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Abstract

Most individuals with a physical disability do not participate in sport despite its numerous benefits. Peers have been known to exhibit leadership techniques associated with increased motivation for sport and they play an important role in influencing behaviours of others with a physical disability (e.g., disseminating knowledge of resources). Transformational leadership (TFL) is associated with positive sport outcomes and has been associated with peers in the sport context. Transformational leaders use individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and idealized influence to enable their follower to perform beyond their own expectations. However, it is unknown how peer athlete mentors (mentors) use TFL to encourage and maintain sport participation among their mentees with disabilities. The purpose of this study was to understand the leadership behaviours, particularly the TFL behaviours of peer athlete mentors in parasport. Participants were 11 mentors and 10 mentees who have been involved in parasport. Data were collected through semi-structured telephone interviews. The interviews were grounded in TFL. Inductive content analysis revealed behaviours from the perspectives of mentors and mentees and the behaviours were deductively cross-referenced with TFL behaviours. Mentors recalled their own mentorship behaviours and behaviours of the mentors that encouraged them. Mentees recalled behaviours of their mentors and mentor behaviours they have begun to engage in. Behaviours were consistent with TFL and were generally perceived as the same among mentors and mentees. Individualized consideration behaviours were creating an enriching environment, appropriate peer matching, understanding readiness to participate, and understanding different personalities. Inspirational motivation behaviours were conveying optimism about the benefits of sport, telling success stories, and being a role model for sport excellence. Intellectual stimulation involved disseminating resources encouraging mentees to try, encouraging reducing sedentary time, and letting the mentee solve problems. Idealized influence included showing commitment, having a positive attitude, and
fulfilling duties on the team. Negative behaviours speaking negatively about another sport and having unrealistic expectations. The results of this study provide an in depth description of the TFL used by peer mentors in parasport and can be used to inform peer athlete mentorship training programs in disability sport.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Overview

A high rate of physical inactivity continues to be a health concern for individuals with a physical disability (e.g., Heller, Ying, Rimmer & Marks, 2002; Martin Ginis, Latimer et al., 2010). These high rates of inactivity have serious health consequences such as cardiovascular disease (Capriotti, 2006; Dearwater et al., 1986; Myers, Lee & Kiratli, 2007). An active lifestyle can counter the detrimental effects of physical inactivity (e.g., Dodd, Taylor & Damiano, 2002; Hicks et al., 2011; Latimer-Cheung, Pilutti et al., 2013; Oliveira, Jaome, & Marques, 2014), improve quality of life (e.g., Kjølhede, Vissing, & Dalgas, 2012; Ravenek et al., 2012) and enhance mental and physical well-being (e.g., Martin Ginis, Jorgensen & Stapleton, 2012). Individuals with a physical disability who participate in sport as a means of physical activity accumulate more minutes of high intensity physical activity per day and the second-most moderate intensity physical activity per day than any other mode of physical activity (Martin Ginis, Arbour-Nicitopoulos et al., 2010). Activities, such as sport, performed at a moderate to high intensity are associated with important fitness benefits (Latimer-Cheung, Martin Ginis et al., 2013; Martin Ginis et al., 2011). Moreover, sport is a promising activity for enhancing physical and psychosocial well-being (e.g., Goodwin et al., 2009; Groff, Lundberg & Zabriskie, 2009; Martin Ginis et al., 2012).

Unfortunately, parasport participation among individuals with a disability remains low with an estimated 4% to 17.4% of individuals participating (Martin Ginis, Arbour-Nicitopoulos, et al., 2010; Sport England, 2015). Lack of knowledge about parasport resources and lack of
motivation are two prominent barriers that inhibit parasport participation (e.g., Kars et al., 2009; Perreault & Vellarand, 2007; Tasiemski et al., 2005). Peers may be especially effective at communicating information for sport resources compared to numerous important others such as physicians, friends, and work colleagues (e.g., Banack, Sabiston & Bloom, 2011; Loughead & Hardy, 2005; Wu & Williams, 2001). Peers also are well positioned to motivate their counterparts to engage in sport by fostering feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness – key determinants of motivation (e.g., Banack, Sabiston & Bloom, 2011). Given the potential for peers to influence parasport participation, peer athlete mentorship is the focus of this study.

Mentorship is a process in which someone who has faced particular challenges (i.e., the mentor) takes an interest in the personal development of someone facing similar challenges (i.e., the mentee; Sherman, Devinney & Sperling, 2004; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Specific to the current research, a peer mentor is someone who offers mentorship to a mentee with a similar experience living with a disability. Within rehabilitation, peer mentorship is known to help individuals with a disability adjust to life once acquiring a disabling condition (e.g., Ljungberg, Kroll, Libin, and Gordon, 2011; Schwartz, 1999). Thus far, research has not focused on specific behaviours known to benefit the health of individuals with a disability such as parasport and has only focused on mentee outcomes. In the sport context, there is very little peer mentorship research. The existent research only examines the mentorship offered to individuals with a spinal cord injury thus limiting the generalizability of this work to other disability groups (Perrier, Smith & Latimer-Cheung, In Press). There is a clear need for research aiming to understand the peer athlete mentor behaviours that persuade mentees with a disability to become involved in parasport.
The Canadian Wheelchair Sports Association (CWSA) provides mentorship to help individuals overcome the barriers associated with parasport participation such as lack of knowledge of parasport resources (Bridging the Gap, 2015). Peer athlete mentors do not receive extensive training and are given quite a bit of latitude in how they approach mentorship activities. An evaluation is needed to understand what leadership behaviours currently exist in these programs and how the behaviours align with known effective leadership behaviours. The results of such an evaluation could be used to inform peer athlete mentorship training programs.

Research involving leadership frameworks has examined leadership styles among coaches (e.g., Tawse et al., 2012) and peers (e.g., Price & Weiss, 2011) and has focused primarily on athlete outcomes rather than the leaders’ behaviour. Transformational leadership (TFL) is especially applicable for the peer leadership and sport context (e.g., Price & Weiss 2011). TFL involves using the 4 Is – inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, idealized influence and intellectual stimulation – to elicit extraordinary experiences from the followers, subsequently developing their own leadership potential (Bass & Riggio, 2006). TFL is associated with enhanced motivation (e.g., Charbonneau, Barling & Kelloway, 2001; Stenling & Tafvelin, 2014) – a key factor in promoting parasport participation among individuals with a disability. Moreover, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation seem particularly relevant for the parasport context. Individualized consideration is relevant because of the varying abilities and circumstances of individuals with a disability. Also, intellectual stimulation may be important because mentees may not be aware of parasport possibilities. Accordingly, TFL is the primary leadership framework underpinning this thesis.

Numerous studies of able-bodied athletes sporting experiences have shown positive outcomes associated with transformational coaching (e.g., Rowold, 2006; Tawse et al., 2012) and
peer leadership (e.g., Loughead & Hardy, 2004). However, these studies have either been quantitative in nature, or have not taken a keen focus on behaviours that are known to be of benefit to athletes such as TFL. Another overarching limitation of this research is that it mostly considers only one perspective – either the coach’s or the player’s perspective. According to Glenn and Horn (1993), there is inconsistency between coaches’ and players’ perceptions of leadership characteristics.

As Perrier and colleagues demonstrated, peer athlete mentors with SCI exhibited some characteristics of TFL behaviours when responding to narrative vignettes describing mentees willingness to become involved in parasport post injury. Given that the mentors were responding to a fixed number of scenarios, the breadth of behaviours exhibited also was limited. Additional research examining peer athlete mentorship within the context of parasport is clearly needed. Thus the objective of the current study is to understand the leadership behaviours of peer athlete mentors in parasport with an emphasis on TFL. The perspectives of both peer athlete mentors and mentees are considered.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Physical disability and physical activity

Over 4.4 million Canadians have a disability and 11.5% of those disabilities involve mobility impairments (Statistics Canada, 2007). Physical inactivity continues to be a health concern for this segment of the population. For example, only 50% of individuals with a SCI engage in any physical activity (Martin Ginis, Latimer et al., 2010). The same rate of activity has been reported for individuals with cerebral palsy (Heller, Ying, Rimmer & Marks, 2002). Additionally, individuals with multiple sclerosis are less physically active than the able-bodied population (Motl, McCauley & Snook, 2005) and accelerometry data reveal that many people with the most common form of Spina Bifida (myelomeningocele) are inactive (Buffart, Roebroeck, Rol, Stam & van den Berg-Emons., 2008).

These high rates of inactivity have serious health consequences. For example, physical inactivity is a modifiable risk factor for cardiovascular disease among women with a physical disability (Capriotti, 2006). Metabolic consequences of being physically inactive include lipid disorders, which have been linked to cardiovascular disease in people with a SCI (Dearwater et al., 1986; Myers, Lee & Kiratli, 2007). There are higher rates of morbidity and mortality among individuals with a SCI compared to able-bodied individuals; cardiovascular disease ranked second-highest among primary causes of death and also became more frequent with aging.
compared to other causes of mortality (Whiteneck et al., 1992). Similarly, physical inactivity is associated with health consequences for other populations with physical disabilities as well (e.g., multiple sclerosis; Motl & Goldman, 2011).

These detrimental effects of physical inactivity can be countered with an active lifestyle. Several systematic reviews of experimental and observational studies show that physical activity such as exercise in populations of adults with a physical disability is associated with improvements in physical fitness (e.g., Dodd, Taylor & Damiano, 2002; Hicks et al., 2011; Latimer-Cheung, Pilutti et al., 2013; Oliveira, Jacono, & Marques, 2014). Moreover, physical activity is also associated with enhanced quality of life (e.g., Kjølhede, Vissing, & Dalgas, 2012; Ravenek et al., 2012) and mental and physical well-being (e.g., Martin Ginis, Jorgensen & Stapleton, 2012). Finding ways to promote physical activity among people with a disability is an important focus for physical activity researchers.

2.2 Benefits of parasport for individuals with a disability

Although individuals with disabilities participate in physical activity in a variety of ways, parasport may involve unique health benefits. As an example, individuals with a physical disability who participate in parasport as a means of physical activity accumulate more minutes of high intensity physical activity per day and the second-most moderate intensity physical activity per day than any other mode of physical activity (Martin Ginis, Arbour-Nicitopulos et al., 2010). According to physical activity guidelines for individuals with a disability, engaging in moderate to vigorous leisure time physical activity generates fitness benefits (Latimer-Cheung, Martin Ginis et al., 2013; Martin Ginis et al., 2011). Participation in parasport also has many psychosocial benefits. For example, in a study of male college students with a physical disability participants believed that participation in parasport or physical activity increased their perceived
physical competence by countering stereotypes of physical incompetence, and enhancing their perceived bodily appearance (Taub, Blinde & Greer, 1999). The authors of this study suggest that participating in parasport may challenge stereotypes of a disabled body being sick and weak. Individuals with physical disabilities who participate in higher volumes of parasport, have higher satisfaction with life in particular domains such as their vocation, and improved psychological and psychosocial outcomes such as anxiety, depression and self-efficacy than those who report less or no sport participation (e.g., Adnan, McKenzie, & Miyahara, 2001; Blauwet et al., 2013; Gioia et al., 2006; Martin Ginis et al., 2012; Muraki, Tsunawake, Hiramatsu, & Yamasaki, 2000; Tasiemski, Kennedy, Gardner & Taylor, 2005). Participation in parasport is also associated with physical health, perceived quality of life, quality of family life and quality of social life (e.g., Goodwin et al., 2009; Groff, Lundberg & Zabriskie, 2009; Martin Ginis et al., 2012). Thus, parasport provides a promising environment for facilitating positive physical and psychosocial outcomes.

2.3 Overcoming barriers limiting parasport participation

Unfortunately, parasport participation among individuals with a disability remains low with estimates ranging from 4% to 17.4% of individuals participating (Martin Ginis, Arbour-Nicitopoulos, et al., 2010; Sport England, 2014). The numerous barriers limiting sport participation for individuals with a disability have been well documented (e.g., lack of transportation, lack of facilities, difficulties with accessibility; Jaarsma, Dijkstra, Geertzen, & Dekker, 2014). Lack of knowledge about parasport resources and lack of motivation are two prominent barriers that inhibit parasport participation (e.g., Kars et al., 2009; Perreault & Vellarand, 2007; Tasiemski et al., 2005). However, several important others (e.g., physicians, friends, work colleagues) have potential to influence thoughts, feelings, and behaviours relating
to exercise (Carron, Hausenblas, & Mack, 1996) and rehabilitation (Liu, Williams, Liu & Chien, 2010).

