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ABSTRACT
Using a conceptual framework based on the work of Mitch McCrimmon, who has highlighted false dichotomies of leadership and management, the Ryder Cup captaincy of Paul McGinley is examined in terms of man management, strategy and tactics, and the Inner Game. For purposes of comparison on these matters, reference is made to American Football coach Pete Carroll. This is a stimulus article aimed at making links between sport and business through invited commentaries. It is intended to provoke critical reflection on nebulous use of the term ‘leadership’ and that much ‘leadership development’ is concerned with matters such as self-awareness that are associated with ‘personal growth’. Attention is drawn to how McGinley’s captaincy is couched in terms of a discourse of ‘management’.
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INTRODUCTION
The first part of this article hinges around ‘authenticity’ and it is shown how Pete Carroll, head coach of the Seattle Sea Hawks has developed his personal philosophy. Mitch McCrimmon’s definitions of leadership and management are presented in the second part of the article. These definitions are then used in the main part of the article which is a case study of the Ryder Cup and in particular Team Europe captain Paul McGinley. What is interesting is that during interviews about being captain, McGinley scarcely used the word ‘leadership’ but rather talked in terms of management. (An exception is when he was discussing team meetings, making reference to his sense of “who the leader on the pitch is going to be” [1].) A sponsor of the Ryder Cup, EY (Ernst and Young Global Ltd), produced a web feature entitled, “Captain’s Leadership Journey”: “In this series of short films, Europe’s 2014 Ryder Captain Paul McGinley meets leaders from around the world to explore modern leadership and team building in sport and business” [2; emphases added]. In one of these short films, the narrator states: “Great leaders inspire, empower and encourage elite individuals to use their talents in the service of the team and that doesn’t happen overnight; it’s the fruit of a
LEADERSHIP AND PERSONAL GROWTH
Making reference to Wittgenstein’s [3] concept of “family resemblance”, Harter [4] suggests that “there does not have to be a single thread running through all uses of the word ‘leadership’ – as though there is an essence of leadership (see also [5]). However, the following definitions are typical of a popular view of leadership based around influence:

Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. [6, p. 3]

Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives. [7, p. 23]

A distinction is made between descriptive theories – what leaders actually do; and normative theories – what leaders ought to do. While the former is typically concerned with ‘leadership styles’, there is a tendency for the latter (especially authentic leadership theory) to be concerned with promoting ethical behaviour [8].

AUTHENTICITY
According to Ibarra [9], authenticity has become “the gold standard for leadership”. Authentic leadership was popularised by Bill George, who was a mentee, friend and colleague of Warren Bennis [10]:

As I was joining Medtronic in 1989, I read Warren’s classic, On Becoming a Leader. For the first time an author described the kind of leader I wanted to be: purpose-driven, values-centered, passionate, and resilient. ... My intent was to incorporate many of the ideas I first learned from Warren into a practical approach to developing leaders that enabled people to be their authentic selves, rather than emulating others. Warren encouraged me to broaden this concept into a book on “Authentic Leadership”. [10]

What Bill George means by authenticity is being who you are, rather than trying to imitate or emulate somebody else, and people will trust you when you are authentic [11; emphasis added]. Bennis argued that “if a leader hasn’t journeyed inside first to get clear on his or her values, strengths, passion and vision, their lack of authentic grounding will cause them to behave in inconsistent ways, eroding trust and undermining leadership effectiveness” [12].

However, Herminia Ibarra, has argued that pursuit of authenticity may keep a person in their comfort zone in order to protect their identity rather than seek challenge and personal growth during a career transition. Furthermore, “being utterly transparent – disclosing every single thought and feeling – is both unrealistic and risky” [9]. Defining identity as “the internalized and evolving story that results from a person’s selective appropriation of past present and future” [13, cited in 9], Ibarra argues “[y]ou have to believe your story, but also embrace how it changes over time, according to what you need to do” [9].

PERSONAL GROWTH
So much of so-called ‘leadership development’ is essentially concerned with personal...
growth, including self-awareness. In terms of a person’s identity and their story, consider the case of Pete Carroll in 1999 after he was fired as coach of New England Patriots in the National Football League (NFL) and he started reading one of John Wooden’s books:

I got to the point in the book where he said that he was in his sixteenth year at UCLA before he won his first national championship. He’d coached other places before, he’d won Pac-10 championships, he had a great winning record. But as soon as I saw that, I smacked the book closed. ... Once he got it, he just nailed it. Once he figured out what was right for him, how to engineer his program in the way that best exemplified his philosophy, nobody could touch him. He wins nine of the next eleven championships, and then he retires, just goes off into basketball heaven. How beautiful is that? ... And then I thought, Oh crap, it took him sixteen years. And I don’t even have a job. I better get may act together. I started working that moment. I got a notebook and started writing. I asked myself: What is my philosophy, what is my approach? And I came up with the thought that if I was going to describe me, the first thing I’ll say is that I’m a competitor. Just one simple line. I’m a competitor. That’s my whole life since I was three, four years old. I tried to beat my brother in every game we played. All of his friends would just laugh at how hard I’d try. I’d be fighting and scratching and crying and whatever it took, from the time I was a little kid. [14; emphasis added]

It should be noted that Carroll understands competition not as being about winning, but rather being about his players being the best they can be:

It is really about us. We’re competing against ourselves to be our best. It’s no disrespect for our opponents. But I don’t want to place any value on our opponents from one week to the next. I want everything to be directed at us being at our best no matter who we’re playing. ... We don’t talk about championships. We talk about performing at our best. And we’ve learned about that gets us what we want. As soon as we focus on something outside ourselves, it becomes a distraction and can keep us from what we have at hand. [15]

It should be said, however, that Carroll did adapt Anson Dorrance’s idea of the “competitive cauldron” to practice sessions for the USC Trojans football programme [16] (see [17]).

The previous quotation from Carroll alludes to the influence of The Inner Game on Carroll’s personal philosophy. In a Foreword that Carroll for the latest reprint of Tim Gallwey’s classic, “The Inner Game of Tennis”, Carroll wrote: “[Coaches and athletes] must clear their minds of all confusion and earn the ability to let themselves play freely” [18, p. xi-xii]. Carroll first came across Gallwey’s work while studying sport psychology at graduate school:

[Gallwey] gave a seminar, then a group from my class had dinner with him, and I was instantly attracted to the perspective, to the point of view that he brought. And I started to incorporate it into my hoops game – playing basketball, and I was also playing tennis at the time. I was done playing football then. And I just thought there was really something there. It resonated, and I’ve stayed with the information ever since, and it has become part of my life, the philosophy, and the background of what he spoke about 30 or 40 years ago. ... It is absolutely woven into everything that we
do, although I never mention the ‘inner game,’’ and I never talk specifically about it. It has become so much of the fabric of the way I think and operate, because it is all a performance-based orientation. I really try to coach our whole football team the way Tim Gallwey might have coached an individual tennis player. [19]

Carroll’s current philosophy is represented by a pyramid in the manner of John Wooden’s Pyramid of Success and Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. At the apex is “Knowing you’re going to win” and the word “Focus”. The latter has a bidirectional relationship with both “Confidence” and “Trust” which appear in the layer of the pyramid below the apex along with the words “Practice is everything”. The central theme of the pyramid is “Always compete” which is in the second layer of the pyramid. The base of the pyramid summarises, among other things, key beliefs: “It’s all about the ball; Everything counts; Respect everyone”. “Always compete” is underpinned by “Respect Everyone” as, following The Inner Game, “the opponent allows you to compete at your highest level” [16].

Carroll combined The Inner Game with John Wooden’s emphasis on disciplined practice and repetition:

The confidence necessary for performing at championship level over long periods of time can only be developed on the practice field through repetition. Disciplined practice enables our players to develop trust in our coaching and in themselves. They also gain the confidence that allows them the ability to focus, regardless of circumstances or surroundings. [18, p. xii]

A great coach once said the best players don’t always win, the players who play the best do. That’s why we work so hard, that’s why we train so hard. That’s why we focus on practicing better than anyone’s ever practiced before. [20].

Other influences included a rock star:

“Jerry Garcia [of the band Grateful Dead] said that he didn’t want his band to be the best ones doing something. He wanted them to be the only ones doing it. To be all by yourself out there doing something that nobody else can touch – that’s the thought that guides me, that guides this program. We’re going to do things better than it’s ever been done before in everything we do, and we’re going to compete our asses off. And we’re going to see how far that takes us.” [14]

Pete Carroll developed his knowledge and understanding of strategy and tactics by ‘standing on the shoulders of giants’; in particular Lou Holtz and Monte Kiffin at Arkansas, Bud Grant and Monte Kiffin in Minnesota, and Bill Walsh and George Seifert at the San Francisco 49ers [16].

The following quotations from Pete Carroll can be examined in terms of Gallwey’s Inner Game equation, Performance is equal to Potential minus Interference; and mobility, which is “the pivotal concept in learning to work free” [21 p. 138]. Mobility involves “being very clear about where you are, where you are going, and why”; essentially it is about “working consciously” [21, p. 138].

“Our system is designed to allow players to be the best they possibly can. That’s why we celebrate uniqueness, their individuality. They have to act with the team,
but they can do that in a way that illuminates who they are. Most people think you can’t do that. They say there’s no space for people to be individuals within a team. I think just the opposite.” [16; emphasis added]

“I’m hoping to help them find their way to be the very best they can possibly be and to do that we trying to center our focus on each kid and see if we can find a way to communicate with them in a really good way and reach them in a really good way and alleviate all the issues they normally deal with and let them really free up and play ball.” [22, emphasis added]

**LEADERSHIP VS. MANAGEMENT**

Mitch McCrimmon has provided the following historical insight on the distinction between leadership and management:

Prior to the Japanese commercial invasion of the 1970s, executives were happy to be called managers. But, overreacting to the Japanese success, we cried out for leaders to replace managers. Management, a convenient scapegoat, was charged with being too bureaucratic, controlling and mechanistic. Instead of upgrading management, we killed it off. ... Previously managers could be theory X or Y, task oriented or people oriented. Now, leadership got the good guy style (theory Y and people oriented) leaving management stuck with the bad guy rule (theory X and task-oriented). [23]

For McCrimmon the key to distinguishing between leadership and management is recognising that “the the purpose of leadership is to promote a new direction, not to get work done through a team of people” [23]:

Leadership does not involve managing people to get things done. ... It comes to an end once those led get on board. It sells the tickets for the journey; management drives the bus to the destination. [24]

Leadership involves discrete, occasional acts of influencing people to think or act differently. It is demonstrated by: i) advocating or promoting a better way through an “explicit verbal appeal” with reference to (for example) vision and values; or ii) example; i.e., providing direction without references to vision and values. Leadership is an impact on people – one that can have good or evil ends – such that for leadership to actually happen people must in fact make a change of direction. [23-30]

Out of a list of quotations on leadership [31], perhaps the following quotation sums up McCrimmon’s definition of leadership best:

Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail.

Ralph Waldo Emerson

According to McCrimmon, the “main obstacle blocking such a change in thinking about leadership is our deep need to look to one person” [32] and leadership should be regarded as “no longer a role or a person in charge of others” but “as actions that anyone can take” [23]: “CEOs only show leadership occasionally, specifically when they influence people to
think or act differently [26]. A CEO, like anyone in a position of authority, is primarily a manager [26].

Management is an “ongoing process” that involves “developing, engaging, empowering and motivating people” towards the achievement of goals “in a way that makes best use of all the available resources”. Managers can use “whatever means necessary to get the best out of people, including allowing them to manage themselves if that is what will work best”. [27, 29, 32]

Yes, the leader challenges the status quo in order to influence change in direction, but managers can also challenge the status quo by deciding on a new direction or by facilitating such a decision in others. [29]

The following quotations from the above-mentioned list [31] perhaps best illustrate what McCrimmon means by management:

*The best executive is the one who has sense enough to pick good men to do what he wants done; and self-restraint enough to keep from meddling while they do it.*
*Theodore Roosevelt*

*So much of what we call management consists in making it difficult for people to work.*
*Peter Drucker*

*Never tell people how to do things. Tell them what to do and they will surprise you with their ingenuity.*
*General George Patton*

**LEADERSHIP IN THE RECENT HISTORY OF THE RYDER CUP**

The Ryder Cup contest between Europe and the USA is one of the biggest sporting events in the world with 500 million people across 183 countries having access to every match in the 2014 contest [33].

In the early 1980s Tony Jacklin provided what has been described as “transformational captaincy” [2] and visionary leadership [34] for Europe:

*I took the captain’s job in 1983 on conditions. I wanted to fly on Concorde because the American team always flew first class and we sat at the back of the bus in bloody economy. We weren’t allowed to take caddies, we had no team room nor a team uniform. One year they even gave us plastic shoes. The Americans had everything.* [35]

Jacklin was captain for not only 1983 match which Europe lost, but also the 1985 (won), 1987 (won), and 1989 (tied) matches. A later captain, Sam Torrance, has said, “Tony gave us first class everything, flew Concorde, leather golf bags, cashmere, jumpers...we felt special” [35].

At the 2014 Ryder Cup, American player Phil Mickelson criticized his captain Tom Watson during the press conference after his team had been defeated:

*[Paul Azinger, captain of the victorious American team in 2008] got everyone
invested in the process. He got everyone invested in who they were going to play with, who the picks were going to be in their pod...when they would play. And they had a great leader for each pod...were all invested in each other’s play. He had a great game plan for us...how we were going to go about doing this. ... Those two things helped bring out our best golf... We use that same process in the President’s Cup. Unfortunately we have strayed from a winning formula for the last 3 Ryder Cups and we need to consider getting to that formula that helped us to play our best. [36]

Tom Watson responded:

I had a different philosophy as far as being captain of this team. It takes 12 players to win. It’s not pods. It’s 12 players. And I felt...I based my decisions on...yes, I did talk to the players, but my vice captains were very instrumental in making decisions as to whom to pair with. [37]

Whereas European captain Paul McGinley was involved in five of the previous six Ryder Cup contests as a player or vice captain [38], Watson had not even attended a Ryder Cup since he was winning captain in 1993 contest [39]. Watson was also was 21 years older than his most senior players and 44 years older than the youngest player his team [38].

One journalist wrote:

Phil Mickelson’s] underlying point – Watson’s inability to forge bonds with his players, his resistance to the US Marines-style “pod system” employed by Paul Azinger in 2008, his failure to develop a cogent “game plan” or plan for contingencies – rang true. For his part, Watson seemed unable to assess where things had gone wrong. [38]

In a similar vein, another journalist compared what European captain Paul McGinley referred to as a “template” to the American’s lack of the same thing (what Mickelson referred to as a “winning formula”):

Ted Bishop, the PGA of America president, appointed Watson on a vanity project. It was so much less to do with giving the US the best chance of winning and so much more to do with Bishop having a legend as his captain during his term. ... Characters such as Olazabal and McGinley do their time as the assistant, find out how it all works and then, with their own tweaks, carry forward the culture which stretches more than 30 years back to the revolution staged by Tony Jacklin. Players know what they are walking into, know the drill, know what the captain will want and feel very comfortable in delivering. The one captain to ignore what McGinley calls “the template” was Nick Faldo in 2008 and that was the only time that Europe have lost this century. There is no US template, there is no line of succession. Only two of the last 10 US captains have been assistants. So they turn up with their own ideas, are totally ignorant as to what may or may not have worked before and crack on regardless. .... [Paul Azinger] split them into tight small groups, gave them a say in the game plan and the result was the most united US team in living memory. So they had it there, the blueprint. ... Corey Pavin ignored it, Davis Love ignored it, and Watson ignored it. [40]
Phil Mickelson’s outspoken comments, in terms of Mitch McCrimmon’s definition, can be regarded as leadership (with the short-term impact being the formation of a Task Force [41]).

For now they lambast, pillory and accuse Phil Mickelson of disrespect, disloyalty and even treachery. But one day they may thank Phil Mickelson ... They might look back on that already infamous press conference... and think that was that moment it all changed. .. History might well define his decision to provide a critique of the US captaincy as extremely brave and not pitifully selfish. [40]

**PAUL MCGINLEY’S CAPTAINCY IN THE RYDER CUP**

**MAN MANAGEMENT**

A journalist wrote: “McGinley was modest to a fault, insisting that he was standing on the shoulders of giants in merely refining the template minted by Tony Jacklin and refined by those captains he had played under and accompanied as an assistant” [38]. McGinley said:

“I’d like to think that a lot of the qualities that I’ll bring to the table will be ones that if I didn’t have them before I will have learnt from the captains I’ve played under. Sam Torrance’s man-management and passion for the Ryder Cup, the heart and soul that José María Olazabal put into it and the sheer passion and determination that we were going to win from Seve Ballesteros and the organisation of Colin Montgomerie. Everybody brought something to the table. My captaincy will be evolved from all that I’ve learned from those captains.” [2; emphasis added]

“I think humble is the word when your peers vote you in to be Captain”, McGinley said in an interview [42]. “I feel I am custodian of this captaincy for a two-year period”, he said in another interview, “One of the things we do have in place is a succession plan in place for the captain coming in” [2].

A journalist asked McGinley, “When I ask around about you as a captain, they say you are a fantastic motivator. Is that what you like to hear?” McGinley replied [smiling], “I would like to use the words man-management if you don’t mind. Everybody is different. Everybody has a different view and everybody is coming from a different place. It’s important to understand that we are not all the same and we shouldn’t be treated the same. [43; emphasis added]

“I probably learnt the most from Sam, because he was my first captain. Looking back on the way he man-managed me that week, he knew me better than I knew myself. Even though I was the rookie on the team, he gave me that sense of importance and put a lot of trust in me, sharing a lot of the ideas he had with me. That got me a close bond with him from a very early stage in his captaincy.” [44; emphasis added]

“One of the things I’ve learned from the captains I’ve played under is that it is hard to address 12 people on the same level but the real management goes on in the microlevel, on the 1 to 1 level, over the individual concerned.” [2; emphasis added]

McGinley made numerous trips to see his players and also made numerous phone calls, and team member Graham McDowell has indicated that he “listened keenly to players’ opinions on what they had witnessed done well and badly at past Ryder Cups” [45]. McGinley kept a
journal with detailed notes on every player’s “individual attributes and peculiarities” [38], prompting more than one journalist [38, 46] to compare McGinley’s meticulous attention to detail to the Sir David Brailsford’s ‘marginal gains’ philosophy in British Cycling (see [47]). McGinley also had numerous discussions with ‘player stakeholders’:

“The caddies are a great source of information, and also their coaches and also their managers and the people they have around them. They are all important and I’ve spent a lot of time over the last few years gathering information.” [38]

McGinley was well aware of the need to avoid ‘micro-management’:

“When it comes to captaincy it has to be about the players and putting structures in place that allow them to breathe, not laden with too much information. There has to be structure but space within it to be themselves and allow the flair to come out. You can over-captain and suffocate. I was very much aware of that and determined I would not fall into that trap. I wanted the players to go out with a smile, not be burdened.” [48]

“The caddies were huge for me – I told them if I had any information I would give it to them (caddies) and not the player, because they knew their player better than I did.” [49]

According to Graham McDowell, each player had a specific role for the week: “Myself, Poults and Lee Westwood were handed the role of ‘blooding’ the rookies, which is hugely important, especially when the captain has the goal of introducing all the newcomers on that opening Friday” [45]. McDowell formed what was to be an effective pairing with Victor Dubuisson, who was “racked with nerves before the 1st tee on Friday” [38]. Such an approach was used by Tony Jacklin during his captaincy: “I inspired Seve by telling him he was to be a father figure for Way.” [35].

McGinley stated that his first challenge in the week of the Ryder Cup was to get the players engaged and he did this “through communication, through videos, through images”; and his second challenge was “the nitty-gritty of tactics, how we are going to execute this plan, how are we going to go about it on an hourly basis to win this Ryder Cup?” [48].

ENGAGEMENT, COMMUNICATION AND INSPIRATION

With regard to engagement, team member Rory McIlroy stated: “From the first day we got here, the speeches that he gave, the videos he showed us, the people that he got to talk to us, the imagery in the team room, it all tied in together; all part of the plan ... ... he was meticulous in his planning” [49]. In McGinley’s own words:

“It is summed up by the image in the team room, the one of G-Mac holding the scales, it says passion has created our past but attitude will determine out future. Up to say two Ryder Cups ago it was all about passion, it was Seve, it was revelling in the role of massive underdogs, little Europe against the might of America.” [48]

There were posters of current team members with message such as (for Ian Poulter) “Europe, I give you my heart”: 
With the exception of the photo of Ballesteros, McGinley focused not about the icons of the past but about the current player-leaders who lived past virtues. A church of living saints, not dead ones, members now inspiring one another. [50]

An image of the late Seve Ballesteros was the last thing the players saw before going out to play [46] and the last words were, “Best days of your lives”:

It was what the late Bob Torrance – the father of vice-captain Sam, a “father figure” to his fellow vice-captain Padraig Harrington and a long-time coach to McGinley used to say to the players as they left the driving range. It epitomised the feelgood factor McGinley [generated] and the emotional bond he created with his players. [38]

For speeches in team meetings, McGinley emphasized “the consistency of the message” – “never too much information, never a new idea every day” [48] – and he “briefed them all what to say” [48].

