Investigating the causal relationship between group cohesion and leadership behavior in adolescent athletes
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Abstract:  
Various factors are involved to improve collective performance and consistency such as leaders’ behavior to influence over followers. The aim of present paper is to study the casual relationship between leadership behavior and collective consistency among junior athletes. This is a casual research conducted as a field study. Its population includes all (5000) male junior athletes in Qom province in 2012 – 2013 educational years. Research statistical sample consists of 250 athletes. The measurement tools include collective environment in sport questionnaire by Caron, Widmeyer and Brawley as well as the leadership in sport scale questionnaire by Chelladwary. Data was summarized and described by descriptive statistics while structural equation modeling (SEM) is used to test casual relations. To analyze data, LISREL software with 0.05 confidence level is used. Five hypotheses of the research indicate that there is a casual relationship between democratic behavior, positive feedback behavior, training and exercising behavior, social support behavior and collective consistency among junior athletes. Concerning research findings, one can claim with 95% possibility that leadership behavior has a significant relationship with collective consistency among junior athletes.
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1. Introduction

Athletic psychology is a branch of sport science which looks for answering different questions on human behavior fields in sport era (Anshel, Mark, 2001). In sport, such role is played by manager who is responsible for athletes’ leadership affairs and plays a vital role on the performance and consistency of the team. Successful athletic teams enjoy distinguished traits that separate them from unsuccessful ones namely active and competent management and leadership (Leith, Larry, 2001). Coaches tend to be active, hardworking and energetic and accept paramount responsibilities. Hence, they are expected to lead athletic programs competently and educate athletes with technical competencies in a high pressure environment (Lawson, Robert, 2002). A coach is effective and competent is he/she has necessary skill to conduct and lead athletes. An important needed skill for coaches is leadership. Some important functions in leadership era include sparking, developing effective relations to athletes and building consistency and coordination (Leith, Larry, 2002). Concerning athletes’ behavior in sport teams, Chelldwary (1990) has pointed out some aspects. According to his model, coaches’ behavior is influenced by three main factors including success attributes (i.e. team conditions), leader’s trait and members’ traits that, finally, impact on the behavior of coaches, performance success, collective consistency and satisfaction (Husseini, Misaq, 2008). The leader should satisfy people and/or players in athletic level. In fact, proper leadership improves personal growth, performance motivation and job satisfaction (Chelladwary and Carron, 1983). Sport psychologists believe that it is vital to set a joint goal that can lead collective efforts toward achieving success (Talebpour, Mahdi, 2006).

2. Leadership nature is sport

Before starting our discussion, it is necessary to get familiar with similarities and difference between coach and manager terms. The coach is in a status that can adopt particular decisions for his/her pupils; someone who can demand more efforts than the expected levels. In other words, the coach should have leadership power (Khalj, Guilda, 2010). Leadership is extended as the management of athletic organizations throughout sport world by which one can improve the quality of achieved experiences and help people to obtain their merit successes (Ramezaninejad, Rahim & Hakimi, Iman, 2011). Effective leadership in sport is a function of varied roles and styles to satisfy athletes’ needs and to achieve team goals (Anshel, Mark, 2001). It is necessary that athletic leaders consider varied conditions dominated on athletes’ ambience since efficient leadership is the result of mutual relations among three factors namely leader, followers and spatial conditions (Moharamzadeh, Mehrdad, 1997). In athletic ambience, coaches are leaders of a group, team or club. They highly impact on individual or collective satisfaction, performance, motivation and success. The question is that how someone can be a good leader? (Maghsudi, Abdulhamid, 2009). In their book titles “Passion for Excellent”, Tom Peters and Nancy Aystin wrote: “coaching is a kind of face – to – face leadership that comes together and encourages people with different talents, experiences and interests so that they accept responsibilities, to continue their improvement and to collaborate their partners (Leith, Larry, 2001).

