UNIVERSITY BIRMINGHAM University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Authentic leadership in sport:

Bandura, Comille; Kavussanu, Maria

DOI: 10.1177/1747954118768242

License: Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Bandura, C'& Kavussanu, M 2018, 'Authentic leadership in sport: Its relationship with athletes' enjoyment and commitment and the mediating role of autonomy and trust', *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954118768242

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

Publisher Rights Statement:

Authentic leadership in sport: Its relationship with athletes' enjoyment and commitment and the mediating role of autonomy and trust, Comille T. Bandura and Maria Kavussanu, International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, First Published April 4, 2018, https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954118768242

Copyright The Author(s) 2018

Published in International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching on 04/04/2018

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.

Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)

•Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Running head: CONSEQUENSES OF AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP

1	Authentic leadership in sport: Its relationship with athletes' enjoyment and commitment and
2	the mediating role of autonomy and trust
3	
4	
5	REVISION
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Revision Submitted: 18 December 2017
19	Revision Re-submitted: 12 February 2018
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

1

2

Abstract

Consequences of leadership styles have become a noteworthy area of research for sport 3 psychology researchers. However, there is scant research on the concept of Authentic 4 5 Leadership (AL). To date, research in sport has demonstrated that AL is associated with positive outcomes for athletes such as satisfaction, commitment, trust and perceptions of 6 choice. In this study, we examined whether athletes' perceptions of coach AL were 7 8 associated with their commitment and enjoyment and whether trust in coach and perceived 9 autonomy mediated these relationships. Participants were 435 athletes (female = 211) from team (e.g., football, hockey; n = 338) and individual sports (e.g., boxing, swimming; n = 97) 10 who completed questionnaires about perceived AL of their coach, perceived autonomy and 11 trust in their coach, and their enjoyment and commitment. Structural equation modelling 12 13 revealed that athletes' perceptions of their coach AL were positively related to their enjoyment and commitment and these relationships were mediated by perceived autonomy 14 and trust. The findings suggest that AL in coaches may facilitate enjoyment and commitment 15 16 in athletes, and this may occur via autonomy and trust.

17

18 *Keywords*: athlete well-being, integrity, coaching

Authentic leadership in sport: Its relationship with athletes' enjoyment and commitment and
 the mediating role of autonomy and trust

3 Over the past decade, the field of leadership has emerged as a salient area of research 4 and covers an increasingly diverse range of topics relevant to success in sporting domains. This is in response to the demand in the understanding of coaching behaviours and 5 consequences of these behaviours on athletes.¹ Athletes' perceptions of a coach directly 6 regulate behavioural responses, and factors such as trust in a coach and autonomy-supportive 7 environments could have consequences for athletes.² Authentic leadership (AL) is a construct 8 that has caught researchers' attention and has gained recognition and position within 9 leadership studies in sport.^{3,4,5} 10

AL has been defined as a "pattern of leader behaviour that draws upon and promotes 11 12 both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater selfawareness, internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information and relational 13 transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-14 development".³ According to Walumbwa and colleagues, AL can best be represented as a 15 higher order construct composed of four related dimensions: internalized moral perspective, 16 self-awareness, relational transparency, and balanced processing.³ Self-awareness refers to 17 how often the leader demonstrates that he or she is cognizant of his or her impact on other 18 people; relational transparency involves promoting trust through disclosures that include 19 20 openly sharing information and expressions of leaders' true thoughts and feelings; internalized moral perspective refers to leader behaviours that are guided by internal moral 21 standards and values as opposed to those behaviours being based on external forces such as 22 peers, organizational and societal pressures; and balanced processing involves objectively 23 analysing all relevant information before coming up with a 'fair' decision.^{6,7,8} Leaders who 24

exhibit balanced processing solicit views from others indicating the willingness to challenge
their deeply held positions before coming to a decision.³

AL originated from Bass & Steidlmeier's observation and critique of the unethical 3 way transformational leaders manipulate their followers.^{9,7} Although transformational 4 leadership requires authenticity as part of their characteristics of being visionary and of high 5 moral character, the distinction between the two lies on the faith of authentic leaders in their 6 own deep sense of self-values and beliefs.⁶ Therefore, an authentic leader "leads with 7 purpose" and takes more consideration of contextual and organizational factors that influence 8 the effectiveness of leadership and ensures the psychological well-being of followers.¹⁰ 9 Moreover, AL is not limited to the authenticity of leadership, but it extends to authenticity of 10 true sustainable leader-follower relationship or "followership" that enhances the performance 11 of leadership at different levels.¹¹ 12

To date, research supports the notion that coaches who are viewed to be authentic 13 create transparent two-way relationships with athletes.^{4.5} Through the creation of these 14 meaningful relationships, authentic leaders raise levels of follower commitment, motivation, 15 and positive emotion, and subsequently facilitate positive follower behaviour.⁶ The integrity, 16 respectability, and trustworthiness of authentic leaders constitute the central elements of 17 high-quality exchange relationships.¹¹ For example, by eliciting diverse viewpoints from 18 followers, authentic leaders are viewed as showing respect for and trust in each of their 19 20 followers. This gesture is likely to be reciprocated by respect and trust on the part of followers.¹² 21

