Chapter

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP: THEORY, RESEARCH, AND APPLICATION TO SPORTS

*A. Rui Gomes**

University of Minho, School of Psychology. Portugal

ABSTRACT

Analyzing the influence of coaches on athlete performance and on the psychological experiences of team members (e.g., motivation, satisfaction, and cohesion) is a fascinating endeavor. Thus, it is not surprising that several authors have dedicated considerable effort to studying coaches' mental representations and actions being proposed important conceptual models (Chelladurai, 1993; Côté, Salmela, Trudel, Baria, & Russell, 1995; Smoll & Smith, 1989; Jowett, 2007).

Despite the unequivocal interest in these proposals, insufficient attention has been given to recent developments in leadership research, namely charismatic and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977). Therefore, analyzing the application of transformational leadership in sports contexts becomes important.

---

* Corresponding author: A. Rui Gomes, Universidade do Minho, Escola de Psicologia, Campus de Gualtar, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal, Tel. +253.604.232, Fax: +253.604.224, Email: rgomes@psi.uminho.pt.

Taking this need into consideration, this chapter aims to: (a) review the theoretical proposals and research conducted regarding charismatic/transformational leadership in several organizational contexts; (b) review the research conducted regarding transformational leadership in sports; and (c) propose conceptual, empirical, and practical guidelines concerning the application of transformational leadership in sports.

INTRODUCTION

According to Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, "leadership is the ability to decide what is to be done, and then go get others to want to do it" (Larson, 1968, p. 21). Accordingly, for Harry S. Truman also President of the United States (1958, p. 139), "a leader is a man who has the ability to get other people to do what they don't want to do, and like it". Likewise, some authors have identified the instrumental side of leadership, meaning that this phenomenon should be understood as a process of influencing others to achieve certain goals (Bartol & Martin, 1994; Zaleznik, 1989). However, there is no mention of the values, ethics, morals, or "goodness" involved in leadership in these definitions (Drouillard & Kleiner, 1996), and somehow they suggest that leaders use manipulative or persuasive strategies to accomplish certain objectives. Thus, these definitions may not overcome other forms of using the power of leadership. For example, recent leadership movements have proposed that power depends on a leader's capacity to create positive and challenging visions of an organization's future and articulate ways for followers to accomplish this vision (Bass, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

Despite these differences, all leadership definitions emphasize the primary characteristic of leadership: influencing others. This chapter analyzes one conceptual approach that explains the processes of influence between leaders and followers: transformational leadership.

The potential impact that transformational leaders have on their contexts, by introducing substantial changes to their social and work environments, as well as on the values and behaviors of their followers justifies this interest. In fact, in the world of open markets in which organizations must deal with aggressive competitors and increase the quality of their performance with fewer resources, leaders play an important role in helping individuals and organizations prosper or simply survive. As it will be presented, transformational leaders have been demonstrating their efficacy in a broad set

of contexts, leading their followers, groups, and organizations to perform beyond what would be expected without them.

Thus, this chapter analyzes the importance of transformational leadership in sports, examining whether this construct can help understand the leadership styles applied by the different individuals involved in sports, with particular attention paid to the leadership of coaches. More specifically, the following questions directed the analyses: does transformational leadership apply to sports? What is the current state of research on this subject in sports? What should be overcome in future research? To best respond to these questions, it is necessary to explain why this "new" leadership movement emerged and what are its primary theoretical and empirical contributions to the study of leadership. To accomplish these goals, this chapter is divided into five sections.

The first section describes conceptual approaches to the study of leadership. The main goal of this section is to provide an historical perspective of the theoretical frameworks of the study of leadership. Furthermore, it explains when and why the study of transformational leadership became useful and important to the social sciences, being also explained the concept of charismatic leadership because it is historically related with transformational leadership.

The second section presents the theoretical models of charismatic and transformational leadership. In addition, it defines the primary constructs and characteristics of these leadership types. As in the first section, the major goal of this section is to provide an historical perspective of the conceptual approaches to the study of charismatic and transformational leadership.

The third section analyzes the impact of transformational leaders. Its goal is to demonstrate the changes introduced by transformational leaders and to observe the impact of these changes on followers and organizations. Thus, some important questions are answered in this section: why study transformational leaders? What is learned from this leadership approach?

The fourth section introduces the study of transformational leadership with regard to sports. Considering the empirical research on the effects of transformational leaders addressed by the previous section, this section attempts to answer the following questions: is there value in analyzing transformational leadership in sports? If so, what are the findings of this research?

The fifth and final part of the chapter highlights the potential for transformational leadership research in sports. Its goal is to identify what must

be better understood about transformational leadership and the advantages of this approach in a sports context.

LEADERSHIP STUDY APPROACHES

Leadership is a complex and fascinating topic. Researchers have dedicated significant effort to study the so-called leadership triangle, which involves a leader, the followers, and the environment where this leadership occurs. Over the years, different approaches have emerged to explain each aspect of this triangle as well as the complex interaction among them.

Early approaches to the study of leadership emphasized the characteristics (or traits) of the leader. For example, in his well-known book *Hereditary Genius*, Sir Francis Galton (1869) proposed that leadership is a property unique to extraordinary individuals who take actions to change the course of history. Similarly, the famous psychologist William James (1880) admitted that major societal changes result from the actions of great individuals who lead others in directions they believe to be important.

This vision of leadership influenced researchers to analyze leader characteristics at different levels (e.g., intellectually, psychologically, and physically), and the study of these attributes dominated the field until the late 1940s and early 1950s (Zaccaro, 2007). This movement has become known as the heroic conception of leadership, which resulted in the "greatman" leadership theory (Vroom & Jago, 2007). This conception of leadership is attractive because psychological tests might be used to discover the important psychological traits of effective leaders, and even more enthusiastically, society would be able to place these individuals in leadership positions to achieve the best results for all of us.

However, important reviews regarding leadership traits concluded that leadership personality features differ significantly across studies, being difficult to define a set of characteristics that explains leadership efficacy (Mann, 1959; Stodgill, 1948). For example, Stodgill (1948) reviewed 30 years of trait studies and concluded that only a few traits (most notably intelligence) were associated (approximately 35% of the time) with differences between leaders and followers. However, the most disappointing result was that no variable or cluster of variables was related to effective leadership across situations. Thus, Stodgill (1948) concluded that finding a single personality trait that predicted effective leadership was unlikely because "an adequate

analysis of leadership involves not only a study of leaders but also of situations" (pp. 64-65).

Due to this conclusion, the 1950s and 1960s embraced new conceptions of leadership. Specifically, researchers were now interested in leadership actions rather than leadership qualities (Fleishman, 1953; Hemphill & Coons, 1957). For example, studies at the Ohio State University and the University of Michigan observed how leaders behave and formulated important constructs that are still used today. The Ohio State studies identified the behavioral dimensions of consideration (which concerns aspects of mutual trust and communication between a leader and a subordinate as well as the leader's concern with subordinate needs) and initiating structure (which concerns the working relationship between a leader and a subordinate as well as aspects of work schedules, methods, and task accomplishments) (Vroom & Jago, 2007). The results of these studies revealed that the most effective leaders use behaviors contingent upon the situation, task-oriented behaviors (initiating structure), relationship-oriented behaviors (consideration), or some combination therein (Erickson, Shaw, & Agabe, 2007). Again, however, these results were not consistent across studies in predicting the important outcomes associated with leadership effectiveness (e.g., follower satisfaction and group performance) (Fleishman & Harris, 1962; Korman, 1966). For example, considerate leadership was related to follower satisfaction and morale, but consideration and initiation of structure were sometimes, but not always, predictive of group performance (Chemers, 2000).

Although the study of a leader's behavior recognized the importance of their personality traits and the situations that they face (both of which are factors needed to explain leadership actions in certain contexts), the results did not fully support the behavioral approach. As Vroom and Jago (2007) note, this approach does not sufficiently explain leadership effectiveness. Thus, studying the external conditions that leaders face becomes crucial which lead to the emergency of contingency theories that seek to explain why some leaders present effective leadership characteristics in certain situations but inadequate leadership characteristics when the situation changes. These contingency theories (which are well represented by the proposals of Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1996; House, 1971; Kerr & Jermier, 1978; and Vroom & Jago, 2007) were based on Fiedler (1964) work and his subsequent book, *A theory of leadership effectiveness* (Fiedler, 1967).

In general, these theories propose that an understanding of the leadership effectiveness requires a comprehension of the leadership situation (e.g., type of subordinate, task, organization, or some combination therein). To be

effective, leaders should do an analysis of theses aspects in order to adopt an appropriate action. Thus, a leader can have a strong effect on the motivational and emotional states of followers and on the performance of the group by adopting specific actions that account for relevant follower characteristics and task environment (Chemers, 2000).

A more recent leadership study movement began at the end of 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. This movement concerned itself with the study of leaders who have the transformational potential of changing situations and others. Interestingly, the leader-trait approach has been to challenge the idea that the personality variables do not explain leadership effectiveness (for a review, see Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004) and somehow the charismatic and transformational leadership models raised again the importance of personal qualities as determinants of leadership effectiveness in conjunction with the situations in which leadership occurs (House, 1988). This return to the study of the leader characteristics is well represented by the neocharismatic theories of leadership (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Beyer, 1999; Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Sashkin, 1988; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). These theories share a "focus on the characteristics and behaviors of leaders described as charismatic or visionary and whose effects on followers are more profound than those specified by past theories" (Erickson et al., 2007, p. 27).

Another important aspect that distinguishes this new set of theories from earlier movements of leadership study is that they emphasize the emotional attachment that followers have regarding their leader, whereas earlier theories were more concerned with the effects that leaders had on their followers' cognitions, levels of satisfaction, and performance (House, 1992). By studying these emotional and motivational processes, this movement proposes that leaders are more able to transform the needs, values, preferences, and aspirations of followers from self-interests to collective interests (House, 1977).

The study of transformational and charismatic leadership has captured the attention of several authors (e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kotter, 1996; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Sashkin, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1986); however, it will be described in the following sections the work of three groups of researchers that made significant influences on the study of charismatic and transformational leaders.

CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP

The term charisma literally means "the gift of grace" and is derived from the ancient Greek word "gift". In social and political science, the term charisma is used to describe leaders who produce a profound and extraordinary effect on their followers, particularly when they are in distress and in a situation where they perceive advantages of following a leader that seems well qualified to change the situation for the better (Bass, 1985). Thus, these leaders can produce a great sense of loyalty and devotion from the followers with regard to a specific vision that extends beyond the self-interests of individual group members.

The sociologist Max Weber (1964; 1968) applied the concept of charisma to leadership contexts by proposing three types of societal authority: traditional, rational-legal, and charismatic. The difference between this forms of authority is that charismatic authority is not based on legitimacy from rules, laws, or titles (unlike the other forms of authority) but on faith in the charismatic's exemplary character. Thus, Weber proposed that charismatic leaders can produce forces of change to innovate society, describing some characteristics in these leaders that are still accepted today in the study of charismatic leaders (e.g., the gifts and abilities to be a leader, the ability to propose a revolutionary vision of the future, the tendency to question the status quo, and the tendency to operate through informal relationships) (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). In addition, Weber (1964) noted that charismatic leaders tend to emerge in times of crisis when basic values, institutions, and the legitimacy of the organization are questioned.

This early view of charismatic leadership emphasized the individual characteristics of leaders and strongly influenced the way charisma has been analyzed until now (Aaltio-Marjosola & Takala, 2000). This view is present in the two major models based on charismatic leadership presented below.

The Theory of Charismatic Leadership

House (1977) conducted one of the earliest works concerning charismatic leadership in organizations in his book, *A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership*. In this work, the author proposed that charismatic leadership depends of the characteristics and behaviors of the leaders, the situations where leadership is developed, and others issues.

House (1977) proposed a number of testable hypotheses that might explain the ability of charismatic leaders to adapt to different situations and their efficacy in this context. Specifically, the author proposed seven propositions that describe different characteristics of charismatic leaders (in contrast with non-charismatic leaders) in complex organizations:

1. Charismatic leaders are dominant and self-confident, have a need for influence, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of their beliefs.
2. Favorable perceptions (in terms of attractiveness, nurturance, success, or competence) of the followers toward their leader correspond to a higher tendency in the followers to (a) assume the values of their leader; (b) assume the expectations of the leader that effective performance will result on desired or undesired outcomes for the followers; (c) model the emotional responses of their leader with regard to work-related stimuli; and (d) model their leader's attitudes toward work and the organization.
3. Charismatic leaders tend to display certain behaviors to create the impression of competence and success.
4. Charismatic leaders are more likely to articulate ideological goals than leaders who are not charismatic.
5. Leaders who simultaneously communicate high expectations and confidence to followers are more likely to increase the acceptance of their goals. Furthermore, they can promote the belief on followers that they can accomplish goals and achieve high performance standards.
6. Charismatic leaders are more likely to engage in behaviors that arouse motives relevant to the accomplishment of the mission.
7. To be a charismatic leader, it is necessary that followers' roles be defined in ideological terms that appeal to them.

