

Destructive Leadership In Sports: Developing The Sports Coaching Destructive Leadership Scale (SC-DLS)

Ali Osman Uymaz

Graduate School of Business
Istanbul Sehir University, Turkey

Cengiz Karagözoğlu

School of Physical Education and Sports
Marmara University, Istanbul Turkey

Emre Türegün

School of Physical Education and Sports
Düzce University, Düzce Turkey

Adem Baba

Lifelong Learning Center
Istanbul Sehir University, Istanbul Turkey

Abstract

This study investigates the validity and reliability of the Destructive Coaching Leadership Scale according to athletes. All athlete participants were asked to fill a personal information form and the Destructive Coaching Leadership Scale developmental version, which consists of 72 items. 360 athletes from several disciplines who have competed for one or more years with their team coaches asked to join to the study, 338 of participants answered the scale and personal information form, 18 of the filled forms were excluded by researchers. The Final research sample consisted of 320 active athletes (214 male and 106 female). According to the principal components factor analysis of five factors, which are I-Planning and Change Management, II-Fear of Failure-Pressure, III- Emotional Ambivalence, IV-Distrust and V-Democratic Behavior were extracted.

Keywords: Leadership, destructive leadership, leadership scale, coaching.

INTRODUCTION

Destructive use of power in organizations is one of the interest areas in leadership studies. In the literature, there are many related forms of bad leadership such as toxic behavior (Goldman, 2009), fake transformational leadership, strategically bullying, managerial tyranism (Uymaz, 2013), abusive treatment (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007), abusive supervision (Tepper, 2007; Harris, Kacmar, & Zivnuska, 2007), petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1994), pseudo-transformational leadership, personalized charismatic leadership (Krasikova, Green, & Lebreton, 2013),

Krasikova et al. (2013) defined destructive leadership (DL) as a leader's deliberate harmful behavior that intends to harm a leader's organization and/or followers by encouraging followers to act opposite of interests of the organization, but just in the process of leading. One of the proposed models, which is the opposite of constructive leadership, destructive

leadership behaviors are basically directed into two directions: anti-organization and anti subordinate (Einarsen et al., 2007; Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaers, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2010). Also, leadership risk-aversion and leadership self-centeredness are accepted as the main predictors of bad leadership which is responsible for organizational decline (Carmeli & Sheaffer, 2009).

Ashforth (1994) conducted one of the pioneer studies on petty tyranny behavior and mentioned that personal factors of the bad manager are rigid or inflexible, emotional outburst, boastful. Another study mentioned narcissism and emotional illiteracy in the dark leadership characteristics (Takala, 2010). Other potential significant predictors of destructive leadership are studied as hostility (angry when someone disappointed) and negative affectivity, which tend to transfer fear to the environment (Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster, & Kepes, 2007). From this point, it is possible to emphasize destructive leadership as a personal characteristic rather than behavior. On the other hand, despite destructive leaders acting badly with the help of susceptible followers; bad or destructive behaviors have negative effects on subordinates (Thoroughgood, Padilla, Hunter, & Tate, 2012) and they suffer many situations such as stress and anxiety (Pouladi & Etebarian, 2007), also they show decreased respect and trust to others (Ferris, Zinko, Brouer, Buckley, & Harvey, 2007) and cause personal low self-esteem and lack of assertiveness (Kiazad, Restubog, Zagencyk, Kiewitz, & Tang, 2010). As a result they possibly become victimized (Aquino & Lamertz, 2004). An average estimate shows 60% of leaders are accepted as incompetent (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994), many of the leaders have the potential of acting as destructive leaders.

Sports team coaching is a leadership mission, which lead athletes towards the desired team goals. A coach is the formal leader of the group (Wałach-biśta, 2014), and studies reported that an effective sports coach is an effective leader (Toros, Türksoy, & Doğaner, 2013) who also develops new sport-specific leadership theories, according to new definitions of the leadership concept (Toros & Soyer, 2015). Various studies focused on sports coaches' leadership skills, because sports coaches have great influence on their team, and the coach's leadership approaches have great effect on performance (Ramzaninezhad & Keshtan, 2009) and coaching behaviors have important impact on athletes' satisfaction and self esteem (Crăciun & Rus, 2009). Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) developed the Leadership Scale for Sports and the widely accepted sports leadership studies focused on the scale's sub-dimensions which are training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback. In the literature, there are numerous studies on the necessity about new leadership measurement instruments. Hogan, Curphy & Hogan's study (1994) recommends to research the dark side of the leaders by Diagnostics and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders measures and with other proper tools. Extejt and Smith (2009) stated that using different leadership measurement instruments such as in a team setting may not be generalized as well as desired. This point of view also shows the importance of developing new sports leadership-specific instruments for reliable and valid data collection. Sports teams are based on social interaction between coach and athletes. Primary element of this interaction is undoubtedly the coach and his leadership style. Hypothetically, human interaction can be double sided: the good side and the bad side. We mostly focus on the destructive coaching behavior by explaining the bad side of coaching.

