AN EXAMINATION OF CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF HANDBALL COACHES: PERCEPTIONS OF HANDBALL PLAYERS

Veli Onur ÇELİK[1]

Koray YALÇINKAYA[2]

ABSTRACT

The aim of the current study is to investigate the charismatic leadership perceptions of male and female players in the leagues of Turkish Handball Federation for their coaches. The sampling of the study consists of 242 handball players in the leagues of Turkish Handball Federation during the 2012-2013 season. In order to obtain data regarding the charismatic leadership perception of the players for their coaches, the "Charismatic Leadership Scale" developed by Çelik (2011) was administered.

For the purposes of data analysis, reliability tests (Cronbach Alpha), t-test, one-way variance analysis and factor analysis were applied. The comparison made according to the variables "gender" and "education level" showed statistically meaningful differences in some subscales which Unusual Appearance, Trust and Personalized Interest, Impressiveness, Taking Risk for Value and Motivating Communication (p <0.05). One-way ANOVA test results revealed meaningful differences among the groups in some subscales for the variables "age", "league level", "the duration of working with the same coach" and "the duration of doing the same sports branch (p<0.05). According to research findings, the players with lower levels of educational background think that their coach trusts them very much, cares them a lot, takes risks for success and has good communication with them.

Key Words: Charismatic Leadership, Handball, Coach, Player.

HENTBOL ANTRENÖRLERİNİN KARİZMATİK LİDERLİK ÖZELLİKLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ: HENTBOL OYUNCULARI TARAFINDAN ALGILANAN

ÖZET

Araştırmanın amacı, Türkiye Hentbol Federasyonuna bağlı liglerde mücadele eden kadın ve erkek sporcuların kendi antrenörleri hakkındaki karizmatik liderlik algılarının incelenmesidir. Araştırmanın örneklem grubunu 2012-2013 sezonunda Türkiye Hentbol Federasyonuna bağlı liglerde mücadele eden 242 sporcu oluşturmaktadır. Sporcuların antrenörleri ile ilgili karizmatik liderlik algılarının değerlendirilmesi amacıyla Çelik (2011) tarafından geliştirilen Karizmatik Liderlik Ölçeği (KLÖ) kullanılmıştır.

Verilerin çözümlenmesinde sporcuların demografik özelliklerine ait frekans tablolarından, güvenilirlik testlerinden (Cronbach Alpha), t- testinden, tek yönlü varyans analizinden, faktör analizinden yararlanılmıştır. Cinsiyet ve eğitim düzeyi değişkenine göre yapılan karşılaştırmada ölçeğe ilişkin Sıradışı Görünüş, Güven ve Bireysel İlgi, Etkileyicilik, Değerler İçin Risk Alma ve Motive Edici İletişim alt boyutlarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar gözlenmiştir (p<0.05). Tek yönlü (One–Way) ANOVA sonucunda yaş, lig düzeyi, antrenörü ile çalışma süresi ve spor branşında çalışma süresi değişkenlerinde bazı alt boyutlarda gruplar arasında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur (p<0.05). Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre eğitim düzeyi daha düşük olan sporcular antrenörlerİne daha çok güvendiklerini,antrenörlerinin başarı için riskler aldığını ve antrenörlerinin sporcuları ile iyi bir iletişim kurduklarını düşünmektedirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Karizmatik Lider, Hentbol, Antrenör

[1]Anadolu Üniversitesi

[2] Osmangazi Üniversitesi

INTRODUCTION

Following the changes in working conditions towards the end of 20th century, the needs of employees and administrators varied to a great extent and new approaches emerged in parallel with these changes. Although situational approaches have cleared the criticisms against behaviorist theories to some extent, research methods and applications in leadership approaches are still being discussed in the field. One of the approaches recently developed and studied in the field of leadership is "Charismatic Leadership" (Çelik, 2011).

Providing the basis for the charismatic leadership approach, the concept "charisma", which literally means "gift", was first used in Ancient Greek. Later, the word "karizmata" (gifts) was derived from this word to explain supernatural powers gifted to those chosen by the gods such as healing and making predictions about the future (Aslan, 2009; Conge and Kanungo, 1994). In other words, "charisma" was originally used for the individuals having exceptional and extraordinary powers and features, which were believed to be gifted by a divine source (Aslan 2009; Conge and Kanungo, 1994).

Due to the studies conducted by Weber (1968), charismatic leadership has been an important topic of study in the field of management and organization (Aslan, 2009; Conger and Kanungo, 1994). Since then, the types suggested by Weber (1968) to account for the authoritarian powers in society has been examined from different perspectives by numerous academicians studying in different disciplines. One of the significant recent approaches in the field of charismatic leadership is "Attribution to Charisma Theory" developed by Conger and Kanungo. The model suggested by Conger and Kanungo focuses on understanding which behaviors of leaders are perceived as charismatic by their followers. In this theory, it is assumed that if the concept "charisma" attributed to the leader by his / her followers is based on the observable behaviors of the leader, then it is possible to explain the nature of this charisma by defining certain behavioral components (Conger, 1999; Conger and Hunt, 1999; Oktay and Gül, 2003).