“Only a select few people spoke to the group other than myself. There was no vast variety of messages from different people. They were all on the same theme. The first to speak was José Maria Olazabal – a previous captain and a guy for whom I have a huge regard. Ian Poulter was another, bringing all his obvious passion. Then I left it until Saturday night to get Lee Westwood to deliver his speech, being the most experienced in the room among the players and even all the vice-captains.” [49]

The other person to speak was Sir Alex Ferguson, with McGinley asking him to discuss what he did as manager of Manchester United Football Club with regard to “dealing with the expectation of winning at home”:

One of the big questions I asked of him was ‘How do you handle the mantle of being favourites?’ .... I used to love the wave after wave of attack his teams used to produce. I wanted us to be like that because we were strong from 1 to 12. ...I had some great chats with [Sir Alex Ferguson] in the 18 months leading up to Gleneagles. He was a big help. So were Gaelic Football managers Jim McGuinness... and Jim Gavin in Dublin. [49]

STRATEGY AND TACTICS
McGinley saw his job as captain not as being out on the golf course as a cheerleader, but rather to have the strategy and plan for the whole week:

“I always felt that when the morning session was on, I was planning the move for the afternoon. My conversations as I went around were not about cheerleading. My conversations were with the vice captains. Are we still on course for this plan, how is he doing, how is he playing, does he look good? If we don’t, what are our options, what do we do? ... I always felt like I had options. I always felt I was half a day ahead rather than be out there cheering and saying great shots. My job is to plot the next move, wind them up and let them go play.” [51]

“You must have faithfully trusted what the vice-captains told you otherwise it was pointless
having them, right?”, McGinley was asked by a journalist, to whom he replied, “Exactly right. I saw my job as managing the situation, not as a motivator. I had vice-captains to do that. The vice-captains were chosen very carefully because they were on the shoulder of each game and I got a reading from them.” [49] Team member Graham McDowell described the appointment of a fifth vice-captain as “[o]ne of McGinley’s strokes of genius”:

There was an assistant with each of the four games on Friday and Saturday morning and afternoon. The fifth was made available throughout both days to manage the practice requirements and expectations of the four players who sat out the session. [45]

INNER GAME

McGinley has an astute understanding of the mental side of the game: “I was very much in management mode and making sure that the players looked focused and weren’t too nervous, conversing with the vice-captains on the first tee and making sure they were aware of where we were…” [42]. Having experienced the enormous pressure of playing in the Ryder Cup, McGinley knows the “tendency to quicken up”:

And the more we quicken up and the more we get too hyper, the more things rush through our head. If your body and actions quicken up, your brain quickens up too, so too much information comes into your brain. This is when we overthink and overanalyze. So when pressure is applied, the best thing you can do is keep it simple. Calm down. Think back to the plans you have in place. They were the plans you made in the cold light of day, when the pressure was off, so trust that they are right. [52]

I learned a lot from [2012 captain José Maria Olazabal] and the emotion he brought to the table, the clarity of mind when things weren’t going well at Medinah, to be able to dig ourselves out of a hole… calmness under pressure. [2]

As a player McGinley worked intermittently from 1999 with the late Jos Vanstiphout [53], a disciple of The Inner Game who described McGinley as the most difficult golfer he tried to help [54].

CONCLUSION

Mitch McCrimmon has stated that in stable organisations, “little or no leadership is required, only good management” [55]. Paul McGinley indicated:

....there’s been a European template. I didn’t want to be a maverick captain. I didn’t want to come in and do things in a very radical way. I wanted to take everything we’ve ever done and just enhance it and make it better .... little things, like statistics. That’s just an example of taking things to another level but not changing... [42].

“People in charge should be called executives, bosses, chiefs, captains, coordinators, catalysts, presidents...anything but leaders or managers”, states McCrimmon [56]. Indeed, captain McGinley does not appear to have referred to himself as a leader or manager.
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INTRODUCTION
Once again, Dr. Jenkins challenges us - this time to consider the role of leadership in recent Ryder Cup performances. Using a framework developed by Mitch McCrimmon [1] and a comparison with Pete Carroll, the head coach of the Seattle Sea Hawks, illustrations are used to suggest that European Ryder Cup success has been due to superior leadership. McCrimmon operates outside the standard domain of academic leadership study and therefore his nomenclature and commentaries strain to resonate with more orthodox leadership discussion. McCrimmon employs a decidedly business framework and he levels fiery criticism for certain popular leadership memes. Unfortunately, I found many of his leadership precepts to be “issueless conflicts”, and many of his opinions contrary to those of eminent leadership scholars. (See Norbutus [2] for a critical review of McCrimmon [1]). Without empirical support, McCrimmon claims that leadership is reserved for situations in which a new direction is sought.

Most conventional leadership scholars [e.g., 3-5] would come down on the same side as McCrimmon in their hypothetical appreciation of the excellent leadership work done on behalf of the European Ryder Cup teams of the past two decades.

ETHICAL AND MORAL DIMENSIONS OF LEADERSHIP

It appears that one of the precepts of the leadership system of the European Ryder Cup Team is a substantial ‘development’ program with leaders entering the pipeline through service as vice captains for past Ryder Cups. Dr. Jenkins astutely characterizes Captain McGinley’s nearly flawless leadership performance in 2014 and briefly reviews the many learning experiences which influenced him. McGinley clearly accepts the role of Captain with a readiness to learn and a willingness to confront any weakness that may have been extant. The American leadership team, comprised of legendary player, Tom Watson and the then President of the PGA of America ordered uniforms and fulfilled the cosmetic duties that these roles inevitably include.

One of the ‘issueless conflicts’ that McCrimmon raises is the difference between leaders
and managers is of particular importance in the American military, which is also the central
office for more leadership study than anywhere on earth. Strong contrasts are made in the
military between the two concepts and both are believed to be essential for success. “Battles
can be lost because of lack of management, but leadership is necessary if they are to be won” [6].

It is impossible to avoid comment on the catastrophic misunderstanding of leadership
behavior [7] in the Phil Mickelson - Tom Watson conflict over the tactics and strategies of
the American captain. Written indelibly into the DNA of transformational leadership is the
primacy of trust in the leader-follower relationship. As suggested previously, at the heart of
leadership is the expectation that both leaders and followers are loyal, honest and fair in their
dealings with the team. Phil’s lapse in ethical conduct towards the Captain would certainly
undermine his own future trust building should he decide that he would like to be a future
Captain. Corrigan’s audacious moral relativist position is a triple bogey at best. All members
of a Ryder Cup team should expect the highest of standards of ethical conduct. Mister
Corrigan apparently has an affinity for Mohist consequentialism, pinning his hopes for
American resurgency on a shot that the entire sad story is better viewed, “Don’t count that”,
than as serious, deliberate and ethically high minded action, by an important and likeable
team leader. Sadly, serious injury has been inflicted upon, not only its Captain, but the entire
American team, with this attack on Watson’s leadership. This “end justifies the means”
argument is solopsitic and potentially deadly to team morale. Deontological ethics [e.g., 8]
would argue that judgment in the Mickelson affair should derive from the rightness or
wrongness of the player’s conduct, duty and character, as opposed to the hope of some future
good outcome for the American team.

DIFFERENCES IN APPROACHES OF EUROPEAN AND
AMERICAN PLAYERS
I would be the first to admit that I am not an objective observer of the Ryder Cup. Further, I
have been very critical of the post hoc analyses of the change in fortunes between the two
teams who compete every other year. For the greater part of two decades, I have noted that
European Tour players are generally better prepared to compete in most high level
competitive events, such as the Ryder Cup. There are many reasons for this assumption
which strike at the center of competitive golf, as well as human learning and memory.

It is not uncommon in traveling the PGA Tour to hear critiques by knowledgeable sources,
as well as casual fans, which suggest differences in approaches between European and
American players. For one hundred and three weeks out of any two-year period, experts
admire the lonely, hard working, “dig it out of the dirt”, solitary American Tour player who
is seen hitting balls at the end of a range, as the sun sets on another long day on Tour. These
players are not finished with their work when this practice is completed, as now, the player
may have to attend to the maintenance of multiple sponsorship agreements. Most of the
European players have been long gone from the range, and are now convivially enjoying
each others’ company and brotherhood at the nearest pub. American players cannot expect to
suddenly, for one week in 104, present a flawless picture of exquisite team cohesion. A
parallel experiment, would be to organize a “dream team” of NBA players, and for one week
every two years, ask them to be short for a week.

European Tour players are better prepared for competition for many other instrumental
reasons. They are less likely to expect, or demand, some might say, course and practice
conditions to be uniform. The very nature of the European Tour playing conditions, with their
inherent variability, promotes more new learning in players. While there is a trend towards
minimizing the differences in conditions between the American Tour and other professional Tours, human performance research would strongly suggest that when practice and playing conditions are variable, and players are not ‘propped up’ by excessive ‘guidance’, there are relatively permanent changes in performance that would meet criteria for learning, retention and transfer.

**GOLF AS AN UNCONVENTIONAL LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITY**

Golf is not fundamentally a team sport, and therein lies much of the problem in applying the received wisdom of leadership science. PGA Tour players are individual contractors and compete in the Ryder Cup because of its prestige, with few other rewards. According to any of our models of leadership, leaders must wield power to be effective. The authority of the Ryder Cup Captain is therefore suspect to begin with. Most leadership roles come with the three kinds of power: ‘legitimate power’, such as those used to divide up tasks or assignments; ‘reward power’, which is used to provide important benefits and advantages; and ‘coercive power’, which is the capacity to relieve a player from his responsibilities. Clearly, the Ryder Cup Emperor has no clothes. He writes out a lineup of pairings each day and attempts to make witty remarks in The Team Room and in interviews.

**LEADERSHIP IS COMPLICATED**

There is no question that the leadership process can be complicated, opaque and confusing. Substituting ‘success’ for competence, efficacy or another more arcane concept can initially simplify the discussion, while at the same time pushing us further away from a true understanding. Magazine researchers can quantify a reward package, but it is more complicated to quantify happiness associated with a feeling that the boss believes in your skills and seems personally invested in your development.

We hear that Steve Jobs was a great entrepreneurial leader who was responsible for a large part of the success of Apple, after it had stagnated for almost a decade. Reports of many of his ‘leadership’ behaviors including impatience with co-workers, personal attacks on company personnel, proneness to fits of anger and other disturbing anti-social behaviors provide quite another view of transformational leadership [9].

Leadership is one of those topics about which most people feel comfortably competent. They may not be able to write a scholarly article about leadership dynamics, but ‘they know it when they see it.’ Virtually every successful coach, either at the college level or in the pro ranks, feels competent enough to write a book on leadership, motivation and success. The crossover appeal alone usually makes these efforts successful, at least from a sales perspective.

I have been very fortunate to have had some unique training experiences, which strongly influenced my understanding of leadership. Vice President Dan Quayle recommended to NASA’s Director that I spend a (remedial?) year of training at the Johnson Space Center. My studies were centered on how leaders and followers ‘perform under pressure’ in hostile environments, such as spaceflight, overwintering in Antarctica, and in combat. I was also appointed to the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Techniques to Enhance Human Performance around this time period. There, our scientific committee studied virtually every known technique associated with performance enhancement and the role of leadership in maximizing or neutralizing performance [10]. Having been on coaching staffs for many years in Major League Baseball, The National Football League, The National Basketball League, and on various collegiate coaching staffs, I was fairly confident by that time that I was no longer completely ignorant about leadership. My passage from ignorance
to vague acquaintance during this period was troublesome, in that we found that the people who had the most to say about leadership, also had little experience, training or education to cloud their judgment or slow their rush to publish their opinion-based observations. Serving as a Scholar-in-Residence at the Kravis Leadership Institute only aggravated the discrepancy between the science and the business world.

What we think we know about leadership is based largely on folk wisdom and ‘New Age’ philosophies, and not on empirical research. Little has changed in the 27 years since we noted that testimonial ‘evidence’ outperforms empirical evidence, especially in the areas of sport performance [11]. When we are pressed to provide support for our positions on leadership, we receive little help from sources that obfuscate the issues rather than clarify them. At the same time, we are rightly suspicious of symbols of leadership that suggest the domination of powerful forces over powerless followership.

_Fortune_ magazine, and other periodicals have ratings that are published on a yearly basis. These ratings feature a highly skewed set of criteria in which little of the leadership process is evident. Even though transformational leadership is well known to produce the best effects on many aspects of corporate function, most ratings of this nature focus on financial packages, reward structure. We learn little about the transformational effects that place, such as the intellectual stimulation, individual consideration and the workers sense of leadership’s concern for their health and welfare.

**CONCLUSION**

J. M. Burns [3] was the first scholar to develop the schema which would result in the branding of “transformational leadership”. Burns argued that leadership behavior is all legitimate actions on behalf of followers to help release human potential. Leadership, he believes, is largely a moral action. Leaders assist followers in finding their own source of strength, which is located inside themselves and is capable of being developed to attain extraordinary achievements. This framework which focuses on the release of human potential, seems consistent with the transformational leadership style exhibited by McGinley and championed by the Euros and Dr. Jenkins.
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INTRODUCTION
In his article, Simon Jenkins examines the commonalities of Ryder Cup success with particular focus on the captaincy of Paul McGinley during the Team Europe victory 2014. In the process, Jenkins broadly explores the false dichotomies found inside the business and sport communities when attempting to define whether the person ‘out front’ is a leader or a manager. Jenkins correctly leans toward the understanding that these judgements are never simply either or. Jenkins explores the methods collectively employed by Team Europe that have led to their recent dominance in Ryder Cup retention. Jenkins concludes that the ‘template’ being used by Team Europe has evolved into what has proven to be a stable model built for success. Key to that sustainable success will likely rely on maintaining the special blend of management and leadership as orchestrated through their appointed Ryder Cup captain.

TEAM EUROPE’S RECENT DOMINANCE
Over the lifetime of the Ryder Cup matches there have been two eras of team dominance. As the first four biannual matches got off the ground (1921-1929), Great Britain and Ireland won three times. What followed was the United States team dominance over the next 24 matches (1931-1985) wherein the US team took home the Ryder Cup an astounding 20 times. Upon the formation of Team Europe in 1979, one could sense the changing tide as the matches became increasingly more competitive. Team Europe hit their stride with a victory in 1987 and their overall supremacy has continued through their last win at Gleneagles in 2014. Team Europe now holds a dominating margin of victory over the US team with 10 wins over the last 14 matches played [1].

TEAM EUROPE: THE ‘MODERN ERA’ WASN’T ALWAYS A BED OF ROSES
Of late, we have witnessed Team Europe enjoying a magnificent ‘esprit de corps’. That wasn’t always the case. In fact, Great Britain and Ireland experienced the same kind of dissent that Jenkins cited in his article sparked by Phil Mickelson’s post round comments to the media at Gleneagles in 2014. During the height of US Ryder Cup dominance, the GB and Ireland team appeared to be in shambles. At Royal Lytham in 1977, there was considerable newspaper coverage of complaints from team members concerning how their
captain, Brian Huggett, managed the team. After being left out of the line-up on the final day singles (not every player played singles in that era), European champion Tony Jacklin complained bitterly. He criticized Huggett, attacking everything about his style of captaincy, citing his lack of consultation in team selection as one reason they did not get on [2, p. 110]. By the next Ryder Cup match hosted in the US at the Greenbrier Club in 1979, the GB and Ireland team had expanded to include European born players. Team Europe immediately benefited from a higher quality talent pool in adding new team members such as future legends, Seve Ballesteros – Spain, and later in 1981, Berhard Langer – Germany. At the same time, the expansion was also fraught with the obvious difficulty of uniting individuals from all around continental Europe. As such, the first Team Europe captain appointment was given to the well-respected and diplomatic, John Jacobs. Although the matches immediately became more competitive, Team Europe did suffer from an overall lack of team unity largely due to the shenanigans of two young UK outliers, Mark James and Ken Brown. Desiring continuity for the 1981 home matches, John Jacobs was re-appointed captain but was hampered by two major selection blunders. The European squad left off two of their finest champions in Tony Jacklin and Seve Ballesteros only to suffer yet another loss at Walton Heath Golf Club, UK [2, p. 113-119]. They had failed to establish the key ingredient to team success: finding a standard of behavior to help players adapt from 12 individuals into a cohesive team with a unified sense of purpose [2, p. 105-141]. Ironically, it was not until the appointment of Tony Jacklin as captain in 1983 that Ryder Cup fortunes slowly began to turn for Team Europe.

Championship golfers are highly fueled individuals yet, for one week every two years during the Ryder Cup matches, they must adjust and/or modify their individualistic tendencies in order to blend together as a team. Clearly, easier said than done! Team Europe wanted desperately to win Ryder Cups, but simply didn’t have the ‘systems’ in place to cultivate, bolster, and fortify a sustainable championship team culture.

TEAM EUROPE DISCOVERS THE RYDER CUP FORMULA FOR SUCCESS

Beginning in 1975, Great Britain and Ireland members were selected straight off the European PGA Tour Order of Merit (money list). In 1985, Captain Tony Jacklin requested and received permission that he be allowed three captain’s nominations to assure that he could select the players to fit his needs [2, p. 105-141]. Jacklin believed the captain’s selections would be certain to provide Team Europe with the best talent available as opposed to relying on the choices made by the administration of the European PGA [2, p. 120]. Following the tied match where the US in a home match (PGA National Golf Club, FL, USA) retained the Cup, captain Tony Jacklin made it very clear: “One thing is certain, these matches are going to be as close as this from now on. There will be no more American walkovers” [6].

Tony Jacklin had a vision for Team Europe. It started with the belief that first class treatment helps produce first class results [4, p. 145]. During his four terms as captain (1983, 1985, 1987, and 1989), the modern ‘template’ of developing and selecting future captains was developed. The formula is straightforward. Future Team Europe captains will serve as a vice-captain for several terms, learn the system, and more importantly, understand how to sustain the now established team culture [5, p. 151]. By and large, Europe has selected captains who are meticulously prepared for their commission. These respected captains have not changed the template, but rather refined it to best serve the current selection of team members. These men have intimate knowledge of the power found in fusing the dynamite
of the now intensely inbred European ‘unity of cause’ with just the right amount of support to give their already talented players the platform to flourish within the team environment of the Ryder Cup.

A unified sense of purpose is a generally accepted ‘key ingredient’ for team success. Bill Bradley stated it clearly, “Championships are not won unless a team has forged a high degree of unity, attainable only through the selflessness of each of its players” [6, p. 14]. Renowned coach Mike Krzyzewski from Duke University and USA basketball coach shared this story:

In the formation of teams, every single person must adapt. And for those who have met with much individual success, adaptability can be a challenge. International teams had been doing this for years. Kobe Bryant explained it best when he pointed out that LA Laker teammate Pau Gasol was certainly a force in the NBA but, when playing for his native Spain, ‘he was Superman.’ Gasol was elevated to the best version of himself when competing for his country. [7, p. 116]

Legendary coach Phil Jackson concurs, “The key leadership function for a coach is getting the players to commit to something bigger than themselves” [6, p. 45]. It becomes even clearer when we hear it directly from the Team Europe players. When asked what the biggest surprise in preparing to play his first Ryder Cup, Rory McIlroy answered, “How important it (Ryder Cup) is to everyone else. Everyone feels a part of the team. You are not just playing for yourself, your teammates; you are playing for country, your continent, the whole lot” [8].

CONCLUSION

Congratulations to Team Europe on getting it ‘right’. Without the ‘key ingredient’, Team Europe was rarely able to break the 54 year stranglehold on the Cup by the United States team. However, once found, skillfully administered and faithfully endorsed by every team member, Team Europe has become a nearly unstoppable Ryder Cup force. They are now fully armed with the core belief in the greater good. They completely understand that this joyful opportunity to undertake a mission with like-minded, fully committed teammates is simply ‘priceless’. This European ‘formula’ has proven its mettle to be strong enough to favorably tip the scales regardless of the individual talent level on either side of the equation.
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INTRODUCTION
As I have come to expect from Simon Jenkins, this is a thought provoking piece, leading up to a climax which suggests that the terms leaders and managers are insufficient, and perhaps most significantly, not actually used in the practice he reflects on. Instead, he offers words like chiefs, captains, or bosses. In this commentary, I want to reflect on just those titles and to discuss a culture which focuses on worth.

CAPTAINCY
We don’t need to remind ourselves of Whitman’s poem *Oh Captain! My Captain!* to see the affective aspect of words like that- but it helps. *Oh Leader! My Leader!* would not quite have worked. I suspect this is partly because the idea of captain locks into a particular narrative, and so to a view of, and feeling about, the leader. In this case the narrative is the captain who has steered the ship, with the captain in this case being Abraham Lincoln – whose death Whitman mourned - and the ship being the United States of America, which Lincoln steered through the horrors of civil war. The idea of captaincy is not just based in competency, but in relationships to the team, empowering members, and also in providing the perspective that would enable the team to work through inevitable difficulties to achieve the objectives. The idea of captaincy then is tied to narratives of struggle, of emotion, and of authentic personal engagement. The worth of captaincy cannot be simply measured by targets or trophies, but by the engagement of the team. It is fascinating then in the Ryder Cup to hear not of ‘team talks’, but of the captain engaging one to one, suggesting that captaincy involves engagement with the particular player, understanding his or her personality and character, as much as skills or virtues.

