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Abstract

Leadership efficacy is “a specific form of efficacy associated with the level of confidence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with leading others” (p. 669). Researchers suggest that a student’s level of leadership efficacy (LE) may impact one’s decision-making, willingness to undertake leadership roles, and one’s subsequent affinity to seek out and obtain a managerial/leadership position upon graduation. One’s lower levels of LE may result in prematurely eliminating certain career options and/or developing self-limiting behaviours— and for female students in particular.

Drawing on Bandura’s (1977) sources of efficacy information and Rotter’s (1966) Internal-External scale, the two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC.

An instrumental case study research design was employed where the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with sport management students. By exploring the perceived LE and LOC of these students, insight was gleaned into how students manifest such beliefs and how they may impact students’ academic journey and subsequent entrance into the competitive sport industry.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my family; my mom, dad, and brother. Mom and dad, thank you for always being there for me and for your unconditional love and support. I am who I am today because of you and I can’t thank you enough for that. Jeremy, thank you for being my best friend, my concert buddy, and my big brother. I appreciate everything you’ve done and continue to do for me.

Thank you to my girlfriend, Briana. We met in first year as undergrads and you’ve been by my side ever since. Thank you for your support, love, and ability to make me smile no matter what the situation. I could not have done this journey without you.

Thank you to my SPMA colleagues and friends: Cole, Daniel, Eddy, Jordyn, Josh, Lindsay, Matt, Michaela, Mike, Mitch, Sean, Stephanie, Stephanos, and Tyler, among others. I apologize if I have missed anyone! Without all of you, this journey would not have been the same. When I reflect on the experiences we had together, so many memories come to mind: the endless laughter, lively discussions, grad room polls, festive get togethers, ‘Nacho Action’, pickup basketball, and genuine comradery. I know each and every one of you are destine for great things and I am glad I could be a small part of your journey. I cherish the friendships that have developed over the last few years and hope they continue for years to come. Thank you.

Thank you to my committee members, Chris and Shannon. Thank you for guiding me through this process and for your willingness to contribute to my research project. Your knowledge, insights, and feedback shaped the document into what it is today and I am thankful to have had the opportunity to work with the both of you; not only are you great professors but you are also fantastic individuals. I wish you and your families health and happiness—thank you.

Thank you to my thesis supervisor, Kirsty. Without your guidance, none of this would have been possible. I want to sincerely express my gratitude and thanks to you for your unwavering support and leadership throughout the entirety of this process. Your mentorship and direction were pivotal in the conceptualization and creation of this thesis and it would not be what it is today without you. It has been my pleasure to work alongside you and I am grateful for each and every conversation, discussion and laugh that we shared. I wish you nothing but the best for you and your wonderful family, Thank you, Kirsty.

And finally, thank you to all SPMA and AHSC faculty members as well as Brock University for providing me with this fantastic opportunity and for helping me navigate my way through it. The experiences I had at Brock will stay with me for a lifetime. Thank you. Surgite!
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ......................................................................................................................... 2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................................................................................ 3
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................. 6
  Women and Sport Industry Leadership ................................................................. 9
  Leadership Efficacy, Locus of Control & Sport Industry Leadership ............. 11
  Purpose of the Study ....................................................................................................... 13
  Research Questions .......................................................................................................... 13
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW ....................................................................................... 15
  Social Learning Theory ................................................................................................. 15
  Self-efficacy .................................................................................................................... 17
  Leadership Efficacy ........................................................................................................ 21
  Locus of Control ............................................................................................................. 28
  Summary of Literature ................................................................................................... 32
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY ............................................................................................. 35
  Research Design ............................................................................................................. 35
  Role of the Researcher .................................................................................................... 37
  Sampling Strategy .......................................................................................................... 41
  Participant Recruitment .................................................................................................. 42
  Research Site ................................................................................................................... 44
  Data Collection Strategies ............................................................................................. 45
  Data Analysis Strategies ............................................................................................... 48
  Data Trustworthiness Strategies ................................................................................... 51
  Data Representation Strategies ..................................................................................... 55
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS/FINDINGS ......................................................................................... 56
  Section I: Participants Perceived Leadership Efficacy ......................................... 56
    Perception of Having Leadership Abilities ......................................................... 57
    Previous Leadership Experience .......................................................................... 60
    Previous and Current Sport Experience .............................................................. 61
    Confidence in Self ....................................................................................................... 64
    Level of Comfort within a Context ......................................................................... 65
    Observing Others Perform Well ............................................................................ 67
    Genuine Feedback from Authority Figure(s) ..................................................... 69
  Section I: Summary of Findings ............................................................................... 70
    Table 1. RQ1: Summary of Findings ..................................................................... 75
  Section II: Participants Perceived Locus of Control ............................................ 76
    Internally Oriented LOC .......................................................................................... 76
    Externally Oriented LOC ......................................................................................... 78
    Gender Difference in Locus of Control ............................................................... 80
    Table 2. RQ2: Summary of Findings ..................................................................... 86
  Section III: Leadership Efficacy and Locus of Control ......................................... 87
    Internally oriented LOC related to higher perceived LE .................................. 87
    Externally Oriented LOC related to lower perceived LE ..................................... 88
    Inverse Relationships between LE and LOC ...................................................... 91
    Table 3. RQ3: Summary of Findings ..................................................................... 94
Summary of Findings ........................................................................................................95
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION .................................................................................................97
Research Question 1 ........................................................................................................98
  Perception of Having Leadership Abilities ..................................................................98
  Gender Differences in Perceived Leadership Abilities ..............................................103
  Gender Differences in Perception of Being Capable to Obtain a Leadership Position ..................................................................................................................105
Research Question 2 ......................................................................................................112
Research Question 3 ......................................................................................................116
Summary of Discussion ..................................................................................................118
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSIONS/FUTURE DIRECTIONS .................................................119
Limitations, Delimitations and Future Research .........................................................123
Implications for Sport Management Educators ..........................................................127
REFERENCES ...............................................................................................................131
APPENDICES ..............................................................................................................139
  Appendix A Interview Guide ......................................................................................139
  Appendix B Participant Recruitment Letter ..............................................................142
  Appendix C Informed Consent ....................................................................................144
  Appendix D Participant Profile ..................................................................................147
  Appendix E LE/LOC Matrix ......................................................................................148
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

If you have decided on a dream industry or specific job that you really feel passionate about, you have to go about doing everything you can to make it happen. From getting the right education, to working in areas that give you the right experience. I refer to that as ‘getting your ticket punched’ at every step of your personal leadership journey (Peddie, 2015, p. 36)

In the United States, approximately 24,000 undergraduate students and 6,000 Graduate students study within accredited Sport Management programs (Gauthier, 2016). In Canada, 16 universities offer Sport Management degree programs; of these universities, eight also offer Master and Doctoral level programs (NASSM, 2015a). The commensurate growth in program number and popularity of Sport Management degree granting programs has led students to engage competitively when seeking sport industry employment upon graduation (Williams, 2004).

Moreover, such intense industry competition for employment creates a reality where the number of potential candidates often outweighs the number of available jobs. Furthermore, employers of these available job opportunities often require candidates to possess strong leadership acumen (Weese & Beard, 2012), both when they compete for and obtain positions, and when they foster their potential for upward career mobility and professional development. Given the characteristics of an intensified job market within the North American sport industry, Sport Management faculty are well advised to focus on students’ development as leaders, as they prepare to enter the industry (Weese & Beard, 2012). Such commitment to students’ leadership development is with the intent
that as graduates, students may be fully prepared to both attain desired leadership positions that align with their career goals and succeed as they work and progress within them.

Leadership efficacy (LE) must be considered when evaluating students’ leadership acumen or suitability for any given position. Leadership efficacy is derived from the concept of self-efficacy (SE), which is defined as one’s conviction in his or her ability to successfully execute the behaviour required to produce desired outcomes (Bandura, 1977). Hannah, Avolio, Luthans and Harms (2008) define LE as “a specific form of efficacy associated with the level of confidence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with leading others” (p. 669).

In an undergraduate context, a student’s level of LE may impact his or her decision-making (Bandura & Wood, 1989), willingness to undertake leadership roles and his or her subsequent affinity to seek out and obtain a managerial/leadership position upon graduation (Betz & Hackett, 1997). One’s lower LE may result in prematurely eliminating certain career options he or she believes to be out of reach (Betz & Hackett, 1981). This scenario may be problematic among sport management students given the demands of the highly competitive sport industry context with respect to being confident in his or her leadership abilities to be successful. This dynamic may be intensified for undergraduate students if they do not take ownership of personal and professional development pursuits.

Further, one’s capacity to take such developmental ownership may be impacted by his or her internally or externally oriented locus of control. Rotter (1954) considers the concept of Locus of Control (LOC) as a personality attribute that reflects one’s
perception of control, where the basis of such control is considered to be either internally or externally caused or oriented. For example, individuals with an internally oriented LOC may view events as under their control, whereas externally oriented individuals may view events as under others’ control or as under the control of fate or chance. Peterson and Stunkard (1992) suggest that self-efficacy and LOC are similar concepts as they are both explicitly cognitive constructs; further, Phillips and Gully (1997) contend that one’s LOC will influence one’s efficacious beliefs. Here, a concerning trend may arise when students with lower levels of LE also possess an externally oriented LOC, given one’s LOC influences decision-making across a wide range of situations and contexts (Phares, 1976), impacts one’s LE development and, in turn, may impact one’s subsequent career intentions. An externally oriented individual may feel less control over his or her own development and this may potentially impact one’s LE and career intentions as they enter the competitive sport industry.

Continuously arising unique and complex leadership challenges require that students look to expand their skills, knowledge, and abilities during their undergraduate degree program to best prepare themselves for the challenges they will inevitably face in the sport industry. Hannah et al. (2008) argue that current organizational conditions require leaders continually “step up” to meet complex challenges; as such, sport leaders strongly value leadership abilities because they realize they are necessary components of a successful organization and employees. Such abilities are undoubtedly a major factor for human resources and recruitment personnel when searching for highly qualified sport management graduates. As such, graduates who aspire to be sport leaders must be confident in their ability to lead others in order to obtain a leadership position in the sport
industry; however, this reality is not always met, and this phenomenon is particularly evident among female undergraduate students.

**Women and Sport Industry Leadership.** Sheppard (2018) suggests that females perceive themselves as having less leadership ability than males and view their attainment of leadership roles as less likely. Betz and Hackett (1981, 1997, 2006) first suggested that an underrepresentation of females in leadership positions exists in the sport industry and the gender imbalance inherent within sport management programs (i.e., more male students enrolled than female students) may lead graduates—and particularly females—to avoid or eliminate certain career opportunities because they perceive themselves as less capable than their male colleagues.

Scholars have examined female representation in leadership positions in sport in numerous managerial contexts and levels, (i.e., lower, middle, upper) (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Burton, 2014; Dugan, Fath, Howes, Lavelle & Polanin, 2013; Hoyt, 2005, 2010; Hoyt & Simon, 2011), where the general consensus is that females are underrepresented in all facets of leadership and at all levels of sport (Burton, 2014). Underrepresentation of females extends into the sport management classroom as well, given the gender disparity evident in many sport management degree programs, where the ratio of male to female students dominate (Parks & Roberton, 2002).

Burton (2014) maintains that the gender imbalance inherent within both undergraduate sport management programs and the North American sport industry suggests that sport is a gendered institution and all processes operate within a hegemonic masculine norm. Sheppard (2018) echoes similarly, claiming that despite undeniable advances, women are still severely underrepresented in the most powerful positions in
government and business. Sheppard (2018) notes that, “although women compose half of the workforce and nearly 40% of middle management positions, they represent less than 15% of executive officer positions and just 5% of CEO positions” (p.1).

Female sport management students may be concerned about this imbalance, considering the potential impact on their desire to seek out, obtain, and maintain leadership positions in sport that may not exist or may not be offered to them (Betz & Hackett, 1997). If female students view leadership as a task or role occupied predominately by males, they perpetuate the hegemonic masculine norm within sport and create artificial barriers for not only themselves, but their female counterparts as well (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Burton, 2014). The gender imbalance that exists both in the sport industry and in sport management programs (Parks & Roberton, 2002) may create potential barriers for female students to develop their leadership acumen throughout their undergraduate studies, which in turn may potentially impact female students’ career decision-making capacity.

In short, if female students do not believe in their leadership abilities, they may not take control of their own development during their undergraduate program. The experiences that female students have throughout their undergraduate program may affect their desire and motivation to become leaders in sport when undertaking leadership roles. Females’ diverse experiences, associated with gender role socialization, may lead to gender differences in LE and confidence with respect to career-related behaviours, especially those expressed within traditionally male dominated career fields (Betz & Hackett, 1997).
Given the ever-evolving challenges inherent in the sport industry and the intensely competitive job market, exploration of undergraduate students’ perception of their LE and LOC is worthy of further exploration. Research is needed on how students make career decisions and how their perceptions of career barriers influence those decisions “due to the quickly changing job market and technology, globalization of labour, and the critical need for job skills” (Kelly & Hatcher, 2013, p. 105). As such, this study focused upon students’ LE and LOC and understanding the difference between males’ and females’ perception of these constructs. Numerous scholars have explored undergraduate and graduate students’ LE (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Hannah et al., 2008; Kelly & Hatcher, 2013; McCormick, Tanguma & López-Forment, 2002; Quigley, 2013; Quimby & O’Brien, 2004), where it is recognized that in an undergraduate context, students’ level of LE may impact decision-making processes, both during their course of study and upon graduation when they enter the sport industry.

Further, Peterson and Stunkard (1992) note the similarity between SE and LOC, where each construct is explicitly cognitive. Students’ LOC has been noted to impact academic performance (Rotter, 1975), job satisfaction (Spector, 1982), and SE (Judge & Bono, 2001; Peterson & Stunkard, 1992). Given research findings, it is reasonable to believe that students’ perceived LE and LOC may impact both their development through their course of study and their career intentions in preparing to enter the competitive sport industry job market upon graduation.

**Leadership Efficacy, Locus of Control & Sport Industry Leadership.** Betz and Hackett (1981) suggest that Bandura’s (1977) SE theory helps one to explain his or her career decision-making process and professional development. Moreover, Phares
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(1976) argues that one’s LOC influences behaviour and decision-making across a wide range of situations. While numerous scholars have explored the relationship between SE and LOC, the current study seeks to contribute to both sport management theory and educational practice by expanding the literature through an in-depth exploration of the relationship between sport management undergraduates’ LOC and LE.

When sport management students explore their future career opportunities, they must consider their decision-making processes to uncover factors that influence their decisions. One’s perceived LE and LOC are two constructs that have been shown to potentially influence one’s desire to become involved in leadership development opportunities. Exploring students’ perceived LE and LOC uncovered gender differences that may help in identifying and addressing barriers such that they do not impact one’s career intentions upon graduation and entrance into the competitive sport industry. Also, this exploration helped reveal the way in which male and female students conceptualize their LE; enabling sport management educators to identify pertinent factors that may impact students’ LE development over the course of their degree program. Findings from this study assist in the development of recommendations on potential pedagogical interventions aimed at developing highly efficacious, confident male and female sport management students.

In this study, perceived LE (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Hannah et al., 2008) and LOC (Phares, 1976; Rotter, 1954, 1966) were explored in detail. Several scholars have explored LE in the undergraduate and graduate population (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Hendricks & Payne, 2007; McCormick, Tanguma & López-Forment, 2002; Quigley, 2013) and scholars have also used this construct to explore career decision-making (Betz
& Hackett, 1981; Kelly & Hatcher, 2013; Quimby & O’Brien, 2004). Limited research examining LE and LOC (Paglis & Green, 2002) exists; and no scholars have explored the relationship between LE and LOC in an undergraduate population. The current study seeks to explore this relationship to fill this identified gap in the literature.

**Purpose of the Study**

Building upon the work of previous scholars (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Hannah et al., 2008; Judge & Bono, 2001; Paglis & Green, 2002; Peterson & Stunkard, 1992; Phares, 1976; Quigley, 2013; Rotter, 1966), the two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC. To fulfill these purposes, a qualitative case study research design was employed, where the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with 15 sport management undergraduate students. Three research questions guided the study, including:

1) how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LE?; 2) how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LOC?; and, 3) what is the relationship between sport management students’ LOC and LE?

The findings of the current study benefit three populations, including: first, undergraduate students enrolled in sport management programs in which competition for sport industry jobs has been well-documented (Williams, 2004); second, sport management educators who may utilize this study’s findings to develop and facilitate evidence based pedagogical interventions (i.e., program/course content) to work towards
fostering more efficacious and confident undergraduate students; and third, female students who are underrepresented in leadership positions in the sport industry as these individuals may benefit from an exploration and understanding of where their LE beliefs stem and how they influence their development.

As such, the findings from this study contribute to both sport management theory and educational practice. Regarding theory, this study contributes to the respective sport management education literature on leadership efficacy and locus of control constructs. As well, the exploration of the perceived LE and LOC of sport management undergraduate students assist in developing recommendations to sport management educators in understanding how these beliefs may manifest into behaviour and how to develop program content that positively influences students’ perceptions of their leadership efficacy. This study contributes to the creation and development of potential educational interventions sport management educators may develop and facilitate to assist in undergraduate students’ LE development.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following chapter, the theoretical underpinnings of the current study are reviewed and detailed in five sections. In the first section, social learning theory, the theoretical framework that gave rise to LE and LOC—the constructs integral to the current study—will be outlined. In the second section, self-efficacy (SE) is discussed pertaining to its origins, sources, and relevance to the current study, as well as implications on students’ decision-making. In the third section, leadership efficacy (LE) is also discussed, pertaining to its origins, impact on students’ decision-making, and relevant studies in the literature. In the fourth section, locus of control (LOC) is discussed relevant to its origins, impact on students’ decision-making behaviours, and relationship with LE. In the fifth section, the literature covered in this review is summarized. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a foundation of knowledge on constructs integral to the current study and to situate studies within the context of their contribution to understand the current research study purpose and associated research questions.

**Social Learning Theory.** Rotter (1954) originally conceptualized social learning theory (SLT) as how individuals make choices “from the variety of potential behaviours available to them” (as seen in Phares, 1976, p. 13). Given SLT is a personality theory, researchers primarily use the theory to explain human behaviour. When using SLT to guide research, researchers assume that humans possess a purposeful quality to their behaviour; specifically, behaviour is often goal-directed, where one strives either to attain or to avoid certain aspects of his or her environment (Phares, 1976). Individuals respond subjectively to their environment on the basis of their specific learning experiences.
Future experiences become influenced by the effects of accumulated knowledge from previous experiences.

As such, experience plays a central role in the development of one’s LE and LOC. For example, if one has a negative experience, then he or she may avoid that same experience in the future. The way in which one perceives an event as either positive or negative has significant implications for one’s LOC. Perception of a positive or successful experience may lead one to have a more internally oriented LOC, which in turn may lead to gravitate toward a similar event in the future, whereas perception of a negative or unsuccessful experience may lead one to have an externally oriented LOC, which in turn may lead to avoid or withdraw from a similar event or activity in the future.

Social Learning Theory relates to both personal (i.e., experience(s), efficacy, habits) and environmental determinants (i.e., situational parameters like the context or setting) when assessing an individual’s behaviour and decision-making (Phares, 1976).

Phares (1976) contended that one’s behaviour is determined by both the importance of reinforcements (i.e., goals) and by one’s expectancy that he or she will achieve these goals. Stated differently, one’s behaviour may be determined by the degree to which one expects that his or her behaviour will lead to achieving stated goals. Further, the magnitude of one’s expectancy will be a direct result of one’s previous experience with similar behaviours. Rotter (1954) defined a reinforcement as “anything that has an effect on the occurrence, direction, or kind of behaviour” (p. 107) and an expectancy as the “probability held by the individual that a particular reinforcement will occur as a function of a specific behaviour in a specific situation” (p. 107). As one experiences success with a given behaviour, one’s expectation to succeed increases that they will
achieve a given goal in the future when exhibiting the same behaviour. Conversely, as one experiences failure with a given behaviour, one’s expectation to succeed decreases that they will achieve a given goal in the future when exhibiting the same behaviour (Phares, 1976).

In the current study, SLT served as a theoretical framework by which the researcher could seek to understand participants’ behaviours, beliefs, and perceptions to explore their decision-making processes and to uncover any gender differences in LE and LOC. The basic concepts of SLT gave rise to both LE (Hannah et al., 2008) and LOC (Rotter, 1966; Phillips & Gully, 1997) constructs integral to the current study. Self-efficacy is detailed next in the following section.

**Self-Efficacy (SE).** Bandura (1977) originally created SE to analyze changes in fearful and avoidant behavioural situations. He defined an efficacy expectation as one’s conviction in the ability to successfully execute behaviour required to produce desired outcomes. The relevance of this construct to the current study is that perceived self-efficacy is a primary antecedent of behaviour at the individual level (Bandura, 1997). SE can influence one’s choice of behavioural settings; as Bandura (1977) noted, people fear and often avoid threatening situations they believe exceed their skills and abilities, whereas they confidently become involved in activities when they judge themselves capable of handling the situation.

