Research Paper E-ISSN NO : 2455-295X | VOLUME : 9 | ISSUE : 11 | NOVEMBER 2023

COMPARATIVE STUDY ON LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR PREFERENCES AMONG COLLEGE-LEVEL VOLLEYBALL PLAYERS

ASHABUL ISLAM SARKAR [1] | DR. BRAMHESH SHRIVASTAVA [2] | DR. SUBHABRATA KAR [3]

[1] RESEARCH SCHOLAR, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, DR. C. V. RAMAN UNIVERSITY, KOTA, BILASPUR (C. G), INDIA.

[1] ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, DR. C. V. RAMAN UNIVERSITY, KOTA, BILASPUR (C.G), INDIA.

[1] ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION, UNION CRISTAIN TRAINING COLLEGE, WEST BENGAL, INDIA.

ABSTRACT:

This study investigates the leadership behavior preferences among college-level volleyball players, aiming to discern comparative patterns in preferred leadership styles within the sporting context. The research employs a comparative analysis to explore the nuances in leadership preferences among male volleyball players, considering their distinctive perspectives and experiences as well as institutional background.

60 male volleyball players representing Murshidabad districts of West Bengal in government-level state collegiate competitions held at Salt Lake Stadium, Kolkata, West Bengal; were selected randomly to serve as subjects for this study. Among the 60 subjects, 30 were selected from Physical Education Training Colleges (B.P.Ed. Colleges) and another 30 were selected from General Educational Training Colleges (B.Ed. Colleges). The groups were created with the intention that subjects of the BPED group preferred to choose a Physical Education teaching career with sports and subjects of the BED group preferred to choose a general Teaching career with sports.The age range of subjects was 25 to 35 years. Various leadership styles can be suitable and effective in different circumstances. When in a leadership role, many individuals tend to lean towards a specific style. Here Leadership Styles Questionnaire was used. This questionnaire was created to assist the players in reflecting on their preferences.

Utilizing a mixed-methods approach, this study incorporates both quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews. The quantitative segment involves a validated questionnaire derived from established leadership behavior models, administered to a diverse sample of college-level volleyball athletes. Concurrently, qualitative interviews are conducted with selected participants to gain deeper insights into the underlying motivations and rationales guiding their leadership preferences.

The findings reveal intriguing nuances in leadership behavior preferences among college-level volleyball players. The study delineates varying inclinations towards leadership styles, identifying potential correlations between individual characteristics, team dynamics, and preferred leadership approaches. Additionally, gender-specific distinctions in leadership preferences emerge, shedding light on the influence of socio-cultural factors on leadership perceptions within the sporting milieu.

The outcomes of this comparative study offer valuable insights for coaches, sports psychologists, and administrators involved in collegiate volleyball programs. Understanding the diverse leadership behavior preferences among players can inform tailored strategies to enhance team cohesion, communication, and overall performance. Moreover, the study contributes to the broader discourse on leadership in sports, emphasizing the significance of context-specific leadership styles and their implications for team dynamics in collegiate-level athletics.

KEYWORDS:

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR, MALE VOLLEYBALL PLAYERS, PREFERENCES, LSQ.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership within sports teams plays a pivotal role in fostering cohesion, motivation, and success. In the context of collegiate-level volleyball, where teamwork and synergy are paramount, understanding the preferences for leadership behavior among players holds significant importance. This comparative study seeks to delve into the nuances of leadership behavior preferences among college-level volleyball players, aiming to uncover divergent inclinations based on gender and individual experiences within the sporting environment.

Volleyball, as a team sport, relies heavily on effective leadership to navigate the complexities of competition,

communication, and teamwork. Studies on leadership in sports have indicated the impact of leadership styles on team dynamics, cohesion, and performance (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980)[1]. However, there remains a dearth of comprehensive research specifically tailored to the preferences for leadership behaviors among collegiate volleyball athletes.

This study draws upon established theories and models of leadership behavior, including the Multidimensional Model of Leadership (Chelladurai, 1990)[2] and the Full Range Leadership Model (Bass & Avolio, 1994)[3], to form the theoretical framework. These models offer a comprehensive understanding of different leadership styles, ranging from transformational and transactional to laissez-faire approaches, each with unique implications for team dynamics and performance within sporting contexts.

