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“The way a team plays as a whole determines its success. You may have the greatest bunch of individual stars in the world, but if they don’t play together, the club won’t be worth a dime.”

– Babe Ruth

Star employees have exceptional, long-term performance, high visibility, substantial social capital, and a broad external status (Asgari et al., 2021). Stars can be the key to an organization’s sustainable competitive advantage, and their presence or absence can shake markets (Groysberg, 2010; Ployhart, Nyberg, Reilly, & Maltarich, 2014). The literature has identified how coworkers (e.g., Boekhorst, Basir, & Malhotra, 2024; Chen & Garg, 2018; Kehoe & Tzabbar, 2015;), the organization (e.g., Aguinis & O’Boyle Jr., 2014; Aguinis, O’Boyle Jr., Gonzalez-Mule, & Joo, 2016; Groysberg, 2010), and the environment (e.g., Dai, Dietvorst, Tuckfield, Milkman, & Schweitzer, 2018; Kehoe, Collings, & Cascio, 2023; Sharma, 2021) all affect stars. However, the literature has yet to incorporate perhaps the most critical force on stars – their leaders. Stars increasingly determine a firm’s success (Aguinis & O’Boyle Jr., 2014), and their ability to upright leave an organization at will shows the organization’s tenuous reliance on keeping stars happy (Groysberg, 2010); however, little is known about how they do so (Morris, Alvarez, & Barney., 2021). Given the importance that stars have placed on their leaders for their success (Cotton, Shen, & Tarandach, 2011), this omission can potentially require new explanations for how organizations must approach stars (Morris et al., 2021).

There is, therefore, a gap in the literature on how leaders affect stars compared to non-stars. Our research question asks how specific leadership styles affect stars and non-stars differently regarding usage, collaboration, and turnover (Groysberg, 2010; Kehoe, Rosikiewicz, & Tzabbar, 2017). We utilize the “fundamental dimensions” (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014: p. 197) of social cognition – agentic and communal leadership – to examine how leadership styles affect the two types of employees uniquely (Bakan, 1966). We examine leaders’ effects on star employees’ direct and indirect performance using prior frameworks focusing on star managing and star mobility (Call, Nyberg, & Thatcher, 2015). We then contrast this with non-star employees and address the lack of research examining stars and non-stars simultaneously (Call, Campbell, Dunford, Boswell, & Boss, 2021). We demonstrate that different leadership styles have unique impacts on stars and non-stars. Additionally, we answer the calls to examine how dynamic environments affect these relationships (Apascaritei & Elvira, 2022; Sharma, 2021). Our findings support the crucial role that leaders and their leadership styles play in a star’s performance and turnover behaviors.

To help answer our research question, we instituted an empirical approach that allowed us to examine leaders, their leadership styles, and stars in fine-grained detail. Sports data is crucial to the star literature, as it allows for a clear designation between stars and non-stars and has measurable performance metrics tied to individuals and teams (Day, Gordon, & Fink, 2012; Fonti, Ross, & Aversa, 2022). We, therefore, follow prior star performer literature (e.g., Aguinis et al., 2016; Chen & Garg, 2018; Kim & Makadok, 2022) and turn to the National Basketball Association (henceforth “NBA”). We analyzed each NBA coach’s agentic and communal leadership style using 171 “super fans” and found support for the idea that leaders are crucial to star management (Morris et al., 2021). Communal leaders decrease star usage and increase collaboration, while agentic leaders increase star turnover and decrease collaboration. Dynamic environments act as an essential boundary condition, amplifying these effects for each leadership type. Additionally, we control for endogeneity with strong fixed effects, survival analysis, and through a unique regression discontinuity in time approach (Hausman & Rapson, 2018; Imbens & Lemieux, 2008).

Our study makes three significant contributions to the star literature. First, we demonstrate the critical role of leadership to stars. While the prior literature looked at how coworkers, the organization, and the external environment interact with stars (Asgari et al., 2021), we unpack the multidimensional nature of leadership and highlight its role in star management. We demonstrate how different leadership styles, specifically agentic and communal, play a crucial role in managing star employees, significantly influencing their performance and turnover. This insight adds a nuanced layer to existing knowledge by highlighting the impacts of leadership behaviors on stars.

Second, our research explores the comparative impacts of leadership on star and non-star employees within the same organizational settings. This dual focus allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how leadership styles can be tailored to suit each type of employees’ specific needs and potential (Abele, Uchronski, Suitner, & Wojciszke, 2008). By studying these groups simultaneously, we reveal the differential effects of leadership, thus providing practical insights for leaders in devising more effective and nuanced strategies for managing star and non-star employees.

Last, we integrate dynamic capabilities into the star literature by examining how dynamic environments amplify the effect of leadership on stars (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). This aspect of our study addresses a significant gap by demonstrating how essential leadership is in dynamic and competitive environments for influencing star employees. Our findings suggest that dynamic environments can further underscore the critical role of leadership in effectively managing star employees.

**THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

"Your biggest opponent is not the other guy. It is human nature."

- NCAA Champion Coach Bob Knight

**Star Literature**

Stars are “highly productive individuals with high market visibility” (Morris et al., 2021: p. 249). Stars make outsized contributions to their organizations, are well-known, and have large amounts of human and social capital (Asgari et al., 2021; Call et al., 2015). A star’s production is in the top 10% or at least one standardization above the mean in their field (Beck, Beatty, & Sackett, 2014; Call et al., 2015; Gagne, 2000). A star’s contributions place them a wrung above the average employee, and their importance to an organization’s current and future status is without question (Kehoe et al., 2023). The star’s capabilities, commitment, and contributions can ensure or ruin an organization’s sustainable competitive advantage (Boxall, 2013).

Stars help organizations build a competitive advantage through human capital (Kim & Makadok, 2022). The resource-based view explains how organizations can use strategic human capital resources – such as stars – to gain sustainable competitive advantages (Armstrong, 2006; Ployhart et al., 2014; Wright, Dunford, & Snell, 2001). Stars create value organizations can capture, leverage, and protect (Sparrow & Makram, 2015). Stars are typically part of interactions with a team or organization; through these interactions, organizations develop advantages that are difficult to replicate (Ployhart et al., 2014).

Thus, stars do not exist in a vacuum (Asgari et al., 2021). While stars contribute considerably to individual performance, they also work in their team, organization, and environment (Kehoe & Tzabbar, 2015). An organization’s resources and capabilities can positively and negatively affect a star’s success, and the environment can moderate this relationship (Groysberg, Lee, & Nanda, 2008; Sirmon, Hitt, & Ireland, 2007). Also, stars rely on their networks to support and bridge the gap from good to great (Cotton et al., 2011). In addition, stars influence their coworkers through their roles, practices, norms, and spillover effects (Kehoe et al., 2017). As stars are vital to their organization’s competitive advantage, how stars contrast with non-stars and how each type of employee reacts to an organization’s characteristics is critical to its success.

**Importance of Stars and Non-Stars**

Stars have an outsized importance compared to non-stars (Aguinis & O’Boyle, Jr., 2014; Aguinis et al., 2016). At the same time, a star’s effect on organizational performance is both directly through their production and indirectly through other employees (Tzabbar & Baburaj, 2020). Stars and non-stars work together through communication, coordination, and cooperation (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003; Okhuysen & Bechky, 2009). These collaborations lead to advantages that are difficult to replicate or purchase through strategic factor markets (Adegbesan, 2009; Lippman & Rumelt, 2003; Ployhart et al., 2014). Therefore, individual production and human capital resource complementarities between stars and non-stars are at the core of the organization’s success (Ployhart & Cragun, 2017). However, stars and non-stars are distinct.

Stars and non-stars can create sustainable competitive advantages for organizations (Ployhart et al., 2014). However, they are vastly different types of employees who are treated differently and react differently to firm decisions (Groysberg, 2010; Kim & Makadok, 2023). Stars are often focused on their individual production and care more about their salary, position in the company, and leadership (Groysberg, 2010). On the other hand, non-stars care more about their stability within the organization and their coworkers’ abilities (Groysberg, 2010). Therefore, stars and non-stars have different objectives (Kehoe et al., 2023), and it should not be assumed that all firm decisions affect them uniformly. Managers, more than any other group, determine whether the star or non-star in such a case will lead to prosperity or disaster.

**Stars and Leadership**

Resource management is at the core of resource and capability-based theories (Sirmon et al., 2007; Teece et al., 1997). Leaders are responsible for ensuring that their employees are capable, committed, and contribute to the organization’s performance (Boxall, 2013), although they do not always do this correctly (Collings, 2014). Leaders can utilize star employees by creating, leveraging, and protecting their value (Sparrow et al., 2010). One way to do this is through their leadership styles, which affect the organization’s underlying dynamic capabilities (Leih & Teece, 2016). However, the link between leadership and strategic human capital resources, especially stars, is underexplored (Gallagher, Wolfson, Reilly, & Mathieu, 2023; Leroy, Segers, Van Dierendonck, & Den Hartog, 2018). This gap is especially noticeable regarding how leadership style affects stars and non-stars differently (Morris et al., 2021).