Only two studies have investigated AL in sport. Houchin examined whether AL
predicted higher levels of trust, team cohesion, and group performance in 109 student athletes
most of whom were females, from various team sports.⁵ An adapted and abbreviated version
of the authentic leadership questionnaire (ALQ) was used, trust, perceived performance were

measured using single item measures in addition to task and social cohesion.¹³ Athletes who 1 2 perceived their coach to be authentic reported greater trust in the coach; this in turn positively predicted their perceptions of group cohesion and performance. In a second study, coach AL 3 was associated with trust, perceptions of choice, commitment and satisfaction in a 4 heterogeneous sample of 532 team sport athletes.⁴ In this study, athletes who perceived their 5 coach to be authentic reported higher commitment and satisfaction. Coach AL, commitment 6 and satisfaction were indirectly related via trust and perceived choice.⁴ Taken together results 7 from these two studies suggest that AL may have important consequences in the context of 8 sport.4,5 9 AL, enjoyment, and commitment 10 AL is associated with affective responses, such as attitudes, and emotions.⁷ Coaches 11 12 perceived to be authentic could result in athletes feeling more motivated and connected with their coach through positive role modelling and mutual respect and trust.¹¹ Due to these 13 positive relationships, they may experience enjoyment, which is a positive emotional 14 response to sport and includes feelings such as fun, pleasure, and liking.¹⁴ 15 Through the creation of meaningful relationships, authentic leaders allow followers to 16 share a deeper understanding with a leader and therefore aid the promotion of positive 17 emotional states, such as enjoyment.¹¹ AL is characterised by a leader's ability to provide 18 constructive feedback, remain hopeful and confident, authentic leaders are able to influence 19 optimism and positive emotions such as enjoyment in followers.⁶ There is scant research to 20 support the relationship between AL and enjoyment in athletes. AL research has focused on 21 levels of follower satisfaction as a positive emotional outcome.^{3, 10} In sport, coach AL has 22 been found to be directly related to satisfaction in athletes.⁴ These findings pave the way for 23 future studies to examine other positive emotional states, such as enjoyment. 24

1 AL may also influence athlete commitment, which reflects the desire and resolve to persist in a sporting endeavour over time.¹⁵ This is because authentic leaders demonstrate an 2 understanding of strengths and weaknesses; they gain an insight into the self through 3 exposure to others and being cognizant of one's impact on other people.^{7,8} With clarity and 4 understanding of their capabilities, and with the willingness to be self-aware, a coach viewed 5 6 to be authentic will be less likely to engage in defensive behaviors and more likely to correct personal predispositions. Research has shown that these characteristics potentially increase 7 commitment in followers of authentic leaders.¹⁶ Furthermore, authentic leaders have been 8 shown to encourage followers to identify with the core values of the collective organization 9 that they represent in addition to the leader.¹¹ Thus, authentic coaches may stress the 10 importance of attending to the shared interests of the team and individual leading to 11 12 commitment. Previous research has shown that coach AL is indirectly related to commitment via trust and perceptions of choice.⁴ 13

14

Trust and autonomy as mediators

In this study, we expect AL to be related to enjoyment and commitment in athletes 15 directly, but also indirectly, through trust in the coach. Trust has been defined as athletes' 16 perceptions of the integrity, credibility, and benevolence of the coach.¹⁷ Trustworthiness is 17 proposed to be an intrinsic feature of AL.⁷ Previous research has provided evidence to 18 support the relationship between athletes' perceptions of AL and trust.^{4,5} These findings 19 20 suggest that coaches who do not show consistency between words and actions, or who frequently lie, will hardly be trusted by their athletes. On the contrary, authentic leaders are 21 expected to build trust in their followers via their supporting behaviour.¹⁸ 22

Recent research supports the importance of trust an intervening variable when
 examining consequences of AL on athlete outcomes.⁴ These researchers found that coaches
 who were perceived to be authentic, openly communicated with their athletes, were honest

and acted in a way that is consistent with their beliefs, had athletes who reported greater trust.
Furthermore, athletes who felt that they could freely share their ideas, feelings, and hopes
considered their coach to be trustworthy, which in turn was associated with commitment and
satisfaction. Based on these findings and the theoretical predictions of AL, we expect trust to
mediate the relationship between AL and enjoyment in athletes.³

6 We also expect AL to be related to enjoyment and commitment in athletes indirectly via autonomy. Autonomy refers to "being the perceived origin or source of one's own 7 behaviour³¹⁹ is one of the three basic psychological needs specified in the self-determination 8 theory (SDT), and encompasses three aspects.^{20,21} First, internal perceived locus of causality 9 (IPLOC) indicates whether a person believes that his or her actions are initiated and regulated 10 by a personal force.²¹ Second, volition refers to an unpressured willingness to engage in an 11 activity.²¹ Finally, perceived choice pertains to the perception of having decision-making 12 flexibility to choose whether to engage in an activity.²¹ Autonomy is satisfied when one is 13 provided with choice over actions, perceived control and an active role in the decision-14 making process.²⁰ 15