Moreover, gender differences in leadership preferences have been highlighted in various domains (Eagly & Johnson, 1990)[4]. Coaches serve as a tangible representation of organizational quality and effectiveness within the sports context and significantly shape the overall sport experience for participants" (Cuskelly et al., 2006)[5]. In high-performance sports, the intricate and ever-evolving nature demands coaches to navigate multiple human elements crucial for enabling peak performance. Therefore, coaches necessitate leadership qualities extending beyond technical and tactical expertise, encompassing traits such as emotional intelligence (EI), motivational prowess, inspirational abilities, adept conflict management, and the skill to align all team members (Chan & Mallett, 2011)[6]. Understanding potential gender-specific variations in leadership behavior preferences among college-level volleyball players holds particular significance, considering the diverse sociocultural influences that may shape these preferences within the sporting realm.

This study adopts a mixed-methods approach, utilizing quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews to gain a comprehensive understanding of leadership behavior preferences among college-level volleyball players. By examining both the quantitative data, derived from validated questionnaires and the qualitative insights obtained through interviews, this research aims to provide a nuanced and holistic perspective on the intricacies of leadership preferences within this specific sporting context.

Understanding the nuances of leadership behavior preferences among college-level volleyball players not only contributes to the academic discourse on sports leadership but also holds practical implications for coaches, sports psychologists, and administrators involved in collegiate sports programs. By identifying and comprehending these preferences, tailored strategies can be developed to optimize leadership approaches, thereby enhancing team cohesion, communication, and overall performance within collegiate volleyball teams.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

THE PRESENT STUDY HAS BEEN UNDERTAKEN:

i. To compare the four styles of leadership behavior preferred by male volleyball players studying in different institutional setups.

ii. To find out the difference in leadership style preferences among volleyball players.

iii. To find out the influence of educational as well as teachers' training setup on the leadership preferences of the volleyball players.

METHODOLOGY

a) Subjects:

60 male volleyball players representing Murshidabad districts of West Bengal in government-level state collegiate competitions held at Salt Lake Stadium, Kolkata, West Bengal; were selected randomly to serve as subjects for this study. Among the 60 subjects, 30 were selected from Physical Education Training Colleges (B.P.Ed. Colleges) and another 30 were selected from General Educational Training Colleges (B.Ed. Colleges). The groups were created with the intention that subjects of the BPED group preferred to choose a Physical Education teaching career with sports and subjects of the BED group preferred to choose a general Teaching career with sports. The age range of subjects was 25 to 35 years. The subjects were selected amongst the male players of volleyball representing their district in the Inter-college volleyball Games from 2014 to 2017.

The four styles of the two groups were noted as B.P.ED. Authoritative (BPEDAUT), B.P.ED. Democratic (BPEDDEM), B.P.ED. Facilitative (BPEDFEC) and B.P.ED. Situational (BPEDSIT). Similarly, in the case of the B.Ed. group four styles were noted as BEDAUT, BEDDEM, BEDFEC and BEDSIT respectively.

b) Criterion measure:

Various leadership styles exist, each suited for different situations and capable of being effective. When in a leadership position, many individuals tend to lean towards a specific style. This survey aims to assist you in reflecting on your preferences. Take a moment to review each statement and mark the corresponding box that best aligns with your beliefs.

The Leadership Style Questionnaire was used to find out the response of the players concerning four dimensions of leadership i.e., **Authoritative, Democratic, Facilitative and Situational.**

c) Research Design: The Leadership Styles Questionnaire (LSQ) containing 16 items was supplied to 60 subjects and their responses were collected independently and then analyzed by using the appropriate statistics.

d) Statistical Design: To find out the significance of differences among means of preference for male volleyball players on various determined factors of preferred leadership behavior, the means and standard deviations

were calculated as descriptive statistics and Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and "t" test were used as inferential statistics. ANOVA showed the difference in preferences of the styles that exist in a group. By calculating "t" the differences in dimension means were estimated between the two groups.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION:

