Valued Insight or Act of Insubordination? How Context Shapes Coaches' Perceptions of Challenge-oriented Followership

Gottlieb, Marcus; Eys, Mark; Hardy, James; Benson, Alex J.

Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology

DOI:
10.1123/jsep.2021-0122

Published: 01/12/2021

Peer reviewed version

Valued Insight or Act of Insubordination? How Context Shapes Coaches' Perceptions of Challenge-oriented Followership

[1]Marcus Gottlieb, [2]Mark Eys, [3]James Hardy, & [1]Alex J. Benson

[1]University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology
[2]Wilfrid Laurier University, Departments of Kinesiology and Physical Education and Psychology
[3]Bangor University, Institute for the Psychology of Elite Performance

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alex Benson, Social Science Centre Rm 7418, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada, N6A 5C2, email: abenson3@uwo.ca

Accepted for publication in ***Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*** (August 14, 2021).

This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology. The final article is available, upon publication, at: https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2021-0122

Funding Acknowledgement: This research was completed with the support of a North American Society for the Psychology of Sport & Physical Activity graduate student research grant.

Date accepted: August 14, 2021

Main text word count: 6532

Reference word count: 1314

Tables: 2

Abstract

Effective leadership is a collaborative effort, requiring a degree of complementarity in how people enact roles of leadership and followership. Using a novel online vignette methodology, we experimentally tested how three contextual factors influenced coaches' responses to challenge-oriented acts of followership as well as investigated two potential mechanisms. Coaches (N = 232) watched videos of an athlete provided unsolicited challenge-oriented feedback to a coach. Videos varied by the (a) athlete's status, (b) presence of third-party observers, and (c) stage of the decision-making process. Following the video, we assessed coaches' evaluations of the athlete. Challenge-oriented followership was perceived more favorably when enacted by an athlete in one-on-one (versus in a group) and before a decision has been reached (versus after a decision is reached). Coaches may appreciate proactivity from athletes in positions of followership, but challenge-oriented followership behaviors enacted at the wrong time and place can elicit negative reactions.

Keywords: Follower; Leader; Leadership; Proactive, Role Perceptions

Valued Insight or Act of Insubordination? How Context Shapes Coaches' Perceptions of Challenge-oriented Followership

Society disproportionately recognizes leaders for their efforts in motivating individuals toward a collective purpose (i.e., a romanticism of leadership; Meindl et al., 1985). Leadership, however, cannot exist in the absence of followership (van Vugt et al., 2008). As described within the *leadership process framework*, effective leadership is the result of a collaborative effort between leaders and followers (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Rather than exclusively focusing on the social influence of a single individual (and the behaviors that underpin such influence), this framework emphasizes that leadership is a process of social influence that arises from how two or more individuals engage in acts of leading and following (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). As individuals can flexibly navigate between roles of leading and following to accommodate the situational demands a group is currently facing, complementary patterns of leading and following are essential to group coordination and the pursuit of instrumental group objectives (Eys et al., 2020). Although conventional wisdom implies that coaches and athletes need each other to succeed—a point supported by abundant empirical evidence and theorizing specific to coach-athlete relationships (e.g., Davis et al., 2019; Jowett, 2017) —research on how specific acts of followership shape the leadership process in sport settings remains scarce.

Followership is defined as "the characteristics, behaviors, and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 96). This definition is value-neutral; followership is not inherently positive or negative, nor does the term imply a static role of subordination. Indeed, research in workplace settings has explored the various beliefs leaders hold about followers, revealing that *prototypical followership* entails the facets of good citizenship, enthusiasm, and industriousness, whereas *antiprototypical followership* entails the facets of insubordination, incompetence, and conformity (Sy, 2010). Another important element emphasized within Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2014) definition is the interdependent nature of leading and following. Interdependence between leaders (e.g., coaches) and followers (e.g., athletes) is

especially apparent in sport, making the athletic context a fertile ground to study leader-follower interactions (Benson et al. 2014; Jowett & Shanmugam, 2016). Notably, high quality coach-athlete relationships are necessary for effective and purposeful coaching (Jowett, 2017) and fruitful interactions between these two parties predict favorable outcomes (Nicholls et al., 2017).

To gain insight into the nature of followership in sport, Benson et al. (2016) interviewed highly accomplished university sport coaches. These coaches described ideal followers as individuals who are accountable and committed to supporting team efforts, while also being proactive and willing to challenge ideas and offer alternative perspectives. A caveat echoed by the coaches, however, was that followers had to understand when and where it was appropriate to engage in such challenge-oriented behaviors. These findings advanced earlier work in the organizational domain demonstrating that leaders preferred followers who were proactive in their role and voiced their opinions (Sy, 2010), but that leaders' reactions to this proactive followership was contingent on the situation in which they were enacted and the way such behaviors were expressed (Sun & van Emmerik, 2014; Whiting et al., 2012). In sport team settings, acts of challenge-oriented followership can be a double-edged sword due to the mixed reactions they can evoke from leaders, and how they may enhance or undermine planning and coordination among team members (Benson et al., 2016). These findings suggest that similar to leadership, followership is a process of social influence that requires situational awareness of how context shapes the appropriateness of behaviors. As such, there is a need to better understand how context affects coaches' perceptions of challenge-oriented followership behaviors.

