

Literature review of transformational leadership and paternalistic leadership in sport: Current status and future directions

San-Fu Kao¹, Yu-Hui Lien², Yu-Hung Cheng³, and Bo-Shiuan Cheng³

Department of Kinesiology, National Tsing Hua University¹

Department of Athletic, National Taiwan University²

Department of Psychology, National Taiwan University³

Transformational leadership (TL) and paternalistic leadership (PL) have been common in sport contexts for decades. Sports teams have several characteristics that make them suitable for the study of TL and PL. These two types of leadership derive from Max Weber's two types of domination authority: charismatic domination and traditional domination, respectively. TL and PL styles may be close to coaching leadership practices. This review critically examines empirical and qualitative studies of TL and PL in sport settings. We consider definitions of leadership styles, coaching from the perspective of leadership theory, the origin and development of the leadership theory in sport, and the main findings on this topic. Common topics in studies of TL in sport are its consequences, qualitative case TL, measurement of authentic TL, and youth sport TL. Common topics in studies of PL are its consequences, types of leadership, the leadership process, and combination paternalistic study. We compare the studies of TL and PL in sport leadership and highlight avenues for advancing research on TL and PL in sports. We make the following suggestions for future studies. To improve research and practice, randomized experiments, interventions, and action research are required. At the conceptual level, it is necessary to refine the definitions of TL and PL in sports contexts. To improve practice, cross-sectional and longitudinal studies of the development of athletes from childhood to maturity are needed.

Keywords: *leadership development, leadership process, sport psychology, team leadership*

Extended Abstract

For decades, leadership has been an important topic in the study of sports (Beauchamp & Eys, 2014; Chelladurai, 1993, 2007; Hopton, Phelan, & Barling, 2014). The primary purpose of this review is to identify the conceptual connections and contracts between TL and PL in coaching and to discuss the future direction of leadership studies in the sports context. This review is timely, given the number of recent articles on TL and PL in sports in English language and Chinese journals.

A sports team is a special social unit that amplifies a leader's influence. The simple structure and clear role of team members means that leaders' (coaches') decisions directly influence the team processes and

outcomes (Hunter, Bedell-Avers, & Mumford, 2007; Van Breukelen, van der Leeden, Wesselius, & Hoes, 2012; Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). The win/loss ratio and rank of a sports team are objective performance measures and can be used as an index of leadership effectiveness (Pulakos, 2007). The life-cycle of a sports team is rapid, with newcomers and departures every year that change the characteristics of the group (Gerrard & Lockett, 2018; Wright, Smart, & McMahan, 1995), but team development and the cultivation of athletes are long-term projects (International Council for Coaching Excellence and the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations, 2012; United States Olympic Committee,

2017). These specificities are close to TL and PL and provide an contexts for testing TL and PL theory.

TL and PL are two organizational leadership styles. Both concepts are based on the work of Max Weber. In *Economy and Society*, Weber (1968) identified three types of legitimate domination: traditional, charismatic, and bureaucratic. A transformational leader is a charismatic leader whose followers are willing place their destiny in their leader's hands and support the leader's mission (Bass, 1985). A paternalistic leader exerts paternal authority over filial followers (Chou, Cheng, & Lien, 2014; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). A coach is the leader of a sports teams, and coaching leadership researchers are interested in the forms of authority coaches exert, and specifically whether they are transformational or paternalistic leaders.

Transformational Leadership in Sport

Bass's (1985) theory of TL is the best known and most influential in contemporary leadership research (Antonakis, 2018; Lowe & Gardner, 2000). He defined transformational leaders as leaders who are proactive, work with their followers to put the needs of the team in front of their own, and help their followers achieve goals that were previously believed to be unattainable (Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggo, 2006). Most studies of coaching leadership in recent decades have focused on TL (Arthur, Bastardo, & Eklund, 2017; Arthur & Tomsett, 2015; Turnidge & Côté, 2018; Hopton et al., 2014).

