
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Senior High School Athletes' Perception of Coach Leadership Behaviours Based on the Type of Sports

Richard Samuel Kwadwo Abieraba

Faculty of Health, Allied Sciences and Home Economics Education, Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Sports, University of Education, Winneba, Ghana

Corresponding Author: Richard Samuel Kwadwo Abieraba, **E-mail:** abiola674@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine if SHS athletes' perception of coaches' leadership behaviour differed based on the type of sports (i.e., team or individual sports) in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. One hypothesis was generated to guide the research. The study employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey to conduct the research. A sample size of 1,002 respondents was drawn using multi-stage sampling from a population of 16,200 Senior High School Athletes in the Ashanti Region who took part in organised interschool sports competitions during the 2022/2023 academic year. An adapted version of the leadership scale for sports and an adapted version of the athletes' satisfaction questionnaire were the instruments used for the study. Data were analysed using multivariate analysis of variance. Results indicated that the perceived coaches' leadership behaviour by SHS athletes significantly differed across the type of sports ($F(5, 995) = .488, p < .001$). Based on the findings, it is recommended that coaches should solicit athlete feedback on specific competition methods, allow athletes to define their own goals, and allow them to attempt things their own way, even if they make mistakes.

KEYWORDS

Athletes, Individual Sports, Leadership Behaviour, Senior High School, Team Sports, type of sports.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 15 September 2024

PUBLISHED: 04 October 2024

DOI: 10.32996/jspes.2024.4.3.2

1. Introduction

Leadership can be defined as the process of influencing others to achieve group or organizational goals (Northouse, 2021). According to Chelladurai and Riemer (1998), leadership is the most imperative process in any organization or group, and it is responsible for the organization's or team's success or failure. It is a dynamic force in sports, which involves utilizing power and interpersonal ties to shape behavior and performance, ultimately serving organizational objectives (Abieraba, 2024; Ackon, 2012). Effective leadership is crucial in sports, as it significantly influences athletes' performance, motivation, and overall team success (Chelladurai, 2006; Horn, 2008). There exist diverse leadership roles and dynamics for the attainment of general and specific goals in the sports setting. The role of the coach is invaluable in the realization of success for individuals, teams, and the overarching organizational missions.

Coaches play a vital role in shaping athletes' experiences and outcomes, and their leadership behavior is a key factor in determining team dynamics and achievement (Lyle, 2002). The role of coaches in the development of senior high school athletes (SHS) is crucial, as their leadership behaviors can significantly influence athletes' performance, motivation, and overall sports experience (Smith, Smoll, & Cumming, 2007). Coaches are often seen as role models, guiding young athletes through the physical, mental, and social aspects of sports. While research has explored coaches' leadership behavior in various contexts, there is a need to examine how young athletes in senior high school perceive their coaches' leadership behavior, particularly in relation to the type of sport (Kidman & Lombardo, 2010).

Senior high school athletes are at a critical stage of development, both physically and psychologically, and their experiences with coaches can have a lasting impact on their athletic careers and personal growth (Weinberg & Gould, 2015). Research has shown that coaches' leadership behavior influences athlete satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Chelladurai, 2006; Horn, 2008). Specifically, transformational leadership behaviors, such as inspirational motivation and individualized consideration, have been linked to positive athlete outcomes (Lyle, 2002). Moreover, different sports require distinct leadership approaches, and coaches' behavior may vary depending on the sport's requirements, culture, and expectations (Jones et al., 2017).