According to organizational literature, an important feature of challenge-oriented followership is that it is a proactive and self-initiated behavior, meaning it is enacted without prior instruction or permission from a leader (Grant & Ashford, 2008; Grant et al., 2009). Leaders may respond negatively to challenge-oriented followership if they perceive the behavior as threatening or insubordinate (Falbe & Yukl, 1992), a dishonest ingratiation attempt (Bolino,

1999), or an overstepping of boundaries (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Nevertheless, challenge-oriented followership may help to curtail selfish decisions made by some leaders (Oc & Bashshur, 2013), and aid in team decision-making processes (Benson et al., 2016). Thus, how challenge-oriented followership is perceived by a leader may ultimately depend on the context in which such behaviors occur (Carsten et al., 2018). In sport, there may be situations when a coach (often the formal team-leader) requires immediate deference and compliance from the athletes on their team (the followers) to move forward with a strategy or task (e.g., the time pressure situation of a basketball timeout). In contrast, there are times when leaders desire followers who are proactive in their role and willing to challenge their ideas and strategies (e.g., in a pre-season team goal setting session). In the current research, we conducted the first experimental test of how three specific contextual factors (i.e., presence of third-parties, stage of the decision-making process, and status of follower)—previously identified through interviews with coaches (Benson et al., 2016)—influenced leaders' responses to challenge-oriented acts of followership. Specifically, we examined how the context in which the acts occurred influenced coaches' appraisals of the behaviour by assessing (a) perceived effectiveness of the athlete's communication, (b) leader receptivity to the feedback, and (c) general evaluations of the athlete's followership. As it pertains to the latter, on the basis of research on implicit followership theory, we evaluated whether coaches perceived the athlete as having traits associated with prototypical followership and insubordinate followership (Sy, 2010), which is the only component of antiprototypical followership that predicts whether followers will refuse their leaders' instructions (Knoll et al., 2017).

According to qualitative work exploring coaches' intepretations of followership in sport (Benson et al., 2016), one contextual factor that may affect how challenge-oriented behaviors are interpreted is the presence of third-party observers. DeRue and Ashford (2010) posited that successful leadership efforts are based upon mutual understanding between leaders and followers; when one person lays claim to leadership in a situation, others must grant this

person's claims by actively assuming a follower identity. Whereas visible displays of deference are critical to ensuring group members collectively endorse the same central leader, followers who challenge their leaders in front of other group members may create ambiguity over who is leading who. From the perspective of a formally appointed leader like a coach, such challenging behaviors may be perceived as acts of insubordination. In contrast, followers who publicly support their leader and/or wait for one-on-one interactions to challenge are less likely to disrupt the central leadership structure within the group. As such, our first hypothesis was as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Coaches will rate challenge-oriented acts of followership more positively in terms of (a) perceived effectiveness, (b) receptivity, and (c) general evaluations of the follower (i.e., higher levels of prototypical followership, lower levels of insubordinate followership)—when they occur in a one-on-one setting than in a group setting.

Coaches also identified that the timing of challenge-oriented acts of followership may affect their perceptions (Benson et al., 2016). Leaders tend to view feedback negatively when it is given too close to when a decision must be made (Whiting et al., 2012). Once the deliberation phase for a given decision has passed, any further input may obstruct rather than assist decision-making processes (Marks et al., 2001). Following this rationale, we hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 2: Coaches will rate challenge-oriented acts of followership more positively in terms of (a) perceived effectiveness, (b) receptivity, and (c) general evaluations of the follower (i.e., higher levels of prototypical followership, lower levels of insubordinate followership)—when they occur before closure on a decision is signaled (i.e., before a decision is made) than after a decision is signaled (i.e., after a decision is made).

The status of the follower is another contextual factor coaches reported as relevant to their understanding of challenge-oriented behaviors (Benson et al., 2016). Oc and Bashshur (2013) proposed that followers are more likely to influence their leaders when they occupy a

higher status position within the group. Individuals with higher status (i.e., respect and admiration) tend to receive more opportunities and have greater access to resources within groups (Anderson et al., 2015). As status is conferred to individuals based on their perceived instrumental value to a group (Anderson et al., 2015), coaches may be more receptive to feedback from higher status group members. Nevertheless, challenge-oriented followership behaviors from high-status followers enacted at the wrong time (i.e., in the presence of third-party observers; Benson et al., 2016) may pose a threat to leaders by undermining their authority and disrupting the leadership hierarchy (van Vugt et al., 2008). As such, we hypothesized the following:

> **Hypothesis 3:** Coaches will rate challenge-oriented acts of followership more positively in terms of (a) perceived effectiveness, (b) receptivity, and (c) general evaluations of the follower (i.e., higher levels of prototypical followership, lower levels of insubordinate followership)—when they are enacted from a higher status than lower status teammate, as long as no other contextual boundaries are violated (i.e., one-on-one setting, before a decision is reached).

Complementing our primary purpose regarding the direct effect of context on coaches' evaluations of challenge-oriented followership, the secondary purpose was to investigate potential mechanisms of *why* coaches sometimes viewed challenge-oriented behaviors less positively (i.e., indirect effects). Understanding why coaches arrived at certain evaluations would help to guide efforts to improve leader-follower communication patterns in sport. We tested two candidate mechanisms in the current study. Given the lack of direct evidence in this domain, we briefly highlight rationale for considering these particular mediators.

One potential mediator is the extent to which challenge-oriented followership is perceived as an expression of dominance. Evolutionary research on leader-follower dynamics suggests that dominant individuals may gain influence through forced compliance (instead of persuasion) by relying on fear and intimidation tactics (Bastardoz & van Vugt, 2019; Cheng et

al., 2010). In research on nonhuman primates, expressions of dominance by subordinates directly threaten the alpha individual and often elicit aggressive countermeasures (Sapolsky, 2005). As such, perceptions of *follower dominance* may mediate the effect of challenge-oriented followership on how coaches evaluate and respond to such behavior in the presence of third-party observers or after a decision is made. Another candidate mechanism is the extent to which challenge-oriented followership is perceived as a *violation of role expectation*s. Coaches develop and communicate specific and general role expectations to ensure athletes are positively contributing to the direction of the team (Eys et al., 2020). Challenge-oriented followership may contravene such expectations when enacted at the wrong moment, such as in the presence of others or after a decision is made. Altogether, we explored the following research questions:

> **Research Questions:** Is the effect of challenge-oriented followership, (a) in the presence of third-party observers and (b) after a decision is made, on coaches' evaluations mediated by either (1) follower dominance or (2) violation of role expectations?

