

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

¹**Lect. Dr. Adel Abdul Wahab Abdulrazaq;**

²**Asst. Prof. Dr. Laith Kaleel Gasim**

¹Middle Technical University/ Technical Institute / Baquba

²University of Diyala, College of Physical Education and Sports Sciences
adelabdalwhab448@gmail.com; Ll_net@yahoo.com

Abstract

Organized sports are similar to each other in the way the competition is conducted between two competing teams within the stadium specified by the referees, but they differ fundamentally in several matters, including the size of the stadium, the method of friction, the law of play, the number of players and other things, the most important of which is the spread of the game or its so-called popularity within the scope of region, province or country. Through the researcher's briefing on the prevailing administrative leadership styles, he noticed that some coaches use the purely administrative leadership style, such as the democratic or dictatorial, and some of them use the behavioral or psychological leadership style, such as social or reinforcement support. In football, the level of its spread is not even subject to the level of comparison in terms of spread and popularity, so the researcher noticed that the styles and the leadership role played by the sports coach in the sports clubs of the Premier League, Basketball and hand vary according to the level of effectiveness and its popularity. The prevailing administrative authority among the coaches of some Premier League clubs in basketball and hand for the 2019/2020 season, which may contribute to understanding the leadership styles and patterns of coaches and the extent to which they understand the specificity of their role as sports leaders. The dominant leadership style for each team game dealt with in the study, as well as knowledge of the differences and patterns Learn about the leadership styles of the study sample trainers.

Keywords :administrative leadership, Premier League, basketball ,comparative study

Introduction:

The topic of leadership occupied a good place in the studies and research of researchers and those concerned in the field of administration and public administration because it is closely related to the group and their leadership and the importance of the leader's role in the process of social interaction. With the increase in the demands of life and its complexity, the leadership methods used by the administrative leader have an effective role in the process of motivating and excitement of others and directing them to make more effort and giving to achieve and accomplish the work, as it is possible to choose the best and most effective methods.

Management to overcome difficulties, and the methods of sports leadership are many and varied and different, varying by the multiplicity of the type of sports activity, the conditions of practice, the type of friction in the effectiveness and the multiplicity of internal and external situations in it, which affects the use of the type of leadership method to influence the players and reach them to better results. The stadium takes the role of the leader in form and content. The role of the leader in departments and institutions Rather, it goes beyond it to delve deeper into the public and private life aspects of the group or team that deals with it and leads it. Sometimes it reaches the aspects of private life in identifying the physiological, morphological and functional aspects of each member of his group (team members), not to mention the various organizational functions and multiple aspects of planning And budget, programming, public relations, nutrition, health conditions, reward and social ties that it achieves with the players and their families, all in order to achieve the reputation of the institution and achieve the noble victory of the team. The positive that a certain person undertakes in the field of administrative supervision over others to achieve a specific purpose by means of influence and resignation or by using official authority when necessary and necessary.” (Abu Halima: 2004: 107), and the researcher sees through this the importance of his research in identifying the role of the coach as a leader in the field Sports activity because it is subjected to a lot of pressure and to changing and different aspects inside and outside the field, which forces it to use multiple and different methods depending on the importance of d His role is the leader, which affects the behavior of his players, positively or negatively, and thus has a direct impact on their performance on the field and achieving the optimal performance to win. Therefore, the role of the coach was the role of the leader by guiding his team, especially towards the technical and tactical aspects, and that he is the influential teacher in the behavior and attitudes of his players. to get them to the best levels of sports, and it had to be the effect of his personality and behavior in the process of planning, programming and preparation of physical and skill and tactical in the hearts of his players and their continuity in the training and practice of actors to win, with (Allawi: 1984: 4) "sees the coach as a figure educational lead the process Education and has a significant impact on the overall and balanced development of the athlete's personality.”

The aim of the research: to identify the types of administrative leadership styles prevalent among the coaches of the Premier League clubs, basketball and hand, for the season 2019/2020, and to identify the differences in leadership styles among the members of the research sample.

2- Research methodology and field procedures

2-1 Methodology: Select a researcher for the research methodology used is one of the important steps that result in the success of the research and this problem has been imposed on the researcher using the descriptive survey manner.

2-2 sample: included research sample on the coaches for some excellent clubs league basketball and handball for the season 2019/2020, it has been selected purposively totaling (60) coaches only, was applied reconnaissance experiment (20) coaches have been excluded From the main work sample, and thus the final work settled on (40) trainers, as shown in Table (1).

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

Table (1)

It shows the distribution of the research sample according to the games

NS	the games	number of coaches	Experiential coaches
1	Army Club	5	1
2	Karkh club	5	1
3	Police Club	5	1
4	South Oil Club	5	1
5	Diyala Club	5	2
6	Sulaymaniyah club	5	1
7	North refinery club	4	2
8	Kufa Club	4	2
9	Karbala Club	5	2
10	bully club	4	2
11	Al Qasim Club	4	2
12	dagger club	5	2
13	Basra municipality club	4	2
total summation		60	20
Total final work sample		40	

2-3 Devices, tools and means of data collection:

2-3-1 Means of collecting information:

- Arab and foreign references and sources.
- International Information Network (Internet).
- Personal interviews.

2-3-2 Devices and tools used in the research:

laptop type (dell voster 1454) camera type (sunny) Dry pens, pencils.

2-4 Research Tool (used scale): -

- The researcher used the measure of leadership in sports (Chelladurai:1980:34) Which appeared as a psychological measurement tool to measure the coach's behavior, as this scale is concerned with studying the coach's personality as well as the players' needs, and it is a multi-dimensional measure to analyze the coach's behavior, and each statement was followed by a five-point scale that is ((always, most of the time, and some charity'). seldom, and never).
- The scale includes (5) basic dimensions:
- The first dimension: the training method / The coach's behavior is directed towards developing the performance of the players, by focusing attention on training demands, instructions performed, strategies and plans, defining the relationship between group members, and setting a structure for coordination between their activities, and this dimension consists of paragraphs (from 1 to 13).
- The second dimension: the democratic method / a behavior that favors the participation of the largest number of players in the decision-making process related to group goals, work methods, strategies, and activity plans, and this dimension consists of paragraphs (14 to 22).

- The third dimension: the dictatorial style / which is the behavior of the coach distinguished by complete independence in the decision-making process and focus on personal power, and this dimension consists of paragraphs (23 to 27).
- - The fourth dimension: the method of social support: - It is a behavior characterized by concern for the interests of the players, and in an attempt to secure good conditions and the development of personal relations between the players, and this dimension consists of paragraphs (28 to 35).
- - The fifth dimension: Positive reinforcement method: - It is a behavior that enhances the player in a positive way by appreciating and rewarding good effort financially or morally, and this dimension consists of paragraphs (36 to 40).

In view of the fact that the scale was prepared in the English language, translated and applied to the Arabic environment, which led to the necessity of extracting the scientific bases to ensure the correctness of the formulation and clarity of the meaning of the paragraphs of the scale nominated for application.