The Purpose of the Study

This study aims to develop a new measurement instrument for the destructive leadership behavior of coaches of sports teams. The main approach was inspired by Uymaz's destructive

leadership scale (2013). Similar methodology was applied to sports setting and coaching missions.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

A total of 360 athletes from several disciplines who have worked for one or more years with their team coaches were asked to join the study, 338 of participants voluntarily filled out the questionnaire and personal information form, 18 of the filled forms were excluded by the researchers. An ultimate research sample consisted of 320 active athletes (214 male and 106 female). The distribution of the sports discipline was as follows; 259 were basketball players, 33 football players, 6 korfbal players and 22 swimmers.

Scale Development

A classic measurement development procedure was applied. Participants were asked to evaluate their coaches given leadership behaviors on the scale and to fill out the personal information form. The main item list was adopted from Uymaz's study (2013). Each item consists from a coaching related leadership proposition and a 5 items Likert-type scale, where the labels ranged from 1="strongly agree", 2="agree", 3="not sure", 4="not agree" and 5="strongly disagree". In the first step, all items of the study examined and situations were transferred into sports coaching situations. The writing of the new items were done by the first author of the study who is an expert in behavioral sciences and the second author who is a sports science expert. Both authors have PhDs in their areas. 72 items were nominated for the field application for validity procedure. In the first stage, all items were written in negative expression but 1/4 of the item pool changed into positive expression to avoid unexpected attitudes in the field application. Positively reverse items were essential to prevent the possible negative attitude of coaches and team managers caused by fear of criticism.

Analyses

Exploratory principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to determine the structure of sub scales. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sampling Adequacy (KMO) measure was used for sampling the adequacy of the items and explore the suitability of the sample for the factor structure. The Bartlett's test was used to compare the normality of the observed correlation matrix.

RESULTS

Table 1. KMO and Bartlett's Test Results

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,919
	Approx. Chi-Square	6299,262
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Df	861
	Sig.	,000

The KMO score was quite high as it was measured to be .919 and the sample size was adequate for factor analysis. According to the Bartlett's test of sphericity, with an $X^2=6299.262$ ($df=862$, $p<.001$) the result indicated that correlations between scale items were sufficiently significant for principal component analysis (Table 1). According to Field, a KMO score above .90 is excellent (Field, 2009), and a Bartlett test score is accepted if the significant level is greater

than .05 (Gie Yong & Pearce, 2013). According to Table 1, the sample structure of the study is suitable for principal components analysis.

An exploratory principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation is conducted to determine the sub scales. Table 2 shows the factor structure and five subscales.

Table 2. Principal Components Factor Analysis Results and Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients with Scale Means

Item No		F	M	SD	C's A	VE
Factor I: Planning and Change						
53	My coach knows what the goals of our team are.	.604	4.25	0.88		
54	My coach immediately adapts to new and changing conditions.	.727	3.99	0.92		
55	My coach has good technical and tactical planning skills.	.716	4.10	1.06		
57	My coach is good at developing athletes' talents.	.747	4.07	0.95	.834	13.4
58	My coach regularly follows up on developing players' talents.	.743	3.96	0.97		
59	My coach knows what needs to be done to motivate players.	.574	3.97	1.05		
Factor II: Fear of Failure-Pressure						
4	My coach relentlessly pressures players.	.647	3.95	1.17		
7	My coach never forgets anything and bears grudges.	.684	4.09	1.02		
8	My coach always sees a discussion as a win or lose situation.	.602	3.77	1.15	.753	12.9
10	My coach takes credit for the success of others.	.707	3.88	1.21		
11	My coach usually blames others for his own mistakes.	.663	4.08	1.11		
Factor III: Emotional Ambivalence						
50	Once my coach makes a decision, it's impossible for him to change his mind.	.627	3.08	1.20		
64	My coach finds it hard to control his anger.	.668	3.49	1.20		
65	There are continuous ebbs and flows in my coach's psychological state.	.584	3.63	1.29		
66	My coach is overly suspicious about a lot of things.	.588	3.59	1.11	.775	11.9
70	When I don't play well, my coach never believes that there might be a good reason behind it.	.687	3.17	1.23		
71	My coach stresses/insinuates that rules are always flexible.	.547	3.30	1.24		

