

THE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLE OF COACHES AND COLLECTIVE EFFICACY OF PLAYERS IN FOOTBALL TEAMS OF KHORASAN RAZAVI PREMIER LEAGUE

Hassani Sangani A. R.¹, Sardar Mohammadi², Mozafar Yektayar³

¹ Sport Management, Sciences and Researches Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kurdistan,

² Sport Management Physical Education and Sport Science Faculty, University of Kurdistan,

³ Department of Physical Education & Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj Branch, IRAN.

¹ myektayar@gmail.com, ² sardarmohammadi@gmail.com, ³ alirezahasani57@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Leadership style and coach feedback plays an important role in the performance and success of a team. In order to investigate the relationship between feedback and leadership style of coaches and the collective efficacy of players in Khorasan Football Premier League in season 91-92, a descriptive study was performed in which 225 players were participated using random sampling. Measurement instrument was a questionnaire on leadership feedback constructed by the researcher that its face and content validity was approved by academic authorities. Confirmatory factor analysis was used for data analysis, Kolmogorov–Smirnov test for normality of data distribution, Pearson correlation coefficient for examining the relationship between feedback and coaches' leadership style and the collective efficacy and leadership style, the regression analysis for prediction of one or more variables and Cronbach alpha test for the reliability of the data. There is a significant correlation between coaches' leadership feedback and collective efficacy and training and instruction, democratic and social support leadership styles, while there was no significant leadership between collective efficacy, autocratic leadership styles and positive feedback. Comparing the coaches' leadership style revealed that football coaches used training and instruction leadership style (task-oriented) more than democratic leadership style. So, it seems that coaches' leadership style especially social support and autocratic leadership styles have a high relationship with collective efficacy. The impact of leadership style and coaches feedback on coaching efficacy and success of athletic teams highlights the importance of using appropriate leadership style more than ever.

Keywords: Leadership style, coaches, collective efficacy, premier league

INTRODUCTION

Successful sport teams have often a prominent feature distinguishing them from unsuccessful teams which is an effective, active and qualified leadership and management. Leadership style and coaching feedback play an important role in the performance and success of the team (Anshel, 2001). Coach is among the most important elements affecting the efficiency or success of sport teams since in clubs, sport teams and especially in football, a coach has an undeniable role and importance as a thoughtful and dynamic brain to determining destiny and achieving the highest possible return. One of the most important aspects in decision making of coaches is to select the style and way of coaching. It is important that how a coach decides, what skills and strategies he trains, how he does the necessary organization for doing exercise and competition, what ways he uses for creating discipline in team and above all, what roles he considers for players in decisions (Hosseini, 2007). A coach should possess necessary skills and characteristics for leading the group so that he can conduct the group members to

the desired goal. Thus, the leadership style of a coach plays an important role in the performance and success of the team (Anshel, 2001).

In the past two decades, researches on coaching efficacy have more been focused on identifying coaches characteristics, leadership styles and the feedback patterns of the coach. In these studies, an effective coach has generally been introduced as a person having the ability to change the results and successful performance and positive mental reactions in the team (Horn, 2002). Not only should coaches consider the performance of sport skills, but also they should pay attention to the mental skills of individuals and teams. Therefore, considering individual and team processes or individual needs of the athletes and teams is essential and is considered as a part of coaching efficacy (Ronayne, 2004). In the past, researchers such as Watson (2001), Greenlees (1999), and Swain (1996) observed a positive and significant relationship between collective efficacy and successful performance of the teams (Jabbari, 2000; Ramazaninejad et al, 2010). However, Allen et al (2009) reported that it is the victory and successful results that enhance efficiency levels of the teams (Ramazaninejad et al, 2010). Also, Hodges and Curran (1992) indicated that subsequent to failure, teams with a high efficiency will have a better performance by much effort and in contrary; teams' performance with low efficiency will suffer (Carron et al, 2002). In the field of coaching, coaches employ various styles; however, no single style would always lead to desired success. In one of the earliest studies using leadership scale questionnaire in sport (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1992), Weiss and Friedrich (1986) concluded that athletes whose coaches used social support leadership styles, positive and democratic feedback were more satisfied than athletes whose coaches used these leadership styles less.

