

# Innovations

## Comparative Analysis of Sports Management Practices and Coaching Leadership Styles of Premier League Football Clubs in Ethiopia

Dr. Biruk Hundito

Assistant Professor in Sports Managements and Leadership  
Wachemo University, College of Natural and Computational Sciences  
Department of sports sciences

---

**Abstract:** *The major purpose of this study was to investigate the Comparative Analysis of sports Management Practices and Coaching Leadership styles of premier league football clubs in Ethiopia. To this end, descriptive survey method (comparative analysis) was employed. The data collected by Questionnaires from selected football club players and coaching /management staff. The target population of this study was all 14 Ethiopian primer league football club players and coaching/ management staff. Based on Ethiopian football federation rules and regulations 25 players registered for one-year computation 25x14(N=350) and coaching/management staff. The researcher selected only 4(28.57%) top two and bottom two clubs from 2015/2016 computation year by using purposive sampling techniques. The total number of participants in this study was 4x25(N=100) players . The research applied for this study was a quantitative approach in nature. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data depending on the nature of the basic research questions, appropriate statistical techniques such as Independent-samples T-test were used for data analysis. The study to explore and focused on the comparative analysis between selected research variables. The level of significance is set at 0.05 alpha levels. The researcher assumption/hypothesis of this study was: There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices, perceive and prefer coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia Finally, the study findings were indicated that: There was no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices and preferred coaching leadership behaviour but there was significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour.*

**Key Words:** *Sports management, coaching leadership style.*

---

### Introduction

Sports management is a field of education concerning the business aspects of sports and recreation. some examples of sport management includes the front office system in professional managers, recreational sport managers, sport marketing, event management, sport economics, sport finance management, sport personnel management, sport facility management, sport equipment management, organizational structure, sport policy management, public relation services and sports information etc. (From Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia) Sports organizational management involves any combination of skills related to planning, organizing, directing, controlling, budgeting, leading, and evaluating within the context of an organization.

Yukl (1989) emphasized the concept of leadership mentioning that "the study of leadership has been an important and central part of the literature of management and organization behavior for several decades". Some researchers argued that leadership has an identifiable set of skills and practices that are available to all people (Kouzes& Posner, 2007). They explained leadership as a relationship between those who want to lead and those who decide to follow. Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) provided a more elaborate definition describing leadership as a process of influencing the task objectives and strategies of a group or organization, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of organizations.

Leadership can also be defined in terms of the focus for group process, personality, and its effects, a

behavior or act, a form of persuasion, an emerging effect of interaction, a differentiated role, and the initiation of.

Structure More specifically in sport, Chelladurai and Riemer (1998) mentioned that leadership research in sport has been sparse and sporadic. In fact, the majority of leadership research in sport has focused on coaches because they are typically the one responsible for making final decisions regarding significant team matters. Weese (1994) recognized that leadership had become the most popular subject in the sport/fitness industries. Weese (1994) found out there were about 7,500 documents on leadership in Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership (1974). The importance of effective leadership has been cited by athletes and coaches as a vital component of achievement and athlete satisfaction (Chelladurai&Riemer, 1998). They argued that, up to that point, most sports leadership research focused on coaching effectiveness by identifying their personality traits, behavioral attributes, and situational determinants.

Leadership is an acritical component to enhance and sustain optimal sports performance (Chelladurai&Riemer, 1998). A coach is typically responsible for making final decisions on the subject of several team matters, such as strategy, tactics and team personnel (Eys, 2003).The Coaches those immediate supervisors and top-level administrators provide helps Athletes recognize their roles, performance prospect, and connection to sport organizational goals and reward systems. In addition, good leadership enhances players' personal growth and development, motivation, performance, and satisfaction. Therefore, managers or coaches need to have a clear understanding of the dynamics of leadership within sports organizations (Chelladurai, 1999).The most important success factor of a coach is to help athletes to improve their athletic skill in a wide range of tasks from sequential development and mastery of fundamental skills, to the additional particular physical, technical, tactical and psychological training. From a theoretical and a practical standpoint of sport organizational management and coaching leadership, it is important to examine many issues that relate sports organizational management, coach's behaviour and leadership style that influence team success. Understanding the factors that are related to coaching leadership styles greater in elite sport is a most important goal of sports management research. To investigate peak performances in sport, researchers have focused on understanding the factors that break off in to increase team success. From sports management, leadership style, and team success research, it is widely recognized that an athlete's psychological state, based on mental preparation and team success, is a contributing factor (Eklund, 1994a, 1994b; Mahoney, Gabriel, & Perkins, 1987).