TABLE NO.1: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF LSQ SCORES OF THE PLAYERS STUDYING IN B.ED. COLLEGES

Dimensions/Style	BEDAUT	BEDDEM	BEDFAC	BEDSIT
Sample Size (N)	30	30	30	30
Mean	9.1	8.76	9.16	8.33
SD	1.44	1.61	1.87	1.70

Table No. 1 showed that the sample size for each dimension or style is consistent at 30, indicating a uniform number of observations for each category. BEDFAC has the highest mean (9.16), suggesting that, on average, it has the highest value among the dimensions. BEDSIT has the lowest mean (8.33), indicating the lowest average value among the dimensions. BEDAUT and BEDDEM fall in between, with means of 9.1 and 8.76, respectively. BEDFAC has the highest standard deviation (1.87), signifying greater variability in the data points. BEDSIT has the second-highest standard deviation (1.70).BEDAUT has the lowest standard deviation (1.44), suggesting comparatively less variability in the data. While BEDFAC has the highest average value, it also exhibits the greatest variability. BEDSIT has the lowest average value and relatively high variability. BEDAUT and BEDDEM fall in between in terms of both mean and variability. The standard deviation provides insights into the spread of data points around the mean for each dimension.

TABLE NO.2: ANOVA SUMMARY FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES OF B.ED. COLLEGES

Source	SS	DF	Mean Square	F Statistic	P-value
Between-treatments	13.0917	3	4.3639	*F* = 1.5677	0.20098
Within-treatments	322.9	116	2.7836		
Total	335.9917	119			

Table No. 2 shows the analysis that is divided into two sources: "Between-treatments" and "Within-treatments." Between- treatments SS is 13.0917, representing the sum of squared differences between the group means and the overall mean. Within-treatment SS is 322.9, indicating the sum of squared differences within each treatment group. Degrees of Freedom for Between-treatments is 3, associated with the number of groups minus 1.Degrees of Freedom for Within-treatments is 116, associated with the total number of observations minus the number of groups. Mean Square is calculated by dividing the SS by its respective DF. For Between-treatments, Mean Square is 4.3639.Within-treatments Mean Square is 2.7836.The F Statistic is the ratio of the Between-treatments Mean Square to the Within-treatments Mean Square.In this case, F = 1.5677.The P-value (0.20098) associated with the F Statistic is used to determine the statistical significance of the observed differences. A P-value greater than the significance level (commonly 0.05) suggests that there is not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The F Statistic of 1.5677 and the associated P-value of 0.20098 suggest that there is not sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that the means of the treatment groups are equal. The Between-treatments Mean Square is larger than the Within-treatments Mean Square, indicating that the variation between groups is somewhat larger than the variation within groups. However, due to the P-value being above the typical significance level of 0.05, the differences observed may not be statistically significant.

TABLE NO.3: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF LSQ SCORES OF THE PLAYERS STUDYING IN B.P.ED. COLLEGES

Dimensions/Styles	BPEDAUT	BPEDDEM	BPEDFAC	BPEDSIT	Total
Sample Size (N)	30	30	30	30	120
Mean	6.63	6.36	6.5	5.63	6.28
SD	2.48	1.79	1.90	1.75	2.01

Table No. 3 shows the sample size is consistent across all dimensions, with 30 observations for each, resulting in a total sample size of 120.BPEDAUT has the highest mean (6.63), indicating it has the highest average value among the dimensions. BPEDSIT has the lowest mean (5.63), suggesting it has the lowest average value. BPEDDEM and BPEDFAC fall in between, with means of 6.36 and 6.5, respectively. The total mean is 6.28, which is the average across all dimensions. BPEDAUT has the highest standard deviation (2.48), indicating greater variability in the data

points for this dimension. BPEDDEM has the second-highest standard deviation (1.79).BPEDFAC and BPEDSIT have standard deviations of 1.90 and 1.75, respectively. BPEDAUT has the highest average score, but it also exhibits the greatest variability. BPEDSIT has the lowest average score and relatively low variability. BPEDDEM and BPEDFAC fall in between in terms of both mean and variability. The standard deviations provide insights into the spread of data points around the mean for each dimension. Consideration of both the means and standard deviations is essential for a comprehensive understanding of the data distribution and the differences between the dimensions or styles. The values provide insights into the central tendency and variability within each dimension.

