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ABSTRACT: This study examined the relationship of role Involvement with team cohesion and athlete satisfaction. Participants included 179 male football players from 13 university in the age range of 18 to 31 and with age average of (M=24.5). To collect the data we use the role ambiguity scale, role acceptance and role satisfaction and team cohesion questionnaire and the athlete satisfaction questionnaire. The participants answer the questionnaires in the end of the maces. The results showed that correlation between the role ambiguity and role acceptance (r=-0.42), Role ambiguity and role satisfaction (r=-0.70), role ambiguity and team cohesion (r=-0.27) and role ambiguity with athlete satisfaction (r=-0.23) is minus and significant. Moreover analysis of regression of several state variables with the use of entering showed that role ambiguity related to the results of failure in the role, predictor of the role acceptance and the role ambiguity related to the evaluation field of role and results of the failure in the role both can predict the role acceptance equally. Additionally multivariable regression analysis with the use of interring method showed that role satisfaction is the predictors of athlete satisfaction and team cohesion of football players.

Key words: Role Ambiguity, Athlete Satisfaction, team cohesion, role acceptance and role satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

A primary focus within the field of sport psychology is to enhance the athletic experience for those that are involved. In order to enhance the athletic experience, it is important to first be aware of those factors that may impact, both positively and negatively, an athlete’s perception of his or her experience. An athlete’s role on a team, the clarity of the role, and the acceptance and satisfaction with the role may all influence both team cohesion and overall athlete satisfaction. This study will focus on these relationships. Specifically, this study will investigate if role ambiguity predicts role acceptance and/or role satisfaction, and if role acceptance and/or role satisfaction predict team cohesion and athlete satisfaction.

For most athletic experiences, athletes are members of groups or teams. These groups have a strong impact on the members of the group. Although this impact can be both positive and negative, an athlete’s involvement in a group is inevitable. Carron, Hausenblaus, and Eys (2005) have defined a sport team (or group) as a collection of two or more individuals who share a common fate, have structured patterns of communication, and hold common perceptions about group structure.

Roles have been defined by a number of researchers as a set of expectations about certain behaviors for a specific position in a particular social context (e.g., Biddle & Thomas, 1966). Carron, Hausenblaus, and Eys (2005) noted that in groups whose purpose is to strive towards peak performance, roles make a crucial contribution to the structure of these groups.

Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) defined athlete satisfaction as a positive affective state that results from a complex evaluation of the structures, processes, and outcomes associated with the athletic experience. Athlete satisfaction with sport is important for several reasons.

Research has demonstrated a negative relationship between role ambiguity and athlete satisfaction, but the research has yet to look at other aspects of role involvement and athlete satisfaction.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships among role ambiguity/clarity, role acceptance and role satisfaction, team cohesion, and athlete satisfaction. The hypothesized model for this relationship is linear.
and asserts that role ambiguity/clarity predicts role acceptance and role satisfaction, and that role acceptance and role satisfaction predict team cohesion and athlete satisfaction (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. The hypothesized relationships among role ambiguity (clarity), role acceptance and role satisfaction, and athlete satisfaction.](image)

Specific research questions are: (a) Does role ambiguity/clarity predicts role acceptance and/or role satisfaction? (b) Do role acceptance and/or role satisfaction predict athlete satisfaction? (c) Do role acceptance and/or role satisfaction predict team cohesion?

Aryanporan et al (2008) in a study entitled "Relationship between the role ambiguities in the sport with the athlete satisfaction in Kermanshah city football players" with this the goal that multi-relation exists between the role ambiguity in sport and athlete satisfaction. Results showed that between the role ambiguity in sport and athlete satisfaction exists the relationship significant negative (r=-0.34). Also, between the role ambiguity in sport and athlete satisfaction, and these two variables with athletic performance exist multiple relationships (p=0.05).

Abolghasemi (2006) have done a study entitled "Relationship between role ambiguity, role conflict and competitive anxiety with sports performance and academic achievement in individual sports athletes (wrestling, tennis and martial arts) and group (football, volleyball and basketball)" With the aim that role ambiguity, role conflict and competitive anxiety influence on athletic performance and academic achievement. Pearson correlation results indicated that each variable of role ambiguity, role conflict and competitive anxiety have a significant negative relationship with sports performance and academic achievement. This correlation in the group athletes was more than individual athletes. These results showed that the increased role ambiguity, role conflict and competitive anxiety will be followed by reduce sports performance and academic achievement.