According to SDT, one of main intrinsic needs that motivate athletes to initiate 16 behaviour and contribute to psychological health and wellbeing is autonomy.¹⁹ SDT research 17 suggests that when leaders create autonomy-supportive environments, follower actions 18 become self-determined. Self-determined behaviour has been extensively linked with 19 enjoyment, enhanced effort, and commitment in the context of sport.² Previous research has 20 shown that out of the three basic psychological needs the influence of autonomy was rated 21 higher in supervisors viewed to be authentic.⁶ Furthermore, autonomy positively affected 22 intrinsic motivation which was also associated with organisational commitment, satisfaction 23 and trust in leaders viewed to be authentic.¹⁰ In sport perceived choice was a mediator in the 24 relationship between athletes' perceptions of AL and commitment and satisfaction in a recent 25

- study.⁴ However, previous research has not investigated the overall construct of autonomy
 considering its different aspects. The current study aims to address this limitation.
- **3** The Present Study

4 As the literature reviewed above indicates, AL is an important construct that has features not evident in other models used to understand leadership in sport. Specifically, this 5 6 is the only leadership construct that encompasses a moral component (i.e., internalized moral perspective) as well as transparency in the interactions of the leader with followers. Together 7 8 with the focus on enhancing self-awareness and objectively analysing information these 9 features make AL a unique construct that could have implications for important athlete outcomes. However, to date, this construct has received very little attention in the context of 10 sport. This form of leadership can increase well-being in athletes because it is a positive form 11 of leadership.^{2,1} 12

Previous research found an indirect relationship between AL and commitment and 13 satisfaction via trust and perceptions of choice in team sports.⁴ The current study aims to 14 15 build on this research in several ways. First, this research will determine if previous findings are replicated with an independent sample of athletes. This is important because replication 16 should attest to the robustness of the findings, thus increasing our confidence in them. 17 Second, we will extend previous research in athletes from individual sports. Third, we will 18 19 measure the construct of autonomy in a more complete manner as we will assess different 20 aspects of this construct. We hypothesised that coach AL – as determined via athlete perceptions - would be positively associated with athlete enjoyment and commitment 21 indirectly through trust and autonomy.^{3,4,7,11} 22

23

Method

24 **Participants**

Participants were 435 athletes who were members of the British universities and colleges sport (BUCS) league aged 18-44 years ($M_{age} = 19.94$, SD = 2.08), who rated 21

1	coaches (32 % female). BUCS consists of two regional leagues and each sport can have up to
2	four teams according to athletic ability from the same university or college competing. The
3	sample included both female ($n = 208$) and male ($n = 227$) athletes from team sports (e.g.,
4	football, hockey; $n = 344$) and individual sports (e.g., boxing, swimming; $n = 97$). In total,
5	298 athletes had a male coach and 137 athletes had a female coach and on average they had
6	been playing their sport for 10.95 years ($SD = 7.25$), played for their current team for 1.69
7	years ($SD = .96$) and played for their current coach for 1.63 seasons ($SD = 1.00$).

8 Measures

9 Authentic leadership. Authentic leadership in sport was measured using an adapted version of the 16-item Authentic Leadership Questionnaire that assesses the four dimensions 10 of AL.³ We adapted the stem "My leader/supervisor..." to "My coach...." before each 11 12 statement and minor changes to wording were made to some items to reflect the context (e.g., followers was changed to players). Example items included "encourages everyone to speak 13 their mind" (relational transparency, five items), "demonstrates beliefs that are consistent 14 with actions" and "makes decisions based on high standards of ethical conduct" (internalised 15 moral perspective, four items), "seeks feedback to improve interactions with players" 16 (balanced processing, three items), and "shows he or she understands how specific actions 17 impact others" (self-awareness, four items). Participants were asked to respond to each 18 statement regarding their coach's leadership style on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 19 20 (not at all) to 5 (frequently if not always). Walumbwa and colleagues have provided evidence of the internal reliability of the scale with each sub- scale (self-awareness $\alpha = .92$, relational 21 transparency $\alpha = .87$, internalised moral perspective $\alpha = .76$, balanced processing $\alpha = .81$) and 22 the overall 16-item scale, $\alpha = .70$.³ Previous research has confirmed the factorial validity of 23 the ALQ with results from CFAs ($\chi^2 = 1865.31$, df = 1214, $\chi^2/df = 1.54$, p < .01, CFI = .97, 24 RMSEA = .05) of the 4-factor model showing strong loadings (.84 to .90) on intended 25

factors.⁸ Several studies have confirmed the factorial, discriminant, construct, nomological,
 face and content validity of the ALO.²²

3 Trust. The Trust in Leader questionnaire developed by McAllister and adapted to 4 sports settings by Dirks was utilised to measure perceptions of athletes' trust in their coach.^{23,17} Two adaptations were made to the original instrument based on interviews with 5 6 basketball coaches. First, two items were dropped, as interviews with coaches suggested they would not apply to the sporting context. Second, minor wording changes were made to the 7 retained items to reflect the context (e.g., the referent was changed to coach). The scale 8 consists of nine items, and example items are: "I trust and respect my coach" and "I can 9 freely share my ideas, feelings, and hopes with my coach". Participants were asked to think 10 about their experiences with their coach, and to indicate their level of agreement with each 11 12 statement on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The 13 scales demonstrated adequate internal consistency for the trust questionnaire ($\alpha = .83$) and the adapted version for sport ($\alpha = .96$).^{23, 17} Factorial validity of the measure has been reported to 14 be adequate with factor loadings ranging from .84 to .96.¹⁷ 15