2-5 Experimental Experiment:

In order to give a clear and accurate picture of the vocabulary of the scale nominated for application in the light of the research problem and after defining the research sample and then conducting the reconnaissance experiment on 4/7/2020 on a sample consisting of (20) coaches from the excellent basketball and handball clubs for the season 2019/2020, and it was The purpose of the pilot experiment is:

- - Knowing the difficulties and problems facing the researcher.
- - Knowing the validity of the scale used.
- - Ensure the appropriateness and ease of the paragraphs of the scale used.
- - Determine the efficiency of the supporting work team.
- - Knowing the time it takes the laboratory to answer the items of the scale.
- - Extracting scientific coefficients for the candidate scale for application.
- - Then the researcher extracted the scientific basis for the test in order to fit it within the current research sample.

2-6 The main experience:

The researcher conducted the main experiment on 11/4/2020 at 8:00 pm by preparing an electronic form in view of the current conditions that the country is going through and distributed it to the members of the research sample by sending a link to the form through social networking sites after the validity and stability of the scale had been confirmed The scale was applied to the research sample, as all items were answered by the research sample members.

2-7 Statistical treatments:-

The data has been statistically processed using a system (SPSS) to extract the results.

3- Presentation, analysis and discussion of the results

3-1 Presenting the results of administrative leadership methods for coaches of some team games (basketball, handball, and basketball):

3-1-1 Presenting the results of the administrative leadership style for basketball coaches:

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

Table (4)

**Arithmetic means, standard deviations, median, and the value of the skew coefficient
For the paragraphs of administrative leadership methods for basketball coaches**

NS	vertebrae	s	-		
+ p	And	Labs			
skewness					
1	I make sure that every player works according to his abilities	4.44	0.72	5	-.33
2	I explain the tactics and playing plans of each player	4.56	0.62	5	2.12
3	I pay special attention to correcting the mistakes of each player	4.53	0.67	5	-.10
4	I make sure the players understand my role in the team	4.25	0.57	4	1.31
5	I give instructions to each player individually about the skills of the game	4.41	0.61	4	2.01
6	I expect what should be done	3.94	0.62	4	-.29
7	I explain to each player that he will take responsibility for his duty until the end	3.50	0.76	3	1.97
8	I expect that every player will take responsibility for the duty until the end	4.72	0.58	5	-.44
9	Point out the strengths and weaknesses of each player	4.75	0.62	5	-.20
10	Give specific instructions to each player on what to do in any circumstance	4.50	0.67	5	-.23
11	Take care of coordinating the efforts of the players	4.25	0.62	4	1.20
12	Explain how the player contributes by completing the group's work	4.34	0.60	4	1.7
13	Specify what is expected of each player in detail	4.13	0.42	4	0.928
14	Ask players' opinion on playing strategies in specific competitive matches	4.78	0.49	5	-.34
15th	Obtain the group's approval on important opinions before beginning the task (training, match)	4.34	0.60	4	1.7
16	Allow players to participate in decision-making	4.78	0.49	5	-.34
17	I encourage players for their suggestions on ways to manage training	4.19	0.59	4	0.96
18	Allow the team to set its goals	3.63	0.75	3	2.52
19	Allow players to try their own way even if they are wrong	3.88	0.66	4	-.54
20	Take the opinion of players on important topics in training	3.75	0.67	4	-1.11
21	Allow players to work at their own pace	4.50	0.62	5	-2.41
22	Allow players to decide which game plans can be used in a match	4.13	0.79	4	0.49
23	Work independently (almost) from the players	4.44	0.72	5	-2.33
24	I don't explain the reason for my work and my decisions	4.06	0.72	4	0.25
25	I refuse to bargain in my personal opinion	4.16	0.68	4	0.70

26	I reserve the right to manage things for myself	3.56	0.76	3	2.21
27	I speak in a manner and in an accent that does not allow for questioning	3.84	0.72	4	-.66
28	I help players solve their personal problems	4.09	0.53	4	0.50
29	I help group members resolve conflicts between them	4.91	0.39	5	-.69
30	I care about the personal interests of the players	4.78	0.49	5	-.34
31	Supported personally known to the players	4.72	0.63	5	-.33
32	I express my feelings towards the players	4.19	0.59	4	0.96
33	I encourage players to trust me	4.13	0.61	4	0.63
34	I encourage informal relationships between myself and the players	4.78	0.55	5	- 1.2
35	I invite the players to my house	4.41	0.61	4	2.01
36	Praise a player's good performance in front of others	4.41	0.61	4	2.01
37	Tell the player when he's performing well	4.53	0.67	5	-.10
38	I make sure to reward the player for good performance	4.56	0.67	5	-.97
39	I like it when a player is special (excellent)	4.22	0.55	4	1.2
40	I give my trust and appreciation when trust is	3.50	0.67	3	2.23

Table (5)

**Arithmetic means, standard deviations, and the value of the coefficient of variance
Administrative leadership styles for basketball coaches**

		-	s	vertebrae	NS	methods
				sequence	coefficient of difference %	+ p
the first	10.16	0.42	4.13	Specify what is expected of each player in detail	13	
The second	12.28	0.58	4.72	I expect that every player will take responsibility for the duty until the end	8	
the third	13.05	0.62	4.75	Point out the strengths and weaknesses of each player	9	
the fourth	13.41	0.57	4.25	I make sure the players understand my role in the team	4	
Fifth	13.59	0.62	4.56	I explain the tactics and playing plans of each player	2	
Sixth	13.82	0.60	4.34	Explain how the player contributes by completing the group's work	12	
seventh	13.83	0.61	4.41	I give instructions to each player individually about the skills of the game	5	
Eighth	14.58	0.62	4.25	Take care of coordinating the efforts of the players	11	
ninth	14.79	0.67	4.53	I pay special attention to correcting	3	

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

				the mistakes of each player	
The tenth	14.88	0.67	4.50	Give specific instructions to each player on what to do in any circumstance	10
eleventh	15.73	0.62	3.94	I expect what should be done	6
twelveth	16.21	0.72	4.44	I make sure that every player works according to his abilities	1
Thirteenth	21.71	0.76	3.50	I explain to each player that he will take responsibility for his duty until the end	7
the first	10.25	0.49	4.78	Ask players' opinion on playing strategies in specific competitive matches	14
The second	10.25	0.49	4.78	Allow players to participate in decision-making	16
the third	13.77	0.62	4.50	Allow players to work at their own pace	21
the fourth	13.82	0.60	4.34	Obtain the group's approval on important opinions before beginning the task (training, match)	15th
Fifth	14.08	0.59	4.19	I encourage players for their suggestions on ways to manage training	17
VI	17.01	0.66	3.88	Allow players to try their own way even if they are wrong	19
seventh	17.86	0.67	3.75	Take the opinion of players on important topics in training	20
VIII	19.12	0.79	4.13	Allow players to decide which game plans can be used in a match	22
ninth	20.66	0.75	3.63	Allow the team to set its goals	18
the first	16.21	0.72	4.44	Work independently (almost) from the players	23
The second	16.34	0.68	4.16	I refuse to bargain in my personal opinion	25
the third	17.73	0.72	4.06	I don't explain the reason for my work and my decisions	24
the fourth	18.75	0.72	3.84	I speak in a manner and in an accent that does not allow for questioning	27
Fifth	21.34	0.76	3.56	I reserve the right to manage things for myself	26
the first	7.94	0.39	4.91	I help group members resolve	29

				conflicts between them	
The second	10.25	0.49	4.78	I care about the personal interests of the players	30
the third	11.50	0.55	4.78	I encourage informal relationships between myself and the players	34
the fourth	12.95	0.53	4.09	I help players solve their personal problems	28
Fifth	13.34	0.63	4.72	Supported personally known to the players	31
VI	13.83	0.61	4.41	I invite the players to my house	35
seventh	14.08	0.59	4.19	I express my feelings towards the players	32
VIII	14.76	0.61	4.13	I encourage players to trust me	33
the first	13.03	0.55	4.22	I like it when a player is special (excellent)	39
The second	13.83	0.61	4.41	Praise a player's good performance in front of others	36
the third	14.69	0.67	4.56	I make sure to reward the player for good performance	38
the fourth	14.79	0.67	4.53	Tell the player when he's performing well	37
Fifth	19.14	0.67	3.50	I give my trust and appreciation when trust is	40

