

A COMPARISON OF COACHING LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR PREFERENCES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE PAKISTANI INTERVARSITY LEVEL BASKETBALL PLAYERS

Hira Atta, Dr. Zafar Iqbal Butt, Babar Kamil, Mudassar Mushtaq

ABSTRACT

The aim of the current study is to examine the coaching leadership behavior preferences at intervarsity level by Pakistani basketball players. A total of 150 players participated in the study. The preferred version of leadership scale for sports (LSS) developed by Chelladurai & Saleh (1980) has been used to investigate the five dimensions of coaching leadership behavior. The statistical test Multivariate analysis is used to check the gender differences in coaching leadership behavior. Distinctly, training and instructions coaching leadership behavior was found most preferred coaching leadership behavior by male and female athletes. The results of the present study will be helpful for the coaches in order to understand about most preferred coaching leadership behavior for the desired results.

Key words: Leadership behavior, preference, gender and basketball players.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is an influence that can be developed in any one because all of us are leading in some areas, and at the same time, we are the followers in some other areas (Maxwell, 1993). In sports coach is viewed as a leader for his/her team because he directs the activities of the athletes, helps them to achieve their goals, and enhances motivation level of athletes. Leadership has been defined in different philosophical perspectives by the researchers. Initially, leadership was viewed as a

traits / ability of the great leaders. The "Great man theory" revealed that great leaders would be great in all situations (Carlyle, 1910). The theory was based on the belief that leaders are having specific traits that distinguished them from followers. In the early studies, leadership was focused as a trait of great leaders and it was believed leaders are born not made. After the World War II, the focus of leadership shifted from universal traits to universal behaviors. It was believed that once these leadership behaviors

were identified that could be taught to potential leaders. Later in 1950s-1960s, research on universal behaviors has been conducted at Michigan and Ohio university and it has characterized two constructs of leadership styles a) Consideration (Democratic type) b) Initiating (Autocratic type). These two general dimensions have provided a framework for many leadership theories. (H.cox, 2007).

In 1978, Chelladurai & Saleh identified that there is no relevant leadership model of other organizational settings available that can be taken into the sports settings. They have developed a multidimensional model of leadership (MML) specifically for the sports settings. According to MML an athlete's satisfaction and performance depend upon three types of leadership behavior a) Required leadership behavior b) Actual leadership behavior 3) Preferred leadership behavior. In 1980, they developed a Leadership Scale of Sport (LSS) to investigate coaching leadership behavior. The LSS consists of five different variables: a) Training and Instructions, b) Democratic Behavior, c) Autocratic

Behavior, d) Social Support and e) Positive Feedback. The training and instruction behavior involves directing towards improving the performance of athletes. The democratic coaching behavior allows athletes to participate in important coaching decisions like team goals; strategies etc., whereas the autocratic behavior shows authority to take independent decisions. On the other hand, social support behavior focuses in developing interpersonal relationships with athletes, and positive feedback coaching behavior involves reinforcing, recognizing and rewarding the good performances.

In the field of Sports, leadership coaching behavior has been explored by different perspectives. Researchers studied coaching leadership behavior and its impact on athletes' performances, team cohesion, satisfaction, gender, intrinsic motivation, success motivation, motivational climate and achievement motivation. The researchers also investigated most preferred leadership behavior about the athletes belonging to different sports but results are not identical. The researchers concluded that leadership beha-

vivors associated with training and instructions, positive feedback, and social support are highly correlated with athletes' satisfaction (Chelladurai 1984; Horne and Carron 1985; Schliesman, Dwyer et.,al 1990; Riemer&Chelladurai 1995; Riemer & Toon 2001; Horn, 2002; Ming 2007; Pilus & Saadan 2009; Nazarudin 2009; Bahrami et., al 2011; Khalaj et., al 2011). Leadership styles can also affect team cohesion (Light Shields, Gardner, Light Bredemeier, & Bostro, 1997; Jowett and Chaudney 2004). Teams found more cohesion that perceived their coaches as high in training and instruction, social support, positive feedback, democratic behavior and lower levels of autocratic behaviors (Ramzani-nezhad, Rahim, & Keshtan, Misagh Hoseini 2009).