Autonomy. Autonomy was assessed using the Basic Needs Satisfaction in Sport 16 Scale (BNSSS), which has ten items.²⁴ Participants responded to the stem: "Below are some 17 sentences that describe personal feelings or experiences you might have regarding your 18 sport". Participants indicated how true each of the statement was on a 7-point Likert scale 1 19 20 (not true at all) to 7 (very true). Autonomy is divided into three subscales, namely, internal locus of causality (IPLOC), perceived choice, and volition. Example items include: "In my 21 sport, I have a say in how things are done" (autonomy – choice), "In my sport, I really have a 22 sense of wanting to be there" (autonomy – IPLOC), and "I feel I participate in my sport 23 willingly" (autonomy – volition). Initial research has supported acceptable reliability validity 24 of the BNSSS (Cronbach's alpha = .61 - .82).²⁴ This research also confirmed the factorial 25

validity of the BNSS with factor loadings ranging from .80 to .89. Results from CFAs
revealed the 3-factor model (χ² (32, N = 371) = 57.16, *p* < .01, NNFI = .99, CFI = .99, SRMR
= .05, RMSEA = .05, RMSEA 90% CI = .03-.07) with item scores showing strong loadings
on intended factors.²⁴ Preliminary evidence also supported the nomological validity of
subscale scales scores.²⁴

Sport commitment. We measured sport commitment using the commitment subscale 6 from the Sport Commitment Model.²⁵ The items are "How dedicated are you playing for this 7 team?" with response options ranging from 1 (not at all dedicated) to 5 (very dedicated). 8 "How hard would it be for you to quit playing for this team?" with response options ranging 9 from 1 (not hard) to 5 (very hard). "How determined are you to play for this team?" with 10 response options ranging from 1 (not at all determined) to 5 (very determined). "What would 11 you be willing to do to keep playing for this team?" with response options ranging from 1 12 (nothing at all) to 5 (a lot of things). Participants were asked to think about their experiences 13 with their current team and respond to each statement. The scale demonstrated adequate 14 internal consistency ($\alpha = .89$).²⁵ Recent research has supported the factorial validity of the 15 commitment subscale of the sport commitment model ($\chi^2 = 174.31$, df = 1.14, $\chi^2/df = 1.04$, p 16

17 < .01, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .05) with factor loadings ranging from .88 to .92.²

Enjoyment. We assessed enjoyment with the four-item enjoyment subscale of the 18 sport commitment model.²⁶ Example items are "Do you enjoy playing for this team?" and 19 "Do you like playing for this team?" Responses were made on a Likert scale, with anchors of 20 1 (not at all) and 5 (very much). Participants were asked to think about their experiences with 21 their current team and respond to each statement. The scale demonstrated factorial and 22 discriminant validity and reliability ($\alpha \ge .90$) in past research.²⁶ CFAs ($d\chi^2/df: 1.01/2$, 23 RFCI:1.000, SRMR:0.003, RMSEA:0.000) conducted on recent data supports this early 24 research with factor loadings for enjoyment ranging from .92 to 94.²⁷ 25

Procedure

2	Ethical approval to conduct this study was granted by the investigators' University
3	School ethics committee. Head coaches were initially contacted by phone, email, or post with
4	a brief description of the study purpose and permission to approach their athletes. Coaches
5	then received a follow-up letter via post or email reiterating the purpose of the study,
6	procedures for confidentiality, and example items to be used in the questionnaire pack. Upon
7	permission from the coach, athletes were approached prior to, or after a training session.
8	Athletes provided written consent, prior to completing the questionnaires which took
9	approximately 15 minutes. Players were asked to respond to the questionnaire independently
10	and as honestly as possible when thinking about their experiences with their current coach.
11	Results
12	Descriptive Statistics, Alpha Coefficients, and Zero-Order Correlations
13	Descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha coefficients, and zero-order correlations for all
14	variables are presented in Table 1. On average, participants perceived their coach to display
15	AL 'sometimes' to 'fairly often'. They also reported 'high' levels of trust and 'moderate'
16	levels of autonomy, commitment, and enjoyment. All measures showed very good to
17	excellent internal consistency (alpha range = $.8595$). Values above .80 and .90,
18	respectively, are considered as very good and excellent indicators of internal consistency,
19	based on Kline's (2016) recommendations for interpreting reliability coefficients. ²⁸ All
20	variables had medium-to-large correlations with each other (see Cohen, 1992). ²⁹
21	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
22	Before testing the hypothesized model that AL is related commitment and enjoyment
23	indirectly via trust and autonomy. We examined the factorial structure of each scale.
24	Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) using the robust maximum likelihood method with
25	EQS software were employed to ascertain the factor structure of the scales used. ^{30} A