Charismatic leadership has been studied in various disciplines of social sciences such as sociology, psychology, organizational behavior, history, management, human resources and political sciences (Oktay and Gül, 2003). The relationship between the role or the behaviors of charismatic leaders and certain predetermined variables is still being discussed in the field through a number of studies focusing on the leadership in the organizations having different structures and objectives (Celik, 2011) In today's world, coaches are considered the leaders of the teams they work for, so they play important roles in achieving organizational or individual goals with their behaviors. It is crucial that the coaches of team sports have certain leadership behaviors that are likely to foster the cohesion in the team, to increase the performances of the players and to achieve these organizational goals (Celik, 2011).

A detailed review of international sports literature shows that there are some studies dealing with the relationship between leadership characteristics of coaches and various variables. One of these studies, focuses on the transformational leadership behaviors and leadership variables of the sports directors working in NCAA Division III and the coaches' job satisfaction, reveals that there is a linear relationship between job satisfaction and certain variables such as coaching talents, the ability to design the organization and foster group cohesion. In addition, transformational leadership behavior of sports directors were found to have a direct relationship with job satisfaction of the coaches when strong leadership is not present (Yusof and Shah 2008). In another study, which examines the situational coaching styles of wrestling

coaches, a significant difference was found between the autocratic leadership perceptions for the coaches by their players playing in successful and failing teams at the end of the season (Turman 2001).

A study conducted during the 1999 Rajabhat Games claims that the variable "gender" does not affect leadership behavior and team cohesion. In addition, no relationship was found between the sports branches available in the games, leadership behaviors and the level of cohesion (Sriboon 2001). Another study conducted in the USA examined the leadership behaviors of basketball coaches working for 3rd Division and group cohesion. The results of the study showed positive and meaningful relationship in 14 of the total 16 correlations between four leadership dimensions (social support, positive feedback, training and democratic behavior) and four cohesiveness dimensions (individual attraction to group-task, individual attraction to group-social, group integration-task, group integration-social). No meaningful relation was found between group integration-social and democratic behavior and social support dimensions (Farnetti 2008).

In a study carried out with the college basketball teams in Taiwan, the researchers found a meaningful relationship between leadership behaviors of the coaches and team cohesion. The results showed a relationship between the leadership dimensions perceived by the players and task and social cohesion perceived in the team (Chen, 2007). Another study conducted by Lan in 2009 in Taiwan examined the relationship between the leadership behaviors of the coaches working for college basketball teams and team cohesion and found a positive relationship between team cohesion and social support, positive feedback, training and democratic behavior (Lan 2009).

When sports-related literature in the Turkish context is examined, it can be seen that there are studies investigating the relationships between leadership behaviors / styles as perceived by the players and various variables. Konter (2007) in his study dealing with leadership power perceptions with regards to gender of coaches and players, found that female players differ from male ones in terms of "expert power" but are similar to male ones with regards to "coercive power", "legitimate power" and "referent power". Data analysis shows that female players perceive expert power of their coaches more dominant than males.

According to Konter (2007), there are more similarities than differences between male and female players regarding the perception of leadership power. In another study by the same researcher focusing on leadership power perceptions of football players according to the variable "the number of matches played in national teams (U-17 and U-19 national teams and the national team), the data obtained from male players showed no significant difference between the number of the matches played and leadership power perception (p>0.05). However, as for the referent power and the number of the matches played, the result was very close to meaningful difference level (Konter 2008).

The study carried out by Toros (2009) examined the relationship between the perceived coaching behavior and team cohesion throughout a season. Designed for a PhD dissertation with the players of U-19 basketball teams, the study suggests that there are relationships among the subscales of "team cohesion" such as individual attraction to group tasks, authoritarian behavior, social support and rewarding behavior prior to the season. During the season, the researcher found relationships between the following variables: individual attraction to group task and teaching; democratic behavior and rewarding behavior; individual attraction to group-social and democratic behavior; and group integration task, teaching and

rewarding behavior. At the end of the season, on the other hand, the following relationships were found: between individual attraction to group task and democratic behavior, authoritarian behavior, social support and rewarding behavior; between individual attraction to group-social and teaching, authoritarian behavior, social support and rewarding behavior; between group integration task and teaching, democratic behavior, social support and rewarding behavior; and finally between group integration social and social support behavior.

Çelik (2013) developed a scale involving 10 subscales and 35 items at the end of a study which aimed to create this scale to evaluate charismatic leadership perception of team sports players. In addition, Çelik

METHODOLOGY
This part is included information about research model, research group, data collection instruments, data analysis procedures and data analysis applied in the study.

Research Model
In the study, the "descriptive" research model was preferred as the most suitable model for the purposes of the current study. Descriptive studies are those aiming to investigate a current situation. In this model, descriptions are used to identify the differences among individuals, objects or situations, etc. rather than analyzing the situation with regard to whether it meets certain criteria or not. The relationships determined through the survey model, in fact, cannot be evaluated as a true cause-effect

(2011) investigated the effects of charismatic leadership characteristics of coaches on team cohesion. The results showed that these ten subscales might be combined into 8 subscales. He claimed that these subscales had effects on team cohesion as well.

The aim of the current study was to investigate the charismatic leadership of handball coaches according to the perceptions of male and female Turkish handball players. In order to achieve this aim, it is examined whether the charismatic leadership characteristics that female and male handball players perceptions their coaches have differ according to various variables.

relationship. However, the results may provide some invaluable insights and the determination of the situation in a variable may enable the researchers to predict the others accordingly as well (Karasar, 2003). The current study tries to examine the relationships between various variables and handball players' perception of charismatic leadership characteristics for their coaches.