Leadership behavior in sports has been widely studied, with various frameworks and models developed to analyze the impact of coaches on athletes. One such model is the Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML), which emphasizes the importance of understanding athletes' preferences and perceptions to enhance coach-athlete relationships and improve outcomes (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). According to Chelladurai (2007), effective leadership in sports requires coaches to adapt their behaviors to meet the specific demands of different sports and the individual needs of athletes. Research has shown that leadership behaviors perceived by athletes can vary significantly based on several factors, including the level of competition, gender, and cultural background (Jowett & Chaundy, 2004; Vella, Oades, & Crowe, 2011). However, it is not clear whether athletes' perceptions of their coaches' leadership behaviors differ based on the type of sport they engage in at the high school level in Ashanti. This study aims to fill this gap by examining senior high school athletes' perceptions of their coaches' leadership behaviors across various sports. The hypothesis tested is that senior high school athletes' perceived leadership behavior of coaches will not differ based on the type of sports the athletes engage in.

Understanding the nuances of coach-athlete relationships in different sports is essential for developing effective coaching practices. Previous studies have highlighted the importance of specific leadership behaviors, such as providing social support, positive feedback, and democratic decision-making, in enhancing athletes' satisfaction and performance (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Horn, 2008). By investigating whether these perceptions vary across sports, this research can offer insights into whether a one-size-fits-all approach to coaching is adequate or if sport-specific adjustments are necessary. Moreover, examining the consistency of perceived leadership behaviors across sports can contribute to the broader field of sports management and psychology by providing evidence on the generalizability of leadership models. It can also inform coach education programs, emphasizing the need for training that addresses the diverse demands of different sports. Ultimately, this research can help in developing more tailored and effective coaching strategies that foster positive athletic experiences and outcomes for high school athletes.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The relationship between coach leadership behaviors and athlete perceptions has been a critical area of study in sports psychology and management. However, there is limited understanding of how these perceptions might vary based on the type of sport, particularly among senior high school athletes in Ghana. This gap is significant because the leadership behavior of coaches can profoundly influence athletes' motivation, performance, and overall sports experience (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Horn, 2002). Understanding these perceptions can help tailor coaching strategies to meet the specific needs of athletes in different sports, thereby enhancing athletic development and satisfaction in Ghana (Abieraba, 2024).

Existing literature indicates that coach leadership behaviors, such as democratic, autocratic, and social support, impact athletes' satisfaction and performances differently (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Jowett & Ntoumanis, 2004). However, there is a paucity of research that specifically addresses how these perceptions differ among athletes participating in various types of sports, such as individual versus team sports or contact versus non-contact sports in Ghana. This distinction is crucial as the dynamics and demands of different sports can influence what athletes value and expect from their coaches (Horn, 2002; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995).

Given the developmental stage of senior high school athletes in Ghana, who are often at a critical juncture in their athletic careers, it is essential to examine their perceptions of coach leadership behaviors in greater depth (Abieraba, 2024). This study aims to fill this gap by investigating how senior high school athletes perceive their coaches' leadership behaviors based on the type of sport they participate in. The findings will provide valuable insights for managers, coaches, athletic directors, and sports psychologists to develop more effective and sport-specific leadership approaches.

1.3 Purpose of the study

To examine if SHS athletes' perception of coaches' leadership behavior differed based on the type of sports (i.e., team or individual sports).

1.4 Research Hypothesis

SHS athletes' perceived leadership behavior of coaches will not differ based on the type of sports the athletes engaged in.

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Design

This study employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey design to investigate the differences in senior high school athletes' perceptions of their coaches' leadership behaviors based on the type of sports. A quantitative approach was used to collect data from a sample of athletes participating in various sports such as volleyball, football, netball, badminton, track and field, field hockey, table tennis, handball, and basketball, allowing for a comprehensive examination of the relationship between sports type and perceived coaching leadership behaviors.

