector will be paralleled in athletic settings where administrators display more transformational leadership behaviors.

Evoking Bass' (1990, 1999) assertion that transformational leadership can be developed, Yusof (1998) recommended that sports organization should make training ADs and sports administrators in transformational leadership a top priority. Doherty (1997) was less optimistic about whether transformational leadership can be developed, suggesting instead that a propensity toward transformational leadership may be attributable to individual factors outside the control of the organization. Both Doherty (1997) and Yusof (1998) advocated recruiting and cultivating candidates who exhibit a potential for transformational leadership.

Scott (1999) employed a "multiframe" perspective for examining elements of leadership and organizational climate in IADs. The theoretical basis for the study was derived from Bolman and Deal's (1984) frames-of-reference approach to understanding organizational leadership. Bolman and Deal delineated four frames:

- The *structural frame* reflects the traditional bureaucracy with a linear hierarchy and clear-cut job and role specifications.

- The *human resource frame* emphasizes the ability of the organization to satisfy human needs. Empowering and facilitating leadership and the person-environment fit are aspects of the human resource frame.

- The *political frame* deals with conflict and competition for scarce resources. Political leaders are typically skilled negotiators.

- The *symbolic frame* recognizes the values and culture of the organization. Symbolic leaders tend to be charismatic and draw on symbolic expressions such as rituals and ceremonies to generate a sense of commitment and enthusiasm.

Scott (1999) noted that Bolman and Deal's (1984) view of managers and leaders

parallels that of Zaleznik (1977/2004) by their assumption that managers and leaders have

distinctly different ways of thinking. However, Scott (1999) emphasized that the leadership

role of ADs includes a myriad of managerial tasks, stating that, "an effective sport

administrator possesses characteristics of both" leadership and management (p. 301). For

assessing organizational climate, Scott used a descriptive approach that captures the "shared

individual perceptions" (p. 302).

Scott (1999) deliberately selected athletic departments representing NCAA Divisions

I, II, and III, as well as the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA). The

criteria specified that each IAD had to have finished as winners or top five finalists in their

respective divisions for the 1995-96 Sears Directors Cup award. The sample consisted of

senior ADs and head coaches of core sports from 21 IADs.

Interestingly, the structural frame, which is rooted in the traditional bureaucracy,

proved to be the most descriptive across the 21 IADs (Scott, 1999). This finding is largely

consistent with that of Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999). Paradoxically, however, *all* the

NCAA and NAIA athletic directors viewed themselves primarily as human resource leaders.

Scott (1999) suggested that this description may have reflected the way the ADs wanted to be

perceived, or alternately, may reflect the nature of interactions between ADs and coaches that

focus on the structural elements of management less than on the relationship between the two

parties. Scott acknowledged that the apparent lack of congruence between the ADs

conceptions of their behaviors and the way they are viewed by subordinates could lead to

conflict if the directors are unaware of it. He also proposed that ADs should be made to

recognize that "effective" leadership actions and behaviors are relative to the unique

demands of each athletic department. Ideally, leaders should be adept at operating from more than one frame; for example, the human resource frame may be most conducive to coaches' job satisfaction whereas the political frame may be most effective for generating revenues. Scott reiterated his belief that effective athletic directors practice both management and leadership.

Scott (1999) found strong support for the idea that organizational climate is most appropriately recognized "by identifying organizational members' perceptions of various workplace processes and events and determining the extent to which perceptions are shared" (p. 313). He acknowledged that the interaction between leader behavior and organizational climate is probably bi-directional, as did Bass and Avolio (1994).

Whereas organizational climate usually refers to measurable aspects of the work environment as perceived by its members, organizational culture embodies its subtle and less tangible aspects (Scott, 1997). Recognizing that both climate and culture contribute to organizational effectiveness, Scott (1997) contended that "the most *desirable* [original emphasis] organization 'cultures' are likely influenced by leaders who exhibit high transformational leadership" (p. 408). This view does not represent a departure from Scott's (1999) assertion that effective leadership in an AD can be contingent on the situation. Scott (1997) conceded that transformational leadership may or may not impact organizational success if the "bottom line" involves "winning games, putting people in the seats, and attracting media attention, sponsorship, and donations" (p. 403).

Scott's theory (1997) emphasizes that the first step in creating a strong organizational culture is discerning the type of culture that currently exists:

In certain circumstances, such as stable, winning athletic programs, the culture may

not be in need of modification. However, in circumstances where programs are

stagnant and there is minimal turnover in staff, an administrator faces significant

challenges in attempting to change the culture. (Scott, 1997, p. 411)

In extreme cases, Scott (1997) noted, an AD may have to replace virtually an entire

staff in order to create a more creative and productive culture. In many cases, a charismatic

or entrepreneurial leader may have the ability to generate positive enthusiasm for change

(Bennis, 1989b; Bernhut, 2001; Kanter, 1983). Bennis cautions that a stagnant culture may

cause a reversion to narrow bureaucracy (Bernhut, 2001). Scott (1997) contended that ADs

who are aware of the dimensions of organizational culture should have an advantage in

creating or managing a culture that brings out the best in the organization. The first step,

determining the existing culture, involves communicating with and enlisting the support of

various subcultures. In an IAD, these consist of the various sports programs sponsored by the

department, external relations units, and internal responsibility arms; the head coach of each

team and department is responsible for developing and/or managing the culture at that

particular level. To ensure the creation of a powerful culture, it is important that the AD do

the following: (a) encourage each subculture to enrich its own individual culture, (b) try to

help the various subcultures understand the problems of other subcultures, and (c) highlight

the fact that the overall culture is enriched by the strength of the subculture.

Using this as a springboard for culture management, the next step calls for the AD "to

develop a vision and strong personal value system around a perceived 'ideal' organization"

(p. 412). The term "vision" is ubiquitous in leadership literature. In fact, Bennis (1989a)

observed that every leader he dealt with in his experience shared "a concern with a guiding

purpose, an overarching vision" (p. 7). To Bennis, the vision goes beyond being goal-directed, and demands a clear sense of purpose. In creating or managing a strong culture, the AD is acting as a transformational leader. Bass (1999) stated explicitly that "Leaders who are concerned about organizational renewal will seek to foster organizational cultures that are hospitable and conducive to creativity, problem solving, risk taking, and experimentation" (p. 17).

Scott's (1997) notion of vision is consistent with Kouzes and Posner's (2001) depiction of the vision that exemplary leaders are able to inspire in others. In enlisting the support of others to realize shared vision, exemplary leaders *challenge the process*, which means seeking out opportunities to alter the status quo. They are willing to take risks to do so and regard their mistakes as learning opportunities rather than failure. Scott (1997) emphasized that challenging the status quo and experimenting with new procedures and new staff is superfluous in an organization that is performing at a high level. It is only necessary when the existing culture is characterized by stagnation or mediocrity. In a very productive culture, the athletic director's best course is managing the existing culture rather than attempting to change it.

Bass and Avolio (1994) recognized that good leadership requires elements of both transformational and transactional leadership. Similarly, Scott (1999) recognized that an effective AD is both manager and leader. Scott's (1997) next step in culture management entailed creating a "timely and adequate reward system" that acts "to reinforce behaviors that contribute to the strength of the culture" (p. 412). Although reward systems are typically thought of in terms of transactional leadership (Yukl, 1989), Bass (1999) considered the creation of motivating reward systems as a function of both transactional and

transformational leadership. Rewards need not be material. In fact, promotions and financial

rewards are often "scarce resources" (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p. 5). Effective leaders

reward excellence with personalized recognition including positive feedback, informal

congratulations, praise in front of colleagues, and formally bestowed awards, as well as

financial incentives (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b; Scott, 1997). Scott (1997) stressed that "It is

important that rewards be offered for actions that support the culture as opposed to rewards

only for winning games" (p. 412). Both implicitly and explicitly, Scott's recommendations

for creating and/or managing a strong culture in the athletics department are consistent with

the principles of transformational leadership.

Burns (1978) envisioned a model of leadership that is intrinsically linked with good

citizenship behaviors. Kent and Chelladurai (2001) investigated the relative impact of leader-

member exchange theory (LMX) and transformational leadership on organizational

commitment and citizenship behavior in the IAD of a large Midwestern university. LMX

focuses on the dyadic relationship between the leader and a subordinate. A high quality

relationship evokes mutual trust and support, which led Bass (1999) to associate LMX with

aspects of transformational leadership. Kent and Chelladurai (2001) based their study on the

assumption that the effects of transformational leadership "cascade" from executive to

middle management levels. Their sample consisted of third-tier employees of the IAD

(N = 75), the subordinates of ADs and AADs who constituted the middle managers.

Kent and Chelladurai (2001) reported a significant association among the three

dimensions of transformational leadership: charismatic leadership, individualized

consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Only intellectual stimulation showed no

significant link with LMX. A strong association between charismatic leadership and

individualized consideration and with LMX showed evidence of a cascade effect of transformational leadership. By definition, individualized consideration should enhance the quality of LMX, which the researchers suggest is the source of conceptualizing LMX as a reflection of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership, especially charismatic leadership, was strongly related to organizational commitment. However, contrary to the assumption that transformational leadership should elicit positive organizational citizenship behavior, Kent and Chelladurai found no relationship between the two concepts. In contrast, high quality LMX predicted organizational citizenship. Kent and Chelladurai noted that other studies have yielded similar findings. They speculated that transformational leadership is more remote from the realities of third-tier employees, while their interactions with the ADs and IADs have more immediate impact.

<div style="text-align:center">Intercollegiate Athletics and Fundraising</div>

Understanding Donor Motivation

Observing that in the United Kingdom, charitable contributions are in a mode of steady decline whereas the number of nonprofit organizations has risen exponentially, Sargeant (1999) sought to develop a model for donor behavior. The issue of why people choose to help others has historically been examined from the perspectives of people from numerous disciplines; economists, clinical psychologists, social psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists have all examined the topic. Recently, marketing researchers have added some useful insights to the existing body of literature. Relationship marketing is especially relevant to the fundraising endeavors of IADs. Relationship marketing is "characterized by emphasis on customer retention and development" (Sargeant,

2001, p. 178). In the case of college alumni, the role of college administrators is to support and reinforce the relationship between the alumni and the institution. The process ideally begins when prospective alumni are still enrolled students (Stutler & Calvario, 1996).

Sargeant (2001) examined the application of relationship marketing to fundraising, or relationship fundraising. To explore the issue in depth, Sargeant arranged eight focus groups. The specific topic was donor attrition, a perennial problem in fundraising. A fairly small proportion of participants (22%) said they stopped giving due to financial circumstances. A larger proportion (>26%) reported that their donations lapsed because they viewed other causes as equally (or more) deserving. Sargeant identified two behaviors that organizational leaders or representatives can engage in to maintain donor loyalty. One relies on "the importance of feedback and perceived effectiveness." A way for organizations to keep donors satisfied is to "ensure that they give ongoing and specific feedback to donors as to how their funds have been put to use, in particular the benefit that has resulted for the beneficiary group" (p. 188). This technique simultaneously satisfies donors' altruistic motives and desire for recognition.