Factor IV: Distrust					
29	My coach isn't good at solving his personal problems.	.774	3.93	1.11	
30	My coach usually makes the team feel very insecure.	.648	4.17	1.13	
32	My coach has lost the trust of the people he works with.	.641	4.07	1.16	.832
40	My coach doesn't care about the needs and desires of the team.	.580	4.20	1.09	10.5
Factor V: Democratic Behavior					
12	Instead of bringing himself forward, my coach makes sure that achievers get the praise they deserve.	.685	3.98	1.06	
21	My coach is good at convincing players.	.721	4.11	0.91	.726
34	Instead of favoring certain players, my coach treats everyone equally.	.614	3.95	1.12	9.5
38	My coach knows how to make it right when he realizes he made a mistake.	.689	4.06	0.98	
Total Variance Explained					58.2

F: Factor Loading, M: Mean, SD: Standard Deviation, C'sA: Cronbach's Alpha, VE: Variance Explained

The principal components analysis produced five factors after four rotations. The first factor consisted of six items (item numbers were 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59). The first factor was described as "Planning and Change Management". The first factor items factor loadings vary between .747 to .574. The second factor consisted of five items (item numbers were 4, 7, 8, 10, 11). The second factor was described as "Fear of Failure-Pressure". The second factor items had factor loadings between .707 to .602. The third factor consisted of six items (item numbers were 50, 64, 65, 66, 70, 71). The third factor was described as "Emotional Ambivalence" and the items had factor loadings between .687 to .547. The fourth factor has four items (item numbers were 29,30,32,40). The fourth factor consisted of four items, was described as "Distrust", and the scale items had factor loadings between .774 to .580. The fifth factor consisted of four items, was described as "Democratic Behavior", and the scale items had factor loadings between .721 to .614 ranges. Combination of the five factors explained 58.241% of the variance.

Table 3. The t-Test Results for Upper Group and Lower Group for Discrimination

Item No	Upper Group Mean	Lower Group Mean	t	P<.
Planning and Change Management				
53	5.00	3.20	23.57	.000
54	4.89	2.84	23.37	.000
55	5.00	2.70	23.17	.000
57	5.00	2.87	27.55	.000
58	4.91	2.74	24.88	.000
59	4.92	2.66	22.84	.000
Fear of Failure-Pressure				
4	5.00	2.42	23.67	.000
7	5.00	2.74	24.03	.000
8	4.88	2.31	25.85	.000
10	4.98	2.26	27.00	.000
11	5.00	2.58	23.57	.000

Emotional Ambivalence				
50	4.43	1.59	33.28	.000
64	4.57	1.95	27.85	.000
65	4.88	1.91	31.13	.000
66	4.39	2.70	11.39	.000
70	4.55	1.65	34.19	.000
71	4.55	1.76	30.12	.000
Distrust				
29	4.92	2.50	23.79	.000
30	5.00	2.60	23.71	.000
32	5.00	2.52	23.75	.000
40	5.00	2.78	19.71	.000
Democratic Behavior				
12	4.91	2.63	21.93	.000
21	5.00	2.94	28.28	.000
34	5.00	2.47	28.26	.000
38	4.91	2.85	19.45	.000

For each item an independent t test was conducted between the upper group (%27) and the lower group (%27) of the participants. Results indicated each item, which was chosen into the five factors of the scale, has a significant discrimination capability. Means of the upper group and the lower groups are presented in the Table 3.

