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Abstract

Youth sport coaches shape the developmental sporting experience for their athletes (Camiré, Trudel, & Forneris, 2014). Specifically, coaches who form individualized, supportive relationships with their athletes can increase the development of personal and social skills (Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2005). In light of the value of these relationships, increasing evidence is prompting the application of leadership theories, such as Transformational Leadership (TFL), in youth sport (Vella et al., 2013). The aim of this study was to explore coach perceptions related to how and why leadership behaviours are applied in the youth sport context. Eleven coaches ($M_{age} = 42.3$, $SD = 15.2$) were recruited from competitive youth soccer and volleyball clubs (athletes’ $M_{age} = 15.8$, $SD = 1.9$) in Eastern Ontario and participated in a stimulated recall interview. During the interviews, coaches reflected upon their own coaching behaviours and provided insight into the application of leadership behaviours in youth sport. Responses were prompted by relevant video sequences from recorded practice and game sessions. Findings of the study revealed that; i) coach leadership behaviours are observable within the youth sport setting, ii) the application of leadership behaviours vary across sport contexts and settings, and iii) contrasting leadership styles (e.g., transformational vs transactional) are associated with distinctive coach objectives (e.g., promoting confidence vs. establishing respect). These findings identify gaps within coach education, and provide theoretical insight for applying leadership theories, and more specifically TFL, to improve the sport experiences of young athletes.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In Canada, 75% of youth (ages 5-17) participate in organized sport (Government Canada, 2013). Sport provides a unique opportunity to improve children’s physical health, teach motor skills, and promote positive personal development (Janssen et al., 2005; Mora, Cook, Buring, Ridker, & Lee, 2007; Turnnidge, Evans, Vierimaa, Allan, & Côté, 2016). In regards to personal development, sport promotes increased social skills and educational performance (Taylor, Davies, Wells, Gilbertson, & Tayleur, 2015), as well as the development of positive behaviours such as increased community volunteering (Harvey, Levesque, & Donnelly, 2007), and reduced rates of committing or re-committing crime (Veliz & Shakib, 2012). Given the potential that sport has to positively influence youth development, there is a need for more research that focuses on how sport can be optimally designed to foster youth’s acquisition of developmental outcomes.

1.1 Sport for youth development

One salient theoretical approach which has been used to examine youth’s development within the sport context is Positive Youth Development (PYD; Holt, 2016; Lerner, Almerigi, Theokas, & Lerner, 2005). As a strength-based approach, PYD suggests that all youth are capable of positive, successful, and healthy development (Lerner et al., 2005). Accordingly, several studies suggest that sport participation can be an effective vehicle for promoting PYD among its participants (e.g., Barber, Eccles, & Stone, 2001; Eccles, Barber, Stone, & Hunt, 2003; Richman & Schaffer, 2000). Although it was originally designed in developmental psychology, youth sport researchers have adopted a PYD approach to measuring outcomes among youth sport
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participants (e.g., Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005; Gould, Chung, Smith, & White, 2006; Jones, Dunn, Holt, Sullivan, & Bloom, 2011). Recently, sport researchers have proposed that the 4 C’s within PYD, (i.e., Competence, Confidence, Connection, and Character; Vierimaa, Erickson, Côté, & Gilbert, 2012) encompass the numerous positive outcomes associated with sport participation (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Vella, Oades, & Crowe, 2011).

Given the mounting evidence supporting the developmental benefits of youth participating in sport, it is important to consider the specific processes that contribute to development of outcomes such as the 4 C’s (Petipas, Cornelius, & Van Raalte, 2008). Côté and colleagues recently presented the Personal Assets Framework (PAF; Côté, Turnnidge, & Vierimaa, 2016; Côté, Evans, & Turnnidge, 2014), which conceptualizes the processes and characteristics of the athletic environment, which have the potential to influence PYD (i.e., the 4 C’s). The three dynamic elements that shape the immediate and long-term sport experience are: *Appropriate Settings* (where), *Personal Engagement in Activities* (what), and *Quality Relationships* (who). Although these elements consistently interact to shape youth sport experiences, the authors identify *Quality Relationships* as an important area for future research given the importance of social interactions within youth sport.

1.2 Quality relationships in sport

The close personal relationships and social experiences that occur within sport teams and clubs provide young sport participants with opportunities to acquire and develop social skills and positive beliefs (Bruner, Hall, & Côté, 2011). For example, youth sport participants establish a number of relationships with important social actors such as peers (teammates), parents, siblings, and coaches (Côté, 1999; Côté & Fraser-Thomas, 2016). Positive peer relationships in youth sport have been linked to outcomes such as increased physical competence, displaying moral
behavior, and positive affective outcomes (d’Arripe-Longueville, Gernigon, Huet, Winnykamen, & Cadopi, 2002; Smith 2003). Similarly, family members (i.e., parents and siblings) have the potential to influence outcomes such as increased participation in sport (Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2008) and a stronger work ethic (Côté, 1999). While parents, peers, and siblings influence the youth sport experience at different stages of sport involvement, it is evident that coaches play a uniquely vital role in shaping the sport environment from childhood through to adolescent sport.

1.3 Influential Role of Coaches

Previous studies consistently demonstrate the significant influence coaches have on the quality of youth sport experiences, and ultimately, on youth’s developmental outcomes (e.g., Erickson & Côté, 2015, Jowett and Cockerill, 2003). Particularly, evidence suggests that coaches who form individualized, supportive relationships with their athletes can enhance the development of social skills and personal assets, such as teamwork and confidence (Conroy & Coatsworth, 2006; Evans, McGuckin, Gainforth, Bruner, & Côté, 2015; Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005). Similarly, coach-athlete relationship quality has been associated with several significant outcomes for both coaches and athletes, ranging from coaches’ subjective wellbeing (Lafrenière, Jowett, Vallerand, Donahue & Lorimer, 2008), to athletes’ intrinsic motivation (Adie & Jowett, 2010), improved performance (Philippe & Seiler, 2006), and satisfaction with training and performance (Jowett & Nezlek, 2011). Taken together, there is ample evidence to suggest that coaches are an integral cog in the process of athletic development.

Over the past four decades, a key focus of the coaching literature has centered around understanding how coaches’ behaviours influence athlete development (Becker, 2013). Coaching behaviours can shape athletic experiences through a variety of actions such as; communicating
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technical information, structuring athletes’ practice sessions, building trust and respect, and influencing athlete development (Evans et al., 2015). While previous research has provided significant insight regarding the types of behaviours coaches exhibit in the sport environment (e.g., Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977) and the influence of such behaviours on athletes’ developmental outcomes (e.g., Coatsworth & Conroy, 2007), studies examining the underlying processes associated with coach behaviours (e.g., how and why behaviours are applied) are limited (e.g., Buckham, 2013; Erickson, Côté, Hollenstein, & Deakin 2011). Therefore, the current study sought to gather youth sport coaches’ perceptions of coaching behaviours through a reflective interview process wherein coaches viewed and discussed their own specific behaviours (Stimulated recall; Lyle, 2003).
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Coach Leadership Behaviours

Several researchers have attempted to analyze and conceptualize the coaching process in order to identify effective coaching behaviours. The following section outlines three predominant lines of research, which have examined the influence of coaches’ leadership behaviours on athlete outcomes. More specifically, this section will review (a) Chelladurai’s Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML; Chelladurai, 2007) which conceptualizes coach behaviour in relation to athlete expectations and preferences, (b) Smith, Smoll, and colleagues’ research related to identifying supportive coaching behaviours, ultimately resulting in the examination of mastery-oriented coaching climates (Smith & Smoll, 2006), and (c) Mageau and Vallerand’s research investigating the role of autonomy-supportive coaching behaviours on athletes’ psychological needs (e.g., Mageau, Vallerand, & Charest, 2009). In assessing the strengths and limitations of these different approaches, Transformational Leadership theory will be introduced as a potentially valuable framework for examining coaches’ leadership behaviours in sport.

2.1.1 Multidimensional Model of Leadership.

Chelladurai’s Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML; Chelladurai, 1990) provides a broad conceptualization of coaching behaviours which aim to increase both performance and satisfaction through meeting the needs and expectations of athletes. Specifically, Chelladurai (1990) suggests that leaders can facilitate performance and satisfaction among their followers when actual leader behaviours are congruent with (a) followers’ preferred behaviours and (b) the behaviour that is required for a given situation. Moreover, Chelladurai stipulates that behaviours will occur in relation to individual situations and can be influenced by
antecedents such as leader or member characteristics. Central to this model of coaching leadership behaviours is the leader’s ability to ‘fit’ behaviours and leadership style to situations, players, and teams.

Chelladurai’s model has been empirically examined in the sport domain. Over the years, several studies have employed questionnaires, such as the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) to examine links between coaches’ behaviours and athlete outcomes (e.g., Westre & Weiss, 1991). For instance, Amorose and Horn (2000) confirm the main assumptions of the MML that athletes’ satisfaction and other positive outcomes in sport are associated with specific coaching behaviors such as instruction, positive feedback, and social support. Further supporting the MML, Martin and colleagues (1999) revealed that youth athletes prefer coaches to establish close personal relationships with regards to leadership style preference. Although the MML provides a broad conceptualization of coach behaviours contributing to our understanding of the dynamic nature of the coaching process, it also has limitations. For instance, concerns have been raised regarding its applicability within the youth sport context, the predominant use of self-report questionnaires, and the comprehensiveness of the leadership behaviours within the model.

2.1.2 Supportive Coaching Behaviours and Mastery Involvement.

In one of the most seminal lines of coaching research, Smith, Smoll, and colleagues (Barnett, Smoll, & Smith, 1992; Smith & Smoll, 1990; Smith, Smoll, & Barnett, 1995; Smoll, Smith, Barnett, & Everett, 1993; Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977) used observational and questionnaire-based methods to assess coaches’ leadership behaviours.

Initially, Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977) developed an observational instrument, the Coach Behaviour Assessment System (CBAS) to identify and analyze coach behaviours. The
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CBAS instrument consists of 11 coach behaviours divided into two broad categories: (a) reactive behaviours and (b) spontaneous behaviours. Reactive behaviours consist of reinforcement, mistake-contingent encouragement, mistake contingent technical instruction, punishment, punitive technical instruction, ignoring mistakes, and keeping control. Spontaneous behaviours, on the other hand, consist of general technical instruction, general encouragement, organization, and general communication. Studies employing the CBAS consistently demonstrate that coaches who use supportive behaviours (e.g., reinforcement and encouraging behaviours) have a positive influence on athlete outcomes, such as self-esteem and anxiety (e.g., Smith & Smoll, 1990).

Building upon these empirical studies, Smith and Smoll (1990) developed the Coach Effectiveness Training (CET), a coach development program designed to train coaches to more effectively relate with children by using supportive coaching behaviours (e.g., reinforcement and encouragement). Studies implementing the CET reveal that coaches participating in the program promote psychosocial outcomes among young athletes such as self-esteem, as well as reduce negative outcomes such as performance anxiety and attrition (Barnett, Smoll, & Smith, 1992; Smith, Smoll, & Barnett, 1995; Smoll, Smith, Barnett, & Everett, 1993).

More recently, the CET has evolved into a new coach behaviour training program (i.e., Mastery Approach to Coaching; MAC; Smith, Smoll, & Cumming, 2007). Specifically, Smith et al. (2007) investigated the effects of the MAC, which is a cognitive-behavioural intervention aimed at promoting mastery-oriented motivational climates in youth basketball leagues across the United States. Within a mastery-oriented climate, coaches define success in relation to self-improvement, task-mastery, giving maximum effort, and persistence (Ames, 1992). Following the intervention, Smith et al. (2007) found that athletes playing for coaches in the intervention group (in a mastery-oriented climate) experienced lower scores of trait anxiety over the course of
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the season. Comparatively, athletes in the control group exhibited higher scores of trait anxiety later in the season. The testing of the CET suggests that coach behaviours can be influenced through coach training programmes or interventions, and can serve as a useful method for optimizing youth development in sport.

The work of Smith, Smoll, and colleagues has provided a wealth of information which has been instrumental in our current understanding of coach behaviours and their potential influence on youth development. One shortcoming of this research is that it focuses mainly on professional coaching behaviours (e.g., technical instruction, positive feedback, and promoting mastery of skills) and does not fully capture a wide range of interpersonal coaching behaviours (Côté & Gilbert, 2009).

2.1.3 Autonomy-Supportive Coaching Behaviours.

Since the work of Smith, Smoll, and colleagues, other researchers have made considerable strides in examining coaches’ interpersonal behaviours. In particular, a growing body of literature recognizes the important role that autonomy-supportive coaching behaviours may play in facilitating positive sport experiences in youth sport (e.g., Adie, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2008; Coatsworth & Conroy, 2007; Gagne, Ryan, & Bargmann, 2003; Mageau et al., 2009; Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, & Briere, 2001). Autonomy-supportive coaching behaviours help to promote a climate in which athletes feel they have autonomy and consists of the following coach behaviours: providing choice, providing rationale for tasks and limits, acknowledging athlete’s feelings and perspectives, providing athletes with opportunities for initiative, providing non-controlling competence feedback, avoiding controlling behaviours, and preventing ego-involvement in athletes; Mageau et al., 2009). Measuring coach behaviours through athlete perceptions using numerous questionnaires (e.g., Autonomy-Supportive
Coach Leadership Behaviours

Coaching Questionnaire; Conroy and Coatsworth, 2007; Health Care Climate Questionnaire; Adie, Duda, Ntoumanis, 2008; Sport Climate Questionnaire; Amorose & Anderson-Butcher, 2006), researchers have examined the influence of autonomy-supportive coaching behaviours on athlete outcomes such as autonomy, competence, relatedness, and motivation (e.g., Adie et al., 2008; Coatsworth & Conroy, 2007; Gagne et al., 2003; Pelletier et al., 2001). Other research (e.g., Duda, 2013) has extended the Autonomy-supportive coaching literature by creating an evidence-based training programme for youth sport coaches which combines psychological theories of motivation (e.g., Self-Determination Theory; Deci and Ryan, 1980; Achievement Goal Theory; Urdan & Maehr, 1995) in order to influence athlete motivation to participate in physical activity, and specifically sport.

The body of research examining autonomy-supportive behaviours underscores the importance of understanding coaches’ interpersonal behaviours in addition to their professional, teaching behaviours. While this research has shed light on the influence of such behaviours on motivational outcomes and basic psychological needs, studies examining the links between autonomy-supportive behaviours and PYD outcomes remain limited. It is also important to acknowledge that this framework is motivational, rather than leadership-based. As such, this model may not provide a complete picture of the leadership behaviours coaches might use to foster positive development in youth sport. Consistent with this perspective, researchers have called for models of coaching leadership that address both the professional and relational aspects of the coaching (Turnnidge & Côté, 2016).

2.1.4 Transformational Leadership.

Transformational leadership (TFL) falls within the full range leadership model (Figure 1; Avolio, 1999), which comprises three leadership styles: Laissez-faire (passive), transactional
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(reactionary and management), and transformational (active). An additional leadership style that has recently been identified in sport research is toxic leadership (Turnnidge & Côté, Submitted). Elements and definitions for each of these leadership styles are presented in Table 1. First, toxic leadership was originally conceptualized in militaristic settings (Pelletier, 2010) and has since been recognized as a component of coaching leadership (Turnnidge & Côté, Submitted). Essentially, toxic leadership consists of behaviours wherein coaches display negative attitudes or frustration towards athletes (e.g., using a negative tone, sarcasm, and displaying anti-social behaviours). Second, laissez-faire leadership is characterized by leader absence or lack of involvement and is generally viewed as passive and ineffective (Burns, 1978; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Third, transactional leadership, falls within the middle of the leadership continuum where leaders facilitate motivation and performance through rewarding followers for meeting goals and objectives as well as correcting them for failing to meet objectives (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003). Comparatively, TFL facilitates personal development among followers through the use of specific behaviours relating to role modelling appropriate behaviours, motivating followers, inspiring innovation, and recognizing individual needs. The fundamental tenet of TFL theory is that by using specific styles of interaction, transformational leaders foster higher levels of follower performance and personal growth, which align with the fundamental principles of PYD. While it is important to note that transactional leadership can be described as the foundation of coaching, it is the leader who displays TFL in conjunction with transactional leadership that will optimize growth and development among followers via the augmentation effect (Kirkbride, 2006). The augmentation effect stipulates that measures of transformational leadership add to measures of transactional leadership in predicting outcomes, but not vice versa. (Bass, 2007). Among the TFL studies within sport, multiple questionnaires
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have been used to measure coach leadership style or transformational behaviours, which help to support this hypothesis (See Table 6 in Appendix A), and identify TFL as a viable avenue for optimizing youth sport experiences through coach behaviours.