Overview of the Current Research

The objective of the proposed research was to experimentally test how specific contextual factors influence leaders' (i.e., coaches') responses to challenge-oriented acts of followership. To examine this question, we introduce a novel experimental vignette methodology in which we filmed leader-follower interactions using paid actors. Such an approach enabled us to directly manipulate three contexts (i.e., presence of third-party observers, stage of the decision-making process, follower status) in which a follower delivered challenge-oriented feedback. Using this methodology enhances the study design's internal validity and strengthens our confidence in making causal inferences (Scandura & Williams, 2000). Moreover, instead of asking participants to envision themselves in a scenario based on a written description, having participants observe a video that depicts an actual leader-follower interaction creates a more

immersive and realistic vignette experience, and controls for other factors such as content of the feedback (Pierce & Aguinis, 1998).

Method

Participants

The final sample consisted of 232 coaches (n_{females} = 67; M_{age} = 37.90, *SD* = 13.02) who coached at either the collegiate (*n* = 139), youth (*n* = 40), club (*n* = 32), or recreational (*n* = 21) level. Table 1 depicts how coaches' competition level varied by gender. We obtained 338 initial responses; however, many coaches (*n* = 91) were not able to complete the experiment due to technical difficulties (i.e., the video did not load properly due to software compatibility issues or the audio was inadequate). An additional 15 coaches were excluded for failing one of the manipulation checks (detailed below). The average number of years of coaching experience in our sample was 13.34 (*SD* = 10.36). More coaches self-identified as head (*n* = 163) than assistant (*n* = 67) coaches (two coaches did not respond to this question). There were slightly more coaches of male-only teams (*n* = 96) than female-only teams (*n* = 94); some coaches (*n* = 42) coached both male and female teams. The individuals in our sample coached a variety of different sports, including basketball (*n* = 50), volleyball (*n* = 41), hockey (*n* = 30), soccer (*n* = 27), football (*n* = 15), rugby (*n* = 10), baseball (*n* = 8), and other sports (e.g., track and field, swimming, curling, dance, field hockey, golf; *n* = 51).

Procedure and Materials

After obtaining approval from two institutional ethics boards (i.e., Western University and Wilfred Laurier University), coaches were recruited via the internet. As there were no comparable experimental designs from which to inform our assumed effect size for the power analysis, we targeted the smallest effect size of interest given the funding available for recruitment (i.e., small-to-medium sized effect). An a priori power analysis (estimated effect of f = 0.175, α = .05) indicated that 259 coaches would be required to achieve a power of .80. Thus, we sought to obtain 32 coaches per condition (i.e., 256 coaches total). Our

primary recruitment method was searching publicly available coaching databases to obtain head and assistant coaches' email addresses—beginning with the collegiate level of competition. We used this method to email over 500 coaches in Canada and the United States to gauge interest in participation. As a secondary recruitment strategy after not obtaining enough complete responses from university coaches, we broadened our sampling criteria and information posts were distributed on social media. Coaching experience was verified once initial contact was made in all cases; coaches were emailed a unique study link to ensure experimenter control over who was included.

Experimental Vignettes

Coaches who consented to participate first completed a demographic questionnaire. They were then randomly assigned to view one of eight video vignettes (created for the purposes of this study). The vignettes depicted an athlete speaking up and verbally challenging a coach during a meeting—hereafter referred to as challenge-oriented followership (COF). The individuals in the vignettes were paid male actors and the actor portraying the coach was a professional coach at the collegiate level—none of whom were part of the research team. Using a full-factorial 2 × 2 × 2 experimental design, three contextual factors were manipulated. We manipulated the *status of the follower* (i.e., high status vs. low status) via the following instructions given to participants immediately prior to watching the video:

> Once you click on the next page you will be taken to a short video (i.e., just over a minute long) depicting an interaction between a coach and several athletes. In the following video clip, please pay careful attention to the athlete wearing the black shirt, who is a [*respected senior team member/newcomer to the team this year*]. Immediately following the video clip, we will be asking for your thoughts on how you, as a coach, feel about the specific interaction with the [*senior athlete/newcomer*] in

the black shirt. We would like you to imagine yourself as the coach interacting with a team member in the following clip….

We manipulated the *presence of third-party observers* by depicting the athlete enacting the COF as either accompanied by four teammates (group condition) or alone (one-on-one condition). Finally, we also manipulated *the stage of the decision-making process*: The COF occurred either before the coach had announced his decision as final (before condition) or after his announcement (after condition). The content of the follower's feedback and the nature of the discussion led by the coach remained constant across the scenarios. After viewing the vignette, participants completed questionnaires of their perceptions of the follower and his feedback. See the supplementary material file for additional information about the vignettes: https://osf.io/cwfhe/

Dependent Measures

Effectiveness of Follower Behavior. We adapted Sauer's (2011) measure of leader effectiveness to develop three items that evaluated the degree to which coaches perceived the COF to be effective in the context of advancing team goals. These items related to the perceived effectiveness of the COF ("To what extent was the athlete effective in his role as a follower?"; "To what extent was the athlete's behavior characteristic of ideal followership"; "To what extent did the athlete positively contribute to the team meeting in this situation?"), with response options ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*).