Athletes with high intrinsic motivation reported high perception with training and instructional behavior, democratic behavior and low in autocratic behavior (Horn, T. 2000). Karimi et al., (2012) concluded that training and instructing, social support, and positive feedback behaviors showed a positive significant relation with success

motivation and a negative significant relation between autocratic behavior and success motivation. Several researches showed that male athletes preferred training and instructions coaching behavior, wherese female athletes preferred democratic coaching behavior from their coaches (Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Lam, et al. 2007; Martin et al.2001; Riemer & Toon, 2001; Turman, 2003; Weinberg & Gould, 2007). Unfortunately, there is no study found on preferred coaching leadership behavior by Pakistani players. Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to investigate the most preferred leadership behavior by intervarsity level basketball players of Pakistan. This study will be helpful for the coaches who are working with university level basketball players to know about most appropriate coaching leadership behavior for effective coaching in order to enhance optimal performance of athletes. In addition, this study will also contribute towards strengthening the literature of preferred leadership coaching style.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A survey research design was chosen to investigate the preferred coaching leadership behavior among university level basketball players of Pakistan. Surveys are important tool for gathering and analyze the information from the selected sample and it is widely used in social sciences. (Rossi James D. Wright, and Anderson, 1983).

Target population

Target population of the present study is all the basketball players of Pakistan at university level.

Sample

Sample size for the current study is 150 intervarsity level basketball players of Pakistan who have voluntarily participated in this research study.

Instrument

Following instrument was used in the present study:

1) The leadership scale for sports: LSS preferred version developed by Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) was used in this

study. LSS consists of 40 items on five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) that described the five aspects of leader behavior.

1. Training and Instructions Behavior (Thirteen items): Coaching behavior that has a main focus towards improving athletes' performance by providing them support, facilitate them during hard training sessions, improving techniques, tactics of the game, structuring team activities and coordination among team members (Chelladurai, 1990).

2. Democratic Behavior (Nine items): Coaching behavior that encourages athletes to participate in decisions making related to the team goals, practice sessions, and game strategies (Chelladurai, 1990).

3. Autocratic Behavior (Five items): Coaching behavior that does not allow athletes in decision and stresses over personal authority (Chelladurai, 1990).

4. Social Support (Eight items): Coaching behavior that shows concerns for the athletes' welfare, and interpersonal relationship with members (Chelladurai, 1990).

5. Positive Feedback (Five): Coaching behavior, which involves in reinforces athletes by recognizing their efforts and rewarding their performances (Chell-adurai, 1990).

Each item of LSS perceived version starts with "My coach" and preferred version items starts with "I prefer my coach" Responses from athletes were made on the following 5-point Likert-type scale (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) occasionally, (4) often, and (5) always.

ANALYSIS

Table- 1
Multivariate test

	Effect	Value	F	df	Sig.
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.028	.820	5.000	.537
	Wilks' Lambda	.972	.820	5.000	.537
	Hotelling's Trace	.028	.820	5.000	.537
	Roy's Largest Root	.028	.820	5.000	.537

p value > 0.05

The above table shows (p value > 0.05) that there is no significant difference in preference of male and female coaching leadership behavior.

Table-2 Test of between subject effects

	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Preferred Training and Instructions	.055	1	.055	.067	.796
	Preferred Autocratic	3.325	1	3.325	3.374	.068
	Preferred Democratic	.245	1	.245	.729	.394
	Preferred social Support	.614	1	.614	.885	.348
	Preferred Feedback	.258	1	.258	1.029	.312

p value > 0.05

The above table 2 showed univariate test for the independent variables effects on dependent variable and it clearly displayed that there is no difference in gender preference of different coaching leadership behavior (p value > 0.05).