In sum, these characteristics suggest that charismatic leaders have high levels of self-confidence, dominance, a need to influence others, and a strong conviction regarding the integrity of their beliefs (Bryman, 1992).

Regarding behaviors, a set of strategies was also proposed in order to promote the perception of leader's charisma by the followers. First, charismatic leaders articulate an ideological vision of a better future based on social contributions and moral values of the followers (e.g., peace, freedom, human rights, among others). Second, charismatic leaders act as role models to promote followers' acceptance of their personal value system regarding the

benefits of effective performance. Third, charismatic leaders engage in image building to create a favorable impression of competence and success. This image also expresses ideological goals for the organization's direction. Fourth, charismatic leaders hold positive expectations regarding their followers' abilities and shows confidence in their ability to realize goals that have been set. Finally, charismatic leaders formulate relevant motives that justify the execution of the tasks and the mission. These motives may be very different, as for example the need for affiliation or achievement, the need to overcome an enemy or competitor, or the need to achieve excellence (Bryman, 1992; House, 1992; House & Shamir, 1993).

With regard to the environment, House (1977) proposed that charismatic leaders tend to emerge in stressful situations. In fact, if the leader assumes the above characteristics and behaviors, and if the situation is particularly difficult for the followers, then a leader's new vision, as well as his confidence in the concretization of this vision, will be welcomed in this situation.

The work of House (1977) provided the most comprehensive approach to the analysis of charismatic leadership in formal organizations prior to 1980 (Bryman, 1992). However, some criticism led to changes in the model namely the fact that some characteristics of charismatic leaders (e.g., high self-confidence, tendency to dominate, the need to influence others) can be identified in other types of leadership, the bias of favoring dyads between a leader and follower, the disregard of the collective dyads occurring in the organization, and the absence of constructs that have become fundamental in later theories such as the notion of self-sacrifice and the use of unconventional behaviors as well as non-traditional strategies and tactics (Conger, 1999; Yukl, 1998).

Therefore, the earlier theory was revised being now known as the self-concept theory. This new model integrates organizational and group aspects as well as the importance of efficacy indicators based on achieved performance into the explanation of charismatic leadership. Generally speaking, it is assumed that the influence of leaders derive from their success in connecting or engaging their followers' self-concepts with the mission articulated by the leader. More specifically, Shamir et al. (1993) proposed that the effects of charismatic leaders should be measured by the motivational impact they have on the self-concept of their followers. So, to be a charismatic leader it is necessary to establish a relationship between the followers' self-concepts and the goals of the established mission in a way that becomes a valued aspect of the followers' identity. According to the same authors, the charismatic leader produces this transformation and achieves motivational outcomes using at

least four mechanisms:(a) change the way followers perceive work, defining it as heroic, morally correct, and meaningful; (b) present a positive and enthusiastic vision of the future; (c) promote a strong collective identity among their followers and reinforce the goals that are shared by followers but distinct from other groups or organizations; and (d) promote individual and collective self-efficacy through the establishment of work plans that are realistic and by demonstrating an attitude of optimism in the abilities of followers to achieve these goals.

In sum, Conger (1999) stated that charismatic leaders promote an appealing organizational vision and create an environment where followers view organizational tasks as inseparable from their own self-concepts. Thus, these leaders de-emphasize the extrinsic rewards of work and reinforce the followers' abilities that contribute to the established vision. In the end, this strategy contributes to an increase in the intrinsic value of work and a professional sense of accomplishment.

Empirical research has been conducted using the new version of this model, but the results are mixed. For example, in a study of Israeli field military units, Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, and Popper (1998) did not observe substantial support for self-concept theory. Only the individual level of analysis revealed the expected results because the leader's emphasis on the unit's collective identity was related to several positive results (e.g., trust and identification with the leader, higher motivation, willingness to sacrifice one's self for the unit, identification and attachment to the unit). More recently, the proposition that charismatic/transformational leaders influence the followers' behaviors by first changing their psychological states or self-concept has progressively obtained some support (see Aryee, Walumbwa, Zhou, & Hartnell, 2012; Bono & Judge, 2003; Walumbwa, Avolio, & Zhu, 2008).

The Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership

Conger and Kanungo (1987; 1998a) proposed the behavioral theory of charismatic leadership model and distinguished the behavioral components of charismatic leadership within organizations, conceiving it as an attributional phenomenon. This proposal was based on a dissatisfaction with leadership research prior to the 1980s that limited the understanding of leaders' actions with regard to analyses of social versus task aspects of work or examinations

of how leaders exert power using participative versus autonomous decision-making processes.

Conger and Kanungo (1987) assumed that a leader's charismatic role is an observable behavioral process that could be analyzed similar to other leadership styles (e.g., task, social, and participative). In this way, it was proposed that the understanding of leaders' charismatic influence should be conducted as an attribution process based on follower perceptions of leader behaviors. The leaders' charismatic influence resides in follower attributions, which turns leadership into a relational and attributional phenomenon (Conger & Kanungo, 1998b). Thus, if charisma is an inferred dimension of leadership behavior and an additional leadership role it can be investigated in the same way as examining task versus social leadership or participative versus autonomous decision-making processes.

Based on this idea, Conger and Kanungo (1998b) proposed a stage model of charismatic leadership that included a process of moving followers from a certain state to a future state. This future state included a movement away from the status quo and toward the achievement of desired longer-terms goals. Due to space limitations, this chapter only includes the main processes of each stage (for a review, see Conger, 1989a; Conger & Kanungo, 1998b). Stage one corresponds with the leader's evaluation of the status quo. In this case, the leader critically evaluates the opportunities that exist in the environment that have not been sufficiently explored. This information is used as the basis to formulate future goals. In addition, leaders evaluate the existing resources and constrains that can influence the achievement of these goals. Furthermore, they evaluate their followers in terms of inclinations, abilities, needs, and level of satisfaction. Conger (1999) stated that leaders' abilities to find existing or potential shortcomings in the status quo are what distinguish charismatic from non-charismatic leaders in this stage.

In stage two, the leader formulates and articulates the goals that account for an idealized vision of the future. The type of strategic vision that is formulated and the manner in which this vision is articulated distinguishes the charismatic leader from the non-charismatic leader (Conger, 1999). The formulated vision is an idealized plan that increases followers' admiration in the leader. However, this theory also suggests that having a vision is not enough when it is not articulated in the proper context and in the way that motivates followers.

In the last stage, the leader demonstrates how the organization can achieve the formulated goals of stage two (Conger & Kanungo, 1998b). In this case,

the charismatic leader uses personal example, risk taking, and unconventional expertise to demonstrate how goals can be achieved. Once again, this strategy causes followers to view the leader as extraordinary and dedicated to the cause, which reinforces the will of followers to do the same.

With regard to the overall model, if the charismatic leader acts in the aforementioned ways, then he or she can achieve positive individual outcomes (e.g., more acceptance of the leader by the followers, high levels of task performance, and so on) as well as positive organizational or group outcomes (e.g., high internal cohesion, low internal conflict, and so on). In addition, this model predicts that if the leader assumes the behaviors proposed in these three stages, then it will increase followers' perceptions of charisma.

Finally, two additional aspects should be highlighted in the model. First, the three stages do not flow linearly; instead, a dynamic process reflects the turbulent environments that organizations must face. Thus, leaders may constantly reformulate their goals to respond to unexpected opportunities and contextual changes. Second, the identification of charismatic leaders results from assuming the constellation of behaviors that the theory proposes; therefore, one or two behaviors in isolation do not turn a leader into a charismatic one. This identification only occurs when followers attribute all the above components to their leader in an interrelated way. The leader becomes charismatic by the number of behaviors assumed, the level of behavioral intensity, and the salience of adapting these behaviors to situations or organizational contexts (Conger & Kanungo, 1998b). Thus, the charismatic leaders differ from other leaders in essence by their ability to formulate and articulate an inspirational vision as well as by a set of behaviors that promote followers' impressions that they and their mission are extraordinary (Conger et al., 1997).

After the formulation of this theory, Conger et al. (1997) developed the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership to test the empirical validity of the hypothesized relationships and found that a five-factor model (including strategic vision and articulation, sensitivity to the environment, personal risk, unconventional behavior, and sensitivity to member needs) best fit their theoretical assumptions. Some studies have confirmed the factorial validity of this instrument as well as some of the propositions of the model (see Conger & Kanungo, 1998b; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Kersting & Rowold, 2008).

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Downton (1973) first discussed the concept of transformational leadership, and then political scientist James McGregor Burns (1978) introduced this concept in his Pulitzer-Prize-winning book on leadership. In this book, Burns (1978) distinguished two types of leadership.

The first type is transactional leadership. In this style, there is an exchange between the leader and the followers (e.g., the follower receives wages or prestige for compliance with the leader's wishes). The leader obtains the cooperation of followers by offering something in exchange of their efforts; therefore, followers accept the leaders' authority because they have something to gain.

The second type is transformational leadership, which can be defined as the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes, beliefs, and values of followers to a point where the goals of an organization and the vision of the leader are internalized and followers achieve performances beyond expectations (Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1999a; 1999b). In this process, leaders and followers raise one another's levels of morality and motivation (Carlson & Perrewe, 1995), and leaders achieve followers' best efforts by inspiring them to identify with a vision that surpasses their own immediate self-interests. The transformational leader aspires to elevate the followers' higher-order needs meaning that leaders and followers raise each other's motivations and senses of purpose. This implies that the aims and aspirations of both parts congeal into one, being established common goals in which they can identify themselves (Bryman, 1992).

The distinction between transactional and transformational leadership was the basis for understanding the true nature of transformational leadership. According to Burns (2003), leaders cannot be both transactional and transformational because the transactional leaders try to satisfy the followers' basic needs in exchange to achieve the leaders' objectives. In contrast, transformational leaders interface with followers in a mutually enriching environment that allows them to realize their higher-order needs and enables them to initiate a process of self-growth and transformation (Khanin, 2007). Thus, Burns (1978) suggests that transformational leaders are those who appeal to positive moral values.

The Full Range of Leadership Model

After formulating the concept of transformational leadership, several models were created. One of the most well-known proposals is Bass's (1985) full range of leadership model. Burns' writing influenced Bass, who admitted that he "had to wait 18 years for James MacGregor Burns (1978) to lead the way" with regard to the study of transformational leadership (Bass, 1995, p. 466).

According to Bass (1998), transformational leaders achieve superior results with one or more of the four components of transformational leadership below.

1) Charismatic leadership (or idealized influence). The leader acts in ways that result in being a role model for the followers. Thus, the leader becomes admired, respected, and trusted by the followers who want to emulate them. The followers also recognize extraordinary capabilities, persistence, and determination in the leader. It is also evident that the leader is willing to take risks to achieve goals but assumes an ethical and moral conduct for that.

2) Inspirational motivation. The leader provides meaning and challenge that motivates and inspires the followers' work. In this case, the leader promotes team spirit, enthusiasm, and optimism in their followers. The leader involves them in a positive vision of the future and communicates high expectations that followers want to achieve.

3) Intellectual stimulation. The leader promotes their followers' innovation and creativity by questioning established assumptions, reframing extant problems, and approaching old problems in new ways. In this way, the leader encourages creativity and does not use public criticism to respond to individual followers' mistakes. Rather, the leader solicits new ideas and creative solutions to problems.

4) Individualized consideration. The leader attends to each follower's need for achievement and growth by acting as coach or mentor. The leader tries to create new learning opportunities in a supportive climate; thus, the leader demonstrates acceptance for individual differences, provides encouragement to some followers, standards patterns of work to others, and provides autonomy to those with more experience. In this way, the leader establishes two-way exchange processes of communication with the followers, adopts an active listening style, and delegates tasks to develop followers' skills.

With these four forms of transformational leadership, leaders inspire their followers to transcend their own interests and limitations and become more effective in pursuing collective goals and achieving performances beyond their own expectations (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Yammarino, Dionne, & Chun, 2002).

Along with these four components of transformational leadership, the model also proposed two specific dimensions of transactional leadership below.

1) Contingent reward. The leader uses this behavior to assign or come to agreement regarding what must be done and establishes rewards in exchange for the satisfactory efforts of followers in accomplishing the assignments.
2) Management-by-exception. This behavior represents an active or passive corrective transaction between the leader and his or her followers. In the active case, the leader monitors deviances from standards, mistakes, and errors in followers' assignments and takes corrective actions when necessary. In the passive case, the leader waits for deviances from standards, mistakes, and errors to occur and only then takes corrective action.

Finally, the laissez-faire leadership style was also included in the model and represents the avoidance or absence of leadership. This style is, by definition, the most inactive and ineffective form of leadership. Laissez-faire is a non transactional form of leadership because the leader does not make decisions, actions are delayed, the responsibility to lead is ignored, and authority is not used (Bass, 1985).