Furthermore, Bandura (1977) argued that the strength of one’s convictions in one’s own effectiveness may affect whether they will even try to manage a given situation. Fundamental to the current study, an efficacy expectation will determine how much effort one will expend and for how long they will persist in the face of obstacles.
and adverse experiences. The aforementioned complex amalgam of factors, including the intensely competitive job market in the sport industry and gender influences in sport may influence students—particularly female students—to possess lower levels of self-efficacy and in turn, may impact students’ ability to obtain and to sustain a leadership position post-graduation. A concern for sport management graduates regarding their efficacy exists, in that those who prematurely cease efforts may retain self-debilitating expectations and fears, thereby possibly impacting their future behaviours (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura (1997) outlines four sources of self-efficacy including: 1) *performance accomplishments*; 2) *vicarious experience*; 3) *verbal persuasion*; and 4) *physiological or emotional arousals*. First, one fosters *performance accomplishments* through personal experiences of task mastery, where one’s success raises mastery expectations, and whereas one’s repeated failures lowers mastery expectations. This source of information on performance accomplishments is particularly important because prior success influences an increase in one’s SE, whereas prior failure influences a decrease in one’s SE. For example, if a student works well in a group setting and creates a successful project or presentation, the student’s belief in his or her ability to accomplish group work in the future will likely increase.

Second, *vicarious experiences* involve one observing others perform both threatening activities and accomplishing a given task without adverse consequences (Bandura, 1977). When witnessing someone else successfully execute a given task, one generates self-expectations that he or she too will improve if intensifying and persisting in efforts over time. While watching someone else succeed can increase one’s SE,
watching another fail can decrease one’s SE (Bandura, 1997). For instance, if witnessing a peer successfully present a project to the class, then it is likely one will believe that he or she can present just as confidently. In contrast, if witnessing a peer unsuccessfully present a project to the class, it is likely that one may believe he or she will not present well; the other’s lack of success may adversely impact his or her behaviours toward success.

Third, one uses others’ verbal persuasion to foster a self-belief toward coping successfully with what has been overwhelming in the past (Bandura, 1977). Although powerful in its own right, one’s efficacy expectations induced by others’ verbal persuasion are likely to be weaker than those arising from one’s own accomplishments, given one is not provided with an authentic experiential base through others’ verbal persuasion alone (Bandura, 1977). For example, a child’s learning when riding a bicycle will be more powerful for the child’s future SE than when the parent tells the child he or she can ride the bicycle; the actual experience is more powerful than utilizing another’s positive verbal reinforcement to increase the child’s efficacious beliefs about riding the bicycle.

Lastly, sources of physiological or emotional arousal contributes to one’s efficacious beliefs, given one’s emotional responses occurring during stressful or taxing situations. Depending on the circumstances, a situation may carry informative value concerning personal competency in a stressful situation (Bandura, 1977). Individuals often rely on their emotional state when judging their vulnerability to stress, where their high emotional arousal usually debilitates performance. Conversely, when individuals are not overcome with emotional stimulation, they are more likely to express efficacious
beliefs (Bandura, 1977). For example, anxious individuals often judge themselves as less self-efficacious, which can create significant negative implications for their future performance.

One’s perception of their level of SE can influence academic motivation, involvement with specific activities and settings, level of effort, persistence, and emotional reactions (Zimmerman, 2000). Moreover, self-efficacy expectations will determine how much effort an individual expends and how long he or she will persist in the face of obstacles and adverse experiences (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy beliefs “effect whether individuals think in self-enhancing or self-debilitating ways, how well they motivate themselves and persevere in the face of difficulties, the quality of their well-being and their vulnerability to stress and depression, and the choices they make at important decision points” (Bandura & Locke, 2003, p. 87).

During the course of an undergraduate degree program, students encounter numerous, diverse experiences and circumstances that may impact their self-efficacy levels, both positively and negatively. Hannah et al. (2008) argue highly self-efficacious individuals will harness these experiences to further their professional development, whereas individuals with lower levels of efficacy will likely view these experiences as debilitating. This dynamic is concerning for students’ SE development and career decision-making because students’ lower levels of SE may result in eliminating certain career options they already deem unattainable (Betz & Hackett, 1981). Recognizing this, scholars (Betz and Hackett, 1981; Hannah et al., 2008; Hendricks & Payne, 2007; Quigley, 2013) have extended the SE construct toward individuals’ associations with
leadership, which has led to development of leadership efficacy (LE), a construct integral to the current study.

**Leadership Efficacy.** Derived from SE, leadership efficacy (LE) is “a specific form of efficacy associated with the level of confidence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with leading others” (Hannah et al., 2008, p. 669). According to Cunningham, Bruening, Satore, Sagas and Fink (2005) and MacCormick, Tanguma and Lopez-Forment (2002) two lenses to view LE exist, the first lens as one’s belief in the ability to be a leader and the second as one’s belief in the ability to obtain a leadership position.

Scholars have explored individuals’ LE (Hannah et al., 2008; Hendricks & Payne, 2007; Quigley, 2013), suggesting that both men’s and women’s efficacy beliefs account for motivation for leadership or managerial aspirations (Hannah et al., 2008). Notably, Hannah et al. (2008) reviewed existing theory and research to propose a multi-level conceptual framework of the LE construct and to stimulate theoretical development and future research.

Hannah et al. (2008) argue that individuals’ efficacious beliefs promote effective leader engagement, flexibility and adaptability because higher levels of SE provide the internal guidance required to manifest behaviours vital to undertaking complex leadership challenges and opportunities successfully. Hannah et al. (2008) suggest that those with higher levels of SE tend to focus on opportunities to pursue challenges, whereas those with lower levels of SE tend to focus on avoiding risks. Likewise, leaders with higher efficacy levels tend to expose themselves to developmental events and experience positive development in their LE over time. As such, efficacious individuals are found to
actively pursue challenges and opportunities to expose themselves to diverse experiences, all of which in turn provide one with the platform to develop and hone leadership acumen.

According to Hendricks and Payne (2007), one’s high levels of LE results in higher levels of engagement in leadership opportunities and overall leadership effectiveness. These researchers explored goal orientation, LE, and motivation to lead as antecedents of leadership effectiveness, concluding that LE partially mediated the relationships between goal orientation and motivation to lead. Accordingly, LE has implications for goal orientation, leadership effectiveness and leadership engagement, all of which impact development and subsequent career intentions. One’s engagement in leadership opportunities is fundamental to one’s LE development (Hendricks & Payne, 2007), where a lack of motivation to engage can be detrimental to one’s personal and professional development. These findings suggest that one’s efficacy development can be cyclical such that, as one engages in leadership opportunities, his or her efficacy and effectiveness increases, as does one’s desire to seek out and participate in further leadership experiences. Such a cycle supports the notion that performance accomplishments positively influence one’s SE.

Likewise, Quigley (2013) noted that a “key antecedent of motivation to lead—and overall leadership effectiveness—is leadership efficacy” (p. 579). Quigley (2013) explored LE among MBA students during a 4-day business simulation, finding that individuals who were more extraverted and who possessed higher cognitive ability possessed higher levels of LE. Quigley (2013) also found students’ emotional stability, agreeableness, and openness to experience influenced their LE over time. Participants
were given expert feedback to better understand from where their personal LE beliefs originated and how they changed over time in response to feedback. Upon receiving feedback, students LE increased, which prompted Quigley (2013) to suggest that research in leadership education should focus on personal and situational antecedents of LE development to better understand the leverage points so they could help individuals build their LE.

Similarly, McCormick et al., (2002) examined LE among psychology undergraduate students to test the hypotheses that LE would be associated with both: 1) students’ previous experiences in leadership roles; and 2) students’ attempts to assume leadership roles. These scholars found that LE was highly related to students’ reporting the frequency of attempts one assumes a leadership role, suggesting that given the opportunity, LE is bolstered by more attempts to do just that. Moreover, McCormick et al. (2002) found that female students’ LE levels were lower than male students’ LE, indicating they were less confident about their leadership capabilities than male students of similar age and education.

From this particular finding, the authors argue that regarding leadership as a masculine behaviour or task perpetuates social role pressures, which likely causes females to avoid leadership roles, which in turn creates significant career and self-efficacy development barriers for females. Lacking confidence in one’s own leadership capabilities can lead individuals to avoid leadership experiences altogether and, will have a detrimental impact on the subsequent development of LE, particularly in females. McCormick et al. (2002) argue that LE can be viewed as one’s perception or belief in the capability to perform leadership skills/tasks.
In a similar vein, Cunningham et al. (2005) explored the factors that influence career choices using social cognitive career theory (SCCT) to examine student intentions to enter the sport and leisure industry. They found that discrimination factors and outcome expectations were perceived to impede one’s attitude toward the sport industry. They argue that discrimination by sport industry professionals and a lack of advancement opportunities in the sport industry may impede an individual’s career decision making and as such, the sport industry is “losing, young qualified professionals even before they have a chance to enter the profession because of these impediments to entering the industry” (p. 134). Cunningham et al. (2005) suggest that the LE construct can also be viewed as one’s perception or belief in their capability to obtain a leadership position.

When exploring LE, scholars have utilized Bandura’s self-efficacy theory to explain an individual’s career intentions (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Kelly & Hatcher, 2013; Quimby & O’Brien, 2004). Correspondingly, Betz & Hackett (1981) conceptualized career or occupational LE as the “belief in one’s capabilities to complete the educational job requirements and to master the job function skills needed to achieve certain occupations” (p. 401). These researchers were first to suggest that SE could be employed to assess an individual’s career decision-making and investigated the influence of SE to explain females’ continual underrepresentation in leadership and managerial occupations. Results indicate that both males’ and females’ expectations were related to the range and interest they expressed of their perceived career options in occupations.

Notably, Betz and Hackett (1981) indicated that females’ low efficacy expectations are a major factor in the restriction of females’ career options, particularly in occupations traditionally viewed as more appropriate for males (e.g., occupations
requiring competence in mathematics). Betz and Hackett (1981) contended this finding may be due to females’ lack of experiences of successful accomplishments and a lack of opportunities to observe other females who are competent in math. These researchers determined that one’s low SE may be an important factor in his or her elimination of possible career options, particularly for females. In conclusion, Betz and Hackett (1981) suggested that “individuals whose beliefs about themselves cause them to avoid pursuits of which they are capable would benefit from exploration of the sources of those beliefs” (p. 409).

Betz and Hackett’s (1981) work is extremely influential for scholars who explore students’ career or occupational decision-making behaviours. Their findings are especially useful for understanding the career development of females and the barriers that exist with regards to females’ LE and decision-making processes. Betz and Hackett’s (1981) findings have both informed and guided studies regarding career decision-making behaviour. For example, Kelly and Hatcher (2013) explored differences in career decision-making self-efficacy (CDMSE) and career barriers between undergraduate students in applied technology programs and undergraduate students enrolled in college transfer programs, finding that students’ higher levels of CDMSE and lower career barriers for those in applied technology programs was attributed to age, suggesting that students’ career interests and intentions develop over time and are reinforced through their repetitive actions. As well, students in applied technology programs showed higher levels of SE as a result of their expectation of earning a degree in their chosen field and of their identification of the goal as attainable (i.e., they possessed efficacious beliefs).
Relatedly, Quimby and O’Brien (2004) examined predictors of career decision-making self-efficacy among nontraditional college women (i.e., 25 years and over), finding that the differences in participants’ career decision-making SE were accounted for by factors such as career barriers and social support. Specifically, these researchers found when these women experienced fewer career barriers and received extensive social support, they experienced feeling greater confidence in both managing responsibilities associated with being a student and in pursuing tasks related to vocational development. Interestingly, circumstances around which one’s skills and competence were recognized were significantly related to strong levels of student and career decision-making self-efficacy, supporting Bandura’s (1977) argument that verbal persuasion enhances self-efficacy. Verbal persuasion, in the form of social support via others’ recognition of one’s competencies, resulted in higher levels of career decision-making efficacy, particularly in female participants.

More recently, Sheppard (2018) examined gender differences in constructs associated with leadership aspirations (i.e., career aspirations, leadership ability, characteristics of leadership) among undergraduate students to explore if these might contribute to the gender gap in leadership attainment. Sheppard (2018) found that female participants perceived their leadership ability as lower than did male participants and also perceived themselves less likely to obtain leadership positions in the future. Interestingly, Sheppard (2018) found that women’s lower self-efficacy (relative to men’s) leads them to underestimate their leadership abilities, thereby diminishing their interest in leadership roles. These findings are problematic when considering situations where females’ lower
SE may lead them to develop self-limiting behaviours or avoid roles in which they are otherwise highly capable.

Sheppard (2018) also found that that male and female participants varied in the extent to which they perceived becoming leaders in their chosen fields was attainable, where specifically, males believed that becoming a leader was more attainable than females. Sheppard (2018) suggested that such varying beliefs between males and females are attributable to young women anticipating that gender discrimination will make it less likely that they will receive advancement opportunities. Practically speaking, this perception is not likely to change unless women are exposed to a greater number of women occupying elite leadership roles (i.e., CEO, general manager, director). Sheppard (2018) suggested that University educators and administrators might be well-advised to consider this when they make important decisions (i.e., when selecting and developing educational content and making personnel decisions), given that an undergraduate degree program may be the last opportunity young women have to witness female role modeling before they enter the competitive, male dominated job market/sport industry (Sheppard, 2018).

Leadership efficacy impacts career related decision-making and behavioural choices in many ways. What has received little attention in the literature however, is the influence of one’s locus of control (LOC) on the development of one’s LE. As such, it is a central proposition in the current study that one’s LOC may influence his or her LE beliefs and this relationship may have implications for students’ personal and professional development. In the following section, details on LOC are provided, relative to its origins, influence on LE, and relevance in the current study.
**Locus of Control.** Originating from SLT, locus of control (LOC) (Rotter, 1954; 1966) is a personality attribute, which reflects the degree to which one generally perceives events as being either under one’s own control (i.e., one’s internal locus) or as being under the control of powerful others’ (i.e., one’s external locus) (Phillips & Gully, 1997). Stated differently, LOC is concerned with one’s self-perception of control and an attribution of an internal or external causality of such control. Central to LOC, a major determinant of one’s behaviour is the degree to which he or she perceives an outcome is controlled by forces occurring either as independently of his or her behaviours or occurring as contingent upon his or her behaviour. Rotter (1966) discusses the notion that individuals build generalized expectancies for internal-external control and this has significant implications for self-efficacy and job performance. Central to the current study, a generalized expectancy is defined as the degree to which one believes in the internal or external control of reinforcement and is flexible enough to be used as a generalized personality construct to describe individual differences in beliefs (Phares, 1976). As such, the LOC construct may be used as one avenue to understand the differences in students’ perception of their LE.

For example, when receiving an exam evaluated with a poor grade, a student with an internally oriented LOC would attribute poor performance to factors including poor study habits, inaccurate notetaking or ineffective use of time allotted either when preparing or when completing the exam. In contrast, an individual with an externally oriented LOC would attribute poor performance to factors including unfairness (e.g., the exam included poorly written questions, the student was given little time to complete the exam), the professor’s teaching style, or that the teacher or the wider program is ‘out to
get him or her.’ Clearly, the implications of LOC on students can be quite substantial, given internally oriented individuals will take ownership of poor performance and seek to correct it, whereas externally oriented individuals will blame their failure on others and likely remain static in their perception and their current state of development (Peterson & Stunkard, 1992).

A full comprehension of LOC relates to understanding how the construct impacts individuals’ behaviour. When determining which behaviour(s) have the strongest potential to occur, expectancy, reinforcement and the psychological situation are considered (Phares, 1976). An expectancy is one’s perception that a particular reinforcement will probably occur as a result of a specific behaviour, whereas a reinforcement is anything that has an effect on the occurrence or type of behaviour (Phares, 1976). For example, if one studies hard for an exam (i.e., eliciting behaviour such as making and studying study notes, following an exam review, meeting with professor during office hours) and receives a grade he or she deems acceptable (reinforcement), the person will expect that studying hard will result in good grades in the future (expectancy).

While expectancies generalize from any one specific situation to a series of situations that one perceives as related or similar (Rotter, 1966), a reinforcement acts to strengthen an expectancy that a particular behaviour will be followed by that reinforcement in the future (Rotter, 1996). Internally oriented individuals believe rewards are brought by his or her own actions, whereas externally oriented individuals believe rewards are due to chance factors, fate, or powerful others (Peterson & Stunkard, 1992).
A concerning scenario arises when students do not believe that their actions lead to the rewards they desire.

One’s generalized attitude, belief, or expectation regarding the causal nature of the relationship between one’s behaviour and the resulting consequences might affect a variety of one’s choices under wide range of circumstances (Rotter, 1996). For example, during a student’s undergraduate journey, numerous circumstances may arise that will potentially impact one’s LOC, both positively and negatively (e.g., a student’s engagement in course or group work, internships, field placements, and leadership opportunities). Students’ perceived LOC may impact their development throughout a course of study in so far as affecting desire to be involved with events and opportunities.

For example, if an externally oriented individual believes that he or she is not in control of self-development when participating in a program, he or she may avoid becoming involved in challenging opportunities.

Additionally, the individual may blame any failures or inadequacies on others and experience a significant loss of motivation, all of which may impact LE development and subsequent leadership skillset both through the program and upon graduation. In contrast, a student with an internally oriented LOC who feels he or she is in control of self-development, may engage in greater information seeking behaviour and may actively pursue challenging opportunities (Phares, 1976). One’s self-perception of control over one’s development is sufficient to reduce an individual’s stress, increase motivation, and encourage performance (Peterson & Stunkard, 1992), which then may potentially and positively impact one’s perceived LE.
Researchers have explored self-efficacy and LOC (Judge & Bono, 2001; Peterson & Stunkard, 1992), and self-evaluation traits (e.g., self-esteem, SE, LOC, emotional stability) (Judge & Bono, 2001) to assess their impact on individuals’ job satisfaction and performance, finding that one’s internal LOC was positively related to job performance and satisfaction. Additionally, Judge and Bono (2001) suggested that when internally oriented individuals are faced with discrepancies between acceptable performance and actual performance, they tended to increase their efforts to match their performance to given standards. From such findings, we may assume that students with an internally oriented LOC may strive to improve performance when faced with difficult or challenging circumstances, which may have implications for both their LE development and their decision-making behaviours.

Moreover, Peterson and Stunkard (1992) explored cognates of personal control (e.g., LOC, self-efficacy, explanatory style) to assess distinctions between these constructs. Although their focus was on exploring dissimilarities between constructs, Peterson and Stunkard (1992) noted that SE, LOC, and explanatory style resembled each other because they are explicitly cognitively oriented constructs. The scholars noted that LOC accounts for perseverance and SE accounts for behavioural change. These researchers suggested that one’s loss of perceived ability to control adverse events is recognized as a major psychological determinant of behaviour and reactions to stressful life events (Peterson & Stunkard, 1992). Given this dynamic, it seems as though LOC and SE have the ability to influence one’s persistence in the face of challenging circumstances, which may impact one’s LE if one avoids opportunities to develop in this area.
Reviewing the literature, specifically relating to LOC and LE, Paglis and Green (2002) emerge as those who explored both constructs, having developed and tested a leadership model that focused on managers’ motivation for leading change efforts. The authors defined LE as “a person's judgment that he or she can successfully exert leadership by setting a direction for the work group, building relationships with followers in order to gain their commitment to change goals, and working with them to overcome obstacles to change” (p. 217). In this study, Paglis and Green (2002) identified internal LOC as an antecedent of LE, whereby managers who possessed an internal LOC were found to positively influence their judgments about whether or not they could create meaningful change (Paglis & Green, 2002).

The researchers suggested that when one believes that goals are achievable largely through one's own efforts, rather than through chance or circumstance, a manager’s perceptions of his or her ability to lead are enhanced (Paglis & Green, 2002). Said another way, the belief in one’s ability to achieve desired outcomes is largely dictated by his or her confidence that the outcome was a result of their own efforts, rather than by chance or by circumstance. As such, it is proposed that one’s LOC may have implications on LE development. In the current study, the researcher sought to explore LOC and LE among an undergraduate student population sample rather than a managerial sample given the contexts are quite different.

**Summary of Literature.** Betz and Hackett (1981) first explained SE as influential in an individual’s career-related decision-making, and specifically noted that if students—and particularly female students—possess lower levels of SE, they may eliminate certain career options. Likewise, Hannah et al. (2008) argued that for both men
and women, their efficacious beliefs account for their desire to seek and obtain leadership positions. That is, men’s higher LE beliefs result in an increased desire to seek out and obtain leadership positions, whereas for females, their lower LE beliefs result in avoiding such opportunities. Quigley (2013) echoed these findings, suggesting that one’s level of LE represents a key antecedent of one’s motivation to lead. As well, numerous scholars (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Kelly & Hatcher, 2013; Quimby & O’Brien, 2004) have noted the relationship between individuals’ SE and career-related decision-making behaviours, and have contended that lower SE levels are undoubtedly a major career barrier because they impact one’s ability and desire to choose a career or position they deem themselves capable of: 1) applying for and obtaining; and 2) managing the responsibilities associated with the role.

Relatedly, Phillips and Gully (1997) suggested that self-evaluation traits such as LOC will strongly affect an individual's level of SE; where, those with an internally oriented LOC display more overt determination for achievement than those with an externally oriented LOC, who feel they have little control over their environment (Rotter, 1966). Furthermore, Judge and Bono (2001) suggested that efficacious individuals tend to display positive psychological characteristics, including self-esteem, efficacy and emotional stability. As a result, such individuals view challenging jobs as a deserved opportunity in which they can master and from which they can benefit. Similarly, Peterson and Stunkard (1992) argued that while a certain relationship between LOC and self-efficacy beliefs exists, individuals may entertain efficacious beliefs independently of their LOC. Furthermore, Paglis and Green (2002) argue that LOC is an antecedent of LE
and suggested that managers’ with an internally oriented LOC positively influences their judgments about their leadership abilities.