Conducted researches in past 50 years indicate that personality traits increase the possibility of a leader’s success while none of them can guarantee his/her success (Robbins, Stephen, 2007). Since leadership includes organizational grounds or situations which involve both leader and members, the authors have suggested several theories on the similarity between certain types of behaviors and different situations (Challadwray Pakinatan, 2011). Since the authors have tried to study the behaviors of some famous leaders, they attempt to see whether there is a unique behavior used by successful leaders (Ramezaninejad, Rahim & Hakimi, Iman, 2011). In several studies, it was determined that coaches’ leadership style plays a vital role in team performance (Ramezaninejad, Rahim & Hakimi, Iman, 2011). Athletes may consider their coaches as a merit and competent manager if the coaches design and identify the roles of themselves and athletes in achieving an aim, have friendly and unprejudiced behavior and show that they would resolve their personal problems (Ramezaninejad, Rahim & Hakimi, Iman, 2011) because that...
traits emerge in behaviors and, finally, people would assess leaders in terms of their behaviors and decide to follow them (Mohammad Panahi, Payam, 2008).

3. Collective consistency definition

In inspirational view, it seems that collective effectiveness in which there is no concurrence and cooperation spirit is lower than a group in which members collaborate and have general concurrence. In conducted researches, collective consistency is highly emphasized and consistency is defined as the degree or extent by which people attract each other in collective aims. It means that collective consistency is higher when people are more attracted and group’s aims are consistent to members’ (Robbins, Stephen, 2007). In athletic ambience, collective consistency was defined by Carron, Brawley and Widmeyer (1998) as dynamic processes that show the tendency of a group to link each other and stay as a team to achieve the aims. Collective consistency is a network of forces which aims at keeping members’ relations to fight against degrading forces and it is influenced by cultural and economic and homogeneous factors (Kazem, Mohammad, 2002).

Researchers have determined two groups of consistency

(a) Social consistency: it is members’ interest to each other and their mutual understanding, trust and supports (Morheh, Griffin, 1998).

(b) Duty consistency: it is members’ cooperation and commitment to achieve joint aims such winning a match (Woods, Barbara, 2006).

According to Mark Anshel, there are several factors that impact on social consistency and duty consistency: members’ attributes, group’s attributes and the situations experienced by the group. These factors are depicted in table 1.

Table 1: affecting factors on the consistency of athletic teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social consistency would be optimized if:</th>
<th>Team members’ attributes</th>
<th>Group’s attributes</th>
<th>Situations experienced by group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Liking each other is a need among players</td>
<td>1. Group should be small</td>
<td>1. Players should feel that the team is threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Players have similar personality</td>
<td>2. Democratic leadership style should be utilized</td>
<td>2. Athletes should partake in fails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Athletes have similar social grounds</td>
<td>3. The Captain should be elected by players and he/she should play an active role</td>
<td>3. Athletes should have similar scientific evidences on wins and losses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attendance in team satisfies social need</td>
<td>4. Group’s structure should be in a manner that acknowledge members equally</td>
<td>4. To be success, the group should be acknowledged fairly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Players are good friends out of the land</td>
<td>5. Players should decide to socialize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Each play feels that he/she is admired by</td>
<td>6. There should be warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Social consistency would be optimized if:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>teammates</th>
<th>collective atmosphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Players should be satisfied on their performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Players should feel that their athletic skills are optimizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Players should have similar skill levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Each member should consider his/her role in team’s situation as important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Group’s leader should support members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Members should work with each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Players should be aware of their roles in team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Repeated exercise teaches players to predict their teammates’ movement patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All athletes have similar work pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team’s aims should be clear for all players</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The way to achieve Team’s aims should be clear for all players</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Research aims

General aim: studying the casual relationship between leadership behavior and collective consistency among junior athletes

Special aims:

1. Determining participants’ demographic traits
2. Determining collective consistency related variables
3. Determining leadership behavior related variables

Major hypotheses:

1. There is a causal relationship between authoritarian behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.
2. There is a causal relationship between democratic behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.
3. There is a causal relationship between positive feedback behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.
4. There is a causal relationship between training and exercise behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

5. There is a causal relationship between social support behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

4. Methodology

The main aim of present paper is to study the casual relationship between collective consistency and leadership behavior among junior athletes. In terms of aim, this is an applied research. Since the status quo should be described without any manipulation. In terms of implementation, this is a descriptive research while it is a futuristic study in term of time. According to its data mainly gathered through a closed questionnaire, this is a quantitative and fields study in terms of data type. Its population consists of all junior male athletes (5000) in Qom province in 2012 – 2013 educational years. Internet as well as library studies and leadership collective ambience in sport questionnaires were used to gather data. The goal was to measure collective consistency in sport teams in 1985 by Carron, Widmeyer and Brawly based on Carron’s conceptual model (1982) in which 18 questions measured collective consistency in four aspects. For collective ambience in sport, 30 questionnaires were distributed and after completion, Chronabch’s alpha was computed (0.73). Since the questionnaire was used repeatedly, its validity was confirmed by elites.