3-1-2 Presenting the results of the administrative leadership style of handball coaches:

Table (6)

**Arithmetic means, standard deviations, median, and the value of the skew coefficient
For the paragraphs of administrative leadership methods for handball coaches**

NS	vertebrae	s	-		
1	I make sure that every player works according to his abilities	+ p	And	Labs	
2	I explain the tactics and playing plans of each player	skewness			
3	I pay special attention to correcting the mistakes of each player	4.69	0.63	5	- 47
4	I make sure the players understand my role in the team	4.77	0.60	5	- 15
5	I give instructions to each player individually about the skills of the game	4.92	0.28	5	- 85
6	I expect what should be done	4.54	0.66	5	- 09
7	I explain to each player that he will take responsibility for his duty until the end	4.31	0.85	5	- 43
8	I expect that every player will take responsibility for the duty until the end	4.69	0.63	5	-.47

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

9	Point out the strengths and weaknesses of each player	4.69	0.63	5	-.47
10	Give specific instructions to each player on what to do in any circumstance	4.08	0.49	4	0.48
11	Take care of coordinating the efforts of the players	4.00	0.58	4	0.00
12	Explain how the player contributes by completing the group's work	3.92	0.64	4	-.37
13	Specify what is expected of each player in detail	4.15	0.55	4	0.81
14	Ask players' opinion on playing strategies in specific competitive matches	4.77	0.60	5	-.15
15th	Obtain the group's approval on important opinions before beginning the task (training, match)	4.08	0.76	4	0.31
16	Allow players to participate in decision-making	4.77	0.60	5	-.15
17	I encourage players for their suggestions on ways to manage training	3.77	0.73	4	-.94
18	Allow the team to set its goals	4.08	0.64	4	0.37
19	Allow players to try their own way even if they are wrong	4.62	0.77	5	-.48
20	Take the opinion of players on important topics in training	4.62	0.77	5	-.48
21	Allow players to work at their own pace	4.46	0.78	5	-.07
22	Allow players to decide which game plans can be used in a match	3.62	0.87	3	2.13
23	Work independently (almost) from the players	4.77	0.60	5	-.15
24	I don't explain the reason for my work and my decisions	4.00	0.71	4	0.00
25	I refuse to bargain in my personal opinion	4.00	0.71	4	0.00
26	I reserve the right to manage things for myself	4.23	0.60	4	1.15
27	I speak in a manner and in an accent that does not allow for questioning	4.23	0.60	4	1.15
28	I help players solve their personal problems	4.00	0.71	4	0.00
29	I help group members resolve conflicts between them	4.69	0.63	5	- 47
30	I care about the personal interests of the players	4.62	0.77	5	- 48
31	Supported personally known to the players	4.62	0.77	5	- 48
32	I express my feelings towards the players	4.08	0.64	4	0.37
33	I encourage players to trust me	4.62	0.77	5	- 48
34	I encourage informal relationships between myself and the players	4.77	0.60	5	- 15
35	I invite the players to my house	3.92	0.49	4	- 48
36	Praise a player's good performance in front of others	4.08	0.49	4	0.48
37	Tell the player when he's performing well	4.69	0.63	5	- 47
38	I make sure to reward the player for good performance	4.77	0.60	5	- 15
39	I like it when a player is special (excellent)	4.23	0.60	4	1.15
40	I give my trust and appreciation when trust is	3.46	0.66	3	2.09

Table (7)

**Arithmetic means, standard deviations, and the value of the coefficient of variance
Administrative leadership styles for handball coaches**

		-	s	vertebrae	NS	methods
				sequence	coefficient of difference %	+ p
the first	5.69	0.28	4.92	I pay special attention to correcting the mistakes of each player	3	
The second	12.00	0.49	4.08	Give specific instructions to each player on what to do in any circumstance	10	
the third	12.57	0.60	4.77	I explain the tactics and playing plans of each player	2	
the fourth	13.25	0.55	4.15	Specify what is expected of each player in detail	13	
Fifth	13.43	0.63	4.69	I make sure that every player works according to his abilities	1	
VI	13.43	0.63	4.69	I expect that every player will take responsibility for the duty until the end	8	
seventh	13.43	0.63	4.69	Point out the strengths and weaknesses of each player	9	
VIII	14.5	0.58	4.00	Take care of coordinating the efforts of the players	11	
ninth	14.53	0.66	4.54	I make sure the players understand my role in the team	4	
The tenth	16.32	0.64	3.92	Explain how the player contributes by completing the group's work	12	
eleventh	17.75	0.71	4.00	I explain to each player that he will take responsibility for his duty until the end	7	
twelveth	18.62	0.76	4.08	I expect what should be done	6	
Thirteenth	19.72	0.85	4.31	I give instructions to each player individually about the skills of the game	5	
the first	12.57	0.60	4.77	Ask players' opinion on playing strategies in specific competitive matches	14	
The second	12.57	0.60	4.77	Allow players to participate in decision-making	16	
the third	15.68	0.64	4.08	Allow the team to set its goals	18	
				Allow players to try their own	19	

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

				way even if they are wrong	
		the fourth	16.66	0.77	4.62
Fifth	16.66	0.77	4.62	Take the opinion of players on important topics in training	20
VI	17.48	0.78	4.46	Allow players to work at their own pace	21
seventh	18.62	0.76	4.08	Obtain the group's approval on important opinions before beginning the task (training, match)	15th
VIII	19.36	0.73	3.77	I encourage players for their suggestions on ways to manage training	17
ninth	24.03	0.87	3.62	Allow players to decide which game plans can be used in a match	22
the first	12.57	0.60	4.77	Work independently (almost) from the players	23
The second	14.18	0.60	4.23	I reserve the right to manage things for myself	26
the third	14.18	0.60	4.23	I speak in a manner and in an accent that does not allow for questioning	27
the fourth	17.75	0.71	4.00	I don't explain the reason for my work and my decisions	24
Fifth	17.75	0.71	4.00	I refuse to bargain in my personal opinion	25
the first	12.5	0.49	3.92	I invite the players to my house	35
The second	12.57	0.60	4.77	I encourage informal relationships between myself and the players	34
the third	13.43	0.63	4.69	I help group members resolve conflicts between them	29
the fourth	15.68	0.64	4.08	I express my feelings towards the players	32
Fifth	16.66	0.77	4.62	I care about the personal interests of the players	30
VI	16.66	0.77	4.62	Supported personally known to the players	31
seventh	16.66	0.77	4.62	I encourage players to trust me	33
VIII	17.75	0.71	4.00	I help players solve their personal problems	28

the first	12.00	0.49	4.08	Praise a player's good performance in front of others	36	
The second	12.57	0.60	4.77	I make sure to reward the player for good performance	38	
the third	13.43	0.63	4.69	Tell the player when he's performing well	37	
the fourth	14.18	0.60	4.23	I like it when a player is special (excellent)	39	
Fifth	19.07	0.66	3.46	I give my trust and appreciation when trust is	40	

3 - 2 display test results (FTo analyze the variance between coaches of some team games (basketball, handball):

In order to find out whether there are statistically significant differences between coaches of some team games (basketball, handball) in the administrative leadership styles, the researcher used the law of analysis of variance to identify the differences between the circles as shown in Table (10).