Numerous scholars and literature have explored SE and LOC in a variety of diverse contexts. Few have examined both LE and LOC (Paglis & Green, 2002) yet none have explored this relationship among undergraduate students to explore differences in males’ and females’ perspectives. The findings from this study may contribute to theory and educational practice in sport management and inform sport management undergraduates and educators of the impact of one’s LOC and LE on their development and decision-making behaviours. The exploration of the perceived LE and LOC of sport management undergraduates may assist sport management educators in understanding how beliefs may manifest into behaviour and how they may develop and facilitate program content to positively influence students’ perceptions. Further, such an exploration may assist undergraduates in recognizing how their perceived LE and LOC influences their development and decision-making. In the next chapter, the methodology that guided this study is detailed.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC. In this chapter, the research design and methodology of the current study are detailed within four sections. In first section, the research design is outlined in detail and the role of the researcher is discussed. In the second section, the purposive sampling of participants, participant recruitment strategies undertaken in the study, and the context of the research site is discussed. In the third section, the data collection methods and data analysis strategies are outlined and data trustworthiness is also addressed. In the fourth section, data representation strategies and interview quotations are discussed. Justification of the research design, methodologies, and strategies included in the current study is provided in detail.

Research Design

Yin (2014) defined a case study as one "that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and its real-world context" (p. 237). Researchers using a case study research design attempt to answer a “how” or “why” question about a given phenomenon within its real-life context. Notably, Yin (1981) contended that a case study does not imply that researchers’ use a particular type of evidence; rather, he suggested researchers may collect and analyze either qualitative or quantitative evidence when engaged with the case study method. In the current study, the researcher utilized a qualitative research design to explore the aforementioned concepts within the context of an undergraduate
sport management population. Furthermore, the case study research methodology was chosen to explore LOC and LE. Hancock and Algozzine (2011) stated that case study research is “focused on an in-depth analysis and description of an individual or individuals representative of a group, an organization, or a phenomenon in a real-life context” (p. 74). What differentiates a case study methodology from others is its intensive focus on a bounded system, where a case may be an individual, a specific program, a process, an institution, or a relationship (Flyvbjerg, 2011). Further, a case may be representative of any phenomenon, as long as it has identifiable boundaries and it comprises the primary object of inference (Gerring, 2007). In the current study, an instrumental case study was identified as appropriate to conduct, given it is used as a way to understand a “broader issue” (Stake, 2005, p. 504). As such, the researcher identified the case as sample of sport management undergraduate students and identified the broader issue to be explored as students’ perceived LE and LOC.

When choosing appropriate methodologies, any researcher must consider his or her view about how knowledge is created and the nature of reality, given the researcher’s worldview has implications for how he or she will conduct the study (Jones, Torres & Arminio, 2014). When situating the current study, the researcher was aware of how the philosophical stance of constructivism informed him, which in turn informed his perspective on the phenomenon of inquiry. Constructivism is associated with how individuals learn and make meaning, and how they link new knowledge to existing understanding (Beck & Kosnik, 2006). One such example of participants linking new knowledge to existing understanding arose during the interview exchange. Participants were aware of their perceived LE (existing understanding) and they created new
knowledge through becoming aware of what impacted that belief or perception. Specifically, as participant’s spoke of their LE, both the researcher and participant began to understand how this belief was being impacted; thus, participants created new knowledge via the interview exchange. Some participants even told the researcher this once the interview had concluded.

Researchers situated within this paradigm function under the notion that “objectivity is impossible; rather the researcher serves as an avenue for the representation of multiple voices” (Jones et al., 2014, p. 13). These scholars contended that knowledge is developed through both the researcher’s and the participant’s voices. As such, the researcher acted as a facilitator in co-creating knowledge with participants, to ensure their perspective was at the forefront of all findings, interpretations, and analysis.

**Role of the Researcher**

As a qualitative researcher, one must situate him or herself within the context of the research and consider the relationship between the researcher and the researched and its implications on not only the research process itself, but also on those involved. Bloor and Wood (2006) suggested that “reflexivity is an awareness of the self in the situation of action and of the role of the self in constructing that situation” (p. 145). In any exploratory study, researchers have no control over their identity categories (i.e., age, race, gender) and positions (Glesne, 2016). What one does control however, is his or her positionality, which represents the researcher’s “social, locational, and ideological placement relative to the research project and participants” (p. 151). Positionality requires that a researcher direct his or her attention beyond the individual self (Madison, 2012), to
ensure he or she accurately represents participants’ voices in data analysis and representation.

Recognizing the importance of researcher positionality in the current study, the researcher incorporated reflexivity to alleviate the impact of his various social identities (i.e., graduate student, teaching assistant, research assistant), his preconceived biases and assumptions, and his developing thoughts and perceptions throughout the research process. The development of a reflexive stance demands one to think “critically about the inquiry throughout the research process—about how the research itself is a product of interactions among researcher, participant, and setting and all that each bring with them” (Glesne, 2016, p. 152). In this study, the researcher incorporated reflexive memo and journal writing in the research process to monitor his biases and assumptions so he could offer insights into his subjectivities, which aided in developing trustworthiness with regard to research methods, interpretations, and representations (Madison, 2012). For example, the researcher wrote reflexive journal entries both during and post interview which were used in the analysis phase and were incorporated throughout the document to offer the reader another level of trustworthiness.

The researcher attempted to monitor and examine any arising biases and assumptions during the study, first noting the personal connection he possessed with the proposed research topic. Specifically, personal interest and experiences with leadership cultivated the researcher’s desire to explore LE to understand how it manifests and influences students’ career decisions. Being a recent graduate of the undergraduate Sport Management program (B.S.M), the researcher possessed first-hand knowledge and experience of being a student within the case site. Consequentially, the researcher
possessed assumptions based upon his personal involvement in the program and he possessed knowledge derived from his research on both LE and LOC constructs.

One such experience that lead the researcher to develop assumptions was based upon his participation as an undergraduate student in a sport management leadership course, through which exploring different leadership theories and constructs led him to believe that leadership is a subjective concept, where each individual constructs different and personal meanings of the word and phenomenon of leadership from another person. Given such recognition, the researcher did not project this personal attitude regarding leadership; rather, he allowed participants to construct and communicate their own meaning and personal significance of the concept, in accordance with the constructivism paradigm. As well, based upon his review of the leadership literature, the researcher believed he would find a qualitative link between LE and LOC, given that researchers have previously explored the link between LE and LOC and noted an association. For example, Paglis and Green (2002) explored these two constructs and found that an internally oriented LOC was an antecedent of LE.

Moreover, the researcher became aware of another of his assumptions arising; this one associated with SLT. Specifically, given the unit of investigation for the study of LOC in personality is the interaction between the individual and his or her environment (Phares, 1976), the researcher mainly focused upon the interaction between individuals and their environment and emphasized upon asking questions to elucidate students’ aspects of their environment in relationship to their perceived LOC. For example, the researcher asked questions related to one’s experience in the program (i.e., courses undertaken, developmental opportunities, work/volunteer experiences undertaken). The
researcher asked these questions to address specific aspects of one’s environment (i.e., the program, the institution, their peers) and how these might impact their perceived LE.

As an undergraduate student, it was not uncommon for the researcher to overhear passionate discussions between SPMA students, who spoke about their career-related goals, ambitions, and aspirations. During such conversations, a common thread emerged in that many students started the program with a vision for themselves that included seeking out and obtaining a managerial and/or leadership role at their favourite sport organization, sport franchise, or business entity, in the position of General Manager, CEO, agent, coach, marketing manager, or account manager. As the sport management program in the current study continues to grow, so does the yearly cohort of aspiring sport managers. Even still, many possessed a similar vision for themselves and their career that included being situated within a leadership or managerial role.

Indeed, when the researcher transitioned to a teaching assistant (TA) role as a graduate student, he noticed incoming (and younger) undergraduate students discussing strikingly similar aspirations and career objectives both among each other and with him. Witnessing this trend, as both an undergraduate student and as a TA prompted the researcher to reflect: “if being a leader and/or obtaining a leadership role are desired outcomes for students, are they “packing their suitcase” with the right necessities? Figuratively, students’ “suitcase,” refers to one’s leadership skillset, whereas necessities refer to the leadership capabilities one may develop through the program through both gaining experience and engaging in self-reflective practice. A troubling scenario may arise if and when students’ suitcases are “empty” upon graduation, such that they cannot meet the leadership requirements of the positions they desire.
Purposive Sampling

To qualitatively explore LE and LOC, Morse (2007) recognized that since the researcher deliberately selects participants, excellent research is subjectively biased. Given the current inquiry, the researcher used purposive sampling as a pertinent sampling strategy because it offered him information rich cases with the greatest potential for students’ insights about the phenomenon of interest (Morse, 2007). Specifically, the researcher purposively sampled students enrolled in the sport management program at a Canadian University to explore the phenomenon of interest in greater detail. Sampling within this particular University was justified because of its reputation as having a leading Sport Management program in Canada (Masters of Sport, 2015) among all its academic programs. Given its position in the international sport management education field, the researcher was given an excellent platform with this particular program from which to explore LE and LOC by providing him with access to an undergraduate student population.

When conducting case study research, the researcher needed to consider which ‘case’ or ‘cases’ were most appropriate to explore the concept under investigation. Stake (1995) recommended that the researcher select cases that maximizes what can be learned, knowing that time is limited. As such, the researcher should select cases that are representative of easy and willing subjects.

Through case study selection, the researcher focused on a small number of cases that he expected to provide insights that he could apply to a larger population of cases; inevitably, the researcher had a concern as to whether he selected appropriate cases (Gerring, 2007). Many researchers using case study methodology offer numerous
techniques for choosing cases; for example, Gerring (2007) highlighted nine potential case study selection strategies, where of these nine, one technique (i.e., diverse) was applicable to this particular study, such that participants in the current study can be identified as diverse cases. Participants involved in the current study were quite diverse in that their age and experience(s) varied. Specifically, participants’ involved aged ranged from 21 years old to 25 and older, and their experiences differed in that some participants were mature students on their second degree and/or transfer students.

As well, given this particular sport management program’s content (i.e., the opportunity to go on exchange and the opportunity to do an internship), these students’ experiences within the program likely differed from other sport management programs. Given the unique opportunities provided by this particular sport management program, these participants’ experiences—and in turn, their efficacious beliefs—likely differed from other undergraduate students’ engaged in sport management degree programs.

Furthermore, given the ratio of males to females was greater within this sport management program, the researcher identified female participants as a diverse case, where the researcher presumed females’ experiences likely differed from their male counterparts. Exploring diverse cases provided the researcher with insight into both the variation among students within the program and the unique circumstances that any individual student representative of a diverse case may face, being part of the ‘minority’ population in the sport management program.

**Participant Recruitment.** To acquire an appropriate sample size, the researcher solicited undergraduate sport management students to participate through two recruitment rounds. Regarding selection criteria, students were required to be majors in the sport
management program and in their third or fourth year of their program of study. To recruit participants for the current study, the researcher solicited participation in two courses in which the majority of students were majors as Sport Management students, arranging with the course instructor to present his research topic and purpose to students at the beginning of class. The researcher chose these particular classes because they offered him access to courses wherein the majority of students were majors. For each course the researcher asked the respective instructor to leave the room each time to alleviate students’ feelings of obligation to participate in the study.

Regarding the first round of solicitation, the researcher was able to recruit nine participants who were willing to be involved in the study from the two sport management classes. At which point, the researcher felt it was necessary to conduct a second round of solicitation from the same two classes from the first round to acquire an appropriate number of participants. Regarding the second round of solicitation, the researcher was able to recruit another six participants for a total of 15 participants (i.e., nine males, six females), at which time the researcher deemed this number of participants appropriate. The researcher was not required to obtain a particular number of participants, as Tracy (2013) suggests, it is often a difficult and ambiguous task to find an appropriate sample size for qualitative research.

Following an explanation of the study’s parameters, the researcher circulated a participant recruitment letter to students within the lecture hall (see Appendix B). Interested students were asked to write the researcher’s email so they could send him a follow up email message expressing their interest in being involved with the study. The researcher commenced data collection processes following his successful proposal
defense, subsequent approval through the University’s Research Ethics Board (17-202), and upon reaching out to interested participants to schedule interviews. As soon as he could possibly do so, the researcher contacted those participants who had already reached out to him to their express interest in being involved via email to inform them of the study parameters and their potential involvement in the interview process.

Following initial contact, the researcher immediately distributed consent forms via email to those students who agreed to be involved with the study (see Appendix C). The researcher collected consent forms via email or in person, depending on participants’ preference. Some participants submitted consent forms to the researcher via email and some brought them to the researcher the day of the interview. Following initial contact and distribution of consent forms, the scheduling process began where the researcher scheduled all interviews with each participant in consideration of his or her availability. As such, the researcher scheduled interviews with participants based upon mutually agreed upon dates/times.

Research Site

The research site was a reputable Canadian University and the participants were sport management undergraduates attending this Canadian University. From the researcher’s position and experience, the identified sample of third and fourth year sport management undergraduates was deemed appropriate given these students are at a pivotal decision-making stage in their undergraduate academic journey. Specifically, in the upper third and fourth years of this sport management program, students have numerous opportunities (e.g. elective courses, fieldwork, placement, internship courses) to both
develop and hone leadership acumen; as such, their decision-making has the potential to impact career and professional development.

The researcher anticipated that collecting data from students who were currently experiencing opportunities during this specific period may possibly elicit students’ efficacious beliefs. The researcher met with participants for interviews in selected settings (i.e., campus meeting rooms), as agreed upon by participants and the researcher to alleviate ethical concerns (i.e., participants’ privacy) and to aid in establishing rapport by making participants as comfortable as possible.

The research site wherein this study was conducted was quite unique in that this particular sport management program offers an internship and/or exchange program. As such, experiences these undergraduates have may differ from other sport management students in different programs that may offer such course content. Participants who were confident in their perceived LE often spoke about internships and exchange program opportunities as pivotal to the development of their efficacious beliefs. Furthermore, this particular program was unique in that the gender disparity in the program (i.e., ~75% males, ~25% females) may create an environment wherein males may dominate discussion in lecture and seminar. As such, this context is important to note because the environment in which these students study and the perceptions that develop as a result of this environment may impact perceived LE, particularly for females. Thus, a central focus in this study was on the research site environment (Canadian University) and its impact on individuals within that environment (the program).

Data Collection Strategies
Prior to scheduling and conducting interviews, the researcher developed a semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix A) to utilize during the interview process as a central mode of data collection. The researcher deemed semi-structured interviews appropriate as the primary data collection method because he could “understand the complex behaviour of members of society without imposing any a priori categorization that many limit the field of inquiry” (Fontana & Frey, 2008, p. 129). Additionally and with methodological coherence in mind, the researcher believed semi-structured interviews were particularly well suited for this case study research because he could invite interviewees to express themselves openly and freely to define the world from their own perspective (Hancock & Algozzine, 2011).

The researcher developed the interview guide to include both LE and LOC constructs, formulating the guide based upon Bandura’s (1977) sources of efficacy information and Rotter’s (1966) Internal-External scale survey. Specifically, when addressing LE, the researcher incorporated questions pertaining to Bandura’s (1977) sources of efficacy; and, specifically, when addressing LOC, the researcher utilized questions from Rotter’s (1966) IE Scale questionnaire, thereby adapting a quantitative questionnaire so he could qualitatively address aspects of LOC. The researcher believed as though qualitatively adapting this quantitative survey would elicit students’ responses to a deeper degree than he could by using a Likert scale questionnaire; the researcher believed her would be more able to appropriately address the why behind participants’ responses. Here, the researcher could to follow up on participants’ specific responses and probe for a deeper understanding of how one’s LOC manifests into behaviour.
Conducting semi-structured interviews enabled the researcher to gain rich, thick description regarding the phenomenon of interest; however, the researcher only garnered pertinent data from participants when he asked focused and appropriate questions. To test the strength of the interview guide, the researcher conducted one pilot interview (see Appendix A) to ensure that both the questions themselves and the interview guide structure would help foster participants’ germane and information rich responses (Glesne, 2016). In an effort to be efficient with time, the researcher contacted the student who was first to reach out to express interest in the study to inquire whether the student would be willing to be involved as the pilot interview participant. Following a pilot interview with this male sport management undergraduate student, the researcher restructured the interview guide to ensure questions were appropriate and would elicit participants’ pertinent response. At this time, the researcher adjusted several interview guide questions for greater clarity and precision. In retrospect, it may have been beneficial to have both a male and female pilot interviews.

The researcher conducted interviews with 15 participants, which were 30-60 minutes in length, doing so through the use of recording device, which captured a nearly complete documentation of what participants said and which permitted the researcher to full attend to each participant over the entire interview (Glesne, 2016). Following the completion of the interview, the researcher transcribed each interview verbatim, a process which allowed him to be immersed in the interview, to listen again to what was said, and to reflect not only on the topic, but also on the interview process itself (Glesne, 2016). Verbatim transcription fostered precision for the researcher in that he was ensured that what participants’ said was correctly represented within interview transcripts. The
The researcher transcribed each audio recording directly following each interview and reflexively journaled his thoughts (i.e., emerging thoughts, patterns) to ensure he accurately captured thoughts about the interview process and content.

The researcher collected primary data through interviews with 15 participants between March and August of 2018. Upon completing the interviews, the researcher contacted participants via email to offer them the opportunity to member check and read preliminary data analysis to confirm the accuracy of what they stated during their interview. Glesne (2016) contended that when the researcher shares interview transcripts, analytical thoughts, and/or drafts of the final report with participants through member checking to obtain their feedback and interpretations, it aids in data trustworthiness.

**Data Analysis Strategies**

Given participants’ thoughts, words, and descriptions through the research process were not inherently meaningful, the researcher made them meaningful through his analysis and interpretation (Glesne, 2016). Yin (2003a) suggested that data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, and testing qualitative evidence to address the initial propositions of a study. For the purpose of this study, the researcher utilized content analysis as a central strategy to transform raw data into a standardized form (Babbie, 2001). Specifically, the researcher segregated themes and patterns into categories by codes. Glesne (2016) suggested the main utility of content analysis is to reveal underlying complexities, tensions, and distinctions, and to help the researcher understand where and why people differ from a general pattern.

Employing content analysis involved the researcher in exacting a number of important steps. First, the researcher used open coding, where Jones et al. (2014) suggest
that using a brainstorming approach can open up data to all the potentials and possibilities contained within these data. Open coding enabled the researcher to discern themes, patterns, and processes to make comparisons and build theoretical explanations (Glesne, 2016), where “a code is a category of activity of which the piece coded is an example” (p. 197). For example, a theme that arose from these data was that participants’ previous experience was integral to their current level of perceived LE. In this study, the researcher implemented open coding to allow his immersion in these data so that he could discover pertinent concepts or themes within the interviews.

Second, the researcher utilized focused coding to link earlier open codes according to their relationship, searching for the most frequent or significant codes. For example, previous experience was frequently mentioned in the context of one’s involvement with sport teams (both past and present). As such, this theme was derived these data. The researcher then compared incidents to find similarities and grouped codes together under broad descriptive concepts (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Furthermore, through the coding and data analysis processes, the researcher attempted to employ theoretical sensitivity (i.e., knowledge of existing research) to make sense of emerging categories (Jones et al., 2014).

According to Glesne (2016), data analysis is not a discrete step in the qualitative research process; ideally, the researcher writes and analyzes throughout the entire research process. Similarly, in case study research, the researcher exerted data analysis concurrently through the research process. Charmez (2006) reminded that such a concurrent process, “prompts you to analyze your data and codes early in the research process” (p. 68). To do so, the researcher wrote reflexive journal entries to elaborate upon
the coded categories developed during the data analysis phase to capture thoughts during the analysis process (Jones et al., 2014). Journaling such entries provided the researcher with added trustworthiness through the researcher’s reflexive thought into his subjectivities and their influence on the interpretation and representation of data (Madison, 2012). For example, when exploring the influence of one’s gender on perceived LE, the researcher reflexively journaled about how female participants conceptualized their LE and how these experiences differed from their male counterparts. This journaling led to insights about how females’ and males’ perceived LE was impacted differently by the sport management environment.

Data analysis involves the “organization of what you have seen, heard, and read to establish what you have learned and make sense of what you have experienced” (Glesne, 2016, p. 183). Stated differently, data analysis is identified as the researcher’s construction of meaning through interpretation. Jones et al. (2014) noted that the researcher answers questions through his or her interpretation about the phenomenon and what it means to participants, how and why it is salient, and what readers are to make of it, moving beyond description to provide deeper clarification. Exploring how and why participants believe a given phenomenon is salient is a central focus of data analysis and interpretation in case study research; as such, the researcher endeavoured to make these processes a major focus throughout the research study.

The researcher co-created the construction of meaning with participants through an interview interaction such that each participant’s voice was centrally represented in the data analysis and representation processes. To achieve this, the researcher allowed each participant to describe their perceived LE and LOC from their perspective and
represented these perspectives in the findings and discussion using direct quotations and by providing the context with which these beliefs were arising.

Data analysis in the current study started with the researcher reading “all data repeatedly to achieve immersion and obtain a sense of the whole” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, p. 1279). Then, in alignment with content analysis principles, data was read word by word to derive codes and the researcher approached the text by making notes of his first impressions, thoughts, and initial analysis. Then, labels for codes emerged and codes were then sorted into categories based on how different codes were related and linked. These emergent categories were then used to organize and group codes into meaningful clusters (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). This enabled the researcher to discern themes and patterns from these data and describe why these themes were emerging for each specific research question. Throughout the data analysis phase of the study, the researcher relied upon Bandura’s (1977) sources of efficacy information when exploring LE and Rotter’s (1966) Internal-External scale when exploring LOC. As well, the researcher utilized Cunningham et al.’s (2005) and McCormick et al’s (2002) lenses for which to view LE as a guide during the analysis phase.