Leaders have an exorbitant influence on stars, but little is known about how they do so (Morris et al., 2021). As Kehoe, Collings, and Cascio note (2023: p. 600), “there is little research on how organizations manage stars.” Previous research has found that organizations can affect star employees’ hiring process, transition, nurturing, compensation, and even their organizational exit (Tzabbar & Baburaj, 2020). Others have theorized that leaders can positively impact stars by removing known constraints to their productivity (Aguinis & O’Boyle Jr., 2014) or negatively affect their productivity by relying too heavily on them to the point of overload (Morris & Oldroyd, 2017). However, it is surprising that prior research has not directly examined how leader characteristics influence star employees. Examining how leaders’ leadership styles can influence stars and non-stars is critical to appreciate how stars succeed or fail.

Managers substantially affect their employees, including through HR decisions and practices (Katou, Budhwar, & Patel, 2021; Kehoe & Han, 2020). In resource-based approaches, managers implement strategies and hiring decisions to ensure their strategies fit the available human capital (Wright, Smart, & McMahan, 1995). Managers significantly impact stars by providing instruction and psychosocial support (Cotton et al., 2011). A manager’s style could affect future generations, as stars often become managers (Kim & Makadok, 2022). Managers exhibit variance in their management practices even across their own employees (Storey, Ulrich, & Wright, 2019). However, these studies only examine human capital and do not look at how managers affect stars and non-stars distinctly. In light of this, the study of leadership styles on human capital needs to be revisited (Aguinis et al., 2016).

**Leadership Typology: Agentic vs. Communal Leadership**

Leaders have different leadership styles that affect both stars and non-stars (Fischer & Sitkin, 2023; Morris et al., 2021). These styles can impact an employee’s productivity (Eldor, 2021), innovation (Yin et al., in press), and even organizational performance (Al Khajeh, 2018). To study how leadership styles affect stars and non-stars, we turn to the two fundamental dimensions of social cognition — agency and communion (Abele et al., 2008; Bakan, 1966).

These two dimensions are the core personality traits and can represent how leaders perceive the world (Chan, Wang, & Ybarra, 2018; Ybarra et al., 2008). Agency refers to “goal-pursuit, involving qualities such as competence, efficiency, and tenacity” (Cislak, 2013: p. 139). On the other hand, communion includes “social functioning and social relations, involving qualities such as warmth, trustworthiness, and sincerity – as well as their opposites” (Cislak, 2013: p. 139). It is important to note that agency and communion are not opposites; they are orthogonal and independent (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014). In most people, communal traits are more desirable and primary, except when thinking about yourself or very close colleagues (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007).

Agentic and communal leadership have substantial impacts on employees. The importance of these traits to the work environment has led to an explosion of related recent management literature (e.g., Kundro & Rothbard, 2023; McClean, Kim, & Martinez, 2022; Polin, Doyle, Kim, Lewicki, & Chawla, 2023). Leadership styles affect human capital deployment decisions. First, they can affect a leader’s desire to rely directly on specific employees more than others (Aguinis et al., 2016). Second, they can determine the level of collaboration a leader desires on their team (Tzabbar & Baburaj, 2020). Finally, they influence how much turnover the team experiences (Groysberg, 2010). These three outcomes are how leaders affect stars and non-stars within organizations (Kehoe et al., 2017). Given these factors, we return to our research questions of how leadership styles affect stars and non-stars.

**HYPOTHESES**

"I was not choking P.J. [his coach] that hard. I mean, he could breathe."

- Star Performer Latrell Sprewell.

**Direct Influence – Usage**

Stars produce far more than non-stars (Aguinis et al., 2016). The literature has differentiated between two types of production: direct production and indirect production (Kehoe et al., 2017; Tzabbar & Baburaj, 2020). Direct production refers to the star’s individual performance (Kehoe & Tzabbar, 2015). The direct production of an individual star is often easy to measure given their output, and it tends to be augmented by leadership (Asgari et al., 2021; Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Therefore, a star’s knowledge, skills, abilities, and other traits will be highly desirable and valuable to leaders (Ployhart et al., 2014), as leaders’ own performance metrics are likely linked to a star employee’s performance. However, agentic and communal leaders will handle a star’s direct usage differently.

Agentic leaders primarily focus on tasks and performance (Ybarra et al., 2008). Given this emphasis, stars are particularly valuable as they enable agentic leaders to achieve superior performance without addressing extraneous factors (Aguinis & O’Boyle Jr., 2014). Such leaders are adept at mobilizing and deploying resources and quickly leverage their stars to obtain the best outcome for their unit (Sirmon et al., 2007). Therefore, agentic leaders will leverage their stars by increasing their usage compared to non-stars. Both academics and practitioners have recommended this approach, which emphasizes utilizing stars as much as possible, especially for high-value projects (Aguinis & O’Boyle Jr., 2014; Mankins, Bird, & Root, 2013). However, not all leadership styles advocate for such a strategy.

Although leaders must focus on the star’s contributions, they must also consider the star’s well-being (Boxall, 2013). Stars have unique psychosocial traits that leaders must be cognizant of (Cotton et al., 2011). Communal leaders tend to be more aware of this and more helpful than agentic leaders (Abele et al., 2008). These traits would lead communal leaders to balance a star’s usage to prevent overload (Knight, 2017; Morris & Oldroyd, 2017), even if it led to a temporary decrease in performance. Additionally, communal leaders focus more on relationship building and the well-being of their employees, allowing stars more time to rest and recover (Abele et al., 2008). This focus on rest also gives non-stars more opportunities to perform and develop (Chen & Garg, 2018). Communal leaders will also want to use non-stars more to give equal opportunities to all team members (Locke, 2018; Tellhed, Bäckström, & Björklund, 2018).

Overall, communal leaders focus more on sharing and collectivism than agentic leaders, traits that would increase the usage of non-stars relative to stars (Abele, 2014). Therefore, we believe:

**H1a:** *As agentic leadership increases, the usage of star employees to perform tasks is more likely to increase compared to the usage of non-star employees.*

**H1b:** *As communal leadership increases, the usage of star employees to perform tasks is more likely to decrease compared to the usage of non-star employees.*

**Indirect Influence– Collaboration**

Stars can affect organizations beyond their individual performance. The literature refers to this type of production as indirect effects, whereby the star contributes “indirectly to improving the productivity of other employees in the organization” (Tzabbar & Baburaj, 2020: p. 2). Kehoe, Rosikiewicz, and Tzabbar (2017) identify three ways the star can indirectly affect performance: through team norms and practices, knowledge transfers, and influences in their career by mentorship. We propose that leadership styles can influence how stars contribute by affecting their collaborative behavior (Call et al., 2015).

Agentic leaders are decisive and persistent and strongly prefer those traits in others (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014). Leaders generally prefer agentic employees (Cislak, 2013), and we argue that this is especially true for agentic leaders, as their task-oriented objectives align with their employees’ goals. Agentic leaders prefer simple, direct actions, which leads them to prefer stars over non-stars for tasks (Abele et al., 2008). At the same time, if agentic leaders rely on stars to perform, they want these stars to perform directly rather than letting stars help non-stars perform. However, as agentic leaders are focused on the star’s direct production, they will emphasize that the role of the non-star is to support the stars. Additionally, agentic leaders are less worried about social interactions and group cohesiveness (Locke, 2018; Locke & Heller, 2017), increasing their willingness to rely on only a few key performers. This focus on the star will likely increase the star’s individual productivity at the expense of non-stars (Kehoe & Tzabbar, 2015).

Communal leadership, on the other hand, is focused on having positive social interactions, relationships, and interpersonal behavior (Ybarra et al., 2008). Therefore, communal leaders focus on traits such as teamwork skills to boost the collective human capital resources of the unit (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003; Ployhart et al., 2014). While agentic leaders rely on stars to perform, a communal leader protects stars and involves all employees in tasks (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014). In this case, stars are used less, and when they are used, they not only make direct contributions but also help their coworkers perform. This emphasis on the team will increase the positives associated with star collaboration, such as mentoring and difficult-to-imitate competitive advantages (Kehoe et al., 2017; Ployhart & Cragun, 2017) while decreasing the negatives too (Boekhorst et al., 2024; Kehoe & Tzabbar, 2015). Communal leadership gives non-star employees a more significant part in the organization’s production, decreasing their support role under agentic leadership. Therefore, we believe that:

**H2a:** *As agentic leadership increases, star employees’ collaborative behavior is more likely to decrease compared to non-star employees’ collaborative behavior.*

**H2b:** *As communal leadership increases, star employees’ collaborative behavior is more likely to increase compared to non-star employees’ collaborative behavior.*

**Mobility – Turnover**

In the previous sections, we discussed how agentic and communal leadership styles influence stars’ and non-stars’ direct usage and indirect collaborative behavior. It is also natural to consider the impact of these leadership styles on employee turnover because how leaders allocate tasks and foster collaboration may influence how likely stars and non-stars want to stay with their jobs. Star turnover is a vital concern for organizations (Han & Ravid, 2020; Maclean & Odegaard, 2021). While star value creation gets considerable attention, value retention and protection are just as important (Sparrow & Makram, 2015). Stars are not “mobile free agents” (Groysberg, 2010: p. 241) and tend to have lower turnover rates than non-stars. However, stars and non-stars have different patterns and preferences for turnover (Aguinis & O’Boyle Jr., 2014; Groysberg & Nanda, 2001). Stars care more about compensation, while non-stars are more likely to move to directly competing organizations (Groysberg, 2010). Managers, though, have a significant role in their star’s turnover decisions.

