Scholars have recognized the importance of leadership in the sport industry; early sport leadership studies emerged in the 1970s. To date, however, there has been no comprehensive review of the scholarly leadership studies in sport management. Thus, the purpose of this review is to provide a comprehensive synthesis of the sport management leadership literature from the 1970s to the present day, to outline what has been learned, and then, drawing from this synthesis, to articulate a preliminary conceptual model capturing how leadership operates in sport management. A number of clear themes in sport management leadership research and conceptual thinking have emerged, with the proposed conceptual model advancing several leadership antecedents and processes unique to sport. Intriguing directions for sport management leadership scholarship are also illuminated. Although progress has been made, many questions and gaps remain that require focused attention from sport management leadership scholars.
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particular emphasis on developing propositions regarding unique antecedents to leadership and leadership processes in sport. Stemming from this model and propositions, we provide suggestions for future scholarship. We hope this review will be a stimulus for engaged sport management leadership scholarship.

**In the Beginning: Before the Mid-1980s**

Early leadership research can be traced to a number of Western European philosophers (e.g., Carlyle, 1907), rooted in a strongly individualistic cultural context, who examined the characteristics of leaders. Stogdill (1948) reviewed 30 years of trait leadership studies and concluded that the diversity of situations in which leaders were embedded made it less likely that a single trait could serve as a universal predictor of effective leadership. Faced by the ineffectiveness of using traits to predict leadership, some researchers turned to the study of leader behavior. Lewin and Lippitt (1938) brought to the forefront democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire styles of leadership. In the democratic style, a leader allows subordinate participation in decision making, whereas an autocratic leadership style discourages such subordinate behavior; decisions are made in a top-down fashion by the leader. A laissez-faire leader is completely hands off, giving little guidance to subordinates. Early leadership theorizing, as well as efforts at defining the construct (Pfeffer, 1977), evolved from the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemp-hill & Coons, 1957), and centered on leader behavior, the end result being the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012).

Although the Ohio State Leadership Studies focused on the influence of the leader’s behavior on followers’ satisfaction or morale, the University of Michigan studies (Katz & Kahn, 1952; Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950; Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, & Floor, 1951) aimed to find out which leader behaviors contributed toward group performance (Hughes et al., 2012). Four categories of leadership behaviors resulted from these studies: leader support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation. During this time, some scholars had the foresight to see the social sciences coming to prominence in academia with regard to the study of human organizations and their managers. For instance, McGregor’s (1960) work centered on the implications of Theory X, the conventional method of managing the human workforce. McGregor (1960) explained how Theory X leaves managers with one of two ways by which they can manage or lead: the hard approach or the soft approach. The hard approach involves a top-down decision-making model, whereas the soft approach allows for more subordinate opinion. He argued that this conventional approach was falling short through its lack of a middle ground, and that by incor-

porating the emerging Hierarchy of Needs, developed by his colleague, Abraham Maslow (McGregor, 1960), a new theory could emerge that may be better suited for managers. The undergirding concepts of this new emerging theory of leadership, called Theory Y, “rest on a set of underlying attitudes or assumptions which holds that people learn to seek responsibility and that the capacity to exercise creativity, self-direction, and self-control is widely distributed in the population” (Roberts, Miles, & Blankenship, 1968, p. 402). The social needs ignored by Theory X are thus embraced in Theory Y (McGregor, 1960; Roberts et al., 1968).

The study of leadership took a dramatic change of direction when Fiedler published his first article (1964) and subsequent book (1967) on the contingency model of leadership effectiveness (Chemers, 2000). This model examined the interaction between leadership styles and situational parameters. Fiedler classified the group setting in terms of the degree of support offered by followers, the structure of the group’s task, and the leader’s formal authority. These three variables were combined into a dimension called “situational favorableness” (Fiedler, 1967). A significant relationship was found between group performance and a leader’s orientation when the leader’s orientation (or style) matched situational favorableness (Chemers, 2000).

One of the early marking points in leadership research examining the American sport context was a study conducted by Sage (1973). He reported that “for most American sports teams the coach is the appointed leader” (p. 35). Indeed, in Sage’s (1973) work, the shift in approach to leadership and organizational value, foreshadowed earlier by McGregor (1960), is evident. Sage’s work focused on how to attain player self-fulfillment, aided by the coach. This represents not only a significant shift in the social norms of the time, but also a shift within leadership research from the earlier conceptual thinking, such as McGregor’s (1960) Theory X. Early on-the-field sport leadership research with athletic teams examined the contingency model of leadership (Danielson, Zelhart, & Drake, 1975) and was generally supportive of its basic tenets.

In the mid-1970s, as leadership researchers continued to study leader behavior, they began to report findings from anomalous study approaches (Chemers, 2000). For example, in Eden and Leviatan’s (1975) study, participants were asked to provide ratings of leader behavior by imagining a leader. Results demonstrated factor structures similar to the ones derived from ratings of actual leaders. Thus, leader legitimacy, a central construct in understanding leader influence, was shown to be based on follower perceptions. Although perceptual biases in leadership caused problems for research methodology, the study did point toward an area for theoretical development. Sport management leadership research had yet to become prominent during this era; much of the sport leadership research was conducted via on-the-field studies.
The Mid-1980s to the Mid-1990s

During this period, Chelladurai (1990) conducted the first review of the sport leadership literature focused on leadership in the on-the-field context of sport performance. The review pointed out that most of the sport leadership research before 1990 involved the study of coaching behaviors and the normative model; studies focused on the autonomy of decision making that was preferred by coaches and athletes in various contexts. In addition, the review centered on use of the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) and the multidimensional model examining sport leadership and its psychometric aspects. Chelladurai suggested that future sport leadership research expand beyond the self-reporting scores of the multidimensional model and examine group properties, and various possible mediating and moderating factors of leadership. More details on the models presented by Chelladurai (1990) can be found in Chelladurai and Riemer (1998), as they delve deeper into these models of measuring leadership in sport.