Participants and Procedures
The participants of this descriptive study were 105 male handball players and 137 female handball players, taken part Super League and 1 st Division Handball League in 2012-13 season in Turkey. The Name of participants teams were given in table 1.

Table 1. The Teams in the Samplingof the Study

1st league Play-off– men	1st league Play-off– women	Super League - men	Super League - women
Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi S.K.	Van Gençlik S.K.	Beşiktaş	Muratpaşa Belediyesi S. K.
Sakarya Büyükşehir Bld. S.K.	Antalya Telekom S.K.	Ankara İl Özel İdare S.K.	Ardeşen Gençlik S.K.
İzmir Aldınordu Konak Bld. S.K.	Arhavi Bld. S.K.		Üsküdar Bld. S.K.
Rize Gençlik S.K.	Amasya Atatürk Lisesi S.K.		Çankaya Bld. S.K.
Yeni Adana S.K.	İstanbul Emniyet Gücü K.		Eskişehir Büyükşehir Bld. S.K.
Trabzon Akçaabat İhtisas S.K.	Ankara Gazete Yenimahalle Gençlik S.K.		

In order to examine the perception of these female and male players for the charismatic leadership, researchers decided to apply the full count system. The total number research population is defined as "full count". Such populations allowing "full count" are relatively smaller populations.

The reason for "full count" is to obtain more detailed information about the population. It is suggested that "full count" can be used when very detailed information about a variable is required (Gürtan,1982). For the purposes of the study, all the teams in all four leagues of the Turkish Handball Federation were sent the questionnaires during 2012-2013 season to distribute amongst their players. Some of the teams contacted chose not to participate in the study for various reasons. Finally, the sampling of the study consisted of 242 female and male players from 19 teams who filled out the scale in a valid way. The teams that agreed to participate in the study are displayed in Table 1 below.

Data Collection Instrument

The Charismatic Leadership Scale developed by Çelik (2011) was used to collect data regarding the charismatic leadership perception of players for their coaches in this study. The scale consists of 8 subscales and 35 items prepared in a four point Likert scale format, these being "I totally agree", "I agree", "I don't agree" and "I don't agree at all". The factors in the scale are "Trust" (5 items), "Taking Risk for Value"(6 items), "Motivating Communication"(5 items), "Impressiveness"(5 items), "Personalized Interest"(5 items), "Antipathetic Perception"(3 items), "Personality" (3 items) and "Unusual Appearance" (3 items) (Çelik, 2011).

Data Analysis

For the purposes of analysis, various methods and tests were used, these were; frequency tests to get the demographic data about the players; Chronbach Alpha reliability tests; t-test; one-way variance analysis; and explanatory factor analysis.

FINDINGS

This section presents the findings related to normality test obtained from research data, descriptive statistics, the findings related to explanatory factor analysis and difference tests.

The first step in understanding the data obtained from surveys, scales, experiments etc. is to examine and summarize the different variables one by one. In a general sense, explanatory statistics involve the following issues: Categorizing the variables and preparing summary tables; drawing the graphics related to the variables and/or obtaining the measures defining the distributions (calculating the percentages and

obtaining means and measures of variability) (Alpar, 2010).

Table 2. Demographic Data of the Handball Players who took part in the study

		Frequency	%
GENDER	Female	137	56,6
	Male	105	43,4
AGE	18 years old and below	90	37,2
	19-22	74	30,6
	23-26	44	18,2
	27 years old and above	34	14,1
EDUCATION	Primary and Secondary Education	111	45,9
	Higher Education	131	54,1
LEAGUE	Super League (woman)	63	26
	Super League (man)	25	10,3
	1st Play-off League (woman)	75	31
	1st Play-off League (man)	79	32,6
TIME WORKING WITH COACH	one season or less	85	35,1
	2 season	34	14
	3 season	26	10,7
	4 season	21	8,7
	5 season	14	5,8
	6 season	62	25,6
TIME IN THE SAME BRANCH	less than one year and five years	46	19
	6-9 years	86	35,5
	10-13 years	58	24
	14-17 years	37	15,3
	18 years and more	15	6,2
NATIONALITY	Turkish Republic	230	95
	Others	12	5
	TOTAL	**242**	**100**

As can be seen in table 2, 137 (56.6%) of the handball players who took part in the study are female and 105 (43.4%) are male and 90 (37.2%) are 18 years old and under and 34 (14.1%) are 27 years and above. The education of 111 (45.9%) of the participants had completed "Primary and Secondary Education" and 131 (54.1%) had "Undergraduate and Graduate Education". As for the duration of time working with the same coach, 85 (35.1%) of the players stated that they had been working with the coach for one season or less whereas 62 (25.6%) for six seasons or more. When the length of time playing handball is looked at, 46 (19%) of the players responded that they had been playing handball for less than one year to five years and 15 (6.2%) said they had been playing for 18 years or more. 230 (95%) of the players are Turkish nationals and 12 (5%) responded as 'other'.

It is suggested that the previous data should be studied in advance before moving to the new analysis of the data obtained from the research group. As kurtosis and skewness coefficients obtained from the research group are significant in the process, they should be receiving extra care and study (Şimşek, 2007).