According to Bass (1998), contingent rewards are reasonably effective (but not as much as transformational leadership), whereas management-by-exception tends to be less effective; however, this latter style can be appropriate when the leader must supervise a large number of subordinates. The laissez-faire style is the least effective form of leadership. Based on this distinction of leaders' actions, Bass and Avolio (1994) proposed that an optimal leadership profile in frequently displays laissez-faire behaviors but shows some frequencies of transactional leadership (ranging in effectiveness from management-by-exception-passive to management-by-exception-active to contingent rewards), and assumes higher frequencies of transformational leadership. Poor leadership profiles are based on the frequent use of the

laissez-faire style, followed by the infrequent use of transactional and transformational dimensions.

Interestingly, Bass (1985) also described an augmentation effect such that the use of transformational leadership *augments* transactional leadership by predicting effects of follower satisfaction and performance. Some empirical evidence supports this effect (see Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990).

Bass and Avolio (2000) created the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to assess the described dimensions of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership, and found evidence for the division of leadership into these three styles (for a review, see Bass & Riggio, 2006). However, there are still some difficulties with the factor structure of this instrument because there are strong relationships among the leadership factors and the inclusion of contingent reward on transactional leadership is also not clear (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Carless, 1998; Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001). This problem has led some authors to propose global measures of transformational and transactional leadership (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999), refine the constructs associated with transformational and charismatic leadership (Javidan & Waldman, 2003; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), reduce the set of items that measure transformational leadership (Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000; Tejeda et al., 2001), and propose new measures of transformational and transactional leadership (Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 1990).

Characteristics and Behaviors of Charismatic and Transformational Leaders

Independent from the theoretical proposal regarding charismatic and transformational leadership, some aspects seem to identify both types of leaders.

The first characteristic of charismatic/transformational leaders is that they have a vision that provides direction and meaning to their followers (Conger, 1999; Kotter, 1996). The vision might involve a specific mission and detailed goals or may be as vague as a dream. In either case, it should be a source of self-esteem for followers and reflect an interesting future for the group or organization (Carlson & Perrewe, 1995; House & Shamir, 1993).

Second, charismatic/transformational leaders are efficient in communicating their high expectations for followers and believe that group members will be able to improve their performances and skills. For example, in the Bass model (1985), leaders used inspirational motivation to encourage and inspire followers as well as intellectual stimulation to support followers' innovative and creative efforts. Similarly, in the Conger and Kanungo model (1998b), charismatic leaders engage in intellectually stimulation articulation to promote their followers capacities to challenge the status quo and move forward.

Third, leaders' high expectations regarding their followers also imply that they understand human needs, assume actions that satisfy their subordinate s' needs for recognition, and reinforce their sense of belonging and self-esteem (Carlson & Perrewe, 1995). Thus, the leader must attend to personal differences among followers and treat them accordingly. For example, the Bass model (1985) suggests that transformational leaders should pay special attention to their followers' needs for achievement and growth by assuming the role of a coach or mentor.

Fourth, to promote the personal growth of followers, charismatic/transformational leaders use empowerment processes rather control strategies to achieve a transformational influence over the group (Conger, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998b). In fact, the leader's empowering tendency has been stressed in all significant models of transformational and charismatic leadership. Thus, the leader demonstrates determination, optimism, self-confidence, and confidence in the collective ability to accomplish the mission and realize the vision (House & Shamir, 1993). Such behavior has a dramatic influence on followers, providing them with confidence and a willingness to self-sacrifice to achieve the established goals.

Finally, charismatic/transformational leaders demonstrate a strong set of personal values (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). For example, Bass's (1985) idealized influence suggests that leaders should act as role models for their followers. As House and Shamir (1993) stated, charismatic leaders build positive images for followers and assume a lifestyle that is consistent with the values of their vision. These actions cause leaders to be evaluated as competent, credible, nurturing, trust worthy, and motivated to serve the established mission of the group or organization. Thus, defending values of integrity, honesty and justice implies that charismatic/transformational leaders act in accordance with the members of the group. If the leader stands for positive values and behaves in a way that is congruent with this stance, then members will be more likely to

analyze their own goals and beliefs as well as assume shared values that can augment group effectiveness (Carlson & Perrewe, 1995).

These characteristics correspond to some specific behaviors used by charismatic/transformational leaders. First, these leaders tend to be great communicators of stimulating visions that motivate followers to be positively involved. In fact, charismatic/transformational leaders are effective in communicating their vision to group members. For example, Bennis and Nanus (1985) analyzed effective leaders and found that they transmitted their vision to their followers in a way that could be easily understood, was challenging to followers, and was credible and realistic enough to be achieved.

Second, charismatic/transformational leaders tend to use reinforcement systems to recognize the involvement of their followers in the established vision. With reward systems, leaders reinforce what they value and motivate group members to perform their best to concretize the vision (Carlson & Perrewe, 1995).

Third, charismatic/transformational leaders also consider the followers as individuals by constantly attending to their welfare and being sensitive to their contributions in the planning process. This attention results in followers having a greater sense of involvement and commitment (Carlson & Perrewe, 1995; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003).

In sum, these leaders have a positive vision that is attractive to group members, tend to assume innovative and unconventional behaviors (which reinforces followers' positive attitudes), believe strongly in their ideas, and act as role models of moral correctness. These characteristics imply that the leader possesses psychological characteristics such as confidence, determination, self-esteem, and motivation for power.

Charismatic and Transformational Leadership

Despite the commonalities between charismatic and transformational leaders, there are also differences that should be described.

To begin with, various authors disagree on the definition of a transformational leader. In fact, the Burns and Bass perspectives differ strongly on this subject. As Khanin (2007) stated, there are at least three major differences between these perspectives. First, for Bass (1995) the task of leadership is not reflected in the goal of raising followers' levels of consciousness (as proposed by Burns, 1978), but in extending followers' needs

and desires. By doing the latter, transformational leaders motivate others to do more than they originally intended or more than they thought possible (Bass, 1998). Second, for Burns (1978) the result of transformational leadership is always morally elevating, whereas for Bass (1985) transformational leaders can have negative effects on their followers by leading them toward destructive, negative, and reactionary goals. This divergence and the criticism that followed (Howell & Avolio, 1992) led Bass (1998) to propose the concept of *pseudo-transformational* leaders. These individuals perform many transforming actions; however, it becomes clear in the long term that they are leading others to become self-interested, self-concerned, self-aggrandizing, exploitative, and power-oriented. As Bass and Riggio (2006) stated, the dimension of transformational leadership that usually best distinguishes authentic from inauthentic leaders is their individualized consideration of followers because an authentic transformational leader is truly concerned with the desires and needs of their followers and cares about their individual development. Interestingly, this possibility has also been applied to charismatic leaders: some are selfish, narcissistic, and lack the ability to develop successors (*pseudo-charismatic*). Instead, they use their power to pursue grandiose projects aimed solely at self-glorification and the final result is leading their followers and organizations to undesirable consequences (Aaltio-Marjosola & Takala, 2000; Collins, 2001; Conger, 1989b). The third difference is related to the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership. For Burns (1978), transformational and transactional leadership styles are mutually exclusive, whereas for Bass (1985), leaders can assume both (or neither) styles in varying amounts. Of course, according to Bass (1985), transformational leadership should be expected to produce more transformative actions than transactional actions.

A second major difference that should be highlighted is about the central characteristic of charismatic and transformational leadership. For Bass (1995), charisma is just a component of transformational leadership. A leader can be considered charismatic without necessarily being considered transformational. More specifically, Bass (1985) proposed that charisma correspond to the idealized influence dimension in the full range leadership model, which is curiously associated with more desirable outcomes produced by transformational leaders (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998). However, this understanding of charisma is not agreed upon. For example, Burns (1978) states a dislike of the term *charisma* because of the variety of meanings that the word can assume. Instead, he proposed the term *heroic leadership* as a

more apt manifestation of transforming leadership. In spite of this divergence regarding the term charisma, for other authors this construct is the best representation of the leadership phenomenon. For example, Conger and Kanungo (1998a) proposed that charisma should be the central dimension of leadership because it is responsible for explaining the exceptional results achieved by certain leaders. However, it is also possible to find authors who propose that both terms are in essence the same (Avolio & Gibbons, 1998).

The third difference concerns the way that both types of leadership are related to organizational culture. Despite the fact that charismatic and transformational forms of leadership are essentially innovative in their approach, charismatic leaders tend to create new organizations and cultures, whereas transformational leaders change existing organizations and their cultures (Trice & Beyer, 1991).

The final major difference is related to how influence occurs between a leader and their followers. That is to say, how are the charismatic and the transformational processes observed? In fact, Conger and Kanungo (1998c) retain much of Weber's original definition of charisma, proposing that the impact of leadership should be understood primarily through perceptions of a leader's extraordinary qualities that result from his or her character. Thus, the personal identification of followers toward their leader becomes the primary source of information, being a signal of charisma the internalization by the followers of the values and vision proposed by the leader. In contrast, Bass and Avolio (1993) focused strongly on leaders' transformational abilities to increase the attractiveness of the task and mission to followers. Thus, leaders are transformational when they stimulate and satisfy the higher-order needs of their followers. This effect can lead followers to having more commitment and effort as well as greater performance.

In sum, despite their differences, the converging points between these models are more substantive because they can strongly influence the way leadership is practiced. Specifically, to be charismatic or transformational leaders should: (a) possess a vision that provides direction and meaning for their followers; (b) use inspiration to promote their followers' beliefs in their abilities to do the task; (c) represent role models of the ideas they defend; (d) use intellectual stimulation to promote new ideas and perspectives regarding the tasks to accomplish; (e) have the capacity to provide a meaning for the tasks to accomplish; (f) appeal to higher-order needs that surpass the self-interests of each follower; (g) use empowerment to promote followers' capacities; (h) have a tendency to set high expectations for the followers; and

(i) use strategies to foster a collective identity and provide the group or organization with a sense of uniqueness (Conger, 1999).

Developments in Charismatic and Transformational Theory

After the formulation of charismatic and transformational models, some new proposals were advanced to integrate these different contributions. Two major proposals that explicate the relationships between leaders' characteristics and their followers' psychological experiences as well as between leaders' behaviors and their followers' behavioral responses are described below.

Behling and McFillen (1996) developed the Syncretical Model of Charismatic Transformational Leadership to integrate the existing theories of charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership styles. Thus, this model provides a set of hypotheses concerning the relationships among leader behaviors, follower beliefs, and follower responses. In general, the "psychic distress" of followers is assumed to interact with leader behaviors (e.g., displays of empathy, dramatizations of the mission, projections of self-assurance, image enhancement, assurances of follower competency, and provisions of opportunities for success) in order to inspire followers (e.g., followers' beliefs that the organization's or unit's activities have a transcendent moral or ethical purpose), augment awe in the abilities of the leader (e.g., faith in their leader's abilities and affection for the leader), and promote empowerment (e.g., beliefs in their own ability and their capacity to overcome obstacles and control events). These effects should result in certain follower responses such as exceptionally high effort and commitment, and a willingness to take risks. McCann, Langford, and Rawlings (2006) tested some of these hypotheses in a study of staff members from 17 profit and non-profit institutions. They found that awe and inspiration, but not empowerment, mediated the effect of leader behaviors on commitment. Specifically, leader behavior was the most strongly related variable to awe, and commitment was the most strongly related variable to inspiration. Thus, the relationships among leader behaviors, follower beliefs, and the affective commitment toward the organization were far more complex than those suggested in the original Syncretical Model of Charismatic Transformational Leadership.

Recently, some authors have suggested the need to study authentic leadership to complement the work on ethical and transformational leadership

(Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck, & Avolio, 2010). Authentic leaders are individuals who are "aware of and exhibit pattern of openness and clarity in his/her behavior toward others by sharing the information needed to make decisions, accepting others' inputs, and disclosing his/her personal values, motives, and sentiments in a manner that enables followers to more accurately assess the competence and morality of the leader's actions" (Walumbwa et al., 2010, p. 901). The concept of authentic leadership posits that leaders cannot merely be just and honest with others so as to be treated honestly and justly in return. Rather, leaders must learn to love honesty and justice for not only by internal personal development but also by their effect on the world, human experience, and the progress of humanity (McCain & Salter, 2004).

Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, and May (2004) considered these ideas and proposed a model linking authentic leadership to follower attitudes and behaviors. Generally speaking, authentic leadership was proposed to be important but not sufficient to achieve a desired goal. For that, it should occur some identification processes between the leader and the followers, namely between the follower attitudes (e.g., commitment, job satisfaction, meaningfulness, and engagement), the follower behaviors (e.g., job performance, extra effort, and withdrawal behaviors), and authentic leadership at both personal and social levels. The model not only seeks to explain how leaders influence follower attitudes and behaviors, but also how intervening variables such as hope, trust, positive emotions, and optimism can be enhanced (Avolio, Gardner et al., 2004). Based on authentic leadership, some changes have been proposed to the model. For example, the inclusion of authentic followership (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005), the importance of analyzing leader and follower eudaimonic well-being (Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005), and leaders' self-concepts as well as the relationship between their self-concepts and behaviors (Shamir & Eilam, 2005) may be components and consequences of authentic leadership development. Some authors (Gardner et al., 2005; Ilies et al., 2005; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008) have also specified dimensions that identify authentic leaders, proposing four types of behaviors: (a) balanced processing: the leader analyzes all relevant information before making a decision; (b) internalized moral perspective: the leader's behaviors are guided by internal moral standards and personal values rather than external pressures such as those originating from peers, the organization, or society; (c) relational transparency: the leader openly shares information and expresses his or her true thoughts and feelings; and (d) self-

awareness: the leader possesses insight into their own strengths, weaknesses, and motives as well as others' perceptions of their leadership (Walumbwa et al., 2010). Research has produced mixed results regarding these four dimensions, which suggests that they might be integrated into a higher-order latent construct (Kernis & Goldman, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). However, these dimensions have external validity being positively related to different outcomes (e.g., supervisor-rated organizational citizenship, organizational commitment and work engagement, satisfaction with supervision, job satisfaction, and supervisor-rated job performance) (Walumbwa et al., 2008; Walumbwa et al., 2010). In this way, future research should clarify the importance of authentic leadership to the study of transformational leadership.

THE IMPACT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Although charismatic and transformational leadership are not identical constructs, it will be used from now how in the chapter the term transformational leadership to refer to leaders with both charismatic and transformational effects on their followers and organizations.

After defining the characteristics of transformational leaders, research has turned its attention to specifying their impact on the followers and organizations by studying their effects in contexts as diverse as the business sector (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Kark et al., 2003; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Milner, 2002), the healthcare system (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004), the military (Bass et al., 2003; Hardy et al., 2010), the public sector (Javidan & Waldman, 2003; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), the public security forces (Durić, 2011), education (Cerni, Curtis, & Colmar, 2008; Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005), religion (Rowold, 2008), sports (Callow, Smith, Hardy, Arthur, & Hardy, 2009; Chen, 2010), and even exercise contexts (Beauchamp, Welch, & Hulley, 2007).

Generally speaking, data from these studies can be divided by the leader' impact in subjective (e.g., follower satisfaction) and objective measures (e.g., profit and organization productivity). A significant amount of data can be found on this subject; however, this chapter does not exhaustively describe the impact produced by transformational leaders. Instead, we present a synthesis of the results of both domains to demonstrate the relevance of transformational leadership within economic and social contexts.

The Impact of Transformational Leadership on Subjective Measures

Several measures have been used to observe the impact of transformational leadership on followers. Some of the most significant data are related to followers' commitment, loyalty, and satisfaction.

Commitment and loyalty are multifaceted constructs that can refer to a larger organization, a team, or a leader. Empirical data shows that if leadership is inspirational, stimulating, and considerate of followers' needs, then it can promote commitment and loyalty (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Some research supports this idea, existing positive correlations between transformational leadership and follower loyalty to a union (Fullagar, McCoy, & Shull, 1992), commitment to an organization (Koh et al., 1995; Niehoff, Enz, & Grover, 1990), and affective and moral commitment to followers' own values and beliefs, the values of others in the organizations, and the values of the organization as a whole (Kane & Tremble, 2000). For example, in a study with managers of the Indian public sector bank, Rai and Sinha (2000) found that transformational leadership scores explained the variance in bank workers' commitment to the organization. Furthermore, this strong follower commitment translated into better financial performance for bank branches. In a study of United States Army leaders, both transactional and transformational leadership styles were correlated with the affective and moral dimensions of commitment; however, transformational leadership augmented the effects of transactional leadership (Kane & Tremble, 2000).

Another positive effect that transformational leadership produces is related to the follower satisfaction and motivation. As expected, research demonstrates that transformational leaders produce more favorable effects on these domains than transactional leaders (Hater & Bass, 1998; Hetland & Sandal, 2003). This impact is higher than the effects produced by non-transformational leaders meaning that transformational leaders have more satisfied followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In fact, data from meta-analyses reveal high average correlations (ranging from .51 to .81) among all components of transformational leadership and different measures of follower satisfaction (DeGroot, Kicker, & Cross, 2000; Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Interestingly, the correlation between the transformational dimensions measured by the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2000) and follower satisfaction with the leader are higher than that of the same leadership dimensions and followers' own job satisfaction (Dumdum et al., 2002).

However, not all forms of transformational leadership seem to produce the same effects. For example, in a study with healthcare subordinates, Hobman, Jackson, Jimmieson, and Martin (2011) found that the individualized forms of leadership (e.g., supportive leadership, intellectual stimulation, and personal recognition) were significantly positively related to job satisfaction and supervisor-rated job performance, and also found that leader identification mediated this relationship. However, inspirational communication and vision leadership did not have significant effects. Accordingly, some recent research has analyzed the impact of mediators and moderators between transformational leadership and follower outcomes. For example, Kovjanic, Schuh, Jonas, Quaquebeke, and Van Dick (2012) found support for the mediating mechanisms of transformational leadership. Specifically, they observed that satisfaction of followers' autonomy, competence, and relatedness mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and their job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and commitment to a leader.

Another interesting question to examine is whether the positive impact of transformational leadership on follower satisfaction is related to outcomes such as better attendance at work, longer tenure with the organization, and better unit performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Researchers have been optimistic regarding this subject. Specifically, Martin and Epitropaki (2001) found that followers of transformational leaders demonstrated more commitment toward their organization and had less intent to leave their job. In addition, Vandenberghe, Stordeur, and D'hoore (2002) found that nurses working with transformational leaders also had less intent to leave their job. Moreover, Rowold (2008) studied Christian pastors in Germany and found that transformational leadership was positively associated with follower satisfaction with their pastor, increased effort and effectiveness, and job satisfaction.

In addition to commitment, loyalty, and satisfaction, research has examined other psychological outcomes, being found that transformational leadership also produce positive effects on the organizational citizenship behaviors (Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998; Podsakoff et al., 1990), the trust between the leader and their team (Avolio, Kahai, & Dodge, 2000), the positive emotional responses of followers (e.g., sense of optimism) (McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002), the followers' creative and original solutions (Eisenbeiss, van Knippenberg, & Boerner, 2008; Jung, 2001; Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003; Paulsen, Maldonado, Callan, & Ayoko, 2009; Pieterse, van Knippenberg, Schippers, & Stam, 2009), the efficacy of leaders in helping followers and groups to be effective in stressful situations and managing burnout (Seltzer,

Numerof, & Bass, 1989; Sosik & Godshalk, 2000), in promoting proactive behavior (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012), and improving positive parental monitoring (Galbraith, 2005;Morton et al., 2010). For a specific example, Hetland, Skogstad, Hetland, and Mikkelsen (2011) studied subordinates of the Norwegian Postal Service and found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and subordinate perceptions of an environment that supports creativity and learning.

Taken together, these results confirm the impact that transformational leaders have on the psychological experiences of their followers; however, they also identify variables that mediate the relationship between a leader's actions and their followers' responses.

The Impact of Transformational Leadership on Objective Measures

There is a great interest in knowing whether transformational leadership affects the performance of followers and organizations. Empirical research partially supports the relationships among transformational leadership theory, transactional leadership, and performance (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1998). Data from meta-analyses demonstrate the positive relationship between transformational leadership and performance (DeGroot et al., 2000; Dumdum et al., 2002; Lowe et al., 1996). However, most of the studies included in these meta-analyses measured leadership and performance at one time point and from one source (Bass et al., 2003).

Thus, there is still little evidence regarding the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance (Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, & Harms, 2008; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Lim and Ployhart (2004) analyzed the available empirical findings in military settings and found a positive relationship between team members' ratings of their commanding officers' transformational leadership, and team performance. Similarly, Bass et al. (2003) found that when platoon leaders and sergeants in the United States Army used transformational and transactional contingent-reward leadership, it positively predicted unit performance, and the unit's level of potency and cohesion partially mediated the relationship between platoon leadership and performance. Also, Schaubroeck, Lam, and Cha (2007) in a study of financial services teams, found that team potency mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance. More recently, Liang, Chan, Lin, and Huang (2011) studied subordinates from 43 Taiwanese

electronic companies and concluded that transformational leaders caused subordinates to display higher task performance than transactional leaders.

Another interesting point is related to the indicators used to evaluate leader performance. In this case, the impact of leaders can be analyzed using subjective measures (e.g., a follower's or superior's perception of the leader's performance) or objective measures of performance (e.g., increases in productivity and profit as well as goal attainment). As expected, data from meta-analyses demonstrate stronger relationships between transformational leadership and subjective measures of leader effectiveness than between transformational leadership and objective measures of leader effectiveness (Dumdum et al., 2002; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Thus, one of the biggest challenges that transformational leadership research faces is understanding its specific effects on objective measures of performance as well as its impact on followers' identification with their leader and group and in the associated outcomes (Kark & Shamir, 2002; Van Knippenberg, de Cremer, & van Knippenberg, 2007; Yukl, 2006).

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN SPORTS

Almost forty years have passed since the first formulations of charismatic (House, 1977) and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Due the impact of these forms of leadership on different social and economic settings, it is pertinent to ask whether they are applicable to sports, or more specifically, to the study of the figure most associated with leadership responsibilities: the coach.

Everything that is needed to study transformational leadership is present in sports: there are leaders (e.g., coaches, sport managers, team captains, and athletes without formal authority but who exert a strong influence on the team) and followers (e.g., other athletes), there is a goal or purpose (e.g., winning competitions, achieving a better personal record, and improving athletic ability), and there is usually a competitive and stressful environment (e.g., competing for a championship at local, regional, national, or international levels).

In addition, sports are probably a context in which social evaluations are more present than other social and economic contexts. For example, the media and fans evaluate the performance of athletes and teams on a daily basis. Besides, the need to achieve the best sports performance is associated with a turbulent environment where a tenuous line divides winning and losing or

success and failure. These factors can increase the need for transformational leaders. Hawkins and Tolzin (2002) confirmed this supposition when they argued that American baseball teams are postmodern organizations that operate in a turbulent context and face uncertain conditions that necessitate new forms of leadership that surpass traditional models. These authors proposed that transformational leadership is a prerequisite for team success.

Despite the apparently favorable conditions related to studying transformational leadership in sports, major theoretical proposals regarding sports leadership do not considerate these indications. In fact, the multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1978; Chelladurai, 1993), the normative model of decision styles (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1978), the mediational model of leadership (Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977; Smoll & Smith, 1989), the coaching model (Côté et al., 1995), the 3+1Cs model of coach-athlete interdependence (Jowett, 2007), the recent coaching effectiveness model (Horn, 2008), and the model of autonomy-supportive leadership (Amorose & Horn, 2000; 2001; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003) did not account for the transformational impact of coaches. In the only exception, Chelladurai (2007) recognized the importance of transformational leadership in sports and incorporated the transformational effects of leader behavior in the multidimensional model of leadership. However, no studies have confirmed this possibility of integrating the transformational leadership until now but, as Chelladurai recognizes, sports research should integrate the most recent advances in the study of charismatic and transformational leadership (Chelladurai, 2007). Thus, it can be stated that the existing theoretical models of coaches' actions do not consider the impact of transformational leadership (Gomes, Sousa, & Cruz, 2006). Although this scenario is not positive, there are encouraging findings that should be mentioned. The next section presents sports research that contributed to the study of transformational leadership.

Research in Sports

The interest in transformational leadership in sports is relatively new. The first studies conducted on this topic occurred in the 1990s. This fact is surprising because so much research has been conducted regarding this subject in contexts in which leadership does not seem as important as in sports. Interestingly, the research that has been conducted in sports has taken a broad approach by considering different agents as the primary sources of transformational influence.

Generally speaking, these findings can be organized into studies conducted with sports managers, parents and significant others, teammates, team captains, and coaches. The main findings from these sources of transformational leadership are presented below.

Some of the first research conducted on sports transformational leadership examined sports managers (see Kent & Chelladurai, 2001; Wallace & Weese, 1995). For example, Doherty (1996) used the MLQ-5X (Bass & Avolio, 1991) to examine the leadership behaviors of intermural athletic administrators based on the perceptions of head coaches from universities in Ontario. They concluded that coaches described transformational as the predominant leadership profile used by the athletic administrators as opposed to transactional and non leadership behavior. Also, leader-centered behavior (e.g., idealized influence and attributed charisma) was used more frequently than the subordinate-centered behavior (e.g., individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation).

One year later, the same author used again coaches' scores on the MLQ-5X to analyse the effect of various leader characteristics of interuniversity athletic administrators on the transformational/transactional leader behavior as rated by their coaches (Doherty, 1997). Doherty concluded that female and younger athletic administrators exhibited transformational behaviors more often, and used transactional behaviors less often, than their male and older counterparts. Gender and age also predicted coaches' perception of leader effectiveness and their frequency of extra effort.

Yusof (1998) analyzed the relationship between the transformational behaviors of sports' managers and coaches' professional satisfaction in Canada using the Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory (TLI; Podsakoff et al., 1990) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The author observed that managers with higher transformational leadership values had coaches with more satisfactory experiences. Thus, it was concluded that transformational leadership was effective when explaining sports relationships and because of that sport managers should be encouraged to train transformational leadership.