After the issue of the relationship between coaches' leadership styles and the satisfaction of athletes, the collective efficacy was considered by researches. Also, in a study on the student teams, Ronayne (2004) showed that there were low levels of autocratic and punishment-oriented feedback between athletes' perceptions of team cohesion and team efficiency during the season with their perceptions of variables of informational feedback. However, Pease and Kozub (1994) observe no significant relationship between coaches' leadership styles and social cohesion (Yousefi, 2007).

In so doing, in the present study, coaches' leadership style was investigated in the frame of five common styles of training and instruction, social support, democratic, autocratic and positive feedback. There are feedbacks to improve athletes through training techniques which is said to coordinate activities of team members in team sports (Moradi, 2006). In the present study, training and instruction feedback is defined as the tactical and technical guidelines of coaches during competition and instruction. In this style, the coach emphasizes the training the strengths and weaknesses of the players and on the improvement of their skills. This style is related to the amount of coach's tendency to athletes' participation in decision making to the team in which the coach allows the athletes to participate in decisions related to determining the team goals and the way to achieve those objectives and seeks the players' opinion on making decision on how to play, exercise and on important issues of coaching (Carron et al, 2002). Autocratic style is a feedback in which the coach does not let the players involve in decision-making and in team issues and players should obey coach commands (Horn, 2002). In social support feedback, to satisfy the mutual personal requirements of the athletes, the coach tries to establish a friendly relationship with players, investigate players' issues and problems and help to resolve disputes among team members (Hoseini and Misagh, 2010). Finally, the positive feedback (rewarding) is a feedback in which the coach praises and encourages the players for good and correct performance and even appreciates them in front of other players (Ronayne, 2004). Also, collective efficacy is defined as the capability and

abilities of the team in doing special team skills and achieving objectives that is the team players believe to what extent their teams achieve the desired aims and demands pre-determined in each game and in general, in the whole games (Ronayne, 2004). Not much research has been conducted on the leadership style of group cohesion in Iran (Shields, 1997). Also, on the issue, more researches are needed by the advancement of football science. The main research question is that what leadership style is more used by football team coaches of Khorasan Razavi premier league? Is there any relationship between coaches' leadership style and the efficacy of Khorasan Razavi football teams?

METHODOLOGY

The present study is a correlation study. Its statistical population consisted of 396 players in Khorasan Razavi premier league (n=396) that were selected as the sample using random sampling and based on Kerjcie and Morgan table (n=225 individuals). The measurement instrument of the variables includes: 1) A researcher-made personal characteristics questionnaire; 2) A researcher-made leadership feedback questionnaire; 3) Collective efficacy questionnaire (Feltz and Lyrg 1998); 4) Leadership scale questionnaire in sport Chladuray and Saleh (1990). To measure the validity of the instrument i.e. the questionnaire, confirmatory factor analysis method has been used to assess the construct validity (convergence validity) and supervisor, consultant and experts' opinions have also been used for the content validity. In this study, characteristics of 2/df, RMSEA, GFI and AGFI have been used to evaluate the confirmatory factor analysis model. 2/df index has no fixed criteria for an acceptable model while a little amount of 2/df implies a better fitness of the model. Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is used as the difference size per degree of freedom. RMSEA index is equivalent to 0.05 or less for good models. Higher values of up to 0.08 indicate a reasonable error for approximation in the population. Models with RMSEA of 0.10 or more have poor fitness. The goodness of fitness index (GFI) and the adjusted goodness of fitness (AGF) have been introduced in LISREL program and show the extent the model has a better fitness with regard to its number. Based on the agreement, the rate of GFI and AGFI should be equal to or greater than 0.90 so that the model will be accepted. GFI and AGFI are under the effect of the sample volume and can be large for models that have been so poorly formulated. There is no general agreement on their use. In this part of the study, the reliability of measuring instruments is studied by the confirmatory factor analysis technique and also using LISREL structural equation modeling software. The results are as follows. In the current study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient has been used to investigate the reliability of the measuring instrument (spectra) that its amount is 0.79.