Table-3 Mean scores of preferred leadership Behavior

	Preferred training and instructions behavior	Preferred Autocratic Behavior	Preferred Democratic behavior	Preferred Social Support Behavior	Preferred Feedback Behavior
Male	4.9032	2.5699	3.8817	2.9301	4.7742
Female	4.9067	2.4533	3.9133	2.8800	4.8067

Table-3 displayed that university level male and female basketball players both scored higher on training and instructions behavior, positive feedback, democratic, and social support respectively. The autocratic coaching leadership behavior is least preferred behavior by them.

DISCUSSION

Leadership coaching behavior is one of the extensive studied topics in the field of sports psychology. The extensive theoretical literature on coaching leadership style and in the context of most preferred leadership style is still debatable. Past researches showed that leadership behaviors have high association with training and instructions, positive feedback, and social support are highly correlated with athletes' satisfaction (Chelladurai 1984; Horne and Carron 1985; Schliesman; Dwyer et.al 1990; Riemer & Chelladurai 1995; Horn, 2002; Ming 2007; Pilus & Saadan 2009; Nazarudin 2009; Bahrami et., al 2011; Khalaj et., al 2011). However, it appears that the coaching leadership behaviors are more associated with training and instruction, whereas positive feedback and social support is most highly correlated with athletes' satisfaction (Horn, 2002) and intrinsic motivation (Amorose & Horn, 2000; 2001).

In the present study, multivariate analysis of variance and

mean scores were used to investigate preferred coaching leadership behaviors of subscales of the LSS: 1) Training and instructions, 2) Autocratic behavior 3) democratic behavior 4) positive feedback behavior. Findings revealed that university level basketball players both male and female preferred more training and instruction behavior from their coaches followed by democratic, positive feedback, social support and autocratic leadership.

Several leadership coaching behavior researches have been conducted which focused on basketball players (Chelladurai 1984; Horne and Carron 1985; Weinberg & Gould 2003; Lam 2007; Chen 2007; Jacob, R. L. 2006). The Training and instructions is most highly preferred behavior by athletes and the findings are consistent with the Martin et al., 1999; Sherman, Fuller, & Speed, 2000; Terry & Howe, 1984; Sherman et al. 2000; Chia et al. 2015; Sharma et., al 2015; and Cruz et, al, 2017. Further, Results are in contrast with the findings of Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson,

2004; Lam, et al., 2007; Martin et al., 2001; Riemer & Toon, 2001; Terry, 1984; Witte, 2011 showed that male and female athletes differ in their preferences for coaching leadership behavior. The results are also conflicted with the findings of team sports such as basketball, volleyball, and football where athletes prefer more autocratic coaching behavior than individual sport athletes such as tennis or golf (Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004; Weinberg & Gould, 2007, Lam, 2007).

References

- Andrew, Damon PS, & Kent, Aubrey. (2007). The impact of perceived leadership behaviors on satisfaction, commitment, and motivation. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 1(1), 37-58.
- Alfermann, Dorothee, Lee, Martin J, & Würth, Sabine. (2005). Perceived leadership behavior and motivational climate as antecedents of adolescent athletes' skill development. *Athletic Insight: The Online Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 14-36.
- Álvarez, María Sol, Balaguer, Isabel, Castillo, Isabel, & Duda, Joan L. (2009). Coach autonomy support and quality of sport engagement in young soccer players. *The Spanish journal of psychology*, 12(01), 138-148.
- Barnes, K. A. (2003). NCAA division I athletes' coaching behavior preferences. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Texas, Denton.
- Beam, J. W., Serwatka, T. S., & Wilson, W. J. (2004). Preferred leadership of NCAA division I and division II inter collegiate student athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 27(1), 3-17.
- Chelladurai, P. & Arnott, M. (1985). Decision styles in coaching: Preferences of basketball players. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 56(1), 15-24.
- Jackson, J. A. (2002). Leadership style preference of high school baseball players in northcentral Missouri. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Truman State University, Kirksville, Missouri.
- Chen, Ming-Hung. (2007). *Exploring the relationship between effective coaching leadership, group cohesion, and achievement motivation in college basketball teams in Taiwan*. UNITED STATES SPORTS ACADEMY.
- C. Maxwell, John. (1993). *Developing the leader within you*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers
- Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sports. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 3, 85-92.
- Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 34-45.

