



Scholars Research Library

Annals of Biological Research, 2012, 3 (3):1225-1230
(<http://scholarsresearchlibrary.com/archive.html>)



Effects of Leadership Styles on Coaches of Iran's National Teams Success and Athletes' Perception of Success

Zinat Nikaieen¹, Farideh Ashraf Ganjouie¹, Fereidoon Tondnevis², Kambiz Kamkari³

¹Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Central Tehran branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran

²Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Tarbiat Moalem University Tehran, Iran

³Department of Psychology and exceptional assessment, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Leadership concept is a relational process between leaders and followers in order that the leaders could influence on their followers, which is a common background in leadership definitions. Study and acquiring leadership for understanding efficiency and usefulness of organizations were important for decades. The research population was constituted of national teams' players who participated in national teams' camps for Asian competitions, and include 90 coaches and 473 athletes (men and women); so, sampling method was full calculated. Measurement instruments were three questionnaires of personal characteristics, MLQ Boss leadership style and Roberts and Balajio POSQ success perception. Results of the analyses showed that prediction of coaches' success was not possible by transformational and transactional leadership styles' elements and success perception of the athletes. There was no significant difference between leadership styles from view point of coaches and athletes. We could predict success perception of the athletes by leadership styles. There was a significant difference between gender of coaches and leadership styles of the coaches, and both spiritual effect and motivation in transformational leadership styles and management, based on active exceptions of transactional leadership styles' elements, were higher in men than women, and management based on passive exception in transactional leadership styles of women were higher than men. Athlete of individual fields considered more the spiritual effect that was one of the elements of transformational leadership styles. Higher spiritual effect and motivation in transformational leadership styles, there was increase on success perception of the athletes. Women were more self absorbed than men. Athletes of individual fields were more self absorbed than athletes of team fields.

Key words: leadership styles, success perception, coaches' success.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays continuous acquisition of leadership is increasingly become important, like determination of efficiency and effect of applied department in organization [20]. Riemer & Chelladurai stated that: coaches are leaders that their behaviors will influence on function of team members. Butta in a research on managers, coaches and athletes, demonstrated that coaches

effects more than others on athletic university students. Coaches as key persons, effect on sportive teams, not only influence on players, but also practice leadership by this [23]. To be successful, moreover to access to sufficient facilities and equipment that result in qualitative and quantitative advancement of sportive activities, a coach shall be skillful and knowledgeable to train skillful and motive athletes. So, in this research leadership style is propounded as transactional and transformational leadership.

Transactional leaders specified their roles and responsibilities in order to reach to objectives, while transformational leaders suggested their followers to promote their personal interests for improvement of organization. Lots of researches were done about leadership styles of managers and their effectiveness and success [14, 21]. They believed that managers have important role in effectiveness and success of the organizations; on the other hand, Kennt (2005) believed to use despotic leadership style and positive feedback. Researchers like Hood et al (2009) and Judge & Piccolo (2004) believed in using both leadership styles. In the scope of coaches [9, 8] stated that transformational leadership of the coach is more effective for the athletes, but Karten & Kent (2005) stated that despotic and transactional leadership is more effective; and Cakiglou (2003), Odai & Dohorti (1966) believed that applying both methods is effective. Considering the above mentioned researches, this question is propounded that which leadership styles are more effective in success of the coaches? And whether there is a difference between leadership style of coaches for athletes in team and individual fields? Motivation is one of the most important discussions in sport psychology, because type of people motivation in reaching sportive objectives is different, based on personal differences and different fields [11]. Social recognition models and approaches of motivation emphasize on important of perceptive comments in athletic success and successful behaviors. In goal-oriented theory, factors such as goal-orientation, percept abilities and successful behavior are essential [12]. Progress-orientation is tendency of person, having dominance or challenge to reach to a better situation. Advancement in sport activities depends on goal-orientation of the person; this goal-orientation is based on task-orientation (becoming skillful or promotion of previous function levels) and self-orientation (in comparison to your ability with others).

Moreno Morsia & Jimono (2008) believed that athletes are more task-oriented and less self-oriented, but Smith (2007) stated athletes are equal in task-orientation and self-orientation. In fact, this question is raised, whether a coach could play different roles in various situations by leadership styles and conduct athletes towards reaching success and motivation according to organizational principals in order to do their responsibilities? And whether there is any difference between leadership style of the coach and success perception of the athletes of the team and individual fields? In this regard, Carthen (2005) stated that acceptance or non-acceptance of leadership style by athletes to reach to success and motivation, is effective by achievements of objectives. Exjets & Smeet (2007) and Alferman & Lie (2005) stated that there is no difference between leadership style of the coaches in team and individual fields. Gomes et al (2007), evaluated their coaches' leadership style as evolutionism.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Researchers method was of survey type that data were gathered emphasizing on field method and applying questionnaire. The population of this research included of two different layers. First layer involved the coaches that were accounted as national teams' coaches, and second layer was athletes of Iran's national teams who were National Team Camp up to 21 May 2010. So sampling method was full calculated. Statistical sample include 182 women and 276 men athletes, 25 women and 64 men coaches.

