



## Investigation of the Relationships Between Wrestling Coaches' Perceived Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Quality of Life Levels

Hakan KIRKBİR<sup>1\*</sup>, Murat KULI<sup>2</sup>, Serkan HACICAİEROĞLU<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Trabzon.

<sup>2</sup>Bayburt Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Bayburt.

<sup>3</sup>Bandırma Onyedü Eylül Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Balıkesir.

Gönderi Tarihi: 18.01.2025

Kabul Tarihi: 03.06.2025

Yayın Tarihi: 30.03.2026

**Abstract:** The study was conducted to examine the relationship between the perceived leadership styles of wrestling coaches and their organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and quality of life levels. For this purpose, individuals who actively work as wrestling coaches in Istanbul were included in the study. 5 different forms were used to collect data in the study. These are; Personal Information Form, Multifactor Leadership Scale, Organizational Commitment Scale, Job Satisfaction Scale, and Quality of Life Scale. SPSS (26th Version) was used in the analysis process of this study, which was conducted in the relational screening model. Pearson correlation and regression analyses were used in the tests. According to the results of the study; It was determined that there was a relationship between the perceived leadership styles of wrestling coaches and their organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and quality of life levels. Finally, it was concluded that the perception of transformational and transactional leadership styles also affected the research group's organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and quality of life (physical area, social area, and environment) areas.

**Keywords:** Coach, Wrestle, Leadership Style, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Quality of Life

## Güreş Antrenörlerinin Algıladıkları Liderlik Stilleri ile Örgütsel Bağlılık, İş Tatmini ve Yaşam Kalite Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi

**Öz:** Araştırma güreş antrenörlerinin algıladıkları liderlik stilleri ile örgütsel bağlılık, iş tatmini, yaşam kalitesi düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda İstanbul ilinde güreş antrenörlük görevini aktif olarak sürdüren kişiler çalışmaya dâhil edilmiştir. Araştırmada verilerin toplanması adına 5 ayrı form kullanılmıştır. Bunlar; Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Çok Faktörlü Liderlik Ölçeği, Örgütsel Bağlılık Ölçeği, İş Tatmini Ölçeği ve Yaşam Kalitesi Ölçeği. İlişkisel tarama modelinde gerçekleştirilen bu çalışmanın analiz sürecinde SPSS (26. Versiyon) kullanılmıştır. Testlerden pearson korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre ise; güreş antrenörlerinin algıladıkları liderlik stilleri ile örgütsel bağlılık, iş tatmini ve yaşam kalitesi düzeyleri arasında ilişki olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Son olarak dönüşümcü ve işlemci liderlik stillerinin algılanması ile araştırma grubunun örgütsel bağlılık, iş tatmini ve yaşam kalitesi (bedensel alan, sosyal alan ve çevre) alanlarının da etkilendiği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Antrenör, Güreş, Liderlik Stili, Örgütsel Bağlılık, İş Tatmini, Yaşam Kalitesi

\* Sorumlu yazar: Dr. Hakan KIRKBİR, E-posta: hakankirkbiroglu@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of management and leadership, which is as old as human history, is considered the oldest art, which is a means of managing people in line with their goals. The scientific study of management science dates back to more recent times. Therefore, management science is considered the oldest of arts and the newest of sciences (Taylor, 2018). The needs that change according to the conditions of the day differ in the field of leadership as in all areas of life. The need for a leader in many areas also appears in the sports sector, like a sport manager and coaches assume the leadership role in the sports sector. A coach who assumes team leadership has the foresight, personality and skills that will affect athletes' reaching their potential performance (elik et al., 2024; Kul et al., 2020). What coaches do and how they behave has a significant impact on athletes' attitudes, emotions, stress and performance. Athletes with coaches who have leadership qualities are seen to be more successful in achieving their goals because they are satisfied with the management. The set of methods that coaches use to implement the decisions they make on their athletes and to lead and guide their athletes is called coaching style (Kalkan & Sarı, 2021).