Transactional/Transformational Leadership in Sport

A major shift in leadership research appeared with the work of Burns (1978), whose original conceptualization of transactional/transformational leadership theory offered a different perspective for leadership scholarship, which was locked in analysis of trait-situation interactions and perceptual biases. Transactional leadership involves a leader-follower exchange relationship in which the follower receives certain rewards related to lower-order needs, such as security, recognition, and affiliation, in exchange for performing a task (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership, on the other hand, revolves around the leader encouraging a follower to maximize his or her potential in the pursuit of higher-order needs, such as achievement and self-actualization, while also aligning the follower with organizational goal attainment (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Beb, 1987). The most extensive empirical analyses of transformational leadership have been conducted by Bass and his colleagues (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993, 1997; Bass, Avolio, & Pointon, 1990), mostly using a key instrument designed by Bass (1985) to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behavior: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). This questionnaire would prove (and continues to prove) to be important in leadership research: Hughes et al. (2012) reported that the MLQ has been used in more than 350 studies.

Transformational/transitional leadership theory became a focus in sport management research beginning in the mid-1990s. With the exception of Weese (1996), research based on transformational/transactional leadership theory in the sport management setting used the MLQ, with inconsistent findings. Wallace and Weese (1995) looked at YMCA organizations in Canada and found that those leaders with a highly transformational style engaged in more culture-building activities, handled change better, and had a greater degree of coordinated teamwork than leaders low in transformational leadership. Moreover, Weese (1995) examined transformational leadership and organizational culture at the administrative levels of campus recreation programs of Big Ten and Mid-American Conference universities. The findings revealed that the campus recreation programs administered by high transformational leaders possessed significantly stronger, more positive cultures than ones administered by low transformational leaders. Furthermore, high transformational leaders carried out culture-building activities to a significantly greater extent than low transformational leaders. In addition, transformational leaders were more effective in transmitting the culture throughout the organization. Moreover, Doherty and Danylychuk (1996) examined transformational and transactional leadership within Canadian intercollegiate athletic associations; findings revealed that athletic administrators exhibited more transformational than transactional leadership profiles. Moreover, coaches’ satisfaction with the leader, extra effort, and perceived leader effectiveness were positively associated with transformational leadership. However, Bourner and Weese (1995) and Weese (1996) found transformational leadership to offer little toward organizational effectiveness.

Gender and Sport Leadership

Another area of leadership research concerns whether there are differences between men and women in leadership orientations and behavior and whether such differences influence follower reactions and group or organizational performance (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Scholars (Defrantz, 1988; Lovett & Lowry, 1988; The-berge, 1984) began to examine gender issues in sport management leadership during the mid-1980s, citing a gap in the numbers of women in leadership positions across sport compared with men (Defrantz, 1988; Lovett & Lowry, 1988). Within the intercollegiate sport context, Doherty (1997) found that both younger and female athletic administrators exhibited more transformational than transactional leadership compared with their male and older counterparts.

Sport Leader Behavior

Outside of investigations into transformational/transaccional leadership and gender and sport leadership, other scholars focused on leadership preferences and the effects of sport leader behavior. This work included evaluating perceptions of leader behavior by athletic administrators and how such perceptions were related to organizational effectiveness. Findings revealed that leaders in effective athletic organizations were more goal- and task-oriented and cared less for developing good relationships with subordinates (Branch, 1990). Moreover, a review of effective managerial leadership in sport organizations noted that managerial leadership was complex, and a general form of effective managerial leadership in sport organizations was nonexistent (Soucie, 1994).
The Mid-1990s to the Present

Chelladurai (2007) pointed to the need to proceed with studying leadership in sport management while acknowledging that “it is time to build on that tradition by consolidating the findings and developing refined models of the pursuit of excellence” (p. 131). In this spirit, the mid-1990s until the present day have seen continued development of previous themes, such as transformational leadership and gender issues and effects in leadership, as well as the emergence of new concepts in sport management leadership research.

During this period, sport management leadership researchers began to investigate tasks and skills associated with leadership in the sport context. In a study regarding perceptions of intercollegiate athletics conference commissioners’ management and leadership skills, findings revealed that although management and leadership skills were both important, commissioners rated skills associated with management higher than those related to leadership (Quarterman, 1998). Using “multiframe” (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) organizational theory, Scott (1999) demonstrated that the structural frame was most descriptive of athletic-director orientation across athletic departments, indicating that successful athletic directors were more likely to be goal-oriented, although they perceived themselves primarily as human resource leaders. Within the Canadian intercollegiate athletics department setting, Danylick and Chelladurai (1999) found that managers perceived leadership to be among their most important responsibilities. Kihl, Leberman, and Schull (2010) integrated social constructivism with leadership to examine stakeholders of intercollegiate athletics and their perceptions of leadership. They found stakeholders’ perceptions were broadly defined and that their view of leadership was shaped by their experiences with organizational processes. This qualitative piece is also important because it did not use the common leadership scales comprising the majority of sport management leadership research, citing the value of qualitative research in answering pivotal questions with regard to leadership in sport management contexts. Finally, Swanson and Kent (2014) conducted a study of leaders’ domain expertise in sport and their associated credibility as leaders, demonstrating the importance of possessing requisite sport-domain knowledge appropriate to the position of a sport leader to gain greater credibility from followers.

Transformational Leadership in Sport

Scholars continued to explore transformational leadership during this time period. Several studies in the intercollegiate sport context illustrated that transformational leadership was the preferred leadership style compared with transactional leadership (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2009; Liu & Wang, 2007; Welty Peachey & Burton, 2011, 2012). In addition, during a significant revolutionary change process, transformational leadership of the athletic director in an intercollegiate athletic department aided in the acceptance of change by various stakeholders because employees and student-athletes were involved in the change process (Welty Peachey, Bruening, & Burton, 2011). Also in the intercollegiate context, transformational leadership had a cascading effect from top-level management down to third-tier employees (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). Turnover intention was a central topic for business management research; however, it had yet to be explored in conjunction with leadership in a sport management context. Wells and Welty Peachey (2011) examined turnover intentions of softball and volleyball assistant coaches within the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and revealed that both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors were associated with less voluntary turnover intentions. However, other work found little evidence that transformational leadership affected job satisfaction for NCAA football conference athletic department employees, yet it did have an influence on employees’ commitment at an organizational and individual level (Kim, Magnusen, Andrew, & Stoll, 2012).