Zacharatos, Barling, and Kelloway (2000) conducted the first study of TL in a sports context, which was published in *Leadership Quarterly*. They found that youth athletes who observed TL behaviors in their parents were more likely to display TL behaviors as rated by their peers and coaches. The MLQ-5X and DTLI are two widely used tools for measuring TL in sports contexts. The MLQ-5X is used to examine the global construct of TL, as the four dimensions are highly correlated and a single composite score of the subscales provides a global TL score (e.g., Kao, Tsai, Schinke, & Watson, 2019). The DTLI is a differentiated construct of TL, and the seven dimensions are related to different TL behaviors (e.g., Cronin, Arthur, Hardy, & Callow, 2015). Rowold

(2006) tested the factorial validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) and examined the predictive power of TL measurements. Rowold (2006) confirmed the factorial validity of four dimensions of TL: idealized influence (II), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individualized consideration (IC). Rowold's (2006) results revealed that TL can explain more of the variance than transactional leadership in predicting leader effectiveness, which lends support for the augmentation effect of TL. Callow, Smith, Hardy, Arthur, and Hardy (2009) explored the validity of another TL measurement in sports settings. They revealed the factorial and discriminant validity of the Differentiated Transformational Leadership Inventory (DTLI). The DTLI measures seven dimensions of TL: individual consideration (IC), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), fostering acceptance of group goals and promoting team work (AGG), high performance expectations (HPE), appropriate role model (ARM), and contingent reward (CR).

Since Arthur and Tomsett's (2015) review of TL in sport, 16 papers have been published in English language journals. We added two in Chinese language journals. Most of these papers have been published in recent years. Our content analysis revealed that the publications can be categorized into the following topics: variable relationship, qualitative research, authentic leadership, and youth sport (see Table 1).

The variable relationship papers focused on the relationship between TL and outcomes. The outcomes included satisfaction (Tu, 2000), team commitment (Kao, 2009), cohesion (Bosselut et al., 2018; Cronin, Arthur, Hardy, & Callow, 2015; Kao et al., 2019), coaching competency (Kao & Tsai, 2016), mentoring (Hoffmann & Loughhead, 2016), motivational climate (Kao & Watson, 2017), and performance (Bormann & Rowold, 2016; Bormann, Schulte-Coerne, Diebig, Rowold, 2016).

Two papers were qualitative studies. Hodge, Henry, and Smith (2014) studied the motivational climate in the New Zealand All Blacks rugby team and revealed the effects of TL. Smith, Young, Figgins, and Arthur (2017) examined TL behaviors in professional county cricket players. The most frequently cited TL dimensions were high performance expectations and individual