Sargeant (2001) also noted that lapsed donors had significantly lower perceptions of the service they received from the organization than ongoing donors. The author proposed that representatives might make an effort to ask donors how they want to be treated by the organization. By doing so, "one is in effect engaging the donor with the organization and requiring the person think through the desired nature of the relationship" (Sargeant, 2001, p. 189). This stance evokes the behaviors of transformational leaders who exercise individualized consideration and make all constituents feel they are valued and recognized

members of the enterprise. It also strengthens the perception that the donor is working with the organization for the purpose of achieving shared goals.

College and university alumni donors.

According to data from the Council for Aid to Education, alumni account for the largest number of voluntary donations (Stutler & Calvario, 1996). At least one study concluded that alumni support is the strongest indicator of the esteem in which the institution is held by a stakeholder group. Furthermore, foundation and corporate grant-makers typically pay careful attention to alumni participation in the institution's annual campaign. Given that alumni donation is a vital concern, Stutler and Calvario raised the question of why some colleges have donor participation rates ranging from 5% to 20% while others can boast of impressive figures exceeding 60%. Stutler and Calvario built their study on findings from a survey conducted by Spaeth and Greeley in the 1970s. The authors concluded that alumni giving is largely contingent on the quality of the person's experience as a student. The extent to which alumni feel the college met their specific needs has a profound effect on donor behavior.

Stutler and Calvario (1996) departed from the standard of studying undergraduate characteristics and experiences as they related to donors a decade or more after departure from campus. They focused on the graduating class of a state-assisted Division I institution. Consistent with research on alumni, their findings implied that the more satisfied the students (present or past) are with their undergraduate experience, the greater their predisposition to donate to the institution. The researchers found that by evaluating nine of the 29 satisfaction items they could distinguish the donor group from the non-donor group with 79% accuracy. Based on their findings, Stutler and Calvario outlined four basic recommendations:

1. Colleges and universities must recognize that students are prospective alumni.

2. Developing programs to create lifelong ties between the institution and alumni should be an imperative and be based on a process that begins while students are still enrolled.

3. Administrators must find ways to evaluate how satisfied or dissatisfied consumers are with their college experience.

4. Alumni fundraising must be viewed as an endeavor based on alliances created throughout the campus community.

Consistent with Sargeant's (1999, 2001) marketing perspective on charitable giving, Harrison, Mitchell, and Peterson (1995) used a marketing approach to examine alumni giving. The authors proposed that alumni provide donations to earn recognition or status. The gifts cover a broad spectrum from bumper stickers to special invitations to having a scholarship or building named for them. According to Harrison et al., "The price in this exchange is the developmental cost to the college of raising a dollar of donations, and this cost captures the benefits rendered to donors" (p. 398).

Harrison et al. (1995) analyzed data from 18 institutions for a three-year period in the late 1980s. They found that "the costs of alumni relations are a major factor in determining alumni giving" (p. 409). Only two aspects of student life appeared to have a direct correlation with alumni donations. Belonging to a sorority or fraternity positively impacted giving, while attending school part-time had negative impact. NCAA classification had no effect on giving nor did the school's status as a public or private or predominantly teaching or research institution.

Intercollegiate Athletics

Wolfe (2000) viewed intercollegiate athletics in the US in terms of an ongoing debate over the relative costs and benefits of a university athletics program. Embedded in this debate are "the economic and non-economic costs and benefits of university athletics, effects of athletics on a university's culture, and the effects of university and athletic program resources on program strategy and success, and the management of university athletics from a stakeholder perspective" (p. 82). It is impossible to isolate the issue of fundraising from other pressures impacting the university. Therefore, the research included in this section examines the issue from a variety of perspectives.

In 1979, a study by Lee Siegelman and Robert Carter generated intense debate over the question of whether success in "big-time college athletics" induces alumni to give more money to the school than they might have otherwise given (Frank, 2004, p. 21). Other researchers followed with largely inconsistent findings. From a resource-based or cost-benefit perspective, the broad question is whether investing more money in college athletics for the purpose of raising donations has a positive impact on the institution.

Baade and Sundberg (1996) explored the proposed link between college sports and alumni giving by analyzing data from a cross-section of colleges and universities over the years 1973 to 1990. Most of the colleges in their sample were Division III schools with a smaller number of Division II schools. The focal sports were football and basketball. Not unexpectedly, donations were higher at private rather than public institutions. However, the pattern of giving was essentially the same for both private and public schools. Winning percentages were not a significant factor in alumni donations, although bowl or tournament appearances were. The implication is that "a bowl or tournament bid legitimizes a good

record; while a good record without a postseason appearance is very disappointing" (Baade & Sundberg, p. 800). Basketball tournament appearances had a significant effect only on giving to public institutions, probably reflecting a stronger basketball tradition at public colleges. Baade and Sundberg concluded that investing heavily in producing winning teams with the goal of raising alumni donations is a risky endeavor.

Recognizing that voluntary donations continue to grow in importance for the operations of intercollegiate athletic programs as compared to other sources of revenue, Verner et al. (1998) developed an instrument for the purpose of assessing donor motivation. Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory formed the basis for the selected items. The result was an instrument that measured the interaction of behavior, cognition, other individual factors, and the environment as predictors of donor behavior. The researchers selected 10 women and 10 men to verify the research literature and possibly disclose other motivations for making donations. All participants were randomly chosen from spectators at basketball or football games.

The scale developed by Verner et al. (1998) encompassed 12 factors that emerged during the interviews. Several reflect Sargeant's (1999, 2001) more general view of donor behavior whereas others are more specific to intercollegiate athletics. The 12 variables identified by the researchers are as follows: (a) participating in secondary events, (b) public recognition, (c) giving time and energy, (d) inside information, (e) priority treatment, (f) philanthropy, (g) collaboration, (h) creating, (i) change, (j) curiosity, (k) power, and (l) loyalty.

Whereas Baade and Sundberg (1996) focused on giving behavior among alumni, Rhoads and Gerking (2000) explored the effects of successful Division I football and

basketball teams on the educational contributions of non-alumni as well. Their study included many high profile teams from the Southeastern, Big Ten, Atlantic Coast, Pacific 10, Big 12, and Western Athletic conferences, along with teams representing other conferences and a few major independents. The data were drawn from 87 universities that sponsored both football and basketball teams during the period 1986-87 to 1995-96. Rhoads and Gerking noted that many of the universities have made long-term investments to teams that regularly appear in televised bowl games and basketball tournaments.

Rhoads and Gerking (2000) found that changes occurring from year to year had no impact on donations by non-alumni. However, winning football teams evoked positive responses from alumni. Conversely, having a basketball team placed on NCAA probation produced negative effects. Overriding these findings was that fact that "long-standing athletic traditions, measured by the extent of participation in football bowl games and NCAA basketball tournaments prior to the sample period, does appear to have a positive impact on voluntary support from both groups" (Rhoads & Gerking, p. 257). Yet even this effect was relatively weak when it was contrasted with the effect of student and faculty quality. This finding offers some support for Baade and Sundberg's (1996) proposal that schools may be losing out by compromising academic quality if they invest heavily in athletics.

Rhoads and Gerking (2000) were less cautious about the prospective return on investment from athletic programs. They noted that the cost of the resources needed to enrich academic programs may far exceed the costs of enhancing athletic programs. Furthermore, improvements in athletic performances are quickly and readily visible and may produce immediate results. Academic improvements are less apparent to prospective donors and less likely to be accompanied by short-term changes to the institution's academic reputation or

status. From this perspective, Rhoads and Gerking suggested that supporting athletic programs may be advantageous for raising the level of donations.

Smart and Wolfe (2000) conducted a detailed exploration of the Pennsylvania State University (PSU) football program from a resource-based view (RBV). The RBV approach assumes that "a resource with the appropriate attributes may ensure, or at least contribute to an enduring competitive advantage" (p. 135). Key attributes of a resource that endows its host with competitive advantage are as follows: (a) it must be valuable in the sense of enabling the organization to exploit opportunities and/or neutralize threats, (b) it must be rare among its existing and potential competitors, and (c) it must be difficult for competing organizations to imitate without encountering cost and/or quality disadvantages.

The PSU football team fits very well with the RBV (Smart & Wolfe, 2000). First, it has an impressive winning record that gave it the sixth highest winning percentage of the 112 Division I-A football programs during the 1990s. Second, the graduation rate of PSU players is 73.6% compared to an average of 50.8% for Division I football players. Third, the PSU football team has *never* been sanctioned by the NCAA for a period spanning two decades. This record contrasts sharply with the 50% of Division I-A teams that have been sanctioned at least once, as well as a general upward trend in violations. Fourth, using attendance as a proxy, PSU's average home attendance of 96,500 was the third highest among Division I-A football teams in 1998.

The PSU case study strongly suggests that effective leadership exerts a positive influence on athletic team performance, which endows it with an advantage as a source of revenue generation. The absence of NCAA sanctions in a climate where violations are soaring implies that leadership practices have the character and integrity of authentic

transformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Kanungo, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1990). In addition, Smart and Wolfe (2000) explicitly credited long-term head coach Joe Paterno with "strong values" and the ability to create a "very strong culture" with the dedication and drive to overcome difficult competition and challenges (p. 143). In general, the coaching staff has had long tenure and minimal turnover, which give it a strategic advantage. The "levels of trust and teamwork and the strength of culture and commitment to values" (p. 145) that have developed within the organization reflect not only the attributes of RBV but also the characteristics of exemplary transformational leadership.

Goff (2000) undertook a review of the direct and indirect effects of intercollegiate football and basketball programs on the host university. His analyses yielded several important conclusions (p. 100):

- For nearly all universities in major conferences (the majority of Division I-A football and top tier Division I basketball), direct revenues from football and basketball exceed direct expenses; the difference exceeds $1 million for almost 70% of the schools.

- For universities below the major conferences, there may be a negative difference between direct revenues and expenses although it is generally less than $1 million.

- Athletic success, especially substantial improvement, can offer a substantial increase in national exposure for universities regardless of their academic reputation.

- Both average and major improvements in athletic achievements seem to have a positive impact on donations to the university.

- Dropping football can have quantifiable negative impacts on enrollments (and possibly on giving) even for teams without top tier programs.

- Negative exposure linked with NCAA sanctions may offset the gains made by prior athletic success but may not negate the positive impact of past success.

The findings of Goff's (2000) study are somewhat analogous to those reported by Rhoads and Gerking (2000). The finding that enhanced athletic success increases exposure for schools independent of academic reputation gives some support to Rhoads and Gerking's recommendation that investing in improving athletic programs may be advantageous for the school.