An important factor identified by researchers, in the pursuit of peak athletic Performance is the influence of sports managers and coaches' leadership styles. In particular, coaches are perceived to be central figures in all aspects of athlete's career's, as well as in training and competition (Lyle, 2002). Coaches are perceived to have a significant influence on all aspects of players' preparations for competition and in determining players' achievement and development (Durand-Bush & Salmela, 2002).The relationship between sports management, coach and athlete is critical to success in elite sport and is viewed as being related to athletes' psychological development and mental preparation.

In many sports, coaches work very closely with athletes immediately prior to Performance. In particular, coaches aim to get athletes physically and mentally ready to perform at their best. The high number of interactions between coach and athlete, at training as well as before, during, and after competition means that coaches are often in a central position to influence athletes' preparations, including their psychological state or more specifically their mental readiness. Indeed, researchers have argued that the sports manager and coach are essential to athletic preparations across all aspects of an athlete's career, including preparations on the day of the performance (Bloom, 1996; Salmela, Trudel et al., 1995; Cote, Salmela, & Russell, 1995a). Furthermore, researchers have shown that coaches are also perceived as being performers in their own right and their performance at competitions can directly influence athletes' satisfaction, in either a positive or negative manner (Gould, Guinan, Greenleaf, Medbery, & Peterson, 1999).

Before a coach determines his leadership style, he must pay attention to some criterions. Chelladurai and Carron (1974) found that prominent players are more concerned with coach's knowledge level than

establishing personal contacts. However, young and unskilled players need more understanding and emotions. Sports organizational Management and coaching leadership are directly linked for important of player performance and organizational development. That means sports organizational management practice like finance, personnel, equipment, facility, organizational structure, sports policy and public relation reflected in coaching leadership. Without sports organizational management practice not achieve and going coaching works effectively.

**Objectives of the Study**

To investigate comparative analysis of sports management practices and coaching leadership styles of premier league football clubs in Ethiopia.

**Materials and Methods**

To Purpose of the study was to investigate comparative analysis of sports management practices and coaching leadership styles of premier league football clubs in Ethiopia. Comparative analysis applied for this study was a quantitative method in nature. The data collected by Questionnaires. The survey was cross-sectional in nature and a standardized questionnaire was used to collect the data from the respondents. The measurement scale on each variable is adopted from the different study, modified to suit the research objectives; and measured on five points Likert scale. The total number of participants in this study was 4x25(N=100) players. The researcher selected by using purposive sampling techniques 100 employers from selected players. After data were collected, the analysed by SPSS Software (Version 26). Such as Independent-samples T-test for the comparison of each variable mean deference of the major variables. To conduct this research, as well as to collect data and information about the selected variables. The items are assigned a score between 1 and 5 (1= Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). The questionnaire was administered on 100 subjects club club player. The level of significance is set at 0.05 alpha levels.

**Results**

**Table 1: Independent samples T-Test comparison between top two and Bottom two club players towards sports organizational management practices.**

Sports Organizational Management Practice	Name of the clubs	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Financial Management	Top two	50	26.64	4.576	1.226	48	0.282
	Bottom two	50	23.41	11.705			
Personnel Management	Top two	50	25.42	6.291	1.701	48	0.214
	Bottom two	50	23.58	7.408			
Facility Management	Top two	50	25.86	6.034	2.328	48	0.066
	Bottom two	50	25.04	5.692			
Equipment Management	Top two	50	28.48	10.377	2.521	48	0.025
	Bottom two	50	23.96	6.081			
Organizational Structure	Top two	50	28.36	6.084	1.329	48	0.324
	Bottom two	50	24.68	6.055			
Sports policy Management	Top two	50	25.26	5.342	2.860	48	0.027
	Bottom two	50	24.32	5.93			
Public relation Management	Top two	50	26.82	5.730	1.23	48	0.434
	Bottom two	50	26.44	6.261			
Total Sports Organizational Management Practice	Top two	50	186.84	28.218	2.93	48	0.082
	Bottom two	50	171.58	31.897			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 1 indicated that the mean score of sports organizational management practice independent-samples T-test results showed that statistically there is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices. With financial management top two ( $M=26.64$ ,  $SD = 4.576$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=23.41$ ,  $SD=11.705$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 1.226$ ,  $P=0.282$ . This is more than 0.05 level of tolerance.

Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted.

The mean score of top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of financial management.

In personnel management top two ( $M=25.42$ ,  $SD= 6.291$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=23.58$ ,  $SD=7.408$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 1.701$ ,  $P=0.214$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of personnel management.

With facility management top two ( $M=25.86$ ,  $SD= 6.034$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=25.04$ ,  $SD=5.692$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 2.328$ ,  $P=0.066$ . This is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the null hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of facility management.

With Organizational structure top two ( $M=28.36$ ,  $SD= 6.084$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=24.68$ ,  $SD=6.055$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 1.329$ ,  $P=0.324$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of Organizational structure.

With Public relation management top two ( $M=26.82$ ,  $SD= 5.730$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=26.44$ ,  $SD=6.261$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 1.23$ ,  $P=0.434$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sport organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of Public relation management.

On the hands, the mean score with sports organizational management practice independent-samples T-test result showed that statistically there is the significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in equipment management and Sports policy management. With equipment management top two ( $M=28.48$ ,  $SD= 10.377$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=23.96$ ,  $SD=6.081$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 2.521$ ,  $P=0.025$ . Which is less than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is rejected. The mean score of top two is significantly higher

than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of equipment management.

With Sports policy management top two ( $M=25.26, SD= 5.342$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=24.32, SD=5.93$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 2.860, P=0.027$ . Which is less than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is rejected. The mean score of top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of Sports policy management.

The total sports organizational management practice top two ( $M=186.84, SD= 28.218$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=171.58, SD=31.897$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 2.93, P=0.082$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted.

The mean score of total top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of total bottom two players. This indicates that total top two club players have the positive opinion than that of the total bottom two club players in the aspects of overall sports organizational management practices.

**Table 2. Independents –samples T-Test comparison between top two and Bottom two club players towards perceived coaching leadership behaviour indices of primer league football clubs in Ethiopia.**

Perceived Coaching Leadership Behaviour	Name of the clubs	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Perceive Training and Instruction	Top two	50	48.04	10.695	1.558	48	0.048
	Bottom two	50	49.22	9.749			
Perceive Democratic Behaviour	Top two	50	29.74	8.048	1.37	48	0.046
	Bottom two	50	33.92	7.634			
Perceive Autocratic Behaviour	Top two	50	14.78	4.795	0.398	48	0.121
	Bottom two	50	18.14	4.607			
Perceive Social Support	Top two	50	26.44	7.935	-0.637	48	0.335
	Bottom two	50	30.48	5.84			
Perceive Positive Feedback	Top two	50	14.56	5.486	0.021	48	0.250
	Bottom two	50	18.92	4.023			
Total Perceived Coaching Behaviour	Top two	50	133.52	28.593	-0.575	48	0.332
	Bottom two	50	150.68	26.638			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 2 indicated that the mean score for perceived coaching leadership behaviour independent-samples T-test results showed that statistically there is the significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour.

For training and instruction top two ( $M=48.04, SD= 10.695$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=49.22, SD=9.749$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 1.558, P=0.048$ . Which is less than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is rejected. The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of training and instruction.

With democratic behaviour top two ( $M=29.74$ ,  $SD= 8.048$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=33.92$ ,  $SD=7.634$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 1.37$ ,  $P=0.046$ . Which is less than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is rejected. The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of democratic behaviour.

On the other hands, the mean score for perceived coaching leadership behaviour independent-samples T-test results showed that statistically there is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour.

With autocratic behaviour top two ( $M=14.78$ ,  $SD= 4.795$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=18.14$ ,  $SD=4.607$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 0.398$ ,  $P=0.121$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of autocratic behaviour.

For social support top two ( $M=26.44$ ,  $SD=7.935$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=30.48$ ,  $SD=5.84$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 0.637$ ,  $P=0.335$  which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of social support.

With positive feedback top two ( $M=14.56$ ,  $SD=5.486$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=18.92$ ,  $SD=4.023$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 0.021$ ,  $P=0.250$  which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted.

The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of positive feedback.

The total perceived coaching behaviour top two ( $M=133.52$ ,  $SD=28.593$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=150.68$ ,  $SD=26.638$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 0.575$ ,  $P=0.332$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted.