Table 1. Transformational leadership in sports setting

Reference (sorted by publication year)	Concept or measure of TL	Key Findings or Results
I. Variable relationship		
Tu, C. H. (2000). The study of the influence of coaches' leadership styles on satisfaction and performance of athletics. <i>Physical Education Journal</i> , 28, 45-58.	Bass (1985)	Athletes' perception of TL were differ by their demographical characteristics. Transactional leadership could predict more variances in outcomes than TL.
Kao, S. F. (2009). The effects of coaches' transformational/ transactional leadership and athletics' team commitment: The moderation effects of intrinsic motivation. <i>Physical Education Journal</i> , 42, 45-62.	TLI	Intrinsic motivation negatively moderate the relationship between TL and instrumental commitment, and positively moderate the relationship between transactional leadership and instrumental commitment.
Cronin, L. D., Arthur, C. A., Hardy, J., & Callow, N. (2015). Transformational leadership and task cohesion in sport: The mediating role of inside sacrifice. <i>Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology</i> , 37, 23-36.	DTLI	Personal and teammate inside sacrifice mediate the relationship between TL and task cohesion.
Bormann, K. C., & Rowold, J. (2016). Transformational leadership and followers' objective performance over time: Insights from German basketball. <i>Journal of Applied Sport Psychology</i> , 28, 367-373.	TLI	TL significant effect on players' performance.
Bormann, K. C., Schulte-Coerne, P., Diebig, M., & Rowold, J. (2016). Athlete characteristics and team competitive performance as moderators for the relationship between coach transformational leadership and athlete performance. <i>Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology</i> , 38, 268-281.	TLI	TL positively or negatively related to athlete's personal and team performance. The relationship between TL and athlete's performance is moderating by team performance.
Hoffmann, M. D., & Loughead, T. M. (2016). Investigating athlete mentoring functions and their association with leadership behaviours and protégé satisfaction. <i>International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology</i> , 14, 85-102.	DTLI	TL was positively related to psychosocial mentoring and vocational mentoring.
Kao, S. F., & Tsai, C. Y. (2016). Transformational Leadership and Athlete Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Coaching Competency. <i>Journal of Applied Sport Psychology</i> , 28, 469-482.	MLQ-5X	TL is positively related to coaching competency and athletes' satisfaction, and coaching competency is a mediator between TL and athletes' satisfaction.
Kao, S. F., & Watson, J. C. (2017). A multilevel study of transformational leadership and motivational climates in university basketball teams. <i>International Journal of Sport Psychology</i> , 48, 50-69.	MLQ-5X	TL is positively related to mastery climate at individual, team, and cross level. TL is negatively related to performance climate at cross level.
Bosselut, G., Boiché, J., Salamé, B., Fouquereau, E., Guilbert, L., & Serrano, O. C. (2018). Transformational leadership and group cohesion in sport: Examining the mediating role of interactional justice using a within- and between-team approach. <i>International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching</i> , 13, 912-928.	DTLI	Interactional justice is a mediator between TL and cohesion. Interpersonal justice and informational justice is the mediator between TL and cohesion at individual or team level.
Kao, S. F., Tsai, C. Y., Schinke, R., & Watson, J. C. (2019). A cross-level moderating effect of team trust on the relationship between transformational leadership and cohesion. <i>Journal of Sports Sciences</i> , 37, 2844-2852.	MLQ-5X	Team-level trust cross level moderate the individual level Team trust cross-level direct and moderating effect on the relationship between coach TL and cohesion.

Reference (sorted by publication year)	Concept or measure of TL	Key Findings or Results
2. Qualitative research		
Hodge, K., Henry, G., & Smith, W. (2014). A case study of excellence in elite sport: Motivational climate in a world champion team. <i>The Sport Psychologist</i> , 28, 60-74.	Concept of Callow et al., (2009) and Author et al. (2012)	The contents of empowerment, leadership group, challenge and personal meaning, and best in the world every day are similar to TL.
Smith, M. J., Young, D. J., Figgins, S. G., & Arthur, C. A. (2017). Transformational leadership in elite sport: A qualitative analysis of effective leadership behaviors in cricket. <i>The Sport Psychologist</i> , 31, 1-15.	Concept of Callow et al. (2009)	The most frequently cited is high performance expectations and individual consideration, and appropriate role-modeling of the captain. A range of other factors are also found.
3. Authentic leadership		
Mills, J. P., & Boardley, I. D. (2017). Development and initial validation of an indirect measure of transformational leadership integrity. <i>Psychology of Sport and Exercise</i> , 32, 34-46.	Mills 與 Boardley (2017)	The transformational leadership integrity implicit association test (TLI-IAT) was developed. The TLI-IATs construct and criterion validity was supported.
4. Youth sport TL		
Turnnidge, J., & Côté, J. (2016). Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review. <i>International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology</i> , 16, 327-342.	Concept of Bass (1985, 1998) and Bass and Riggio (2006)	Synthesis and integrate the processes by which TL influence followers' psychological development at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and environmental levels.
Turnnidge, J., & Côté, J. (2017). Transformational coaching workshop: Applying a person-centred approach to coach development programs. <i>International Sport Coaching Journal</i> , 4, 314-325.	Concept of Bass (1985) and Bass and Riggio (2006)	Established a 4 hours transformational coaching workshop through Coach Development Programs (CDPs).
Newland, A., Newton, M., Moore, E. W. G., & Legg, W. E. (2019). Transformational Leadership and Positive Youth Development in Basketball. <i>International Sport Coaching Journal</i> , 6, 30-41.	DTLI	TL significantly predicted positive youth development and 5Cs (Competence, Confidence, Connection, Character, and Caring).