Gender Issues and Effects

Research into gender issues and effects in sport management leadership research continued as well. Burton, Barr, Fink, and Bruening (2009) examined the stereotypes of senior level athletic administrators, noting that the position of athletic director was perceived as masculine. Moreover, women were perceived to be better suited for the role of life-skills coordinator than men; however, because the athletic director position is commonly stereotyped as masculine, women were not viewed as candidates for this role. Additional work regarding perceptions of women as a fit with athletic director positions found that despite having qualifications similar to those of male candidates, women were perceived as significantly less likely to be hired for the position of athletic director (Burton, Grappendorf, & Henderson, 2011). Hovden (2010) found Norwegian sports federations’ executive board members to have stereotyped views of appropriate gender roles, noting that women were blocked from leadership positions because those positions were stereotyped as masculine and therefore appropriate only for men. In New Zealand, Maori women faced marginalization as women and as ethnic minorities; however, they were able to leverage performance in sport as one mechanism to obtain leadership positions (Palmer & Masters, 2010). Along these lines, other studies examined inequalities associated with gender in sport leadership positions (Claringbould & Knoppers, 2012) and specifically in the NCAA (Molina, 2013; Wright, Eagleman, & Pedersen, 2011), as well as incongruences between women as sport leaders and organizational fit in South Africa (Titus, 2011).

Welty Peachey and Burton (2011, 2012) examined gender and transformational leadership in intercollegiate athletics in the United States, finding that when athletic
department subordinates rated their athletic director on transformational leadership, both male and female transformational leaders were deemed to stimulate extra effort and foster satisfaction with the leader. Overall, transformational leadership was found to be preferred by subordinates, regardless of the leader’s gender (Welty Peachey & Burton, 2012). This finding illustrated that no preference for male leaders was evident with regard to leadership outcomes, and therefore countered the stereotype discussed previously by Burton et al. (2009) with regard to the typical masculine athletic director. Burton (2015) conducted a review of research on women in sport management leadership, asserting that women are underrepresented in leadership positions at all levels of sport. In exploring the reasons behind such reality, she further examined available scholarship through a multilevel analysis.

Finally, Knoppers and Anthonissen (2001) provided one of the only studies to have examined the intersection of gender and race on leadership perceptions in management of Dutch football clubs. Dominant discourses that favor White, Dutch, and masculine norms regarding performance were used as the means to evaluate leadership success; these norms marginalized women and ethnic-minority men who did not subscribe to or demonstrate those norms of success. Moreover, merely including more women or minority men in these organizations was not going to change the race and gender constructs (i.e., White and male) involved in evaluation of leadership success; any effect on the perceptions of women and minority men in sport leadership requires a change in discourse around perceptions of successful leaders (Knoppers & Anthonissen). Although our hope was to examine leadership and race in sport management in this review, unfortunately, we found a dearth of research in this area; only one off-the-field study addressed institutional racism (Bradbury, 2013), and we included it in the citation analysis. We highlight this study later in the Future Directions section and call attention to the need for scholars to examine the intersection of race and leadership in sport management.

**Sport Governance and Leadership Implications**

Governance of sport organizations and its impact throughout an organization and a nation stands as another important issue facing sport organizations internationally (Arnold, Fletcher, & Molyneux, 2012; Ferkins, Shilibury, & McDonald, 2005; Fletcher & Arnold, 2011). As sport organizations move further away from using models and structures based on volunteers serving as board members, more formal, sophisticated structures have been adopted, along with boards of governors that must be strategic to be effective (Ferkins & Shilibury, 2012; Ferkins et al., 2005; Shilibury, Ferkins, & Smythe, 2013). With this in mind, the effect of governance on leadership in sport organizations has become more pronounced over time, culminating in what Ferkins et al. (2005) refer to as “shared leadership.” They point to the balance that exists between the voluntary board of governors’ structure and the top management team of the sport organization and how this balance has favored the paid staff executives in the decision-making process (Shilibury, 2001). This remains a theme of research prevalent in sport governance as the complexity of shared leadership continues to evolve, especially in New Zealand football (Ferkins, Shilibury, & McDonald, 2009). Although some scholars point to the evolution of sport governance and the shared leadership issue (Ferkins et al., 2005, 2009), others have noted issues of commercial roles and the handling of increased revenues, among other issues, facing global sport organizations (GSOs; Forster, 2006). Consequently, scholars have begun to question ethical values of the leaders of these GSOs and sport organizations in general. Sherry and Shilibury (2007), through research with the Australian Football League, identified possible implications (scrutiny, sport business, sport context, social investment, and historical development) of social expectations for the ethical conduct and decision making of leaders in sport organizations. In addition, Adriaanse and Scholfield (2013) explored gender dynamics in sport governance in Australia, finding that of the three gender regimes identified, only one (gender mainstreaming in process) provided significant opportunities for gender equality.

The governance and leadership of international sporting events has also garnered attention (Parent, Beaufre, & Seguin, 2009a; Parent, Olver, & Seguin, 2009b). In an examination of leadership in the World Aquatics Championships, it was found that networking and human resource management were key leadership traits needed in overseeing such a sport event. Also disseminated from this event was a multiple-linkage leadership theory that called on leaders to use relationships with followers as well as stakeholders to administer a successful event (Parent et al., 2009a, 2009b). In a related vein, to examine how leadership development can be improved in the National Governing Bodies of sport in the United Kingdom, Jones and Spamer (2011) used the Leadership Style Inventory, noting that current leaders mostly displayed a coaching and democratic leadership style. They parlayed these findings into a proposed Leadership Styles Competency Framework to develop leaders.