**Data Trustworthiness Strategies**

Glesne (2016) stated “trustworthiness is about alertness to the quality and rigour of a study, about what sorts of criteria can be used to assess how well the research was carried out” (p. 53). Given his awareness of the importance of trustworthiness in qualitative research, the researcher used many strategies to ensure he met trustworthiness criteria throughout the entire research process. Each data trustworthiness strategy is detailed herein to convey its relevance and place within the current study.
An initial trustworthiness strategy involved the researcher using rich, thick description obtained from participants’ responses to semi-structured interview questions to demonstrate the emergent themes, which allowed readers to understand the context for the researcher’s interpretations (Glesne, 2016). Additionally, the researcher utilized member checking to add another layer of trustworthiness by sharing interview transcripts, analytical thoughts, and/or drafts of the final report with participants to obtain their feedback and interpretations (Glesne, 2016). This was an important tactic to ensure accurate representation of participants’ thoughts. As Glesne suggested, “by sharing working drafts, both the researcher and researched may grow in their interpretations of a phenomenon central to the inquiry” (p. 212).

The researcher used a second central trustworthiness strategy of clarifying researcher bias and subjectivity through his reflexivity. This strategy involved the researcher reflecting upon his subjectivities and how they are both used and monitored (Glesne, 2016). The researcher primarily addressed reflexivity through journal writing and by developing a positionality statement. Given how his personal history with the topic may have influenced his positionality and given he knew that he must effectively monitor and manage these biases and assumptions accordingly, the researcher became aware of how he engaged with his own personal history by the research (Glesne, 2016).

In this study, the researcher’s heightened awareness aided in trustworthiness and ensured that he managed his positionality throughout the research process. By reflexively journaling, the researcher monitored his biases and assumptions such that these did not impact the interview process. Reflexive journal writings allowed the researcher to track his thoughts throughout the interviews to ensure he remained impartial and strived to co-
create knowledge with participants. For example, following each interview, the research
textually journaled in an attempt to ensure that he was remaining impartial and
allowing participants to express themselves openly and freely. Journaling allowed the
researcher to compare and contrast participants’ responses to understand what impacted
these beliefs (i.e., the program, the environment etc.)

The researcher noted other important strategies toward trustworthiness, including
peer review and debriefing. Glesne (2016) defined briefing as “obtaining external
reflection and input on your work” (p. 53). As a novice researcher, the researcher took
advantage of every opportunity to strengthen the rigour and quality of the work. For
example, the researcher utilized and incorporated feedback from multiple constituents
(e.g., supervisor, committee, external examiner). Strategically, the researcher selected
each individual for his or her expertise and ability to provide knowledgeable, constructive
feedback. As such, the researcher received guidance in a number of areas, including but
not limited to: writing style and coherence (i.e., document revisions and/or
modifications); and, research design and methodological guidance (i.e., data analyses
 techniques, data representation).

An important aspect of trustworthiness is recognizing both delimitations and
limitations of the current study (Glesne, 2016). Regarding delimitations, the researcher
chose to sample only sport management students, given the focus of the current study. To
explore LE and LOC in great detail, the researcher believed that it was acceptable
delimiting the sample to include sport management students was acceptable because they
alone provided an opportunity to explore both LE and LOC in depth.
The researcher also considered the limitations of the current study; one such limitation was the exclusion of observing students’ LE in a team or group setting. Case study research often includes observations as a central avenue for data collection; however, this was not feasible in the current study for a number of reasons. Specifically, participants were not involved in any activities that would provide the opportunities to observe leadership skills, given leadership opportunities are diverse and sporadic. As such, the researcher relied upon interviewing each participant to explore his or her perceived LE and LOC. This was deemed a limitation because the researcher was not able to utilize observations to triangulate the data, a common strategy in case study research. Both delimitations and limitations are discussed in the last chapter.

Another central consideration related to trustworthiness was ensuring confidentiality was maintained. The researcher used a number of strategies to both protect the confidentiality around both participants’ identity and their data. First, the researcher removed all personal identifiers (i.e., participants’ university email addresses and associated names) from each interview transcript. Moreover, the researcher deleted each email address upon completing both the interview and member checking processes. Second, the researcher gave each participant a pseudonym when he transcribed each interview to aid in maintaining confidentiality of these data. Third, the researcher removed all markers related to the program and institution to maintain confidentiality. The researcher could not guarantee participants anonymity, given that the researcher was present and conducted each interview.
Further, the researcher had sole access to these data and securely stored signed consent forms in a locked cabinet, separate from digital audio files and transcripts. Following the completion of data collection, all consent forms were destroyed.

Each interview was digitally recorded, with participants’ permission, and these digital files were deleted once they were transcribed and saved on a password protected USB that remained in the researcher’s possession until he completed the study. A master list linking participants’ identifiers with unique study codes was created to ensure that transcripts were not stored with identifiers. These data were destroyed once data collection was completed.

**Data Representation Strategies**

An important consideration upon completion of data analysis was data representation. Once the researcher completed data were analyses, he presented these data in a meaningful way to resonate with the reader. Glesne (2016) suggested that no matter what strategies the researcher uses, the emphasis is on thinking with these data as a whole and on constructing meaning, rather than compartmentalizing the information into distinct sections. For the purpose of the study, data were represented by participants’ direct quotations derived from interview questions and transcriptions, and by developing charts or tables.

Incorporating participants’ transcribed quotations was beneficial to solidify themes and provide evidence to justify a category or theme. Furthermore, the researcher utilized data displays in the form of tables and charts to visually represent these data, enabling him to depict similarities and differences amongst cases to both provide readers another level of analysis.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC. Of the 15 participants, nine were male and six were female. Furthermore, of the 15 participants, eight were third year students and seven fourth year students. In this chapter, all findings derived from these data obtained from participants are outlined. The purpose of this chapter is to present themes from these data in detail over three sections.

In the first section, findings related to participants’ perceived LE are detailed, organized according to: 1) participants’ perceptions of having leadership skill or abilities (McCormick et al., 2002) and 2) participants’ perceptions of having the capability to obtain a leadership position (Cunningham et al., 2005; Hannah et al., 2008). In the second section, findings related to participants perceived LOC are outlined. In the third section, findings related to the relationship between participants’ LOC and LE are presented. Throughout this chapter, both gender differences and antecedents of LE are addressed and discussed in detail.

Section I: Participants’ Perceived Leadership Efficacy

In this section, findings are discussed according to the participants’ perceived LE, in relation to the first research question: “how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LE?” Participants’ discussion of their perceived LE arose as the researcher posed questions to participants including: ‘how would you describe your leadership efficacy at this point time?’; ‘how have your past experiences impacted your
leadership efficacy?’; and, ‘can you explain why these experiences may have shaped your leadership efficacy?’

As previously noted, Hannah et al. (2008) defined LE as “a specific form of efficacy associated with the level of confidence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities associated with leading others” (p. 669). Furthermore, Cunningham et al. (2005) and McCormick (2002) presented two specific lenses through which to view LE; first, as one’s perception of his or her leadership abilities; and second, as one’s perception of his or her ability to obtain a leadership position. As such, transcribed data were analyzed and organized according to these two lenses in the following chapter. Upon reviewing and coding the interview data, several themes emerged relevant to the participants’ varied perceptions of having leadership abilities and their perception of having the ability to obtain a leadership position. Findings associated with participants’ perception of possessing leadership abilities are first presented.

Perception of Having Leadership Abilities. These data indicate that some participants perceived their LE to be relatively strong, whereby they were confident in their perception of possessing skills, knowledge, and abilities associated with leading others in some capacity. Participants’ confidence in their abilities was tied to their personal leadership experience (i.e., within person) as integral to their perceived LE level. Previous experience(s) was found as a factor that led to one feeling more confident (efficacious) in their ability to lead others, given the opportunity. For example, when asked to describe his LE, fourth year Jake stated, “I feel leadership gives people confidence…you have to be able to lead yourself first before leading others….I feel like I have a lot of confidence in my leadership abilities.” Jake noted the importance of his self-
confidence and his ability to follow through on personal goals as important steps in becoming an efficacious leader in sport. Jake noted that his self-confidence came from previous experience with leadership roles, stating “yeah, so for me it all comes back to when I worked as a team leader at [Fast Food Restaurant]. I think that experience helped me feel confident in myself as a leader. Working in a fast-paced environment in a team setting helped me a lot.”

Similarly, fourth year Melissa described her efficacy saying, “I think it’s strong but I am looking forward to like I know that there is room to grow so I am looking forward to being challenged a little bit with working with a new team.” When describing her perceived LE, Melissa cited five years of previous experience as a swim instructor as the main reason why she possessed strong LE at this point in time. Again Melissa spoke to her previous experience, stating “…I’ve been a swim instructor for the last 5 years so I’ve been in the role of like, having to deal with all different types of people every day so I do think I have a strong acumen.”

When asked ‘how have your past experiences impacted your LE?’ Denis responded, “Positive for sure because well I’ve been in positions of leadership before; for example, I was a chef in a kitchen so I had a few staff…I also had a leadership position in other jobs where it definitely helped me.” Denis continued, “I didn’t necessarily have the experience to be the chef…but I had to take action, I had to lead, I had to show direction, even if I didn’t have confidence in my skills as a cook at that point.” Denis felt as though his experience as a chef in a kitchen positively influenced his LE because he was prompted to make decisions and show direction to his staff.
Anthony discussed how his previous experience helped to build his perceived LE, stating, “I worked at a summer camp, Olympia. And it really helped too because there are a lot of situations where you have to be a leader, whether you’re a good one or a bad one, you have to be one because there’s instances where you’re in charge of 10-12 kids.” Anthony vocalized a similar perspective to Denis’s, suggesting that his involvement with a previous leadership role allowed him to become “comfortable being uncomfortable,” allowing him to build upon his leadership skillset through hands-on experience.

While participants expressed different contexts in which they gained leadership experience (i.e., from Melissa’s experience of being a swim instructor to Denis’ experience as a chef to Anthony’s camp leader experience), participants’ thoughts were similar; that is, participants who expressed their perceived confidence and belief in their leadership abilities pointed to having gained previous experiences in those roles (leadership or otherwise) as pivotal to such LE perceptions. Within reflexive journal entries, a common theme emerged where participants who perceived their LE as relatively strong focused unambiguously on the previous experience(s) that provided the opportunity to develop such efficacious beliefs. Further, journaling enabled the researcher to discover that for some participants, these experiences were often tied to outside of the program factors.

When asked about his perceived LE, 4th year [mature] student Fraser said, “I believe in my abilities but I am not naïve enough to believe that I am done.” Fraser discussed his previous experience as a foreman in the construction industry as a key step in his LE development, stating “so, by having the experience of making decisions on things good or bad, I’ve kind of learned from it, and throughout that experience I’ve
learned how to deal with others.” Fraser felt his confidence in his leadership abilities had strengthened through his foreman role, given this experience enabled him to make and analyze decisions, and learn from all decision outcomes.

Participants felt as though their previous exposure to leadership roles provided them opportunities to hone their skills by actively engaging in activities that worked to strengthen their perceived LE. As some participants became more involved in leadership roles, their perceived LE seemed to strengthen. Although these participants expressed higher perceived LE, the experiences they drew from that formed their LE were not related to their educational experience in their undergraduate program. The following themes were drawn from these data and highlight the factors related to discussion of LE by the participants.

**Previous Leadership Experience.** Given the frequency with which participants’ mentioned previous experience as being integral to their LE, previous experience(s) with leadership roles emerged as a personal antecedent of LE within this specific sample. Some participants stated that their success within a leadership/group setting led to an increase in their LE. Fourth year student Lawrence supported this concept when asked whether success increases his confidence, commenting

This past summer we had 600 kids go through our junior activities programs, we did around 200,000 dollars in those eight weeks and it’s, for me as a young manager being in charge of 18 staff members, was an extremely daunting task on its own, especially with half of them being older than me…So getting through that year last year gave me a lot of confidence for moving forward this year to be able
to go in and start off knowing the things that I’ve learned from last year and being able to implement those this year.

Lawrence’s LE was positively impacted by his successful experience in a managerial role at a local not-for-profit sport organization. Lawrence felt as though the lessons he learned the previous year would benefit him as a leader moving forward.

Participants who noted they possessed strong levels of LE often supported their perception by detailing how their previous experience(s) positively impacted their perception of their ability to be a leader. That said, not every participant expressed he or she possessed such strong levels of LE. Specifically, some participants described their efficacious beliefs much less favourably.

For example, some participants expressed self-perceived lower levels of LE, relative to their student peers. These participants spoke about their lack of experience or compared themselves to others within the program (i.e., between person) when they noted their perceived LE. Specifically, when asked to describe their perceived LE, some participants expressed that they did not feel fully confident in their ability to be a leader. For example, third year Mark qualified his LE as “about average,” stating “I haven’t really taken a sort of leadership role here at Brock.” In Mark’s case, he immediately spoke to his lack of leadership experience when he was asked to describe his perceived LE, with no prompting from the researcher about leadership.

**Previous and Current Sport Experience.** Many participants expressed how their sport experience and involvement contributed to a strong perception of having leadership abilities. From these interview data, participants’ experience on sport teams, both past
and present, emerged as an antecedent of LE. Allison summarized the relationship between sport experience and strong perceived LE, stating

Yeah, so I just think that hockey is obviously a sport and something that we all want to work in and I think that it just develops yourself into a leader. So like, I can see other leaders, other mentors, my coaches, and I guess I can take things from them, good or bad, and kind of apply them to the type of person that I want to be and who and how I want to influence the people around me.

Allison spoke to the importance of sport in her development, both personally and professionally, believing it was a major factor in how her perceived LE developed and strengthened. From these findings, it appears one’s level of LE may be impacted (i.e., positively or negatively) by situations incurred by the individual and from immersion within a specific context (i.e., in sport, in school).

Likewise, Danielle spoke to the value of sport in the development of her LE, stating

my leadership efficacy skills came from playing sports….I carried many like, assistant and captain roles when I was playing sport and I think because of that not necessarily because I was the best player on the team but because I liked to create a positive attitude on the team and that’s definitely where my skills started

Danielle felt that her LE was positively influenced by her experience on sport teams and that her perception of having leadership abilities was impacted by her involvement with those teams. Danielle suggested that sport developed her “emotional intelligence” and as such improved her perception of her leadership ability. Justin echoed this sentiment stating,
Yeah, so for me like, I was a goaltender in hockey… So for me I, you know, not only can you see everything that’s in front of you as the game is going on, you can kind of, at least for me… I was very observant of like the different personalities in the dressing room or the different, you know, cliques or non-cliques or people who can handle criticism, people who can’t, people who rise to the occasion when it matters, people who don’t. I think I had a really good sense of how somebody was going to react in a situation.

Justin spoke to the notion that his emotional intelligence allowed him to manage people and relationships. Both Justin and Danielle noted the importance of sport in the development of their LE and its impact on their ability to manage people and develop positive relationships.

Participants also identified their current athletic or sport experience (i.e., U SPORTS) as integral to the belief in their leadership abilities. For instance, Greg articulated the importance of his role on a varsity/collegiate sport team to the development of his LE, stating

I think even coming into my first year at [University] I was kind of more I wouldn’t say immature but not ready to take a lead role. But after getting a year of university and hockey under my belt I think that second year coming in, the coach was like, “hey listen like, you’re a leader on this team and you need to start not acting like it but realizing that that’s what your role is on this team” and I think that made me feel good.

Greg spoke to his involvement on a varsity/collegiate sport team as fundamental to the development of his perceived LE. Greg noted that the confidence he felt as a leader on
the hockey team translated to his efficacy in other situations. Allison also supported how involvement on a varsity/collegiate sport team contributes to her LE, commenting,

I’m assistant captain on the [University] Women’s [Sport] Team right now so I’ve been that for the past two years and I think it’s really opened my eyes to like how sometimes the hardest thing you can do is lead your friends and learning the boundaries and I guess…because I am more aware of like how to identify people’s strengths and weaknesses…so I think that like I feel confident in myself because I’ve like had past experiences that have helped me with those situations.

Here, Allison mentioned her past experience as being integral to the development of her perceived LE. Both Greg and Allison, among others, articulated the importance of their current involvement on varsity/collegiate sport teams to the development of their LE. Given the frequency with which previous and current sport experience was mentioned by participants as integral to their perceived LE, sport experience both past and present was found to be an antecedent of LE.

**Confidence in Self.** When asked about her perceived LE, third year Sarah mentioned that her level of introversion led her to perceive weaker levels of LE, stating “when I first started first year in the program it [LE] wasn’t high because I was a really introverted person.” Sarah felt as though her introversion hindered her ability to develop her LE in her first few years of university.

Similarly, when she articulated her perceived LE, fourth year [mature] student Danielle discussed her lack of confidence in her leadership abilities, which stemmed from her belief that she possessed less sport-specific knowledge (i.e., statistics, game scores, athlete information) than her program peers, stating,
within the program, the only time I feel leadership is when I am in a group project because when I am in class I don’t feel, I sit in the front, I answer when I can, but I don’t know, there’s people around me that say know the content better or are able to take part more because they understand sport better than I do…you don’t want to ask something about the Maple Leafs that’s like: ‘obviously!’ but to me like I don’t know [laughs].

Danielle felt as though her lack of sport-specific knowledge relative to others—and particularly male students—hindered her perceived LE, especially in sport settings (i.e., work and volunteer experiences in sport).

**Level of Comfort within a Context.** When discussing their LE, a number of participants suggested that context elements like the situation or the setting impacted their perceived LE. Specifically, a number of participants noted their perceived LE was stronger in settings where their level of comfort was higher or believed they possessed the necessary skillset to be successful (i.e., while participating in their favourite class or subject or within particular sport settings). For example, third year Anthony expressed a fluctuating perception of his level of LE, stating: “I think it varies. There are some instances where I think I can be pretty good and there are some instances where I don’t think I’m good.” Anthony suggested that his LE fluctuated depending on the setting, where he noted feeling more efficacious in settings or circumstances in which his level of comfort is higher (i.e., his favourite class, on the basketball court).

Anthony continued “in situations where I am comfortable and I feel like I can say what I want and do what I want I think I can be, like in basketball I feel comfortable being a leader.” When discussing about how his LE fluctuated, Anthony spoke about his
confidence leading within a sport setting on the basketball court; while off the court, he noted “I have trouble voicing my opinion sometimes and I keep a lot to myself in group situations. If we’re doing a project that I don’t feel personally invested in I’m just like I’ll do this part.” Although Anthony perceived his level of LE as high while playing basketball, he reported that his perception of his leadership ability changed within an academic context, where he perceives it lessens. Others expressed similarly to Anthony’s self-observation, noting that one’s level of LE can fluctuate depending on the context.

For example, fourth year, Greg shared

In certain situations I am a good leader, if it is something that I am confident in. I mean, for example, hockey, I would say I am a strong leader because it’s something that I believe in and I have a strong background in, but let’s say for example, a written group project or something like that, it’s not up my alley, so I take a smaller role.

Greg discussed his perceived LE varies depending on the context, suggesting that academically, his LE fluctuates from class to class noting, “I mean there’s obviously some classes like for example sport finance I would be able to take a leadership role in because I’ve had a lot of success in that class…whereas if it was another class like sport policies or something like that it’s not really my cup of tea.” Given participants’ responses, one’s comfort level and/or perceived skill in a given context was found to impact perceived LE. When exploring reflexive journal writings, it became evident that participants’ perceived LE seemed to increase in settings wherein these individuals felt more comfortable, prompting the researcher to note that contextual elements (e.g., environment context) may impact one’s perceived LE. For example, following a number
of interviews (Greg, Anthony, Trevor, Mark; among others) the researcher wrote “LE fluctuated based on setting.”

**Observing Others Perform Well.** From these interview data, it was found among participants that observing others perform well, particularly in a leadership context, as a vicarious experience that defined one’s efficacy level. When asked about what impacts his LE, Trevor stated, “I think a couple of things, probably watching others lead, I know my boss at the golf course was…always open to me sitting in on what he does or just watching how he goes about things.” Trevor contended that his LE is positively impacted when he watches someone else lead; specifically watching his boss lead enabled him to improve his perceived LE.

In a similar vein, when asked what happens to him when he sees others perform well, Denis said, “…I respect that if I can see that that person is working really hard I’m like good for you, you deserve it. And I’ll be like okay that’s me now, that’s what I want to do and I know that’s what it takes.” Denis noted he can improve his LE by observing others perform well and seeing what it takes to experience success. Notably, when reviewing reflexive journal writings, the researcher noted some participants experienced a degree of jealousy when they observed others performing well; these participants spoke to how jealousy served as motivation for them to work harder. For instance, when asked about vicarious experience, Sarah commented, “I feel like it makes me want to work harder and be that person that other, you know, think that they’re doing well you know?” Melissa further supported this notion by stating, “I think that it just makes me work harder, so if I see others doing really well, like it makes me want to work harder.”
Mark shared his belief that, “in some ways it makes you jealous, you want to be that person and stuff. But I found I use to always try and relate myself to other people and see “oh, my friend has an internship, why don’t I yet? Why couldn’t that be me?” Once participants noted the feeling of jealously subside, many said they would try and emulate the characteristics they felt led that individual to experience success. Lexy supported this notion, stating

So when I see others performing really well I want to try and see, you know, what I can do to be better so, you know, if someone on your team is performing really well you don’t want to be that person to kind of drag the team down. So I think when I see something like that it makes me want to be better.

Lexy felt as though she could learn something from someone else’s success and once witnessed, she would attempt to emulate it in her own way. Likewise, Lawrence vocalized a similar perspective, noting

if someone does really well I actually reach out and be like hey how’d you go about that? What was your experience throughout it? How did you get to that point? What were some of the pros/cons going through it? So I try and learn from those people that are doing well because there’s no sense in being vengeful about someone doing well.