The total mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the total mean score of top two players. This indicates that the total bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of total top two club players in the aspects of overall perceived coaching leadership behaviour.

**Table3. Independent-samples T-Test comparison between top two and Bottom two club players towards preferred coaching leadership behaviour indices of primer league football clubs in Ethiopia.**

Preferred Coaching Behaviour	Name of the clubs	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Prefer Training and Instruction	Top two	50	50.82	10.32	0.499	48	0.339
	Bottom two	50	50.58	10.328			
Prefer Democratic Behaviour	Top two	50	34.36	5.743	0.665	48	0.179
	Bottom two	50	35.54	7.645			
Prefer Autocratic Behaviour	Top two	50	18	4.047	0.813	48	0.33
	Bottom two	50	18.32	3.97			
Prefer Social Support	Top two	50	30.12	6.834	-1.206	48	0.327
	Bottom two	50	31.22	5.716			
Prefer Positive Feedback	Top two	50	17.54	4.953	-0.115	48	0.632
	Bottom two	50	19.58	4.468			
Total Preferred Coaching Behaviour	Top two	50	150.84	25.402	0.1312	48	0.362
	Bottom two	50	155.24	27.479			

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 3 indicated that the mean score for preferred coaching leadership behaviour independent-sample T-test results showed that statistically there is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour.

With training and instruction top two ( $M=50.82$ ,  $SD= 10.32$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=50.58$ ,  $SD=10.328$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 0.499$ ,  $P=0.339$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of top two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players. This indicates that top two club players have the positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of training and instruction.

With Democratic behaviour top two ( $M=34.36$ ,  $SD=5.743$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=35.54$ ,  $SD=7.645$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = 0.665$ ,  $P=0.179$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of democratic behaviour.

With Autocratic behaviour top two ( $M=18$ ,  $SD=4.047$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=18.32$ ,  $SD=3.97$ ) conditions;  $t=(48)= 0.813$ ,  $P=0.33$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of autocratic behaviour.

With social support top two ( $M=30.12$ ,  $SD=6.834$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=31.22$ ,  $SD=5.716$ ) conditions;  $t= (48) = -1.206$ ,  $P=0.327$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted. The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that

bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of social support.

With positive feedback top two ( $M=17.54$ ,  $SD=4.953$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=19.58$ ,  $SD=4.468$ ) conditions;  $t(48) = -0.115$ ,  $P=0.632$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted.

The mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the mean score of top two players. This indicates that bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of top two club players in the aspects of positive feedback.

The total preferred coaching behaviour top two ( $M=150.84$ ,  $SD=25.402$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=155.24$ ,  $SD=27.479$ ) conditions;  $t(48) = 0.1312$ ,  $P=0.362$ . Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. Hence, the hypothesis that “There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour indices premier league football clubs in Ethiopia” is accepted.

The total mean score of bottom two is significantly higher than that of the total mean score of top two players. This indicates that total bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of total top two club players in the aspects of overall preferred coaching leadership behaviour.

## Discussion

The mean score of independent samples T-test results showed that statistically there is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices in financial management top two ( $M=26.64$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=23.41$ ) personnel management, top two ( $M=25.42$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=23.58$ ), facility management top two ( $M=25.86$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=25.04$ ), organizational structure top two ( $M=28.36$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=24.68$ ) and public Relation top two ( $M=26.82$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=26.44$ ) Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance.

On the hands, the mean score of independent samples T-test results showed that statistically there were significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in equipment management top two ( $M=28.48$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=23.96$ ), ( $P=0.025$ ) and Sport policy management top two ( $M=25.26$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=24.32$ ), ( $P=0.027$ ) and The total sports organizational management practice top two ( $M=186.84$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=171.58$ ), ( $P=0.082$ ). Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance.

The mean score of top two were significantly higher than that of the mean score of bottom two players in financial management, personnel management, facility management, equipment management, organizational structure, Sports policy management and public Relation this indicates that top two club players have positive opinion than that of bottom two club players in the aspects of sports organizational management practices.

The mean score of independent samples T-test results showed that statistically there were significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour in training and instruction top two ( $M=48.04$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=49.22$ ), ( $P=0.048$ ) and Democratic behaviour top two ( $M=29.74$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=33.92$ ), ( $P=0.046$ ) which is less than 0.05 level of tolerance.