There may be no better case to exemplify the intertwining of governance and leadership in a sport organization than the history of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA). In his article reviewing the history of FIFA and examining the presidents, managers, and unethical conduct that has characterized FIFA, Tomlinson (2014) concludes that “governance issues have become increasingly prominent in the era of the presidents since 1974; this is historically and analytically undeniable, as is the escalation of ethically unacceptable and, at times, corrupt practices at high levels within the organization” (p. 1164). This conclusion points to structural issues of FIFA’s governance and its susceptibility to issues related to leadership style, such as the autocratic nature of President Havelange, as well to the inherent...
questions regarding ethical leadership (FIFA did not introduce an ethics committee until 2006; Tomlinson, 2014).

**Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

Another leadership theory that has garnered sport management leadership researchers’ attentions has been leader-member exchange (LMX). This dyadic relationship between leaders and followers has its foundations in work by Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975). The relationship tenets of focus here include high mutual trust, respect, and obligation. In sport management, Hoye (2003) examined voluntary sport organization boards in Australia, finding that board chairs and organization executives had a higher perceived quality of their exchanges than those of other board members. The involvement of LMX in sport board governance continued to receive scholarly attention, because when the board chair, board members, and organization executives perceived higher quality LMX, increased board performance was one outcome (Hoye, 2004). Further work in the context of Australian nonprofit, voluntary sport organizations noted that a better working relationship among top executives and board members led to increased performance of employees and volunteers throughout the organization (Hoye, 2006). In a nonprofit, volunteer-based sport organization, LMX was examined to determine its impact on volunteer job satisfaction and intention to continue to volunteer (Bang, 2011). Contrary to studies in human resource management, Bang (2011) found job satisfaction was not an antecedent to turnover intentions, positing that this nonsignificant relationship may be due to volunteers possessing a psychological contract with the sport organization. The continued study of LMX and its intertwining with sport governance continues to be an intriguing line of research.

**Ethical Leadership**

Recently, sport management scholars have begun to address issues of ethical leadership, particularly in intercollegiate sport. Scholars (e.g., Staurowsky, 2014; Sagas & Wigley, 2014) argue that it is critically important to lead ethically and to enhance ethical leadership in this sport context. Staurowsky (2014) examined issues related to athletes’ right to freedom of speech and freedom of association through the case of the All Players United Campaign. She argued that college athletes, as a result of constraints enacted by leaders in intercollegiate sport (i.e., coaches, conference administrators, college presidents), often do not experience academic freedom, such as the right to freely disagree, initiate judgment, and evaluate evidence. This is especially the case for college athletes who participate in big-time, revenue-generating sports. Staurowsky further explained the difficulties college athletes face in advocating for their rights and suggested possible ways to promote athlete self-advocacy within higher education. Moreover, in their article developing a conceptual model to assess ethical leadership among NCAA member institutions, Sagas and Wigley (2014) proposed the College Athletics Ethical Leadership Continuum, which is designed to evaluate whether the behaviors, rules, and decisions made by the NCAA membership are ethical or not. DeSensi (2014) argued that in facing an increasing number of moral dilemmas in the culture of intercollegiate sport, future sport managers must take social and moral responsibility. She further echoed Burton and Welty Peachey (2013), suggesting that servant leadership may help athletic directors with the ethical development of intercollegiate athletics. Outside of intercollegiate sport, Grosset and Attali (2011) found that the support of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) for the International Fair Play Committee allowed the IOC to be at the forefront in sport ethics leadership and to be considered an indispensable governmental partner for sport policy.

**Emerging Themes**

One emerging theme in business and sport management leadership research is servant leadership. Servant leadership was first coined by Greenleaf (1977) as a way of life; an individual has “the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first” (p. 7). It has evolved as a paradigm and recently as an emerging leadership theory (Parris & Welty Peachey, 2013a), where the focus of the leader is on follower development rather than specifically on attaining organizational objectives (although this is still important). The follower must be developed first, which will then lead to better organizational effectiveness. Various scholars have explored dimensions of servant leadership (e.g., Reed, Vidaver-Cohen, & Colwell, 2011; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011), perhaps the most concise being the work of van Dierendonck (2011), who conceptualized the following six dimensions: empowering and developing people, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, and stewardship.

Recently, servant leadership was proffered as a form of leadership that could help rectify the ethical imbalance prevalent in intercollegiate athletics in the United States through its moral component and focus on followers (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2013); however, no research has yet investigated this possibility. In one investigation, it was found that a cause-related charity sport event helped to develop servant leadership behaviors in its participants and volunteers (Parris & Welty Peachey, 2013b). Because the exploration of servant leadership in sport management is in its infancy, this is a viable and intriguing area of inquiry for future research.

Another emerging theme centers on emotional intelligence. Schneider (2012) has advocated that a sport leader’s emotional intelligence will play a critical role in effective leadership because a sport leader must demonstrate positive emotions while fostering and maintaining positive emotions among employees. The connection between emotional leadership and organizational effectiveness has not yet been fully developed or studied by sport management scholars.
What We Have Learned

The sport management discipline has made progress in leadership research over the past 40 years, yet there is still much room for further research. To date, the majority of sport leadership research has focused on the on-the-field leadership of sport teams (e.g., coaches and their teams), rather than on leadership in conventional sport organizations (e.g., management). Of the sport management leadership research, a majority of these studies have explored leadership behavior, specifically transformational leadership behavior and subsequent associated outcomes. Additional work has examined gender differences in leadership across sport contexts as related to organizational outcomes, sport governance, and LMX; emerging conceptual thinking and studies address ethical and servant leadership. To aid us in our review, we conducted a citation analysis of leadership studies in sport management ranked by citations per year and total citations (Table 1). This analysis revealed that the most frequently cited articles in sport management leadership center on transformational leadership, LMX, and gender issues in sport leadership. Interestingly, the article with the highest number of citations per year focuses on servant leadership (Parris & Welty Peachey, 2013b), which suggests sport management scholars will be exploring this line of research in the coming years. Note that we were unable to find citation information for three articles included in the review: Liu and Wang (2007), Molina (2013), and Welty Peachey and Burton (2012).