Taken together, these results concerning the application of transformational leadership to sports are encouraging. However, examining sport managers and administrators is not a novel finding because it was already demonstrated in managers working in others contexts such as the business world (see Bass et al., 2003; Purvanova, Bono, & Dzieweczynski, 2006).

Another interesting research line explored the influence of significant others, including family, team captains, and team members on transmitting transformational behaviors.

Beginning with the family's influence, Zacharatos, Barling, and Kelloway (2000) analyzed the extent to which adolescents that observe transformational behaviors exhibited by their parents adopted similar behaviors in other contexts. This study included 112 high school students and confirmed that parents use transformational leadership behaviors to influence their children. More interestingly, adolescents who used transformational leadership behaviors in a team context were perceived as more effective, satisfied, and effort-evoking leaders by their peers and coaches. These results confirm what Bass (1985) called the *cascade effect:* leaders serve as role models, mentors, and coaches for followers, and this transformational influence cascades down to other levels of the organization (or in the case of Zacharatos et al., down to other levels of the family and social functioning).

However, these effects are not the same according to the people who exert a transformational influence. Tucker, Turner, Barling, and McEvoy (2010) recently confirmed this finding in a study of adolescent ice hockey players. In fact, parents' transformational leadership did not influence player aggression when simultaneously assessed with team-level coach transformational leadership. In addition, team aggression mediated the relationship between coaches' leadership behaviors and players' aggression, which suggests that transformational leaders indirectly affect individual followers by discouraging aggression in their salient social group. Thus, the authors concluded that, consistent with social learning theory, transformational leaders (e.g., coaches) model prosocial behavior in their followers (e.g., athletes).

Recently, Morton et al. (2011) developed an instrument to measure transformational parenting in adolescents (Transformational Parenting Questionnaire). In a study with 857 adolescents, these authors found positive relationships between adolescent evaluations of their mothers' and fathers' transformational parenting behaviors and adolescents' self-regulatory efficacy for physical activity, healthy eating, and life satisfaction. More specifically, the adolescent perceptions of transformational parenting behaviors predicted their self-regulatory efficacy beliefs regarding physical activity and healthy eating as well as explained 28% of the variance in life satisfaction.

Taken together, these results confirm the transformational influence that parents have on their children, which supports the external validity of the transformational leadership construct (Bass, 1997) to parenting.

Other studies have observed the transformational impact of teammates by analyzing peer leadership. Callow et al. (2009) used the Differentiated Transformational Leadership Inventory, which is an adapted instrument of transformational leadership in sports based on the MLQ-5X, to explore the relationship between team cohesion and performance level in Frisbee players in the United Kingdom. In this case, athletes evaluated the leadership behaviors of their team captain and found that some transformational behaviors (e.g., fostering acceptance of group goals, promoting team work, holding high performance expectations, and using individual consideration) predicted task cohesion, whereas other transformational behaviors (e.g., fostering acceptance of group goals and promoting teamwork) predicted social cohesion. The performance level of the teams (teams who did or did not qualify for the European Ultimate Club Championships) moderated these relationships.

Price and Weiss (2011) recently examined the relationships among personal characteristics, peer leadership behaviors, and team outcomes in adolescent female soccer players. The leadership scale evaluated both peer and sports leadership behaviors using two dimensions: instrumental and prosocial leadership behaviors. According to the authors, these dimensions highlight several characteristics of transformational leaders (e.g., confidence, initiative, prosocial skills, leading by example, expressing optimism regarding future goals, among others) (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The authors concluded that effective peer leadership was associated with players who reported greater task and social cohesion as well as collective efficacy. In addition, athletes who were rated higher by teammates with regard to instrumental and prosocial leadership behaviors reported greater social cohesion, and athletes who rated themselves higher in leadership behaviors reported greater task and social cohesion as well as collective efficacy.

Finally, Vidic and Burton (2011) also observed the motivational correlates (i.e., ability beliefs as well as motivational and social orientations) of four leadership styles (i.e., servant, transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant) in 132 high school and college athletes at a military institute. Canonical correlations showed that high task orientation, learning beliefs, as well as affiliation and recognition social orientations coupled with lower capacity beliefs were positively related to intrinsically oriented leadership styles (e.g., servant, transformational, and transactional leadership). The authors concluded that individuals who believe that their talent and

intelligence could be changed through hard work as well as those who placed a higher priority on learning and improving rather than outperforming others were rated as having more intrinsic leadership styles, particularly servant leadership, and to a somewhat lesser extent, transformational and transactional leadership.

In addition to the interest in studying the transformational impact of these individuals, examining the influence of coaches is especially important due their role in successful sporting performance (Gould, Greenleaf, Chung, & Guinan, 2002). In fact, coaches represent a predominant source of transformational influence on athletes. They should be effective at several domains in which transformational leaders are particularly successful, specifically (a) developing personal and positive relationships with athletes to improve their commitment and satisfaction; (b) preparing athletes and teams to improve their physical and mental skills that ultimately contribute to achieving high performance; (c) creating a strong team spirit and a cohesive team; and (d) establishing challenging goals that motivate and involve the athletes.

Considering the above examples, sports are an excellent context to study the potential transformational impact of coaches. Thus, it should be interesting to find whether this leadership approach explains coaching efficacy.

A study by Aaltio-Marjosola and Takala (2000) was one of the first studies to advance the above possibility. They examined whether Curt Lindström, the Finnish national ice hockey coach, could be considered a charismatic leader. He led Finland to won the world championship games for the first time in 1995. The authors concluded that some of Curt Lindström's characteristics were similar to those examined in the research conducted outside of sports, namely he: (a) showed behaviors that led by example for the whole team; (b) advocated a philosophy that athletes and the team should do "a little bit better", meaning that gradual improvement would increase team performance and lead to positive results over time; (c) assumed a personal leadership style that emphasized care for other people; (d) reinforced the athletes desires to take risks, even when they failed while trying to improve; (e) reinforced the importance of being honest with each other because dishonesty would lead to distrust and decrease team performance; and (f) promoted togetherness with the team members to create the conditions conducive to increased performance. These aspects of Curt Lindström's leadership were associated with a crisis Finland faced (the nation was looking for a leader who might show the way out of a depression). Moreover, the media created an image of a hero who should be followed, thereby turning the coach into a charismatic leader.

What is interesting about this study is the evidence that coaches operate in external conditions that can increase the need for transformational (or charismatic) leaders, and some characteristics of transformational leaders can promote a team's high performance. That is, transformational leadership makes a difference when applied to coaches and helps to explain their efficacy.

Empirical findings confirm this assumption. For example, Rowold (2006) tested the augmentation effect of transformational leadership with regard to transactional leadership and non leadership in a study of martial arts students (Bass, 1985). To do so, these authors measured leadership using the MLQ-5X (Bass & Avolio, 2000) and concluded that transactional leadership was significantly related to leader effectiveness; however, transformational leadership explained additional variance in leader effectiveness.

Regarding the impact of transformational leadership on the psychological experiences of athletes, recent research has found a positive relationship. For example, Gomes, Lopes, and Mata (2011) evaluated the leadership styles of coaches using the Multidimensional Scale of Leadership in Sport and the athletes' Satisfaction Scale (SS; Chelladurai, Imamura, Yamaguchi, Oinuma, & Miyauchi, 1998) in a study of swimming and handball athletes. The former scale includes three dimensions (e.g., transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and decision making). The results of a regression analysis revealed that two transformational dimensions (e.g., training and instruction as well as personal respect and fairness) predicted satisfaction with leadership in both types of athletes.

Additional studies have analyzed the role of mediators in the relationship between the transformational leadership of coaches and athlete efficacy. For example, Charbonneau, Barling, and Kelloway (2001) tested the possibility that transformational leadership affects sports performance through the mediating effect of intrinsic motivation. Therefore, they evaluated the transformational leadership of coaches using the MLQ-5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995) as well as athletes' intrinsic motivation in a sample of 168 university athletes. At the end of the season, coaches assessed the performance of their athletes. The authors concluded that intrinsic motivation mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and sports performance. This result suggests that transformational leadership developed greater intrinsic motivation in the athletes whose performance increased.

Similarly, Arthur, Woodman, Ong, Hardy, and Ntoumanis (2011) tested the possibility that athlete personality (e.g., narcissism) moderates the coach behavior–coach effectiveness relationship using Bass's (1985)

transformational leadership model as a framework. In this study, 209 young athletes from the Singapore Sports Academy completed the Differentiated Transformational Leadership Inventory (Callow et al., 2009), the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Terry, 1998), and indices of follower effort. Their results revealed that transformational leadership was positively associated with leader-inspired extra effort, and that athlete narcissism moderated the relationship between fostering acceptance of group goals and athlete effort as well as the relationship between high performance expectations and athlete effort. The authors concluded that transformational leadership behaviors based on providing athletes with opportunities for individual self-enhancement and glorification have less impact on athletes who are high in narcissism than on those who are relatively low in this construct.

Taken together, the results of applying the construct of transformational leadership to sports are encouraging. This effect is evident even when we consider that the transformational influence can be extended to several sources of leadership. Thus, the phenomenon of transformational leadership represents a broad and general concept.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Although the promising results of transformational leadership in sports are evident, there are still some topics that must be clarified. The final section of this chapter discusses questions that needed be answered in future research

The Construct of Transformational Leadership

Considering the full range of leadership models (Bass, 1985), there remain major concerns regarding the differentiation of the transformational leadership dimensions and the factor structure of the MLQ-5X (see Avolio et al., 1999; Bryman, 1992; Carless, 1998; Yukl, 1999a). For example, empirical problems were found with regard to the distinction between charisma and inspirational motivation (Barbuto, 1997), the diversity of behaviors encompassed by individualized consideration (Yukl, 1999a, 1999b), and the complexity of considering contingent reward as both a transactional and transformational process (Goodwin, Wofford, & Whittington, 2001). As previously stated, this difficulty may lead authors to test other measures of transformational measures or refine the MLQ-5X.

One of the solutions that may solve this problem involves clarifying the definition of a transformational leader. To do so, researchers should identify the primary characteristics of this type of leadership. In this way, some dimensions of transformational leadership seem fundamental.

1) Vision. This construct is probably the most important dimension of transformational leadership being encompassed by the more global construct of charisma. Vision in a leader can be identified by their expression of a positive, idealized picture of the future based on existing organizational values (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). In sports, a coach's vision becomes fundamental when he or she defines positive and challenging scenarios for athletes and teams and then establishes goals and defines tasks to achieve the vision. Anecdotal evidence confirms that some coaches are particularly skillful at appointing new paths and objectives for their teams as well as involving the athletes in the mission to accomplish more than expected. By doing so, coaches ensure that their athletes give their best efforts to realize a common goal. Previous research confirms the importance of vision in sports. In a qualitative study of national performance, Fletcher and Arnold (2011) found that Olympic sports directors invested a significant amount of time in identifying and articulating a vision that established and expressed the team's ultimate aspirations, disseminating the vision, assuming the part of a role model for this message, and inspiring others to invest in it.

2) Inspiration. Depending on the theoretical background, this construct might be related to inspirational motivation (Bass, 1990) or inspirational communication (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). However, following Yukl's (1981, p. 121) more broad definition, inspiration is "the extent to which a leader stimulates enthusiasm among subordinates for the work of the group and says things to build subordinate confidence in their ability to perform assignments successfully and attain group objectives." In sports, achieving a high performance and constantly improving one's capacities are processes in which coaching inspiration becomes fundamental. In this case, coaches stimulate the athlete enthusiasm, build their confidence, install pride, enhance morale, set an example of courage and dedication, and share in hardships (Chelladurai, 2007). By assuming these behaviors, coaches (similar to leaders in other social and

economic contexts) push their athletes to perform beyond their expectations (Bass, 1985).

3) Supportive leadership. The individualized consideration proposed by Bass (1985) can measure this dimension of transformational leadership meaning that a leader pays special attention to each follower's needs for achievement and growth. However, the more general concept of supportive leadership might include the support assumed by the leader regarding their followers' efforts (Avolio & Bass, 1995), the leader's concern for followers' individual needs (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), and the demonstration of empathy regarding their followers' values, needs, and desires (McCann et al., 2006). In sports, a coach's tendency to individualize his or her attention to an athlete's needs is important, turning the coach a mentor in a true sense. Some examples of this tendency are observed when coaches treat athletes as individuals, express appreciation, provide corrective feedback, assign special responsibilities, and display personal behaviors such as counseling, empathy, care giving, concern, and support for athletes with specific needs (Chelladurai, 2007).

4) Intellectual stimulation. This dimension is related to leaders stimulating their followers to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In sports, coaches can challenge athletes to discover new ways of performing tasks; for example, what different tactics are available when playing against a competitor who already knows an athlete's game tendencies? Coaches may also question the way athletes perform training tasks; for example, what new exercises can be adopted to improve a specific skill? However, this dimension must be confirmed in terms of its relevance to the understanding of transformational leadership because is an underdeveloped component of the full range of the leadership model (Lowe et al., 1996). This problem might extend to sports because coaches have a tendency to centralize their power, and their need to see their authority recognized may reduce the will to provide opportunities to athletes to think about new ways of performing important tasks or question the way things are conducted. This relationship should be analyzed in future research.

