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ABSTRACT
This article examines the significance of the correlation between coach leadership behavior and players’ organizational citizenship behavior, and the mediating role of psychological empowerment in the process. A total of 73 professional handball players from five different teams assessed leadership style, psychological empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior based on the scale adapted from Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire form 5X. Regression analysis and bootstrap methods were utilized to test the proposed hypotheses. Findings indicated that both transactional and transformational leadership styles significantly predicted players’ organizational citizenship behavior. In particular, psychological empowerment played a mediating role in the association between coach leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.
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INTRODUCTION
Studies within the domain of sport identified that coach leadership is a significant determinant of game performance at both the individual and team level [1, 2]. Leadership, in an organizational context, can be understood as the process that unites a diverse group of people to work effectively as a team toward a common purpose [3]. How a leader, or coach in the case of this study, unifies people is determined by the different characteristics of the leader [4]. Mainstream researches in leadership studies have identified two core characteristics to be significantly effective, transactional and transformational. These two leadership styles are known to positively influence subordinates’ performance by inducing job satisfaction, attitude, commitment, psychological empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior [5-7]. Given that sport teams possess similar aspects as those found in corporate settings, the findings from business literatures may highly relate to leadership in...
the context of sport [8]. Evidently, recent studies have devoted effort in identifying effective coach leadership behaviors and provided valuable findings [9, 10]. Despite the previous research efforts, there has been a paucity of research in effective coaching that assesses the differences between transactional and transformational leadership on performance predictor variables such as organizational citizenship behavior, specifically when psychological empowerment plays a mediating role [11]. These variables are particularly important since they are closely related to game performance and sport organizational success. The limited studies in coaching, thus far, restrain teams and individual athletes from taking full advantage of implementing leadership theory into practice.

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to fill this gap in literatures by exploring elite handball players’ perception of coach leadership style and its relationship with psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior.

LEADERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONAL STUDIES
The theory of leadership has attracted heightened attention from social scientists for several decades and continues to be a prevailing research endeavor [2, 12]. Two leadership behaviors, in particular, have been the focus of considerable organizational research over the past years: transactional and transformational. Burns [13] first introduced the concepts of the two different leadership styles based on a qualitative classification of various political leaders. The major difference that sets the two styles apart is what leaders and followers offer one another. In transactional leadership, exchange of resources is the basis of the leader-follower relationships [14]. Bass [15] defined transactional leadership as the process of managing by contract and reward, and identified four different characteristics of leadership based on the leader’s activity level and the nature of interaction with followers: contingent reward, active management by exception, passive management by exception, and laissez-faire leadership.

In contrast to transactional leaders, transformational leaders articulate goals and visions of the future that can be shared with their followers. Transformational leadership signifies beyond exchanges of values and is characterized by leaders who “motivate subordinates to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group or organization” [16, p.159]. Transformational leaders, often described as inspirational, center on long-term goals, provide vision and mission, and instill pride, trust, and respect [14]. This leadership style utilizes intelligence and rationality to provide clear solutions to problems, treats subordinates with personal attention, and mentors them to take on greater responsibility for their own development, as well as the development of others [17, 14].

Theoretical and empirical research has found transactional and transformational leadership to have significant effects on various employee attitudes, perceptions, performance, and behaviors [5]. Scholars also report that leadership affects employee extra effort, job satisfaction, commitment, trust in leadership, and organizational citizenship behavior [6]. Meanwhile, several studies claim that procedural justice, trust, commitment, job satisfaction, service quality, and psychological empowerment all play a significant role in the association between leadership and outcome variables [7].

While Burns [13] perceived the two leadership styles to be at opposite ends of the spectrum, other studies provide evidence that a leader can portray both transactional and transformational leadership behaviors while harmonizing each [18]. For instance, Tosi [19] discovered that leaders with charismatic features also employ managerial activities such as attaining resources and allotting responsibilities. Hence, various transformational leaders engage in transactional behaviors; however, they often complement those behaviors with
transformational leadership components [17].