2.2 Study Participants

A sample size of 1,002 respondents (501 males and 501 females) was selected from the Ashanti Regional inter-school sports competition held in the 2022/2023 academic year. The 1,002 student athletes were selected from 50 out of 162 SHS in Ashanti Region that participate in inter-school sports and games competitions. Fifty (50) out of 162 SHS were selected because the study is a survey and, therefore, needs to measure a wide range of data from the population, as suggested by Kuranchie (2021). Equal subjects (males and females) were selected on the basis that the same number of males and females were selected to partake in all the sports events. The schools were grouped into five (5) zones. One hundred and fifty-seven (157) females' schools had 501 respondents; therefore, using simple proportion, 31 females' schools in zone one was $\frac{31 \times 501}{157} = 98.9$. This means 99 respondents from zone one were from females' schools. The same was used to calculate the rest of the female schools and the male schools. Simple proportion was used in order to obtain a proportional representation of athletes from each zone. One hundred and sixty-two SHS in the Ashanti Region were put into five subgroups (strata) called zones with a stratified sampling technique. Ten (10) schools were selected from each zone using fish bowl approach of simple random sampling. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2009), stratified sampling increases the possibility of representativeness and nearly ensures that key features of persons in the population are represented in the same proportions in the sample. It was employed to choose the athletes. The population was heterogeneous; therefore, stratified sampling was used to ensure that all subgroups were represented in the sample. For instance, in this study, there was the need for equal representation of zones, males and females, high and low performers (in terms of those who qualify or not for athletics super zonal or from group stages of various games), and schools. After stratifying the athletes into strata to ensure equal representation of the above categories, each athlete in the schools from the zones was given the opportunity to be chosen for the study by selecting a label "yes" or "no" using the fish bowl method of simple random sampling. Those who said yes were randomly selected for the study. To ensure that all affiliates of the various strata had the same chance of being chosen, simple random sampling was used (Creswell, 2014). The participants were between the ages of 15- 20 years.

2.3 Data Collection

Chelladurai and Saleh's Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) and Chelladurai and Riemer's athletes' satisfaction questionnaire (ASQ)

Chelladurai and Saleh's Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) and Chelladurai and Riemer's athletes' satisfaction questionnaire were used in the study. The demographic questions made up the first section of the questionnaire (Age, sex, school, zone, class, and discipline). The second component of the questionnaire was based on Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) adapted version of LSS, while the third section was based on an adapted version of ASQ (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

An adapted version of the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) was used to determine the leadership practices of coaches (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The LSS is founded on the Multidimensional Leadership Model (MML). When attempting to comprehend the conclusions of studies in the sports field, the MML is frequently used (Chelladurai, 1984). The LSS, established by Chelladurai and Saleh (1980), is widely regarded as one of the most comprehensive methods of sports leadership research. The LSS evaluates athletes' impressions of their coach, preferred leadership behavior, and coaches' perceptions about themselves, and it has three components (Whalley, 2003). Only the athletes' perceived leadership behavior was adapted from the three facets of the LSS for the purpose of this study.

The original LSS is divided into five (5) subscales that assess a coach's decision-making style (Democratic and Autocratic), motivating tendencies (Social support and Positive feedback), and instructional behavior (Training and Instruction). Two of the five dimensions of leadership behavior are training and instruction (13 items). This aims to increase an athlete's performance by accentuating and facilitating hard and demanding training, teaching them about the sport's talents, methods, and strategies, defining team affiliates' relationships, and structuring and controlling the team's operations Vaughan (2017), democratic conduct (9 items). This gave athletes more voice in team goals, practice methods, and game strategies and plans, as well as autocratic conduct Driscoll (2000) and autocratic behavior (5 items). This includes coaching behavior that stresses personal power and independence in decision-making Moen, Hoigaard and Peter (2014), as well as social support behavior (8 items) which describes coaching behavior that prioritizes the well-being of specific athletes, a positive group climate, and interpersonal relationships with

teammates Moen, Hoigaard and Peter (2014) and positive feedback (5 items) - refers to the coaching behaviors that use acknowledgment and rewards to promote positive performance (Vaughan, 2017).