This influence, especially that of peers, may extend to the parasport context. In a study by Wu & Williams (2001), 143 individuals with a SCI who participated in wheelchair sport completed questionnaires to identify factors that influence participation in sport. The authors found peers were the most important sources for parasport information for both those who were active and inactive pre-injury. Interestingly, health care specialists and peers are preferred messengers of physical activity information for individuals with a disability; however, health care specialists are often difficult to access (Letts et al., 2011) and peers with a physical disability were found to be a more important influence for parasport participation (Slater & Meade, 2004; Wu & Williams, 2001). Slater and Meade (2004) and Wu and Williams (2001) also found coaches are a preferred messenger of parasport information; however, coaches often only reach those who already participate. Therefore, the current study focuses on peer athlete mentorship for encouraging parasport participation.

Lack of motivation to participate in parasport is another prominent barrier for physical activity participation among people with a disability (Scelza, Kalpakjian, Zemper & Tate, 2005). Efforts are needed to foster autonomous motivation. Autonomous motivation is a desirable form of motivation in which an individual performs a behaviour due to reasons emanating from the self (Deci & Ryan, 1985). This form of motivation is desirable because it can reduce the need for external intervention to increase participation. Autonomous motivation results from the satisfaction of three innate psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The need for autonomy is defined as the need for personal causation (DeCharms, 1968), competence refers to an individual’s ability to perform a task (Harter, 1978) and
relatedness refers to an individual’s need to feel connected to others (Beaumeister & Leary, 1995). As such, fulfilling individuals’ innate psychological needs is essential to increasing their autonomous motivation towards participating in parasport. Accordingly, barriers to parasport participation related to a lack of autonomous motivation may be addressed by assisting an individual (e.g., a mentee) fulfill the innate psychological needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness. As I discuss below, important others such as coaches and peers who take on a mentorship role have potential to facilitate need fulfillment and in turn support their mentees’ autonomous motivation (e.g., Banack, Sabiston & Bloom, 2011; Loughead & Hardy, 2005).

In summary, individuals with a disability prefer to receive information about parasport resources from peers (Wu & Williams, 2001). A peer also has potential to also enhance mentees’ autonomous motivation to participate in parasport. Given the potential for peers to influence an individuals parasport participation, an understanding of the behaviours that may enhance the effectiveness of peers is required. Two bodies of literature that provide context and direction in shaping this understanding include a) the peer mentorship and disability literature and b) the leadership in sport literature.

2.4 Peer mentorship and disability

Peer mentorship is a process in which someone who has faced particular challenges (i.e., the mentor) takes an interest in the personal development of someone facing similar challenges (i.e., the mentee; Sherman, Devinney & Sperling, 2004; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). In doing so, the mentor purposefully allocates his/her time to fulfill the needs of the mentee and the mentee imitates the actions of the mentor (Bloom, Durand-Bush, Schinke & Salmela, 1998). Specific to the current research, a peer mentor is someone who has similar experience living with a disability.
Researchers have explored the role of peer mentors with a disability in helping individuals through rehabilitation. Peer mentorship is known to help individuals with a disability adjust to life once acquiring a disabling condition. For example, Ljungberg, Kroll, Libin, and Gordon (2011) implemented and evaluated a peer mentorship program for individuals in a SCI rehabilitation program anticipating it would increase self-efficacy for coping with general life demands and situations and reduce medical complications for the mentee. Results indicated self-efficacy increased and medical complications decreased over the course of the peer mentorship program. Furthermore, an exit interview indicated that mentees acquired knowledge of SCI and they perceived their mentors were knowledgeable about living with an SCI. Notably, this study did not include a comparison group, thus the authors are limited in making any inferences about best practice.

Schwarts (1999) addressed this limitation by comparing the impact of a telephone peer mentorship program to a coping skills program led by a health professional. Participants were 136 individuals with multiple sclerosis. The peer mentors were trained in active listening, which aimed to give the mentee strength and insight to cope with problems. The control coping skills intervention taught approaches such as goal setting for dealing with emotional difficulties. The coping skills intervention was led by a health professional with a background in public health and clinical psychology and was group-based. The telephone peer support group was most helpful at reducing depression, reducing avoidant coping strategies, increasing satisfaction with socioeconomic status, and increasing self-acceptance among participants who reported either affective difficulties such as depression or took medication for these symptoms. The telephone peer support group reported an increasingly external health locus of control, which is a positive change. The coping skills group reported increased social activity, satisfaction with family, global
satisfaction. Furthermore, the coping skills group reported increases in personal growth, social relatedness, self-acceptance and environmental mastery. The benefits achieved in the coping skills group may be attributable to the group-based nature of this intervention, which included peers.

Sherman, DeVinney, and Sperling (2004) conducted a study that compared the impact of peer mentorship on rehabilitation and society re-integration relative to other sources of social support. They interviewed 62 individuals with a SCI who had either a peer mentor or a live-in partner and compared cross-sectional data of psychosocial outcomes. Individuals who received peer mentorship indicated greater satisfaction with life scores, and greater life participation than those who had a live-in partner.

Veith, Sherman, Pellino, and Yasui (2006) followed Sherman et al. by examining the areas of adjustment and the dimensions of peer mentorship from the perspectives of the mentees. They interviewed seven participants with SCI from a rehabilitation unit who reported receiving peer mentorship and used a grounded theory approach to examine the context of the interviews. Mentees’ responses reflected their mentors’ strategies for helping them overcome the practical, emotional and identity changes following a SCI. In doing so, mentors provided relevant information about practical aspects of having a SCI such as resources available. They also provided hope by discussing topics such as return to work and school, which were motivational for the mentee. Mentees noted that mentors acted as role models who have successfully lived with an SCI, thus mirroring the identity mentees could achieve.

These results are echoed in Haas, Price and Freeman (2013) who evaluated peer support provided in hospitals for individuals with a SCI. They interviewed 14 individuals with a SCI, their close relatives and health care professionals involved in the care of those injured.
benefits individuals with an SCI experienced were the psychological and emotional support of the peer, advice on living with an SCI, practical advice and information, and on-going support and friendship. Furthermore, health-care professionals commented on the impact a peer mentor had on the mentees’ motivation above what the health-care professional could provide.

Taken together, this research suggests peer mentorship for individuals with a disabilities associated with numerous positive outcomes. Although peer mentorship includes many topics, the research lacks focus on specific behaviours known to benefit the health of individuals with a disability such as parasport. The research is also focused on mentee outcomes such as barriers related to motivation, social relatedness, and competence; therefore it is important to understand what peer athlete mentors’ behaviours contribute to mentees’ positive outcomes. This thesis aims to address this research gap.

2.4.1 Peer athlete mentorship in parasport

Peers may play an important role in promoting parasport participation. Interestingly, their role was highlighted in a qualitative study of four elite wheelchair rugby coaches’ experiences in developing athletes with a SCI (Tawse et al., 2012). In this study the importance of veteran athletes (i.e., peer athlete mentors) in wheelchair rugby emerged as a common theme in recruiting new athletes, sharing knowledge about the parasport and their disability, and assisting with coaching. It is notable that although the focus of this study was not on peer athlete mentorship, the role of peer athlete mentors was identified. The emergence of this theme highlights the pivotal role peers play in parasport promotion among people with a disability.

Recognizing the need for increased parasport participation and the potential for peer athlete mentors to assist in these efforts, Perrier, Smith and Latimer-Cheung (In Press) examined how peer athlete mentors (n = 13) responded to vignettes typifying the stories of mentees. Each of
the vignettes described the story of an individual with a SCI. The stories each varied in level of resistance or hesitance to participate in parasport expressed by the mentee. Participants said they would respond to the vignettes in ways that were consistent with the mentees’ narrative. For example, they suggested ways in which a mentee who was resistant to parasport could participate in sport with their able-bodied friends rather than individuals with a physical disability. Another finding was that as mentees became more resistant to parasport and peer athlete mentorship, some peer athlete mentors struggled with their response. This difficulty with responding to these individuals suggests peer athlete mentors may need more support and training to assist all mentees with sport participation. However, to do so we first must understand what mentor behaviours exist and subsequently, which of those are associated with parasport participation. Perrier et al. (In Press) was one of the few studies to consider the mentors’ perspective and behaviours. While this study provides initial insight into peer athlete mentorship behaviour research, more investigation is needed to understand the mentorship behaviours that are exhibited within the parasport context.

Together, the studies by Tawse et al. and Perrier et al. present the roles and reactions peer athlete mentors have in the parasport context; however, there are several areas this research has not addressed. Given that the participants in the study by Tawse and colleagues included coaches only and Perrier et al. recruited only mentors with SCI, it is unknown how peer athlete mentors influence parasport participation with congenital disabilities such as cerebral palsy. These studies also do not consider the perspectives of the mentees with regard to their mentors’ behaviours. Doing so may expound behaviours the mentors may not realize they perform or may not interpret as important.

2.4.2 Peer athlete mentorship programs in practice
There are numerous examples of peer mentorship programs in Canada. For instance SCI Ontario matches individuals with a SCI with peer mentors to provide support for a range of topics such as activities of daily living or returning to work or school (SCI Ontario, 2014). Peer mentors and mentees are matched based on several factors such as age and level of injury. This program also offers monthly interactive events designed for education and discussion and peer interaction (SCI Ontario, 2014). Although the focus of many of the peer-based activities and discussions relate to community integration and health, parasport participation is an area peer mentors only occasionally provide insight.

Bridging the Gap, a partner of the Canadian Wheelchair Sports Association (CWSA), provides mentorship to help individuals overcome the barriers associated with parasport participation such as lack of knowledge of parasport resources (Bridging the Gap, 2015). This program includes formal and informal mentorship. Wanberg, Welsh, and Hezlett (2003) describe formal mentorship as that which the mentor-mentee pairing is assigned by an organization, and informal mentorship as a relationship develops naturally. Peer athlete mentors involved with Bridging the Gap provide formal mentorship by meeting with participants one-on-one, and informal mentorship during group events such as “Have-A-Go days”. Have-A-Go days are events held to introduce a variety of parasports to individuals or a group of individuals with a disability. The duration and frequency of these events vary depending on the community (Bridging the Gap, 2015). The focus on parasport in the current study renders the Canadian Wheelchair Sports Association an appropriate research partner to examine the behaviours.

There is a lack of in-depth understanding of what mentorship behaviours exist within these programs. There is also a lack of evidence that the behaviours in the programs lead to increased parasport participation. For the most part, in these programs, peer mentors are selected
based on their level of injury, age, or willingness to volunteer. They do not receive extensive training. In the absence of training peer mentors are given quite a bit of latitude in how they approach mentorship activities. An evaluation is needed to understand what leadership behaviours currently exist in these programs and how the behaviours align with known effective leadership behaviours. The results of such an evaluation could be used to inform peer athlete mentorship training programs.

2.5 Leadership behaviours

The context of organizational leadership is said to parallel sport contexts (Barling, 2014). Thus, the frameworks described in the leadership literature have demonstrated applicability to the context of able-bodied sport (e.g., Charbonneau, Barling & Kelloway, 2001). This applicability likely extends to the parasport context as well (e.g., Perrier et al., In press). Select frameworks relevant to parasport are outlined in this section. Specifically, I review the frameworks most widely studied in organizational leadership research. Moreover, because mentorship involves going beyond teaching skills by taking a special interest in the development of the mentee, I look at leadership frameworks that are considered new-genre leadership models. This term refers to leadership frameworks that emerged post-1980 and emphasize relational, inspirational and ethical leadership (Bryman, 1992). Traditional frameworks are more transactional (i.e., rewards/punishment for a given behaviours) and emphasize the importance of goals, performance feedback, and followers’ behaviours (Bass, 1985). Followers can be thought of as individuals who are affected by a leader’s traits, behaviours and power (Dvir & Shamir, 2003). Accordingly, in a peer athlete mentorship relationship, peer athlete mentors take on a leadership role and mentees act as followers. These frameworks historically are driven to benefit the organization rather than the individual. New-genre leadership frameworks are now receiving most of the
research attention and are more consistent with the definition of mentorship where the leader is the mentor and the follower is the mentee.