LEADERSHIP STUDIES IN SPORT
Leadership studies within sport academia have produced meaningful findings. Doherty [1] investigated the effect of various leader characteristics on transactional and transformational leader behavior and the impact of interuniversity athletic administrators. The study results indicated that all leaders in general exhibited transformational leadership behavior more often than transactional leadership behavior regardless of gender and age. However, in relative comparison, female administrators were perceived to display transformational leadership characteristics (e.g., attributed charisma, inspiration, and individualized consideration) more frequently than their male counterparts. Male administrators, on the contrary, practiced more transactional leadership behavior such as passive management-by-expectation than females. In respect to age, younger administrators were perceived to exhibit transformational leadership behavior more frequently than the older administrators. Older administrators were perceived to practice transactional leadership behavior more often than younger administrators. In essence, transformational leadership behavior was exhibited more often by younger female administrators than younger male administrators, whereas older females exhibited transformational leadership behavior more frequently than older males.

Kent and Chelladurai [2] discovered that transformational leadership was significantly correlated with perceived leader-member exchange quality in intercollegiate athletics settings. The study further indicated that dimensions of transformational leadership and leader-member exchange quality between managers and their followers were unlikely to be related to organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Additional attempts have been made in order to better understand leadership theory in sport such as examining leadership preferences of athletic administrators and managers, comparing part-time and full-time employees’ commitment and citizenship behaviors in sport organizations, and assessing the range and effectiveness of distinct leadership styles of coaches [14, 11, 20]. For instance, Rowold [21] suggested the generalization of the leadership paradigm in a martial arts setting. The research findings provided evidence that followers’ performance was augmented by leadership behaviors. Specifically, active management-by-exception style enhanced coaching effectiveness and optimized the leadership role.

LEADERSHIP AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT
The traditional approach to psychological empowerment involves vesting power and granting decision-making authority to followers [22]. This perspective centers on the actions of the holders of power who transfer a certain extent of autonomy to the less powerful [23]. Thomas and Velthouse [24] further defined psychological empowerment as a cognitive condition that induces escalated intrinsic task motivation demonstrated in cognition such as meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. Subsequently, Menon and Borg [25] denote additional magnitudes of power, such as perceived control, perceived competence, and goal internalization, which signify the process of psychological empowerment.

Bennis and Nanus [26] postulate that facilitating employee empowerment is a major component of managerial and organizational effectiveness, and that leadership precedes empowerment in the process of affecting employee performance. According to Thomas and Velthouse [24], the organizational environment can significantly affect empowerment. Ozaralli [12] views this idea as a belief that “existing traditional organizational practices could render employees powerless to utilize their full productive and creative potential, thus resulting in passive mind-sets and ineffective or mediocre performance” (p.336). In other
words, leaders possess the opportunity to alter the environment that causes negative cognitions of empowerment. Leader-empowering behavior is one of the central antecedents of psychological empowerment. Done effectively, leaders are capable of inducing followers to perform at their productive and creative best by empowering them to transform their vision into reality.

In reference to the work by Dvir et al. [27], psychological empowerment is considered as one of the major characteristics that differentiate transactional and transformational leaders. Subsequent studies indicate that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment [28]. However, it is also evident that transactional leaders simultaneously possess the characteristics that affect psychological empowerment in the process of nurturing maximum organizational performance [17].

Hypothesis 1. Transactional leadership is positively correlated with psychological empowerment.
Hypothesis 2. Transformational leadership is positively correlated with psychological empowerment.

LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR
The overall concept of organizational citizenship behavior is largely discretionary. It is rarely included in official job descriptions related to formal organizational reward systems [29]. The focal emphasis is on voluntarily proposing to help others without expecting reciprocal exchange of benefits from the individuals receiving such help. Although organizational citizenship behavior is not required or considered as a regular duty, if performed, it plays a positive role of accelerating the activities of an organization and promotes effective functioning [29]. The proposed concepts of organizational citizenship behavior include following rules and procedures, dedication, persevering with enthusiasm, and volunteering to perform task activities [30], sportsmanship, generalized compliance, courtesy, altruism, and civic virtue [31], extra role performance, goodwill, cheerleading, and conscientiousness [32].

