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
Leadership approaches and practices may vary depending on different circumstances.

Players do not show 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 \( (p \leq 0.05) \) at different experience cohorts. 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 show any statistical significant difference \( (p \leq 0.05) \). Players with 31-35 years of age better Perceived Training and instruction (TI) leadership style than other age cohorts.

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 ($r = -0.28$, $p < 0.01$) and Perceived Positive Feedback ($r = -0.25$, $p < 0.01$). 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 ($r = 0.19$, $p \leq 0.05$). Perceived Democratic Behavior ($r = -0.24$, $p < 0.01$) Preferred Autocratic Behavior ($r = -0.23$, $p < 0.01$ and Positive Feedback ($r = -0.28$, $p < 0.01$) 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 falling 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: β=.19, p<.05) and Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: β=-.19, p<.05) revealed themselves as significant contribution 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: β=.20, p<.05); Perceived Positive Feedback (Model II: β=-.18, p<.05); Preferred Social Support (Model II: β=-.27, p<.05) and Preferred Positive Feedback (Model II: β=-.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 (≤.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 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: ß=.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: β=.16, p<.05); and Preferred Social Support (Model II: β=-.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: β=-.21, p<.05) and Perceived Autocratic Behavior (Model II: β=.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.