2.5.1 Overview of Selected Leadership Frameworks

One leadership framework that is re-emerging in the organizational literature is the authentic leadership framework. Authentic leadership involves taking authentic moral action, and having moral courage (May, Chan, Hodges & Avolio, 2003). Authentic moral action involves reflecting on beliefs an individual holds about a decision, considering and *openly* evaluating the alternatives, deciding on the right thing to do such that the decision benefits the entire group, and acting on that decision. Moral courage refers to doing the right thing when faced with internal or external pressures. Furthermore, the leader’s moral behaviour is sustainable over time, and resilient to adversity. They are also self-aware and open to changes in beliefs. This framework relies on the consistency between the leader’s self-perception and behaviour rather than the interaction with others (i.e., leadership behaviours are consistent with their “true self”; Ladkin & Taylor, 2010). That is, the framework is based on the premise that the leader acts based on his/her moral beliefs rather than the premise of known effective leadership behaviours. With respect to peer athlete mentorship, authentic leadership may not be the most suitable as a guiding framework because the characteristics are subjective in terms of the leader’s moral behaviour. That is, moral action may seem moral to one group but may harm another. High moral behaviour is also a virtue that may not be inherent, and intervening on unethical behaviour may be beyond the scope of peer athlete mentorship training programs.

Servant leadership is another leadership framework that has its roots pre-1980, however its emphasis on ethical behaviour and the leader-follower relationship emerged more recently and this fits the new-genre category. Moreover, it was not until after 1980 that it was subject to
scientific research (Barling, 2014). The premise of this framework is that the leader gives clear job descriptions or roles and helps the follower execute the task (Greenleaf, 1977). There are seven descriptors of a servant leader: power, pride, serving others, empowering and developing others, participatory leadership, courageous leadership, inspiring leadership, and visionary leadership (Wong, 2004). This framework involves a high moral standard of leadership, and reflects the followers’ needs rather than the leader. Servant leadership also fosters follower well-being by nurturing followers. However, Barling (2014) suggests this framework is well suited for contexts that have stability (Barling et al., 2014). Therefore servant leadership may not be optimal for participant recruitment in parasport because the followers in this context are often not established in the parasport setting. This framework also works on the basis that the “servant leader” holds a formal leadership position. Thus, while servant leadership may be suited for a team setting in which a coach may serve the players by participating with them, it is not an optimal framework for peer athlete mentors initiating parasport participation among mentees with a disability because the peer athlete mentor’s role in parasport is the same as the mentee’s.

Charismatic leadership is another prominent leadership approach (Barling, 2014). Charismatic leaders behave in ways that evoke emotional attachment from the follower, follower emotional and motivational arousal, an enhanced vision of a goal articulated by the leader, follower self-esteem, trust, confidence, and values and intrinsic motivation. Two perspectives of charismatic leadership exist. The first involves the distinction between personalized and socialized charismatic leadership. Personalized charismatic leaders are autocratic, exploitive, and act out of self-interest. Socialized charismatic leaders are democratic, empowering, and serve the collective group (Howell, 1988). The other interpretation is the attribution model of charisma wherein the leader scrutinizes an organization, offers a vision that is dramatically different from
the current reality, develops followers’ commitment through their unusual skills, risk-taking, dedication and commitment to goals, and provides instruction on how to reach the goals.

Socialized charismatic leadership is consistent with development of followers beyond teaching the skills of the tasks at hand and holds true to the moral compass of peer mentorship. However, the ambiguity in how charismatic leadership is defined makes it difficult to describe what behaviours are consistent with a charismatic leader. Moreover, charismatic leadership leaves participative thinking and decision making by the follower to be desired (Van Dierendonck, 2011).

Bass and Riggio (2006) outline the full range of leadership model, which includes laissez-faire leadership, transactional, and transformational leadership (TFL). Laissez-faire and transactional leadership reflect traditional leadership behaviours, however they are important to discuss in relation to TFL (a new-genre leadership framework). Laissez-faire involves the avoidance or absence of a leader (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Lewin, Lippitt & White, 1939).

Important decisions, actions and responsibilities are not made, are delayed, or are ignored and the leader avoids getting involved when important issues arise. This leadership style is associated with distress through co-worker conflict, bullying, role conflict and role ambiguity.

Transactional leadership is also on the continuum of the full range leadership model. It involves several management behaviours. One such behaviour is active management by exception, which is monitoring followers to detect deviances, mistakes and errors and taking corrective action as needed. Another transactional behaviour is passive management by exception, which is waiting until mistakes occur and then taking corrective action. A third transactional behaviour is contingent reward, which involves constructive transaction providing rewards in exchange for carrying out the assignment. This method has been found to enhance the
role clarity of athletes (Beauchamp, Bray, Eys & Carron, 2005); however, the transactions of
punishment or reward for compliance with agreed upon tasks to be done by the follower, though
they may generate follower interest, will result in the follower continuing to feel undermined
(Bass & Riggio, 2006; Levinson, 1980). Moreover, transactional leadership highly reflects
formal, hierarchical positions of leadership and the power associated with those positions
(Barling, 2014); however leadership can exist in those who do not hold formal leadership
positions (Northouse, 2004) such as peer athlete mentors.

TFL involves using the 4 Is – inspirational motivation, individualized consideration,
idealized influence and intellectual stimulation – to elicit extraordinary experiences from the
followers, subsequently developing their own leadership potential (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The 4
Is of TFL require that the leader provide more than rewards or punishments for a behaviour;
leaders must behave in ways to which follower wants to relate to and emulate by being
charismatic, leading by example, challenging and providing meaning and understanding.
Idealized influence requires that the leader have extraordinary capabilities, persistence and
determination and is respected and trusted by the followers. Inspirational motivation requires that
the leader express enthusiasm and optimism and expresses clear commitment to a shared vision of
the group. Intellectual stimulation involves the leader elevating their followers by encouraging
them to think for themselves, question assumptions, and participate in problem solving.
Individualized consideration involves caring for, focusing on, and actively listening to the
individuals.

There are numerous ways in which TFL can support the needs for autonomy,
competence, and relatedness. For example, mentors’ intellectual stimulation can support feelings
of autonomy by allowing the mentees to think for themselves, thus allowing them to choose their
level and type of behaviour. Moreover, mentors use of intellectual stimulation can improve the mentees’ feelings of competence by helping them learn how to perform a behaviour by involving them in problem solving and allowing them to performing the behaviour themselves. Additionally, a mentor’s inspirational behaviour may provide the mentee with a sense of competence through the vicarious success of someone with a similar level of ability. Lastly, an mentor’s individualized consideration can help support the mentee’s need for relatedness by, for example, making him/her feel cared for and included in a group of his/her peers.

The TFL framework seems especially applicable for the peer athlete mentorship and parasport context. Accordingly, TFL is the primary leadership framework underpinning this thesis. Overall, the combination of TFL behaviours provides the mentee with a clear understanding that their leader is a mentor. That is, the TFL behaviours the leader exhibits are known to develop the follower in aspects of life other than simply instruction within parasport. Bass and Riggio (2006) further suggest TFL adds to the follower’s sense of self-worth and engages the follower in true commitment and involvement in the task at hand. This aspect of follower development is consistent with the definition of mentorship (Mackenzie, Podzakoff & Rich, 2001).

Not only does the general philosophy of TFL align with peer mentorship in parasport, but also specific Is of TFL align. Individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation seem particularly relevant. Individualized consideration is relevant because of the varying abilities and circumstances of individuals with a disability. This concept is consistent with the finding that individuals with a disability exhibit different resistances to parasport and mentorship (Perrier et al., In Press). Also, intellectual stimulation may be important because mentees may not be aware of parasport possibilities.
Given the apparent relevance of TFL to the parasport context, TFL may also help address barriers of knowledge and autonomous motivation. Peer leadership may be especially important for enhancing followers’ knowledge of parasport because of the experience peer athlete mentors have with disability and their ability to disseminate resources that are available. Moreover, they may be able to enhance their mentees’ autonomous motivation toward parasport. For instance, through knowledge and resource dissemination, peer athlete mentors can help their mentees understand the parasport possibilities. Also, through psychological need satisfaction, mentees autonomous motivation may be further supported. For example, if the peer athlete mentor can help satisfy the mentee’s need for relatedness (e.g., by including them in team outings), the mentee may feel more welcomed by the team and therefore participate voluntarily as opposed to agreeing to an external invitation to participate. Therefore, peer athlete mentors’ leadership behaviours in parasport have great potential to provide knowledge to their mentees and, through psychological need satisfaction, may also help enhance the mentees’ autonomous motivation to participate in parasport.

2.6 Transformational leadership in sport

TFL behaviours have been examined in a variety of contexts. Consistent with the goals of this study, I look specifically at leadership in sport. Within a sport context, two groups often are identified as leaders – coaches and peers. Research examining the behaviours of each of these groups is reviewed here.

*Sport Coaches*

Several of the leadership frameworks described above have been examined in the context of coaching (e.g., transactional leadership and TFL; Rowold, 2006). TFL seems to be especially suitable for this context. For example TFL contributes to effects beyond that of transactional and
charismatic leadership styles for follower outcomes such as extra effort, perceptions of coach effectiveness, and satisfaction with their coach (Rowold, 2006). Moreover, in a longitudinal design study, TFL has exhibited positive effects on athletes’ performance through intrinsic motivation (Charbonneau et al., 2001). A myriad of other positive outcomes have been associated with coach TFL such as group cohesion (Callow, Smith, Hardy, Arthur, and Hardy, 2009), autonomous motivation (Arthur, Woodman, Ong, Hardy, and Ntoumanis, 2011) and affective well-being (Stenling & Tafvelin, 2013). Unfortunately, this line of research has remained quantitative in nature. This singular approach limits the depth of our understanding of how TFL behaviours manifest within the sport context.

Research conducted on parasport indicates numerous coach behaviours that align with the principles of TFL For example, Cregan, Bloom and Reid (2007) found that coaches of elite swimmers with a physical disability involved their athletes in the leading their training programs, similar to the intellectual stimulation component of TFL. The coaches in this study also reported tailoring programs to match their athletes functional capacity and ability levels. This behaviour parallels individualized consideration. Similarly, Tawse et al. (2012) found coaches in wheelchair rugby fostered athlete independence also similar to intellectual stimulation, and they created high expectations, and helped them realize new possibilities, similar to inspirational motivation. This research though qualitative in nature, did not focus specifically on behaviours known to be of benefit to athletes such as TFL. Moreover, although TFL behaviours emerged, the focus on coaches may not provide an optimal example for understanding mentorship behaviours in parasport,, as coaches may not be able to provide individual attention to their athletes.
**Peer leadership in sport**

The leadership behaviours of peers have also been examined in the sport context. The literature provides comparisons of peer leaders to coaches (e.g., Loughead & Hardy, 2004), identifies behaviours and attributes of effective peer leaders (e.g., Glenn & Horn, 1993; Moran & Weiss, 2006) and highlights the occurrence and utility of TFL behaviours among peer leaders in sport (Zacharatos et al., 2000). Based on this literature, it seems that peer leaders in sport demonstrate TFL in numerous ways and these behaviours seem to be associated with positive sport relationships.

For example, Price & Weiss (2011) suggested that personal characteristics such as perceived competence and peer acceptance are key correlates of effective peer leadership behaviours that are similar to TFL behaviours such as idealized influence. In addition to peer leadership behaviours consistent with TFL, they measured perceived soccer competence and intrinsic motivation in a sample of 191 adolescent female soccer players. Peers who were perceived as competent and instrumental (i.e., being confident, consistent and determined) were seen as leaders. These perceived behaviours align with idealized influence in TFL. Furthermore, higher intrinsic motivation was positively associated with those peer leadership behaviours indicating individuals who exhibited more TFL behaviours were also more intrinsically motivated. Together, these findings suggest team members associate leadership behaviors with peers who exhibit TFL behaviours.