Leader Receptivity to Feedback. Coaches were asked to indicate the extent to which they were receptive to the athlete's COF on three items, with response options ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*). The items were: "I would carefully consider the athlete's feedback under these circumstances."; "I would pay close attention to the athlete's suggestion in this situation."; "I would be receptive to the athlete's advice in this situation."

Evaluations of the Follower. We modified Sy's (2010) Implicit Followership Scale to assess coaches' evaluation of the athlete depicted in the vignette. Specifically,

coaches were asked to rate "how characteristic each adjective is of the player [they] just observed in the previous interaction" with response options ranging from 1 (*not at all characteristic*) to 10 (*extremely characteristic*). This scale captures both prototypical and antiprototypical follower traits, but was initially designed as a trait measure in a workplace context. In modifying the questionnaire for this experimental context, ten items (i.e., adjectives) were excluded from the original scale (i.e., hardworking, uneducated, easily influenced, slow, excited, follows trends, outgoing, inexperienced, soft spoken, happy), leaving five items reflecting *prototypical followership* (i.e., loyal, productive, reliable, goes above and beyond, team player) and three items reflecting *insubordinate followership*—a specific facet of antiprototypical followership (i.e., arrogant, rude, bad temper).[1]

Dominance. Four items were adapted from Cheng et al.'s (2010) Dominance and Prestige scale to assess the extent to which coaches perceived the target athlete as dominant. Coaches were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with the four statements, with response options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The items included were, "This athlete is concerned with demonstrating control over others"; "This athlete is willing to use aggressive verbal tactics to get his way"; "This athlete has a forceful personality"; "This athlete enjoys having authority over others."

Role Violation. To assess whether coaches perceived the athlete to be in violation of his role, we created three items specifically for this study. Coaches were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with three items related to role violation, with response options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). These items were, "This athlete clearly violated his role under these circumstances"; "The athlete's behavior was inappropriate in this situation"; "I would not encourage this type of behavior in my group."

[1] A confirmatory factor analysis evaluating this two-factor structure demonstrated the following model fit, $\chi 2$ (19) = 41.13, $p < .001$, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.08, 95% CI [0.05, 0.11], SRMR = 0.47, with factor loadings ranging from .68 to .85.

Manipulation and Deception Checks

Finally, coaches completed three multiple-choice manipulation check questions to ensure coaches could recall the context surrounding the interaction (i.e., "How many athletes were present during the interaction you observed?"; "Which of the following best reflects the athlete you observed during the video?"; "Which of the following reflects the athlete's behavior?"). To gauge coaches' naiveté regarding the study, coaches also responded to an open-ended question about whether they developed their own ideas about the study's purpose and hypotheses. Of the 247 coaches who completed the full experiment, 15 coaches were excluded for incorrectly responding to one of the manipulation check questions.

Analysis

We used confirmatory factor analysis to model scores derived from each subscale as a latent factor in Mplus 8.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). The overall measurement model yielded the following fit indices, χ^2 (174) = 364.71, $p < .001$, RMSEA = 0.07, CFI = 0.93, TLI = 0.92, SRMR = .09. Although the RMSEA and SRMR values exceed the recommended cutoff values by Hu and Bentler (1999), these indices should be interpreted in the context of measurement quality, as the standardized factor loadings are strong and significant ranging from .54 to .96, with an average factor loading of .80 (McNeish & Hancock, 2018). Nonetheless, inspecting the modification indices revealed that fit markedly improves when allowing the residual error term to correlate for items one and two of the follower effectiveness subscale, χ^2 (173) = 267.108, $p < .001$, RMSEA = 0.05, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.96, SRMR = .04. This suggested modification may reflect the fact that these items used the term "follower/followership", whereas the third item did not. Most of the interfactor correlations were moderate, but the correlation between insubordinate and dominance was strong at r = .80. All of the subscale scores demonstrated sufficient levels of reliability (effectiveness of follower behavior, α = .76, leader receptivity to feedback, α = .87; prototypical followership, α = .88; insubordinate followership, α = .83; dominance, α = .88; role violation, α = .92).

To evaluate the substantive hypotheses, full-factorial analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to test the main and interactive effects of the contextual variables on how coaches evaluated the COF. Significant interaction effects were followed by pairwise comparisons to evaluate differences among specific combinations of factors using the least significant differences method.

Results

As Little's MCAR was non-significant, X^2 (460) = 471.17, p = .349, the expectation-maximization algorithm was used to replace missing data from incomplete responses (Schafer & Olsen, 1998). Levene's test of homogeneity of variance was also non-significant across all variables (ps ≥ 0.322), fulfilling the assumption that variance between conditions was approximately equal. Fisher's exact tests were used to compare responses for coaching level, gender of the coach, and gender of the team coached across the three experimental conditions. This analysis revealed no significant relations between these demographic variables and the experimental conditions (ps ≥ .149). A one-way ANOVA also revealed that participant age did not significantly differ between conditions, Fs ≤ 1.10, ps ≥ .331.

Coaches' Evaluations of Followership

Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 2. As seen in the table, scores fell near the midpoint of the scale for the majority of measures, suggesting that, on average, coaches deemed the act of challenge-oriented feedback to be relatively neutral. In the following analyses, we examined the degree to which contextual factors shifted coaches' evaluations of such behaviors.