WORTH
I would argue that this does start with the culture which focuses on worth. The example of Tony Jacklin’s focus on first class flying is very telling here. You could look upon this as simply instrumental; they will perform better if I give them the best of everything. Or you could view this as a public statement of worth, and how the captain sees the worth of his players. It made them feel ‘special’. Change to Agincourt and the rhetoric of the St Crispin’s Day speech in William Shakespear’s play “Henry V” in which King Henry focuses on the
worth of his troops. The dynamics of the speech engage the imagination of the troops as they look forward to the memorial of the battle and how their community will acknowledge their worth. Then Henry returns to the present. There is no need for more help from England; they are more than enough, they who are elevated to brotherhood with the king. They are special, and with that he seals an emotional bond that will carry them through the fierce challenge of the battle to come. Note there is no culture of fear here. The culture of fear, as the Mid Staffs case in the National Health Service (NHS) shows [1], closes down the imagination, prevents consciousness of the surrounding social environment and the narratives which give meaning to it, and discourages the practice of judgement and the development of autonomy.

CONCLUSION
Leadership for Henry and for the examples in Jenkins’ piece rather enables all of these things; including the stark awareness in Henry’s case of how much the English were outgunned. At the beginning of Henry’s speech he also skilfully offers his troops a choice, they can go and he will pay their way. Of course, none would, but nonetheless he invites them to make a judgement, and a judgement not based on skill, competency and great plans but on what they saw as of worth, indeed what they saw as honourable.
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INTRODUCTION

It seems clear that the PGA of America is trying to find the secret of Europe’s success in the Ryder Cup. While the respective qualities of the players is undoubtedly the major factor, each team looks to gain every advantage they can to ensure that their team performs as closely as possible to their best over the three days of competition. In that respect, a number of other factors have been examined. This includes the actual format of the matches as apparently Americans don’t like foursomes much. Team spirit has been identified as another important element with the view that Europeans travel, stay and eat together in comparison to the more isolated lifestyle of those on the American team. Certainly the latest focus of the PGA of America is who should be captain and how he should be selected. This has been the focus of the ‘Task Force’ that was announced almost as soon as the plane carrying the American Team back from Gleneagles had landed. It would appear that the days of the Captaincy being a reward for a successful playing career on the PGA Tour are gone. Now, the role of the captain is seen at least as important as the players themselves. Simon’s article is therefore a timely consideration of what that role has become and his careful consideration of the terminology used, the theories espoused and the various leadership icons from all walks of life is very welcome.

SELECTING THE CAPTAIN

There has been an element of the traditional British and Irish concept of the Captain and Manager from the beginning of the European success. The manager prepares the team to perform and then empowers them to make the decisions as they see them. This approach is also referenced in the article from the perspective of Pete Carroll who designed a system to “allow the players to be the best they possibly can”. The first of the identified modern captains was Tony Jacklin (English, captain four times) who begat Bernard Gallacher (Scottish and captain three times) and the tradition began. There have been three captains from continental Europe, all of whom were winners, but the British and Irish influence has been strong.

There is also a structure in Ryder Cup Europe that supported this development with in itself a greater emphasis of team over individual. The original partnership of the Ryder Cup was between The PGA and The European Tour and since the early 1990s there has been a
consistent approach partly due to the fact that the same people were involved, people who
understood what was needed, and worked through the committees to create a shared vision
of team and captain. Sandy Jones and Ken Schofield were the CEOs with their respective
chairman, Phil Weaver and Neil Coles operating as joint chairman of Ryder Cup Europe.
Although Ken Schofield retired, he was succeeded by his long time deputy, George O’Grady.
Europe therefore had a stable and secure professional management team of five leaders for
almost 25 years going into the Gleneagles match. The tenure, experience, leadership and
management of this group of British born, but Europe focussed executives played a crucial
role in the establishment of the blueprint and supported the Players Committee to produce a
line of captains who, by and large, followed the same strategy. Compare this to the American
system with a two year tenure President who also becomes Chairman of The US Ryder Cup
Committee where a decision is made about who should be captain of Team America. Simon’s
article alludes strongly to the influence of the President on the selection of Tom Watson as
captain.

I lack the same level of understanding of the American system, but as an observer, it
appears that they subscribe strongly to the ‘Great Man’ theory of leadership and
management. Because someone is a great player, which requires significant levels of other
factors such as motivation, determination, will to win and calmness under fire, it is assumed
that these qualities will also be brought into the capaincy role. For many years, the PGA of
America deliberately chose Past PGA Champions as their Captains – Hagen led the way in
1927 though to 1937, then after the war Hogan was there for 1947 and ‘49, Snead for ’51,
’59 and ‘69, with Lloyd Mangrum being the first non PGA Champion to lead the team in
1953. Hebert in ’55, Barber in ’61, Burke in ’73 and Finsterwald in ’77 were all past
Champions and then we have Arnold Palmer, who never won the PGA being Captain in ’63
and ’75 with other past Champions Hebert, Nicklaus, Trevino, Floyd, Stockton and Wadkins
littering their Captaincy records up to 1995. Thereafter, they have chosen a number of
players who were other Majors Champions including Billy Casper, Tom Watson, Tom Kite,
Ben Crenshaw, Curtis Strange, Tom Lehman and Corey Pavin, before reverting back to PGA
Champions Hal Sutton (2004) and Paul Azinger (2008) and Davis Love (2010 and again in
2016).

**LEARNING TO BE CAPTAIN**

These individual traits and learned behaviours are, however, not always transferable. To be
a great player needs a focus on the individual. To be a great leader needs a very strong focus
on the team and this in itself needs to be learned. Just as they learned as players from success
and adversity, so they need to learn the same as captains. However, unlike the role of coach
or manager in other sports, there is not a career as a Ryder Cup Captain. It is a once, possibly
twice or three-time, in a lifetime opportunity. A two year career for most, so where does the
learning occur? There is no doubt that there are plenty of role models out there from other
sports and from the world of business and Simon refers to what Captain McGinley did to
learn from leaders in a number of different fields and how he was not afraid to see this as a
job to be learned. That opportunity is certainly also open to the American Captains with
many, successful examples to choose from. But the European Captains have, by and large,
also served their apprenticeships as captains by operating in the less glamorous, but
important role of Vice-Captain. This role has been seen as crucial over the years, not only for
the immediate match and the support provided not only to the players but also as intelligence
gatherers for the Captain. Within Europe it is seen as a badge of honour and, perhaps more
crucially recently, as a stepping stone to the role of captain. It again brings to bear the
significance of the team ethic within Europe. Players who had aspirations to be playing in the team are offered roles as vice-captains and rather than see this as a poor substitution see it as an opportunity to still contribute to the success of their team. So McGinley, Garcia, Clarke, Harrington and others have brought to the team, another of the key words from the article, authenticity. They are the real deal, they have been there before in the heat of battle. They have been there as part of the team and they are demonstrating their loyalty to the team by taking on these roles. They are not too big to be the water carriers on this occasion and so, if and when their opportunity comes to be Captain, they do so from a basis of having not just being one of the players but also as one of the lieutenants. It is probably the best apprenticeship system that you can have for the role of Ryder Cup Captain and one that the American team have ignored. Just as they allowed the PGA President to have a big say in who is selected as captain, so they allow their captain to select who to have as their vice-captains. Often it has been their personal friends from the Tour, but to use that phrase again, these may not have the authenticity required to act as lieutenants and there is certainly no eye on the future. Again Ryder Cup Europe has that behind-the-scenes experience and structure to enable guidance and advice. The American PGA set about remodeling their captain selection policy while on the flight back from Gleneagles and had their Task Force established by the time they had touched down. However time will tell whether they are able to change the culture and traditions already laid down. America is justifiably proud of the role that West Point plays in the education and training of military leaders and the way they use the lessons from the past to educate the leaders of the future. To become a General takes a long time and a lot of learning, yet in golf they have taken too many short cuts and fast-tracked their soldier heroes into roles for which they are not prepared.

**CONCLUSION**

While in Europe the next few years will see new faces in the roles occupied behind the scenes with new Chairmen already in place at The PGA and European Tour and George O’Grady to retire this year, there is a steadiness and understanding of what has worked in the past and how that should evolve in the future. That process has already started by adding the past three captains to the committee responsible for selecting the Captain. The same focus on team rather than individual has come to the fore with McGinley supporting the nomination of Darren Clarke, despite their well reported rivalry over the captaincy in 2014. The good of the team taking precedence over personal feelings. Expect to see in future the names of Jimenez, Bjorn, Harrington and Garcia as Captain of the Ryder Cup. Not just because of their records of players, but for their authentic roles as members of Team Europe.
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INTRODUCTION
Simon Jenkins’s article frames Paul McGinley’s successful European Ryder Cup captaincy in Mitch McCrimmon’s business management model. McGinley’s preparation for captaincy, execution of Europe’s ‘template’ and man management are neatly mapped onto McCrimmon’s definition of management. McCrimmon differentiates management from leadership and although not examined fully in Jenkins’s article, it is also informative to frame Tom Watson’s American Ryder Cup captaincy in McCrimmon’s leadership model.

MANAGEMENT VERSUS LEADERSHIP
As defined by McCrimmon, “Management is an ongoing process that only ends when the goal is achieved. By contrast, leadership is a discrete, brief injection of influence that may be needed only at the beginning of the journey or periodically throughout. But leadership is an event, a kind of impact, like all forms of influence, not an ongoing process.”

Based on McCrimmon’s definitions, I propose that McGinley saw his captaincy role as management, and Watson saw his as leadership. Europe has a well-defined ‘template,’ and McGinley was adamant that he would not introduce new ideas as captain, but simply improve on the existing template. The changes McGinley made to Europe’s template were small, and as Jenkins suggests, McGinley successfully achieved marginal gains in Europe’s template by his man management, inclusion of relevant stakeholders and consistency of message.

McCrimmon defines leadership’s purpose as influencing and promoting change within an organization or situation – with no involvement in its execution. Although not effective, Watson’s captaincy characterized leadership more than management. His goal was to influence change and strategy. But Watson failed to meet pre-requisites associated with effective leadership. He was unable to form bonds with his players and he failed “to sell tickets for the bus.” In context, Watson failed to sell his Ryder Cup leadership vision to his team.

Although it is interesting to contrast McGinley and Watson’s Ryder Cup captaincies using McCrimmon’s management and leadership models, their captaincies can be understood more fully by combining McCrimmon’s definitions with Carol Dweck’s self-theories.
MINDSETS
Dweck’s self-theories framework demonstrates that individuals who perceive ability as malleable (have a growth mindset) exhibit adaptive behaviour. They work harder, learn from challenges, are persistent and are motivated by the success of others. By contrast, individuals with a fixed mindset, those who perceive ability as a fixed trait, see no need for effort (if an ability cannot be changed, effort is futile) and avoid challenges. They have a tendency to give up when faced with difficulties and they feel threatened, not inspired, by the success of others. Dweck’s framework originated in academia, but is now used to study behaviours in myriad domains, including sport and business management.

McGinley’s conduct as captain exemplified a growth mindset. He sought advice from others and he learnt from his own experiences as a player and vice-captain. He also worked tirelessly to ensure every detail about Team Europe was managed correctly. McGinley was familiar with Europe’s Ryder Cup template and his management responsibilities to enforce it. His success as captain was the combination of Europe’s template, well executed management and McGinley’s growth mindset towards the task.

In contrast to McGinley, Watson’s US Ryder Cup captaincy symbolized a fixed mindset. His qualification to lead was based on his legend as a player. It was assumed that Watson’s presence alone was enough to inspire Team USA to victory. For example, in 2012 Keegen Bradley said, “I really want to play for Watson. He is a legend, and that would be so cool.”

The notion that Watson would innately be an inspiring captain suggests that to the PGA of America, leadership skills are perceived as innate and fixed. Predictably, when competition got tough for Team USA, Watson demonstrated attributes of a fixed mindset. He ignored feedback, he appeared threatened and seemed unwilling to acknowledge and learn from mistakes. For example, in a press conference Watson defended his decision-making not with a vision, but with a ‘gut’ instinct:

“I made the best decisions I possibly could at the time I was making the decisions with the help of my vice captains and my guts. That’s what they brought me in as the captain for, to try to make those best decisions.”

Dweck’s work that examines the culture of businesses and organizations is also relevant when framing the Ryder Cup captaincies in theoretical concepts. Dweck and her colleagues argue that organizations endorse fixed and growth mindsets. Furthermore, associates within organizations display behaviour in line with the organization’s mindset. This perpetuates a culture of fixed mindsets in some organizations, and growth mindsets in others.

CONCLUSION
Applying this concept to the 2014 Ryder Cup, Team Europe endorsed a culture, and captain, who worked hard, followed a management plan and learnt from past mistakes. The perception that an ability to defeat the USA can be learnt is an attribute of an organization with a growth mindset.

Team USA approached the 2014 Ryder Cup very differently to Team Europe. Watson’s appointment as captain was described as a vanity project. More likely, Watson’s appointment simply echoed the PGA of America’s culture that endorses a fixed mindset.
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INTRODUCTION
When I was in my teens I caddied for Paul McGinley’s foursome’s partner in a Home International’s Match at County Sligo Golf Club, in the West of Ireland. “We’ve got them where we want them now,” Paul confidently proclaimed marching down the 10th fairway on the windswept links. McGinley was barely up to the shoulder of my ‘boss’ that day, but he appeared to walk taller. They had just come back from being 2 down after 8 and were still 1 down.

To this day, I remember Paul’s ‘gutsy’ determination, the fire, and the desire. I was impressed. Paul has a diploma in marketing and a degree in International Business from college in San Diego, where his golf coach’s biggest issue was getting him off the range before his hands would bleed. McGinley would never be accused of lacking in work ethic or effort.

ATTITUDE, PERSPECTIVE AND PLANNING
On being appointed Captain, McGinley expressed awe and appreciation, noting his “modest” credentials compared to previous captains.

“I’m really, really thrilled,” he said. “It’s also a very humbling experience. It’s also a situation I’m relishing. I can’t wait to get into the captain’s responsibilities and begin working with the players who have shown so much support for me.”

And get going he did, with meticulous planning from the start making sure that the Ryder Cup would not be lost for want of a horseshoe nail – to cite a proverb popularised by Benjamin Franklin and quoted recently by Phil Jackson:

For want of a nail the shoe was lost. For want of a shoe the horse was lost. For want of a horse a rider was lost. For want of a rider a message was lost. For want of a message a battle was lost. For want of a battle the Kingdom was lost. And all for the want of a horseshoe nail. [1, p. 70]

As Captain of the Ryder Cup team was McGinley a Leader or a Manager? From my understanding he was possibly both, he himself preferred to describe his role as “man management”. In relation to “lessons for executives from the fairways” I have spoken on a topic I call APPs, which is an acronym for Attitude, Perspective, and Preparation leading to Success.
ATTITUDE
McGinley had the right attitude, and he was humble as well as respectful to his opposition and opposing Captain, Tom Watson who was one of his childhood heroes. If Bill George knew him, he would certainly say he was authentic, he remained true to who he was and was; according to Graeme McDowell: “He’s been a very, very open book with the players. He’s made a point of speaking with us while not trying to single out guys, so trying to keep a large pool of players in the loop about potentially what could happen” [2]. He had the trust of the players, and had trust in his carefully chosen assistants. He feared losing, but knew he could not guarantee winning and he was determined to do everything in his control to set up the environment for the players to perform at their best.

PERSPECTIVE
On perspective, McGinley was well covered. He knows and loves sport, the history of golf, the history of the Ryder Cup. He grew up playing Gaelic Football, a traditional Irish team sport. He played on International teams, Ryder Cup teams and was Captain of the Seve Trophy, then vice-Captain for the Ryder Cup before becoming Captain. As a player he knew the pressures of being a rookie, hitting that first tee shot, and also of holing the clutch winning putt in front of a home crowd at The Belfry. He knew what it was like from every angle. He knew the importance of winning as well as the possibilities of losing, how devastating that would feel. Given recent success for Europe, he certainly did not want that to happen on ‘his watch’. He recognised that the ‘market’ had shifted, the previous wins by Europe had been as underdogs and pure passion pushed them over the line. They were no longer underdogs and passion alone would not suffice, a new approach was required a more comprehensive, more meticulous approach, and he set off in pursuit of the 1% edge. Yet he realised win or lose, life would go on and above all else he wanted his team and himself to enjoy the week.

PREPARATION
As for preparation, no stone would be left unturned. Whether he was a Grateful Dead fan or not he was going to follow Jerry Garcia’s policy of “doing things better than it’s ever been done before in everything we do”. McGinley pointed out that a “template” was in place which he would follow, having this template from previous captains dating back to Tony Jacklin, who had introduced significant changes, freed Paul to refine and add his spice to the mix. I do know that at least one of his vice captains was a fan of John Wooden and I suspect Paul was well versed in the writings of many top coaches. Like Jose Maria Olazabal before him he acknowledged that all the players were individuals and they would “celebrate uniqueness (and) their individuality” and use this to bond the players.

McGinley sought counsel from others including the legendary coach Sir Alex Ferguson, yet it was clear Paul was directing the show. Sir Alex was to address the players on a specific topic, “expectations and pressure of playing at home”. The vice captains and other assistants were established, well known golfers, but they too were clear on their positions and roles; this was not about egos, this was doing the job as well as possible.

McGinley created and used imagery to help promote the messages he wished to embed in the player’s minds and souls. An image of Justin Rose connecting and drawing power from the 20,000 crowd on holing a putt, they were to “be the hunters not the hunted, to be like a boxer, on the front foot, to anticipate the roar of the support for holing putts”. They had an image of a rock in the storm at sea, representing the “management and team remaining unfazed by the inevitable onslaught” the US team would make. “There will always be an ebb
and flow”, stay strong was the clear message.

CONCLUSION
If as McCrimmon suggests “the purpose of leadership is to promote a new direction”, in recognising that “the template needed evolution” [3], I feel he did put some new direction on things. If, as McCrimmon also suggests, “management drives the bus to the destination”, then he certainly did that too.

McGinley’s planning was so comprehensive, with fantastic imagery, even a u-shaped sofa for the team to include all members equally around him, and of course a fish tank with “European” blue and gold fish! Key for me was his “ruthlessness in what we were doing” and doing as well as we can and “with a smile on our faces”, the same ruthlessness and smile I had seen more than 25 years ago in the west of Ireland.
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INTRODUCTION
Notwithstanding the issues about how to distinguish the leadership – or should I say, leading – from the managing in Jenkins’ stimulus article, I’d like to concentrate on the issues that it struck for me. Crucially – and this is me nailing my colours to the wall – I am drawn to what the account says about positive behaviour change. These issues are generic because they play out equally for leaders and managers, for teachers and coaches, for experts and novices. My central point throughout this piece is to highlight that the quality of any performance is the result of what was repeated in the ‘run-up’ and delivered during the ‘main event’.

In a part of the account I see much to support the implication of W. Edward Deming’s idea that 94% of all business problems originate in the system, with only 6% people-driven. That says as much about what to do as what not to do (https://www.deming.org/). The accounts around Paul McGinley’s approach also sit well with the contemporary interest in managing environments to establish positive ‘choice architecture’ [1]. It also seems to align with the recent evidence showing that high performing work groups are populated by individuals who create the following in their conversations: i) positive energy, ii) engagement, and iii) exploration of ideas [2].

POSITIVE REPETITION AND HABITS OF WINNING
From the outset, it is important to recognise that my account is offered based on the inherent limitations of Jenkins’ account. The most obvious of these is that it relies on accounts that are riven by the cognitive biases associated with second-hand and retrospective justifications that we all use to explain winning. That said, and looking beyond these limitations, the quotes and snippets that are provided continually highlight the value of repetition in human learning. In this case, positive repetition, delivered through routines that the players often just had to go along with, continued to be refined. This process was begun early and continued throughout the process of securing victory. For reasons I will elucidate, the likelihood is that a similar process – who knows about the outcome? - will characterise Europe’s next Ryder Cup campaign.

A first feature of repetition lies in McGinley’s intention to build on a tradition of success. This is a simple idea; it involves repeating what’s good that’s gone before. The effects of serial winning – in this case, winning the Ryder Cup - has been summarised in the recent text,
‘The Winner Effect’ [3]. The successful 2012 team successfully inducted players who were new to this format. Importantly, the European team – with eight wins in 10 competitions - seems to have acquired and refined strong habits of winning. For the European players, this has also provided them with ample leadership prototypes [4] for orchestrating success in subsequent events. Such prototypes may be especially important in golf, where team play is rare. With little to match this in their armoury, the US team will take some time to acquire such positivity around their processes. For that reason, if for no other, it will be interesting to see how long their ‘new broom’ approach, announced February 2015, will take to bear fruit.

At the same time, routine was the order of the day. Routines, which are the ultimate in repetition, build confidence when they have been associated with previous success, while also creating an overall sense of purpose. When individuals experience a sense of purpose, they find it easier to handle the normal ups-and-downs of any achievement scenario. For them repeating daily routines represented what, in modern educational terms, might be labelled as ‘dispersed learning’ wherein learning is consolidated and expanded by regular repetition. In the way McGinley ran the GB camp, novices were not only learning about the required behaviours of competition play but also were caught up in the positive emotional energy brought by the notion of personal progress [5]. Equally, experienced players were quickly promoted to important roles and shown how to deliver that role in every match. The regular meetings, daily reflections and acknowledgement of being part of a bigger overall ‘movement’ around European golf bear a striking similarity to many of the features of Action Learning [6].