This research contributes to the overall peer leadership literature, and attests to TFL’s utility for athlete and leadership development. However, Price & Weiss (2011) deductively examine the extent to which specific behaviours that exist based on previous evidence. They do not allow the ability to discover TFL behaviours specific to the context. Moreover, the literature
does not extend past able-bodied populations to individuals with disabilities, which is the main focus of the current work. Addressing this gap may be especially important to the knowledge of sport leadership for individuals with varying and specific needs. Another overarching limitation of this research is that it mostly considers only one perspective. According to Glenn and Horn (1993), there is inconsistency between coaches’ and players’ perceptions of leadership characteristics.

**Peer leadership in parasport**

To my knowledge, the study by Perrier et al. (In Press), which I describe earlier, is the only investigation into peer leadership in parasport. As Perrier and colleagues demonstrated, peer athlete mentors exhibited some characteristics of TFL behaviours when responding to narrative vignettes describing mentees willingness to become involved in parasport post injury. Specifically, they seemed able to tailor their responses to the mentee for the most part, which is congruent with the concept of individualized consideration in the TFL framework. Given that the mentors were responding to a fixed number of scenarios, the breadth of behaviours exhibited also was limited. Additional research examining peer athlete mentorship within the context of parasport is clearly needed. As such, this study provides a preliminary understanding of how peer athlete mentors encourage parasport participation among individuals with a physical disability.

**2.7 Purpose and objective**

In summary, the low rate of parasport participation among people with a disability requires researchers’ attention. Lack of knowledge and low motivation to participate in parasport are two barriers that often inhibit participation – barriers that peer athlete mentors may be well positioned to address. Indeed, as a preferred source of parasport information and known supporters of followers’ autonomous motivation, peer athlete mentors are an important source of
leadership in the parasport context. Thus the objective of the current study is to understand the leadership behaviours of peer athlete mentors in parasport with an emphasis on TFL. The perspectives of both peer athlete mentors and mentees were considered.
Chapter 3

Methods

3.1 Context

This research exists as part of a community based peer athlete mentorship program. The Canadian Wheelchair Sport Association (CWSA) supports and governs programs in parasport at the national, provincial and regional level. In addition to general sport programming, the CWSA manages wheelchair rugby at all levels including the national level (CWSA, 2015). The CWSA also administers a parasport awareness program for individuals with a disability called “Bridging the Gap”. This program offers mentorship as well as referrals, wheelchair loans, parasport development clinics, and “Have-A-Go days” where individuals can try a variety of parasports in a supportive atmosphere with the equipment and assistance necessary to participate (Bridging the Gap, 2015). Peers play an important role in providing information and motivating individuals to participate in sport.

The Bridging the Gap program has a training manual (Appendix A) for peer athletes that addresses the objectives of being a peer athlete mentor and topics such as personal involvement, safe wheelchair transfer techniques, risk management, and disability differences. Currently, neither the CWSA nor Bridging the Gap offers formal training for their peers; however, peer athlete mentorship remains in effect. Importantly, the elements of the program vary in communities throughout Canada.
3.2 Participants

Participants were individuals with a physical disability who are or have been involved in peer mentorship specifically through the CWSA. To be eligible, mentorship experiences had to centre around parasport. Mentors and mentees were recruited from across Canada excluding Quebec due to language and financial barriers. Administrators from the CWSA identified consenting participants as either a) someone who has influenced others with a physical disability to participate in sport (i.e., peer mentor) or; b) someone who has been influenced by others to participate in sport (i.e., mentee). Participants were excluded if they did not speak English or were not at least 18 years of age. Participants were not recruited from Quebec because of the language barrier and the CWSA does not have the budget to translate. The administrators circulated a recruitment flyer (Appendix B) to peer athlete mentors and mentees they are familiar with, or CWSA staff across Canada via e-mail and followed up with them via telephone.

3.3 Approach

Typically, qualitative research holds a constructivist view, wherein we seek to understand a given phenomena through individual cases (Creswell, 2013). In doing so, the researcher presents themes that reflect the perspectives of participants and advances evidence of different perspectives of those themes (Creswell, 2013). While the current study draws on conclusions of past research that suggest TFL extends to mentorship in sport and parasport (e.g., Perrier et al., In Press), the data collection and analysis aim to advance evidence and further understand the ways in which peer athlete mentors and mentees experience TFL phenomena in parasport. That is to say, although this study deductively seeks TFL behaviours, it inductively examines how the behaviours present in this context and may contribute to the TFL framework.
3.4 Data Collection

The Queen’s University General Research Ethics Board approved all procedures and materials prior to study commencement (Appendix C). All participants received a letter of information and consent form via e-mail (Appendix D) and verbal consent was obtained prior to the interviews. To pilot test the interview guide and ensure that relevant questions were incorporated (Sampson, 2004; Yin, 2009) I, along with my co-author (MJP) conducted a pilot interview with an administrator from the CWSA who also fit the criteria for the study. This pilot allowed me to develop my interview skills and ensure the interview questions are relevant. The pilot interview also resulted in minor changes to the interview guide such as ensuring the language used was consistent with the language used at the CWSA.

Given the geographical challenges associated with recruiting athletes with disabilities, interviews were conducted over the phone. This method provides the best source of information when face-to-face contact is not available (Creswell, 2013). While some may argue that non-verbal cues such as body language and facial expressions are absent in this form of interviewing, other cues including tone and cadence of speech can still be heard (Opdenakker, 2006). Similarly, research by Cachia and Millward (2011) suggest that both face-to-face interviews and telephone interviews generate similar levels of detail. Interviews were 30 to 75 minutes long and semi-structured to encourage depth and to allow new concepts to emerge. Semi-structured interviews permitted inclusion of cues and encouraged elaboration on topics mentioned by participants (Dearnley, 2005).

To gain context, first participants answered questions about their involvement in parasport and peer athlete mentorship. The subsequent questions in the interview guide (Appendix E) were grounded in the TFL framework and adapted from Beauchamp (in prep). A
sample question to explore peer athlete mentors’ behaviours in alignment with idealized influence was “Why do you think your mentee trusts your advice toward sport?” Inspirationally motivation was explored by asking questions such as “How do you show you have high expectations for your mentees?” Peer athlete mentors described their use of intellectual stimulation by responding to questions such as “How have you challenged your mentee to learn about sport?” Finally, a sample question exploring individualized consideration was “How do you consider the needs of your mentee for sport participation?” Participants were then asked to describe an ideal peer athlete mentorship sport program and how peer athlete mentorship can be improved within sport organizations. Mentee interviews consisted of a similar set of questions but were worded in terms of behaviours exhibited by their peer athlete mentors. Detail expansion probes were used to generate depth in the interviews and participants were encouraged to expand or further explain their responses. For instance, when the participant is asked if their mentee trusts their advice for sport, I would ask, “why do you think they trust you?” or “what do you do that makes them trust you?”

3.5 Data Analysis

Analysis began by transcribing each interview verbatim and immersion with the data, which involved listening to the transcripts and expanding field notes. Data were subject to a content analysis (Sparkes & Smith, 2013); in this process, I began coding each transcript line by line using NVivo 10 qualitative analysis software (QRS International, 2014) to find all the behaviours that existed in the transcripts. Content analysis is inductive wherein a researcher avoids using preconceived categories and allows new categories to emerge from the data (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Once all behaviours were coded, I coded them according to the TFL
framework. As mentioned, I used TFL perspectives because of its known associations with athlete well-being. Behaviours that are not considered TFL were given an appropriate term.

3.5.1 Trustworthiness

Participants were recruited until data saturation was reached. Data saturation is the point when no new data is gained from further interviews (Patton, 1990). Saturation was monitored through an ongoing review of field notes from the interviews after every three to four new interviews and by reviewing the audio recordings of the interviews. Saturation was reached at 8 peer mentors and 6 mentees. Nonetheless interviewing continued until the remaining participants, 3 peer athlete mentors and 3 mentees, were interviewed. After all transcripts were coded and organized into common themes, a research assistant versed in TFL and the study objective independently coded each transcript line by line to ensure credibility of the coding scheme as well as to confirm the proposed themes. In this process, the research assistant coded behaviours by labeling them with a term that fit the data and categorizing them into a TFL construct. Once all transcripts were coded, we compared each behaviour and discussed them to agree on an appropriate label for each of them. Any discrepancies between coders were discussed until a consensus was reached. To further ensure credibility, I compared the data with previous literature and theory as a means of triangulation (Creswell, 2013). As a final means of ensuring trustworthiness in data analysis, I routinely presented findings and my interpretations to the co-authors (MB, ALC, MJP) to receive feedback. The co-investigators reviewed and critically questioned the emerging themes that were accompanied by sample quotes from the data. This examination was followed by dialogue leading to a final consensus.
Chapter 4

Results

4.1 Participants

Eleven peer athlete mentors and ten mentees participated (Table 1). As expected, the only significant difference between peer athlete mentors and mentees were age and years post-injury. Peer athlete mentors were more years post-injury than mentees 13.23 (t = 2.92, p = .010). Peer athlete mentors were an average of 12.67 (t = 3.286, p = .005) years older than mentees.

Of those with a SCI, 60.00% of peer athlete mentors and 88.89% of mentees had quadriplegia. These ratios of quadriplegia to paraplegia were higher than the general Canadian population with an SCI (44 % quadriplegia; Noonan et al., 2012) because the CWSA is the governing body of wheelchair rugby at all levels, wherein most athletes have quadriplegia (CWSA, 2014). Therefore, most peer athlete mentors and mentees interviewed had quadriplegia. Other disabilities included Spina Bifida (peer mentor = 9.09%, mentee = 0.00%) and Cerebral Palsy (peer mentors = 0.00%, mentees = 10.00%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic information</th>
<th>Peer athlete mentors</th>
<th>Mentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 11 )</td>
<td>( n = 10 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n) / M (SD)</td>
<td>% (n) / M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (yrs)</td>
<td>43.27 (11.29)</td>
<td>30.00 (5.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81.81% (7)</td>
<td>70.00% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.18% (4)</td>
<td>30.00% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>90.91% (10)</td>
<td>90.00% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>60.00% (6)</td>
<td>77.78% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>40.00% (4)</td>
<td>22.22% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraplegic</td>
<td>40.00% (4)</td>
<td>11.11% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadriplegic</td>
<td>60.00% (6)</td>
<td>88.89% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years post injury</td>
<td>23.8 (11.78)</td>
<td>9.33 (6.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spina Bifida</td>
<td>9.09% (1)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral Palsey</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>10.00% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82.82% (9)</td>
<td>90.00% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9.09% (1)</td>
<td>10.00% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Canadian</td>
<td>9.09% (1)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>36.36% (4)</td>
<td>60.00% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>18.18% (2)</td>
<td>10.00% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>45.45% (5)</td>
<td>30.00% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>45.45% (5)</td>
<td>80.00% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>36.36% (4)</td>
<td>20.00% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common law</td>
<td>18.18% (2)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 TFL Themes

Throughout the interviews peer athlete mentors described the behaviours they engaged in to encourage sport participation among their mentees as well the behaviours they observed from their own mentors when they were previously mentees. This section encompasses both of these accounts. Similarly, mentees spoke of their peer athlete mentors’ past and present behaviours that support their sport participation. The mentees also discussed the ways they have started influencing others.

Overall, five common themes emerged. For the most part, the subthemes that emerged from the mentor interviews were corroborated by mentees. Similarities and differences in the themes that emerged from the mentors’ interviews versus the mentees’ interviews are noted in Tables 2 – 5.