Lawrence highlighted that one can learn from others’ successes; and as such, he reported that he often attempts to reach out to others to inquire about their experience(s) and success. Justin supported the idea that one can learn from others given he often reaches out to others, stating “I want to find out what they did to achieve that and if that’s something that I can do too…I would probably pick their brain about what they did to get
there.” Given these responses, one can argue that observing others perform well is an antecedent of LE for this specific sample of undergraduates. Another antecedent derived from these data is that of genuine feedback from authority figures.

**Genuine Feedback from Authority Figure(s).** From these interview data, it was found among participants that genuine feedback from authority figures and verbal persuasion impacted their LE levels. When asked about the influence of feedback, almost every participant cited the importance of authority figures’ genuine feedback on their performance. Participants most often spoke about receiving candid feedback from professors, managers, or someone in a higher position as central to their efficacy development and perception of their leadership abilities. For example, when asked about the importance of feedback, Justin remarked:

> the more positive feedback or the more encouragement from people that I truly respect that pushes me forward and that helps me understand that at some point they were in that spot too, maybe not in the exact same way, but at some point in their life they faced similar situations and came out the other side. So when people I respect give me positive encouragement in the field that I am trying to get towards, then that always helps me.

Justin discussed the importance of feedback to his confidence, thereby emphasizing the importance of the feedback source.

Anthony reiterated this perspective when discussing the importance of feedback from his manager, stating “in that situation it’s pretty powerful if it’s coming from someone you really respect….I think if it comes from someone you respect and you respect their knowledge and you respect their abilities.” Both Justin and Anthony stressed
the importance of feedback from a respected person, someone to whom they look up to in some capacity (i.e., mentor, professor, manager).

Mark expressed similarly, stating “I think so yeah. If someone in a higher position than you says you can do this or go try this out,” indicating the importance of the source from which the feedback was received. Lawrence supported this notion when asked how powerful feedback is to his development, saying “Instrumental. I try and learn as much as I can from others and that’s where I try and take what people say as feedback and implement it. There’s no sense in wasting someone’s breath if you’re not going to implement it.”

Upon reviewing reflexive journal writings, it was quite apparent that the genuine nature and the source of such feedback was critical, given nearly every participant spoke to the importance of candid and constructive feedback as pivotal to the development of efficacious beliefs. For example, one journal entry, referring to feedback specifically, stated “it appears that for many participants thus far, the candid nature and source of the feedback are crucial for one’s perceived LE.”

Section I: Summary of findings. When exploring participants’ perception of their leadership capabilities, participants expressed varying degrees of perceived confidence in leadership abilities when asked ‘how would you describe your leadership efficacy at this point in time?’ These data suggest that participants’ perceived their LE as varying from highly efficacious to less efficacious in their leadership abilities. Furthermore, certain individuals perceived that their LE fluctuated, depending on the context. Moreover, a number of participants described their LE as a work in progress and stressed the importance of them continuing to grow and develop. As well, participants’
perceptions of LE were discussed pertaining to leadership experience, sport experience, comfortable context, observing others perform well, and genuine feedback from authority figures.

**Gender Differences.** Upon analyzing these data, gender differences were found among participants’ responses. For example, certain female participants (i.e., Sarah and Danielle) expressed perceptions of their LE as weaker than others, specifically with respect to their self-perception of their leadership ability. In particular, accounts of introversion and of possessing less sport-specific knowledge than males contributed to these perceptions of weaker LE. Furthermore, no male participants mentioned such accounts as factors that impacted their perceived leadership abilities. As such, this may be identified as a gender difference with regards to these participants’ perceived leadership abilities (LE).

Sarah’s introversion may be seen as a within-person factor that may have impacted her perception of her leadership ability. Sarah was the sole participant to mention introversion as a factor as to why she perceived her leadership abilities as weak. Given Sarah is female, a gender difference in one’s self-perception of their leadership ability may be evident, as no male participants mentioned introversion as a factor that impacted their perceived leadership abilities. As well, Danielle’s perception that her leadership abilities are negatively impacted by her belief that she has less sport specific knowledge than her male counterparts. To that end, no male participant mentioned their lack of sport specific knowledge as a factor related to lower levels of LE.
Perception of Being Capable to Obtain a Leadership Position. Findings are also presented vis-à-vis the second lens from which the LE construct is conceived; that is, one’s perception of their ability to obtain a leadership position (Cunningham et al., 2005; McCormick et al., 2002). Participants were found to express varied perceptions of their abilities to obtain a leadership role.

For some participants, gender played a role in these perceptions; where some female participants perceived their gender to impact their perception of their ability to obtain a leadership position. Specifically, some female participants spoke about how the male dominated sport influences their desire to get involved with academic and work-related experiences. For example, Danielle candidly stated:

I see the people I am surrounded by in class and I am just not them. I don’t know everything about sports, I don’t care to know everything about sports, I like sports, I grew up playing sports, and I appreciate what sports does for people but…I just feel like it’s a very, this isn’t going to sounds very proper, but a Bro-y environment. I’m not saying as a general statement, but it tends to attract that kind of crowd.

Here, a between-person factor was found as Danielle expressed her perceptions of LE by comparing herself to others—and specifically males—in the program. Danielle mentioned that she often feels nervous to contribute in class discussion because of her perceived lack of sport-specific knowledge, where “people know a lot about sport teams and stats and all of this kind of stuff and you don’t want to ask something about the Maple Leafs that’s like: obviously!…I’ve felt like that before not with professors but with
peers.” Again, Danielle expresses a between-person factor by comparing herself to others in the program.

Danielle was not the only female participant to express a between person factor, given third year female Samantha’s comments, “when I entered the program, I noticed how the competition will be much harder because you’re looking at me, a black women, trying to overcome a white man’s industry so me looking at everyone else…made me realize that it is going to be way more difficult than I thought it was going to be.” When discussing her LE, Samantha compared herself to others (specifically white males), where she perceived the sport industry to be both white and male-dominated and felt that being a black female in a “white man’s industry” amplified the difficulties and challenges she would face in the future, particularly when it comes to her ability to find employment in the sport industry. Upon reviewing reflexive journal writing pertaining to Samantha’s interview, it was clear that her perceived LE was being impacted by the lack of opportunities provided to her to assume leadership roles. Here an entry stated “it seems clear from our discussion that Samantha’s lack of opportunity to assume leadership roles may be impacting her perceived LE at this point in time.” When discussing a previous role, Samantha noted

My boss and the people in the organization, males, obviously didn’t see my leadership skills as strong […] I kept on asking you know, I really want to do something behind the scenes and when I asked and they said yes we will make sure you get a job and three years go by and nothing happens […] Sometimes you get upset so I feel like that negatively made me think like, maybe I’m not good
enough, maybe I don’t have the skill for it. So that negatively hit me and I was pretty upset […] so that was probably my most negative effect for leadership.

Additionally, when discussing her career aspiration to become a sport agent, Samantha said, “again, as a female in the industry and especially as a sport agent, there’s only like what, five female agents in Canada? Maybe ten all over.” A lack of female role models as sport agents in this case, led Samantha to perceive that a career as a sport agent may be less achievable for her than for her male counterparts. Here, Samantha’s perception that she will not be offered the same opportunities as her male colleagues was found to impact her perceived LE.

Given these responses, gender differences emerged among some participants with respect to their perception of their ability to obtain a leadership role among sport management undergraduates. Specifically, not one of the nine male participants (of the total 15), mentioned their gender as a barrier to success within the sport industry or in obtaining a leadership role. Female participants spoke to a lack of opportunities to assume such roles; of the six female participants, three referred to their gender as impacting their perceived LE as a student within the context of the sport management program. Therefore, some females in this specific sample perceive their gender and a lack of opportunity provided to them to be impacting their perceived LE.
Table 1. Research Question 1: Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Having Leadership Abilities</th>
<th>Perception of Capability to Obtain a Leadership Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Previous leadership experience(s) identified as antecedent of LE  
  - Lack of experience results in participants’ perception of lower LE  
  - Context impacts participants’ perceived LE (emotional arousal)  
  - Previous and current sport experience identified as antecedent of LE (i.e., as a youth, intercollegiate sport)  
  - Observing others perform well is an antecedent of LE  
  - Genuine feedback from authority figures is an antecedent of LE  
  - Gender differences related to confidence in self emerged |
| - Perception of male dominated sport industry among some female participants impacts perception of ability to obtain a leadership position and LE  
  - This perception further influences female participants’ desire to get involved with academic and work-related experiences  
  - Perception of ‘white man’s industry’ and difficulty obtaining a leadership position impacts perceived LE  
  - No male participants mentioned gender as a barrier to their success in sport.  
  - Gender differences apparent in some participants’ perception of ability to obtain a leadership position |
Section II: Participants’ Perceived Locus of Control.

In this second section, findings are discussed pertaining to participants’ perceived locus of control (LOC) with an intention being answering research question two (RQ2): “how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LOC?” As such, 11 questions were developed, adapted from Rotter’s (1966) 23-item Locus of Control Scale (I-E scale). Questions were posed to participants, who responded whether they agreed, disagreed and provided additional anecdotal evidence or support for their responses. In this study, one’s LOC is defined as a personality attribute, reflecting the degree to which one generally perceives event outcomes are under one’s control or under the control of powerful others (Phillips & Gully, 1997). From data analyzed among 15 participants, eight were identified as possessing an internally oriented LOC and seven were identified as possessing an externally oriented LOC, based upon the participants’ specific responses. Furthermore, each participant’s LOC was found to be linked to his or her age, experience(s), and academic journey, all of which are discussed below.

Internally Oriented LOC. Of the 15 participants interviewed, the researcher analyzed eight as possessing an internally oriented LOC. Statements read to participants were a priori categorized by the researcher (according to Rotter’s I-E scale), as relating to either an internal or external LOC. For example, the researcher read one statement, “professors in the sport management program often make difficult tests or exams,” in which participants’ responses ranged from, “there’s always unfair tests. Always,” to “No, I disagree. I just don’t think they are that hard, reasonably challenging but I would not say they are difficult.” As such, participants’ response to statements enabled the researcher to assess one’s perceived LOC and probe to further determine from where
these beliefs stem. Specifically, when the researcher asked participants academically-related questions, internally oriented individuals focused on their own efforts rather than on external factors (i.e., the professor, the class, the test). For instance, Lexy (identified as possessing an internally oriented LOC), responded to the statement, “oftentimes, exam questions are so unrelated to coursework that studying does not make a difference,” by stating

Disagree. I don’t think that…the question may not have been framed in a way that you remember it from class or other situations but it’s about again understanding that material and being able to make those connections so, you know, if you learn about a specific theory and then your professor provides one example in class that’s not how all the examples in the real world will be so being able to understand that theory and recognizing it when it does happen in a different situation or whatever it might be.

In contrast, Samantha (identified as possessing an externally oriented LOC) responded to the same statement

Pffft studying does not make a difference. For [specific professor’s name], I would memorize every single thing, I would understand and learn every single thing on the piece of paper on those lecture slides and still come out with 50 or a 60 because certain words, the way they worded it.

Participants and their different responses conveyed two distinct streams of thought, where one implied that one’s ability to do well on a test was dictated by his or her understanding of the material and study habits, whereas the other directly implied that one’s ability to do well had nothing to do with one’s own efforts but rather external forces.
It was found that those possessing an internally oriented LOC responded by focusing upon the idea that the effort one expends is reflected within or by the outcome one experiences. For example, Denis stated “it was not meant to happen because you were sitting on your ass on your couch, it was meant to happen because you made it happen.” This is further supported by Danielle who said, “I feel like what you put in is what you get out in any situation so you create what happens to you…your effort in your life leads you to be who you are, which ends up creating how you approach every day and every situation.” These responses suggest that internally oriented individuals tend to rely more on their efforts rather than focusing their energy on external factors. Illustrating the latter, Sarah (one identified to possess an externally oriented LOC) stated:

you try like so hard and you put in so much work and effort to do an assignment because want to have a specific grade and then it just turns out that you know it’s just not as good or done as well as you thought and even though you worked hard and you got other people to look over it and it’s just frustrating for me because I feel like professors and TAs, they try to like get you down for the most stupid and specific things.

Sarah’s response indicates her focus is on the external factors that she believes are at play (i.e., teaching assistants, professors) rather than the effort she expends on the tasks themselves. Samantha reinforced this belief, stating “you put so much effort into a paper and I come back with like a 50 or a 60 and you’re just like why? Because it’s the person on the other side sometimes is the gatekeeper and they just, they block you sometimes.”

**Externally Oriented LOC.** Of the 15 participants interviewed, the researcher identified seven as possessing an externally oriented LOC, based upon their responses.
These data indicate that externally oriented individuals quickly attribute their failures and inadequacies on external factors and often experience a significant loss of motivation if and when their effort does not translate to success. Sarah exemplifies this dynamic stating,

I can know everything, every single thing, and then I go to the exam and I’m just like what the hell is this? This is not even the class I’m in, so. It’s the wording, it’s also the trick questions, it’s also the, and I feel like they purposefully set you up to fail. A lot of them do and I do I usually go and complain I’m not afraid to say…I don’t remember learning this, this, this and this and I came to every single class and I wrote down all the notes and I still don’t know any of this. Why is this on the exam? But, it’s University.

Moreover, individuals who possessed an externally oriented LOC expressed feeling a loss of motivation if they perceived that their efforts were not translating to success. Upon a review of reflexive journal writings, it was apparent that for some participants, failure (i.e., a poor mark on an exam) resulted in demotivation. A number of journal entries (i.e., Anthony’s, Sarah’s) pointed at the idea that participant’s failure resulted in them feeling less motivated to get involved with a similar experience. For example, Anthony supported this stating, “so I think situations like that especially in school when you get mark after mark…it’s like: what’s the point? No matter how hard I try I am not going to get a good mark.” In responding in this manner, Anthony felt as though his efforts did not translate to success and this had implications for his motivation in that class. Instead of looking to
improve his efforts for next time, Anthony experienced a loss of motivation resulting from his LOC.

**Gender Differences in Locus of Control.** Of the nine male participants, the researcher identified five as possessing an internally oriented LOC and four as possessing an externally oriented LOC. Of the six female participants, the researcher identified three as possessing an internally oriented LOC and three as possessing an externally oriented LOC. As such, no gender differences in LOC were found; rather, it was found that—regardless of gender—participants expressed their LOC in diverse ways. Given the relatively equal distribution between internally and externally oriented participants, it may be reasonable to suggest that one’s LOC is not impacted by their gender but rather other factors. Specifically, these data suggest that one’s LOC may be influenced by one or more of the following, including: 1) age; 2) academic journey; and 3) experience(s), each of which will be discussed below.

When exploring undergraduate students’ LOC, participants’ age was found to be a factor in determining one’s LOC, specifically, influencing whether one is internally or externally oriented. Findings indicate that of the seven participants identified as internally oriented, five were either mature students (i.e., 25 years or older) or were in progress toward achieving a second academic degree. For instance, when participants were asked whether they believed professors in the sport management program make difficult tests/exams, mature student Danielle (who is engaged in second degree studies) commented,

Disagree. I think well maybe this is because I am an older student, but I put in I would say I apply myself 75% and that’s just because I work like 30 hours a week
outside of school and it’s not necessary if I didn’t have to work then I would be giving it my all but our program is very simple if you go to class and you do all the things that are required of you…Not simple just handed to you, simple if you put the effort in, so I would say I disagree with that but for people that don’t put the effort in, I could see them saying “yeah the tests are very hard.”

Danielle expressed a belief that her ability to do well is dictated by the amount of effort she expends and that if one persists in his or her efforts, he or she will experience success in the sport management program. While Danielle’s statement demonstrates her internally oriented mindset, third year Samantha (aged 21 years), responded to the same question, commenting:

[laughs] Yes. I feel like our program is not, everyone thinks our program is so easy, it’s not easy. The knowledge that we’re learning a lot of people won’t understand it. The tests are, they do make it a little bit more difficult than they need to be…I feel like it was first year and second year just to weed those passengers out…But yeah, the tests are a little difficult, a little too difficult for my liking.

Samantha’s comments reveal her externally oriented LOC, where her perception relates to how difficult the program is for her, rather than the effort she needs to expend to be successful (i.e., an internal LOC). When Danielle was asked a follow-up question about whether her first-year self would say the same thing, Danielle purported, “yeah this would be a complete 180,” potentially signifying the impact of one’s age to the development and/or shift of one’s LOC.
Furthermore, third year Mark (identified as possessing an externally oriented LOC) responded to a question around the statement “sometimes, I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me” noting, “yeah, I agree with that, I think. I mean at the end of the day in the program for example, we’re just students, so if something were to change course-wise or they were to take away a course for example, or they were switch an exam at the last minute, that’s on them, we have no say in that.” Noticeably, given his response, Mark perceived he has little influence over the things that happen to him.

On the contrary, fourth year (college transfer) Justin, responded to the same statement,

I can usually have influence over the things that happen to me. Yeah. And I think that comes back to just working like in an academic context working hard and your input determines your output, it seems very straightforward. But that’s something, I don’t blame people for not understanding that because I didn’t up until like two years ago. It took an extreme shift in perspective to understand that like I am in control of my own sort of destiny in some ways. Justin’s belief that his ability to have an influence on things happening to him was associated to the hard work he exerted. Notably, Justin cited a perspective shift that allowed him to appreciate that he is in charge of his own destiny. Justin noted that “I kind of had a shift in mindset when I transferred to [University name], everything became real…and for me this came with a fresh sort of perspective on what I am trying to do with my life.” Justin was not the only participant who spoke about previous college and university experience as beneficial in his or her personal and professional development.
From these data, participants expressed a more internally oriented LOC, given their diverse experiences prior to entering the sport management program. These data suggest that transfer students (i.e., college to university), mature students (i.e., 25 years and older), and students who were engaged in their second degree were found to possess a more internally oriented LOC than younger students (i.e., 25 years and younger) and/or students who were engaged in their first degree. For example, Justin transferred from [College] to [University] and stated, “I started out at [College] actually, I was not academically inclined at all, I had zero direction, I was just like that guy like many who I like sports, I am not good at anything else let’s go into sport management at a College that I can guarantee I can get into.” Coming to [University name], Justin noted he had to shift his perspective if he wanted to be successful, stating “so for me I had to put myself through some rough times academically to kind of understand that at some point you have to grow up… and for me that came with a fresh perspective.”

Similarly, in response to the questions related to the statement that ‘many students don’t realize the degree to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings, Denis (i.e., a mature male student) communicated an internally oriented LOC response, stating

No, I don’t know. I think of course, I put myself in the TAs shoes, right? You have to grade 60-70 papers of course paper number 51 or 61 might, it’s possible but everybody makes mistakes, right? Like I myself, I’ve had a test sometimes and I go see the teacher not because I wanted to have a better grade… I want to know what I did wrong! Because otherwise I am going to have another test at some point and I could make the exact same mistakes and I’d never know.
Rather than suggest that professors and TAs mark incorrectly or rather than verbalize his displeasure, Denis’ reply focused upon recognizing how and where he went wrong on that particular test such that he might improve his effort for the next test. In stark contrast, responding to the same question, Samantha noted her displeasure, stating “teachers, profs need to really go through all the coursework, I know maybe they’re teaching a class with 300 students and they have like five TAs but a lot of students don’t even realize that they’re being marked wrong.” Here, Samantha explicitly suggests that students are being marked incorrectly, conveying a somewhat externally oriented LOC.

Regardless of gender, more experience(s) (i.e., work and volunteer experience) were found to be related to participants’ internally oriented LOC. Specifically, the experiences one amasses (i.e., leadership related or otherwise), were found to positively impact one’s LOC.

When discussing one’s LOC, it became apparent that one’s LOC orientation (i.e., internal or external) was impacted by that individual’s previous experience(s), or lack thereof. This finding was supported by Melissa’s (identified as possessing an internally oriented LOC) statement regarding how her experience has led her to succeed:

Yeah so, definitely being in the program. And then my internship was huge, I don’t think I would be necessarily where I was without it. But it was volunteering that got me in first year that I was introduced to a few people at the CHL... But I think it’s also just having the job that I’ve had throughout school has helped me develop that little bit of management little bit of a leadership role… I have always said that it was everything I did outside of the classroom that I think would probably be [why I am] where I am now.
According to Melissa, these experiences actively shaped her LOC. On the contrary, when asked if he felt he was progressing toward achieving his ideal job or career in sport, Anthony said:

I want to say yes, but a little part of me also thinks I am not doing enough. I think everyone might be in the same boat where it’s like I just don’t know what to do. Like you can’t just reach out and go “hello NBA I would like a job please.” You can’t just go knock on the door, right?

Anthony expressed a response more characteristic of an externally oriented LOC, implying that his career goals were somewhat out of his reach at this point. Given this response, Anthony’s perception may be a result of his lack of experience and further, his perceived lack of effort to seek out opportunities that may benefit his career pursuits.
Table 2. Research Question 2: Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ2 Summary of Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internally Oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused on their own efforts rather than on external factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused upon the idea that the effort one expends is reflected in the outcome one experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externally Oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attribute their failures and inadequacies on external factors (i.e., the professor, the TA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focused on a significant loss of motivation if and when individuals’ efforts do not translate to success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Difference in LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No gender differences in LOC found among participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants’ LOC was found to be influenced by age, experience, and one’s academic journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Older participants tended to be those with a more internally oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals referred to age as integral to possessing a more internally oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse experiences prior to entering the sport management program found to impact development of internally oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transfer students, mature students (25 and older), and students engaged in their second degree found to possess a more internally oriented LOC than younger students (25 years and younger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More experience(s) (i.e., work, volunteer) related to participants’ internally oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants spoke to the importance of experience as impacting their LOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Leadership Efficacy and Locus of Control.