FINDINGS

Table 1. The frequency distribution of respondents in terms of age

<i>Year</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>14-18 year</i>	48	21.3
<i>19-22 year</i>	60	26.7
<i>23-26 year</i>	59	26.2
<i>More than 27 year</i>	58	25.8
<i>Total</i>	225	100
<i>Statistical Indices</i>	23.39= mean 5.28=Standard deviation	14= The lowest data 40= The highest data

Table 1 describes the mean age of the players. Their mean age is 23 years, the presence history in their own team is equal to 3 years, the history of club activity in the province is 7.32 years and the activity record in their club is 3 years that the age range of players, the activity history in club and the history in their team are from 14 to 40, 1 to 20 and 1 to 15 years, respectively.

Table 2. The frequency distribution of respondents in terms of the history of club activity

<i>Year</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>1-2 year</i>	83	36.9
<i>3-4 year</i>	94	41.8
<i>More than 4 year</i>	48	21.3
<i>Total</i>	225	100
<i>Statistical Indices</i>	Mean = 7.81 10.07=Standard deviation	1= The lowest data 2= The highest data

The findings in Table 2 indicate that 37%, 42% and 21% of studied respondents have the history of club activities less than 5 years, between 6 to 10 years and more than 10 years, respectively. The statistical indices show that the range of club activity of respondents is from 14 to 20 years that the mean history of their club activity is 8 years.

Table 3. The frequency distribution of respondents in terms of the history of activity in the current club

<i>Year</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>1-2 year</i>	131	58.2
<i>3-4 year</i>	46	20.4
<i>More than 4 year</i>	48	21.3
<i>Total</i>	225	100
<i>Statistical Indices</i>	31.14= Mean 2.95=Standard deviation	1- The lowest data 15- The highest data

Table 3 indicates that 58%, 20% and 21% of studied respondents have stated that they have had the history of activity in their current clubs from 1 to 2, 3 to 4 and more than 4 years. The statistical indices show that the activity range of respondents in the current club is from 1 to 15 years that the mean history of their current club activity is 3 years.

Table 4. The frequency distribution of respondents in terms of playing post

<i>Playing Post</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Goalkeeper</i>	24	10.7
<i>Defender</i>	71	31.6
<i>Midfielder</i>	73	32.4
<i>Striker</i>	48	21.3
<i>No Answer</i>	9	4
<i>Total</i>	225	100

Findings in Table 4 show that 11%, 32%, 32% and 21% of respondents are goalkeeper, defender, midfielder and striker.

In order to identify the relationship between leadership styles of the coaches and collective efficacy, we used the Pearson correlation coefficient. According to Table 4-11, given the correlation rate (0.06) and the obtained level of significance (0.380), it shows that there is no relationship between leadership feedback of coaches and collective efficacy of the players, (Table 5).

Table 5. Correlation of leadership feedback of the coaches with collective efficacy

<i>Variable</i>	<i>M± sd</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Leadership Feedback of Coaches</i>	36.67+151.92	0.06	0.380

Given the results of correlation test, there is a significant and positive relationship between the leadership style of training and instruction and collective efficacy of the players according to the level of significance (0.001 which is less than 0.05). Also, the efficiency of players has a significant and positive relationship with democratic and social support styles and positive feedback while it has no significant relationship with the autocratic style (Table 6).

Table 6. Correlation between coaches' leadership style and collective efficacy

<i>Variable</i>	<i>M± sd</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
Training & Instruction Style	8.60+54.06	*0.21	0.001
Autocratic Style	27.87+31.64	-0.08	0.235
Democratic Style	6.23+18.79	*0.12	0.048
Social Support Style	5.80+30.25	*0.18	0.005

The results of variance analysis also show the reliability equivalent to each regression. The level of significant for training and instruction and autocratic styles is significant. In general, training and instruction and autocratic leadership styles are only the predictor dimensions of the efficacy of the players. According to β weight, training and instruction style plays the greatest role with players' efficiency in the rate of prediction and coefficients and then, the autocratic style having a negative relationship with players' efficiency given its negative coefficient (Table 7)

Table 7. Results of stepwise regression analysis of leadership styles with the players' rate efficiency