Drawing on the political writings of Burns (1978), Bass (1991) conceptualized TFL as the four I’s: Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration (defined in Table 1). Sport research has shown that the theory of TFL encapsulates the coaching process, as the 4 I’s, when measured with questionnaires, have been associated with outcomes such as team cohesion, motivation, and performance (e.g., Callow, Smith, Hardy, Arthur, & Hardy, 2009; Rowold, 2007; Smith, Arthur, Hardy, Callow, & Williams, 2013).

Table 1. Definitions and components of leadership styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behaviours</th>
<th>Leader displays this by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational:</td>
<td>Facilitating growth among followers by developing potential, empowering others, and encouraging critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>Becoming a role model who is admired, trusted, emulated and respected by followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>Inspiring and motivating others by providing meaning and challenge to followers work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Stimulating followers’ to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions and reframing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>Disbursing attention to followers’ based on followers needs for achievement and growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Transactional:** Often involving an exchange of reward or punishment by the leader for follower compliance

Contingent Reward
Providing rewards for satisfactory performance by follower

Management by Exception (Active)
Attending to followers’ mistakes and failures to meet standards

Management by Exception (Passive)
Waiting until problems become severe before attending to them and intervening

**Laissez-Faire:**
Exhibiting frequent absence and lack of involvement during critical junctures

*Toxic Leadership*
Displaying negative attitudes or frustration towards athletes


In essence, TFL provides a set of leadership behaviours that are known to be related to positive outcomes in sport such as personal development, motivation, and skill. Moreover, TFL integrates many elements of existing models and frameworks of effective coaching leadership (e.g., importance of interpersonal relationships, promoting autonomy, providing choice, and increasing motivation). Finally, TFL includes other constructs that have been notably absent from other coaching leadership frameworks (i.e., moral components).

### 2.1.5 Transformational Leadership and Coaching.

Several studies have investigated athletes’ perception of TFL behaviours on different outcomes in sport. As an example, Charbonneau and colleagues (2001) tested and supported TFL theory with university-aged athletes, revealing that transformational coaching behaviours
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promote individual and team sport athletes’ motivation and, in turn, increase team-level performances. Charbonneau et al. used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Form 5X (MLQ-5X; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999) to measure athlete perceptions of coach leadership in combination with the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS; Pelletier et al., 1995) and measures of coach-rated performance based on improvement.

Furthermore, Rowold (2006) found that martial arts athletes perceive coaches who use transformational behaviours as more effective leaders than those using other leadership styles (e.g., Transactional and Laissez-faire). Similar to Charbonneau et al. (2001), the authors used the MLQ-5X (Avolio et al., 1999), however, the study also included four items to measure coaching effectiveness (i.e., effectiveness of coach behaviours, follower satisfaction, followers’ extra effort, and training effort indicated by frequency of training) to determine if TFL scales accounted for a unique variance of leadership effectiveness beyond other leadership styles (e.g., transactional or laissez faire). A regression analysis displayed a pattern between leadership style and coach effectiveness, where transformational style was associated with higher levels of athlete perceived coach effectiveness (Rowold, 2006).

While previous research has intended to reveal the general effectiveness of transformational coaches, recent studies have also aimed at assessing more specific individual-level outcomes among youth athletes. Stenling and Tafvelin (2014) found that youth floor ball players who rated their coaches as being high in TFL (TTQ; Beauchamp et al., 2010) also reported that their basic needs (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness; BNSSS; Ng, Lonsdale, & Hodge, 2010) were satisfied and, in turn, reported increased overall well-being. Similarly, Price and Weiss (2013) identified that transformational coaching behaviours were associated with not only individual outcomes (i.e., perceived competence and athlete enjoyment),
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but were also related to team-level outcomes such as task cohesion and collective self-efficacy. Price and Weiss administered the MLQ-5X to assess athlete perceived leadership style. In addition, they administered packages including overall enjoyment in sport, perceived competence (Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents; Harter, 1988), intrinsic motivation (Motivation Orientation in Sport Scale; Weiss, Bredemeier, & Shewchuk, 1985), team cohesion (Group Environment Questionnaire; Carron, Brawley, & Widemeyer, 1998) and collective efficacy (Collective Efficacy Questionnaire for Sports; Short, Sullivan, & Feltz, 2005). Smith, Arthur, Hardy, Callow, and Williams (2013) also identified - using the Differentiated Transformational Leadership Inventory (DTLI; Callow et al., 2009) - that athlete perceptions of transformational coach behaviours were able to predict task cohesion mediated through intrateam communication. Clearly, TFL has been associated with numerous developmental, motivational, and relational outcomes among youth sport participants. However, studies examining TFL within the sporting context have primarily been cross sectional, questionnaire-based, and quantitative in nature. The adaptation of existing leadership or teaching questionnaires to measure athlete perceptions of transformational coach behaviours has provided limited information about the actual behaviours in sport that positively affect athletes. Indeed, evidence suggests that TFL influences group and individual level outcomes related to PYD, however, much of the previous literature has focused on measuring athlete perceptions of coach behaviours.

Some researchers have begun to apply TFL into youth sport, through intervention strategies. In their initial efforts, Vella, Oades, and Crowe (2012) validated the DTLI within a youth sport context (soccer). Vella and colleagues (2013) then aimed to test the relationship between transformational behaviours (DTLI; Callow et al., 2009), coach-athlete relationships, and developmental experiences of athletes – using the Youth Experience Survey for Sport (YES-
Coach Leadership Behaviours

S; MacDonald, Côté, Eys, & Deakin, 2012). Coaches in the active group participated in a two-hour TFL training program and were compared to a control group of coaches that did not receive training. The researchers found that the young athletes in the intervention group had higher scores of cognitive skills compared to the control group post-intervention. Vella and colleagues suggest that TFL does in fact have the ability to promote positive development among followers in a youth sporting environment. Nevertheless, the quantitative nature of this study did not allow the authors to identify specific transformational coaching behaviours that coaches perceived as being effective.

Evidently, TFL can serve as a useful conceptualization of coach behaviours, which has the ability to holistically influence development beyond previous conceptualizations of coaching behaviours. In sum, sport studies show that TFL fosters numerous developmental athlete outcomes as well as provides enjoyable experiences for youth in sport settings. Although the application of TFL in sport is encouraging, a number of theoretical and practical questions still remain.

First, it remains unclear how specific transformational behaviours are used in youth sport. Although ample evidence suggests that TFL is effective at promoting positive outcomes across numerous settings, no studies to our knowledge have identified how these specific behaviours are used by day to day youth sport coaches. It seems rational that before researchers can begin to design interventions for TFL in youth contexts, a greater understanding of coaches’ current use of transformational behaviours would be useful. Specifically, do coaches use specific, observable transformational behaviours, and if so, in what context are they used?

Secondly, research has yet to examine how TFL may differ in youth sport from that of its original conceptualization with adults in formal organizations. The primary concern here is that
previous studies have primarily examined athlete perceptions of coaches’ transformational behaviours with few exceptions (e.g., Vella et al., 2011). In addition, those studies which do address both athlete and coach perceptions include questionnaires used in the sports domain which were developed or adapted from the business domain using adult samples. Studies of TFL in the youth activity context have, however, used instruments that were developed or adapted from the organizational or teaching literature with little recognition of the lived experiences of leaders and followers. Beauchamp, Barling, Li, and Morton (2010) for example, adapted questionnaires, and created an intervention tailored for a youth population in school-based settings. Beauchamp, Barling, and Morton (2011) then designed and implemented an intervention for physical education teachers in an attempt to experimentally examine how transformational behaviours may influence student’s self reported motivation, efficacy, and intentions to be active. The researchers found that students in the experimental group reported significantly higher scores of self-determined motivation, self-efficacy and their intentions to be active than those within the control group. Although these findings are helpful in our understanding of how transformational behaviours can similarly influence youth behaviour when compared to adult contexts, there were no attempts in these studies to identify actual transformational behaviours that were more or less effective in different contexts. Côté and Gilbert (2009) argue that we cannot generalize coaching behaviours across contexts without first validating them. In addition, youth athletes are likely experiencing cognitive and social development across age groups (Gruber, Vonêche, & Piaget, 1977), which again may limit our ability to simply apply this theory into youth sport. Understanding of transformational behaviours within the sports setting would enhance our ability to adapt this model into youth sport and properly apply TFL within this context. Through obtaining coach perceptions of TFL
behaviours, we will generate a better understanding of how coaches apply transformational behaviours in youth sport currently.

Third, it remains unclear how coaches view transformational behaviours as a whole. Specifically, it is unclear as to why coaches may choose to use transformational behaviours. A major concern in this regard is that the voices of coaches in terms of the development of leadership in sport are notably absent. Again, a greater understanding of how coaches perceive transformational behaviours is necessary. Specifically, it is important to consider why coaches might use transformational behaviours, in order to understand coaches’ motivation behind their leadership style.

2.2 Purpose of the study

The aim of this research project is to provide an understanding of coaches’ leadership behaviours through coach perceptions. Specifically, 1) what do transformational behaviours look like in youth sport? 2) What contextual factors influence how leadership behaviours are applied in youth sport? 3) Why do youth sport coaches use specific leadership behaviours?

Given the important role that coaches have on the developmental outcomes of athletes as well as the current literature that supports the use and applicability of TFL in the youth sport environment, this study has the potential to contribute to the literature by providing an in-depth understanding of coaches’ implementation of specific leadership methods into their coaching contexts. This study also fills an important existing gap within the current sport leadership literature.
Chapter 3

Methods

3.1 Methodological orientation

When developing our methodological approach, a constructionist orientation served as the primary framework (Ritchie, Lewis, McNaughton, Nichols, & Ormston, 2014). Our approach is grounded within an ontological stance of relativism, where multiple mind-dependent realities exist (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). A constructionist approach seeks to display constructed realities of people within a specific setting and explore the participants’ meanings and explanations of these realities (Ritchie et al., 2014). This approach rejects ideas of universal laws, and as such focuses on capturing lived experiences from the participants themselves. Although constructionism does not reject the idea of phenomena, it does however question our ability to understand them without theory (Mir & Watson, 2000). Therefore, although phenomena exist independently from what researchers and participants might perceive, reality is constructed subjectively through an individual’s frame of reference (Ritchie et al., 2014). To this end, the epistemological stance selected for this study was epistemological relativism, in which, the participant and the researcher co-create the findings (Guba & Lincoln, 2005).

In this regard, obtaining and understanding the actions or behaviours of coaches during the coaching process involves much more than direct observation. In order to gain insight into the perceived realities of lived experiences, methods were used to examine coach perceptions of their own behaviours. In line with the research questions for this study and a constructionist approach, we used methods throughout this study that seek to gain an understanding of coach behaviours specifically relating to TFL by obtaining coach perceptions through Stimulated Recall (SR).
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SR is defined as “an introspection procedure in which (normally) videotaped passages of behaviours are replayed to individuals to stimulate recollection of their concurrent cognitive activity.” (Lyle, 2003, p. 861). Although this qualitative approach was adapted from other domains of research (e.g., educational and counseling psychology; Bloom, 1953; Kagan, Krathwohl, & Miller, 1963), similar interviewing protocols have been previously used to explore youth sport coaches’ experiences (e.g., Debane & Fontayne, 2009; Gilbert & Trudel, 1999; Stodter & Cushion, 2014; Wilcox & Trudel, 1998). Indeed, it is logical that SR can be beneficial for researchers aiming at examining cognitive processes in naturalistic research settings.

Moreover, researchers have noted that this type of research method has potential for examining contexts that are uncertain and characterized by non-deliberative behaviour, similar to that of the coaching context (Lyle, 2003). While different versions of SR exist (see Lyle, 2000 for review), video-SR was chosen for the purpose of this study. Video-SR allows the researchers and participants to view specific behaviours or interactions of interest (through video images), and attempts to elicit responses about those behaviours through a qualitative interview. The primary advantages to this method are that it avoids self-report bias from the participants, and strengthens the participant’s ability to recall behaviours in given situations (Lyle, 2003). Debane and Fontayne (2009) further advocate for using SR describing the technique as instrumental in consulting coaches with regards to their decision making. Although SR studies have examined coach perceptions related to cognitive management, decision making, and learning procedures, this method has yet to be utilized in analyzing perceptions of coach leadership behaviours.

3.2 Participants

Coaches were recruited through convenience sampling, and were required to meet eligibility criteria (listed below) in order to take part in the study. Although numerous criteria are
used to select coaches within qualitative coaching research (Smith & Cushion 2006), one notable approach is to select coaches with a specific level of education and experience (e.g., Côté, Salmela, Trudel, & Baria, 1995; Smith & Cushion, 2006, Vallée & Bloom, 2005). The most commonly recognized credential among Canadian coaches is certification through the National Coach Certification Program (NCCP; Canada Soccer, 2015). The Coaching Association of Canada stipulates that coaches who wish to coach athletes above the age of 11 should have completed a minimum of two levels of NCCP certification (Coaches Association of Canada, 2015). Therefore, participating coaches were required to have a minimum level 2 NCCP certification and two or more years of youth sport coaching experience. Finally, participants were required to be coaching a competitive level youth sport team during the 2015/2016 season with athletes ranging from 11-18 years of age. The purpose for the eligibility criteria was to increase the likelihood that coaches had a range of experiences to draw upon during their interviews.

A total of ten soccer coaches were contacted with permission from a soccer club in Eastern Ontario. Eight of the coaches responded and chose to take part in the study. Following filming, five coaches took part in the SR interviews. An additional ten volleyball coaches were contacted from a volleyball club in Eastern Ontario from which six completed the SR interviews. A total of eleven interviews were completed comprising five soccer coaches and six volleyball coaches. Table 2 provides demographics for the group of coaches who participated in the interviews, while Table 3 provides information pertaining to attrition, reach, and gender breakdown. It is worth noting that although all participants for the study were male, female participants were recruited, however, there were simply less female coaches within these organizations and none of which participated for the entirety of the study.
Table 2. Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Sport coached in 2015/2016 season</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Gender of Athletes</th>
<th>Age of Athletes</th>
<th># yrs. Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>U18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>U16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>U14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>U13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>U17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>U17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>U18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>U15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>U18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>U15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 11</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>U13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Participant attrition rates, reach of the study, and gender breakdown by sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th># of Coaches Contacted</th>
<th># of Coaches Responded</th>
<th># of Coaches Interviewed</th>
<th>% Male Team</th>
<th>% Female Team</th>
<th>% Male Coach</th>
<th>% Female Coach</th>
<th>% Attrition</th>
<th>% Reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Club</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Club</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.3 Procedure

Prior to the beginning of the study, university ethics approval was obtained through the institution’s regular procedures (see Appendix B). Following ethical approval, youth sport organizations were contacted and recruited to participate. The procedure of conducting video-SR for this study is outlined in a three-phase process. First, video-recorded observation was conducted – capturing interactions between coaches and their athletes during practices and competition. Second, the primary researcher coded and reviewed the video-recordings for each coach participant, selecting sequences of video that related to the research questions. Finally, video segments from each coach were integrated into an interview guide to stimulate recollection or response to a set of pre-identified questions. Each of these phases is expanded upon in the remainder of this section.

