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ABSTRACT

The purpose this study was to survey relationship of coach’s Leadership Style and player performance outcomes. The research was descriptive. The population consisted of sport coaches Tabriz city of Iran in 2011. The sample was selected using convenience sampling. The instruments for data collection included demographics questionnaire, Leadership Scale for Sport. The data were analyzed using Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient (p = 0.05). The results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between Training and instruction and Democratic with winning, but there is no significant relationship between Autocratic, Social support and Positive feedback with winning. However, a significant negative relationship was observed between Autocratic, Social support and Positive feedback with failure.
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INTRODUCTION

Researchers have shown that the many factors are directly affected by coaching behaviors and more specifically, leadership. Also, the type of leadership behavior displayed by the head coach can have a significant effect on the performance and psychological well being of the athlete, as mentioned earlier [1]. Case (1998) suggested that although leader behavior is often discussed, it is one of the least understood aspects of coaching [2]. Effective leadership can help an organization or team develop new directions and promote change toward proposed objectives [3]. Jung and Avolio results concluded that the same leadership style can be perceived differently and can have different effects on motivation and performance for followers from different cultural groups. For example, a transformational leader’s encouraging followers to come up with long-term ideas that challenged the current state of the school, the focal organization, appeared to have different motivating effects among Caucasians and Asian … Thus, future leadership research should be based on a broader theoretical framework that includes both the type of cultural value orientation [4]. Gibson and Marcoulides studied the invariance of leadership styles across the United States, Australia, Norway, and Sweden to see if the 6-factor leadership model held up there. This model describes six styles: autocratic, benevolent autocratic, consultative, participative, consensus, and laissez-faire. It had been previously determined that the Americans and Australians preferred an individualistic, direct approach, while the Norwegians and Swedes Preferred a collectivistic, participative approach to leadership. The study indicated that, despite cultural differences, the model applied across the four countries. This indicates that most managers will share some common areas despite their cultural differences [5]. Coaching can be a key success factor to the leadership style. It is within this intimate coaching relationship that the leader identifies and supports the strength, weakness, and needs of the follower [6]. Each member of your team has a potential for personal greatness; the
leader’s job is to help them achieve it [7]. It has yet to be determined which leadership style correlates to successful performance outcomes in sport [8]. College coaches assume diverse leadership roles including teacher/instructor, organizer/planner, counselor, communicator, and motivator [9]. College coaches often assume dual roles as both teachers and coaches. They must be able to provide instruction, guide skill development, and offer performance feedback, while directing a team toward a specific goal or outcome. It is not surprising then that coaches play an integral role in the success of their athletes and athletic teams, influencing factors such as their athlete’s self-esteem [10], skill learning [11], mental development [12], sport performance satisfaction [1], as well as performance outcomes [13].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was descriptive and regression. This study used self report measures including a coaching demographic questionnaire and the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS: Challaduria& Salleh, 1980) to evaluate the relationship of coach’s Leadership Style and player performance outcomes. From multiple regressions was used to analysis of LSS and demographic data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Result of the Multiple Regression for coach’s Leadership Style and player performance outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Variable</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and instruction</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training and instruction (p≤0.03) and Democratic leadership behavior (p≤0.02) were correlated with all of the descriptive data or performance outcomes. But, Autocratic (p≤0.63), Social support (p≤0.76) and Positive feedback (p≤0.55) were no correlated with any of the descriptive data or performance outcomes.

The results of this study about training and instruction supported by Jambor and Zhang [7], which found that older, more experienced college coaches utilized Training and Instruction behavior at a significantly higher rate than did less experienced and younger junior high coaches. Also, Democratic leadership behavior was significantly correlated with performance an outcome that was similar study of many researchers [14, 15].

In contrast, Autocratic leadership behavior was no significantly and positively correlated with winning in athletics. These results suggest that those coaches, who used autocratic leadership styles coached, probably hadn’t successful teams. These results were similar with previous findings from Penman, Hastad, and Cords (1974), than less successful coaches. One reason for this may be because more mature athletes prefer autocratic leadership [14].

Social Support had not positively related with the performance outcomes. This finding is consistent with past studies results from Weiss & Freidrichs (1986), who found a relationship between greater amounts of social support and poor team performance [16]. Ultimately there was not significant relationship between Positive feedback and performance outcomes, which was contrast with finding Bryce newell [16].

CONCLUSION

A challenge for coaches is to find a leadership style that is conducive to team success. Hence, the current study shall help coaches better understand how their leadership behaviors relate to their team’s performance, and enhance the literature in this area. Ultimately, the results of this study may provide coaches with better awareness of the effect of their leadership styles on performance and help determine which style or styles are most effective.
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