Agentic leaders may overuse stars to gain short-term unit-level productivity gains at the expense of the star’s long-term development (Morris & Oldroyd, 2017). Additionally, as agentic managers depend more heavily on star employees for performance, this can lead to outsized expectations for stars, which induces them to quit more than non-stars (Dai et al., 2018). Stars, who often rely more on their own performance, are typically less embedded with their current team under agentic leadership. They do not have the benefits of a more collaborative environment that typically exists under communal leadership; thus, they feel less bound to their teammates and leadership. Stars also have high visibility and external status, which allows them the flexibility to leave their current position, as they possess the skills and reputation to find opportunities elsewhere (Asgari et al., 2021; Terry, McGee, Kass, & Collings, 2023). On the other hand, non-stars under agentic leadership may also desire to leave due to the high demands and low support. However, they are generally less sensitive to the influence of agentic leadership as they do not possess the status of star employes. Additionally, they often lack the marketability to do so (Asgari et al., 2021), making them more likely to stay despite dissatisfaction.

In contrast, communal leaders not only care about stars but also about building substantial task and social connections between stars and non-stars, which is more likely to embed stars in the current organization (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014). Stars focus on the team and the support system they have in place when determining whether to stay or leave an organization (Groysberg, 2010). An extensive and robust social network decreases a star’s desire to leave, as organizational fit is crucial to a star’s success (Call et al., 2015). While non-stars also benefit from communal leadership, the impact of communal leadership may be less pronounced as their decision to stay is often influenced more by limited external opportunities rather than the relational ties and supportive context that significantly impact a star’s decision. In summary, we would expect agentic leaders to have higher turnover among stars than non-stars, while communal leaders should see lower turnover among stars relative to non-stars, leading to our third set of hypotheses:

**H3a:** *As agentic leadership increases, star employees’ turnover is more likely to increase compared to non-star employees’ turnover.*

**H3b:** *As communal leadership increases, star employees’ turnover is more likely to decrease compared to non-star employees’ turnover.*

**Dynamic Environments**

In the previous sections, we discussed how agentic and communal leadership styles influence stars’ and non-stars’ direct usage, indirect collaborative behavior, and turnover intentions. It is essential to examine the dynamic environment as a critical moderator, as the external environment in which organizations operate can significantly impact how leadership styles affect employees. Dynamic capabilities are also relevant to the theoretical star literature (Sharma, 2021), as stars interact uniquely with environmental and contextual uncertainty (Kehoe et al., 2023). Dynamic capabilities are the “firm’s ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments” (Teece et al., 1997: p. 516). In high-velocity environments, dynamic capabilities are simple and highly experiential rules that provide a basic sensemaking explanation for individuals (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). Leaders rely on their leadership styles to implement these rules (Leih & Teece, 2016; Teece, 2011).

Leaders and their leadership styles are essential for sustaining dynamic capabilities (Apascaritei & Elvira, 2022). Leaders incorporate outside environmental changes and internal resources to create value (Sirmon et al., 2007). However, when leaders engage with rapidly changing environments, their long-standing routines get thrown out, and they must enact more straightforward rules for their employees to follow (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). These simple rules are partly based on the manager's personality (Apascaritei & Elvira, 2022), as dynamic changes will be heavily influenced by immediate feedback and pressure (Teece et al., 1997). Therefore, under extreme dynamic changes, we expect the effects of our previous hypotheses to be strengthened.

The effects of the agentic leadership style will become more extreme in dynamic environments. As rules simplify and are more based on a leader’s personality, we expect all three situations – usage, collaboration, and turnover – to intensify. For example, due to the pressure, agentic leaders will rely more on their stars in dynamic environments than in regular environments (Teece et al., 1997). Additionally, agentic leadership’s preference for star production and non-star support will exacerbate due to simplified routines (Winter, 2003). Lastly, as dynamic environments place greater demands on stars, they will also seek better opportunities elsewhere (Dai et al., 2018).

Similarly, the effects of communal leadership style will become more intense in dynamic situations. As both agentic and communal leaders quickly turn to their simple routines under pressure (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000), communal leaders will become warmer and more collaborative in dynamic environments. These tendencies sharpen the relationships mentioned above (Teece et al., 2017). First, communal leaders will rely even less on stars and more on non-stars in rapidly changing environments. As this occurs, communal leadership will further strengthen its emphasis on collaboration, encouraging stars to involve all employees while motivating non-stars to have a more significant part in production (Dunlop & Scheepers, 2023). Finally, communal leaders, through emphasizing collaboration and a strong network at the current position, will decrease a star employee’s desire to leave (Groysberg & Nanda, 2001).

Therefore, we argue that:

**H4a:** *In dynamic environments, the effect of agentic leadership on increasing the direct usage of star employees, decreasing the indirect collaborative behavior of star employees, and increasing the turnover of star employees compared to non-star employees will be intensified.*

**H4b:** *In dynamic environments, the effect of communal leadership on decreasing the direct usage of star employees, increasing the indirect collaborative behavior of star employees, and decreasing the turnover of star employees compared to non-star employees will be intensified.*

**METHODOLOGY**

**Context**

Sports data offers scholars a way to address concerns regarding the value of a resource, its connection with performance, and endogeneity (Fonti et al., 2022; Wolfe et al., 2005). Basketball data, in particular, allows us to measure individual human resource potential directly, thus avoiding worries of tautology. The NBA closely scrutinizes player performance data, ensuring that our measures are precise. Along similar lines, both strategic actions and performance are evident in our context, avoiding concerns of mismeasurement or misspecification. Finally, due to the precision of the data and clearly defined events, we can enact endogeneity controls such as fixed-effect, survival analysis, and regression discontinuity models, which help in testing the causal relationships we predict (Allison, 2010; Angrist & Pischke, 2009; Angrist & Pischke, 2014).

Additionally, our context allows us to identify and study leaders easily. Each NBA team has a coach who oversees the player’s training and the team’s game-to-game decisions. The role of the coach as a leader has been verified in the education and training literature (Fullan & Knight, 2011; Jowett & Chaundy, 2004), and coaches have different leadership styles that directly affect team satisfaction (Kim & Cruz, 2016), burnout (Dale & Weinberg, 1989), and performance (Vella, Oades, & Crowe, 2013). The equivalence between a coach and a leader has led management scholars to derive theory by examining NBA coaches (e.g., Kim & Makadok, 2022; Zhang, 2017; Zhou, He, & Deng, 2023).

To examine hypothesis 4 and to provide supplementary support for hypotheses 1 through 3, we use the exogenous event of the NBA Bubble of 2020. The NBA Bubble was the league's $190 million reaction to the COVID-19 crisis. On March 11th, 2020, the NBA suspended its 2019-2020 season because many stars tested positive for the disease. On July 7th, 2020, the NBA started moving players into the ESPN Wide World of Sports complex at Walt Disney World. Here, the players were isolated from the world and were subjugated to intense contact with their coaching staff. Therefore, the NBA Bubble was a time of intense coaching, pressure, and dynamism, as each team only played eight games to determine the rest of their regular season.

**Data**

We collected archival data for 30 NBA organizations and their players from the 2013-2014 to 2022-2023 seasons. We gathered NBA coach data for those same seasons as well. Most of our information was obtained from Basketball-Reference, a well-known and verified sports data website (Chen & Garg, 2018). We supplemented this dataset with NBA transaction data from ProSportsTransactions.com, which we validated by having three research assistants individually track a player's transactions to and from teams. Finally, our collaboration metrics needed fine-grained data that typical depositories did not have, so we procured play-by-play data from BigDataBall.com. For our main independent variables – agentic and communal leadership – we relied on a survey for our primary analysis.

We surveyed NBA “Super Fans” to measure each coach’s agentic and communal leadership styles. We based our approach on prior literature that used expert third parties to gauge the personality traits of well-known and identifiable leaders (e.g., Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). An institutional review board approved all survey designs and procurement methods, and we paid each participant for their participation. We focused on the last ten years – 2013-2014 to the 2022-2023 season – to limit the recall needed for participants. We first invited 721 “Super Fans” to participate in a 20-question timed screening survey on Prolific to identify their top 3 favorite teams and test their recent NBA knowledge. We provide the survey in Online Appendix 6. From that list, based on their scores and the teams they were most knowledgeable about, we pared our sample to the top 171 fans. Then, we sent each participant two coaches from one of their favorite teams to measure the coaches' agentic and communal traits on a 5-point Likert scale (Abele, 2003).

Dynamic capabilities are difficult to measure and calculate (Arend & Bromiley, 2009). Many problems arise due to using only primary data, such as surveys. Datasets also need to have a significant number of observations and be longitudinal to distinguish between moderately dynamic and high-velocity markets (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). Our dataset contains all of these features, as it combines both primary and archival data with a robustness test to ensure the construct validity of our survey. Our dataset contains ten years of data for 30 different organizations, with changes between low and high environmental dynamism.