Extant literatures provided empirical evidence that organizational citizenship behavior positively affects organizational outcomes. What instigates organizational citizenship behavior is leadership [33]. For instance, Koh et al. [34] discovered that transactional and transformational leadership in Singaporean secondary schools positively influenced organizational citizenship behavior. However, transformational leaders had a stronger effect than transactional leaders. Additional study suggests that transformational leaders who encourage social identification and value internalization will result in obtaining an extraordinary level of organizational citizenship behavior from the subordinates [35].

Hypothesis 3. Transactional leadership is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior.
Hypothesis 4. Transformational leadership is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior.

PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR
Studies regarding antecedents and results of psychological empowerment recognized that psychological empowerment is closely linked to organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work effectiveness. Castro et al. [23] reported
that psychological empowerment influenced job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees of a food and beverage company in Spain. While numerous studies focused the effect of psychological empowerment on the individual level, Ozaralli [12] centered on team-level analysis. The result signified that the more a team’s members experience team empowerment, the higher the level of team effectiveness.

Also of note, one specific organizational outcome that has received special attention is organizational citizenship behavior. This is due in part since psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior are associated with positively affecting organizational effectiveness. Research findings supporting this theory are discovered in several literatures. Raub and Robert [36] conducted a study on the members of a hotel organization and discovered that psychological empowerment positively influenced the level of organizational citizenship behavior of members. Alge et al. [37] found that psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior had a positive relationship in their study performed on university faculty members. Yukl and Becker [38] report that psychological empowerment motivates subordinates to perform more out-of-the-ordinary job objectives, which in the perspective of Organ [29] is identical to organizational citizenship behavior.

Hypothesis 5. Psychological empowerment is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior.

MEDIATING ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT
Recent trend in leadership studies has expanded into exploring the mediating effects of psychological empowerment between leadership and organizational outcome variables. For instance, a study conducted on Singapore’s large public hospital nurses imply that psychological empowerment plays a mediating role between transformational leadership and organizational commitment [30]. Castro et al. [23] postulate that psychological empowerment mediated the association between leadership and job satisfaction and commitment of employees of a multinational corporation. Yoo [40] proved the presence of a partial mediating effect of psychological empowerment, while Lee and Choi [41] analyzed both partial and full mediating effects of psychological empowerment in a relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment of hotel employees. In the context of sport, Jung and Lee [42] revealed that the mediating effect of psychological empowerment in a relationship between transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness of sports center organizations supported the partial mediation model.

Hypothesis 6. Psychological empowerment positively mediates the association between transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.
Hypothesis 7. Psychological empowerment positively mediates the association between transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior.

METHOD
SAMPLE AND PROCEDURE
The subjects were recruited from five different professional male handball teams in Korea. Most of the survey data were gathered on site before and after training sessions and during recesses. The researchers visited each team and explained the procedures and purpose of the survey to coaches and players prior to commencement. Thereafter, survey questionnaires were distributed to the players for self-administered assessment. The remaining subjects who
could not be reached during team visits were surveyed via postal mail. Procedures and purpose of the study were explained by either written document or phone conversation.

Seventy three valid surveys were obtained with no falsely labeled questionnaires. Although the absolute number of samples obtained for this study is small, Krejcie and Morgan [43] denote that sample size needs to be considered relatively to the size of a given population. The minimum number of samples required for a population size of 90 is 73 [43]. The entire population of the Korean handball league consisted of 88 male players at the time of the survey. Hence, the relatively small sample size was not a significant issue.

The general characteristics of the subjects revealed that 57 players were in their 20s (78.2%), 15 in their 30s (20.5%), and 1 respondent was in his 40s (1.4%). As for the length of career, 1 (1.4%) player had less than 10 years of experience, 63 (86.1%) had experience from 10 to 20 years, and 9 (12.5%) players had over 20 years.

MEASUREMENT
The survey consisted of 45 items representing three themes: leader behaviors, psychological empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior. The survey also included items asking basic player information. All measures used in the present study were composed of a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (strongly agree).