In the third section, findings related to the association between sport management students’ LOC and LE are presented to thereby address research question three (RQ3): “what is the relationship between sport management students’ LOC and LE?” Findings suggest that in some instances, participants’ LOC (i.e., internal or external) has substantial implications for their perceived LE. Notably, participants found to possess an internally oriented LOC tended to perceive they possessed higher levels of LE, whereas participants found to possess an externally oriented LOC tended to perceive they possessed lower levels of LE. Individuals were also found to entertain efficacious beliefs independently of their LOC orientation (See Appendix E for LE/LOC Matrix). These results are detailed below.

**Internally oriented LOC related to higher perceived LE.** For some participants, their internally oriented LOC resulted in higher perceived LE. Among the several participants who expressed higher perceived LE, many also expressed an internally oriented LOC. These individuals spoke to their previous experience(s) as a factor in their development, often citing numerous and diverse experiences. Moreover, these individuals valued such experience(s) and understood how and why these experiences actively shaped their LE and LOC. For example, Melissa expressed high perceived LE from engaging in volunteer experience(s) and from an opportunity to engage on international exchange, stating “going on exchange…was a big thing for me and definitely brought back a lot of confidence.”

Furthermore, Melissa divulged that her development is a direct result of “everything I did outside the classroom that I think would probably be where I am now.”
Melissa valued how such experience benefitted her as a sport manager moving forward into the sport industry. Melissa’s higher perceived LE was also found to be influenced by her internally oriented LOC, as demonstrated when she responded to questions related to the statement “sometimes, I feel I have little influence over the things that happen to me,” by replying, “most of the experiences or the opportunities or challenges that come are from like previous decisions, and previous experiences and who you surround yourself with.”

Fraser, another participant who expressed higher perceived LE, also spoke to his previous experience (i.e., Forman of a construction crew) as integral to his development. When speaking about his LE, Fraser stated, “I believe in my abilities, but at the same time, I know that there are things I need to work on but I think the fact that I understand what I am trying to accomplish is helping me, right? So I feel confident in my abilities but I do know there are areas I need to work on.” From Fraser’s response, he was cognizant of his LE and he is aware that it must be continually shaped through diverse experiences. From this response, Fraser’s perceived LE seems positively impacted by his internally oriented LOC. Rather than dwelling on his limitations or placing blame on external factors or others, Fraser was found to be actively improving his LE through various experience(s). He reinforced this sentiment toward the end of the interview when he noted, “obviously, everything I do causes some sort of action and reaction, so like what I decide upon can lead to other things.”

**Externally oriented LOC related to lower perceived LE.** For some participants, their externally oriented LOC resulted in lower perceived LE. Among the several participants who expressed lower perceived LE, some also demonstrated an
externally oriented LOC. For instance, when asked to describe her LE, Sarah felt as though being introverted led to lower levels of perceived LE, stating “when I first started first year in the program it wasn’t as high because I was a really introverted person.” Moreover, Sarah’s perceived LE was found to influence her externally oriented LOC, potentially preventing her from becoming involved in activities that may otherwise benefit her LE during her undergraduate studies. One such example of this orientation can be seen when she responded to the statement, ‘does effort always equal an outcome you want?’, stating

Not always. This is most of my assignments to be honest. Like sometimes, like you try like so hard and you put in so much work and effort to do an assignment …and then it just turns out that you know it’s just not as good or done as well as you thought…and it’s just frustrating for me because I feel like professors and TAs, they try to like get you down for the most stupid and specific things so I feel like sometimes it does work out in your favour and you do get that grade but other times it doesn’t because we’re still in university and I feel like professors and TAs just want to knit pick the stupidest things.

This response aligns with an externally orientation LOC, given Sarah’s externalizing of blame toward professors and TAs, rather than Sarah’s focusing on her own efforts as connected to success. This mentality results in Sarah feeling as though her efforts do not translate into goal attainment; thus potentially impacting her motivation and LE. Here, reflexive journal writing revealed that Sarah’s belief that her efforts do not translate to success may create circumstance wherein she feels less motivated to get involved in work, volunteer, or academic experiences. For example, “multiple times participant
seems to express that her lack of success results in avoidance of similar opportunities/experiences.”

Similarly, Anthony’s perceived LE was found to be impacted by his externally oriented LOC. When asked about his LE, Anthony suggested that in certain instances he perceived it as high (i.e., on the basketball court), while in other instances he perceived it as low (i.e., in academic settings). Anthony expressed an externally oriented LOC and when asked the same question as Sarah regarding one’s effort he said: “When I [get] that test back and it’s a 65 and I am going what the heck? I thought I knew this? I think that can be discouraging and then that just tumbles down to all your other classes.” Instead of finding out why he did poorly or using the failure as motivation for next time, Anthony’s reaction to his poor mark resulted in a decrease in motivation across all his classes.

These data suggest that the relationship between participants’ LE and LOC may have implications for their LE levels. That is, if one possesses an internally oriented LOC, he or she may take control of their LE development by actively seeking out experiences and opportunities that positively impact such development (i.e., work/volunteer experiences). In contrast, externally oriented individuals dwell on failure and may look to allocate liability for their lack of success on anyone and anything but themselves. One’s LOC was found to impact whether or not one feels in control of their development and whether or not that individual becomes involved with opportunities that are outside of one’s comfort zone. These data suggest that internally oriented individuals feel more ownership over their own development during their undergraduate journey and as such perceive themselves to be more efficacious toward leadership than their externally oriented colleagues. Danielle summarizes this notion, stating:
I think leadership is definitely a skillset you need because if you don’t take, let me word this properly, because I see leadership as taking control of your own situation as well so in order for you to control where you are going to be you need to have a certain set of skills that are going to put you in that situation…and to stand out from others you need to like not lead but you need to be not one step ahead but you need to be…able to take on those roles if and when they do come.

**Inverse Relationships between LE and LOC.** It was found that some participants expressed higher perceived LE while concurrently expressing an externally oriented LOC, where some expressed a low perceived LE while concurrently expressing an internally oriented LOC. Such findings of inverse expressions may suggest that some participants express efficacious beliefs independently of their LOC.

For instance, Danielle exemplified having expressed lower perceived LE while also expressing an internally oriented LOC. When discussing her LE, Danielle mentioned numerous times feeling as though her lack of sport specific knowledge impacted her LE, expressing “there’s people around me that say know the content more than I do or are able to take part more because they understand sport better than I do.” Furthermore, Danielle suggested that the male dominated environment embedded within sport impacts her perceived LE, “I think it’s because I see the people I am surrounded by in class and I am just not them…I just feel like [sport] is a very, this isn’t going to sound proper but a very bro-y environment.”

Danielle’s perception that sport specific knowledge equates to leadership acumen in sport seemingly impacted her ability to feel highly efficacious, specifically in sport settings; however, she also expressed an internally oriented LOC, given statements as, “I
believe you attract a lot of things to yourself, you attract success through the effort you put in,” and “I feel like what you put in is what you get out in any situation so you create what happens to you.” Here, results indicate that Danielle’s perceived LE is being influenced by factors such as her gender and confidence level, however this is not the case for her LOC as she was identified as internally oriented.

As well, Allison expressed higher perceived LE while also expressing an externally oriented LOC. Allison held the belief that her LE was high because of her numerous experiences in leadership roles, stating “Yeah, I’d say I’m pretty confident leading other people just because I’ve had a lot of experience leading people in the past.” Allison felt as though this experience positively impacted her LE where “[it] helped me like in a professional work environment because I am more aware of how to identify people’s strengths and weaknesses…so I think that like I feel confident in myself because I’ve had past experiences that have helped me with those situations.” Based upon these responses, Allison’s perceived LE was positively influenced by her previous experience but these experiences did not translate into an internally oriented LOC. When discussing her LOC, her responses were quite different.

When responding to the statement, “being successful is a matter of hard work, luck has little of nothing to do with it,” Allison disagreed, commenting “I think that some people are lucky enough to have family or friends or a neighbour…who’s like a CEO of a company. Like I even hear of people like who aren’t academically inclined and they know someone so they got their internship there.” Allison mentioned the influence of luck frequently, for example, stating “if I’m like getting a coffee at Starbucks and all of a sudden Tessa Bonhomme walks in…that’s luck.” While Allison expressed higher
perceived LE, she demonstrated an externally oriented LOC by mentioning luck frequently rather than mentioning the effort required for one to take advantage of an opportunity presenting itself, such as a happenstance meeting.

Allison and Danielle were two participants who expressed their perceived LE separately from their LOC orientation. Although these two constructs are both explicitly cognitively oriented, research has suggested that one may entertain efficacious beliefs independently from their LOC; which was the case for these two participants in particular. This finding suggests that one’s LOC may not directly influence one’s LE in every situation. Although not a central focus of this study, it would be interesting to explore why this occurred in a future study. Exploring the characteristics of participants who express their LE separately from their LOC and the factors that contribute to this perception may help to identify how and why this occurs and shed light on this particular phenomenon.
Table 3. Research Question 3: Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ3 Summary of Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally oriented LOC related to higher perceived LE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants spoke of their previous experience(s) as a factor in their development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants spoke about numerous and diverse experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants valued such experience(s) and understood how and why these experiences actively shaped their LE and LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internally oriented LOC may influence increases in perceived LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Externally oriented LOC related to lower perceived LE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants possessing an externally oriented LOC were found to feel as though their efforts do not translate into goal attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perceived lack of success was found to impact one’s LE because it may lead one to avoid trying behaviours (i.e., taking risks) that may work towards developing one’s LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inverse Relationships between LE and LOC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some participants expressed higher perceived LE while revealing an externally oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some participants expressed lower perceived LE while revealing an internally oriented LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- From inverse relationships between LE and LOC, one may hold efficacious beliefs separate from their LOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings

Central themes that emerged from these data included: participants’ perception of having leadership abilities is positively impacted by previous leadership experience, previous and current sport experience, the level of comfort and familiarity within a context, observing others perform well, and genuine feedback from authority figures. Gender differences emerged, as some female participants perceived leadership abilities is impacted by their confidence in self. These participants discussed introversion and a lack of sport specific knowledge as impacting their perceived LE. Gender differences also arose in participants’ perceiving having the capability to obtain a leadership position. Of nine males, none mentioned their gender as a barrier to their capability to obtain a leadership position, whereas three of six females mentioned their gender as influencing their ability to obtain a leadership position.

While no gender differences were found to impact LOC, one’s age, academic journey, and experience were found to impact one’s LOC. With regards to the relationship between LE and LOC, it was found that in some instances one’s LOC (i.e., internal or external) may have considerable implications for one’s LE levels. Results indicate that internally oriented individuals tended to possess higher levels of LE, whereas externally oriented individuals tended to possess lower levels of LE; however, these data also indicate that individuals may entertain efficacious beliefs independently of their LOC.

These findings highlight the complexity of LE and LOC and some factors that may impact one’s perceived LE and LOC. These findings also point toward potential gender differences in perceived LE, demonstrate antecedents of LE development, and
offer a glimpse into the relationship between LE and LOC. Regarding theory, these findings provide the platform to understand LE and LOC at the undergraduate level and the factors that influence one’s LE levels and LOC (i.e., internal or external). In the next chapter, the findings are discussed according to their implications as aligned with the literature. Limitations and delimitations are also discussed as are the implications of the findings for sport management undergraduates and educators. Future research opportunities are also outlined.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Aspiring sport managers need to be confident in their capability to both have leadership skills and to obtain a sport industry job and/or leadership position, given Betz and Hackett’s (1981) finding that graduates’ lower levels of leadership efficacy (LE), may result in their premature elimination of certain career options believed to be out of reach. This may be particularly the case for females in the sport industry, given this particular industry’s existing and marked gender imbalance (Burton, 2014; Parks & Roberton, 2002). Within an undergraduate context, students’ lower levels of LE may be intensified if students do not take ownership of their personal and professional development during their undergraduate studies. The two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC.

In this chapter, the findings are interpreted and explained in the context of existing literature pertaining to both LE and LOC to demonstrate the contribution of the findings to new knowledge, specifically related to these two constructs. In this chapter, discussion is structured vis-a-vis the three research questions guiding this study. The following discussion revolves around how the findings of this research may contribute to both the sport management literature and educational practice; how sport management undergraduates—and specifically female sport management undergraduates—may utilize these research findings, and; how sport management educators may use the findings to enhance pedagogical interventions to work towards bolstering undergraduate students’
levels of LE, such that upon graduation, graduates may be better prepared to manage the complex challenges they will face within the sport industry.

**Research Question #1**

Central to leadership and its development, Bandura (1997) stated that efficacy is the most pervasive among the mechanisms of agency and provides a foundation for all other facets of agency to operate. Importantly, individuals’ efficacy beliefs affect whether they think in self-enhancing or in self-debilitating ways, how effectively they motivate themselves and persevere in the face of difficulties, and the choices they make at important decision points (Hannah et al., 2008). With regards to the LE construct, these beliefs extend to one’s perception of their leadership abilities and can impact the strength of one’s perceived LE. From this information, it is important for sport management undergraduates to be well aware of their LE and to actively develop their perception of their LE through various experiences, such that it positively impacts their decision making.

**Perception of Having Leadership Abilities.** In this study, it was found among some participants that their perceived LE was relatively strong; these participants expressed self-perceptions of being confident in their skills, knowledge, and abilities associated with leading others in some capacity. Participants’ perceived LE was found to vary based on their experience(s) (or lack thereof) and was found also to be influenced by participants’ previous experiences in and with leadership. This finding is aligned with Hannah et al.’s (2008) research, who suggested that individuals with higher levels of LE may in turn become involved more frequently with experiences and opportunities that positively impact their LE development. Notably, when participants were asked to
describe their perceived LE, a number spoke to their previous experience(s) in leadership roles as integral to their LE development.

Given the previous experience that participants mentioned was often related to external (outside of the university) factors (i.e., work/volunteer experiences not provided or offered by the university), one may assume that the social learning environments outside of the university and/or the program in which participants are involved may be impacting these students perceived LE. From this finding, it is recommended that sport management educators work towards developing pedagogical interventions aimed at fostering experiences and opportunities for these students to develop their LE within the classroom/program setting. For example, “creating leadership role opportunities for students and providing them with the instruction and coaching needed to help them succeed” (McCormick et al., 2002, p. 45) may lead to an increase in students perceived LE while engaged within the University setting.

One such way this can be achieved is by “designing and administering undergraduate curricula that focuses on students’ vertical development” (Spence, Hess, McDonald, & Jowdy, 2009, p. 1). Spence et al. (2009) define vertical development as the means by which one learns to see the world through new eyes and how one changes their interpretations of experience and transform their views of reality. These authors suggest pedagogical interventions with the use of the learner-centered Experiential Learning (EL) approach could aim toward fostering vertical development (Jowdy, McDonald, & Spence, 2008). This approach allows students to be actively engaged and “learn by doing,” wherein students are directly responsible for participating in their own learning. Such pedagogical interventions may work to increase students’ awareness level of their
own and others’ leadership strengths and limitations through hands on experiences (Spence et al., 2009). For example, when students take risks within an EL environment, they may develop “affective, perceptual, behavioural complexity by internalizing theory through guided experience.” (p. 2). These authors suggest a number of different ways to incorporate EL learning in a classroom setting such as structuring courses such that students are able to work in groups and teams on real-life projects (i.e., having students run an event or be on an organizing committee).

Spence et al. (2009) suggest that these complexities may impact one’s vertical development and leadership effectiveness. For example, educators may want to include in their course offerings an element of EL wherein students are tasked with assuming leadership roles to execute a task or specific event. For example, students could create, develop, and lead an event with minimal direction and support. This may create circumstances where one can experience leadership in practice within a team setting, rather than experience leadership theoretically within a classroom setting.

These and other pedagogical interventions may positively impact sport management students’ perceived LE given that individuals who perceived they possessed higher LE spoke about their involvement in developmental events (i.e., work/volunteer experience, leadership roles, networking events) attributed these experience(s) contributed to strengthening their LE over time. Notable about this finding is that often participants’ accounts of experiences were not overtly tied to their respective educational settings. For example, many participants spoke about work/volunteer roles outside of their undergraduate program as pivotal to the perception of their ability to be a leader.
This is an interesting finding, given scholars (Lawson, Kooiman & Kuchta, 2018) found that the learning environment contributes to students’ LE development.

Some participants perceived themselves as possessing higher LE in certain contexts (i.e., in sport, in a specific course) than in other contexts, potentially inferring that one’s level of LE may fluctuate depending on the circumstances and the specific context in which one finds him or herself. Bandura (1977) supported this finding, suggesting that people fear and often avoid threatening situations they believe exceed their skills and abilities, whereas they confidently become involved in situations when they judge themselves capable of handling said situations. Participants expressed exactly this, perceiving their LE as higher in circumstances where they judged themselves capable; for example, when engaged in their favourite course or when playing their favourite sport.

Moreover, participants’ perceived their LE fluctuated depending on the context in which they found themselves, which is a finding that extends Bandura’s (1977) concept of emotional arousal, wherein a given setting may evoke both positive and negative emotional responses for individuals, which in turn may impact their perceived LE. Specifically, settings wherein one feels comfortable may work to strengthen one’s perceived LE, whereas settings wherein one feels uncomfortable may work to weaken one’s perceived LE. The sport team setting (i.e., previous and current sport team involvement [i.e., U SPORTS]) was one such setting in which participants were found to be confident, given numerous participants spoke to such sport involvement as integral to their self-perceived ability to be a leader. This finding may be unique to the participant pool given that this specific sample of undergraduates was studying within a sport
management degree program. In future research studies, exploring the uniqueness of this finding could be endeavoured to see if sport involvement is integral to one’s LE for non-sport management students (i.e., students studying in other academic programs).

Moreover, when participants described their perceived LE, some articulated that their perceived LE is a “work in progress,” suggesting that one’s LE can always be further developed and to do this, one must actively be involved in such enabling experiences. Hendricks and Payne (2007) noted that one’s engagement in leadership opportunities is fundamental to the development of one’s LE, an increase in one’s effectiveness, and an increase in one’s desire to seek out and participate in further leadership experiences. Corroborating these findings, if one becomes involved in leadership opportunities, it may increase their perceived LE.

Given this result, sport management educators are advised to increase the number and depth of these leadership-related opportunities (i.e., EL courses, volunteer experiences), such that students may take advantage of these opportunities throughout their undergraduate program studies. One such example could be incorporating leadership opportunities into every sport management class in some capacity. This may create circumstances wherein apprehensive individuals (i.e., those who may avoid pursuits of which they are otherwise capable) might become involved with these opportunities and such involvement in turn may lead them to develop efficacious beliefs, given that experience increases ones perceived LE.

Given courses in which opportunities may develop and exist may be voluntary in nature (i.e., elective courses), not every undergraduate will partake; however, verbally stressing the importance of students’ LE development via course offerings may be
beneficial for students. As well, mandating/incorporating leadership related activities across all sport management classes may benefit development of these students’ efficacious beliefs. Sport management educators may want to review the management education and leadership literature as a guide when incorporating related courses and content which may impact students’ levels of LE. Doing so will ensure that pedagogical interventions introduced are effective and supported by the educational literature (Spence et al., 2009).

**Gender Differences in Perceived Leadership Abilities.** In this study, some participants were found to have lower perceived LE, which was further connected with their perceived lack of confidence associated with leading others. Specifically, these participants expressed hesitation when discussing their involvement in experiences that lay outside their comfort zone, which suggested that individuals with lower perceived LE may avoid challenging circumstances or settings in which they perceive their skill to be unsatisfactory or ineffective, a finding also supporting Hannah et al.’s (2008) research, who note that those with lower LE tend to focus on avoiding risk.

Here, some female participants perceived their lack of self-confidence impacted their leadership abilities. One participant tied her introverted personality as impacting her lack of leadership abilities, whereas another participant tied her belief that she possessed less sport specific knowledge than their male counterparts as impacting her leadership abilities. From a social learning theory perspective, one may argue that the sport management educational context is not one in which all may build their confidence and one in which those with introverted personalities have a place to feel they are developing leadership skills. Regarding the participant who felt as though she lacked sport specific
knowledge, the same might be said, where program constituents (i.e., Professors, Teaching Assistants, students) have implicitly or explicitly created a perception that one’s sport knowledge equates to sport leadership ability.

Here, the environment in which these participants engaged impacts their perceived LE. For example, given the gender disparity among students within the program, there are times where males dominate discussion (i.e., in lecture and seminar) and as such, can dictate the conversation. In particular, some male students tend to make comments that can divert discussion from the lecture content and toward professional sport teams (i.e., statistics, players, box scores). As such, this may create the perception among students that leadership in sport settings is dictated by one’s knowledge of sport teams, players, and statistics.

Furthermore, some female participants expressed that their sport specific knowledge was less than males’ knowledge and therefore, not comparable to their male counterparts in the program, which led to them perceiving lower LE. For example, Danielle was one participant who felt as though the gender imbalance in the program impacted her (lower) perceived LE. In this way, it could be said that Danielle’s perception—that sport specific knowledge (i.e., rules, statistics, standings) equates to leadership acumen or success—negatively impacts her perceived LE. The masculine hegemonic norm operating within sport management programs and the industry at large may in turn create this perception and it can be argued that males within the program often perpetuate this belief by their comments and actions in sport management lectures and seminars.
Danielle’s lower perceived LE may impact her desire to become involved in sport specific leadership roles and experiences, which in turn supports the notion that women’s lower perceived LE relative to men’s perceived LE leads them to underestimate their leadership abilities (Sheppard, 2018). Again, sport management educators are encouraged that they ensure they remain content focused and on topic within lecture and seminar dialogue, thereby working towards eliminating the students’ perception on the importance of sport specific knowledge within sport management classrooms. With respect to being on topic, professors are encouraged to keep dialogue focused upon business theory (i.e., ethics in sport) relative to the particular learnings within lecture or seminar. Oftentimes, students utilize professional sport as their context to answer questions, even if topics are non-professional sport related (i.e., grassroots, not-for-profit, community sport).