**Dependent Variables**

*Direct Usage: Minutes*. To test hypotheses 1a and 1b, we employ the *Usage* variable. Managers decide how to divide the work each employee must do. Minutes played is a good operationalization of usage, and prior scholars have used it similarly (Maoret, Marchesini, & Ertug, 2023). This construct is well-known in NBA circles, and specific agentic coaches are even criticized in the popular media for using their stars too much (Amick & Robbins, 2024).

*Indirect Collaboration: Assists*. For hypotheses 2a and 2b, we measure collaboration by calculating a player's assists in a given season. Assists are when, instead of shooting the ball themselves, a player passes it, hoping to set up an easy shot for a teammate. Other management papers have used assists as a DV for performance (Zhang, 2019), as it accurately measures the group's collaboration and can mediate overall performance. Please note that we have player position fixed effects and control for the total number of minutes to account for heterogeneity.

*Turnover.* For hypotheses 3a and 3b, we use the employee turnover variable. This variable is coded as 1 if a player re-signs with the same team they played with the previous year. It is coded as 0 if the player chooses to join a new team, indicating they will not play for the same team in the following season. Negative values for this coefficient indicate higher turnover.

*Dynamic Environment – Usage*. To examine hypotheses 4a and 4b, we use the next set of three dependent variables, which model hypotheses 1 through 3 but in dynamic environments. Here, we look at the usage of stars compared to non-stars in high- and low-pressure situations. Specifically, we look at close playoff games for high-pressure situations – where teams are within 5 points of each other. Our primary control variable is the usage in low-pressure situations in not-close playoff games, where the teams are only 15 points or less from each other, following similar econometric approaches as recent papers (Srikanth, Anand, & Stan, 2021). We expect agentic coaches to play their stars for more in high-pressure situations than communal coaches, who we believe will play their stars less in such environments.

*Dynamic Environment—Collaboration*. We follow a similar approach for the collaboration variable as we did for the usage variable (Srikanth et al., 2021). We measure assists in the final 2 minutes of close games compared to just those in the final quarter, as close games in the final 2 minutes are high-pressure situations as the game is near its ending. Here, we labeled close games as those within 5 points. To do so, we examine individual assists on a play-by-play rather than a cumulative basis. In these high-pressure environments, coaches usually defer to their simple rules. We expect agentic coaches even more than usual to emphasize their direct strategy and limit stars’ assists to prioritize production. On the other hand, we expect communal coaches to focus on their team’s social interconnectedness and emphasize collaboration, especially in such situations.

*Dynamic Environment – Turnover.* Finally, we examine if there is increased turnover in dynamic situations. As turnover decisions are rare and bunched, we could not calculate dynamic capabilities similar to the approach of the previous two tests. Therefore, we made a split-sample approach by looking at whether the player was on a team with high competitiveness, with a previous season record above 0.600, or low competitiveness, with a previous season record below 0.600. NBA teams tend to have consistent performance year-to-year (Ertug & Castellucci, 2013), and given that workplace stress is a crucial determinant of turnover (Qureshi et al., 2013), NBA teams with high performance should drive turnover. We expect that agentic leaders will drive more turnover for star performers compared to non-stars in cases of high competitiveness, while communal leaders will have the opposite effect.

**Independent Variables**

*Leadership Styles*. Our main independent variables are *Agentic Leadership* and *Communal Leadership* (Abele, 2003). As previously mentioned, we surveyed 171 NBA “Super Fans” to get their evaluation of coaches in the NBA from the 2013-2014 through 2022-2023 seasons. We only asked our raters to judge coaches who coached at least an entire season, limiting our sample to 70 coaches. One important thing about our independent variable is that we measured agentic and communal leadership separately, as these traits are considered orthogonal and not highly correlated (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014).

The survey results for evaluating coaches’ agentic and communal leadership characteristics reveal essential insights. For the agentic leadership dimension, the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) indicates a moderate degree of non-independence of data (ICC(1) = 0.21), suggesting that responses within groups are moderately correlated. Additionally, the reliability of group means is relatively high (ICC(2) = 0.51), indicating consistency in the perception of agentic leadership across groups. As assessed by rWG(J), within-group agreement for multi-item measures shows a mean value of 0.91, indicating substantial agreement among respondents within the same group regarding agentic leadership traits. Turning to communal leadership, the ICC(1) value of 0.16 suggests a similar degree of non-independence of data as observed for agentic leadership. The ICC(2) value of 0.42 indicates a moderate level of reliability of group means for communal leadership perceptions. Furthermore, the mean rWG(J) value of 0.92 suggests a strong agreement among respondents within groups regarding communal leadership characteristics. These findings highlight the consensus on agentic and communal leadership traits among respondents evaluating coaches, supporting the validity of our measure.

*Star Performer*. Star performers are typically in the top 10% of their field or one standardization above the mean in production (Beck et al., 2014; Gagne, 2000). We use a measure found in the prior star literature to replicate this level of performance – all-star appearances (Maoret et al., 2023). In the NBA, the top 24 players are selected to an all-star team every year, which is one of the highest honors an individual can receive. The NBA all-star selection includes media, player, and fan votes, which nicely mimics the performance, social capital, and visibility, respectively, that star performers generally have (Call et al., 2015). We mark star performers as a 1 if the player has been selected as an all-star in any of the previous three years and 0 otherwise.

**Control Variables**

We control for both individual and organizational-level variables.

Perhaps the most critical control variable that we include is the lagged player efficiency rating (*PER*) that controls for a player’s ability (Kim & Makadok, 2022). One positive aspect about using *PER* to control for ability, rather than other metrics such as points-per-game, is that *PER* is not related to the number of minutes a player played but their overall efficiency.

We also control for the player’s *Age* and *Age Squared*, as *Age* is known to have an inverted U effect on a player's performance (Kim & Makadok, 2023; Marr & Thau, 2014). We control for the player’s importance to the team through their *Salary*, as teams have limited resources that they devote to each player given that the team’s salary has a soft limit in the NBA (Kim & Makadok, 2023). Finally, there are three individual-level control variables that we only use in specific models. We include *Minutes Played* in models that do not use it as a dependent variable, as a player’s usage is positively related to counting stats such as assists or whether they want to stay on the team (Maoret et al., 2023). We include *Failures*, or turnovers in basketball nomenclature, in models that examine collaboration, as we are interested in the quality of collaboration (To, Yan, & Sherf, 2022). Finally, in models focusing on turnover, we follow the prior literature and only look at players – both stars and non-stars – with a *Salary Increase* (Kim & Makadok, 2023). This approach ensures we are focused only on high-caliber employees, although we found similar results with the total sample.

We included organizational controls that focused on the coach and team as well. Our coach-related control variable was the *Coach Experience* with the team, which might influence strategy (Kim & Makadok, 2022). Then, we looked at the team’s *Previous Record*, which might affect the team's current performance (Szatmari, 2022). We also included controls that looked at the *Team Familiarity* with each other (Grijalva, Maynes, Badura, & Whiting, 2020) and the *Star Performer Familiarity*. These controls were operationalized by the number of minutes before the season that the whole team had played together and the number of games before the season that the stars played with the team. Last, we included a control for the number of *Games in a Season*, as it has differed year-by-year in our sample due to player strikes and COVID-19 (Szatmari, 2022).

**Model Specifications**

For hypotheses 1, 2, and part of 4, we use Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) models as our dependent variables are not bound by 0 and 1. Our unit of analysis is at the player-team-year level to analyze the effect of managers on star and non-star employees. To help control for endogeneity, in most models, we use team, year, and position fixed effects. These help decrease within-level heterogeneity and lessen false positives (Li & Wibbens, 2023). We also account for unobserved heterogeneity by clustering our standard errors on either the player or team level, depending on the dependent variable (Li & Wibbens, 2023).

To test hypothesis 3 and part of hypothesis 4, we use a Probit model, as our dependent variable, *Turnover,* is a binary variable, taking a value of 1 if a player stays with their team for the following season and 0 otherwise. We focus only on decisions where players can choose whether to stay or leave. We also followed the prior literature and only included free agents whose salaries the following year were the same or increased (Kim & Makadok, 2023). This approach ensures that only players who were desired and thus had opportunities were included in the analysis, although we found similar results when including the whole sample. Our unit of analysis for the Probit model is at the player-team-year level. We use the same control variables and fixed effects as we do in the OLS regressions and cluster standard errors at the player level.

We test our hypotheses with the following equations. As mentioned, we use a base OLS model for our first two hypotheses and a Probit model for our third hypothesis, both with robust standard errors at either the player or team level.

*Hypothesis 1 and 4*

*Hypothesis 2 and 4*

*Hypothesis 3 and 4*

Pr(*Employee Turnoverit*​ = 1 ∣ *X* ) = Φ (+​ +

​ + ​+ + ​\* + )

**RESULTS**

The correlation matrix shows some intriguing results. First, the correlation between *Communal Leadership* and *Agentic Leadership* is positive. This result lends credence to the idea that these two leadership styles are not opposites but orthogonal. There are no real concerns in examining the rest of the correlation matrix. There is an expected high correlation between *Age* and *Age Squared*.

Additionally, the correlation between *Team Familiarity* and *Star Performer Familiarity* is high. However, removing these variables from the regressions has no impact on our results. When examining the variance inflation factor (VIF) without *Age Squared* included, the highest value is 3.73 with a mean of 1.79, well below the widely accepted threshold of 10 (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1985). Therefore, our models do not have a problem with multicollinearity.