5. Descriptive findings

Here, statistical descriptive techniques such as frequency table and statistical graphs are used to analyze date and statistical sample distribution in terms of such variables age, athletic record, championship record, descriptive statistics and research variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregative percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table2 indicates that of 248 participants in this research, 106 were 15 – 16 years old (42.7%) while only 10 were 11-12 years (4%).
Table 3: Participants athletic variable description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athletic record</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Aggregative percentage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that of 248 participants in this research, 111 had over 4 years of athletic record (44.8%) while 40 with 3-4 years (16.1%) and 43 with less than 1 year had the lowest athletic records.

6. Participants’ championship record description

Table 4: participants’ championship record description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championship record</th>
<th>freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Aggregative percentage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above table indicates that of 248 participants in this research, the highest championship record was regional with the frequency of 100 (40.3%) and the lowest one was championship in the world with the frequency of 3 (1.2%). 111 had over 4 years of athletic record (44.8%) while 40 with 3-4 years (16.1%) and 43 with less than 1 year had the lowest athletic records.
7. Describing research variables

Table 5: leadership behavior and its variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback behavior</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support behavior</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian behavior</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and exercise behavior</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>120.98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic behavior</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership behavior</td>
<td>137.36</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>61.49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>204.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: collective consistency behavior and its variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual social consistency</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective social consistency</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective duty consistency</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>35.63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual duty consistency</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>70.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective consistency</td>
<td>92.92</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>288.48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Deductive findings

8.1. st null hypothesis:

There is no causal relationship between authoritarian behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The findings of the main research model indicated no causal relationship between research independent variables (authoritarian behavior) and dependent variable (collective consistency). Significant test values greater than 1.96 or less than -1.96 indicate the significance of relations. The basis to support or not to support hypotheses (the significance of relations) is to study the model in significant ratios. The impact of authoritarian behavior on collective consistency is 0.07 and its significance value is 0.72 which shows the insignificant impact by authoritarian behavior on collective consistency. Therefore, null hypothesis concerning no relationship between authoritarian
behaviors is supported. Since RMSEA = 0.055 namely it is less than 0.1, it shows proper fitness of the structural model. Chi² = 2679.92 and df = 1535 which show very proper fitness of the model.

Below, regression equations are studied in structural mode. Such equations indicate path ratio, significance ratios and R². R² = 0.05 in authoritarian variables and collective consistency extent which is relatively weak.

Collective consistency × 0.019 = authoritarian behavior

Errorvar = 0.068 , R² = 0.0050

(0.026) (0.057)

0.72 1.20

8.2. nd null hypothesis:

There is no causal relationship between democratic behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The findings of the main research model indicated no causal relationship between research independent variables (democratic behavior) and dependent variable (collective consistency). Significant test values greater than 1.96 or less than -1.96 indicate the significance of relations. The basis to support or not to support hypotheses (the significance of relations) is to study the model in significant ratios. The impact of democratic behavior on collective consistency is 0.56 and its significance value is 6.40 which show the significant impact by democratic behavior on collective consistency. Therefore, null hypothesis concerning no relationship between democratic behaviors is not supported. Since RMSEA = 0.055 namely it is less than 0.1, it shows proper fitness of the structural model. Chi² = 2679.92 and df = 1535 which show very proper fitness of the model.

Below, regression equations are studied in structural mode. Such equations indicate path ratio, significance ratios and R². R² = 0.31 in democratic variables and collective consistency extent which is relatively high value.