consideration, and appropriate role-modeling of the captain. The researchers also found that a range of other factors, such as leader characteristics, appropriate boundaries, and quality of communication, influenced players' perceptions of TL.

Mills and Boardley (2017) developed an indirect measure of TL integrity. They used an implicit association test (IAT) from social psychology to measure authentic TL in sport (called TL integrity in their study). They provided evidence to support the construct and criterion validity for the TL integrity implicit association test (TLI-IAT). The TLI-IAT was found to be a reliable method for measuring automatic attitudes towards TL integrity, and the attitudes were a predictor of outcomes.

Three papers focused on youth sport TL. Turnnidge

and Côté (2016) reviewed and integrated research across a variety of disciplines examining the processes by which TF influences followers' psychosocial development. They offered a conceptual model of how integrated TL influences followers' psychological development at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and environmental levels. Based on Coach Development Programs (CDPs), Turnnidge and Côté (2017) established a four-hour transformational coaching workshop for coaches. The workshop provided practical strategies for educating youth coaches. Newland, Newton, and Moore (2019) found a positive relationship between TL and positive youth development and the 5Cs (Competence, Confidence, Connection, Character, and Caring).

In brief, the majority of TL studies have been

quantitative studies that examined the relationships between variables. Most extended the framework developed by Callow et al. (2009) showing the relationship between TL and team cohesion. A few examined mediating (Bosselut et al., 2018; Cronin et al., 2015) and moderating (Kao et al., 2019) variables. Another important stream of quantitative research examined the relationship between TL and objective performance (Bormann & Rowold, 2016; Bormann et al., 2016). Qualitative studies of TL in sports have been rare. A few qualitative studies of TL in coaching (Hodge et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2017) found a link between organizational TL and coaching. Authentic TL (Mills & Boardley, 2017) and youth sport TL (Turnnidge & Côté, 2016, 2017) were conceptualized and applied to the organizational TL theory in sport contexts.

Paternalistic Leadership in Sport

PL is a Chinese style of leadership characterized by strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence. It includes three leadership behaviors: authoritarianism, benevolence, and moral character (Farh & Cheng, 2000). PL is based on the typical relationship between a father and his children, which is extended to the relationship between leaders and followers (Farh & Cheng, 2000). Athletes start learning when they are students. The relationship between athletes and coaches is similar to the relationship between students and teachers. Athletes need care, discipline, and role models when they are young. Therefore, PL is a suitable leadership style for coaches of young athletes.

PL is not limited to Chinese leaders and can be useful for understanding American leaders (coaches). Jenkins (2014) applied Wooden's Pyramid of Success to UCLA basketball coach John Wooden. He argued that Wooden is more of a paternalistic leader than a servant leader. Hiller, Sin, Ponnappalli, and Ozgen (2019) noted that PL is often ignored by mainstream scholarship in North American and Western European countries. They noted that the description of Steve Kerr, the highly successful NBA coach of the 2015, 2017, and 2018 Championship teams, sounds remarkably like PL: "*The idea: To create*

a balance between a really good relationship with the players—where they know that you genuinely care about their lives and how their careers are going and their kids—and every once in a while snapping to 'remind them how much you're asking of them and that you're in charge.' Kerr believes players will accept the outburst if they know you care about them. 'To be honest, it's sort of how I parented too,' he says" (as cited in Hiller, Sin, Ponnappalli, & Ozgen, 2019, p. 179). It seems that PL is a common leadership style, although mainstream scholars have overlooked its existence.