Baade and Sundberg (1996) suggested that increased athletic donations might negatively impact donations to the school's academic programs. The study of Stinson and Howard (2004) supported this assumption. The in-depth analysis used data from the University of Oregon, whose athletic teams compete at the elite Division I-A level. The research sample included all donors who gave $1,000 or more to the university's Annual Giving Program between 1994 and 2002.

Stinson and Howard (2004) observed that while both alumni and non-alumni gave to athletic and academic programs, alumni made significantly greater contributions to academics than non-alumni, whereas non-alumni were more likely to make athletic contributions. There was a noticeable increase in athletic contributions for the final year of the study. In fact, data analyses at several levels clearly showed that the high-profile athletics program is reaping gifts from alumni and non-alumni alike, while "academic giving struggles to remain stable" (Stinson & Howard, 2004, p. 136). In effect, the success of athletic fundraising may come at the expense of the academic program.

A recent study prepared for the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics created a stir in a number of popular publications. Frank (2004) concluded that

although a few high profile athletics programs prosper, most lose in the cost-benefit analysis. Incidents like Doug Flutie's spectacular touchdown pass that led Boston College to unexpected victory and generated a 12% increase in applications during the following year command a great deal of media attention. However, Frank emphasized that "Such vivid events notwithstanding," (p. 25) the existing research offers little support for the assumption that high profile athletic teams have any consistent effect on the quality of student enrollment or on alumni donations. Frank noted that impressive successes stand out as do failures:

> All major college programs go through cycles of relative success and relative failure. And if success stimulates alumni giving, then failure must inhibit it. The empirical literature seems to say that if the overall net effect of athletic success on alumni giving is positive, it is likely to be small. (Frank, 2004, p. 26)

Frank (2004) argued that athletic expenditures should be guided by acute understanding of the economic forces that drive big-time athletic markets. He proposed that policy questions should be addressed at two levels. The first is that individual institutions must determine how much they choose to invest in the pursuit of high profile athletic achievement. Second, private and public governing bodies must decide whether or how to regulate the actions of individual athletic programs. The first question, which relates to decisions made at the organizational level, implicitly evokes the importance of leader behaviors. Of the research reviewed in this section, only the case study of the PSU football team directly links effective leadership to athletic achievement and competitive advantage at the organizational level.

Conclusion

In spite of the large, accumulated body of literature on transformational leadership, the topic has been given remarkably little attention in the literature on sport management. The study of professional cricket unions provided decisive support for the positive impact of transformational leadership (Ristow et al., 1999). In the context of managing intercollegiate athletics departments, there are some findings that support the effectiveness of transformational leadership (Doherty, 1997; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Yusof, 1998). However, the issue has been largely neglected.

The case study of the Pennsylvania State University football program reported by Smart and Wolfe (2000) provides the only tangible evidence that transformational leadership leads to more successful athletic achievement and effectively positions the program as a valuable school resource. However, Frank (2004) would have characterized PSU as one of the few high profile athletic teams that has an indelible impact on voluntary donations amidst a myriad of programs whose effects on fundraising are negligible.

Sargeant's (2001) focus group study suggests an alternative path; namely, that transformational leaders may act as successful fundraisers by devising strategies to enhance the quality of the relationship between the donor and the institution. Theoretically, transformational leadership should be effective in the very competitive and unpredictable realm of elite division intercollegiate athletics. However, it is clear that more research is needed in this area. At present, the idea that transformational leaders can increase the success of fundraising efforts in intercollegiate athletics is primarily based on theoretical assumptions.

Chapter 3: Design And Methodology

Five main sections compose the arrangement of this chapter: (a) research design, (b) sample population, (c) survey instrument, (d) data collection procedures, and (e) data analysis. The overall design of the study is described in the first section. A description of the survey group, criteria for selection, and justification for the scope is provided in the second section. The development of the survey instrument is described in the third section. The processes and methods used to gather data are described in detail in the fourth section. Finally, the approach to data analysis is covered in section five.

Research Design

In correlational research, the purpose is to explore the extent to which relationships are present between and/or among variables. The purpose in such a research design is not to determine a cause-and-effect relationship. This study employed quantitative analysis to determine the relationship between donor preferences and AD leadership styles, thereby making this a correlation research design. The research questions were listed in Chapter 1. Based upon the correlational research, the Null Hypotheses below were tested.

Research Null Hypotheses

1. No significant difference will be present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between alumni and non-alumni donors.

2. No significant difference will be present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between former student athletes and non-former student athlete donors.

3. No significant difference will be present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between football season ticket holders and non-football season ticket holder donors.

4. No significant difference will be present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between basketball season ticket holders and basketball non-season ticket holder donors.

5. No significant difference will be present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between donors who live in the local community (within a 50-mile radius of the central campus) and donors who do not live in the local community.

6. No significant difference will be present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between donors who attend women's sporting events and donors who do not attend women's sporting events.

7. No significant difference will be present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between donors who interact regularly (at least 12-times in an academic year) with the athletics director and donors who do not interact regularly (at least 12-times in an academic year) with the athletics director.

Sample Population

Participants included those persons who are the top 100 lifetime active (contributed in the past 12-months) athletic donors at the onset of the survey of two universities that compete in two Bowl Championship Series conferences. Those two institutions were the University of

Missouri (Big Twelve) and the University of Michigan (Big Ten). Both institutions are known nationally for their competitive athletics programs.

The criteria for selection included the following: (a) the researcher had an existing relationship with the institutions (had worked in the University of Missouri Athletics Department and is currently employed in the University of Michigan Athletics Department); (b) the institutions had given the researcher permission to survey their donors; and (c) the institutions had an expressed interest in receiving and utilizing the results and findings as they developed their plans to improve donor relations and increase/maximize their fundraising revenue. For various reasons, a number of institutions that were part of the original methodology were not comfortable involving their donors.

Prior to the collection of any data, permission to survey participants was requested from the Human Subjects Review Committee. Data collection proceeded once consent had been obtained from the Committee.

Survey Instrument

A special survey was developed and sent to the top 100 lifetime active donors at the University of Michigan and the University of Missouri. Survey questions were designed to ask donors to respond to questions pertaining to an AD's behavior, philosophy, and actions. The donors were asked to rate on a scale of 1-5 whether they preferred or did not prefer the stated characteristic/behavior. In addition to this set of questions pertaining to leadership styles, donors were asked seven demographic questions: (a) whether they were alumni of the institution to which they have donated, (b) whether they were student athletes at the institution to which they have donated, (c) whether they were football season ticket holders at

the institution to which they have donated, (d) whether they were men's basketball season ticket holders at the institution to which they have donated, (e) whether they resided in the local community (within a 50-mile radius of the central campus), (f) whether they attended women's sporting events, and (g) whether they interacted regularly (at least 12-times in an academic year) with the athletics director.

The survey was developed using the Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) study. The questions were written based upon the three transformational leadership components that were agreed upon by a majority (4 out of 7) of leadership studies: (House – 1977), (Bradford & Cohen – 1984), (Bass – 1985), (Bennis & Nanus – 1985), (Tichy & DeVanna – 1986), (Conger & Kanungo – 1987), and (Kouzes & Posner – 1987). The three areas agreed upon by the majority were (1) identify and articulate a vision, (2) provide an appropriate model, and (3) foster the acceptance of group goals. Five questions were included for each area and address both transformational (three in each area for a total of nine) and non-transformational (two in each area for a total of six) leadership behaviors in language similar to the Podsakoff et al. (1990) study. The non-transformational behaviors were reverse coded during analysis to determine how "transformational" the preferences of donors were. Each of the three areas were identified on the survey key as (a) vision category - with a letter V or VR (if question was reversed), (b) model category – with a letter M or MR (if question was reversed), and (c) group goals category – with a letter G or GR (if question was reversed).

An initial survey was written and the wording analyzed to ensure the questions read the way they were intended to read and fell into a particular category. A pilot test was completed with 65 athletic donors from the two study institutions that were not part of the

actual study. They were asked to complete the survey, give feedback on the survey questions, and provide information on anything that was not clear or seemed misleading.

The results from the initial pilot study were analyzed and the feedback utilized to create a revised instrument. The revised instrument was used in a second pilot test. The second pilot test was completed by 27 athletic donors from the two study institutions that were not a part of the actual study. They were asked to complete the survey, give feedback on the survey questions, and provide information on anything that was not clear or seemed misleading. Results were analyzed and the two pilot tests were checked for reliability.

Exisiting instruments were not used for this study because they were developed to measure transformational leadership in other contexts (e.g., business) rather than athletics. The focus of this particular study was specifically on transformational leadership, and there had not been any other studies in an intercollegiate athletics environment involving donor preferences. No previous research had connected transformational leadership characteristics and athletic director characteristics/behaviors. One commonly used leadership survey was the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). This instrument had been used in a majority of the studies and was not applicable for this study because MLQ was designed to test multiple leadership styles. A lot of the questions were written from a leader's viewpoint. MLQ was written with the assumption that transformational leadership is composed of four different traits – idealized influence, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. When used, most of the time the MLQ instrument was compressed into a single transformational leadership scale. It didn't appear that the MLQ had been subjected to an independent assessment of its content adequacy.

Hinkin and Tracy stated that the 5-X form of the MLQ, which was supposed to erase some concerns, had deficiencies: (a) the measure was developed inductively by generating measures from individuals rather than developing items based on a theoretical definition, (b) studies using the MLQ had given little attention to the psychometric qualities of transformational leadership measures, and (c) a possible problem with the theoretical (content) adequacy of some of the items included in the MLQ.

This survey measured the donor's level of preference that an Athletic Director should possess characteristics to articulate a vision, be able to create an environment where group goals exist, and demonstrate an idealized influence. One of the primary reasons a new instrument was created for this study was the fact that a department of intercollegiate athletics had several features that distinguished them from conventional organizations (Danylchuk and Chelladurai, 1999): (a) They are embedded in a larger system of universities and they must operate within parameters established by the institution, (b) They are primarily engaged in extramural activities, (c) They generate interest and excitement in their communities, (d) They exist under pressure from the alumni and media to create and sustain a winning tradition, and (e) They are governed by leagues and/or conferences outside the University as well as the NCAA.

Data Collection Procedures

Once the donors had been identified at each institution and their mailing addresses procured, surveys were mailed. In addition to the survey, the mailing contained a cover letter expressing the importance of their strong support on the future success of the program, explained the importance of the survey process, detailed the goal/objective of the study,

thanked participants for their valuable input, and provided a postage-paid return envelope to make the process as easy and cost-free as possible.

The surveys were anonymous. The names and addresses were not released to the researcher. The mailings took place in-house at each institution. This eliminated any legal issues.

A variety of efforts were made to maximize response rates. The goal was to have a minimum of 50 surveys completed and returned from each institution. Thus, the minimum number of anticipated respondents was 100, with a maximum, if all persons surveyed responded, of 200 participants. Actual returns consisted of 59 responses from the University of Michigan and 51 responses from the University of Missouri.