This whole process allowed the overall chef de mission to focus on managing the situation. At the same time, and this managed the possibility that boredom might result from repetition, the captain added new dimensions to show that there were new things to learn for all the ‘senior’ people in that team. These new things were learned and refined by regular repetition in team meetings, in social gatherings and in personal interactions. This ‘prototype’ process, which builds on what already seems to work, seems – to me at least – to draw more on design science as on the other sciences we might want to imagine are important in implementation.

Another perspective on routine relates to the way in which communication was handled. In particular players, vice-captains and the captain were gathered to be inducted into key communication points that related to ways-of-being during the tournament (e.g., ‘This is the best day of your life’). I am always impressed when groups have well developed ‘routines of reflection’. In their end-of-day meetings campaign messages were not only repeated, but also individualised to help each player through that campaign.

These gatherings are important for many reasons beyond sharing ‘official’ messages. On the one hand they support sharing, collegiality and relatedness; this helps to handle the intensive emotionality that accompanies high stakes events like the Ryder Cup. Building positive emotional bonds – even if only for a transitory period – helps players to: i) retain focus, ii) assess risk more accurately, and iii) be better self-regulators. When individuals repeatedly share experiences, especially those involving positivity, these beneficial effects radiate in a positive spiral to help others [7]. Equally, these gatherings represent important opportunities to reflect on the day’s event and to extract key learning that helps all players to develop. Importantly, this process capitalises on the repetition inherent to reflection; in many ways learning is most enhanced by the first period of repetition, since this arrests the greatest proportion of lost recall [7].

My final point relates to the widely reported post-competition comments of Phil
Mickelson. Wrongly, in my view, these seem to have been used to label him as a sore loser (although that may be right too). His comments have a directness that is both refreshing and important. They more than adequately put flesh on the bones of my paraphrasing of what Bob Sutton, doyen of management science, commented [9, p. 18] about ineffective managers/leaders; they don’t notice what others do. Like the many media pundits around him, Mickelson was giving voice to what many of them could see. If he was frustrated by the end of the 2012 campaign, there appeared to be no timely way for him to vent his concerns during the tournament; for anyone focused on winning, what could be more maddening?

Now that the US response – in preparation for the 2016 Ryder Cup - has been announced, we have a better way of making more direct comparisons of the most potent ingredients of Ryder Cup success. The US response already seems to centre on establishing new, more functional, routines. If I understand it correctly, their newly-announced 11-man panel has already appointed their captain, Davis Love III and one vice-captain, so far); he comes with a reputation for being player-centred and personable. The new captain also signalled the growth he experienced from participating in six defeats, one as captain, by commenting “I am here with the same goal as in 2012, but not as the same captain” [10].

CONCLUSION

With an eye on the importance of establishing routines and habits around effectiveness and future success, Love also noted, “What we accomplish in 2016 at Hazeltine must serve as the foundation for future USA Ryder Cup teams” [10]. To me, all this seems to signal a renewed attention on the US’s routines and practices; i.e., what they repeat. The challenge for them is to maintain the most functional practices and behaviours so that the players and managers acquire them as habits. The process will take time, since learning science shows that the development of habits hinges on how well repetition is ingrained into the ‘organisational habits’ of the team and its acolytes. So, it’s game on for 2016 in a way we’ve never seen before.
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INTRODUCTION

Any article that includes quotes from a group so diverse that it includes Ludwig Wittgenstein, Jerry Garcia, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Peter Drucker, Teddy Roosevelt and George Patton must be worth reading. The central thesis, that an understanding of, and adherence to, a performance enhancement strategy founded on Gallway’s Inner Game is well structured and the various quotes are illuminating and/or confirmatory. There is a valuable contribution using McCrimmon’s acknowledgement that leadership and management are functions that need not be performed by individual leaders and managers, but are activities that need to be carried out often by different individuals or groups in different circumstances and at different times. In the military, for example, the person who knows where initial enemy fire is coming from will take charge, irrespective of rank. In the moment, a leader will emerge and it will be obvious who and why that is. Once the immediate emergency is passed however the formal rank structure will re-emerge.

INFLUENCING SKILLS

Functions can be just as flexible in the daily routine of most businesses and to a certain extent this highlights a problem in using the Ryder Cup as the vehicle for progressing the debate. It is difficult to imagine that the Ryder Cup could be a genuine model for, or indeed even analogous to, any business with the possible exception of running a corporate board where leading and managing talented individuals with conflicting agendas and egos is the routine. Notwithstanding that particular comparison, the Ryder Cup is a temporally contained activity with a clearly defined goal and a defined end date and as such presents problems for those wishing to transfer lessons to the usually longer term business environment.

Where the story of McGinley’s Ryder Cup is persuasive, however, is in its value as evidence for the ‘descriptive theory’ of leadership. A recurring term in the article is ‘influence’ which appears to be an obligatory term in leadership definitions. McGinley clearly exercised considerable influencing skills in all aspects of his own self-defined, ‘man-management’. Robert Cialdini’s work on influencing [1] where he identifies six core influencing techniques could have been a template for McGinley’s behaviours and perhaps more complementary research in this area could bear fruit.
AUTHENTICITY AND BRAND

Another strong theme addressed is the role of ‘authenticity’. There seems to be general agreement about its significance but few agree how far transparency and ‘finding yourself’ should be taken and perhaps more importantly, how much should be exposed to the workforce/players. And what if your ‘authentic self’ isn’t working? Then, either the players or the leader goes. If football is any guide, it won’t be the players. As Ibarra argues, it isn’t about “complete transparency” rather it’s about telling a story about yourself in which you can genuinely believe. In reality it is about establishing a ‘brand’. In this instance ‘brand’ can be defined as the essence of the self, or the team, or the organisation. Ultimately it is about those things over which you will not compromise. For Brailsford and Woodward that might be ‘marginal gains’; for Wenger, ‘style’; for Ferguson, ‘control’; for Mourinho, ‘winning’; or for Carroll, as the article states, ‘competing’.

Having established the ‘brand’ it is essential that it is communicated unambiguously to the players/workforce and just as importantly what that means in terms of acceptable behaviour. Again, this is where the role of influencing skills is so important. The players need to be influenced to buy-in to the vision of the future that an adherence to the brand will entail.

TRUST

Key to the followers buying in is ‘trust’ in the leader. Research has shown that trusting the abilities, consistency and fairness of the leader is far more significant than trust between the players. And this is where Gallway’s Inner Game equation is so important. Once the trust is established it becomes much easier for the leader to remove the ‘noise’, the ‘interference’ in Gallwey’s words. Once a brand and a code of behaviour have been established then disciplined focus on the goals becomes self-reinforcing and the recruitment policy for the culture that has been developed becomes very clear.

Extraneous noise is generated by what Gallway characterises as ‘overthinking’ and ‘overanalysing’. Much research in the psychology of performance considers the self-imposed pressure exerted by overthinking to be a major impediment to optimal performance. Removing that pressure, as McGinley appears to have done so successfully with the Ryder Cup, must be a priority for leaders and managers.

CREATIVITY AND FREEDOM SERVING THE COLLECTIVE GOOD

Another significant thread to emerge from the article is that of embedding the creativity and freedom of the individual within the structure and context of the team. Some more famous names that could be added to those quoted in the article could include Valeriy Vasylyovych Lobanovskiy, Michael Jordan and Leon Trotsky. One particular quote by Jordan, one of the greatest individuals of all time, makes the point precisely.

There are plenty of teams, in every sport, that have great players and never win titles. Most of the time, those players aren’t willing to sacrifice for the greater good of the team. The funny thing is, in the end, their unwillingness to sacrifice only makes individual goals more difficult to achieve. One thing I believe to the fullest is that if you think and achieve as a team; the individual accolades will take care of themselves. Michael Jordan

Lobanovskiy, during his nearly 20 year reign at Dynamo Kiev, believed that creativity and freedom were only acceptable within the agreed tactics and strategy of the team. Using this approach enabled superb individuals such as Oleg Blokhin, Igor Belanov and Andriy
Shevchenko to emerge from what was viewed, at least from the outside, as an overly disciplined approach. As long as the creativity and freedom served the collective good it was encouraged and consequently flourished.

CONCLUSION
Great leaders provide the story of the future and design the structure that will deliver that future. Managers ensure that the structure runs smoothly and the final function, quality coaching, ensures that the individuals within the structure achieve their potential through the team. There is, therefore, a triumvirate of functions, leadership, management and coaching.

Finally it is worth mentioning how fragile the reputation of great leaders can be. Pete Carroll was rightly lauded as a strategic genius for leading Seattle to a first Super Bowl victory in 2014 and nearly repeated the feat this year, save for one fatal call on the very last play of the game. Within seconds his leadership was being questioned on social media and even in his own locker room.

“Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown”. Henry IV Part 2; Act III, Scene 1.
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INTRODUCTION
I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment on this thought-provoking article. It raises excellent questions about the nature of leadership in the context of sport although I believe much of the discourse could equally be applied to a business setting. The case study of the “Paul McGinley” Ryder Cup captaincy story is well chosen as it raises a range of intriguing themes relating to the captaincy/leadership/management debate. To complicate matters further, it is worth noting that McGinley was named “Coach of the Year” at the 2014 BBC Sports Personality of the Year awards. Many people within sport would claim that his role was most definitely not “coach”. The same claims were made when Sir Dave Brailsford won the award on two previous occasions when he was leading British Cycling during a period of remarkable, and unprecedented, Olympic success.

HIGH PERFORMANCE ENVIRONMENT AND CULTURE
What McGinley and Brailsford have in common, in my view, is the emphasis they each placed on creating the right environment for their performers. Over the past 15 years there has, quite rightly, been a strong emphasis in elite sport on the importance of “environment and culture”. This is the key theme for me in the McGinley story. He acknowledged the role that “environment” had played in previous successes for the European Team and immersed himself in doing absolutely everything possible to manufacture and maintain this environment. A large part of this, as the article outlines, was conserving the things that had worked well for the Europeans in the past. In addition, though, he was forensic in his approach to adding extra dimensions to the environment which were specifically pertinent to that year’s group of players. His strategy clearly worked as the “group” of players became a “unified team” in pursuit of its goal. I believe this most definitely is a form of effective leadership – albeit for a temporary period of time. Looking ahead to the next Ryder Cup in 2016, the newly appointed European Captain, Darren Clarke has already stated that he has “big shoes to fill” and “will not be straying far from the winning blueprint”. He is keen to replicate the “team bonding” and “spirit” that McGinley cultivated. Without knowing what went on behind closed doors, it did appear that Tom Watson perhaps underestimated the time, effort and energy that needed to go in to creating this type of “high performance” environment and assumed that it would just naturally happen with a group of such talented players.
LEADERSHIP CAPABILITY
As stated during the article, many contemporary definitions of “leadership” focus on the role of “influencing others” and some even claim that you have the potential to “lead” if you are in a position to influence others around you – whatever your role. I like this broader approach to understanding leadership and its impact. When I previously worked with the England Cricket Team I recall Michael Vaughan addressing the team prior to one of his early matches as Captain in the lead up to the famous Ashes series of 2005 when England beat Australia for the first time in 18 years. Vaughan challenged the team by saying “I want 11 leaders on the field” which, over a decade ago was quite a radical call to arms. He was absolutely not abrogating his role as leader of the team. Rather, he was acknowledging that leadership is everyone’s responsibility and that all 11 players had the potential to influence each other and the environment. For this reason, the England and Wales Cricket Board is currently investing in developing leadership capability in younger players even though most of them will not end up being Captain. Andy Flower (another recipient of the BBC Coach of the Year award in 2011), on stepping down from his role as England Team Director in 2014 took up a new role within the ECB which encompassed developing leadership capability in prospective England players. The education of these young players will incorporate aspects of captaincy, leadership and management. Similarly, the ECB’s Elite Coach Education programme has a continuing professional development strand for Level 4 qualified coaches which is exclusively focused on “leadership” development. It consists of six interactive workshops addressing aspects of: i) leading self; ii) leading teams; and iii) leading organisations. The “coaches” attending these workshops have a wide variety of roles ranging from Director of Cricket, Head Coach, Assistant Coach or Academy Director at one of the 18 professional county clubs, England Team specialist coach, minor counties coach, school coach, etc.. We maintain that all of these roles have “leadership” components within them and hence the rationale for the development programme.

SELF-AWARENESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH
The two most successful England Cricket Captains (ever) are Michael Vaughan and Andrew Strauss. They were each extremely effective “leaders” who were able to inspire their teams to achieve great success on the field. As mentioned earlier, Vaughan’s team won the Ashes in 2005 in what has been described as the greatest Test Series ever and Andrew Strauss won home and away Ashes series as well as taking the team to the No.1 spot in the world rankings which England had never achieved before. Having been close to these two individuals throughout their tenure as captains, it was fascinating to observe their significantly contrasting leadership styles. Vaughan was a high energy, action oriented extravert while Strauss was a much more introspective, analytical introvert. Both styles worked to great effect and both were hugely popular and respected by their teams. In short they were “authentic” leaders who were not, as the article described, trying to imitate or emulate somebody else. They were highly self-aware and utilised their respective strengths effectively. However, they were each able to adapt their style according to different situations and when engaging with different types of players – an essential element of effective leadership whatever the context. Additionally, I would maintain that each of these individuals invested in “personal growth” during their captaincy and did not remain in their “comfort zone in order to protect their identity”. I believe that “self-awareness and personal growth” are actually core elements of effective leadership and essential aspects of any leadership development programme – in either sport or business.
CONCLUSION
There is much scope for discourse and debate in the so called “false dichotomies of leadership and management”. My inclination is to believe that we can waste a great deal of time and effort attempting to distinguish between the two. Most roles (in sport and business) have elements of leadership, management, and indeed coaching, within them. The performance objective is to create, and maintain, environments in which people can execute their skills with confidence and deliver results that will be both personally rewarding as well as beneficial to the organisation. Whatever term we choose, this will involve engaging, influencing and managing people, communicating with clarity and getting things done efficiently.
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INTRODUCTION

The stimulus article aims to spark critical reflection on leadership and management. Even with the great regularity of investigations in the sport and business disciplines over the past century these areas represent several of these most studied yet misunderstood and paradoxical social science concepts. Indeed, Klenke [1] summarized the combination of scholarly interest and consternation regarding leadership research as such:

Leadership has been defined, constructed and researched from a bewildering number of conceptual perspectives including trait and contingency theories, normative decision theories, leader-follower exchange theories, behavioral and managerial approaches, multiple linkage, transactional, transformational, charismatic and self-leadership. Each of these models has generated its own definitions of leadership, produced a large amount of empirical evidence, yet has failed to serve as the basis for a generally accepted knowledge base. [1, p. 326]

The primary goal of my research is to explore the nature of work relationships and apply the social influence and effectiveness processes literatures to sport management. For example, in several recent articles [2-5], my colleagues and I explored how the social effectiveness characteristics of intercollegiate coaches may improve the success of their recruiting efforts. In this commentary, I argue that highly effective leaders are politically skilled leaders and that without making the connection between social effectiveness and leadership effectiveness, a much needed component of leadership research and practice is being neglected.

SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND LEADERSHIP

Social effectiveness refers to “a rather broad, higher-order, umbrella term which encapsulates a number of moderately-related, yet conceptually-distinctive, manifestations of social understanding and competence” [6, p. 50]. Social effectiveness competencies tend to include the ability of individuals to be conscientious of others, aware of themselves and their circumstances, effective networkers, and persuasive.

For McCrimmon [7], leadership includes discrete, intermittent acts of influencing people to act and think in certain ways. Though true, the role of influence in effective leader
behaviors and social exchanges is far more significant than sporadic instances in the workplace where a leader might influence a subordinate, peer, or superior. Influence is the quintessence of leadership in part because interactions are an inescapable and recurrent aspect of life and achievement in life and work stem mostly from effective social exchanges [6]. All told, to be an effective leader:

…it is necessary to influence people to carry out requests, support proposals, and implement decisions. In large organizations, the effectiveness of managers depends on influence over superiors and peers as well as influence over subordinates. [8, p. 185]

Thus, the connection between leadership and social effectiveness is that leadership is profoundly relational in nature and inherently considered a social influence process by which subordinates, peers, and even superiors are persuaded to endorse, and subsequently pursue, certain beliefs, attitudes, and/or goals [6, 9].

POLITICAL SKILL AND LEADERSHIP

Political skill is a manifestation of social effectiveness that describes the ability of individuals to “effectively understand others at work and to use such knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal and/or organizational objectives” [10, p. 127]. Unlike other social effectiveness constructs, political skill was “explicitly developed to assess an employee’s ability to recognize and then navigate the political realm of interpersonal relationships” [11, p. 139]. Peled [12], in an article about politicking for career success, further differentiates political skills from general interpersonal skills in the following manner:

Project leaders’ inter-personal skills refer to the ease and comfort of communication between these leaders and their employees, peers, superiors, and clients. However, inter-personal skills do not explain why technological projects succeed or fail. In fact, project managers are frequently loved and admired by their employees and yet their project result in failure. Political skills refer to the manager’s ability to manipulate his/her inter-personal relationships with employees, colleagues, clients, and supervisors to ensure the ultimate success of the project. [12, p. 27]

The political skill construct consists of four distinct, but moderately-related dimensions: a) social astuteness, b) interpersonal influence, c) networking ability, and d) apparent sincerity [10]. These dimensions offer a breadth of specific social competencies, perceptual understanding, and behaviors that are, together, necessary for effective leadership and unlikely to be found in other current conceptualizations and operationalizations of social effectiveness [6, 10].

When discussing leadership, Jenkins notes authenticity is the gold standard of leadership and that “so much of so-called ‘leadership development’ is essentially concerned with personal growth, including self-awareness.” These observations connect to the apparent sincerity and social astuteness dimensions of political skill respectively. Apparent sincerity describes individuals who, through their words and deeds, are perceived by others as being authentic and genuine. This aspect of political skill strikes at the very heart of leadership and whether leader influence attempts will be successful because: a) it focuses on the perceived objectives of the behavior in question; and b) perceived intentions or objectives are what
form the entire response [10]. Politically skilled leaders are also socially astute; they are keenly aware of themselves, their social environments, and the attitudes and behaviors of others, which helps these individuals determine how best to present themselves and respond in order to achieve the desired personal, team, or organizational objectives [13].

The example of Tony Jacklin, who was captain of Europe’s Ryder Cup team from 1983 to 1989, specifically showcases a leader who was socially astute and able to convey authenticity to his players. He saw what the Americans had, recognized what his players needed to feel like first-rate competitors, and made the appropriate changes. Indeed, as noted by a subsequent captain, Sam Torrance, “Tony gave us first class everything, flew concorde, leather golf bags, cashmere, jumpers...we felt special.”

Jenkins also notes how McGinley use the words ‘man-management’ when describing his success. This term seems to capture all four dimensions of political skill in that McGinley was: a) socially astute; b) possessive of a heightened level of interpersonal flexibility that enabled him to effectively exert sway over his team members; c) able to demonstrate an impressive capacity to initiate, develop, and maintain relationships with a diverse group of contacts; and d) able to display high levels of sincerity. Certain individuals in the business workplace (be it a boardroom or golf course) are better than others in developing new and advantageous social connections. McGinley appeared to be quite skilled at forging positive and constructive relationships with his team members whereas Watson failed to do so, with Phil Mickelson even openly criticizing his captaincy during a 2014 press conference. McGinley, as the captain, did not micro-manage. He understood that each of his players was different and, because of their individual attributes and peculiarities, they needed to be treated differently. He took the time to listen to them, visit them personally, and talk to them over the phone on a consistent basis.

CONCLUSION
Political skill is a style construct. It explains the ‘how’ of leader behaviors instead of just the ‘what,’ and the style of leaders is critically important to understand because it provides insights into the manner in which leaders interact with others to actually achieve individual-, dyadic-, group-, and organizational-level success [13, 14]. Though the four dimensions of political skill are not stated as ‘political skill’ per se in the Jenkins piece, they are present. Therefore, in reframing notions of authenticity, personal growth, and even man-management through a social effectiveness lens generally and as elements of political skill specifically, I believe a greater level of terminological uniformity and an improved understanding about leadership and the commonalities of success can be achieved.
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INTRODUCTION

“Be yourself – everyone else is taken” is a quotation of uncertain origin (often misattributed to Oscar Wilde). Be yourself - perhaps it is good advice for some coaches, but perhaps not. Certainly it raises the question: Who exactly are you? Many coaches don’t figure that out until they are in their 50s and 60s after accumulating a wealth of professional and life experience; raising children, experiencing the death of one’s parents and other loved ones, and of course enduring the slings and arrows of competitive life, all the triumph and all the despair.

AUTHENTIC IDENTITY

Inevitably many people start coaching in their 20s, 30s and 40s without a strong sense of who they really are. That self knowledge can be somewhat accelerated through coach development programs, mentoring of coaches by more experienced coaches and working with outside counsellors, psychotherapists and life coaches, but there is no full substitute for the passage of time; two or three decades to be a bit more precise.

Family of origin and the culture the coach grew up in are important sources of authentic identity. If the coach was raised as the oldest of eleven children – that is an important source of identity; a personality differentiator. Or being from Scotland, for example, when almost everyone else in the organization is from England is important. Perhaps on an even more sensitive cultural note, raised as strictly observant in a minority religion with distinct practices and traditions – that’s important too.