Table 1 Rank and Number of Citations for Each Sport Management Leadership Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cites/year</th>
<th>Total Cites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank No.</td>
<td>Rank No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 9.00</td>
<td>18 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4.90</td>
<td>3 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4.63</td>
<td>5 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4.46</td>
<td>2 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 3.88</td>
<td>1 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 3.80</td>
<td>9 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 3.00</td>
<td>18 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 3.00</td>
<td>18 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2.67</td>
<td>22 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2.20</td>
<td>16 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 2.11</td>
<td>4 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2.00</td>
<td>11 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 1.80</td>
<td>18 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 1.75</td>
<td>24 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 1.50</td>
<td>26 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 1.50</td>
<td>28 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 1.40</td>
<td>8 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 1.33</td>
<td>14 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 1.28</td>
<td>6 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 1.15</td>
<td>6 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 1.00</td>
<td>35 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 1.00</td>
<td>35 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 1.00</td>
<td>35 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 1.00</td>
<td>35 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 0.84</td>
<td>12 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 0.83</td>
<td>13 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 0.80</td>
<td>14 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, most of the leadership scholarship in sport management has paralleled the leadership research and theories in business management and social psychology, applying concepts, theories, and principles of leadership derived outside of sport management to the context of sport. This derivative model (Chalip, 2006) of knowledge construction is important because it allows us to confirm or disconfirm theories from other disciplines and perhaps establish sport as a boundary condition. There is opportunity for sport management scholars to further and deeply engage with leadership theory to ascertain how and under what conditions effective leadership may differ in the sport context from other disciplines.

**Multilevel Conceptual Model of Leadership in Sport Management**

In reviewing sport management leadership literature over the past 40 years, we have highlighted contributions to the field. At this point, it is important to now identify areas of leadership research that are not represented in sport management and the gaps that need to be addressed. Importantly, we must develop a conceptual model that enables a greater understanding of leadership within the field that begins to answer Chalip’s (2006) call to develop sport-focused theory. To this end, Figure 1 presents a preliminary conceptual model, drawn from this review, that addresses aspects of leadership in sport management that may be unique from other disciplines. In support of this model, we include several research propositions and future directions that we hope will challenge those interested in leadership research to take up and further develop our understanding of this complex phenomenon. The conceptual model we propose is a multilevel framework representing an iterative process. As a process, leadership is dynamic, fluid, and affected by numerous factors, so it will be difficult for us to capture all that is required to understand the process of leadership in sport management. But our objective is to form an initial framework to be tested, critiqued, challenged, and revised. We welcome all contributions in this regard.
Multilevel Approach to Leadership

Leadership scholars have acknowledged that a primary constraint to studying leadership has been the restriction of analyses of leadership to a single level, and that a key to advancing leadership theory is to incorporate a multilevel perspective (Hitt, Beamish, Jackson, & Mathieu, 2007; Yammarino & Dansereau, 2011; Yammarino, 2013). Within this review, we have also noted that research examining leadership in sport management has been limited to a single level of analysis. Yammarino (2013) provides a definition of leadership that we have used as a basis for constructing our conceptual model of leadership in sport management:

Leadership is a multilevel (person, dyad, group, collective) leader-follower interaction process that occurs in a particular situation (context) where a leader (e.g., superior, supervisor) and followers (e.g., subordinates, direct reports) share a purpose (vision, mission) and jointly accomplish things (e.g., goals, objectives, tasks) willingly (e.g., without coercion). (p. 150)

According to this definition, leadership research and theory development in sport management will advance if research and analysis follow multilevel analyses. There is a critical need to incorporate multilevel investigations into our work to develop sport-focused leadership theory and the boundary conditions under which such theory will operate (Chalip, 2006; Yammarino, 2013). Levels of analyses in leadership research include individuals, dyads, teams and groups, and organizations (Yammarino, 2013). It follows, then, that “outcomes of interest are the result of a confluence of influences emanating from different levels of analysis” (Hitt et al., 2007, p. 1387). Our conceptual model follows similar models of leadership evaluation and, importantly, depicts how leadership may operate differently in the sport context. Specifically, the model advances how individual-level antecedents of the “darker” traits of leadership, moral identity, lived experience, and sport participation affect the leadership process at the individual level in sport organizations (see Figure 1). The model also suggests that part of the leadership process includes the principal differentiating factors of how leadership operates in sport occur at the organizational/collective level through fans and alumni, governance structure, organizational culture, and stereotypes; at the group/team level through coaches and athletes; and at the individual level within the lived experience of the leader. The leadership process then leads to the multilevel consequences or outcomes of leadership. Importantly, we acknowledge that this model is iterative and that learning and reflection inform leadership. In addition, we recognize that each aspect of the model (i.e., antecedents, leadership process, outcomes) requires examination from multiple levels.

Antecedents to Leadership

When considering the process of leadership, we developed the conceptual model starting with consideration of antecedents to leadership, specifically at the individual level. It is also important that analysis of leadership outcomes acknowledge the integration of leadership and its antecedents (Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011).

Darker traits of leadership. Although the trait approach to examining leadership has fallen out of favor with some in the research field (Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009), other scholars have advocated for a reconsideration of
this approach and have made contributions worthy of consideration in this conceptual model (Derue et al., 2011). As the trait approach to leadership research has evolved in recent years, there has been reexamination of some of the darker traits associated with leadership, including hubris, narcissism, social dominance, and Machiavellianism (Judge et al., 2009). This “dark-side” (Judge et al., 2009, p. 153) of leadership has not been explored within sport management leadership studies and would provide a balance to the more “positive and perky” (p. 153) leadership work that has predominated (Yammarino, 2013). Thus, this antecedent is included in our conceptual model (see Figure 1).

When considering multiple levels of influence on leadership development, the context of sport may serve to influence leadership antecedents, including the darker traits of hubris, narcissism, and others listed above (Resick, Whitman, Weingarden, & Hiller, 2009), as well as seduction of leadership and why followers continue to follow sport leaders clearly seduced by power (Sinclair, 2007). This context may include pressures of commodification of athletes (e.g., Griffin, 2011), the massification of sport (e.g., DeSensi, 2014), the pressure to win at all costs (e.g., Sagas & Wigley, 2014), and the significant valuation and wealth creation associated with certain sectors of the sport industry. Moreover, social status accrued as a leader within a sport organization may be greater than leaders accrue in other business sectors because sport plays a unique role in the United States and internationally.