1 combination of fit indices were examined to determine the degree of model fit, including the Satorra-Bentler chi-square (S-B χ^2), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Standardized Root 2 Mean Square Residual (SRMR), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation 3 (RMSEA).³⁰ Previous research has proposed that acceptable fit of a hypothesized model to 4 the data is indicated when the CFI is close to .95, the SRMR is close to .08, and the RMSEA 5 is close to .06.³¹ However, it is worth noting that when testing complex models, these criteria 6 may be overly restrictive.³² In addition, the RMSEA is sensitive to model complexity and 7 often falsely indicates a poor fitting model in cases with small degrees of freedom.³³ 8 CFAs of the scales assessing enjoyment (S-B χ^2 (2) = 5.30, p < .001; CFI = 1.00; 9 SRMR = .01; RMSEA = .06, CI = .00 - .13) and commitment (S-B χ^2 (2) = 5.16, p < .001; 10 CFI = .99; SRMR = .02; RMSEA = .06 CI = .00 - .13), demonstrated excellent model fit. Due 11 to the hierarchical nature of the AL variable, a second order CFA was conducted.³ In this 12 model, the first-order factors of relational transparency, internalised moral perspective, 13 balanced processing, and self-awareness are explained by the higher order factor of authentic 14 leadership. This model fitted the data well: S-B χ^2 (86) =248.36, p < .001; CFI = .92; SRMR = 15 .05; RMSEA = .07 (CI = .06-.08). A similar second-order CFA was conducted for the 16 autonomy variable, which consisted of three lower order factors (perceived choice, IPLOC 17 and volition); this showed very good model fit: S-B χ^2 (32) =73.10, p < .001; CFI = .96; 18 SRMR = .03; RMSEA = .05 (CI = .03-.07). 19

20 CFAs indicated that items tapping into the trust variable $(S-B\chi^2 (27) = 260.6, p <$ 21 .001; CFI = .80; SRMR = .07; RMSEA = .14, CI = .13 – .16) should be revised. Based on 22 inspection of the standardized residual matrix and the modification indices, problematic items 23 were removed one at a time and factor models were re-evaluated. Researchers have proposed 24 this stepwise technique, as it maintains the factorial structure of a scale, while retaining only 25 the best available indicators.^{34,35} Two items were omitted in the trust measure: 'If I shared my

problems with my coach he/she would respond constructively and caringly' and 'I can freely share my ideas, feelings and hopes with my coach". It is important to note that the removal of these items from each scale can also be supported from a conceptual standpoint. The similarity in these items wording and another indicator with high factor loadings suggested these items were redundant and were removed. The revised model had good fit (S-B χ^2 (14) =67.79, *p* < .001; CFI = .93; SRMR = .03; RMSEA = .09, CI = .07-.12).

7 **Measurement model**. The recommended two-step approach was adopted to test our 8 hypothesis. Prior to testing the structural model, the psychometric properties of the measurement model were examined.³⁶ The measurement model tests the relationships 9 between observed variables and their posited factors.³⁶ The measurement model consisted of 10 all items (N = 41) measuring AL (n = 16), autonomy (n = 10) trust (n = 7), commitment (n = 16) 11 4) and enjoyment (n = 4). This model fitted the data well S-B χ^2 (514) = 566.67, p < .001; CFI 12 = .94; SRMR = .06; RMSEA = .02 (CI = .07-.11). Standardized factor loadings of the item 13 indicators in the measurement model were all satisfactory (>.40) and ranged from .41 to .90 14 (median loading = .70).³⁷ 15

Structural model. The proposed structural model (see Figure 1) was tested using the 16 robust maximum likelihood estimation method (Mardia's normalized estimate of multivariate 17 kurtosis = 212.08). Fit indices revealed that the data fitted the model well: S-B χ^2 (725) 18 =1237.53, p < .001; CFI = .93; SRMR = .07; RMSEA = .04 (CI = .03-.09), and all structural 19 20 pathways were statistically significant. AL was directly related to both commitment and enjoyment respectively. AL was a strong positive predictor of trust and a moderate positive 21 predictor of autonomy. In turn, trust was a moderate positive predictor of enjoyment and also 22 23 a positive predictor of commitment. Autonomy was a moderate predictor of both commitment and enjoyment. Coach AL explained 55% of the variance in trust and 14% in 24

autonomy, and in turn, AL, autonomy, and trust explained 23% of the variance in
 commitment, and 31% of the variance in enjoyment.

3 Mediation Analysis

4 We examined the mediating role of trust and autonomy using the bootstrapping procedure, with 1000 bootstrap samples and estimates of indirect effects.³⁸ A sampling 5 6 distribution of the indirect effect was yielded, allowing for the point estimate, standard error, and bias-corrected (BC) confidence interval (CI) of the mediation effect. Bootstrapping 7 allows for higher analytical power combined with lower risk of committing Type I error 8 when testing indirect effects 38 BC 95% confidence intervals were used in the present study 9 for identifying significant mediation effects.³⁸ There is evidence of a significant effect when 10 the bootstrap-generated 95% CI does not contain zero.^{38,39} AL significantly predicted 11 commitment through trust (β = .22, 95% CI = .08 to .22) and autonomy (β = .19, 95% CI = 12 .12 to .24). AL also significantly predicted enjoyment through trust ($\beta = .51, 95\%$ CI = .40 to 13 .62) and autonomy ($\beta = .26$, 95% CI = .09 to .16). The percentage of the total effect 14 15 accounted for by the indirect effect conveys the degree of mediation. The percentage of the total effect of AL on the outcome variables mediated by trust and autonomy was 68% for 16 commitment and 61% for enjoyment. 17