3.3.1 Phase 1: Video observation.

For each team, data collection took place three times during the season. Two cameras were used for each observation; one camera captured a wide angle of the entire play area, while the other was manually operated to capture coach behaviours and interactions with athletes (Buckham, 2013). During observation, coaches wore a lapel microphone which provided audio for the film sessions. Based on scheduling, availability, and resources, each coach was filmed three times consisting of one pilot session, one practice, and one game (when possible). Coaches who either did not have a game in the proximal area of the research or could not be reached to film a game session, were alternatively filmed for a second practice. In total, eight coaches were recorded for one pilot film session, as well as one game and one practice, while three coaches were recorded for a pilot film session and two practices. Film sessions lasted anywhere between 1.5 hours to 2 hours in length, resulting in approximately 40 hours. Observations took place
during various points of the season, ranging from beginning, middle, and end. The reason for multiple collection points was threefold; first, multiple data collection times allowed the participants to become acclimated to having cameras present. While it is important to note that observer presence is a limitation within this methodology, collecting more than one observation helped to attenuate this risk. This allows the participants to become acclimated to the presence of the research team, and the data collection equipment. Second, collecting data in multiple settings (e.g., game and practice) allowed for a wider range of behaviours and more thorough analysis of coach leadership. Finally, conducting observation during different time points in the season adds to the richness of the data. Given that coaches might change or adapt coaching styles depending on timing, results or desired outcomes, collecting data at multiple time points accounts for differences in coaching style that might be seen during different times of a season.

3.3.2 Phase 2: The Coach Leadership Assessment System (CLAS).

The Coach Leadership Assessment System (CLAS) was developed for observations of coaches in the sport environment (Turnnidge & Côté, submitted) and used to code coach leadership behaviours recorded in this study. Appendix C provides a detailed description and examples of the coding system and manual. The system classifies coach behaviours according to the interactive content and leadership tone – broadly classifying TFL (11 codes, which can be further divided into the four I’s), Transactional (2 codes), Neutral (1 code), Laissez-Faire (1 code), and Toxic leadership behaviours (2 codes). In addition, with associating each coach behaviour with a code, the tool also identifies the context in which the behaviour was displayed (e.g., the training or competition activity context in which a given behaviour takes place). The CLAS also has the ability to separate codes into each of the four I’s, which proved useful for the process of selecting video clips in this study. Prior to coding the videos for the current study, the
primary investigator completed a coder training program for the CLAS (please see Turnnidge & Côté, in preparation for more details on this protocol). The primary investigator reached the minimum 75% standard for inter-rater reliability on two separate 10 minute videos in congruence with Erickson and colleagues (2011) guidelines set out by Hollenstein, Granic, Stoolmiller, and Snyder (2004).

3.3.3 Phase 3: Selecting video clips.

Previous SR studies have used random selection of video clips, determined by segmenting practice or game sessions into portions, and randomly selecting a percentage of each portion (Lorimer & Jowett, 2010). However, given the previously mentioned purpose of SR, clips were purposefully selected by the researchers to match the research questions and objectives in this study. That is, what do leadership behaviours look like in youth sport, how are they applied, and why do coaches use specific leadership behaviours? Therefore, clips were selected based on their ability to offer meaningful insight into the research questions. The selected clips were then compiled into one continuous film, each clip separated by blank footage.

The following protocol was used for the selection of video clips for each coach; initially, one clip for each behaviour within the identified leadership styles (i.e., Transformational, Transactional, Laissez-faire, and Toxic) was selected for each coach if it was available. In the instance that a coach did not display a behaviour from one of the aforementioned categories, the clip was replaced with a behaviour that was representative of another more common leadership behaviour from that coach. Following this selection, 2-3 additional clips were selected that reflected the uniqueness of each coach. For example, if one coach displayed a great number of transformational behaviours, additional clips that reflected these behaviours were chosen. If a coach, however, did exhibit a large portion of transactional behaviours, additional clips reflecting
those behaviours were chosen. In most instances, coaches displayed leadership behaviours that fell within transformational and transactional categories. It was atypical for a coach to use behaviours identified in all of the categories (e.g., Laissez-Faire), however, toxic behaviours did occur in certain instances. Therefore, interviews consisted of coaches discussing transactional, TFL, and in some cases toxic behaviours.

3.3.4 Phase 4: Stimulated recall interview.

Each participant took part in a SR interview in order to elicit their perception of their own behaviours throughout the selected video clips from phase 1. A video clip was played for the participant, after which, the researcher consulted the interview guide to prompt the participant’s response. The participant was allowed to replay the video as necessary in order to fully capture the clip and behaviours within it. The key questions of the interview aimed at exploring coaches’ perceptions of interactive behaviours that are related to theories of leadership, which can be found in Appendix D. Generally, throughout the interviews, participants were asked to expand upon their responses using probing questions from the interviewer (Patton, 2002). The lead researcher, who has experience conducting one-on-one and focus group interviews, conducted each interview. Interviews were recorded using two audio devices and supplemented by the researcher’s notes taken during and following the interview, otherwise known as reflexive journaling (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Interviews lasted 58 minutes on average, with a total range of 24 minutes. Each interview took place in a quiet, and private room.

3.3.5 Demographics and Interview guide.

Before each interview, coaches were asked to fill out a demographic questionnaire in order to provide information about previous experience coaching, as well as basic information about themselves (Appendix E). A semi-structured interview guide was used to stimulate recall
from coaches while their video sequences were viewed. The primary researcher with guidance from other members of the authorship team who have previous experience conducting SR interviews developed the interview guide. The guide is divided into three primary sections. First, coaches were asked to reflect on their coaching background, and previous coaching experience as well as information about the team that they were currently coaching. This portion of the interview guide served as an opportunity to establish rapport with the coach and obtain basic demographic information about the coach and their team that may have been missed in the demographics information questionnaire. The second portion of the interview guide aimed at obtaining the coaches perceptions pertaining to the video sequences that they were shown. The second portion of the interview guide involved the SR interview in which coaches were asked to comment on each of their recorded behaviours. This section of the interview guide sought to gain insight related to what types of behaviours coaches were using, how they used them in specific instances, and why they chose specific leadership behaviours. The third and final phase of the interview guide was designed to provide coaches an opportunity to state their overall coaching approach and reflect on any remaining thoughts.

3.4 Data Analysis

Interviews were transcribed verbatim. Notes made during each interview were also used to help the researcher recall specific parts of the interviews and ensure consistency of transcriptions. A detailed list of all thoughts, feelings or emotions relating to the research topic, often known as a reflexive journal (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was kept and can be found in Appendix E. Notes were used primarily to record thoughts of the primary author during the interview process, as well as other anecdotal conversations or observations, to further provide context to the interview that may be overlooked in the transcripts.
Following transcription, the analysis followed recommendations put forth by Braun and Clarke (2006) for thematic analysis. First, the lead author reviewed transcripts and listened to each audio recording to become more familiar with the data. This initial step served as a foundation for outlining initial meanings or patterns, and was followed by thematic content analysis (i.e., line by line coding of transcripts). The second phase involved the development of initial codes and refinement of categories that fit with the data as the coding process took place. In the third phase, codes were sorted and placed into overarching themes and initial visual representations (e.g., mind maps) were formulated to assist in sorting codes. Finally, themes were reviewed using Patton’s (1990) dual criteria for judging categories – internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity, then defined and named to reflect the essence of each theme. Patton’s criteria ensure that data within each category belong together (internal homogeneity) and that the themes and meanings of the categories are clearly different (external heterogeneity). This criterion ensures themes and categories are not overlapping and consist of meaningful data which help the researcher to tell a true, meaningful story.

3.5 Research Quality

Sparkes and Smith (2009) noted that it is important to ensure that qualitative research adheres to a set of quality criteria in order to avoid “blunting knowledge and stifling creativity” (p.496). To this end, the authors recommend that researchers should “use criteria that are consistent with their own internal meaning structures and purposes” (p. 496). In doing this, researchers are able to ensure that research quality is optimized and not influenced by governing funding bodies, research journals, or other external forces.

Grounded in ontological relativism and epistemological subjectivism, a list of criteria was developed to guide evaluations of quality with respect to this study. According to Sparkes and
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Smith (2009), criteria are viewed as characterizing traits and can be organized into a contextually dependent list. This list is paradigmatically sensitive, therefore criteria may be added, removed, or adapted in line with the background or views of the researcher, as well as the purpose and context of a given study (Smith & Hodkinson, 2005). Therefore, the list of criteria for this study has been tailored to help enhance the quality of the research and is in line with the research questions being examined. The list includes: (a) importance of the research, (b) selection of appropriate methods (c) reflexivity, and (d) credibility.

3.5.1 Importance of the research.

Zitomer and Goodwin (2014) list a number of ways to achieve research that is likely to make important contribution to a field of study. The authors describe that applying theory in a new context, using a new methodological approach, moving readers to act, providing implications for practice, reaching out to multiple audiences, or providing suggestions for future research can deem research as important (Zitomer & Goodwin, 2014). It has been discussed at length throughout the initial portion of this paper, that TFL is only recently being applied to the youth sport context. Given its recent attention and application to this context, qualitative research is important to inform its application. In addition, this study hopes to help guide development of a sport coach intervention through its unique methodology. Based on Zitomer and Goodwin’s guidelines, it can be argued that this research be deemed as important for helping researchers to apply TFL and inform future coach education processes in a very practical sense.

3.5.2 Reflexivity.

Sparkes and Smith (2009) identify the importance for qualitative researchers to be reflexive in their work. Reflexivity refers to the researcher recognizing his or her role in the research process, including subjective values, biases, and motivations (Tracy, 2010). In line with
recommendations from Sparkes and Smith, this study used processes and methods that helped guide reflexivity. First, the primary researcher wrote out his coaching philosophy and reflected on his possible biases as an athlete and as a researcher (see Appendix F). This exercise was used as a form of bracketing (Zitomer & Goodwin, 2014) to disclose any type of researcher bias that may have occurred throughout the data collection and analysis. Biases that emerged from this exercise included past positive coaching and athletic experiences, as well as an understanding of the leadership literature. These biases were taken into consideration during the interview and coding processes. Second, reflexive journals (see Appendix E) were kept as a tool for logging thoughts and feelings towards participants or sets of data. This allowed the researcher to reflect upon and identify any potential circumstances that could have influenced the results or data collection processes.

3.5.3 Credibility.

A process called peer debriefing was used throughout the entire data analysis process to establish credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1995). At each stage of the analysis, specific members of the research team were consulted in order to help understand participant meanings and construct accurate, meaningful depictions of the data.

This study has attempted to utilize a range of criteria that are contextually appropriate to enhance the quality of the research. The criteria chosen should not be considered as an exhaustive list but rather steps which have been taken to select appropriate methods, reduce biases, and enhance the richness of the data. Finally, it is worth noting that it is not the readers’ responsibility to agree with the researcher’s perspective or findings in order for them to be credible. Readers are encouraged to perceive what the researcher heard on their own, and
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whether or not they agree with this interpretation (Finlay, 2006). The reader is asked to trust the research enough to act and make decisions based on the findings (Tracy, 2010).
Chapter 4

Results

The results are separated into three parts: (1) identifying and describing coach leadership behaviours, (2) factors contributing to the application of coach leadership behaviours, and (3) intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviours. In Part One, *Identifying and describing coach leadership behaviours*, the behaviours of coaches that were observed within the first phases of data collection (i.e., observational coding and selection of video clips) are reported. Next, Part Two of the results, *Factors contributing to the application of coach leadership behaviours*, highlight results derived from the SR phase of the data collection. Finally, Part Three, *Intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviours*, describes the rationale coaches provided for selecting and implementing specific coach leadership behaviours.

4.1 Part One: Identifying and Describing Coach Leadership Behaviours

Following the initial filming of coaches, each video session was observed, wherein the main researcher attempted to identify video clips relating to each of the different leadership styles (e.g., Transformational, Transactional, and Toxic). For each coach, 5-7 video clips were selected, creating a sequence of videos to be used for the stimulated recall interviews.

Relating to the identification of observable leadership behaviours, the first finding indicates that youth sport coaches display transformational, transactional, and toxic behaviours as identified by the CLAS (Turnnidge et al., 2016). In particular, each of the eleven coaches within this study displayed each of the four I’s of TFL during their observed sessions. Similarly, all of the coaches displayed at least one behaviour that was coded as transactional. Only three of eleven coaches displayed behaviours that were classified as toxic. Finally, no coaches were
observed using Laissez-Faire leadership behaviour. Table 5 provides specific examples of behaviours that were observed and are organized by leadership style associated with the behaviour.
### Table 4. Examples of leadership behaviours by leadership style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behaviours (What behaviours look like)</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Toxic Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Benching players</td>
<td>- Promoting unsportsmanlike play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Making new team members feel comfortable/welcomed</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Making players run/do pushups for undesired behaviour/performance</td>
<td>- Displaying anger or frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Joking around/having fun</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing consequences if a drill is unsuccessful (if, then contingency)</td>
<td>- Encouraging dishonesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discussing positive values (e.g., sportsmanship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing positive role models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expressing belief in their athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discussing team goals with athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teaching understanding of the game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Asking questions to athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allowing athletes to choose drills, partners, or outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Consideration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Talking to players about confidence/reinforcing thoughts about skill/performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promoting creativity and effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Part Two: Factors contributing to the application of coach leadership behaviours

This section provides an overview of themes that were derived based on SR interviews that took place, during which coaches were asked to observe and comment on videos containing their own leadership behaviours. Two overarching themes emerged which help describe factors that contribute to the application of coaching leadership behaviours. The first theme discussed by coaches described how behaviours change depending on the context in which they occur (Contextual considerations). The second theme identified helped to describe the sources from which coaches perceived to learn coach leadership behaviours (Sources of knowledge). Example quotes from the participants will be provided to offer a complete explanation of each theme and how they were discussed during the SR interviews.

4.2.1 Contextual Considerations

The first factor discussed by coaches which contributed to their application of leadership behaviours was contextual considerations. This theme describes the ways in which coaches tailor behaviours to specific contexts. Coaches identified that the leadership behaviours observed in the video clips varied in their application across context and situation. These considerations are determined by a number of factors (e.g., age of athletes, skill level of athletes, etc.) and were divided into two sub-themes: Developmental differences and Circumstantial differences.

4.2.1.1 Developmental differences.

Coaches referred to the age or skill level of the athletes when discussing how developmental differences contributed to their application of coach leadership behaviours. Coaches identified that behaviours may differ depending on the actual age level of the team that they are coaching. For example, one coach talked about the importance of considering specific age groups when using specific behaviours:
I think probably if it was a much older kid, like 17 or 18, the tail end of that, I would probably be a bit firmer, and I would expect an 18-year-old kid to not be talking like that. Whereas a younger kid I would probably joke a bit more...I think you just have to adjust it to the age of the person that you're dealing with. (P8)

Another coach used an analogy to explain how developmental differences among athletes may alter the amount and intensity of expectations that a coach has for their athletes:

The workload is going to be different. But the process and the philosophy will be the same just at a different level. So, if we’re on the highway at 110 or back road at 80 or whether we’re on a city street at 60 and there are no lights along the way, your intensity is different. (P5)

Although in most instances, coaches discussed how the behaviour that they were shown would change depending on age or skill level, there were a few coaches who noted that the observed behaviour would not in fact change, and is applicable to all situations and contexts. For example, one coach simply noted ‘To be honest, I don’t think it would change, I think that behaviour would be pretty consistent’ (P9). In all, the coaches mostly agreed that specific behaviours need to change to be appropriately tailored to the athletes age, skill or developmental level. However, in a few cases, specific behaviours might be applied similarly across context.

4.2.1.2 Circumstantial differences.

Aside from developmental differences, coaches discussed how application of behaviours change depending on the given circumstance. Within this theme, coaches communicated that the behaviours which were viewed might also differ depending on other variables, (e.g., competition vs practice, throughout the course of the season, athlete-athlete, and the individual situation). For example, one coach discussed how leadership behaviours might only occur during certain points
of a game. When asked if this behaviour ever changes, he said “At the beginning of games we try to do that, but not as much at half time.” (P3). Others discussed that observed behaviours may differ depending on the point in the season. One coach said:

(It would change) at the start of the season when the kids don’t really know each other.