On a five-point Likert scale, the questionnaire comprised 40 items: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (undecided), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree) (strongly agree). Twenty-nine (29) of the forty (40) items were adapted or modified to suit the subjects in this study. Alpha values as measures of internal consistency were reported as markers of the LSS's reliability from athletes' perceived leadership in a study of Canadian athletes (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). Training and Instruction received a 0.93, Democratic Behavior 0.87, Autocratic Behavior 0.59, Social Support 0.86, and Positive Feedback 0.92. The above values are much higher than the 0.70 suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) to be good for collecting data with the exception of autocratic behavior. Over the past 40 years the LSS has been slightly adapted by sports leadership researchers, though the major themes remain constant. Both the theory and tool are believed to be reliable and have strong validity Duda (1998). The LSS and its variety of different approaches, the Revised Leadership Scale for Sport (RLSS), have been used in a number of studies, though there are several inconsistencies that have been recognized and documented by researchers who use the tools (Whalley, 2003). Few words were modified to suit the subjects apart from the 29 out of 40 items chosen for this study. For example, the season was changed to interschool and colleges season.

Athlete satisfaction was measured using a modified version of Riemer and Chelladurai's Athletes Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ). The Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) is a 56-item survey that includes 15 gratification categories for athletes. Some of the subscales include individual performance (3 items), team performance (3 items), Ability utilization (5 items), tactic (6 items), personal treatment (5 items), training and instruction (3 items), team duty involvement (3 items), team social contribution (3 items), ethics (3 items), team amalgamation (4 items), personal dedication (4 items), budget (3 items), medical personnel (4 items), academic backing services (3 items), and outside agent (4 items). The ASQ is a 7-point Likert scale that was modified for this study to a 5-point Likert scale. ASQ covers important aspects of sports involvement, performance (individual and team), leadership, team, organization, and athlete (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). Internal validity and reliability are assumed to exist. For the facets to be measured, the internal consistency coefficients Cronbach's alpha is 0.92 for ability utilization, 0.94 for strategy, 0.92 for personal treatment, 0.85 for individual performance, and 0.95 for team performance.

The above values are much higher than the 0.70 suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) to be good for collecting data. The 5-point Likert scale differs slightly from the original ASQ. The original ASQ was based on a 7-point Likert scale, but in order to reduce confusion for athletes, it was adapted to a 5- Likert scale to match the RLSS (Whalley, 2003). The following is how the ASQ is graded: 'Not at all satisfied' is number 1. 2'satisfied to a degree' 3'satisfied in a reasonable way' 4 'extremely satisfied,' 5 'very satisfied.' To conceptualize coach leadership behavior, twenty-one (21) items of the fifty-six (56) items and also five (5) of the fifteen (15) subscales were adapted for this study. In all, 50- an item questionnaire was formulated.

The 50-item questionnaire was identified as follows: Training and instruction were scored by items 4,9,18,22 and 28; items 2,8,13,23, and 26 all scored autocratic behavior of the coach from the LSS; items 5,11,16,21,25 and 27 scored social support behavior of the coach from the LSS and items 1,6,10,12,15,17 and 20 all scored democratic behavior of the coach from the LSS, and positive feedback behavior was scored by items 3,7,14,19,24 and 29. The third section measured athletes' satisfaction and performance, which was splited into five separate sub-sections. These were ability utilization, which was measured in items 30,37,41,45, and 48; Strategy, which was measured in items 34,39,42,46, and 49; items 33,38,43,47, and 50, which measured personal treatment. Items 31,35 and 40 measured individual performance, and Team performance was measured by items 32,36 and 44.

For easy interpretation of the instrument used for the study, a Mean score greater than three (3) was perceived largely by student-athletes, whilst a Mean score less than three (3) was perceived as not utilized. The two extreme options for the ASQ were collapsed for meaningful interpretation. For example, not at all satisfied and slightly satisfied merged as not satisfied and very satisfied, and extremely satisfied as satisfied. The higher the mean value on a dimension, the more it was perceived. For instance, 1 to 2.4 was not satisfied, 2.5 to 3.4 was moderately satisfied, and greater than 3.5 was satisfied.