The construct validity of each scale, leader behavior, psychological empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior was assessed by submitting the scales to a principal-component factor analysis with Varimax rotation. The validity of each questionnaire was assessed with construct validity, given the lack of standard for exploring the criterion validity of a behavioral rating scale that assesses coach leadership and player behaviors. Nonetheless, as an effort to increase behavioral validity, the current study assessed coach leadership style based on behavioral observations by players over a 6-month period during training sessions and team meetings, and employed reliable and valid measures used in previous researches [44-46]. Internal consistencies of each measure were tested with Cronbach’s alpha calculation.

Leadership Behaviors. The survey incorporated 9 items reflecting transactional leadership ($\alpha=.87$) and 13 items representing transformational leadership ($\alpha=.96$). A Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X, developed by Bass and Avolio [44] was utilized to measure coach behavior. Players were instructed to assess the frequency with which the coach engages in each type of leader behaviors on the measurement scale.

Psychological Empowerment. In order to measure psychological empowerment ($\alpha=.89$), 12 items were modified and adapted from the scale developed by Spreitzer [45]. Spreitzer verified 4 sub-concepts of psychological empowerment according to the classification provided by Thomas and Velthouse [24]: meaning, impact, competence, and self-determination.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Organ [29] initially provided a scale to measure organizational citizenship behavior. The scale consisted of 5 dimensions that include altruism, sportsmanship, courtesy, generalized compliance, and civic virtue. Podsakoff et al. [47] further performed a systematic research to extend the scope of the scale’s usage and validity. Based on the works of Organ [29] and Podsakoff et al. [41], Williams and Anderson [46] constructed a scale capable of measuring organizational citizenship behavior on two different perspectives, individual and organizational. The focus of this study in terms of implementing organizational citizenship behavior is primarily on the individual perspective of the players. Thus, in order to measure organizational citizenship behavior ($\alpha=.88$), the study modified and integrated 7 items from the scale proved by Williams and Anderson [46].
Data Analysis. SPSS PASW Statistics 18 was utilized to process the data for regression analysis to examine the correlational relationship between leadership, psychological empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior. The mediation effect of psychological empowerment was examined by applying the bootstrap method using AMOS 18. This approach is particularly useful when sample sizes are within the range of twenty to eighty [48]. Shrout and Bolger [49] denote that bootstrap results are likely to generate more accurate probability estimates in testing mediation effects. A percentile estimate of 95% confidence interval was computed for 1,000 bootstrap samples.

RESULTS
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS
Prior to hypotheses testing, preliminary analysis was conducted to discover the mean, standard deviation, and correlation of each item. The results are indicated in Table 4. The mean rating of each measure was above the midpoint of 3.0 on the rating scale. The lowest mean value was 3.161 for transactional leadership (SD=.433) and the highest was 3.265 for transformational leadership (SD=.851). The highest correlation existed between transactional and transformational leadership ($r=.709, p<.001$), whereas the lowest occurred on transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior ($r=.309, p<.01$).

Tables 1, 2, and 3 represent the results of factor analysis for transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and psychological empowerment, respectively. The construct of organizational citizenship behavior consists of a single factor; therefore, only test of reliability was assessed. Factor analysis results for transactional leadership confirmed that contingent reward, passive management-by-exception, and active management-by-exception are valid dimensions of transactional leadership behavior with eigenvalues greater than 1.006 along with items loading at .657 or higher. Results for transformational leadership confirmed that charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration form transformational leadership behavior. The lowest eigenvalue was 1.033 and the four factors had a loading higher than .631. The construct of psychological empowerment consists of four factors – meaning, impact, competence, and self-determination – with eigenvalues greater than 1.006 and factor loadings higher than .612. Cronbach’s alpha values for all measurements exceeded the standard value of .70 suggested by Nunnally [50]; thus internal consistency was confirmed.