For our team, it wasn’t like it was a team from a previous year, there were some kids that knew each other and some new kids. (P9)

This theme included a wide range of factors that might influence the application of leadership behaviours. Coaches discussed that behaviours can change depending on the context of a game versus a practice. They also mentioned that behaviours would change depending on the individual athlete that the behaviour was directed at. Similar to the developmental differences, coaches did not always say that their observed behaviours would change. In certain instances, coaches recognized that behaviours would remain the same across situations, although again it was much less common.

Essentially, coaches expressed that the behaviours observed and discussed within this study should typically be tailored to the developmental and skill level of the athletes. Similarly, the behaviours should be tailored to the individual situation in which the behaviour is occurring. One final important note about tailoring leadership behaviours to contexts or situations is that coaches did not explicitly say that they would change the actual behaviour itself. Rather, they described that the way in which the behaviour was applied should change. This is important to consider when examining how leadership theories or processes can be applied across contexts.

4.2.2 Sources of knowledge

The second sub-theme within factors contributing to the application of coach leadership behaviours was ‘sources of knowledge’. Upon viewing a video clip, coaches were asked ‘If
anything, what led you to using this behaviour?’ Derived from responses to this question, the theme of Sources of knowledge was created and can be summarized as experiences or information from which coach leadership behaviours may be learned. This section provides an overview of coaches’ perceived sources of knowledge, as identified by the participants of the study during the SR interviews.

Specifically, when discussing antecedents that preceded their exhibition of particular leadership behaviours, coaches suggested Athletic experience, Coaching experience, Life experience, and Coach education as sources of knowledge that led to a specific leadership behaviour.

4.2.2.1 Athletic experience.

All coaches cited athletic experiences as a source of knowledge that influenced all types of leadership behaviours. Interestingly, within this theme, valence of athletic experience did not affect the coaches’ decisions to use certain behaviours, meaning that both positive and negative athletic experiences helped inform coach behaviours. For example, one coach noted that:

I would probably relate that (behaviour) a lot more to my influences with a few coaches back in my high school days. You know, I always liked their approach, and I respected them. They would joke with you about things, and those are the ones that you remember, and you respect them because you knew they were fair, but they would never throw you under the bus. (P9)

While another discussed how perceived experiences with toxic leadership can still inform transformational coach behaviour:

I remember when I was young, I remember getting coached by coaches that I didn’t like, and coaches that I did like, and over time I realized I didn’t want to be that guy that was
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always grumpy and yelling, so that is not the way I coach. I coach through my own experiences and that isn’t me. (P2)

In sum, through previous athletic experiences (e.g., being an athlete, interacting with coaches, etc.) coaches were offered opportunities to learn, and tailor coach behaviours that they now use today.

4.2.2.2 Coaching experience.

Similar to athletic experiences, coaches identified that their own coaching experience helped to learn specific leadership behaviours. For example, one coach explained that his behaviours were informed by ‘Coaching younger age groups in the past, sometimes in your head the drill is pretty obvious and not very complicated. Then the kids get going and all of a sudden it isn’t quite what you envisioned’ (P8). Another coach resounded this by saying his behaviour was influenced ‘Mostly just through my coaching experience, and by looking at the reactions of players too, to see how they’re receiving you’ (P1). In all, previous coaching experience served as another contributor to learning and applying coach leadership behaviours.

4.2.2.3 Life experience.

The third way in which experiences informed behaviour was through life experiences. Life experiences refer to experiences through employment or outside of sport itself. For example, coaches identified that employment experiences such as instructing or teaching helped inform all types of leadership behaviours, as one participant discussed:

(I am a) military helicopter pilot. I have a lot of instructional time for teaching guys that have never flown before. In the military I have always believed in four things: Firm, Fair, Friendly, and Fun. So, you want to treat everyone fair, you want to treat everyone the
same. You want to make it fun, but when an individual needs a little more discipline you’ve got to be more firm when required. (P8)

While another participant described life experiences in relation to other relationships he has had, when he said “I’m married. [Laughs] I’ve got a wife!” (P5). This participant discussed that his ability to interact with his female athletes has been influenced through interactions with other women, specifically, his wife. As is evident, this theme covers a wide range of experiences that help to inform coach behaviours relating to work experience, relationships with others, and parenting.

4.2.2.4 Coach education.

With regards to coach education, coaches identified two sources which helped inform and apply leadership behaviours, the first, being informal education. When discussing this theme, coaches identified methods such as using online searches, reading books, and watching other coaches as vehicles for conducting their own research. For example, one participant mentioned:

I have seen it broken down into maybe three or four different styles of coaching, like authoritative or dismissive or passive - there are different levels. Authoritarian is like ‘this is the way it is’ but that doesn’t work for many kids. So it is important to find a balance between them all. There are times where you need to be a little more assertive and you pick your spots to reinforce those. (P8)

While coaches noted that they had read or learned about coaching in books or online, this was relatively less common than that of the themes discussed above (e.g., athletic experiences, life experiences, and coaching experiences).

Of particular interest (and concern) is that few (n=2) coaches identified that leadership behaviours were informed through formal coach education or training. One coach noted “I’ve
done some coaching clinics and some coach training. I’m also in the military. I learned long ago that sometimes the carrot approach works better than the stick approach. If you know what I mean”. (P10). Data falling within the formal education category was relatively scarce, and seldom recognized by the coaches within this study.

4.3 Part Three: Intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviours

This section discusses coaches’ rationale behind choosing specific leadership behaviours. Upon viewing their behaviours, coaches were asked to explain why they chose to use that specific behaviour. Subsequently, coaches discussed objectives that they were attempting to achieve with the behaviour (e.g., instilling confidence, establishing respect, emphasizing winning, etc.). Interestingly, objectives were discussed differently for each of the different leadership styles (i.e., Transformational, Transactional, and Toxic). Therefore, this section is organized by coaching objectives and their associated leadership style. First, outcomes associated with transformational behaviours are discussed, followed by those associated with transactional behaviours, and finally outcomes associated with toxic behaviours. Table 5 provides a summary of the intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviours that were discussed, and is organized by leadership style.
Table 5. Intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviour organized by leadership styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended outcomes</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Toxic Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instilling confidence</td>
<td>Establishing respect</td>
<td>Emphasizing winning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Instilling trust in athlete’s skills or decision making</td>
<td>- Establishing (more traditional) relationships</td>
<td>- Winning is an important component of sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Promoting competence</strong></td>
<td>- Respecting time/punctuality</td>
<td><strong>Advocating Competitiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching concepts</td>
<td><strong>Seeking Commitment</strong></td>
<td>- Aggression can be okay in sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Developing an understanding of the game</td>
<td>- Understanding consequences:</td>
<td>- Promoting unsportsmanlike play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Establishing connection</strong></td>
<td>o Behavioural consequences</td>
<td><strong>Lighting the fire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting supportive, open relationship</td>
<td>o Success related consequences</td>
<td>- Motivating athletes through toxic behaviours (e.g., yelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Developing character</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building life skills:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Teaching ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Promoting sportsmanship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Providing enjoyable experiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prolonging engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 Transformational Leadership Behaviours

When video clips of transformational behaviours were presented, coaches discussed the following objectives: *Instilling confidence, promoting competence, establishing connection, developing character, and providing enjoyable experiences*. An important consideration when interpreting these results is their applicability to each of the constructs within TFL (i.e., The Four I’s). When coaches identified their objectives for each type of transformational behaviour, none of the themes appeared to be mutually exclusive to one or more of The Four I’s. For example, a coach discussing a behaviour that was coded as *Idealized Influence*, may have discussed his intended objective to be any one of the themes which appear below (e.g., *instilling confidence, promoting competence, establishing connection, developing character, and providing enjoyable experiences*). Each of these sub-themes are described and explained below, with specific examples of participant quotes.

4.3.1.1 Instilling confidence.

Within this theme, coaches discussed how specific behaviours were intended to increase or instill confidence within their athletes. One coach summarized this theme quite nicely by saying:

I hope by instilling confidence in them that it makes them a more confident athlete. Overall, I hope over time they realize that the coach believes in them and that when I have to call them for not performing, they understand that he is serious, because he encourages me all the time. And I hope that later on, if they decide to coach, that some of those behaviours transfer. (P8)
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Coaches communicated that transformational behaviours can be used to instill both sport specific confidence (as shown above) and overall confidence in other aspects of life. For example, one coach said:

If I have an introverted kid that talks and everyone else listens, that kid will have confidence to talk in front of his peers. So if I can promote open discussion, they are going to have confidence to voice their opinion. (P11)

As a whole, coaches discussed how their observed transformational behaviours can be used to facilitate both sport-specific and non-sport confidence among their athletes.

4.3.1.2 Promoting competence.

While some coaches discussed how their behaviours were targeted at building confidence among athletes, coaches also discussed behaviours intended to promote development of sport knowledge or skill (i.e. competence). This theme classified instances where coaches discussed the objective of promoting athletes’ sport-related skill or knowledge. For example, some coaches discussed that some transformational coaching behaviours were intended to focus on very specific skills:

I just want a successful drill. They’re all trying their hardest, nobody is goofing off, and as they’re doing the drill, not only are they getting the exercise and the blood flow, but they’re also actually working on their ball handling. (P10)

While other coaches discussed the importance of understanding the game related concepts, or the game as a whole, rather than focusing on a specific skill:

For me, it’s not about the results. These guys are learning how to play the game, and hopefully they’re going to go onto better teams than U16, so they have to know how to
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play the game. I have always said that I don’t care about the result because there are other factors that can change that. Like the refs or whatever. But how you play the game is more important. (P4)

In all, coaches discussed that certain transformational behaviours help to target sport related skill or knowledge among their athletes, and that these behaviours can be beneficial for teaching a deeper understanding of the game.

4.3.1.3 Establishing connection.

Coaches also acknowledged that certain transformational behaviours can be intended to target interpersonal relationships with or among their athletes (i.e. connection). One participant effectively captured the essence of this theme in saying:

I personally want them to come to me with anything volleyball related and outside of volleyball, I want to be that person. Especially as a young man, there is so much stuff going on in their life. I want to open the dialogue as volleyball first, because that is what they're there for, but after that they can open up to different things, whether it is at home or school or whatever is going on. So I want them to think that they can talk to their coach about something volleyball related and if he was comfortable, he can talk about something else. (P6)

Although connection was primarily related to developing the relationship between the coach and the athlete, other coaches noted that behaviours can be targeted at fostering broader social skills. For example, this coach identified that his objective was:

Just to get them to be more comfortable around people that they don’t know. Or be more forthcoming and making someone else feel comfortable. There’s nothing
like being the lone kid in the corner because he doesn’t know everyone else around him. So just trying to make them understand that it’s important. (P8)

In sum, the participants identified that their viewed transformational coach behaviours could be targeted at fostering individual relationships with their athletes, but also towards promoting a positive social environment in general.

4.3.1.4 Developing character.

Another theme which emerged when coaches discussed transformational behaviours was about developing character. Coaches identified that some of their transformational behaviours were intended to facilitate the development of life skills or positive values. For example, one coach discussed that:

It’s basically trying to reinforce him to not blame other people and to take ownership and try harder next time. That’s how I have always looked at it, and I look at that same skill set in life. It’s very easy to blame people for your own problems. (P8)

While one coach spoke specifically about ownership of mistakes, another identified that the intention of his behaviour was to help foster overall development, but more specifically, accountability among his athletes:

I think that’s (accountability) a really key factor in development as a person. I think that it’s vital that people recognize that you have accountability to people around you and accountability to the people who you are going to be working for and with. (P3)

When discussing clips that display transformational behaviours, coaches identified a vast number of objectives related to the development of character. They discussed their intentions to foster outcomes related to life skills such as handling criticism, learning to be successful, and
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overcoming barriers. A clear message emerging from the data is that coaches do understand that sport is a vehicle for the development of personal values and character, and that transformational behaviours can be utilized to target these outcomes.

4.3.1.5 Providing enjoyable experiences.

Finally, coaches identified that some of their observed transformational behaviours were intended to promote positive, enjoyable experiences for their athletes. These experiences were typically intended to promote long-term sport participation. One coach captured this by mentioning:

I was just trying to make the kids enjoy the season, it was going to be a tough season from the very beginning, and in reality my measurement of success was how many came back this year for the tryouts. Probably 85% came back, some kids decided to move on to other things but they still told me at the end of the season that they enjoyed the season and that their parents enjoyed what I did so, that was a reward in itself. (P8)

On the whole, coaches discussed a number of transformational behaviours which were intended to foster immediate enjoyable experiences for their athletes. The coaches emphasized the importance of enjoying the game and its impact on having athletes return to sport, and long term participation.

4.3.2 Transactional Leadership Behaviours

When discussing their own transactional behaviours, coaches discussed objectives that related to two overarching categories; establishing respect and seeking commitment. Similar to that of transformational behaviours, coaches discussed numerous intended objectives for specific
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behaviours. Therefore, each theme is presented with its relation to transactional coach behaviours as a whole.

4.3.2.1 Establishing respect.

When discussing transactional coach behaviours, participants discussed a number of concepts related to respect. Firstly, coaches discussed how transactional behaviours can be used to help establish respect among their athletes. For example, one coach discussed that his objective was to establish a more traditional sense of the coach-athlete relationship (e.g., coach as superior):

The important relationship is that I am their mentor, that I am potentially their role model. I would like to be their role model. That I can make them better volleyball players and at the end of it [the season]. (P3)

This coach discussed the fact that it is not necessary for his athletes to be his friends. More importantly, they need to understand that he is largely there as a superior, rather than a peer. Another coach similarly discussed the importance of athletes having respect for their superiors and understanding rules. The coach spoke about his rationale for benching a player who was late for his warm-up:

Well I think they should respect timelines in terms of: ‘Okay, I’m playing today and I need to be there a half hour before warm up…and that doesn’t mean 5 minutes late, that means I have to be there ready to go.’ (P7)

As can be seen, coaches use transactional behaviours to promote positive life skills (e.g., punctuality), however, it seems that the tone or life skills being targeted are slightly different than those discussed within the TFL themes (e.g., connection to the coach). In sum, certain
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transactional behaviours were reviewed and described by coaches as a method of establishing or maintaining the respect of their athletes.

4.3.2.2 Seeking commitment.

In this final theme relating to transactional leadership behaviours, coaches discussed how their viewed behaviours can be used to help athletes understand the importance of commitment. In some instances, commitment was viewed as a level of effort, for example, one coach mentioned:

I think they need to understand that you're going to be punished for things like a lack of trying, but not for trying your best and not having the results... So I might do a drill where I don’t care where the ball goes but if you have perfect technique on your platform that is good. You might put the ball to the right spot with wrong technique, and there will be a consequence. (P3)

Another coach discussed how transactional behaviours can be used to keep athletes committed to the team. When athletes were not showing up to training sessions, he described that the use of a transactional behaviour would help to establish a greater level of commitment among his athletes. In most instances, coaches discussed using additional physical activity (e.g., push-ups, sit-ups, running) as consequences for undesirable behaviour and occasionally discussed the need to sit or bench players due to undesirable behaviour (e.g., showing up late to a game). An important note to make about the participants’ discussion around transactional behaviours, is that they seem to serve as a retroactive strategy to managing athlete behaviour, particularly when athlete behaviour is not meeting coach expectations.
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4.3.3 Toxic Leadership Behaviours

Although video clips for this category were present for only 3 of the 11 coaches, overarching objectives were still derived for the use of these behaviours. *Emphasizing winning,* *advocating competitiveness,* and *lighting the fire,* were defined as intended objectives of toxic coaching behaviours.