Regarding to research basics, the tools included MLQ leadership styles questionnaire [2]. MLQ questionnaire evaluated subscales of transformation and transaction; these subscales were evaluated and confirmed by factor discovery analysis statistical method. This questionnaire includes 36 questions that were in two forms related to leader and followers and was evaluated according to Likert scale, from zero for never to 4 for always. Perception of Success Questionnaire was originated from Nikoles & Noulen (1985). Scale was prepared for sport by Douda & Nikoles. It had had a good position in 1998 and constitutes of 12 items of two subscales of self-oriented and task-oriented in two forms for childhood and adulthood; it had evaluated by Likert scale. POSQ anecdotal was obtained [30]. as 0.82 for transactional and 0.87 for self-orientation. For more reliability of the research a retest was done for 22 chosen athletes; correlation which obtained as 0.54 reliability of leadership style questionnaire of view point of coaches and athletes was 0.88. the model of two independent groups, were used for comparison of coaches leadership styles, by considering team and individual fields and comparison evaluation of “success perception of athlete”, emphasizing on “sport type”; single variable regression was applied for examination of effects of transformational and transactional leadership styles on success of the coaches. Multivariable regression was used for examination of effects of transactional and transformational leadership styles on success of the coaches and success perception of athletes and prediction of success of the coaches by perception of success and its components; and Pearson correlation coefficient was used for evaluation of the relationship between responses of the coaches and athletes to leadership styles.

RESULTS

Based on results, participants were 90 coaches and 473 athletes (men and women). They were constituted of all of national team's players who participate in national teams' camps for Asian competitions. This research led to prediction of coaches success is not possible by transactional and transformational leadership styles and success perception of the athletes.

Table 1. Multivariable Regression for Prediction of “Success of Coaches” by “Components of Transactional Leadership Styles of the Coaches”

Resource of Changes	Sum of Squares	Freedom Degree	Average of Squares	Average of F	Significance Level
Regression	0.50	4	0.12	0.28	0.888
Rest	34.03	76	0.44		

Table 1 shows $F=0.28$, we could state that there is no significance relationship between “components of transactional leadership styles of the coaches” and “success of coaches” in $\alpha=0.05$; or prediction of “success of coaches” is not possible by “components of transactional leadership styles of the coaches”. Thus, null hypothesis is confirmed.

Table 2. Multivariable Regression for Prediction of “Athletic Success” by “Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles of Coaches”

Resource of Changes	Sum of Squares	Freedom Degree	Average of Squares	Average of F	Significance Level
Regression	0.22	2	0.11	0.23	0.788
Rest	31.60	68	0.46		

In table 2 shows $F=0.23$, we could state that there is no significance relationship between “transformational and transactional leadership styles of coaches” and “athletic success” in $\alpha=0.05$; and prediction of “athletic success of coaches” is not possibly by “transformational and transactional leadership styles of coaches”. Thus, null hypothesis is confirmed.

Table 3. Multivariable Regression for Prediction of “Success of Coaches” by “Components of Success Perception of Athletes”

Resource of Changes	Sum of Squares	Freedom Degree	Average of Squares	Average of F	Significance Level
Regression	0.44	2	0.22	0.47	0.621
Rest	34.97	76	0.46		

And in table 3 shows $F=0.47$, we could state that there is no significance relationship between “components of success perception of athletes” and “success of coaches” in $\alpha= 0.05$; or prediction of “success of coaches” is not possible by “components of success perception of athletes”. Thus, null hypothesis is confirmed.

DISCUSSION

The research findings showed that there is no effect between independent variable of transactional leadership style of coaches and dependant variable of success of coaches, research findings are not compatible with findings of the following persons. Carten (2005) stated that successful strategy of an athlete relates to acceptance or rejection of transactional leadership of the coaches; Kent (2005) stated that transactional leadership is effective in motivation level and success of the athletes. Houg et al, (2004) emphasized that transactional leaders are effective for short-term objective and no clear policies and motivation and rewarding. Painment (2008) stated that despotic style has effects on plays and decision making strategies. Also, there is no significance relationship between transformation independent variable of leadership style of coaches and dependant variable of success of the coaches. While it is in contrast with researches of the following persons: Houg et al, (2004) stated that transformational managers have indirect influence on effectiveness of the staffs. Barbuto (2009), Burton et al, (2009) believed that transformational leaders have important role in success of the organizations. Hesse & Hessian (2008) stated that transformational leaders are more effective on success of the coaches; but Hood & Palson (2009), Houg et al,(2004), Judge & Piccolo (2004), Cakioglu (2003), Odai & Dohorti believed that both transformational and transactional leadership styles are effective in success. Nonconformity of the research is possibly due to difference in statistical population, because statistical population of the above mentioned researchers is about a special athletic field, but population of the research includes athletes of different fields and national teams.

