

The Relationship between Perceived Coaches' Leadership Style And Motivation of Middle and Long Distance Runners' of Addis Ababa City Administration Second Division Athletics Clubs

Ayanttu Jembere^{1*} Amanu Eba² Samson Wondirad³ Eshetu Girma⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Department of Sport Science, College of Natural Science, Jimma University P.O Box 378, Ethiopia

Abstract – The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived coaches' leadership style and athletes Motivation in Addis Ababa city administration second division athletics clubs in middle and long distance runners. Cross-sectional study design was employed. The population of the study were selected from fifteen (n=15) clubs. From each club 8 athletes total 120 and 30 coaches were purposively selected. Those clubs and athletes were selected by using proportional stratified sampling technique. The instrument of data collection used were Leadership Style Questionnaire developed by Peter (2009) to assess the leadership style of coaches and Luc et al., (1995) to determine athletes' motivation and semi-structure interview. SPSS version 23 was used for statistical analysis of the data. Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to test the relationship between coaches' leadership style and athlete's motivation. There was no significant correlation between autocratic leadership style and athlete motivation ($r = -0.23, p > 0.05$) and Laissez fair leadership style with motivation, ($r = -0.12, p > 0.05$).there was significant relationship between democratic leadership style and athletes' motivation ($r = -0.02, P < 0.05$). the finding of this study concludes that democratic leadership types of coach leadership style has significant relationship with motivation however, autocratic and laissez fair coach leadership style have no significant relationship with athletes' motivation.

Keywords: Athletes, Coaches, Leadership Style, Motivation and Perceived

1. INTRODUCTION

In athletics context there are many personal relationships (e.g. coach–parent, athlete–athlete, and athlete–partner) that can impact on performance, but the coach–athlete relationship is considered to be particularly vital (Jowett & Cockerill, 2002). They further noted that positive coaching behavior was a key factor in many aspects of athletes' performance. As Wooden (2005) asserted that each member of the team has a potential for personal greatness; the leader's job is to help them achieve it. Hence, a challenge for coaches is to find a leadership style that is conducive to athletes' success. The role is critical because athlete success depends significantly on athlete's willingness to exert mental as well as physical effort in pursuit of excellence (Moran, 2004).

The problem is that most coaches tend to coach in the style that they were coached themselves. But to become a better coach they should look carefully at the coaching or leadership styles that they use most of the time. Although, still now most Ethiopian athletics Club coaches tend to coach in the way they were coached in early time. Where they following

coaching styles suggested by early theories and mostly depend on the cooperative styles in most situations (Asres.2007).

Athletics and Ethiopia, the large number of first- class distance runners' immediately comes to our mind. In fact, at this stage one could safely and justifiably come to an agreement that Ethiopia has some of the best middle and long distance runners in the world. Accordingly, the new York times called Ethiopia "running Mecca" due to its historical successes in the athletes program, in which it also took 5th place in the world ranking during the Olympic champion at Beijing (international Olympic committee, 2010). Athletics in Ethiopia include many fields. Although Ethiopia is best known internationally for its middle-distance and long-distance runners, consistent result is not registered at global and continental level. This might be due to lack of athletes' motivation towards their training, lack of quality and behavior of an effective and successful coach and lack of working relationship between clubs and athletics federations (Haftay, 2015).Therefore, the study aimed to assess the relationship between perceived coaches' leadership style and athletes Motivation in Addis

Ababa city administration second division athletics clubs in middle and long distance runners

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1. Study area and its' design

This study was conducted in Addis Ababa city administration second division athletics club. Addis Ababa is the capital city of Ethiopia. The city is located at the southern foot of Mount Entoto, in the Entoto Mountains, at an elevation of about 8000 feet (2440 meters) above sea level, Cross-sectional study design was used in which quantitative and qualitative approach was used (Kumar, 2011).

2.2. Study population and sample

The population of the study was selected from fifteen (n = 15) Addis Ababa city administration second division athletics clubs. Those clubs were selected by using proportional stratified sampling technique and athletes by using equal allocation stratified sampling technique. The simplified formula to calculate the sample size used determine at 95% of confidence interval and 5% precision (e). The total samples from middle and long distance runner was (n = 120) (Shalabh, 2016).

2.3. Instrument of data collections

Leadership Style Questionnaire developed by Peter, (2009) to assess the leadership style of coaches and Luc et al., (1995) to determine athletes' motivation questionnaires were used. Supplementing the questionnaire interview was used for the purpose of data collection instruments.

2.4. Method of data analysis

The collected data were entered into SPSS version 23 then Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to test the relationship between coaches leadership style with athlete's motivation in Addis Ababa city administration second division athletics clubs.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study the result of the data were analyzed by Pearson product moment correlation coefficient as discussed under the table below. Then, discussions from different literatures were supplementing the finding of this study.