- Curtis, Bill, Smith, Ronald E, & Smoll, Frank L. (1979). Scrutinizing the Ski-pper: A study of leadership behaviors in the dugout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64(4), 391.
- Chia J. S., Pyun D. Y., Kwon H.H. (2015). The impact of congruence between perceived and Preferred leadership on satisfaction among college student-athletes in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 35, 498-513.
- Cruz, A. B., & Kim, H. D. (2017). Leadership preferences of adolescent players in sport: influence of coach gender. *Journal of sports science & medicine*, 16(2), 172.
- Hosseini Keshtan M (2010) The Impact of Group Dynamics and Leadership styles of Coaches on the Team's better Volleyball clubs in Iran, *Journal of Sport Science Research*, No, 27, PP, 190-126.
- Hollembeak, Jill, & Amorose, Anthony J. (2005). Perceived coaching behaviors and college athletes' intrinsic motivation: A test of self-determination theory. *Journal of applied sport psychology*, 17(1), 20-36.
- Horne, Tammy, & Carron, Albert V. (1985). Compatibility in coach-athlete relationships. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 137-149.
- House, Robert J, & Mitchell, Terrence R. (1974). Pathgoal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-97.
- H.cox, Richard. (2007). *Sports Psychology: Concepts and applications* (6thed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hanin, Y. L., & Straub, W. F. (1980). Sport psychology: Sport psychology: An analysis of athletic behavior. Ithaca, NY: Movement Publ. 236-249.
- Peter H. Rossi, James D. Wright, Andy B. Anderson (1983). *Handbook of survey Research* (pp. 35-45). New York: Academic Press
- Jowett, Sophia, & Chaundy, Victoria. (2004). An Investigation Into the Im-pact of Coach Leadership and Coach-Athlete Relationship on Group Cohesion. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Res-earch, and Practice*, 8(4), 302.
- [John C. Maxwell](#) (2005). *Developing the leader within you*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc
- Jacob, R. L. (2006). The relationship bet-ween perceived coaching behaviors and win-loss success in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division-I men and women's baske-tball coaches. Un-published doctoral dissertation. State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo.
- Kravig, S. D. (2003). Coaching behavior preferences of interscholastic athletes [Abstract]. Unpublished doctoral dis-sertation. University of North Texas, Denton.
- Khalaj, Gilda, Khabiri, Mohamad, & Sajjadi, Nasrollah. (2011). The relationship between coaches leadership styles & player satisfaction in women skate championship. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 3596-3601.

- Millard, L. (1996). Differences in coaching behaviors of male and female high school soccer coaches. *Journal of Sports Behavior*, 19(1), 19-22
- Martin, S. B., Dale, G. A., & Jackson, A. W. (2001). Youth coaching preferences of adolescent athletes and their parents. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 24(2), 197-212.
- Lam, E. T. C., Chen, L., Zhang, J. J., Robinson, D. A., & Ziegler, S. G. (2007). Preferred and Perceived leadership styles by NCAA basketball players. Paper presented at the 2007. American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance National Conference.
- Pilus, AH, & Saadan, Rosli. (2009). Coaching leadership styles and athlete satisfaction among hockey team. *Journal of Human Capital Development*, 2(1), 77-87.
- PETERS, DEREK M. (2015). Perceived coach behavior in training and competition predicts collective efficacy in female elite handball players. *Int. J. Sport Psychol*, 46, 321-336.
- Riemer, Harold A, & Chelladurai, Packianathan. (1995). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. *Journal of sport and exercise psychology*, 17, 276-
- Sherman, C. A., Fuller, R., & Speed, H. D. (2000). Gender comparisons of preferred coaching behaviors in Australian sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 23(4), 389- 406.
- Terry, P., & Howe, B. (1984). Coaching preferences of athletes. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 9, 188-193.
- Witte K.S. (2011) Coaching leadership preferences: Insight from the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division-III Athlete. *International Sport Coaching Journal* 4, 73-87.