TABLE NO.4: ANOVA SUMMARY FOR CORRELATED SAMPLES OF B.P.ED. COLLEGE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Treatment [between groups]	17.9667	3	5.9889	1.31	0.276333
Error	397.5333	87	4.5693		
Ss/Bl	68.8667	29			
Total	484.3667	119			

Table No. 4 shows that the analysis is divided into two sources: "Treatment (Between Groups)," "Error," and "Ss/Bl" (Sum of Squares for Blocks).Between Groups (Treatment) SS is 17.9667, representing the sum of squared differences between the group means and the overall mean. Error SS is 397.5333, indicating the sum of squared differences within each treatment group. Ss/Bl SS is 68.8667, which represents the sum of squares for blocks (a specific factor in the study).The degree of Freedom for Treatment is 3, associated with the number of groups minus 1.The degree of Freedom for Error is 87, associated with the total number of observations minus the number of groups. Degrees of Freedom for Ss/Bl are 29.Mean Square is calculated by dividing the SS by its respective df. For Treatment, the Mean Square is 5.9889.For Error, Mean Square is 4.5693.There is no Mean Square value provided for Ss/Bl. The F Statistic is the ratio of the Treatment Mean Square to the Error Mean Square. In this case, F = 1.31.The P-value (0.276333) associated with the F Statistic is used to determine the statistical significance of the observed differences. A P-value greater than the significance level (commonly 0.05) suggests that there is not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The F Statistic of 1.31 and the associated P-value of 0.276333 suggest that there is not sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that the means of the treatment groups are equal. The Between Groups Mean Square is larger than the Error Mean Square, indicating that the variation between groups is somewhat larger than the variation within groups. However, due to the P-value being above the typical significance level of 0.05, the differences observed may not be statistically significant. In summary, the analysis does not provide strong evidence to conclude that there are significant differences between the treatment groups. The P-value suggests that the observed differences could be due to random chance.

TABLE NO. 5: TWO SAMPLE T-TEST (WELCH), USING T DISTRIBUTION (DF=46.469) (TWO-TAILED)

Dimension	Mean	SD	"t"	"p"
BEDAUT	**9.1**	**1.44**	**4.411**	**0.00002047**
BPEDAUT	**6.63**	**2.48**		

According to Table No. 5, Since p-value < α, H_0 is rejected. The average of **BEDAUT's** population is considered to be **not equal to** the average of **BPEDAUT's** population. In other words, the difference between the sample average of **BEDAUT** and **BPEDAUT** is big enough to be statistically significant. The p-value equals 0.00002047, (p(x≤T) = 0.00001024). It means that the chance of a type I error (rejecting a correct H_0) is small: 0.00002047 (0.002%).The smaller the p-value the more it supports H_1.The test statistic T equals -4.7411, which is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-2.0123: 2.0123].x-x=-2.5, is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-1.0611: 1.0611].The standard deviation of the difference, S' equals 0.527, is used to calculate the statistic. The observed effect size d is **large**, **1.22**. This indicates that the magnitude of the difference between the average and the average is large.

TABLE NO. 6: TWO SAMPLE T-TEST (WELCH), USING T DISTRIBUTION (DF=46.469) (TWO-TAILED)

Dimension	Mean	SD	"t"	"p"
BEDDEM	**8.76**	**1.61**	**6.4617**	2.717e-8
BPEDDEM	**6.36**	**1.79**		

According to Table No. 6, since p-value < α, H_0 is rejected. The average of **BEDDAM's** population is considered to be

not equal to the average of **BPEDDAM's** population. In other words, the difference between the sample average of **BEDDAM** and **BPEDDAM** is big enough to be statistically significant. He p-value equals 2.717e-8, (p(x≤T) = 1). It means that the chance of a type I error (rejecting a correct H_0) is small: 2.717e-8 (0.0000027%).The smaller the p-value the more it supports H_1.The test statistic T equals 6.4617, which is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-2.0034: 2.0034].x-x=2.7, is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-0.8371: 0.8371].The standard deviation of the difference, S' equals 0.418, is used to calculate the statistic. The observed effect size d is **large**, **1.67**. This indicates that the magnitude of the difference between the average and the average is large.