5) Contingent reward. This type of leadership is a complex behavior because, together with the management-by-exception, it represents a component of transactional leadership in the full range of the

leadership model. However, according to some studies it is also strongly correlated with transformational leadership (Bycio et al., 1995; Goodwin, Wofford, & Boyd, 2000; Wofford, Goodwin, & Whittington, 1998). Goodwin et al. (2001) proposed that this apparent incongruence might be related to the way this dimension is measured. Specifically, if the items that evaluate contingent reward derive from the negotiation of rewards for satisfactory performance, then this behavior may represent transactional leadership; however, if the contingent reward derives from recompenses based on performance, then this behavior may represent transformational leadership. This division suggests that if followers interpret their leaders' rewards as a recognition of their efforts to realize the leader's vision for the group or organization, then they may attribute the use of rewards to their leader's transformational influence. Thus, when a leader provides rewards, their followers attribute this action to their performance in helping the group to achieve their goals. In line with this theory, Rafferty and Griffin (2004) proposed the dimension of *personal recognition* to exemplify leaders' provisions of rewards to followers such as praise and the acknowledgement of effort to achieve specified goals. Therefore, future research should clarify this question because performance is one of the most important indicators of failure and success that are used to evaluate athlete and coach efficacy.

Another interesting question regarding the dimensions of transformational leadership is to know whether there are additional aspects that characterize the transformational influence of individuals involved in sports, namely the coaches. In this case, coaches training behaviors should be considered. In fact, teaching and training dimensions are considered the primary responsibility of coaches, given that this aspect of coaching best helps athletes improve their performance (Bloom, 2002; Lyle, 2002; Woodman, 1993). Thus, it is difficult to accept that coaching behaviors related to teaching a new skill, correcting athletes' technical skills, providing specific feedback regarding athletic performance, and improving athletic performance are not transformational enough to be considered a part of this dimension. In fact, some of these actions strongly influence athletes by objectively changing their physical and psychological skills, their bodily appearance and physical strength, and their performance. For example, reviewing the leadership dimensions that tend to predict athletes' levels of satisfaction have shown the importance of democratic leadership styles, high frequencies of social support, positive

feedback, and training and instruction (Chelladurai, 2007; Chelladurai & Riemer, 1998; Gomes & Resende, this volume). Therefore, future research should analyze whether the introduction of training behavior (i.e., *coaching*) clarifies the understanding of the transformational influence of coaches.

Future research must also specify whether dimensions that characterize transformational leadership should be measured as separate factors (the differentiated approach) or whether multiple dimensions refer to one global factor of transformational leadership (the globalized approach). The use of different factors seems more useful and comprehensive, but the research on this topic is ambiguous because there is also evidence that each transformational dimension predicts different outcomes (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Callow et al., 2009; Hardy et al., 2010; Morton et al., 2011), and that they also tend to assume high inter factor correlations (Tejeda et al., 2001; Vandenberghe et al., 2002).

This problem also raises the question of evaluating transformational leadership in sports. As already demonstrated, some studies have applied the MLQ-5X to measure this construct in sports (Arthur et al., 2011; Callow et al., 2009; Charbonneau et al., 2001; Doherty, 1996, 1997; Rowold, 2006), but others have found problems with this instrument regarding coaching (Charbonneau et al., 2001). Thus, sports may have specific characteristics that should be considered when conceptualizing and evaluating transformational leadership. The differences between sports teams and organizational work teams led Zhang, Jensen, and Mann (1997) to question whether the scales developed for industry and business areas can be applied to sports because sports teams tend to have shorter periods of existence, are usually evaluated based on a win-lose dichotomy, and occupy much more of their time training for competitions. In addition, if important dimensions are integrated to measure transformational leadership in sports (e.g., training and instruction as previously mentioned), then future research should address the possibility of developing new measures or refining existing ones.

Decision Making and Transformational Leadership

Debate exists regarding the way transformational leaders make decisions. Some critics view transformational leadership as elitist and antidemocratic; however, Bass (1985) stated that both transactional and transformational leaders may be either directive or participative, choose to negotiate or persuade, and consult or delegate. For example, the charismatic leader can

formulate a stimulating vision for the group by sharing their ideas with their followers, using intellectual stimulation to promote new perspectives and solutions to existing problems, and showing individualized consideration for their followers' needs for achievement. Although this principle is logical, there are few findings concerning the possible effects of transformational leaders who are more participative and directive with regard to their followers' psychological experiences and performances. Because leading a group with an open style of decision making is not the same as doing so with a closed style, the efficacies of these forms of leadership may not be the same. Future research should address this supposition.

In sports, there are some indications regarding the differential effects of democratic and autocratic coaching behaviors. The first behavior is related to athlete performance and psychological well-being, and the second one is related to negative psychosocial outcomes (for a review, see Chelladurai, 2007; Horn, 2008). Again, however, research must confirm whether there is a relationship between these styles of decision making and transformational leadership in sports. Furthermore, studies must determine whether the profiles that result from different combinations of decision making (e.g., democratic versus autocratic) and leadership (e.g., transactional versus transformational) explain the efficacy and performance of athletes and teams.

The Efficacy of Transformational Leadership

The efficacy of transformational leaders is a topic that requires more research. For example, Judge and Piccolo's (2004) meta-analysis of the relationship between transformational leadership and effectiveness revealed that few studies have examined the impact of transformational leadership on team performance. Thus, this subject clearly needs more investigation in organizational settings.

The scarcity of data in sports is even more evident given that the objective measures used to evaluate coaching efficacy are complex and controversial. In fact, the existing data reveal that there have been more studies conducted regarding coaches' influence on their athletes' psychological reactions (the psychological study of leadership) than those concerning coaches' influence on their athletes' performance (the performance study of leadership; for a review see Chelladurai, 2007; Horn, 2008). One reason that might explain this situation is the difficulty of using performance outcomes for research purposes. For example, Courneya and Chelladurai (1991) noted that external

variables that coaches do not control (e.g., opponent's ability, officials' errors, individual decisions of team members, and so on) could influence the most common measures of sports performance (e.g., win-loss percentage or championship status at the end of the season). Thus, using external sources to evaluate coaching efficacy might lead researchers to incorrectly assume that coaches are completely responsible for a team's success (Mallett & Côté, 2006). For this reason, Chelladurai (2007) suggested that the best way to evaluate coaching efficacy is through indicators related to athletes' psychological reactions to sporting activities (e.g., athlete satisfaction with their personal performance and that of their team, athletes' perceptions of individual and team performance, among others).

Outside of the sports leadership context, however, some authors have challenged this alternative. For example, Kaiser, Hogan, and Craig (2008) assumed that leaders affect the performance of organizations, existing some empirical findings that support this possibility. For example, some studies indicate that leaders account for 14% (Joyce, Nohria, & Roberson, 2003), 19% (McGahan & Porter, 1997), and even to 45% (Day & Lord, 1998; Thomas, 1988) of their organizations' financial results. The implications of these results are clear: "Organizations that choose and reward leaders on the basis of how their teams perform will be more likely to succeed and stand the test of time" (Kaiser et al., 2008, p. 103).

Given the interest in this perspective, more research is needed concerning the performance impact of leaders; this necessity holds for sports leaders as well. In fact, sports are a context in which objective indicators are more easily defined and they tend to be used by coaches, athletes, sport managers, fans, and others to evaluate the success of athletes and teams. Thus, the question is as simple as it is challenging: do transformational coaches affect the performances of athletes and teams? At this stage, research will profit by adopting a more conservative approach integrating as well subjective and objective indicators to evaluate the influence of transformational leadership in sports. However, these recommendations are a major challenge to the study of transformational leadership in sports.

Training Transformational Leadership

Whether transformational leadership can be developed, taught, and learned is an interesting question. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), the

answer for this question is positive and evidence exists that leaders can be trained to practice transformational leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1998).

For example, in a field experiment of 20 bank branch managers Barling et al. (1996) demonstrated the positive effects of transformational leadership training. In fact, subordinates rated trained leaders as more transformational than leaders from a control group and also assumed more commitment and performance. Interestingly, the largest changes were found in intellectual stimulation, which was particularly emphasized in the training of the leaders. In another study with managers, Kelloway, Barling, and Helleur (2000) evaluated the training in transformational leadership and counseling/feedback provided to 40 managers in a Canadian healthcare organization. They concluded that both training and providing feedback regarding supervisors' leadership styles positively affected leaders' displays of transformational behaviors.

In another context, Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) provided evidence of the positive effects of transformational leadership in a field experiment of Israeli Defense Forces training. They observed that platoon leaders who were trained had a more positive influence on their noncommissioned officers than other platoon leaders included in the control leadership training groups. This positive influence was observed in dimensions related to self-efficacy, collectivistic orientations, critical independent thinking, and extra effort.

More recently, Hardy et al. (2010) examined the effectiveness of a transformational leadership intervention with United Kingdom Royal Marine recruits. Participants were divided into experimental and control groups, and the results revealed that the intervention significantly enhanced three of the five key leadership behaviors (e.g., fosters acceptance of group goals and team work, contingent reward, and individual consideration) as well as all three recruit attitudinal variables (e.g., self-confidence, satisfaction with training, and resilience).

However, in a meta-analytic review of leadership impact research, Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, and Chan (2009) concluded that the interventions based on recent theory approaches (e.g., transformational, visionary, and charismatic leadership style), while positive, did not have a greater impact than other theoretical approaches. Specifically, these approaches proved to be more efficient in changing followers' feelings and cognitions, whereas the traditional approaches had a greater impact on more proximal target follower behaviors. Thus, these authors requested that future intervention research identify appropriate criteria for evaluation, selecting in

the case of transformational leadership performance measures that inspire individuals or groups to perform beyond expectations.

The existing data have implications for the possible training of transformational leadership in sports. The most important implication is the need to clarify whether these positive effects extend to this context, particularly to the training of coaches. Unfortunately, no known data confirm this topic.

Another important aspect is related to the efficacy of the intervention programs. As in the case of evaluating the efficacy of transformational coaches, training might be evaluated via indicators that measure the influence of coaching on athletes' psychological reactions (the psychological impact of training) or those that measure the influence of coaching on athletes' performance (the performance impact of training). Both domains are important for coaches and teams, but athlete age might also be a factor in defining a training philosophy, adopting the psychological impact of training in young athletes, and using the impact of performance training in adult athletes.

Another challenge point is related to the specific effects of transformational training. In this case, if the differential approach is adopted to evaluate transformational leadership, then it becomes interesting to know which of the main dimensions (e.g., vision, inspiration, supportive leadership, intellectual stimulation, personal recognition, and others) affect the psychological reactions and performance of athletes. If these dimensions affect athletes, then useful guidelines should be formulated to train people involved in sports.

As in the case of organizational settings, there is also a need to evaluate the impact of training based on different conceptual approaches of leadership. Thus, empirically demonstrating whether transformational training can be adjusted to sports becomes a priority. However, demonstrating the objective advantages that exist (if any) is also important when adopting transformational training compared with other approaches. No data was found on this subject, but some authors have discussed the differential and conceptual impact of leadership training. For example, Chen (2010) analyzed the transformational/transactional model of leadership (Bass, 1990) and the leader member exchange model (LMX; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) to assess which model was the most appropriate to apply when building teamwork in a baseball team. The author suggested that the transformational/transactional model does not sufficiently address actual coach-player relationships; therefore, the LMX model was more useful for this purpose because it includes more specific mechanisms regarding the improvement of teamwork

than the transformational/transactional model. However, no data was provided to sustain this hypothesis; therefore, this proposal must be confirmed.

Specific Topics

As previously stated, vision is probably the most important dimension of transformational leadership. The leader's vision depends on his or her ideas and principles, and these mental representations are observed by the specific goals and actions that he or she adopts; that is, there is a connection between the leader's vision, his or her ideas and principles, and the final actions taken. However, how this process occurs in transformational leadership is unclear. Despite the problems presented above about the differentiated and globalized approaches of transformational leadership, there is some evidence concerning the dimensions that define transformational leadership (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1985; Burns, 2003; Conger, 1999); however, the specific correspondence of these dimensions to leader behaviors is less evident. This point is important because assessing the actions of transformational leaders might clarify the mechanisms that explain the positive influence they exert in followers. Furthermore, it might also help to establish taxonomies between each leadership dimension and sets of behaviors to be used for training purposes.