All participants were assured of anonymity. Surveys were differentiated by the demographic questions to permit the researcher to be able to identify responses by institution without compromising the anonymity of individual subjects.

Data Analysis

The quality of the measure was analyzed using reliability and factor analysis to determine whether the overall survey was reliable and valid. This was done to confirm what was found in the pilot studies. Cronbach's reliability alpha was used to measure scale reliability, and content validity was established in item development, with questions rooted in transformational leadership theory. Descriptive statistics were utilized to describe respondents' answers to each of the survey items. That is, the percentage of responses to each response category for each item were shown to the readers. The percentages of responses that

reflect different preferences of ADs leadership characteristics/behaviors were presented. These percentages were calculated separately for each independent variable.

Next, an analysis was conducted to determine the numbers of participants in each of the categories for each of the independent variables. If a sufficient number of subjects were represented in each category, inferential statistics were performed to determine if there are significant differences between subjects with differing background characteristics. An overall scale was created with a range of 15 to 75, with higher scores indicating stronger preference for transformational leadership characteristics and behaviors. Group differences were examined using t-test and ANOVA with Boneferroni adjustments to coefficient alpha (from .05 to .007 for significance utilizing the formula alpha/7 for the number of t-tests) to control for the possibility of Type I error due to multiple t-tests on the same data. If there were fewer than 30% in any one of the categories, that variable was not analyzed using inferential statistics.

Summary

This chapter provided details on the design and methodology of this study including the following: (a) research design, (b) sample population, (c) survey instrument, (d) data collection procedures, and (e) data analysis. Chapter 4 contains the data presentation and analysis, and Chapter 5 presents the conclusions and recommendations for further study.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter includes information regarding the following results: (a) response rates, (b) descriptive statistics for all participants for questions 1-15 as overall responses and by institution, (c) descriptive statistics from responses to demographic questions reflecting overall responses and by institution, (d) internal consistency reliabilities of the measures, (e) analyses related to the major research hypotheses, and (f) an analysis of question number 16 pertaining to the donor's inclination to donate to the respective intercollegiate athletics department based upon the values of the AD. Response rates will be addressed first.

Response Rates

On November 15, 2005, the survey instrument, a cover letter, and a postage-paid return envelope were sent to the top 100 lifetime active donors at the University of Michigan. A 30-day cut-off (December 15, 2005) from when the surveys were mailed was established as the last day in which completed surveys would be accepted for the study. A total of 59 surveys were received by the deadline, for a 59% response rate. One other survey was received after December 30 but was not included in the analysis.

On November 28, 2005, the survey instrument, a cover letter, and a postage-paid return envelope were sent to the top 100 lifetime active donors at the University of Missouri. A 30-day cut-off (December 28, 2005) from when the surveys were mailed was established as the last day in which completed surveys would be accepted for the study. A total of 51 surveys were received by the deadline for a 51% response rate (a two institution response rate of 55%). One other survey was received after January 6, but was not included in the analysis.

Data Analysis

Primary data and data analysis are presented in two sections. The first section provides a descriptive summary of the primary data obtained through the survey instruments. The second section provides data analysis of the seven research questions.

After coding the survey results into an Excel spreadsheet, the spreadsheet was then converted into a form suitable for analysis by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences-PC (SPSS, version 13.0). Initially, descriptive statistics were calculated on all of the survey and demographic items without regard for the respondents' specific institutional affiliation. Then descriptive statistics were determined for each survey and demographic items for each of the two institutions whose alumni were surveyed for this research investigation.

Each respondent completed a survey of seven demographic questions and 16 questions by choosing, based on his/her own preference, the athletic director's characteristic/behavior (15 questions pertained to preference of transformational leadership characteristics/behaviors and one question addressed his/her inclination to continue contributing). The Likert scale range included the following: 1-Strongly Not Prefer, 2-Not Prefer, 3-Indifferent, 4-Prefer, 5-Strongly Prefer.

Responses to seven demographic questions were obtained. The questions asked whether the respondents were/did the following: (a) an alumni of the University of Michigan/Missouri, (b) a football season ticket holder, (c) lived within a 50-mile radius of the central campus of the University of Michigan/Missouri, (d) interacted with the AD on a regular (12-times in an academic year) basis, (e) a former student-athlete, (f) a men's basketball season ticket holder, and (g) attended women's sporting events at the University of Michigan/Missouri. Table 1 displays the demographic information.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Questions

Demographic item	Percent responding	Percent responding	Percent responding
	Overall	Michigan	Missouri
Are you an alumnus of the University of Michigan/Missouri?	80.0%	81.4%	78.4%
Are you a Michigan/Missouri football season ticket holder?	87.3%	83.1%	92.2%
Do you live within a 50-mile radius of the central campus of the University of Michigan/Missouri?	50.0%	49.2%	51.0%
Do you interact with the Michigan/Missouri AD on a regular basis?	43.6%	40.7%	47.1%
Are you a former student-athlete?	35.5%	37.3%	33.3%
Are you a Michigan/Missouri men's basketball season ticket holder?	57.3%	33.9%	84.3%
Do you attend women's sporting events at the University of Michigan/Missouri?	35.5%	32.2%	39.2%

The demographic information provided very interesting information. Eighty percent of the respondents were alumni of the University of Michigan/Missouri. Eight-seven percent were football season ticket holders. Fifty percent lived within a 50-mile radius of the respective central campus. Forty-four percent interacted with the athletic director on a regular basis. Thirty-six percent of the respondents were former student-athletes. Fifty-seven percent were basketball season ticket holders. Thirty-six percent attended women's sporting events at their respective institutions. When reviewing the demographic information by institution there appeared to be only one notable difference between the two institutions. At the University of Michigan, only 34% were basketball season ticket holders, and 83% were football season ticket holders. At the University of Missouri, 84% were basketball season ticket holders, and 92% were football season ticket holders. What makes these percentages even more interesting is that both institutions had roughly the same percentage of

respondents living within a 50-mile radius (which could have easily explained the difference due to the number of games and days of weeks) at 49% and 51% for Michigan and Missouri, respectively. This statement is a notable point because distance to travel to the events could have been an explainable difference with weeknight games and a more significant number of home events as compared to six or seven home football games a year.

Following these descriptive procedures, survey items 2, 4, 9, 11, 12, and 14 were reverse-scored so that these items contributed in the same way as the other survey items toward the measurement of preferred characteristics/behaviors of an Athletic Director. After reverse-scoring these items, the internal reliability was calculated for items 1 through 15. The resulting Cronbach's coefficient alpha was .755, more than sufficient for research purposes (Nunnally, 1988). The corrected item-total correlations, or relationship of each individual item with the total 15 items, ranged from a high of .519 to a low of .160. All corrected item-total correlations were positive, reflecting that each of the 15 survey items contributed positively to the measurement of preferred characteristics/behaviors of an Athletic Director. The results of the reversed-scored questions also strengthen the support for transformational leadership. Table 2 depicts the relationship of each individual survey item with the composite of measurement of preferred characteristics/behaviors of an Athletic Director.

Table 2

Internal Reliability Statistics for Survey Items 1-15

Survey items 1-15	Corrected item-total correlation	Cronbach's alpha if item deleted
...who holds herself/himself accountable while supporting the vision of the department.	.280	.751
..who is not concerned with getting employees and donors engaged in the department's future goals.	.385	.739
...who can be trusted and respected by employees and donors to make the right decision for the future of the department.	.160	.756
...who creates an environment that only focuses on group goals as opposed to an environment that fosters growth of the individuals striving to achieve the department-wide goals.	.336	.750
...who leads by example.	.316	.749
...who develops commitment and trust from employees in the department and donors to the program.	.390	.747
...who continually seeks new opportunities for the department.	.261	.750
...who works closely with donors to match the priorities of the department with goals of the supporters.	.445	.733
...who leads by directing rather than cooperating with employees and donors to accomplish goals.	.498	.727

Table 2 (continued)

...who engages employees and donors in the future of the department.	.402	.740
...who individually implements a strategy as opposed to engaging employees and donors in the strategy.	.519	.723
...who focuses on maintaining the current level of operations.	.387	.740
...who fosters an environment in which the employees share responsibility as a team.	.310	.746
...who does not delegate meaningful responsibility to employees.	.494	.730
...who uses inspirational motivation to reach goals of increased competitive success, market growth for the department, and increased national visibility.	.367	.741

Evaluating the total of 110 respondent answers to 15 questions (after reverse-coding questions 2, 4, 9, 11, 12, and 14 so they contributed in the same way as the other 9 survey items toward the measurement of preferred characteristics/behaviors of an Athletic Director), applying the Likert scale reflected a range of means of 3.85 to 4.95 on the 15 questions (See Table 3). Per the scale, this would indicate the low of 3.85, or almost "Prefer an AD who focuses only on group goals." The highest mean was 4.95, or almost "Strongly Prefer an AD who can be trusted and respected by employees and donors to make the right decision for the future of the department." These findings provide very strong results for an AD using a transformational leadership style. It should be noted that the reverse-coded items showed similar patterns with a little more variation.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for All Participants for Items 1-15

Survey items 1-15	Mean	Standard Deviation
...who holds herself/himself accountable while supporting the vision of the department.	4.48	.324
...who is not concerned with getting employees and donors engaged in the department's future goals.	4.49	.854
...who can be trusted and respected by employees and donors to make the right decision for the future of the department.	4.95	.209
...who creates an environment that only focuses on group goals as opposed to an environment that fosters growth of the individuals striving to achieve department-wide goals.	3.85	1.135
...who leads by example.	4.85	.354
...who develops commitment and trust from employees in the department and donors to the program.	4.90	.301
...who continually seeks new opportunities for the department.	4.55	.685
...who works closely with donors to match the priorities of the department with goals of the supporters.	4.41	.805
...who leads by directing rather than cooperating with employees and donors to accomplish goals.	3.90	1.196

(table continues)

Table 3 (continued)

...who engages employees and donors in the future of the department.	4.60	.562
...who individually implements a strategy as opposed to engaging employees and donors in the strategy building process.	3.98	1.031
…who focuses on maintaining the current level of operations.	4.12	.984
…who fosters an environment in which the employees share responsibility as a team.	4.55	.659
…who does not delegate meaningful responsibility to employees.	4.55	.711
…who uses inspirational motivation to reach goals of increased competitive success, market growth for the department, and increased national visibility.	4.52	.739

Evaluating the 15 questions answered on the Likert scale for each institution separately (59 responses for Michigan and 51 responses for Missouri; after reverse-coding questions 2, 4, 9, 11, 12, and 14 so they contributed in the same way as the other 9 survey items toward the measurement of preferred characteristics/behaviors of an Athletic Director) reflected a range of means of 3.86 to 4.97 and 3.73 to 4.94 for Michigan and Missouri respectively (See Table 4). All of the means for the 15 survey questions by institution fell close to "Prefer" (4.0) and up to "Almost Strongly Prefer" (5.0) on the Likert scale. Therefore, the individual institutional results support the overall results of the 110 respondents without much difference.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics Reported Separately for the Two Universities for Items 1-15