In examining the control variables in Table 2 and Table 3, we see some predictable patterns. First, we see the importance of lagged *PER* – a control variable that accounts for the player’s efficiency. *PER* is highly significant and essential to both usage and collaboration models. This finding makes sense as an employee’s ability should affect how many opportunities they get and how central they are to the social network (Asgari et al., 2023). Interestingly, the results were similar when removing this lagged variable from our models. Surprisingly, *Age*’s inverted U did not follow its historical pattern; however, we believe this is because we look at usage and collaboration while controlling for performance. *Salary* shows a positive and significant relationship in some, but not all, models. We see few strong relationships between our dependent and remaining control variables outside of the above.

[ Insert Table 1 about here ]

**Main Results**

Hypothesis 1a predicts that agentic leadership is more positively related to stars’ usage than non-stars. On the other hand, communal leadership is negatively related to stars’ usage compared to non-stars. To study this, we analyze the interaction between leadership style and star performer in Model 3 of Table 2. As indicated in the table, the interaction coefficient between agentic leadership and star performer is positive, as predicted, but insignificant (*β* = 115.5, SE = 146.9, p = 0.432, 95% CI -172.9 to 403.9). However, the coefficient for the interaction between communal leadership and star performer is negative and significant (*β* = -343.4, SE = 165.8, p = 0.039, 95% CI -668.8 to -18.0). Examining the interaction plot in Online Appendix 1 shows that stars are driving this relationship, as their usage decreases significantly as a coach’s communal ratings increase. This finding led us to test a split sample where we only looked at star performers in Table 2, Model 4. Here, we see support for agentic leaders increasing usage and communal leaders decreasing usage. Therefore, we find only partial initial support for Hypothesis 1a but strong support for Hypothesis 1b.

[ Insert Table 2 about here ]

We now examine how leadership styles affect star and non-star collaboration. Hypothesis 2a states that agentic leadership is negatively related to stars’ collaborative behavior compared to non-stars. Returning to Table 2, we now examine Model 7. The interaction between agentic leadership and star performers is negative and significant (*β* = -51.57, SE = 20.09, p = 0.016, 95% CI -92.56 to -10.38). Additionally, the interaction between communal leadership and star performers is positive and significant (*β* = 55.81, SE = 24.17, p = 0.028, 95% CI 6.39 to 105.24). Looking at Online Appendix 2 and 3, we can see that the star performers are again driving the relationships. Star performers significantly increase their collaboration under communal leadership and significantly decrease it under agentic leadership, with non-stars staying more-or-less the same, albeit with predicted directionality. We find significant support for both parts of hypothesis 2, which states that leadership styles affect a star’s willingness to collaborate.

In Hypotheses 3a and 3b, we examine how agentic and communal leadership styles affect turnover among star and non-star players. Using a Probit, we test these hypotheses. For Hypothesis 3a, we explore the interaction between agentic leadership and star employee turnover. As shown in Table 3 Model 3, agentic leadership increases turnover for star players, as indicated by the significant negative coefficient of the interaction term (*β* = -1.084, SE = 0.564, p = 0.054, 95% CI -2.189 to 0.021), supporting Hypothesis 3a. However, Model 3 also shows that the interaction between communal leadership and star employee turnover is not significant (*β* = 0.349, SE = 0.627, p = 0.578, 95% CI -0.880 to 1.578), thus not supporting Hypothesis 3b.

[ Insert Table 3 about here ]

However, caution must be exercised in interpreting the significance of coefficients or log odds, as highlighted by prior scholars such as Hoetker (2007) and Wiersema and Bowen (2009). Significance at this level does not uniformly translate to significance in probability across all combinations of explanatory variables and covariates. To discern where precisely the interaction effects manifest significance, we adopt the steps established as best practices outlined by Hoetker (2007). Specifically, we scrutinize the predicted probabilities of agentic leadership’s impact on turnover for both star and non-star employees across various levels of agentic leadership while keeping all other covariates at their mean values. Our analysis presented graphically in Online Appendix 4 shows that while the predicted probabilities of star employees remaining with the organization are higher than those of non-stars at low and moderate levels of agentic leadership, a notable divergence occurs at higher values of agentic leadership, where the predicted probability of retention for star employees increase significantly compared to non-star employees.

Now, we turn to hypothesis 4, where we study how leadership styles affect star relationships in dynamic environments. First, we examine how this affects usage in Table 4, Model 3. Here, we look at usage rates in playoff games within 5 points compared to those within 15 points. You will notice that the dependent variable is *Minutes Played in Games within 5 Points*, while our chief control variable is *Minutes Played in Games within 15 Points*. The former variable indicates a high-pressure dynamic environment, while the latter controls for the typical usage rates. The interaction between agentic leadership and star performers is positive and significant (*β* = 0.701, SE = 0.355, p = 0.049, 95% CI 0.004 to 1.397), which shows that when a team is in a dynamic environment, agentic leaders respond by relying even more heavily on star performers. However, the interaction between communal leaders and star performers is negative and significant (*β* = -0.945, SE = 0.420, p = 0.025, 95% CI -1.770 to -0.120), which demonstrates that when a team is in a dynamic situation, communal leaders instead utilize more non-stars. These findings, which mirror the *Usage* variable found in earlier testing, strongly support hypotheses 4a and 4b while providing supplemental support for hypotheses 1a and 1b.

[ Insert Table 4 about here ]

Mirroring hypotheses 2a and 2b, we examine how leadership styles and dynamic environments affect collaboration behavior. In Model 6 of Table 4, we look at collaboration in close games in the final two minutes while using close games in the final quarter as a control. Here, we use *Assists* as our primary dependent variable instead of minutes played, which is again added as a control variable. These models are very similar to the ones measuring collaboration in hypotheses 2a and 2b, with the added element of a dynamic environment. Looking at agentic behavior, we see that the interaction between agentic leaders and star performers is negative and significant (*β* = -2.562, SE = 0.875, p = 0.003, 95% CI -4.279 to -0.845). Therefore, agentic coaches emphasize star collaboration less than non-stars when the team is in a more dynamic and fluid environment. However, communal leaders act differently, as seen in the positive and significant interaction between communal leadership and star performers (*β* = 2.933, SE = 1.282, p = 0.022, 95% CI 0.418 to 5.448). These findings provide more backing for hypotheses 4a and 4b while providing supplemental support for hypotheses 2a and 2b.

Next, we investigate the influence of agentic and communal leadership styles on employee turnover, considering the distinction between star and non-star employees within both high and low-dynamic environments. Our probit regression analysis in Model 6 of Table 3 reveals that the interaction effect between agentic leadership and star employees on employee turnover is negative and statistically significant (*β* = -9.048, SE = 2.577, p < 0.001, 95% CI -14.098 to -3.998), specifically in high-pressure situations. In contrast, the interaction effect between communal leadership and star employees fails to attain statistical significance. Moreover, within low-pressure contexts, no interaction effects of leadership styles with star employees reach statistical significance. These outcomes support our argument that star employees moderate the relationship between agentic leadership and employee turnover, even more so in high-pressure situations.

To interpret the results for H3, we analyzed the turnover rates of star and non-star employees at varying levels of agentic leadership under high pressure while holding other variables at their mean values. Our graphical analysis in Online Appendix 5 shows that star employees have higher predicted probabilities of staying with the organization at low levels of agentic leadership. However, a significant divergence occurs at medium levels, and at higher levels of agentic leadership, star employee retention significantly decreases compared to non-star employees.

**Robustness Tests: Regression Discontinuity in Time**

We see little concern for endogeneity in our models. The three main concerns stemming from endogeneity are errors in variables, omitted variable bias, and simultaneous causality (Bascle, 2008). Regarding variable errors, our archival data has been verified from industry and academic studies (e.g., Chen & Garg, 2018). To help control for omitted variable bias, we also use position, team, and year fixed effects models to manage any unobserved heterogeneity. Additionally, given that many of our decisions are strategic actions on minute-by-minute levels, we do not perceive simultaneous causality as a concern. However, we also ran a Regression Discontinuity in Time model to control for possible endogeneity as we have a unique natural experiment available to our context.

We provide a unique test that can further clarify the relationships occurring. As a reminder, we look specifically at the NBA Bubble of 2020, the NBA’s response to the COVID-19 crisis. While most of the regular season was played under normal conditions, the NBA played the last eight games in a lockdown at the Walt Disney Resort. Players were isolated from the outside world and had to deal with the dual issues of being around coaches constantly and preparing for playoff seeding. Therefore, using this shock, we run a regression discontinuity in time model to provide additional support for Hypotheses 4a and 4b.

This scenario tests our hypotheses uniquely and accurately for three reasons. First and foremost, the NBA Bubble was a very dynamic environment, as players and the league had never experienced such a change in location, atmosphere, isolation, and stakes. Second, coaching was emphasized and focused on, as coaches were not even permitted visits from outside the bubble. Finally, in studying the interaction between the shock and coaching, we can isolate the effect of the coach's ability under pressure much more resolutely than we can under most situations. Having game-by-game and pass-by-pass data that analyzes the shock allows us to understand the impact of leadership that high-velocity environments cause in employee actions.