2.4 Procedure

Ethical standards were applied in the conduct of the study before distributing the questionnaire. The researcher requested endorsement from the University of Cape Coast's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Before any data was collected, permission was obtained from UCC's IRB. The study's main data collection tool was a questionnaire. This information was gathered from student athletes in SHS Ashanti Region Ghana. A letter of introduction from the Head of Department Health, Physical Education and Recreation (HPER) and IRB, UCC, was addressed to the Regional P.E. Coordinator and forwarded to the heads of the sampled schools to give easy access to the student athletes.

The researcher was in charge of administering the questionnaire. Two research assistants were trained to assist with the distribution of the questionnaires. Four (4) days were used to train the assistants. The researcher explained thoroughly all fifty (50) items of the questionnaire to the assistants. They asked questions that were answered carefully and correctly to avoid any misunderstanding. These assistants were taken through how to administer the questionnaire to the extent that even in the absence of the researcher, they could administer it on their own. The assistants helped to prevent students from discussing and providing identical responses and also helped to promptly collect the completed questionnaires. Consequently, all the questionnaires were retrieved the same day after the student athletes had completed them. It took students 25 to 30 minutes to respond to the questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered within three months, from 15th August 2023 to 15th November 2023.

2.5 Data analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was used to process the data. To evaluate the data, the researcher employed one-way MANOVA to test the hypothesis. The study's hypothesis was to see if the leadership behavior of SHS coaches differed depending on the type of sport the athletes were participating in (team sports or individual sports).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Preliminary Data Screening

Assumptions underlying the use of MANOVA, such as multivariate normality, multivariate outliers, and linearity, were tested and verified using the Q-Q plots, mahalanobis distance analysis, and scatter plot matrix.

The results of the multivariate test for the MANOVA are shown in Table 1

Table 14: Multivariate Tests and Box Test Results

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	.991	20796.52	5	995	.000
		3			
Type of sports	.065	13.904	5	995	.000

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices	
Box's M	68.523
F	4.539
df1	15
df2	1746755.062
Sig.	.000

Source: Field data, 2023
*significant at $p < .05$

The analysis outcomes in Table 1 displayed that the box test of parity of covariance matrices assumption was violated, $F(15, 1746755.062) = 4.539, p < .001$. Based on this violation, the Pillai's Trace estimates were presented for the main results of the MANOVA. The multivariate results in Table 14 further revealed that the perceived coaches' leadership behavior by SHS athletes significantly differed across the type of sports (team or individual), $F(5, 995) = .488, p < .001$.

The outcomes of the univariate analysis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Based on the Type of Sports

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Intercept	Positive feedback	18030.02	1	63054.12	.000
	Democratic behavior	11153.76	1	17097.69	.000
	Training and Instruction	17823.80	1	67676.62	.000
	Autocratic behavior	6602.75	1	9382.80	.000
	Social support	15242.51	1	27011.90	.000
Type of sports	Positive feedback	.11	1	.39	.530
	Democratic behavior	34.56	1	52.98	.000*
	Training and Instruction	.33	1	1.24	.266
	Autocratic behavior	6.00	1	8.52	.004*
	Social support	.29	1	.52	.471
Error	Positive feedback	285.66	999		
	Democratic behavior	651.70	999		
	Training and Instruction	263.10	999		
	Autocratic behavior	703.00	999		
	Social support	563.72	999		
Total	Positive feedback	20846.56	1001		
	Democratic behavior	13881.10	1001		
	Training and Instruction	20493.20	1001		
	Autocratic behavior	8384.20	1001		
	Social support	17968.89	1001		

Source: Field data, 2023

*significant at $p \leq .010$

The outcomes showed differences in perceived democratic ($F(1, 999)=59.98, p<.001$) and perceived autocratic ($F(1, 999)=8.52, p=.004$) leadership behaviors on the basis of type of sports. That is, the SHS athletes reported different levels of perceived democratic leadership to those involved in team sports and to those involved in individual sports. As perceived by athletes participating in team and individual sports, there were no noteworthy differences in coaches' positive feedback, training and instruction, or social support leadership behaviors.