Survey items 1-15	University of Michigan		University of Missouri	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
...who holds herself/himself accountable while supporting the vision of the department.	4.86	.345	4.90	.300
...who is not concerned with getting employees and donors engaged in the department's future goals.	4.56	.794	4.39	.918
...who can be trusted and respected by employees and donors to make the right decision for the future of the department.	4.97	.183	4.94	.238
...who creates an environment that only focuses on group goals as opposed to an environment that fosters growth of the individuals striving to achieve the department-wide goals.	3.86	1.181	3.82	1.09
...who leads by example.	4.85	.363	4.86	.348
...who develops commitment and trust from employees in the department and donors to the program.	4.93	.254	4.86	348
...who continually seeks new opportunities for the department.	4.58	.700	4.53	.674
...who works closely with donors to match the priorities of the department with goals of the supporters.	4.42	.914	4.39	.666
...who leads by directing rather than cooperating with employees and donors to accomplish goals.	4.05	1.224	3.73	1.15

(table continues)

Table 4 (table continued)

...who engages employees and donors in the future of the department.	4.71	.493	4.47	.612
...who individually implements a strategy as opposed to engaging employees and donors in the strategy...	4.15	.925	3.78	1.119
...who focuses on maintaining the current level of operations.	3.98	1.091	4.27	.827
...who fosters an environment in which the employees share responsibility as a team.	4.56	.702	4.53	.612
...who does not delegate meaningful responsibility to employees.	4.66	.685	4.43	.728
...who uses inspirational motivation to reach goals of increased competitive success, market growth for the department, and increased national visibility.	4.49	.817	4.55	.642

Participants' responses to the 15 survey items were added to create a total score (a possible total of 15 to 75) regarding their preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership. A higher score on the survey reflected a stronger preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership, whereas a lower score reflected less of a preference for such an AD.

The mean score for all respondents from the University of Michigan and the University of Missouri was 67.64 (a mean score of 4.51 over the first 15 survey questions) and 66.39 (a mean score of 4.43 over the first 15 survey questions), respectively. The overall mean for the 110 respondents was 67.06 (a mean score of 4.47 over the first 15 survey questions). A mean score of 45.00 would be "Indifferent," a mean score of 60.00 would be "Prefer," and a mean score of 75.0 would indicate "Strongly Prefer". Both the institution and the overall scores exceed the "Prefer" mean of 60.00, thus demonstrating a strong preference for the leadership characteristics of a transformational leader. Once the survey instrument

was determined to have sufficient internal consistency for research purposes, the research questions previously described were addressed.

Research Question 1

Was there a significant difference in preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges as a function of whether the donors were alumni of the institution to which they donate? That is, did top alumni and non-alumni donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions differ in their preference for an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style? An analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was then performed to ascertain whether these two groups, alumni and non-alumni, differed in their preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership. The resulting analysis yielded a statistically significant difference, F (1, 108) = 3.839, $p < .05$. Participants who reported that they were alumni of the university indicated a stronger preference ($M = 67.60$, $SD = 5.12$) for an AD utilizing transformational leadership than was indicated by non-alumni ($M = 65.09$, $SD = 6.34$). The effect size for this statistically significant finding was .18 using Cohen's formula of square root of eta squared divided by one minus eta squared (eta squared is generated by the SPSS software), or small in size (Cohen, 1988). Thus, due to a finding of a statistically significant difference in the respondents' preferences for an AD utilizing transformational leadership between alumni and non-alumni donors, the null hypothesis for the first research question was rejected.

To delineate the specific item or items that contributed to this overall difference between the two groups, chi-square analytic procedures were used with each of the 15 survey items serving as dependent variables and the alumni/non-alumni variable serving as the

independent variable. The item "An Athletic Director who engages employees and donors in the future of the department" yielded a statistically significant difference between these two groups, with X^2 (2) = 9.46, p < .05. Of the participants who were alumni, 70.5% indicated a strong preference compared with only 36.4% of participants who were not alumni. The effect size for this finding (.29) was moderate (Cohen, 1988). A statistically significant difference was also yielded between these two groups on the item, "An Athletic Director who does not delegate meaningful responsibility to employees," X^2 (3) = 11.62, p < .05. Keeping in mind that this item was reverse-scored, of the participants who were alumni, 71.6% indicated a strong preference for a transformational leadership style, compared with only 40.9% of participants who were not alumni, for an AD that did delegate meaningful responsibility to employees. The effect size for this finding was moderate (.33) (Cohen). Therefore, these two items contributed to the statistically significant difference that was observed between alumni and non-alumni on their preferences regarding an Athletic Director.

Following these analyses, a 2 (institution of respondent) X 2 (alumni versus non-alumni) analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether or not respondents' preference for a transformational leadership style was related to institution, alumni/non-alumni, and/or to the interaction between these two variables. The analysis revealed a statistically significant difference as a function of institution, F (1, 106) = 4.944, p < .028, as a function of alumni/non-alumni, F (1,106) = 3.990, p <.048, and as a function of the interaction between institution and alumni/non-alumni, F (1,106) = 5.092, p < .026. The University of Michigan had a significantly higher mean than the University of Missouri. This could be due to the success of the football program at the University of Michigan instilling a sense of instant ownership of the institution, therefore giving the University of

Michigan donors a greater, or more vested, interest in the operations of the athletics programs, irrespective of whether the donor graduated from the University of Michigan. The mean of the alumni was significantly higher than the mean of the non-alumni, possibly indicating a stronger vested interest by individuals who have spent a considerable amount of time on the respective campuses (when enrolled as students).

Finally, there was a significant interaction between the responses of alumni and non-alumni at each institution, with a greater difference between the two groups at the University of Missouri than their University of Michigan counterparts. The effect suggests that non-alumni donors at the University of Missouri, with their significantly lower mean (M=62.3), are somehow different than non-alumni at the University of Michigan or alumni at either institution. While this group still "Prefers" transformational leadership, when comparing the non-alumni of the University of Missouri to the other three groups, two things are revealed: (a) The non-alumni of the University of Missouri scored lowest on all fifteen items; and (b) they responded differently to the reverse coded items (2, 4, 9, 11, 12, and 14). This suggests that the community where each institution is located is important because of the potential impact of the media market on engaging non-alumni at each institution. The strong national media presence of the University of Michigan may mitigate the differences between donors who are alumni and those without an academic connection to the institution with regards to the leadership style of the athletic director. In addition, the perception donors hold of the institution, both academically and athletically, could have an impact on the level of ownership that non-alumni feel towards the University of Michigan compared to the University of Missouri. The stronger feeling of ownership could be enunciated in the desire for an AD utilizing transformational leadership, reinforcing the donors' personal connection

with the University. The effect sizes, or practical importance, of these three statistically

significant findings were .217, .193, and .219, respectively. These effect sizes were reflective

of moderate importance. Means and standard deviations for these groupings are presented in

Table XX1.

Table XX1

Research Question 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Analyzed in the 2 X 2 ANOVA

School of respondent	Question 1: Are you an alumni of the University of Michigan/Missouri?	Mean	Standard Deviation
University of Michigan	No	67.9091	6.15556
	Yes	67.5833	5.22202
Total		67.6441	5.35229
University of Missouri	No	62.2727	5.38685
	Yes	67.6250	5.05705
Total		66.4706	5.54023
	No	65.0909	6.33891
	Yes	67.6023	5.11823
Total		67.1000	5.44691

Research Question 2

Was there a significant difference among the top donors to athletics programs at

Division-IA institutions as to a preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership as

a function of whether the donors were former student-athletes? That is, did top former

student-athlete and non-former student-athlete donors to athletics programs differ in their

preference related to an AD utilizing transformational leadership? An ANOVA test was

applied to the data. The resulting statistical analysis failed to identify a statistically

significant result, $F (1, 108) = 0.539$, $p > .05$. Participants who reported that they were

former student-athletes of the university indicated a similar preference ($M = 67.62$, $SD =$

4.52) for an AD utilizing transformational leadership to the one indicated by participants who were not former student-athletes (*M* = 66.82, *SD* = 5.91). Thus no statistically significant difference was present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between former student-athlete and non-former student-athlete donors. Thus, the null hypothesis for the second research question was not rejected. These two groups of participants did not differ statistically in their responses to the 15 survey items.

Following these analyses, a 2 (institution of respondent) X 2 (former student athlete or not) analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether respondents' preference for a transformational leadership style was related to institution, former student athlete or not, and to the interaction between these two variables. The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences as a function of institution, *F* (1, 106) = 0.596, *p* > .05, as a function of former student athlete or not, *F* (1, 106) = 0.601, *p* > .05, and as a function of the interaction between institution and former athlete or not, *F* (1, 106) = 0.844, *p* > .05. Means and standard deviations for these groupings are presented in Table XX2.

Table XX2

Research Question 2: Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Analyzed in the 2 X 2 ANOVA

School of respondent	Question 2: Are you a former student-athlete?	Mean	Standard Deviation
University of Michigan	No	67.7027	5.63158
	Yes	67.5455	4.97352
Total		67.6441	5.35229
University of Missouri	No	65.8529	6.13056
	Yes	67.7059	3.99632
Total		66.4706	5.54023
	No	66.8169	5.90716
	Yes	67.6154	4.51673
Total		67.1000	5.44691

Research Question 3

Was there a significant difference in preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions as a function of whether they were football season ticket holders? That is, did top football season ticket holders and non-season football ticket holder donors to athletics programs at Division-IA colleges differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership? An ANOVA test was applied. The resulting statistical analysis failed to yield a statistically significant result, $F (1, 108) = 0.586, p > .05$. This analysis yielded a non-significant finding despite a small cluster of responses. Participants who reported that they were football season ticket holders at the institution indicated a similar preference ($M = 66.95, SD = 5.60$) for an AD utilizing transformational leadership to the preference indicated by participants who were not football season ticket holders at the university ($M = 68.14, SD = 4.22$). Thus, no statistically significant difference was present in the respondent's preferences for an AD utilizing transformational leadership between football season ticket holders and individuals not owning football season tickets. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the third research question was not rejected. These two groups of participants did not differ statistically in their responses to the 15 survey items.

Following these analyses, a 2 (institution of respondent) X 2 (football season ticket holder or not) analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether or not respondents' preference for a transformational leadership style was related to institution, football season ticket holder or not, and to the interaction between these two variables. The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences as a function of institution, $F (1, 106) = 0.731, p > .05$, as a function of football season ticket holder or not, $F (1, 106) = 0.211, p > .05$, and as a

function of the interaction between institution and football season ticket holder nor not, F (1, 106) = 0.080, p > .05. Means and standard deviations for these groupings are in Table XX3.

