CHAPTER THREE

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of literature relating to the variables in this study. The key purpose of this study was to examine the relationship among Perceived and Preferred leadership, their congruence and satisfaction with leadership, and the second purpose of this study was to explore the differences among the offensive, the defensive and the midfield football Premier League club players in Perceived, Preferred leadership, and satisfaction with leadership. The review is presented in four sections which include: (1) Definition and overview of coaching leadership style in sport; (2) Social support in sport Leadership; (3) sport specific approach to leadership; (4) Leadership theories; (4) Athletes Satisfaction to leadership style.

3.2. Definition and Overview of Coaching Leadership Style in Sport

Researchers in sport psychology utilize several leadership definitions; however, these definitions follow similar lines. The most
popular definition of leadership is, "The behavioral process of influencing individuals and groups toward set goals" (Barrow, 1977, p. 232). Similarly, Murray (1986) combined the definitions of Stogdill (1974) and Barrow by stating that leadership is "the behavioral process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward specific goals and the achievement of those goals" (pp. 93-94). In addition, Loughead et al. (2006) and Dupuis et al. (2006) have used a more recent definition of leadership developed by Northouse (2004), "A process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 3). Although these leadership definitions used in sport are different in terms of wording, the underlining emphasis is that leadership is an influencing process.

Despite a number of leadership definitions being based on various perspectives in mainstream psychology, sport leadership definitions generally have four common components (Northouse, 2004). These four components central to leadership are: (a) leadership as a process, (b) leadership involving influence, (c) leadership occurring within a group context, and (d) leadership involving goal attainment. Two of these four leadership components are consistent with two of Stogdill’s perspectives in understanding
leadership, namely, the exercise of influence and an instrument of goal achievement. For the present dissertation, I used Barrow's definition simply because the Multidimensional Model of Leadership (Chelladurai & Carron, 1978) was developed based on the definition proposed by Barrow (1977). Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) claimed that, although the managerial functions of coaches vary (e.g., planning, organizing, and allocating budget, scheduling, reciting, public relations, leadership), the functions included in Barrow's definition are significant in an athletic context.

There are a wide variety of definitions found in the literature for personal and professional coaching (Brotman et al., 1998; Diedrich, 2001; Frisch, 2001; Garman et al., 2000; Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001; Kilburg, 1996; Kralj, 2001; Peterson, 1996; Tobias, 1996; Williams & Davis, 2002; Witherspoon & White, 1996a). This is in part due to the variable context in which coaching is used. The first definition to appear on the ICF/International coaching Federation/ website defined professional coaching as "an ongoing partnership that helps clients produce fulfilling results in their personal and professional lives" (ICF, n.d.).
Currently the ICF defines professional coaching as “an ongoing professional relationship that helps people produce extraordinary results in their lives, careers, businesses or organizations. Through the process of coaching, clients deepen their learning, improve their performance and enhance their quality of life” (ICF, 2005, Code of Ethics section, para. 2). ICF (2003, coach referral section, para. 3) further describes coaching as an interactive, action-oriented, goal setting process that helps both individuals and organizations more fully develop. The most significant difference between the two definitions is removal of the term “partnership,” which was used by Katz and Miller (1996) to describe an essential aspect of the relationship that makes coaching unique from other interventions. Although Kilburg (1996) did not use the term partnership in his definition, he described coaching as a helping relationship formed to "achieve a mutually identified set of goals," (p.142) indicating that the client and coach relationship is an affiliation based on reciprocity rather than one formed for the sole purpose of seeking or giving advice.

Both past and present ICF definitions place emphasis on personal and professional goals, keeping the context of the process very broad. The same is true of definitions found in the literature. Belf
(1996) described the process as organized and ongoing, placing an emphasis on action, improvement in performance, and personal learning and growth. Frisch's (2001) definition specified that it is a one-on-one intervention designed to support professional growth from within the organization, and should be distinguished from other general advisory roles provided by inside consultants and human resource professionals because it is focused at the individual level.

The most popularly cited definition (Brotman et al., 1998; Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001; Kilburg, 1997; Richard, 1999) found in peer-reviewed literature is Kilburg's (1996) definition of executive coaching which stated: Executive coaching is defined as a helping relationship formed between a client who has managerial authority and responsibility in an organization and a consultant who uses a wide variety of behavioral techniques and methods to help the client to achieve a mutually identified set of goals to improve his or her professional performance and personal satisfaction and, consequently, to improve the effectiveness of the client’s organization within a formally defined coaching agreement. (p.142)
In his definition, Kilburg (1996) referred to a formal agreement. When coaching is outsourced or sought externally to the organization, confidentiality with respect to other employees can be easily guaranteed, yet if the coaching contract is made within the organization between an employee and internal coach, confidentiality is at greater risk. Due to the nature of the coaching relationship, many authors agree that confidentiality is essential to the process and is a fundamental ethic to be respected (Brotman et al., 1998; Frisch, 2001; Kiel et al., 1996; Kralj, 2001; Sauer, 1999; Wasylyshyn, 2003).

Frisch (2001) defined internal coaching as "a one-on-one developmental intervention supported by the organization and provided by a colleague of those coached who is trusted to shape and deliver a program yielding individual professional growth" (p. 241). In this type of coaching scenario, absolute confidentiality would be cumbersome at best considering most work related issues concerning performance would not only be discussed, but be judged by a colleague who may not be impartial, fair or above gossiping with other employees. Other definitions specify that executive coaching, to be defined as such, be provided by outsiders
or individuals not connected with the organization (Garman et al., 2000).

Laske’s (1999a) definition of coaching differs from the others in that it is limited to a method-specific model and uses distinct terminology that relates only to the model it describes. He has defined coaching as “the multidirectional ability to observe executive organization interaction in two related mental spaces called the Professional House and the Company House, for the purpose of bringing about not only adaptive but transformative change” (p. 152). Hargrove (1995) also differentiated his description of coaching from others by referring specifically to “transformational coaching,” which he explains as a process that enables clients to broaden their vision. Some definitions describe coaching more in terms of a learning process in which clients increase their knowledge (Peterson & Hicks, 1996), facilitate learning (Diedrich, 2001), and increase opportunities with the tools that coaching provides rather than through the direct consultation from the coach as Kralj (2001) suggested.

Tobias (1996) emphasized the individualization of the process and noted that it is an ongoing process, unlike professional
development workshops and seminars that serve as one-time consultations for employee issues. Williams and Davis (2002) agreed with the aspect that coaching is typically a long-term relationship. Some definitions are specific for coaching teams (Diedrich, 1996), while others call for an expansion of the definition to include individual, team and organizational interventions that are strategy-driven on a group level in order to stimulate individual and group change (Kralj, 2001).

Coaching has not been described as an intervention to assist people in getting over their past but rather as an intervention designed to move forward with future endeavors (Williams & Davis, 2002) by facilitating understanding and learning (Diedrich, 2001) in a holistic approach (Diedrich, 1996). Coaches have also been referred to as change agents in the corporate culture (Katz & Miller, 1996). Lowman's (2001) criticism concerning the definition of coaching is that the term is often used too broadly within Organizational Development (OD) and Organizational Consulting Psychology (OCP). Kleinberg (2001) went so far as to say that coaching lacks a theoretical understanding and, due to the lack of research, is ill-defined and inchoate. This may be due to the variety of fields from which essential concepts of the coaching construct...
are drawn. According to the ICF, this definition is designed to enable clients to "deepen their learning" (ICF, 2005, Code of Ethics section, para. 2).

Common to all definitions of coaching in the literature is the aspect that coaching is a partnership or a relationship in which both coach and client share an interest in the development of a client's goals and aspirations. Structure of the process is emphasized with significance being placed on the development of clearly defined goals and a means of measuring the progress of the goals identified and agreed upon. Central to all definitions is the role of the coach as a facilitator of the process, rather than a director. In general, coaching is described as an action-oriented process that promotes personal and professional development through self-initiated change, differing from therapy in that it is designed for the normal, non-clinical population that is seeking to improve their present day life, rather than heal from issues that need therapeutic intervention.

3.2.1. Leadership in Sport

In the 1920s researchers considered leadership as a trait which a person had or did not have. According to Goul and Weinberg
(1999), leadership traits were considered to be relatively stable personality disposition, such as intelligence, assertiveness, independence and self-confidence. Successful leaders were individuals who had these personality characteristics, and that was why they were leaders, no matter what situation they were in. This theory lost favor after World War II because the research studies where not supported the existence of specific traits which discriminated between leaders and non-leaders. Then, the behavioral approach emerged, which was based on the premise that any person should be taught to become leader by simply learning the behaviors of other effective leaders; in other words leaders were made, not born (Gould & Weinberg). Several studies have investigated the beavers of leaders. Over the years, lots of beavers have been identified and examined. For example, several researchers examined a behavior referred to as instruction and demonstration. In terms of instruction, the individual focuses on the positive aspects of another person’s performance while providing definite feedback and technical instruction.

Similar to the trait theory, the behavioral theories have not been able to identify specific list effective behaviors with the downfall of this theory; researchers began to focus on an interactional
approach. This approach posts that there are not specific or pre-existing leadership characteristics or traits but rather effective leadership must fit the specific situation and one’s leadership style may change from situation to situation. In one of Chelladurai’s studies (1984), he introduced the interactional approach which was a composite of the contingency theory (Fiedler, 1967), the path-goal theory (Evans, 1970; House, 1971; Chelladurai & Dessler, 1974), and the multidimensional theory (Chelladurai, 1984, Chelladurai & Carron, 1974), and the multidimensional theory was created by modifying earlier theories and has been the focus of recent leadership studies.

Chelladurai (1980) developed the multidimensional model of sport leadership specifically for athletic satisfactions. He categorized leadership behavior into three groups which included required behavior. When these three groupings are consistent optimal performance and satisfaction are achieved. Therefore, leader’s effectiveness depends on the situational characteristics of both the leader and the group members. A variety of studies have been conducted in attempt to examine effective leadership. According to Gould and Weinberg (1999), there are four components of effective leadership. The first factor to be considered is the leader’s qualities
included integrity, loyalty, confidence, accountability, candor, preparedness, resourcefulness, self-discipline, and patience. The second component consists of leadership style, while there are many leadership styles, two styles receiving more attention are the democratic and autocratic styles. Democratic style is athlete-centered, cooperative, and relationship-oriented in comparison to autocratic style which is win-oriented, tightly structured, and task-oriented.

The specific situation is the third factor, which needs to be considered. That means one must take into account several characteristics about the sport such as it is team or individual, interactive or coactive, team size, amount of team available to make decisions, etc. The last factor to be considered is the follower’s qualities of characteristics such as the age, maturity level, etc. A more recent line of research has focused on the leader’s thought, his/her leadership style and the players’ thought about their effectiveness.

The three factors mentioned by Gould and Weinberg could be applied to the interactional approaches as well as the model constructed by Chelladurai. From the previous studies, it is
important to consider what effective leadership in a particular situation based on the situation, leader, and member characteristics. In a sport such as football, it would be important to determine which type of leadership styles are preferable to satisfy the needs of players which contribute to effective leadership.

3.2.2. Discovering Coaching Leadership

There are numerous dimensions of leadership behaviors that a strength and conditioning or fitness coach can draw from that are sensitive to the situation, sport and/or activity, and skill level of the athlete or fitness level of the client. Six behavior dimensions of leadership exist, including autocratic, democratic, Positive Feedback, Social Support, training and instruction, and situational consideration (Zhang 1997).

**Autocratic leadership:** Autocratic leadership limits the involvement of its participants in decisions. The use of commands and punishments are prevalent as is the prescription of plans and methods for activities (Zhang 1997). With autocratic leadership, a coach or trainer will map out a plan with very little, if any, input from the athlete or client. The Autocratic Behavior dimension is a
prime example of a coach or trainer giving the athlete or client what the coach or trainer thinks she/he needs.

**Democratic leadership:** Democratic leadership allows for the participation of athletes or clients in decisions, and coaches are respectful of their rights (Zhang 1997). Under this dimension, athletes or clients are allowed to set their own goals and are permitted to provide input about their training program. According to Coach Wooden, coaches should “consider the rights of others before [their] own feelings and the feelings of others before [their] own rights” (ESPN 2010). This form of leadership engages the athletes or clients that they are working with, making them feel needed and important (Zhang 1997).

**Positive Feedback:** Positive Feedback is based upon a behaviorist approach and is also known as positive reinforcement (Zhang 1997). Coaches and personal trainers will compliment or reward their athletes or a client on their successes, which maintains motivational levels (Mageau 2003; Zhang 1997). The athlete or client will be rewarded for a good performance or effort (Zhang 1997).
**Social Support**: The dimension of Social Support, which is a humanistic style, satisfies the interpersonal needs of athletes or clients by remaining sensitive to them and helping them with their personal problems (Zhang 1997). A high degree of emotional intelligence (Goleman 1998), specifically empathy or having the ability to understand the emotional makeup of people and treating them according to their emotional reactions, will be required to effectively carry out this dimension (Zhang 1997; Goleman 1998).

**Training and instruction**: Another dimension, training and instruction, is utilized to bolster the athlete’s or client’s skill set. Here a strength coach may help refine an athlete’s Olympic lifting technique or a personal trainer may guide his client through some mobility drills or flexibility exercises that were just introduced. This dimension focuses on explaining the techniques of the exercises and the tactics of the drills, provides rationale as to why these new concepts are being implemented (Mageau 2003), and clarifies training priorities to be worked on (Zhang 1997).

### 3.2.3 Coaching Effectiveness

The research that has been conducted over the past two decades in the area of coaching effectiveness has primarily been focused on
identifying the coaching characteristics, leadership styles, and behavioral patterns which are most effective. In general, these research studies have defined an “effective coach” as one who elicits either successful performance outcomes or positive psychological responses on the part of her or his athletes (Horn, 2002). Since coaches affect not only their athletes’ physical performance but also their psychosocial well-being, it is important for an effective coach to become attuned to the many personal and individual needs of their athletes. Thus, in addition to the technical skills of their sport, effective coaches may be required to occupy many roles within the lives of their athletes. These may include being a leader, follower, teacher, role model, limit setter, psychologist/ counselor and/or mentor (Anshel, 2003). Effective coaches are those who are prepared to meet the individual needs of their athletes and realize that they can make a difference in the team performance by improving their own coaching skills and understanding the effect that their behavior can have on their athletes (Anshel, 2003). The two most prominent models of leadership effectiveness in sport, the Multidimensional Model of Leadership (Chelladurai, 1978) and the Meditational Model of Leadership (SMOLL & SMITH, 1989) have served as frameworks for
much of the related research. Recently, elements of both models have been combined to form a working model of coaching effectiveness (HORN, 2002). Horn’s (2002) working model is founded on three assumptions. First, antecedent factors (i.e. socio-cultural context, organizational climate, and personal characteristics of the coach) and athletes’ personal characteristics (e.g. age, gender, etc.) exert influence on coaches’ behavior indirectly through coaches’ expectancies, beliefs, and goals. Second, coaches’ behavior affects athletes’ evaluation of their coaches’ behavior and team performance. Third, the effectiveness of various coaching interventions is influenced by situational factors and individual differences. Much work remains in clarifying the specific relationships that exist within these broad assumptions.

To quantify the MML, Chelladurai & Saleh (1980) developed the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS). The LSS is a sport-specific measure, which consists of five dimensions of leader behavior; training and instruction, Positive Feedback, Social Support, democratic and Autocratic Behavior. Training and instruction is related instructional behaviors towards task accomplishment. Democratic and Autocratic Behaviors refer to social process of decision making. Positive Feedback and Social Support refer to
the motivational tendencies of the coach and concern for the personal needs of the athletes (Chelladurai, 1985). The LSS has three different versions: the athletes' perception of their coaches' behavior; the athletes' preference for coaching behavior and the coaches' perception of their own behavior. Great leaders come in many forms. In one sense solid leadership is a subjective thing, in another there are certain characteristics that are, by consensus, typical of quality leadership. Leadership is the process of influencing team members to work hard towards, and be committed to, team goals. Leaders can either be task-oriented or person-oriented. Task-oriented leaders are most interested in training, instructing behavior, performance and winning. Person-oriented leaders are more interested in the interpersonal relationships on the team. Great leaders in sports are both task- and people-oriented, but lean more towards being task-oriented.

Leaders must possess the qualities they are trying to incorporate into their team. For example, if you want members to be confident, have self-control, be disciplined, etc., then you must first possess all these traits. One of the most powerful things you can do is lead by example. You serve as an influential role model for your players and everything you do will be watched. Vince Lombardi says,
"Leaders are made, they are not born; and they are made just like anything else has ever been made in this country - by hard work" (Dowling, 1970, p. 179).

According to Cakioglu, Ash (2003), literature review of coaching revealed that great leaders are often scholars in their field and are intelligent and like all great scholars, they aren't know-it-alls, they feel there is always more to learn and have a willingness to admit mistakes. Outstanding leaders make decisions based on facts, and apply common sense and simplicity to complex tasks. You must select the right strategy for the right situation, even when the pressure is overwhelming. They are well organized, detail-oriented and, due to their thorough preparation, rarely caught off guard. Their great knowledge allows them to be great educators and motivators. They are also smart enough to know that many times they will have to alter what they originally planned due to changing circumstances, so flexibility and having an open mind are crucial to leadership. Successful leaders are not only highly driven and intrinsically motivated but also foster that same enthusiasm in their associates. Charles Schwab says, "I consider my ability to arouse enthusiasm among the men the greatest asset I possess, and the way to develop the best that is in a man is by appreciation
and encouragement" (Carnegie, 1964, p. 34). They have a high energy level, create task excitement and are catalysts for positive action. One must be a good motivator and have the gift for verbal persuasion to get athletes to "buy in" to the fact that hard work does pay off and that the pursuit of excellence, while a tough journey, is a worthwhile one. One cannot take motivation for granted. Even the players who are always motivated can use some outside motivation from coaches. They must be encouraged as people and as players.

Great leadership encompasses confidence, assertiveness and mutual respect. Great leaders take calculated risks and are innovative and confident in their decisions to do so. They realize that being timid will not get them where they want to go. This confidence and assertiveness will usually trickle down to the team members. The quality and effectiveness of a great leader will often show itself by way of the team's effort as a whole. A coach's confidence in the team can give team members added strength to do extraordinary things. One also must have respect for the players; if athletes are not treated with genuine respect, they will respect the coach. Sincerity is important because players can
usually tell if positive talk is phony, and in that case they won't take it to heart.

To get the most out of each player and make the team experience a positive one, one must understand the individuality of players and the dynamics of group interaction. It is essential to know members well enough to be able to assess their strengths and weaknesses and use them to their fullest potential within the context of the team. Systematic delegation getting the right players doing the right job is vital on teams. For example, the selection of the right person to be team captain can be important. This is why it is so important for a coach to get to know each of the players as well as possible.

The great leader is a master in the art of communication. He or she is aware of the strong need for actions to match words. Leaders need to possess a willingness to listen to input with an open mind. Two-way communication, being approachable and having an "open door" policy makes for very good team relations. This is crucial in building a trusting and open environment. It must be an established norm that it is okay to ask for help and that players can communicate openly without fear of punishment. The way one
communicates with and leads a team may play a big part in their motivation to work hard.

The goal is to push the team to perform to their full potential. The coach, along with the players, must set obtainable yet demanding team goals. Strong leadership becomes a moot point if the players are uninterested in the mission and goals. Coaches must develop a strong rapport which involves trust and confidence on both ends. "Good leadership consists of motivating people to their highest levels by offering them opportunities, not obligations" (Tzu, p. 135).

Murray & Mann stated that a proficient leader "has a vision, an intense focus on outcome and results, a realistic strategy to carry out the vision and the ability to communicate the vision and rally support of others" (Williams, 1993, p. 87). Leaders are there to coach, direct and nudge players in the direction of the goals. They have a strong ability to pass their intensity along to their others. They are always "in the game" right along with the players.