Table 3. The Findings Regarding the Distribution of Data

	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Standard Error	Statistic	Standard Error
1. My coach knows about my family.	-1,019	0,156	0,002	0,312
glish2. My coach helps me with my future plans.	-0,748	0,156	-0,137	0,312
3. My coach is sensitive to my problems.	-0,778	0,156	0,012	0,312
4. My coach stands by me during my bad days (death, illness, injury etc).	-1,007	0,156	0,549	0,312
5. My coach knows my special days (birthday etc).	-0,101	0,156	-1,139	0,312
6. My coach is supportive even when I am out regardless of the quality of my performance in the match.	-0,293	0,156	-0,68	0,312
7. I am sure that my coach will support me even if I fail to play well.	-0,448	0,156	-0,651	0,312
8. My coach helps me with any kinds of problems I have.	-0,542	0,156	-0,267	0,312
9. I can speak with my coach comfortably about my daily life problems.	-0,407	0,156	-0,72	0,312
10. My coach takes good care of the needs of all players.	-0,41	0,156	-0,642	0,312
11. My coach is considered antipathetic due to his odd behaviors.	0,253	0,156	-0,886	0,312
12. My coach is considered arrogant by many people.	0948	0,156	0,256	0,312
13. My coach is considered a "know-it-all" due to his odd behaviors.	0,994	0,156	0,3	0,312
14. My coach has impressive physical appearance.	0,111	0,156	-0,7	0,312
15. My coach looks classy no matter what he wears.	-0,464	0,156	-0,364	0,312
16. My coach has an impressive tone of voice.	-0,367	0,156	-0,805	0,312
17. My coach communicates effectively with the people around him.	-0,601	0,156	-0199	0,312
18. In my opinion, my coach cannot even be considered an average person due to his opinions.	0,131	0,156	-0,596	0,312
19. My coach cannot even be considered an average person according to the values of our society due to his behaviors.	0,028	0,156	-0,512	0,312
20. My coach cannot be considered even an average person due to his values.	0,018	0,156	-0,437	0,312
21. My coach is able to fire me up with his actions.	-0,588	0,156	-0,234	0,312
22. My coach is able to fire me up by uttering even one sentence.	-0,498	0,156	-0,371	0,312
23. My coach knows how to motivate each player.	-0,478	0,156	-0,589	0,312
24. The speech of my coach is clear to understand.	-0,722	0,156	0,051	0,312
25. When my coach starts to talk, everybody stops talking and listens to him.	-0,88	0,156	0,376	0,312
26. My coach is quite good at making the right intonations while talking.	-0,629	0,156	-0,56	0,312
27. The hair style of my coach can be considered unusual according to the standards in our society.	0,582	0,156	-0,685	0,312
28. The clothes of my coach can be considered unusual according to the standards in our society.	0,709	0,156	-0,151	0,312
29. The physical appearance of my coach can be considered unusual according to the standards in our society.	0,382	0,156	-0,855	0,312

30. My coach takes risks which other coaches are not brave enough to take.	-0,314	0,156	-0,686	0,312
31. My coach makes surprising and unexpected decisions and puts them into practice.	-0,303	0,156	-0,679	0,312
32. My coach makes radical decisions and puts them into practice.	-0,437	0,156	-0,466	0,312
33. My coach realizes his decisions despite the obstacles he faces.	-0,534	0,156	-0,176	0,312
34. My coach is determined to realize his plans even at the risk of breaking the existing obstacles.	-0,522	0,156	-0,349	0,312
35. My coach always backs his ideas and stands behind them determinedly.	-0,797	0,156	0,002	0,312

Therefore, these values were evaluated accordingly in this study. The skewness value obtained from charismatic leadership scale is between -1,019 and 0,994 and kurtosis value between -1,139 and 0,549, which are between the range of ±2 and ±7 as suggested in the related literature. According to these findings, the data shows a normal distribution (West et.al, 1995; Şencan, 2005; Şimşek, 2007). As a result, the researchers decided to move to other analyses for the obtained data.

In the current study, Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied in order to determine the dimensions of Charismatic Leadership Scale developed (Celik, 2013) for the purposes of the study. Exploratory Factor Analysis is a multiple variable analysis technique used to enable researchers to understand the relationships among many variables, to make comments about them by reducing this high number of variables into more manageable groups and providing a summary at the end. In other words, factor analysis facilitates the understanding of the relationships in a set of data that involves a lot of variables by determining the basic factors of this particular set of data (Altınışık et.al 2005). According to Hair et.al (1998), factor analysis is a multi-variable analysis technique used to understand the relationship structure that forms the basis for a data matrix. In addition, in exploratory factor analysis, the researcher tries to identify the possible relationships among variables since he does not have any idea or predictions regarding such relationships (Altunışık et.al 2005). Prior to exploratory factor analysis, Keiser-Meyer-Olkin Test (KMO) was applied to determine whether the sampling size is suitable for the analysis, and Barlett's Sphericity Test to test the relationships among variables.

As for the KMO test, the values between 0.5 and 1 are acceptable and the values lower than 0.5 imply that factor analysis is not appropriate for the data set obtained. The generally accepted ideal value for KMO test is 0.7 (Altunışık et.al 2005; Çokluk, 2010). The following gives the values and their implications for data sets when a KMO test is applied (Çokluk, 2010; Şencan 2005):

1. Between 0.50 - 0.60: bad
2. Between 0.60 - 0.70: poor
3. Between 0.70 - 0.80: medium
4. Between 0.80 – 0.90: good
5. Between 0.90 and over: perfect

The KMO value for the scale was found to be 0.895, which implies that sampling size is appropriate for the factor analysis. The value for Barlett's Sphericity test, which tests the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis, was calculated as χ2= 4898,521 and p < 0.001.