Table 1. Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlation of Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transactional leadership</td>
<td>3.161</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>3.265</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.709**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological empowerment</td>
<td>3.421</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.359*</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational citizenship behavior</td>
<td>3.741</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.596**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = p < .01; ** = p < .001.
**RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

Table 5 provides analysis results for testing hypotheses 1 to 4. Table 6 represents hypothesis 5. Tables 7 and 8 consist of analysis results for hypotheses 6 and 7, respectively. Regression analysis was used to examine hypotheses 1 through 5. As for hypotheses 6 and 7, the bootstrap method was used in order to examine the mediating effect of psychological empowerment.

Since the independent variable is supposed to be the foundation of the mediator, the two variables are correlated to a certain extent. This serves a reason for a possible multicollinearity. Therefore, tolerance level and variance inflator factor (VIF), which quantify the severity of multicollinearity, were examined. As a result, the tolerance value between transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, and psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior both turned out to be .871.

---

**Table 2. Factor Analysis Results of Transactional Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>-.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(passive)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(active)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue              | 5.561 | 1.438 | 1.006 |
| % of Variance          | 46.342 | 11.986 | 8.384 |
| Cumulative %           | 46.342 | 58.328 | 66.712 |

**Table 3. Factor Analysis Results of Transformational Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
<th>Factor4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue              | 11.527 | 1.703 | 1.033 | .788 |
| % of Variance          | 57.635 | 8.516 | 5.166 | 3.940 |
| Cumulative %           | 57.635 | 66.151 | 71.317 | 75.257 |
Table 4. Factor Analysis Results of Psychological Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
<th>Factor4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>-.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.561</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.342</td>
<td>11.986</td>
<td>8.384</td>
<td>6.263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.342</td>
<td>58.328</td>
<td>66.712</td>
<td>72.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Leadership Effect on Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.359*</td>
<td>3.246</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>10.534</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>2.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.455*</td>
<td>4.303</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>18.517</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.408*</td>
<td>2.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TSL = transactional leadership; TFL = transformational leadership; PE = psychological empowerment; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior

* = p < .01.

Table 6. Effect of Psychological Empowerment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.596*</td>
<td>6.262</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>39.215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PE = psychological empowerment; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior

* = p < .01.

Table 7. Mediating Effect of Psychological Empowerment on the Relationship between Transactional Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Individual path</th>
<th>Total path</th>
<th>Indirect effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized coefficient</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>Standardized coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL → PE</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>3.268</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE → OCB</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>5.545</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL → OCB</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TS = transactional leadership; PE = psychological empowerment; OCB = organizational citizenship behavior
Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, and psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior both displayed .793. VIF for transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, and psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior both were 1.148. VIF test for both transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, and psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior displayed 1.261. Kutner et al. [51] proposed 10 as the cut off value for VIF. O’Brien [52] recommended VIF of 5 or 10 and above, and tolerance less than .2 or .1 indicates a multicollinearity problem. All figures regarding VIF and tolerance provided in this study conformed to the standards of Kutner et al. [51], and O’Brien [52]. Therefore, the multicollinearity issue was irrelevant.

H1. Transactional leadership is positively correlated with psychological empowerment. Regression analysis results from Table 5 indicated that transactional leadership significantly predicted psychological empowerment ($\beta=.359$, $p<.01$) and adjusted $R^2$ value represented 12.9% of total variance ($F=10.534$, $p<.01$). Thus, hypothesis 1 was sustained.

H2. Transformational leadership is positively correlated with psychological empowerment. In reference to Table 5, regression analysis revealed that transformational leadership ($\beta=.455$, $p<.01$) has a statistically positive relationship with psychological empowerment. The adjusted $R^2$ value represented 20.7% of total variance, which displayed significant result ($F=18.517$, $p<.01$). Hence, hypothesis 2 was supported.

H3. Transactional leadership is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. According to the regression analysis, transactional leadership positively predicted organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta=.309$, $p<.01$). As can be seen in Table 5, adjusted $R^2$ value covered 9.5% of total variance ($F=7.468$, $p<.01$). Hence, hypothesis 3 was supported.

H4. Transformational leadership is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. The figures from Table 5 suggest that transformational leadership has a significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta=.408$, $p<.01$). Adjusted $R^2$ value indicated 16.7% of the total variance ($F=14.209$, $p<.01$). Therefore, hypothesis 4 was sustained.