18

Discussion

Previous research has provided evidence that coach AL facilitates an environment that enhances athletes' satisfaction, trust, commitment and perceptions of choice.^{4,5} The purpose of the study was to examine coach AL as perceived by athletes and whether this was related to their enjoyment and commitment indirectly through trust and autonomy. The adoption of novel conceptual models such as AL is often open to refutation.² Therefore, the main goal of this study was to extend and build upon previous research in support of the application of AL in the context of sport.^{4,5}

1 AL and Enjoyment

2 Consistent with our hypothesis, athletes' perceptions of coach AL had positive direct 3 effects on their enjoyment. Athletes who perceive their coach to be open and honest and a 4 role model for high ethical standards could feel more motivated eliciting feelings such fun and liking associated with enjoyment. This is in line with previous research where employees 5 working under authentic supervisors were reported to enjoy their work and were more 6 satisfied with the working atmosphere.¹⁰ Findings also support previous research in sport 7 which suggests that coaches who were viewed to be authentic had athletes who percieved 8 higher satisfaction, a positive psychological state linked to enjoyment.⁴ 9

Within the current study, we found an indirect relationship between AL and 10 enjoyment via trust. This result suggests that coaches, who openly communicate with their 11 12 athletes, are perceived as and acting in a way that is consistent with their beliefs by being honest may engender athletes' trust, and it may be because of this trust, that athletes 13 experience enjoyment. Specifically, interactions that develop between the coach and athlete 14 15 could nourish positive social exchanges by virtue of building credibility and winning the respect and trust of followers.^{10,11,12} Our findings extend previous work by showing that the 16 process through which coaches may facilities enjoyment is because AL elicits athletes' trust 17 which in turn makes them enjoy the experiences.^{4,5} This is also consistent with research on 18 coach-athlete relationships which support the idea that athletes are happier if they trust their 19 coach.40 20

As predicted, the relationship between AL and enjoyment was also mediated by autonomy. Athletes, who perceived their coaches as authentic leaders, did not feel forced or coerced but rather, had a say in how things were done and participated willingly in pursuing their own goals. Results suggest that through the satisfaction of autonomy, athletes are more likely to be intrinsically motivated which builds up levels of confidence and persistence,

which in turn could be related to enjoyment.^{6, 19} The indirect relationship between AL and
enjoyment via autonomy is also an important finding as the current study encompasses all
aspects of autonomy to explain its working in the hypothesised relationships.

4

AL and Commitment

Our results support our hypothesis that athletes' perceptions of AL were positively 5 associated with commitment, replicating that of previous research.⁴ This result suggests that 6 coaches viewed to be authentic could have athletes who feel more dedicated and determined 7 because they are achieving their goals and objectives which are associated with commitment. 8 9 In addition, athletes could feel more committed due to coaches being viewed as considerate of their individual wants, needs, and desires. Indeed, these findings are in line with prior 10 research in organisational settings which has shown AL in supervisors had employees who 11 reported higher commitment.¹¹ Furthermore, findings extend that of previous research in 12 sport by showing a direct relationship between AL and commitment.⁴ 13

We also found that athletes' perceptions of AL were related to commitment indirectly 14 through trust. These findings substantiate those of previous work in showing that the process 15 through which coaches enhance commitment in athletes is because AL elicits trust, in turn 16 this trust leads commitment.⁴ Coaches viewed to be authentic leaders are likely to engender 17 trust in their athletes. Results are consistent with the view that if athletes feel that can freely 18 19 share their ideas, feelings, and hopes they may consider their coach to be trustworthy, and 20 this could reinforce their commitment. Indeed, trust is crucial for successful coach-athlete relationships and the inclusion of individual sport in the current study supports the view that 21 this may also be pertinent at this level.⁴¹ 22

Mediation analysis also revealed an indirect effect of AL on commitment via
autonomy. Results suggest that AL in coaches allows room for athletes to make choices and
participate in their sport willingly, and in turn, the autonomy athletes may experience could

lead to higher sport commitment. This is consistent with the view that autonomy promotes
positive psychological states including enjoyment.²⁰ Our findings extend previous research
by highlighting that coaches may lead to enjoyment in athletes since AL supports autonomy
and because of is they enjoy their experiences.⁴

5

Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research

6 The present research revealed some interesting findings but also has some limitations. One limitation of the current study involves the cross-sectional design. There is a possibility 7 8 that the direction of the relationships in this study may occur in some other fashion (e.g., AL-9 enjoyment- commitment) as data were collected on the same occasion. Thus, it will be important for future research to employ longitudinal designs to help provide a better 10 understanding of the temporal order of study variables. Future research should examine AL 11 12 and how relationships with athletes develop over time that could then be examined in terms of its impact on the mediators (trust and autonomy) and the outcomes (enjoyment and 13 commitment). In addition, to fully test the direction of these relationships, the independent 14 variable and the mediator could be manipulated in randomised experimental designs.⁴²An 15 updated version of the original instrument to measure commitment and enjoyment, the sport 16 commitment questionnaire-2 is recommended for future research.⁴³ Future research could 17 examine other variables as consequences of AL (e.g., motivational orientation and team 18 sacrifice).² From a SDT perspective, future research could include relatedness and 19 20 competence. Finally, researchers could evaluate AL together with servant leadership given the importance of trust within both paradigms. 21

22 Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of this study demonstrate that athletes' perceptions of coach AL positively predict both enjoyment and commitment indirectly through autonomy and trust. Coaches viewed to be authentic may be perceived as trustworthy and inciting autonomy

- 1 in athletes who as a result may experience enjoyment and are more committed.
- 2 Consequently, we need to find ways to encourage coaches to adopt AL as this may support
- 3 athletes' needs for autonomy and trust, promoting commitment and enjoyment.

