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Abstract

The propose of study is to examine the Relationship Between Coaches Leadership Styles & Player Satisfaction in Women Skate Championship and for subordinate purpose is to organize the Coaches Leadership Styles & Player Satisfaction in Teams. From a total of 157 questionnaires distributed, 101 questionnaires returned by using the Friedman test, Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) and Spearman correlation coefficient were analyzed. Results arising from the study showed that the coach’s style of training and instruction is more and democratic leadership style is less. Also there was positive correction between training and instruction, social support, positive feedback and autocratic leadership style with all types of athletic satisfaction (α ≤ 0.01).
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1. Introduction

It is appear that coach's role is the most difficult and troublesome role among all roles of a person in a sport like player, coach, manager, technical team or referee. Some believe that Therefore, they are expected to lead complicated sport programs with worthiness and train Athlete with technical competence in an atmosphere with high pressure.

Coaches that they do not consider appropriate time in their works and activities or have no correct plan, often become involved in a difficulty (Lis, 2001). In case of coaching position and its specifications some various and different subjects have been presented by authorities and different Psychological Books has a section about this attractive and difficult profession. Martens (2004) in Successful Coach Book says: Coaching is an occupation different from other occupations in the society and the coach is expected to give gentle and good persons to the society. This occupation is an expectation and difficult job and needs different skills. Athletes are considered as main profiting persons of Physical Education departments and also main providers of its related entertainments and amusements. So, their satisfaction and occupation in sport is main responsibility of physical education managers. In addition, Sportsmen /sportswomen's satisfaction should be part of sport programs evaluation (Chelladurai, 2008). Separated discussion around Athlete's satisfaction arisen for tow specific cases. At first, Athletes are first profiting persons of university sports. In fact, reason of existence of theses sports are Athlete university student. Second,
when university sports are considered as an entertainment and amusement, Athletes are first producers of these amusements (Chelladurai, 2008).

In the field of coaches' behavior in sport teams, Chelladurai (1990) announced sport multidimensional model; according to this model coaches' behavior is influenced by three main factors, circumstance properties (like team condition), leader and members' particulars that coaches' behavior finally influences success, function, satisfaction and even group versatility (Hosseini & et al., 2008). Jorehnush mentioned that four prior points of satisfaction dimensions from the viewpoint of Athlete are satisfaction of coach's behavior and cooperation, satisfaction of coach's personal participation and coach’s strategy (Ramezaninejad & et al., 2010). Khooran & et al. (2008) reported a positive relation between leadership behaviors realized by Athlete (exercise and training, democratic behavior, social support and positive feedback) with Athlete's satisfaction, but they did not observed a meaningful relation between leader's despotic behaviors and all satisfaction indexes (Khooran & et al., 2008). Undoubtedly, having leadership skills is one of salient particulars of an effective and successful coach and if using leadership scales by coaches are compatible with players' different functions; it encourages Athlete surely. Also, knowledge of coaches about satisfaction of team players can clear one of team psychological and management dimensions. According to different theories, one of satisfaction dimensions is related to type of coach's behavior, ethics, training and function. Type of coach's behavior and ethics may influence Athlete's satisfaction; therefore, one of important factors in coaching is gaining Athlete's satisfaction (Maghsoudi, 2009).

Some limited researches have been collected in Iran for determining relation between coaching behaviors and Athlete's satisfaction. In this research, in addition to comparison of coaches' leadership styles, relation between coaches' leadership scales and Athlete's satisfaction and answer of this question that "Whether there is relation between coaches' leadership scales and Athlete's satisfaction?" has been studied.

2. Method

Present research is applied from viewpoint of purpose and is descriptive (type of correlation) from viewpoint of collection, which is performed as field research. 3 questionnaires were used in this research for collecting information. (1) Demography specifications and properties (ascertained), (2) Leadership Scale Questionnaire LSS (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) with Kronbakh Alpha r=0.75 and (3) Athlete's Satisfaction Questionnaire ASQ (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998) with Kronbakh Alpha r=0.78. SPSS instruments have been applied in this research for statistical computations. Statistical society in this research includes all athletes of teams participated in National Championship Women Skate Competitions in the year 2009, in the amount of 157 persons. Because of limitation of statistical society, sample is considered same as society. 101 questionnaires of 110 distributed questionnaires are applicable in statistical analysis methods.