Further analysis was conducted to understand the actual differences in perceived coaches' leadership behaviors with regard to athletes across types of sports, especially for the dimensions that showed significant differences. The details of the post hoc are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics (follow-up)

Variables	Type of Sport	Mean	SD
Positive feedback	Individual sports	4.52	.57
	Team sports	4.54	.52
	Total	4.53	.53
Democratic behavior	Individual sports	3.76	.76
	Team sports	3.36	.90
	Total	3.63	.83
Training and Instruction	Individual sports	4.52	.47
	Team sports	4.48	.53
	Total	4.50	.51
Autocratic behavior	Individual sports	2.66	.76
	Team sports	2.82	.87
	Total	2.77	.84
Social Support	Individual sports	4.15	.80
	Team sports	4.18	.72
	Total	4.17	.75

Source: Field data, 2023

The follow-up consequences, shown in Table 3, revealed that athletes from individual sports perceived their coaches to have exhibited more democratic leadership behaviors with a higher mean value ($M=3.76$, $SD=.76$) compared to athletes involved in team sports ($M=3.36$, $SD=.90$). Further, coaches were perceived to have displayed more autocratic leadership behaviors to athletes involved in team sports ($M=2.82$, $SD=.87$) compared to athletes involved in individual sports ($M=2.66$, $SD=.76$)

3.2 Discussion

The significance of sport type is important in clarifying the relationship between coaching specific behaviors (Baker, 2003). SHS athletes' perceptions of coaches' leadership behavior varied depending on the sport (individual or team sports). The discoveries revealed that athletes in individual sports perceived coaches exhibited more democratic leadership behaviors than athletes in team sports. This could have been a result of the fact that the coaches of the individual sports tend to offer regular feedback and recognise athletes' contributions and achievements. Coaches in team sports were assessed to have demonstrated more authoritarian leadership characteristics than coaches in individual sports, according to this study. Previous studies (Chelladurai, 1978; Weiss & Friedrichs, 1986) yielded comparable results. For example, Terry and Howe (1984) discovered that athletes with a history in individual sports reported more democratic and less autocratic behavior than team sport athletes. Team sport athletes, according to Terry (1984), perceived more training and instruction, authoritarian behavior, and positive feedback but less democratic behavior and social support than individual sport athletes. These outcomes indicate that coaches of individual sports solicited their athletes' opinions and took collective decisions with them, permitted athletes to set their own goals, obtained their consent on important matters before proceeding, gave credit where credit was due, heartfelt gratitude when their athletes performed well, and complimented athletes in front of others on good performance (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1978). A similar study from Ragogna (2017) indicated that individual sports athletes perceived their coaches to be more democratic than team sport athletes. Individual sports athletes who saw their coaches as very democratic and socially supportive indicated high levels of contentment with leadership (Schiesman, 1987). Coaches in team sports were found to be more dictatorial and less democratic than those in individual sports (Enoksen, Fahlstrom, Johansen, Hageskog, Christensen & Hoigaard, 2014). The perceived leadership behavior exhibited by the coaches can be influenced by the coach's underlying philosophy and values. For instance, a coach who emphasizes teamwork, mutual respect, and athletes' development is more likely to be perceived as democratic. Conversely, a focus on strict adherence to rules and directives may be perceived as autocratic.

3.3 Practical Implication of Findings

Perceived coaches' leadership behavior by SHS athletes differed across the type of sport (individual or team sport). The implication is that coaches' leadership behavioral tendencies should mirror the type of sport they handle. For example, task characteristics from the motor control and learning perspective indicate that there are unique peculiarities (e.g., cyclical, acyclical, close-open, interactive) associated with individuals and teams. Therefore, coaches handling athletes should bear in mind that although athletes could be playing together in teams, they come as individual persons and must be treated as such.