Effectiveness of Follower Behavior

Although there were no significant main effects related to the status of follower, F(1, 223) = .92, p = .338, η_p^2 = .00, or the stage of the decision-making process, F(1, 223) = 2.41, p = .115, η_p^2 = .01, perceived effectiveness of the feedback differed based on the presence of third-party observers, F(1, 223) = 4.07, p = .045, η_p^2 = .02. Supporting Hypothesis 1, coaches perceived the COF as more effective when it was delivered

individually (M = 3.68, SD = 1.32) than in a group context (M = 3.33, SD = 1.36). Of note, there was a significant interaction between presence of third-party observers and stage of the decision-making process, $F(1, 223) = 5.40$, $p = .021$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. The COF delivered after a decision was reached was perceived as more effective when it occurred individually (M = 3.75; SD = 1.37) than in a group (M = 3.00; SD = 1.24), $p = .003$, Hedges's g = 1.08. There was also a significant interaction between presence of third-party observers and status of follower, $F(1, 223) = 4.23$, $p = .041$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. COF enacted by a newcomer (i.e., lower status member) was perceived as more effective when enacted individually (M = 3.78; SD = 1.29) than in a group (M = 3.01; SD = 1.26), $p = .005$, Hedges's g = 0.60. The two-way interaction between status of follower and stage of the decision-making process, $F(1, 223) = .000$, $p = .990$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$, and three-way interaction, $F(1, 223) = 0.11$, $p = .740$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$, were nonsignificant.

Leader Receptivity

There were no significant main effects of any contextual variables on leader's receptivity to the COF: status of follower, $F(1, 224) = 1.709$, $p = .192$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, presence of third-party observers, $F(1, 224) = 2.542$, $p = .112$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, stage of the decision-making process, $F(1, 224) = 0.104$, $p = .747$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$. Nonetheless, a significant interaction effect was found between stage of the decision-making process and presence of third-party observers, $F(1, 224) = 4.281$, $p = .040$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. When COF was delivered after a decision was reached, coaches were more receptive to the COF when it was enacted individually (M = 5.28; SD = 1.08) than in a group setting (M = 4.70; SD = 1.37), $p = .012$, Hedges's g = 0.46. Despite this finding, there were no other interaction effects detected, including between presence of third-party observers and status of follower, $F(1, 224) = 0.223$, $p = .637$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$, or status of follower and stage of the decision-making process, $F(1, 224) = 3.283$, $p = .071$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. The three-way interaction was also non-significant, $F(1, 224) = 0.30$, $p = .864$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$.

Prototypical Followership

Ratings of prototypical followership varied according to the stage of the decision-making process, $F(1, 220) = 4.37$, $p = .038$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Supporting Hypothesis 2, coaches rated the athlete higher on prototypical followership characteristics when the COF was enacted before a decision was made ($M = 5.88$; $SD = 1.15$) than after ($M = 5.62$, $SD = 1.30$) a decision was made. Conversely, there were no main effects of follower status, $F(1, 220) = 1.51$, $p = .221$, $\eta_p^2 = .007$, or presence of third-party observers, $F(1, 224) = 0.05$, $p = .921$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$, on prototypical followership. There were also no significant interaction effects between the presence of third-party observers and status of follower, $F(1, 220) = 0.32$, $p = .570$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$, status of follower and stage of the decision-making process, $F(1, 220) = 0.14$, $p = .707$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$, or stage of the decision-making process and presence of third-party observers, $F(1, 220) = 2.45$, $p = .119$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. The three-way interaction was also nonsignificant, $F(1, 220) = 1.75$, $p = .187$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

Insubordinate Followership

Counter to predictions, there were no significant main or interactive effects related to insubordinate followership (see supplementary file for complete statistics).

Potential Mediators

Similarly, analyses revealed that neither of the potential mediators (i.e., perceptions of follower dominance, perceived role violation) exhibited differences across conditions (i.e., first linkage in the mediation pathway) that merited proceeding to evaluating them as potential mediators linking COF to coaches' evaluations of such behavior (see supplementary file for complete statistics).

Discussion

Followership is a process of social influence that is tightly intertwined with the process of leadership (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). In sports, positive relationships between leaders (e.g., coaches) and followers (e.g., athletes) are a key component of successful

team performance (Davis et al., 2019), yet there is a scarcity of systematic research on the nature of followership and its consequences in sport. The present study is the first to use an experimental vignette methodology to examine whether contextual factors previously identified by coaches (i.e., presence of third-parties, stage of the decision-making process, and status of follower; Benson et al., 2016) impacted coaches' evaluations of both COF and the athlete enacting the challenging behavior. Analyses revealed the presence of higher-order interaction effects of context on leaders' interpretations of follower behavior. As commonly observed in research examining interpersonal exchanges, the setting, complexity, breadth, and nuance of social interactions means that several contextual factors ought to be accounted for in a given analysis (Kenny, 1996).

Nonetheless, of the factors manipulated, the presence of third-party observers (i.e., teammates) appeared to be the most salient factor influencing coaches' evaluations. Coaches perceived COF to be more effective in a one-on-one setting than in the presence of others. The timing of the COF was also relevant to coaches' evaluations; a preference for COF enacted before (rather than after) a decision emerged. Generally, coaches' evaluations of the COF were relatively neutral (mean responses clustered around the midpoint of the measures), suggesting that the behavior itself was not deemed inherently positive or negative. As the context the COF occurred within appeared to skew coaches' appraisals away from the midpoint of the scales (i.e., positively or negatively), this underscores the notion that COF is indeed a double-edged sword (e.g., Benson et al., 2016; Carsten et al., 2018).

Theoretical Implications

A major contribution of this study was that the presence of third-party observers affected how coaches evaluated COF. Providing support for our first hypothesis, coaches rated the COF as more effective when enacted by the athlete one-on-one than in the presence of teammates.