In the case of Pete Carroll, his current leadership style reflects his childhood in California and extensive time spent surfing in a more relaxed, breezy environment. This is complimented and augmented by working closely with a sports psychologist who shares a similar California surfing background (Michael Gervais). Contrast that with the stern public persona of one Carroll’s main rivals – Bill Belichick, head coach of the East Coast New England Patriots, who beat the Seahawks in the 2015 Super Bowl. The often grim-faced and taciturn Belichick spent much of his childhood in and around the U.S. Naval Academy in Maryland and is the grandson of Croatian immigrants.

At 63, Carroll’s leadership philosophy is increasingly multi-layered and nuanced, as befits extensive life experience. Indeed his age is a time when many leaders in business are already
retired or very nearly so. Highly successful football coaches tend to go on for longer, however, with some still coaching in their late 70s.

Paul McGinley, at 48, is relatively young to be considered a senior leader in sport. Many of his statements about leadership seem modest, and overall his style appears to be low ego, outward directed — typical of the “servant-leader” style. This style is also sometimes referred to as “athlete-centric,” one based on putting the players’ needs first, building a support structure around them to create the optimal conditions to succeed. In many ways the approach is highly compatible with the identity and role of a senior manager rather than a leader.

Compared to an American football squad, a Ryder Cup team is quite small, and much of the challenge of winning is tactical rather than strategic. The overall strategy in golf is straightforward relative to football; i.e. get the ball in the hole in the fewest attempts possible; what the opponent is doing is arguably irrelevant except for the psychological pressures that are created by his or her successes.

AUTHENTICITY, ROLE-PLAYING AND HONESTY

“Keeping it real” and being a truly authentic leader are life-long challenge for most coaches. Apart from the apocryphal “Be yourself; everyone else is taken” quotation cited above, there is perhaps even more useful advice for coach-leaders in some of the bona fide writing of Oscar Wilde, which was often concerned with issues of authenticity, role-playing and honesty in public life.

In an essay from 1890, Wilde suggested there is a complex relationship between the self-presentation masks that a person wears and social honesty. “Man is least himself when he talks in his own person. Give him a mask, and he will tell you the truth,” Wilde wrote.

In the same year, Wilde completed the novel, “The Picture of Dorian Gray”, featuring comments from the character Lord Henry, who says: “Being natural is simply a pose, and the most irritating pose I know.” And later in the book: “Perhaps one never seems so much at one’s ease as when one has to play a part.”

Five years later, in Wilde’s play “An Ideal Husband,” the character Sir Robert Chiltern asks another character, Mrs. Cheveley, whether she is an optimist or pessimist. She replies that she is neither and that both stances were merely poses. Then Chiltern asks her a follow-up question: “You prefer to be natural?” To which Mrs Cheveley answers: “Sometimes. But it is such a very difficult pose to keep up.”

Wilde’s work highlights how difficult it is to separate the roles one is compelled to play as a leader-coach and who one really feels oneself to be deep down inside. This evokes the famous lines: “All the world’s a stage, And all the men and women merely players; They have their exits and their entrances, And one man in his time plays many parts...”. These words were by an even more illustrious playwright, William Shakespeare (1564 to 1616).

Authenticity is a frequent theme in Shakespeare’s work. In “Hamlet”, Polonius advises the lead character: “...to thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man...”. That admonition is an echo of an even more classical reference, to the inscription on the forecourt at the Temple of Apollo at Delphi in ancient Greece: “Know thyself.” The meaning is largely self-evident, but some scholars suggest that the phrase in its original form is also an exhortation for people of principle to disregard the opinions of the multitudes. The inscription serves as a warning to those whose boasts exceed what they truly are [1].
CONCLUSION
Whether a coach aspires to “authentic leadership” or “servant leadership” or “adaptable / situational leadership” the advice to “know thyself” is of great potential value. The challenge, however, is to engage in the process of personal enquiry that leads to deep and lasting self-knowledge. In my experience, this is best done when the coach engages in deliberate reflective practice, seeks out and consistently engages with mentors and in some cases, as seen successfully with Pete Carroll, specifically invests time and energy in a mindfulness and/or structured reflective practice [2].
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INTRODUCTION
Reading Simon Jenkins’ article was like a slap in the face for me. And it was also like coming home. Let me explain what I mean. I have taught on many ‘leadership development programmes’. I made a big deal of ‘authentic leadership’. I got excited about the London Business School research that showed leaders needed to be ‘more themselves, with skill’ [1]. I took my delegates on journeys of self-discovery and on missions to ‘find themselves’. I put them in the psychologist’s chair and under the diagnostic microscope of psychometric tests. I probed their personal values, revisited their adolescent passions, resurrected their first loves; I mean, drumming, dancing, guitar playing, singing, acting, climbing, and yes, in many cases, wives (for most of the consumers of this leadership product were men), and children. I even talked about the difference between leadership and management, and so became a small part of the establishment that made leadership the heroic ‘good guy’ and management the bureaucratic ‘bad guy’ [2].

THE SUCCESS OF MANAGEMENT
So when I read about the failure of leadership in the Ryder Cup (Tom Watson) and the success of management (Paul McGinley), I recognized the truth of what was being said. I acknowledged in that moment that, far from presiding over a journey of self-discovery, I, and countless practitioners like me, had been leading our executives up the garden path.

I recognized in a flash that what I was condoning was a flight away from the hard work of good management into the heady delights of creative, inspirational leadership. I recognized that in doing that, I was failing to honour the hard graft of people like Paul McGinley, and the many many managers in business, who lead painstakingly and humbly. These are people who bring about a multitude of small improvements in a system which they acknowledge was already laid down by their elders, and so achieve yet another victory in an ongoing campaign. They choose the right people, they carefully select people for roles, they keep an eye on their performance, they implement a structure which is fit for purpose, they check that the messages which people are conveying are not confusingly complex or contradictory, and so on and so on. In short they do the tasks of a manager well, and in so doing, they lead. So there was my ‘slap in the face’. And my ‘coming home?’
HONESTY
I had if truth be told long been a little uncomfortable with the notion of authenticity. Somehow it seemed a rather pompous concept, even though it appeared to have pretensions to the commonplace. I preferred the philosophy of Will Schutz, the American psychologist who was utterly startled when he found he had acquired a formidable reputation as a miracle worker for simply going round troubled teams and dealing with them straightforwardly. He said, “I had a great deal of difficulty persuading executives..of the value of telling the truth. But every now and then, someone was willing to give truth a chance, and the results were amazingly effective” [3]. In other words, Schutz found, and others too, that honesty is the key to good management and leadership. He maintained that if people behave honestly with each other, then a huge amount can be achieved.

CONCLUSION
Honesty is the mechanism by which people can be set free from all the ‘interfering’, distracting factors in organizational life, free from expending their energy trying to second-guess each other, free to do their work to the best of their ability. Honesty is all we need. Authenticity is irrelevant. So in Simon Jenkins’ article, I came home to that simple yet compelling insight into management. The truth will indeed set us free.
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INTRODUCTION
In drawing on the tactics and philosophies of NFL football coach, Pete Carroll and professional golfer, Paul McGinley, Simon Jenkins touches on effective leadership in the shadow of the leadership/management debate. In spite of philosophical overtones about what terms best describe those who guide and inspire others, Jenkins highlights accessible insights gleaned from the remarkable successes of two contemporary leaders.

A ROSE BY ANY OTHER NAME ...
While Jenkins explores the eye-opening tactics of two celebrated leaders in sport, there is a sense of caution around terms.

What’s in a name? That which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet
William Shakespeare, Romeo & Juliet

Reacting to what Stephen Covey has bluntly stated, “Leadership is not management” [1, p. 101], Jenkins cautiously pokes at the leadership vs. management conundrum. The trepid overtones around word and referent are best captured when Jenkins closes his piece with the sentiment, “Indeed, captain McGinley does not appear to have referred to himself as a leader or manager” (p.). However, in this instance, debate about words and their definitions seem trivial in light of the larger matter at hand. The true star of the piece is the catalogue of efforts both Carroll and McGinley engaged in as they led and/or managed others to inspiring heights. And this star is a star that can be admired without questioning the terms used to describe it.

TWO LEADERS
In his effort to depict two athletic leaders, Jenkins does well to catalogue a grocery list of seemingly mortal efforts. While both subjects are generally portrayed with far less flesh and bone, Jenkins humanizes their abilities and actions in accessible terms. In spite of the stunning achievements of both Pete Carroll and Paul McGinley, Jenkins chronicles a developmental trajectory where each man seemingly toiled in workman-like style to guide
others toward championships. A feat far more mercurial than generally discussed, Jenkins lays a promising framework for how researchers, students, fans, even other coaches can learn how to lead others in success.

In their seminal tome, “The Leadership Challenge”, Kouzes and Posner write, “When first learning to lead, we paint what we see outside ourselves – the exterior landscape … We want to learn everything we can from others, and we often try to copy their style” [2, p. 59]. Through this declaration, Kouzes and Posner touch on a critical component of leadership education and scholarship. Specifically, we often learn from watching others. To this end, Jenkins has highlighted two cases to aptly learn from. Although hardly comprehensive, the brief sketches of Carroll and McGinley offer plenty of illuminating insights.

LEADERSHIP TAKEAWAYS

The exercise of reviewing two athletic leaders in an accessible albeit critical package may be a model worthy of more attention. In the introduction to her book, “Leadership”, Barbara Kellerman asks, “What should leaders learn?” [3, p. xiii]. Among five critical takeaways, Kellerman starts with: “(1) leaders should develop certain skills, such as communication skills, negotiating skills, and decision-making skills, (2) leaders should acquire awareness – most obviously self-awareness and contextual awareness” [3, p. xiii]. In accordance with this hierarchy, Jenkins provides considerable insight into how two figures have guided success on some of the biggest stages in sport. Among such critical takeaways, Jenkins highlights the value of both skills and awareness by focusing on the virtues of authenticity, consistency, collaboration and humility. Additionally, through quotes and media stories, Jenkins manages to drill below vague concepts, and deliver clear tactical efforts, or something of a blueprint that others may consider when pursuing their own leadership efforts.

The reader gains insight into how Pete Carroll found inspiration as a football coach through varying sources in football (e.g., Lou Holtz, Monte Kiffin), in sport (e.g., Basketball’s John Wooden and Tim Gallwey’s book, “The Inner Game of Tennis”), and outside of sport (e.g., Jerry Garcia and The Grateful Dead). The reader is introduced to Carroll’s personal philosophy of “I’m a competitor”, and gains an understanding of how that philosophy fuels his commitment to promoting individual freedom and self-discovery among his players. Perhaps most prescient, the reader learns of a general philosophy that seems to guide Carroll, serving as something of a linchpin that connects his personal mantra and the teams he coaches: “allow players to be the best they possibly can” (p. ).

Similarly, through the Irish golfer, Paul McGinley, Jenkins provides clear examples of how a successful leader can quietly impact a high performing team through modest and continual effort. In serving as the captain for Team Europe in the Ryder Cup, McGinley spent time visiting and talking with his teammates, building relationships, and developing trust. He consciously drew on previous captains he played for and observed, and worked to model standout behaviors. He strove to build a present-oriented and high achieving team culture by hanging pictures and quotes of current team players, hand-selecting guest speakers to share specific messages, and advancing communication through a variety of sources that included video, images and conversations. Perhaps most notable, McGinley opened himself to the ideas and impressions of the professionals around him. He humbly learned from those he was charged to lead, advancing buy-in and commitment, by continually soliciting the perspectives of the teammates he was charged to lead.
CONCLUSION
Kouzes and Posner write, “What we’ve discovered is that people make extraordinary things happen by liberating the leader within everyone” [1, p. xxiii]. Jenkins holds the line at the same sentiment, offering two blooming roses as examples of active and effective leaders. To this end, although Jenkins ultimately provides well-documented insights into two famous sportsmen, he offers a roadmap for how we can better chronicle the spirit and efforts of the leaders around us. Far from another essay about the virtues of Abraham Lincoln, Jenkins chose figures who feel more human in virtue and practice. All in all, leadership is to be learned through human endeavor, and by gaining insights into the gritty, real-world, and even flawed (at times) efforts of two contemporary leaders, we gain insight into inspiring and replicable best practices.
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INTRODUCTION
This commentary is written as an open letter to a friend, Simon Jenkins, who kindly invited me to respond to his stimulus article.

Conviviality is at the core of what you discuss in your article, Simon. I sense that Pete and Paul are people’s people. Pete’s experience at Super Bowl XLIX is a reminder that people’s people are authentically fallible as well as examples of those behaviours Mitch McCrimmon [1] aggregates for “people in charge”.

INNER GAME
I enjoyed your integration of Pete and Paul’s stories with the Inner Game narrative. As I followed your story, I thought about my own use of Inner Game [2] approaches in the 1980s in teacher education. At that time the Inner Game approach resonated strongly with ideas shared with me in the 1970s when David Bunker and Rod Thorpe [3] were developing their approaches to teaching for understanding at Loughborough College. Both approaches left me with a strong sense of teacher and coach as guide.

ENTANGLEMENT OF LEADING AND FOLLOWING
Your biographical accounts of Pete and Paul encouraged me to think about the entangled nature of leadership and followership. I believe you managed to steer a very careful path between hagiography and the cult of charismatic leadership. I see entanglement of leading and following to be an important dynamic in sport contexts. At some point in the Super Bowl and in the Ryder Cup, followers step up to be leaders.

I think your account indicates that this entanglement is possible because of the humility of people like Pete and Paul. John Dickson observes “the most influential and inspiring people are often marked by humility” [4]. He defines humility as “the noble choice to forgo your status, deploy your resources or use your influence for the good of others before yourself” [4]. Your narrative brings this out very clearly, Simon.

AUTHENTICITY AND IDENTITY
If I may, I will end this response with reference to a project with which I am involved. In 2013, I started a learning journey with twenty high performance coaches. My plan was to
spend three years with the coaches on their continuing professional learning journeys to see if the experiences of each of the coaches might inform the experiences of all the coaches.

The group comprises ten cricket coaches and ten rugby union coaches. Each of them is dealing with the dynamic interplay of authenticity and identity. My role as their critical friend [5] is to explore this interplay in their emergence and development as world-class coaches. Ironically, our conversations over the last two years have touched upon Pete and Paul as well as the essence of teaching, coaching and learning.

CONCLUSION
Your article felt like home, Simon. I was relieved that you did not pursue the heroic leader line. Like all of us, Pete and Paul are ordinary people capable of extraordinary deeds. Perhaps the Inner Game for all of us is to position ourselves in our learning so that the extraordinary becomes more possible.
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INTRODUCTION
I read Simon Jenkins’ piece with great interest, particularly because I recently delivered (December, 2014) a public presentation on Bill Belichick and Pete Carroll, as part of my Learning From Legendary Coaches series, focusing upon the intertwined story of how these contemporary American football coaches not only overcame adversity in their developmental journeys, but used it as a resource in order to do things differently in the pursuit of competitive success. Little was I then to know that their respective teams would face off in the 2015 Superbowl. One of the aims of this session was to stimulate thought about who we are as sports coaches, and how and why we operate as we do; and this seems to resonate well with ideas in the article around self-awareness, personal growth, and authenticity. Furthermore, the rare status of both of these coaches as simultaneously Head Coaches and General Managers of their organisations offers us the opportunity to explore further issues raised in respect of the relationship between leadership and management.

NADIR
“The man who is afraid to risk failure seldom has to face success,”
John Wooden [1, p. 198]

“Adversity is the state in which man mostly easily becomes acquainted with himself, being especially free of admirers then.”
Samuel Johnson [2]

Bill Belichick had been an NFL assistant coach for 16 years, and was already recognised as a prodigious talent, when he became Head Coach of the Cleveland Browns in 1991 [3]. In a remarkably poor showing for a coach now on a 66% win percentage, Belichick achieved a 36-44 record over 5 seasons [3]. Nonetheless, the Browns made the play-offs in his only winning season, with what seemed to be developmental momentum; only for the financially compromised owner to announce the next season that the franchise would be moving to Baltimore post season (Belichick learned about it in the papers [4]), triggering fan unrest, and a slump in form [5]. Notwithstanding assurances that he would continue as coach, Belichick was sacked, by phone, after winning only 1 of the last 8 games [4].

It was a sorry ending given that Belichick started with a clear plan to establish a winning formula, and had brought in his own assistants to counter a lack of organisational identity at
Cleveland, typified by the college and pro scouts not even working to the same criteria for spotting talent [6]. At the outset he played tough with the media, shutting down their access, and trying to be like Bill Parcells, who he had assisted for years, when dealing with them, without having either Parcells' acid wit or winning record [3]. Again, like Parcells, he allowed veteran players to bend the rules, but, in contrast, received little in return [3]. And when Belichick brutally cut the quarterback, a popular local boy made good, because he sensed diminishing physical prowess, there was uproar from the fans, who called for Belichick to go [6]. While he survived all this, when that penultimate season showed signs of improvement, the press and fans quickly turned against him when things went downhill [3]. Belichick received death threats [5], and was later portrayed on a Browns fan site as Hitler (now withdrawn but picture can be seen at [7]).

After 10 years coaching at collegiate level, and 10 in the NFL, Pete Carroll became Head Coach of the New York Jets, following 4 years there as an assistant, in 1994 [8]. He was fired after only one season (6-10), when initial confidence evaporated following one particular last minute defeat, with every game thereafter lost [8]. Carroll had excitedly started the year with an address to the organisation outlining his ideas about a positive approach and a fun ethos towards competition, and he felt that the players and coaching staff, who already knew his style and had previously generally accepted him, bought into the message [8]. However, the owner remained tight lipped, and Carroll suspected that he did not conform well to his conception of an NFL Head Coach [8]. Nonetheless, Carroll was more concerned with his own authenticity in the role.

…when you’re a head coach everything changes, and I think everyone was wondering how different I would be from the Pete they had worked with in the past. I wanted to show them that they were going to get the same coach they had had the past four seasons… The last thing in the world I wanted to do was throw away the things I had learned over the course of my career and pretend to be someone I wasn’t. Walking into the meeting, I was determined that I was not going to transform into an unapproachable head coach. I was going to be me, no matter what. [8, p. 41].

However, Carroll never spoke to the owner again until the fateful end of the season, and was left rueing that he had not communicated his ideas more effectively to the wider organisational audience [8]. He subsequently spent 2 seasons as the Defensive Coordinator for the San Francisco 49ers, before being appointed Head Coach of the New England Patriots, replacing the hardnosed sharp tongued Bill Parcells [8]. He made a promising start, winning the AFC East Division (10-6). In fact he had no losing season at NEP, and made the playoffs twice, but his record gradually declined to 55% overall [8]. He was living on borrowed time after being thought to be outcoached by Parcells (ironically coaching the New York Jets), after which the media started calling for his head [8]. He was sacked after 3 seasons, when the Patriots did not make the playoffs in 1999 [8].

At NEP Carroll was initially hired to bring in organisational change based on the renowned SF philosophy, but it quickly became apparent that he would not have the freedom to run the programme the way he wanted to, or to be the Head Coach he wanted to be [9]. Carroll’s positive open communication approach and laid back coaching style was a big contrast following Parcells’s closed communication aggressive style that had made the owner wary of sharing power [9]. Carroll may have suffered disempowerment as a reaction against the abuse of power by the previous coach (who had sabotaged NEP’s 1996
Superbowl chances by playing politics out in the open during the run up regards a forthcoming potential move to manage another side [4]).

**NEXT TIME WOULD HAVE TO BE DIFFERENT**

Belichick was in danger of being labelled the dour perennial assistant (always the bridesmaid, never the blushing bride); a football nerd who lacked charisma, and the human touch [3]. Back at NEP, once again assisting Parcells, Belichick correctly made a call that opposed the Head Coach’s, and Parcells let rip:

“Yeah, you’re a genius, everyone knows it, a goddamn genius, but that’s why you failed as a head coach – that’s why you’ll never be a head coach – some genius!” [3, p. 202].

Carroll was in danger of being labelled a rah-rah positive thinking players’ coach; lacking a suitably tough or serious approach for anything but collegiate level [8]. While at NEP Carroll was caricatured in the press with a surfboard, sushi, and wine; while Parcells was portrayed with smoking handguns [9].

**BEGINNINGS AND INFLUENCES**

Belichick came from a family of Croatian immigrants who settled in the harsh coal and steel mining belts of the US; poor, hard workers, who helped each other, and wasted nothing [3]. Belichick’s father was a tough smart coach, an exceptional teacher, and the foremost scout of his era, who had Bill breaking down game footage by age 9 [3]. Bill also accompanied his Dad on scouting trips, and undertook the analysis of upcoming opponents; early on he developing a coaching eye; particularly for spoiling [3]. Belichick was too small and slow to be a player, although he played centre where he could use his intelligence, and read the game well [3]. He always planned to coach, and went straight into poorly paid modest assistant roles, after graduating with a degree in economics [3].

So, Belichick’s greatest influences were his father, and his existing network of contacts; and the cultural memes from his Croatian ancestry – working hard, sticking together, and taking opportunities - although his intellect was also sharpened by a demanding elite private school [3]. He went on to do the hard yards as an assistant at 4 NFL teams, observing at close quarters a variety of head coaching styles, and working with great players [3]. He was industrious, and always hungry for work on the small details; having to prove himself and gain respect as a very young coach, which he did by getting inside the head of opposing coaches, spotting crucial tendencies, and preparing the team well by masterfully using film footage [3].