Table (10)

Variance analysis of managerial leadership styles among coaches of some team games (Basketball, handball)

	leadership styles	Contrast source	sum of squares	degrees of freedom	mean squares	value (q)	indication
NS	I make sure that every player works according to his abilities	between groups	0.688	2	0.344	0.702	insignificant
		within groups	24.519	50	0.490		
1	I explain the tactics and playing plans of each player	between groups	0.506	2	0.253	0.715	insignificant
		within groups	17,683	50	0.354		
2	I pay special attention to correcting the mistakes of each player	between groups	1.422	2	1.894	1.894	insignificant
		within groups	18,767	50	0.375		
3	I make sure the players understand my role in the team	between groups	0.816	2	0.408	1.090	insignificant
		within groups	18.731	50	0.375		
4	I give instructions to each player individually about the skills of the game	between groups	0.524	2	0.262	0.516	insignificant
		within groups	25,363	50	0.507		

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

5	I expect what should be done	between groups	1.251	2	0.626	1.380	insignificant
		within groups	22,673	50	0.453		
6	I explain to each player that he will take responsibility for his duty until the end	between groups	2.804	2	1.402	2.515	insignificant
		within groups	27,875	50	0.558		
7	I expect that every player will take responsibility for the duty until the end	between groups	0.056	2	0.028	0.074	insignificant
		within groups	19.113	50	0.382		
9	Point out the strengths and weaknesses of each player	between groups	0.110	2	0.055	0.134	insignificant
		within groups	20,644	50	0.413		
10	Give specific instructions to each player on what to do in any circumstance	between groups	1.766	2	0.883	2.161	insignificant
		within groups	20.423	50	0.408		
11	Take care of coordinating the efforts of the players	between groups	0.597	2	0.298	0.790	insignificant
		within groups	18,875	50	0.378		
12	Explain how the player contributes by completing the group's work	between groups	1.700	2	0.850	2.235	insignificant
		within groups	19,017	50	0.380		
13	Specify what is expected of each player in detail	between groups	0.008	2	0.004	0.017	insignificant
		within groups	12.067	50	0.241		
14	Ask players' opinion on playing strategies in specific competitive matches	between groups	0.160	2	0.079	0.255	insignificant
		within groups	15,651	50	0.313		
15	Obtain the group's	between	0.660	2	0.330	0.762	insignificant

	approval on important opinions before beginning the task (training, match)	groups					
		within groups	21,642	50	0.433		
16	Allow players to participate in decision-making	between groups	0.160	2	0.079	0.255	insignificant
		within groups	15,651	50	0.313		
17	I encourage the players for their suggestions on how to manage the training	between groups	1.647	2	0.824	2.147	insignificant
		within groups	19.183	50	0.384		
18	Allow the team to set its goals	between groups	2.815	2	1.408	2.782	insignificant
		within groups	25.298	50	0.506		
19	Allow players to try their own way even if they are wrong	between groups	7.020	2	3.510	7.177	moral
		within groups	24,452	50	0.489		
20	Take the opinion of players on important topics in training	between groups	6.923	2	3.462	6,392	moral
		within groups	27,077	50	0.542		
21	Allow players to work at their own pace	between groups	0.913	2	0.457	0.874	insignificant
		within groups	26.106	50	0.522		
22	Allow players to decide which game plans can be used in a match	between groups	4.869	2	2.434	3.751	moral
		within groups	32.452	50	0.649		
23	Work independently (almost) from the players	between groups	1.025	2	0.512	1.059	insignificant
		within groups	24,183	50	0.484		
24	I don't explain the reason for my work and my decisions	between groups	0.323	2	0.162	0.318	insignificant
		within groups	25,375	50	0.507		
25		between	0.227	2	0.114	0.246	

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

	I refuse to bargain in my personal opinion	groups					insignificant
		within groups	23.094	50	0.462		
26	I reserve the right to manage things for myself	between groups	5.112	2	2.556	4.905	moral
		within groups	26,058	50	0.521		
27	I speak in a manner and in an accent that does not allow for questioning	between groups	1.398	2	0.699	1.552	
		within groups	22.526	50	0.451		
28	I help players solve their personal problems	between groups	0.111	2	0.055	0.167	insignificant
		within groups	16,719	50	0.334		
29	I help group members resolve conflicts between them	between groups	0.750	2	0.375	1.404	insignificant
		within groups	13.363	50	0.267		
30	Pay attention to the personal interests of the players	between groups	0.624	2	0.312	0.841	insignificant
		within groups	18,546	50	0.371		
31	Ed personally known to the players	between groups	0.341	2	0.171	0.362	insignificant
		within groups	23.546	50	0.471		
32	I express my feelings for the players	between groups	0.174	2	0.086	0.225	insignificant
		within groups	19,298	50	0.386		
33	I encourage players to trust me	between groups	2.225	2	1.112	2.520	insignificant
		within groups	22.077	50	0.442		
34	I encourage informal relationships between myself and the players	between groups	1.103	2	0.552	1.563	insignificant
		within groups	17,651	50	0.353		
35	Invite the players to my	between groups	2.294	2	1.147	3.275	insignificant

	house	within groups	17,517	50	0.350		
36	Praise a player's good performance in front of others	between groups	1.238	2	0.619	1.767	moral
		within groups	17,517	50	0.350		
37	Tell the player when he's performing well	between groups	0.255	2	0.127	0.282	insignificant
		within groups	22.613	50	0.452		
38	I make sure to reward the player for good performance	between groups	0.395	2	0.198	0.448	insignificant
		within groups	22.058	50	0.441		
39	I like it when a player is special (excellent)	between groups	0.337	2	0.168	0.534	insignificant
		within groups	15,776	50	0.316		
40		between groups	0.102	2	0.050	0.110 value (q)	insignificant
		within groups	23.106	50	0.462		

3-4 Presenting and discussing the results of the least significant difference test results.LSD):

Use the finder select (LSD) to find out the value of the least significant difference between coaches (basketball and handball) in the administrative leadership styles with moral significance, as shown in Table (11).