4.3.3.1 Emphasizing winning.

Within this theme, one coach discussed that certain behaviours were intended to help athletes understand that winning is also important in sport. The coach said:

> I think if they know that I'm there to win, if I didn’t say that and I just said ‘be honest, I don’t care if we win or lose’ they would ask if I wanted success. So me saying that gets across that I still care about winning and that the competitive level needs to be there. (P6)

Similarly, other coaches identified that in certain instances, it is okay to be dishonest, if it is at the cost of winning or losing. The coach noted that since sport is being played at a competitive level, at certain times, it is okay to stress the importance of wanting to win even if it might be against the rules.

4.3.3.2 Advocating competitiveness.

Similar to emphasizing winning, coaches discussed that some behaviours are used to breed competitiveness within their athletes. One coach noted that his behaviour would “tell them that aggressiveness is okay in certain circumstances” (P6) and hoped that “he (athlete) knows he’s allowed to be aggressive (towards his opponent)” (P7). At times, coaches used certain behaviours classified as toxic to promote competitiveness and aggressive behaviours among teammates as well as towards the other team.
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4.3.3.3 Lighting the fire.

The discussion of video clips in this theme conveyed instances where coaches were trying to light a proverbial fire under their athletes. Coaches displayed this behaviour by using negative language or promoting unsportsmanlike play with their athletes. When asked about objectives of these behaviours, one coach put it quite simply by saying “The most positive outcome is getting an extra spring in his step when he gets on the field.” (P7). As discussed above, these behaviours were less commonly seen than others, but still important to note. The participants of this study discussed that these behaviours are important because at the end of the day, sport provides opportunities for its participants to learn how to be competitive, and feel the effects of being successful (e.g., winning).

In sum, Toxic leadership behaviours were viewed as methods of motivating athletes to win, be competitive, or simply try harder. These behaviours were often at the cost of being dishonest, or promoting unsportsmanlike play. Although we are aware that coaches have athletes’ best intentions in mind while coaching, the observation and discussion of these behaviours sheds light on the reality of youth sport experiences, in that, they may not always be focused solely on the PYD or the developmental needs of athletes.
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Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this project was to gain a deeper understanding of coaches’ leadership behaviours by examining coach perceptions about what leadership behaviours look like in youth sport, how they are applied, and why coaches implement certain leadership behaviours. The use of SR interviews to examine the leadership behaviours of coaches is a novel approach to sport coaching research. SR compliments the follower-centered approach (i.e., examining athlete perceptions of coach behaviour) that has been mostly used to examine TFL in youth sport (e.g., Callow et al., 2009; Richman, & Schaffer, 2000; Stenling & Tafvelin, 2014). Although identifying follower outcomes (e.g., motivation, enjoyable experiences, competence), and perceptions of leadership behaviour are valuable to understanding leadership in youth sport, it provides an incomplete picture of the overall process. Therefore, the findings of this study can contribute to the current literature in providing a more complete depiction of leadership in youth sport by offering an opportunity for coaches to share their perspective. The discussion will follow the same trajectory as that of the results presented above. First, the findings related to the identification and description of coach leadership behaviours will be discussed. Next, research relating to the factors contributing to the application of coach leadership behaviours will be discussed. Third, intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviours will be discussed with their relation to previous research findings. The final section of the discussion will focus on limitations, potential avenues for future research, and practical implications.
5.1 Identifying and describing coach leadership behaviours

One novel contribution of this study was the identification of observed coach leadership behaviours in the youth sport context. Interestingly, coaches used behaviours relating to each of the four I’s within TFL. Previous studies have identified that specific coach behaviours related to constructs of TFL (e.g., autonomy-supportive behaviours; Mageau et al., 2009) are observable, and related to positive athlete outcomes (e.g., basic needs and motivation; Stenling & Tafvelin, 2014). The influence of transformational coaching behaviours on athlete development is well supported (Price & Weiss, 2013; Vella et al., 2013). Both findings from this study, and those outlining the numerous positive outcomes associated with transformational behaviours, echo the testimony that TFL is a salient conceptualization of coach leadership behaviours that can support holistic athlete development (Rowold, 2007; Vella, et al., 2012, 2013).

Similar to transformational behaviours, each coach in this study was observed using behaviours identified as transactional. Although this finding is not novel within sport or organizational research, it still contributes to our current understanding of coach leadership behaviours in youth sport. Indeed, the behaviours observed within this study (e.g., discussing rewards/penalties, responding to deviations from rules or norms) are those that are prevalent in both organizational and sport related literature (e.g., Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Mackenzie & Podsakoff, 2001). Even pioneering research in the field of coach observation by Smith and Smoll (1977) identified mistake-contingent behaviours, which closely resemble the transactional behaviour of ‘responding to deviations from rules or norms’. The fact that coaches were observed using both transformational and transactional behaviours supports the use of the full range leadership model (Avolio, 1999) as a more encompassing conceptualization of coach
leadership behaviours than previous conceptualizations (e.g., The MML; Chelladurai, 1990; Mastery-oriented coaching behaviours; Smith et al., 2007; Autonomy-Supportive coaching behaviours; Mageau et al., 2009). Certainly, previous conceptualizations of coaching behaviours have identified important aspects of coaching behaviour that closely resemble portions of the full range leadership model (e.g., individualized coach behaviours; Chelladurai, 1990; mistake-contingent behaviours, supportive behaviours, mastery-oriented behaviours; Smith et al., 2007; Autonomy-supportive behaviours; Mageau et al., 2009). However, the full range leadership model provides a more nuanced conceptualization, which includes behaviours identified in previous conceptualizations, in addition to other components (e.g., moral components of coaching behaviours).

With regard to laissez-faire and toxic behaviours, no coaches were observed using laissez-faire leadership behaviours, while only three out of eleven coaches had an observable toxic behaviour. Although abundant examples of negative coach behaviours (e.g., expressing anger or hostility and modelling anti-social behaviours) are prevalent in social media, television platforms, and even professional sports, the participants within this study did not commonly exhibit negative coaching behaviours. If we consider that this sample of coaches is representative of the coaching population for these sports and within its geographical region, this finding indicates that the use of observable negative coach behaviours in youth sport may be limited. It is possible that this finding serves as a testament to existing coach training and education programs (e.g., NCCP; 2015), and their ability to discourage negative coaching behaviours. If nothing else, this finding is encouraging, given that early research in the coach behaviour domain identified
5.2 Factors contributing to the application of coach leadership behaviours

Two factors that contributed to the application of coach leadership behaviours were identified by coaches within this study and are discussed herein. First, the relevant literature discussing the importance of context in applying coach leadership behaviours will be reviewed. Next, literature relating to coaches’ sources of knowledge will be discussed.

5.2.1 Importance of Context.

The first overarching theme that was described as a factor contributing to the application of coach leadership behaviours was contextual considerations. This theme was divided into two sub-categories: (a) developmental differences and (b) circumstantial differences. These categories help to illustrate how coaches tailor their leadership behaviours to ensure that they are contextually appropriate.

When discussing developmental differences, coaches identified that the behaviours themselves do not typically change according to factors such as age or maturity. Rather, the way in which a given behaviour is implemented (e.g., tone, language, and information) might change depending on age, developmental level, or skill level. A body of literature that may shed light on the issue of contextual considerations centers on coaching effectiveness. Specifically, Côté and Gilbert (2009) contend that performance demands (competitive level) and developmental level (age and maturity) are the most important variables in defining a specific coaching context. In line with this assertion, the findings of this study indicate that although a coach’s leadership
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behaviour may apply to different contexts, leadership behaviours are not one size fits all and are displayed differently according to a particular developmental context.

Through athlete development models such as the Developmental Model of Sport Participation (DMSP; Côté and Vierimaa, 2014), we can garner further support that coach leadership behaviours should be contextually appropriate. The DMSP proposes a typology of coaching contexts, classifying sport into four contexts (e.g., participation coaches for sampling years, participation coaches for recreational years, performance coaches for young adolescents, and performance coaches for adolescents and young adults; Côté, Bruner, Erickson, Strachan, & Fraser-Thomas, 2010). The identification of different coaching contexts suggests that coaches will employ transformational behaviours differently to communicate with their athletes of different competitive levels and ages. For instance, all coaches displayed behaviours that were classified as “intellectual stimulation” but intellectual stimulation was manifested differently for athletes of different ages. As an example, one coach mentioned that if working with a team of adolescent athletes (e.g., 17 years old) he might ask his athletes to identify the purpose of a drill (e.g., ‘why do you think we are doing this drill?’). Differently, the coach would provide examples or queues to a group of 12 years old athletes (e.g., ‘do we do this drill because we need to work on footwork or because we need to work on field vision?’). Therefore, the objectives and actual behaviour remain the same, while the way in which the behaviour is implemented is tailored to the context in which the behaviour is displayed.

In all, these findings are supported by previous research and models identifying the importance of contextually appropriate coaching behaviours (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Côté & Vierimaa, 2014; Erickson et al., 2011). To this end, we argue that effective coach behaviours
(both transformational and otherwise) should be tailored to fit within the individual context that they occur in order to be most effective.

5.2.2 Sources of Knowledge.

Within the sub-theme of sources of knowledge, four categories helped to identify the sources from which coaches had received knowledge about interacting with athletes: (a) athletic experience, (b) coaching experience, (c) life experience, and (d) coach education. These findings are certainly supported by existing evidence (Cregan, Bloom, & Reid 2007; Gilbert, Côté, & Mallett 2006; Hardin, 2000; Saury & Durand 1998), which demonstrates that coaching knowledge comes from a variety of sources, with previous experiences (as an athlete and a coach) making a key contribution to coaching knowledge. As a specific example, Wilson, Bloom, and Harvey (2009) interviewed coaches about sources of knowledge, and found that previous athletic experience plays a substantial role in coach development. Erickson, Bruner, MacDonald, and Côté (2008) also interviewed youth sport coaches and found that coaches typically obtain knowledge through doing and interacting with other coaches, rather than through formal sources of education. On the contrary, coaches said that they would prefer to learn through guided sources of education (e.g., formal education). Similarly, in this study, coaches relied on their life experience as well as their experiences as an athlete and a coach to explain the choice and application of specific coach behaviours.

In examining these findings, it is important to note one caveat; while previous athletic experience can be valuable, it is not an essential ingredient for effective coaching (Carter & Bloom, 2009). Consistent with this perspective, the current study illustrated how other forms of experiences such as interacting with children or involvement in contexts outside of sport (e.g.,
work experiences and social experiences) help to inform coach behaviours as well. This is important to consider, given that youth sport coaches are typically volunteers and may have a vast range of life experiences that contribute to their interpersonal coaching knowledge and behaviours.

Broadly, the findings of the present study further demonstrate that informal experiences make a crucial and potentially unique contribution to coaches’ learning of leadership behaviours. In line with this assertion, numerous researchers have called for coaching research to recognize the importance of informal education and prior non-sport coaching activities as a potentially important vessel for coach learning experiences (Cregan, et al., 2007; Erickson et al., 2008; Gilbert et al., 2006).

5.2.3 Intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviours

One unique finding from the present study was related to the theme of intended outcomes of coach leadership behaviours. Results indicate that coaches associated very specific objectives with a particular coach leadership style (e.g., transformational, transactional, and toxic). When reflecting upon their own transformational behaviours, coaches identified five intended outcomes: Instilling confidence, promoting competence, establishing connection, developing character, and providing enjoyable experience. The five intended outcomes that coaches elicited in this study are consistent with findings of empirical studies using questionnaires to identify athlete outcomes associated with transformational behaviours (Beauchamp et al., 2011; Charbonneau et al., 2001; Price & Weiss, 2011; Vella et al., 2013a). Specifically, studies that have examined outcomes of coach leadership behaviours as perceived by their athletes including: competence (Price and Weiss, 2011), development of personal and social skills (Vella et al.,
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2013), self-efficacy (Beauchamp et al., 2011), and intrinsic motivation (Charbonneau et al., 2001). In addition, qualitative research within the sports coaching domain support the findings of this study (Vella et al., 2011). For example, Vella and colleagues interviewed youth sport coaches about which outcomes coaches attempt to influence among their athletes and identified the 4 C’s of PYD, in addition to team climate, broader life skills, enjoyment, and psychological capacities. Similarly, coaches in the present study identified that transformational behaviours were intended to promote the constructs of PYD alongside enjoyable experiences.

In addition to constructs related to PYD, researchers within organizational literature have suggested that transformational behaviours can also be used to influence enjoyment through intrinsic motivation (Barbuto, 2005; Garcia-Mas et al., 2010). In sport, Vierimaa, Turnnidge, Bruner, and Côté (2014) found that coaches stressed the importance of facilitating immediate and enjoyable sporting experiences with specific behaviours. The recent work of Visek and colleagues (2015) in their creation of ‘fun maps’ with youth athletes support the important role that coaches play in creating a “fun” sport experience for their athletes. In this study, the immediate enjoyment of athletes in youth sport was intended to be enhanced by coach behaviours that were related to TFL and typically classified under the category of ‘Idealized Influence’.

With regards to transactional behaviours, coaches discussed two categories of intended outcomes: establishing respect and seeking commitment. In assessing these intended outcomes compared to those discussed with transformational coach behaviours, it is evident that there are distinct differences. Primarily, when discussing their own observed transactional behaviours, coaches discussed topics of team structure and power dynamics. Coaches also revealed that they
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employed transactional behaviours to help enforce values such as respect for superiors and abiding to team rules. Specifically, coaches identified that transactional behaviours are sometimes used to seek commitment from their athletes. Commitment in this sense was related to athletes showing up on time, or simply giving their best effort.

Transactional leadership is deemed as a necessary, but insufficient component of leading (Bass, 2007). In fact, it has been suggested that the use of transactional behaviours in conjunction with transformational behaviours result in an augmentation hypothesis, which proposes that ‘more active forms of transactional leadership (contingent reward and active management-by-exception) represent necessary but insufficient conditions for superior performance and responses among followers’ (Morton, Barling, Rhodes, Masse, Zumbo, & Beauchamp, 2011, p. 136). Bass (1985) defines a transactional leader as one who operates under a traditional management leadership style. Specifically, transactional leaders “prefer process over substance as a means for maintaining control” (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam; 1996, p. 387). This conceptualization of transactional leadership, developed and proposed within organizational psychology, is however strikingly similar to that of the style described by coaches within this study. For example, upon viewing their own transactional behaviours, coaches discussed objectives related to maintaining control of athletes through respect and commitment. Therefore, conceptualizations of transactional leadership in youth sport may mirror those proposed in organizational settings. The primary concern regarding these findings is the negative association coaches had with transactional behaviours. Although transactional behaviours can be useful for providing extrinsic motivation (e.g., providing rewards) to athletes, coaches in this study viewed
transactional leadership as a reactive strategy to managing undesired athlete behaviours which could have negative consequences on athletes’ long term sport engagement.

The final group of leadership behaviours observed in this study was classified as Toxic. Coaches discussed that they employed toxic behaviours to *emphasize winning, advocate competitiveness*, and *light a fire*. Previously in sport research, few studies have examined these types of coaching behaviours. As one example, Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, and Thogersen-Ntoumanis (2010) found examples of behaviours from British coaches and youth athletes across numerous sports (i.e. swimming, squash, and dancing) that parallel the toxic behaviours displayed by some coaches in the present study. More specifically, Bartholomew et al. discussed two behaviours (i.e. promoting ego involvement and intimidation behaviours) used by coaches to demonstrate their superiority towards athletes. Similarly, coaches in this study discussed two objectives (i.e., emphasizing winning and breeding competitiveness) that relate very closely to promoting ego involvement. Secondly, intimidation behaviours, were described by Bartholomew et al. as instances in which coaches use power or assertive techniques to promote the desired athlete behaviour such as ‘Lighting a fire’ in the present study, where coaches yelled or took an assertive tone with athletes. Bartholomew and colleagues contend that these types of behaviours can have negative implications on youth sport experiences by manifesting coach resentment, stunting autonomy, reducing motivation, and ultimately leading to burnout.