Proposition 1: Given the pressures for success in certain sport contexts (e.g., professional sport, international sport, high-level intercollegiate sport) and the expectations to deliver results in other contexts (e.g., grant funding in nonprofit programs), the darker traits of leadership, including hubris and narcissism, are likely to manifest in leaders of sport organizations.

Moral identity. Conversely, although the darker traits of leadership may be present as a result of specific influences in sport, we also recognize and highlight the importance of ethical and moral development of leaders within our model. Scholars have called for a greater understanding of ethical and moral development of leaders and how that development influences leadership within the domain of sport (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2014; DeSensi, 2014). Consequently, leader moral identity symbolization (external) and internalization contributes to leadership, specifically to ethical leadership (Mayer, Aquino, Greenbaum, & Kuenzi, 2012); thus, moral identity is included in our conceptual model as an antecedent (see Figure 1). If the pressures of commodification and massification can have an impact on leadership behavior as we have proposed, we must also consider the impact of moral identity and ethical development on leadership behavior and whether more ethical leaders will provide more positive organizational outcomes.

Proposition 2: Leader moral identity symbolization and internalization contribute to ethical leadership behavior in sport; higher levels of moral identity development decrease the manifestation of the darker traits of leadership behavior.

Lived experience. Sinclair (2010) challenges those doing research in leadership to consider how the self is placed in leadership and to recognize how the lived experience shapes leadership and the process of leadership. As such, we advocate for scholarship that places the self (i.e., lived experiences) into both the antecedents to leadership and also within the process of leadership (see Figure 1). Sinclair (2010) pushes for a reflection of personal histories as important to understanding one’s “beliefs, practices, and assumptions about authority and leadership” (p. 451). Therefore, exploring the concept of leadership requires an acknowledgment of identity and history and a sense of place. Reflecting on identity includes recognition of race/ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, physical ability, and physical characteristics because these form our overall identities, yet these identities intersect, and no one identity is most salient. Moreover, context influences identity salience. We must contest the notion of a “single, perfectible leadership identity” (Sinclair, 2010, p. 451) as we develop a conceptual model of leadership.

We also recognize that stereotypes operate to constrain identification with leadership (Cunningham, 2010; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). Within our conceptual model, across all levels of antecedents, stereotypes constrain leadership development and the process of leadership (see below for discussion of stereotypes; for an analysis of how these affect women in sport leadership, see Burton, 2015). Because sport operates as a site of support for a particular definition of masculinity (i.e., exclusively heterosexual and physically dominant; Anderson, 2009), those outside of this masculine norm may not be considered as capable of leading or may have no desire to lead organizations that operate in support of this narrow version of masculinity.

Participation in sport. Specific to leadership in sport organizations, it is important to consider the impact of participation in sport on leadership; many (albeit not all) leaders may have had experience participating in sports. Work in the sport psychology field has noted that development of life skills such as leadership can be fostered through participation in sport (Gould & Carson, 2008). However, research findings are equivocal in support of sport as a means of producing positive life skills. Nevertheless, participation in sport as an antecedent to leadership is included in the conceptual model (see Figure 1). It is unknown whether sport participation is beneficial with regard to leadership and the process of leadership and, furthermore, whether level of participation (e.g., youth, interscholastic, intercollegiate, professional, international) influences leadership development and/or leadership outcomes in either a positive or negative way.
Proposition 3: Participation in sport will affect leadership behavior in sport organizations.

We have highlighted a trait approach to examination of antecedents to leadership in this conceptual model and put forward propositions to examine the impact of individual traits on leadership. However, our iterative conceptual model acknowledges and supports that leadership is a learned phenomenon, such that, “regardless of where leadership competencies start for an individual, leadership and related competencies can be learned, developed, trained, and coached” (Yammarino, 2013, p. 151).

Leadership Process

As depicted in Figure 1, the antecedents to leadership have a direct influence on leader development at the individual level. Although leadership style is not depicted visually in our conceptual model, it is captured at this individual level of analysis. This conceptual model recognizes that leadership style is influenced by antecedents to leadership and affects is affected by upper levels of analysis (Yammarino & Dansereau, 2011). However, given our review of leadership research in sport management, it becomes apparent that scholars have not yet found that leadership styles operate differently in the sport context than in other business environments with regard to their influence on various multilevel outcomes. Thus, leadership research in sport management needs to move beyond the investigation of the influence of leadership styles alone, and consider other contextual factors that may differentially affect leadership style, decision making, and process (Yammarino, 2013).

External and internal stakeholders. To this end, our multilevel conceptual model integrates contextual factors that influence leadership in the sport context, particularly outlining the role of external and internal stakeholders in this process. In considering stakeholder influence on leadership in sport management, we posit that the leadership process operates differently than in other industry sectors. In so doing, we draw from business management leadership scholars, who advance the idea that higher levels of analysis will influence lower levels of analysis as moderators or mediators (Yammarino & Dansereau, 2011; Yammarino, 2013) and that the larger context will have more influence downward than the lower levels will have upward (Hitt et al., 2007). We also draw from stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) to examine and opine on how these influences may operate differently in the sport context.

Stakeholder theory has been applied extensively within business and sport management. It assists in understanding leader decision making by taking into account the interests of stakeholders, or “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization’s purpose” (Freeman, 1984, p. 53). If an organization satisfies the conflicting interests of various stakeholders, it can be more successful over the long term. From a leadership perspective, stakeholder theory helps to identify and understand to what and to whom leaders need to listen by examining the power, legitimacy, and urgency of the claim that stakeholders possess (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). Power refers to the ability of a stakeholder to bring about desired outcomes, legitimacy to the validity of the claims on the sport organization, and urgency to the stakeholder’s need for a solution in terms of severity of impact and time sensitivity. In sum, stakeholders will perceive and act on issues differently to advance their own interests (Freeman, 1984) and could thereby influence leader decision making.