Table (11)

Values (LSD) Calculated and significant differences between arithmetic means among trainers

Basketball and handball in leadership styles

NS	vertebrae	comparison totals	Differences between circles	the difference	value(LSD)	indication
19	I allow players to try their own way even if they are wrong	Basket - Hand	3.88 - 4.62	- 0.74 *	0.228	moral
20	Take the opinion of players on important topics in training	Basket - Hand	3.75 - 4.62	- 0.87 *	0.252	moral

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

22	Allow players to decide which game plans can be used in a match	Basket - Hand	4.13 - 3.62	0.51*	0.303	moral
26	I reserve the right to manage things for myself	Basket - Hand	3.56 - 4.23	- 0.67 *	0.242	moral
35	Invite the players to my house	Basket - Hand	4.41 - 3.92	0.49 *	0.163	moral

It is noted from the table that the researcher has reached the following facts as follows: -

As for the nineteenth paragraph:

(I allow players to try their own way even if they are wrong)

It is noted that the highest difference was (-0.75), which is determined between (basketball and basketball) coaches in the nineteenth paragraph of the second dimension (the democratic method), as the arithmetic mean of basketball coaches reached (3.88) and basketball coaches (4.63) and the moral difference was In favor of the basketball coaches, therefore, the researcher believes that the basketball coaches are the best and they were in the first place, and it is clear that the handball coaches were in the second place because the difference in the circles between the coaches (basketball and handball) which amounted to (-0.74), as the arithmetic mean For basketball coaches it reached (3.88) and for handball coaches (4.62) and that this moral difference was in favor of handball coaches.

As for the twentieth paragraph:

(Asking the players' opinion on important topics in training)

It is noted that the highest difference was (- 0.88), which is determined between the (basketball and basketball) coaches in the twentieth century of the second dimension (the democratic method), as the arithmetic mean of basketball coaches reached (3.75) and basketball coaches (4.63) and the moral difference was in favor of Basketball coaches Therefore, the researcher believes that the basketball coaches are the best and they were in the first place, and it is clear that the handball coaches were in the second place because the difference in the circles between the coaches (basketball and handball) which amounted to (-0.87), as the arithmetic mean of the coaches Basketball reached (3.75) and handball coaches (4.63), and this moral difference was in favor of handball coaches.

The researcher sees with regard to the two paragraphs (the nineteenth and twenty) that basketball coaches use this method because the basketball rule in Iraq is a small rule compared to handball and the number of practitioners for this activity is few compared to the popularity of handball and the number of its practitioners, and this difference cannot be in the number of The practitioners are compared between the two, as is the case with basketball and the number of its practitioners in Iraq is greater than the number of basketball practitioners, and this activity is almost also a popular game, especially in the southern region of Iraq compared to basketball, and basketball coaches use the democratic method in decision - making related to the objectives of their teams and their clubs and the way to work and in support of its strategy to expand the base game and preserve them from the players move away from the practice and therefore weakness.

This result is in agreement with what was stated in the study (Horne and carran 1985) Which showed that the democratic method ranked second among the methods used in Canada and Jordan. (Ebda: 1993: 27)

and adds (Bobnelson - 1998) The compromise is the ideal, as good coaches work well, and division and estrangement are not required along the line. They know that friendly coaches finish their work first, so if their players work hard to do their training, and if there is no need for your personal intervention, you can By letting your players do their exercises in peace, not only will your players learn to take responsibility, but you will also be able to focus your efforts on the things that are most important to your team's success. (Shiba: 2003: 108)

As for the twenty-second paragraph:

(Allow players to decide which game plans can be used in a match)

It is noted that the highest difference was (0.79), which is determined between (basketball and basketball) coaches in the twenty-second paragraph of the second dimension (the democratic method), as the arithmetic mean of basketball coaches reached (4.13) and basketball coaches (3.38), and the moral difference was in favor of Basketball coaches Therefore, the researcher believes that the basketball coaches are the best and they were in the first place, and it is clear that the handball coaches were in the second place because the difference in the circles between the coaches (basketball and handball) which amounted to (0.51), as the arithmetic mean of basketball coaches The basketball score was (4.13) and the handball coaches (3.62) and that this moral difference was in favor of the basketball coaches as well.

As for the twenty-sixth paragraph:

(I reserve the right to do things for myself)

It is noted that the highest difference reached (0.85), which is determined between the (handball and basketball) coaches in the twenty-sixth paragraph of the third dimension (the dictatorial method), as the arithmetic mean of the handball coaches reached (4.23) and the basketball coaches (3.38), and the moral difference was in favor of Handball coaches Therefore, the researcher believes that handball coaches are the best and they were in the first place, and it is clear that basketball coaches were in the second place because the difference in the circles between coaches (basketball and handball) which amounted to (-0.67), as the arithmetic mean of coaches Basketball reached (3.56) and handball coaches (4.23), and this moral difference was in favor of handball coaches.

Therefore, the researcher sees that the handball coaches are superior to the basketball and basketball coaches, because this paragraph, which includes the phrase (I reserve the right to conduct things for myself) from the third dimension (the dictatorial style) is a natural and logical result according to the requirements of the game, in which it is imperative to use this method because The coach, according to the large area of the field and the relatively large number of players, does not succeed in controlling the course of affairs and forcing the players to adopt what he deems appropriate from immediate plans and according to what the coach deems to be able to lead the team while maintaining his leadership role in that.

As for the thirty-fifth paragraph / (I invite the players to my house)

It is noted that the highest difference reached (0.49), which is determined between (basketball and handball) coaches in the thirty-fifth paragraph of the fourth dimension (social support method), as the arithmetic mean of basketball coaches reached (4.41) and handball coaches (3.92) and the moral difference In favor of the basketball coaches, so the researcher

Administrative Leadership Styles for Coaches of Some Premier League Clubs, Basketball and Handball, for the 2019/2020 Season, A Comparative Study

believes that the basketball coaches are the best and they were in the first place, and it is clear that the basketball coaches were in the second place because the difference in the circles between the coaches (basketball and basketball) was (-0.28), as the arithmetic mean for basketball coaches of (4.41) and basketball coaches (4:13) and that this moral difference was in favor of basketball coaches also.

The researcher believes that basketball coaches are distinguished by paying attention to the interests of the players in an attempt to secure good conditions for the players, because the basketball game has a wide base, and the attention from the administrative bodies and the material and moral support from these bodies helped the coaches to use the method of social support for this paragraph without the coaches Basketball and handball.

Conclusion:

Through the results that appeared, the researcher reached the emergence of different views of basketball coaches in the administrative leadership styles in the dimensions (first, second, fourth, and fifth), which are respectively (training style, democratic style, social support style, and positive reinforcement style), respectively. And the absence of significant differences between the opinions of basketball coaches in the (third dimension) represented by (the dictatorial style), as well as the emergence of different views of handball coaches in the administrative leadership styles in the dimensions (first, second, third, and fourth), which are on respectively (training style, democratic style, dictatorial style, and social support style), and there were no significant differences between the opinions of football coaches in the (fifth dimension) represented by (positive reinforcement method), and there were no significant differences between the opinions of The coaches (basketball, handball) in the dimensions (first and fifth), which are respectively (training method, and positive reinforcement method).

References

1. Amira Shehadeh is eternal; The leadership style of coaches: (Proceedings of the Second Scientific Sports Conference, Part 1, Special Issue, University of Jordan, 1993)
2. Chelladurai, P, And SD, “ Dimension Of Leader Behavior In Sports: Development Of A Leadership Scale, Journal Of Sport Psychology, Vol. 2, 1980.
3. Faeq Hussein Abu Halima; Hadith in Sports Management, 1st Edition: (Wael House for Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan, 2004)
4. Muhammad Hassan Allawi; The Science of Sports Training, 8th Edition: (Dar Al Maaref in Egypt, Cairo, 1984)
5. Samir Muhammad Ali; Building and applying a measure of leadership styles for coaches of some team games from the players' point of view and its impact on the teams' ranking: (Master's Thesis, College of Physical Education, University of Basra, 2003).