Collective consistency × 0.45 = democratic behavior

Errorvar = 0.45 , R² = 0.31

(0.071) (0.098)

-6.40 4.61

8.3. rd null hypothesis:

There is no causal relationship between positive feedback behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The findings of the main research model indicated no causal relationship between research independent variables (positive feedback) and dependent variable (collective consistency). Significant test values greater than 1.96 or less than -1.96 indicate the significance of relations. The basis to support or not to support hypotheses (the significance...
of relations) is to study the model in significant ratios. The impact of positive feedback on collective consistency is 0.66 and its significance value is 6.67 which show the significant impact by positive feedback on collective consistency. Therefore, null hypothesis concerning no relationship between positive feedback is not supported. Since RMSEA = 0.055 namely it is less than 0.1, it shows proper fitness of the structural model. Chi$^2$ = 2679.92 and df = 1535 which show very proper fitness of the model.

Below, regression equations are studied in structural mode. Such equations indicate path ratio, significance ratios and $R^2$. $R^2$ = 0.44 in positive feedback variables and collective consistency extent which is relatively high value.

Collective consistency $\times$ 0.44 = positive feedback

Errorvar= 0.31, $R^2$ = 0.44

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
(0.073) & (0.078) \\
-6.67 & 3.90
\end{array}
\]

8.4. Th null hypothesis:

There is no causal relationship between training and exercise behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The findings of the main research model indicated no causal relationship between research independent variables (training and exercise behavior) and dependent variable (collective consistency). Significant test values greater than 1.96 or less than -1.96 indicate the significance of relations. The basis to support or not to support hypotheses (the significance of relations) is to study the model in significant ratios. The impact of training and exercise behavior on collective consistency is 0.74 and its significance value is 5.31 which show the significant impact by training and exercise behavior on collective consistency. Therefore, null hypothesis concerning no relationship between training and exercise behavior is not supported. Since RMSEA = 0.055 namely it is less than 0.1, it shows proper fitness of the structural model. Chi$^2$ = 2679.92 and df = 1535 which show very proper fitness of the model.

Below, regression equations are studied in structural mode. Such equations indicate path ratio, significance ratios and $R^2$. $R^2$ = 0.55 in training and exercise behavior variables and collective consistency extent which is relatively high value.

Collective consistency $\times$ 0.75 = training and exercise behavior

Errorvar= 0.46, $R^2$ = 0.55

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
(0.14) & (0.17) \\
-5.31 & 2.73
\end{array}
\]

8.5. Th null hypothesis:

There is no causal relationship between social support behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.
The findings of the main research model indicated no causal relationship between research independent variables (social support behavior) and dependent variable (collective consistency).

Significant test values greater than 1.96 or less than -1.96 indicate the significance of relations. The basis to support or not to support hypotheses (the significance of relations) is to study the model in significant ratios. The impact of social support behavior on collective consistency is 0.69 and its significance value is 6.20 which show the significant impact by social support behavior on collective consistency. Therefore, null hypothesis concerning no relationship between social support behaviors is not supported. Since RMSEA = 0.055 namely it is less than 0.1, it shows proper fitness of the structural model. Chi2 = 2679.92 and df = 1535 which show very proper fitness of the model.

Below, regression equations are studied in structural mode. Such equations indicate path ratio, significance ratios and R2. R2 = 0.48 in social support behavior variables and collective consistency extent which is relatively high value.

Collective consistency × 0.49 = social support behavior

Errorvar = 0.26 , R² = 0.48

(0.079)                  (0.077)
Figure 1: the model in standard estimation mode
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Figure 2: the model in significance ratios mode

chi-square=2679.92, df=1535, P-value=0.00000, RMSEA=0.055
9. Model fitness values

GFI, AGFI and NFI values are 0.72, 0.70 and 0.76 respectively that show relative proper fitness of the model (table 4.17). Likewise, table 4.18 and 4.19 indicate main model good to fit (figures 4.8 and 4.9). In testing research hypotheses by using structural equation model, the outcome indicates proper fitted structural model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: the results of research model fitness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Discussion and conclusion

10.1. 1st null hypothesis

There is no causal relationship between authoritarian behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The computed significance level is 0.72. By considering the assumed significance level as p ≤ 0.05, one can claim that there is no significant difference between authoritarian behavior and collective consistency. In other word, authoritarian behavior has no impact on collective consistency extent. Therefore, research hypothesis is supported. This hypothesis is not consistent with findings by Ramezaninejad (2011), Scherman (1996), Riemer, Harold A& Toon, Kathy (2001) and Hollembeak, Jill & Amarose , Anthony (2004) while it is consistent with finding by Moradi (2004), Yusefi (2007), Husseinin Keshan et al (2008), Gregg Bennett (2003) and Ronayne (2004). On this basis, one can conclude that since in authoritarian behavior, managers want to dictate their requests to employees, they try to control their situation. To the same reason, employees are not consulted. Decisions are taken rapidly but employees have lower motivation.