Jones (2006) was studied Relationship between role involvement (role ambiguity, role satisfaction, role acceptance), with team cohesion and athlete satisfaction. Stepwise multiple regression analysis showed that role ambiguity regarding role evaluation was predictive of role satisfaction, and role ambiguity regarding scope of responsibilities was predictive of role acceptance. Stepwise multiple regressions also showed role satisfaction to be the only predictor of athlete satisfaction with regard to leadership as well as the only predictor of team cohesion with regard to individual attractions to the group-task.

In the study Beauchamp, Eys, Bray, and Carron (2005) showed that greater role ambiguity was associated with less satisfaction of athletes. They also found that relationship between role ambiguity and different aspects of the athlete satisfaction was significant only in the athletes who need more have role clarity.

**METHODS**

**Participants**

One-hundred-seventy-nine Iranian male football players compete in the ninth Football Sport Olympiad of Universities of nation (summer 2008; Yazd). Participants included (n=179) male football players from 13 university in the age range of 18 to 31 (M=24.5; SD=1.8).

**Measures**

Tools used in research to gather data including questionnaires of role ambiguity (Beauchamp, Eys, Bray, Carron; 2003), the role of acceptance and satisfaction (Bray; 1998), team cohesion (Carron, Widemeyer, Brawley; 1985) and athlete satisfaction (Riemer, Chelladurai; 1998). The reliability coefficient of questionnaires was reported by Cronbach's alpha method, respectively, 0.71, 0.87, 0.94, 0.81, and 0.94. Questionnaires validity of the questionnaires used in the study by teachers department of Physical Education, University of Chamran Ahvaz were confirmed. The participants answered to the questionnaires after the competition.
RESULTS

Descriptive statistics
Means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores for role ambiguity, role of acceptance and satisfaction, team cohesion, athlete satisfaction are reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for role ambiguity, role of acceptance and satisfaction, team cohesion, athlete satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role ambiguity</td>
<td>62.05</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role acceptance</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role satisfaction</td>
<td>21.18</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team cohesion</td>
<td>111.02</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athlete satisfaction</td>
<td>163.86</td>
<td>41.14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bivariate Relationships between variables
The hypothesized bivariate relationships between role ambiguity, role of acceptance and satisfaction, team cohesion, athlete satisfaction at end of the competition.

Table 2. Bivariate correlation between variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>role acceptance</th>
<th>role satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role acceptance</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.70**</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team cohesion</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athlete satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **P<0.001; *p<0.05

The results revealed statistically negative and significant relationships between role ambiguity with role of acceptance and satisfaction, team cohesion, athlete satisfaction, and positive and significant relationships between role satisfaction with team cohesion and athlete satisfaction. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table 2.

Does Role Ambiguity predict Role Acceptance and Role Satisfaction?
Analysis of regression of several state variables with the use of entering showed that in the players of football teams is participating in the Olympiad, among the four areas of role ambiguity (role ambiguity–Scope of responsibilities, role behaviors, scope of role evaluation and ambiguity related to failure consequences), only the scope of failure consequences is as the variable best of predictor for the role acceptance $F(4,174) = 10.28; p<0.001$.

Among the four areas of role ambiguity, two components of role behaviors and scope role ambiguity related to failure consequences are as the variables best of predictor for the role satisfaction among football players is participating in the Olympiad $F(4,174) = 45.66; p<0.001$.

Do Role Satisfaction and Role Acceptance predict Team Cohesion?
Analysis of regression of several state variables with the use of entering showed that between the two variables of role acceptance and role satisfaction, the role satisfaction has been able as the variable best of predictor for the team cohesion among football players is participating in the Olympiad $F(2,176)=5.06; p<0.01$.

Do Role Satisfaction and Role Acceptance predict Athlete Satisfaction?
Analysis of regression of several state variables with the use of entering showed that between the two variables of role acceptance and role satisfaction, the role satisfaction has been able as the variable best of predictor for the athlete satisfaction among football players is participating in the Olympiad $F(2,176) = 7.57; p<0.001$.

Between mean of the role ambiguity in the players of successful team (Top three teams in this tournament) and the players of unsuccessful team (bottom three teams in this tournament) was a significant difference. This means that the players of successful teams were less ambiguity on her role. Also, between mean of the role acceptance in the players of successful team and the players of unsuccessful team was not a significant difference. This means that was not difference between role acceptance in the players of successful teams and the players of unsuccessful teams.