4.2.1 Individualized consideration

Individualized consideration involves paying special attention to the needs of individual followers and ensuring their need for achievement and growth are fulfilled (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Peer athlete mentors spoke about the ways in which they consider the individual needs and characteristics of the mentees. Four subthemes emerged from the mentor interviews: 1) creating an enriching environment, 2) understanding readiness to participate, 3) understanding different personalities, and 4) appropriate peer matching. The latter theme, appropriate peer matching, did not emerge from the mentee interviews. All other mentor themes were corroborated by the mentees.
Table 2. Individualized consideration comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Creating an enriching environment</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Understanding readiness to participate</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Understanding different personalities</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Appropriate peer matching</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✖️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creating an enriching environment for the mentees was a prominent theme. Peer athlete mentors felt factors such as having proper equipment or competition level was important for creating an enriching experience for the participants. It is encouraging to see that peer athlete mentors provided key resources for their mentees including: knowledge of adapted sport availability, transportation and methods of subsidizing cost for programming, and equipment. For example:

So making sure they have the right equipment that they can try, you know making sure we’re not bringing them into some sort overwhelming practice or game situation where they’ll be like ‘holy shit I could never do that’. And then just providing the right type of whether it’s feeding or advice on how to play the game or whatever it might be to make them have a really great first experience. (Mentor 4)

Similarly, peer athlete mentors often mentioned helping their mentee overcome the specific barriers they faced to participate such as transportation, hand-me-down equipment, or education on overcoming the barriers on their own. Additionally, humour emerged as another way mentors tried to enrich the parasport environment. As Mentor 1 put it, “humour works…it breaks down the barriers, it allows people to be themselves”.
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Mentees expressed appreciation for how peer athlete mentors have developed sport to suit varying abilities and preferences of individuals with a disability. For example, mentees commented on the different classifications that can make sport competitive for different ages, levels of injury and the different ways their peer athlete mentors made the an enriching environment:

Like wheelchair rugby for example has a plus 45 rule where if your over 45 you get a half point taken off your classification. That’s when you’re like having an old guy on your team is not a disadvantage; it can even be used as an advantage. (Mentee 3).

Mentees also felt their peer athlete mentors created an enriching environment by provided them individualized support to overcome barriers to participating in and excelling in sport (e.g., lack of knowledge, cost of equipment and transportation).

Peer athlete mentors recognized the right time to “push” the mentee by understanding their readiness to participate. Conversely, peer athlete mentors also said all mentees need is an extra push to get them to try it once. For example:

You don’t have to be pushy but you just need to encourage people on a regular basis because the other thing your dealing with is people that have had or may have had a traumatic injury, and they need to deal with all the other things that come along with that before they’re ready to get involved in sport. (Mentor 1)

Mentees also said their peer athlete mentors weren’t “pushy” when encouraging participation because they understood they might not be ready to participate. They appreciated peer athlete mentors giving them time and having their contact when they were ready to participate. They were happy the peer athlete mentor was able to support them:
In the beginning I didn’t want anything to do with people in wheelchairs. It’s kind of a phase you go through. So like I wasn’t super drawn to him but like looking back and realizing how important it was to meet him and talk to him looking back it’s really big just like knowing that you have that kind of support is always nice. (Mentee 8)

The varying abilities and circumstances of individuals with a disability require the peer athlete mentors to be individually considerate of their needs for relatedness. Peer athlete mentors who were also coaches of a parasport commented on the needs to understand the mentees different personalities when giving feedback or instruction. For instance when Mentor 7 spoke about giving positive feedback she said: “…it depends on the personality; some people need it and some people don’t. So it just really depends if they’re a person to kinda read off how what kinda person they are and go from there.” All peer athlete mentors agreed positive feedback (as opposed to negative feedback) is needed.

Mentees said their comfort in sport was due to the sense of relatedness they had with their peer athlete mentors or other athletes in the sport environment:

I mean I think that the biggest thing was that when I first started out, I didn’t know anybody else on the team and I’m not the kind of person that likes situations where I don’t know anybody. But this person sort of made it accessible for me and I would show up knowing that I had support at least, I wasn’t completely on my own. (Mentee 2)

Therefore, being individually considerate of the mentees’ comfort meant making sure they felt connected to the group. Moreover, mentees felt their peer athlete mentors were patient within parasport, which helped make an enriching environment.

Lastly, mentees also felt their peer athlete mentor understood what they needed with regard to feedback and encouragement:
… and I’m sure if they see [me working hard] that they’ll just keep positively re-enforcing me which is like… that’s the best way to motivate someone. But I’m sure that if I show up in the fall and I’m out of shape, they’re gonna say what the hell have you been doin’ all summer, so it’s next season I expect them to be harder on me which would be cool. (Mentee 8)

This exemplifies a progression in the mentorship relationship, where different individuals require different feedback, and those needs might change over time.

Some peer athlete mentors were administrators involved in appropriately matching mentees with other individuals or groups with similar interests or characteristics. For example, Mentor 4 said:

…we have what we call late entry athletes in wheelchair sports. So someone who might be 30 years old might be newly injured and come to wheelchair basketball but be at the skill level as my 14 and 15 year old, so to throw them into a junior program with a bunch of kids is a bit of a slap in the face. So being able to match their sort of stage in life with their skill stage and then have a program that kinda fits those needs I think is a really big piece.” (Mentor 4)

Peer athlete mentors also mentioned they had the contacts they could call on that could relate to the participants’ circumstances or were better suited to facilitate a mentee’s participation in a different parasport. This phenomenon did not emerge in the mentee interviews because, as mentioned, some of the peer athlete mentors were also administrators who were tasked with matching and introducing mentees to other peer athlete mentors. The mentee interviews did not focus on antecedents to their mentorship, rather, the mentorship itself.

4.2.2 Inspirational motivation
Providing inspirational motivation involves communicating clear expectations, enthusiasm and optimism, helping followers see an attractive future (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Peer athlete mentors were inspirationally motivating in three ways: 1) conveying optimism about the benefits of sport, 2) telling success stories, and 3) being a role model for sport excellence. Compared to peer athlete mentors, the mentees also said their peer athlete mentors motivated conveyed optimism. Mentees did not suggest their mentors told success stories, or that they were role models in the inspirational motivation category, but added that their mentors promoted the enjoyment of health benefits, and said they were active themselves (Table 3).

Table 3. Inspirational motivation comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Conveying optimism</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Telling success stories</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Role model for sports excellence</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Promoting enjoyment of health benefits</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Being active</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing mentees how sport has helped them in their lives was especially important in conveying optimism in the benefits of participating in sport, with the aim of motivating the mentees to participate. Peer athlete mentors often credited their independent lifestyle to being involved in sport when talking to their mentee:

Yah I think it was just a conversation saying everything that I could do for myself like I live by myself at home I travel, I do a lot of things and that person doesn’t do much for himself. He’s dependent. He has less function than me but he has to depend on a lot of
people and he hasn’t done a lot of activities that I have done. So I think just for him to realize that there’s a lot more he can do just kind of motivated him to kinda make it out more often so he can maybe learn a few things. (Mentor 10)

Showing and telling mentees about the daily and social activities with teammates helped give mentees incentive to continue participating. Moreover, the opportunity to travel is often associated with playing adapted sport at a high level and contributes to their independence according to peer athlete mentors.

Similarly, mentees thought peer athlete mentors conveyed optimism by showing them positive opportunities they could look forward to. In doing so, mentees said they were envisioned positive future experiences:

Um I think at the time X just showed me how fun it was. It was important for me to just have fun with sport at the time. I mean at the beginning there was just so many negative emotions that you could relate your injury towards that. It was just important to do something that was fun… (Mentee 4)

Mentees felt they needed a positive environment and said peer athlete mentors were enthusiastic and optimistic in the parasport environment, which made it enjoyable.

The accomplishments the peer athlete mentors have made in sport gave mentees a sense of purpose. Hence, telling success stories from sport experiences was inspirationally motivating according to the peer athlete mentors. For instance, Mentor 11 said, “Team Canada has 4 medals from the Paralympics so I guess that helps too because you’ve shown the new guys that you do have something to strive for in wheelchair sports and it helps them push a little extra”. Moreover, telling mentees about the social outings and friends they have made through sport helps their mentees see potential to be connected to a social network. Peer athlete mentors spoke about their
success as a means of inspiring their mentees; however, mentees seemed to speak about their mentors’ as idols because of their success.

Working hard in parasport was a behaviour peer athlete mentors felt was inspirationally motivating. This act of being a role model was inspiration for the mentees to work hard as well. For example:

I love every minute of it. I love competing. I wish I was a better coach but I think I’m a good motivator because I lead by example and ya know give 110%. Every time your on the floor and they’ll be ok for you I don’t wanna be a straggler I think yah leading by example.

(Mentor 5)

Leading by example with a positive attitude and effort was contagious for the mentees from the peer athlete mentors’ perspective. Telling success stories and acting as a role model did not emerge as a theme in this category for mentees; however similar subthemes emerged for mentees later under the category of idealized influence because mentees seem their peer athlete mentors as moral and competent beings.

Mentees said their peer athlete mentors would promote the health benefits of sport by speaking about the physical and psychological and social outcomes of participating in sport, which inspired them to participate. For instance, peer athlete mentors credited sport as something that helped their independence:

So I think it’s just really rewarding in that perspective for them just to see the enjoyment other people get out of it and the enjoyment they get every day learning every day tricks out of it too, not just learning to have fun at the sport. (Mentee 10)

The peer athlete mentor simply being active was motivating for the mentee because they wanted to emulate that peer athlete mentor:
Yah so my mentor I see him every week at practice, wheelchair rugby practice, but then I also see him out on his hand cycle all the time, but yah I see him out in the community just hanging out, going out for dinner, so yah I see him lots, he’s definitely a good role model. (Mentee 4)

Mentors spoke with modesty about their activity level and health; therefore, the two latter subthemes did not emerge as prominent themes for mentors in this category.

4.2.3 Intellectual stimulation

Leaders who involve their followers in problem solving, questioning assumptions, and seeing old situations in new ways are intellectually stimulating (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Peer athlete mentors used intellectual stimulation in three ways: 1) disseminating resources, 2) encouraging mentees to try, 3) encouraging reducing sedentary time, and 3) letting the mentee solve problems. These mentor themes did not emerge in the mentee interviews, rather the mentees suggested the mentors helped them overcome the stigma associated with parasport (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Disseminating resources</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Letting mentees problem solve</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Encouraging mentees to try</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Overcoming stigma</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Intellectual stimulation comparison

Disseminating disability sport resources for individuals with and without disabilities was a common practice for peer athlete mentors. Several peer mentors said they give presentations
aimed at promoting adapted sport to those with and without a physical disability. In doing so, the peer athlete mentors opened the possibilities of more sport availability with the inclusion of able-bodied individuals:

So I go to schools and I bring like 10 basketball chairs with me and I talk to kids. I teach them about the difference between a regular chairs and ball chairs and lastly they get to jump in the chairs and they get to push around and have fun. And so I go into quite a few schools and spoke to hundreds of kids that’s my job now so it’s easier for me. (Mentor 3)

Promoting adapted sport to schools where individuals with a disability are marginalized in order to teach (and encourage) able-bodied kids to participate in adapted sport was important for increasing opportunity for those with a disability according to the peer athlete mentors. In addition to disseminating knowledge as a disability sport resource, peer athlete mentors also disseminate skills they’ve learned through living with a disability (e.g., wheelchair skills), assist with transportation to sporting events, and assist with finding parasport equipment.

Encouraging mentees to try sport was important for peer athlete mentors to do to help the mentees find the activity they enjoyed and helping them learn their own way. This was important when the mentees had apprehensions about their level of competition. For instance:

…if somebody is involved and somebody gives you bunch of trouble because they’re not playing at a high enough level, I’m going to encourage them to just play period, ya know. Don’t worry about that guy, you’re doin fine, just do it the way that you wanna do it if that’s what you wanna do… (Mentor 1)

Peer athlete mentors encouraged reducing sedentary time by questioning some things the mentees are told in the rehabilitation setting such as using a manual versus a power wheelchair:
You ask anyone that plays rugby and they’ll tell you if you stay in a power chair for the rest of your life your gonna die in that chair. I mean you’re gonna be overweight, you’re gonna be lethargic, it’s just sitting in a manual chair even if you’re wheelin' yourself around the house all day, it’s physical activity it’s a way to get the blood flowin'. So I mean yah that ‘s one of the first things even before I got into a professional mentorship role. (Mentor 7)

Peer athlete mentors said they are liberal with sharing information with their mentees in sporting events; however, some mentioned letting the mentee solve problems. For instance, Mentor 11 said “Just positive motivation, just let them know that try it at first and just don’t tell them they suck right away just let em’ try it out let em’ figure things out.” This behaviour aligns with intellectual stimulation because the mentee is involved in the problem solving process, however is guided by the peer athlete mentor.

Mentees reported their peer athlete mentors helped them see adapted sport in new ways by challenging the stigma often associated with adapted sport as not a “real sport”:

I mean anybody who’s starting wheelchair sports after being involved in lots of other sports is going to look at it in a different way. And in the beginning I looked sort of down on it. People don’t really understand the level that wheelchair sports are being played at and he sort of showed me that level and helped me sort of gain an admiration for what people in wheelchairs are doing for sport in sort of like a downward gaze upon them.