One of the most important factors closely related to the coach's leadership style is organizational commitment (Akgl & Gl, 2021). Conceptually, organizational commitment is the interest and sense of belonging of individuals to the organization they are in (Dođan & Kılı, 2007). According to Hunt and Morgan (1994), organizational commitment is the belief of individuals in achieving organizational goals, their efforts to achieve these goals, and their sense of being willing to be in the organization. According to Bogler and Somech (2004), commitment to the organization consists of the elements of working for the organization, accepting the organizational goal, and attaching importance to staying in the organization. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) divided the consequences of low organizational commitment into two categories: job performance and withdrawal behaviors. Similarly, Balaji (1988) argued that the worst effect of low commitment is the decrease in job performance. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) stated in their study that there is a negative relationship between tardiness and turnover. řahin et al. (2021) associated low organizational commitment with low quality of life.

Quality of life is the individual's perception of his/her stance in life, which is related to the individual's purpose, expectation, standard and interests in line with the culture and values he/she lives in. This definition, which expresses it as a broad concept that is affected in a complex way by the individual's physical health, mental state, beliefs, dual relations, social ties and ties with his/her environment, reflects the view that quality of life is a subjective assessment intertwined with cultural, social and environmental concepts (Orley & Kuyken, 1994). When this view is considered from a professional perspective, it is known that quality of life is increased with various sources (Kırkbir & Zengin, 2022). However, the first of the most striking elements among this diversity is undoubtedly job satisfaction. Aydın's (2019) research with coaches provided data supporting this view and determined that there is a positive correlation between quality of life and job satisfaction. As a result; It is thought that the leadership orientations of coaches are related to their organizational commitment levels and job satisfaction, and that this situation also affects the person's quality of life. In this context, the

main purpose of the research; To examine the relationships between wrestling coaches' perceived leadership styles and their organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life levels. In this study, the following main hypothesis was tested.

H<sub>1</sub> There is a relationship between the leadership styles perceived by wrestling coaches and their organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life levels.

## METHOD

In this section of the research, information on the research model, study group, data collection tools and data analysis processes are provided, respectively.

### Research Model

The opinions of wrestling coaches were measured using the relational screening model. In relational screening type research, a situation or event is described as it is, and it is a research model that shows the relationship, effect and degree of the variables that cause this situation (Karasar, 2014).

### Study Group

The study group of the research consists of wrestling coaches working in Istanbul. The participants were determined by using the convenience sampling method in determining the group. Initially, data was obtained from 442 participants, but after the necessary data extraction processes were carried out from these data, a total of 328 participants remained. The frequencies and percentages of these participants are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Distribution of the Research Group According to Demographic Information

Demographic Information	Groups	f	%
Gender	Woman	71	21,6
	Man	257	78,4
Education	High school	23	7,0
	University	234	71,3
	Master degree	71	21,6
Financial Income	Low	92	28,0
	Avarage	219	66,8
	High	17	5,2
Marital status	Single	137	41,8
	Married	191	58,2
National Coach-Athlete Status	Yes	72	22,0
	No	256	78,0
Coach Certificate Level	First Stage	60	18,3
	Second stage	117	35,7
	Third Stage	106	32,3
	Fourth Stage	30	9,1
	Fifth Stage	15	4,6
Organisation	State	209	63,7
	Private	119	36,3
Region	Town	111	33,8
	City	217	66,2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>100</b>

### **Data Collection Tools**

A total of five separate forms were administered to the participants within the scope of the research. These forms used for data collection were; Personal Information Form, Multifactor Leadership Scale, Organizational Commitment Scale, Job Satisfaction Scale and World Health Organization Quality of Life Scale-Short Form.

**Personal Information Form:** “Personal Information Form” was prepared by the researcher in order to obtain demographic information of the participants. This form included questions aimed at obtaining information such as gender, age, marital status, coaching level, monthly financial income, education level, years of service, status of being a national athlete, institution/organization where the employee worked, region where the employee worked.