In contrast, Carroll was raised in California, excelling in several sports, but frustrated by a lack of sufficient physical growth [8]. His parents were supportive, and did not make him feel pressured, or afraid of failing [8]. His mother encouraged optimism and openness, his father modelled competitiveness [8]. Carroll achieved a degree in Business Administration, and tried out (unsuccessfully) for Hawaii in the World Football League, finding it difficult to accept that he did not make it as a player [8]. At this point his former coach offered him a graduate assistant post at University of Pacific, where he took a Masters in Physical Education, and became immersed in the study of psychology; before taking up assistant coaching roles at collegiate and NFL levels, with some success [8].

Carroll was particularly influenced by Maslow’s positive humanistic psychology, Gallwey’s inner game, and Michael Murphy’s work on combining Western psychology with
Eastern philosophy to explore the transformational possibilities of sport, and flow experiences [8]. Furthermore, he was able to apply and experiment with these ideas in practice, and started to develop his unique approach to coaching, founded upon striving to be the best you can be, and playing with a quieted mind, and supreme confidence [8]. As indicated in Simon Jenkins’ article he also established a powerful network of legendary coaches as mentors [8].

**WHAT DID THEY LEARN FROM FAILURE?**

Belichick learned that dealing with issues around the game is as important as preparing for the game itself [4]. Cleveland instructed him that you need an intimate familiarity with the whole business – dealing with the public, the press, the owners. Nowadays, Belichick has a press officer who advises on all Patriots media coverage, and he typically reviews the most significant coverage while working out on a treadmill [10]. However, Belichick does not just play a fake role of the coach as a result, instead, he remains the coach that he is – serious and protective. He is now more aware of the press, and a bit better practiced with them, but remains a grim colourless character [3].

Belichick also discovered that he needed to be his own man, and step out of the shadows. To that end he resigned as New York Jets Head Coach after only one day, after Parcells moved upstairs as General Manager [11]. Instead he became HC and GM when appointed at NEP, and developed an attuned relationship with the owner [4].

Nonetheless, Belichick recognised the need to be true to his core values and principles in remaining harsh and unsentimental in his decision making, tolerating no complacency nor entitlement culture (for example, cutting quarterback Bledsoe for Brady), although also blending uncelebrated veterans alongside youth [4].

Finally, he founded a sort of Belichick University, deliberately recruiting bright young employees with a love for football, who were capable of graduating from low paid unofficial apprenticeships [6]. Hence, surrounding himself with smart staff given licence to disagree if they could support their arguments [6]. In this regard he was attempting to construct a vision for long term success, by cultivating a comprehensively interconnected coaching, scouting, and administrative organisational system [6].

Carroll realised that he needed to more effectively justify his unconventional approach [8]. That is, he had to fully discover himself and his philosophy, in order to be able to explain it convincingly to other stakeholders; to move past accumulated bits and pieces of advice from mentors, to bringing it all together in a clarity of vision to guide his actions [8]. Or, as Carroll has stated: “I had to be true to who I was. I didn’t want to pretend to be someone or something I’m not.” [12, p. 27]

Furthermore, he came to appreciate that success depends on all parts of an organisation working together in unity [8]; implementing his new ideas with great success, first at USC, and later at the Seahawks. Hence, Carroll’s Win Forever philosophy centred around maximising of competitive potential, and cultivating a sense of knowing that you are going to be victorious [13]. Alongside came a sharpened awareness to capture the opportunities within opportunities, such as only recruiting players compatible to the team’s ethos, identifying teachable moments, and Carroll’s own adoption of broader roles beyond coaching football (such as *A Better LA/Seattle* to combat gang culture) [8].

**CONTRASTING WORLDVIEWS**

One could sum up Carroll by the phrase (from his mother) - “Something good is just about to happen.” [8]. He is all about trying to create the fertile ground for athlete flourishing,
staying optimistic and having fun, and emphasising just how good his team and players can be [8]. Thus, Carroll is famous for playing jokes on his players, and for his own youthful exuberance on the field; and cultivates a shared mindset of self-belief (collective efficacy) in the face of difficulty, without fear or doubt [8].

Conversely, Belichick might be encapsulated by – “Something bad is going to happen if we don’t do something about it.” He is all about meticulous and industrious preparation for situations that the team might encounter, encouraging others to do their jobs unselfishly and accept constructive criticism, and taking opponents away from how they like to play [4]. For example, when Belichick replaced Carroll at NEP he put more pressure on the players, and effectively threatened their jobs [6]. But, importantly, both approaches work. For instance, shared faith in Belichick, his methods, and his system, plus each other, also means good things are liable to happen.

ZENITH

Belichick was voted coach of the decade for the 2000’s [14], has the highest win percentage of any active NFL coach, and no other coach has won more Superbowls [15]. With the NEP Belichick has now had 14 consecutive winning seasons [15], and they are the closest thing to a dynasty in the modern era in a sport which is deliberately structured to spread success around [3].

At USC Carroll had an 84% win record over 8 years, won national and conference titles, and produced 3 Heisman Trophy winners [12]. He not only led the Seahawks to their first ever Superbowl, but they ended up as runaway victors although considered underdogs, and returned to the final again the year after [16].

WHAT DO THEY DO DIFFERENTLY?

Belichick has an extreme emphasis on competing against others, using an acute coaching eye and insight honed over many years from a young age [3]. He has careful constructed a talented team (in its broadest sense), and a sophisticated talent ID system that does not just recruit the usual suspects; and he clearly defines his expectations of all employees [6]. Belichick is about planning for the long term, so there are no quick fix buys, and no sudden slumps either [4].

Carroll brings an infectious positive energy and optimism to the job, an open communication style, and respect for players as people and learners [12]. In a reversal of an insult that was often thrown at him previously Carroll has become the ultimate players’ coach, with a 2014 ESPN poll naming him the coach players would most like to play for [17]. His implementation of ideas from modern psychology and Eastern philosophy is revolutionary, and he has an extreme emphasis on competing against yourself, in the relentless pursuit of a competitive edge [8].

CONCLUSION

In relation to leadership and management these two unique practitioners seem to be heavily involved in both selling the tickets (promoting a working vision of how the game can be approached successfully), and driving the bus (impression management, dealing with micropolitics, managing expectations). For me, if you want to truly understand a coach (or a leader/manager) then you need an appreciation of who they are, where they come from, and why they operate as they do. That is, one needs to comprehend the biography of learners in order to apprehend the way that they have come to be in the world [18]. Furthermore, if we are to cultivate and promote our own authenticity, then we need to be critically introspective
about the influence of our own developmental experiences, and what we believe as a result. Crucially, encounters with failure can serve as powerful awakening experiences in this regard, which sharpen our self-awareness and self-knowledge [19]. Hence, in respect of that worst Superbowl call in history, I loved the tweet that Carroll put out in response to criticism – “One moment does not define you; the journey does.” [20].
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INTRODUCTION

A possible preliminary response to a comparison article exploring leadership practices in an international golf competition and American football is to simply dismiss the premise. The differences between the contexts are striking, so much so that they require little elaboration to either the casual sports fan or the well-educated sport scientist. To Jenkins’s credit, a myriad of topics were included in his stimulus article that placed the leadership tasks in the Ryder Cup in closer proximity to the Super Bowl than a cursory glance would suggest. Thus, the purpose of this commentary is to further celebrate the diversity of topics and find parallels in alternative contexts with an eye toward bringing those contexts together and strengthening our connections to the practice of leadership.

INDIVIDUALS WORKING TO A COLLECTIVE GOAL

The need to foster an environment where individuals work to a collective goal is a well understood piece of group dynamics [1] and often that charge is placed within the tasks of the leader [2]. Jenkins makes reference to this goal through showcasing both Pete Carroll’s and Paul McGinley’s comments; and finding examples of needing to establish a group mindset in other contexts was not difficult. Michael Jordan was an exceptionally talented basketball player with tremendous individual creativity and a fundamental theme of his career was how he related to his teammates, developed trust in his teammates and ultimately won or lost with his teammates [3]. In Joe Torre’s retrospective look on his years as manager of the New York Yankees he thoroughly described the culture change across different groups of players with some teams being best described as a collection of individuals striving for individual glory and other groups of players being best described as a cohesive group willing to sacrifice for the group performance [4]. Furthering the notion of diversity of contexts, by considering the bitter rivalry between the Boston Red Sox and New York Yankees, Terry Francona’s retrospective book [5] on his time as the manager of the Red Sox provides examples of the same fluctuations in team dynamics as Torre and the Yankees experienced.

ACCEPTANCE OF ROLES AND WORKING THROUGH CONFLICTS

One lens from which to view this combination of team personality styles is by considering the composition of the group. Carron and Eys [1], in a chapter on group dynamics in sport,
describe the relationships between Winston Churchill, Joseph Stalin and Franklin Roosevelt during World War II and the dramatic differences between the individuals that presented significant challenges working together; and yet they were able to collectively accomplish many of their objectives. The relationship between Churchill and Roosevelt has been explored in great detail [6] and presents a reminder of the importance of group members accepting their role and working through conflicts that arise. Jenkins’s piece relays a brief history of Ryder Cup ‘templates’ to winning and a critical piece is individuals having the appropriate role and accepting and executing that particular role.

The story of Abraham Lincoln’s rise to, and time as, the President of the United States may be one of the most well documented cases of a leader believing in roles and empowering his subordinates. Kearns Goodwin [7] updated the history of Abraham Lincoln by including the experiences of Lincoln’s chief rivals for the office of the President who later became members of Lincoln’s Cabinet. The picture presented by Kearns Goodwin [7] is that Lincoln’s greatest strength was his ability to bond together competing interests from accomplished individuals into a formation that provided direction for a nation embroiled in civil war. Returning to sport, the stimulus article explains McGinley’s reliance on the vice-captains and reliance on vice-captains is congruent with the coaching approach of Tony Dungy, an American football coach. Dungy explained [8] that because he was not a yeller and screamer it was a benefit for him to have a coach that possessed those attributes and often set up the classic dichotomy of ‘good-cop versus bad-cop’ to send messages to players. Pat Summit, a pioneer within women’s basketball at the University of Tennessee, relied heavily on her trusted assistant coaches [9] and the need to surround leaders with high quality subordinates is prevalent in the corporate world also [10]. Showing the true diversity of time and context of valuing roles within a group, Sun-Tzu [11] took a philosophical and military strategy approach to roles and identified the importance of them both within types and levels of rank of warriors with each having discrete responsibilities.

**PLANNING AND PREPARATION**

While roles are a part of Sun-Tzu’s *Art of War* [11], the central thesis of the text is the need to be prepared and diligently think through a variety of scenarios before making a decision. Pat Riley, a long time National Basketball Association (NBA) player, coach and current general manager, writes about what leads teams to ‘choke’ [12]. Riley’s assertion [12] is that in addition to the traditional viewpoint of choking during a competition, leaders can also choke by not preparing their team adequately, which can be due to underestimating the opponent or overestimating one’s own team. NBA legend Bill Russell concurred and credited his detailed scouting work, even before he made it to the NBA, on other players and his teammates, as a source of his early career success [13]. The need to prepare properly and devise an appropriate plan for competition, and adhere to the plan, is espoused by both Carroll and McGinley as noted in the stimulus article. The importance of planning can also be seen in baseball. Will [14] compiled an examination of baseball from the perspective of manager Tony La Russa, pitcher Orel Hershiser, outfielder Tony Gwynn, and shortstop Cal Ripken Jr. One consistency across all of Will’s interviewees was their belief in preparation. Gwynn and La Russa both advocated a belief that instincts take over in baseball, but those instincts can be trained and that is where preparation becomes crucial to success [14]. Will [14] does point out that not all baseball hitters believe preparation to be as important which makes room for the individual differences inherent in performance. This notion of different performers taking different paths to performance in sport science literature is well documented through uses of Hanin’s [15] model of Individual Zones of Functioning.
AUTHENTICITY

Once a leader understands the individual nature of performance, including leadership, authenticity should be recognized as a critical variable. Jenkins, in the stimulus article, points out that there is a potential downside to a leader being overly-authentic and disclosing too much. However, it seems reasonable to expect in sport contexts there are more coaches on the other end of the continuum, needing encouragement to move beyond imitation. The media attention on sports, as young as the youth level, is staggering, which provides informal modeling for novice and aspiring coaches. Authentic leadership for sport coaches exists in the literature [16-17], but examples in other sources are readily available. Halberstam [18] provides a specific example of Bill Belichick not being authentic with reporters. Early in Belichick’s career he had not yet developed his own style and interacted with the media in a manner similar to his predecessor, Bill Parcells [18]. The result was uncomfortable, clumsy and ineffective for both the coach and the media [18]. Being authentic can certainly be challenging due to both external situational variables and internal debates about what is right and wrong. Abraham Lincoln’s moniker of ‘Honest Abe’ was well deserved and he diligently worked to treat others with honesty and respect [7]. It is difficult for most of us today to truly empathize with the context of the situation Lincoln was facing, but after a series of anti-Lincoln speeches was given by Frederick Douglass, Douglass and Lincoln met at the White House [7]. Douglass would go on to recount the meeting by saying “I will tell you how he received me— just as you have seen one gentleman receive another” [7, p. 553].

CONCLUSION

The Ryder Cup and Super Bowl are vastly different in many respects. Jenkins’s stimulus article provided a description of leadership qualities and actions that showed golf and American football to have parallel aspects. I have tried to expand upon the diversity of contexts by extending parallel pieces to basketball (player, coach, collegiate, professional, men’s and women’s), baseball (player and manager), politics (international and American), business, sport science research and military strategy. I do not mean to imply that specific contexts are not important or that leaders could be equally effective irrespective of diverse contexts. Rather, I seek to emphasize the similarities of leadership across diverse contexts to remind us of the possibilities for inspiration and lessons we can apply to our own unique contexts.
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INTRODUCTION

The quest for leadership insights is relentless. The most successful sport coaches view themselves as leaders and are constantly seeking guidance on how to enhance their leadership skills. At the time I was asked to write this commentary, I was just completing a three-part webinar series on coach leadership. What I learned through that exercise, and what Simon Jenkins has illustrated in his article, is that there is no one ‘optimal’ or ‘correct’ leadership style. There are, however, some timeless leadership principles that are evident in the world’s great coaches. The three that I will briefly address in this commentary are: a) core values, b) genuine approach to coaching, and c) complex family environment.

CORE VALUES

Those selected to manage / coach the European Ryder Cup team appear to have clearly embraced a leadership style that stays close to the ‘template’ set in place by former captain Tony Jacklin. Although each successive captain brings their own unique personality and ideas to the role, and makes small incremental adjustments, they never venture far from the original leadership ideals. In the leadership literature, the term ‘core values’ is used to describe this non-negotiable foundation. Core values are the enduring standards that serve as stable guiding principles. They provide a compass as we attempt to navigate the many unpredictable and challenging moments we encounter on our path to excellence.

Research on the world’s most enduring and successful companies shows that a clear awareness of and commitment to the founders’ core values is a defining principle of excellence. The core values are stable yet they are counter-balanced with an openness to change and evolution – not in core values, but in strategies and practices that will honor the core values.

The world’s most successful sports team, the New Zealand All Blacks, provide a prime example of how keen awareness of and commitment to core values provides a foundation for durable success. In a series of recent studies, 20 All Blacks’ captains and coaches were interviewed about the purpose and core values that provide the foundation for their sustained excellence. The following three core values serve as guiding principles for the team from year-to-year and are critical to sustaining the winning ethos: 1) Pride in winning, 2) Pride in the All Blacks legacy, and 3) Willingness to evolve. These core values are communicated
and transferred from team to team through rites, rituals, symbols and stories. Examples include the iconic black jersey, which has largely remained the same across their 125 year history, The Haka, a war dance inspired by the indigenous peoples of New Zealand and enacted by the national team before every test match, and player-driven leadership councils.⁷

**GENUINE COACHING APPROACH**

In his article Simon Jenkins references Bill George to illustrate the importance of being authentic as a leader. I too have found this to be a defining characteristic of successful coaches. In 2005 one of my former graduate students, Amy McRae, and I conducted a systematic analysis of the philosophies of the championship professional sport coaches.⁸ Our criteria for inclusion in the study were that the coach had to have coached teams to multiple championships and be recognized as among the all-time best coaches in their sport. At the time of our study, the five coaches we selected had collectively won 29 professional sport championships in North America: Scotty Bowman (9 ice hockey championships), Van Chancellor (4 women’s basketball championships), Joe Gibbs (3 football championships), Phil Jackson (9 men’s basketball championships), and Joe Torre (4 baseball championships).

One of the greatest lessons we learned from this research was that although they shared some common core values (e.g., genuine care for players and consideration of their individual needs), the coaches were distinctively unique in the strategies and leadership approaches used to teach and model their coaching philosophy. They adapted common elements of a ‘championship coaching philosophy’ to fit their unique personalities and the culture of their specific sports. In this sense, the championship coaches adopted an authentic approach to leadership, much like that advocated in the leadership literature referenced by Simon Jenkins.

**COMPLEX FAMILY ENVIRONMENT**

In his article, Simon Jenkins provides direct quotations from American football coach Pete Carroll and Ryder Cup captain Paul McGinley that clearly illustrate the value of creating environments that simultaneously provide structure and support while allowing players to have autonomy and freedom. I have also found this to be a hallmark of successful coaches. Borrowing from research on the types of environments that are most conducive for developing talent I like to refer to these types of settings as complex family environments.⁹ Complex family environments include two apparently contradictory, but interdependent features – attachment (the provision of support and structure), and autonomy (freedom and choice). Another way to think about these types of settings is that they are ‘and’ settings, as opposed to ‘or’ settings. The most effective talent development settings are engineered to provide both structure and freedom.

One of the world’s most successful coaches in recent memory is professional basketball coach Phil Jackson, who coached Michael Jordan and the Chicago Bulls to six championships followed by a stint as the head coach of the Los Angeles Lakers where he coached Shaquille O’Neal and Kobe Bryant to five more championships. In his recent book Eleven Rings coach Jackson provides a vivid summary of the strategies he used to create a complex family environment with every team he coached during those 11 championship seasons.¹⁰ His leadership approach rested on a commitment to providing athletes with autonomy, freedom, and input into important team decisions while simultaneously setting boundaries and providing formal structure. Nowhere is the complex family approach more evident than in how he approached practices compared to how he coached in games:

I would assert myself forcefully in practice to imbue the players with a strong vision of
where we needed to go and what we had to do here. But once the game began, I would slip into the background and let the players orchestrate the attack. (p. 121)

I believe complex family environments are effective because they directly address innate human needs for competence, relatedness, and autonomy. These three basic human needs, and how they impact human behavior and motivation, have been widely examined in the research and are the foundation for self-determination theory.  

SUMMARY

Although there certainly is no shortage of leadership literature, I believe Simon Jenkins makes a unique and important contribution with his article by illustrating common principles of leadership from across diverse sport and business examples. The story of how golf coach captain Paul McGinley led the European team to a Ryder Cup championship while balancing tradition and core values with incremental change and authenticity provides a compelling case study in leadership.
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INTRODUCTION

It is important for individual development and growth to regularly remove oneself from day-to-day tasks and reflect upon one's current state and direction. Indeed, the ability to engage in critical reflection – a deep level of self-analysis - is argued to be a key ingredient to both effective coaching and coach development\(^1\). Similarly, it is important for us – those responsible for extending the evidence base in the area of coaching – to regularly undertake similar tasks in relation to the current state of the literature. The article by Simon Jenkins provides a stimulus for us to stop and reflect on the body of evidence as a whole, its direction, and our understanding of key terms and principles. In line with the intended purpose of Jenkins' article, it is worthwhile to provide some critical reflection on the use of terms 'management' and 'leadership' as they pertain to coaching research in the area of youth sports. This commentary will consider whether youth sport coaching is a process of management or leadership, and the implications that these labels may have for the field.

IS YOUTH SPORT COACHING A PROCESS OF MANAGEMENT OR LEADERSHIP?

The question of whether coaching youth sports is more akin to a process of 'management' or 'leadership' goes beyond the semantic. Our understanding of the nature of the coaching process will have repercussions for the coaching practices that we observe in efforts to provide descriptive theories of the coaching process, the hypotheses that we articulate in service of gaining evidence to support those practices, and the changes that we desire for coaching practitioners during interventions based on normative theories of the coaching process. Despite this, an understanding of the coaching process that is theoretically-sound and evidence-based is still some way off, despite the obvious benefits of such a model\(^2\). A clearer understanding of coaching as 'management' or 'leadership' may help to resolve, at least in part, some of the confusion surrounding the coaching process and be of benefit to the field moving forward.

Perhaps one way of distinguishing whether youth sport coaches are 'managers' or 'leaders' is to do so in relation to the core objectives of youth sport coaches. While the core objectives of effective coaching are heavily context dependent, Côté and Gilbert\(^3\) have provided a helpful starting point. Coaches of children should: adopt an inclusive focus as
opposed to an exclusive selection policy; organise a mastery-oriented motivational climate; set up safe opportunities for athletes to have fun and engage playfully in low-organization games; teach and assess the development of fundamental movements by focusing on the child first; and, promote the social aspect of sport and sampling.

