International Journal of Sport Culture and Science
September 2022 : 10(3)
ISSN : 2148-1148
Doi : 10.14486/IntJSCS.2022.660

DETERMINING LEADERSHIP STYLES WITH COACHES WORKING IN DIFFERENT BRANCH

Caner CENGİZ[1], Mehmet AYDOĞAN[2], Mert Mazhar ERDURAN[2]
[1] Ankara Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, ANKARA
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0446-537X
[2] Ankara Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, ANKARA
https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-6856-8319
https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-2504-7978
Email: canercengiz@ankara.edu.tr, m.aydgn66@gmail.com, Mert.erdurann@gmail.com

Type: Research Article (Received:17.12.2021– Accepted: 24.09.2022)

Absract

The purpose of this study is to investigate the leadership styles of coaches. The aim is to determine the leadership styles of the coaches working in different branches, how the leadership styles are in line with the opinions of the athletes, whether there are differences between the branches and to offer solutions. The universe of the research; The coaches working in Turkey and the athletes working in these teams constitute the sample; trainers and athletes working in selected branches. A questionnaire was applied to approximately 240 athletes, and the leadership styles of the coaches working in their teams were questioned. In the research, besides the "Personal Information Form", the "Leadership Scale for Sports" consisting of 40 items, developed by Chelladurai and Saleh, was used to obtain information about the athletes themselves. After the research data were obtained, the data were analyzed by calculating the frequency, frequency (f) and percent (%) of the demographic characteristics of the athletes using the SPSS statistical package program. The results of the study showed that the athletes from different departments participating in the study did not differ in educational support, social support and autocratic subscales. However, there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the democratic and positive feedback subscales.

Keywords: Sports, Coach, Leadership, Leadership Styles

Introduction

The most distinctive feature of collective life is that it has the distinction between the ruler and the ruled. This distinction is found in the family unit, which is the smallest structure of the society, and also in the largest social units. This distinction has caused some needs. These needs; reasons such as disagreement over personal goals, personal cooperative obligations, and division of labor due to increased cooperation and specialization can be calculated. Due to these factors, the relationship of influence and power between people; this has also led to the emergence of concepts such as leadership, management and coaching (Çalışkan, 2001). "Leadership is one of the most important concepts in the field of sports. Leadership styles of athletes, coaches and sports managers affect success" (Serin, 2016). Coaches are the people who teach the rules of the game, train them, observe their abilities, make them ready for competitions and apply a discipline system suitable for their structure, taking into account individual differences (Genç, 1998). In order for the athlete to be successful, it is very important for the coach to reveal what he needs to have and to lead the athletes. The features that will enable a coach to direct his/her athletes in every aspect are realized by knowing the characteristics of his personal characteristics and leadership styles (Köksal, 2008). Nowadays, various leadership styles have emerged in terms of leadership behaviors and new styles continue to be formed as time passes. These leadership behavior types are autocratic leader, democratic leader, liberal leader, transformational leader, visionary leader, charismatic leader, situational leader and strategic leader (Donuk, 2006).

In the light of the literature given above, in this research, it is aimed to determine the leadership styles of the coaches working in different branches.

Method

Since it was aimed to determine the leadership styles of the coaches in this study, the scanning model was used. This model can be defined as "research models aiming to determine the existence and/or degree of co-variation between two or more variables" (Karasar, 2007). In the research; It has a descriptive nature as it will be done to determine the leadership level of the coaches.

Working group

The working group of this research consists of trainers working in the Ministry of Youth and Sports.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics Of The Study Group