DISCUSSION

Ultimately in the Destructive Coaching Leadership Scale, out of 72 items, 25 items remained in five factors. Factor I and Factor V are designed as positive propositions (10 items) , Factor II, Factor III and Factor IV have negative scales (15 items). During the preparation stage of the items, previously all items were written as representing negative leadership behaviors. It is preferred to avoid negative attitudes in the application stage of the participants, 17 of the items were changed into positive scales. 10 of the positive items consisted of Factor II and I. For this reason, the scoring of the scale of Factor I and Factor II must be calculated as reverse items. Reliability analysis was conducted for each five factors separately. The highest factor Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found to be .834 for Planning and Change Management subscale. The lowest Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found for the Democratic Behavior subscale (CR Alpha= .726). Each subscale explained variances were found in Planning and Change Management= 13.405; "ear of Failure-Pressure= 12.940; Emotional Ambivalence= 11.917; Distrust= 10.5; Democratic Behavior=9.480 consecutively. The combination of five factors explains 58.241 % of the variance.

References

- Aasland, M. S., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The Prevalence of destructive leadership behavior. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 438–452. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00672.x
- Aquino, C., & Lamertz, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimization: Social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 1023–1034.
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, 47(7), 755–778. doi:10.1177/001872679404700701
- Carmeli, A., & Sheaffer, Z. (2009). How leadership characteristics affect organizational decline and downsizing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 86(3), 363–378. doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9852-7

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2(1), 34-45. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Dimensions+of+Leader+Behaviour+in+Sports:+Development+of+a+Leadership+Scale#0>

Crăciun, M., & Rus, C.-L. (2009). The relationship between perceived coach leadership behaviours and team cohesion among romanian athletes. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología Del Ejercicio Y El Deporte*, 4(2), 217-232.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour : A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 207-216. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002

Extejt, M. M., & Smith, J. E. (2009). Leadership development through sports team participation. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 8(2), 224-237. doi:10.12806/V8/I2/RF7

Ferris, G. R., Zinko, R., Brouer, R. L., Buckley, R. M., & Harvey, M. G. (2007). Strategic bullying as a supplementary , balanced perspective on destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 195-206. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.004

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. doi:10.1234/12345678

Gie Yong, A., & Pearce, S. (2013). A beginner's guide to factor analysis: Focusing on exploratory factor analysis. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 9(2), 79-94.

Goldman, A. (2009). *Destructive leaders and dysfunctional organizations: A therapeutic approach*. NY, Cambridge University Press.

Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2007). An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 252-263. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.007

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership. *American Psychologist*, 49(6), 493-504.

Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L. D., Zagencyk, T. J., Kiewitz, C., & Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(4), 512-519. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.004

Krasikova, D. V, Green, S. G., & Lebreton, J. M. (2013). Destructive leadership: A theoretical review, integration, and future research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 20(10), 1-31. doi:10.1177/0149206312471388

Pouladi, A., & Etebarian, A. (2007). The effect of destructive leadership on deviant behaviors through job stress and psychological wellbeing among employees of Khorasgan University. *GMP Review*, 18(2), 219-225.

Ramzaninezhad, R., & Keshtan, M. H. (2009). The relationship between coach's leadership styles and team cohesion in Iran football clubs professional. *Brazilian Journal of Biomotricity*, 3(2), 111-120.

Schaubroeck, J., Walumbwa, F. O., Ganster, D. C., & Kepes, S. (2007). Destructive leader traits and the neutralizing influence of an "enriched" job. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 236-251. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.006

Takala, T. (2010). Dark leadership, charisma and trust. *Psychology*, 1, 59-63. doi:10.4236/psych.2010.111009

Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 261-289. doi:10.1177/0149206307300812

Thoroughgood, C. N., Padilla, A., Hunter, S. T., & Tate, B. W. (2012). The susceptible circle: A taxonomy of followers associated with destructive leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 897-917. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.007

Toros, T., & Soyer, F. (2015). The effect of parental attitudes of basketball coaches on their leadership perception and life satisfaction. *Anthropologist*, 20(3), 707-713.

Toros, T., Türksoy, A., & Doğaner, S. (2013). The comparison of basketball coaches' leadership and motivation according to length experience. *Nigde University Journal of Physical Education And Sport Sciences*, 7(1), 12-14.

Uymaz, A. O. (2013). Yıkıcı liderlik ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *İ.Ü. İşletme Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü Yönetim Dergisi*, 24(75), 37-57.

Wałach-biśta, Z. (2014). Leadership scale for sports – theoretical background and review of psychometric properties research. *Česká Kinantropologie*, 18(3), 67-76.