Table 3

Comparisons Regarding the Perceived Anxiety, Motivation, Performance and Efficiency Levels of the Pre-service Teachers While Performing the Teaching Role in Virtual Classroom And Face-to-Face Teaching Environment.

	(Face-to-face) (Virtual Classroom)	N	Mean Rank	Total Rank	z	p
	Negative Ranks	21	21.33	448	-1.46	.14 3
	Positive Ranks	16	15.94	255		
	Equal	2				
	Negative Ranks	8	14.38	115	-3.53	.00 0
	Positive Ranks	30	20.87	626		
	Equal	2				
	Negative Ranks	10	11.90	119	-3.73	.00 0
	Positive Ranks	27	21.63	584		
	Equal	3				
	Negative Ranks	8	7.75	62	-4.38	.00 0
	Positive Ranks	29	22.10	641		
	Equal	3				

As a result of Wilcoxon Signed Rank test performed in order to reveal whether there was a statistically significant difference among the perceived anxiety, motivation, performance and efficiency scores of the pre-service teachers while performing the teaching role in virtual classroom and face-to-face teaching environment, it was determined that there was not a significant difference in terms of perceived anxiety ($z=-1.46$, $p>.05$); whereas there was a statistically significant difference in terms of perceived motivation ($z=-3.53$, $p<.00$) with a large effect size ($r=-0.55$), perceived performance ($z=-3.73$, $p<.00$) with a large effect size ($r=-0.59$), and perceived efficiency ($z=-4.38$, $p<.00$) with a large effect size ($r=-0.69$) on behalf of the experience in face-to-face teaching environment (positive ranks) (Table 3).

Reasons of the Pre-Service Teachers Perceived Anxiety, Motivation, Performance and Efficiency Levels

During the interviews conducted, the reasons for the anxiety perceived by the pre-service teachers regarding both virtual classroom and face-to-face teaching environments were revealed. It could be said that the pre-service teachers had the anxiety of teaching in front of the class, not being able to use their body language effectively and forget what to tell in face-to-face teaching environment; whereas they had the anxiety of facing technical problems in a virtual classroom environment. Some of the views of the pre-service teachers on this subject are presented below.

“...Virtual classroom has been easier for me. As a result, I made a plan in my head and I was not worried about the lectures as I would not be in a scene environment.” (PST13).

“In synchronous classroom application, the technical problems experienced in the computer and the materials I used panicked me and I could not express myself clearly.” (PST14).

“Virtual classroom environment is easier due to the convenience of being alone and as the materials are with me because of the fact that I may be concerned about forgetting the things I will teach.” (PST19).

“In face-to-face environment, the anxiety level is high, and thus, it is required to work harder in order to be able to use body language effectively.” (PST22).

In the interviews conducted, the pre-service teachers expressed that their motivation was low in virtual classroom environment due to such reasons as talking to the camera and being unable to ensure student participation; and that it was also low in face-to-face teaching environment due to such reasons as being excited and not being able to use body language effectively. Some of the views of the pre-service teachers on this subject are presented below.

“Talking to the camera in synchronous virtual classroom gave me a strange feeling. Talking in front of the students and getting feedback was important for a more enjoyable and fluent lesson.” (PST22).

“In virtual classroom, I was tired after a while since I could not provide student participation just because I was teaching on my own, and my voice was thrilling, which was a very tedious situation for me.” (PST23).

Comparison of Pre-Service Teachers’ Teaching Experiences in Virtual Classroom and Face-to-Face Teaching Environment

“The feeling that I was talking to the camera in synchronous virtual classroom is really boring.” (PST38).

“Since I was anxious when I first appeared on stage in face-to-face classroom application, I used the same body language from beginning till the end of the lesson and I could not be very energetic.” (PST13).

In the interviews conducted, the pre-service teachers stated that their performance was low in virtual classroom environment due to such reasons as not being able to make eye contact, less interaction and not being able to take individual differences into consideration; and that it was also low in face-to-face teaching environment due to such reasons as being excited and not being able to provide the control of the classroom. Some of the views of the pre-service teachers on this subject are presented below.

“I could not take into account the individual differences of the students in virtual classroom.” (PST7).

“Since I made too much effort in order to provide classroom control in face-to-face education, I sometimes went off the subject and spent a certain amount of time for returning back to the subject. During this time, I experienced difficulties in teaching the whole subject and could not get some of the activities done.” (PST23).

“Since I was on my own in synchronous virtual classroom, there was not much interaction and I felt like I was shooting videos rather than teaching the lesson. I was overwhelmed by my excitement from time to time in face-to-face classroom and this affected the way I taught quite a lot.” (PST31).

“Since I was in front of the computer in synchronous classroom, I could not perform enough teaching because I was just like talking to myself.” (PST36).

In the interviews conducted, the pre-service teachers emphasized that the technical problems experienced and not being able to make eye contact in virtual classroom environment decreased the efficiency of the lesson; whereas having the opportunity to interact and make eye contact with the students in face-to-face teaching environment increased the efficiency of the lesson. Below are some of the opinions of pre-service teachers on this subject.

“While I was teaching synchronously in virtual classroom, some of my students could not benefit from the course effectively because they had problems with the speed or quality of their internet connection. Although this situation seemed as a technical problem, it created a remarkable problem in achieving the goal of the course.” (PST3).

Şerife Ak, İbrahim Gökdaş

“The interaction with the students in face-to-face classroom makes the teaching livelier and easier to understand. I also think it also makes the teaching convenient for the teacher.” (PST10).

“In face-to-face classroom environment, classroom interaction was extremely high. Therefore, I think the lesson was more efficient. As I had the opportunity to make eye contact with all the students, I could make everyone participate actively. It was easier to motivate the students in terms of participating them in the lesson.” (PST19).

Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, it was aimed to evaluate the pre-service teachers' teaching experiences in virtual classroom and face-to-face teaching environment. In accordance with this purpose, the results regarding the pre-service teachers' teaching environment preferences, the anxiety, motivation, performance and efficiency levels they perceived while performing the teaching role in virtual classroom and face-to-face teaching environment, and the reasons for the emotional responses were obtained. As a result of the research, it was determined that the majority of the pre-service teachers preferred face-to-face teaching environment for such reasons as teacher-student interaction and eye contact. This finding coincides with the findings of the researches that revealed such negative views of the students regarding virtual classroom environments as the lack of face-to-face communication and low student-teacher interaction (Berge, 2002; Birişçi, 2013; Jin, 2005; Chen, et al., 2001; Ojo & Olakuluhin, 2006). Within the framework of this study, it was noteworthy that the pre-service teachers preferred face-to-face environment, not as a student but because of the same negative views as a teacher in virtual classroom environment.