Table 7: Correlation matrix results between coaches' leadership style and athletes motivation

S. N:	Leadership style	Types of athletes motivation						
		Know	Accomplish	experience	identified	interjected	external	A motivation
1	Democratic	-.22*	-.19*	0.00	0.03	-.19*	-.16*	-.16
2	Autocratic	-0.02	-0.1	0.01	0.11	-0.08	-0.05	-.15*
3	Laissez fair	-0.12	0.11	-0.05	0.09	0.11	0.06	0.11
Aggregate correlation coefficient result								
S.n	Leadership style	Motivation						
1	Democratic	-0.218**						
2	Autocratic	-0.023						
3	Laissez fair	-0.117						
*P<0.05 and **P<0.01								

With regard to Table 7 analysis reveals that democratic leadership style negatively significantly correlate to intrinsic motivation to know ($r=-0.22$, $P<0.05$) and intrinsic motivation to accomplish ($r=-0.19$, $p <.05$), whereas, no significantly correlated with extrinsic motivation to interjected($r=-0.189$, $p <0.05$), extrinsic motivation-to identified ($r= -0.03$, $p > 0.05$), and democratic leadership style and a motivation were significant low negative correlated, ($r= -0.16$, $P < 0.05$). Democratic leadership style insignificantly negatively correlated with intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation ($r = 0.00$, $p > 0.05$), and extrinsic motivation to identified ($r= 0.03$, $p>0.05$).

Autocratic leadership style insignificantly correlated negatively with a motivation, ($r=-0.15$, $p<0.05$).Autocratic leadership style insignificantly correlated negatively with intrinsic motivation of to know, ($r=-0.02$, $p>0.05$), intrinsic motivation to accomplish, ($r=-0.08$, $p>0.05$). Intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation, ($r=0.01$, $p>0.05$), whereas, insignificantly negative correlated with extrinsic motivation to identified= 0.11 , $p>0.05$), with extrinsic motivation to interjected($r=0.08$, $p>0.05$), and extrinsic motivation to external regulation. Laissez fair leadership style insignificantly negatively correlated with intrinsic motivation to know ($r= 0.12$, $P >0.05$),

intrinsic motivation to accomplish ($r= 0.11$, $P> 0.05$), intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation ($r = -0.05$, $P > 0.05$), extrinsic motivation – identified ($r = 0.09$, $P > 0.05$), intrinsic motivation – to interjected($r = 0.11$, $p >0.05$) and extrinsic motivation external regulation ($r= 0.06$, $P >0.05$). A motivation ($r= 0.11$, $P > 0.05$).

Generally there was significant correlation to democratic leadership style to motivation, ($r = -0.22$, $p < 0.05$), while there was no significant correlation between autocratic leadership style and motivation ($r =-0.23$, $p > 0.05$) and Laissez fair leadership style and a motivation, ($r = -0.12$, $p>0.05$).

This above discussed analysis implies that as coaches become democratic the athletes were intrinsically motivated while mastering certain difficult training techniques, improving some of their weakness, perfecting their abilities and executing certain difficult movements. In line with this, as a coach were democratic the athletes were motivated

while living exciting experiences, involved in the activity, performing a sport that they like and totally athletes immersed in their training.

Correspondingly, as a coach were exhibiting democratic leadership style the athletes were extrinsically motivated because it was one of the best ways to meet people, to develop other aspects of myself, to learn lots of things which could be useful to them in other areas of my life and the best ways to maintain good relationships with my friends. In addition to this, athletes were motivated to run in order to keep their shape, to feel better, they feel bad when they stop training and they highly motivated to do sport regularly.

When a coach shows autocratic leadership style, athletes become motivated in questioning themselves to continue their training in the future because they don't have clearly impression to succeeded in running middle and long distance in the future, they believe that they place was not in sport as well as they don't have clearly objectives to achieve.

From the above analysis democratic leadership style has significant relationship with intrinsic motivation including, to know and to accomplish and have significant relationship with extrinsic motivation such as it has significant relationship with a motivation. More importantly, democratic leadership style has significant relationship with motivation. Considering quantitative findings qualitative response suggests that using autocratic approaches lead to tense relationship between coaches and athlete which might decrease their motivation level. (Code: 1 March2019...that was the rationale behind coaches have been changing their style from autocratic to democratic Code: 5 and Code: 6 , 2019).