Recognizing this, sport management educators are recommended to bolster their educational structure (e.g., lecture slides, course content, case study examples) to include content beyond box scores and statistics. Specifically, sport management educators could focus less on sport-specific content (i.e., teams, athletes, leagues) and more on business/management theories and content. Moreover, sport management educators could modify teaching assistant (TA) training so that TAs recognize and steer conversations away from box scores and statistics in seminars to focus more on course material and lecture content, or TAs could also clarify the utility of box scores/stats (i.e, what they are and what they are not, relative to the learning at hand).

**Perception of Being Capable to Obtain a Leadership Position.** These data indicate that gender differences were present in participants’ responses regarding their
perceived LE related to obtaining a leadership position. This finding corresponds with Sheppard’s (2018) and Betz and Hackett’s (1981) work, all of whom suggested that females perceive lower LE than do males’ about their LE. When asked to describe their perceived LE, several females vocalized beliefs that their gender disadvantaged them with respect to sport related experiences. For example, Samantha’s perceived lack of female sport agents in the sport industry led her to believe that a career as a sport agent may be less achievable for her than for her male counterparts.

Samantha’s perception may lead female participants who think similarly to avoid pursuing career choices in which they are otherwise capable. When exploring how such beliefs arise, one may want to consider how the environment impacts others’ perception of females’ leadership ability. In Samantha’s case, perhaps her inability to pursue advancement opportunities is a result of the lack of opportunities provided to her to assume such roles. Here, it is important to consider how others view leadership (i.e., her superiors) and the way in which they afford opportunities to females like Samantha. Samantha’s perceived LE may be impacted by others’ assumption or belief that leadership roles are more oriented for males; and as such, Samantha may not be provided with opportunities to develop her LE.

Given no male participants discussed gender, perhaps male participants do not view their gender as a barrier to their success as do some female participants. Or, it may be argued that males in particular are provided access more frequently to these opportunities and as such have ample opportunity to develop their perceived LE. This finding is congruent with Sheppard (2018), who noted that females’ anticipation of
gender discrimination makes it less likely that they will receive advancement opportunities, which may diminish females’ interest in leadership roles.

In this study, a between-person comparison occurred, wherein some female participants felt inferior to their male colleagues in some cases, as tied to their perceived LE. From a social learning perspective, for these participants, they may be receiving either implicit or explicit messages in and out of the educational context, which suggest their gender is a barrier to obtaining a leadership position. Furthermore, females may not be provided with the same opportunities as their male counterparts to pursue and experience leadership roles.

To alter females’ perception of gender discrimination, sport management educators are recommended to work towards eradicating the stigma of gender discrimination in sport. Sheppard (2018) believed that educators and administrators within universities must consider the perception of gender discrimination in sport when they make important decisions (e.g., when selecting educational content, course curricula, personnel). For example, educators could make important decisions toward adjusting course topic selection (i.e., incorporating social justice themes within courses) and toward modifying course offerings (i.e., include female guest speakers and focus on female leaders in sport via case study [i.e., Rt. Honourable Kirsty Duncan, MP]. Moreover, faculty could hire adjunct professors or lecturers who are prominent female leaders in the sport industry [i.e., Ms. Michelle O’Keefe, former CEO, Canada Basketball]). Such decisions may expose all students to female role models and may highlight the important contributions these influential sport leaders make to the sport industry, which may help to eradicate the perception of gender discrimination in sport.
From the findings, gender differences were apparent in participants’ responses, where certain females among all 15 participants perceived their LE in relation to their ability to obtain a leadership position as lower than males, thereby supporting Sheppard’s (2018) findings. Such a finding contributes to the LE literature because it confirms that females’ social learning environment within the educational context may impact perceptions of self in relation to obtaining leadership positions. Participants may find this situation problematic because with lower LE, female participants expressed self-limiting beliefs and behaviours, which impacted their avoidance of taking on roles in which they otherwise may be highly capable.

In this study, participants revealed a number of personal antecedents of LE, all of which build upon Quigley’s (2013) research. First, participants’ previous experience(s) with leadership roles was found to be an antecedent of LE, where participants previous experience(s) (i.e., either positive or negative) was cited as fundamental to their efficacy beliefs. In this regard, perhaps one’s performance accomplishments (i.e., success) derived from experience works to increase one’s perceived LE, which corroborates the notion that prior successes influence increases in one’s efficacy, whereas prior failures influence decreases in one’s efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

This finding confirms both that experience can be described as an antecedent of LE and Bandura’s (1997) theory of sources of efficacy information. Given participants success within leadership and group settings led to an increase in their perceived LE, it is reasonable to assume that performance accomplishments (i.e., success) may positively influence one’s LE. Again, this outcome suggests that by educators increasing and/or
mandating the number of EL driven leadership opportunities for undergraduates to become involved, their LE development may benefit.

Furthermore, participants’ experience within the context of sport teams was also identified as an antecedent of LE. Multiple participants spoke of their involvement on sport teams (i.e., past youth based experiences, current collegiate athletic experiences) important to their LE development. This finding further supports the idea that experience helps develops one’s LE, while providing an example of how context or the environment can impact one’s LE. To this point, no researchers have addressed one’s experience on sport teams in the LE literature; perhaps this finding may be unique to the participant pool, given they were studying within a sport management program. Researchers could endeavour exploration of this finding to determine differences between undergraduates involved in both sport and non-sport-related degree programs. Given that participants interviewed were from a sport management degree program, it makes sense that they would value sport experience(s) and suggest such experiences were important to their perceived LE. Here, perhaps the sport team environment creates opportunities for individuals to experience leadership (i.e., team captaincy) prior to and during their undergraduate experience. Such experience in areas where one is confident (i.e., their favourite sport) may translate to confidence in other areas (i.e., school), a connection to which participants eluded.

As such, researchers could quantitatively assess the impact of undergraduate’s sport experience on LE, specifically with those enrolled in programs other than sport management. Furthermore, recognizing the benefit of sport to one’s LE development, sport management educators may be well-advised to encourage students to become
involved in sport in any capacity (i.e., collegiate athletics, competitive level intramural sport) during their undergraduate program and speak to the import impact of sport on one’s efficacious beliefs and explain how and why this occurs. It would be interesting to further explore the dynamics of the sport environment and why and how this particular environment impacts students’ perceived LE. Such an exploration may elicit some interesting results related to students’ sport experience and its impact on their perceived LE.

It was also found that observing others perform well, specifically in a leadership context or role, was an antecedent of LE, one also aligned with Bandura’s (1997) finding that vicarious experience improves one’s efficacy. It was found that when participants observed others performing well, their perceived LE increased, suggesting that vicarious experience is an antecedent of LE. This finding contributes to LE research, as it builds upon Quigley’s (2013) work on antecedents by uncovering a personal antecedent of LE.

Here, sport management educators may wish to make another pedagogical intervention, specifically increasing the number of group presentations and/or EL offerings to expose students to a greater number of vicarious experience(s) (i.e., international exchange, event committees, student leadership experiences) to positively influence their levels of LE. This may provide students with more opportunity to view their peers performing well, which may stimulate an increase in all students’ perceived LE. Again, sport management scholars may look to incorporate more EL opportunities as recommended by Spence et al. (2009). Doing so may create opportunities for students to become more aware of their leadership strengths and weaknesses and work towards improving their perceived LE.
In the current study, participants’ reporting the value of genuine feedback from authority figures was found to be an antecedent of LE. When asked about the importance of verbal persuasion from authority figures, students made apparent the impact of feedback on their LE. Some participants commonly vocalized both that feedback from bosses/managers, professors, and/or mentors was critical to their perceived LE and the importance of receiving genuine (i.e., honest, candid and constructive) feedback versus receiving ‘lip service’ from a professor saying what he or she thought the student wanted to hear. The genuine and honest nature of the feedback was important because it demonstrated to the participant that professor or TA was committed to his or her success.

This finding confirms Bandura’s (1997) theory that one uses received verbal persuasion to foster his or her self-belief toward coping successfully with what has been overwhelming in the past. As such, genuine feedback from authority figures can be understood as an antecedent of LE for these participants, corroborating Bandura’s (1997) theory that verbal persuasion impacts one’s efficacy levels. Moreover, given the important role of feedback, this finding is significant to sport management educators who are recommended to offer students as many opportunities to receive feedback as possible.

For example, sport management educators may offer ample opportunity for students to receive feedback on assignments, tests, and group projects, both in-class and during office hours. Moreover, educators could increase the amount of group work in courses with “hands-on” EL components (e.g. event management courses, leadership courses) as another avenue to provide students with a platform for students to receive abundant feedback in leadership-related scenarios. Such opportunities may incite students to risk being uncomfortable that may otherwise increase their LE and confidence. Also,
educators may wish to ensure that the feedback is both genuine and as candid as well as constructive.

**Research Question #2**

The researcher identified participants LOC as either being internally or externally oriented, based upon their specific responses to statements from the interview guide. Notably, participants who were identified as internally oriented frequently cited one’s own effort as a precursor to any outcome, specifically focusing upon the idea that the effort one expends is reflected in the outcome one experiences. Here, participants’ relationship to effort supports Peterson and Stunkard’s (1992) idea that internally oriented individuals believe rewards will emerge through an exertion of their own actions. This finding confirms Rotter’s (1966) view that one’s perception of the causal nature of the relationship between one’s behaviour and the resulting consequences might affect a variety of behavioural choices under a broad array of circumstances. Therefore, one may assume that an undergraduate’s LOC may impact his or her development throughout the course of study because it may affect his or her desire to be involved with developmental events and opportunities.

The researcher further identified participants with an externally oriented LOC as those who tended to blame their failure or inadequacies on factors other than themselves (i.e., professors, TAs, course offerings, program content). When discussing their LOC, some participants discussed the external factors they perceived that limited their experience of success, thereby also providing support for Rotter’s (1954) notion that externally oriented individuals believe events to be under others’ control. In the context of undergraduate sport management education, a concerning scenario arises with this
finding if externally oriented individuals believe that they are not in control of their self-development when participating in their studies. If so, such students may avoid becoming involved in any challenging opportunities or may blame their failures or inadequacies on others. This finding is significant to the LOC literature (Judge & Bono, 2001; Phillips & Gully, 1997; Rotter, 1966) given the current finding confirms Rotter’s (1954) findings.

With respect to gender differences in LOC, none were found among sport management participants. Given the relatively equal distribution between internally and externally oriented individuals with males (five internal, four external) and females (three internal, three external), it may be plausible to understand that while one’s LOC is not substantially impacted by gender, it may be impacted by other factors. For example, it was found that participants’ LOC was impacted by age, academic journey, and experience(s).

First, one’s age was found to be associated with determining one’s LOC. Of the participants identified as possessing an internally oriented LOC, several were mature students (i.e., 25 years and older), which may be further associated with the notion that one’s LOC develops over time. Specifically, within an undergraduate context, one’s LOC may be influenced by time as he or she matures, grows and exposes him or herself to unique experiences. This finding is important to the LOC literature because maturation via one’s age and experience has not been a focal point of discussion in any related LOC research (Peterson & Stunkard, 1992; Phillips & Gully, 1997; Rotter, 1996). As such, scholars may assess the accuracy of this interpretation in future research endeavours regarding LOC.
For example, sport management educators could conduct a longitudinal study that explores participants’ LOC over a 4-year period as they engage in undergraduate studies to assess one’s age on their perceived LOC. This might be an interesting study to conduct because it could explore students’ fluctuation in LOC as they travel through a 4-year program. Exploring students’ LOC is important because if one is externally oriented, they may avoid challenging opportunities and experiences, which may impact one’s perceived LE; in turn, such perceived (lower) LE may impact their career decision making and development of self-limiting behaviours.

Second, one’s academic journey was found to have a potential association with one’s LOC with his or her LOC. Specifically, those participants who expressed a more internally oriented LOC were found to be those who had accrued diverse experiences prior to entering the sport management program (i.e., transfer students, students working to obtain their second degree). Some participants, like Danielle, felt as though they were not ready for university when they first entered, stating “I’ve done other schooling before, so I started my undergrad in child and youth studies and then I wasn’t ready for university at that point.” Notably, when Danielle responded to questions pertaining to LOC construct, it was clear that she possessed an internally oriented LOC based upon her responses; however, when asked if she was always like that, she responded, “No, no! Like first year as in when I was in child and youth studies? Yeah, this would be a complete 180.” From her comment, Danielle’s previous academic experience prior to entering the sport management program may have positively influenced her LOC.

This finding of previous academic experience impacting one’s LOC contributes to LOC literature related to undergraduate students, because it suggests that students may be
more internally oriented if they accrued previous academic experience prior to entering the sport management program. Moreover, students’ supplementary academic experience(s) once within a sport management program may result in the iterative development of a more internally oriented LOC, given one may be more capable of handling program requirements with such previous experience. Also, given those students who are working to obtain their second degree or transfer students are older further compounds on the notion that age may influence one’s LOC. Again, researchers could further explore the influence of one’s previous academic experience(s) to one’s LOC in their second undergraduate program in the future to more deeply understand the associations here.

Third, experience (i.e., work, volunteer experience) was found to be associated with a student possessing an internally oriented LOC. Specifically, it was found that the more experiences one amasses during his or her undergraduate program may positively impact his or her LOC. When exploring LOC, it became apparent that one’s orientation was impacted by that individual’s previous experience(s), or conversely, the lack thereof. This result supports Phares (1976) assumption that those possessing an internally oriented LOC feel they are in control of self-development may engage in greater information seeking behaviour and actively pursue challenging opportunities, versus those possessing an externally oriented LOC, who may avoid becoming involved in challenging opportunities and may hinder their capacity to develop toward possessing an internally oriented LOC because of their avoidance.

To this end, research could assess the accuracy of this finding by offering participants various leadership experiences throughout a degree program in the future and
explore their impact on students’ LOC. Research could address such a research purpose in a 4-year longitudinal study to occur simultaneous to students’ journey through an undergraduate program, with participants’ LOC assessed after each academic year. This could be achieved by mandating students’ participation within an evidence-based leadership program.

**Research Question #3**

Regarding the relationship between LE and LOC, some participants were found to have a direct relationship between LE and LOC; that is for some, internally oriented LOC resulted in higher perceived LE. In these cases, these participants often spoke of the value of effort and experience to their development and conveyed a sense of ownership over such development. Given this result, it would be interesting to explore further this relationship in a longitudinal study, where researchers could assess the influence of students’ LOC on the development of their LE through a 4-year degree program. Researchers could focus on the factors that contribute to one’s LOC orientation and how such orientation impacts that individual’s LE development. This finding contributes to the LE and LOC literature because it supports the idea that one believing that goals are achievable largely through effort, rather than through chance or circumstance will enhance his or her perceptions of the ability to lead (Paglis & Green, 2002).

As well, some participants were found to have a direct and negative relationship between LE and LOC; that is for some, their externally oriented LOC led to lower perceived LE. When discussing their LOC, these individuals expressed a belief that their efforts did not often translate to success, which resulted in them being less motivated to become involved in experiences and opportunities in and out of the classroom.
Ultimately, these individuals often avoided challenging opportunities (i.e., networking and volunteer events and opportunities). This finding provides evidence for the notion that if an externally oriented individual believes that he or she is not in control of one’s own development, he or she may negate and thus avoid becoming involved in challenging opportunities, blame his or her failures on others and potentially experience a loss of motivation; all of which may impact one’s LE development and subsequent leadership skillset, both through their undergraduate program and later upon graduation.

This finding is important to LE and LOC literature because it demonstrates the negative implications of one’s externally oriented LOC on one’s LE. This finding is pertinent to the LOC literature because no researchers have previously explored an undergraduate population; and as such, this finding may contribute to LOC literature specifically in an undergraduate population.

Some participants expressed efficacious beliefs independently of their LOC, where some either expressed higher perceived LE while concurrently expressing an externally oriented LOC or expressed lower LE while concurrently expressing an internally oriented LOC. This finding implies that one may entertain efficacious beliefs independent of their LOC and in turn, one’s LOC may not always influence one’s perceived LE. This result supports Peterson and Stunkard’s (1992) findings, who argued that while a certain relationship between efficacy beliefs and LOC exists, individuals may exhibit efficacious beliefs independently of their LOC because “each cognate exists at a different level of abstraction and generality” (p. 115). As such, researchers must further investigate LE and LOC constructs and theories in an undergraduate context. Doing so may allow researchers to determine the extent to which one’s LOC impacts their LE,
thereby building upon the current studies and their contribution to the literature. A future research endeavour could explore this inverse relationship to further assess and understand the interpretations brought forth and such the implications of one’s LOC on their perceived LE.

**Summary of Discussion**

From the analysis of these data, undergraduate students’ perceived LE was found to vary but some gender differences were apparent. Particularly, these data suggest that some female participants expressed lower levels of perceived LE. As well, participants’ LOC was found to be equally distributed and as such, no gender differences were found; however, one’s LOC were found to be influenced by one’s age, academic journey, and experience(s). In certain instances, one’s LOC influenced one’s LE, where an internally oriented LOC related to a higher perceived LE and an externally oriented LOC related to lower perceived LE. Results also pointed toward occasions where participants entertained efficacious beliefs independently of their LOC. Finally, antecedents of LE derived from these data were previous experience with leadership roles, experience on sport teams (past and present), observing others perform well, and receiving genuine feedback from authority figures.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Leadership efficacy (LE) research arose as scholars (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Hannah et al., 2008) extended the self-efficacy (SE) theory to include associations with leadership. Betz and Hackett (1981) first suggested SE to explain individuals’ career-related decision-making and specifically noted that if students—and particularly female students—possess lower levels of SE, they may eliminate certain career options. Leadership efficacy scholars recognized that for students in an undergraduate context, one’s level of LE may impact his or her decision-making (Bandura & Wood, 1989), willingness to undertake leadership roles (Betz & Hackett, 1997), and one’s subsequent affinity to seek out and obtain a managerial/leadership position upon graduation. Specifically, the aforementioned dynamic may be intensified when students do not take ownership of their development during their undergraduate program. As such, the LOC theory was introduced in this study to explore its impact on and relationship with one’s LE development. According to Phares (1976), scholars can understand the influence of one’s LOC by integrating it with other theoretical concepts. Thus, the researcher chose to explore LE and LOC concepts to explore their relationship in detail.

Although LE scholars have advanced the literature, gaps remain. For example, scholars have explored undergraduate and graduate students’ LE and career decision making processes (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Hannah et al., 2008; Kelly & Hatcher, 2013; McCormick, Tanguma & López-Forment, 2002; Quigley, 2013; Quimby & O’Brien, 2004), and gender differences in LE (Sheppard, 2018); however, the relationship between students’ LOC and LE remained as two constructs necessary to be explored in detail.
Numerous scholars have explored SE and LOC in a variety of diverse contexts (Peterson & Stunkard, 1992; Phillips & Gully, 1997), yet few have examined SE in relation to leadership (i.e., LE) and LOC and none have explored this relationship in an undergraduate context. As such, this gap was identified as an area worthy of further exploration in and contribution to the literature.

Therefore, the two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC. Utilizing the rich, thick qualitative descriptions provided by sport management undergraduates who were interviewed by the researcher, the following research questions were answered, including:

1) how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LE?;
2) how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LOC?; and, 3) what is the relationship between sport management students’ LOC and LE?

Regarding the first research question (i.e., how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LE?), results suggested that participants’ perceived LE varied, given each participant’s accumulation of different and past experiences altered their perception of their LE. These data also suggested that gender differences in LE were apparent, where some females perceived they possessed lower LE than their male counterparts. Some female participants expressed a between-person comparison when they juxtaposed themselves to male students. Certain female participants also perceived that their gender might be barrier to their success and further, felt as though their sport
specific knowledge was not on par compared with other male students. This result supported Sheppard’s (2018) finding that females tend to possess lower levels of LE than males. In contrast, focusing on within-person comparisons, male participants did not mention their gender or sport-specific knowledge as barriers to their success, nor did they compare themselves to female students.

Regarding the second research question (i.e., how do sport management students make meaning of and perceive their LOC?), findings indicated that participants’ LOC was equally dispersed between internally and externally oriented, promoting the researcher to conclude that no gender differences in LOC existed among these sport management undergraduates. That said, age, academic journey, and experience(s) were factors found to influence participants’ LOC. Specifically, age was found to positively influence one’s LOC, where older participants expressed a more internally oriented LOC than did younger participants. Such internally oriented participants often commented that their LOC was more externally oriented in their first few years of university, as compared to their current LOC.

Moreover, previous academic experience was also a factor found to influence participants LOC, as those working on their second degree and/or transfer students were found to possess a more internally oriented LOC. Lastly, experience was also identified as a factor influencing the development of one’s LOC, where participants who had accumulated more experience were found to possess a more internally oriented LOC. Such an influence may occur because as an individual undertakes experience, their confidence related to the skills required to execute the task grows and so does the belief in their ability to execute the task. As such, that individual then may feel more in control.
of that experience and express a more internally oriented LOC given such related experience.