Moreover, the presence of interaction effects indicated that delivering COF in a one-on-one setting (instead of in front on teammates) may have actually buffered against the costs of violating other norms—namely, speaking up after a decision was made or as a low status group member. In such situations, coaches responded more favourably to the COF in terms of perceived effectiveness and receptivity when enacted individually. Altogether, the pattern of findings suggests that when other contextual conditions are violated (i.e., speaking up after a final decision is made, speaking up as a new group member), the mere presence of others may play a role in how such behaviors are interpreted by coaches. This aligns with research spanning several populations (e.g., elementary school students, Archer-Kath et al., 1994; medical students, Camp et al., 2010) whereby feedback is received more positively when delivered one-on-one compared to in a group. Indeed, publicly disagreeing with a leader or offering an alternative solution could be construed as threatening to the leader (Camp et al., 2010; Oc & Bashshur, 2013). In the context of sport, the coach-athlete relationship is highly interdependent and thrives due to the presence of complementarity, commitment, closeness, and co-orientation (see Jowett, 2017). When an athlete challenges in front of teammates, it may signal a mismatch (or absence) in these values, leading to the coach perceiving such behavior as threatening to their standing.

Our study also adds to the literature by showing how challenge-oriented behaviors can be a component of prototypical followership. In partial support of the second hypothesis, athletes engaging in COF before a decision was made (rather than after) tend to be perceived as a prototypical follower (i.e., loyal, productive, reliable, goes above and beyond, and is a team player). Research on workplace interactions have emphasized that timing is important to determining how leaders evaluate follower feedback (e.g., Whiting et al., 2012), as it can signal proactivity (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Leaders, however, do not always appreciate proactive behavior (Grant et al., 2009; Grant & Ashford, 2008), despite the fact that it can contribute to various positive work outcomes (see Parker et al., 2010). In sport, teams benefit from players

who proactively correct each other and voice suggestions to overcome obstacles (Van Puyenbroeck et al., 2018). Prior to the present study, however, coaches' evaluations of this proactive behavior had not been experimentally examined. Our findings suggest that coaches prefer when athletes enact early proactive behaviors (i.e., enact COF before a decision is made).

Although the third hypothesis was not supported (i.e., follower status did not affect coaches' evaluations), this may reflect the nature of the vignette design rather than the importance of a follower's status. As status refers to the respect, admiration, and voluntary deference afforded to an individual based on their instrumental social value (Anderson et al., 2015), the status manipulation may have lacked experimental realism in contrast to the other contextual factors that were varied across conditions (i.e., timing of feedback, presence of third-party observers). According to social impact theory (Latané, 1981), followers of higher social rank have a greater capacity to influence leaders because of their relative proximity to the leader (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). Moving forward, research should consider differences between what leaders prefer from their followers and what is beneficial for team outcomes (Fuller et al., 2012). Whereas qualitative work described how coaches preferred feedback from higher-status followers (Benson et al., 2016), research in organizational settings suggests that dissent from lower-status followers is associated with improvements in group decision making processes (De Dreu & West, 2001). Indeed, lower status followers may be the primary drivers of innovation and change as they stimulate a broader range of ideas (Blair & Bligh, 2018). Despite the absence of status-based effects in the current study, organizational scholars have drawn attention to the consequential role of status in shaping individual, interpersonal, and group consequences (Bendersky & Pai, 2018), and thus it is perhaps premature to rule out this important variable in relation to leader-follower dynamics in sport teams.

Practical Implications

Speaking up and providing alternative points of view is an important aspect of being an effective follower (Carsten et al., 2010; Sy, 2010), but it can also lead to ruptures in leader-

follower relationships (Grant & Ashford, 2008; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Thus, it is perhaps unsurprising that followers often fear retaliation when providing feedback to superiors (Kudisch et al., 2006). In sport teams, open and honest communication between coaches and athletes is vital to predicting team outcomes (see Davis et al., 2019). Coaches understand the importance of feedback given from the athletes on their team, but recognize they are not always open to receiving it (Mason et al., 2020). As such, athletes may benefit from understanding how to more effectively voice their ideas when they differ from their coach. Our results suggest that athletes should approach their coach one-on-one to maximize the likelihood of conflicting ideas being regarded as effective. They should also do so before their coach reaches a decision to increase the chance they are perceived as a good follower. Establishing team norms consistent with these recommendations may facilitate optimal team functioning.

Limitations and Future directions

Like all research, the present study should be considered recognizing its limitations. Experimental video vignettes have inherent trade-offs as a methodology. Vignettes afford researchers a high degree of control by enabling manipulations of specific variables while effectively controlling for extraneous factors, which make them a useful way to establish cause-and-effect relationships (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014; Pierce & Aguinis, 1998). However, creating and implementing immersive experimental vignettes (i.e., filmed interactions) is resource intensive and both the external validity and realism can be diminished (Scandura & Williams, 2000). A few participants in the open-ended deception check, for example, noted that the brevity of the coach-athlete interaction in the vignette did not provide enough information for them to make an accurate assessment of the situation. Although minimal acquaintance impressions are commonplace and consequential (Rule & Ambady, 2008), this may explain the gap between the present findings and prior qualitative research that emphasized the nuanced interplay among all three contextual factors manipulated in the experimental vignettes (Benson et al., 2016). Future research could study proactive followership behaviors with actual coach-

athlete dyads to mitigate this limitation. Although such an approach would sacrifice experimental control, studying the consequences of different types of followership behavior (e.g., Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) in actual sport teams would help bridge the gap between laboratory and *in vivo* settings.

Another limitation pertains to statistical power. Our final sample consisted of 232 coaches, which fell slightly below our target sample. Moreover, due to the automatic randomization technique used (the gold-standard when using experimental methodologies to assess human behavior; Dugard, 2014) and failed attention checks in specific conditions, an uneven distribution of participants emerged across conditions. Thus, the study is at risk of committing a Type II error and results ought to be interpreted with some caution. Future researchers should focus on strategic and creative ways to tackle participant recruitment to mitigate this limitation. An empirically supported (e.g., McCullagh et al., 2014) way to accomplish this is partnering with organizations who can distribute the study internally. As the present study was not preregistered, it would be informative to replicate these findings with a high-powered sample. An additional benefit of using larger samples would be to implement structural equation modelling to account for measurement error and model multiple dependent measures in a single model (Breitsohl, 2019).