Following the prior literature, we run a regression discontinuity in time model with interactions (Imbens & Lemieux, 2008; Keefer, 2021) but use time as a sharp discontinuity for the cut-off point (Hausman & Rapson, 2018). We also use triangular kernels within our regression discontinuity, which puts extra weight on events close to the cut-off point, as this is the best approach for cases such as regression discontinuity models (Cheng, Fan, & Marron, 1997).

Our cut-off point is March 12th, when the NBA stopped playing regular season games due to COVID-19. The bandwidth of our model is eight games, as determined by the RDRobust measure in STATA (Calonico, Cattaneo, Farrell, & Titiunik, 2017). This bandwidth works well for us, as each team in the lockdown played eight games. Therefore, we have a balanced panel before and after the cut-off, which is best practice in regression discontinuity models (Imbens & Lemiuex, 2008). Regression discontinuity models work well with a parsimonious amount of control variables to account for possible heterogeneity. Therefore, we added the following controls to ensure a well-specified test: a dummy variable for the cut-off, the progression game number, the game result, and minutes played for the models mimicking Hypotheses 2a and 2b.

Due to the difficulty in interpreting three-way interactions in regression discontinuity models, we reported split samples for all our regressions. Turning to Online Appendix 7 Models 1 and 3, we test hypothesis 4a – that the effects of agentic leadership will become greater in dynamic environments. We did not find support for our findings in this supplementary analysis, as the results following Hypothesis 1a (*β* = -1.686, SE = 2.352, p = 0.478, 95% CI -6.445 to 3.075) and Hypothesis 2a (*β* = -0.062, SE=0.063, p=0.331, 95% CI -0.190 to 0.066) were insignificant. We believe that the insignificant results, which mirror the non-significance found in Hypothesis 1a, might be due to the context whereby communal effects are emphasized over agentic ones. However, returning to Models 1 and 3, we see that the effects of communal leadership do become greater in dynamic environments for stars. We see this when the dependent variable is *Usage* (*β* = -8.454, SE = 3.901, p = 0.037, 95% CI -16.351 to -0.556) and *Collaboration* (*β* = 0.396, SE = 0.156, p = 0.015, 95% CI 0.081 to 0.710). Therefore, in analyzing this unique case study of the NBA Bubble, we find substantial additional support for Hypothesis 4b.

**Additional Robustness Tests**

We ran multiple tests to check the robustness of our results. First, we adjusted the period of the study. While our “Super Fans” proved to be quite knowledgeable, we were curious whether recall could be an issue. We included year-fixed effects in all our main regressions to account for this. We also adjusted the number of games before and after the shock for our regression discontinuity in time approach. Although our main results follow the best practice of keeping an even number on each side of the shock, our model was robust to different ranges.

We also changed our definition of a star performer in two ways. Our main results identify star performers as those recognized as all-stars in the past three years. We used this definition because star performers often keep their designation, as a star’s assessment is usually backward-looking (Kehoe et al., 2023). However, we did the shorter and longer period with similar results, as seen in Online Appendix 8. The second way we adjusted our definition of a star performer relied on a quirk in how the NBA selects all-stars. Since the 2016-2017 all-star game, the NBA has relied on a combination of fan, player, and media votes. These nicely align with different theoretical dimensions of what makes a star performer: visibility with fan votes, social capital with player votes, and high performance with media votes (Call et al., 2015). While we did find support overall when breaking the star performers down in this fashion, we found the strongest results for visibility and social capital, as found in Online Appendix 9.

Finally, we conducted a detailed survival analysis to examine the impact of communal and agentic leadership styles on the duration of players’ tenure with their team and how this relationship varies based on whether the player is a star. Using a survival analysis helps address problems such as censoring and time-dependent covariates (Allison, 2010). Given that coaches may change over time within the team, we used a discrete time approach to accommodate time-varying coefficients. The unit of analysis was player-team dyads, split by each day they stayed with the team, using stsplit command in STATA. Then, we constructed our dependent variable as a binary *Turnover* variable, which takes 1 if the player leaves the team and 0 otherwise. After that, we ran a logistic regression to test the interaction effect of agentic and communal leadership with star employees on the binary *Left* variable. The results indicate that both the coefficient and the odds of leaving the team are higher with agentic coaches. However, similar to our main results, we did not find a significant interaction effect for communal leadership. See Online Appendix 10 for details.

**DISCUSSION**

In this study, we investigated the nuanced effects of agentic and communal leadership styles on the outcomes of star and non-star NBA players across the seasons from 2013-2014 to 2022-2023. Leveraging evaluations from “Super Fans” to assess leadership styles alongside a detailed array of player performance metrics, we examined the impact of agentic and communal leadership on usage, collaboration, and turnover among differing player categories. Our analysis indicates that, especially in dynamic environments, agentic leadership is likely to amplify the usage and turnover of star employees while diminishing their propensity for collaboration. Conversely, communal leadership appears to reduce the usage of star players and bolster their collaborative engagements, yet it shows a non-significant impact on their turnover. These insights illuminate the distinct influences of agentic and communal leadership on various employee types and emphasize how dynamic contexts magnify these leadership effects. Thus, our findings highlight significant implications for both the literature on star employees and managerial practices.

**Theoretical Implications**

Our research contributes to the star employee literature in several important ways. First, the literature on star employees and high-potential individuals has increasingly recognized the need for more insights into managing these exceptional performers' work behaviors and career outcomes (Kehoe et al., 2023). Our study addresses this gap by exploring the impact of a critical yet underexplored variable—leadership—on workplace usage, collaborative behavior, and turnover outcomes of star employees. Specifically, we investigated the distinct roles of agentic and communal leadership styles, discovering that each influences star employees in unique ways. These findings not only underscore the critical role of leadership in shaping outcomes for star employees but also suggest that organizations can strategically manage their top talent through tailored leadership approaches. We expect our research to encourage further exploration into how various leadership dimensions can profoundly affect star employees, thereby deepening our understanding of leadership’s impact on high-performing individuals.

Second, although prior research has demonstrated how star employees can impact the performance and behavior of their non-star peers (e.g., Kehoe & Bentley, 2021; Prato & Ferraro, 2018), our study extends this narrative by examining how agentic and communal leadership styles shape differences in work and career outcomes between star and non-star employees. Our results suggest that agentic leadership tends to amplify the visibility and usage of star employees, potentially at the cost of reduced collaboration and higher turnover of stars. Conversely, communal leadership provides more opportunities for non-stars and enhances the collaborative behaviors between stars and non-stars. These findings enrich our understanding of the dynamics within teams, highlighting how leadership styles can strategically influence not just individual star performers but also their interactions with and impact on the broader team environment. This perspective encourages leaders to adopt a more nuanced approach to managing different types of employees, balancing the drive for individual excellence with the need for collaborative team relationships.

Third, our research underscores the significance of exploring the interplay between leadership styles and dynamic environments in shaping the outcomes of star employees. While a recent review by Asgari et al. (2021) has cataloged the antecedent conditions of star performers, prior studies often examine these antecedents in isolation, with limited attention paid to the potential interactions among various factors. Contemporary research on strategic human capital resources underscores the importance of simultaneously considering human capital deployment and environmental contexts to fully grasp the impact of human capital resources (e.g., Gallagher et al., 2023; Wolfson & Mathieu, 2018). Consistent with this line of thinking, our findings demonstrate that dynamic contexts are critical for comprehending how leadership influences star employees. Specifically, our study reveals that dynamic environments can amplify the effects of leadership styles, suggesting that the effectiveness of agentic and communal leadership is contingent upon the situational pressures and challenges faced by teams. This insight extends our understanding of star employees by showing how the interaction between leadership behavior and environmental dynamism can influence the outcomes of both star and non-star employees.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

While our study provides valuable insights, it is not without limitations. First, even though sports data are commonly used in management research in general (e.g., Crocker & Eckardt, 2014; Grijalva et al., 2020; Wolfson & Mathieu, 2021) and in research on star employees (e.g., Chen & Garg, 2018; Kim & Makadok, 2022), the generalizability of our findings may be restricted to contexts similar to the NBA, where the dynamics of star and non-star relationships and the visibility of performance are more pronounced than in typical corporate settings. Therefore, we encourage future research to verify our findings in diverse organizational settings to explore whether similar dynamics exist in less publicized industries.

Second, our reliance on ratings from “Super Fans” to assess leadership styles represents a novel approach to measuring and integrating these data with archival data. However, this method may introduce a subjective element that might not fully capture the complexity of leadership behaviors as perceived by the players themselves. Thus, future research should consider employing more objective or direct measures of leadership to validate and extend our findings. Furthermore, incorporating additional perspectives, such as those from direct reports and peers, could provide a more comprehensive view of the leadership dynamics at play.

Third, the current research examined the effect of leadership on star and non-star employee outcomes at the player-year level. It is also possible to extend our research to the game-level analysis to provide a more granular understanding of how leadership styles influence behavioral outcomes in real time. By analyzing game-by-game data, future research could identify specific situations or phases within a game where leadership has the most significant impact, such as during high-pressure moments or when a team is trailing. This approach could uncover nuanced insights into the immediate effects of leadership styles and their direct consequences on team dynamics and individual outcomes. Additionally, a game-level analysis could explore the temporal stability of leadership effects, examining whether the influence of a leader’s style is consistent throughout a season or fluctuates with the team’s changing circumstances and competitive pressures.