4. Conclusion

The athletes' perception that their coaches exhibited more democratic leadership behavior to athletes involved in individual sports and exhibition of autocratic leadership behavior to those in team sports is evidence that coaches do not want to spend too much time listening to the opinions of various athletes which can affect the time for practice and play and also, coaches' leadership behavioral tendencies should mirror the type of sport they handle.

4.1 Recommendation

Individual athletes viewed their coaches in individual sports as more democratic leaders than those in team sports in the region. As a result, coaches should solicit athlete feedback on specific competition methods, allow athletes to define their own goals, and allow them to attempt things their own way, even if they make mistakes.

4.2 Study Limitations

The study experienced some limitations. The descriptive cross-sectional survey design captures data at a single point in time. This limits the ability to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between athletes' perceived leadership behaviour and the type of sports. A longitudinal study could provide insights into how athletes' perceptions evolved over time. The data collection was self-reported; therefore, participants could be biased. For instance, based on social desirability, they may answer in a way they think is more socially acceptable than being entirely truthful and factual. The study did not account for external factors such as quality of coaching, cultural differences, or the school environment, which could significantly influence leadership behaviours in both individual and team sports.

4.3 Suggestions for Future Research

Future studies could, therefore, adopt a longitudinal approach to observe how athletes' perceptions of leadership behaviours evolved over time, especially as they transition between different levels of competition. Also, incorporating qualitative methods such as interviews or focus group discussions could provide deeper insights into specific reasons behind the athletes' perceptions of leadership behaviour in individual versus team sports.

Funding: This study received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

ORCID Id: 0009-0000-0843-3845.

References

- [1] Abieraba, R. S. K. (2024). Senior high school athletes' perception of coach's leadership behaviour in terms of sex. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 21(2), 1116–1126. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.2.0537>
- [2] Ackon, J. K. (2012). *Survey into Leadership Styles of Principals in the Nurses Training Colleges in the Central Region* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of Cape Coast.
- [3] Aleksic-Veljkovic, A., Djurovic, D., Dimic, I., Mujanovic, R., & Markovic, K. Z. (2016). College Athletes' Perceptions Of Coaching Behaviours: Differences Between Individual And Team Sports. *Baltic Journal of Sport and Health Sciences*, 2(101), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.33607/bjshs.v2i101.57>
- [4] Baker, J. (2003). Coach behaviours and athletes satisfaction in team and individual sports. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 34, 226–239
- [5] Chelladurai, P. (1978). *A contingency model of leadership in athletics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Management Sciences, University of Waterloo, Canada.
- [6] Chelladurai, P. (1984). Discrepancy Between Preferences and Perceptions of Leadership Behavior and Satisfaction of Athletes in Varying Sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6(1), 27–41. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.6.1.27>
- [7] Chelladurai, P. (2006). *Human resource management in sport and recreation*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- [8] Chelladurai, P. (2007). Leadership in Sports. In *Handbook of Sport Psychology* (pp. 113–135). John Wiley & Sons.
- [9] Chelladurai, P., & Riemer, H. A. (1998). Measurement of leadership in sport. In *Advances in Sport and Exercise Psychology Measurement*. Fitness Information Technology.
- [10] Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of Leader Behavior in Sports: Development of a Leadership Scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.2.1.34>
- [11] Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. P. (1978). Preferred leadership in sport. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 3, 85–92
- [12] Côté, J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An Integrative Definition of Coaching Effectiveness and Expertise. *International Journal of Sports Science &*