In the present research, there is no significance relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles of the coaches and their athletic success, so prediction of athletic success is not possible by coaches' transformational and transactional leadership styles [7], that there is no method as the best for coaching. This conformity is possibly because of special personal characteristics of the athletes who accept different methods of coaches, and we could not specify a coach that all of the athletes have accepted his or her leadership style.

In the present study, there is no significant relationship between success perception components and success of the coaches. Sarmiento (2008) concluded in his research that professional persons are more goal-oriented who demonstrated excellent levels of disciplinary that would result in more learning and ability. Galin (2007) in a study, evaluated relationship between two components of self –orientation (objectives and success perception) and athletic function. Results demonstrated that task-oriented ones obtained better results than self-oriented ones. Also, task-orientation is identified as an important as an important specification in group function. Latta (2006) emphasized that self-orientation of the athletes will decrease of task-orientation, and they could gain more success. But Smith (2007) concluded that self-oriented and task-oriented

individuals are effective equally in their coaches' success; which is in conformity with results of the present research.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the effects of leadership styles on success of national teams and perception of success of the athletes plays remarkable role to access to victory. Leadership is always called a power to conduct behavior of the group and create appropriate energy for the group. Coaches are leaders that their behaviors will influence on function of team members. Coaches effects more than others on athletes. Coaches as key persons, affected on sportive teams, not only influence on players, but also on practices of leadership. There is no significant difference between leadership styles from view point of coaches and athletes. The success perception of the athletes by leadership styles could be predicted. Due to the effects of leadership styles independent variable on coaches success and athletes success conception criterion variable there is no relation between coaches transactional and transformational leadership styles on the level of coaches success and athletes success, but both of the leadership styles (transactional and transformational) are effective on athletes' success conception. With increasing of transformational leadership style (spiritual effects and motivation) there is more increase in athletes success conception but with the increase in transaction leadership style (inactive exception) the success conception is decreased and there is differences between athletes and coaches viewpoint about leadership styles.

REFERENCES

- [1] D Alfermann, MJ Lee, *J sport psych*, **2005**, 7, 2.
- [2] BM Bass, B Avolio, Multifactor leadership questionnaire Birmingham University, center for leadership studies, **1995**.
- [3] JE Barbuto, SM Fritz, GS Matkin, Effect of Gender, springer science Business Media, **2009**.
- [4] L Burton, J Peachy, J Welty, Transactional or transformational? Colombia, **2009**, 27-30.
- [5] A Cakiglu, MA Thesis (METU, Ankara, **2003**).
- [7] JD Carthen, http://regent.edu/sis/publications/conference_proceedings/ **2005**.
- [8] P Charbonneau, EK Kelloway, J Barling, *J applied Social Psych*, **2001**, 31, 151-153
- [9] J Dexter, www.the-sport-journal.org, **2008**, ISSN, 1543 – 9518
- [10] T Extejts, M Smite, E Jonathan, communications and conflict, **2007**, 8 , 1.
- [11] R Galin, Relationship between two implicit goals orientations (task and ego) University of illinois Champaign, USA, **2007**.
- [12] D Gould, RS Weinberg, *J sport Beh*, **1999**, 8, 115-127.
- [13] AR Gomes, SA Sousa, JF Cruz, Charismatic , transformational and visionary dimensions in sport leadership, **2007**, 84-94.
- [14] C Hsu, R Bell, C Cheng, C Kuei–Mei, www.thesportjournal.org, **2008**.Issn :1518-1543.
- [15] J Hood, D Poulson, L Rounal, *J scholar Teach learn*, **2009**, 9, 1.
- [16] YH Hung, A Caraven, Canada congress, **2004**.
- [17] OA Ipinmoroti, Tai Solarin University of Education Ijebu ODE Nigeria, **2005**.
- [18] T Judge, RF Piccolo, *J Appl Psych*, **2004**, 755-768.
- [19] AW Kent, the U.S Tennis Association, **2005**.
- [20] A Kent, P Cheladurai, *Athlet J Sport Management*, **2001**, 15, 35-159
- [21] D Komskiene, B Svagzdine, www.turiba.lv/darba-tirgus, **2009**.
- [22] J Lata, Phd thesis (California, USA, **2006**).
- [23] S Lumpkin, McGraw-Hill. Sport Ethics: Applications for Fair Play, 2nd Edition, **2001**.
- [24] M Moreno, A Juan, EC Gimeno, *Spanish J psych*, **2008**, 11, 1, 181 -191.

- [25] J Nichols, G Noulén, Research on motivation in education, New York: Academic press, 11, **1985**, 39-73
- [26] M Odai, L Doherty, L Jennifer, Florida International University, New York : Pelhan Books, **1966**.
- [27] D Painment, www.scribd.com, **2008**.
- [28] H Sarmento, L Fonseca, 5th international scientific conference on Kinsiology , Zagerb , Croatia, **2008**.
- [29] AL Smith, J Blake, elsevier.com/retrieve/ **2007**.
- [30] DC Treasure, GC Roberts, *Perceptual and motor skills*, **1994** , 79, 607-610 ,