While there was not a significant difference in terms of the anxiety levels perceived by the pre-service teachers during performing the teaching role in virtual classroom and face-to-face teaching environment, it was determined that there was a significant difference in terms of the perceived motivation, performance and efficiency on behalf of face-to-face teaching experience. The fact that the anxiety of lecturing in front of the classroom, not being able to using body language effectively and forgetting what to teach in face-to-face teaching environment expressed by the pre-service teacher is balanced with the anxiety of experiencing technical problems in virtual classroom environment can be considered as the reason why there

Comparison of Pre-Service Teachers' Teaching Experiences in Virtual Classroom and Face-to-Face Teaching Environment

was not a significant difference in terms of anxiety level for both of the teaching environments. Interestingly, not being on the stage in virtual classroom environment reduces the anxiety level of the pre-service teachers, whereas perceived motivation, perceived performance and perceived efficiency levels regarding virtual classroom experience decreases due to the fact that not being on the stage also yields such consequences as being unable to talk to the camera and being unable to make eye contact. This finding coincides with the findings in the literature revealing that technical problems in distance education negatively affect student motivation (Birişçi, 2013; Gilkes, 2020; Kalelioğlu et al., 2016; Ojo & Olakuluhin, 2006) and teachers' emotional response toward online teaching (Badia et al., 2019; Naylor & Nyanjom, 2020;. The decrease in student motivation can be considered as a factor that reduces perceived performance and perceived efficiency by creating the perception that the teacher is not able to provide student participation sufficiently and that the lesson is not productive. For this reason, as also stated by Yıldız (2011), in order to minimize the technical problems in virtual classroom applications, it is extremely important to eliminate the technical infrastructure deficiencies at the institutional level and provide continuous internet connection. In the relevant literature, the positive impact of institutional support on both preservice and in-service teachers' emotions to teaching online is also recognized (Naylor & Nyanjom, 2020; Nelson, Voithofer & Cheng, 2019). A recent study conducted by Naylor & Nyanjom (2020) reported a significant relationship between teachers' emotional responses type to teaching online and the perceived amount of institutional support.

The results of this study highlight the factors influencing pre-service teachers' teaching environment preferences and their emotional responses toward teaching. These factors are mostly related to the nature of virtual classroom where somewhat limit nonverbal interaction. Actually positive interaction between teachers and students is an important source of positive emotions for teacher (Chen, 2016). In this context, training programs for pre-service teachers aimed at providing knowledge and skills on interaction opportunities in virtual classrooms should be conduct. It was also revealed in this study that the pre-service teachers emphasized "interaction" most. The importance of interaction in online teaching is frequently emphasized in the literature (Moore, 1993; Swan, 2002; Wilson & Stacey, 2004). For this reason, it is important to organize the course activities carried out in virtual classroom environment in such a way that they enable the students to be more active (Kalelioğlu et al., 2016; Sae-Khow, 2014). At this point, it is possible to benefit from the features of current virtual classroom software

Şerife Ak, İbrahim Gökdaş

that is similar to the one present in real class environment and from the opportunities that will increase interaction (İzmirli & Akyüz, 2017). As well as the availability of these opportunities, the fact that these opportunities are indigenized and used by the teacher is of great importance. According to Song, Kim & Luo (2016), teachers should know different characteristics of online and face to face teaching and being skilled using tailored strategies for increase interaction. Therefore, pre-service teachers should be given the opportunity to experiences of teaching online where they are able to use these software and interaction opportunities.

In conclusion, it was determined in this study that among the reasons why the majority of the pre-service teachers preferred face-to-face teaching environment were such reasons as the anxiety of experiencing technical problems, not being able to use the interaction opportunities offered by virtual classroom environments and not being able to provide student participation. Based on this finding, it is necessary to teach pre-service teachers the technical specifications of virtual classroom environments and the interaction opportunities they offer, as well as training them in terms of the competencies to teach in these environments. In such a time period when digital transformation is experienced so rapidly, it is extremely significant for pre-service teachers to graduate by obtaining the necessary knowledge, skills and experience for virtual classroom environments as well as for face-to-face education environments.

Limitations and future research directions

Although the present findings add to our understanding of the reasons of pre-service teachers' teaching environment preferences and their emotional responses for both teaching in virtual classroom and teaching in face to face, there are several limitations worth noting. First, the results of the study have a limited generalizability. Besides, in this study, the collected data were limited to self-report data in the questionnaires and interviews. Future research may use a scale for collecting quantitative data and integrate observations and peer evaluations of pre-service teachers while they are performing the teaching role. Second, in this study, previous virtual classroom experiences of the pre-service teachers were not considered as a variable. However, some of the findings obtained may be correlated with the fact that the pre-service teachers who participated in the study experienced teaching in virtual classroom for the first time and that they had just a little experience in this subject. It is deemed significant to develop self-efficacy beliefs by pre-service teachers regarding the fact that they can teach the class effectively in virtual classroom environment as well as in face-to-face teaching environment

(Cakiroglu, Cakiroglu & Boone, 2005; Gorrell & Dharmadasa, 1994; Lambe, 2007; Woodcock et al., 2015). For this reason, there is a requirement for the applications that will increase virtual classroom experiences of pre-service teachers and for the studies examining the effects of this experience.

Statements of Ethics and Conflict of Interest

“I, as the Corresponding Author, declare and undertake that in the study titled as “*The Comparison of Pre-Service Teachers’ Teaching Experiences in Virtual Classroom and Face-To-Face Teaching Environment*”, scientific, ethical and citation rules were followed; Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry Journal Editorial Board has no responsibility for all ethical violations to be encountered, that all responsibility belongs to the author/s and that this study has not been sent to any other academic publication platform for evaluation. ”

References

1. Abdous, M. (2019). Influence of satisfaction and preparedness on online students' feelings of Anxiety. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 41, 34–44.
2. Abdous, M., & Yoshimura, M. (2010). Learner outcomes and satisfaction: A comparison of live video-streamed instruction, satellite broadcast instruction, and face-to-face instruction. *Computers & Education*, 55(2), 733–741.
3. Agyei, D. D., & Voogt, J. M. (2011). Exploring the potential of the will, skill, and tool model in Ghana: Predicting prospective and practicing teachers’ use of technology. *Computers & Education*, 56 (1), 91–100.
4. Anderson, D. L., Standerford, N. S., & Imdieke, S. (2010). A self-study on building community in the online classroom. *Networks*, 12(2), 1-10.
5. Badia, A., Garcia, C., & Meneses, J. (2017). Approaches to teaching online: Exploring factors influencing teachers in a fully online university. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 48, 1193–1207.
6. Badia, A., Garcia, C., & Meneses, J. (2019) Emotions in response to teaching online: Exploring the factors influencing teachers in a fully online university, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 56:4, 446-457
7. Badia, A., Meneses, J., & Monereo, C. (2014). Affective dimension of university professors about their teaching: An exploration through the semantic differential technique. *Universitas Psychologica*, 13, 161–173.
8. Baker, J. D. (2004). An investigation of relationships among instructor immediacy and affective and cognitive learning in the online classroom. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(1), 1-13.
9. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
10. Bennett, L. (2014). Putting in more: Emotional work in adopting online tools in teaching and learning practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(8), 919–930.
11. Berge, Z. (2002). Active, interactive, and reflective elearning, *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 3(2), 181-190.
12. Birişçi, S. (2013). Video Konferans Tabanlı Uzaktan Eğitime İlişkin Öğrenci Tutumları ve Görüşleri. *Journal of Instructional Technologies & Teacher Education*, 1(2), 24-40.
13. Brannen, J. (2005). Mixing Methods: The Entry of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches into The Research Process. *The International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(3): 173-185.