Fans and alumni. One external stakeholder group that may uniquely influence leadership at the organizational level in sport management is fans and alumni, as depicted in Figure 1. Because of the passion associated with sport, and the degree to which sport fans can highly identify with their team, fans, including alumni of programs, could have more power, legitimacy, and urgency of claims than customers or alumni in other business sectors. This passion and identification, for example, could give alumni a great degree of power to influence sport leaders by threatening to discontinue support of a sport program unless certain urgent stakeholder claims are attended to by the leader. Fans also have purchase power, deciding whether to invest in a sport product depending on their perception of how the product is meeting their needs. These claims are legitimate, because alumni and fans are key stakeholders of many sport programs, and urgent, for without their support, programs may not be able to flourish. Thus, there is potential for these stakeholders to strongly influence the process of leadership in sport organizations, perhaps more so than in other industry sectors, where customers do not necessarily have the same passion for and high identification with the product.

Proposition 4: Fans and alumni of sport programs will have a unique influence on leadership process in sport organizations at the organizational level.

Governance structure. As another external stakeholder, the league and conference governance structure of sport could operate uniquely and influence the process of leadership quite differently from that in other business sectors (see Figure 1). One of the unique aspects of sport governance, compared with other industries, is that sport organizations often must both collaborate and compete (Chadwick, 2009). Sport organizations are part of a conference in youth sport (e.g., Little League, Pop Warner Football) and in interscholastic or intercollegiate sport (e.g., Big Ten, Southeastern Conference, Pac-10); a league in professional sport (e.g., National Football League, Major League Baseball, National Basketball Association, European Professional League); or national and international governing bodies (e.g., NCAA, IOC, FIFA), where sport organization directors, athletic directors, university presidents, and team owners meet and work collaboratively at setting structure, rules, and guidelines for the conference or league. But then
these are also the organizations against which one will be competing in conference, league, or international play. This dynamic could give power, legitimacy, and urgency of claim to one’s competitors and influence and constrain the process of leadership in particular sport organizations. In other industry sectors, businesses do not both collaborate and compete—competition is the norm (Chadwick, 2009). Consequently, the structure and governance of sport (Ferkins et al., 2005; Tomlinson, 2014) could provide salient leadership challenges in navigating the cooperation/competition dynamic.

Proposition 5: The governance and league structures in sport will have a unique influence on the process of leadership in sport organizations at the organizational level.

Athletes and coaches. The preceding propositions reflect top-down stakeholder influences, as is the norm in leadership research (Yammarino, 2013). However, leadership scholars have called for the need to examine more bottom-up influences in leadership, examining how followers influence leadership dynamics and processes (Dinh et al., 2014). In this vein, there could be bottom-up influences that are unique in the sport context, particularly with regard to the influence of athletes and coaches on the process of leadership at the group/team level (see Figure 1). Often, many high profile coaches and athletes have certain expectations about what their leaders need to provide to allow them to be successful. At times, these expectations and needs could be at odds with the leader’s preferred direction for the organization (e.g., coaching transitions, player trades, and player recruitment). These internal stakeholders could wield a great degree of power in the organization, as well as have legitimate and urgent claims, to a much greater extent than internal stakeholders in other business sectors. The celebrity status attributed to some coaches and athletes could accentuate power, legitimacy, and urgency that may influence the decision-making strategies of sport leaders. Moreover, athletes who have traditionally lacked voice and power in some contexts (e.g., intercollegiate sport; see Staurowsky, 2014) may be gaining power and influence over leaders when advocating for changes to improve their participation experiences (e.g., NCAA reforms to meal allowance and full cost of scholarships in Division I).

Proposition 6: Internal stakeholders such as coaches and athletes will have a unique influence on the process of leadership in sport organizations at the group/team level.

Organizational culture. Our conceptual model calls for greater consideration of the influence of organizational culture, not only at the organizational level, but also across all levels of the leadership process (see Figure 1). Because much leadership research has been conducted as “context free” (Yammarino, 2013, p. 152), including the scholarship in this review, we call attention to organizational culture as a context in which to examine the process of leadership in sport. Key components to organizational culture are formal systems, such as the structure of the organization, the decision-making processes, and managing individual and group performance (Treviño, den Nieuwenboer, & Kish-Gephart, 2014). Leadership influences and is influenced by organizational culture (Schein, 2010) because leaders are instrumental in establishing the structure of the organization, engaging in decision making, and managing performance of subordinates. This reciprocal relationship between leadership and organizational culture has not been explored in the domain of leadership in sport organizations. Moreover, if we are to consider ethical leadership in sport organizations (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2014), the influence of culture must be considered in the process of ethical leadership (Treviño et al., 2014).

Stereotype constraints in sport leadership. As noted in the section of the conceptual model regarding antecedents to leadership, stereotypes can constrain individual perceptions regarding fitness for leadership in the masculine domain of sport. Fink et al. (2001) have described the leadership of sport as dominated by White, able-bodied, heterosexual men. Researchers have noted that this dominant group holds the majority of leadership positions and positions of power in professional (Lapchick, 2013), international (International Working Group on Women and Sport, 2012), and U.S. intercollegiate sport (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Given the influence of this dominant group, and although positioned within the organizational level (see Figure 1), our conceptual model includes the impact of stereotypes on the process of leadership at the individual, dyadic, group, and organizational levels. Because scholars in sport management have provided more extensive reviews on multilevel frameworks to examine the impact of stereotyping on sport leadership (for a review of women in sport leadership, see Burton, 2015; for review of race in coaching, see Cunningham, 2010), we will not repeat these reviews here. However, it is important to include the overarching impact of stereotyping as a multilevel constraining force influencing the process of leadership in sport organizations.

Proposition 7: As a result of the dominant influence of White, able-bodied, heterosexual men in sport leadership, women and other minority groups are negatively affected by stereotypes of what is deemed acceptable sport leadership at all levels of the leadership process.