In factor analysis, the factor structure of the data was analyzed through basic components methods by using Varimax rotation. Exploratory factor analysis showed that 35 items are grouped under

7 subscales. This scale, which was also used for a PhD dissertation by Çelik (2011), originally consists of 8 dimensions. In the current study, however, the subscales "trust" and "personalized interest" were grouped under one structure, so it was labeled as one single factor and analyzed accordingly. In order to evaluate whether overlapping and factor load values for 35 items are between the limits of acceptability, factor reduction was applied. For an item to overlap, it is necessary to produce load value higher than acceptable level for two or more factors, or the difference between load values in two or more factors should be lower than 0.1 (Çokluk et.al 2010). The items having such structure were omitted from the scale. In order to have meaningful structures in theoretical terms, the acceptability level for factor loads was determined as 0.40. The items having a value lower than 0.40 were omitted from the scale (Hair et.al 1998). As a result of this item reduction process, item 6 (whatever I do on the pitch, my coach supports me"), item 7 (I know that my coach will support me even if I fail), item 23 (my coach knows how to motivate each player) and item 26 (my coach is good at making effective intonations during his speech) were omitted from the scale and the number of items was reduced to 31. The seven factors obtained from explanatory factor analysis are 1. Trust and Personalized Interest, 2. Taking Risk for Value, 3. Motivating Communication, 4. Impressiveness, 5.Antipathetic Perception, 6. Personality and 7. Unusual Appearance.

There are eight items under the Trust and Personalized Interest factor, and their factor load values range between 0.626 and 0.739. The factor "impressiveness" has six items with factor load values between 0.469 and 0.755. As for the factor "Taking Risk for Value", there are six items with factor load values between 0.465 and 0.694. Under the factor "Personality" are 3 items whose factor loads vary between 0.821 and 0.875. The factor "Unusual Appearance" has 3 items with factor load values between 0.763 and 0.847. As for the factor "Antipathetic Perception", there are 3 items and their factor loads values range between 0.657 and 0.844. Finally, there are two items on the factor "Motivating Communication" with factor load values between 0.870 and 0.882. The analysis shows that seven factors accounts for 66.416 % of total variance and the factor loads of all the items under seven factors are over 0.40.

According to the results of the Cronbach Alpha Test applied to determine internal consistency of the factors in Charismatic Leadership Scale, the value for the dimension "Trust and Personalized Interest" was found to be 0.887, for "Taking Risk for Value" 0.817, for "Motivating Communication" 0.910, for "Impressiveness" 0.857, for "Antipathetic Perception" 0.762, for "Personality" 0.845 and for "Unusual Appearance" 0.819. This result implies that the internal consistency of Charismatic Leadership Scale is high and subscales are reliable. The table below displays the factor loads for each factor, Cronbach Alpha Values and variance explained values.

Table 4. The Findings related to Explanatory Factor Analysis

FACTORS	Factor Loading Values	Cronbach Alpha	Explained Variance %
Trust and personalized interest		,887	%15,216
My coach knows about my family.	0,659		
My coach helps me with my future plans.	0739		
My coach is sensitive to my problems.	0,738		
My coach stands by me during my bad days (death, illness, injury etc).	0,724		
My coach knows my special days (birthday etc).	0,64		
My coach helps me with any kinds of problems I have.	0,715		
I can speak with my coach comfortably about my daily life problems.	0,699		
My coach takes good care of the needs of all players.	0,626		
Impressiveness		,857	%11,035
My coach has an impressive physical appearance.	0,755		
My coach looks classy no matter what he wears.	0,732		
My coach has an impressive tone of voice.	0,732		
The speech of my coach is clear to understand.	0,469		
My coach makes radical decisions and puts them into practice.	0,473		
My coach communicates effectively with the people around him.	0,691		
Taking Risk for Value		,817	%10,332
When my coach starts to talk, everybody stops talking and listens to him.	0,465		
My coach takes risks which other coaches are not brave enough to take.	0,631		
My coach makes surprising and unexpected decisions and puts them into practice.	0,691		
My coach realizes his decisions despite the obstacles he faces.	0,663		
My coach is determined to realize his plans even at the risk of breaking the existing obstacles.	0,629		
My coach always backs his ideas and stands behind them determinedly.	0,694		
Personality		,845	%7,617
In my opinion, my coach cannot even be considered an average person due to his opinions.	0,821		
My coach cannot even be considered an average person according to the values of our society due to his behavior.	0,875		
My coach cannot be considered even an average person due to his values.	0,859		
Unusual Appearance		,819	%7,610
The hair style of my coach can be considered unusual according to the standards in our society.	0,763		
The clothes of my coach can be	0,847		

considered unusual according to the standards in our society.			
The physical appearance of my coach can be considered unusual according to the standards in our society.	0,768		
Antipathetic Perception		,762	%7,555
My coach is considered antipathetic due to his odd behavior.	0,657		
My coach is considered arrogant by many people.	0,815		
My coach is considered a "know-it-all" due to his odd behavior.	0,844		
Motivating Communication		,910	%7,051
My coach is able to fire me up with his actions.	0,882		
My coach is able to fire me up by uttering just one sentence.	0,87		
N:242 KMO:0,895 ; Bartlett's Sph. x^2=4898,521 ve p<0,001			