Freidman Tests (for prioritizing leadership scales), Colmogrouf – Smirnoff Test (for testing normality of data distribution) and Spearman Correlation Coefficient Test (for studying on relation of two unmoral variables) were used for analyzing research findings. All research hypotheses are analyzed in $P \leq 0.01$ level. Conclusions of research consist of, Coaches' Leadership Scales of Skate Teams participated in National Championship Women Competitions are Training and Instruction, Positive Feedback, social support, Autocratic Behavior and Democratic and there is positive and meaningful relation between all of them and satisfaction dimensions, except democratic leadership scale.

3. Findings

Descriptive findings for tested cases are according to age and number of their participations in National Team.
Table 1: Athletes' Statistical Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Abundance</th>
<th>Percent of Abundance</th>
<th>Membership Record of National Team</th>
<th>Abundance</th>
<th>Percent of Abundance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>Juveniles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years old</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years old</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>No record</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in Table 1; 18.8% of Athletes are younger than 15 years old, 54.5% 15-20 years old, 20.8% are 21-25 years old, 3% are 26-30 years old, and record of playing in National Team, 5.6% in Juveniles, 16.8% in Youth, 17.8% in Adults Team and 56.4% has no record in this field.

Table 2 mentions that by using Freidman Test, exercising educational scale with Rank average of 3.94 in First Rank, positive feedback scale with Rank average of 3.030 in Second Rank, social support scale with Rank average of 2.96 in Third Rank, Imperious scale with Rank average of 2.60 in Fourth Rank and Democratic scale with Rank average of 2.20 is in Fifth Rank.

Table 2: Priority of Coaches' Leadership Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Scale</th>
<th>Rank Average</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Leadership Scales according to Ranking (more to less)
According to Spearman Correlation Coefficient for determining relation between Coaches’ Leadership Scale and Athlete's Satisfaction, there is positive and meaningful relation between Training and Instruction, Autocratic Behavior, social support and positive feedback leadership scales with all satisfaction dimensions, but only there is no meaningful relation between democratic leadership scales with all satisfaction dimensions.

Table 3: Spearman Correlation Coefficients for Determining Relation between Leadership Scales and Satisfaction Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Scales / Satisfaction Dimensions</th>
<th>Training and Instruction (TI)</th>
<th>Democratic Behavior (DB)</th>
<th>Autocratic Behavior (AB)</th>
<th>Social Support (SS)</th>
<th>Positive Feedback (PF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Performance Satisfaction (TP)</td>
<td>0.518 *</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.486 *</td>
<td>0.453 *</td>
<td>0.510 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Performance Satisfaction (IP)</td>
<td>0.676 *</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.544 *</td>
<td>0.596 *</td>
<td>0.626 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction Satisfaction (T &amp; I)</td>
<td>0.635 *</td>
<td>- 0.056</td>
<td>0.430 *</td>
<td>0.438 *</td>
<td>0.444 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Treatment Satisfaction (PT)</td>
<td>0.575 *</td>
<td>- 0.031</td>
<td>0.370 *</td>
<td>0.341 *</td>
<td>0.396 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = relation is meaningful in level of α = 0.01.