**Multifactor Leadership Scale:** In the research, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5-x short (MLQ) questionnaire adapted to Turkish by Cemaloğlu (2007) was used to determine the transformational and transactional leadership styles of the managers. There are a total of 45 items in the data collection tool. Of these items, there are 20 items in the transformational leadership dimension, 16 items in the transactional leadership dimension, and 9 items in the results dimension. In the study, the transformational leadership and transactional leadership sub-dimensions of leadership were calculated, and the data related to the results dimension were excluded from the evaluation.

**Organizational Commitment Scale:** The Organizational Commitment Scale was developed by Porter et al. in 1974. The Turkish form of the scale was created by Erceylan in 2010 (Erceylan 2010). This scale consists of 15 questions and is a 5-point Likert type. The scale consisting of 15 questions evaluates commitment with questions regarding the individual's desire to remain in the organization, their efforts for the success of the organization, their belief in the goals and values of the organization and their adoption of them. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the Organizational Commitment scale developed by Erceylan was calculated as 0.88.

**Job Satisfaction Scale:** The reinterpretation and Turkish validity-reliability study of the “Job Satisfaction Scale” developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) and abbreviated by Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) was carried out by Başol and Çömlekçi (2020). The internal consistency of the job satisfaction scale, consisting of 5 items and a single factor, was calculated as .929 and it was determined that it was competent for measuring the job satisfaction levels of adult individuals.

**WHOQOL-BREF (World Health Organization Quality of Life Scale-Short Form):** The Quality of Life Scale was prepared by the World Health Organization with the participation of 15 collaborating centers and adapted to Turkish by Eser, Fidaner, Fidaner, Yalçın Eser, Elbi and Göker (1999). The items in the 27-item scale are scored by the person according to his/her own quality of life. The WHOQOL-BREF scale consists of four sub-dimensions: physical area, psychological area, social relations and environment, and is scored using the Likert type. The scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions. These are; “Physical Health (5 items)”, “Psychological Health (5 items)”, “Social Relations (3 items)” and “Environment (9 items)”. The reliability coefficients of the scale sub-dimensions are; 0.65 for “Physical Health”; 0.54 for “Psychological Health”; It was calculated as 0.66 for “Social Relations” and 0.80 for “Environment”. Cronbach's Alpha reliability value of the scale (0.86) was found to be highly reliable.

## Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the scores of the Organizational Commitment Scale, Job Satisfaction Scale, Multifactor Leadership Scale and its sub-dimensions (Transformational, Transactional and Behavioral Leadership Results) and the Healthy Life Quality Scale and its sub-dimensions (Physical Domain, Psychological Domain, Social Relations Domain and Environmental Domain) used in the study. Pearson correlation and regression tests were performed for relational screening. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 26.0) package program was used in the analysis of the data. The statistical significance level was accepted as “ $p<0.05$ ”. The normality test of the scale scores used was checked according to single and multiple normality values. By examining the kurtosis and skewness values in single normalities, 12 data showing extreme values were removed from 340 data and analyses were conducted on demographic variables with the remaining 328 data. When the single normality values of the scales are examined, it is seen that they are in the range of +2 to -2 and meet the relevant normality condition for parametric analyses (George & Mallery, 2021; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

## FINDINGS

In this section of the research, the findings obtained after the statistical analysis process of the data are presented in tables.