<i>Statistical Variable Indices</i>	<i>Standard coefficient</i>		<i>Error Standard Deviation</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Level of Significance</i>
	<i>B</i>	β Beta rate			
Model 1	B rate				
Fixed rate					
Training and instruction style	250.56		26.91	0.31	0.0001
Autocratic style	1.22	0.16	0.56	2.18	0.030
Autocratic style	-0.28	-0.13	0.13	-2.15	0.032
Democratic style	0.30	0.03	0.65	0.46	0.641
Social support style	1.02	0.09	0.73	1.39	0.165
Positive feedback style	0.99	0.07	0.87	1.13	0.258

According to the results of Table 4, as it is seen, the level of significance of the above component is not significant. Generally, the leadership feedback is not able to predict variables of players' efficiency.

Table 8. Results of regression analysis along with leadership feedback with player's rate of efficiency

<i>Statistical Variable Indices</i>	<i>Standard coefficient</i>		<i>Error Standard Deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Level of significance</i>
	B	β			
<i>Fixed Rate</i>	348.20				0.000
<i>Leadership</i>	0.09	0.06	15.97	21.80	0.380
<i>Feedback</i>		0.16	0.10	0.88	

DISSECTION AND CONCLUSION

The analysis of research findings indicates that no significant relationship is confirmed between coaches' leadership feedback with players' collective efficacy in football teams in Khorasan Razavi premier league. However, the obtained result is different from the studies conducted on the same issue.

In a research conducted on Iranian volleyball premier league in which the effect of coaches' feedback and group dynamics on team performance was examined, it was concluded that coaches' feedback and group dynamics affect team performance. The effect is that coaches of successful teams have used training and instruction and social support feedback more and their teams had more collective efficacy levels too.

Also, in a research studying the relationship between coaches' feedback and collective efficacy, for volleyball teams in Iranian premier league, the investigation of collective efficacy shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between training and instruction and social support feedbacks and the collective efficacy. This means that teams with higher collective efficacy levels had coaches who used training and instruction feedback and also social support feedback style more.

Collective efficacy indicates the effective and coordinated use of abilities and available resources by team and group members to achieve desired results. The group performance depends on the extent its members have effective and coordinated activity to achieve predetermined goals. The collective efficacy also shows that the extent to which team members believe that they have necessary ability and skills and also the group has sufficient resources for success. This suggest that having skill for team members and enough resources for the team is not sufficient to achieve success, but these various qualities, skills and resources should be complement and coordinate with each other and finally, another feature of collective efficacy is that its rate and levels change regarding various conditions and positions i.e. it is possible that a team enjoys high collective efficacy in a particular condition or during a particular task which leads to successful performance, while in another condition and situation or doing another task, their attempts do not lead to desired performance.

So, it can be argued that the reason for lack of proving this hypothesis; in other words, lack of relationship between coaches' leadership feedback and player's collective efficacy in Khorasan Razavi Premier League Football teams should be searched in the absence of other cases. In other words, the lack of other requirements has caused various leadership feedbacks to be ineffective on player's collective efficacy

According to the obtained results, training and instruction leadership style has a positive and significant relationship with players' collective efficacy. Also, players' efficiency has a positive and significant relationship with democratic and social support and positive feedback styles while it has no significant relationship with autocratic style. Overall, the hypothesis based on the existence of a significant relationship between coaches' leadership style and players' collective efficacy is confirmed.

Among consistent researches having similar results to this hypothesis, the followings can be cited to: Research findings by Yousefi (2007) showed that the relationship between the coaches' leadership styles (except for the autocratic style) and technical atmosphere is negatively significant, while it is positively significant with performance atmosphere.

Coaches' leadership styles have four dimensions that the presence of these dimensions causes the difference in the rate of players' collective efficacy: A) Coaches' support feedback due to creating friendly and respectful environment. B) The conductional feedback specifying the role and responsibilities of all team members based on regulations. C) The participatory feedback creating a democratic atmosphere in the team and decision making is done participatory with the team members D) Coaches' targeting feedback that tries to challenge the targets for individuals with reference to the team results.

According to the results obtained, among the leadership styles, the training and instruction and autocratic style is the predictor of player's efficiency. In other words, among the leadership styles, training and instruction style is only the predictor of the rate of player's efficiency.