In a preliminary study on this subject, Gomes and Cruz (2006) adopted a qualitative methodology to evaluate the leadership of high performance Portuguese coaches. They analyzed the relationship among the leaderships principles adopted by these coaches (e.g., their philosophy of leadership), the actions taken to implement their ideas (e.g., the exercise of leadership), and the criteria used to evaluate the success of these behaviors (e.g., the efficacy of leadership). The results revealed that some of the principles the coaches adopted were similar to those present in transformational leadership, especially the importance of being a role model to athletes, the use of inspirational motivation to challenge athletes' abilities, the use of supportive leadership and social support to help athletes overcome sports and personal problems, and the provision of clear and simple team strategies to perform in competitions. Regarding behaviors, the most significant aspect was the use of multiple strategies of actions to implement each of the leadership principles, including the use of goal setting for the team and each athlete, the use of positive communication in practices and competitions, the enhancement of cohesion by creating activities outside of sports that promoted interaction between the

athletes, and the provision of positive and specific technical feedback to correct and develop the athletes' skills. In the third domain (e.g., the efficacy of leadership), all coaches recognized the importance of achieving competitive goals (e.g., winning competitions and championships). Most coaches labeled these goals as the *primary criteria of success and efficacy*; however, all coaches mentioned other success criteria, as for example helping athletes to develop their personal and sport skills and having more cohesive team at the end of the sport season. These aspects were labeled *peripheral criteria of success*. Thus, the results identified the connections among leadership principles, behaviors, and efficacy. However, the small sample used in this study (four coaches) did not allow these data to reach the theoretical saturation (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), meaning that it was not clear whether the inclusion of additional data would change the theoretical and practical insights. However, future research should test whether the theoretical assumption regarding the relationship that one leadership principle corresponds with specific behavior(s) that have leadership efficacy criteria such that principle → behavior → efficacy (i.e., a triphasic model) is evident in transformational coaches. Conversely, if these connections are not evident or simply do not exist (i.e., a tripartite model), then it would be interesting to find if they correspond to less successful forms of leadership.

The final point is related to the role of environmental contingencies in the emergence of transformational leadership. Empirical evidence exists regarding the tendency of transactional leaders to emerge and be relatively effective when they face stable and predictable environments, and the tendency of transformational leaders to emerge and be effective when they face unstable, uncertain, and turbulent environments (for a review, see Bass & Riggio, 2006). In fact, transformational leaders seem particularly able to deal with environmental instability, transforming threatening situations into opportunities for change by adopting new values and purposes. If these scenarios are the case, then sports are again an ideal context to study transformational versus transactional leaders. One of the primary characteristics of sports is its tendency to change at different levels: teams tend to frequently change athletes, the existing human and financial resources vary considerably based on athlete or team success, different teams and athletes compete for the same goal, and competitions occur constantly, which places athletes and teams under permanent social scrutiny.

In sum, everything changes in sports. Even coaches are frequently dismissed from their jobs due to an apparent "inability" to cope with one or more of these constrains. For example, anecdotal evidence from the

Portuguese soccer team demonstrates that when a team has a string of bad results and the club administrator affirms that he or she maintains the confidence in the coach's ability to overcome the current situation, then this mean that the coach will be fired soon. Thus, sports have many constrains that raise interesting questions for research: do transformational leaders have an advantage in sports? If so, why? What makes these leaders suitable for this situation? But, the other side of the question is also important. That is to say, are there situations that facilitate the actions of transformational leaders? If so, what are they?

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The study of transformational leadership examines individuals who have the capacity to change situations and influence their followers using a challenging and appealing vision. As previously mentioned, several studies have demonstrated the impact of transformational leadership in diverse contexts such as the business world, the healthcare system, the military, education, and others. However, in the case of sports, transformational leadership research has not achieved the same relevance as demonstrated by the number of studies conducted, but the situation is changing and the preliminary results are encouraging.

Although any person involved in sports (e.g., managers, parents, athletes) has a transformational potential impact, this chapter highlighted the transformational leadership of coaches. Of all the sources that influence athletes, coaches may be the most important not only for their ability to improve the physical and technical skills of athletes but also for their strong influence on an athlete's psychological growth and well-being. This chapter defended a broad perspective regarding the potential impact of coaches including psychological, relational, and technical domains. Thus, including all of these aspects into a conceptual framework and in future methodologies may increase the understanding of the significant changes produced by transformational coaches.

In addition, this phenomenon could be better understood when research dedicates itself not only to the study of transformational leadership characteristics (e.g., vision, inspiration, supportive leadership, intellectual stimulation, personal recognition, and others) but also to the study of the potential relationship between a coach's transformational principles, his or her behaviors, and leadership efficacy criteria. Not only will this increase the

knowledge regarding why transformational leaders make a difference, but it will also provide useful insights to train future sports leaders.

As mentioned in the beginning of this work, leadership is a complex and fascinating topic. The main point of this chapter is that transformational leadership may explain the complexities of being a leader and why this role is so fascinating.

REFERENCES

Aaltio-Marjosola, I. & Takala, T. (2000). Charismatic leadership, manipulation and the complexity of organizational life. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counselling Today*, *12*(4), 146-158.

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. & Alban-Metcalfe, R. J. (2001). The development of a new transformational leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *74*(1), 1-27. doi: 10.1348/ 096317901167208

Amorose, A. J. & Horn, T. S. (2000). Intrinsic motivation: Relationships with collegiate athletes' gender, scholarship status, and perception of their coaches' behavior. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *22*(1), 63-84.

Amorose, A. J. & Horn, T. S. (2001). Pre-to pos-season changes in the intrinsic motivation of first year college athletes: Relationships with coaching behavior and scholarship status. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *13*(4), 355-373.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(3), 261-295. doi: 10.1016/s1048-9843(03)00030-4

Arthur, C. A., Woodman, T., Ong, C. W., Hardy, L. & Ntoumanis, N. (2011). The role of athlete narcissism in moderating the relationship between coaches' transformational leader behaviors and athlete motivation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *33*(1), 3-19.

Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F. O., Zhou, Q. & Hartnell, C. A. (2012). Transformational leadership, innovative behavior, and task performance: Test of mediation and moderation processes. *Human Performance*, *25*(1), 1-25. doi: 10.1080/08959285.2011.631648

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiples levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 199-218.

Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1998). You can drag a horse to water but you can't make it drink unless it is thirsty. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *5*(1), 4-17. doi: 10.1177/107179199800500102

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72*(4), 441-462.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F. & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(6), 801-823. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.003

Avolio, B. J. & Gibbons, T. C. (1998). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 276-308). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Avolio, B. J., Kahai, S. & Dodge, G. E. (2000). E-leadership: Implications for theory, research, and practice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(4), 615-668. doi: 10.1016/s1048-9843(00)00062-x

Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O. & Chan, A. (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(5), 764-784. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.006

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W. & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*(8), 951-968. doi: 10.1002/job.283

Barbuto, J. E. (1997). Taking the charisma out of transformational leadership. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *12*(3), 689–697.

Barling, J., Weber, T. & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and fiscal outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(6), 827-832. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.6.827

Bartol, K. M. & Martin, D. C. (1994). *Management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill`s handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3 ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(4), 463-478.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, *52*(2), 130-139.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1991). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire (form 5X rater)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49-80). New York: Academic Press.

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

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Mindgarden.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I. & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 207-218. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207

Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2 ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Beauchamp, M. R., Welch, A. S. & Hulley, A. J. (2007). Transformational and transactional leadership and exercise-related self-efficacy. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *12*(1), 83-88. doi: 10.1177/1359105307071742

Behling, O. & McFillen, J. M. (1996). A syncretical model of charismatic/transformational leadership. *Group & Organisation Management*, *21*(2), 163–191.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 307-331.

Bloom, G. A. (2002). Role of the elite coach in the development of talent. In J. M. Silva & D. E. Stevens (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 466-483). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bono, J. E. & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*(5), 554–571.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.

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

Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D. & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass`s (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*(4), 468-478.

Callow, N., Smith, M. J., Hardy, L., Arthur, C. A. & Hardy, J. (2009). Measurement of transformational leadership and its relationship with team cohesion and performance level. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *21*(4), 395-412. doi: 10.1080/10413200903204754

Carless, S. A. (1998). Assessing the discriminant validity of transformational leadership behaviour as measured by the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *71*(4), 353–358.

Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J. & Mann, L. (2000). A short measure of transformational leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *14*(3), 389−405. doi: 10.1023/A:1022991115523

Carlson, D. S. & Perrewe, P. L. (1995). Institutionalization of organizational ethics through transformational leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *14*, 829-838.

Cerni, T., Curtis, G. J. & Colmar, S. H. (2008). Information processing and leadership styles: Constructive thinking and transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *2*(1), 60-73. doi: 10.1002/jls.20049

Charbonneau, D., Barling, J. & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Transformational leadership and sports performance: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*(7), 1521-1534. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02686.x

Chelladurai, P. (1978). *A contingency model of leadership in athletics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Waterloo, Waterloo: Canada.

Chelladurai, P. (1993). Leadership. In R. N. Singer, M. Murphey & L. K. Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sport psychology* (pp. 647-671). New York: Macmillan.

Chelladurai, P. (2007). Leadership in sports. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (pp. 113-135). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Chelladurai, P. & Haggerty, T. R. (1978). A normative model of decision styles in coaching. *Athletic Administration*, *13*(1), 6-9.

Chelladurai, P., Imamura, H., Yamaguchi, Y., Oinuma, Y. & Miyauchi, T. (1998). Sport leadership in a cross-national setting: The case of Japanese and Canadian university athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *10*(4), 374-389.

Chelladurai, P. & Riemer, H. A. (1998). Measurement of leadership in sport. In J. L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 227-253). Morgantown, WY: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.

Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory*, *Research*, *and Practice*, *4*(1), 27-43. doi: 10.1037//1089-2699.4.1.27

Chen, C.-C. (2010). Leadership and teamwork paradigms: Two models for baseball coaches. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, *38*(10), 1367-1376. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2010.38.10.1367

Chen, X.-P., Hui, C. & Sego, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(6), 922-931. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.922

Collins, J. (2001). Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*(1), 66-76.

Conger, J. A. (1989a). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystic of exceptional leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J. A. (1989b). Leadership: The art of empowering others. *Academy of Management Executive*, *71*(1), 17-24.

Conger, J. A. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: An insider's perspective on those developing streams of research. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 145-170.

Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioural theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *The Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 637-647.

Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998a). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership* (pp. 78–97). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998b). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.

Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998c). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, *13*(3), 471-482.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N. & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(7), 747-760.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T. & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo Scale of Charismatic Leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *14*(3), 290-301. doi: 10.1111/j.1936-4490.1997.tb00136.x

Côté, J., Salmela, J. H., Trudel, P., Baria, A. & Russell, S. (1995). The coaching model: A grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches knowledge. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *17*(1), 1-17.

Courneya, K. S. & Chelladurai, P. (1991). A model of performance measures in baseball. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *13*(1), 16-25.

Day, D. V. & Lord, R. G. (1998). Executive leadership and organizational performance: Suggestions for a new theory and methodology. *Journal of Management*, *14*(3), 453-464. doi: 10.1177/014920638801400308

DeGroot, T., Kicker, D. S. & Cross, T. C. (2000). A meta-analysis to review organisational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *17*(4), 356–371.

Den Hartog, D. N. & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behavior? The role of autonomy and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(1), 194-202. doi: 10.1037/a0024903

Doherty, A. J. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Sport Management*, *10*(3), 292-309.

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*(3), 275-285.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in a revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.

Drouillard, S. E. & Kleiner, B. H. (1996). Good leadership. *Management Development Review*, *9*(5), 30-33.

Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B. & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. J.

Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (pp. 35-66). Oxford, U.K: JAI/Elsevier.

Durić, D. (2011). Transformational leadership styles in Slovenian Police. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Security*, *13*(2), 188-207.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J. & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(4), 735-744.

Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D. & Boerner, S. (2008). Transformational leadership and team innovation: Integrating team climate principles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(6), 1438–1446. doi: 10.1037/a0012716

Erickson, A., Shaw, J. B. & Agabe, Z. (2007). An empirical investigation of the antecedents, behaviors, and outcomes of bad leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *1*(3), 26-43. doi: 10.1002/jls.20023

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. *1*, 149-190). New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectivenes*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, *37*, 1-6.

Fleishman, E. A. & Harris, E. F. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievance and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, *15*(1), 43-56.

Fletcher, D. & Arnold, R. (2011). A Qualitative study of performance leadership and management in elite sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *23*(2), 223-242. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2011.559184

Fullagar, C., McCoy, D. & Shull, C. (1992). The socialization of union loyalty. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *13*(1), 13-26.

Galbraith, K. A. (2005). Family leadership styles and family well-being. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, *33*(3), 220-239. doi: 10.1177/1077727x04272362

Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius*. New York: Appleton.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R. & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 343-372. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.003

Gomes, A. R. & Cruz, J. F. (2006). Relação treinador-atleta e exercício da liderança no desporto: A percepção de treinadores de alta competição.

[Coach-athlete relationship and leadership practice: The perceptions of high level competition coaches]. *Estudos de Psicologia (Natal)*, *11*(1), 5-15.

Gomes, A. R., Lopes, H. & Mata, R. T. (2011). Leadership, cohesion and satisfaction: Differences between swimming and handball Portuguese teams. *Revista Mexicana de Psicologia*, *28*(1), 31-42.