**Practical Implications**

Despite these limitations, our findings offer important practical implications for leaders managing both star and non-star employees. For managers, understanding the balance between agentic and communal approaches can be key to maximizing the potential of all employees. Specifically, our study suggests that fostering a communal environment can reduce the heavy usage of star employees and enhance their collaboration with non-stars. Leaders might consider integrating more communal strategies into their management practices if they aim to encourage collaboration among star employees, especially in environments that undergo rapid changes or are under high pressure. In contrast, agentic leadership may be associated with increased usage of star employees. While the use of star employees is expected to lead to immediate improvements in performance outcomes, this leadership style may also reduce stars’ collaboration with others and increase their turnover. Therefore, managers should be cautious about employing this leadership style excessively when managing star employees.

Another critical implication of our research is the reminder to organizations and managers that the context in which leadership is exercised profoundly impacts its effectiveness, particularly in dynamic settings. Our findings underscore the importance of considering the specific conditions under which leadership styles are applied, as the influence of agentic and communal leadership on star employees becomes more pronounced in dynamic environments such as high-pressure situations or during significant external changes. Therefore, organizations should not only focus on the styles of their leaders but also on how these leadership styles can be adapted to fit the changing contexts. For instance, in times of crisis or significant change, a communal approach may better support collaboration and mitigate the risks associated with high turnover, while agentic leadership could be more effective in stable conditions where maximizing the performance of star employees is crucial. Depending on the current environment and organizational needs, leaders who can flexibly toggle between these styles will likely be more successful in managing star employees effectively.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, this study advances our understanding of how agentic and communal leadership styles differentially impact star and non-star employees within the dynamic NBA environment. It highlights the differential effects of these two leadership styles on star and non-star employees’ usage, collaborative behavior, and turnover. Additionally, it underscores the crucial role of environmental context in determining the effectiveness of each leadership style. This research contributes to the star employee literature by demonstrating how leadership styles can be strategically deployed to influence individual outcomes. By offering insights into the effects of leadership styles in varying contexts, this study provides a valuable framework for future research and practical applications in managing both star and non-star employees.
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**TABLE 1:** Matrix of Correlations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Mean** | **Std. Dev.** | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** | **(6)** | **(7)** | **(8)** | **(9)** | **(10)** | **(11)** | **(12)** | **(13)** |
| (1) Agentic Leadership | 3.484 | 0.366 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (2) Communal Leadership | 3.221 | 0.299 | 0.391 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (3) Star Performer | 0.127 | 0.333 | 0.100 | 0.092 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (4) Age | 26.941 | 4.148 | 0.117 | 0.058 | 0.146 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (5) Age Squared | 743.034 | 233.922 | 0.118 | 0.059 | 0.143 | 0.996 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (6) Games in Season | 79.164 | 4.981 | 0.022 | -0.030 | -0.008 | 0.055 | 0.054 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (7) Previous Record | 0.512 | 0.148 | 0.249 | 0.279 | 0.156 | 0.166 | 0.161 | -0.010 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| (8) PER (Player Ability) | 14.031 | 6.151 | 0.048 | 0.038 | 0.420 | -0.025 | -0.029 | -0.008 | 0.092 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| (9) Team Familiarity | 40069.72 | 21284.85 | 0.295 | 0.120 | 0.110 | 0.193 | 0.195 | 0.179 | 0.355 | 0.049 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| (10) Star Perf. Familiarity | 15050.61 | 15577.63 | 0.281 | 0.227 | 0.163 | 0.203 | 0.203 | 0.147 | 0.426 | 0.057 | 0.836 | 1 | - | - | - |
| (11) Coach Experience | 4.021 | 4.350 | 0.489 | 0.207 | 0.088 | 0.106 | 0.111 | -0.073 | 0.248 | 0.047 | 0.397 | 0.328 | 1 | - | - |
| (12) Salary Increase | 0.770 | 0.421 | -0.023 | -0.013 | 0.041 | -0.295 | -0.287 | 0.021 | -0.005 | 0.121 | -0.005 | -0.019 | -0.008 | 1 | - |
| (13) Salary | 7.58e06 | 8.23e06 | 0.037 | 0.048 | 0.610 | 0.247 | 0.228 | -0.077 | 0.091 | 0.412 | 0.034 | 0.050 | 0.049 | 0.106 | 1 |

**TABLE 2:** Usage (H1) and Collaboration (H2) Hypothesis Testing – Ordinary Least Squares Model

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (1) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
|  | Usage - MP  H1 Control | Usage - MP  H1 Main Effects | Usage - MP  H1 | Usage - MP  H1 Alt. | Coll.- Ast  H2 Control | Coll.- Ast  H2 Main Effects | Coll.- Ast  H2 |
| Age | -87.83 | -76.85 | -77.21 | -300.3 | -3.226 | -0.395 | -0.421 |
|  | (42.51) | (45.65) | (45.32) | (169.3) | (3.985) | (4.336) | (4.285) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age Squared | 1.125 | 0.933 | 0.933 | 4.441 | 0.0809 | 0.0299 | 0.0318 |
|  | (0.747) | (0.805) | (0.798) | (2.770) | (0.0681) | (0.0745) | (0.0735) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Games in the | 45.38 | 42.59 | 42.74 | 41.61 | -2.006 | -2.117 | -2.193 |
| Season | (5.244) | (5.471) | (5.450) | (18.01) | (0.337) | (0.318) | (0.315) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Previous Record | 144.5 | 144.0 | 153.0 | -228.5 | 12.21 | 4.159 | 2.501 |
|  | (109.9) | (116.4) | (115.9) | (263.0) | (6.904) | (6.445) | (6.664) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PER | 43.01 | 43.88 | 43.82 | 52.02 | 1.353 | 0.958 | 0.934 |
| (Player Ability) | (5.001) | (5.520) | (5.519) | (11.48) | (0.302) | (0.318) | (0.326) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team | -0.0023 | -0.0020 | -0.0019 | -0.0080 | -0.00002 | 0.00002 | -0.00001 |
| Familiarity | (0.0014) | (0.0015) | (0.0015) | (0.0061) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer | 0.0016 | 0.0006 | 0.0005 | 0.0122 | -0.0001 | -0.0003 | -0.0002 |
| Familiarity | (0.0020) | (0.0021) | (0.0021) | (0.0070) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coach Exp. | 11.43 | 8.775 | 8.017 | 4.449 | 0.555 | 0.197 | 0.299 |
|  | (7.381) | (7.660) | (7.675) | (17.79) | (0.491) | (0.453) | (0.456) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary Increase | 98.90 | 75.28 | 74.41 | 86.82 | -3.646 | -1.991 | -2.000 |
|  | (36.47) | (37.13) | (37.21) | (137.5) | (2.857) | (3.022) | (2.972) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 0.00004 | 0.00003 | 0.00003 | 0.00001 | 0.000002 | 0.000001 | 0.000001 |
|  | (0.000003) | (0.000003) | (0.000003) | (0.00001) | (0.0000003) | (0.0000003) | (0.0000003) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communal | - | -129.8 | -97.43 | -664.9 | - | 2.886 | -3.645 |
| Leadership | - | (82.10) | (82.68) | (321.1) | - | (6.568) | (6.538) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agentic | - | 170.5 | 151.7 | 404.8 | - | -3.772 | 2.417 |
| Leadership | - | (67.94) | (67.54) | (214.5) | - | (2.999) | (3.319) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer | - | 96.86 | 803.1 | - | - | 52.41 | 54.40 |
|  | - | (66.59) | (632.5) | - | - | (10.06) | (78.22) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer X | - | - | -343.4 | - | - | - | 55.81 |
| Communal Leadership | - | - | (165.8) | - | - | - | (24.17) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer X | - | - | 115.5 | - | - | - | -51.47 |
| Agentic Leadership | - | - | (146.9) | - | - | - | (20.09) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minutes Played | - | - | - | - | 0.0545 | 0.0578 | 0.0579 |
|  | - | - | - | - | (0.0059) | (0.0061) | (0.0061) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Failures | - | - | - | - | 2.881 | 2.583 | 2.601 |
|  | - | - | - | - | (0.356) | (0.348) | (0.345) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \_cons | -1961.0 | -2091.4 | -2141.2 | 3409.5 | 115.5 | 100.5 | 107.6 |
|  | (690.0) | (816.1) | (815.6) | (2987.3) | (62.70) | (62.44) | (64.85) |
| *N* | 2778 | 2557 | 2557 | 325 | 2778 | 2557 | 2557 |
| *Team / Year / Pos. FE* | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included |
| *Clustered SE* | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player |
| *R*2 | 0.363 | 0.376 | 0.377 | 0.425 | 0.760 | 0.770 | 0.772 |