- Coaching*, 4(3), 307–323. <https://doi.org/10.1260/174795409789623892>
- [13] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.
- [14] Driscoll, D. L. (2000). Coaching style preferences of soccer athletes in successful Division III college teams. Unpublished thesis, Ithaca College Paper 75
- [15] Duda, J. L. (1998). *Advances in Sport and Exercise Psychology Measurement*. Fitness Information Technology.
- [16] Enoksen, E., Johansen, B. T., Hageskog, C.-A., Christensen, J. B., & Høigaard, R. (2014). Perceptions of leadership behavior and the relationship to athletes among Scandinavian coaches. *Handle.net*, 5, 131–147. <https://doi.org/2000-088X>
- [17] Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (7th ed.). Mcgraw-Hill Higher Education.
- [18] Horn, T. S. (2002). *Advances in Sport Psychology* (2nd ed.). Human Kinetics.
- [19] Horn, T. S. (2008b). Coaching effectiveness in the sport domain. In *Advances in Sport Psychology* (pp. 239–267). Champaign, IL; Human Kinetics.
- [20] Jin, H., Kim, S., Love, A., Jin, Y., & Zhao, J. (2022). Effects of leadership style on coach-athlete relationship, athletes' motivations, and athlete satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1012953>
- [21] Jowett, S., & Chaundy, V. (2004). An Investigation Into the Impact of Coach Leadership and Coach-Athlete Relationship on Group Cohesion. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 8(4), 302–311. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.8.4.302>
- [22] Jowett, S., & Ntoumanis, N. (2004). The Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q): development and initial validation. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 14(4), 245–257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0838.2003.00338.x>
- [23] Kuranchie, A. (2021). Research made easy. Kumasi: Bookworm Publications
- [24] Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches' Behaviour*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203994986>
- [25] Moen, F., Høigaard, R., & Peters, D. M. (2014). Performance Progress and Leadership Behavior. *Worc.ac.uk*, 8(1). ISSN 1975-8286. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7873-7737>
- [26] Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. (9th ed.). Sage Publications Inc.
- [27] Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). Tata Mcgraw-Hill Ed.
- [28] Ragogna, M. (2017). *Exploring youth athletes preferred leadership styles and behaviours of sports coaches*. Unpublished master 's thesis. Brock University. St. Catharines, Ontario
- [29] Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1995). Leadership and Satisfaction in Athletics. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(3), 276–293. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.17.3.276>
- [30] Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ). *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20(2), 127–156. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.20.2.127>
- [31] Schliesman, E. S. (1987). Relationship between the congruence of preferred and actual leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with leadership. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 10(3), 157.
- [32] Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Cumming, S. P. (2007). Effects of a Motivational Climate Intervention for Coaches on Young Athletes' Sport Performance Anxiety. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 29(1), 39–59. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.29.1.39>
- [33] Terry, P. C. (1984). The coaching preferences of elite athletes competing at Universiade '83. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 9(4), 201–208. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/16670060_The_coaching_preferences_of_elite_athletes_competing_at_Universiade_'83
- [34] Terry, P. C., & Howe, B. L. (1984). The Coaching Preferences of Athletes. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 9(4), 188–193. [pmid:%206525751](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/206525751/)
- [35] Vaughan, R. S. (2017). Measuring leadership in sport coaching. In *Measuring Leadership in Sport* (pp. 211–227). Routledge.
- [36] Vella, S., Oades, L., & Crowe, T. (2011). The Role of the Coach in Facilitating Positive Youth Development: Moving from Theory to Practice. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 23(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2010.511423>
- [37] Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (2015). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology* (6th ed.). Human Kinetics.
- [38] Weiss, M. R., & Friedrichs, W. D. (1986). The Influence of Leader Behaviors, Coach Attributes, and Institutional Variables on Performance and Satisfaction of Collegiate Basketball Teams. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8(4), 332–346. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.8.4.332>
- [39] Whalley, C. M. (2003). A study of the relationship between coaches styles and athletes satisfaction of young soccer players. Unpublished Master's thesis. Mercyhurst College, U.S.A