Table XX3

Research Question 3: Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Analyzed in the 2 X 2 ANOVA

School of respondent	Question 3: Are you a Michigan/Missouri football season ticket holder?	Mean	Standard Deviation
University of Michigan	No	68.7000	4.37290
	Yes	67.4286	5.54527
Total		67.6441	5.35229
University of Missouri	No	66.7500	4.03113
	Yes	66.4468	5.68296
Total		66.4706	5.54023
	No	68.1429	4.22187
	Yes	66.9479	5.60520
Total		67.1000	5.44691

Research Question 4

Was there a significant difference in preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions as a function of whether they were men's basketball season ticket holders? That is, did top donors who were basketball season ticket holders and non-season basketball ticket holder donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions differ in their preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership? An ANOVA test was again applied. The resulting statistical analysis failed to yield a statistically significant result, F (1, 108) = 1.310, p > .05. Participants who reported that they were basketball season ticket holders at the university

indicated a similar preference ($M = 66.59$, $SD = 5.48$) for an AD utilizing transformational leadership to the preference reported by participants who were not basketball season ticket holders at the university ($M = 67.87$, $SD = 5.38$). Thus, no statistically significant difference was present in the respondent's preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between basketball season ticket holders and individuals not owning basketball season tickets. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the fourth research question was not rejected. These two groups of participants did not differ statistically in their responses to the 15 survey items.

Following these analyses, a 2 (institution of respondent) X 2 (basketball season ticket holder or not) analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether respondents' preference for a transformational leadership style was related to institution, basketball season ticket holder or not, and to the interaction between these two variables. The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences as a function of institution, $F(1, 106) = 0.755$, $p > .05$, as a function of basketball season ticket holder or not, $F(1, 106) = 0.715$, $p > .05$, and as a function of the interaction between institution and basketball season ticket holder nor not, $F(1, 106) = 0.636$, $p > .05$. Means and standard deviations for these groupings are presented in Table XX4.

Table XX4

Research Question 4: Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Analyzed in the 2 X 2 ANOVA

School of respondent	Question 4; Are you a Michigan/Missouri men's basketball season ticket holder?	Mean	Standard Deviation
University of Michigan	No	68.1538	5.29915
	Yes	66.6500	5.45098
Total		67.6441	5.35229
University of Missouri	No	66.0000	5.80640
	Yes	66.5581	5.55622
Total		66.4706	5.54023
	No	67.7872	5.38491
	Yes	66.5873	5.47909
Total		67.1000	5.44691

Research Question 5

Was there a significant difference in preference for an AD utilizing transformational

leadership among top donors to athletics programs at Division I-A institutions as a function

of whether they lived in the local community (within a 50-mile radius of the central

campus)? That is, did top local community member (donors who live within a 50-mile radius

of the central campus) and non-local community member (do not live within a 50-mile radius

of the central campus) donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions differ in their

preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership? The ANOVA test conducted to

determine the resulting statistical analysis failed to indicate a statistically significant result, *F*

(1, 108) = 0.795, *p* > .05. Participants who reported that they were local community members

reported a similar preference (*M* = 67.56, *SD* = 5.20) for an AD utilizing transformational

leadership to the preference reported by participants who were not local community members

(*M* = 66.64, *SD* = 5.69). Thus, no statistically significant difference was found in

respondents' preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between donors who live in the local community (within a 50-mile radius of the central campus) and donors who do not live in the local community (within a 50-mile radius of the central campus) Therefore, the null hypothesis for the fifth research question was not rejected. These two groups of participants did not differ statistically in their responses to the 15 survey items.

Following these analyses, a 2 (institution of respondent) X 2 (lived in local community or not) analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether respondents' preference for a transformational leadership style was related to institution, lived in local community or not, and to the interaction between these two variables. The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences as a function of institution, $F(1, 106) = 1.303$, $p > .05$, as a function of whether they lived in the local community, $F(1, 106) = 0.898$, $p > .05$, and as a function of the interaction between institution and living in the local community or not, $F(1, 106) = 0.288$, $p > .05$. Means and standard deviations for these groupings are present in Table XX5.

Table XX5

Research Question 5: Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Analyzed in the 2 X 2 ANOVA

School of respondent	Question 5: Do you live within a 50-mile radius of the central campus of the University of Michigan/Missouri?	Mean	Standard Deviation
University of Michigan	No	67.4333	5.50037
	Yes	67.8621	5.28288
Total		67.6441	5.35229
University of Missouri	No	65.6800	5.87878
	Yes	67.2308	5.19467
Total		66.4706	5.54023
	No	66.6364	5.69068
	Yes	67.5636	5.20243
Total		67.1000	5.44691

Research Question 6

Was there a significant difference in preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions as a function of whether they attend women's sporting events at the respective institutions? That is, did top donors who attended women's sporting events compared with top donors who did not attend women's sporting events at Division-IA institutions differ in their preference an AD utilizing transformational leadership? An ANOVA test was utilized to examine the differences. The resulting statistical analysis failed to yield a statistically significant result, $F(1, 108) = 0.195$, $p > .05$. Participants who reported that they did attend women's sporting events at Division-1A colleges indicated a similar preference ($M = 67.41$, $SD = 5.93$) for an AD utilizing transformational leadership to the preference indicated by participants who did not attend women's sporting events at Division-1A colleges ($M = 66.93$, $SD = 5.19$). Thus,

no significant difference was yielded in the respondents' preferences for an AD utilizing transformational leadership between donors who attend women's sporting events and donors who do not attend women's sporting events. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the sixth research question was not rejected. These two groups of participants did not differ statistically in their responses to the 15 survey items.

Following these analyses, a 2 (institution of respondent) X 2 (attend or not attend women sporting events) analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether respondents' preference for a transformational leadership style was related to institution, attend or not attend women sporting events, and to the interaction between these two variables. The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences as a function of institution, $F(1, 106) = 1.700$, $p > .05$, as a function of whether they attended women sporting events, $F(1, 106) = 0.254$, $p > .05$, and as a function of the interaction between institution and whether they attended women sporting events, $F(1, 106) = 0.470$, $p > .05$. Means and standard deviations for these groupings are present in Table XX6.

Table XX6

Research Question 6: Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Analyzed in the 2 X 2 ANOVA

School of respondent	Question 6: Do you attend women's sporting events at the University of Michigan/Missouri?	Mean	Standard Deviation
University of Michigan	No	67.2250	5.43723
	Yes	68.5263	5.20009
Total		67.6441	5.35229
University of Missouri	No	66.5484	4.93179
	Yes	66.3500	6.50728

(table continues)

Table XX6 (continued)

Total		66.4706	5.54023
	No	66.9296	5.19704
	Yes	67.4103	5.93259
Total		67.1000	5.44691

Research Question 7

The seventh and final research question asked whether or not there a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing transformational leadership among the top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions as a function of whether or not they interacted regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director. That is, did donors who interacted regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director compared with donors who did not interact regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the Athletics Director at Division-IA institutions, differ in their preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership? The difference in results between the two groups was not statistically significant, F (1, 108) = 1.642, p > .05. Participants who reported that they interacted regularly with the AD reflected a similar preference (M = 67.85, SD = 5.64) for an AD utilizing transformational leadership to the preference reflected by participants who did not interact regularly with the AD (M = 66.52, SD = 5.26). Thus, no significant difference was present in respondents' preferences of an AD utilizing transformational leadership between donors who interact regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the athletics director and donors who do not interact regularly (at least 12 times in an academic year) with the athletics director. Therefore, the null hypothesis for the seventh research question was not rejected. These two groups of participants did not differ statistically in their responses to the 15 survey items.

Following these analyses, a 2 (institution of respondent) X 2 (interact regularly with AD or not) analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether or not respondents' preference for a transformational leadership style was related to institution, interact or not interact regularly with AD, and to the interaction between these two variables. The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences as a function of institution, F (1, 106) = 1.395, $p > .05$, as a function of whether they interacted regularly with the AD, F (1, 106) = 1.856, $p > .05$, and as a function of the interaction between institution and whether they interacted regularly with the AD, F (1, 106) = 0.036, $p > .05$. Means and standard deviations for these groupings are present in Table XX7.

Table XX7

Research Question 7: Descriptive Statistics for the Variables Analyzed in the 2 X 2 ANOVA

School of respondent	Question 7: Do you interact with the Michigan/Missouri AD on a regular basis?	Mean	Standard Deviation
University of Michigan	No	67.1429	4.99496
	Yes	68.3750	5.86673
Total		67.6441	5.35229
University of Missouri	No	65.7037	5.58029
	Yes	67.3333	5.48252
Total		66.4706	5.54023
	No	66.5161	5.26274
	Yes	67.8542	5.64175
Total		67.1000	5.44691

Survey Question 16

In response to the question 16 on the survey in which participants were queried regarding whether they would be more inclined to donate to the Athletic Department if the AD manages an Athletic Department with characteristics and behaviors that they support, 6.8%

and 7.8% indicated they were indifferent for Michigan and Missouri. Respectively, 33.9% and 29.4% indicated that they preferred this for Michigan and Missouri, and 59.3% and 62.7% indicated they strongly preferred this for Michigan and Missouri, respectively.

Table 5

Results of Survey Question 16

School of respondent	Response	Percent
University of Michigan	Indifferent	6.8
	Prefer	33.9
	Strongly Prefer	59.3
University of Missouri	Indifferent	7.8
	Prefer	29.4
	Strongly Prefer	62.7

To determine whether participants from the two universities differed with regard to this item, a Pearson chi-square analysis was conducted with school membership as the independent variable and responses to this item as the dependent variable. The finding was not statistically significant, x2 (2) = 0.268, *p* > .05.

Finally, an Analysis of Variance was conducted to determine whether or not a statistically significant difference was present in the preferred characteristics of an AD as a function of the extent to which participants were inclined to donate to the Athletic Department (item 16). The results were statistically significant, F (2, 107) = 12.567, $p < .001$, indicating that participants' response to item 16 was related to their preferred characteristics of an AD. Follow-up Scheffe post hoc analyses (*p*s < .05) revealed that participants who reported a "Strongly Prefer" on item 16 had significantly overall higher scores on the

aggregated measure of preferred characteristics ($M = 68.98$) than was obtained either by

participants who reported a "Prefer" on item 16 ($M = 64.34$) or by participants who reported

an Indifferent on item 16 ($M = 63.38$). Thus, participants who responded with a "Strongly

Prefer" to item 16 responded more positively to the preferred characteristics of an AD in this

study.