**Table 2.** Correlation Analysis Results Regarding the Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Quality of Life Levels of the Study Group

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Organizational Commitment (1)	<b>r</b>	1	,630**	,390**	,444**	,357**	,329**	,385**
	<b>p</b>		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
Job Satisfaction (2)	<b>r</b>		1	,430**	,479**	,386**	,407**	,359**
	<b>p</b>			,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
Physical Area (3)	<b>r</b>			1	,772**	,666**	,708**	,590**
	<b>p</b>				,000	,000	,000	,000
Psychic Area (4)	<b>r</b>				1	,678**	,669**	,611**
	<b>p</b>					,000	,000	,000
Social Relationship Area (5)	<b>r</b>					1	,651**	,490**
	<b>p</b>						,000	,000
Environmental Area (6)	<b>r</b>						1	,559**
	<b>p</b>							,000
General Area (7)	<b>r</b>							1
	<b>p</b>							

\* $p<0,05$ ; \*\* $p<0,01$

Table 2 shows the correlation analysis results regarding the organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life levels of the study group. According to these data, it was determined that there were positive relationships between all sub-dimensions of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life levels ( $p<0,05$ ).

**Table 3.** Correlation Analysis Results Regarding the Multi-Factor Leadership Scale Sub-Dimension Scores of the Study Group and Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Quality of Life Levels

	Idealized Effect (behaviour)	Idealized Effect (attributed)	Motivation by Suggestion	Intellectual Stimulation	Individual Support	Conditional Reward	Management by Exception (Active)	Management by Exception (Passive)	Laissez Faire (Releaser)	Extra Effort	effectiveness	satisfaction	
Organizational Commitment	r	,420**	,501**	,489**	,451**	,440**	,489**	,100	,052	-,448**	,444**	,485**	,451**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,079	,359	,000	,000	,000	,000
Job Satisfaction	r	,364**	,388**	,353**	,323**	,292**	,362**	,158**	,125*	-,215**	,306**	,364**	,310**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,006	,029	,000	,000	,000	,000
Bodily Space	r	,200**	,234**	,225**	,201**	,181**	,229**	,024	,030	-,205**	,186**	,236**	,211**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,001	,000	,670	,597	,000	,001	,000	,000
Spiritual Domain	r	,163**	,236**	,227**	,192**	,144*	,202**	,051	,010	-,209**	,185**	,222**	,186**
	p	,004	,000	,000	,001	,012	,000	,375	,860	,000	,001	,000	,001
Social Relationship	r	,124*	,137*	,145*	,146*	,128*	,152**	,011	-,089	-,195**	,081	,121*	,119*
	p	,029	,016	,011	,010	,025	,008	,846	,119	,001	,158	,034	,038
Environmental Area	r	,200**	,236**	,226**	,217**	,205**	,236**	,064	-,003	-,131*	,188**	,220**	,188**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,264	,958	,021	,001	,000	,001
General Area	r	,218**	,278**	,229**	,217**	,221**	,245**	,132*	,133*	-,111	,220**	,251**	,223**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,020	,019	,051	,000	,000	,000

\* $p < 0,05$ ; \*\* $p < 0,01$

Table 3 shows the results of the correlation analysis regarding the multifactor leadership scale sub-dimension scores of the study group and the levels of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life. According to these data, when the findings related to organizational commitment and multifactor leadership scale sub-dimensions were first examined; it was found that there was a high level of positive correlation between the wrestling coaches' organizational commitment levels and idealized influence (behavior), idealized influence (attributed), motivation by suggestion, intellectual stimulation, individual support, conditional reward, laissez faire, extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction sub-dimensions ( $p < 0,05$ ). When the findings related to job satisfaction were examined; it was found that there was a high level of positive correlation between job satisfaction and all of the sub-dimensions of the multifactor leadership scale ( $p < 0,05$ ). Finally, when the findings related to quality of life and multifactor leadership scale sub-dimensions were examined; It was found that there was a positive relationship with the sub-dimensions of physical domain, psychological domain, social relationship domain and environmental domain and idealized influence (behavior), idealized

influence (attributed), motivation by suggestion, intellectual stimulation, individual support, conditional reward, extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction, and a negative relationship with the laissez faire sub-dimension ( $p < 0,05$ ). It was found that there were positive relationships between the sub-dimensions of general health domain and idealized influence (behavior), idealized influence (attributed), motivation by suggestion, intellectual stimulation, individual support, conditional reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction ( $p < 0,05$ ).