- 5
- 6
- 7

1 2	References 1. Vella SA, Oades, LG and Crowe. Review: The application of coach leader
3	ship models to coaching practice: Current state and future directions. Int J Sports Sci and
4	<i>Coach</i> 2010; 5: 425-434.
5	2. Morton JT. Leadership in Sport. Routledge, Abingdon, 2016.
6	3. Walumbwa FO, Avolio BJ, Gardner WL, et al. Authentic Leadership: Development and
7	validation of a theory-based measure. J Manage 2008; 34: 89-126.
8	4. Bandura CT, Kavussannu M and Stebbings J. Authentic leadership is related to satisfaction
9	and commitment in athletes: The mediating role of perceived choice and trust. Paper
10	presented at North American Society for Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity.
11	Montreal, Quebec, Canada, June 15-18, 2016, NASPSA.
12	5. Houchin G. Authentic leadership in team sports. Master's thesis. The University of
13	Tennessee at Chattanooga, USA, 2011.
14	6. Sağnak M and Kuruöz M. Authentic Leadership and Altruism: The Mediating Role of
15	Meaningfulness. Univ J Educ Res 2016; 5: 447-452.
16	7. Gardner WL, Cogliser CC, Davis M, et al. Authentic leadership: A review of the literature
17	and research agenda. Leadersh Q 2011; 22: 1120-1145.
18	8. Rego A, Sousa F, Marques C and Cunha MPE. Hope and positive affect mediating the
19	authentic leadership and creativity relationship. J Bus Res 2014; 67: 200-210.
20	9. Bass BM and Steidlmeier P. Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership
21	behavior. Leadersh Q 1999; 10: 181-217.
22	10. Penger S and Cerne M. Authentic leadership, employees' job satisfaction, and work
23	engagement: A hierarchical linear modelling approach. Eco Res-Ekonomska Istraživanja
24	2014; 21: 508-526.
25	11. Emuwa A. Authentic leadership: Commitment to a supervisor, follower empowerment,
26	and procedural justice climate. Emer Leadersh J 2013; 6: 45-63

1	12. Norman SM, Avolio BJ and Luthans F. The impact of positivity and transparency on trust
2	in leaders and their perceived effectiveness. Leadersh Q 2010; 21: 350–364.
3	13. Carron AV, Brawley LR and Widmeyer WN. The measurement of cohesiveness in sport
4	groups. In Duda JL (ed) Advancements in sport and exercise psychology measurement.
5	Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, 1998, pp. 213-226.
6	14. Scanlan TK, Russell DG, et al. Project on Elite Athlete Commitment (PEAK): II. A direct
7	test and expansion of the Sport Commitment Model with elite amateur sportsmen. J Sport
8	Exerc Psychol 2003; 25: 377-401.
9	15. Scanlan TK and Simons JP. The construct of sport enjoyment. In Roberts GC (ed)
10	Motivation in sport and exercise. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1992, pp. 199-215.
11	16. Gatling A, Kang HJA and Kim JS. The effects of authentic leadership and organizational
12	commitment on turnover intention. Leadersh Org Dev J 2016; 2: 181-199
13	17. Dirks KT. Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. J
14	Appl Psychol 2000; 85: 1004-1012.
15	18. Peus C, Wesche JS, Streicher, et al. (2012). Authentic leadership: an empirical test of its
16	antecedents, consequences, and mediating mechanisms. J Bus Ethics 2012; 107: 331-348.
17	19. Deci EL and Ryan RM. Self-Determination Theory: A macro theory of human
18	motivation, development, and health. Can Psychol 2008; 49: 182-185.
19	20. Ryan RM and Deci EL. A self-determination theory approach to psychotherapy: The
20	motivational basis for effective change. Can Psychol 2008a; 49: 186-193.
21	21. Reeve J, Nix G and Hamm D. Testing models of the experience of self-determination in
22	intrinsic motivation and the conundrum of choice. J Educ Psychol 2003; 95: 375-392.
23	22. Roof R. Authentic leadership questionnaire (ALQ) psychometrics. Asian J Bus Ethics
24	2014; 3: 57-64.

- 1 23. McAllister DJ. Affect and cognition based trust as foundations for interpersonal
- 2 cooperation in organizations. *Acad Manage J* 1995; 38: 24–59.
- 3 24. Ng JYY, Lonsdale C and Hodge K. The Basic Needs Satisfaction in Sport Scale
- 4 (BNSSS): Instrument development and initial validity evidence. *Psychol Sport Exerc* 2011;

5 12: 257-264.