The toxic behaviours displayed by coaches in this study can be viewed through the lens of the organizational contexts literature more specifically related to the concept of abusive supervision (Bies & Tripp, 1998). Tepper (2000) conceptualized abusive supervision as ‘the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours, excluding physical contact’ (p.
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178). Indeed, this definition is an exaggerated form of the behaviours and coaching styles that were viewed and discussed within this study. However, given that behaviours defined as toxic in this study could potentially be viewed as hostile by athletes (e.g., yelling at athletes), there remains an important area of research examining the perceptions of athletes towards toxic behaviours. It is plausible that although the coaches in this study were not consistently employing toxic behaviours, specific athletes still may perceive these behaviors as abusive. If for example, the toxic behaviours that do occur are targeted at one or a few athletes on multiple occasions, the leader’s behaviour could easily fall within Tepper’s definition of abusive behaviours. The importance of this is emphasized by the fact that abusive supervision behaviours in work supervisors are linked to followers’ (workers) negative outcomes of anxiety, life satisfaction, commitment, and emotional exhaustion (Tepper, 2000). Literature tends to suggest that behaviours of this sort can have a potentially negative impact on social and personal development of young athletes (Bartholomew et al., 2010). In addition, displays of toxic behaviours in youth sport could be considered as a form of abusive supervision, resulting in more severe negative consequences for athletes (e.g., anxiety, depression, emotional exhaustion; Tepper, 2000). It is encouraging that toxic behaviours were rare for this sample of coaches, however; concern is still warranted given their potentially negative impact on athletic experiences and outcomes.

5.3 Limitations and Future directions

The current study sheds light on the applicability of transformational behaviours in youth sport; however, there were limitations that can be addressed in future research projects. First, this study examined only coach perceptions of leadership behaviours. In response, future studies may
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seek to obtain perceptions of players, parents, or other coaches using a similar methodology (e.g., stimulated recall). This information would provide researchers with a richer understanding of leadership behaviours and their potential influence on youth development. Secondly, although this study contained a sample of coaches who have a wide range of experiences in coaching (see table 2), each coach was currently coaching a competitive level sports team between the ages of 13-18. With this in mind, future research studies may seek to study the perception of coaches that work with athletes of different sports, ages, and competitive levels. Another limitation to this study is the fact that female coaches were recruited, but they did not partake in the entirety of the study. It should be noted, however, that this sample of coaches could be considered relatively representative of the coach demographics for these sports, within this geographical region. As can be viewed in Table 3, a majority of competitive coaches for these two sports and across these age groups were male (89.5%). Given that coaching and leadership literature report gender differences in leadership behaviours (e.g., Barling, 2014; Millard, 1996) future studies examining female coaches would be beneficial in the realm of coaching leadership research.

There are also a number of additional avenues of future research stemming from the current work. First, given the current popularity of the Long-Term Athlete Development Model (Balyi & Hamilton, 2004), more research is needed to explore how coaches’ leadership behaviours can influence the long-term engagement of young athletes and, as importantly, the immediate experiences of youth in sport. Second, researchers may consider further observational methods across different sport contexts to provide an objective understanding of how the implementation of specific leadership behaviours do indeed change according to developmental and situational differences in contexts.
Chapter 6

Conclusion

This section will discuss the practical implications of this study, and seeks to offer information pertaining to how the information collected can be used by coaches, coach developers, and researchers intending to design interventions relating to coach leadership. This section will also discuss the limitations of the study and offer future directions for studies in this field of research. Finally, this section includes a summative paragraph on concluding thoughts.

The coaches within this study identified that their behaviours may change depending on context (e.g., competition vs practice, throughout the course of the season, athlete-athlete, and the individual situation). Importantly, coaches identified that the broad style of leadership behaviours (i.e., Intellectual Stimulation) typically remain the same across contexts. Coaches may change the way in which their behaviours are implemented for specific situations but overall their behavioural responses are targeted at fulfilling specific goals and objectives. Therefore, we can presume that leadership behaviours are not one size fits all, and coach education programs should emphasize the fact that coaches are not restricted to using behaviours in the same way, every time, but that different versions of a similar behaviors are often used.

Understanding the origin of a specific behaviour is an essential component in aiding the development of coach development programs (CDP’s) and interventions for behaviour change (Michie, West, Campbell, Brown, and Gainforth, 2014). Perhaps the most interesting finding within this theme was that coaches rarely cited formal education or training as a source of knowledge. This is important to consider, given that coach education programs predominantly
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focus on the professional rather than the interpersonal aspects of coaching. For example, a recent review conducted by Lefebvre, Evans, Turnnidge, Gainforth, and Côté (in press), identified that CDPs designed for coaches most commonly target aspects of technical, tactical skills, and planning, whereas CDPs designed to target coach-athlete interactions or leadership style are much less common. With this information, the findings of this study highlight the necessity for program developers and stakeholders of interventions or applied CDPs to draw attention towards (a) programs targeting interactions with athletes and (b) programs which combine both practical and informational components.

One interesting finding from this study that can be applied in a practical manner is related to coaches’ association between leadership style and their coaching objective. Practically, this finding indicates the need for coach interventions or workshops related to the application of TFL behaviors in youth sport. Specific TFL education programs may provide coaches with an opportunity to understand how transformational behaviours can influence outcomes that may typically be associated with more ineffective and passive forms of leadership (e.g., respect, commitment, etc.). Coaches with a greater understanding of TFL may in turn be less likely to resort to transactional and toxic behaviours, thus reducing young athletes’ exposure to a leadership style that can potentially limit the impact that sport participation can have on positive youth development.

Overall, this study has contributed important findings which will help guide researchers’ application and understanding of leadership behaviours in youth sport. As research examining coach leadership behaviours continues to gather attention, this study can serve as a component in providing academics and coaches with the foundational understanding of what youth sport
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coaches leadership behaviors look like, where, when, and why they are implemented, and finally, how they may vary across contexts. These pieces of information will also be important for those who wish to devise leadership interventions or CDPs in the youth sport setting. Researchers should continue to attempt to investigate processes of coaching from the viewpoints of coaches and athletes, in order to develop the knowledge base related to coach-athlete relationships and interactions. This exciting new area of research can greatly contribute to the current understanding of TFL in youth sport, and it is hoped that the findings from this study will spark further interest in this important area of research.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire Subscales Table
Table 6. Previous questionnaires measuring athlete perceptions of TFL with examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>MLQ-5X</th>
<th>TTQ</th>
<th>DTLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence</strong></td>
<td>“My coach talks about his/her most important values and beliefs”</td>
<td>“Acts as a person that I look up to”</td>
<td>“My coach leads by example”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td>“My coach talks optimistically about the future”</td>
<td>“Is optimistic about what I can accomplish”</td>
<td>“My coach talks optimistically”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong></td>
<td>“My coach seeks differing perspectives when solving problems”</td>
<td>“Gets me to think for myself”</td>
<td>“My coach gets me to rethink the way I do things”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized Consideration</strong></td>
<td>“My coach helps develop my strengths”</td>
<td>“Displays a genuine interest in my life”</td>
<td>“My coach treats each team member as an individual”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Research Ethics Documentation and Approval
COACH LETTER OF INFORMATION

Title of the study: Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport

The purpose of this study is to examine coach perceptions of their behaviours in youth sport. Specifically, the goal is to understand what behaviours coaches use, how they use them and why. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's policies.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a one-on-one stimulated recall interview with the primary researcher. During the course of the interview, you will be shown video clips and asked to reflect on your own coaching behaviours. The interview should take about 1 hour to complete. The interview will take place at either (a) over SKYPE or (c) in person at the location of your choice, either at the interviewer’s office or in a private room at your practice facility (while other co-workers are present in the building).

There are no known or foreseeable risks involved for participating in this study. There will be no deception used in this study. Participation is completely voluntary and you can withdraw at any time. This is part of a research project for which Matthew McGuckin is the primary researcher. The results from this study will be published and presented at conferences; however, your identity will be kept confidential. Although we will report direct quotations from the interviews, each interview participant will be given a pseudonym (false name), and all identifying information will be removed. All the information provided through the interviews will be confidential and will be stored by in a locked office in the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies at Queen’s University for a minimum of seven years after the completion of the study. As a reminder, participation is completely voluntary and should you wish, you may withdraw from the study at any time, for any reason, without explanation or consequences by contacting the primary researcher, Matthew McGuckin. Any information collected up to the time you withdraw from the study will be destroyed. All images of athletes and coaches will be viewed only by the research team during the analysis of the data. They will then be destroyed. No images will be shown in conference presentations or in any publications.

With your permission the interviews will be used to help improve coach behaviours within the youth sport environment. If you decide that you would like to be a part of this study, please complete the attached form. Any questions about study participation may be directed to Matthew McGuckin at (905) 506-1793 or 14mecm@queensu.ca. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the General Research Ethics Board 613-533-6081 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM – COACH

Title of the study: Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport

I have read the information letter and understand the purpose of this study and my involvement in this study.

I have been informed that my confidentiality will be protected throughout the study, and that the information I provide will be available only to the primary researcher and her research team. While the results of this study may be presented at academic conferences and/or in academic journals, I am aware that any results will be presented using pseudonyms—thereby maintaining my anonymity.

I understand that my participation in this research project is completely voluntary and that I reserve the right not to answer any question(s) I do not feel comfortable with. I also recognize that I may stop participating at any time without explanation or consequence. I understand that any data collected up to that point will be destroyed.

Finally, any questions I have about this research project and my participation have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am invited to contact the primary researcher and/or the General Ethics Review Board should any further questions or concerns about this research project or my participation.

I consent to participate in this research project conducted by the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies at Queen’s University.

________________________
Name of Participant

________________________
Signature

________________________
Date

Please indicate if you wish to receive a summary of the study findings: [ ] Yes [ ] No

Matthew McGuckin
Primary Investigator
MSc Candidate
School of Kinesiology & Health Studies
Queen’s University
Kingston, ON
(613)533-6000, ext. 78207
14mecm@queensu.ca

Joan Stevenson, PhD
Chair
General Ethics Review Board
Queen’s University
Kingston, ON
(613)533-6000, ext. 74025
chair.GREB@queensu.ca
PARTICIPANT PARENTAL LETTER OF INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM

Title of the study: Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport

We would like to ask for your child’s assistance with a study that is being carried out by a team of researchers from Queen’s University. The purpose of this study is to examine coaches’ leadership behaviours in youth sport. The findings from this project will provide important information to coaches and educators with regards to creating positive sport environments and facilitating youth development in sport settings. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's policies.

If your child volunteers to participate in this study, they will be observed and video recorded multiple times. Coaches will wear a microphone to record any talking that takes place within the sport environment. The videotaped practices will then be watched by one of the principal investigators to examine coach behaviours within sport. There will be no deception used in this study. Participation is completely voluntary and your child will be informed that they can withdraw at any time.

This is part of a research project for which Jordan Lefebvre and Matthew McGuckin are co-primary researchers. The results from this study will be published and presented at conferences; however, the identity of your child will be kept confidential. All the information provided through the questionnaires and observations will be confidential and will be stored by in a locked office at Queen’s University for a minimum of seven years after the completion of the study. As a reminder, participation is completely voluntary and should you (or your child) wish, they may withdraw from all or part of the study at any time, for any reason, without explanation or consequences by contacting either of the primary researchers, Jordan Lefebvre and Matthew McGuckin. Any information collected up to the time your child withdraws from the study will be destroyed.

With your permission and your child’s permission, the questionnaires and observations will be used to help improve coach behaviours within the youth sport environment. If you and your child decide that they would like to be a part of this study, please complete the attached form. Also, please ask your child to read their letter and indicate their consent as well. Any questions about study participation may be directed to Jordan Lefebvre or Matthew McGuckin at 613-533-6000, ext. 78207 or 14JL64@queensu.ca and 14MECM@queensu.ca respectively. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board, Joan Stevenson, at 613-533-6000, ext. 74025 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.
PARENTS/GUARDIANS PLEASE READ and SIGN YOUR CONSENT

I have read and understood the purpose of this study and my child’s involvement in this study. I am aware that my child will remain anonymous throughout the study and in any written results of the data collection through participation in this project.

I understand that my child’s participation in this research project is completely voluntary. I also recognize that my child has the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and that any data collected to this point will be destroyed.

Finally, any questions I have about this research project and my child’s participation have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am invited to contact the primary researcher and/or the General Ethics Review Board should I have any further questions or concerns about this research project and my child’s participation.

I, ____________________________ give permission to allow ____________________

to participate in the study conducted by the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies at Queen’s University.

Signature__________________________________________ Date __________

Please indicate if you wish to receive a summary of the study findings: [] Yes [] No
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM-ATHLETE

Title of the study: Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport

You are invited to participate in a study entitled ‘Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport’. This study has been granted clearance according to the recommended principles of Canadian ethics guidelines, and Queen's policies. Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have.

Purpose and Procedures

The purpose of this research study is to examine coaches’ leadership behaviours in youth sport.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to be videotaped during your sport sessions (games and practices)

Potential Risks

You have the right to not answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with and are invited to contact Telehealth Ontario at 1-866-797-0000 if any of these questions trigger emotional upset.

Potential Benefits

As a participant, you may be making important contributions to the research literature. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any direct benefits from the study.

Storage of Data

The questionnaires and video recordings will be safeguarded and securely stored in a locked filing cabinet at Queen’s University for a minimum of seven years as per University requirements.

Confidentiality

The data from this study will be published and presented at conferences; however, your identity will be kept confidential. All images of athletes and coaches will be viewed only by the research team during the analysis of the data. They will then be destroyed. No images will be shown in conference presentations or in any publications.

Right to Withdraw

You may withdraw from the study for any reason, at any time, without penalty of any sort by contacting one of the principal investigators, Jordan Lefebvre or Matthew McGuckin (613-533-6000, ext. 78207). There will be no team related effects associated with withdrawal. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering. Any information collected up to the time you withdraw from the study will be destroyed.
Questions

Any questions about study participation may be directed to Jordan Lefebvre at 613-533-6000, ext. 78207 or 14JL64@queensu.ca or Matthew McGuckin at 613-533-6000, ext. 78207 or 14MECM@queensu.ca. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board, Joan Stevenson, at 613-533-6000, ext. 74025 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.

Jordan Lefebvre  Mathew McGuckin  Jean Côté, PhD
Co-Primary Investigator  Co-Primary Investigator  Lab Supervisor
MSc Candidate  MSc Candidate  Director and Professor
School of Kinesiology & Health Studies  School of Kinesiology & Health Studies  School of Kinesiology & Health Studies
Queen’s University  Queen’s University  Queen’s University
(613)533-6000, ext. 78207  (613)533-6000, ext. 78207  (613)533-6000, ext. 79049
14JL64@queensu.ca  14MECM@queensu.ca  Jc46@queensu.ca
Consent to Participate

I have read and understood the description provided above. I have been provided with an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered satisfactorily. I consent to participate in the study described above, understanding that I may withdraw this consent at any time. A copy of this consent form has been given to me for my records.

_________________________________________  _______________________________________
Signature of Participant                        Date

_________________________________________  _______________________________________
Signature of Researcher                        Date
Confidentiality Agreements and Guidelines for Researchers
Confidentiality Agreement for Data Collectors

Title of the study: Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport

A. I have read and retained the Letter of Information and the Guidelines for Data Collectors and Collaborators concerning the research “Examining Coach Behaviours and Athlete Outcomes Within Sport”, which is being conducted by Jordan Lefebvre and Matthew McGuckin. In my role as a data collector for the researcher, I understand the nature of the study and requirements for confidentiality. I have had all of my questions concerning the nature of the study and my role as a data collector answered to my satisfaction. I agree to adhere to the protocol outlined with the Guidelines for Data Collectors and Collaborators document.

B. Maintaining Confidentiality

I agree not to reveal in any way to any person other than the researcher any data gathered for the study by means of my services as a data collector.

C. Acknowledgement of My Services as a Data Collector

I understand that the researcher may acknowledge the use of my services in any reporting on the research. I have indicated below whether I wish that acknowledgement to be anonymous or whether it may recognize me by name.

____ I do not wish my name to be associated with the acknowledgement of the use of a data collector in data gathering for the research.

OR

____ I agree that the researcher may associate my name with the acknowledgement of the use of a data collector in data gathering for the research.