Standard errors in parentheses

**Table 3:** Turnover (H3) and Turnover Under Pressure (H4) Hypotheses testing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|  | Turnover  H3 Controls | Turnover  H3 Main Effects | Turnover  H3 | Turnover  H3 Controls  (High Press) | Turnover  H3 Main Effects  (High Press) | Turnover  H3  (High Press) | Turnover  H3 Controls  (Low Press) | Turnover  H3 Main Effects  (Low Press) | Turnover  H3  (Low Press) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | -1.056 | -1.117 | -1.116 | -1.402 | -2.720 | -2.962 | -1.032 | -1.102 | -1.097 |
|  | (0.162) | (0.167) | (0.167) | (0.543) | (0.631) | (0.732) | (0.189) | (0.204) | (0.205) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age Squared | 0.0168 | 0.0178 | 0.0178 | 0.0231 | 0.0446 | 0.0485 | 0.0163 | 0.0176 | 0.0175 |
|  | (0.00276) | (0.00283) | (0.00283) | (0.00911) | (0.0106) | (0.0123) | (0.00322) | (0.00349) | (0.00351) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Games in the | -0.0124 | -0.0108 | -0.0139 | -0.108 | -0.255 | -0.568 | 0.0250 | 0.0325 | 0.0313 |
| Season | (0.0295) | (0.0310) | (0.0310) | (0.0747) | (0.0922) | (0.178) | (0.0375) | (0.0416) | (0.0418) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Previous | 0.695 | 0.672 | 0.626 | -1.029 | -6.716 | -6.747 | 0.160 | 0.140 | 0.115 |
| Record | (0.539) | (0.561) | (0.559) | (3.287) | (4.602) | (4.760) | (0.758) | (0.876) | (0.876) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PER | 0.0176 | 0.0155 | 0.0140 | 0.0196 | -0.00429 | -0.0249 | 0.0205 | 0.0205 | 0.0198 |
| (Player Ability) | (0.0120) | (0.0129) | (0.0129) | (0.0290) | (0.0331) | (0.0364) | (0.0148) | (0.0154) | (0.0154) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team | 0.00002 | 0.00001 | 0.00001 | 0.00002 | 0.00005 | 0.00006 | 0.00002 | 0.00001 | 0.00001 |
| Familiarity | (0.00001) | (0.00001) | (0.00001) | (0.00002) | (0.00003) | (0.00003) | (0.00001) | (0.00001) | (0.00001) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer | -0.00001 | -0.00001 | -0.00001 | -0.00000 | -0.00005 | -0.00005 | -0.00001 | -0.000003 | -0.00000 |
| Familiarity | (0.00001) | (0.00001) | (0.00001) | (0.00002) | (0.00004) | (0.00004) | (0.00001) | (0.00001) | (0.00001) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coach Exp. | 0.0275 | 0.0172 | 0.0153 | -0.0386 | 0.141 | 0.294 | 0.0759 | 0.0707 | 0.0718 |
|  | (0.0377) | (0.0392) | (0.0393) | (0.107) | (0.145) | (0.177) | (0.0478) | (0.0502) | (0.0501) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | 1.35e-08 | 2.2e-08 | 1.93e-08 | 3.37e-08 | 4.9e-08 | 3.72e-08 | 1.34e-09 | 1.41e-08 | 1.23e-08 |
|  | (8.89e-09) | (1.0e-08) | (1.0e-08) | (1.8e-08) | (2.4e-08) | (3.9e-08) | (1.2e-08) | (1.3e-08) | (1.4e-08) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minutes Played | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | 0.0006 | 0.0007 | 0.0008 | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | 0.0004 |
|  | (0.0001) | (0.00009) | (0.0001) | (0.0002) | (0.0002) | (0.0003) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communal | - | 0.306 | 0.287 | - | -3.377 | -10.16 | - | -0.0714 | -0.0951 |
| Leadership | - | (0.399) | (0.401) | - | (2.148) | (3.991) | - | (0.407) | (0.410) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agentic | - | -0.0596 | 0.0677 | - | 7.629 | 15.11 | - | -0.0359 | 0.0259 |
| Leadership | - | (0.363) | (0.376) | - | (3.839) | (4.268) | - | (0.431) | (0.458) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer | - | -0.254 | 2.532 | - | 0.0563 | 44.46 | - | - | 0.0285 |
|  | - | (0.246) | (2.244) | - | (0.584) | (13.44) | - | - | (2.882) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star X Comm. | - | - | 0.349 | - | - | -2.714 | - | - | 0.546 |
| Leadership | - | - | (0.627) | - | - | (2.036) | - | - | (0.896) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star X Agentic | - | - | -1.084 | - | - | -9.048 | - | - | -0.575 |
| Leadership | - | - | (0.564) | - | - | (2.577) | - | - | (0.690) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \_cons | 15.49 | 15.64 | 15.52 | 26.97 | 40.40 | 56.47 | 12.71 | 13.77 | 13.66 |
|  | (3.257) | (3.945) | (3.931) | (9.719) | (15.70) | (17.66) | (3.994) | (4.588) | (4.600) |
| *N* | 638 | 588 | 588 | 178 | 167 | 167 | 450 | 411 | 411 |
| *Team / Year /Position FE* | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included |
| *Clustered SE* | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player |
| *Pseudo R*2 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.24 | 0.26 | 0.26 |

Standard errors in parentheses

**TABLE 4:** Usage (H4) and Collaboration Under Pressure (H4) Hypothesis Testing

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | Usage – MP  H4 Control  (High Press) | Usage – MP  H4 Main Effects  (High Press) | Usage – MP  H4  (High Press) | Collab – Ast.  H4 Control  (High Press) | Collab – Ast.  H4 Main Effects  (High Press) | Collab – Ast.  H4  (High Press) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | -0.105 | -0.158 | -0.150 | -0.0953 | -0.0504 | -0.0613 |
|  | (0.110) | (0.104) | (0.104) | (0.108) | (0.115) | (0.117) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age Squared | 0.00182 | 0.00274 | 0.00258 | 0.00182 | 0.00103 | 0.00128 |
|  | (0.00199) | (0.00187) | (0.00186) | (0.00196) | (0.00209) | (0.00212) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Games in the | 0.107 | 0.0832 | 0.0832 | -0.0156 | -0.0202 | -0.0188 |
| Season | (0.0207) | (0.0203) | (0.0202) | (0.0221) | (0.0228) | (0.0228) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Previous | -1.667 | -1.608 | -1.610 | 0.965 | 1.021 | 0.931 |
| Record | (0.371) | (0.371) | (0.373) | (0.415) | (0.449) | (0.446) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PER | 0.000840 | 0.00530 | 0.00636 | -0.0169 | -0.0227 | -0.0233 |
| (Player Ability) | (0.00890) | (0.00971) | (0.00966) | (0.00623) | (0.00679) | (0.00661) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team | 0.00001 | 0.00001 | 0.00001 | 0.000003 | 0.000005 | 0.000004 |
| Familiarity | (0.000005) | (0.000005) | (0.000005) | (0.000005) | (0.000005) | (0.000005) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer | 0.000004 | 0.000004 | 0.000003 | -0.00001 | -0.00001 | -0.00001 |
| Familiarity | (0.000006) | (0.000006) | (0.000006) | (0.000007) | (0.000007) | (0.000007) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coach Exp. | 0.0734 | 0.0472 | 0.0444 | 0.0475 | 0.0374 | 0.0427 |
|  | (0.0232) | (0.0231) | (0.0233) | (0.0292) | (0.0313) | (0.0312) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary | -1.55e-08 | -1.64e-08 | -1.47e-08 | 1.77e-08 | 1.16e-09 | -4.15e-09 |
|  | (7.62e-09) | (9.07e-09) | (9.04e-09) | (1.29e-08) | (1.55e-08) | (1.50e-08) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minutes Played | 0.00003 | 0.00002 | 0.00002 | -0.0002 | -0.0002 | -0.0002 |
|  | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) | (0.0001) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communal | - | -2.847 | -2.654 | - | 0.610 | 0.339 |
| Leadership | - | (0.382) | (0.379) | - | (0.313) | (0.263) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agentic | - | 0.280 | 0.167 | - | -0.365 | -0.0947 |
| Leadership | - | (0.313) | (0.310) | - | (0.288) | (0.268) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer | - | -0.0326 | 0.532 | - | 0.629 | 0.234 |
|  | - | (0.195) | (1.657) | - | (0.349) | (4.057) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer X | - | - | -0.945 | - | - | 2.933 |
| Communal Leadership | - | - | (0.420) | - | - | (1.282) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Star Performer X | - | - | 0.701 | - | - | -2.562 |
| Agentic Leadership | - | - | (0.355) | - | - | (0.875) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Pressure Assists | - | - | - | 0.649 | 0.651 | 0.651 |
| (Close Game Last Q) | - | - | - | (0.0084) | (0.0088) | (0.0086) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Pressure Minutes | 0.559 | 0.560 | 0.560 | - | - | - |
| (Score 15pts or below) | (0.00724) | (0.00725) | (0.00727) | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \_cons | -6.295 | 4.459 | 4.111 | 2.710 | 1.760 | 1.789 |
|  | (2.160) | (2.693) | (2.698) | (2.230) | (2.432) | (2.433) |
| *N* | 1834 | 1768 | 1768 | 4355 | 3999 | 3999 |
| *Team / YR /Position FE* | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included | Included |
| *Clustered SE* | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player | Player |
| *R*2 | 0.936 | 0.939 | 0.939 | 0.916 | 0.916 | 0.917 |

Standard errors in parentheses