- 6 25. Scanlan TK, Carpenter PJ and Schmidt GW, et al. An introduction to the Sport
- 7 Commitment Model. J Sport Exerc Psychol 1993; 15: 1-15.
- 8 26. Scanlan TK, Carpenter PJ and Lobel M, et al. Sources of enjoyment for youth sport
- 9 athletes. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 1993; 5: 275-285.
- 10 27. Al-Yaaribi A, Kavussanu M and Ring C. Consequences of prosocial and antisocial
- 11 behavior for the recipient. *Psychol of Sport Exerc* 2016; 26: 102-112.
- 12 28. Kline RB. Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling. 4th ed. Guildford
- 13 Press: NY, 2016.
- 14 29. Cohen J. A power primer. *Psychol Bull* 1992; 112: 155–159.
- 30. Bentler PM. On tests and indices for evaluating structural models. *Pers Indiv Diff* 2007;
 42: 815-824.
- 17 31. Bentler PM. EOS 6.1 for Windows [Computer software]. Encino, CA: Multivariate
- 18 Software, 2003.
- 19 32. Marsh HW, Hau K and Wen Z. In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-
- 20 testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu
- 21 and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Struct Equ Mod* 2004; 11: 320-341.
- 22 33. Kenny DA, Kaniskan B and McCoach DB. The performance of RMSEA in models with
- small degrees of freedom. *Sociol Methods Res* 2015; 44: 486-507.
- 24 34. Byrne BM. Structural equation modeling with EQS: Basic concepts, applications and
- 25 *programming*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2006.

- 1 35. Hofmann R. Establishing factor validity using variable reduction in confirmatory factor
- 2 analysis. *Educ Psychol Meas* 1995; 55: 572-582.
- 3 36. Anderson JC and Gerbing DW. Structural equation modelling in practice: A review and
 recommended two-step approach. *Psychol Bull* 1988; 103: 411-423.
- 5 37. Pituch, K.A. & Stevens, J.P. (2016). Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social
- 6 Sciences. 6th ed. New York, NY: Routledge, 2016.
- 7 38. Preacher KJ and Hayes AF. Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and
- 8 comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. Behav Res Methods 2008; 40: 879-

9 891.

- 10 39. Shrout PE and Bolger N. Mediation in experimental and non-experimental studies: New
- 11 procedures and recommendations. *Psychol Methods* 2002; 7: 422-445.
- 12 40. Jowett S. Interdependence analysis and the 3+1Cs in the coach–athlete relationship. In
- 13 Jowett S & Lavallee D (eds.) Social psychology in sport. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics,

14 2007, pp.15-27.

- 15 41. Jowett S and Nezlek J. Relationship Interdependence and Satisfaction with Important
- 16 Outcomes in Coach-Athlete Dyads. J Soc Pers Relat 2012; 29: 287-301.

17 42. MacKinnon DP, Lockwood CM and Hoffman JM, et al. A comparison of methods to test

- 18 mediation and other intervening variable effects. *Psychol Methods* 2002; 7: 83–104.
- 19 43. Scanlan TK, Chow GM and Sousa C, et al. The development of the Sport Commitment
- 20 Questionnaire-2 (English version). *Psychol Sport Exerc* 2016; 22: 233-246.
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

1 Table 1

2 Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients, and Bivariate Correlations among all

3 Variables

Variables	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. AL	3.78	0.68	(.85)											
2. AL-IMP	3.86	0.87	.76*	(.83)										
3. AL-RT	3.89	0.63	.84*	.49*	(.86)									
4. AL-SA	3.76	0.77	.86*	.44*	.70*	(.84)								
5. AL-BP	3.62	0.74	.87*	.50*	.65*	.75*	(.83)							
6. Trust	5.70	1.08	.61*	.33*	.61*	.59*	.54*	(.87)						
7. Autonomy	5.50	0.82	.34*	.15*	.34*	.34*	.32*	.39*	(85)					
8. Aut-V	6.44	0.73	.29*	.16*	.32*	.25*	.26*	.29*	.69*	(.84)				
9. Aut-C	4.48	1.32	.25*	.80*	.23*	.29*	.24*	.28*	.83*	.25*	(.82)			
10. Aut-I	4.43	0.75	.29*	.15*	.29*	.26*	.28*	.33*	.75*	.67*	.33*	(.83)		
11.Commitment	4.19	0.67	.21*	.15*	.20*	.20*	.16*	.30*	.40*	.22*	.31*	.36*	(.88)	
12.Enjoyment	4.59	0.58	.36*.	.25*.	.35*	.35*	.27*	.44*	.41*	.33*	.26*	.40*	.43*	(.95)

4 Note. Alpha coefficients are presented in the diagonal. Possible range of scores: 1 to 5 for AL

5 enjoyment and commitment and 1 to 7 for autonomy and trust. AL-RT, AL-IMP AL-BP, and

6 AL-SA refer to the four components of Authentic Leadership (Relational Transparency,

7 Internalized Moral Perspective, Balanced Processing, and Self-Awareness). Aut-V, Aut-C,

8 and Aut-I refer to the three components of autonomy (volition, choice and IPLOC).

9 * *p* <.01



Note. All regression coefficients are standardized. Solid lines represent significant and associations between constructs, respectively. For clarity of
 presentation, the individual indicators for all latent factors and the variances of the seven authentic leadership and satisfaction first-order factors are omitted.
 AL-RT, AL-IMP AL-BP, and AL-SA refer to the four components of Authentic Leadership (Relational Transparency, Internalized Moral Perspective,
 Balanced Processing, and Self-Awareness, respectively). Aut-V, Aut-C, and Aut-I refer to the three components of autonomy (volition, choice and IPLOC).