A leader guides a team, not rules a team. He or she charts a course, gives direction and develops the social and psychological environment (Martens, 1987). The leader either the coach or a player with leadership qualities provides an atmosphere where
others can learn and grow. A coach must give some responsibility to the group and have the courage to foster independence. Otherwise the members will feel that they are not trusted to take care of themselves and will be irresponsible. There must be a balance where the coach accepts his or her share of responsibility and gives some back to the team members. Excellence in leadership is acquired by people who have a strong sense of vision, have passion and are able to get people to commit 100% and take the necessary action to see that vision become a reality. Great leaders excel in the art of communication and motivation, mutual respect, instilling confidence and enthusiasm, and showing credibility and integrity on a consistent basis.

3.2.4. Athletic Coaching

Kilburg's (1996) literature review of coaching revealed that the field of athletic coaching has been researched extensively, yet research on the application of athletic coaching techniques and variables have not been duplicated in personal and professional coaching research. Despite the lack of duplicative research, many dimensions of athletic coaching are incorporated in personal and professional coaching.
Miller, Ogilvie, and Adams (2000) found that careful assessment of an athlete's personality, learning, and competitive profiles provided information beneficial to the coaching process. Personality traits evaluated were loss of control, maturity of judgment, and emotional stability. Teaching ability, optimal learning conditions, and visual, kinesthetic, and auditory preferences were evaluated for the learning profile. The competitive profile examined the athlete's determination, concentration, poise, and mental toughness. Miller et al. (2000) concluded that insight is needed in all three areas for coaches to understand the needs of their athletes and determine strategies that will enhance performance. Similar assessments were made in many of the non-athletic coaching case studies reviewed, however many of the assessment tools used were proprietary materials and not universally accepted, empirical, peer-reviewed psychological tests. Blattner (2005) used 55 DISC, an assessment tool he described as analyzing “behavioral style,” a term not used within psychological literature and absent from "The Dictionary of Psychology" (Corsini, 2001). In collecting information on goals, abilities, perceptions and organizational standards (GAPS) for the coaching process, Peterson (1996) cited a variety of means as diverse as personal reflection, career interest instruments,
professional assessment, and perceptions from peers, bosses, clients, customers, and friends, none of which were documented as researched protocols for collecting information.

No studies could be found in the coaching literature that evaluated the efficacy of any coaching intake method, unlike other disciplines which are rich with studies analyzing various aspects of the intake such as client language (Amrhein, Miller, Yahne, Palmer, & Fulcher, 2003), client receptivity to the intake procedure (Hahn & Marks, 1996), individual aspects of a systemic intake procedure (Sommers-Flanagan & Sommers-Flanagan, 1995), and predictors of non-attendance at intake appointments (Akutsu, Tsuru, & Chu, 2004).

Self-esteem, an aspect of personality that affects performance, has also been researched by sports psychologists, and factors that affect global self-esteem have attracted the attention of theorists from the early beginnings of psychology (James, 1950). Rogers (1961, 1980, 1989) regarded self-concept as an important aspect of personality that influences behavior. Smoll, Smith, Barnett, and Everett (1993) studied the effects of coaching support for the enhancement of player self-esteem in a self-enhancement model of
coaching sports. It was concluded that coaches trained to exhibit behaviors that enhanced self-esteem were regarded more positively by the players they coached. Players also had more fun and exhibited a higher level of interaction with other team members. Similar results were observed with technical instruction and competency development. Athletes responded best to coaches who provided positive reinforcement (Smith & Smoll, 1990).

Feltz et al. (1999) emphasized the teaching aspect of sport coaching models by recognizing that athletic coaches provide instruction, oversee the practice of skills, and give feedback when coaching. The authors also agree that coaches must also believe they have the capacity to affect the learning and performance of their athletes. Leadership development, an aspect of executive coaching that is given much attention in the literature (Day, 2000), is also an important aspect of athletic coaching models that receives much attention (Chelladurai, 1990; Chelladurai, & Saleh, 1980; Spink, 1998).

Additional aspects of sports coaching that receive attention and are thematic within the personal and professional coaching models are self-confidence (George, 1994), psychological skills (Smith &
Christensen, 1995; Howe, 1993), the effect of expectations on goals
(Horn, 1984), performance enhancement (Petrie & Diehl, 1995),
competition (Stanne, Johnson, & Johnson, 1999), individual and
team efficacy (Feltz & Lirgg, 1998), coach effectiveness (Douge,
1993), and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Vallerand &

Many variables exist in the coach-client relationship independent of
the context in which coaching is done. Poczwardowski, Barott, and
Henschen (2002) pointed out that the dynamics of the coaching
relationship in sports is a multifaceted and interpersonal
phenomenon. Kilburg (2001) reminded coaches that some of the
coach/client relationship variables are within the power of the
couch to control, yet others emerge as the result of coach/client
interactions which are specific to the circumstances. In sports an
athlete’s perception of their relationship with their coach and coach
leadership are two important variables that influence team
cohesion and performance (Jowett & Chaundy, 2004). Strong
coach/athlete relationships also serve to enhance the athlete’s self-
efficacy (McCormick, 2002) and improve performance (Jowett &
Cockerill, 2003). Although research is lacking on this specific
aspect of the coach/client relationship in a systems approach to
executive coaching, the leadership behavior of a coach have been found to be of importance.

3.3. The Definition and Structure of Social Support in Sport

Previous literature on Social support has been varied in terms of its conceptualization. Social Support is generally accepted as “knowing that one is loved and cared for” (Sarason, Sarason, & Pierce, 1990, p. 119). It can be divided into two main components, structure and function, with structure referring to the number of people and the physical distance that separate them, and function referring to the nature of Social Support provided (Cauce, Reid, Landsman, & Gonzales, 1990). Recent trends in Social Support have lent towards its multi-dimensional structure supported by Cutrona and Russell’s (1990) review and synthesis which revealed five main dimensions of support.

The first dimension is emotional support – “the ability to turn to others for comfort and security during times of stress leading the person to feel that he/she is cared for by others”. Assisting with dealing with on-site pressures, selection pressures, comfort, and distance from home and relationship issues would factor under this dimension. The second, informational support, “providing the
individual with advice or guidance concerning solutions to a problem” include giving advice on life direction, general guidance, and technical instruction and fitness concerns. Thirdly, tangible support, defined as “concrete, instrumental assistance in which a person in a stressful situation is given the necessary resources” could range from injury rehabilitation to training fees to accommodation. The fourth dimension of network support highlights that a person is part of a group whose members have common interests could stem from team mates, peers outside of sport, family members or role models. Lastly, esteem support, “the bolstering of a person’s sense of competence or self-esteem by other people who can offer individual Positive Feedback” relates to the belief in their ability, motivating them for competition and training and boosting their confidence levels, especially in a slump or in the event of non-selection. As can be seen, Social Support is a fundamental aspect of a person’s life as well as an athlete, but its effects could be even more pronounced in an athlete due to the increased and specific pressure in his or her life.
3.3.1. The Role of Social Support in Elite Youth Sport

Although primary research in Social Support focused on clinical samples (Hanna & Guthrie, 2001), educational and social settings (Cheng & Chan, 2004), Social Support in sport has been found to play an important role as well. Rees and Hardy’s (2000) qualitative study of top-level sport performers supported the multi-dimensional structure of Social Support and their results suggested that good Social Support may be an important part of a competitor’s make-up. Qualitative and quantitative data obtained on former elite figure skaters revealed that they attributed some of their success to the Social Support structure surrounding them (Scanlan, Stein, & Ravizza, 1989).

3.3.2. Measurement of Social Support

The measurement of Social Support has mainly been divided into two factions those who wish to measure the number of supports available to an individual should a need arise, that is, the size and complexity of one’s social network, and those who wish to measure the type of support sought out for particular reasons (d’Abbs, 1982; Pierce et al., 1996). However, since the size and complexity of individual’s networks can be so vast, the majority of research has
focused on measuring the type of support that is available to an individual (Sarason & Sarason, 1985). It is also more useful to researchers to document the type of help that people seek in specific situations so that particular interventions may be formed.

Initial attempts at specifying categories of Social Support include Barrera’s “Social Support Interview Schedule” (Barrera, 1979) in which he identifies six categories of Social Support: material, physical assistance, intimate interaction, guidance, feedback and social participation. Participants are then asked, to whom they would turn for each of the kinds of support and to whom they actually have turned to in the previous month. As a result of Cutrona and Russell's (1990) review and synthesis of the Social Support literature, the “Interpersonal Support Evaluation List” (ISEL) was formed. It consists of a list of 40 statements concerning the Perceived availability of potential Social Support providers and participants respond to each statement by marking it as “Probably true” or “Probably false”. Whilst this dichotomous scale lends itself to statistical problems, the ISEL is vague about the support providers, (e.g. “There are several different people with whom I enjoy spending time”). Therefore, the need for an improved scale beckons.
To date, there is no validated instrument that measures Social Support provided in a sporting context. The need for one is highlighted by reviewing the literature in sport and realizing the specialized niches in which support is required, for example, coaching advice, costume design, and high levels of dependency on transport and finances (Ryan, 1996). Whilst it has been emphasized that it is the perception of received and available support that is important, not the actual support, there is no instrument in the field that attempts to measure the discrepancy between the ‘support-receivers’ and the ‘support-providers’. Thus, one of the aims of this project is to develop and validate such an instrument.

3.3.3. Improved Coaching Through Emotional Intelligence

Tony was the top middle distance runner on his high school track team. After a successful season in which he set two school records, and helped his team to a league title, Tony was primed to continue his success at the upcoming sectional meet. But there was a problem. Tony had tweaked his knee during training three weeks before the meet. Even worse, because of his coach’s propensity for losing his temper and accusing injured athletes of “faking it” or
acting like a bunch of “sissy’s,” Tony was afraid to mention his injury, and instead attempted to train as if nothing were wrong. As a result, Toney’s knee worsened, and he was in less than top shape for the big meet. He finished a disappointing sixth, leaving his coach and teammates wondering what went wrong.

Unfortunately, situations such as the one just described are not uncommon in the win-at-all-cost world of competitive sport. Coaches often feel that the best way to motivate their athletes is through ridicule, fear, and intimidation. In fact, the volatile leadership style of the coach in the above example led Tony to feel ashamed of his injury, and rather than speak up and seek treatment, choose to remain silent and risk further damage to his knee. According to researchers in psychology and business, scenarios such as this are the result of leaders who lack emotional intelligence.

Emotional intelligence (EI) refers to individual’s ability to perceive, utilize, understand, and manage their emotions (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). Not surprisingly, EI has been identified as critical for effective leadership. EI was found to be twice as important as IQ or
technical skills for leader performance in several large companies (Goleman, 1998).

3.4. Leadership Theories

The word “leadership” is a sophisticated, modern concept. In earlier times, words meaning “head of state”, “military commander”, “principal’s”, “proconsul”, “chief” or “king” were common in most societies. These words differentiated the ruler from other members of society. Although the Oxford English Dictionary noted the appearance of the word “leader” in the English language as early as the year 1300, the word “leadership” did not appear until the first half of nineteenth century in writings about political influence and control of British Parliament and the word did not appear in the most other modern languages until recent times (Bass, 1990).

Today, there are many different definitions of leadership but there still appears to be no generally accepted definition of leadership. Burns (1978) stated that leadership is one of the least understood phenomena on earth. However, in order to make clear understanding of leadership phenomena, social scientists and behavioral psychologists have studied leadership for several decades and developed leadership theories. Leadership theories can
be classified in three approaches. The first approach focused on the
traits of great leaders. It was believed that successful leaders have
certain personality that make them to be successful leaders in
every situations and great leaders were born not made. The second
approach focused on behaviors of effective leaders. Behaviorists
argued that anyone could be great leader by learning behaviors of
other effective leaders. Because of the weakness and fallacy of trait
and behavioral approaches, leadership researchers focused on
situational factors that are important to leadership success.
Whereas trait and behavioral approaches, situational approach (the
third approach) assumes that there is not one best type of leader
but that leadership effectiveness depends on interaction between
the leader and situation.

3.4.1. Trait Theories

In the 1920's and 1930's, leadership research focused on trying to
identify the traits that differentiated leaders from non-leaders.
These early leadership theories focused on "what" an effective
leader is, not on 'how' to effectively lead. The trait approach
suggested that physical, intellectual and personality traits are
inherent in leaders. Because leadership traits thought to be stable
to be successful leader, leaders who were successful in one situation were expected to be successful in every situation. Sets of common traits and characteristics, such as intelligence, assertiveness, independence, self-confidence, initiative, and self-assurance, to great leaders were identified to assist in selecting the right people to become leaders.

Attempts were also made in sport to identify successful coaches according to the trait view. In their study, Ogilvie and Tutko (1966) profiled typical coach as someone who is authoritarian, independent in their thinking, and realistic in their perspective and emotionally mature. This approach had a great deal of support from social scientists prior to and during World War II, but lost favor around the end of World War II, when Stogdill (1948) published his review of 124 trait-related studies of leadership and found only a couple of consistent personality traits and he concluded that it was simply not possible to evidence that successful leaders have a universal set of leadership traits.

In addition, in his review of the sport personality literature, Sage (1975) made the same conclusion relative to leadership in sport. As a result of Sage’s review, the number of sport studies investigating
trait leadership was discontinued. Trait theory has not been able to identify a set of traits that consistently distinguish leaders from followers. The limiting aspect of the trait theory was de-emphasized to take into account situational conditions.

3.4.2. Behavioral Theories

To measure traits, researchers had to rely on constructs that were lack of reliability and also lack of validity because of given differing definitions. After World War II, owing to the problems with the trait approach became evident; researchers turned their attention to leader behaviors. Researchers decided to examine the behaviors of successful leaders. Unlike trait theory, this approach stressed that “leaders are made, not born” (Cox, 1998). Researchers interested in “how” a leader leads not “what” a leader is.

This approach to leadership was very optimistic. Behaviorists argued that anyone could learn to become a potential leader by learning the behaviors of other effective leaders. In fact, several different successful leader behaviors have been identified. First, leaders can be categorized either autocratic or democratic. Second, leaders can be classified as directive or as permissive. Third, some leaders are task oriented while others are people oriented. Two
important products or concepts with leadership behaviors were undertaken by the University of Michigan and by Ohio State University by attempts to define more specific leadership dimensions (Stogdill, 1959).

3.4.2.1. Ohio State University Leadership Studies

The majority of earlier studies were conducted at Ohio State University during 1940s and 1950s. Researchers at Ohio State University developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to assess leader behaviors. Using it, they found results that suggested two basic leader behaviors or styles: consideration and initiating structure.

1. Consideration Behavior: Consideration refers to “the leader’s behavior which is indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his or her staff” (Halphin, 1959). Leaders who scored high on consideration had good rapport and communication with others.

2. Initiating Structure Behavior: Initiating structure refers to “the leader’s behavior in delineating the relationship between him/her and members of the work and in endeavoring to establish well-
defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure” (Halphin, 1959). Leaders who scored high on initiating structure were active in directing groups’ activities, communicating, scheduling, and experimenting new ideas. These two kinds of behavior are considered to be relatively independent but also compatible. Therefore, the leader can exhibit varying degrees of both initiating structure and consideration at the same time and a leader can be high in both.

3.4.2.2. The University of Michigan Studies

The University of Michigan studies were also begun approximately at the same time of Ohio State University studies. These studies focused on research objectives to determine leader behaviors related to performance effectiveness. The Michigan studies described a leader as being employee-centered or either production-centered (Stogdill, 1974).

1. **Employee Centered Behavior**: An employee-centered leader is interested in ensuring employees are satisfied with their job and in the needs of their followers and differences among them. The employee-centered leader also encourages worker participation by developing a cohesive work group.
2. Production Centered Behavior: A production-centered leader emphasizes technical aspects of job and is concerned with the performance. The production centered leader sets job standards and explains work procedures. The primary concern of leaders with considerate and employee-centered style is the employee's welfare. The primary concern of leaders with initiating structure and production-centered styles are achieving goals.

3.4.2.3 The Managerial Grid Theory

The results of behavioral studies were incorporated into a grid proposed by Blake and Mouton (1964). The Managerial Grid utilizes the concern for people versus concern for production proposed by both the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies.
Figure 3.1

Managerial Grid

Source: Changingminda.org

Grid figure adopted from wikipedia.org
It identifies five different types of leadership based on concern for production and concern for people. The five leadership styles of the managerial grid include impoverished, country club, task oriented, middle-of-the road, and team. The impoverished style is located at the lower left-hand corner of the grid, point (1, 1). It is characterized by low concern for both people and production. The country club style is located at the upper left-hand corner of the grid, point (1, 9). It is characterized as a high concern for people and a low concern for production. The task-oriented style is located at the lower right-hand corner of the grid, point (9, 1). A high concern for production and a low concern for people characterize it. The middle-of-the-road style is located at the middle of the grid, point (5, 5). A balance between workers' needs and the organization’s productivity goals characterize it. The team style is located at the upper right-hand of the grid, point (9, 9). It is characterized by a high concern for people and production. This research concluded that managers perform best under a 9, 9 style, as contrasted with a 9, 1 or the 1, 9 styles.

More recently researchers have focused on leadership behaviors of the coach. When these various behavioral theories were applied to sport, it was found that the most desired behaviors of coaches were
training for competencies, providing Social Support, and being rewarding (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1978). However, according to Chelladurai and Carron (1978) and Singer (1972), the behavioral theories on coaching leadership usually lack of consideration of situational factors.

3.4.3 Contingency Theories

Trait and behavioral approaches emphasize personal factors at the absence of considering both individual and situational factors that are important to leadership success. The contingency theories attempted to explain the appropriate leadership style based on the leader, followers, and situation. It was suggested that effective leadership is a function of the interaction of the situation and personal characteristics. There were several approaches to isolate situational variables. Some of these approaches which have acquired more successful recognition are presented in this study.

3.4.3.1. Fiedler's Contingency Model

Fiedler’s theory is one of many that use the contingency approach. This theory suggested that the leader’s traits and the leader’s control of the situation determine a leader’s effectiveness. Fiedler’s
contingency theory postulates that there is no best way for leaders to lead. Leader effectiveness is situation specific, and leader behaviors that are effective in one situation may not be in other. That is, effective leadership depends on specific environmental situations. Fiedler (1967) believes that a leader’s style results from the leader’s own needs and personality. He also suggests that leadership style is a stable personality characteristic. According to Fiedler (1967) situational favorableness depends upon three sub factors:

1. **Leader-Member Relations**: a Leader-member relation refers to the feelings subordinates have for the leader. Good relations result in respect and trust by followers, and group cooperation and effort.

2. **Task Structure**: Task structure concerns the extent to which the followers’ jobs are structured or unstructured.

3. **Position Power**: Position power concerns the leader’s ability to force workers to comply with his or her demands.

According to Fiedler (1967), the effectiveness of the group depends on two factors: The personality of leader, and the degree to which the situations give the leader power, control and influence over the situation. In terms of personality, Fiedler believes that leaders are
either relationship motivated or task motivated. Relationship motivation refers to concern with the interpersonal relationship between leader and followers. Task motivation refers to the leader’s concern with the accomplishing the task at hand. In order to classify leadership styles, Fiedler developed the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) scale. The LPC scale asks a leader to think of all the persons with whom he or she has ever worked, and then to describe the one person with whom he or she worked the least well with. From a scale of 1 through 8, leaders are asked to describe this person on a series of scales shown below:

- Unfriendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Friendly
- Uncooperative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Cooperative
- Hostile 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Supportive
- Guarded 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Open

A high LPC score suggests that the leader have a human relation’s orientation, while a low LPC score indicates a task orientation. The application of Fiedler’s model to sport might imply that a coach who is successful in one situation might not be so in other (Murray & Mann, 1993).
Reviews of sport oriented research testing this theory have found little support for the model (Carron, 1980). In addition, based on his examination of the literature, Cox (1990) concluded, “it would appear that Fiedler’s contingency theory is not applicable to sport settings.” Fiedler’s theory differs from most situational theories, since the emphasis on relatively stable personality traits, as opposed to behaviors (Cox, 1998). On the other hand, in other situation specific theories the focus is on the situational specific behaviors, rather than personality dispositions (Murray & Mann, 1993).