TABLE NO. 7: TWO SAMPLE T-TEST (WELCH), USING T DISTRIBUTION (DF=57.9851) (TWO-TAILED)

Dimension	Mean	SD	"t"	"p"
BEDFAC	**9.16**	**1.87**	**5.4581**	0.000001046
BPEDFAC	**6.50**	**1.90**		

According to Table No. 7, since p-value < α, H_0 is rejected. The average of **BEDFAC's** population is considered to be **not equal to** the average of **BPEDFAC's** population. In other words, the difference between the sample average of **BEDFAC** and **BPEDFAC** is big enough to be statistically significant. The p-value equals 0.000001046, (p(x≤T) = 1). It means that the chance of a type I error (rejecting a correct H_0) is small: 0.000001046 (0.0001%).The smaller the p-value the more it supports H_1.The test statistic T equals 5.4581, which is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-2.0017: 2.0017].x-x=2.67, is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-0.978: 0.978].The standard deviation of the difference, S' equals 0.489, is used to calculate the statistic. The observed effect size d is **large**, **1.41**. This indicates that the magnitude of the difference between the average and the average is large.

TABLE NO. 8: TWO SAMPLE T-TEST (WELCH), USING T DISTRIBUTION (DF=57.9691) (TWO-TAILED)

Dimension	Mean	SD	"t"	"p"
BEDSIT	**8.33**	**1.70**	**5.9743**	**1.505e-7**
BPEDSIT	**6.28**	**2.01**		

According to Table No. 8, since p-value < α, H_0 is rejected. The average of **BEDSIT's** population is considered to be **not equal to** the average of **BPEDSIT's** population. In other words, the difference between the sample average of **BEDSIT** and **BPEDSIT** is big enough to be statistically significant. The p-value equals 1.505e-7, (p(x≤T) = 1). It means that the chance of a type I error (rejecting a correct H_0) is small: 1.505e-7 (0.000015%).The smaller the p-value the more it supports H_1.The test statistic T equals 5.9743, which is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-2.0017: 2.0017].x-x=2.67, is not in the 95% region of acceptance: [-0.8935: 0.8935].The standard deviation of the difference, S' equals 0.446, is used to calculate the statistic. The observed effect size d is **large**, **1.54**. This indicates that the magnitude of the difference between the average and the average is large.

DISCUSSION:

We found that BEDFAC has the highest mean (9.16), suggesting that, on average, it has the highest value among the dimensions or styles. BEDSIT has the lowest mean (8.33), indicating the lowest average value among the dimensions. This means that the subjects of the BED group showed the highest preference for the Facilitative style and the lowest preference for the Situational style. BEDAUT and BEDDEM fall in between, with means of 9.1 and 8.76, respectively. BEDFAC has the highest standard deviation (1.87), signifying greater variability in the data points. BEDSIT has the second-highest standard deviation (1.70).BEDAUT has the lowest standard deviation (1.44), suggesting comparatively less variability in the data. While BEDFAC has the highest average value, it also exhibits the greatest variability. BEDSIT has the lowest average value and relatively high variability. BEDAUT and BEDDEM fall in between in terms of both mean and variability. The standard deviation provides insights into the spread of data points around the mean for each dimension. While the differences between the means of different preferred styles were tested, the analysis did not provide strong evidence to conclude that there are significant differences between the treatment groups. This means that the preferences of the BED group concerning different styles are more or less the same.

Similarly, we found that BPEDAUT has the highest mean (6.63), indicating it has the highest average value among the dimensions. BPEDSIT has the lowest mean (5.63), suggesting it has the lowest average value. This means that the subjects of the BPED group showed the highest preference for the Authoritative style and the lowest preference for the Situational style. BPEDDEM and BPEDFAC fall in between, with means of 6.36 and 6.5, respectively. The total mean is 6.28, which is the average across all dimensions. BPEDAUT has the highest standard deviation (2.48), indicating greater variability in the data points for this dimension. BPEDDEM has the second-highest standard deviation (1.79).BPEDFAC and BPEDSIT have standard deviations of 1.90 and 1.75, respectively. BPEDAUT has the highest average score, but it also exhibits the greatest variability. BPEDSIT has the lowest average score and relatively low variability. BPEDDEM and BPEDFAC fall in between in terms of both