D. Identification and Signature Indicating Agreement

Name: _______________________________

Email: _______________________________

Telephone: ______________ Mailing Address: _____________________________

Signature: __________________________________________

Should you have further questions or concerns regarding any aspect of this study, you may contact any of the individuals listed below:

Matthew McGuckin, MSc  
Primary Investigator  
School of Kinesiology & Health Studies  
Queen’s University  
Kingston, ON  
(905)506-1793  
14mecm@queensu.ca

Jordan Lefebvre  
Primary Investigator  
School of Kinesiology & Health Studies  
Queen’s University  
Kingston, ON  
(819)640-0122  
14jl64@queensu.ca

Jean Côté, PhD  
Lab Supervisor  
School of Kinesiology & Health Studies  
Queen’s University  
Kingston, ON  
(613)533-6000, ext. 79049  
je46@queensu.ca

General Research Ethics Board  
(613)533-6081  
chair.GREB@queensu.ca
Confidentiality Agreement for Coders

Title of the study: Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport

A. I have read and retained the Letter of Information concerning the research “Exploring Leadership Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport”, which is being conducted by Jordan Lefebvre and Matthew McGuckin. In my role as coder for the researcher, I understand the nature of the study and requirements for confidentiality. I have had all of my questions concerning the nature of the study and my role as coder answered to my satisfaction.

B. Maintaining Confidentiality
I agree not to reveal in any way to any person other than the researcher any data gathered for the study by means of my services as coder.

C. Acknowledgement of My Services as Coder
I understand that the researcher may acknowledge the use of my services in any reporting on the research. I have indicated below whether I wish that acknowledgement to be anonymous or whether it may recognize me by name.

___ I do not wish my name to be associated with the acknowledgement of the use of a coder in data gathering for the research. 
OR

___ I agree that the researcher may associate my name with the acknowledgement of the use of a coder in data gathering for the research.

D. Identification and Signature Indicating Agreement

Name: _______________________________
Email: _______________________________
Telephone: _______________ Mailing Address: _____________________________
Signature: ____________________________

Should you have further questions or concerns regarding any aspect of this study, you may contact any of the individuals listed below:

Primary Researcher: Primary Researcher: General Research Ethics Board:
Jordan Lefebvre Matthew McGuckin Dr. Joan Stevenson (Chair)
School of Kinesiology and School of Kinesiology and Health Queen’s University
Health Studies Studies (613) 533-6000, ext. 74025
Queen’s University Queen’s University chair.GREB@queensu.ca
(613) 533-6000, ext. 78207 (613) 533-6000, ext. 78207 14mecm@queensu.ca
Confidentiality Agreement for Transcribers

Title of the study: Examining Coach Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport

A. I have read and retained the Letter of Information concerning the research “Examining Leadership and Youth Outcomes Within Sport”, which is being conducted by Jordan Lefebvre and Matthew McGuckin. In my role as transcriber for the researcher, I understand the nature of the study and requirements for confidentiality. I have had all of my questions concerning the nature of the study and my role as transcriber answered to my satisfaction.

B. Maintaining Confidentiality
I agree not to reveal in any way to any person other than the researcher any data gathered for the study by means of my services as transcriber.

C. Acknowledgement of My Services as Transcriber
I understand that the researcher may acknowledge the use of my services in any reporting on the research. I have indicated below whether I wish that acknowledgement to be anonymous or whether it may recognize me by name.

___ I do not wish my name to be associated with the acknowledgement of the use of a transcriber in data gathering for the research.

OR

___ I agree that the researcher may associate my name with the acknowledgement of the use of a transcriber in data gathering for the research.

D. Identification and Signature Indicating Agreement
Name: ____________________________________________
Email: ____________________________________________
Telephone: __________________ Mailing Address: __________________

Signature: ____________________________________________

Should you have further questions or concerns regarding any aspect of this study, you may contact any of the individuals listed below:

Primary Researcher: Primary Researcher: General Research Ethics Board:
Jordan Lefebvre Matthew McGuckin Dr. Joan Stevenson (Chair)
School of Kinesiology and School of Kinesiology and Health Queen’s University
Health Studies Studies (613) 533-6000, ext. 74025
Queen’s University Queen’s University chair.GREB@queensu.ca
(613) 533-6000, ext. 78207 (613) 533-6000, ext. 78207
14jl64@queensu.ca 14mecm@queensu.ca
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Guidelines for Data Collectors and Collaborators

In collecting observational data for the study entitled: “Examining Leadership Behaviours and Youth Outcomes Within Sport”, the following protocol **MUST** be adhered to:

1. Prior to the collection of any data, an email must be sent out to parents with electronic version of the letters of information and consent forms. This email will also include an outline of the study and supply parents/guardians with planned dates for data collection. This email will provide parents/guardians with an opportunity to bring in their consent forms ahead of time and will also allow them to voice any questions/concerns.

2. On the agreed date for the pilot session, data collectors will arrive 20 minutes before practice. This time is to allow parents/guardians a chance to discuss any questions/concerns. The data collector will also have hard copies of the letters of information and consent forms on hand in case they are needed.

3. Pilot testing of the equipment may **only** occur if consent forms have been received from the participants (both the coach and the athletes and their parents/guardians).

4. If there are participants who do not wish to participate in the study, data collectors are responsible for finding an appropriate solution that the participants are comfortable with. This may include: (1) if not enough consent forms are obtained, then the team will not be able to participate in the study, (2) if the coach, athletes, and parents are willing, those athletes who do not wish to participate may partake in a separate drill while the video-taping is occurring, or (3) if the coach, athletes and parents are willing, video-taping may still occur with the understanding that all efforts will be made to keep non-participants out of camera view and if the non-participants are included in the camera view, their actions will not be analyzed for research purposes. This decision **must** be made prior to any data collection.

5. During video-taping, efforts will be made to allow the coach to run their practice in a “business as usual” manner.

6. The content of these video-taped sessions must be kept confidential and no references to the identity of the participants should be made.

In order to ensure that this protocol will be followed, all data collectors and/or collaborators with this project will be required to undergo a training session which outlines the steps involved in collecting data for this project and the potential issues that may arise. All data collectors and/or collaborators will be required to read the above guidelines and sign a form outlining that they (a) understand the guidelines and (b) agree to adhere to the guidelines.
Appendix C

CLAS Coding System Manual
## CLAS Coding System Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Order Dimension</th>
<th>Lower Order Dimension</th>
<th>Leadership Tone Behaviours</th>
<th>Content Modifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>1 - Discussing/modelling pro-social values or behaviours</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Showing vulnerability/humility</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3 - Discussing goals/expectations</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - Expressing confidence in athlete potential</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - Promoting team concept</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - Providing rationales/explanations</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>7 - Eliciting athlete input</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 - Sharing decision making/leadership responsibilities</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 - Emphasizing the learning process</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>10 - Showing interest in athlete feelings/needs/concerns</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization 3-General Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 - Recognizing athlete achievements/contributions</td>
<td>1-Instruction/Feedback 2-Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>1- Instruction/Feedback</td>
<td>2- Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>12- Discussing rewards/penalties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13- Searching for/responding to deviations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from rules or standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14- Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>15- Showing disinterest</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic</td>
<td>16- Expressing anger/hostility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17- Modelling anti-social behaviours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X-Uncodable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Coding Guidelines

Overview

The Coach Leadership Assessment System (CLAS) has been designed so that it can be used to code videos that have been uploaded into a computer program (e.g., Noldus Observer). When using the tool, coders review videos of coaches – pausing the video to code each coach behavior. This tool is intended for use with a continuous coding approach and thus every possible type of coach behavior must be classified into one of the categories of this instrument. Each behavior is then coded according to the individual initiating the behavior (e.g., coach) and the leadership tone of the behavior (i.e., the primary code). In addition, coders complete ratings to further describe the behavior, and indicate the more specific content of the behavior, as well as with the recipient (i.e., athlete) of the behavior and the context in which the behavior occurs (i.e., scrimmage).

This instrument is designed to be able to capture leadership behaviours in a variety of sports (e.g., volleyball, soccer, swimming, synchronized swimming, beach volleyball, hockey, basketball, etc.) and sport activities (e.g., competition, practices).

Coding sessions will involve coding the continuous behaviour of the coach during a 15-minute video clip. The amount of time required to code each 15-minute segment in its entirety is highly variable, and may depend on factors such as the experience of the coder or the content of the particular segment.

The codes in the CLAS are based on classification of behaviours across two (2) dimensions:

1. Coach Behaviour, which includes:
   a. The initiator subject (i.e., whose behaviour is being coded)
   b. The leadership tone of a given interactive behaviour
   c. The content modifier of a given interactive behavior
   d. The recipient of a given coach behavior (i.e., to whom a coded behavior is directed).

2. Context (the training or competition activity context in which a given coach behaviour takes place).

Rules

- 3-second rule
  o Wait three (3) seconds before coding ‘neutral’ (leadership tone) when changing from any actively communicative code. Code for this behaviour only if it continues past the three (3) second waiting period, at which point you would rewind the video three seconds and begin coding it at its true initiation point. If within three (3) seconds a different actively communicative behaviour occurs, do not wait to code that behaviour.

  o Wait three (3) seconds before coding ‘observation’ (content modifier) when changing from any actively communicative code. Code for this behaviour only if
it continues past the three (3) second waiting period, at which point you would rewind the video three seconds and begin coding it at its true initiation point. If within three (3) seconds a different actively communicative behaviour occurs, do not wait to code that behaviour.

- Wait three (3) seconds before coding ‘uncodable’ when changing from any other code. Code for this behaviour only if it continues past the three (3) second waiting period, at which point you would rewind the video three seconds and begin coding it at its true initiation point. If within three (3) seconds a different behaviour visibly or audibly occurs, do not wait to code that behaviour.

- **Default codes**
  - For the coach leadership tone dimension, specific behaviour codes are to be coded by default if criteria for any other behaviour within the dimension are not met. That is, use the default codes in the absence of any other codable behaviour:
    - Leadership tone: 14 (Neutral)
  - However, priority is given to more extreme codes in the leadership tone dimension. If deciding between the default code and an active code, always select the more extreme code
    - E.g., if deciding between ‘neutral’ and ‘transactional’ leadership tone, code ‘transactional’
  - For the content modifier dimension, the default code to be used in the absence of any other codable behaviour is:
    - If the coach is not actively communicating with any of the athletes, Leadership tone + content modifier: 14 (Neutral), 4 (Observation)
    - If the coach is actively communicating with any of the athletes, Leadership tone + content modifier: 14 (Neutral), 3 (General Communication)
  - For the recipient modifier, the default code is:
    - Team (if behaviour is directed to two or more athletes)
  - No default categories exist for the context dimension as this must be directly observed.

**Subject – Initiator or Recipient (letters)**

As there are multiple participants in all videos (i.e., individual athletes and the coach), the coder must specify which subject’s behaviour is being coded. Once assigned a subject ID, athletes must be coded as same subject for all videos. Note: Athletes could be coded individual (i.e., athlete A, athlete b, etc.) or could be coded as individual vs. team, depending on the research question or design. The subject codes can be used as follows:

**CODE**
- z – Coach
- a – Athlete A
b – Athlete B
c – Athlete C
d – Athlete D
e – Athlete E
f – Athlete F
g – Athlete G
h – Athlete H
i – Athlete I
j – Athlete J

dimension – leadership behaviour

overview

• The leadership behaviour dimension is comprised of (a) leadership tone and (b) a class of coach behaviour content modifiers.
• Each leadership behaviour code (i.e., all codes other than uncodable) is linked to the content modifier codes. For every observed leadership behaviour, a leadership tone code and a content modifier code MUST be scored. Thus, each observed behaviour is categorized by the combination of two (2) codes – a leadership tone code followed by modifier code(s) (e.g., “Discussing/modelling pro-social values or behaviours + General Communication” or “Eliciting athlete input + Instruction/Feedback, etc.)
• If there is a change in any of these codes (leadership tone OR content modifier), begin a new entry and code as new independent coach behaviour. Thus, if the coach begins with “Discussing/modelling pro-social values or behaviours + General Communication” and moves immediately to “Discussing/modelling pro-social values or behaviours + Instruction/Feedback” in the same continuous interaction, code as two (2) separate behaviours.
• Leadership tone behaviours and content modifier codes are intended to encompass BOTH verbal and non-verbal behavioural indicators. For instance, the leadership tone code “Recognizing athlete achievements/contributions” could include giving high-fives, a thumbs up, etc., whereas the content modifier code “Organization” could include whistle-blowing, etc. For non-verbal behaviours, they must be easily identifiable (i.e., there must be a definite behavioural cue).
• For the leadership tone behaviour dimension, please use theoretical constructs (i.e., the 4 I’s, transactional, etc.) as a general guide for interpreting the “general message” of the behaviour. For instance, when deciding whether a coach behaviour truly “fits” with a particular behavioural code, such as eliciting athlete input, it may be useful to assess whether this behaviour aligns with the general concept of intellectual stimulation.
LEADERSHIP TONE

**Idealized Influence:** Behaviours conveying the coach as (a) a positive role model, (b) an individual of high moral/ethical standing, or (c) trustworthy and respected.

Categories:

- **01- Discussing/modelling pro-social values or behaviours**
  - Prosocial values/behaviours generally refer to values/behaviours that are intended to benefit others and that are prompted by empathy, morality, or a sense of social responsibility, rather than a desire for personal gain.
  - Can include general social or moral topics (e.g., displaying respect, supporting others, empathy/understanding, etc.).
  - Can include deliberate attempts to foster pro-social attitudes or skills among the athletes, etc. (e.g., teaching responsibility, highlighting the importance of assisting teammates, etc.).
  - Can include humour-based behaviours (e.g., humor as an initial ice-breaking method, a stress-relieving method, or a means of motivation, team communication, energy, or enjoyment promotion). Note: humour that is mean-spirited, sarcastic, or at the expense of others should not be included here, but in modelling anti-social behaviours; self-deprecating humour should not be included here, but in showing vulnerability/humility.
  - Can also include non-verbal behaviours (e.g., helping athletes gather their equipment).
  - E.g., *“It is really important that we stay friendly and respectful on the court.”*

- **02-Showing vulnerability/humility**
  - Discussions where they recognize gaps in their knowledge, understanding, and may involve asking an athlete for help.
  - Can include admitting to, or apologizing, for mistakes.
  - Can include discussing personal information with athletes (e.g., telling stories where they felt discouraged, saying they’ve also had bad days, sharing that they get nervous too, etc.).
  - E.g., *“Sorry guys, I messed up and gave you the wrong set.”*

**Inspirational Motivation:** Behaviours through which a coach demonstrates that they hold (a) high expectations for their athletes, or (b) a compelling vision of the future for either individual athletes or the team as a whole. Also includes behaviours through which a coach promotes team spirit, enthusiasm, and meaning/challenge.
Categories:

- **03-Discussing goals/expectations**
  - Expectations can be for a particular training session, a particular drill, or as a part of a larger picture, such as an upcoming game or goals for the season.
  - Can include discussion of goal(s), goal setting, etc. (can be for a particular training session, a particular drill, or as a part of a larger picture, such as an upcoming game or goals for the season). Can also involve asking athletes to write down or vocalize their own goals.
  - E.g., “For this drill, I want to see you guys giving 100 percent.”

- **04-Expressing confidence in athlete potential**
  - Talking optimistically/enthusiastically about what the athlete(s) can achieve.
  - Providing challenging task(s), etc. (E.g., “I think you guys can handle this higher intensity, so we’re going to go for it today.”)
  - E.g., “I know you guys can do this.”

- **05-Promoting team concept**
  - Encouraging team spirit/attitude towards team members.
  - E.g., team chants, discussing the importance of coming together as a team, teamwork, etc.
  - Can also include clarifying roles with team, discussing team issues
  - Note: This category involves behaviours that involve a collective goal/vision etc. If the behaviours involve a moral/ethical element (i.e., this is how we should behave towards others), it should be coded as 01-discussing/modelling pro-social values or behaviours.
  - E.g., “Come on everyone, it’s ‘let’s go Vikings’ on three.”