3.4.3.2. House’s Path Goal Theory

In the path-goal theory, “the leader is viewed as a facilitator who helps subordinates achieve their goals” (House, 1971). As the term implies, the leader provides a path by which the followers can reach their goals. House's 1971 article on Path-Goal Theory argued that a subordinate' motivation, satisfaction and work performance are dependent on the leadership style chosen by their superior. The leader’s success is viewed in terms of whether or not the subordinates achieve their goals. This is done by rewarding subordinates for goal attainment, pointing out roadblocks and
pitfalls on the path to success, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction (Cox, 1998). The extent to which such guidance and support will be provided is dependent upon the ability and personality of the subordinate (Chelladrai and Carron, 1983). Path-Goal theory assumes that leaders are flexible and that they can change their style, as situations require. “Path-goal theory has not been investigated much either in or out sport environments, perhaps due to lack of clarity. However, Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) looked at the theory from a sport context and reported partial support for path-goal theory. Individuals who demonstrated a preference for team sports also indicated a preference for leader behavior that was calculated to improve performance through training procedures. Thus, leader behavior correlated with the athletes’ preference for an independent type of sport. As predicted by the theory, a particular athlete personality consistently Preferred a particular leader behavior” (Cox, 1998).

3.4.3.3. Heresy – Blanchard Situational Leadership Model

The Hersey-Blanchard (1972) Situational Leadership theory is based on “the amount of direction (task behavior) and amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader must
provide given the situation and the ‘level of maturity’ of the followers.” This theory places the emphasis in leader behavior on the subordinates and not on the leader. Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1977, and 1982) proposed that effective leaders could and should adjust their leadership style to respond to the life cycle needs of their followers and to the environment. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) suggested that an appropriate leadership style for a specific situation be determined by the maturity of the followers. Maturity is defined in terms of “the capacity to set and obtain goals, willingness and ability to assume responsibility, and education or/and experience” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Two types of leadership behavior were identified by Hersey and Blanchard (1982) in terms of task behavior (initiating structure) and relationship behavior (consideration).

1. **Task Behavior:** The extent the leaders engage in spelling out the duties and responsibilities to followers. This behavior includes telling people what to do, how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and who's to do it. In task behavior the leader engages in one-way communication.
2. **Relationship Behavior**: The extent to which leaders engage in a two-way communication, listen, provide support and encouragement, facilitate interaction, and involve the followers in decision making. This includes listening, facilitating, and supportive behaviors. In relationship behavior the leader engages in two-way communication by providing socio-emotional support. The behavior of leader in relation to the follower(s) is then based on three variables: (1) the amount of guidance and direction a leader gives, or initiating behavior; (2) the amount of socio-emotional support a leader gives, or consideration behavior; and (3) the maturity level of the followers as they perform a task. In this theory four-leader behavior quadrants are:

1. **Directing (S1)**: It is high task/low relationship behavior. The leader provides clear instructions and specific direction.

2. **Coaching (S2)**: It is high task/high relationship behavior. The leader encourages two-way communication and helps build confidence and motivation on the part of the employee, although the leader still has responsibility and controls decision-making.
3. **Supporting (S3):** It is high relationship / low task behavior. With this style, the leader and followers share decision making and no longer need or expect the relationship to be directive.

4. **Delegating (S4):** It is low relationship / low task behavior. This style is appropriate for leaders whose followers are ready to accomplish a particular task and are both competent and motivated to take full responsibility.

Hersey and Blanchard believed that effective leaders adapt their leadership style to meet the needs of the group and the situation. The maturity of subordinates determines the most effective leadership style. “The concept of maturity also exists in the context of sport and physical activity. Paraphrasing Hersey and Blanchard, athletic maturity can be viewed as the relative mastery of skill and knowledge in sport, and experience and the capacity to set high but attainable goals. Because opportunities for participation in sport reflect a pyramid profile with advancing age and since the exclusive and selective nature of sport insures that only those athletes with the requisite abilities, knowledge, attitudes, and experience advance to each successive level in that pyramid, it can be assumed that athletic maturity increases as the athlete progress
through the competitive levels of elementary, high school, university and professional sport” (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983).

The Hersey and Blanchard situational leadership theory has been tested in athletic settings and no support has been obtained (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). Case (1980) tested the validity of Hersey and Blanchard ‘s (1972) situational theory to sport setting by examining the relationship behaviors of 40 successful basketball coaches (and their athletes) from junior high, senior high, college, and A.A.U teams. The results did not support the theory that a high task structure and low relationship would exist at lowest level of competition and low task structure and high relationship at the highest level of competition. In addition, Chelladurai and Carron (1983) examined task oriented and relationship oriented behavior of basketball coaches from high school midget, junior, and senior divisions’ university level. They did not find any support for the maturity –leader behavior hypothesis and they concluded that “the situational leadership theory may not have any relevance for sport because maturity, as defined by Hersey and Blanchard, remains largely unchanged with advancing chronological age and experience”
3.4.3.4. The Normative Theory of Leadership

The Normative theory is another approach to develop in the 1970s. This model is to design to examine the decision making of leaders. It provided a set of rules to determine the form and amount of participative decision making in different situation (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Vroom’s theory proposes five different methods of reaching a decision. The methods vary in the amount of input given to subordinates:

**Autocratic I (AI):** the leader makes the decision alone with the information already available.

**Autocratic II (AII):** the leader acquires information from subordinates and then decision alone, using the information gathered.

**Consultative I (CI):** the leader consults with subordinates individually, acquiring information and their suggestions/comments. The leader then makes the decision alone, using the information gathered.

**Consultative II (CII):** the leader consults with subordinates in-group meeting, acquiring information and their suggestions/
comments. The leader then makes the decision alone, using information gathered.

**Group Decision (GII):** the leader consults with subordinates in a group meeting, acquiring information and their suggestions/comments. The leader and subordinates then make the decision together -from (Wann, 1997).

Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) developed a normative model of decision styles in sport settings after the works of Vroom and his colleagues. Rather than using five decision styles in the manner of Vroom, Chelladurai and Haggerty’s model includes three methods of decision making: autocratic, participative, and declarative. The autocratic style occurs when the coach makes the decision alone. The participative decision style occurs when the decision made by a group of individuals. The delegative decision style occurs when the coaches delegate the decision-making responsibilities to others such as assistant coaches and players. One conclusion that is found from the several researches testing the validity of this model is that delegation is quite rare in sport decision making (Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985).
3.5. A Sport Specific Approaches to Leadership Style Model

Only recently, two significant theoretical frameworks have been advanced for the study of leadership in sport settings (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). Smoll and Smith and their associates have proposed one approach. They posited a cognitive - behavioral model of leadership which specifies individual difference variables, situational factors, and cognitive processes assumed to mediate overt coaching behaviors and athletes’ reactions to them (Smith, Smoll & Curtis, 1978, 1979; Smith, Smoll, Curtis & Hunt, 1978; Smoll & Smith, 1980, 1989). The second approach is exemplified by Chelladurai’s Multidimensional Model of Leadership that focused on the congruence among three leadership behavioral states: required, actual, and preferred. The antecedents of these three states of leader behaviors are the characteristics of the situation, the leader, and the members (Chelladurai, 1978, 1990, 1993; Chelladurai & Carron, 1978)

3.5.1. The Leadership Behavior Model

Smoll and Smith (1989) proposed the leadership Behavior Model that is based upon situation specific behaviors of the leader. The models central process is defined with lines leading from coach
behaviors to player perception of coach behaviors to player responses. This model stipulates that the ultimate effects of coaching behaviors are mediated by the meaning that players attribute to them. In other words, cognitive and affective processes serve as filters between overt coaching behaviors and youngsters’ attitudes toward their coach. Thus, this model measured and defined relationship existing between a) what coaches actually do, b) how these behaviors are Perceived and recalled by their players, and c) children’s attitudinal responses to the total situation (Smoll & Smith, 1989).

In the model, coach individual difference variables include such factors as goals, intentions, perceptions of self/athletes, and gender. Player individual difference variables include such things as age, gender, and perceptions about coach, motivation, anxiety, and self-confidence. Situational factors include such things as nature of sport, competitive level, success/failure, and team cohesion. Coach behavior is influenced by the coach’s perception of the individual athlete. A coach may treat an athlete who exhibits low self-confidence or high anxiety differently from other athletes.
In order to observe and code Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) was developed by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977). The CBAS permits the direct observation and coding of coaches’ leadership behaviors during practices and games (Smoll & Smith, 1989). The observed behaviors are reactive and spontaneous in nature. The CBAS includes 12 categories that are divided into two classes of behaviors and spontaneous. Reactive behaviors are coach reaction to player or team behaviors. Spontaneous behaviors are initiated by the coach and do not occur in response to a player behavior.

1. Reactive Behaviors.

    ➢ **Responses to desirable performance.**
    
    • Reinforcement: a positive, rewarding reaction to a good play or good effort.
    
    • Non reinforcement: failure to respond to a good performance.

    ➢ **Responses to Mistakes**
    
    • Mistake- contingent encouragement: encouragement given to player following a mistake.
• Mistake-contingent technical instruction: instructing and demonstrating to player how to correct a mistake he or she has made.

• Punishment: a negative reaction, verbal or non-verbal following mistake.

• Punitive technical instruction: technical instruction following a mistake given a punitive or hostile manner.

• Ignoring mistakes: failure to respond to a player mistake.

➢ **Responses to Misbehavior**

• Keeping control: reactions intended to restore or maintain order among team members.

2. **Spontaneous Behaviors**

➢ **Game-Related**

• General technical instruction: spontaneous instruction in the techniques and strategies of the sport (not following a mistake).

• General encouragement: spontaneous encouragement that does not follow a mistake.

• Organization: administrative behavior that sets the stage for play by assigning duties or responsibilities.
Game-Irrelevant

- General communication: interactions with players unrelated to the game (Smoll & Smith, 1989).

The CBAS has been the most widely studied system for observing and documenting coaching behaviors in youth sports. Research with the CBAS has revealed a number of interesting relationships. When they are working with the youth sport athletes, the dominant behaviors of coaches are positive reinforcement, general technical instructions, and general encouragement. The behaviors of keeping control and administrating punishment are perceived by players to occur much more often than they usually do. Another interesting finding is that coaches of youth sport teams spend a great amount of their time providing technical instruction and feedback to low-expectation youth than to high-expectation youth (Cox, 1998).
**Figure 3.2**

Leadership Behavior Model

3.5.2. Multidimensional Model of Leadership

Research and theories from non-sports settings provided useful frameworks for understanding leadership (Horn, 2002); specific approaches that reflected the unique demands of sports settings were required. In response, Chelladurai (1978, 1990, and 1993) developed the multidimensional model of leadership to provide a conceptual framework that allowed leadership effectiveness to be studied in the sports domain. Chelladurai proposed that effective leadership is dynamic and is based on a complex series of interactions between leader, group members and situational constraints. The model suggests that positive outcomes will occur when there is congruence between the leaders actual, the group members Preferred leadership and that is required in relation to the situation. In essence, Chelladurai’s (1978, 1990, 1993) model stresses the importance of ‘fit’ or ‘alignment’ with high levels of satisfaction and performance predicted when there is congruence between actual, required and Preferred. Therefore, when discrepancies occur, it would seem that leaders are faced with important dilemmas to carry on without making significant changes and to expect others to be more accommodating; to remove barriers; or to be more flexible. It is interesting to note that some
football managers appear to be ‘recycled’ following previous failures and eventually succeed in certain types of situation but are less effective or less able to adapt their style to more positive situations and vice versa.

Riemer & Chelladurai, (1995) reported one of the difficulties in comparing results of previous studies is that they included various sports that differed on the task attributes of dependence and variability. But these sports also differed in other situational attributes such as organizational size, popularity, and accompanying public pressure to perform. Thus the results relating to task dependence and variability could be confounded they effects of other attributes. To avoid this difficulty, a better approach would be to select a sport in which the playing positions differ in terms of variability and dependence. A single sport with contrasting levels of task variability and dependence in a single team would provide an excellent opportunity to compare their effects on leadership process while at the same time controlling for other situational variables (For example, size of team, number of coaches) that may affect leadership behavior preferences
In the multidimensional model, group performance and member satisfaction are considered to be a function of the congruence among three states of leader behavior: required, Preferred, and actual. The antecedents of these states of leader behaviors are the characteristics of the situation, the leader, and the members.
Figure 3.3

Multidimensional Model of leadership

Factors/Antecedents  Leader Behavior  Consequence

1 Situational Characteristics
2 Leader Characteristic
3 Member Characteristics

4 Required Behavior
5 Actual Behavior
6 Preferred Behavior

7 Member Satisfaction Group Performance

The leader is required (box 4) to behave in certain ways by the demands and constraints placed by situational characteristics, i.e., the parameters of the organization and its environment. For example, the goals and the formal organizational structure of the team and the larger system, the group task and the associated technology, the social norms, cultural values, and government regulations are some of the situational characteristics that prescribe an exercise

**Leader Behavior Preferred By Members**

Members’ preferences for specific leader behaviors (box 6) are largely a function of the individual characteristics of group members. Personality variables such as need for achievement need for affiliation, cognitive structure, and competence in the task influence a member’s preferences for coaching and guidance, Social Support and feedback. In addition the situational characteristics also affect member preferences (Chelladurai, 1990).

**Actual Leader Behavior**

Actual leader behaviors (box 5) are simply the behaviors the leader exhibits. According to Chelladurai, the leaders’ characteristics,
such as personality, ability, and experience affect these behaviors directly. In addition, leaders are considerably influenced by situational requirements. Actual behaviors also directly affected by group preferences (Chelladurai, 1990).

**Performance and Satisfaction**

Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) have defined athletic satisfaction as “a positive affective state resulting from a complex evaluation of the structures, processes, and outcomes associated with the athletic experience” Performance and satisfaction are a function of the degree of congruence among the three stages of leader behavior. They are not independent of each other. Thus, performance and satisfaction (box 7) are jointly affected by congruence among the required, Preferred, and actual leader behavior (Chelladurai, 1990).

Recently, Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) developed a multiple-item, multiple dimension scale to measure athlete satisfaction. A central thesis of the MML is that congruence between Preferred and actual leadership behavior enhances member satisfaction. Previous findings related to this central thesis have been inconsistent. While some indicated a significant curvilinear relationship between discrepancy scores of leadership behavior and satisfaction with
leadership (i.e., satisfaction was highest when discrepancy was zero), others reported only significant linear relationship (i.e., satisfaction was greatest when perceptions were greater than preferences), or no relationship (Riemer & Toon, 2001).

**Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS)**

Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) to assist in the testing of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership developed the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS). The LSS was developed to measure leadership behaviors, including the athletes’ preferences for specific behaviors, athletes’ perceptions of their coaches’ behaviors, and coaches’ perceptions of their own behavior (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The LSS has five dimensions:

- **Training and Instruction**: coaching behavior aimed at improving the athletes’ performance by emphasizing and facilitating hard and strenuous training; instructing them in the skills, techniques, and tactics of the sport; clarifying the relationship among the members; and by structuring and coordinating the members’ activities (Chelladurai, 1990).

- **Democratic Behavior**: coaching behavior which allows greater participation by the athletes in decisions pertaining to
group goals, practice methods, and game tactics and strategies (Chelladurai, 1990).

- **Autocratic Behavior:** coaching behavior which involves independent decision making and stress personal authority (Chelladurai, 1990).

- **Social Support:** coaching behavior characterized by a concern for the welfare of individual athletes, positive group atmosphere, and warm interpersonal relations with members (Chelladurai, 1990).

- **Positive Feedback:** coaching behavior which reinforces an athlete by recognizing and rewarding good performance (Chelladurai, 1990).

Weinberg and Gould (2003) make a similar observation when referring to NBA (national basketball association) coach Doug Collins, whose autocratic and emotional style appeared to be most effective in providing direction for young, unpredictable teams. However, when Collins failed to adapt his style as the teams matured, this autocratic approach was seen as a liability and, in two similar situations, Collins was fired after making a positive initial impact. Clearly, such anecdotal observations do little to advance knowledge of leadership, but it is evident that research in
this area is warranted given the potential applied importance of knowing which types of leaders suit particular situations and why. Before briefly reviewing some of the research that has tested the accuracy and usefulness of the multidimensional model of leadership, it is important to acknowledge that the most widely used measure in this regard, has been the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) which was developed by Chelladurai and Saleh (1978, 1980). The LSS has received extensive testing and generally good psychometric support (Chelladurai, 1993; Chelladurai & Riemer, 1998) and measures five dimensions of leadership which incorporate instructive decision-making style, and motivational tendencies.

A number of replicable research findings appear to be important when reviewing the literature concerning the multidimensional model. First, it appears that generally, as athletes grow older and more mature, that a greater preference for an autocratic and supportive style of leadership emerges (Horn, 2002). These preferences might reflect older athletes becoming more serious about their performances and more goal-oriented. Interestingly, Chelladurai and Carron (1983) suggested that the relationship between age and preference for autocratic style may occur because
athletes become ‘socialized’ into preferring less responsibility in a social system that is generally an autocratic enterprise. Interestingly, there is evidence that participants in highly interactive team sports such as basketball, football or volleyball prefer more autocratic leadership than do participants from co-acting sports such as swimming or bowling (Terry & Howe, 1984; Terry, 1984). Finally, Weiss and Fredrichs (1986) found a relationship between poorer team performance and frequency of Social Support which probably indicates that losing teams need more Social Support from leaders in order to sustain motivation.

In general, research evidence has supported the predictions of the multidimensional model (See Horn, 2002), that indicate when there is congruence between required actual leader and group preferences, that increased group performance and satisfaction will result. In contrast larger discrepancies between actual, Preferred and required are likely to produce less satisfaction and influence performance negatively.

More recently, researchers (Chelladurai & Doherty, 1998) have used the LSS to investigate the decision-making styles of coaches. While both the democratic and autocratic styles of decision-making
have inherent strengths and limitations, Chelladurai and Doherty (1998) stressed that the appropriateness of autocratic or democratic styles varied with the problem situation. Also, styles in absolute terms implies that there is no middle ground, when past researchers have indicated that blends of autocratic and democratic styles do exist (Blake & Moulton, 1969), and it is not unreasonable to suggest that flexible managers can use the styles interchangeably as the situation dictates. In professional soccer, where large squads of players are involved, it is likely that more autocratic styles will predominate by necessity, as Chelladurai and Doherty (1998) point out, democratic styles are less effective for complex problems and are more time consuming. Thus, Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) reported that team sport athletes’ preference for training and instruction was significantly greater than that of individual sport athletes. Closed-sport (low-variability tasks) athletes also preferred significantly more training and instruction than did the open-sport athletes. It was also found that interdependent closed-sport athletes preferred the greatest level of training and instruction (House’s, 1971).

Terry and Howe (1984) found that athletes in independence sports preferred more democratic and less Autocratic Behavior than did
the athletes in interdependence sports. Terry (1984) reported that team sport athletes preferred significantly more training and instruction, Autocratic Behavior, and Positive Feedback, but less Democratic Behavior and Social Support, than individual sport athletes. These results lend support to path-goal theory (House, 1971), which postulates that when tasks are varied and interdependent, greater structure and closer supervision will be preferred.

Riemer & Chelladurai, (1995) reported one of the difficulties in comparing results of previous studies is that they included various sports that differed on the task attributes of dependence and variability. But these sports also differed in other situational attributes such as organizational size, popularity, and accompanying public pressure to perform. Thus the results relating to task dependence and variability could be confounded they effects of other attributes. To avoid this difficulty, a better approach would be to select a sport in which the playing positions differ in terms of variability and dependence. A single sport with contrasting levels of task variability and dependence in a single team would provide an excellent opportunity to compare their effects on leadership process while at the same time controlling for other situational variables.
(For example, size of team, number of coaches) that may affect leadership behavior preferences.