Notwithstanding an overlap in the definitions provided by Jenkins, it seems clear that some of the core objectives of effective youth sport coaches incorporate elements of both leadership and management. Jenkins has put forward the following definition of leadership as provided by Yukl:

“Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives” (p. 23). On the other hand, management is defined as “an ongoing process that involves developing, engaging, empowering and motivating people towards the achievement of goals in a way that makes best use of all the available resources” (p. 5). Clearly, some coaching objectives can fall into both categories. For example, the simple act of implementing a selection policy needs a leader to sell the policy to both parents and youth sports athletes – undoubtedly there will be individuals in both categories who prefer to ‘win at all costs’ – while the day-to-day or week-to-week management of that policy is more akin to a management process – selecting some athletes to start while leaving some others on the bench in order to maximise development, engagement, and motivation.

Similarly, the implementation of a mastery motivational climate includes elements of both leadership and management. Smoll and Smith’s Mastery Approach to Coaching stipulates many behaviours that are consistent with a management process without any elements of leadership, including: sound technical instruction; non-controlling competence feedback; positive reinforcement of desired behaviours; and, individualised attention for athletes. However, the core focus on self-referenced goals and emphasis on winning requires a leader to sell the vision of “mastery” as more important than “winning”.

In contrast, the majority of the core objectives of effective youth sport coaches could legitimately be couched in terms of a management process. Namely, setting up safe opportunities for athletes to have fun and engage playfully in low-organisation games, teaching and assessing the development of fundamental movements by focusing on the child first, and promoting the social aspect of sport and sampling all seem to be management tasks as defined by Jenkins. Other management tasks that are not mentioned but are also important may include the development of positive coach-parent relationships, providing athletes with choice within certain limits and rules, and acting to keep age-appropriate levels of discipline among the athletes.

CONCLUSION

It seems that ‘coach leadership’ may not be reflective of the coaching process in its entirety. While there appears to be several critical windows when a coach will be required to influence others (namely athletes and parents) in order to decide on a set of goals and how those goals will be achieved, a lot of the continuous and interdependent coaching process could be argued to be consistent with a process of management. If this were the case, it would have some repercussions for the field. For example, one way forward may be to rekindle investigations into the positive management of some of the most core tasks assigned to youth sports coaches, rather than to continue to investigate effective coaching from a foundation of normative leadership theories. For example, what is the best way to teach and assess fundamental movement skills?; and, what is the best way to promote the social aspects of sport? Such a bottom-up process may be more beneficial for the field than the top-down
approaches that are consistent with current work in the area (see Vella and Perlman\textsuperscript{6} for a review).

However, marrying the coaching process with leadership has brought several distinct advantages to the field, not the least of which is a focus on the facilitation of self-awareness as a critical driver of increasing coaching effectiveness. This includes both reflective practice and critical reflection\textsuperscript{7}. Furthermore, an important outcome, and purpose, of coach reflection is to not only increase self-awareness, but to facilitate awareness of the preferences, needs, and learning styles of athletes that they may be more able to engage in athlete-centred coaching\textsuperscript{8}. However, even when reflection is built in to large-scale coaching courses and coaches are supported with centralised resources, coaches struggle to implement such a practice\textsuperscript{9}. As such, coaches may benefit from elements of theories and research pertaining to both leadership and management. A pragmatic, complimentary, or supplementary approach to the two processes as they relate to coaching youth sports would be of benefit.
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INTRODUCTION
In the stimulus article, Simon Jenkins provides an interesting and thought provoking discussion of “leadership” and “management” at the athletic and coaching levels, by reflecting on the experiences of Paul McGinley (Ryder Cup captain) and Pete Carroll (American Football coach). Based on my research conducted with national performance directors (NPDs) in elite sport, this commentary will discuss both the differences and similarities in leadership and management, suggest how the experiences of these constructs at the athletic and coaching level might relate to those of individuals operating at a managerial/organizational level in sport, and provide recommendations for leader and manager development.

LEADERSHIP VERSUS MANAGEMENT?
Simon’s article brings greater clarity to the key components of and distinctions between the leadership and management constructs. Of particular note, was McCrimmon’s [1] differentiation, which stated that: “Leadership does not involve managing people to get things done . . . . It comes to an end once those led get on board. It sells the tickets for the journey; management drives the bus to the destination”. This difference in scope and vision between leaders and managers is often identified in the literature [2-4] – with leaders typically focusing on a broader meaning and purpose and seeking change and movement, while managers tend to emphasize the more immediate implementation of operations and seek order and stability [see also 5]. Examples of both leadership and management are evident in the stimulus article, with Paul McGinley leading and engaging his team by understanding every player’s attributes and peculiarities, and Pete Carroll discussing the system he is managing and implementing to help players perform to their potential. Despite the identified conceptual differences between leadership and management, it is generally accepted at a pragmatic and operational level, that considerable overlap exists and an individual’s role might entail elements of both. Indeed, leadership and management both involve influence, working with people under often changing and uncertain environmental demands, identifying and solving problems, initiating activities, and effectively accomplishing goals [6, 7]. To illustrate this overlap in practice, Northouse [7] highlights that leaders involved in planning, staffing, and controlling are also involved in management, and managers tasked with influencing a group to meet set goals are also involved in leadership.
Similarly, in the stimulus article, while Paul McGinley perhaps views himself as more of a manager by his attention to detail in planning and his man management of key stakeholders and their emotions, I believe that he is, ultimately, also leading his team through his strategizing (e.g., “My job is to plot the next move, wind them up and let them go play”), “I wanted to . . . take things to another level”) and inspiration (e.g., communication and speeches in team meetings and dressing room images). Therefore, based on the above evidence and examples, it is suggested that the time at which leadership ends and management begins may not be as clear-cut in practice as is often proposed in the literature; instead, the two are frequently intertwined and individuals may be acting as both a leader and a manager within the same role.

COMMONALITIES OF LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT ACROSS LEVELS
A further observation that occurred when reading the stimulus article was that many of the aspects that are forwarded as important components of successful leadership and management at the athletic/coaching level parallel those in research with national performance directors (NPDs) on best practice at their level of functioning in Olympic sports [5]. In this work, four main areas of best practice performance leadership and management were identified (vision, operations, people, culture) and many of the reflections from Golf and American Football in the stimulus article appear related to these dimensions. For example, ensuring that any influences on and distractions towards a vision are identified and addressed (“One of the big questions I asked him was “how do you handle the mantle of being favorites?”), sharing the vision and inspiring others to invest in it (“…got everyone to be invested in the process”), strategically planning for training and competition (“The confidence necessary for performing at championship level over long periods of time can only be developed on the practice field through repetition”), communicating effectively with others (“See if we can find a way to communicate with them in a really good way” “He listened keenly to players’ opinions”), and ensuring everyone is aware of their own and others’ roles (“Each player had a specific role for the week”). Another commonality between leaders and managers operating at any level in sport is that they must be contextually aware of their surroundings and act accordingly [8]. Therefore, while there are many best practice leadership and management principles that are applicable across the different levels (e.g., athletic, coaching, managerial), there will also be nuances and idiosyncrasies that leaders and managers will need to contend with based upon their position and surrounding context.

LEADER AND MANAGER DEVELOPMENT
It seems to be the case that many of the recommendations and suggestions that NPDs provided for other leaders and managers in a follow-up article [8] are already being followed and implemented by the cases in the stimulus piece. For example, establish an approach (“I asked myself “What is my philosophy?” “What is my approach?” and I came up with the thought”), understand roles within the team (“I saw my job as managing the situation, not as a motivator, I had vice-captains to do that”), enhance personal skills (“A lot of the qualities that I’ll bring to the table will be the ones that if I didn’t have them before I will have learnt them from the captains I’ve played under”), and strengthen relationships (“The caddies are a great source of information, and also their coaches and also their managers and the people they have around them. They are all important and I’ve spent a lot of time over the last few years gathering information”). Often such leadership and management skills are learnt from previous life experiences, observing significant others, or through trial and error of what does
and does not work, rather than any formal training or education [9]. Certainly, in the present article, it seems like Paul McGinley has drawn many of his captaincy principles and behaviors from his own Ryder cup experiences and previous captains and role models. Some scholars have emphasized the importance of adopting a more formal educational approach [10] or enhancing coach leadership practice [11] to develop athlete leaders and captains [see also 12, 13]. This research has typically been conducted with youth or collegiate captains however; therefore, more research is required on leadership and management development programs in elite adult captains and coaches.

CONCLUSION
This commentary has drawn on research from leaders and managers at an organizational and managerial level in elite sport to help reflect on and discuss those experiences forwarded in the stimulus article. In addition, the commentary has presented both the conceptual differences and operational similarities between leadership and management, and suggested methods for informal and formal leader and manager development.
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INTRODUCTION
The stimulus article by Simon Jenkins touches on a number of issues related to “leadership” and “management” effectiveness that are worth discussion and, at some level, debate including:

- Is there a distinction between “management” and “leadership” and does it really matter?
- What do/should effective managers/leaders actually do?
- How are effective leaders “created?”

Based on my firm’s work with and research on leaders (and managers) of companies ranging in size from small entrepreneurships to members of the Fortune 500, each of these will be discussed, in turn, below.

LEADERSHIP VERSUS MANAGEMENT
Consistent with one definition presented in this article, we define effective leadership as “the ability to influence people to achieve desired results/goals” [1, p. 273]. In our approach, there are two types of leadership:

1. Operational – where the focus is on influencing people to achieve goals on a day-to-day basis; and
2. Strategic – where the focus is on influencing people to be concerned about and support the future development of the enterprise. [1]

In our leadership development work with companies of all sizes, we typically use the term “manager/leader” to refer to anyone who occupies a role where he or she has responsibility for supervising other people and/or for overseeing the operations of a specific unit or the company as a whole. If we were pressed to differentiate leadership from management, we would agree with Kotter [2] that the most senior leaders of an organization are in “leadership” roles where the focus needs to be on effective “strategic leadership” (that is, on
the strategic development of the business), while those at other levels are in “management”
roles where the focus needs to be on ensuring effective day-to-day operations (through
effective operational leadership). We therefore view “leadership” and “management” as a
“distinction without a difference” because managers at all levels (from CEO to front line
supervisors) must exercise the functions of operational leadership. In addition, those at the
most senior levels of the organization need to develop effective strategic leadership skills.

WHAT EFFECTIVE LEADERS DO/SHOULD DO

OPERATIONAL LEADERSHIP

On a day-to-day (operational basis), we have identified through our own and others’ [3] research
five key tasks that need to be performed to successfully “influence people to achieve goals” (that
is, to be an effective leader) [1]. Jenkins’ article provides at least one example of each:

• Setting, communicating, and monitoring performance against individual and
team goals. McGinley’s “nitty-gritty tactics” and checking in with his vice
captains on these tactics.
• Helping people work effectively together as a team. McGinley effectively used
a variety of mechanisms to create a sense of team – something Tom Watson
apparently failed to do.
• Ensuring that each individual has what he or she needs to effectively complete
the work and achieve the goals. McGinley used a variety of methods to ensure
that each of his players had what they needed – including information and
specific pairings with others – (and he tailored it to their needs) to be successful.
• Providing feedback on performance achieved. While not explicitly stated, the
case suggests that McGinley solicited and used his players’ opinions about their
performance as a basis for providing them with feedback.
• Developing each team members’ capabilities. As was true of Pete Carroll and
John Wooden, McGinley focused on finding ways to help each team member be
the best that he could be within his capabilities and provided the resources to
make this happen.

STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP

Influencing people to be concerned about the long-term development of the business
involves performing three strategic leadership tasks:

• Strategic Planning: Developing, effectively implementing, and monitoring
performance against a strategic plan. McGinley was very focused on managing
and monitoring performance against his team’s plan. He was also willing to
make adjustments, if needed.
• Organizational Development: Creating and managing the infrastructure needed
to support the achievement of long-term goals. McGinley created and managed
very specific roles for his vice captains and had specific roles each day for his
players.
• Organizational Culture Management: Identifying, communicating, and
reinforcing organizational values. Unlike Watson, McGinley was very aware of
and worked to reinforce a team culture that was motivating and that focused on
“virtues” of the past. Pete Carroll’s “philosophy” is another example of culture
in practice.
The bottom line is that McGinley provides a very good example in practice of effective leadership. His ability to effectively execute these tasks is, in fact, the “winning formula.”

DEVELOPING EFFECTIVE MANAGERS/LEADERS
The management/leadership role is fundamentally different from that of the “doer” role. In fact, becoming an effective manager/leader involves letting go of the old ways of doing things and embracing a very “new” role – that is, it involves a very significant transition. Our research suggests that success in any management/leadership role – whether it is the CEO role or that of a front line supervisor – depends on effectively managing and making the transition on three factors or dimensions [1]:

• Role Concept: How the individual actually behaves in his or her role (including how he or she manages his or her time). In the management/leadership role, significant time needs to be devoted to managing other people and managing the “business” (that is, performing the key leadership tasks described above) versus doing the work. This can be seen in the description of how McGinley executed his role.

• Management/Leadership Skills: The extent to which the individual has developed the skills needed, given his or her level of management/leadership. These skills include delegation, time management, planning, performance management, meeting management, and leadership effectiveness (described above).

• The Inner Game of Management: The manner in which the individual manages his or her own mindset – including how the individual manages his or her need for control, source of self-esteem, and need to be liked [4]. Effective managers/leaders understand that they cannot directly control results/performance, but, instead, need to manage/oversee others. This was exhibited by McGinley in describing the “trust” that he had in his vice captains. They derive their sense of self-worth from the success of their team versus their individual efforts. Clearly, McGinley valued his role as a leader. They also find ways to “manage” their need to be liked so that it does not interfere with the things that they need to do as managers/leaders (like deal with conflict, ask people to do things they may not want to do – but that they should do, etc.).

Management/leadership development, then, needs to focus not just on skill development, but also on helping individuals understand how to manage their own behavior (Role Concept) and mindset (Inner Game). The overall goal of leadership/management development is “personal growth” – but of a very specific type.

CONCLUSION
This commentary provides a framework for understanding management and leadership effectiveness and draws upon the case studies presented in Jenkins’ article to illustrate the application of this approach in practice. Achieving the “best” results as a manager/leader involves effectively performing specific “tasks,” developing appropriate skills, and adopting a management mindset (“inner game”).
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INTRODUCTION
In his stimulus article, Simon Jenkins mines the rich veins of the interfaces between leadership and management and how both of these constructs relate to sports. He brings the perspectives of Pete Carroll, the head coach of the National Football League’s Seattle Seahawks and Canadian leadership author Mitch McCrimmon into the frame with the goal of reflecting on how Carroll and McCrimmon’s views can be used to assess the 2014 Ryder Cup, won by Europe against the United States at Gleneagles in Scotland.

In this response, we will reflect briefly on management literature with regard to the distinction between management and leadership, and then extrapolate from our own experience on what is relevant to sports. Lastly, we will focus on what seems to us to be applicable to golf and to the Ryder Cup.

LEADERSHIP VERSUS MANAGEMENT
As Jenkins point out, the literature is indeed very nebulous on the distinction between leadership and management. Exacerbating the situation is the fact that even the literature on leadership in and of itself is very nebulous insofar as identifying who is actually a leader generates a myriad of perspectives. In some cases, there is one clearly identified leader within an organization while in other cases, leadership is seen to be shared by different people who are considered leaders because they form a part of the top team of an organization. The latter definition strikes us as realistic in a business environment in any case. Drawing a distinction between leadership and management is also a fraught exercise. Jenkins helpfully draws on the work of a former colleague of ours at Ashridge, Mitch McCrimmon, in drawing a distinction not between individual leaders and managers, but between the tasks of leadership and management. As McCrimmon recognizes, leadership is about on-going sense-making and subsequently about charting a new organizational course, while management is about delivering the new direction. Leadership is thus both continuous in terms of scanning the horizon while also sporadic when a larger decision is made. Management is more continuous. The same senior individuals in an organization play both roles at different times.
DEVELOPING BUSINESS SKILLS IN SPORTS PEOPLE
Over the past ten plus years, we have been working at the interface of management and sports in a reversal of the usual sports motivation into business metaphor. Our interest and emphasis has been on helping sports people manage better on and off the pitch or arena, or track or pool. Different sports and sports structures actually have very different needs and drivers. Within some sports there are very high levels of education among both the actual athletes and their coaching contingents (sailing, for example) while in others competitors and the coaching infrastructure has often not had the opportunity to enjoy an extensive education (boxing, for example). Some sports are continuous and team based where development over time is possible, while others are semi-continuous like national teams for rugby or football (soccer). In all of these cases, we work with the coaching and managerial staff to develop their skills in the basics of both the hard and soft skills of business and importantly in helping them come to terms with the myriad actors in their eco-system which are “off field” like funding bodies, sponsors, sports infrastructure and the media.

THE RYDER CUP AS A PROJECT
From the perspective of a time horizon, the Ryder Cup is even more sporadic than a national team. The Ryder Cup takes place for a three-day weekend every second year, alternating between Europe and the United States. While there are individuals who compete for their side over multiple Cups, there are also numerous new additions at every tournament to make up the full twelve-aside contingents. Wearing a management theory hat, we’d posit that neither the literature about leadership nor about management adds as much to the debate as it could. The Ryder Cup, seen from a business academic perspective, is actually about project leadership and project management where individuals are taken out of their normal contexts and are brought together to fulfill a time-limited goal leading to completion. It is more akin to the completion of a film, perhaps with a director who regularly collaborates with a cameraman and a number of core actors, rather than it is to longer-term managerial tasks.

When one looks at the comments made by the European captain Paul McGinley from a project leadership perspective, he does a good job. He looked extensively at what had worked in previous iterations of the Ryder Cup, provides continuity for the players who had competed previously, and evokes a spirit of success. From a project management perspective, he also did a good job on setting goals rather than on micro-management, on measuring progress, reflection and on adjusting along the way. In contrast, Tom Watson, leading the US team, seems to have given considerably less thought to his role as a project manager. McGinley was also clearly aware of the importance of preparation physically through practice and mentally through the “inner game”.

DEALING WITH COMPLEXITY AND CHAOS IN SPORT
All that said, there are a number of significant issues that must be considered here. Outcomes are not always the best measure of good leadership or management in sport. In continuous sporting competitions like a League championship, there are many variables. In a project-based event like the Ryder Cup, there are even more that can have a critical effect: the bounce of a ball, a gust of wind, a player’s problems at home. Nearly all these are outside the influence of the coach or managers. The margins in top-level sport are so small that to suggest one person or one approach is the single cause for success or failure would be dangerous. Every player is different, every competition is different, every opposition is different, every referee is different and in golf, every course is different. Many complex and sometimes chaotic factors are at play in sporting events.
At Ashridge, we believe that the best way to approach the sports performance world is to enable all participants with whom we work to be able to become comfortable in chaos and also in the chaos of the moment. We believe that the best way to do this is not to impersonate another person’s approach, but to seek self-awareness through a number of approaches including life scripting, psychometrics and great conversations. When you know yourself and your strengths and recognise the same in others, then it is possible to select the best approach at the right time to achieve results. If we are seeking sustainable results, not a win here and there, we must look beyond the win and losses and towards the complexity of the environment and the people to seek out the true answers: that sport is complex and the speed at which you can adapt to the chaos is the key. McGinley certainly seems to share this perspective and articulate it succinctly in his comments.

CONCLUSION
There is a lot that can be gained from looking at the interface between business theory and sports. It requires a nuanced approach which guides one in the right direction to ensure that one is using the most suitable parallel from one world to the other: leadership, management, project leadership and project management can all provide useful perspectives for sports and hopefully, in some cases, can actually make the difference between success and failure.
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INTRODUCTION

In this commentary on the stimulus article by Simon Jenkins, I will reflect on how ‘like for like’ comparisons between sport and business are not applicable and fall short.

COMPARISON BETWEEN SPORT AND BUSINESS

‘Like-for-like’ comparisons are often made between the worlds of professional sport and business. It seems sport is comparable to any type of business practice, discipline, or activity. Popular analogies are made in the areas of performance, coaching, leadership, management, winning, etc. Some examples would be: “successful businessmen and elite athletes share the same qualities as high performers” and “preparing for a key race is like preparing the right strategy to deliver a keynote speech”.

The intention to compare is both genuine and understanding. Sport and games are inherently human and mostly fun! Working is inherently human as well, but has evolved into something we dread and wish we could live without. Using sport analogies somehow makes business more meaningful again and brings the idea of work back to life. Although it can be emotionally uplifting in the short term, the reality is that professional business and sport actually have much less in common, and in many ways inhabit totally different worlds.

If sport and business were similar in practice and approach, we would probably see more professional sports players or coaches/managers making fairly seamless transitions into business roles (or vice versa business roles into sport coaching/management). Very few, however, are able to make these types of transition even within their same sport (e.g., from football player to Manager/Coach of players). Not only are the required skillsets completely different, but in addition each environment is a singular culture and context (whether sport or business), which demands different approaches to management, leadership, coaching and performance.

What sport and business do have in common are ‘functional’ applications such as techniques that help get the best out of oneself or others (i.e. leadership, management, mental focus, ‘The Inner Game’, etc.). These can be applied to almost any discipline across the spectrum, say from helping a construction worker focus 30 floors above ground level to a woman using breathing techniques to give birth. Timothy Gallwey exemplifies the multiple ‘functional’ application approach in his The Inner Game.
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BUSINESS AND SPORT

WORK ENVIRONMENT
Diverse sports have come into existence differently (challenges, resources, geography, economics, technology, etc.). As a result, each sport attracts a specific type of athlete (or professional). As an example, a team of professional American Football players (NFL) is very different to a team of individual golf players for the Ryder Cup. Even teams in similar sports are different and require different approaches.