Gomes, A. R., Sousa, S. & Cruz, J. F. (2006). Charismatic, transformational and visionary dimensions in sport leadership: Toward news paths for the study of coach-atlethes relationships. In N. Huber & M. Harvey (Eds.), *Leadership at the crossroads* (pp. 84-94): University of Maryland: The James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership.

Goodwin, V. L., Wofford, J. C. & Boyd, N. G. (2000). A laboratory experiment testing the antecedents of leader cognitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(7), 769-788. doi: DOI: 10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:7<769::AID-JOB53>3.0.CO;2-J

Goodwin, V. L., Wofford, J. C. & Whittington, J. L. (2001). A theoretical and empirical extension to the transformational leadership construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *22*(7), 759-774. doi: 10.1002/job.111

Gould, D., Greenleaf, C., Chung, Y. C. & Guinan, D. (2002). A survey of U.S. Atlanta and Nagano Olympians: Variables perceived to influence performance. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *73*(2), 175–187.

Graen, G. B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years. Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 219-247.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F. & Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(6), 669-692. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.09.007

Hardy, L., Arthur, C. A., Jones, G., Shariff, A., Munnoch, K., Isaacs, I. & Allsopp, A. J. (2010). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors, psychological, and training outcomes in elite military recruits. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(1), 20-32. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.10.002

Hater, J. J. & Bass, B. M. (1998). Superiors` evaluations and subordinates perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*(4), 695-702.

Hawkins, K. & Tolzin, A. (2002). Examining the team/leader interface: Baseball teams as exemplars of postmodern organizations. *Group &*

Organization Management, *27*(1), 97-112. doi: 10.1177/1059601102027 001006

Hemphill, J. K. & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the leader behaviour description questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behaviour: Its description and measurement* (pp. 6–38). Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1996). *Management of organizational behaviour: Utilizing human resources* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hetland, H. & Sandal, G. (2003). Transformational leadership in Norway: Outcomes and personality correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *12*(2), 147-170. doi: 10.1080/ 13594320344000057

Hetland, H., Skogstad, A., Hetland, J. & Mikkelsen, A. (2011). Leadership and learning climate in a work setting. *European Psychologist*, *16*(3), 163-173. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040/a000037

Hobman, E. V., Jackson, C. J., Jimmieson, N. L. & Martin, R. (2011). The effects of transformational leadership behaviours on follower outcomes: An identity-based analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *20*(4), 553-580. doi: 10.1080/1359432x. 2010.490046

Horn, T. S. (2008). Coaching effectiveness in the sport domain. In T. S. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in sport psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 239-267). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*(3), 321-328.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J. (1988). Power and personality in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *10*, 305–357.

House, R. J. (1992). Charismatic leadership in service-producing organizations. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *3*(2), 5-16.

House, R. J. & Shamir, B. (1993). *Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Howell, J. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, *6*(2), 43–54.

Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P. & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 373-394. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.002

James, W. (1880). Great men, great thoughts and their environment. *Atlantic Monthly*, *46*, 441–459.

Javidan, M. & Waldman, D. A. (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: Measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review*, *63*(2), 229-242.

Jowett, S. (2007). Interdependence analysis and the 3+1 Cs in the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett & D. Lavallee (Eds.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 15-27). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Joyce, W. F., Nohria, N. & Roberson, B. (2003). *What really works*. New York: Harper Business.

Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 755–768. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Jung, D. I. (2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, *13*(2), 185-195. doi: 10.1207/s15326934crj1302_6

Jung, D. I., Chow, C. & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(4–5), 525-544. doi: 10.1016/s1048-9843(03)00050-x

Kaiser, R. B., Hogan, R. & Craig, S. B. (2008). Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologist*, *63*(2), 96-110. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.63.2.96

Kane, T. D. & Tremble, T. R., Jr. (2000). Transformational leadership effects at different levels of the Army. *Military Psychology*, *12*(2), 137-160.

Kark, R. & Shamir, B. (2002). The dual effect of transformational leadership: Priming relational and collective selves and further effect on followers. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership* (pp. 67-91). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Kark, R., Shamir, B. & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 246-255. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.246

Kelloway, E. K., Barling, J. & Helleur, J. (2000). Enhancing transformational leadership: The roles of training and feedback. *The Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, *21*(3), 145-149.

Kent, A. & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, *15*(2), 135-159.

Kernis, M. H. & Goldman, B. M. (2005). From thought and experience to behavior and interpersonal relationships: A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity. In A. Tesser, J. V. Wood & D. Stapel (Eds.), *On building*, *defending and regulating the self: A psychological perspective* (pp. 31–52). New York: Psychology Press.

Kerr, S. & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *22*(3), 375-403.

Kersting, M. & Rowold, J. (2008). The assessment of charismatic leadership. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *24*(2), 124-130. doi: 10. 1027/1015-5759.24.2.124

Khanin, D. (2007). Contrasting Burns and Bass: Does the transactional-transformational paradigm live up to Burns' philosophy of transforming leadership? *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *1*(3), 7-25. doi: 10.1002/ jls.20022

Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M. & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *16*(4), 319-333. doi: 10.1002/job.4030160404

Korman, A. K. (1966). Consideration, initiating structure, and organizational criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, *18*, 349-360.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). What leaders really do. In R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter & G. A. Bigley (Eds.), *Motivation and leadership at work* (pp. 620-627). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kouzes, O. & Posner, B. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kovjanic, S., Schuh, S. C., Jonas, K., Quaquebeke, N. V. & Van Dick, R. (2012). How do transformational leaders foster positive employee outcomes? A self-determination-based analysis of employees' needs as mediating links. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(8), 1031-1052. doi: 10.1002/job.1771

Larson, A. (1968). *The president nobody knew*. New York: Popular Library.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *4*(3), 177-199. doi: 10.1080/15700760500244769

Liang, T.-l., Chan, L.-C., Lin, C.-W. & Huang, Y.-L. (2011). Relationship between leadership behaviors and task performance: The mediation role of job satisfaction and the moderation role of social distance. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(14), 5920-5928.

Lim, B. C. & Ployhart, R. E. (2004). Transformational leadership: Relations to the five-factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(4), 610–621.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 385-425.

Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: A framework for coaches' behaviour*. London: Routledge.

Mageau, G. A. & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *21*(11), 883-904. doi: 10.1080/0264041031000140374

Mallett, C. & Côté, J. (2006). Beyond winning and losing: Guidelines for evaluating high performance coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, *20*(2), 213-221.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, *56*(4), 241-270.

Martin, R. & Epitropaki, O. (2001). Role of organizational identification, on Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs), transformational leadership and work attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *4*(3), 247-262.

McCain, J. & Salter, M. (2004). *Why courage matters: The way to a braver life*. New York: Random House.

McCann, J. A. J., Langford, P. H. & Rawlings, R. M. (2006). Testing Behling and McFillen's syncretical model of charismatic transformational leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, *31*(2), 237-263. doi: 10.1177/1059601104273061

McColl-Kennedy, J. R. & Anderson, R. D. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(5), 545-559. doi: 10.1016/s1048-9843(02)00143-1

McGahan, A. M. & Porter, M. E. (1997). How much does industry matter, really? *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(S1), 15-30. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199707)

Morton, K. L., Barling, J., Rhodes, R. E., Mâsse, L. C., Zumbo, B. D. & Beauchamp, M. R. (2010). Extending transformational leadership theory

to parenting and adolescent health behaviours: An integrative and theoretical review. *Health Psychology Review*, *4*(2), 128-157. doi: 10. 1080/17437191003717489

Morton, K. L., Barling, J., Rhodes, R. E., Mâsse, L. C., Zumbo, B. D. & Beauchamp, M. R. (2011). The application of transformational leadership theory to parenting: Questionnaire development and implications for adolescent self-regulatory efficacy and life satisfaction. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *33*(5), 688-709.

Niehoff, B. P., Enz, C. A. & Grover, R. A. (1990). The impact of top-management actions on employee attitudes and perceptions. *Group & Organisation Studies*, *15*(3), 337-352.

Paulsen, N., Maldonado, D., Callan, V. J. & Ayoko, O. (2009). Charismatic leadership, change and innovation in an R&D organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *22*(5), 511-523. doi: 10.1108/ 09534810910983479

Pieterse, A. N., van Knippenberg, D., Schippers, M. & Stam, D. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behavior: The moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*(4), 609-623. doi: 10.1002/job.650

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A. & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, *25*(6), 897–933.

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

Price, M. S. & Weiss, M. R. (2011). Peer leadership in sport: Relationships among personal characteristics, leader behaviors, and team outcomes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *23*(1), 49-64. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2010.520300

Purvanova, R. K., Bono, J. E. & Dzieweczynski, J. (2006). Transformational leadership, job characteristics, and organizational citizenship performance. *Human Performance*, *19*(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1901_1

Rafferty, A. E. & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(3), 329-354. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009

Rai, S. & Sinha, A. K. (2000). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and facilitating climate. *Psychological Studies*, *45*(1-2), 33-42.

Raskin, R. & Terry, H. (1998). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(5), 890–902.

Rowold, J. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership in martial arts. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *18*(4), 312-325. doi: 10.1080/10413200600944082

Rowold, J. (2008). Effects of transactional and transformational leadership of pastors. *Pastoral Psychology*, *56*(4), 403-411. doi: 10.1007/s11089-008-0121-6

Rowold, J. & Heinitz, K. (2007). Transformational and charismatic leadership: Assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLQ and the CKS. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(2), 121-133. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.01.003

Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 122-160). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 1020-1030. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1020

Seltzer, J., Numerof, R. E. & Bass, B. M. (1989). Transformational leadership: Is a source of more burnout and stress? *Journal of Health and Human Resource Administration*, *12*(2), 174-185.

Shamir, B. & Eilam, G. (2005). "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 395-417. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.005

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

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinin, E. & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charisma leader behaviour in military units: Subordinates` attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors` appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*(4), 387-409.

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L. & Hunt, E. B. (1977). A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly*, *48*(2), 401-407.

Smoll, F. L. & Smith, R. E. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *19*(18), 1522-1551.

Sosik, J. J. & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*(4), 365-390.

Stodgill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, *25*, 35-71.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tejeda, M. J., Scandura, T. A. & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *12*(1), 31–52. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00063-7

Thomas, A. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*(3), 388-400.

Tichy, N. M. & Devanna, M. A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Trice, H. M. & Beyer, J. M. (1991). Cultural leadership in organizations. *Organization Science*, *2*(2), 149-169.

Truman, H. S. (1958). *Memoirs*. New York: Doubleday.

Tucker, S., Turner, N., Barling, J. & McEvoy, M. (2010). Transformational leadership and childrens' aggression in team settings: A short-term longitudinal study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(3), 389-399. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.004

Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, V. & Milner, C. (2002). Transformational leadership and moral reasoning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(2), 304-311. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.2.304

Van Knippenberg, D., de Cremer, D. & van Knippenberg, B. (2007). Leadership and fairness: The state of the art. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *16*(2), 113–140.

Vandenberghe, C., Stordeur, S. & D`hoore, W. (2002). Transactional and transformational leadership in nursing: Structural validity and substantive relationships. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *18*(1), 16-29.

Vidic, Z. & Burton, D. (2011). Developing effective leaders: Motivational correlates of leadership styles. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *23*(3), 277-291. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2010.546827

Vroom, V. H. & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 17-24. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M. & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behavior-the augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group & Organization Studies*, *15*(4), 381-394.

Wallace, M. & Weese, W. J. (1995). Leadership, organizational culture, and job satisfaction in Canadian YMCA organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, *9*(2), 182-193.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S. & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, *34*(1), 89-126. doi: 10.1177/0149206307308913

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J. & Zhu, W. (2008). How transformational leadership weaves its influence on individual job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(4), 793–825.

Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J. & Avolio, B. J. (2010). Psychological processes linking authentic leadership to follower behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(5), 901-914. doi: 10.1016/ j.leaqua.2010.07.015

Weber, M. (1964). *The theory of social economic organization*. New York: The Free Press.

Weber, M. (1968). *Economic and society* (Vol. *1*). New York: Bedminster.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W. & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center Work Adjustment Project.

Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L. & Whittington, J. L. (1998). A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(1), 55-84.

Woodman, L. (1993). Coaching: A science, an art, an emerging profession. *Sport Science Review*, *2*(2), 1-13.

Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. & Chun, J. U. (2002). Transformational and charismatic leadership: A levels-of-analysis review of theory, measurement, data analysis, and inferences. In L. L. Neider & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership* (pp. 23–63). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (1999a). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 285–305.

Yukl, G. (1999b). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(1), 33–48.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yusof, A. (1998). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors and coaches` job satisfaction. *Physical Educator*, *55*(4), 170-176.

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 6-16. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6

Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C. & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101–124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*(2), 211-227.

Zaleznik, A. (1989). *The managerial mystique, restoring leadership in business*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Zhang, J., Jensen, B. E. & Mann, B. L. (1997). Modification and revision of the Leadership Scale for Sports. *Journal of Sports Behavior*, *21*(1), 105-122.