Having increased statistical power would also facilitate further sub-group comparisons. It would be worthwhile, for instance, to determine whether the competition level of the coach or the sport they coached affected how coaches evaluated the COF. Although there is scarce research in this regard, qualitative evidence suggests that high-performance coaches (e.g., professional) across various sports welcome feedback from athletes on their team (Mason et al., 2020). However, these findings have yet to be demonstrated quantitively; additional research is needed to substantiate this relationship.

Coaches' individual differences were not accounted for and were not a focus of this study. However, understanding how individual factors (e.g., personality composition) affected leaders'

evaluations of COF would advance the literature in a meaningful way by generating individually tailored advice for followers. In the military, for example, leaders who are higher in openness to experience are more likely to be receptive to feedback (Smither et al., 2005). This type of research has yet to be conducted in sport settings, yet it could elucidate differences in coaches' individual receptivity to COF.

The present investigation focused on coach-athlete interactions as a proxy for the leader-follower relationship due to the inherent power imbalance that exists between these roles. In sports teams, however, certain individuals switch between leading and following. A team captain, for example, must lead junior players while being subservient to the coach (who in turn defers to the General Manager). Indeed, coaches report that navigating dual leader-follower roles is an issue for many team members (Benson et al., 2016).

Conclusion

To advance the current understanding of followership in sport teams, this was the first study to experimentally evaluate how coaches responded to an important but potentially contentious social behavior. That is, we tested how coaches' perceptions of being challenged on their strategy and tactics varied based on the context surrounding the interaction. We found no support for our mediation-oriented expectations; however, coaches perceived such challenge-oriented behavior more favourably when enacted by an athlete (a) one-on-one (versus in a group), and (b) before a decision has been reached (versus after a decision is reached). In addition to making a unique contribution to the sport literature on coach-athlete interactions, our findings add to the body of organizational literature that seeks to impact macro improvements in leader-follower interactions. These results can be used by practitioners to guide athletes who want to strategically provide oppositional feedback to their coach, which is important to team success.

References

Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods, 17*(4), 351-371. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952

Anderson, C., Hildreth, J. A. D., & Howland, L. (2015). Is the desire for status a fundamental human motive? A review of the empirical literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *141*(3), 574. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038781

Archer-Kath, J., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). Individual versus group feedback in cooperative groups. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134*(5), 681-694. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1994.9922999

Bastardoz, N., & van Vugt, M. (2019). The nature of followership: Evolutionary analysis and review. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(1), 81-95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.09.004

Bendersky, C., & Pai, J. (2018). Status dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *5*, 183-199. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104602

Benson, A. J., Hardy, J., & Eys, M. (2016). Contextualizing leaders' interpretations of proactive followership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*(7), 949-966. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2077

Benson, A. J., Surya, M., & Eys, M. A. (2014). The nature and transmission of roles in sport teams. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 3*(4), 228-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000016

Blair, B. A., & Bligh, M. C. (2018). Looking for leadership in all the wrong places: The impact of culture on proactive followership and follower dissent. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(1), 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12260

Bolino, M. C. (1999). Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(1), 82-98. https://doi.org/10.2307/259038

Breitsohl, H. (2019). Beyond ANOVA: An introduction to structural equation models for experimental designs. *Organizational Research Methods*, *22*(3), 649-677. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118754988

Camp, C. L., Gregory, J. K., Lachman, N., Chen, L. P., Juskewitch, J. E., & Pawlina, W. (2010). Comparative efficacy of group and individual feedback in gross anatomy for promoting medical student professionalism. *Anatomical Sciences Education, 3*(2), 64-72. https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.142

Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., & Huang, L. (2018). Leader perceptions and motivation as outcomes of followership role orientation and behavior. *Leadership*, *14*(6), 731-756. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715017720306

Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 31*, 334 –347. https://doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.004

Davis, L., Jowett, S., & Tafvelin, S. (2019). Communication strategies: The fuel for quality coach-athlete relationships and athlete satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02156

De Dreu, C. K., & West, M. A. (2001). Minority dissent and team innovation: The importance of participation in decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(6), 1191. https://doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1191

DeRue, D., & Ashford, S. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review, 35*(4), 627-647. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02156

Dugard, P. (2014). Randomization tests: A new gold standard? *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 3*(1), 65-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2013.10.001

Eys, M., Evans, M., & Benson, A. (2020). *Group dynamics in sport* (5th ed.). Fitness Information Technology.

Falbe, C. M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*(3), 638-652. https://doi.org/10.2307/256490

Fuller Jr, J. B., Marler, L. E., & Hester, K. (2012). Bridge building within the province of proactivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(8), 1053-1070. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1780

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 3-34. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002

Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology, 62*(1), 31-55. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.01128.x

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Jowett, S. (2017). Coaching effectiveness: The coach–athlete relationship at its heart. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *16*, 154-158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.006

Jowett, S., & Shanmugam, V. (2016). Relational coaching in sport: Its psychological underpinnings and practical effectiveness. In *Routledge international handbook of sport psychology* (pp. 501-514). Routledge.