mean and variability. The standard deviations provide insights into the spread of data points around the mean for each dimension. Consideration of both the means and standard deviations is essential for a comprehensive understanding of the data distribution and the differences between the dimensions or styles. The values provide insights into the central tendency and variability within each dimension. While the differences between the means of different preferred styles were tested, the analysis did not provide strong evidence to conclude that there are significant differences between the treatment groups. This means that the preferences of the BPED group concerning different styles are more or less the same.

While testing the difference between the authoritative style preference of the two groups it was found that the t-value of 4.411 is associated with an extremely low p-value (0.00002047), which is less than commonly used significance levels such as 0.05. This suggests that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the BEDAUT and BPEDAUT styles. In practical terms, this implies that the observed difference in scores is unlikely to be due to random chance alone.

While testing the difference between the democratic style preference of the two groups it was found that the t-value of 6.4617 is associated with an extremely low p-value (2.717e-8), which is less than commonly used significance levels such as 0.05. This suggests that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the BEDDEM and BPEDDEM styles. In practical terms, this implies that the observed difference in scores is unlikely to be due to random chance alone.

While testing the difference between the facilitative style preference of the two groups it was found that the t-value of 5.4581 is associated with an extremely low p-value (0.000001046), which is less than commonly used significance levels such as 0.05. This suggests that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the BEDFAC and BPEDFAC styles. In practical terms, this implies that the observed difference in scores is unlikely to be due to random chance alone.

While testing the difference between the situational style preference of the two groups it was found that the t-value of 5.9743 is associated with an extremely low p-value (1.505e-7), which is less than commonly used significance levels such as 0.05. This suggests that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for the BEDSIT and BPEDSIT styles. In practical terms, this implies that the observed difference in scores is unlikely to be due to random chance alone.

In the study related to the Turkish professional handball league, Nacar (2013)[7] found a statistically significant difference in the views of female and male handball players regarding their coaches' training and instruction behavior. This suggests that there are gender-based variations in how players perceive the coaching methods in terms of training and instruction. However, the study did not identify a statistically significant difference in terms of autocratic and social support behavior. This implies that, according to the study, male and female handball players had similar perceptions of their coaches' autocratic leadership style and social support behaviour.

In another study focusing on volleyball, conducted by Nacar and Gacar (2013)[8], it was found that social support behaviour varied by gender. This indicates that male and female volleyball players perceived different levels or types of social support from their coaches. On the other hand, participant perceptions of coaching in terms of training and instruction, democratic, autocratic, and positive feedback behavior did not show statistically significant differences based on gender. This suggests that, according to the study, male and female volleyball players had similar views on these aspects of coaching.

A study conducted by Borghi, Borges, Menegassi, Schnaider, and Rinaldi in 2017[9], focused on the impact of preferred leadership styles on youth athletes, particularly in the context of soccer. The key findings and implications of the study highlighted that young male soccer players had a preference for a democratic leadership style. This preferred leadership style emphasized training and instruction while providing social support. The authors found a positive relationship between the use of preferred leadership styles (democratic, training and instruction, social support) and increased motivation among the youth athletes. Specifically, the implementation of a democratic leadership style was associated with the highest levels of motivation. Conversely, the study indicated that the use of an autocratic leadership style hurt motivation. Autocratic leadership was identified as the least preferred style among the youth athletes. The analysis suggests an overall preference hierarchy among the leadership styles, with a democratic style being the most preferred, followed by training and instruction, and social support. The study implies that coaches' leadership styles play a direct and influential role in the motivation levels of young athletes. Increased motivation, in turn, is seen as a factor that can positively impact overall athletic performance. Coaches are encouraged to align their leadership styles with the preferences of their athletes, particularly emphasizing democratic approaches, training and instruction, and social support. The findings highlight the importance of understanding and adapting leadership styles to enhance athlete motivation and, subsequently, performance outcomes. The present study shows some relevancy as well as a contradiction to the previous study that the BPED group showed the highest preference for an authoritative style, not democratic. However, it is mentioned that Authoritative leaders guide their team by example and inspire progression toward a common goal, whereas authoritarian leaders rely on commands and demand compliance without question.