10.2. 2nd null hypothesis

There is no causal relationship between democratic behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The computed significance level is 6.40. By considering the assumed significance level as p ≤ 0.05, one can claim that there is a significant difference between authoritarian behavior and collective consistency. In other word, authoritarian behavior impacts on collective consistency extent. Therefore, research hypothesis is supported. This hypothesis is consistent with findings by Moradi et al, (2004), Yusefi (2007), Khoran et al, (2007), Wester and Weiss (1991), Tyler Eichas and Vikki Krane (1993), and Peace and Kozub (1994) while it is not consistent with
findings by Mohammad Panahi (2008), Dehghan et al (2008), Ramezaninejad (2011) and Scherman (1996). On this basis, one can conclude that in democratic behavior, managers accept the responsibility of their tasks since they assign authorities to employees. Employees will use their own interested methods to perform their task and they will participate in decision making. It gives them the feeling of belonging and improves their motivation.

10.3. 3rd null hypothesis

There is no causal relationship between positive feedback behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The computed significance level is 6.67. By considering the assumed significance level as \( p \leq 0.05 \), one can claim that there is a significant difference between positive feedback behavior and collective consistency. In other word, positive feedback behavior impacts on collective consistency extent. Therefore, research hypothesis is supported. This hypothesis is consistent with findings by Dehghan et al (2008), Khoran et al, (2007), Ramezaninejad (2011), Weiss and Friedrichs (1986), Wester and Weiss (1991), Riemen, Harold A & Toon, Kathy (2001), Catharina O. Rang (2002) and Nolan et al (2002) while it is not consistent with findings by Mohammad Maghsoodi (2009). On this basis, one can conclude that positive feedback behavior is proper since coaches acknowledge athletes due to their well performance.

10.4. 4th null hypothesis

There is no causal relationship between training and exercise behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The computed significance level is 5.31. By considering the assumed significance level as \( p \leq 0.05 \), one can claim that there is a significant difference between training and exercise behavior and collective consistency. In other word, training and exercise behavior impacts on collective consistency extent. Therefore, research hypothesis is supported. This hypothesis is consistent with findings by Mohammad Panahi (2008), Dehghan et al (2008), Khoran et al, (2007), Challace, J.M., Millin (1990), Wester and Weiss (1991), Tyler Eichas & Vikki Krane (1993), Amorose, Anthony J & Horn (2001) and Catharina O. Rang (2002) while it is not consistent with findings by Mohammad Maghsoodi (2009). On this basis, one can conclude that training and exercise behavior can be profitable since the coach emphasize on hard and intensive exercise, training the skills, techniques and tactics to improve the athletes and to teach them to achieve high performance.

10.5. 5th null hypothesis

There is no causal relationship between social support behavior and collective consistency extent among junior athletes.

The computed significance level is 6.20. By considering the assumed significance level as \( p \leq 0.05 \), one can claim that there is a significant difference between social support behavior and collective consistency. In other word, social support behavior impacts on collective consistency extent. Therefore, research hypothesis is supported. This hypothesis is consistent with findings by Moradi (2006), Yusefi (2007), Mohammad Panahi (2008), Khoran et al, (2007), Ramezaninejad (2011), Wester and Weiss (1991), Tyler Eichas & Vikki Krane (1993), Peace and Kozub (2002) and Catharina O. Rang (1994) while it is not consistent with findings by Hollembeak, Jill & Amorose, Anthony (2004), Dehghan et al, (2008) and Hussieni et al (2008). On this basis, one can conclude that coach’s social
support behavior measures this aspect by concerning on the welfare and convenience of all athletes, establishing a positive collective atmosphere and warm relation among members.
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