THE NATURE OF TALENT
In many sports, athletes compete and train in a specific discipline from a pre-pubescent age to early teen. In the case of professional sport, individual athletes and teams are selected from the highest quality talent pools from a young age. As a ‘leader’ (or ‘coach’) you are typically working with the top 1% (often in the world) in a given specific discipline. In business, professional employees/staff begin their work life as mature adults having obtained formal skills (i.e., vocational diplomas, university degrees). They often change disciplines several times during life and are normally selected via a structured recruitment process. As a ‘leader’ you are typically working with a vast surplus of average-to-high-quality talent (at best).

HUMAN PERFORMANCE DOMAINS
Sport naturally engages every level of the human performance domains - physical, mental, emotional and ‘spiritual’ (purpose). In business, however, there is limited potential to engage every level of human performance domains. In the last decade, how to increase ‘employee engagement’ has become a major topic and strategy in the business world.

PERFORMANCE LIFECYCLE
In sport, athletes begin ‘working’ as pre-pubescents, peak in their teen years, and typically retire during early adulthood. In general, most training and competition happens in the human development phase of growth. Coaches/managers maximise training intensity to fully ‘exploit’ this phase in order to create champions in their sport. In business, professional work typically begins during early adulthood, peaks at mid-life (45 to 55), and can continue past 70 years.

CONCLUSION
As you can appreciate from highlighting just a few key differences, business is very different to sport.

EDITOR’S NOTE
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INTRODUCTION

As scientist-practitioners with a strong interest in elite team leadership/management, we were grateful for the opportunity to read Simon Jenkins’ stimulus paper. As an early point of clarification, we do not see that leadership and management are distinct constructs; at least not in an operational sense. Instead, and as we and others have considered before [1, 2], we see that leaders manage and managers lead [3], with the major issue being that such stylistic and procedural differences are used appropriately rather than as a distinct and consistent style; in short, doing the right thing in the right way at the right time [cf. 4, 5]. As such, we are less concerned with what these individuals are called (by themselves or others) and more so on what they actually do and when – as set by their professional judgment and decision making (hereafter PJDM). Pairing this spirit with Jenkins’ impetus for critical discussion, our contribution is consequently built on two parts: In the first, we outline some key considerations for knowledge transfer from other fields to elite sport in the context of ‘day-to-day’ leadership; in the second, we offer additional perspective on some actions that seemed to underpin Paul McGinley’s success. In doing so, we hope to stimulate continued discussion and highlight some emerging consistencies within elite team leadership research and practice.

FROM BUSINESS TO SPORT: THE NEED FOR A CRITICAL EYE

While research and practice in sport has profited from business-based knowledge [6, 7], there are inevitably, of course, certain features that transfer should meet for optimal relevance and impact (whether between business, sport, or any other domain). We see that such transfer relies on two broad features: 1) thorough and critical evaluation of the evidence underpinning the external knowledge (i.e., is it theoretically sound and practically meaningful in its field of origin?); and 2) subsequent empirical research and refinement of this knowledge for sport to establish/exploit its specificity [8]. It is in this light that we are unsure on the precise merits of much of the business/other literature quoted in Jenkins’ article (for sport or business).

Indeed, although motivational idioms and ‘one line philosophies’ are attractive due to their simplicity and positive connotations, their use for investigating and guiding day-to-day practice is highly questionable. Take, for example, the cited quote from Theodore Roosevelt:
“The best executive is the one who has sense enough to pick good men to do what he wants done; and self-restraint enough to keep from meddling while they do it.” While defined by an undeniably influential figure, there is a real danger in elite team leaders taking such general themes from other contexts and uncritically basing their specific work on them. More specifically, elite team leaders have already reported that “meddling” with their staff and performers – at the right time, in the right way, with the right set up – is in fact a key success factor [4]. This difference continues when considering the presented views of Mitch McCrimmon, such as “the purpose of leadership is to promote a new direction”. In this case, evidence also exists on the need for these figures to possess much more than transformational skills, with success also deemed to rely on leadership behaviours that protect the status quo; including those of a ‘dark’ nature [4]. Finally, and contradicting the quoted view of Ibarra that authenticity is “the gold standard for leadership”, we also know that elite team leaders, at specific points, deliberately use behaviours that do not fit their values and beliefs to achieve ultimate goals [9].

In sum, while decisive advice from respected figures is appealing, it is not, as evidence suggests, sufficiently accurate or impactful: nor we suggest was it ever meant to be in the vast majority of cases (the growth of Twitter philosophy notwithstanding!). Unfortunately, however, a mix of assured individuals/bodies who are ‘quick to tell’ and audiences who are ‘quick to listen/follow’ mean that Hume’s ‘is-ought’ problem is still highly relevant for elite sport (i.e., because that champion is doing that, I ought to as well [10]). Indeed, without appreciating why and how leaders assess, select, combine, and deliver actions against short, medium, and long term goals, then we will remain mired by the “great man”/reductionist paradigm where one approach/style/individual is judged (or chased) as the approach/style/individual. Consequently, consideration of leaders’ PJDM is imperative. Against the backdrop of our first section, we now offer some additional perspectives on the stimulus paper that resonate with recent work in elite team leadership.

**PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING**

Firstly, it seems that McGinley’s success was underpinned by effective PJDM [11-13]. For example, we see that McGinley undertook a detailed assessment of the challenge so that his subsequent work harnessed the established culture/‘template’ yet was modified for the present (and different!) situation; revolving around a focus on “attitude” as well as “passion”. Indeed, intentions on what and how to enhance the ‘system’ seemed to be based on a careful triangulation of data; including the work of prior captains, views of informed stakeholders (i.e., players’ caddies, coaches, and managers), insights of external experts (i.e., Sir Alex Ferguson et al.), and player personalities. In contrast to ‘blanket mantras’ and ‘do it this way’ philosophies, we thereby see evidence for the development of a bespoke solution for a bespoke task. In fact, McGinley’s approach suggests that even uncritical transfer within the same sport and competition is inappropriate, let alone between different sports/competitions and from business to sport!

With a thorough appreciation of the team’s needs, it also seems that McGinley’s ensuing plan was nested in nature; another pillar of effective PJDM [14]. More specifically, McGinley’s moment-to-moment decisions and actions appeared locked to his short, medium and long term intentions; subsequently supporting consistency and impact. The ostensibly advanced planning of intentions against hypothesized scenarios was perhaps best evidenced in McGinley’s call to leave it “until Saturday night [ahead of the last day of play] to get Lee Westwood to deliver his speech, being the most experienced in the room among the players and even all the vice-captains”. As a final feature of PJDM and expertise, McGinley also
alluded to ‘fox-like’ monitoring, evaluation, and adaptation [15, 16]; in doing so, embracing complexity, creating a strong declarative base for decisions, and ‘rolling with the changes’:

When the morning session was on, I was planning the move for the afternoon . . . . Are we still on course for this plan, how is he doing, how is he playing, does he look good? If we don’t, what are our options, what do we do?

Thus, we see further evidence that the reflection (and evaluation) of elite team leaders/managers is best done against their nested intentions and the theoretically/empirically grounded methodologies that they apply to achieve these [11].

POWER SHARING

Another empirically-supported aspect of McGinley’s work was his sharing of power with core stakeholders [9, 17, 18]. Indeed, McGinley seemed acutely aware of stakeholders’ power and motivations, including the need for consequent respect, consultation, and shared ownership. For instance, regular visits and phone calls to players, interaction with players’ caddies, coaches, and managers, use of prior captains and current vice-captains, and setting up structures that allowed appropriate freedom and player leadership all seemingly worked to create a managed ‘to and fro’ of control [18]. Beyond enabling a collective approach, such two-way interaction can also help to limit possible frustration, disagreement and conflict. Perhaps conveying this point most clearly was McGinley’s use of a 5th vice-captain (another ‘tweak’ to the ‘template’) to support the expectations and practice needs of the four players left out of the main session; a scenario where the management of player emotions and opinions would have been crucial for sustaining individual and group morale [19, 20].

INTERACTING WITH THE MEDIA

A final feature of McGinley’s work that we highlight here was his interaction with the media. Given their potential to shape the functioning and success of elite teams, management of the media is viewed as an important feature of modern elite team leadership [9, 17]. In this sense, McGinley appeared to have played this ‘game’ well via the nature and coherence of his discourse. For example, modest, measured, politically sensitive and positive communication, which aligned to his actions, was invariably ‘controversy-free’ and widely bought into by the media (as shown by broad positive reporting). In this way, McGinley seemed to have a clear awareness of the media roles, agendas, and influence, as shown in this quote given before the Ryder Cup:

I was very tempted to speak up [about my potential to be appointed captain] . . . . [but] I stepped back and watched the story grow legs . . . . The players were speaking for me . . . . and when I had that support I didn’t need to speak. One thing I’ve learned is the power of Twitter. [21]

CONCLUSION

Although we have reservations on messages provided in Jenkins’ lead article, on both conceptual and applied levels, this work has nonetheless given additional useful impetus in an evolving area. More specifically, we see that further weight has been added to the need for a critical approach to knowledge transfer as well as a focus on PJDM, power, and management of the media in elite team leadership theory and practice. We hope that scholars and practitioners continue on these lines and help the field to move beyond its historical focus on leader personality and ‘bright and fluffy behaviours’.
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INTRODUCTION

Having consulted and researched within both sport and business settings as psychologists, we now recognize that the link between sport and business is more pronounced than we first thought. In our book “What Business Can Learn From Sport Psychology”, the title speaks to the relationship between the demands of the business environment and the demands of the sport environment, so much so that similar mental skills can be applied to key stakeholders within each context. We promote the use of psychological (mental) skills to enhance what we call “resources” which are vital in important and stressful situations to meet the demands of whatever situation individuals find themselves in, be it business presentations or athletic competition. In addition to helping individual employees develop these important resources, we have also endeavored to help leaders develop their own resources, but more importantly promote resources in their staff or athletes. To align with the stimulus article, we consider how effective management can help individuals fulfill their potential under pressure, and how effective leadership can compliment pressure management.

EFFECTIVE PRESSURE MANAGEMENT

One approach we have used in both business and sport is The Theory of Challenge and Threat States in Athletes (TCTSA). In short, a challenge state is associated with superior performance in mental and physical performance and better health outcomes, compared to a threat state. The TCTSA brought together numerous psychophysiological theories and proposed that when approaching pressure situations individuals engage in a cognitive appraisal process that determines whether they experience a challenge or a threat state. If an individual appraises sufficient resources to meet the situational demands then a challenge state is evinced. These “resources” comprise self-efficacy (i.e., belief in one’s ability to be successful), perceived control, and achievement goals (approach or avoidance). An individual approaching a stressful situation with high self-efficacy, high perceived control, and a focus on approach goals will experience a challenge state and thus is more likely to fulfill their potential in that situation.

In one of our recent papers, we showed how challenge states could be promoted by instructing individuals in the right way. For example, facing a 10-meter climbing wall task, those who were encouraged to be confident about the task (high self-efficacy), made aware
of the control they had over their performance (high perceived control), and advised to focus on climbing as high as they could (approach goals) rather than not falling off the wall (avoidance goals), showed a challenge state. In essence, this showed that how an individual is managed at that moment before a tough task is able to dictate their reactions and hence has clear implications for leaders and business managers.

For the managers in the stimulus article these resources are important. Pete Carroll talks about “competing against ourselves to be our best” reflecting an approach focus, and mentions the problem of focusing “on something outside ourself” indicating recognition that external and uncontrollable factors are not an appropriate focus. The stimulus article also indicates that Carroll subscribes to John Wooden’s Pyramid of Success in which confidence (self-efficacy) is near the top. If management does indeed “drive the bus to the destination” then it is possible to steer individuals towards a challenge state by ensuring that they approach all pressure events with high confidence, a clear focus on what they can control and a focus on performing well, not just winning. To this end, performing well can be ensured, winning cannot.

Similarly, if leadership does indeed involve “discrete, occasional acts of influencing people to think and act different” then this is never more crucial or apparent in the approach to important situations. As part of these “discrete” acts, the promotion of a challenge state should form part of whatever a leader wishes to say to individuals in the build up to an event. Even further, leaders should be able to promote a challenge state in individual athletes at an individual level. To illustrate, McGinley stated that “real management goes on in the microlevel, on the 1 to 1 level”, a philosophy that fits well with cognitive appraisals. We know that for some people it is enough to prompt them to realize that they have the resources to meet the situational demands, but with others, it is a more lengthy and in-depth process. This may involve work with a psychologist to help them develop mental skills that have been shown to increase a challenge state such as imagery or reappraisal. As we have found, these mental skills applied with athletes are easily translated to those working in business and other high performance domains (e.g., such as the military).

But above and beyond psychologists, leaders should be making sure that individuals are approaching pressure in the right way. McGinley made sure “that the players look[ed] focussed and weren’t too nervous” helping them to display “calmness under pressure” by getting himself into “management mode”. In sum, the ability of a leader to influence individuals, appraisal of the upcoming situation is vital, and is very much about how they choose to manage those individuals leading up to the event.

LEADERSHIP FOR PRESSURE MANAGEMENT

The challenge and threat cognitive appraisal process we describe has largely been considered to be a process dictated mostly by the individual’s estimation of the extent to which their resources meet or exceed the demands. However, a body of research indicates that the appraisal process is mediated by social interactions. Specifically, social support is thought to play a significant role in how an individual approaches stressful situations, thus contributing to challenge and threat responses. The social support literature intimates that the type, frequency, and quality of social interactions may be vital in promoting challenge in the face of pressure.

The quality of social interactions has been encapsulated within the social identity tradition, which posits that that leaders’ capacity to develop a shared psychological connection between themselves and their group is the foundation of successful leadership. Particularly in the face of stress and pressure, the stronger the connections between leaders
and their group, and the connections between group members, the more likely group members are to react positively to stress\textsuperscript{12}. It makes sense then, that some of the high profile leaders in the stimulus article strive to foster and strengthen these connections. Developing psychological connections can be seen in the extent to which leaders, coaches, or athletes create a team identity\textsuperscript{13}. For example, by examining leadership surrounding the London 2012 Olympic Games, we demonstrated how performance directors in TeamGB created a strong team identity alongside a collective vision underpinned by distinctive team values\textsuperscript{14}. We suggest that effective leadership for pressure management should create a shared team identity, where the individual members feel a psychological connection to the group, something evident in McGinley’s approach, but perhaps not Watson’s.

McGinley’s meticulous preparation evident prior to the Ryder Cup is mirrored in elite sport by Sir David Brailsford. As indicated in the stimulus article McGinley and Brailsford appear to share many leadership principles. For instance, McGinley meticulously planned independently but empowered his players with responsibility (e.g., speaking with every player to gather their opinions of previous Ryder Cup successes and failures), which brought the Europeans together as a team and increased motivation. Speaking to John Wooden’s Pyramid of Success McGinley enabled his team to co-operate, show loyalty, and become friends. Not only was McGinley the catalyst for his players to invest in one another and the plan, he has also served his apprenticeship by competing in the previous 4 Ryder Cups. Watson had not. Put another way, McGinley understood what it took to be a European Golfer at the Ryder Cup, to create a European Team, and he had first-hand experience(s) of the triumphs and tribulations of the recent European performances. In turn, McGinley was well positioned to successfully assign certain players to leadership roles. To highlight, Poulter, Westwood, and McDowell were to “blood the rookies” and socially support them in their preparation and performance. We would suggest that these decisions are effective because the selected players represented the team ideal and epitomized the values of team Europe. In social identity terms, Poulter, Westwood, and McDowell are prototypical leaders (see \textsuperscript{15} for a review). It is clear how McGinley could draw on recent history to create an “emotional bond” with his players, fostering strong connections required for performance under pressure.

Research has shown how creating strong emotional bonds increases levels of social support provided by teammates\textsuperscript{12}. Social support can become a valuable resource for individuals’ cognitive appraisals in pressured situations\textsuperscript{16} and perhaps this was evident in the European team. Importantly, the receipt of social support alone may not be as beneficial as the receipt of social support from those with whom one has a strong connection. Social support is more likely to be given, received, and interpreted in the spirit intended if a strong social identity is present within a given group\textsuperscript{17}. For example, research indicates how social support has a positive effect on stress levels if provided by an in-group member\textsuperscript{18}. Presently, in our laboratory\textsuperscript{19} we are beginning to see that in pressurized situations leaders with whom followers feel little or no emotional bond are more likely to display a threat state (negative stress) in response to verbal instructions.

**CONCLUSION**

Theories developed in sport, such as the TCTSA, are highly transferable to business environments because, regardless of the context, the cognitive appraisal process is the same. Regardless of whether it’s a cup final or a pitch for millions of dollars, using management skills to promote self-efficacy, perceived control, and an approach focus is vital. It matters little whether the group is a soccer team or a sales team, developing strong relationships that
cultivate social support is vital for the success of that team when the going gets tough. The development of a team identity represented by emotional bonds across a team provides the foundation of effective management in pressurized situations. But more importantly, doing leadership in a manner that resonates with identity principles will allow this to become reality. In short, effective leaders create a “challenge culture” underpinned by strong inter-group connections that promote positive approaches to pressure and stress.
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INTRODUCTION
In the stimulus article, Dr. Simon Jenkins explores the meaning of leadership and management, referencing coaches that build winning strategies. A common definition of “leadership” is “a position as a leader of a group, organization, etc.; the time when a person holds the position of leader; and the power or ability to lead other people” [1]. Jenkins takes a much closer look into the make-up of building a winning strategy, beyond the basics of leadership or management.

The topic of interest among many golf enthusiasts always lingers around what it takes to win a Ryder Cup. Everyone from writers, TV personalities, bloggers, to amateur golfers in the grill room will be discussing what this coveted position needs to do to win (and what has gone wrong in the past). Of all the opinions and questions to be raised, the one I am most interested in is, “Can leadership be learned?” First will I look at the similarities of sound business leadership practices and then reflect that upon what the most recent Ryder Cup coach, Paul McGinley has done as a comparison. Then, I will comment on how golf instructors need “leadership training” and the demands run parallel to running a corporation or a team.

BUSINESS AND SPORT
Running a business is much like coaching an elite-level sports team. A business leader’s responsibilities are to coach the players in the organization, guide them to find solutions, set the tone in the working environment, promote the culture, and be active learners themselves. A business leader is expected to fundamentally impact the organization to provide outstanding solutions. The long-term success of the organization is contingent upon many things, but a prominent factor is the leadership skills from the senior level. The coach or captain of a sports team is also expected to make high-level decisions that will affect the long term success.

The primary purpose of coaching a team or rallying players to perform at the Ryder Cup, the highest level of play, under the most pressure filled circumstances, is to out-perform the opponent. Out-performing an opponent sounds strikingly similar to how a business might describe its own goal. According to Ray Carvey, great leadership training is done with the context in mind. He says, “Top-level training organizations move beyond abstract learning
to understand how to align what they’re doing with key business objectives” [2]. That might mean looking closely at what an organization really needs to move a strategy forward. Put into the context of training a winning team, the coach must be on top of what will create the right formula for the specific needs of that team. The Ryder Cup is comprised of various individuals with a range of experience levels, personalities and styles. Carvey explains that all businesses should not be managed the same way, and if we are to continue the parallel of sports teams, they should not be coached the same way either.

Jenkins reports on the Ryder Cup Captain, Paul McGinley, as bringing in five vice captains in order to help him “manage the practice requirements and expectations of the four players sitting out.” McGinley added that he was managing the situation while the vice-captains could do the motivating. In business, another element that makes up a successful leadership program, according to Carvey, is the involvement of senior leadership as sponsors, mentors and coaches. McGinley’s strategy was to have a plan all week, and with the input from his vice-captains and other senior leaders, he could make game time changes and adjustments according to unexpected situations.

Another building block that McGinely used, also supported by Carvey, is the use of interactive experiences in order to increase engagement. McGinely was brilliant in how he communicated with his players, the videos that he chose to share and images he posted. He carefully planned out how he could bring in his players through inspiring quotes and stories. This was another way in that business leaders can increase participation and increase their influence.

TEACHING GOLF

Pete Carroll realized that to be a great coach, he needed to be true to himself and dig deep to learn about what his inner passion was all about. He began to think about why he had passion and what he believed in. Through his self-reflection, he was able to find his own voice and authentically speak from his own beliefs, and not from a list of points on leadership that were in some book. Citing John Wooden as his inspiration, Carroll realized that the answers to how to run his team would have to come from within himself. He realized that in order for his constituents to listen to him, his voice would need to be clear and confident.

In my opinion, great golf instructors are more than just teachers. My most influential golf teachers were authentic, enthusiastic, and inspirational. They were able to convince me to buy into what they were saying. I respected their opinion because I knew they had uncovered answers through experience and research. My most memorable teachers were not wishy-washy, inconsistent or vague. They knew what they wanted to say, said it clearly, and were consistent with the message over time. My teachers influenced me to work hard and to believe in myself.

CONCLUSION

Great golf instructors not only rise to the demands of diagnosing swings, creating practice schedules and effective training programs, but they command attention and respect. Much like Pete Carroll or Paul McGinley, they can work on what it takes to bring greatness out of others.

In the advent of a master’s degree for golf coaches and instructors [3-5], without the slightest doubt, the curriculum should include coursework on leadership and management, specifically on motivating, training, inspiring and organizing groups. Perhaps with this background, golf professionals who are chosen to Captain the US Ryder Cup Team might be better equipped to improve their winning record.
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