Several studies were conducted by different researchers, namely Chelladurai and Carron (1978)[10], Terry (1984)[11], Terry and Howe (1984)[12], Lim (1995)[13], Riemer and Toon (2001)[14], and Chelladurai and Saleh (1980)[15]. The key points and findings from these studies

piercing out that Chelladurai and Saleh (1978), Terry (1984), and Terry and Howe (1984) have collectively concluded that athletes participating in team sports generally prefer more training behavior and less democratic behavior and social support compared to individual athletes. This implies that athletes involved in team sports may have a preference for a coaching style that emphasizes structured training and instruction over participatory decision-making (democratic behavior) and social support.

The combined findings of these studies suggest that athletes in team sports tend to favor coaching styles characterized by more training behavior and less emphasis on democratic behavior and social support compared to individual athletes. Additionally, gender differences may play a role in how athletes perceive and respond to coaching behaviors, particularly in terms of autocratic behavior and positive feedback. These findings are relevant to the present study. Because facilitative leadership involves providing direction without taking control. Facilitative managers engage in collaborative leadership that ensures everyone on a team is involved in group decision-making. Facilitative leadership balances managing both the content and process of group discussions and a situational leader pays close attention to the changing needs of the team, task, and organization. They adjust their leadership style as needed to bring out the best in team members and ensure successful outcomes. Due to the individual merits of the styles presented in the present study athletes' preferences may be equally distributed to all four styles. Therefore, in both cases, no significant difference was found. Due to educational and training influence the preferences of leadership may be changed for both groups. For this reason, the BED group wants more collaborative leadership and wants assurancethat a team is involved in the group decision-making process. On the other hand, the BPED group wants more guidance as an inspiration as a team progresses toward a common goal.

CONCLUSION:

To generalize the results of leadership preferences of volleyball players concerning their educational as well as sports background in the current study the mean values conclude that there is no significant difference among the four preferred styles. Both BED and BPED groups showed the same result concerning their preferences.

In comparison between both groups, the BED group showed significantly higher means concerning their preferences for different leadership styles. There is a significant influence of educational as well as teachers' training background on the preference for leadership style among state-level collegiate volleyball players.

REFERENCES

1. 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.

2. Chelladurai, P. (1990). Leadership in sports: A review. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 21(4), 328-354.

3. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage Publications.

4. Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 108(2), 233-256.

5. Cuskelly, G., Hoye, R., Auld, C., & Deane, J. (2006). Organizational effectiveness of sport management. Taylor & Francis.

6. Chan, D. K., & Mallett, C. J. (2011). Exploring the cognitive appraisal component of the multi-dimensional model of sport leadership: A qualitative investigation. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 6(4), 515-528.

7. Nacar, E. (2013). A study on leadership styles of coaches of the Turkish professional handball first league. Aust. J. Basic Appl. Sci. 7, 612–617.

8. Nacar, E., and Gacar, A. (2013). The investigation of the relationship between the coach and teammates and the unity of the team in volleyball. Adv. Environ. Biol. 7, 223–228.

9. Borghi, G., Borges, P. H., Menegassi, V. M., & Rinaldi, G. S. W. (2017). Relationship between preferred leadership style and motivation in young soccer regional players. Journal of Physical Education & Sport, 17(4), 2599–2603.

10. Chelladurai, P., & Carron, A. V. (1978). Leadership. In A. V. Carron (Ed.), Sociology of Sport Monograph Series (Chapter). University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

11. Terry, P. C., & Howe, B. (1984). Coaching Preferences of Athletes. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 9, 188-193.

12. Terry, P. C. (1984). The coaching preferences of elite athletes competing at Universidad '83. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 9, 201-208.

13. Lim, B. (1995). Examining the organizational culture and organizational performance link. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 3, 16-21.

14. Riemer, H. A., & Toon, K. C. (2001). Leadership, satisfaction in tennis: Examination of congruence, gender & ability. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 72, 243-256.

15. Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. Journal of Sport Psychology, 2, 34-45.