14. Cabı, E. (2018). Teaching Computer Literacy via Distance Education: Experiences of the Instructors. *Başkent University Journal of Education*, 5(1), 61-68.
15. Cakiroglu, J., Cakiroglu, E., & Boone, W. (2005). Pre-service teacher self-efficacy beliefs regarding science teaching: A comparison of pre-service teachers in Turkey and the USA. *Science Educator*, 14, 31–40.
16. Chen, G. D., Ou, K. L., Liu, C. C., & Liu, B. J. (2001). Intervention and strategy analysis for web group-learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 17, 58-71.
17. Chen, J. (2016). Understanding teacher emotions: the development of a teacher emotion inventory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 68–77.
18. Chen, J. (2019). Exploring the impact of teacher emotions on their approaches to teaching: A structural equation modelling approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(1), 57-74.
19. Compton, L. K. L., Davis, N. E., & Mackey, J. (2009). Field experience in virtual schools – to be there virtually. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 17(4), 459-477.
20. Downing, J. J. & Dymont, j. E. (2013). Teacher Educators' Readiness, Preparation, and Perceptions of Preparing Preservice Teachers in a Fully Online Environment: An Exploratory Study, *The Teacher Educator*, 48:2, 96-109.
21. Ertmer, P. A. & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: how knowledge, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42, 255–284.
22. Gilkes, A., L. (2020). Teachers' Knowledge and Self-Efficacy Beliefs as Factors Affecting Technology Integration Practices. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. 9365. Retrieved November 30, 2020 from <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/9365>.
23. Gorrell, J., & Dharmadasa, K. (1994). Perceived self-efficacy of pre-service and in-service Sri Lankan teachers. *International Education*, 24, 23–36.
24. Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255–274.
25. Gudmundsdottir, G. B., & Hatlevik, O. E. (2018). Newly qualified teachers' Professional digital competence: implications for teacher education, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 214-231.
26. Gülbahar, Y. & Karataş, E. (2016). Learning Distance Teaching via Distance Learning: “E-Instructor Certificate Program”. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(4), 1867-1880.
27. He, Y. (2014). Universal Design for Learning in an Online Teacher Education Course: Enhancing Learners' Confidence to Teach Online. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 10 (2): 283–297.
28. İzmirli, S., Akyüz, H. İ. (2017). Eş Zamanlı Sanal Sınıf Yazılımlarının incelenmesi. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 13(4), 788-810.
29. Jin, S. H. (2005). Analyzing student-student and student-instructor interaction through multiple communication tools in web-based learning, *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 32, 1, 59-67.

30. Kairu, C. (2020). The Role of the Instructor in Asynchronous Learning: Students' Views. In E. Langran (Ed.), *Proceedings of SITE Interactive 2020 Online Conference* (pp. 63-72). Online: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved November 29, 2020 from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/218121>.
31. Kalelioğlu, F., Atan, A. & Çetin, Ç. (2016). Sanal sınıf eğitmen ve öğrenen deneyimleri. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(2), 555-568.
32. Kennedy, K., & Archambault, L. (2012). Offering preservice teachers field experiences in K-12 online learning: A national survey of teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(3), 185-200.
33. Lambe, J. (2007). Student teachers, special education need and inclusion education: Reviewing the potential for problem-based, e-learning pedagogy to support practice. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 33, 359–377.
34. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.
35. Moore, M. G. (1993). Theory of transactional distance. In D. Keegan (Ed.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp. 22-38). New York: Routledge.
36. Naylor, D. & Nyanjom, J. (2020). Educators' emotions involved in the transition to online teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2020.1811645.
37. Nelson, M. J., Voithofer, R., & Cheng, S. L. (2019). Mediating factors that influence the technology integration practices of teacher educators. *Computers & Education*, 128, 330–344. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2018.09.023
38. Ojo, D.O., & Olakuluhin, F.K. (2006). Attitudes and perceptions of students to open and distance learning in Nigeria, *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 7(1), 1-10.
39. Reisoğlu, İ. & Çebi, A. (2020). How can the digital competences of pre-service teachers Be developed? Examining a case study through the lens of DigComp and DigCompEdu, *Computers & Education* (2020), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103940>.
40. Regan, K., Evmenova, A., Baker, P., Jerome, M. K., Spencer, V., Lawson, H., & Werner, T. (2012). Experiences of instructors in online learning environments: Identifying and regulating emotions. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 15(3), 204–212.
41. Sae-Khow, J. (2014). Developing of Indicators of an E-Learning Benchmarking Model for Higher Education Institutions. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 13(2), 35-43.
42. Shea, P., Li, C. S., & Pickett, A. (2006). A study of teaching presence and student sense of learning community in fully online and web-enhanced college courses. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 9(3), 175–190.
43. Song, H, Kim, J & Park, N . 2019. I know my professor: Teacher self-disclosure in online education and a mediating role of social presence. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 35(6):448–455.
44. Sprague, D., Kopfman, K., & Dorsey, S.L. (1998). Faculty development in the integration of technology in teacher education courses. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 14(2), 24-28.

45. Swan, K. (2002). Building learning communities in online courses: the importance of interaction. *Education, Communication & Information*, 2(1), 23-49.
46. Teddlie, C. & Tashakkori, A. (2009). Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
47. Telli-Yamamoto, G. & Altun, D. (2020). Coronavirüs ve Çevrimiçi (Online) Eğitimin Önlenemeyen Yükselişi. *Journal of University Research*, 3(1), 25-34.
48. Tondeur, J., Scherer, R., Siddiq, F., & Baran, E. (2020). Enhancing preservice teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK): A mixed method study. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 68(1), 319-343.
49. Trigwell, K. (2012). Relations between teachers' emotions in teaching and their approaches to teaching in higher education. *Instructional Science*, 40, 607-621.
50. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
51. Wilson, G. & Stacey, E. (2004). Online interaction impacts on learning: Teaching the teachers to teach online, *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 20(1), 33-48.
52. Woodcock, S., Sisco, A. & Eady, M. (2015). The learning experience: Training teachers using online synchronous environments. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 5(1), 21-34.
53. Yang, J., Zhu, F., Guo, P. & Pi, Z. (2020). Instructors' gestures enhance their teaching experience and performance while recording video lectures. *J. Comput. Assist. Learn.* 36(2): 189-198.
54. Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. (10. Baskı).Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
55. Yıldız, E. (2011). *Web-tabanlı senkron derslerin öğretmen adaylarının uzaktan eğitime karşı tutumları ve senkron teknolojileri kabulleri üzerine etkisi* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Balıkesir.
56. Yılmazsoy, B., Özdiç, F. & Kahraman, M. (2018). Sanal Sınıf Ortamındaki Sınıf Yönetimine Yönelik Öğrenci Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi. *Trakya Journal of Education* 8(3), 513-525.
57. Yordam, M. F., & Bülbül, T. (2018). Öğretmenlerin Özyeterlilik Algılarının Çevrimiçi Öğrenmeye Yönelik Hazırbulunurlukları ile İlişkisi. *Trakya University Journal of Social Science*, 20(1), 447-470.