**Individual Differences**

Erle (1981) assessed the effects of sex, experience, and motivation on the leadership preferences of university and intramural players. He found that males preferred training and instruction more than females. Also, athletes high on task motivation preferred more training and instruction; on the other hand, athletes high on affiliation motivation and extrinsic motivation preferred more Social Support. Moreover, the greater experience the higher the preference for Positive Feedback in competitive sports.

Chelladurai and Carron (1983) examined the high school midget, high school junior, high school senior, and university level basketball players’ preferences a paradigm thought to reflect the maturity level of the subjects. Trend analysis revealed two significant results. First, preference for training and instruction progressively decreased from high school midget through junior to senior levels and increased at the university level. Secondly, the preference for Social Support progressively increased from the high school midget level to the university level.
Garland and Barry (1988) examined the influence of personality traits and Perceived leader behaviors on performance in collegiate football. Garland and Barry considered the grouping of athletes into regulars, substitutes, and survivors as a performance measure. They found that personality traits and leader behaviors taken together contribute significantly to the prediction of performance. Players who were more group dependent, tough-minded, extroverted, emotionally stable and who Perceived their coach as offering more training and instruction, having a democratic decision style, being more socially supportive, and offering more Positive Feedback were associated with higher levels of performance, Whereas, players who Perceived their coach as having an autocratic decision style were associated with lower levels of performance.

**Situational Variables**

Chelladurai, Imamura, Yamaguchi, Oinuma, and Miyauchi (1988) studied the effects of culture (a situational variable) on sport leadership. This study explored the difference between Japanese and Canadian university level male athletes in their leader behavior preferences and perceptions of leader behaviors, their satisfactions
with leadership and personal outcome, and the relationships between leader behaviors and satisfactions. The results showed that a) the Japanese athletes Preferred more Autocratic Behavior and Social Support while the Canadian athletes preferred significantly more training and instruction, and b) the Japanese athletes Perceived higher levels of Autocratic Behavior while the Canadian athletes perceived higher levels of training and instruction, Democratic Behavior, and Positive Feedback.

Another study to mention effects of situational variables on leadership behavior patterns was performed by Ipinmoroti (2002). This study was to find out whether type of sport would be a predictor of coach leadership behavior. Subjects in this study consisted of team sport coaches and individual sport coaches. Findings of this study did not show any significant differences in coach leadership behaviors of team and individual sport coaches.

**Consequences of Leadership**

Some authors have dealt with the consequences of leadership. For example, Chelladurai (1984) examined the relationship between the discrepancy between Preferred and Perceived leadership and athlete satisfaction in varying sports on the basis of task variability
and/or task dependence. The results showed that discrepancy in leadership for athletes in various sports were associated with three measures of satisfaction: satisfaction with team performance, with leadership, and overall involvement. Further, discrepancies in training and instruction and Positive Feedback were the most common dimensions of leader behavior affecting the athletes’ satisfaction in all three sport groups (basketball, track and field, and wrestling).

Horne and Carron (1985) examined the relationship between coach-athlete compatibility and athlete performance and the relationship between coach-athlete compatibility and athlete satisfaction on university volleyball, basketball, track and field, and swimming athletes and their coaches. They found that the discrepancy between athletes’ perceptions and their preferences for Positive Feedback and Autocratic Behavior were the best discriminators of compatible and incompatible dyads. Further, the results showed that the discrepancies in training and instruction, Social Support and Positive Feedback were significant predictors of athlete satisfaction with leadership.
In Schliesmann’s (1987) study of university track and field athletes, Perceived Democratic Behavior and Social Support were positively related to general satisfaction with leadership. Also discrepancy scores in training and instruction, Social Support, and Positive Feedback were significantly related to satisfaction with the three leader behaviors. In addition, Schliesman mentioned that the Perceived Democratic Behavior and Social Support were slightly better predictors of satisfaction with general leadership than the corresponding discrepancy scores.

Weiss and Friedrichs (1986) examined the relationship of university basketball players’ perceptions of coach behavior, coach attributes, and institutional variables to team performance and athlete satisfaction. They found that neither institutional nor coach attribute variables were significantly related to team performance or satisfaction. On the other hand, leader behaviors were found to be significantly related to these team outcomes. Positive Feedback was found as the most predictive of team satisfaction. Analysis with individual satisfaction scores revealed that size of school, coach attributes, and leader behaviors were predictive of athlete satisfaction. Moreover, coaches who engaged in more frequent
rewarding behavior, Social Support behavior, and Democratic Behavior produced more satisfied athletes.

In their study, Riemer and Chelladurai (1995) the differences between the offensive and defensive personnel of football teams in Preferred leadership, Perceived leadership and satisfaction with leadership, and also, the relationship among Preferred and Perceived leadership, their congruence, and satisfaction with leadership were examined. The results showed that defensive players Preferred and Perceived greater amounts of Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, and Social Support than did offensive players. Also, the congruence Preferred and Perceived leadership in the dimension of Social Support was critical to enhancing member satisfaction. On the other hand, Perceived leadership in training and instruction as well as Positive Feedback was stronger determinants of satisfaction with leadership than either the preferred leadership or the congruence of Preferred and Perceived leadership in these dimensions.

The authors Riemer and Toon (2001) investigated the congruence between Preferred and actual leadership behavior that enhance member satisfaction in tennis players competing at NCAA Division I
and II Tennis Championship level. Results indicated that athlete satisfaction was not dependent on the congruence between Preferred and Perceived leadership behavior. Previous findings related to central thesis of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership have been inconsistent. While some indicated a significant curvilinear relationship between discrepancy scores of leadership behavior and satisfaction with leadership, others indicated a significant linear relationship or no relationship. Riemer and Chelladurai, 1995 suggested that the inconsistencies in the direction and pattern of the reported significant relationship may stem from the problems associated with the use of discrepancy scores.

Several authors have dealt with some of the antecedents elements of the Multidimensional Model of Leadership in their research and in the recent years, the LSS has been mostly used in coaching leadership studies (Weiss & Friedrichs, 1986; Schliesman, 1987; Garland & Barry, 1988; Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Riemer & Toon, 2001; Ipinmoroti, 2002). Individual Differences Erle (1981) assessed the effects of sex, experience, and motivation on the leadership preferences of university and intramural players. He found that males Preferred
training and instruction more than females. Also, athletes high on task motivation Preferred more training and instruction; on the other hand, athletes high on affiliation motivation and extrinsic motivation Preferred more Social Support. Moreover, the greater experience the higher the preference for Positive Feedback in competitive sports.

3.6. Athletes Satisfaction to Leadership Style in Sport

Although many studies can be found in the academic literature regarding job satisfaction, few studies have specifically examined athlete satisfaction as a separate construct. Athlete satisfaction is a positive affective state resulting from a complex evaluation of the structures, processes, and outcomes associated with the athletic experience (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997).

The level of an athlete’s satisfaction is determined by the discrepancy between what is wanted by the athlete and the perception of what is received within the psychological, physical, and environmental domains. Furthermore, Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) suggested that athlete satisfaction may prove to be the ultimate measure of organizational effectiveness of an athletic program based on the following unique features of athletics. First,
the measures of performance in athletics are deficient and/or contaminated by such factors as luck, an opponent’s extraordinary performance, referee’s mistake, and so on. Second, activities engaged in during the pursuit of excellence cannot be solely judged by measures of wins and losses since every contest results in a winner and a loser. Third, the win-loss records pertain only to the periods of performance (i.e. the actual competitions), which does not encompass the total athletic experience. Therefore, the authors concluded, “It is imperative that evaluation of an athletic program and its coaches should be based on athlete satisfaction in addition to measures of performance such as win-loss records” (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997).

### 3.6.1. Athlete Satisfaction

Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) define athlete satisfaction as the positive affective state that arises when an athlete evaluates the structures, processes, and outcomes that are related to the athletic experience. In other words, an athlete’s level of satisfaction can be seen as a reflection of how well the athletic endeavor meets the athlete’s own personal standards. Chelladurai and Riemer (1998) noted that athlete satisfaction is important for three reasons. First,
an athlete’s satisfaction with his or her sport should naturally be linked to his or her performance in that sport. For example, an athlete who is more satisfied will put out more effort and persistence during competition. The second reason that athlete satisfaction is important because satisfaction can be seen as a precursor or outcome in the conceptual frameworks of other constructs, such as cohesion. The final reason, which is central to the rationale behind this study, is because athletic satisfaction is a key concern in athletic programs.

The humanistic view suggests that the athletic experience needs to be enjoyable and instrumental to further the development of athletes, and development is a primary outcome, at the college level. That being said, athlete satisfaction has both theoretical and practical implications. One construct that could have quite an impact on athlete satisfaction is role ambiguity. Bray, Beauchamp, Eys, and Carron (2004) looked at the need for role clarity as a potential moderator variable between role ambiguity and athlete satisfaction. To examine this relationship, Bray et al. had 112 male ice players complete the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Role Ambiguity Scale, and a measure that assessed the athletes’ need for role clarity. Their correlation results showed that greater
ambiguity was associated with lower athlete satisfaction, which is consistent with the results from Eys and colleagues (2003). They also found that the relationship between role ambiguity and the various facets of athlete satisfaction were only apparent in the athletes who had a higher need for role clarity. It is important to note that the authors elected to use the subscales of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire that related to the individual as opposed to the team (Bray, Beauchamp, Eys, & Carron, 2004). Their reason for doing this was because they were concerned with athlete satisfaction as it related to the primary role sender (i.e., the coach) based on Jackson and Schuler’s (1985) meta-analytic findings from the business literature that showed that job satisfaction and satisfaction with supervision were the dimensions of satisfaction that correlated the strongest with role ambiguity. The findings from the Bray, et al. study suggest that there could be more involved in the ambiguity-satisfaction relationship. Two variables that have not been examined, but may be essential to athlete satisfaction, are role acceptance and role satisfaction. For example, an athlete may understand his or her role and accept that role, but not be satisfied with that role; the literature is not clear on whether that athlete will be satisfied with the athletic experience.
3.6.2. Athlete Satisfaction Model

Satisfaction is an integral part of sport participation and enjoyment. Without satisfaction, athletes would turn to other sources for potential success and enjoyment (Maday, 2000). Satisfaction in sport has been studied extensively in combination with several variables, mostly leadership (Chelladurai, 1984; Chelladurai et al., 1988; Coffman, 1999; Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Horne & Carron, 1985; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Riemer & Toon, 2001; Schliesman, 1987; Sriboon, 2001; Yusof, 1999). Several scholars in sport psychology have included athlete satisfaction as an antecedent or outcome variable in their work. For example, the multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990) includes satisfaction as an outcome variable along with performance. Studies based on the multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990) have been largely concerned with linking leadership dynamics with athlete satisfaction. Satisfaction as an outcome has been employed in different leadership studies based on the multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1984; Chelladurai et al., 1988; Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Eichas, 1992; Horne & Carron, 1985; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Riemer & Toon, 2001; Schliesman, 1987;
Sriboon, 2001). In the multidimensional model (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990), leadership behaviors were suggested to be antecedents of member satisfaction. The model suggests that the discrepancy between athletes’ Perceived and Preferred leadership style would impact their level of satisfaction. In 1997, Chelladurai and Riemer proposed the model “A Classification of Facets of Athlete Satisfaction.” The purpose of the model was to study the needs, benefit, and treatment that were provided for intercollegiate athletics. Based on Chelladurai and Riemer’s (1997) classification of facets of athlete satisfaction, Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) developed, multiple-item, multiple-dimension scale to measure athlete satisfaction, the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ). The development of the ASQ resulted in a final scale with 15 facets, or subscales, and a total of 56 items on the scale. The format of the scale allows researchers to include those dimensions of satisfaction most salient for a particular situation (Riemer & Toon, 2001). In the proposed model, satisfaction was evaluated using 4 of the ASQ’s 15 subscales: training and instruction satisfaction, personal treatment satisfaction, team performance satisfaction, and individual performance satisfaction. The first two subscales concentrate on satisfaction with the process of coaching behavior,
while the second two assess satisfaction without comes associated with the processes of leadership (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). Training and instruction satisfaction refers to satisfaction with the training and instruction provided by the coach. Personal treatment satisfaction refers to satisfaction with those coaching behaviors that directly affect the individual yet indirectly affect team development. It includes Social Support and Positive Feedback. Team performance satisfaction refers to athlete’s satisfaction with his other team’s level of performance. Task performance includes absolute performance, goal achievement, and implies performance improvements. Finally, individual performance satisfaction refers to athlete’s satisfaction with his or her own task performance. Task performance includes absolute performance, improvements in performance, and goal achievement (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

3.6.3. Role Satisfaction in Sport

Role satisfaction is viewed as an affective element of role involvement, and it is the only affective element that has been identified in the literature (Eys, Beauchamp, & Bray, in press). As mentioned in the previous section, role satisfaction has been used to describe role acceptance. However, Eys and colleagues (in press)
noted that the definition for role satisfaction that has been used in the industrial/organization literature can be adapted easily to the sport domain. There has not been much research on role satisfaction, but the limited literature supports the importance of this construct. To determine factors that can lead individuals to derive satisfaction from their role, Rail (1987) conducted a study with volunteer sport executives. Four perceptions of role satisfaction emerged from semi-structured interviews with participants: (a) the degree to which their abilities were used, (b) how important they viewed their role to be, (c) the extent to which they received feedback and recognition for their role, and (d) the level of independence they were allowed when it came to performing the responsibilities of their role. Eys and colleagues (in press) described how these perceptions could apply in an interactive sport setting. For example, athletes will most likely have greater role satisfaction if they believe their role is important, their abilities are used effectively, and they receive feedback and recognition for their role. Bray (1998) looked specifically at sport teams and examined perceptions of role satisfaction (as well as many other role constructs) of intercollegiate basketball players. Using a measure adapted from job satisfaction scales in organizational psychology,
he found role satisfaction to be positively associated with task cohesion, role efficacy, and role importance, and negatively related to role ambiguity. In another study, Beauchamp and colleagues (in press) drew from similar literature to develop a measure of role satisfaction. In this case, role satisfaction was looked at in relation to role ambiguity in rugby and field hockey players (Beauchamp et al., in press). Their findings showed that role ambiguity experienced during the middle of the season was predictive of role satisfaction later in the season. Even after controlling for prior satisfaction and the athletes’ tendency to experience negative emotions, the relationship still remained. The review of the literature on team cohesion, athlete satisfaction, role ambiguity role acceptance, and role satisfaction, indicates that many different constructs and relationships warrant further examination. First, although role ambiguity has been studied more than the other role elements, the possibility of an athlete being clear on his or her role (low ambiguity) but not accepting or being satisfied with that role has not been examined. These two constructs (role acceptance and role satisfaction) could have important impacts on both team cohesion and athlete satisfaction, which, in turn, may have both theoretical and practical implications for the field of sport psychology. Also, 23
clarifications of role acceptance and role satisfaction constructs are needed. Specifically, role acceptance and role satisfaction need to be measured as separate constructs to determine if these are in fact two separate elements of role involvement. This study will contribute to the existing literature by examining the separate role constructs in more depth. Greater understanding of role constructs and relationships has practical implications for coaches and practitioners by calling attention to the role of interpersonal relationships and group dynamics in the athletic experience and by examining the relationships among role constructs.

3.7. Role and Responsibilities of Football Coach/Leader in Sport

The title of ‘manager’ in British association football is distinct from that of coach and is closer to that of the responsibilities held by a Head Coach or athletic director in the united States. The process of managing people whether in sport or business is a complex task and requires a sympathetic appreciation of the multi-dimensional roles required. Traditionally, a coach has a prescribed number of roles, which typically includes a planned, coordinated and integrated program of athlete preparation (Baker, Horton,
Robertson-Wilson & Wall, 2003; Lyle, 2002; Pyke, 1992; Sabock, 1985; Woodman, 1993). Not only is a coach an expert in a particular area, but he is also a manager, friend, planner, and motivator.

**Manager:** Managers are viewed as an integral piece to the success of a person and/or an organization. Appointing the right manager is crucial, and research indicates that there is a direct link between manager/coach behavior and an athlete’s performance (Crust 2006). A manager is charged with the responsibility of making decisions for the team or athlete and plays a fundamental role in the operation of a team. Managers also handle personnel matters, institute policy, and are responsible for skill development, fitness preparation, and public relations (Crust 2006).

**Friend:** Coaches also work to build rapport with their athletes, sometimes befriending them. They may lend support to their athletes and provide them someone to confide in.

**Planner:** Coaches develop strategies to achieve desired results. They assess talent, organize and develop the content of practices and specific drills (Crust 2006), and in the case of strength and
conditioning and fitness coaches, design and implement periodized exercise programs to elicit continuous results (Baechle 2008).

**Motivator:** Coaches also serve as motivators to maximize an athlete’s full potential. Coaches utilize supportive behaviors such as providing choices within specific rules within the sport, providing a rationale for tasks and limits, and acknowledging their athletes’ feelings (Mageau m2003). These coaches impart their passion and energy for the sport in the athlete. Motivators have a strong drive to achieve and remain optimistic in the face of adversity (Goleman 1998). This attitude is contagious, as research has shown that these behaviors improve an athlete’s intrinsic motivation and self-determined types of extrinsic motivation (Mageau 2003).

The modern football manager must acknowledge the importance of his role from a business or financial perspective (Perry, 2000). While some theorists have attempted to distinguish the difference between a manager and a leader by emphasizing the organizational role of the manager and the vision and direction provided by leaders (Weinberg & Gould, 2003), the role of the football manager (See Table2.1) clearly encompasses elements of both. According to
Beech (2002), the consensus is that management implies leadership, but that leaders need not necessarily be managers. Blair (1996) suggests that the role of a manager is to maximize the output of the organization by organizing, planning, staffing, directing and controlling; and that leadership is just one aspect of the directing function. Since football management is essentially a role that is likely to include leadership and coaching responsibilities, research evidence from both leadership and coaching domains will be reviewed in this paper. The extended role of a football manager is summarized below.
**Table 2.1** The Roles of a football Coach

| Core responsibilities | • First team selection  
|                       | • Methods of play  
|                       | • Assembly, maintenance of play squad  
| Prime tasks           | • Club coaching policy  
|                       | • Player discipline, fitness, preparation  
|                       | and well-being  
|                       | • Player development  
|                       | • Appointment of assistant staff  
|                       | • Attendance at board meetings  
|                       | • Media dealings  
| Contributory tasks    | • Salary/contact of players  
|                       | • Club scouting policy  
|                       | • Club youth policy  
|                       | • Preparing match program notes  
|                       | • General public relationship/dealings  

*Source: Perry, 2000*
Kilburg (1997) the qualities a coach must have for a successful coaching outcome, which include being respectful, considerate, predictable, courteous, empathetic, friendly, tactful, non-defensive, knowledgeable, and skillful. At times the coach may need to be tender and nurturing or even playful when challenging a client to grow, explore, or be curious. Ultimately the coach is responsible for engaging the client in full participation of the coaching process. The coach is also responsible for providing knowledge, skills, and technical assistance for the client's professional and personal growth. Coaches must be competent in facilitating the client's attention to stay on task. Since both coach and client are continually reflecting on and exploring performance issues, Kilburg (1997) added that coaches must be competent, appropriate and effective with their use of coaching skills.

Katz and Miller (1996) added that coaches must be careful, gentle and honest, and Diedrich (1996) added that practicality is an additional important quality. Other attributes include flexibility and creativity (Kiel et al., 1996), good rapport building, communication, organization, problem-solving, and assessment skills (Modoono, 2002), approachability, comfort around top management, compassion, customer focus, integrity, intellectual horsepower,
interpersonal and political savvy, attentive and active listening skills, adaptability to the situation, and self-knowledge (Brotman et al., 1998).