(Mentee 2)

Often people do not realize the skill level or difficulty level of adapted sport. Peer athlete mentors’ fitness level and skill when participating in sport made some mentees change their attitudes about sport. Mentees often mentioned simply gaining a better understanding of the
parasport possibilities by learning from the peer athlete mentors. The peer athlete mentors did not speak about overcoming the stigma associated with parasport, rather this mentee perspective seemed to be a result of other mentor behaviours such as disseminating resources.

4.2.4 Idealized Influence

Idealized influence involves a leader being a role model and being admired, respected, and trusted by their followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Three peer athlete mentor behaviours aligned with the concept of idealized influence: 1) showing commitment, 2) having a positive attitude, and 3) fulfilling duties on the team. Mentees also said their peer athlete mentors in three had a positive attitude and fulfilled duties in their sport; however, mentees did not comment on commitment of their peer athlete mentors. Mentees added that they noticed when their mentors encouraged others to participate.

Table 5. Idealized influence comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Showing commitment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Positive attitude</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Fulfilling duties</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Encouraging others</td>
<td>✖</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer athlete mentors show commitment by following through on what they say they are going to do and showing up to all the practices and games. For instance:

I follow through like if I say I’m gonna do something for somebody I do it so I guess that’s a good piece of it that people know that they can ask me for help and it’s gonna be
there if I can do it, and if I don’t do it I don’t tell people I’m gonna do something that I
know I can’t do so I guess that’s a big piece of it is knowing that I’m gonna follow
through and not just talk the talk but walk the walk too so to speak. (Mentor 4)

Following up with participants as they leave rehabilitation and re-integrate into society was
another way peer athlete mentors mentioned showing commitment. “I think the key is the follow
up piece where you’re just kinda checking in now and then to see how people are doing or where
they’re going and if they need anything and stuff like that” (Mentor 4). Following up with the
mentee can help show the mentee they have the support they need to participate after they leave
the rehabilitation setting. Perhaps, this was not a strong subtheme in the mentee interviews
because mentees were unaware of the circumstances their peer athlete mentors had to overcome
to commit to their role.

Peer athlete mentors also suggested having a *positive attitude toward sport* as something
their mentees wanted to emulate. For example Mentor 4 said, “…and so just having that positive
attitude people are more willing to listen to you, to be around you, to participate to talk to you.”
Thus, being positive may attract mentees to the mentor and help them be comfortable in their
environment. The mentees thought the peer athlete mentors used positive feedback and avoided
punishment. The positive encouragement may be essential to help mentees feel as if obstacles can
be overcome. For instance:

Oh basically just givin’ them good like good pass or good try and not giving them heck
for you know screwin’ up or anything and involving them in plays more ya know passin’
him the ball, just getting them involve ya know and not bein’ negative just keeping
everything positive. – Mentee 9
Peer athlete mentors spoke of the importance of *fulfilling their duties on the team* or in sport. They felt it was their duty to pass on the knowledge and resources to those who need help participating. This behaviour was also evident in some mentees indicating a “pay-it-forward” pattern. For example:

I mean certainly I’ve benefitted myself. So I feel like giving back is really important because it really helped me in my life so I understand how much it can impact someone else’s life. So for me I feel like it’s my… I mean it is part of my job at X but it’s also part of my duty I think. So um it makes me feel good when I’m able to help somebody for sure. (Mentor 5)

Similar to the peer athlete mentors’ accounts of showing commitment, mentees felt their peer athlete mentors *encouraged others* in hopes they would succeed. This aligns with idealized influence because the peer athlete mentor is looking out for the well-being of others. For instance:

so once you get out and talk to these guys that have been through it all before they kinda let you know that you’re not that fragile and you can take a fall. And they encourage you they teach you easier ways than what you might have learned in rehab. (Mentee 10)

Certain actions or attributes of peer athlete mentors such as the help they give to others, or the ways they seem active in the community casts them as a *role model* to the mentees. Similarly, other mentees conceived parasport as a vehicle for increased competence and sought to emulate the peer athlete mentor. For example, Mentee 9 said, “Just that he’s still involved with it he’s helping out a bunch of new athletes he’s always there with us. It’s not always easy, sometimes we’re difficult but. He’s still there…” Mentees recognize that the peer athlete mentors are giving their time to help others with parasport and disability enabling them to achieve a higher potential than they originally thought. As I mentioned earlier, the peer athlete mentors were
modest; therefore, their discussion consisted of what they felt were moral behaviours such as showing commitment, rather than being an extraordinary role model.

### 4.2.5 Negative peer athlete mentor behaviours

Participants mentioned behaviours they avoided, which seem to deviate from TFL behaviours. Although only several participants mentioned actually doing negative behaviours, other participants discussed avoiding these negative behaviours. Peer athlete mentors mentioned being positive toward, and encouraging other sports, and both mentors and mentees talked about having realistic expectations (Table 6).

**Table 6. Negative behaviour comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Negativity toward other sports</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Unrealistic expectations</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer athlete mentors rarely self-reported actually being negative toward other sports; however, when promoting sport to a mentee, one peer athlete mentor used humour in a disparaging way:

I will quote if they ‘wanna play a real man’s sport’. I’ll throw that out at em’ ya know ‘if you don’t wanna play a real man’s sport I guess I could get my track buddy to come talk to ya’. Cause um and that sport it’s like ‘what’s comin’ up? A left turn. Oh wait what’s comin’ up next? Oh another left turn [laughs]’, so I’ll sometimes harass em’ into it. (Mentor 2)
Despite the humorous tone, demeaning another sport could have discouraged the mentee from trying that sport. Although mentees did not discuss this in their interviews, this type of humour should be avoided among peer athlete mentors.

Several participants mentioned having realistic expectations for the mentee’s sport level. This was especially important for Mentee 9 who mentioned receiving promises that he would compete at a high level and then was not allotted that chance:

He was a huge mentor to me, really took me under his wing. He kept pumping my tires, to use a really annoying cliché, but he kept telling me that it was working, that I could get to this level and get to that level and I would keep moving up…So I assumed that this would be a good thing for me and that I’d be moving up but instead I got a complete dressing down which at the time wasn’t the right thing for me. That was difficulty for me, being given all these unrealistic expectations and then having them torn away. (Mentee 9)

The high expectations this athlete had for his parasport career was due to the high praise and promises from his peer athlete mentors. However giving a mentee unrealistic hope may have caused the participant to feel unsatisfied.
Chapter 5
Discussion

The objective of the current study was to understand the leadership behaviours of peer athlete mentors in parasport with a particular emphasis on TFL. To my knowledge, this is the first study to examine the presence of TFL behaviours among peers in this context. Research has examined TFL in the sport setting (e.g., Callow et al., 2009); however, it has not been extended to the context of peer mentorship in parasport. Furthermore, research has focused on sport outcomes (e.g., team cohesion) rather than sport initiation and participation. Study results provide a detailed descriptions of TFL behaviours used by peer athlete mentors in parasport. This study contributes to our theoretical understanding of TFL behaviours and our practical knowledge about peer athlete mentorship among athletes with disabilities.

The four TFL behaviours, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and idealized influence, emerged as being relevant to peer mentorship in a parasport context. This relevance may be reflective of the nature and needs of mentees with a disability. For example, the life circumstances of individuals with a disability are highly variable (e.g., individuals with the same disability have varying levels of physical function). Resistance to sport participation also is common among people with a disability. To address this variability and common element of resistance, mentors and mentees noted the use of individualized consideration to promote sport. Conversely, those ready to embrace sport (i.e., those with low levels of resistance to sport) appropriately received inspirational motivation through sport success.
stories. To address gaps in knowledge prevalent among individuals with a newly acquired injury, Peer athlete mentors used intellectual stimulation to encourage them to see sport in a new way. This approach helped mentees to understand the sporting opportunities available, to become familiar with the demands of competing at a high level, and to accept parasport as a “real sport”. This is a particularly important point, given that as studies have found that people with acquired disabilities often do not consider parasport to be real sport (Perrier et al., 2013; Sparkes & Smith, 2005). Peer athlete mentors’ use of idealized influence behaviours reported by these participants, such as having commitment to sport and a strong work ethic in their sport countered these perceptions. Idealized influence seems to persuade the mentees’ to see sport as a meaningful activity.

There was notable benefit in interviewing both mentors and mentees. Having both perspectives enhanced the richness of the data. While several common themes emerged from the two sets of interviews, some unique themes also emerged for each group. For example, some peer athlete mentors were administrators or coaches working with the CWSA; consequently they frequently commented on appropriate peer matching, whereas mentees did not. Had only mentees been interviewed, this subtheme would have been missed. Having the dual perspectives also provided insight into how particular mentoring activities are perceived differently by mentors versus mentees. For mentors, the use of success stories aligns with the concept of inspirational motivation. They predominantly indicate using these stories as strategy to help mentees see the potential parasport has for future opportunity and success. In turn, mentees account of these stories aligns with the concept of idealized influence. For mentees, success stories positioned their mentors as having extraordinary capabilities to achieve their parasport goals. These findings are consistent with previous leadership studies in sport that demonstrate the differences in
perspectives of leader and follower (e.g., Glenn & Horn, 1993). Future dyadic studies should consider recruiting both leader and follower in order to determine reasons leaders perform the behaviours they do, how the followers perceive the behaviours, and the outcomes that result in the mentees’ parasport experiences.

The TFL behaviours observed in this study have implications with regard to self-determined motivation. Specifically, the TFL behaviours noted have potential to fulfill the innate psychological needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. The need for autonomy is defined as the need for personal causation (DeCharms, 1968). From the outset of the relationship, the mentors’ understanding of the mentees’ readiness to participate and suggesting a variety of different activities that are available has the potential to support the psychological need for autonomy. Competence refers to an individual’s ability to perform a task (Harter, 1978). Similarly, the mentors’ dissemination of the appropriate knowledge of resources to the mentee, and the mentors’ success stories from their own parasport experience may help fulfil the mentees’ need for competence either through their own experience or vicariously. Lastly, relatedness refers to one’s need to feel connected to others (Beaumeister & Leary, 1995). Parasport has been shown to produce this sense of community improving feelings such as belonging, sport affection, need support, and decreased feelings of isolation (Goodwin et al., 2009). The current study echoes these results, adding that introducing mentees into parasport situations with individuals similar in age, ability and level of injury may also be essential to supporting their need for relatedness. For example the mentors’ understanding of the mentees’ capabilities as a result of the mentors’ lived experience with disability seemed to give the mentee motivation to go beyond his/her own expectations. Future research may examine the strength of peer athlete mentor behaviours in relation to the innate psychological needs of mentees. Such research could also have implications
for motivational outcomes of the mentees. Although we were unable to demonstrate these needs were fulfilled due to the research design, TFL has been shown to support these needs in the sport context (e.g., Reinboth & Duda, 2006).

Although behaviours specific to other leadership frameworks were considered in the analysis, they did not emerge as strong themes. This may be due in part to the focus of TFL in the interview guide. Nonetheless, due to the open nature of the interview there was potential for behaviours outside of TFL to emerge. Potentially, the peer athlete mentorship context may have influenced this finding. For instance, other leadership behaviours such as those in transactional leadership are focused on productivity, which may be of more concern to a coach than a fellow player. Moreover, the other behaviours of the other frameworks may overlap with TFL behaviours. For example, inspirational motivation behaviours such as promoting the enjoyment of health benefits could be thought of as authentic leadership in that the mentor encourages participation (and participates themselves) because they believe in the benefits of sport. Thus, TFL behaviours may have overshadowed the other leadership behaviours. Moreover, Rowold (2006) found TFL augmented the transactional behaviours with regard to leader effectiveness. For example, transactional behaviours such as positive feedback may have been construed as intellectually stimulating knowledge dissemination on how to participate in parasport.

This study has important implications for the TFL framework in general. For example, a component of inspirational motivation is that leaders have the ability to communicate high expectations for their followers (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The current study exemplifies that communicating unrealistic goals may be detrimental to the followers’ psychological needs when the goals are eventually not met. This information will allow us to create tools for examining TFL behaviours in relation to positive mentorship and sport outcomes. Hence, effective TFL
behaviours can inform peer athlete mentorship training.