Summary

This chapter provided response results of the data analyses completed in the study. In

addition, this chapter contained results related to the following: (a) response rates, (b)

descriptive statistics for the responses to the survey questions, (c) descriptive statistics for

demographic questions both for overall responses and by institution, (d) internal consistency

reliabilities of the measures, (e) analyses related to the major research hypotheses, and (f) an

analysis of question number 16 pertaining to the donor's inclination to donate to the

respective intercollegiate athletics department based upon the values of the AD. A significant

difference was found to exist in the respondents' preferences for an AD utilizing a

transformational leadership style between top donors to athletics programs representing the

two groups of alumni and non-alumni. Two items in particular contributed to the significant

difference: (a) "An Athletic Director who engages employees and donors in the future of the

department" and (b) "An Athletic Director who does not delegate meaningful responsibility

to employees." Also the analysis revealed a statistically significant difference as a function

of institution, as a function of alumni/non-alumni, and as a function of the interaction

between institution and alumni/non-alumni.

No significant differences were found between the other six groups of constituencies to NCAA Division-IA athletics programs. These include football season ticket holders/non-football season ticket holders, donors living within the local community of the institutions/donors not living within the local community, donors interacting regularly with the athletic directors/donors not interacting regularly with the athletic directors, former student-athletes/non-former student-athletes, men's basketball season ticket holders/non-men's basketball season ticket holders, and donors attending women's sporting events/donors not attending women's sporting events.

Chapter 5: Overview, Discussion, and Recommendations

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the study including details pertaining to the instrument development. Following is a review of the findings, a discussion of the results and conclusions derived as a result of the data analyses, and direction for future research.

Overview of the Study

NCAA Division –IA intercollegiate athletics has become a big business with equally big expenses. The average NCAA Division-IA IAD expense budget increased 110% over the ten-year period from 1993-2003. Of the eleven NCAA Division-IA conferences and the group of independents, only four conferences (Big 12, Big 10, Mountain West, SEC) reported an average net profit for their conference members for the 2001-02 academic year. The overall NCAA Division-IA average, excluding institutional support, was a net loss of $600,000 for the same academic year.

Skyrocketing expenses can be attributed to the increasing cost of line items such as salaries, scholarships, equipment, travel, publications, contractual obligations, and recruiting. Due to the strain on the operating budgets, athletics directors are feeling the pressure to increase revenue to balance the budget. When institutional support is continually decreasing, and ticket revenue cannot be counted on (except at a handful of institutions), the athletics director needs to aggressively pursue a larger piece of the philanthropic community pie.

Theoretically, transformational leadership should be effective in the very competitive and unpredictable realm of the elite NCAA Division-IA intercollegiate athletics programs. In spite of the large, accumulated body of literature on transformational leadership, the topic has been given remarkably little attention in the literature on sport management. In the context of

managing intercollegiate athletics departments, there are some findings that support the effectiveness of transformational leadership (Doherty, 1997; Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Yusof, 1998). However, there has been no research on the effectiveness of an athletics director utilizing transformational leadership and the impact on fundraising at NCAA Division-IA institutions.

The top 100 lifetime active athletic donors at the University of Michigan and the top 100 lifetime active athletic donors at the University of Missouri were asked to complete a survey instrument. The survey questions were designed to ask donors to respond to questions pertaining to an AD's behavior, philosophy, and actions. The donors were asked to rate, on a scale of 1-5, whether they preferred or did not prefer the stated characteristic/behavior. In addition to this set of questions pertaining to leadership styles, donors were asked seven demographic questions and a question probing their level of inclination to continue to contribute if the AD's values mirrored his/her values.

The survey questions were written based upon the three transformational leadership components that were agreed upon by a majority of leadership studies reviewed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). The following three components were written in question format to address both transformational and non-transformational leadership behaviors in language similar to the 1990 study by Podsakoff et al.: (a) identify and articulate a vision, (b) provide an appropriate model, and (c) foster the acceptance of group goals). A new instrument was created for this study based on the fact that a department of intercollegiate athletics had several features that distinguished them from conventional organizations such as an automobile manufacturer or a bank.

The seven research questions analyzed in this study addressed the primary seven core groups of supporters confirmed by experts in intercollegiate athletics. Those seven groups were as follows: (a) alumni, (b) football season ticket holder, (c) those who live within 50 miles of the central campus, (d) those who interact on a regular basis with the athletics director, (e) former student-athletes, (f) men's basketballs season ticket holders, and (g) individuals who attend women's sporting events.

Review of the Findings

The current study explored a number of previously unresearched or under-researched factors that could influence the relationship between top donors to intercollegiate athletics programs and an AD's leadership style. The seven most significant groups of supporters as determined by individuals in top Bowl Championship Series Conference institutions' athletic administrations were utilized in this study. One hundred and ten completed surveys were used in the analysis. Eighty percent were alumni of the respective institutions, 87% were football season ticket holders, 50% lived within 50 miles of each respective campus, 44% interacted regularly with the athletics director, 36% were former student-athletes, 57% were men's basketball season ticket holders, and 36% attended women's sporting events at the respective institutions.

The first research question regarding whether there was a significant difference in donor preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership among top donors to athletics programs at Division-IA institutions as a function of whether they were alumni of the institution to which they donate was asked. The null hypothesis was rejected, meaning that alumni prefer an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style more significantly than

non-alumni. A chi-square analytic procedure was used with each of the 15 survey items serving as dependent variables, and the alumni/non-alumni variables serving as the independent variable was yielded between these two groups on survey questions 10 and 14. Research question 2 did not lead to a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style among top donors by whether they were former student-athletes. Research question 3 did not lead to a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style among top donors by whether they were football season ticket holders or not. Research question 4 did not lead to a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style among top donors by whether they were basketball season ticket holders or not. Research question 5 did not lead to a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style among top donors by whether they lived within the local community (within a 50-mile radius) of the institution. Research question 6 did not lead to a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style among top donors by whether they attend women's sporting events at the institution. Research question 7 did not lead to a significant difference in preference of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style among top donors by whether they interact regularly (a minimum of 12-times in an academic year).

Finally, research question 16, which asked whether or not a donor is more inclined to donate to the athletic department if the athletic director manages an athletic department with characteristics and behaviors that the donor supports, was addressed. The mean score on a scale of 1-5 for the 110 responses was 4.53. The responses for the University of Michigan

reflected 6.8%-Indifferent, 33.9%-Prefer, and 59.3%-Strongly Prefer; for the respondents

from the University of Missouri 7.8%-Indifferent, 29.4%-Prefer, and 62.7%-Strongly Prefer.

Discussion of the Results

Seven research questions are examined in this study, and one of the seven

demonstrates some significance. An ANOVA was performed to determine whether alumni

and non-alumni differed in their preference for an AD utilizing transformational leadership.

The analysis reveals a statistically significant difference, $F (1,108) = 3.839$, $p<.05$. Alumni

respondents reflected a mean score of 67.60 and a standard deviation of 5.12 whereas non-

alumni reflected a mean score of 65.09 and a standard deviation of 6.34. Literature discusses

the role of administrators at institutions taking steps to support and reinforce the relationship

between the alumni and the institution. Stutler and Calvario (1996) conducted a study that

reinforces why a difference might exist in alumni and non-alumni giving. They concluded

that the extent to which the alumni feel the college met their specific needs has a profound

effect on donor behavior. One of the recommendations that Stutler and Calvario (1996) made

following their study was that "alumni fundraising must be viewed as an endeavor based on

alliances created throughout the campus community" (p. 12). Since an athletic director is an

extension of the campus community, the impact on alumni giving as compared to the impact

on non-alumni could be significant.

Responses to Question 16 show the increased inclination to donate when an athletic

donor agrees with the values and philosophy of the athletic director. It dramatically increases

the interest in continuing support for the department. This is critical information to

institutions across the country. Specifically, this information can be very valuable to the

institution's president if one of the charges to a new athletic director is to fundraise. If the institution's president is in touch with the community, then she/he can hire an athletic director who will manage/lead with a philosophy/style consistent with the community's wishes.

The selection of an AD by a college or university doesn't appear to be driven by the same selection criteria that would be applied when hiring a manager or business leader in a typical "American business." Danylchuk and Chelladurai's (1999) study of Canadian intercollegiate athletic directors identified several key differences between the search and selection criteria applied in intercollegiate athletics programs and those applied in other business settings such as an automaker, a hospital, and a bank. These differences were noted even when comparing higher education institutions' search criteria for other types of organizational leaders. According to the researchers, "Having to deal with these divergent expectations and pressures from influential and not-so-influential quarters makes managerial work in intercollegiate athletics even more complex than typical organizations." (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999, p. 150)

An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether a statistically significant difference was present in the preferred characteristics of an Athletic Director as a function of the extent to which participants were inclined to donate to the athletic department. The results are statistically significant, $F(2, 107) = 12.567$, $p<.001$, indicating that participants' response to item 16 is related to their preferred characteristics of an AD. Analyses revealed that participants who reported a "Strongly Prefer" on item 16 had a significantly overall higher scores on the aggregated measure of preferred characteristics. Overall, respondents who were more inclined to donate with shared values of the AD also responded more positively to the

other characteristic questions. This finding provides reinforcement to the premise that it is important to spend time getting to know the donors to an institution since this will allow the department to align its values with those of its constituencies. This is congruent with Sargeant's (2001) research that found relationship marketing is relevant to the fundraising endeavors of IADs. Relationship marketing is "characterized by emphasis on customer retention and development" (Sargeant, 2001, p. 178). The results of survey question 16 (which reinforces top donors' preference of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style) could enhance a relationship marketing effort.

The results of the current study confirm the strong preference of the seven key donor groups to NCAA Division-IA intercollegiate athletic programs from Bowl Championship Series Conferences of an AD utilizing a transformational leadership style. This can have great significance for institutional presidents when hiring an AD to oversee the institution's athletics programs. With the great reductions impacting intercollegiate athletics programs at the NCAA Division-IA level, it is imperative for institutions to have an AD who can maximize the philanthropic support of its constituents. This fact, coupled with the results that donors are more inclined to contribute when they share the same values as the athletic director, can have tremendous impact on the resources available to a department.

<center>Directions for Future Research</center>

The case study of the Pennsylvania State University football program reported by Smart and Wolfe (2000) provided the only tangible evidence that transformational leadership leads to more successful athletic achievement and effectively positions the program as a valuable school resource. At the present, the idea that transformational leaders can increase

the success of fundraising efforts in intercollegiate athletics is primarily based on theoretical assumptions.

The purpose of this study was to determine which characteristics/behaviors of an athletic director donors to athletic programs prefer and whether that impacts their willingness to support the institution's athletics program. In addition, institutional presidents will have a better understanding of the importance of knowing the members of the donor community, both local and national, which will enable them to reach out and achieve higher philanthropic giving totals.

The current study may be considered significant in that it examined the seven key categories of athletic donors to two NCAA Division-IA institutions and their preferences for an athletic director's leadership philosophy/values/style. The study established statistically significant preferred characteristics of an athletic director and the donors' inclination to continue to contribute.

Building upon the current study, several avenues of future research are available that will allow for increased understanding of the relationship between an AD's leadership style and donor behavior. The giving records of individual donors to departments of intercollegiate athletics can be analyzed to provide a better understanding of how an AD's leadership style influences donor behavior in terms of dollars gained. It is hoped that current results can be utilized by the two subject institutions to relate to their current donors. In addition, other institutions at the various NCAA Division I, II and III levels can utilize the results in the selection process of individuals to head their respective department of intercollegiate athletics.