Between mean of the role satisfaction in the players of successful team and the players of unsuccessful team was a significant difference. This means that balance of role satisfaction in the players of successful teams were more than the players of unsuccessful teams. Also, between mean of the team cohesion in the players of
successful team and the players of unsuccessful team was a significant difference. This means that balance of team cohesion in the players of successful teams were more than the players of unsuccessful teams.

Between mean of the athlete satisfaction in the players of successful team and the players of unsuccessful team was a significant difference. This means that balance of athlete satisfaction in the players of successful teams were more than the players of unsuccessful teams. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Means, standard deviations, and degree free for the successful and unsuccessful teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>successful team</th>
<th></th>
<th>unsuccessful team</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role ambiguity</td>
<td>141.67</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>132.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role acceptance</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role satisfaction</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team cohesion</td>
<td>117.53</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athlete satisfaction</td>
<td>183.47</td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>146.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The results of research indicate that in additional between the role ambiguity with role acceptance, role satisfaction, team cohesion, and athlete satisfaction is a significant negative relationship among the players. But with some of the components of role ambiguity significant relationship with these variables not found that includes the scope of responsibility in the role with role acceptance, team cohesion, and athlete satisfaction, but between other components of role ambiguity significant relationship with these variables found. This means that the players have less conflict and duality in the roles. Whatever this conflict and duality have less, consequently role acceptance, role satisfaction, team cohesion, and athlete satisfaction were more, that lead to the beneficial in the Task. If this conflict and duality have more, occasion that the athletes have not a good understanding of the role, and adverse effects will be for athletes.

Results of research indicate that between role acceptance with team cohesion and athlete satisfaction are related among the athlete’s football team participated in the Olympiad Yazd. Although this relationship was not significant, and between role acceptance with team cohesion and it subscale was correlated positively but lower than expected levels have been found. Also between role acceptance with athlete satisfaction and some of it subscale was correlated positively.

According to the literature research and results reported in the most they, is the relationship between role acceptance with team cohesion and athletes satisfaction has been confirmed at the level of significant. So, expect of researcher on this relationship of low and no significant attributed to the probable cause that the players not together during a full season, but they have together a months before the competing.

The role satisfaction considered to be as a condition affective of the role involvement and the only effective element that is known in literature (Beauchamp and Eys; 2005). Bakeman and Helmreich (1975) team cohesion and athletic satisfaction was investigated in three interval time (early season, during the season and end season). The results showed that between three interval times and athletic satisfaction is a significant positive correlation; mean that at the end of the season the most consistent team will have the best players (Beauchamp, Eys, Bray, and Carron; 2005). The findings showed that role ambiguity experienced during mid-season, predictor nose consent role next season.

Findings from this study showed that between role satisfaction with team cohesion and athlete satisfaction exist a relationship significant positive. This means that variable of the role satisfaction comes into account an effective factor on team cohesion and athlete satisfaction in team sports. Whatever the athletes are role satisfaction of enough in the group sport cause to be well athlete’s performance and team cohesion.

During this the tournament, the majority of the teams of courses are invited to camp a month before starting competitions and have not the enough time to understand responsibilities, the role-related behaviors and evaluate their roles, and have not the necessary experience. Therefore consider reasonable that fear and knowledge of failure has the most potent stimulus for accepting their role.

Statistical analysis this study showed that only the role satisfaction can predicted the athlete satisfaction.

Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) mentioned that role satisfaction and athletic performances have been related. For example, an athlete very satisfied on the training environment may have expected more of him in the compete scene. Athletic satisfaction has a significant relationship with other variables such as role ambiguity and sports leadership. Whatever the cohesion of a sports team and athletic satisfaction is high; Players are not
uncertainty in their role. For example, if a footballer is complete satisfies from himself team, he can cooperate with their teammates in the sports compete.

Also multiple regression statistical analysis indicated that across subscale of role ambiguity, scope of the results of failure in the role is strongest predictor of the role acceptance. And scope of evaluation role and results of failure in the role, both are equally able to strongest predictor for the role satisfaction from across four subscale of role ambiguity. Also among variables of the role acceptance and the role satisfaction for predicted the team cohesion and athletes satisfaction, the role satisfaction has able been predicted both them.

The results of this research especially in the group sports can are useful and valuable for coaches in various organizations, particularly the physical education organization, to prepare athletes, because one from the effective factors that causes decrease athletic performance are non group cohesion, non satisfaction and role ambiguity of high in athletes (Jones; 2006).
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