

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR AS PREFERRED BY MALE ATHLETES

Dr. Indranil Mondal

Associate Professor, Dept. of Physical Education, Union Christian Training College, Berhampur,
Murshidabad, West Bengal

Dr. Subhabrata Kar

Associate Professor, Union Christian Training College, Berhampur, Murshidabad, West Bengal

ABSTRACT

Coach's leadership behavior is a composite and diversified behavior; it guides player to reach the goal through direct or indirect ways. An outstanding coach should possess training basics and abilities to improve player's body and mind, and also make much of using skills, strategy, and procedure to encourage player, to work willingly toward his goal. The purpose of the present study was to investigate the leadership behavior as preferred by male Football players. Thirty (n=30) male football players, representing Murshidabad districts of West Bengal in Government level state collegiate competitions held at Salt Lake Stadium, Kolkata, West Bengal; were selected randomly to serve as subjects for this study. Leadership Scale for Sports developed by P. Chelladurai (1980) was selected as a criterion tool to measure behaviour preferences of male players. To find out the significant differences among means of male players on various determined factors of preferred leadership behaviour, the means, standard deviations, analysis of variance and post-hoc test were computed. The results of the study revealed the significant difference among state level male football players in their actual leader behaviour. Male player preferred greater amount of positive feedback and lesser of autocratic behaviour from their coaches.

Keywords: Leadership behaviour, Male football players, Preferences, LSS

INTRODUCTION

Sport and exercise psychology research has largely studied the interpersonal dynamics between leadership behavior preferred by the athletes. Since the late 1970s, the multidimensional model (Chelladurai, 1993) and the meditational model (Smoll & Smith, 1989) of coach leadership have been the main frameworks for studying the behaviors. Emphasis is placed on how behaviors are perceived by the male ball players, themselves and their relative impact on outcomes such as

satisfaction, self-esteem, and performance. This approach may be limited especially if one considers coach leadership as a function that can be shared. A coach cannot do it alone (Jowett & Chaundy, 2004). Ultimately, a focus on what one person does to another may not accurately reflect what goes on between the football players. Since the leaders for skill and personal development of different ball players for pursuing player objectives, coaching leadership received increasing attention during the past twenty years. In the sports, research literature leadership has been studied primarily in terms of coaching leadership and its effects on player performance (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983; Chelladurai, 1984; Horne & Carron, 1985; Weiss & Friedrichs, 1986; Schliesman, 1987; Chelladurai, Imamura, Yamaguchi, Oinuma, & Miyauchi, 1988; Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Jambor & Zhang, 1997; Zhang & Jensen, 1997; Ipinmoroti, 2002). Research suggests that leadership behaviors may affect performance in sport. However, there is limited research relating leadership behavior styles to performance outcomes beyond wins and losses. Research also indicates that gender may play a role in leadership behaviors styles and their effectiveness. Specific coaching behaviors are related to increase the performance, especially when the actual and preferred coaching behaviors are congruent (Weinberg & Gould, 2003). But, the frequent social support behaviors were related to poorer team performance i.e., win-loss record (Weiss and Freidrichs, 1986). Leadership style is considered by many coaches to be an important factor in athlete's success. Most coaches use different leadership styles at one time or another to different situations. Some styles are more suitable in certain situations than others. For this reason, it is beneficial for the coach to know which leadership behaviors will facilitate performance. Coaches play an integral role in the success of their athletes and athletic teams, influencing factors such as their players' self-esteem (Barnett, Smoll, & Smith, 1992), skill learning (Chelladurai, 1984), mental development (Gould, Dieffenbach, & Moffett, 2002), sport performance satisfaction (Horn, 2002), as well as performance outcomes (Horne & Carron, 1985, Schliesman, 1987). Player interactions immediately prior to performance are focused on the optimal mental and physical preparation, player mental readiness and game focus, positive reinforcement of team plan/strategies, team cohesion, and coach preparation. Coach-player interactions were focused on motivation, confidence, positive reinforcement, and game focus. Importantly, coaches needed to be aware of all aspects of their players' behavior and personality in order to be an effective coach. The physical power to gather the emotional strength needed to perform well inevitably changes the hearts and the minds of coaches and players alike. In the present study, the researcher took the topic of "Leadership Behavior as Preferred by Male Football Players" to find out the leadership preference of lower

level football players in social situation.

2. METHODOLOGY

To achieve the purpose of the study, Quantitative Research has been conducted by the researcher.

2.1 Subjects

Thirty (n=30) male football players, representing Murshidabad districts of West Bengal in Government level state collegiate competitions held at Salt Lake Stadium, Kolkata, and West Bengal, were selected randomly to serve as subjects for this study. The age range of subjects was 25 to 35 years. The subjects were selected amongst the male players of Football representing their district in Inter-College Football Games from 2014 to 2017.