Kenny, D. A. (1996). The design and analysis of social interaction research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 47*, 59-86. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.59

Knoll, M., Schyns, B., & Petersen, L. E. (2017). How the influence of unethical leaders on followers is affected by their implicit followership theories. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *24*(4), 450-465. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817705296

Kudisch, J. D., Fortunato, V. J., & Smith, A. F. (2006). Contextual and individual difference factors predicting individuals' desire to provide upward feedback. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(4), 503-529. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601106286888

Latané, B. (1981). The psychology of social impact. *American Psychologist, 36*(4), 343. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.36.4.343

Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2001). A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*(3), 356-376. https://doi.org/10.2307/259182

Mason, R. J., Farrow, D., & Hattie, J. A. (2020). Sports coaches' knowledge and beliefs about the provision, reception, and evaluation of verbal feedback. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 2424. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.571552

McCullagh, M. C., Sanon, M. A., & Cohen, M. A. (2014). Strategies to enhance participant recruitment and retention in research involving a community-based population. *Applied Nursing Research, 27*(4), 249-253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2014.02.007

McNeish, D., An, J., & Hancock, G. R. (2018). The thorny relation between measurement quality and fit index cutoffs in latent variable models. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *100*(1), 43-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2017.1281286

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*(1), 78-102. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392813

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. (2017). *Mplus user's guide: Statistical analysis with latent variables, user's guide*. Muthén & Muthén.

Nicholls, A. R., Earle, K., Earle, F., & Madigan, D. J. (2017). Perceptions of the Coach–Athlete Relationship Predict the Attainment of Mastery Achievement Goals Six Months Later: A Two-Wave Longitudinal Study among FA Premier League Academy Soccer Players. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 684. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00684

Oc, B., & Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(6), 919-934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.006

Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management, 36*(4), 827-856. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310363732

Pierce, C. A., & Aguinis, H. (1998). Using virtual reality technology in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(5), 407-410. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199709)

Rule, N., & Ambady, N. (2010). First impressions of the face: Predicting success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*(8), 506-516. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00282.x

Sapolsky R. M. (2005). The influence of social hierarchy on primate health. *Science*, *308* (5722), 648-652. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1106477

Sauer, S. J. (2011). Taking the reins: The effects of new leader status and leadership style on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(3), 574. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022741

Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2000). Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends, and implications for future research. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 1248-1264. https://doi.org/10.5465/1556348

Schafer, J. L. & Olsen, M. K. (1998). Multiple imputation for multivariate missing-data problems: A data analyst's perspective. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 33*, 545-571. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3304_5

Smither, J. W., London, M., & Richmond, K. R. (2005). The relationship between leaders' personality and their reactions to and use of multisource feedback: A longitudinal study. *Group & Organization Management, 30*(2), 181-210. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601103254912

Sun, S., & van Emmerik, H. I. (2015). Are proactive personalities always beneficial? Political skill as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(3), 966. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037833

Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 113*(2), 73-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.06.001

Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 83-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007

Van Puyenbroeck, S., Stouten, J., & Vande Broek, G. (2018). Coaching is teamwork! The role of need-supportive coaching and the motivational climate in stimulating proactivity in volleyball teams. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 28*(1), 319-328.

van Vugt, M. V., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2008). Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past. *American Psychologist, 63*(3), 182-196. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.182.

Whiting, S. W., Maynes, T. D., Podsakoff, N. P., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2012). Effects of message, source, and context on evaluations of employee voice behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 182-182. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024871

Table 1

Coaches' Competition Level Breakdown by Gender

	Demographic Category		
Competition Level	Males	Females	Combined
	n (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)
Recreational	13 (7.9%)	8 (11.8%)	21 (9.1%)
Youth	29 (17.6%)	11 (16.2%)	40 (17.2%)
Collegiate	100 (60.1%)	39 (57.4%)	139 (59.9%)
Club	23 (13.9%)	9 (13.2)	32 (13.8%)

Note. Male coaches, n = 165; Female coaches, n = 67.

Table 2

Coaches' Evaluations of Followership as a Function of Context

Condition		Effectiveness *M* (*SD*)	Receptivity *M* (*SD*)	Prototypical *M* (*SD*)	Insubordination *M* (*SD*)	Dominance *M* (*SD*)	Role violation *M* (*SD*)
High Status							
After	Group	3.23 (1.43)	5.00 (1.30)	5.43 (1.39)	4.81 (1.99)	3.79 (1.47)	3.11 (1.69)
	Individual	3.69 (1.39)	5.45 (1.01)	5.86 (1.48)	4.12 (2.08)	3.13 (1.27)	2.81 (1.56)
Before	Group	3.97 (1.35)	4.95 (1.03)	6.31 (1.17)	4.13 (1.97)	3.42 (1.41)	2.87 (1.36)
	Individual	3.50 (1.34)	4.83 (0.94)	5.60 (1.36)	4.88 (1.83)	3.91 (1.12)	3.24 (1.35)
Low Status							
After	Group	2.77 (0.98)	4.41 (1.40)	5.66 (1.14)	5.01 (1.88)	3.83 (1.62)	3.34 (1.73)
	Individual	3.83 (1.36)	5.01 (1.15)	5.54 (1.20)	4.69 (1.62)	3.59 (1.20)	3.10 (1.40)
Before	Group	3.39 (1.43)	4.98 (1.21)	5.88 (1.18)	5.22 (1.98)	3.84 (1.43)	3.31 (1.57)
	Individual	3.75 (1.25)	4.96 (1.20)	5.71 (0.89)	4.53 (1.66)	3.49 (1.36)	2.90 (1.20)

Note. Male coaches, n = 165; Female coaches, n = 67. High Status: the athlete engaging in the COF was described as a respected senior team member. Low Status: the athlete engaging in the COF was described as a newcomer to the team. After: the COF occurred after a decision was made. Before: the COF occurred before a decision was made. Group: The COF occurred in the presence of teammates. Individual: The COF occurred in a one-on-one setting with the coach. Scores on effectiveness and receptivity measures range from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*); prototypical and insubordination scores range from 1 (*not at all characteristic*) to 10 (*extremely characteristic*); dominance and role violation scores range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).