The Findings Related to the T-test and Anova

When the data obtained from Charismatic Leadership Scale was found to have normal distribution and reliable subscales, the next phase was the analysis testing of the differences. T-test was used to compare the subscales of charismatic leadership and the replies of two groups (gender and educational background) and One-way ANOVA to compare more than two groups (age, league level, the duration of working with the same coach, and the duration of doing the same sports branch). As for the variance homogeneity, the Bonferonni Test was used, which is a Post Hoc test. For all of the statistics, 0.05 meaningfulness level was used. The following tables show the findings related to the comparisons made between the subscales of charismatic leadership and a group of variables such as gender, age, educational background, the duration of working with the same coach, and the duration of doing the same sports branch. The mean scores of Charismatic Leadership subscales according to the variable "gender" are displayed in Table 5. The comparison made for this variable revealed a statistically meaningful difference for the subscale "Unusual Appearance" (p<0.05). The mean scores of male players were found to be higher

than those of the female ones according to the variable. No significant difference was found for the subscales "Trust and Personalized Interest", "Taking Risk for Value" "Impressiveness", "Antipathetic Perception", "Personality" and "Motivating Communication" according to the variable "gender".

This section examines the mean scores of the participant players from the subscales of charismatic leadership scale and the comparison of the scores according to the variable "educational background". The mean scores of Charismatic Leadership Scale according to the variable "educational background". The comparison made accordingly showed statistically meaningful differences for the subscales "Trust and Personalized Interest", "Impressiveness", "Taking Risk for Value", and "Motivating Communication" (p<0.05). For these variables, the mean scores of the players with "Primary School / Secondary School" educational background were higher than those with Undergraduate / Graduate degrees. In other subscales, the analysis showed no statistically meaningful difference according to the variable "educational background" (p<0.05).

Among the groups formed according to the variable "age", meaningful differences were found for the subscales of Charismatic Leadership Scale for the

scores related to "Taking Risk for Value" (p=0,000**), "Motivating Communication" (P=0,044) "Impressiveness" (p=0,000**), and "Trust + Personalized Interest" (p=0,000**). No meaningful differences were found for the other subscales. The multiple comparison test applied to determine the age groups of the participants according to the subscale "impressiveness" revealed meaningful differences for the following age groups: 18 and below, 19-22, 23-26 and 27 and above. As it can be understood from Table 8, this difference is observed mostly for the age group "18 and below".

The analysis showed meaningful differences among the groups formed according to the variable "League Level" relating to the scores for the subscales of Charismatic Leadership Scale such as Impressiveness "(p=0.007**), Taking Risk for Value (p=0.002**), Unusual Appearance (p=0.017*) and Trust and Personalized Interest (p=0.000**). The multiple comparison test applied to determine the difference among the scores obtained related to the variable "League Level" for the subscale "impressiveness" revealed meaningful differences between the scores of the players in Super League (women) and 1st Play-off League (women) and 1st Play-off League (men). The scores of the participants in Super League (women) are lower than the other two groups. As for the subscale "Taking Risk for Value", the scores of Super League female players significantly differed from those of Super League male player and 1st Play-off League female players. The scores of Super League female players are lower than the other two groups. The results of the subscale "Unusual Appearance" showed a meaningful difference between the scores of 1st Play-off League male players and those of Super League female players and 1st Play-off league female ones. The scores of Super League male players were found to be lower than the other two groups. Finally,

for the subscale "Trust + Personalized Interest", the test revealed meaningful differences between the scores of the players in Super League (women) and 1st Play-off League (women) and 1st Play-off League (men). The scores of Super League female players were lower than those of the players in the other two leagues.

The analysis revealed meaningful differences for the variable "The Duration of Working with the Same Coach" for the subscales "Impressiveness" (p=0.005**), "Taking Risk for Value" (p=0.001**), "Motivating Communication" (p=0.029*) and "Trust + Personalized Interest" (p=0.000**). The multiple comparison test results showed meaningful differences for the subscale "impressiveness" between the scores of the players who work with their coach for one season or less and those working for 6 seasons and more. As for the subscale "Taking Risk for Value", the meaningful difference was between the scores of those working with the same coach for one season or less and those who work for four seasons and for six seasons and more. The results revealed meaningful differences for the subscale "Trust and Personalized Interest" between the scores of the players who work with their coach for one season or less and those working for six seasons and more; the results being higher for the second group.

There are meaningful differences among the groups formed according to the variable "the Duration of Doing the same Sports Branch" for the subscales "Impressiveness" (p=0.000**), "Taking Risk for Value" (p=0.004**), "Motivating Communication" (p=0.017*) and "Trust and Personalized Interest" (p=0.004**). As for the subscale "impressiveness", it shows that the multiple comparison test applied to the scores revealed meaningful differences among the scores of the players who play handball for 14-17 years, for one year or less, for 5 years, for 6-9 years and 10-13 years. The scores of

those who played handball for 14-17 years were lower than those of the other groups. As for the subscale Taking Risk for Value, a meaningful difference was found between the scores of those who played handball for 14-17 years and those who played one year or less, five years and 6-9 years. The results of Motivating Communication subscale showed meaningful difference between those who have been playing handball for 14-17 years and 6-9 years. Finally, a meaningful difference was found for the subscale Trust and Personalized Interest between the groups who have played this sport for 14-17 years and those for one year or less, five years and 6-9 years.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

A meaningful difference was found for the subscale "Unusual Appearance" between male and female handball players who participated in the study; the average scores of males being higher than those of females. This result might imply that male players find unusual appearance of their coach more charismatic. This difference is consistent with the findings of the studies conducted by Çelik and Sümbül (2008) and Kocatürk (2007).