Gender	N	%
Female	91	42,5
Male	123	57,5
Total	214	100

Sample and Data Collection

The Leadership Scale in Sport was developed by Chelladurai and Saleh. The scale is a five-point Likert-type scale consisting of 40 items (Chelladurai, Saleh: 1980). The scale was adapted to Turkish by Güngörmüş, Gürbüz, and Yenel and its validity and reliability was tested on players playing in university teams. The scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions (Güngörmüş, Gürbüz, Yenel, 2006). **Instructor and Instructor Behavior Sub-Dimension:** 13 items consisting of 1,5,8,11,14,17,20,23,26,29,32,35,38. **Democratic Behavior Sub-Dimension:** It consists of 9 items; 2, 9, 15, 18, 21, 24, 30, 33 and 39. These items show how the coach allows the athletes to participate in the decision making process. **Autocratic Behavior Sub-Dimension:** 6, 12, 27, 34 and 40, consisting of 5 items. These materials measure how far the coach stays away from the athletes and how their coaches adopt a controlling and authoritative style while expressing their authority. **Social Support Behavior Sub-Dimension:** It consists of 8, 3, 7, 13, 19, 22, 25, 31 and 36 items. These items show how coaches play a role in eliminating the needs of athletes. **Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-Dimension (Reward):** It consists of 5, 4, 10, 16, 28 and 37. The positive feedback subscale is the coaches who reinforce or praise the good performance of the athletes (Güngörmüş, vd. 2006). Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale. 71 (autocratic behavior) and 84 (educational supportive). The total internal consistency coefficient of the scale is 87 (Alpar, 2001).

Evaluation of Research Data

The data collected for the problems whose answers are sought within the framework of the purpose of the research were first processed into the data coding form. All of the data were included in the research. Then, statistical analyzes were applied to the data transferred to the computer on the SPSS 24.0 program. The results of personal information, scale and inventory total scores, factor scores, frequency and percentage values of the candidates were analyzed. The normal distribution of the scores, their curves, and the values of the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were examined.

Table 2. The skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the scores and the significance level results

	N	Çarpıklık	Basıklık
Autocratic Behavior Sub-Dimension	14	-0,280	-0,643
Social Support Behavior Sub-Dimension	14	0,961	1,024
Democratic Behavior Sub-Dimension	14	0,911	0,361
Instructor and Instructor Behavior Sub-Dimension	14	1,123	1,668
Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-Dimension (Reward)	14	1,194	1,192

Considering the skewness and kurtosis coefficients in Table 2, it was determined that the scores were in the range of ±2. While Cooper-Cutting explains that the skewness and kurtosis values are in the range of ±2, it is a suitable situation in terms of normality, while Büyüköztürk interprets that these values are in the range of ±1 as no deviation from normality. In the study, it was decided to apply parametric statistical techniques since it was seen that the skewness-kurtosis values of the scores were not at extreme levels, were in the range of ±2, and there were no excessive deviations in the normal distribution curves.

Results

Table 3. T-Test Distribution Values of Leadership Styles Scale Scores Related to Gender Variables

		N	X± Ss	t	p
Autocratic Behavior Sub-	Kadın	91	21,47±4,85	-2,38	0,048*

Dimension	Erkek	123	16,54±5,56		
Social Support Behavior Sub-Dimension	Kadın	91	22,47±7,53	-5,79	0,037*
	Erkek	123	29,87±7,28		
Democratic Behavior Sub-Dimension	Kadın	91	12,71±4,59	-2,31	0,023*
	Erkek	123	18,34±3,45		
Instructor and Instructor Behavior Sub-Dimension	Kadın	91	12,48±4,28	3,79	0,033*
	Erkek	123	16,72±3,81		
Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-Dimension (Reward)	Kadın	91	9,28±4,29	-3,72	0,018*
	Erkek	123	15,49±4,58		

In Table 3, when the mean scores of the Autocratic Behavior Sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports scale, are examined, it is seen that the average of female athletes is 21.47, and the average of male athletes is 16.54. The p value (0.048) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the two groups was found and the difference between the two groups was found to be significant ($p<0.05$). When the Democratic Behavior Sub-Dimension mean scores of the sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports scale are examined, it is seen that the average of female athletes is 22.47, while the average of male athletes is 29.87. The p value (0.037) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the two groups was found and the difference between the two groups was found to be significant ($p<0.05$). When the mean scores of the Social Support Behavior Sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports scale, are examined, it is seen that the average of female athletes is 12.71, while the average of male athletes is 18.34. The p value (0.023) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the two groups was found and the difference between the two groups was found to be significant ($p<0.05$). When the mean scores of the Trainer and Instructor Behavior Sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports scale, are examined, it is seen that the average of female athletes is 12.48, while the average of male athletes is 16.72. The p value (0.033) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the two groups was found and the difference between the two groups was found to be significant ($p<0.05$). When the Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-Dimension (Award) score averages from the sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports Scale were examined, the average of female athletes was 9 ,28, and the average of male athletes is 15.24. The p value (0.018) calculated to test the significance of the difference between the two groups was found and the difference between the two groups was found to be significant ($p<0.05$).