Wasylyshyn's (2003) outcome study reported that the ability to form a strong coaching alliance, professionalism and the use of a well-defined coaching method were considered the top three coach characteristics deemed important by executives participating in a survey to assess client reactions to coaching. Graham, Wedman and Garvin-Kester's (1994) investigation of coaching skills found that defining clear performance goals, providing regular and pertinent feedback, and building a warm coach-client relationship are important.

Coaching responsibilities include providing feedback (Kampa-Kosesch & Anderson, 2001), forging a partnership, inspiring commitment, facilitating the growth of new skills, promoting persistence toward goals and encouraging the client to make maximum use of environmental support (Peterson, 1996). Witherspoon and White (1996a) identified the coach’s role as one of helping executives learn, grow and change. This involves coaching
for skills and developing performance while keeping the focus on the executive's agenda (Witherspoon & White, 1996a).

3.7.1. Consistency between Perceived Leadership and Preferred Leadership in Sport

When consistency exists between the preferred leadership styles and Perceived leadership styles, player’s satisfaction toward their coaches’ leadership styles is highest according to his multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1984). In order to examine what is effective leadership style in a particular setting, it would be important to investigate the strength of this relationship.

Chelladurai (1984), examined the relationship between athletes’ Preferred and preceded leadership styles and their satisfaction, Democratic Behavior, Social Support, and Positive Feedback were greater, or when the players’ perceptions relative to the preference in Autocratic Behavior were lower, their satisfaction with leadership was higher. And, the players satisfaction with leadership increased as the coaches’ Perceived emphasis on training and instruction increased. And when the players’ perception of Autocratic Behaviors from their coaches was equal to their preference, their
satisfaction was optimal, however, when the perception that the players felt too much higher or too much little was occurred, their satisfaction decline. Interestingly, the players expressed satisfaction even when the coach’s Positive Feedback beavers exceeded their preferences. Chelladurai suggested future researchers should examine the leadership variables and satisfaction measures related to some objective measures on actual performance.

Barrow (1977) defined leadership as “the behavioral process of influencing individuals and groups towards set goals” (p.232). This definition is important because it places emphasis on the vision of a leader (i.e. goals, objectives) while also highlighting the necessary interaction between the leader and group members. The act of leadership attempts to influence and convert others into ‘followers’ (Tannenbaum, Weschler, & Massarik, 1961) and may be achieved through a variety of mechanisms such as coercion, persuasion and manipulation. Leadership requires an understanding or respect for the power dynamic between the influencer and the follower. The relationship recognizes that every act between the two parties is a ‘political act’ with potential for coercion (Miller, 1985).
Researchers have suggested that the interpersonal dynamics at play between player and coach are complex (Bloom, Schinke, & Salmela, 1998; Martens, 1990) and this complexity is also likely to extend to player and manager relations. Managers unable to communicate effectively with their players may inadvertently exacerbate problems due to a lack of understanding from their perspective. To improve the relationship between player and coach it may be necessary to integrate specialist sports psychology consultants into the team to facilitate reflection from both parties. To understand leadership it is important to transcend the superficial and retrospective lay-perspective which tends to define success in terms of winning. For some football clubs with limited resources, success might be defined in terms of maintaining their status (i.e. avoiding relegation to a lower division). According to Weinberg and Gould (2003), leaders typically have two functions: (i) to ensure the demands of the organization (club) are satisfied by the group effectively meeting its targets and (ii) to ensure the needs of group members are satisfied. Clearly, those individuals who are responsible for appointing leaders / managers need to ensure that the visions and targets of both the club and potential leader are
compatible and that the qualities of the leader and group members (players) are not incongruent.

In today's world, business organizations need effective leadership in order for them to continue to be successful. Without this, organizations cannot function correctly or achieve company goals and visions. Effective leadership is dependent upon the role of the leader and whether or not they can ensure their employees meet company objectives and standards. This assignment will critically examine the role of leadership as a contributing factor to contemporary organizational success. Effective leaders are made not born. If an individual has the desire and will power, then they can become a successful leader. Leaders develop through a never-ending process of learning, education, training and experience (viewed 25th July 2003). In order to inspire people to achieve higher levels of work, there are a few things a leader must be, know and do. These do not come naturally however are acquired through continual work and study. Effective leaders are individuals who are continually working and studying to improve their leadership styles and skills, (viewed 25th July 2003).
CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Any scientific research involves the application of various methods (also referred to as strategies or approaches) and procedures to create scientific knowledge (welman and kuger, 1999:2). The validity of this knowledge largely depends on the manner in which data has been collected, which is the research methodology. Thus scientific knowledge is obtained through rigorous methods and techniques that in some controllable way correspond to the social world. A variety of methods and techniques are available for social research. Some are quantitative, while others are of a qualitative nature. This chapter deals with the research methodology of the study including Selection of the Participants, instruments of data collection and data Analysis.

Each strategy offers a particular and unique perspective that illuminates certain aspects of reality more easily, and produces a type of result better suited for some applications than others. The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among Preferred and Perceived leadership, their congruence and satisfaction with leadership, and the second purpose of this study
was to investigate the differences among the offensive, the defensive and the midfield players of football premier league club players in Ethiopia, with Preferred leadership, Perceived leadership and satisfaction with leadership.

4.1. Selection of the Participants

Wiersma (1986:455) defines population as the totality of all members that possess a special set of one or more common characteristics that define it. Polit and Hungler (1999:43,232) define a population the totally of all subjects that conform to a set of specifications, comprising the entire group of persons that is of interest to the researcher to whom the research result can be generalized. LoBiondo-Wood and Haber (1998:250) describe a sample as a portion or a subset of the research population selected to participate in a study, representing the research population. Depending upon the scientific theory mentioned over the selection of the participants was designed.

Using methods of convenient sampling (Gall et al, 1996) random sampling was used to select 7(50%) from 14 premier league clubs in Ethiopia. All 182 male football players in these 7 clubs selected as sample size. According to the rules and regulations of Ethiopian
football federation each clubs should contain only 26 players’ approved by football federation for one year competition season only. All seven selected club players was incorporated in the study (N=7×26=182). The players consisted of 52 offensive players, 65 defensive players, and 65 mid-field players. Coaches of the selected teams at premier league clubs were contacted to obtain permission to meet the players, inform them of the nature of the study and invite them to participate in the study.

4.2. Instruments

The questionnaire was comprised of three major sections such as: Leadership behavior Perceived, Preferred, Athletes satisfaction questionnaire and sample’s demographic characteristics. Players filled Demographic Questionnaire, Leadership scale for sport Questionnaire (LSS) and Athletes Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) to determine their preference for and perception of leadership behaviors of their coaches and their satisfaction with leadership behaviors of their coaches.

4.2.1. Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questions were asked athletes their age, experience of playing year they were played in premier league
competition, name of playing clubs and playing position. The purpose of this was to get the athletes to think of their specific information, so that they had a frame of reference as they answered the rest of the questions (Appendix “A” for complete questionnaire).

4.2.2. Leadership Behavior questionnaires

Preferred and Perceived versions of Chelladurai and Saleh’s (1980) Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) were used to assess the leader behaviors. These 40-item scales measure 5 dimensions of leadership behavior: training and instruction behavior (13 items), Democratic Behavior (9 items), Autocratic Behavior (5 items), Social Support behavior (8 items), and Positive Feedback behavior (5 items) through both a preference (“I prefer my coach to…”) and a Perceived version (“my coach to…”) version. The items are assigned a score between 1 and 5 (1= never, 5 = always).

In this study, this questionnaire was adapted in to Ethiopia working language that is Amharic. In the first stage, experts translated the preference version of the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) into Amharic. In order to overcome differences in meaning of translated items; Amharic translation was back translated into English. In the second stage, Amharic version of the 40 items of
Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) in to the five original scales was administered to 26 Dilla Kenema soccer club players to see validity of the content. This was to check to sort out difficult and ambiguous question. Items that were not clear and ambiguous were revised and the final revised Amharic translation accepted and administrated to participants (Appendix “B” and “C” for complete questionnaire).

4.2.3. Athletes Satisfaction Questionnaire

Satisfaction was evaluated using 4 of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire’s (ASQ) 15 subscales designed by Riemer & Chelladurai (1998): this subscales include training and instruction satisfaction (3 items), personal treatment satisfaction (5 items), team performance satisfaction (3 items), and individual performance satisfaction (3 items). Riemer and Toon (2001) also used these 4 subscales in their study to examine leadership and satisfaction in tennis. The first two subscales focus on satisfaction with the processes of coaching behavior, while the latter two evaluate satisfaction with outcomes with the processes of leadership (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). The items are assigned a score between 1 and 7 (1= very dissatisfied, 7= very satisfied). In this study, Athletes Satisfaction Questionnaires (ASQ) was also
adapted from English version to Ethiopia working language Amharic in the same manner with Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS). The items assigned a score between 1 and 7 was recorded to 1 and 3 to make them easy for data analysis and interpretation (1=Not at all satisfied, 3=extremely satisfied, Appendix “D” for complete questionnaire).

4.2.4. Validity and Reliability

Before administering questionnaire to have credible result it is fundamental to assess validity and reliability of data collection instruments. Validity is, therefore, a very important and useful concept in all forms of research methodology. Its primary purpose is to increase the accuracy and usefulness of findings by eliminating or controlling as many confounding variables as possible, which allows for greater confidence in the findings of a given study Marczyk et.al. (2005:158).

Measuring the content validity and reliability of measurement instrument is fundamental to build confidence on research destiny. The overall questionnaire designed exposed to experienced peer scholars, researchers and subject specialists. This is to obtain grater face validity. This procedure is intended to purify the
measures as Churchill (1979) denotes and subsequently renders greater face validity to the study. Validity check on questionnaire designed forced modification of two double barrel questions and the other three questions suggested as difficult and confusing were cancelled. Besides this, interrater reliability of instruments evaluated to minimize measurement errors.

Marczyk et.al (2005:105) “Interrater reliability is used to determine the agreement between different judges or raters when they are observing or evaluating the performance of others.” Finally, to improve the sensitivity of the measurements, the scales for responses are a five score measure for (LSS) and three score measures for (ASQ) giving the respondents a wider range of possibilities to express their perception, preference and satisfaction in coaching leadership style. Sensitivity refers to accurate measurement of variability in responses (McPhail 2003 in Paelmke, 2007).

Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) reported internal consistency estimates (Cronbach’s alpha, 1951) ranging from .85 (individual performance satisfaction) to .95 (team performance satisfaction). In the present sample, the Cronbach Alpha values of the instrument
designed to gather data on Leadership style and Athletes satisfactions are provided in (Table 4.1) below Perceived training and instruction 0.76; Preferred Training and instruction 0.80; Perceived Positive Feedback 0.88; Preferred Positive Feedback 0.92; Perceived Autocratic Behavior 0.70; Preferred Autocratic Behavior 0.78, Individual performance satisfaction 0.72; Team performance satisfaction 0.75; Training and instruction satisfaction 0.85 and Personal treatments satisfaction 0.78. The reliability test showed the questionnaires were reliable instrument to gather empirical data form sampled respondents. These estimates are all considered adequate.
**Table 4.1**

Internal consistency Estimates for the LSS and ASQ dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Group of Attributes Tested For Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perceived training and instruction</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preferred Training and instruction</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perceived positive feed back</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preferred positive feed back</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preferred Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Individual performance satisfaction</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Team performance satisfaction</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Training and instruction satisfaction</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Personal treatments satisfaction</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary data*
4.3. Data Analysis

Data collected and analyzed to test the null hypothesis that were put as the research destiny.

1. There is no difference in leadership style perception across age, experience and playing position of players.

2. There is no difference in leadership style preference across age, experience and playing position of players.

3. There are no differences in Leadership style and Satisfaction across age, experience and playing position.

4. There is no correlation among the variables of preferred, perceived Leadership Style and Players Satisfaction.

5. There are no relationship among Preferred and Perceived leadership, their congruence and satisfaction with leadership.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the demographic variables and to see the behavior and situation of Perceived, Preferred leadership styles and players satisfaction. Bivariate correlation (Pearson r) of the major variables was calculated to examine the relationship between selected research variable. To examine congruence hypothesis two sets of four multiple regression analyses were carried out for each satisfaction subscale. This procedure provided for assessment of the unique and cumulative
variance in personal treatment satisfaction, training and instruction satisfaction, individual performance satisfaction, and team performance satisfaction explained by the preferences for and perceptions of the leadership behaviors and their satisfaction.

In the first set, the preference score in each of the five dimensions of leader behavior was entered first, followed by preference score and the interaction term. In the second set the order of preferences and perceptions were reversed. “This procedure provided information on the amount of unique variance accounted by each component variable and was expected to reveal the dominance, if any, of preference scores, perception scores, or interaction scores “(Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). This approach has been carried out in similar studies (e.g., Courneya & Chelladurai, 1991; Riemer and Chelladurai, 1995; Toon and Riemer, 2001).

Kruskal Wallis H test were used to assess sub group differences in the five dimensions of Perceived leadership style and preferred leadership style tested across different age, experience and playing position groups of players. Besides this offensive, midfield and defensive players’ perception and preference of leadership styles examined using the same procedure.
CHAPTER FIVE

5. RESULTS

This Chapter presents results of data that were obtained from the research questionnaires. The main purpose of this study was to find out the relationship among Preferred and Perceived Leadership, and Satisfaction with Leadership. The second purpose was to investigate the differences among Offensive, Defensive and Mid-field football premier league club Players Perceived Leadership, preferred Leadership, and Satisfaction with Leadership during competition season in a year 2011-2012 in Ethiopia.

Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the congruence hypothesis. Correlation analysis of Leadership Satisfaction with preferences for and perceptions of each dimension of leader Behavior were computed. In order to examine the differences between Offensive, Defensive and Midfield player’s descriptive analysis and multivariate analysis of variance were used. The analyses were described in the following sections.
5.1. Demographic Variables of Respondents

This part tried to describe age of respondents, playing position and playing experience. The results of the descriptive statistics calculated for the demographic variables were indicated in (Figure 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).

5.1.1. Age of Respondents.

The sample featured a total of 182 (100%) of male football premier league club Players from seven (7) football premier league club Players in Ethiopia was included in the study. Age of the respondents ranged from 20 to 25 years was (Frequency 55, percentages 30.2). Age of the respondents ranged from 26 to 30 years was (Frequency 99, percentages 54.4) and Age of the respondents ranged from 31 to 35 years was (Frequency 28, percentages 15.4). The majority, of the sample respondents was included under the age of 26 to 30 years (Frequency 99, percentages 54.4).
Figure 5.1

Age of the respondents

Source: primary data
5.1.2. Playing Experiences of Respondents

Year of playing experience in premier league club ranged from 1 to 3 years was (Frequency 33, percentages 18.1). Year of playing experience in premier league club ranged from 4 to 6 years was (Frequency 99, percentages 54.4) and year of playing experience in premier league club ranged from 7 to 9 years was (Frequency 50, percentages 27.5). The majority of the sample respondents were included under the years of playing experience of 4 to 6 years (Frequency 99, percentages 54.4).
Figure 5.2

Years of playing experiences

Source: primary data
5.1.3. Players Playing Position

A total of 182 male football premier league club Players seven (7) of fourteen (14) in Ethiopia was included in the study. According to the composition of Players 52(28%) offensive, 65(36%) defensive, and 65(36%) Midfield Players was incorporated in the study.
Figure 5.3

Players Playing Position

Source: primary data
5.2. Descriptive Statistics

A total of 182 football premier league club Players from seven (7) clubs of Ethiopia were included in the statistical analysis. The means and standard deviations of perception and preference of Leadership Behavior, and Satisfaction scores and also means and standard deviations by Players’ positions were showed in Table (5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).
Table 5.1

Descriptive Statistics for Means and Standard Deviations Of Players Preferred Leadership Styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Training and</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** primary Data

**Response Scale:**

1=Never (0% of the time),

2=Seldom (25% of the time),

3=occasionally (50% of the time),

4= Often (75% of the time) and

5=Always (100% of the time).
Table 5.2

Descriptive statistics means and standard deviations of Players, Perceived Leadership Styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Training and instruction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** primary Data

*Response Scale:*

1=Never (0% of the time),

2=Seldom (25% of the time),

3=Occasionally (50% of the time),

4=Often (75% of the time) and

5=Always (100% of the time).
Table 5.3

Descriptive statistics means and standard deviations of Players satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behaviours</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance Satisfaction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team performance Satisfaction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal treatment Satisfaction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and instruction Satisfaction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: primary Data

Response Scale:-

1=Never (0% of the time),
2=Seldom (25% of the time),
3=occasionally (50% of the time),
4= Often (75% of the time) and
5=Always (100% of the time).
Table 5.4

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Means and Standard Deviations Preferred Leadership Style, Perceived Leadership Style, and Athletes Satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Leadership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Leadership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual performance</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team performance</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal treatment</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: primary Data

Response Scale:

1=Never (0% of the time),
2=Seldom (25% of the time),
3=occasionally (50% of the time),
4=Often (75% of the time) and
5=Always (100% of the time).
The results of the study indicated that Players Preferred more Autocratic Behavior (M=4.49) and also they Perceived more Training and instruction (M= 3.90) than other Leadership Behaviors. Players Preferred less Positive Feedback and Perceived less Autocratic Behavior (M= 4.40, M= 3.19 respectively). Players were satisfied more with Training and instruction (M= 1.98 on a 3 point scale) and they satisfied less with Individual performance (M=1.91). The Players were consisted of 52 Offensives, 65 Mid-field and 65 Defensive Players (See Table 5.4).

5.3 Sub Group Analysis (Leadership Behavior Perception and Preference across Respondent’s Age, Experience and Playing Position).

Examining the results of the research findings, considerate the respondent’s age, playing position and playing experience would be vital to see the Leadership Behavior of preference and perception of Players in order to find out the effects of Leadership Styles across the Satisfaction of Players. Kruskal-Wallis test was used to see “hypotheses 1,2 and 3” whether athletes at different age, experience and playing position differ in their perception, preference of Leadership Style and Satisfaction.
5.3.1. Leadership Behavior Perception and Preference across Respondents Age.

Leaders’ Behavior perception across different age cohort of Players indicated that except Perceived Training and Instruction Players did not showed statistical significant difference p≤0.05 across different age group of Players. Perceived Training and Instruction Leadership Style recorded highest mean rank (MR=122.41) by the age group from 31-35. On the other hand Players preference of different Leadership Styles did not showed statistical significance difference p≤0.05 across respondent’s different age group (See Table 5.5 and 5.6).
Table 5.5

Leadership Perception across Respondents Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Leadership Style</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Training and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>122.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>96.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>87.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>97.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>89.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>94.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of significance: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Source: primary data
Table 5.6
Leaders Behavior Preference across Respondents Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Leadership Style</th>
<th>Respondents Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X²</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Training and Instruction</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>97.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>87.68</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>101.26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>89.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>96.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of significance: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Source: primary data
5.3.2. Leadership Behaviors, Perception and Preference across Players Playing Experience

Kruskal-Wallis significant test was used to see players playing position. Players do not showed any significant difference in their Leadership perception based on their playing experience in clubs (See Table 5.7). Regarding their preference of Leadership Styles only preferred Positive Feedback showed significant difference p≤0.05 at different experience cohort. This Leadership Behavior showed, better Preferred by Players from 7-9 years of experience. The highest mean rank observed was 108.04 (See Table 5.8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Leadership Style</th>
<th>Experience of Players at years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Training and Instruction</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>93.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Level of significance: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01*

*Source: primary data*
Table 5.8

Leaders Behavior Preference across Experience of Players at Playing Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Leadership Style</th>
<th>Experienc e Playing at years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Training And Instruction</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>87.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>103.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>93.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94.61</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>87.35</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.02</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Level of significance: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

*Source: primary data*
5.3.3. Player’s Perception of Leadership Style across Players

Playing Position.