More research is needed to better understand and build upon the impact that an athletic director practicing transformational leadership can have on fundraising within the department, and overall within the institution, at the different NCAA levels. These institutions could face varying challenges and perceptions based upon available resources and the potential different academic missions of the institutions, creating similar or different results.

A statistically significant difference was found in this study relating to alumni/non-alumni as a function of the institution and as a function of the interaction of the institution with the alumni/non-alumni. Additional research on the composition of the donor base at each institution could uncover some of the characteristics leading to this difference. The length of time an individual has held football and/or men's basketball season tickets could help explain whether donors felt more vested in the program or if their preference was impacted by winning and/or losing seasons.

In addition, this study utilized lifetime donors as the key research groups. Expanding this study to include new and/or younger donors could uncover some interesting findings as well. Understanding this dynamic would be important to both ADs who have managed an IAD for a long period of time as well as ADs who inherit a new program, as they seek a potentially robust source of increasing income as the donor's income goes up with age. If an AD is fortunate to detect a trend in the younger group of donors, she/he could implement a strategic fundraising plan to capture this future wealth.

An interesting next step could be to conduct further research at other institutions to analyze whether the success of the predominant sport impacts the leadership style preferences. For example, investigating donors to Duke's men's basketball program, donors

to Virginia Tech's football program, and donors to Connecticut's women's basketball program could reveal valuable results.

Finally, additional research is needed to determine whether the classification of an institution as private or public impacts the top athletics donors' preferences of an AD's leadership style. With the difference in the funding model for public and private institutions, the donors' preference of behaviors/characteristics of the respective IAD's leadership might be different.

References

Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2004). Strategic change and the role of interests, power, and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management, 18,* 158-198.

Baade, R. A. & Sundberg, J. O. (1996). Fourth down and gold to go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly, 77,* 789-803.

Bandura, A. (1986*). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18,* 19-31.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8,* 9-32.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M. & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10,* 181-217.

Bennis, W. G. (1989a). Managing the dream: Leadership in the 21st century. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 2,* 6-10.

Bennis, W. G. (1989b). *Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bernhut, S. (2001). Managing the dream: Warren Bennis on leadership. *Ivey Business Journal,* 36-41.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Conger, J. A. (1989). Leadership: The art of empowering others. *Academy of Management Executive, 3,* 17-24.

Conger, J. A. (1991). Inspiring others: The language of leadership. *Academy of Management Executive, 5,* 31-45.

Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13,* 471-482.

Danylchuk, K. E. & Chelladurai, P. (1999). The nature of managerial work in Canadian intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 13,* 148-166.

Doherty, A. J. (1997). The effect of leader characteristics on the perceived transformational/transactional leadership and impact of interuniversity athletic administrators. *Journal of Sport Management, 11,* 275-285.

Frank, R. H. (2004). *Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletic success, student quality, and donation.* Report prepared for the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved January, 2005 from http://www.knightfdn.org/athletics/reports/2004_frankreport/KCIA_Frank_report_2004.pdf

Fulks, D. L. (2003). Revenues and expenses, profits and losses of division I-A intercollegiate athletics programs aggregated by conference – 2003 fiscal year. Retrieved February, 2005 from http://www2.ncaa.org/media_and_events/ncaa_publications/research/index.htm

Goff, B. (2000). Effects of university athletics on the university: A review and extension of empirical assessment. *Journal of Sport Management, 14,* 85-104.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* New York: Paulist Press.

Harrison, W. B., Mitchell, S. K., & Peterson, S. P. (1995). Alumni donations and colleges' developmental expenditures: Does spending matter? *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 54,* 397-412.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). Change masters and the intricate architecture of corporate culture exchange. *Management Review,* 18-28.

Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 18,* 257-265.

Keller, R. T. (1995, May/June). Transformational leaders make a difference. *Research Technology Management*, v38, 41-44.

Kellett, P. (1999). Organizational leadership: Lessons from professional coaches. *Sport Management Review, 2,* 150-171.

Kent, A. & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 15,* 135-139.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *Force for change: How leadership differs from management.* New York: Free Press.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1990, January). The credibility factor: What followers expect from their leaders. *Management Review,* 29-33.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2001, June). Exemplary vision: Inspire shared vision. *Executive Excellence,* 3-4.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2003a, September). Character development: It's what leadership is all about. *Executive Excellence,* 3-4.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2003b, November). Recognize contributions: Bring out the best in your people. *Executive Excellence,* 4-5.

Mahesh, V. S. (1993). *Thresholds of motivation: Nurturing human growth in the organization.* New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). New York: Van Nostrand.

Mintzberg, H. (1980). *The nature of managerial work* (2nd ed). New York: Harper & Row.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on follower's trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*(2), 107-142.

Raiborn, M. (1990). Revenues and expenses of intercollegiate athletics programs. Overland Park, KA: NCAA.

Rhoads, T. A. & Gerking, S. (2000). Educational contributions, academic quality, and athletic success. *Contemporary Economic Policy, 18,* 248-258.

Ristow, A. M., Amos, T. L., & Staude, G. E. (1999). Transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness in the administration in South Africa. *South African Journal of Business Management, 30,* 1-5.

Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behaviour. *Journal of Marketing Management, 15,* 215-238.

Sargeant, A. (2001). Relationship fundraising: How to keep donors loyal. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 12,* 177-192.

Scott, D. K. (1997). Managing organizational culture in intercollegiate athletic organizations. *Quest, 49,* 403-415.

Scott, D. K. (1999). A multiframe perspective of leadership and organizational climate in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 13,* 298-316.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P. M., Heifetz, R. A., & Torbert, B. (2000). A conversation on leadership. *Reflections, 2*(1), 57-68.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4,* 577-594.

Smart, D. L. & Wolfe, R. A. (2000). Examining sustainable competitive advantage in intercollegiate athletics: A resource-based view. *Journal of Sport Management, 14,* 133-153.

Stinson, J. L. & Howard, D. R. (2004). Scoreboards vs. mortarboards: Major donor behavior and intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 13,* 129-140.

Stutler, D. & Calvario, D. (1996, November). In alumni support, satisfaction matters. *Fund Raising Management,* 12-13.

Suggs, W. (2003). Increased spending on college sports does not increase net profits, NCAA report says. Retrieved May, 2005 from http://chronicle.com/daily/2003/08/2003081501n.htm

Verner, M. E., Hecht, J. B., & Fansler, G. (1998). Validating an instrument to assess the motivation of athletic donors. *Journal of Sport Management, 12,* 123-137.

Wolfe, R. A. (2000). Understanding university athletics: Cultural, strategic, and economic perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management, 14,* 79-84.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15,* 251-289.

Yusof, A. (1998). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors and coaches' job satisfaction. *Physical Educator, 55,* 170-175.

Zaleznik, A. (2004, January). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review,* 74-81. (Original work published 1977).

Appendices

Appendix A: Letter to Michigan Donors

November 15, 2005

Dear valuable supporter,

This survey is being administered to gain important information about you and your preferences as a top supporter of the University of Michigan Athletics Department. The survey will take approximately five minutes. The information I receive from you will be summarized, returned to Bill Martin, the Director of Athletics at the University of Michigan, and used as part of the overall evaluation of the Athletic Development process as well as providing the final data necessary for the completion of a doctorate in Educational Leadership.

Your responses are guaranteed to remain confidential and used for research purposes only. Participation is completely voluntary. There will be no identifying marks on your survey to ensure your confidentiality. Because the University receives only summarized data, your responses will not be connected to you. It is very important that you answer the questions carefully and frankly.

The questions ask you to provide basic demographic information about yourself as well as your preferences for leadership characteristics of athletics directors. After completing the questionnaire, please place it in the postage-paid, self-addressed envelope provided, seal it, and return drop in any United States mail box that is convenient.

This research has been approved by Eastern Michigan University's Institution Review Board. If you have any questions or problems with the enclosed survey please contact Dr. Patrick Melia, Associate Dean, EMU UHSRC Administrative Co-Chair at patrick.melia@emich.edu or Dr. Steven Pernecky, EMU UHSRC Administrative Co-Chair at steve.pernecky@emich.edu.

If you have any questions about the survey, the process or about the study in general, please call me direct at 734-255-3639 or e-mail me at bwickstr@emich.edu. Thank you for your cooperation and the valuable information you provide by completing this survey.

Sincerely,

Brian Wickstrom
Doctoral Candidate in Educational Leadership
Eastern Michigan University

Appendix B: Survey for Michigan Donors

Appendix C: Letter to Missouri Donors

November 15, 2005

Dear valuable supporter,

This survey is being administered to gain important information about you and your preferences as a top supporter of the University of Missouri Athletics Department. The survey will take approximately five minutes. The information I receive from you will be summarized, returned to Mike Alden, the Director of Athletics at the University of Missouri, and used as part of the overall evaluation of the Athletic Development process as well as providing the final data necessary for the completion of a doctorate in Educational Leadership.

Your responses are guaranteed to remain confidential and used for research purposes only. Participation is completely voluntary. There will be no identifying marks on your survey to ensure your confidentiality. Because the University receives only summarized data, your responses will not be connected to you. It is very important that you answer the questions carefully and frankly.

The questions ask you to provide basic demographic information about yourself as well as your preferences for leadership characteristics of athletics directors. After completing the questionnaire, please place it in the postage-paid, self-addressed envelope provided, seal it, and return drop in any United States mail box that is convenient.

This research has been approved by Eastern Michigan University's Institution Review Board. If you have any questions or problems with the enclosed survey please contact Dr. Patrick Melia, Associate Dean, EMU UHSRC Administrative Co-Chair at Patrick.melia@emich.edu or Dr. Steven Pernecky, EMU UHSRC Administrative Co-Chair at steve.pernecky@emich.edu.

If you have any questions about the survey, the process or about the study in general, please call me direct at 734-255-3639 or e-mail me at bwickstr@emich.edu. Thank you for your cooperation and the valuable information you provide by completing this survey.

Sincerely,

Brian Wickstrom
Doctoral Candidate in Educational Leadership
Eastern Michigan University

Appendix D: Survey for Missouri Donors

Appendix E: Human Subjects Review Committee Approval

Patrick Melia <patrick.melia@emich.edu> 11/15/2005 3:33:43 PM

Brian,

This is to let you know that the UHSRC faculty Expedited Review committee has recommended approval of your protocol ³A Study of Athletic Donor Preferences for a Director of Athletics Leadership Characteristics and Behaviors² and this email is to let you know of this approval. You will be receiving an official letter of approval following our next UHSRC meeting on November 18th but until that time this email is to let you know that you are approved to begin your data collection procedures of this study at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes.

Dr. Patrick Melia
Administrative Co-Chair
UHSRC