Table 4. Anova Test Distribution Values for Age Variables of Leadership Styles Scale Scores

	Years	**X± Ss**	**F**	**p**	**Tukey HSD**

Autocratic Behavior Sub-Dimension	14-17 years[1]	76	3,26±0,93			**1-3***
	18-21 years[2]	79	2,94±1,06			
	22-25 years[3]	36	2,45±1,04	**4,315**	0,02	
	26-29 years[4]	10	2,47±0,90			
	30 years ve üzeri[5]	13	3,09±0,69			
Democratic Behavior Sub-Dimension	14-17 years[1]	76	1,85±0,69			**1-2***
	18-21 years[2]	79	1,53±0,56			**2-4***
	22-25 years[3]	36	1,62±0,63	**3,804**	0,05	
	26-29 years[4]	10	2,12±0,75			
	30 years ve üzeri[5]	13	1,85±0,51			
Social Support Behavior Sub-Dimension	14-17 years[1]	76	1,92±0,66			**1-2***
	18-21 years[2]	79	1,63±0,56			
	22-25 years[3]	36	1,66±0,58	**2,706**	0,03	
	26-29 years[4]	10	1,84±0,61			
	30 years ve üzeri[5]	13	1,79±0,36			
Instructor and Instructor Behavior Sub-Dimension	14-17 years[1]	76	1,68±0,58			**1-2***
	18-21 years[2]	79	1,44±0,49			
	22-25 years[3]	36	1,52±0,47	2,191	0,07	
	26-29 years[4]	10	1,66±0,65			
	30 years ve üzeri[5]	13	1,47±0,36			
Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-Dimension (Reward)	14-17 years[1]	76	1,85±0,63			**1-2***
	18-21 years[2]	79	1,55±0,49			
	22-25 years[3]	36	1,68±0,53	**2,958**	0,02	
	26-29 years[4]	10	1,71±0,58			
	30 years ve üzeri[5]	13	1,87±0,62			

When Table 4 is examined, when the averages of the age categories of the autocratic behavior sub-dimension are considered, the average age of 14-17 is 3.26, the average age of 18-21 is 2.94, the average of 22-25 is 2.45, the average of 26-29 is 2. It was determined that the average of those aged 30 years and over was 47, and 3.09. In addition, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level between the ages of 14-17 and 22-25 years. When the averages of the age categories of the democratic behavior sub-dimension are examined, it is seen that the average age of 14-17 is 1.85, the average age of 18-21 is 1.53, the average of 22-25 is 1.62, the average of 26-29 is 2.12, 30 and 30 years old. The average of the above was found to be 1.85. In addition, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level between the ages of 18-21, the ages of 14-17 and the ages of 26-29. When the averages of the age categories of the social support behavior sub-dimension are examined, it is seen that the average age of 14-17 is 1.92, the average age of 18-21 is 1.63, the average of 22-25 is 1.66, the average of 26-29 is 1.84, 30 years old. and above was found to be 1.79. In addition, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level between the ages of 14-17 and 18-21 years. When the averages of the Instructor and Instructor Behavior Sub-Dimension age categories are examined, it is seen that the average age of 14-17 is 1.68, the average age of 18-21 is 1.44, the average age of 22-25 is 1.52, the average age of 26-29 is 1.66. 30 the mean age and above was found to be 1.47. In addition, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level between the ages of 14-17 and 18-21 years. When the averages of the Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-Dimension age categories are examined, it is seen that the average age of 14-17 is 1.85, the average age of 18-21 is 1.55, the average of 22-25 is 1.68, the average of 26-29 is 1.71, 30 years and 30 years old. It was determined that the mean of the higher score was 1.87. In addition, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level between the ages of 14-17 and 18-21 years.