There have been three significant qualitative studies of PL that used observations and interviews with the owners of Chinese family businesses (Cheng, 1995; Redding, 1990; Silin, 1976) and one theoretical study (Westwood, 1997). These studies showed some meaningful similarities in the leadership styles in these businesses, including authoritarian behaviors to control subordinates, establishing a moral model, and showing care and benevolence towards subordinates. Farh and Cheng (2000) used an iceberg metaphor to explain the cultural roots of this type of PL. Cheng, Chou, and Farh (2000) built a model and measurement scale of PL leadership. In 2004, Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, and Farh published a ternary model of PL in English, which promoted the rapid development of organizational and leadership research in Chinese society. Pellegrini and Scandura (2008) wrote a review of PL research for *Leadership Quarterly* that drew the interest of international scholars. In recent years, papers on PL have become increasingly common in the field of organizational and leadership research in English (e.g., Chen & Farh, 2010; Farh, Liang, Chou, & Cheng, 2008; Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, & Johnson, 2011; Hiller et al., 2019; Lin, Cheng, & Chou, 2019; Wu & Xu, 2012).

Since Kao and Change's (2015) review of PL in sport, there have been three papers published in English language journals and five published in Chinese journals. Our content analysis categorized their contents as follows: variable relationship, leadership types, leadership process, and combinations of PL (see Table 2).

The papers on variable relationships in PL focused on two topics: the influence of PL in sport settings and

Table 2. Paternalistic leadership in sports setting

Reference (sorted by publication year)	Concept or measure of PL	Key Findings or Results
1. Variable relationship		
Lu, J. H. F., & Hsu, Y. (2015). The interaction between paternalistic leadership and achievement goals in predicting athletes' sportspersonship. <i>Kinesiology: International Journal of Fundamental and Applied Kinesiology</i> , 47, 115-122.	Triad model of PL	Coaches' Authoritarianism moderated the relationship between athletes' ego orientation and sportspersonship.
Kao, S. F., Watson, J. C., Chen, Y. F., & Halbrook, M. (2015). Relationships between the congruence of required and perceived leadership behavior and satisfaction in athletes. <i>Psychological Reports</i> , 117, 391-405.	MML (multidimensional model of leadership)	Athletes were more likely to be satisfied when their perceptions of their coaches' positive feedback behavior conformed to the expectations of their athletic directors. These results validated aspects of the multidimensional model of leadership in a cultural perspective.
Peng, Y. C., & Shen, W. J. (2018). Perceived coaching style: The examination of variable- and person-centered approach. <i>Physical Education Journal</i> , 51, 69-186.	Controlled and supportive behavior	Coaching style with greater autonomy support and lower controlling coaching behaviors revealed more adaptive coach-athlete relationship and burnout.
Chang, C. M., Huang, H. C., Huang, F. M., & Hsieh, H. H. (2019). A multilevel analysis of coaches' paternalistic leadership on burnout in Taiwanese athletes. <i>Perceptual and Motor Skills</i> , 126, 286-304.	Triad model of PL	Moral leadership at school level enhanced the negative relationship between athletes' psychological capital and burnout.
2. Types of leadership		
Yang, C. T., & Kao, S. F. (2017). Relationships between eight types of coaches' paternalistic leadership and athletes' trust in coach and team values. <i>Bulletin of Sport and Exercise Psychology of Taiwan</i> , 17, 23-37.	Triad model of PL	The top five frequency ranks in leaders' types were: indulgent PL leaders, authentic leaders PL leaders, ideological PL leaders, Laissez-fire PL leaders, and disciplinarian PL leaders. The indulgent PL leaders, authentic leaders PL leaders, and disciplinarian PL leaders were the effectiveness styles, whereas dictatorial PL and Laissez-fire PL leaders were the less effectiveness.
3. Leadership process		
Lien, Y. H., Huang, J., & Cheng, B. S. (2018). The analysis of dynamic processes in paternalistic leadership: The relationship between elite tennis players and their coaches. <i>Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies</i> , 50, 151-207.	Triad model of PL	PL does not stable for the two generations of tennis players' coach. Rather, PL evolves over time. The dynamic interplay amongst PL's three elements results in different compositions, and such compositions are affected by the social context and players' accomplishments. The dynamic interplay is jointly constructed by the players, their coaches, and the social contexts in which interaction unfolds.
4. Combinations of PL		
Cheng, Y. H., Chou, W. J., Chou, T. H., & Cheng, B. S. (2019). Does authoritarian leadership lead to bad result? A contingency perspective. <i>Chinese Journal of Psychology</i> , 61, 97-130.	Dual dimensional model of authoritarian leadership	Discipline-focus authoritarian leadership enhances the player's hard work; and the impact becomes nonsignificant when the player has a high avoid performance goal orientation or a high prove performance goal orientation. Dominance-focus authoritarian leadership has a negative impact on the player's hard work behavior only if the player has a low prove performance goal orientation.
Huang, K. E., Kuo, C. C., Cheng, C. F. (2019). Authoritarian leadership among Chinese coach and athlete's perception of coach effectiveness: The mediating role of psychological collectivism. <i>Physical Education Journal</i> , 52, 109-126.	Authoritarian leadership	Authoritarian leadership and psychological collectivism is significantly positive. The relationship between authoritarian leadership and athletes' perception of coach effectiveness is partially mediated by psychological collectivism.