On the hands, the mean score of independent-sample T-test results showed that statistically there were no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players their perceived coaching leadership behaviour in Autocratic behaviour top two ( $M=14.78$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=18.14$ ), social support top two ( $M=26.44$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=30.48$ ) and positive feedback top two ( $M=14.56$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=18.92$ ) Which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance. The total perceived coaching behaviour top two ( $M=133.52$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=150.68$ ), ( $P=0.332$ ) which is more than 0.05 level of tolerance.



The total mean score of bottom two was significantly higher than that of the total mean score of top two players. This indicates that the total bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of total top two club players in the aspects of overall perceived coaching leadership behaviour.

The mean score of independent samples T-test results showed that statistically there were no significant different between top two and bottom two club players in their preferred coaching leadership behaviour in training and instruction top two ( $M=50.82$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=50.58$ ), Democratic behaviour top two ( $M=34.36$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=35.54$ ), Autocratic behaviour top two ( $M=18$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=18.32$ ), Social support top two ( $M=30.12$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=31.22$ ) and Positive feedback top two ( $M=17.54$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=19.58$ ) and the total preferred coaching behaviour top two ( $M=150.84$ ,  $SD=25.402$ ) and Bottom two ( $M=155.24$ ,  $SD=27.479$ ), ( $P=0.362$ ). This is more than 0.05 level of tolerance.

The total mean score of bottom two was significantly higher than that of the total mean score of top two players. This indicates that the total bottom two club players have the positive opinion than that of total top two club players in the aspects of overall preferred coaching leadership behaviour.

## Conclusion

- There is no significant difference between top two and bottom two club players in their sports organizational management practices and preferred coaching leadership behaviour. The mean score of top two was significantly higher and positive opinion than that of the mean score of bottom two players in the aspects of sports organizational management practices.
- There were significantly different between top two and bottom two club players in their perceived coaching leadership behaviour but, there is no significant difference in preferred coaching leadership behaviour.
- The total mean score of bottom two was significantly higher and positive opinion than that of the total mean score of top two players in the aspects of overall perceived and preferred coaching leadership behaviour.
- The study has the great implication on promoting the sports organizational management practices of football coaching and bringing about the required player improvement. Realizing the strong relationship between management/coaching staff and player improvement, club management at different levels can arrange and improve sports management practice and coaching leadership.
- Top two and bottom two clubs can share each other sports organizational practices and be coaching leadership behaviours for club and player improvements and it is advisable for players to participate in coaching staff decision-making and undergoing regular communications on regular bases in order to minimize the gap between top two and bottom two clubs practices in their sport organizational management.

## References

1. Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1996). *The Importance of Mentoring In The Development of Coaches And Athletes*, *International Journal Of Sport Psychology*, 29(3), 267-281.
2. Chelladurai, P. & Carron, A. V. (1974). *Athletic Maturity and Preferred Leadership*. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 5, 371-380.
3. Chelladurai, P. (1993). *Leadership*. In R. N. Singer, M. Murphy, & K.L. Tenant (Eds.). *Handbook of Research in Sport Psychology*, 647-671. New York.
4. Durand-Bush, N., & Salmela, J. (2002). *The Development and Maintenance of Expert Athletic Performance: Perceptions of World and Olympic Champions*.
5. Eklund, R. C., & Crawford, S. (1994). *Active Women, Social Physique Anxiety, and Exercise*. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 16, 431-448.
6. Eys, M.A., Carron, A.V., Beauchamp, M.R., & Bray, S.R. (2003). *Role Ambiguity In sport Teams*.

- Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 25, 534-550.
7. Gould, D., Guinan, D., Greenleaf, C, Medbery, R., & Peterson, K. (1999). *Factors Affecting Olympic Performance: Perceptions of Athletes and Coaches from More and Less Successful Teams. The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 371-394.
  8. Mahoney, M. J., Gabriel, T. J., & Perkins, T. S. (1987). *Psychological Skills and Exceptional athletic Performance. The Sport Psychologist*, 1, 181-199.
  9. Weese, W. J. (1994). *A leadership discussion with Dr. Bernard Bass. Journal of Sport Management*, 8, 179-189.
  10. Weese, W. J. (1996). *Do leadership and organizational culture really matter? Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 197-206.
  11. Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. Journal of Management*, 15, 251-289.
  12. Yukl, G. W., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). *Theory and research on leadership in Organizations in M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough, Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.