Kruskal-Wallis significant test was used to see playing position of player’s Perception of Leadership Styles. The result indicated that Perceived Training and Instruction and Perceived Positive Feedback did not show any significant difference across groups. But the significant difference $P \leq 0.05$ observed by Players Perceived Democratic Leadership Behavior (Offensive MR=102.98, Midfield MR=78.30, Defensive MR=95.52), Autocratic Leadership Behavior (Offensive MR=70.32, Midfield MR=113.49, Defensive MR=86.45), and Social Support Leadership Style (Offensive MR=74.45, Midfield MR=102.37, Defensive MR=94.27). Perceived Democratic Behavior supposed as better Leadership Behavior by Offensive Players. On the other hand Perceived Autocratic Leadership Behavior and Perceived Social Support better viewed by Midfield Players (See Table 5.9).
Table 5.9

Player’s Perception of Leadership Style across Playing Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Leadership Style</th>
<th>Players position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94.45</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Training and Instruction</td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92.51</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>102.98</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95.52</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70.32</td>
<td>20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>113.49</td>
<td>20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86.45</td>
<td>20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>102.37</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94.27</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84.59</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98.78</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89.75</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of significance: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Source: primary data
5.3.4. Preferred Leadership Style of Player’s across playing position

Kruskal-Wallis significant test was used to see preference of Leadership Styles across Players playing position. The result indicated that only Preferred Democratic Leadership Style (Offensive MR=75.67, Midfield MR=86.55, Defensive MR=109.12) and Preferred Positive Feedback (Offensive MR=99.98, Midfield MR=117.85, Defensive MR=58.36) Leadership Styles showed significant difference across Players playing position. Defensive Players better Preferred Democratic Leadership Behavior and Midfield Players Preferred Positive Feedback Leadership Behavior (See Table 5.10).
Table 5.10

Player's preferred Leadership Style across Players Playing Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Leadership Style</th>
<th>Players position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Training And Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>97.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>91.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Democratic Behavior</strong></td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75.67</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>109.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Autocratic Behavior</strong></td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Social Support</strong></td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>94.65</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Positive Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td>48.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>117.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Level of significance: *p* ≤ 0.05, **p* ≤ 0.01

*Source: primary data*
5.3.5. Player’s Satisfaction across Playing at Different Position

Kruskal-Wallis significant test was used to see player’s satisfaction across playing at different position. Players Satisfaction such as Individual Performance Satisfaction, Team Performance Satisfaction, Training & Instruction Satisfaction and Personal Treatment Satisfaction across different playing position showed no significant difference p≤0.05 across Players playing at different position (See Table 5.11).
Table 5.11

Player’s Satisfaction across Players Playing at different Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Players Satisfaction</th>
<th>Players position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Performance Satisfaction</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>90.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance Satisfaction</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>83.10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Instruction Satisfaction</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82.28</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment Satisfaction</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>89.68</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of significance: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Source: primary data
5.3.6. Perceived, Preferred and Satisfaction between Players Position

Player's Perceived Leadership Style and preferred Leadership Style as well as their Satisfaction across groups tested using kruskal-Wallis test. As indicated in the table below Players Perceived Leadership Style showed statistical significance difference p≤0.05 between Players position. In order of rank the Midfield Players record mean rank of 104.35, Defensive position of player’s record mean rank of 93.80 and Offensive Players record mean rank of 72.57. The rest Preferred Leadership Styles and Players Satisfaction showed no statistical significance difference p≤0.05 across Players position (See Table 5.12).
Table 5.12

Perceived, Preferred Leadership and Satisfaction between Players Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived, Preferred Leadership &amp; Satisfaction</td>
<td>Perceived Leadership Style</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72.57</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>104.35</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Leadership Style</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96.87</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction Style</td>
<td>Offensive</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midfield</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of significance: *p≤0.05, **p≤0.01

Source: primary data
5.4. Relationship among Variables of the Study

Bivariate correlation of Leadership Styles of player’s Satisfaction with preferences for and perceptions of each dimensions of Leadership Behavior were computed to see “hypotheses 4”. Examining the correlation between variables is useful in determining relationship. Preferably, all of the predictor (independent) variables should be significantly correlated with the dependent variables and uncorrelated with each other (Stevens, 1999). By using the SPSS System, a correlation matrix was generated examining the relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variables (See Table 5.13).
Table 5.13. Correlation Matrix for preference and perception Leadership Style and Satisfaction scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tla</th>
<th>Tlb</th>
<th>DBa</th>
<th>DBb</th>
<th>ABa</th>
<th>ABb</th>
<th>SSa</th>
<th>SSb</th>
<th>PFa</th>
<th>PFb</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>T&amp;I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlb</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBa</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBb</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aba</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.353**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abb</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSa</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.167*</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSb</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>-0.165**</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfa</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.247**</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pf b</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.303**</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.266**</td>
<td>-0.297**</td>
<td>0.162**</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.280**</td>
<td>-0.439**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>0.218**</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.197**</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.280**</td>
<td>-0.250**</td>
<td>0.464**</td>
<td>0.180*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;I</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.190*</td>
<td>-0.235**</td>
<td>-0.232**</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.276**</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.483**</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.405**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=182,  *p ≤05  **p≤, 01  a = preferences  b = perceptions.

**Source:** Primary Data

Note, TI=Training and instruction; DB=Democratic Behavior; AB=Autocratic Behavior, SS=Social Support; PF=Positive Feedback; IP=Individual performance; TP=Team Performance; PT=Personal treatment; T&I=Training and instruction.
The result of the study indicated that individual performance Satisfaction were negatively correlated \( (r=-.30, \ p<0.01) \) only with preference for Positive Feedback. Team performance Satisfaction showed significant negative relationship with perception for Democratic Behavior \( (r=-.27, \ p<0.01) \); preference for Autocratic Behavior \( (r=-.29, \ p<0.01) \); preference for Positive Feedback \( (r=-.28, \ p<0.01) \). But the only significant \( (r=.16, \ p\leq0.05) \) positive relationship observed with Perceived Autocratic Behavior. Personal Treatment Satisfaction positively related with Preferred Democratic Behavior \( (r=.22, \ p<0.01) \). But negative significant relationship observed with Preferred Autocratic Behavior \( (r=-.19, \ p<0.01) \), Preferred Positive Feedback \( (r=-.28, \ p<0.01) \) and Perceived Positive Feedback \( (r=-.25, \ p<0.01) \). Finally Training and Instruction Satisfaction positively related with Preferred Democratic Behavior \( (r=.19, \ p\leq0.05) \). Perceived Democratic Behavior \( (r=-.24, \ p<0.01) \) Preferred Autocratic Behavior\( (r=-.23, \ p<0.01 \) and Positive Feedback \( (r=-.28, \ p<0.01) \) negatively related with Training and Instruction Satisfaction.
5.5. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the influence of Leader Behavior variables on player’s Satisfaction. A total of 40 hierarchal multiple regression analysis was carried out to examine congruence “hypothesis 5”. For each of the four dependent variables, two were conducted for each of the five Leadership Behavior dimensions. In the first, in order of entry was preference score, perception score, and interaction score; in the second, perception scores were entered first then preference scores and interaction term was entered last.

5.5.1. Predictive Efficacy of Leadership Behaviors Over “Individual Performance” Satisfaction.

In hierarchical regression (also called sequential) the independent variables are entered into the equation in the order specified by this study theoretical ground. Variables or sets of variables are entered in steps (or blocks); with each independent variable being assessed in terms of what it adds to the prediction of the dependent variable individual performance Satisfaction, after the previous variables have been controlled for. Once all sets of variables are entered, the overall model is assessed in terms of its ability to predict the dependent measure. The relative contribution of each block of variables is also assessed.
**Table 5.14** Hierarchical Multiple Regression Model “Individual Performance” Satisfaction as Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived and Preferred Leadership Style</th>
<th>Model I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>sig</td>
<td>Part correlation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Training and instruction</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Training And Instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>- .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Democratic Behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Autocratic Behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance Level = $^*P\leq.05$, $^{**}p\leq0.01$

**Source:** Primary data.
In this section an attempt was made to find the factors which predict “Individual Performance Satisfaction”. The researcher determined to analyze these factors because they are the causes for Players Satisfaction. Prediction was therefore made to see relevant variables among the set of variables categorized under Perceived and Preferred Leadership Behaviors. To find out which variable among the set of variables identified have a significant predictive efficacy over “Individual Performance Satisfaction”.

Beta Weight analysis of each coefficient in the regression equation was used. Multiple regression analysis models were fitted in two steps considering “Individual Performance Satisfaction” as the dependent variable. Here the objective was to find which variable are important in predicting “Individual Performance Satisfaction”. In this Model Summary box there are two models listed. Model 1 refers to the first block of variables entered were Perceived Leadership Behavior. These include Perceived Training and Instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback. Model 2 includes all the variables that were entered in blocks Perceived Training and Instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support,
Perceived Positive Feedback and Preferred Training and Instruction, Preferred Democratic Behavior, Preferred Autocratic Behavior, Preferred Social Support, Preferred Positive Feedback.

R Square values in Model I check to see predictive power of Perceived Training and Instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback. The overall model did not explain any sort of the variance over Individual performance Satisfaction. The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole was not significant at (p<.05).

After Block 2 variables (Preferred and Perceived Training and Instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback) have also been included, the model as a whole explains 14%. It is important to note that this second R square value includes all the variables from both blocks, not just those included in the second step. To find out how much of this overall variance is explained by our variables of interest (Perceived Training and Instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback) after the effects of Preferred Training and Instruction, Democratic
Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback, you need to look in the column labeled R Square change.

The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Training and Instruction (Model II: $\beta$=.15, p<.05); Perceived Social Support (Model II: $\beta$=.14, p<.05); Preferred Democratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta$=-.16, p<.05); Preferred Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta$=.13, p<.05) and Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta$=-.34, p<.05) have strong predictive power to Individual performance Satisfaction.

In the output presented above you will see, on the line marked Model 2, that the R square change value is .14. This means that Perceived training and instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback explain an additional 14 per cent of the variance on “Individual Performance Satisfaction”, even Preferred training and instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback controlled for. The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole (which includes both blocks of variables) is significant at p<.05.

To find out how well each of the variables contributes to the equation we need to look in the Coefficients table. Always look in
the Model 2 row. This summarizes the results, with all the variables entered into the equation. Scanning the Sig. column, there are five variables that make a statistically significant contribution (≤.05). In order of importance they are Preferred Social Support (Model II: β=-.34, p<.05); Preferred Democratic Behavior (Model II: β=-.16, p<.05); training and instruction (Model II: β=.15, p<.05); Perceived Social Support (Model II: β=.14, p<.05); and Preferred Autocratic Behavior (Model II: β=.13, p<.05).

5.5.2. Predictive Efficacy of Leadership Behaviors Over “Team Performance” Satisfaction.

In this section also an attempt is made to find out the factors which predict “Team Performance Satisfaction”. Prediction is therefore made to see relevant variables among the set of variables categorized under Perceived and Preferred Leadership Behaviors. To find out which variable among the set of variables identified have a significant predictive efficacy over “Team Performance Satisfaction”.

Model 1 refers to the first block of variables that entered are Perceived Leadership Behavior. These include Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived
Positive Feedback. Model 2 includes all the variables that were entered in blocks Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support, Perceived Positive Feedback and Preferred training and instruction, Preferred Democratic Behavior, Preferred Autocratic Behavior, Preferred Social Support and Preferred Positive Feedback (See Table 5.15).
Table 5.15. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Model “Team Performance Satisfaction” as Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived and Preferred Leadership Style</th>
<th>Model I</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>Part correlation</th>
<th>Model II</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>Part correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived training and instruction</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Training and Instruction</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Democratic Behaviors</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Level = *P≤ .05, **p≤0.01

Source: Primary Data.
R Square values in Model I check to see predictive power of Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback. The overall model explained significant the variance over Team performance Satisfaction. The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole significant at (p<.05). The model explained 36% percent of its contribution to Team Performance Satisfaction. Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: β= -.23, p<.05) and Perceived Social Support (Model II: β= -.18, p<.05) reveled themselves as significant contribution over Team performance Satisfaction respectively.

After Block 2 variables (Preferred and Perceived training and instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback) have also been included, the model as a whole explains 1%. It is important to note that this second R square value includes all the variables from both blocks, not just those included in the second step. To find out how much of this overall variance is explained by our variables of interest (Perceived training and instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback) after the effects of Preferred training and instruction, Democratic
Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback, you need to look in the column labeled R Square change.

The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Training and Instruction (Model II: $\beta=-.15$, $p<.05$); Perceived Social Support (Model II: $\beta=-.18$, $p<.05$); Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.21$, $p<.05$); Preferred training and instruction (Model II: $\beta=.16$, $p<.05$) and Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.34$, $p<.05$) have strong predictive power to Individual performance Satisfaction. In the output presented above you will see, on the line marked Model 2, that the R square change value is .10. This means that Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback explain an additional 1% of the variance on “Team Performance Satisfaction”, even Preferred training and instruction, Preferred Democratic Behavior, Preferred Autocratic Behavior, Preferred Social Support and Preferred Positive Feedback controlled for. The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole (which includes both blocks of variables) is significant at ($p<.05$).
To find out how well each of the variables contributes to the equation we need to look in the Coefficients table. Always look in the Model 2 row. This summarizes the results, with all the variables entered into the equation. Scanning the Sig. column, there are five variables that make a statistically significant contribution (≤.05). In order of importance they are Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.27$, $p<.05$); Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.21$, $p<.05$); Perceived Social Support (Model II: $\beta=.18$, $p<.05$); Preferred training and instruction (Model II: $\beta=.16$, $p<.05$); and Perceived Training and Instruction (Model II: $\beta=-.15$, $p<.05$).

5.5.3. Predictive Efficacy of Leadership Behaviors Over “Training and Instruction” Satisfaction.

The third Satisfaction category tested was Training and Instruction Satisfaction. The significant contribution of Leadership Behaviors over Training and instruction Satisfaction tested Beta weight regression analyses following the above procedure. The same procedure applied here.
Table 5.16, Hierarchical Multiple Regression Model “Training and Instruction” Satisfaction as Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived and Preferred Leadership Style</th>
<th>Model I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>sig</td>
<td>Part correlation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>sig</td>
<td>Part correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived training and instruction</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Training And Instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Democratic Behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Autocratic Behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Level = *P ≤ .05, **P ≤ 0.01

Source: Primary Data.
R Square values in Model I check to see predictive power of Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback. The overall model explained significant the variance over Training and instruction. The ANOVA Table indicates that the model as a whole significant at (p<.05). The model explained 7 percent of its contribution to Training and Instruction Satisfaction. Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=19$, p<.05) and Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.19$, p<.05) revealed themselves as significant contribution over Training and instruction respectively. After Block 2 variables (Preferred Perceived training and instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support and Positive Feedback) have also been included, the model as a whole explains 15 percent.

The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=.20$, p<.05); Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.18$, p<.05); Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta=-.27$, p<.05) and Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.27$, p<.05) strong predictive power to Training and Instruction Satisfaction. In the output presented above you will see, on the line marked Model 2, that the R square change value is .15. This means
that Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback explain an additional 15 percent of the variance on Training and instruction, even Preferred training and instruction, Preferred Democratic Behavior, Preferred Autocratic Behavior, Preferred Social Support and Preferred Positive Feedback controlled for. The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole (which includes both blocks of variables) is significant at (p<.05).

To find out how well each of the variables contributes to the equation we need to look in the Coefficients table. Always look in the Model 2 row. This summarizes the results, with all the variables entered into the equation. Scanning the Sig. column, there are four variables that make a statistically significant contribution (≤.05). Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: β=-.27, p<.05) and Preferred Social Support (Model II: β=-.27, p<.05); equally contribute to Training and Instruction Satisfaction. Besides this Perceived autocratic support (Model II: β=.18, p<.05); and Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: β=-.18, p<.05) contribute to Training and Instruction Satisfaction at the third and fourth place.
5.5.4. Predictive Efficacy of Leadership Behavior Over “Personal Treatment” Satisfaction.

The fourth Satisfaction category tested was Personal Treatment Satisfaction. The significant contribution of Leadership Behavior over Persona Treatment Satisfaction tested using Beta weight regression analyses following the above procedure. The same procedure applied here like as the previous approach.
Table 5.17 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Model “Personal Treatment Satisfaction” As Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived and Preferred Leadership Style</th>
<th>Model I</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>Part correlation</th>
<th>Model II</th>
<th>sig</th>
<th>Part correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Training and Instruction</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Training and Instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Democratic Behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Autocratic Behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Social Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Positive Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ Change $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>.18</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Level =*P< .05, **p≤0.01

Source: Primary Data.
R Square values in Model I check to see predictive power of Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback. The overall model explained significant the variance over Personal Treatment Satisfaction. The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole significant at (p<.05). The model explained 12 percent of its contribution to Personal Treatment Satisfaction. The only factor Perceived Training and Instruction (Model I: $\beta=.05$, p<.05) has significant contribution over personal treatment Satisfaction. After Block 2 variables (Preferred and Perceived training and instruction, Preferred and Perceived Democratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Social Support and Preferred and Perceived Positive Feedback) have also been included, the model as a whole explains percent.

The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=.16$, p<.05); and Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta=-.21$, p<.05) strong predictive power to Personal Treatment Satisfaction. In the output presented above you will see, on the line marked Model 2, that the R square change value is .06. This means that Perceived training and instruction, Perceived
Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback explain an additional 6 percent of the variance on “Personal Treatment Satisfaction”, even Preferred Training and instruction, Preferred Democratic Behavior, Preferred Autocratic Behavior, Preferred Social Support and Preferred Positive Feedback controlled for. The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole (which includes both blocks of variables) is significant at $p<.05$.

To find out how well each of the variables contributes to the equation we need to look in the Coefficients table. There are two variables that make a statistically significant contribution ($\leq .05$). Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta=-.21$, $p<.05$) and Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=.16$, $p<.05$) sequentially contribute to Personal Treatment Satisfaction.
CHAPTER SIX

6. DISCUSSION

Sport leadership research endures to emphasis on the study of selected situational variables and their relationship to leadership success. This chapter provides a brief discussion of the results of this study. The chapter also provides a general conversation related to the hypotheses and exploratory questions. To extend the knowledge of leadership in sport, the primary purpose of this study was to examine the congruence hypotheses of the multidimensional model of leadership. Second purpose was to investigate the differences between offensive, midfield and defensive players of football premier league clubs in Perceived leadership, preferred leadership and satisfaction with leadership in Ethiopia. Descriptive data such as age, educational level, playing experience and Congruence Hypothesis, Correlation analysis and Sub Groups differences in Leadership Behaviors was discussed in relation to leadership behavior and Athletes satisfaction. Finally, the limitations of the current study are addressed, and conclusion of the findings and relevance of the study was presented.
6.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The sample featured a total of 182 (100%) of male football players was comprised in the study. Regarding age of the respondents the majority (54.4%) of the sample respondents was included under the age of 26 to 30 years. Concerning Years of playing experience, the majority (54.4%) of the sample respondents was included under the age of 26 to 30 years. The result showed that the selected composition of respondents for the study was definite and relevant for the study.

6.2. Sub Group Differences of Perception and Preference of Leadership across Age, Experience and Playing Position

6.2.1. Across Age and Experience

Leaders’ behavior perception across different age cohort of players indicated that except Perceived Training and Instruction players did not show statistical significant difference (p≤0.05) across different age group of players. Perceived training and instruction leadership style recorded highest mean rank (MR=122.41) by the age group from 31-35. On the other hand players preference of different leadership styles did not showed statistical significance difference
(p≤0.05) across respondent’s different age group. Leadership approaches and practices may vary depending of difference circumstances.

Players do not showed any significant difference in their leadership perception based on their playing experience in clubs. Regarding their preference of leadership styles only preferred Positive Feedback showed significant difference (p≤0.05) at different experience cohort. This leadership style better Preferred by players from 7-9 years of experience. The highest mean rank observed was 108.04.

Majority Perceived as well as Preferred leadership styles did not showed statistical significant difference (p≤0.05). Players with 31-35 years of age better Perceived Training and instruction (TI) leadership style than other age cohort.