the application of Western leadership theories in a PL cultural context. Lu and Hsu (2015) examined how PL mediated the relationship between goal orientation and sportspersonship. Their results revealed that coaches' authoritarianism moderated the relationship between athletes' ego orientation and sportspersonship. Chang, Huang, Huang, and Hsieh (2019) examined a cross-level effect of PL and team cohesion on athletes' burnout. They found moral leadership at the school level enhanced the negative relationship between athletes' psychological capital and burnout.

Studies of the cultural components of PL included Kao, Watson, Chen, and Halbrook's (2015) exploration of the relationship between the congruence of perceived and required leadership behavior and its effect upon athlete satisfaction in Taiwan. Their results revealed that athletes were more likely to be satisfied when their perceptions of their coaches' positive feedback behavior conformed to the expectations of their athletic directors. These results validated the cultural perspective on aspects of the multidimensional model of leadership (the MML). Peng and Shen (2018) used a PL cultural perspective to explore the relationship between leadership style and coach-athlete relationships and burnout. They found that coaches with greater autonomy and lower controlling behaviors had better adaptive coach-athlete relationships and burnout.

Yang and Kao (2017) used the leader exemplar approach to analyze the distributions of eight types of PL in sports and examined the relationship between the eight types of PL and coaching effectiveness (i.e., trust in the coach and team values). Using the theory of PL in Farh and Cheng (2000) and Cheng et al. (2004), Yang and Kao categorized paternalistic leaders into eight types: authentic PL leaders, selfless benefactor PL leaders, disciplinarian PL leaders, godfather PL leaders, indulgent PL leaders, ideological PL leaders, dictatorial PL leaders, and laissez-faire PL leaders. The five most common types were indulgent PL leaders (28.9%), authentic PL leaders (28.7%), ideological PL leaders (13.3%), laissez-faire PL leaders (9.2%), and disciplinarian PL leaders (8.4%). Indulgent PL leaders, authentic PL leaders, and disciplinarian PL leaders were the most effective types

of leaders, whereas dictatorial PL and laissez-faire PL leaders were the least effective.