2.2 Criterion measure

Leadership Scale for Sports developed by P. Chelladurai (1980) was selected as a criterion tool to measure preferred behavior preferences of inter-university level Football athletes. The Leadership Scale for Sports (L.S.S.) is a valid and reliable instrument. The scale consists of 40 items for athlete's perception of coach's behavior and 40 items for preference version representing five dimensions of leadership behavior i.e. training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social supports and positive feedback (Rewarding behavior). The five response categories were always (100% of the time), often (75%), occasionally (50%), seldom (25%) and never (0.0%). The scale had test-retest reliability 0.72 for training behavior, 0.82 for democratic behavior, 0.76 for autocratic behavior, 0.71 for social supports, and 0.79 for positive feedback. The scale consisted of 40 items for five dimensions in which training and instruction (13 items), democratic behavior (9 items), autocratic behavior (5 items), social support (8 items), and positive feedback (Rewarding behavior) had 5 items on which there were no negative responses. The scoring of the leadership items were as follows: - Always - 5; Often - 4; Occasionally - 3; Seldom - 2; Never- 1. Each question had five responses namely 1. Always, 2 Often, 3 Occasionally, 4 Seldom, 5 Never. According to above stated responses, scoring was carried out for preferred leader behavior of Judo athletes. The score tabulated for all the items under dimensions of leadership behavior were averaged out to get score for each dimension.

2.3 Research Design

The LSS questionnaire containing 40 items were supplied to 30 subjects and their responses

were collected independently and then analyzed by using the appropriate statistic.

2.4 Statistical Design

To find out the significant differences among means of male football players on various determined factors of preferred leadership behavior, the means, standard deviations, Analysis of variance and post-hoc analysis was done.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Results

To assess the preferred leadership behavior of state college level male players, means and standard deviations were computed and data pertaining to this have been presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Preferences on Five Dimensions of Leader Behavior of Male Players belong to Football

Sl. No.	Leader Behavior Dimensions	Mean	SD
1.	Training & Instruction (TI)	3.975 (T_1)	0.4103
2.	Autocratic Behavior (AB)	3.66 (T_2)	0.8681
3.	Democratic Behavior (DB)	4.0343 (T_3)	0.6931
4.	Social Support (SS)	4.1263 (T_4)	0.5132
5.	Positive Feedback (PF)	4.2333 (T_5)	0.6127

The mean scores of five dimensions of leader behavior as preferred by male football players of state college level have been presented in this above table. To find out the significant of differences among means of male football players on various determined factors of preferred leadership behavior, the Analysis of Variance was computed and data pertaining to this have presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Analysis of Variance for Preferred Leadership of State College Level Male Football Players

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p value
Between-treatments	5.6292	4	1.4073	3.44749	0.01006
Within-treatments	59.1904	145	0.4082		
Total	64.8197	149			

*** Significant at 0.05 level**

From Table 2, it is evident that the statistically significant difference existed among state college level male football players on preferred leadership, as the obtained F-value of 3.44749 was higher than the required $F_{.05}(4, 145) = 2.42$ as well as p value $0.01006 < 0.05$ showed the existence of significant differences.

As the F-ratio was found to be significant, Tukey's HSD Test of Post-hoc comparison was applied to study the significance differences among state college level male players on five dimensions of leader behavior of preferred leadership and the data pertaining to this have been presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Significance of Differences among State College Level Male Football Players between Ordered Paired Means on Five Dimensions of Preferred Leadership

<i>Pair wise Comparisons</i>		HSD _{.05} = 0.4557 HSD _{.01} = 0.5471	Q _{.05} = 3.9066 Q _{.01} = 4.6900
T₁:T	M ₁ = 3.98 M ₂ = 3.66	0.31	Q = 2.70 (p = .31698)
T₁:T₃	M ₁ = 3.98 M ₃ = 4.03	0.06	Q = 0.51 (p = .99639)
T₁:T₄	M ₁ = 3.98 M ₄ = 4.13	0.15	Q = 1.30 (p = .88991)
T₁:T₅	M ₁ = 3.98 M ₅ = 4.23	0.26	Q = 2.21 (p = .52173)
T₂:T₃	M ₂ = 3.66 M ₃ = 4.03	0.37	Q = 3.21 (p = .16105)
T₂:T₄	M ₂ = 3.66 M ₄ = 4.13	0.47	Q = 4.00 (p = .04213)*
T₂:T₅	M ₂ = 3.66 M ₅ = 4.23	0.57	Q = 4.91 (p = .00598)*
T₃:T₄	M ₃ = 4.03 M ₄ = 4.13	0.09	Q = 0.79 (p = .98082)
T₃:T₅	M ₃ = 4.03 M ₅ = 4.23	0.20	Q = 1.71 (p = .74774)
T₄:T₅	M ₄ = 4.13 M ₅ = 4.23	0.11	Q = 0.92 (p = .96666)

*** Significant at 0.05 level**

It is quite evident from the table 3, that there were no significant differences in all dimensions on preferred leadership among State level male Football players between TI–AB, TI-DB, TI-SS, TI-PF; AB-DB, DB-SS, DB-PF and so on. The significant difference found in the cases of AB-SS and AB-PF only. Therefore, the differences exist between Authoritarian Behavior (AB) and Social Support (SS) as well as between Authoritarian Behavior (AB) and Positive Feedback (PF).