**Table 4.** Regression Analysis Results on the Effect of Perceived Leadership Behaviors of the Working Group on Organizational Commitment

	Nonstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model		ANOVA		Tolerans	VIF
	B	Std. Mistake B	Beta*			R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	p		
Constant	2,805	,166		16,855	,000						
Transformational Leadership	,526	,119	,683	4,413	,000*	0,527	0,271	39,066	0,000	,099	10,084
Transactional Leadership	-,349	,091	-,365	-3,822	,000*					,260	3,851
Behavioral Consequences	,087	,086	,132	1,012	,313					,139	7,192

Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

df=3,304

Independent Variable: Leadership Sub-Dimensions; Transformational, Transactional, and Behavioral Outcomes.

\* $p < 0,05$

When the regression analysis findings in Table 4 are examined; it is seen that the relationship model between the perceived leadership behaviors of the coaches and organizational commitment is statistically significant ( $F(3,304) = 39,066$   $p < 0,00$ ). The independent variable coaches' leadership perception level sub-dimensions together explain the dependent variable organizational commitment level by 27% ( $R^2 = 0,271$ ). When the significance tests of the regression coefficients are examined, it is shown that the effects of transformational leadership ( $B = ,683$ ;  $p < 0,01$ ) and transactional leadership ( $B = -,365$ ;  $p < 0,01$ ) dimensions constituting the leadership behaviors of the coaches on organizational commitment are statistically significant ( $p < 0,01$ ). According to these findings, a 1-unit increase in transformational leadership corresponds to a 0,475 point increase in organizational commitment, while a 1-unit increase in transactional leadership corresponds to a 0,365 point decrease in organizational commitment.

**Table 5.** Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Effect of Perceived Leadership Behaviors of the Working Group on Job Satisfaction

	Nonstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model		ANOVA		Tolerans	VIF
	B	Std. Mistake B	Beta*			R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	p		
Constant	3,416	,185		18,479	,000						
Transformational Leadership	,345	,132	,442	2,611	,009*	0,369	0,127	7,726	0,000	,099	10,084
Transactional Leadership	-,088	,101	-,090	-,863	,389					,260	3,851
Behavioral Consequences	,001	,096	,002	,011	,991					,139	7,192

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

df=3,304

Independent Variable: Leadership Sub-Dimensions; Transformational, Transactional, and Behavioral Consequences.

\* $p < 0,05$

When the regression analysis findings in Table 5 are examined, it is seen that the relationship model between the leadership behaviors of the coaches and job satisfaction is statistically significant ( $F(3,304)= 7,726$   $p<0,00$ ). The independent variable coaches' leadership perception level sub-dimensions together explain the dependent variable job satisfaction level by 13% ( $R^2=0,127$ ). When the significance tests of the regression coefficients are examined, it is shown that the effect of transformational leadership ( $B=,442$ ;  $p<0,01$ ), one of the dimensions constituting the leadership behaviors of the coaches, on job satisfaction is statistically significant ( $p<0,01$ ). According to these findings, a 1-unit increase in transformational leadership corresponds to a 0,442 point increase in job satisfaction.

**Table 6.** Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Effect of the Leadership Behaviors Perceived by the Study Group on the Physical Area from the Quality of Life Dimensions

	Nonstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model		ANOVA		Tolerans	VIF
	B	Std. Mistake B	Beta*			R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	p		
Constant	3,487	,165		21,196	,000						
Transformational Leadership	,223	,118	,334	1,894	,059	0,252	0,054	6,878	0,000	,099	10,084
Transactional Leadership	-,188	,090	-,226	-2,078	,039*					,260	3,851
Behavioral Consequences	,051	,085	,089	,597	,551					,139	7,192

Dependent Variable: Bodily Space

df=3,304

Independent Variable: Leadership Sub-Dimensions; Transformational, Transactional, and Behavioral Consequences.