The above two relationship tests of leadership styles preference and perception across demographics of players can be summarized in the following discussion. Chelladurai (1980, 1990, 1999) and Chelladurai & Riemer(1998) conceptualization confirmed that effectiveness of coaching behaviors is a function of situational, member, and leader characteristics. As well as member
characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ability) primarily influence athletes’ preferred coaching behaviors, while the coach’s personal characteristics (e.g., gender, age, personality characteristics, and years of experience) influence the coach’s actual behaviors).

But here there is little indication that different leadership approaches are important to different composition of players in terms of age and experience. Major reality in this study was the prevalent weak Perceived leadership styles equally disagreed by all sort of players and the players evenly put their future leadership demand. This has to be observed and internalized to the leadership approach to coach players and to obtain needed satisfaction from individuals concerned.

But the Perceived Training and Instruction leadership style selected by players between the age of 31-35 and Preferred Positive Feedback leadership style selected by Players with playing experience of 7-9 may be an indication that the aged players should be treated by their Perceived training and instruction and players with mature experience better approached by Preferred leadership style which is totally concerned for Positive Feedback.
**6.2.2. Sub Group Difference across Players Playing Position**

Kruskal Wallis significant test was used to see perception of players to leadership behavior across different players playing position. Significant difference (P≤0.05) observed by players perception of Perceived democratic leadership behavior (Offensive MR=102.98) and autocratic leadership behavior (Midfield MR=113.49) and Social Support leadership behaviors (Midfield MR=102.37). Perceived Democratic Behavior supposed as better leadership behavior by offensive players, Perceived autocratic leadership style and Perceived Social Support better viewed by midfield players.

Significant test to see preference of leadership styles across players playing position was indicated that only Preferred democratic (Defensive MR=109.12) and Preferred Positive Feedback (Midfield MR=117.85) leadership styles across players position showed significant difference (p≤0.05). Defensive players Preferred more democratic leadership behavior and midfield players Preferred more Positive Feedback leadership style. Players satisfaction across different playing position showed no significant difference (p≤0.05) across players playing at different position. Similar study of Riemer and Chelladurai (1995) results showed that defensive players
Preferred and Perceived greater amounts of Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, and Social Support than did offensive players. Here preference for Democratic Behavior is similar with this study.

Overall assessment Player’s Perceived leadership style and preferred leadership as well as their satisfaction across groups tested as summery indicated that players Perceived leadership style showed statistical significance difference (p≤0.05) between players position. Midfield players record highest mean rank of 104.35. The rest Preferred leadership styles and players satisfaction showed no statistical significance (p≤0.05) across players position. In Cakioglu, Asli(2003) study except Perceived leadership behavior preference of leadership behavior and satisfaction showed similar result.

Of course the practice on ground may be perceived by different position players in different ways. But the leadership Preferred and satisfaction counted was similar across sub group. What has to be understood here are different leadership behaviors within Perceived as well as preferred leadership styles revealed difference among players playing position. Coaches now leading the players
must identify the difference in perception of existing leadership practice by players and must identify preferred leadership styles by players. This would lead to gaining required satisfaction and may enhance Ethiopia football premier league club player's performance and satisfaction. According to Cakioglu, Asli(2003) players in different positions have different athletic environments and different skills so they have different demand.

Coaches can use the following suggestion to coach their clubs based on this study result offensive players can be treated by Democratic Behavior, midfield players can be treated by autocratic leadership style and Social Support. Defensive players Preferred more democratic leadership behavior and midfield players also preferred more Positive Feedback leadership style. Still it has to take so cautiously that there is no one best way of leadership behavior it depends on situation. For example Weiss and Friedrichs (1986) in their study involving 201 male NCAA Division 1-AA football players found that defensive players, whose tasks were more open, preferred higher amounts of Democratic Behavior and Social Support than offensive players with less variability in the play environment.
6.3. Correlation Analysis

Bivariate correlation of leadership satisfaction with preferences for and perceptions of each dimensions of leadership behavior were computed. The result of the study indicated that individual performance satisfaction were negatively related ($r=-.30$, $p<0.01$) only with preference for Positive Feedback. Similar study of Cakioglu, Asli (2003) resulted similar finding for preference but perception for Positive Feedback also negatively related with individual performance satisfaction (IPS) in the same study.

Team performance satisfaction showed significant negative relationship with perception for Democratic Behavior ($r=-.27$, $p<0.01$); preference for Autocratic Behavior ($r=-.29$, $p<0.01$); preference for Positive Feedback ($r=-.28$, $p<0.01$). But the only significant ($r=.16$, $p≤0.05$) positive relationship observed with Perceived Autocratic Behavior. In Cakioglu, Asli (2003) study Team performance satisfaction (TPS) only negatively correlated with preference for Democratic Behavior. Personal treatment satisfaction positively related with Preferred Democratic Behavior ($r=.22$, $p<0.01$). But negative significant relationship observed with Preferred Autocratic Behavior ($r=-.19$, $p<0.01$), Preferred Positive
Feedback($r=-.28, p<0.01$) and Perceived Positive Feedback($r=-.25, p<0.01$). In Cakioglu, Asli (2003) study Team performance satisfaction (TPS) only negatively correlated with perception of training and instruction.

Finally training and instruction satisfaction positively related with Preferred Democratic Behavior($r=.19, p\leq0.05$). Perceived Democratic Behavior($r=-.24, p<0.01$) Preferred Autocratic Behavior($r=-.23, p<0.01$) and Positive Feedback($r=-.28, p<0.01$) negatively related with training and instruction satisfaction. In Cakioglu, Asli (2003) study Training and instruction satisfaction (TIS) only negatively correlated with preference for Positive Feedback.

Actually players expressed their preference for what their leaders should be in the future and reflected their perception on existing leadership practice. By one way or other players satisfaction positively or negatively related with different leadership behaviors. Most relationships resulted negative relationship with players satisfactions. Chelladurai (1984) and Schliesman (1987) examined the relationship between the preferred coach leadership behavior.
and athlete satisfaction. Both found that the preferred coach leadership behavior was significantly related to athlete satisfaction.

Perceived leadership is the leadership practice currently on ground observed as weak and resulted mean result below 4 from 5 point scale. The Preferred leadership is players’ future demand of what their leadership behavior should be in the future. The highest mean rank greater than 4 from 5 point scale recorded for preferred leadership style. Satisfaction of players’ also recorded positive mean greater than 1.5 from 3 point scale (see table 5.3 for this results).

Therefore from existing weak Perceived leadership obtaining positive relationship is so difficult. The finding indicates that Perceived leadership was weak but satisfaction of players was great. On the other hand positively described preferred leadership also not resulted in required positive satisfaction. This means if players treated by their preferred leadership style their satisfaction will go farer than what is observed now. Therefore by enhancing the Perceived leadership to the status of what is Preferred now is fundamental to generated maximum satisfaction from players. The players’ preference and Perceived leadership
behavior must be examined to result all satisfaction by applying leadership approach fit for purpose.

Taking care of the following Chelladurai’s (1984) relationship analysis is so fundamental to bring desired change. According to Chelladurai’s (1984) the relationship between athletes’ Preferred and Perceived leadership styles and their satisfaction, Democratic Behavior, Social Support, and Positive Feedback were greater, or when the players’ perceptions relative to the preference in Autocratic Behavior were lower, their satisfaction with leadership was higher. And, the players satisfaction with leadership increased as the coaches’ Perceived emphasis on training and instruction increased. And when the players’ perception of Autocratic Behaviors from their coaches was equal to their preference, their satisfaction is optimal, however, when the perception that the players felt too much higher or too much little was occurred, their satisfaction decline.

6.4. Predictive Efficacy of Leadership Behavior over Satisfaction

In hierarchical regression (also called sequential) the independent variables were entered into the equation in the order specified by
this study theoretical ground. Variables or sets of variables are entered in steps (or blocks); with each independent variable being assessed in terms of what it adds to the prediction of the dependent variable Individual performance satisfaction (IPS).

In this section an attempt was made to find the factors which predict “Individual Performance Satisfaction (IPS)”. The overall model did not explain any sort of the variance over Individual Performance Satisfaction (IPS). The ANOVA table indicates that the model as a whole not significant at p≤0.05. Here it can be easily seen that Perceived leadership did not contribute to players’ satisfaction. The weak practice of Perceived leadership behavior would be real cause for this. Because the recorded mean for Perceived leadership was for Training and instruction was 3.90, Democratic Behavior was 3.35, Autocratic Behavior was 3.19, Social Support it was 3.29 and Positive Feedback it was 3.27.

But after Preferred training and instruction, Preferred Democratic Behavior, Preferred Autocratic Behavior, Preferred Social Support and Preferred Positive Feedback included, the model as a whole explains 14 percent contribution. The regression analysis also showed that Perceived training and instruction (Model
II: $\beta=.15$, $p<.05$; Perceived Social Support (Model II: $\beta=.14$, $p<.05$); Preferred Democratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=-.16$, $p<.05$); Preferred Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=.13$, $p<.05$) and Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta=-.34$, $p<.05$) strong predictive power to Individual performance satisfaction (IPS).

In order of importance Preferred Social Support; Preferred Democratic Behavior; Preferred training and instruction showed their true contribution to players Individual Performance Satisfaction (IPS). This lowest 14 percent Individual Performance Satisfaction (IPS) rate must be maximized by applying preferred leadership styles liked by players at each position. Working on Preferred Social Support, Preferred Democratic Behavior and Preferred training and instruction would maximize players Individual Performance Satisfaction (IPS).

An attempt also was made to find the factors which predict “Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS)”. Prediction was therefore made to see relevant variables among the set of variables categorized under Perceived and Preferred leadership behaviors. Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta=-.23$, $p<.05$) and Perceived Social Support (Model I: $\beta=-.18$, $p<.05$) revealed themselves as significant
contributor over Training and Instruction (TI) respectively. The model explained 36 percent of its contribution to Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS). Here the Perceived leadership styles came out with two important leadership styles practical in coaching and had fundamental contribution to Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS). The contribution of this were 36 percent this should not be ignored it was working contribution. If we add what players demand at each position the total fundamental satisfaction would be significant.

The regression analysis also showed that Perceived training and instruction (Model II: β=-.15, p<.05); Perceived Social Support (Model II: β=-.18, p<.05); Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: β=-.21, p<.05); Preferred training and instruction (Model II: β=.16, p≤0.05) and Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: β=-.34, p≤0.05) strong predictive power to Team performance satisfaction (TPS). Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback explain an additional 1 per cent of the variance on “Team Performance Satisfaction” (TPS). In order of importance they were Preferred Positive Feedback, Perceived
Positive Feedback, Perceived Social Support, Preferred training and instruction, and Perceived training and instruction.

Here in addition to the Perceived Positive Feedback and Perceived Social Support providing due concern to Preferred Positive Feedback and Preferred training and instruction as well as Perceived training and instruction leadership styles can yield additional Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS). Not only what players Preferred but also the coach leadership choice is so important to ascertain Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS). Therefore maintaining the existing Perceived Positive Feedback, Perceived training and instruction and Perceived Social Support plus providing leadership styles Preferred by player that is training and instruction can elevate player Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS).

The significant contribution of leadership behaviors over Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS) tested Beta weight regression analyses following the above procedure. The overall model explained significant the variance over Team Performance Satisfaction (TPS). The model explained 7 percent of its contribution to Training and Instruction Satisfaction. Perceived
Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta = .19$, $p < .05$) and Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta = -.19$, $p < .05$) revealed themselves as significant contributions over Training and instruction Satisfaction (TIS) respectively.

After Preferred and Perceived training and instruction, Preferred and Perceived Democratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Social Support and Preferred and Perceived Positive Feedback have also been included, the model as a whole explained 15 percent. The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta = .20$, $p < .05$); Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$); Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta = -.27$, $p < .05$) and Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta = -.27$, $p < .05$) strong predictive power to Training and Instruction satisfaction (TIS). To find out how well each of the variables contributes to the equation out of our variables those make a statistically significant contribution ($\leq .05$) Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta = -.27$, $p < .05$) and Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta = -.27$, $p < .05$); equally contribute to Training and Instruction satisfaction. Besides this Perceived autocratic support (Model II: $\beta = .18$, $p < .05$); and Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: $\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$) contribute to
Training and Instruction satisfaction at the third and fourth place respectively.

The result indicated that Working on Perceived Autocratic Behavior and Perceived Positive Feedback is one way to get Training and instruction satisfaction (TIS). But considering Preferred Social Support and Preferred Positive Feedback had a plus in gaining Training and Instruction satisfaction (TIS). It is true that Training and Instruction satisfaction (TIS) is not the result of one selected leadership style of a coach it is a blend of what the coach do to benefit players and the clubs and what is Preferred by the players to achieve individual as well as common objective of the clubs. The significant contribution of leadership behaviors over Personal treatment satisfaction (PTS) tested using Beta weight regression. The model explained 12 percent of its contribution to Personal Treatment Satisfaction (PTS). The only factor Perceived training and instruction (Model I: β=.05, p<.05) has significant contribution over personal treatment satisfaction.

After Preferred and Perceived training and instruction satisfaction, Preferred and Perceived Democratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Social
Support and Preferred and Perceived Positive Feedback included the model as a whole explains 6 percent contribution over Personal treatment satisfaction (PTS). The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=.16$, $p<.05$); and Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta=-.21$, $p<.05$) strong predictive power to Personal Treatment Satisfaction. This means that Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback explain an additional 6 percent of the variance on “Personal Treatment Satisfaction”, even. Preferred Social Support (Model II: $\beta=-.21$, $p<.05$) and Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: $\beta=.16$, $p<.05$) sequentially contribute to Personal Treatment Satisfaction (PTS). Here the result indicated that importance of due work on Perceived training and instruction to enhance Personal Treatment Satisfaction (PTS). Besides this the result also confirmed that working on Preferred Social Support and Perceived Autocratic Behavior can boost Personal Treatment Satisfaction (PTS).

In general the above findings evidenced that the notion that “there is no one best way of leadership style fit for every circumstance”. Leadership approach and behaviors vary depending on situations.
That was why blend of approaches revealed their impact on players’ satisfaction in different depth and width in this study.

Within this regression analysis all the four satisfaction enhanced and increased by democratic, Positive Feedback, training and instruction and Social Support leadership behaviors. Chelladurai (1984) reached similar conclusion in his study. Chelladurai (1984) found that satisfaction with leadership for basketball players produced significant relationships with training and instruction, Democratic Behavior, Social Support, and Positive Feedback. The greater the perceptions of the actual behaviors in these four dimensions relative to the athletes’ preference, the higher was satisfaction with leadership. For instance Chelladurai (1996) indicated democratic coaches allow greater participation by the athletes in decisions pertaining to group goals, practice methods, and game tactics and strategies in Jordan. He was not surprised that college athletes desire and appreciate more involvement in the decisions pertaining to group goals, practice methods, and game tactics and strategies. Since the athletes’ success or failure depends mostly on themselves, they may feel the need to be involved in the training process, and they seem to prefer coaches who let them express their ideas and set their own goals.
CHAPTER SEVEN

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will discuss the conclusions that have been drawn from the research and recommendations that have surfaced from the literature review and the results of the questionnaire.

7.1. CONCLUSION

Football is a complex sport and depends on many external and unanticipated factors that coaching process attempts to control in order to bring success to clubs. Within coaching process, great emphasis is placed on the coach’s ability to observe and recall all the critical discrete incidents from a sport performance (Borrie, Jonsson & Magnusson, 2002). However, it has been shown that coaches cannot accurately observe and recall all of the detailed information that is required for a complete understanding or interpretation of performance (Franks & Miller, 1986). The question of effective leadership of football coaching in Ethiopia has been a subject of discussion for many years, but there is still little known about it. One of the problems in understanding leadership in sport research is that there are so many conflicting views. Additionally, sports leadership research continues to focus on coaching
leadership. This study assesses the congruence hypotheses, and the subgroup difference hypotheses relating to players’ position, of Chelladurai’s (1980) Multidimensional Model of Leadership. The results of current study indicated that:-

7.1.1. **Sub group differences of Perception and Preference of Leadership across Age, Experience and playing position**

The study tried to investigate the leadership style perception and preference across groups of player’s results was well described in chapter five. However, players perceive and prefer their leadership in terms of Age, Experience and playing position concluded in the following ways based on the results obtained.

7.1.2. **Sub group differences of Perception and Preference of Leadership across Age and Experience**

- Leadership styles perception across different age cohort of players indicated that except Perceived Training and Instruction players did not show statistical significant difference ($p \leq 0.05$) across different age group of players.
- Players preference of different leadership styles did not showed statistical significance difference ($p \leq 0.05$) across
respondent’s different age group. Players with 31-35 years of age better Perceived Training and instruction (TI) leadership style than other age cohort.

- Players do not showed any significant difference in their leadership perception based on their playing experience in clubs.
- Regarding their preference of leadership styles only preferred Positive Feedback showed significant difference (p≤0.05) at different experience cohort. This leadership better Preferred by players from 7-9 years of experience. The highest mean rank observed was 108.04.

7.1.3. Sub Group Difference across Players Playing Position

- Perceived Democratic Behavior supposed as better leadership behavior by offensive players, Perceived autocratic leadership style and Perceived Social Support better viewed by midfield players.
- Significant test to see preference of leadership styles across players playing position was indicated that only Preferred democratic and Preferred Positive Feedback leadership styles across players position showed significant difference (p≤0.05).
Player’s satisfaction across different playing position showed no significant difference ($p \leq 0.05$) across players playing at different position.

### 7.1.4. Correlation analysis

- The result of the study indicated that individual performance satisfaction was negatively related only with preference for Positive Feedback.
- Team performance satisfaction showed significant negative relationship with perception for Democratic Behavior preference for Autocratic Behavior preference for Positive Feedback. But the only significant positive relationship observed with Perceived Autocratic Behavior.
- Perceived Autocratic Behavior and Perceived Positive Feedback revealed themselves as significant contribution over Team Performance Satisfaction (TIS) respectively.

### 7.1.5. Predictive Efficacy of Leadership Behavior over Satisfaction

- The regression analysis also showed that Perceived training and instruction Perceived Social Support Perceived Positive Feedback Preferred training and instruction and Preferred Positive Feedback strong predictive power to Team
performance satisfaction (TPS). Perceived training and instruction, Perceived Democratic Behavior, Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Perceived Social Support and Perceived Positive Feedback explain an additional 1 per cent of the variance on “Team Performance Satisfaction” (TPS). In order of importance they were Preferred Positive Feedback, Perceived Positive Feedback, Perceived Social Support, Preferred training and instruction, and Perceived training and instruction.

The overall model explained significant the variance over training and instruction Satisfaction (TIS). The model explained 7 percent of its contribution to Training and Instruction Satisfaction. Perceived Autocratic Behavior and Perceived Positive Feedback revealed themselves as significant contribution over Team Performance Satisfaction (TIS) respectively.

After Preferred and Perceived training and instruction, Preferred and Perceived Democratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Social Support and Preferred and Perceived Positive Feedback have also been included, the model as a whole
explained 15 percent. The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Autocratic Behavior Perceived Positive Feedback Preferred Social Support and Preferred Positive Feedback strong predictive power to Training and Instruction satisfaction (TIS). Preferred Positive Feedback and Preferred Social Support equally contribute to Training and Instruction satisfaction. Besides this Perceived autocratic support and Perceived Positive Feedback contribute to Training and Instruction satisfaction at the third and fourth place respectively.

- The significant contribution of leadership behaviors over Personal treatment satisfaction (PTS) tested using Beta weight regression. The model explained 12 percent of its contribution to Personal Treatment Satisfaction (PTS). The only factor Perceived training and instruction has significant contribution over personal treatment satisfaction.

- After Preferred and Perceived training and instruction satisfaction, Preferred and Perceived Democratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Autocratic Behavior, Preferred and Perceived Social Support and Preferred and Perceived Positive Feedback included the model as a whole explains 6
percent contribution over Personal treatment satisfaction (PTS). The regression analysis also showed that Perceived Autocratic Behavior and Preferred Social Support strong predictive power to Personal Treatment Satisfaction. Preferred Social Support and Perceived Autocratic Behavior sequentially contribute to Personal Treatment Satisfaction (PTS).