In autocratic types of coach leadership style the motivation of an athletes' fear their coach, must obey the order and finish the required test what scores. This creates unhealthy partnership between the coach and an athlete which decrease athletes' motivation. The athletes' performance might be below the required performance. Most of the coaches explained using democratic approach motivates an athlete because the athletes are involved in decision making and there is good athlete and coach partnership. This contributes to an increment of motivation and performance of athletes. The finding of this study reveals that democratic leadership style have significant relationship with athletes' motivation. Correspondingly, similar findings supported that the perceived autocratic and democratic behaviors had a significant indirect effect on Intrinsic Motivations (Jill and Anthony, 2003). There was a significant positive relationship between the leadership style of education and practice, with satisfaction and developmental motivation, passionate behavior style with satisfaction and progressive motivation (Kürşat, 2017). There was a significant positive relationship between training and instruction and also democratic with winning, but there is no significant relationship between autocratic,

social support and positive feedback with winning (Zahra, 2012).

The democratic coach behavior invites an athlete into the relationship with the coach and gives him or her opportunity to express own needs for help from the coach. Autocratic behavior on the other hand does not give an athlete this opportunity (Moen, 2014). Côté & Gilbert, 2009) asserted that a coach's decision-making style in the relationship with an athlete will clearly affect the adaption of his or her behavior towards this particular athlete. There is a positive and significant relationship between transformational leadership style of coaches and athlete's satisfaction of football players (Saybani et.al.2013). There was a positive relationship between democratic behavior with satisfaction and developmental motivation, social support behavior with satisfaction and progressive motivation and positive feedback behavior with satisfaction and progressive motivation (Kürşat, 2017).

Coaching style of coaches was significantly related to self-determination motivation and burnout of the players and also there is a meaningful relationship between exhaustion and instructed motivation and a motivation as well as the self-determination itself (Farogh et, 2012). There was a significant relationship between the authoritative style of leadership styles with and motivational climate (Younis et.al, 2012). McDonald (2010) asserted that there is positive and significant relationship between leadership behaviors and motivational climate as well as Coaches showed higher training and instruction and democratic behavior.

4. CONCLUSION

This study reports that Coaches democratic leadership style has significant relationship with motivation mainly to know and accomplish their tasks. In most cases, athletes were involved in decision making which has a direct contribution for an increment of motivation level leads to improvement of athletes' running performance. In contrary, autocratic coach leadership style has no significant relationship with athletes' motivation. Because, athletes fear their coach, must obey the order and finish the required task considering that this could depends on athletes' awareness and their courage towards achieving their vision.

5. REFERENCES

- Asres, A. (2007) Coaches' Leadership Style and Motivational Climate of Players in South East Ethiopian National League Foot Ball Clubs. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Sports* www.iiste.org ISSN (Paper) 2312-5187 ISSN (Online) 2312-5179 Vol.16, 2016
- Cote, J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise *International Journal of Sports Science and*

Coaching, 4, pp. 307-322.
doi:10.1260/174795409789623892

- Farogh et. al. (2012). The relationship of coaching style with self-determination motivation and athlete burnout of male karate elite in Iran.
- Haftay E. (2015). The problems of coaching middle distance runners: the case of first division athletics clubs in Addis Ababa City Jowett, S. & Cockerill, I. (2002). Incompatibility in the coach-athlete relationship. Solutions in sport psychology, pp. 16-31.
- IOC (2010). Athletics Achievement in Olympic Game Canada: Mcara printing Ltd.
- Jill. H. and Anthony J. (2003). Perceived Coaching Behaviors and College Athletes' Intrinsic Motivation: A Test of Self-Determination Theory
- Kumar, R. (2011). Research Methodology. First edition. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.
- Kürşat, Y. (2017). The relationship between leadership styles of coaches with the satisfaction and motivation of football players in Trabzon Universities. European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science.
- Luc et al. (1995). New Measure of Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Motivation in Sports MacDonald, D. J. (2010). The Role of Enjoyment, Motivational Climate, and Coach Training in Promoting the Positive Development of Young Athletes. Kinesiology & Health Studies Graduate Theses Queen's Theses and Dissertation.
- Moran, P. (2004). Sport and exercise: A Critical Introduction Rutledge 27 Church Road. 80 pp. motivation.htm
- Peter. N. (2009). Leadership style Self-Assessment Questionnaire. Sage publication
- Saybani et.al. (2013). Athletes' Satisfaction as Mediator of Transformational Leadership Behaviors of Coaches and Football Players' Sport Commitment Relationship. World Applied Sciences Journal 21 (10): pp. 1475-1483.
- Wooden J. R, & Jamison, S. (2005). Wooden on leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Younis M., Shirin Z., & Rasool, H., (2012). The Relationship between leadership styles of coaches with motivational climate of Iranian Elite Male Volleyball Players. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences. 2 (1); ISSN: 2222-6990
- Zahra. R. (2012), Relationship of coach's leadership style and player performance outcomes European Journal of Experimental Biology, 2012, 2 (4): pp. 1134-1136

Corresponding Author

Ayantü Jembere*

Department of Sport Science, College of Natural Science, Jimma University P.O Box 378, Ethiopia