\* $p<0,05$

When the regression analysis findings in Table 6 are examined; it is seen that the relationship model between the coaches' leadership behaviors and the physical area from the quality of life sub-dimensions is statistically significant ( $F(3,304)= 6,878$   $p<0,00$ ). The findings obtained show that the effect of the transactional leadership from the dimensions constituting the leadership behaviors of the coaches on the physical area from the quality of life sub-dimensions is statistically significant ( $B=-,226$ ;  $p<0,05$ ). Accordingly, a 1-unit increase in transactional leadership causes a decrease of 0,226 points in the physical area. The independent variable, the coaches' leadership perception level sub-dimensions, together explain the dependent variable, the physical area level of the coaches by 5% ( $R^2=0,054$ ). Accordingly, when the effect of the three dimensions constituting the leadership behaviors of the coaches on the physical area is examined, it is concluded that only the transactional leadership dimension is effective.

**Table 7.** Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Effect of the Leadership Behaviors Perceived by the Study Group on the Spiritual Area from the Quality of Life Dimensions

	Nonstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model		ANOVA		Tolerans	VIF
	B	Std. Mistake B	Beta*			R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	p		
Constant	3,637	,165		22,037	,000						
Transformational Leadership	,177	,118	,265	1,498	,135	0,231	0,053	5,700	0,001	,099	10,084
Transactional Leadership	-,158	,091	-,190	-1,739	,083					,260	3,851
Behavioral Consequences	,064	,085	,112	,746	,456					,139	7,192

Dependent Variable: Spiritual Domain

df=3,304

Independent Variable: Leadership Sub-Dimensions; Transformational, Transactional, and Behavioral Consequences.

When the regression analysis findings in Table 7 are examined, it is seen that the relationship model between the leadership behaviors of the coaches and the spiritual domain, one of the sub-dimensions of quality of life, is statistically significant ( $F(3,304)= 5,700$   $p<0,00$ ). The independent variable, the coaches' leadership perception level sub-dimensions, together explain the dependent variable, the physical domain level of the coaches, by 5% ( $R^2=0,053$ ). When the significance tests of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the effect of the dimensions constituting the leadership behaviors of the coaches on the physical domain, one of the sub-dimensions of quality of life, is not statistically significant ( $p>0,05$ ).

**Table 8.** Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Effect of the Leadership Behaviors Perceived by the Study Group on the Social Domain, One of the Dimensions of Quality of Life

	Nonstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model		ANOVA			
	B	Std. Mistake B	Beta*			R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	p	Tolerans	VIF
<b>Constant</b>	3,512	,189		18,568	,000						
<b>Transformational Leadership</b>	,417	,135	,548	3,080	,002*	0,211	0,035	4,733	0,003	,099	10,084
<b>Transactional Leadership</b>	-,255	,104	-,270	-2,458	,015*					,260	3,851
<b>Behavioral Consequences</b>	-,120	,098	-,184	-1,224	,222					,139	7,192
<b>Dependent Variable: Social Field</b>						<b>df=3,304</b>					
<b>Independent Variable: Leadership Sub-Dimensions; Transformational, Transactional, and Behavioral Consequences.</b>											

\* $p<0,05$

When the regression analysis findings in Table 8 are examined, it is seen that the relationship model between the leadership behaviors of the coaches and the social area of the quality of life sub-dimensions is statistically significant ( $F(3,304)= 4,733$   $p<0,00$ ). The independent variable coaches' leadership perception level sub-dimensions together explain the dependent variable coaches' social area level by 4% ( $R^2=0,035$ ). When the significance tests of the regression coefficients are examined, it is shown that the transformational leadership ( $B=,548$ ;  $p<0,01$ ) and transactional leadership ( $B=-,270$ ;  $p<0,05$ ) dimensions of the leadership behaviors of the coaches have a statistically significant effect on the physical area of the quality of life sub-dimensions ( $p<0,05$ ). According to these findings, a 1-unit increase in transformational leadership corresponds to a 0.548 point increase in the social area, while a 1-unit increase in transactional leadership corresponds to a 0,270 point decrease in the physical area.