Lein, Huang, and Cheng (2018) investigated the evolution of PL in the changing society of Taiwan. They interviewed two top-ranked tennis players from different generations, and all of their coaches from the start of their careers until they won international tournaments. Their results revealed that PL evolves over time. The dynamic interplay amongst PL's three elements results in different types of leaders, and the proportion of these elements is affected by the social context and players' accomplishments. The dynamic interplay is jointly constructed by the players, their coaches, and the social contexts in which the interactions unfold.

Authoritarian leadership is a controversial issue, as young generations may be less willing to accept authority. Cheng, Chou, Chou, and Cheng (2019) used a dual dimensional model of authoritarian leadership, which distinguished between dominance-focus and discipline-focus authoritarian leadership, to examine the relationship between leadership style and players' efforts. They also proposed that a player's goal orientation is a boundary condition. Their results revealed that discipline-focus authoritarian leadership enhances players' hard work, but the impact becomes nonsignificant when the player has a high avoid-performance goal orientation or a high prove-performance goal orientation. Dominance-focus authoritarian leadership has a negative impact on the players' hard work behavior only if the player has a low prove-performance goal orientation. In addition, Huang, Kuo, and Cheng (2019) tried to identify the positive effect of authoritarian leadership on coaching effectiveness. They found that the relationship between authoritarian leadership and athletes' perception of coaches' effectiveness was partially mediated by psychological collectivism.

In brief, there have been few studies of PL in sport since Kao and Change's (2015) review. However, recent papers have extended our understanding of PL in sport and improved the methodologies for studying it. Researchers have explored the influence of PL on sportspersonship, goal-orientation, and burnout (Change et al., 2019; Lu & Hsu, 2015), and have the identified

some cultural aspects of PL (Kao et al., 2015; Peng & Shen, 2018). Scholars have explained the mechanisms through which authoritarian leadership is exerted in sports and identified its usefulness (Cheng et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2019). Lein et al. (2019) showed that there is a dynamic relationship between PL coaches and players and that the three elements of PL can change.

Connections and Contracts in Transformational Leadership and Paternalistic Leadership in Sports

Here, we summarize the connections and contracts in TL and PL in sports teams (Table 3). TL and PL are both present in sports teams and affect the teams' processes and outcomes (Hunter et al., 2007; Van Breukelen et al., 2012; Zaccaro et al., 2001). Teams' win/loss ratios and rankings are objective performance measures and can be an index of leadership effectiveness (Pulakos, 2007).

TL and PL can be different in many ways. We summarize the contracts for sports teams.

Transformational leaders express their dominance through personal charisma (Bass, 1985), whereas paternalistic leaders' dominance is based on traditional legitimacy (Chou et al., 2014; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). A typical example of a transformational leader is a politician (Bass, 1985), whereas a typical example of a paternalistic leader is a Taiwanese CEO (Farh & Cheng, 2000). The distance between leaders and followers is different in the TL and PL frameworks. PL is characterized by high-power distance (Farh & Cheng, 2000), whereas TL has variable power distance. Typical TL behaviors are seen in the four dimensions of the MLQ: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Typical PL behaviors are revealed by the three dimensions of the ternary PL measurement model: authoritarianism, benevolence, and moral character (Cheng et al., 2000). A paternalistic leader is emotional, passionate, challenging, and supportive (Bass, 1985), but also angry, reprimanding, affirmative, supportive, and caring (Cheng et al., 2000; Farh & Cheng, 2000). Studies of coaching leadership may expand leadership theory by extending and supporting TL

Table 3. The connections and contracts of TL and PL in sports teams

	Connections	
	TL	PL
	Leaders' decision directly influence to team process and outcomes	
	The win/loss and rank for sport team is an objective performance and an index for leadership effectiveness	
	The rapid life-cycle for sport team reveal the characteristics for recruiting and using people	
	The nature of development and cultivate human resource	
	Contracts	
	TL	PL
Leaders' power of domination	Personal charisma	Traditional legitimacy
Type of theory	Politician	Taiwanese business CEO
Distance between leader and follower	Not sure	High-power distance
Example of leadership behaviors	idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration	authoritarianism, benevolence, and moral character
Leader's emotion	Emotional, passion, challenge, and supportive	Angry, reprimand, affirmative, supportive, and care
Contribution of coaching leadership study	Extend and support to TL theory	Develop PL theory

theory and developing PL theory.