Additional Future Directions

We hope that this conceptual model and associated propositions will stimulate scholars to further explore
the uniqueness of leadership in the sport management context, answering Chalip’s (2006) call to continue to develop sport-focused theory. It must be acknowledged that the antecedents to leadership and the influences on leadership will vary by sport context, in that leadership at the grassroots, nonprofit level of sport, for example, will develop and operate differently than leadership in professional sport. Further work should examine leadership development and process across various segments of the sport industry, because most scholarship to date has centered on leadership in North American professional and college sport. To date, most of the leadership research in sport management has been quantitative. However, sport management leadership scholars may wish to consider qualitative methods when conducting multilevel research because of the ambiguities inherent in the leadership process across levels (Hitt et al., 2007). In addition, there is a critical need to move beyond cross-sectional leadership studies in sport management and incorporate longitudinal work to ascertain how leadership processes may change or need to be adapted over time (Yammarino, 2013).

Sport management scholars need to continue to explore the nexus of identity/identities and leadership (Sinclair, 2010). How does gender influence the process of leadership and the outcomes associated with leadership in a male dominated sport environment? Might women exhibit more servant leadership qualities than men and thus be more effective in certain contexts (e.g., community sport, nonprofit sport) because they demonstrate more communal qualities and are favorably evaluated for doing so, which could also be valued in these sport environments? Moreover, more research is needed to understand how race and ethnicity influence the process of leadership (Smith & Hattery, 2011). Some initial work has been done in this regard, examining the underrepresentation of minorities in university coaching positions (Cunningham, 2010) and the perspective of African American university athletes regarding their institution’s integrity toward their education and well-being (Singer, 2009). Bradbury (2013) conducted the only off-the-field study of race and leadership in sport, depicting how institutional racism may play a role in the underrepresentation of minorities in leadership positions in European soccer (Bradbury, 2013). As a launching point for scholarship to address race/ethnicity issues in leadership in sport organizations, scholarship in other fields can be considered, in addition to the work established in sport (see Knoppers & Anthonissen, 2001). As we have described in our conceptual model, context is critical to understanding the process of leadership. OSPINA and Foldy (2009) noted in their review of race/ethnicity and leadership that “increased considerations of race–ethnicity as a fluid social phenomenon” (p. 890) can assist us in developing a more nuanced understanding of leadership in context. Moreover, recognizing power and the shifting influence of power can help us understand impacts on leadership and that navigating identity-related issues (e.g., gender, race) may lead to development of enhanced leadership skills for underrepresented groups (Ospina & Foldy, 2009). Likewise, and of import for future sport leadership scholarship, Festekjian, Tram, Murray, Sy, and Huynh (2014) contest that Asian Americans need to be more central to research on leadership and race and that scholars should consider how the relationship between race and leadership aspiration is mediated by intrapersonal leadership perceptions. Horsford (2014) provides insight into advancing issues of race in leadership through the lens of educational leadership, which could be applied to scholarship exploring issues of race in sport leadership by examining how race has been used to reproduce inequality and oppression (racial literacy), establishing the pervasiveness of race and racism in U.S. and international cultures (racial realism), challenging racial assumptions (racial reconstruction) and, finally, healing from the damages wrought by racism in sport and sport leadership (racial reconciliation).

In addition, future work could also examine age as an antecedent to leadership development, exploring how age may influence leadership style, process, and subsequent outcomes. One intriguing question here would be to ascertain how the interplay of a leader’s age and legacy beliefs predict leadership behaviors, such as transformational, transactional, passive-avoidant, and even servant, across various sport domains (Zacher, Rosing, & Frese, 2011). Moreover, we must address intersectionality in sport leadership research. That is, how do “multiple layered social identities such as gender, class, sexual orientation, and so on” (Ospina & Foldy, 2009, p. 893) affect individual leadership behavior enactment and choices, affect the leadership process, and affect reactions to or evaluation of leadership?

Another exciting avenue of sport management leadership scholarship could center on servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977) and its effects on outcomes of interest across multiple sport contexts. There has been a concerted call to explore servant leadership in intercollegiate athletics (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2013) and in the sport industry in general (Parris & Welty Peachey, 2013a), but to date, little has been done in this regard. Although some work has investigated servant leadership with a charity sport event (Parris & Welty Peachey, 2013b), there is need to examine the viability of this leadership behavior in other sport sectors as well. How might servant leadership be related to procedural and distributive justice (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2013; Parris & Welty Peachey, 2013a) and other ethical considerations and outcomes in sport? Could servant leadership be important in reducing unethical conduct in sport through its emphasis on service and follower development (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2013; van Dierendonck, 2011)? How might servant leadership be related to acceptance of or resistance to organizational change? Are there sport contexts in which servant leadership could be more viable?

Distributed or shared leadership stands as another avenue of future exploration in sport leadership, building on educational leadership literature such as Harris,
Leithwood, Day, Sammons, and Hopkins (2007), who examined how schools and organizations develop through the process of distributed leadership. Likewise, the work of Pearce and Manz (2005) takes a more organizational management approach to how shared leadership stands as an answer to issues facing the typical “top-heavy and heroic leadership” (p. 130) structures in organizations. We encourage this research stream to be explored in sport management given the recent issues facing sport organizations following a more traditional top-heavy leadership structure.

The sport management discipline has grown in its legitimacy and scholarship since the 1980s, and scholars have tackled the issue of leadership in sport management from diverse angles and in a variety of contexts. Many advances have been made, theoretically and empirically. However, as with any young discipline, we have only begun to scratch the surface of leadership in sport management; there are many layers yet to uncover and many questions to be answered. With this review, we have attempted to show the breadth of the sport management leadership scholarship that has taken place over the past 4 decades while also highlighting its gaps. We have offered from this synthesis a preliminary conceptual model and associated propositions for other scholars to refine, test, critique, and elaborate on. Although we have tried to make this review as comprehensive as possible, we realize that some works and scholars may have been omitted, and we hope they accept our apologies. We have, however, outlined the major themes in sport management leadership research and provided, we hope, stimulating and engaging questions for scholars to examine in the coming decade and beyond. These suggestions for future scholarship are illustrative at best because we are sure many of our colleagues can add to this list and build on it to create compelling questions that require further theorizing and empirical testing. We invite our sport management colleagues to join us in this exciting line of inquiry.
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