Table 5. Anova Test Distribution Values of Leadership Styles Scale Scores Related to Sports Branch Variables

	Branc		**X± Ss**	**F**	**p**	**Tukey HSD**
Autocratic Behavior Sub-Dimension	Basketbol[1]	43	2,79±0,95			
	Futbol[2]	34	2,77±1,07			
	Falk Dance[3]	50	3,11±1,09	**1,063**	0,37	
	Hentbol[4]	43	3,08±0,97			
	Voleybol[5]	44	3,04±0,66			
Democratic Behavior Sub-	Basketbol[1]	43	2,14±0,68			**2-1***
	Futbol[2]	34	1,53±0,59			**2-3***

Dimension	Falk Dance[3]	50	1,70±0,62	**6,929**	0,000*	**2-4***
	Hentbol[4]	43	1,80±0,78			
	Voleybol[5]	44	1,71±0,58			
Social Support Behavior Sub-Dimension	Basketbol[1]	43	2,00±0,67			**1-2***
	Futbol[2]	34	1,60±0,59			**1-4***
	Falk Dance[3]	50	1,84±0,57	**4,892**	0,001*	**2-3***
	Hentbol[4]	43	1,90±0,65			
	Voleybol[5]	44	1,76±0,31			
Instructor and Instructor Behavior Sub-Dimension	Basketbol[1]	43	1,45±0,54			**2-1***
	Futbol[2]	34	1,79±0,42			**2-3***
	Falk Dance[3]	50	1,41±0,47	3,377	0,01*	
	Hentbol[4]	43	1,58±0,69			
	Voleybol[5]	44	1,60±0,37			
Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-Dimension (Reward)	Basketball[1]	43	1,55±0,62			
	Futbol[2]	34	1,89±0,48			
	Falk Dance[3]	50	1,62±0,53	**2,290**	0,61	
	Hentball[4]	43	1,74±0,50			
	Voleyball[5]	44	1,78±0,57			

When the mean scores of the autocratic behavior sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports scale, are examined in Table 5, it is seen that the highest average belongs to the athletes of the folk dances branch with an average of 3.11, handball with an average of 3.05, volleyball with an average of 3.04, 2, 2. It is seen that basketball and football athletes follow with an average of 79. When the average of democratic behavior sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the scale, is examined, it is seen that the highest average belongs to basketball players with 2.14, they are handball with an average of 1.80, volleyball with an average of 1.71, folk dances with an average of 1.70 and 1, respectively. It is seen that football players follow with an average of 53. As a result of the statistical analyzes made on the sub-dimension of democratic behavior, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the $p<0.05$ level between the football branch and basketball, folk dances and handball branches. Considering the Social Support mean scores,

one of the sub-dimensions of the scale, it is seen that the highest average belongs to basketball players with an average of 2.00, handball with an average of 1.90, folk dances with an average of 1.84, volleyball with an average of 1.76 and an average of 1.60, respectively. It is seen that football athletes follow with this. As a result of the statistical analyzes on the social support behavior sub-dimension, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the $p<0.05$ level between basketball branch and football and handball branches, and between football and folk dances. When the mean score of the Trainer and Instructor Behavior Sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the scale, is examined, it is seen that the highest average belongs to the athletes of the football branch with 1.79, volleyball with an average of 1.60, handball with an average of 1.58, basketball with an average of 1.45, and 1, respectively. It is seen that folk dance athletes follow with an average of 41. As a result of the statistical analyzes made on the Instructor and Instructor Behavior Sub-Dimension, it was determined that there was a significant difference at the $p<0.05$ level between the football branch and the basketball and folk dances branch. When the Positive Feedback mean scores, one of the sub-dimensions of the scale, are examined, it is seen that the highest average belongs to the athletes of the football branch with 1.89, volleyball with an average of 1.78, handball with an average of 1.74, folk dances with 1.62 and basketball with 1.55. It is seen that the sportsmen of the branch are watching.

Discussion and Conclusion

In order to test the significance of the difference between male and female groups in Autocratic Behavior, Democratic Behavior, Social Support Behavior, Trainer and Instructive Behavior and Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-dimensions of Leadership for Sports Scale, the difference between the two groups with p value less than 0.05 was calculated. was found to be significant ($p<0.05$).