Conclusion

Conclusion of first hypothesis in this research shows that there is no positive and meaningful relation between democratic scale and personal function and behavior and a negative and meaningless relation observed between democratic scale and satisfaction with education and exercise and also satisfaction with personal function. These findings are conformed to findings of Khooran & et al. (2008), Cakioglu (2003), Busobhan (2004), Vilani & et al. (2005), Aoyagi & et al. (2008) that believed positive relation and also these findings are not confirmed to findings of Wang (2006) and Nazarudin & et al. (2009). Reasons of this inconformity can be difference between statistical society sex, circumstance and cultural specifications and field of sport and leads to dissatisfaction of athletes. Enshel (2006) dictates circumstances and method of working with group members, a Coach should contemplate some standards like nationality, type of sport, age, sex and ability before determining her/his leadership scale. According to finding of Wang (2006), there is positive relation between all leadership scales with all items of athletes' satisfaction. In addition, present research is conformed to findings of Li Ki Yan & et al. (2007). Vilani & et al. (2005) and Aoyagi & et al. (2008) believed to meaningful relation between all leadership scales (except Imperious scale) with athletes' satisfaction and these conclusions are conformed to 3 parameters of positive feedback, educational - exercising and social support scales with athletes' satisfaction but not conformed to 2 another parameters of Autocratic Behavior and athletes' satisfaction. Perhaps difference of statistical society sport field, statistical samples age, teams' competition level, cultural and racial particulars are reasons of this inconformity. Sadegh (2008) expressed that athletes are more worried about coach's knowledge and science than making personal communications, but younger athletes needs more sympatric support. Social support of coach makes effort step more pleasurable and makes it free from any kind of personal collision and positive feedback behavior leads to create equality feeling between members. Chelladurai (2008) expressed that positive feedback behavior guarantees justly distribution of coach's personal bonuses (it means same bonus for same function). From the viewpoint of Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) athlete's satisfaction is positive effective state that is concluded from one complicated transformation in structure and conclusions related to athlete's experiences. According to Japanese viewpoint about satisfaction issue, is it a stable concept:

1- Attracting satisfaction should be stipulated as first purpose of leadership (coaching).
2- Satisfaction strategy should be stipulated more important than close relation.
3- Amount of satisfaction should be evaluated regularly and systematically.
4- Achieving to satisfaction should be flowed and continued by leader (Maghsoudi, 2009).

According to viewpoint of Fidler, any scale of leadership can be effective if it is conformed to that condition. If all members of a team realize and accept stages for achieving to purpose clearly; so, there is many agreement between
leader, member and condition. However, there is appropriate base for a coach; a dictator coach can be effective. Maghsoudi expressed in 2009 that relation between coach and athlete is an important factor in team and athlete’s success and satisfaction. As result, leadership scale is related to followers’ status and relation and respect between coach and athlete leads to athlete's satisfaction and performance improvement.

Also analysis of research findings shows that from the viewpoint of athletes, coaches of participated teams in National Championship Women Skate competitions use educational – exercising scale more than other scales. Conclusion of researchers performed by Moradi & et al. (2006), Hosseini Keshtan & et al. (2008), Mohammad Panahi (2008), Tahami (2009) and Alferman (2005) are conformed to present conclusions. Hiogaard and & et al. (2008) also believed that Football coaches use positive feedback scale that is not conformed to present research. Maghsoudi (2009) expressed that coaches used participatory – justifiable scale. Inconformity of conclusions was difference of coaches' age and type of sport. Farhangi (2008) believed that leader presents a kind of a behavior that is appropriate with preparation of followers for performing works.

Also, conclusions show that from the viewpoint of athletes, coaches use democratic scale lesser in National Skate competitions. It means that athletes have little participation in making decisions related purposes determination. Conclusions of researches of Mohammad Panahi (2008), Ghaifarokhi & et al. (2008), Tahami (2009), Sherman (1996) and Alferman (2005) are conformed to the present conclusions, but Moradi & et al. (2006), Hosseini Keshtan & et al. (2008) mentioned in their researches that coaches use imperious scale less and Li Ki Yan & et al. (2007) reported that coaches use educational - exercising scale less; Hiogaard and & et al. (2008) reported that coaches use social support scale less that is nor conformed to present research. Reasons of this inconformity are difference between coaches' age and type of sport and also different cultural states. Because a leader should be able to conform the leadership for preparing followers. Farhangi (2005) expressed that no one of leadership scale is the best for all circumstances. Perhaps, strange point in the present research with previous researches is not specified direction in satisfaction athletes in different fields of sport. Nazarudin (2009) expressed that coaching effective behavior passed from special records direction, as changing of athlete's particulars and status.

As a result, sport records, coach's particulars and athlete determine leadership scale. For achieving to improvements for performing sport, it is necessary that each coach behaves in a way that is accepted by athlete. Perhaps another reason of inconformity of these conclusions is difference of sport field and also teams' competition level. Because this is of one of the first researches for studying on relation between coaches' leadership scales and athletes' satisfaction, it seems better and precise justice needs more researches in sport different levels.
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