The current study also revealed statistically meaningful differences in the subscales Trust and Personalized Interest, Impressiveness, Taking Risk for Value and Motivating Communication for the variable "educational background". The primary or secondary school graduate players think that their coaches trust themselves, take a risk for success and have better communication with them more than the other group. When we assume that the players in this group are relatively young compared with those in the other group, it seems normal that coaches are more sensitive to their needs. The findings are also consistent with autocratic leadership results according to the variable educational background found by Yılmaz (2008). In addition, Çelik (2011) found a meaningful difference for the "Educational Background" variable only in the subscale "Personalized Interest".

Among the groups formed according to the variable age, statistically meaningful differences were found for the subscales Trust and Personalized Interest, Taking Risk for Value, Impressiveness and Motivating Communication. According to multiple comparison test, the players who are 18 years old and younger think that their coach trusts and cares about them, he/she is attractive and takes the risk for success more compared to the replies of other age groups.

The current study found statistically significant differences among female and male participants with regard to the following subscales: impressiveness, taking risk for value, unusual appearance, trust and personalized interest. When the findings obtained from the study are examined, it is observed that the scores of female players in Super League are generally lower than those playing in other leagues in terms of the subscales such as impressiveness, taking risk for value, trust and personalized interest. As for the unusual appearance subscale, male players in the 1st Play-off League got lower scores than those playing in other leagues.

According to the research findings, a meaningful difference was found among the groups formed according to the variable "the duration worked with the same coach" with regards to impressiveness, taking risk for value, motivating communication and trust and personalized interest, which are the same as those found by Çelik (2011). According to multiple comparison tests, it can be said that the scores of the players that work with the same coach for a long time are higher for all the subscales in which statistically meaningful differences were found. Working with the same coach for a long time might play such a role in forming

such a perception by the players for their coach.

As for the groups formed according to the variable "Duration of Doing the same Sports Branch", a meaningful difference was found for the scores received from the subscales impressiveness, taking risk for value, motivating communication and trust and personalized interest. The difference identified for all the subscales shows that the score of the players who play in the same branch for a long time is lower than those who play relatively shorter periods of time in the same sports branch.

According to the results of this research athletes who have primary and secondary education level, perceive much more "charismatic" their coaches than the other athletes. Athletes who educated in this level stated that trust their coaches. Also they perceive their coaches, motivates them and cared for individual needs. Similar results are available for group which younger age athletes. Young athletes are perceive their coaches much more charismatic than the other groups. According to results of this resarch athletes who are challenge sub-league levels in Turkish Handball Leagues, perceive much more charismatic their coaches than other league's athletes. In other words, amateur athletes trust their coach and believe him or her than the others. Athletes who working with the same coach for a long time, perceive their coaches reliable, motivator, fight for him or her value and attractiveness. Working with the same coach for a long time, may create such a perception. These results are conflict with those found Celik (2011) and Yilmaz (2008).

SUGGESTIONS

This section includes the suggestions made for coaches and further researches;

- Coaches should have an unusual outside appearance compared to the individuals in the society they belong to. However, they should pay extra attention to their physical appearance, hair style and clothing not to be so much diverse so as not to be perceived negatively by their players.
- When a coach is sensitive to the needs of his or her players, can gain their trust. Since non-traditional and unusual personality structure may pose negative effects on players, this situation might weaken the trust to the coach.
- Leadership behaviors that take into consideration the physical, emotional and cultural characteristics of players might lead to considerable achievements.
- Since the perception of charisma might differ from culture to culture, the cultural analysis of this particular society should be done prior to the studies evaluating charismatic leadership.
- The use of charismatic leadership scale in other disciplines such as marketing and business administration might increase the generalizability of the findings.
- According to the review of the related literature, there are limited number of studies on the relationship between charismatic leadership and certain variables such as players' performances, emotional commitment and self-concept. The analysis of the relationship among these variables might reveal invaluable results for sports organizations, players, coaches and administrators.

REFERENCES

1. Altunışık, R., Coşkun. R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. ve Yıldırım, E., Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: Spss Uygulamalı, Sakarya Yayınevi, Sakarya, 2005 [In Turkish].

2. Alpar, R., Spor, Sağlık ve Eğitim Bilimlerinden Örneklerle Uygulamalı İstatistik ve Geçerlik- Güvenirlik, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara, 2010 [In Turkish].

3. Aslan Ş., "Karizmatik Liderlik ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İlişkisi: "Kurumda Çalışma Yılı" ve "Ücret" Değişkenlerinin Rolü" Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi. 6 (6).pp. 256-275, 2009 [In Turkish].

4. Chen, M.H., Exploring The Relationship Between Effective Coaching Leadership, Group Cohesion, and Achivement Motivation In College Basketball Team In Taiwan. United States Sports Academy, Doktora Tezi, 2007.

5. Conger J. A. and Kanungo R. N., "Charismatic Leadership In Organizations: Perceived Behavioral Attributrs And Their Measurement" Journal of Organizational Behavior.15.pp.439- 352, 1994.