"Nacar and Gacar" (2013) investigated the relationship between volleyball coaches and coaches and team relationships. Considering the scores of volleyball players in the leadership behavior sub-dimension according to gender variables, statistically significant differences were found in the social support behavior sub-dimension. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the dimensions of education, training, democracy, autocracy and positive feedback behaviors (Nacar and Gacar 2013). Again Nacar (2013) In the Turkish Professional Handball League, "A research on the leadership style of in-service coaches according to the gender of handball, the scores they got from the coaching leadership sub-dimension; Statistically significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions of positive feedback behaviors in education and guidance behaviors, and there was no statistically significant difference in the dimensions of democracy, autocracy and social support behavior. These results support our study.

As a result of the statistical analyzes carried out to test the significance of the difference between age groups in the Autocratic Behavior, Democratic Behavior, Social Support Behavior, Trainer and Instructive Behavior and Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports Scale; In the autocratic behavior sub-dimension, there was a significant difference at the $p<0.05$ level between the ages of 14-17 and 22-25.

There was a significant difference at the level of p<0.05 between 14-17 years and 18-21 years of age in the social support behavior sub-dimension, p<0, between the ages of 14-17 and 18-21 in the teacher and instructive behavior sub-dimension. It was determined that there was a significant difference at the 05 level, and a significant difference at the p<0.05 level in the positive feedback behavior sub-dimension between the ages of 14-17 and 18-21 years.

Weinberg and Gould (1995) stated in their study in 1995 that as people get older and mature as athletes, they increasingly prefer authoritative and socially supportive coaches. These results also support our study.

As a result of the statistical analyzes carried out to test the significance of the difference between the branch groups in the Autocratic Behavior, Democratic Behavior, Social Support Behavior, Trainer and Instructive Behavior and Positive Feedback Behavior Sub-dimensions of the Leadership for Sports scale; There was no significant difference at the p<0.05 level in the autocratic behavior sub-dimension, There was no significant difference at the p<0.05 level in the democratic behavior sub-dimension, There was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level between the football branch and the basketball, folk dances, and handball branches, In the social support behavior sub-dimension, basketball and football and There was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level between handball branches and between football and folk dances branch. It was determined that there was a significant difference at the p<0.05 level in the positive feedback behavior sub-dimension.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there is no study examining the branches and leadership styles of coaches. In this respect, it is thought that the study will contribute to the literature.

Having a leadership style is undoubtedly an important factor in raising successful and disciplined athletes. From this point of view, it is necessary for the coaches to have a leadership style and to participate in the activities in order to develop the leadership styles they have.

REFERENCES

Alpar R. (2001). Spor Bilimlerinde Uygulamalı İstatistik, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.

Chelladurai P., Saleh, S.D. (1980). Dimensins Of LeaderBehavior İn Sports: Development Of A LeadershipScale. Journal Of SportPsychology, P.34-45.9

Çalışkan, G. (2001). Liderlik Açısından Antrenör Davranışlarının Sporcu Performansı Üzerine Etkisinin Değerlendirilmesi, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kütahya.

Donuk, B. (2006). Türkiye Profesyonel Futbol Ligleri Antrenörlerinin Liderlik Tarzlarının İncelenmesi ve Bir Model Yaklaşım, (Doktora Tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Genç, D.A. (1998). Spor Hukuku, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.

Güngörmüş Ah. Gürbüz B.Yenel F. (2006). Spor İçin Liderlik Ölçeğinin Sporcuların Antrenörün Davranışlarını Algılaması Versiyonunun Psikometrik Özelliklerinin Değerlendirilmesi, 9.Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi,1043, Muğla.

Karasar. N. (2015). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi, Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Köksal, F. (2008). Antrenörlerin Liderlik Tarzları ile Öz Yeterlikler Arasındaki İlişki, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.

NacarE. (2013). A Study on LeadershipStyles of Coaches of theTurkish Professional Handball First League" AustralianJournal of Basic andAppliedSciences, 7(2): 612-617.

Nacar E, Gacar A. (2013).TheİnvestigationOf TheRelationShipBetweenTheCoachAnd Team MatesAndTheUnity Of The Team İn Volleyball" Advances in EnvironmentalBiology, 7(2):223-228.

Serin, K. (2016). Antrenörlerinin Liderlik Tarzlarının Belirlenmesi, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Boks, Konya.

Weinberg R, Gould D. (1995). Foundations of SportAndExercisePsychology. Human Kinetics. Illions.