Practically, this study extends our knowledge of TFL into parasport participation. The findings can inform peer athlete mentorship training programs that are currently not evidence-informed. TFL behaviours are known to be associated with many positive outcomes for followers/mentees (e.g., Stenling & Tafvelin, 2013) and interventions focused on teaching TFL skills demonstrate that TFL can be taught (e.g., Beauchamp et al., 2011). Therefore, incorporating TFL behaviours in peer athlete mentor training programs may also improve the efficacy of peer athlete mentorship training programs. Further research is required to test the efficacy of a peer athlete mentor TFL training program.

Mentors and mentees rarely mentioned negative peer athlete mentorship behaviours with regard to parasport. This may be because the participants in the current study are leaders with a disability who take a keen interest in the well-being of their followers (i.e., mentorship). Alternatively, individuals with a disability who understand the hardships that can accompany disability, may contribute to the overwhelming finding of positive behaviours. For instance, peer athlete mentors are inclined to keep the experience positive. The negative behaviours that were mentioned may have important practical implications. In promoting his preferred sport, one peer athlete mentor sarcastically put down another parasport. In doing so, this may have suggested that sport is undesirable among individuals with a disability, thereby thwarting the mentees’ perceived satisfaction of relatedness should he/she had been interesting in that sport. Compromised relational functioning, is comprised of interpersonal sensitivity and low feelings of interpersonal competence (Costa & Bartholomew, 2014). The former refers to undue and excessive awareness and sensitivity to the behaviours and feelings of others (Boyce & Parker, 1989). The latter refers to the capabilities of disclosing personal feelings, compromising, and negotiating to manage
conflicts with others (Buhrmester, Furman, Wittenberg, & Reis 1988). Costa, Ntoumanis and Bartholomew (2014) found need thwarting, which is when needs are undermined as a result of social influence, predicted compromised relational functioning. Ensuring mentors see value in the benefits of all sports they do not regularly participate in may be essential to training new peer athlete mentors. A second negative behaviour mentioned by mentees was the false promise that the mentee would compete at a higher level. The realization that this aspiration may not happen may have thwarted his need for competence. This is also in line with the notion that thwarting the need for competence can compromise functioning in interpersonal relationships (Costa et al., 2014). This behaviour can be avoided by ensuring peer athlete mentors have a good understanding of a peers’ functional ability.

5.1 Strengths

This study has several strengths. First, the qualitative data provides an in depth look at the peer athlete mentors’ behaviours. This preliminary examination of the behaviours of peer athlete mentors in parasport will inform further cross-sectional and experimental studies in this context. For example, creating and validating a peer athlete mentorship measurement tool would enable us to examine the behaviours that are associated with positive outcomes such as motivation. Subsequently, we could use the results to create interventions targeting those behaviours. Secondly, Glenn & Horn (1993) found perceptions of leadership vary between the self, and teammates; thus, interviewing both peer athlete mentors and mentees increases the quality of this study by gaining different perspectives of leadership behaviours. Lastly, the real-world context of the participants’ recollections of their peer athlete mentorship experiences reduces bias derived from manipulations of the materials and setting of the study as in experimental research.
5.2 Limitations

This study does have limitations warranting discussion. Sport participation data, such as frequency and duration, were not collected, limiting the ability to assess the participants’ sport involvement. Moreover, the CWSA, a partner in this project, has strong involvement in wheelchair rugby, which resulted in a participant sample with a high ratio of individuals with a SCI versus other disabilities. Further research may benefit from partnering with specific parasport organizations that may attract more individuals with other disabilities. Furthermore, the interviews were not conducted in dyads. That is, mentor-mentee pairs were not recruited. Therefore behaviours of the mentors cannot be matched to specific mentees limiting the ability to verify the mentor behaviours. Future studies might consider recruiting peer athlete mentor-mentee dyads. Despite the apparent fit of SDT to this context, we did not consider other theoretical frameworks, which might provide additional information about motivational constructs affected by leadership behaviours.

5.3 Biases

Several biases also warrant discussion. For example, the results favouring TFL may be due to the interview guide’s directed content. This influence may have affected the responses of the participants. Furthermore, my previous experience participating in parasport may have affected my line of questioning. Therefore, I may have had pre-conceived assumptions about the questions. Also, because I do not have a disability I may not experience some of the barriers that those with a disability experience. These factors may affect the way individuals experience leadership behaviours. Therefore I continued the line of questioning despite the expectation of a specific response. This process is known as bracketing (LaVasseur, 2003). Alternatively, my
knowledge of parasport and experiences in adapted physical activity may have allowed me to ask relevant questions in order to keep the participant engaged in the conversation.

5.4 Future Directions

Future research should aim to develop best practice peer athlete mentorship training programs. This research will include determining which manifestations of TFL behaviours in this context are the most effective with regard to parasport motivation. Determining the associations between the behaviours and important outcomes such as motivation requires the creation and validation of a measurement tool of TFL behaviours. The most efficacious techniques can then be tested in interventions that simultaneously train peer athlete mentors on evidence-based practice in peer athlete mentorship in parasport. For example, Beauchamp, Barling and Morton (2011) conducted a randomized control trial in which an intervention significantly increased teachers’ student-rated TFL and increased student self-determined motivation. The intervention consisted of a 1-day TFL training wherein teachers learned about the theoretical background of TFL and how to use of TFL within the gym. Teachers also had the opportunity discuss their own experience and consider how they would apply TFL principles. The teachers were also provided with a series of readings two months after the workshop to reinforce what they learned in the workshop. The success of this intervention in the education setting with regard to self-determined motivation, suggests it may be an appropriate model for TFL interventions in the parasport setting.

5.5 Conclusions

In summary, the current study contributes to the theoretical understanding of how TFL is used in peer athlete mentorship for parasport and potential important connections with motivational antecedents. The use of these behaviours in future experimental workshops may
develop TFL behaviours of more peer athlete mentors, thereby improving mentees’ motivation and participation in parasport.
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Appendix A

Bridging the Gap Training Manual
BTG PEER ATHLETE TRAINING

BTG Program Information

- Program Philosophy
  - Removal of barriers (ie. Transportation, Financial)
  - Participation at the level appropriate to the individual
  - Value of physical activity

- Program Structure & Elements
- Opportunities
- Wheelchair Loan Program (should be explained at every HAG, and peers should understand the program)
- Value of role model with a similar disability
- Value of multiple sport experiences – try a number of sports, cross train
- Understanding that individuals do not necessarily have a sport background

Roles & Responsibilities

- Clearly defined ‘job description’
- Describe the roles of responsibilities of other BTG program staff and volunteers

Using the Proper Terminology

- Never use derogatory terminology even in describing yourself

Words With Dignity

When speaking about or to people, consider the following inclusive language practices. Words that exclude some people are unfair and are usually inaccurate. When producing or approving print materials, interacting with colleagues, staff or students, or speaking to community members and participants.

Consider the following word choices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTEAD OF</th>
<th>USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled, handicapped</td>
<td>Person with a disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled, Crippled by, afflicted with, suffering from,</td>
<td>Person who has . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of, deformed, Lame</td>
<td>Person with . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined, bound, restricted to or dependent on a wheelchair</td>
<td>Person who is mobility impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and dumb, deaf mute, hard of hearing</td>
<td>Person who is deaf, hearing impaired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retarded, mentally retarded: Person with a developmental disability
Spastic: Person with Cerebral Palsy
Physically challenged: Person with a physical disability
Mental patient, mentally ill: Person with a mental illness
Mental, insane: Person who has schizophrenia,
Learning disabled, difficulty learning: Person with a learning disability
Visually impaired, blind: Person who are visually impaired

If in doubt, ask. Most people with a disability will be more than willing to help you.
Source: Active Living Alliance For Canadians with a Disability (see Appendix B)

Boundaries personal/professional

Recruitment responsibilities
- Individual follow-up
- Supporting participation

Understanding the Power of being a Role Model
- The power of your words, actions, etc. on others
- Responsibility

Disability awareness
- Individual Differences
- Appropriateness of individuals to BTG programs
  - Physical vs. Cognitive Disabilities
  - Level of participation – ie. Gym Rats
  - Level of functional ability

Inclusion Discussion
- Reverse Integration

Public Speaking Training
- What to focus on in presentations
- Information about the athletes themselves
- Full continuum of participation in their sport that is available
- Practice Presentations

Training Sessions the morning of a HAG for Peers, Volunteers, Etc.
• Transfers
• Awareness
• Sensitivity

Empathy Training, etc.

• BCPA Peer Training Example
• Philosophy of repeated contact/support – ie. takes 5 ‘Connections’ with someone before they come out to the program – ie. email/phone call/flyer/phone call/follow-up
• Time frame – some people take a long time to get involved (ie. years). Or, they sit on the side lines for weeks. Peek in the door, sit on the side, eventually participate.
  • Therefore, never give up on someone (but be respectful)

Risk Management Procedures

Peers should be aware of Risk Management Policie
Appendix B

Recruitment Flyers
We want to know what you think about peer athlete mentorship!

A team of adapted sport researchers from the School of Kinesiology at Queen’s University, UBC and the Department of Kinesiology at McMaster University would like to get your impressions on your experiences with sport mentorship in sport participation.

The study involves one one-on-one telephone interview session with the student investigator:

- The interview will last approximately 60 minutes. You will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire and tell us your experience providing peer mentorship in adapted sport physical disability peer support for sport.
  To thank you for your participation, you will be given a $25 gift certificate for Starbucks.

We would like to speak with athletes who have mentored other athletes with physical disabilities in adapted sport. You must be able to understand and speak English and your mentorship must have involved sport.

If you are interested or would like more information, please contact the student investigator (Bryce Donald, M.Sc. Candidate) at 63bd@queensu.ca or 613-533-6000 ext. 79283.
We want to know what you think about influential peer athletes and sport!

A team of adapted sport researchers from the School of Kinesiology at Queen's University, UBC and the Department of Kinesiology at McMaster University would like to get your impressions on your experiences with sport and an influential peer athlete.

The study involves one one-on-one telephone interview session with the student investigator:

- The interview will last approximately 60 minutes. You will be asked to complete a demographic questionnaire and tell us your experiences with an influential peer athlete and in adapted sport.
  To thank you for your participation, you will be given a $25 gift certificate for Starbucks.

We are looking to speak to men and women with a physical disability who have been influenced by an athlete with a physical disability in adapted sport. You must be able to understand and speak English and you must have been influenced in sport by a peer athlete with a physical disability.

If you are interested or would like more information, please contact the student investigator (Bryce Donald, M.Sc. Candidate) at 63bd@queensu.ca or 613-533-6000 ext. 79283.
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Ethics Approval
January 31, 2014

Mr. Bryce Donald
Master’s Student
School of Kinesiology and Health Studies
Queen’s University
28 Division Street
Kingston, ON, K7L 3N9

GREB Ref #: GPHE-163-14; Romeo # 6011771
Title: "GPHE-163-14 Understanding the Use of Transformational Leadership Behaviours to Promote Leisure Time Physical Activity Among Spinal Cord Injury Peer Mentors"

Dear Mr. Donald:

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled "GPHE-163-14 Understanding the Use of Transformational Leadership Behaviours to Promote Leisure Time Physical Activity Among Spinal Cord Injury Peer Mentors" for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCP5) and Queen’s ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article D.1.6) and Senate Terms of Reference (article G), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GREB will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB, with a copy to your unit REB, of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Adverse Event Report). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services or irvingg@queensu.ca for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair, General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. Amy Latimer-Cheung, Faculty Supervisor
   Dr. Kathleen Martin Ginas, Dr. Marie-Josée Perrier, and Dr. Mark Besuchamp, Co-investigators
   Dr. Brendon Gurd, Chair, Unit REB
Appendix D

Letter of Information and Consent
LETTER OF INFORMATION

Understanding the use of transformational leadership behaviours to promote adapted sport among peer athlete mentors with a physical disability

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
You are being invited to participate in a study being conducted by Bryce Donald, M.Sc. candidate and Dr. Amy Latimer-Cheung from Queen’s University, Dr. Mark Beauchamp from the University of British Columbia, and Dr. Kathleen Martin Gimis and Dr. Marie-Josée Perrier from McMaster University. This study will explore how peer athlete mentors use leadership to promote adapted sport within peer mentorship programs for people with physical disability. This study has been reviewed for ethical compliance by the Queen’s University General Research Ethics Board.