Lastly, regarding the third research question (i.e., what is the relationship between sport management students’ LOC and LE?), it was found that participants’ amassed experience resulted in an internally oriented LOC and a higher perceived LE. Conversely, it was found that an individual’s lack of experience and a desire to compare themselves to others led to possessing an externally oriented LOC, which fostered individuals’ lower perceived LE. Specifically, internally oriented individuals tended to actively become involved in opportunities through which they could develop their LE, whereas externally oriented individuals avoided such opportunities, if they deemed themselves incapable.

Interestingly, it was found that one may entertain efficacious beliefs independently of one’s LOC, supporting Peterson and Stunkard’s (1992) findings. Several participants were found to have an inverse relationship between LOC and LE, indicating these participants expressed their efficacious beliefs separately from their LOC orientation, suggesting that one’s LOC may not directly influence their LE in every situation. Individuals may entertain efficacious beliefs about their ability to perform a given behavior independently of their LOC orientation depending on their level of comfort within a context and other factors (i.e., perceived skill, amount of previous experience). Peterson and Stunkard (1992) suggested that when exploring these constructs, a longitudinal study would be more informative from the contention that if these concepts interact, they do over time.

As well, building upon Quigley’s (2013) work, antecedents of LE derived from these data were found to be previous experience with leadership roles, past and present
experience on sport teams, observing others perform well, and receiving genuine feedback from authority figures. By identifying antecedents of LE from undergraduate students, the findings from the current study could advance Quigley’s (2013) antecedent research, specifically within the sport management undergraduate context.

These findings are important to the LE and LOC literature because they offer a glimpse into sport management undergraduates perceived LE and LOC while also exploring how and why these beliefs manifest. As such, the findings provide a platform upon which sport management scholars may build to help inform educational practice so that sport management educators may work towards developing more efficacious undergraduates ready to enter and work effectively within the sport industry.

**Limitations, Delimitations, and Future Research**

Although this study contributes to the literature pertaining to LE and LOC, limitations existed that must be acknowledged. First, the researcher was not able to observe participants’ actual level of LE in a leadership setting due to time constraints and feasibility (i.e., it was deemed inefficient and impractical to ask participants to be involved in a circumstance where the researcher was viewing their LE in practice). As such, researchers may endeavour to include some element of observation of one’s LE in a group or team setting in future studies so that researchers may examine and assess undergraduate’s LE while performing a group task/assignment. Doing so may allow researchers to evaluate students’ levels of actual LE gleaning through assessing participants within a leadership setting versus perceived LE, gleaning through assessing participants’ answers to interview questions.
Another limitation was that the researcher was able to address students’ LE development. Given that interview interactions offered a snapshot (i.e., one specific period of time) of participants’ perceived LE and LOC, the researcher was unable to make any conclusions regarding students’ LE development. As such, the researcher could not comment on LE development, rather he relied on participants’ account of their perceived LE in analysis and discussion. Here, a limitation could also be identified as self-reporting where perhaps some participants’ self-reported higher perceived LE because they wanted to present themselves in a socially acceptable manner. As such, this may be identified as a potential drawback of qualitatively versus quantitative research designs.

Given the timeframe and study parameters, it was deemed impractical by the researcher to conduct a longitudinal study that specifically addressed LE development over time. As such, a 4-year longitudinal study during an undergraduate degree program would be beneficial to address students’ development as they progress through their program. This study could explore LE development over a 4-year timeframe and LE fluctuations (i.e., increases and decreases) that occur during that time.

A challenge that arose as another limitation in the current study was participants’ knowledge of LE and LOC and their ability to speak to and about these constructs. At the outset of each interview the researcher provided a definition of both constructs; however, given participants’ unfamiliarity with the concepts, it may have been difficult for some participants to speak directly about them than for others. As such, a limitation arose in that participants’ level of understanding limited their responses in some instances and; oftentimes these individuals would express responses unrelated to the constructs.
themselves. Reflecting on the reflexive journal writing, it became apparent that some participants’ ability to grasp the concepts impacted their capability to speak to them appropriately. Furthermore, when the researcher solicited participation, a limitation may have emerged from the beginning such that individuals who felt they did not understand the purpose of the study or the central constructs may have avoided participation. These particular individuals may have been those who could benefit most from this research but the researcher may not have been able to access these individuals.

Regarding delimitations, the researcher chose to conduct this research in one specific sport management undergraduate program, thereby delimiting the researchers’ ability to compare these findings to other sport management programs or other non-sport management programs. Given the time frame of the study, the researcher chose to conduct research at within one Canadian University and the Sport Management program herein with participants delimited to being majors in the program. As such, another potential future research opportunity may be for researchers to conduct a study with participants from multiple sport management and/or sport business programs to test and compare the findings presented here. Findings may allow researchers to decipher specific program and environmental factors that may influence students’ LE and/or LOC.

Another delimitation was reflective of the sample, which specifically included only senior (i.e., third and fourth year) undergraduate students, given the researcher’s belief that such students are in a stage where they are making important career-related decisions (i.e., selecting internships, selecting senior elective courses) and are on the cusp entering the competitive sport industry and as such, they would elicit germane responses relevant to the study’s purpose.
One avenue for future research might be for future researchers to test the conclusion that students’ age impacts their LOC. In this study, a number of participants reported that upon initially entering university, their LOC was more externally oriented. An interesting avenue for future research might be a longitudinal study tracking an undergraduates’ LOC from first year to graduation. Doing so may allow a researcher to explore if and how one’s age impacts their LOC and if change does in fact occurs as students travel through an undergraduate program. Researchers may also explore in detail what factors contribute to the development of one’s LOC over that time period.

Moreover, researchers could potentially design a future longitudinal study to explore the impact of one’s LOC on the development of their LE. Given the researcher was assessing participants perceived LE at one particular time period, inferences on LE development could not be made. As such, a longitudinal study might explore sport management undergraduates’ LE and LOC over a 4-year time period to assess the implications of their LOC on the development of their LE. This study could look at the perceived LE and LOC of students at several time points, including: prior to entering university (first year) and then after each subsequent academic year to explore fluctuations in perceived LE and LOC. Doing so would enable the researcher to explore factors that may contribute to one’s LE and LOC as they progress through a university degree program.

One other avenue for future research could be to further explore antecedents of LE development in an undergraduate population. In this study, the researcher uncovered a number of antecedents of LE (i.e., previous experience with/in leadership roles, experience on sport teams, observing others performing well, the impact of receiving
genuine feedback from authority figure(s)); however, researchers could build upon these findings by exploring the antecedents brought forth here in detail. The credibility of the antecedents from the current research study could be evaluated and others could imaginably be uncovered in the process, which may help educators to capitalize on these antecedents and incorporate them into their pedagogical interventions (i.e., increasing the number of feedback opportunities for undergraduates). Recognizing antecedents of LE development may help educators because they can use this knowledge to create course content focusing on fostering students’ LE development.

Notably, it was found that some participants’ LE was not substantially impacted by their LOC orientation. Several participants expressed their efficacious beliefs independently from their LOC; as such, a future research opportunity could be to explore the inverse relationship between LE and LOC to further assess and understand the interpretations brought forth in this study. This particular study could focus on the characteristics of participants that express their LE separately from their LOC and the factors that contribute to this phenomenon.

**Implications for Sport Management Educators**

The findings from this study have implications for sport management educators who may be tasked with producing highly efficacious sport leaders. Sheppard (2018) suggested that professors and faculty members are among the last role models among which undergraduates will be able to observe and with which they will interact prior to entering the sport industry. As such, faculty members may be tasked with ensuring graduates are ready to tackle the complex challenges the sport industry has to offer. Given that some female participants’ perceived LE was found to be lower than males and
given female participants were found to focus on between-person comparisons, sport management faculty might introduce interventions to help reverse this trend. For example, female leader guest speakers could be invited to speak to students and could be showcased more within case studies, thereby highlighting two pedagogical interventions that may potentially help to reverse male dominance in the sport industry and within the sport management classroom.

Another avenue to alter females’ perceived LE could relate to the training of Teaching Assistants (TAs) to ensure that they continuously keep course content beyond sport specific conversations (i.e., box scores, stats) at the forefront of discussion and that they ensure that seminar discussion remains content focused and that they are creating an environment where all students are encouraged to participate. Training TAs in sport management programs to recognize when seminar discussion strays from content-based dialogue toward such sport-specific conversations and to ensure that seminar dialogue remains content-focused would be appropriate.

Such training may help TAs to keep discussions on topic and encourage all students to participate, regardless of their sport-specific knowledge (i.e., professional teams, players, standings). Such training could offer TAs with strategies and tips to keep conversations content focused in seminar and to redirect discussions if and when they get off track. For example, when training incoming new and returning TAs, sport management faculty members could provide a mock seminar about a particular topic in which they could simulate a discussion where they purposefully make comments that detract from the discussion. This may provide an opportunity for TAs to recognize how and when conversations are disrupted and how to manage such disruptions appropriately.
As well, educators could potentially implement targeted pedagogical interventions that focus specifically upon undergraduates’ development of their LE during their degree program. It was evident from participants’ that their LE was often influenced by experiences outside of the classroom context. As such, offering EL courses and content, as aligned with Spence et al.’s (2009) suggestions may be an appropriate intervention in addition to increasing the number of group/team assignments and volunteer experience(s) offered within the program. Increasing the number and frequency of these opportunities may enable students to become involved in experiences that work towards the development of their LE. As well, increasing the frequency of these opportunities may provide the platform to provide feedback in this area such that students are aware of their strengths and weaknesses. Armed with this knowledge, undergraduates may benefit from consciously working towards developing their efficacious beliefs and, in turn, developing a more internally oriented LOC. Offering undergraduates the opportunity to partake in diverse experiences may positively influence their LE and if so, should be a central focus in program content development.

Lastly, with regards to antecedents of LE and the importance of experience for students, educators are encouraged to offer ample opportunities for undergraduates to move from their ‘comfort zone’ toward new opportunities and experiences. This may be achieved by offering leadership opportunities across all courses, rather than being specific only to a leadership course and/or a placement course. Incorporating leadership oriented tasks across all courses may provide undergraduates with more opportunity to get involved and get experience in and with leadership roles, which may stimulate an increase in one’s efficacious beliefs.
Participants often spoke apprehensively about becoming involved in experiences outside of their comfort zone and/or aside from their perceived and established skill-set. As such, educators may want to work towards providing challenging opportunities for undergraduates, while also providing support, as it may be advantageous to their LE development. Doing so may offer undergraduates valuable experience, which may develop their efficacious beliefs, while simultaneously providing a platform for professors to offer candid feedback that may work to increase their perceived LE. In turn, undergraduates will receive necessary experience and the desired feedback, which may result in heightening their efficacious beliefs to in turn prepare them willingly to take on the unique challenges within sport industry jobs upon graduation.
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APPENDIX A

Interview Guide

The following interview guide was created to qualitatively address both leadership efficacy and locus of control. To address LE, questions were formulated with reference to existing LE literature to ensure effective, targeted questions (See: Bandura, 1977). To address LOC, questions were constructed with reference to existing LOC literature and by adapting Rotter’s (1966) 23-item Locus of Control Scale (I-E scale).

Section I: Opening Questions

To start, I will ask you questions that relate to some of the experiences and/or challenges you may have faced as a student, both in SPMA courses and within the Brock community. When hearing your answers, I may ask follow up, probing questions to uncover your ways of managing the challenges you face. The questions I will ask will focus upon your leadership efficacy and locus of control.

1. Where do you see yourself working upon your graduation from the SPMA program (i.e., position/organization/area of sport)?

2. How have your career aspirations changed since you entered the program, if at all? Why or why not?

Section II: Self/Leadership Efficacy

3. How would you define leadership?
   a. Explain why (or why not) you believe leadership is necessary for your industry success?

4. How would you describe your leadership efficacy at this point in time?
   a. How have your past experiences impacted your leadership efficacy?
   b. Can you explain why these experiences may have shaped your leadership efficacy?

5. Can you explain what happens to you (cognitively, behaviourally, emotionally) when you see others perform well, particularly in a job or leadership related context? (VE)

6. Describe a situation when you were involved in a leadership context when someone led you to believe you could cope or even succeed with something that had previously overwhelmed you? (VP)
   a. If you can’t think of a situation in a leadership context, can you think of describing another situation when someone led you to believe you could cope or even succeed with something that had previously overwhelmed you?
   b. In reflection, describe how powerful was this person’s influence in helping you conquer a difficult task?
7. Describe a situation when your success with a given task or job led you to experience increased confidence? *(PA)*
   a. In contrast, can you (if at all) describe for me when your lack of success led you to feel decreased confidence?

8. Can you discuss how you reacted in a situation when you experienced a heightened stress level that impacted your performance? *(P/EA)*
   a. How did stress play a role in your performance in this situation?

Section III: Locus of Control

9. Let’s speak again about your career aspirations. Do you feel that you are progressing toward achieving your ideal job/career in sport? Why or why not?
   a. What factors have contributed to your feelings about your (lack of) progress?
   b. Have your effort(s) translated to you attaining personal/professional goals?

10. Describe where you stand with the idea that the amount of effort you expend on any given task or job is reflected in the outcome you experience?
    a. Can you describe for me a situation or circumstance where your effort did not translate to experiencing success during your undergrad program?

11. Can you give me an example of how the SPMA program has provided opportunities for personal and/or professional development (i.e., course offerings, experiential learning opportunities, networking events)?

12. Now I am going to read you several sentences and I would like you to describe your opinions regarding such statements.
    a. Professors in the sport management program often make difficult tests/exams. *(E)*
    b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of the opportunities available to them. *(I)*
    c. In the case of a well-prepared student, there is rarely (if ever) an unfair test. *(I)*
    d. Oftentimes, exam questions are so unrelated to course work that studying does not make a difference. *(E)*
    e. Being successful is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it. *(I)*
    f. Getting a good job in sport often depends on being in the right place, at the right time. *(E)*
    g. Many students don’t realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings. *(E)*
    h. Sometimes, I do not understand how teachers arrive at the marks they give. *(E)*
    i. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get. *(I)*
    j. There really is no such thing as “luck” *(I)*
k. Sometimes, I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me. (E)

Thank you for your time. Do you have any questions for me at this point?
APPENDIX B

Participant Recruitment Letter

March 2018

Title of Study: Exploring leadership efficacy and locus of control in sport management undergraduate students at Brock University: A qualitative case study

Principal Investigator: Dr. Kirsty Spence, Associate Professor, Sport Management Department, Brock University
Student Principal Investigator: Adam King, MA candidate, Sport Management Department, Brock University
Co-investigator(s): Dr. Chris Chard, Dr. Shannon Kerwin, Associate Professors, Sport Management Department, Brock University

I, Adam King, MA Candidate from the Department of Sport Management at Brock University, invite you to participate in a research project entitled: “Exploring leadership efficacy and locus of control in sport management undergraduate students at Brock University: A qualitative case study.”

The two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC. Should you choose to participate, you will be asked to partake in a 30-60 audio recorded minute interview(s) that will involve discussing your personal leadership beliefs in relation to your future career path.

The expected duration of the interviews will be 30-60 minutes and they will take place beginning in March of 2018 and will occur at your convenience in a setting of your choosing.

This research may benefit SPMA students as you explore your efficacious beliefs in relation to leadership. Further, it may benefit the Sport Management program in its quest to produce highly capable, efficacious individuals ready to tackle the complex challenges that the sport industry has to offer.

You may feel obligated to participate should your professor be on the research team. Please note that myself (Adam King) will be responsible for arranging and conducting the interviews and corresponding with you throughout the whole process. I will also retain all consent forms and data until after final grades are submitted for the course. This means that your professor will be unaware of whether or not you have chosen to participate and will not have access to any of your data until after final grades are submitted for the course. We have put these important safeguards in place to ensure that your decision to participate, not participate or withdraw will have no impact on your grade in the course. Your decision to participate is completely voluntary.
If you have any pertinent questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Brock University Research Ethics Officer (905 688-5550 ext 3035, reb@brocku.ca). If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me (see below for contact information).

Thank you,

Adam King
ak11ti@brocku.ca
289-929-0884
This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through Brock University’s Research Ethics Board [17-202].
APPENDIX C

Informed Consent

Date: March 2018
Project Title: Exploring leadership efficacy and locus of control in sport management undergraduate students at Brock University: A qualitative case study

Principal Investigator (PI): Dr. Kirsty Spence, Ph.D. & Associate Professor
Department of Sport Management
Brock University
T: 905 688 5550 x1-5027; kspence@brocku.ca

Faculty Supervisor (SPI) Student Principal Investigator
Kirsty Spence, Ph.D. & Associate Professor Adam King, AHSC grad student
Department of Sport Management Department of Sport Management
Brock University Brock University
(905) 688-5550 Ext. x1-5027; kspence@brocku.ca

INVITATION
You are invited to participate in a study that involves research. The two purposes of this study were first, to explore sport management undergraduate students’ perceived leadership efficacy (LE) and locus of control (LOC); and second, to explore the relationship between these students’ LE and LOC. Should you choose to participate, you will be asked to partake in a 30-60 minute interview(s) that will involve discussing your personal leadership beliefs in relation to your future career path.

WHAT’S INVOLVED
As a participant, you will be asked to partake in a 30-60 minute interview in a setting and date selected and agreed upon by you (the participant) and the student researcher. Participants will be contacted via email and asked to participate in the study. Participants will be recruited using a participant recruitment letter that will be distributed in person during solicitation. Prior to the interview taking place, participants will be asked to give their informed consent. Participation will take approximately 30-60 minutes of your time, depending on the length of the interview. Participation will conclude once a follow-up email has been sent to all participants informing them of the opportunity to review their interview transcripts/quotations. Reviewing your transcript for accuracy should take about 30-45 minutes. If you fail to return your transcript after one week, I will assume data are fine as is and your interview will be included in study results.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND RISKS
Possible benefits of participation include a better understanding of one’s leadership capacity and how this may impact decision making. Further, this research serves as an opportunity to reflect on one’s career aspirations to focus career-related efforts and align one’s skillset with the career/job/position they desire. Moreover, valuable input from SPMA undergraduates may benefit the sport management program in its efforts to produce highly capable, efficacious individuals ready to tackle the unique challenges sport has to offer.

There may be assumed risk associated with participation in that the personal nature of the questions asked—as related to one’s experience in SPMA—may possibly constitute a cause of emotional upset for participants. If you do feel upset during or after the interview you can stop at any time. We will also provide information on campus support services in the form of personal counselling at the end of the interview. Student health services can be reached at 905-688-5550 x3243.

You may also feel obligated to participate should your professor be on the research team. Please note that myself (Adam King) will be responsible for arranging and conducting the interviews and corresponding with you throughout the whole process. I will also retain all consent forms and data until after final grades are submitted for the course. This means that your professor will be unaware of whether or not you have chosen to participate and will not have access to any of your data until after final grades are submitted for the course. We have put these important safeguards in place to ensure that your decision to participate, not participate or withdraw will have no impact on your grade in the course. Your decision to participate is completely voluntary.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

It is important to note that anonymity can not be guaranteed in this study, given that the student researcher will hear your interview responses; however, every attempt will be made to enhance confidentiality. All personal information will be removed from the transcripts of each interview. The name of each interview participant will be replaced with a pseudonym. The interviews will be audio recorded (with the participants’ permission), these audio recordings will be destroyed once (1) transcribed and (2) transcriptions have been saved on a secure e-file with back-up files completed.

Data collected during this study will be stored on a password-protected USB, and hard copies (surveys, interview transcripts, and consent forms) will be stored in a locked cabinet in an office on the fourth floor of Walker Complex (note that identifiers will be stored separate from de-identified transcripts. Only the SPI will have direct knowledge of which students participated in the study. Data collected during study will be destroyed upon completion of findings/results chapter and finalization of thesis document.

Access to this data will be restricted to the student principle investigator. Only the student researcher will have access to the data while the course is ongoing. Upon completion of the course and final grade submission, data will be shared with faculty members.
VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you wish, you may decline to answer any questions or participate in any component of the study. Further, you may decide to withdraw from this study at any time and may do so without any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled.

Note: If a participant chooses to withdraw participation, please contact the student investigator (Adam King) and data will be immediately destroyed.

If you feel any discomfort during or after the interview, please connect with Student health services at 905-688-5550 x3243.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS
Results of this study may be published in professional journals and presented at conferences. Feedback about this study will be available to those who indicate during the session that they want a summary of the study upon completion. If you did not indicate that you would like a summary of the study during one of the sessions, you may contact SPMAresearch@gmail.com at any time and request for one upon completion of the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION AND ETHICS CLEARANCE
If you have any questions about this study or require further information, please contact the student researcher using the contact information provided above. No recruitment or consent can happen until ethics clearance has been obtained by the Research Ethics Board (REB) at Brock University. If you have any comments or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Research Ethics Office at (905) 688-5550 Ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca. This study has been reviewed and has received clearance from the REB office [17-202].

CONSENT FORM
I have read the information outlined above regarding the qualitative interview portion of this study. I have had the opportunity to receive any additional details I wanted about the study and understand that I may ask questions in the future. I understand that I may withdraw my consent to participate in the study at any time without punishment in any sport management course or within the sport management program.

Based on this information, I provide consent to participate in an interview. In consenting, I have also consented to having the interview audio-recorded.

Once this form is signed and dated, a copy will be presented to you at the interview itself, to remind of your rights as a participant and to validate your continued consent through an initial on the form.

Name: __________________________________________________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________________________ Date: ______
APPENDIX D

Participant Profile Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year in Program</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mature student (25+) Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexy</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX E

## LE/LOC Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High LE/Internal LOC</th>
<th>High LE/External LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Fraser Denis Lexy Lawrence</td>
<td>Allison Jake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-moderate LE/Internal LOC</th>
<th>Low-moderate LE/External LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Trevor Justin</td>
<td>Sarah Mark Anthony Greg Samantha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>