Future Directions

As TL theory has been dominant in leadership research, researchers are highly encouraged to conduct cause-effect studies that will inform practical policy development (e.g., Antonakis, 2018; Antonakis, Bendahan, Jacquart, & Lalive, 2010). Antonakis (2018) recommended using experimental designs to study TL. There is a dearth of studies of the training of transformational leaders (see Antonakis, 2018). There is also need for studies that manipulate TL as an independent variable in sports settings. Compared to TL, the literature on PL is in the early stage of theoretical development. It is important to model the full leadership process in sports settings. Briefly, future studies should include randomized experiments, interventions, and action research in sports settings.

Level of concept of TL and PL is an important issue. Numerous studies have discussed the level of concept for TL theory (e.g., DeChurch, Hiller, Murase, Doty, & Salas, 2010; Dionne et al., 2014; Yammarino, Dionne, Chun, & Dansereau, 2005; Yammarino & Gooty, 2017) and the general consensus is that idealized influence and inspirational motivation operate at the group level, and intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration operate at the individual level. Therefore, the MLQ-5X is suitable for exploring the group and individual levels of TL in sport (e.g., Kao & Watson, 2017). Most of the studies that used DTLI had nested data (i.e., individual nested in the team level) (Bormann & Rowold, 2016; Bormann et al., 2016; Bosselut et al., 2018; Cronin et al., 2015). However, the levels of DTLI's seven dimensions are unknown. Therefore, the need to identify the levels of the DTLI's dimensions is both theoretically and analytically urgent.

The level of PL has been discussed (e.g., Chou & Cheng, 2014; Kuo, Lin, Chou, & Cheng, 2015; Lin, Cheng, & Chou, 2014). Paternalistic leaders do not treat each subordinate equally. The general consensus is that authoritarianism and benevolence operate at the dyad level and moral character operates at the group

level. More importantly, subordinates' perceptions of authoritarianism and benevolence can be diverse, which fits the dispersion model (Chan, 1998), and variability can be an index for measuring authoritarianism and benevolence at the group level (Kuo et al., 2015). Moral character operates at the group level. It would be very interesting to compare the presence of PL in different team sports (e.g., basketball, volleyball, and baseball). Do paternalistic coaches treat athletes on the team differently and how do they convince athletes to work together as a team? What is the leadership process? These are important questions.

It is critical to consider the effects of training methods and coaching philosophies on actual practices (Ericsson & Pool, 2016). Practice is a foundational concern in the development of athletes (Baker & Young, 2014; Côté, Bruner, Erickson, Strachan, & Fraser-Thomas, 2010). However, research on TL in sports has not focused on its potential effect on athletes, but on a relatively narrow set of issues related to short term coach-athlete relationships. The study by Lein et al. (2018) on how the evaluation of PL changes in a changing society provides an important perspective on leadership, athlete development, and deliberate practice. When the coach is a paternalistic leader, the coach-athlete relationship is like a parent-child relationship. The coaches change their role as the athletes progress in skills and age. According to Lein et al. (2018), coaches are first teachers, then supervisors, and finally mentors. The relative importance of coaches' authoritarianism, benevolence, and moral character changes as athletes develop. PL theory may provide a useful framework for understanding training methods and practice.

Conclusions

This article reviews the current research on TL and PL theory and related phenomena. It presents the most up-to-date findings on TL and PL in sports. Sports teams are a rich field for exploring leadership theories, as the setting allows researchers to describe, explain, and predict phenomena associated with social settings that are important to the quality of athletes' performance, mental health, and achievements.