3.2. Discussion

The results of this study revealed the significant differences among state level male football players as the F-ratio was found higher than the required value to be significant. Male athletes of football games in this study gave higher ratings and positive feedback to leadership behavior dimension from their coaches appear to support the path-goal theory. Terry (1984) suggested that preferences for positive feedback behavior might represent fulfillment of the individual student-athletes' need for recognition and reward in a group environment where interpersonal needs might go unfulfilled. Chelladurai (1990) and Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) suggested positive feedback behavior reflected coaches reinforcing proper performance through encouraging, recognizing, and correcting student-athletes. The male players indicated the autocratic behaviour in lesser amount from their coaches in comparison to other dimensions of preferred leadership behaviour. This leadership scale used in our study i.e. LSS has been extensively validated in studies on various sports (e.g., football and ice hockey) and different cultural contexts (e.g., the United States, Canada, Japan, and Singapore) (Chia, Pyun, & Kwon, 2015; Chittle, Horton, Weir, & Dixon, 2015; Kwon, Pyun, Han, & Ogasawara, 2011; Riemer, & Chelladurai, 1995). Most of these studies revealed small to medium effect size in the comparison between different groups (e.g., Chittle et al., 2015; Kwon et al., 2010; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995). Our result is very much concerned with the study conducted by Shrivatava, Y & Sharma, R (2015).

4. CONCLUSIONS

1. Significant difference was observed among state level male football players in their actual leadership behaviour.
2. State level male football players preferred more of positive feedback from their coaches.
3. State level male football player demanded less amount of autocratic behaviour from their coaches.
4. Players, who wanted authoritarian behavior had denied preferring social support and positive feedback from their respective leaders or coaches.

REFERENCES

- Beam, J.W., Serwatka, T.S., Wilson, W.J. (2004). Preferred leadership of NCAA division I and II inter-collegiate student-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 27(1), 1-17.
- Beam, J.W. (2001). *Preferred leadership of NCAA division I and II intercollegiate student-athletes*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Florida.
- Barr, J. (1996). *Comparison of leadership preferences and perceptions among canadian high school, CÉGEP, University, and Professional Football Players*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, McGill University.
- Chelladurai, P. (1980). Leadership in sports organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sports Sciences*, 5, 226-231.
- Chelladurai, P. and Saleh, S.D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sports. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 3, 85-92.
- Chelladurai, P, Haggerty, T.R. & Baxter, P.R. (1989). Decision style choices of university basketball coaches and players. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11, 201-215.
- Chelladurai, P. & Saleh, S.D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 34-45.
- Dwyer, J.J. & Fischer, D.G. (1988). Psychometric properties of the coach's version of leadership scale for sports. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 67, 795-798.
- Erle, F.J. (1981). *Leadership in competitive and recreational sport*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Western Ontario.
- Horn, T. (2002). *Advances in Sport Psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- House, R.J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-338.
- Jaiswal, Y. et al. (2019). A Comparison of leadership behaviour of Inter-university and all India level male volleyball players, *Indian Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Applied Science*, 9 (3).
- Loughead, T. M. & Hardy, J. (2004). An examination of coach and peer leader behaviors in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 6, 303-312.
- Morgan, W.P. (1986). Sports Personology. The Credulous - Skeptical Argument in Perspective in Sports Psychology. An Analysis of Athletic Behaviour. (Ed. W. Straub), Movement Pub. In this N.Y. Cited by Stan-Power Psychological Assessment Procedures at a Track & Reid

National Event Squad Training Weekend' Sports science Education by J. Watkins. Thomas Reilly and Les Burtwiz (London: E & FN Spon), 181.

Pawar, R.S., Yadav, R.K. & Sharma, R.K. (2009). An analysis of leadership behavior preferred by individual sports athletes at inter-university level. *Serbian Journal of Sports Sciences*, 3(3), 99-104.

Shrivatava, Y. & Sharma, R. (2015). Leadership behavior as preferred by male athletes of different games and sports. *IJPESH*, 1(6), 96-99

Singer, R.N., Murphy, M. & Tenant, K.L. (Eds.) (1993). *Handbook of Research in Sport Psychology*, New York: Macmillian.