6. Conger J.A. and Hunt J.G., "Overview Charismatic And Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of The Present And Future (Part I)" Leadership Quarterly. 10 (2).pp.121-127, 1999.

7. Conger J.A., "Charismatic and Transformational Leadership In Organizations: An Insider's Perspectice On These Developing Streams Of Reseach" Leadership Quarterly. 10 (2).pp.145- 179, 1999.

8. Çelik C. and Sünbül E., "Education and Gender Factor in Perceptions of Leadership: A Field Study In Mersin" The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences. 13(3). pp.49-66, 2008 [In Turkish with English Abstract].

9. Çelik, O. V., Basketbol Oyuncularının Görüşlerine Göre Antrenörlerin Karizmatik Liderlik Özelliklerinin Takım Bütünlüğüne Etkisi. Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, Eskişehir, 2011 [In Turkish].

10. Çelik O. V., "Takım Sporlarında Görev Yapan Sporcuların Antrenörleri İle İlgili Karizmatik Liderlik Algılarının Değerlendirilmesine Yönelik Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması: Basketbol Branşı Örneği" Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences. 4(2).pp.16-45, 2013 [In Turkish].

11. Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, Ç. and Büyüköztürk, Ş., Sosyal Bilimler İçin Çok Değişkenli İstatistik: Spss Ve Lisrel Uygulamaları, Pegem, Ankara, 2010 [In Turkish].

12. Farneti, C. M., Exploring Leadership Behaviors and Cohesion In Ncaa Division III Basketball Programs, Doktora Tezi, The Ohio State University, 2008.

13. Gürtan, K., İstatistik ve Araştırma Metodları. İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1982 [In Turkish].

14. Hair, J.F., Jr., Andreson, R.E., Tahtam, R.L. and Black, W.C., Multivariate Data Analysis, (Fifth Edition). Prentice-Hall International Inc., New Jersey, 1998.

15. Karasar, N., Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara, 2003 [In Turkish].

16. Kocatürk, A., Meslek Lisesi Müdürlerinin Karizmatik Liderlik Davranışlarının İncelenmesi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Soyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi A.B.D., Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul, 2007 [In Turkish].

17. Konter E., "Antrenörlerin ve Sporcuların Cinsiyetlerine Göre Liderlik Gücü Algıları" Spormetre; Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi. 2.pp. 85-90, 2007 [In Turkish].

18. Konter, E., "Futbolcuların Ulusal Takımlarda Oynama Sayılarına Göre Liderlik Gücü Algıları" Spormetre; Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi. 2.pp. 81-86, 2008 [In Turkish].

19. Lan, W.J., The Relationship Between Athlete's Perception of Intercollegiate Basketball Coach Leadership Behavior and Team Cohesiveness In Taiwan. , The University of the Incarnate Word, Doktora Tezi, San Antonio, 2009.

20. Oktay, E. and Gül, H., "Çalışanların Duygusal Bağlılıklarının Sağlanmasında Conger Ve Kanungo'nun Karizmatik Lider Özelliklerinin Etkileri Üzerine Karaman ve Aksaray Emniyet Müdürlüklerinde Yapılan Bir Araştırma" Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 10.pp.403-429, 2003 [In Turkish].

21. Sriboon, N., Coach Leadership Behaviors, Team Cohesion, and Athlete Satisfaction In Relation To The Performance Of Athletes In The 1999 Rajabhat Games. The Florida State University, Doktora Tezi, Florida, 2001.

22. Şencan, H., Sosyal ve Davranışsal Ölçümlerde Güvenilirlik ve Geçerlik, Seçkin Yayınevi, Ankara, 2005 [In Turkish].

23. Şimşek, O. F. Yapısal Eşitlik Modellemesine Giriş: Temel İlkeler ve LISREL Uygulamaları, Ekinoks Yayınevi, Ankara, 2007 [In Turkish].

24. Toros, T., Genç Erkek Basketbolcularda, Bir Sezon Boyunca Sporcuların Algıladıkları Antrenörlük Davranışı, Hedef Yönelimleri, Takım Sargınlığı, Algılanan Motivasyonel İklim ve Kolektif Yeterlik İlişkisi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2009 [In Turkish].

25. Turman, P.D., "Situational Coaching Styles: The Impact of Success And Athlete Maturity Level On Coaches' Leadership Styles Over Time" Small Group Research. 32(5).pp. 576-594, 2001.

26. Weber, M., Economy and Society Three Volumes, New York,1968, Aktaran; Conger, J. A. ve Kanungo, R. N., "Charismatic Leadership In Organizations: Perceived Behavioral Attributes And Their Measurement" Journal of Organizational Behavior. 15.pp. 439-452, 1994.

27. West, S. G., Finch, J. F. and Curran, P.J., Structural Equation Models With Nonnormal Variables and Remedies, 1995. Aktaran; Hoyle, R. H., Structural Equation Modeling: Concepts, Issues, and Applications, Sagec, London, 1995.

28. Yılmaz, İ., Sporcu Algıları Çerçevesinde Farklı Spor Branşlarındaki Antrenörlerin Liderlik Davranış Analizleri ve İletişim Beceri Düzeyleri. Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor A. B.D., Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2008 [In Turkish].

29. Yusof, A. and Shah, P.M., "Transformational Leadership and Leadership Substitutes In Sports: Implications On Coaches' Job Satisfaction" International Bulletin of Business Administration. 3.pp. 1-13, 2008.