DETAILS OF THE STUDY:
1. Description of the study:
We would like to take the time to talk with you in detail about your experience with peer athlete mentorship as it relates to adapted sport). This involves a 45-60 minute telephone interview to gather information about how peer athlete mentors are encouraging their mentees to engage in sport. This will help us understand how peer athlete mentors motivate people with a physical disability to perform sport and will help us better train peer athletes for this role. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen’s policies
2. **Benefits of participating in the program/study:**
This will be the first study that explores leadership in the context of peer athlete mentorship and sport among adults with a physical disability. You will have the opportunity to share knowledge and challenges associated with providing or receiving peer mentorship for sport and to have input regarding improving peer mentorship programs for this context.

3. **Risk of participating in the study:**
The risks of participating in the study are low. You may become upset when remembering the early days of your injury or other associated memories. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering, and you do not have to give the reason why you chose to not answer a particular question. You can continue being in the study if you do not answer all the questions, and you can leave the study at any time without penalty. The student investigator will answer any questions you may have (either during the interview, or by email or phone) and you can take a break during the interview session if you need to.

4. **Inclusions:**
To be eligible to participate in the study, you must be able to speak English; have a physical disability; be a peer athlete mentor with a physical disability; be over the age of 18; have been involved in peer mentorship for adapted sport and be able to provide us with your consent.

5. **Compensation:**
You will receive one $25 gift card from your choice of Tim Horton’s or Starbucks.

6. **Confidentiality**
The information obtained during the course of this study is strictly confidential. The interviews will be digitally audiotaped. The files will be stored on a password-protected computer in Dr. Amy Latimer-Cheung’s secure lab. The interviews will be transcribed verbatim and kept separately from the audio-recordings. You will be identified only by a made up name (pseudonym) of your choice in the transcripts. Any quotation used in publications will contain this pseudonym and no identifiable information. After five years, the data will be destroyed.
7. Freedom to withdraw or participate:

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to skip any questions in the interview; to do so, please state that you do not wish to answer. You will have the opportunity to review the transcript of your interview. If you decide to take part you may leave the study any time before June 2014. To withdraw please contact me (Bryce Donald) by telephone or email to inform me of your decision. Your withdrawal from the study will not affect your future relationship with Queen’s University or the investigators. If you have further questions about the study, problems or concerns you can contact:

Bryce Donald at 613-533-6000 ext. 74699 or 63bd@queensu.ca
Masters Candidate
Queen’s University
School of Kinesiology and Health Studies

Dr. Amy Latimer-Cheung at 613-533-6000 ext. 78773 or amy.latimer@queensu.ca
Associate Professor
Queen’s University
School of Kinesiology and Health Studies

Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081.
RECORD OF CONSENT

To be read to the participant over the phone prior to the interview taking place (participants will also be sent a hard copy of this letter and consent form prior to the interview):

You have been given information about the study Understanding the use of transformational leadership behaviours to adapted sport among peer athlete mentors with a physical disability by Bryce Donald and Dr. Amy Latimer from Queen’s University, Dr. Mark Beauchamp of UBC and Drs. Kathleen Martin Ginis and Dr. Marie-Josée Perrier of McMaster University. By verbally consenting, you agree that you have read the letter of information and any questions you have about the study have been answered sufficiently. Verbal consent also indicates that you understand what participating in this study entails, that you understand the appropriate contacts involved in the study, and that you understand the confidentiality measures taken by the investigators. If you agree to participate in this study, you may withdraw from the study at any time. The information that you provide here will not be used in any other capacity except this study. Participation in the study is voluntary.

Do you consent to participate in this study? Yes / No (An oral agreement to participate denotes consent). Do you agree to audio recording of the interview? Yes / No

Name of Participant ______________________________
Date: __________________________
Mailing address: (will only be used to mail your gift card)

________________________________________________________________________________________ (Street #, name, apt #)

________________________________________________________________________________________ (City, Province)

________________________________________________________________________________________ (Postal code)

Signature of Interviewer: ___________________________ Date: ____________
LETTER OF INFORMATION

Understanding how influential peer athletes promote adapted sport to individuals with a physical disability

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
You are being invited to participate in a study being conducted by Bryce Donald, M.Sc. candidate and Dr. Amy Latimer-Cheung from Queen’s University, Dr. Mark Beauchamp from the University of British Columbia, and Dr. Kathleen Martin Ginis and Dr. Marie-Josée Perrier from McMaster University. This study will look at how peer athletes influence and provide support to their peers with a physical disability in adapted sport. This study has been reviewed for ethical compliance by the Queen’s University General Research Ethics Board.

DETAILS OF THE STUDY:
1. Description of the study:
We would like to take the time to talk with you in detail about your experience with an influential peer athlete in adapted sport. This involves a 45-60 minute telephone interview to gather information about how influential athletes are encouraging their peers with a physical disability to engage in sport. This will help us understand how peer athletes encourage individuals with a physical disability to perform sport and will help us increase future adapted sport participation in the future. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen’s policies

2. Benefits of participating in the program/study:
This will be the first study that explores the influence of peer athletes and adapted sport among adults with a physical disability. You will have the opportunity to share knowledge and challenges associated with peer athlete promotion of adapted sport and to have input regarding improving peer athlete relationships for this context.

3. **Risk of participating in the study:**
The risks of participating in the study are low. You may become upset when remembering difficulties of your physical disability or other associated memories. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering, and you do not have to give the reason why you chose to not answer a particular question. You can continue being in the study if you do not answer all the questions, and you can leave the study at any time without penalty. The student investigator will answer any questions you may have (either during the interview, or by email or phone) and you can take a break during the interview session if you need to.

4. **Inclusions:**
To be eligible to participate in the study, you must be able to speak English, have a physical disability, have been influenced by a peer athlete with a physical disability to engage in adapted sport, be over the age of 18 and be able to provide us with your consent.

5. **Compensation:**
You will receive one $25 gift card from your choice of Tim Horton’s or Starbucks.

6. **Confidentiality**
The information obtained during the course of this study is strictly confidential. The interviews will be digitally audio recorded. The files will be stored on a password-protected computer in Dr. Amy Latimer-Cheung’s secure lab. The interviews will be transcribed verbatim and kept separately from the audio-recordings. You will be identified only by a made up name (pseudonym) of your choice in the transcripts. Any quotation used in publications will contain this pseudonym and no identifiable information. After five years, the data will be destroyed.

7. **Freedom to withdraw or participate:**
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Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to skip any questions in the interview; to do so, please state that you do not wish to answer. You will have the opportunity to review the transcript of your interview. If you decide to take part you may leave the study any time before June 2014. To withdraw please contact me (Bryce Donald) by telephone or email to inform me of your decision. Your withdrawal from the study will not affect your future relationship with Queen’s University or the investigators. If you have further questions about the study, problems or concerns you can contact:

Bryce Donald at 613-533-6000 ext. 74699 or 63bd@queensu.ca
Masters Candidate
Queen’s University
School of Kinesiology and Health Studies

Dr. Amy Latimer-Cheung at 613-533-6000 ext. 78773 or amy.latimer@queensu.ca
Associate Professor
Queen’s University
School of Kinesiology and Health Studies

Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081.
RECORD OF CONSENT

To be read to the participant over the phone prior to the interview taking place (participants will also be sent a hard copy of this letter and consent form prior to the interview):

You have been given information about the study Understanding how influential peer athletes promote adapted sport to individuals with a physical disability by Bryce Donald and Dr. Amy Latimer from Queen’s University, Dr. Mark Beauchamp of UBC and Drs. Kathleen Martin Ginis and Dr. Marie-Josée Perrier of McMaster University. By verbally consenting, you agree that you have read the letter of information and any questions you have about the study have been answered sufficiently. Verbal consent also indicates that you understand what participating in this study entails, that you understand the appropriate contacts involved in the study, and that you understand the confidentiality measures taken by the investigators. If you agree to participate in this study, you may withdraw from the study at any time. The information that you provide here will not be used in any other capacity except this study. Participation in the study is voluntary.

Do you consent to participate in this study? Yes / No (An oral agreement to participate denotes consent). Do you agree to audio recording of the interview? Yes / No

Name of Participant __________________________________________
Date: ________________
Mailing address: (will only be used to mail your gift card)

______________________________________________ (Street #, name, apt #)
______________________________________________ (City, Province)
______________________________________________ (Postal code)

Signature of Interviewer: ___________________________ Date: ____________
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Interview Guide
Interview Guide – Peer Athlete Mentors

The following questions represent an overarching agenda for interviews with peer athlete mentors. The questions will be pursued flexibly and may be altered and added to over time as different themes and patterns emerge in the data.

Pre-amble to questions about peer-mentorship: “Peer mentors are individuals who have faced a particular experience and can provide support, guidance, and understanding to help another person through a comparable experience. Peer mentorship can be provided through both formal programs and also informally. Some organizations refer to peer mentorship by other names such as ‘peer support’ or ‘peer match’. In a moment I’ll ask you some questions about your experiences providing peer support for sport. For the purpose of this interview, we are going to call it “peer athlete mentorship”.

Personal background and context in which physical disability mentorship is taking place:

Tell me about yourself and your background with peer athlete mentorship?
   Probe: How long have you been providing mentorship?
   Probe: How many peers have you mentored during this period?

Tell me about your experiences with your mentee(s)? What does this mentorship involve?

To what extent do you enjoy peer mentorship?

What do you consider to be the benefits of peer athlete mentorship?
   - Probe: for yourself
   - Probe: for your mentees
Can you tell me what you like most about peer athlete mentorship?

Can you tell me what you dislike most about peer mentorship?

To what extent is peer mentorship important to you?

To what extent is sport important to you?

**Questions about the SCI mentor:**

How do you see your role as a peer athlete mentor when it comes to sport?
   - Probe: role model
   - Probe: information provider
   - Probe: something else?

Are you currently providing mentorship for sport?

How much time do you spend with your mentee(s) and what sort of activities do you do?

**Questions about sport:**

What is your past experience with sport?
   - Probe: before or after injury

What do you find challenging about being participating in sport?

What do you think your mentees find difficult about participating in sport?

Could you describe what you do in your mentorship role and how you mentor adults with SCI to participate in sport?***
   - Probe: what ways do you mentor your mentees for sport?
Probe: Can you give an example of a time when you mentored someone for sport?

Probe: what kind of support do you provide?

Probe: companionship, social support, informational etc.

Probe: can you give an example of this support/behaviour?

How does this way of mentoring affect/influence your mentees’ sport?

Probe: Sport, exercise, recreation?

Probe: Theoretical constructs like attitudes, self-efficacy, intentions etc.

Questions about Mentor’s promotion of Sport

If you received peer athlete mentorship from someone else, how did that person encourage you to participate in sport?

If money and resources were no object, how would you design a sport program?

Probe: barriers, resources, equipment, facilities, inclusion.

Individualized Consideration

To what extent do you let your mentee (or mentees) know that his or her health is important to you?

Inspirational Motivation

To what extent do you think you influence your mentees to perform sport?

Probe: Can you explain how?

How do you show that you have high expectations to your followers?
In your role as a peer athlete mentor, to what extent do you think it’s important to display enthusiasm and encourage your mentee(s) participate in sport?

   Probe: how do you go about doing this?

**Intellectual Stimulation**

How have you responded when your mentee has asked you for help to participate in sport?

   Probe: if they expressed interest in other activities?

To what extent do you think it’s important to get your mentee(s) to see various methods of sport in new ways?

   Probe: how do you go about doing this?

**Idealized Influence**

To what extent do you see yourself as a role model with your mentee for sport?

To what extent do you think your mentee trusts your advice for sport?

**Demographic Questionnaire**

Birth Date: ________________  Sex: [M]  [F]

Type of disability: _______________

Date of onset: ________________

If SCI, Level: ________________

Complete or incomplete SCI? ________________

Which of the following describes your ethnicity?
White  Native Canadian  Black  Asian  Other: __________

What is the highest level of education you have completed?
High school  College  University  Post Graduate  Other: __________

What is your marital status?
Single  Common Law  Married  Divorced  Widowed