- **06-Providing rationales/explanations**
  - Behaviours through which the coach highlights the value/meaning of certain activities/drills (i.e., “This drill is important because. . . ”).
  - Can include providing reasoning behind decisions (i.e., highlighting the method behind the madness).
  - Can include connecting activities to a larger picture (e.g., connecting particular activities to athlete/team goals; “This will help us reach finals”).
  - E.g., “It’s really important that we get this defensive drill right because you know our opponents on Saturday are defensive all-stars.”
**Intellectual stimulation:** Behaviours that convey a view of the athlete(s) as capable decision makers and contributing members of the situation. Also includes behaviours that encourage athletes to think and act in novel and creative ways.

Categories:

- **07-Eliciting athlete input**
  - Questioning. Must allow an answer reflecting athlete input. These questions should require a higher level of thinking. For instance, asking critical questions regarding practice activities or social issues.
  - Can involve encouraging athletes to (a) solve problems and to look for alternative solutions, (b) have open discussions, and (c) contribute new and alternative ideas.
  - **Note:** This category relates to coach-initiated athlete input. If the athlete offers input and the coach listens and/or incorporates their input, this should be coded as 10-Showing interest in athletes’ feelings/needs/concerns. Questions that do not require a higher level of thinking should not be included (e.g., How many sets have you finished?), code as 14-Neutral rather than 07- Eliciting athlete input.
  - E.g., “How can we use what we have learned from this drill to make us more successful in our games?” or “What can we learn from a drill/game when things did not go as expected?”

- **08-Sharing decision making/leadership responsibilities**
  - Can involve providing athletes with choice(s) such as providing different drill/task options.
  - Can involve offering opportunities to show initiative, leadership, etc. (i.e., demonstrating skills for teammates, leading a warm-up, helping younger athletes etc.).
  - E.g., “Today, it’s Maddie’s turn to lead the warm-up set. She will decide the stroke and distance.”

- **09-Emphasizing the learning process**
  - Encouraging or recognizing athlete(s) who seek or engage in challenging tasks.
  - Can include encouraging athlete(s) after mistakes or discussing the value of mistakes.
  - Can involve behaviours that emphasize effort.
  - E.g., “That was a really great try Amy, mistakes like that only help us get better.”

**Individualized consideration:** Behaviours through which a coach recognizes an athlete’s individual needs, considers their unique abilities, and displays genuine care and concern.
Categories:

- **10-Showing interest in athlete feelings/needs/concerns**
  - Adapting activities to suit the needs of the athlete(s).
  - Listening to athlete(s) and considering/incorporating their opinions.
  - Can include discussing personal issues with the athlete(s).
  - Can include referencing to past events, interactions, etc.
  - E.g., “I know you weren’t feeling well yesterday, how are you today?”

- **11-Recognizing athlete achievements/contributions**
  - Can include thanking the athletes for their hard work, help, etc.
  - Note: Recognition should have some level of specificity (i.e., a particular performance or a particular athlete) and a higher degree of enthusiasm. For example, a passive “Good job” would not fit with this category and would be coded as 14-Neutral.
  - E.g., “That’s excellent, Jamie! Fantastic job on the turn!”

**Transactional:** Behaviours that reinforce standards/expectations through rewards or punishments.

Categories:

- **12-Discussing rewards/penalties**
  - Examples: If ____, then __ statements.
  - Clarifying, negotiating, and tying specific rewards/penalties to performance.
  - E.g., “If you guys don’t complete this set properly, then everyone is going to run laps”; “If you try one more time, then we can have a scrimmage.”

- **13-Searching for/responding to deviations from rules or standards**
  - Focusing on errors/mistakes (could include negative reactions to undesirable athlete(s) behaviours).
  - E.g., “Stop blowing bubbles and get back on task.”

**14-Neutral:** Absence of leadership related tone.

**Notes**

- Only code if no criteria from any other category is met.
- If the behaviour seems to meet any of the other criteria, choose the more active category (i.e., categories other than neutral).
**Laissez-Faire:** Behaviours that convey coach’s disinterest in or ambivalence towards the athletes or practice activities.

Categories:

- **15-Showing Disinterest**
  - Not paying attention to the athlete(s) or practice (e.g., seeming distracted).
  - E.g., Playing with music, talking with others (assistant coaches, parents) about non-relevant (i.e., not sport related) matters.
  - Avoiding action.
  - Note: Leaving the coaching area (and consequently being out of view/inaudible should be coded as x-Uncodable, NOT laissez-faire/showing disinterest.

**Toxic Leadership:** Behaviours that convey that a coach holds negative attitudes/feelings towards the athlete(s).

Categories:

- **16-Expressing anger/hostility**
  - Can include threats, intimidation (e.g., yelling).
  - Can involve both verbal (e.g., threats) or non-verbal (body language, shaking fists, etc.).
  - E.g., “Stop what you’re doing right now or you’ll be sorry!”

- **17-Modelling anti-social behaviours**
  - Examples: Being rude, sarcasm, swearing.
  - Can also include criticising, belittling, ridiculing, insulting, devaluing athlete(s) input, making negative comments about athlete(s) to others.
  - Can include verbal or non-verbal behaviours.
  - Note: These behaviours may not necessarily be delivered in an angry/hostile tone.
  - Can include excluding athlete(s) from particular drills/activities.
  - E.g., “Joey, that’s a terrible idea. No wonder you didn’t make the team last year.”

**MODIFIERS**

**1-Instruction/Feedback:** Technical and/or tactical and/or teaching instruction or feedback from coach, directed at athlete(s) motor performance or skill execution. Also includes communication from coach related to individual mental/psychological skills, characteristics, qualities, or aspects of performance.
Notes

• Includes prescriptive/corrective technical information in reference to the quality of the movement or skill execution (e.g., how it should be performed, what could be improved, etc.)

• Can be directed at general psychological topics related to performance (e.g., confidence, focus, mental toughness, etc.)

2-Organization: Communication from coach related to organization of practice tasks and athlete actions, NOT intended to directly influence performance.

Notes

• E.g., “Now we’re doing ___ drill”, “Go over there”, “Do 10 of these”, etc.

• Can include discipline, keeping control, etc.

• Can include timing or counting during skill execution/drills.

• Can include non-verbal behaviours (e.g.,

• CANNOT include any technical instruction related to movement quality (code 2). Code for each separately, even if these behaviours occur in immediate sequence.

3-General communication: Communication from coach not directly related to task, performance, or organization in the current team/training/performance context.

Notes

• Default code if coach is actively interacting with athlete(s) but criteria is not met for other conversational categories (i.e., Instruction/feedback or Organization codes).

• E.g., joking with athletes, talking about school, etc.

4-Observation: Coach engaged in observing/watching athletes during training/performance activities, though not directly communicating with athletes.

Notes

• Default code if coach is engaged in training/competition activities, but criteria is not met for any actively communicative code.

• 3-second rule in effect before coding for ‘observation’ from an active communication code.
MODIFIER – TARGET

- **Individual** athletes (ind or athlete a, b, c, etc.). Depending on the depth of coding, individual athletes can be coded broadly as ind or individually identified as athlete, b, c, d, etc.)
- **Team**: Default code if coach behaviours are not targeted towards anyone in particular or if behaviours are targeted towards 2 or more athletes.
- **Other**: Only use for assistant coaches when discussing matters that are relevant to the sport. If discussing non-sport related matters with an assistant coach or any other person (e.g., ref, lifeguard, parents, friends, etc.), code as 15-Showing disinterest.

CONTEXT

- 1-Warm-up or cool-down
- 2-Structured drills/exercises
- 3-Instruction (if athlete(s) is stationary/listening to coach)
- 4-Scrimmage
- 5-Free play
- 6-Break – e.g., water break
Appendix D

Interview Guide
Coach Demographics

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.
Please do not answer any questions you do not feel comfortable answering.

Name: __________________________ Age: ________ Gender: ______________

Sport you coach: _________________ Level: ______________________________

Age of athletes: __________________ Gender of athletes: __________________

How long have you been coaching this sport: ___________________________________

Each week, roughly how many hours do you spend coaching this sport in a formal practice:
_____________________

Each week, roughly how many hours do you spend in coaching this sport in a competition:
__________________

Have you coached any other sports (please include sport, level and how many years you coached
for)?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Now that we’ve had a chance to go through the information letter, would it be okay if we began the interview? I’ve developed a series of questions to discuss. However, I’d like you to know that I may – at any time – ask you related questions that are relevant to the interview, and that you may add in any information that you think is pertinent.

Section A. Background Involvement in Coaching

1. To start the interview, I’m interested in your experiences as an athlete and a coach. Could you please describe your development as a coach - feel free to discuss your athletic experiences if you think it was important. What were the major influences and milestones that marked your development as a coach?

2. Can you briefly describe the team that you are currently coaching?
   a. What is the age group and competitive level?
   b. How long have you been coaching this team?
   c. How is the team doing at this point in the season?
   d. How does this team compare to the teams that you have coached in the past?

Section B. Stimulated recall portion

As we have discussed earlier, a core aspect of this interview involves reviewing some of the video recorded during the practices and games we visited. What this involves will be watching brief video clips of your own behaviours, followed by a number of questions related to each clip. You can stop and replay clips as needed, and should you feel uncomfortable with any questions, you can chose not to answer them.

[Coaches will then be asked to watch 15 sec clips from their own personal practice. After reviewing each video clip, coaches will be asked to expand on the thought processes and feelings]
that contributed to and came about following the recorded behaviors. Coaches will be permitted to stop and replay each interaction clip whenever needed.]

(a) Could you explain what is happening in this clip?
   - What specific thoughts do you remember having?
   - What feelings do you remember experiencing?

(b) How was the training session going at this point?

(c) At what other times during practices or games might you use this behavior?
   - Are there specific places where you might use this behaviour? (e.g., dressing room, side of the field etc.)

(d) If anything, what lead you to this behaviour?
   - What are the specific goals or outcomes that you feel might result from this behavior?
   - How might this behaviour influence…
     - Athletes’ development as a person?
     - Athletes’ motivation to continue participating in sport?
     - The team as a whole?
     - Relationships with your athletes? Relationships among your athletes?
   - In an ideal world, what is the most positive outcome that might result from this behaviour

(e) Was this interaction/behaviour representative of behaviors that occur during training for you and your team?
   - How might this change depending on certain situations? (E.g., throughout different points during games or different points in the season)
   - How might your response differ depending on the team or setting? (E.g., Elite teams or very young children)
   - If not, what would you describe as typical for interactions/behaviours that occur during training for this team
   - If not, why do you think this interaction/behaviour occurred?
(f) I would now like to ask you to think of and describe what perhaps the ideal coaching response would have been in this situation?

- Are there any reasons why you did not choose to use the ideal response/behavior?
- How about ineffectiveness – could you describe an extremely ineffective response in this situation?

Section C. Closing thoughts

1. In summary, using only one sentence or two, could you describe your coaching approach?

2. If you were mentoring a new coach, what advice would you give them about coach-athlete interactions?
Appendix E

Reflexive Journals
Interview 1
- Overall I think this interview went well
- At times, Norm seemed to think that certain questions were trivial (e.g., what thoughts do you remember experiencing?)
- I think a challenge for myself will be keeping coaches engaged and interested throughout the entirety of each interview
  - Perhaps certain questions seem unimportant and silly to coaches and are best left out – I will keep my eye on this
  - Alternatively, if coaches are subject to watching very similar clips over and over, the interview could become repetitive for them. I think it’s important that I continue to choose a variety of clips relating to all dimensions of leadership

Interview 2
- Wow. This interview went extremely well
- I was able to establish and maintain a strong connection with the participant – perhaps because he was passionate about coaching and more specifically, the development of his athletes
- He was quite receptive to all questions, and never seemed to become tired or bored.
  - Again, the questions mentioned in my previous reflection seemed to elicit little response or no recall of specific thoughts/feelings

Interview 3
- Comparatively, this interview went about as well as my first
- At times, the participant was misinterpreting questions or answering them in a roundabout way
- All participants seem like they truly care about their athletes and have genuine passion to grow the game and their kids – this is extremely refreshing

Interview 4
- This interview went very well, it was long, and I feel a bit exhausted from all of the information I’m trying to process right now
- The coach seems to have quite a bit of experience, and was very happy to share previous stories and previous experiences with me to help explain or elaborate on certain behaviours/interactions
- Again, the feelings question was a miss in this interview. If coaches continue to be unresponsive to it, I may have to avoid it in order to keep them engaged and interested.
Interview 5
- This interview was interesting – limited coaching experience but tons of playing experience (played pro)
- We were able to establish a great connection at the beginning of the interview, he was very responsive and quick to elaborate on responses
- This participant quickly picked up on the rhythm of the interview guide and was able to answer questions even before they were coming
- The interview flowed very well and there was rarely a time when the participant was off topic or misinterpreting questions

Interview 6
- This was a short, but thorough interview
- Similar to the last one, the coach was picking up on questions that were coming and answering them before hand
- I had to skip the feelings/emotions question because he seemed to think it was trivial or unimportant
- Otherwise, this interview went very well, and the participant gave thorough, detailed responses with little probing required.

Interview 7
- This was a good interview, great rapport back and forth
- One note is that there were times when questions were misinterpreted, but very few of them
- Although this coach is young, he did a great job reflecting on previous experience or examples from the past that helped explain or provide context to behaviours

Interview 8
- Another very young coach, who was very responsive and engaged for the entire interview
- Again, although he has limited coaching experience, was still good at drawing parallels between other sport experiences and his coaching experience
- I’m finding that a lot of coaches are beginning to have similar responses to questions, I will need to keep my eye on this as well

Interview 9
- This was a fantastic interview. He has so much experience and is extremely well spoken.
- Participant took questions and ran with them, he was great at picking up where the questions were going and what was coming up next
- Seemed to really enjoy the process of watching himself and reflecting on behaviours. This coach really cares.

Interview 10

- This was a very casual and solid interview
- We were sitting having a beer, he told me all kinds of great stories and experiences
- This coach has been around for a long time, and has tons of experience from teaching, coaching etc.
- I felt that this was a very rich interview and am finding more and more that coaches have similar responses to the interview guide

Interview 11

- Best interview yet. We connected on a deep level, this coach ended up crying at one point.
- Although we had to stop and start the interview at a few points (people interrupting, crying) this went extremely well
- This coach cares about developing as a coach and really cares about his athletes. I can’t think of a better way to finish my last interview.
Appendix F

Coaching Philosophy
Coaching Philosophy

One of the greatest impacts a coach can have on their athletes is engrained in their ability to establish and maintain strong interpersonal connection with their athletes. These strong connections will help form the foundation of a healthy, strong relationship with each member of the team, facilitating trust, openness and mutual respect.

Coaches should treat each athlete with respect, honesty and openness. Each athlete on the team should be treated the same, as everyone plays an integral role to the overall success of a team. Fair treatment of athletes will also help promote strong relationships, trust and mutual respect.

A great coach once told me that the will to win is important, but the will to prepare is vital. This is a mantra that has become deeply rooted in my every day life. I vow as a coach to prepare my athletes as best as I can for each and every practice, game and situation. It is my hope that my athletes will strive to do the same.

Through displaying my own personal beliefs and values, I will set a good example for my athletes to follow. I hope that throughout their experiences, my athletes will have a chance to learn a number of life skills, including but not limited to teamwork, preparedness, responsibility, communication and trust. These are skills that I hope will translate into their everyday lives.

Finally, I feel that a great coach establishes open lines of communication with athletes as well as parents. Open lines of communication are healthy ways for a team to establish strengths, weaknesses and concerns. They will only help in allowing each and every member of the team (including the coach) to understand needs or wants in order to make improvements.

While winning is important, I would like to make it clear that it will not be my primary focus for this team. My ultimate goal is for each of my athletes to learn, have fun and continue playing sport. I hope that through my coaching techniques and interactions each athlete has the opportunity to grow and mature as an athlete, but more importantly, as a person.