Hosseini Kshtan's results (2007) showed that coaches use training and instruction feedback more and democratic feedback less. Also, a significant positive relationship between the task and social cohesions and training and instruction, democratic leadership social support and positive feedback was observed. It seems that an emphasis on much and sever training, training skills and tactics, clarifying the relationship between members and guiding and coordinating activities of team members in which components of leadership style is training and instruction, play a dominant role in forming and promoting player's collective efficacy while it seems that independent decision-making and applying personal power cause to create a special coordination and order in teams that spontaneously causes to promote players' collective efficacy.

In general, what obtained from the research results is that there are differences in feedback of coaches' leadership in Khorasan Razavi football premier league that among them, training and instruction feedback is used more, while and autocratic leadership style is used less. Also, the study findings suggest that there is a positive and significant relationship between training and instruction, democratic and social support feedback with the collective efficacy that shows the importance of coaches' feedback in group dynamics and group mental condition and finally team performance so that it indicates that coaches' teams with more collective efficacy used the leadership style and social support feedback more.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to extend his gratitude to Khorasan Razavi football staff for their efforts to do this. Many thanks go for coaches, trainers and teams in the 92-91 season for their cooperation with the researcher.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anshel, M. H. (2001). Sport psychology, from theory to practice, translated by Mosaded Seyed A. A. *Ettelaat Publication*, 11, 44-54.
- [2] Carron, A.V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J. & Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and Performance in Sport: A Meta Analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 24(2), 168-188.
- [3] Chelladurai, P. & Saleh, S. (1980). Dimensions of leader feedback in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 34-35.
- [4] Horn, T. S.(2002). Coaching Effectiveness in the Sport Domain, In T.S. Horn (Ed.). *Advances in Sport Psychology*, 12, 309-355.
- [5] Hoseini, K. & Misagh, H. (2010). The Relationship Between Collective Efficacy and Coaching Feedbacks in Professional Volleyball League of Iran Clubs. *World Journal of Sport Sciences*, 3(1), 1-6.
- [6] Hosseini, K. M. (2007). *The relationship between coaches' style and team cohesion of Iranian Premier League football teams*. MA Thesis, Physical Education and Sports Science field. Guilan University.
- [7] Jabbari, G. R., Kozechian, H. & Khabiri, M. (2000). Studying the leadership between coaches' style and abilities and performance of Iranian first and second league clubs (Azadegan cup). *Harakat publication*, 6, 103-120.
- [8] Moradi, M. R. (2006). The relationship between coaches' leadership styles with players' group cohesion in basketball teams of Iranian premier league clubs. *Harekat Journal*, 29, 16-5.
- [9] Moradi, M. R. (2004). *Studying the relationship between coaches' leadership style with players' group cohesion in basketball teams of Iranian premier league clubs*. MA Thesis, Physical Education and Sports Science field, Tarbiat Modarres University.
- [10] Ramazaninejad, R., Hosseini Keshtan, M., Noshin, B. & Mahds, F. (2010). The relationship between coaches' styles with group cohesion and success of female volleyball teams in Islamic Azad University. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6, 29-46.
- [11] Ronayne, L. S. (2004). *Effects of Coaching Feedbacks on Team Dynamics: How Coaching Feedbacks, Influence Team Cohesion and Collective Efficacy over the Course of a Season*, Master of Science in Sport Studies, Physical Education, Health, and Sport Studies, Miami University.
- [12] Shields, D. L. (1997). The Relationship between Leadership Feedbacks and Group Cohesion in Team Sports. *The Journal of Psychology*, 131(2), 196-210.
- [13] Turman, P. D. (2003). Coaches and Cohesion: the Impact of Coaching Techniques on Team Cohesion in the Small Group Sport Setting. *Journal of Sport Feedback*, 26, 86-103.
- [14] Weiss, M. R. & Friedrichs, W. D. (1986). The Influence of Leader Feedbacks, Coach Attributes, and Institutional Variables on Performance and Satisfaction of Collegiate Basketball Teams. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8, 332-346.
- [15] Yousefi Paskesh, M. (2007). *The relationship between coaches' leadership styles and sports motivational atmosphere in female sport teams*. MA thesis, field of physical education, University of North.