H5. Psychological empowerment is positively correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. Regression analysis verified that hypothesis 5 was supported based on the statistically significant results that indicated psychological empowerment positively affected organizational citizenship behavior ($\beta=.596$, $p<.01$). As can be seen in Table 6, adjusted $R^2$ value was .356 ($F=39.215$, $p<.01$), which occupied 35.6% of total variance.

H6. Psychological empowerment positively mediates the association between transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. The result of bootstrapping to test hypothesis 6 indicates that the mediation effect of psychological empowerment in the
association between transactional leadership and organizational citizenship behavior is statistically significant ($b=.200$, $p=.041$). Detailed information is displayed in Table 7.

H7. Psychological empowerment positively mediates the association between transformational leader behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. Bootstrap method applied to test hypothesis 7 generated statistically significant results ($b=.236$, $p=.010$). Further information is depicted in Table 8.

**DISCUSSION**

The main objective of this study was to examine the coach leadership effect on elite male handball players’ psychological empowerment and organizational citizenship behavior. Specifically, the focus was on understanding coach effectiveness of transformational and transactional coach behaviors. The study provides important information to the academia and practice in sport coaching that may aid better understanding of effective coaching and player performance.

The results of this research highlight several findings. First, both transactional and transformational coaches positively predicted players’ psychological empowerment. This finding is in line with previous researches that either transactional or transformational leaders could empower subordinates [28, 17]. It also supports the statement that psychological empowerment differentiates the two leadership behaviors [27] since transformational coaches displayed stronger effect than transactional coaches. The reason for such a phenomenon is perhaps due to the construct similarities of psychological empowerment and transactional leadership behavior. Leaders with transformational traits insist on independence and the proactivity of subordinates [27]. Hence, subordinates who possess the perception of psychological empowerment are naturally influenced more by a transformational leader than a transactional leader. Coaches can benefit from transformational leadership behavior by inducing intellectual stimulation, establishing inspirational goals, and underscoring a higher purpose. It is noteworthy to mention, however, that the stronger correlation between psychological empowerment and transformational coaches needs to be viewed in a relative perspective. It is not that transactional coaches were completely ineffective in inducing players’ psychological empowerment. Transactional coaches, therefore, are also capable of inducing players to empower themselves for maximum performance with the promise of financial or external benefits.

Second, the two leadership types positively predicted organizational citizenship behavior of the players. This is consistent with the findings from previous literature that leaders affect their subordinates’ extra role behavior regardless of leadership style [31]. This phenomenon conforms to the idea that all leaders possess both transactional and transformational leader characteristics to a certain extent, which affect organizational outcome variables [17-19]. Meanwhile, the results indicated that transformational coach behavior had a stronger correlation with players’ organizational citizenship behavior than transactional coach behavior. This seems natural since transformational coaches, considered relatively more charismatic and inspirational, motivate players to voluntarily sacrifice time and effort for the benefit of the team. This is a display of players’ willingness to perform beyond the level of expectations induced by transformational leader characteristics [53]. Organizational citizenship behaviors in the context of sport may include volunteering to perform tasks such as preparing training equipment before training session and cleaning up thereafter, following rules, displaying sportsmanship during games, complying with league rules, dedicating to coaching philosophy, encouraging teammates, and persevering hardships to achieve organizational goals. These extra role behaviors may very well contribute to forming
effective training sessions, establishing strong teamwork, and building camaraderie among players that may eventually lead to performance enhancement.

Third, psychological empowerment significantly predicted organizational citizenship behavior, which in previous studies ratified the effect mainly on variables such as commitment and job satisfaction [23]. This finding adds depth and expands the body of knowledge on understanding the psychological empowerment effect on various organizational outcome variables. This naturally leads to the fourth finding that psychological empowerment mediated the paths from leadership to organizational citizenship behavior regardless of coach leadership style. This particular finding suggests that influencing players to perform organizational citizenship behavior via psychological empowerment is more effective than directly affecting players to commit to extra roles that are not required as regular duty. These two findings are important in terms of filling the gap in previous literatures requiring a better understanding of what variables associate the paths between coach leadership and performance and how they can be utilized more effectively [11].