➢ Within this regression analysis all the four satisfaction enhanced and increased by democratic, Positive Feedback, training and instruction and Social Support leadership behaviors.

7.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations for future research are presented:

7.2.1. Consider Demographic Differences during Coaching

weak Perceived leadership styles equally disagreed by all sort of players and leadership style evenly demanded by players in the future should be observed and internalized to the leadership approach to coach players and to obtain needed satisfaction from individuals concerned. Uniform leadership approach guide line can
be prepared and implemented to all sort of players at different age and experience.

But aged players - players between the ages of 31-35 should be treated by their Perceived training and instruction and players with mature experience of 7-9 better approached by Preferred leadership style which was totally concerned for Positive Feedback. Therefore, member characteristics (age and experience) should be considered in selection of coaching leadership styles.

7.2.2. What should be done for Players playing at different position?

Coaches now leading the players must identify the difference in perception of existing leadership practice by players at different position and must identify preferred leadership styles by players playing position. This would lead to gaining required satisfaction and may enhance Ethiopia football premier league club player’s performance and satisfaction. Players in different positions have different athletic environments and different skills so they have different demand.

As this study implied coaches can use the following suggestion to coach their clubs. Offensive players can be treated by Democratic
Behavior, midfield players can be treated by autocratic leadership style and Social Support. Defensive players preferred more democratic leadership behavior and midfield players also preferred more Positive Feedback leadership style. Still it has to be taken so cautiously that there is no one best way of leadership behavior it depends on situation.

The coming environment changes and world dynamics must be considered in selection of coaching leadership styles. Remaining stagnant, traditional and not following technological innovation has negative pay off. To increase Ethiopia clubs competitive advantage in the world following the tail of technology is so critical. Observing Africa leading clubs coaching leadership behaviors is so important. Coaching leadership guide line to each position players must be prepared as manual.

Actually players expressed their preference for what their leaders should be in the future and reflected their perception on existing leadership practice. By one way or other players satisfaction positively or negatively related with different leadership behaviors. Most relationships resulted negative relationship with players satisfactions.
Therefore from existing Perceived leadership obtaining positive relationship is so difficult. This means if players treated by their preferred leadership style their satisfaction will go farer than what is observed now. Therefore by enhancing the Perceived leadership to the status of what is Preferred now is fundamental to generated maximum satisfaction from players. The players’ preference and Perceived leadership behavior must be examined to achieve all satisfaction by applying leadership approach fit for purpose.

7.2.3. Which Leadership Behavior/s must be given special attention?

Within this study the four satisfactions enhanced by democratic, Positive Feedback, training and instruction and Social Support leadership behaviors. In addition to watching appropriate leadership style/s for players at different age, experience and playing position stressing on these leadership styles will yield important outcome. Strategic coaching leadership behaviors can take these as foundation to coach their players. The coaching culture should bear this behaviors and then can change based on environment demand.
7.2.4. Directions for Future Study

Despite the numerous research efforts involving leadership in sport, many opportunities for future research exist. No research has yet explored a full test (i.e., required, Preferred and Perceived leadership behaviors) of the congruency hypothesis in the Multidimensional Model of Leadership. Some prior research has examined the effect of Preferred and Perceived leadership behavior congruency on satisfaction. Further research is needed with the multidimensional theory of leadership in varying sport populations and with greater number of participants to identify other situational and behavioral factors associated with player’s performance and satisfaction.

Additionally, further research is needed to be made based on variables such as gender and educational level of players in order to obtain further information concerning the variables that affects player’s performance and satisfaction. Also, further research should obtain additional information about coaches’ characteristics such as gender, experience, ability, and the coaches’ perception of their own behavior in Ethiopia. Successful coaching is much more than just winning. Successful coaches help athletes master new skills, enjoy competing with others, and feel satisfaction.
Successful coaches are not only well versed in the skills of their sport, they also teach and model the skills needed for successful living in society because coach’s characteristics affect actual behavior.

Players are important sources of information to assess coaching behaviors. If coaching behavior is important to the coach for players’ performance and satisfaction, player input should be sought as a source of documentation. In order to obtain genuine information, players and coaches should give full attention for future research in coaching leadership. Therefore, player input will be beneficial to the coach for understanding what players refer and what behaviors the coach is actually exhibiting.
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Appendix-A

Athlete’s satisfaction questionnaires (ASQ)
(Players’ perception of coaches’ behaviour)
Chelladurai and Saleh’s (1980)

Part one: Demographic Questionnaire for Players

Please answer the following questions.

1. Name of playing club: __________________________

2. Age:
   - 15-19
   - 20-25
   - 26-30
   - 31-35
   - 36-40
   - >40

3. Indicate how long you have been playing in premier league club competition.
   - 1-3
   - 4-6
   - 7-9
   - > 9

4. Playing position in your club
   - Offensive
   - Midfielder
   - Defensive
Part Two: Directions:

Each of the following statements describes a specific behaviour that a coach may exhibit. For each statement there are five alternatives: 5 mean (always), 4 (often), 3 (occasionally), 2 (seldom), and 1 (never). You are requested to indicate your characteristic behaviour by in circling the appropriate number. There is no right or wrong answers. Your spontaneous and honest response is important for the success of the study.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seldom 25% of the time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My coach...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Matters</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>See to it that every athlete is working to his/her capacity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explains to each athletes the techniques and tactics of the sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pay special attention to correcting athlete’s mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Make sure that his/her part in the team is understood by all the athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructs every athlete individually in the sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Figures ahead on what should be done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Explains to every athlete what he/she should and what he/she should not do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expects every athlete to carry out his assignment to the detail.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Point out each athlete’s strength and weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Give specific instructions to each athlete as to what he/she should do in every situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sees to it that the efforts are coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Explain how each athlete’s contribution fit in to the total picture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Specifies in detail what is expected each athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Let’s his/her athletes share in decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Encourages athletes to make suggestions for ways of conducting practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Let’s the group sets its own goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Let’s the athletes try their own ways even if they make mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ask for the opinion of the athletes on important coaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Let’s athletes work at their own speed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Let the athletes decide on the plays to be used in a game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Work relatively independents of the athlete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Does not explain his/her action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Refuse to compromise a point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Keeps to himself/herself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Helps the athletes with their personal problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Helps members of the group settle their conflicts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Looks out for the personal welfare of the athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Does personal favours for their athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Expresses affection he/she feels for his/her athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Encourages the athletes to confide in him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Encourage close and informal relations with athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Invites athletes to his/her home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Complements an athlete for his/her performance in front of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tells an athlete’s when he/she do a particularly good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>See that an athlete is rewarded for a good performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Express application when an athlete’s perform well.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gives credit when credit is due.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire!!!
Appendix-B
Athlete’s satisfaction questionnaires (ASQ)
(Players’ preference of coaches’ behaviour)
Chelladurai and Saleh’s (1980)

Directions:
Each of the following statements describes a specific behaviour that a coach may exhibit. For each statement there are five alternatives: 5 mean (always), 4 (often), 3 (occasionally), 2 (seldom), and 1 (never). You are requested to indicate your characteristic behaviour by in circling the appropriate number. There is no right or wrong answers. Your spontaneous and honest response is important for the success of the study.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seldom 25% of the time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My coach...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Matters</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>See to it that every athlete is working to his/her capacity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explains to each athletes the techniques and tactics of the sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pay special attention to correcting athlete’s mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Make sure that his/her part in the team is understood by all the athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructs every athlete individually in the sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Figures ahead on what should be done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Explains to every athlete what he/she should and what he/she should not do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expects every athlete to carry out his assignment to the detail.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Point out each athlete’s strength and weaknesses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Give specific instructions to each athlete as to what he/she should do in every situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sees to it that the efforts are coordinated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Explain how each athlete’s contribution fit in to the total picture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Specifies in detail what is expected each athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Let’s his/her athletes share in decision making.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Encourages athletes to make suggestions for ways of conducting practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Let’s the group sets its own goal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Let’s the athletes try their own ways even if they make mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ask for the opinion of the athletes on important coaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Let’s athletes work at their own speed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Let the athletes decide on the plays to be used in a game.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Work relatively independents of the athlete.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Does not explain his/her action.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Refuse to compromise a point.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Keeps to himself/herself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Helps the athletes with their personal problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Helps members of the group settle their conflicts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Looks out for the personal welfare of the athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Does personal favours for their athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Expresses affection he/she feels for his/her athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Encourages the athletes to confide in him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Encourage close and informal relations with athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Invites athletes to his/her home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Complements an athlete for his/her performance in front of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tells an athlete’s when he/she do a particularly good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>See that an athlete is rewarded for a good performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Express application when an athlete’s perform well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Gives credit when credit is due.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire!!!
Appendix-C

ATHLETE SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE (ASQ)

Riemer & Chelladurai (1998)

This study is concerned with satisfaction of athletes. Each of the following statements describes a specific behaviour that a coach may exhibit. For each statement there are three alternatives: In the following pages, several items related to athletic satisfaction are listed. Against each item, a response format ranging from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 3 (extremely satisfied) is provided. You are requested to participate in the study and indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with the content of each item. Your honest and spontaneous response to each and every item is vital to the success of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>I am satisfied with….</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The degree to which I have reach (reached) my performance goals during the season.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The team's win/loss record this season.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The training I receive (received) from the coach during the season.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The friendliness of the coach towards me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The improvement in my performance over the previous season.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The instruction I have received from the coach this season.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The tactics used during games.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The team's overall performance this season</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The coach’s teaching of the tactics and techniques of my position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The improvement in my skill level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The level of appreciation my coach shows (showed) when I do (did) well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My coach’s loyalty towards me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The extent to which the coach is (was) behind me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The recognition I receive (received) from my coach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire!!!
Appendix-D

በቡድን ተጫዋች የሚሞላ ቀጽ፡፡ ለእኔ ወረያ ወደፈት የሚለክ ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም በሆኑ ከተለቀ ይሆሎች ከተለቀ ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታረም ከወረ ያለው የሆነ የሚታራ
ክፍልሁለት፡-

በዚህ ወይም የተቀመጡ ላይ የመስጠት የተጠቃሚ የአማራጨችን የሚያስፈልጉ እንደተመለከው ከውስጥ በሠንጠረዥ የአማራጨች የዘዋል-

አማራጫች ይወስዳሉ ያሹን የተቀመጡ ሆነ የስለሆነ የተቀረቡት ይወስዳል፡፡

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ምንም ይብጊዜ ይሱ ሲብለመቶጉዳይ በሰበር የተቀመጡ የስለሆነ የተጫዋች ያሹሉ ይመለከታል፡፡

አሰልኘን ይወስዳሉ ያሹን የስልጠና የሚከሰቱት የስህተቶች ይወስዳል፡፡

የራሱን የስራ ውድርሻና ለለብቻ የተጫዋች ያስለጠናው ይወስዳል፡፡

ወልሆኑ ይወስዳሉ ያሹን የስልጠናውን ይግራን ይስልጣና ይስልጣናውን ያስለጠናው ይግራል፡፡

የእያንዳንዱ የቡድኑ የተጫዋች ያስልጠናው ይግራል፡፡

አጠቃላይ እርምጃዎችን ይገልላቸዋል፡፡

አወይም ይገልፋ ለወደፊት የሚกระบวนስ ያውና ይገላቸዋል ይባላቸዋል::

አአ / ል የርሃር የምደት

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ባ/ቀ</th>
<th>ከርሃር የምደት</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>የወልሆኑ የሚከሰቱት የስህተት ያስለጠናውን ይግራል፡፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>የመፈለት ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ከሆነ ይረጋግጡ : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ለማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ለማስጠቀም ከሆነ ይጠይቁ ለማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>በሚልዝር ውስጥ ይቀረቡት ለማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>የማስጠቀም ያቀረቡት ይህ ማህበር ድረስ መጋቢት : : 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
በቀረቡት አስተያየቶች ቙ሪያ ፤ የዙሪያ ወይይቶችን አያደርግም፡፡

ከተጫዋች ጋር የጠበቀ ባንኙነት አያደርግም፡፡ 1 2 3 4 5

ጥያቄዎችን ውዴስወ በለው መንገድ በቅደባች ጋር ዋይናት ከደርጋል፡፡ 1 2 3 4 5

ተጫዋችን ሰገማቸው የግል ጋዳዮች ድረክት ከልደርጋል፡፡ 1 2 3 4 5

በተጫዋች ምካከል እስላክ ምገባቶችን ፤ የፍጥትሄ ለደያወኑ ይመቻቻል ከ(ያስተካክላል)፡፡ 1 2 3 4 5

ስለ ማስፈልገው ኤቅዳሚ ወይም ዯውል (ያደርግላቸዋል)፡፡ 1 2 3 4 5

ለተጫዋች የግሉን እርዳታ ይለግሳል (ያደርግላቸዋል) :: 1 2 3 4 5

ለተጫዋች ይቅርና ምልካም ፤ ሞነምግባር ዯሳያል :: 1 2 3 4 5

ተጫዋች ይምነት ይንዲያሳወት ይገፋቸዋል (ያደርጋል) :: 1 2 3 4 5

ከተጫዋች ይግራ ይህ ከተዘወዋሪ ወልካም ባንኙነት እንድፈጠር ይበረታታል፡፡ 1 2 3 4 5

ተጫዋች ወደ በገደቡ ይጋብዛል :: 1 2 3 4 5

የእያንዳንዱ በተጫዋች ብቃትና ዳሎታ ካሉም በተጫዋች ይበገኙበት ይህን ከአስተያየት ዋስትካርባል (ጥንካሬ/ድክመት) :: 1 2 3 4 5

እያንዳንዱ ባተጫዋች ይመ ይሆን ይላክ ይማdıግ ይህን ከደረግ ይለስተ ብቃትና ዳራ ይናገራል (የገልጻል) :: 1 2 3 4 5

የተሻለ ይውንት ይላስመዘgements በተጫዋች ይማበረታቻ ጋልማት ይእንድደረግ ይመቻቻል፡፡ 1 2 3 4 5

የተቫለ እንቅስቃሴ ይሚያደርግለትን በተጫዋች ይለይቶ ይቀርባል (ይመለምላል) :: 1 2 3 4 5

ሽልማት ይበሚልፈርበት ጊዜ ይናዳስፈላጊነቶች ይእንድዘጋጅ ከደርጋል :: 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix-E

በቡድንተጫዋችየሚሞላቅጹ
ስለአሰልጣኞች
የአሰለጣጠን
የአመራር
ዘዴ
ሁኔታ
ለመገምገም
የቀረበ
መጠይቅ
፡፡
መግቢያ
ከዚህ
በታች
የቀረቡት
መጠይቆች
የክለባችሁን
አሰልጣኝ
የአሰለጣጠና
አመራር
ዘዴ
በመገምገም
የተጫዋቾችን
አስተያየት
እ
ንድሰበሰብ
የተዘጋጀ
ጥናታዊ
መጠይቅ
ነው፡፡የጥናቱ
ዓላማ
በሕንድአገር
(Andhra)
አንድራ
ወኒቨርሲቲ
ለዶክትሬት
ዲግሪ
ማሟያ
የጥናትና
ምርመር
ክፍል
ስሆን
ለአገራችን
የእግር
ኳስ
እድገት
አስተዋጽ
ኦ
耶በረክታል
ተብሎ
የታሰበጥናት
ምርምርነው፡፡
ለእያንዳንዱ
የጥናቱ
መጠየቅ
ቅፍሎች
መመሪያዎች
የተቀመጡ
ስለሆነ
በመመሪያው
መሠረት
እንድትሞሉልን
እየጠየቅን፣
የእርስዎ
tab
ትብብርና
ታማኝነት
ለጥናት
መሳካት
ከፍተኛ
አስተዋጽኦ
ስለሚኖረው
ትብብርዎን
እንጠይቃለን፡፡
ክፍልአንድ፡-
4. የምርጫዎን
መልስ
በተቀመጠው
ሳጥን
ውስጥ
የ( √)
ምልክት
በማስቀመጥ
ይግለጹ፤
ዕድሜ
15-19                   2
ዐ-
25                           26-3
ዐ-
31-36 36-4               ከ 4 ከ እሆ

5. የኢትዮጵያ
እግርኳስ
ፌደሬሽን
በሚያዘጋጀው
የኘሪሚየር
ሊግ
ጨዋታ
ለስንት
ዓመት
ተሳትፈዋል
(ተጫውተዋል)
ከ
1-3 በስ በ
7-9 በስ በ
4-6 በስ በ
ከ
9 በስ በ
የልይ

6. 1bùdNH tsL fh yMTÅwTbT ኢነ-
2.x qE
2. x¥µY
3. tk$µY


**አምስት ለማረም እርምጃዎችን የሚስሉ እንደተመለከው**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ፈፋ ዲ</th>
<th>የሆነ እንደተመለከው እንወጥ</th>
<th>የሆነ እንደተመለከው ወቅት</th>
<th>የሆነ እንደተመለከው ወቅት</th>
<th>የሆነ እንደተመለከው ወቅት</th>
<th>የሆነ እንደተመለከው ወቅት</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>የስልጠናው የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው በወቅት የሠራት ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ይህ ማስረጃ በውድድር የሚስክር የሚገባው የሚያስገדоко ለማድረግ የሚሆኑ የሚችል ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>የስልጠናው የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው የሚስክር የሚገባው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>የስልጠናው የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው የሚስክር የሚገባው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ይህ ማስረጃ በውድድር የሚስክር የሚገባው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>የስልጠናው የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው የሚስክር የሚገባው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ይህ ማስረጃ በውድድር የሚስክር የሚገባው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ይህ ማስረጃ በውድድር የሚስክር የሚገባው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ያስፈልገው ከቡድኑ የሚደረገው ያስፈልገው 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>የበቀረቡት ከተጫወጡት ከወረ መጋዘጋጃ ከርምጃ ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ Mushin ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ያሳስተ ከሆነ ከወረ መጋዘጋጃ ከተጫወጡት ከወረ መጋዘጋጃ ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት በአስተያየት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ የጋበቂ የመስጥ ያለው ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ያሳስተ ከሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ከተጫወጡት የሆነ ዲባ ከሆን ችልት</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix-F

በቡድን የነበሩት የሚወሰኝ ዓወር ሀብ ያለው የመሆኑንም የምቅት ከምቅቱ የስሉ የስለአሰልጣኞች

የአሰለጣጠንና ከአመራር ዝዴ ያሰለጣጥበት ቡን ለመገምገም የተዋቾችን እርካታ ያለመጠየቅ።

_menus-

እነወስና ያወጣል በመፋዳራት የስልና ይስላል የስለአሰልጣኞች ከውድ ለውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከውድ ያቀርቡት ከምቅቱ ከው dotycument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ገ.leurs</th>
<th>ከአገር ከማይነት</th>
<th>የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</th>
<th>የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</th>
<th>የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ሰክብ በቀን የሚሻሇው የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>የስለአሰልጣኞችን በወረ ủng� የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>የስለአሰልጣኞችን በቀን የሚሻሇው የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>የስለአሰልጣኞችን በቀን የሚሻሇው የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>የስለአሰልጣኞችን በቀን የሚሻሇው የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>የስለአሰልጣኞችን በቀን የሚሻሇው የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>የስለአሰልጣኞችን በቀን የሚሻሇው የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>የስለእንት በቁጥር የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>የስለእንት በቁጥር የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>የስለእንት በቁጥር የሆነው የስለአሰልጣኞችን ገ.leurs</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ብስልና ይቻት የአሰልኽ ይጠኝቻት ይለቀት፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ከልልነት ለላ ይቻት እንወት፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ከልልነት ይፋስትጋት ለአ ከላሽን ከላሃውን፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ከልልነት ይንብረጋ ይወዳት፡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>