It may be true based on the statistical showings that transformational coaches are more effective than transactional coaches. However, a careful understanding is in need since in reality there is no such case that a coach possesses only the characteristics of a transformational leader. It is unrealistic to demand that all coaches should become a transformational leader when certain leadership traits are not easily developed, modified, or manipulated. Furthermore, the research results, although less significant, indicated that transactional coaches had a positive correlation as well. The realistic approach is that coaches need to understand the different traits and effects of the two leadership behaviors and apply the appropriate approach depending on the different circumstances of the players. For instance, the primary interest for a certain player could be in obtaining immediate financial incentives or tangible benefits rather than advocating long-term team goals. The influencing factor may be the length of time served in the team, experience as a player, age, or cultural background. A transactional coach behavior may be more influential in this particular case. This can also be reversed depending on the perspective of a player. A franchise player, for example, has longer contracts that signify long-term steady income, and is honored and respected in the community, which provides inner fulfillment. The goal to become a franchise player requires positive teamwork, inspiration, goals and vision sharing, and performing beyond expectations, similar to transformational characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior. In this case, there is a chance for a transformational coach behavior to be more influential.

The current study employed self-report questionnaires to collect data from the same participants. This may lead to a concern of shared method variance, which can cause systematic measurement errors that either inflate or deflate relationships between variables [54]. In consideration, the research incorporated a number of procedural remedies during the survey process to reduce the likelihood of shared method bias. For instance, the data was collected at different points in time, before and after training sessions. The temporal separation of data collection allows previously recalled information to leave short-term memory [55]. As part of the standard survey practice, respondents were allowed to be anonymous and encouraged to answer questions as honestly as possible. This standard procedure reduces the possibility of respondents editing their responses to be more socially desirable or avoid negative feedback [56]. The shuffling of questions also contributed to mitigating common method bias. The positive effort to reduce shared method variance notwithstanding, the use of only self-report questionnaires still may have led to the small
magnitude of the effects as a result of a possible shared method bias. Therefore, the findings from this research should be taken into consideration rather carefully.

CONCLUSION
Unlike the relationship between a conventional business and its employees, athletes are frequently traded, demoted, promoted, signed, released, disabled, injured, and retired. The unusual and unstable condition of player employment and unforeseen outcomes provide much more volatility than a conventional business might encounter with its office employees. This uniqueness of sport requires coaches to adapt to the different player circumstances and practice leadership accordingly. Situational leadership approach, considering player’s maturity, organizational goals, external circumstances, and preferred leadership behaviors must be applied when coaching [27]. Hence, the research findings suggest adequate implementation of both transactional and transformational leadership behavior according to distinct player circumstances is recommended in order to effectively empower players to perform extra role behavior which may contribute to extraordinary performance.

The study, in addition, provides the foundation for future research opportunities and a few limitations that need to be addressed. This research noted the existence of potential moderators pertaining to players’ age, experience, and time of service within the team, their level of sport, cultural background, and the nature of the sport, whether it was a team sport or an individual sport. This is particularly important since the more the moderators are examined, the better the understanding of coaches and players relationships in the complex sport environment. On a similar note, it is difficult to measure the significant correlation of coach leadership behavior with the one-dimensional models and limited variables incorporated, ruling out the possibilities of various factors that may affect the linkage between coach leadership and player behaviors leading to performance. The quest to search for additional variables that may mediate or predict the coach leadership behavior effect is important in expanding the body of knowledge in sport coaching studies. Possible variables include: preferred coach behavior, procedural justice, job satisfaction, and perceived relationship quality. In addition, the research was applied to a single sport setting and cultural background. Further investigations on a variety of sport teams and athletes with different cultural backgrounds are recommended to understand coach leadership practice within a larger sport context. Lastly, the current study was conducted based on a correlational research design. Therefore, the limitations include that the study was not designed as prospective, longitudinal, or experimental.
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