**Table 9.** Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Effect of the Leadership Behaviors Perceived by the Study Group on the Environmental Area from the Quality of Life Dimensions

	Nonstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	p	Model		ANOVA			
	B	Std. Mistake B	Beta*			R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Tolerans	VIF
<b>Constant</b>	3,236	,149		21,741	,000						
<b>Transformational Leadership</b>	,288	,107	,475	2,702	,007*	0,258	0,057	7,223	0,000	,099	10,084
<b>Transactional Leadership</b>	-,165	,082	-,220	-2,022	,044*					,260	3,851
<b>Behavioral Consequences</b>	-,031	,077	-,059	-,398	,691					,139	7,192
<b>Dependent Variable: Environmental Area</b>						<b>df=3,304</b>					
<b>Independent Variable: Leadership Sub-Dimensions; Transformational, Transactional, and Behavioral Consequences.</b>											

\* $p<0,05$

When the regression analysis findings in Table 9 are examined, it is seen that the relationship model between the leadership behaviors of the coaches and the environmental area from the quality of life sub-dimensions is statistically significant ( $F(3,304)= 7,223$   $p<0,00$ ). The independent variable coaches' leadership perception level sub-dimensions together explain the dependent variable coaches' social area level by 6% ( $R^2=0,057$ ). When the significance tests of the regression coefficients are examined, it is shown that the transformational leadership ( $B=.475$ ;  $p<0,01$ ) and transactional leadership ( $B=-,220$ ;  $p<0,05$ ) dimensions that constitute the leadership behaviors of the coaches have an effect on the environmental area from the quality of life sub-dimensions are statistically significant ( $p<0,05$ ). According to these findings, a 1-unit increase in transformational leadership corresponds to a 0.475 point increase in the environmental area, while a 1-unit increase in transactional leadership corresponds to a 0,220 point decrease in the physical area.

**Table 10.** Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Effect of the Leadership Behaviors Perceived by the Study Group on the General Area of Quality of Life Dimensions

	Nonstandard Coefficients		Standard Coefficients	t	P	Model		ANOVA			
	B	Std. Mistake B	Beta*			R	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	Tolerans	VIF
Constant	2,934	,169		17,386	,000						
Transformational Leadership	,128	,121	,187	1,061	,290	0,249	0,053	6,726	0,000	,099	10,084
Transactional Leadership	-,001	,093	-,001	-,008	,994					,260	3,851
Behavioral Consequences	,039	,087	,067	,448	,655					,139	7,192
<b>Dependent Variable: General Area</b>								<b>df=3,304</b>			
<b>Independent Variable: Leadership Sub-Dimensions; Transformational, Transactional, and Behavioral Consequences.</b>											

When the regression analysis findings in Table 10 are examined, it is seen that the relationship model between the leadership behaviors of the coaches and the general area of the quality of life sub-dimensions is statistically significant ( $F(3,304)= 6,726$   $p<0,00$ ). The independent variable, the coaches' leadership perception level sub-dimensions, together explain the dependent variable, the coaches' physical area level, by 5% ( $R^2=0,053$ ). When the significance tests of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the effect of the dimensions constituting the leadership behaviors of the coaches on the physical area of the quality of life sub-dimensions is not statistically significant ( $p>0,05$ ).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

First of all, it should be noted that our research hypothesis was accepted. It was concluded that there are positive relationships between the organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life levels of the research group. Similarly, it was concluded that there are positive relationships between the perceived leadership styles of the coaches and the levels of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life. Finally, it was concluded that the perceived leadership style of the wrestling coaches constituting the research group affects the level of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life (physical area, social area and environment). In this context, it should be noted that many researchers have a consensus on the relationship between the perceived leadership style and the level of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life (physical area, social area and environment) (Güler & Cinnioğlu, 2021; Sökmen et al., 2019).

When organizational commitment is examined on the basis of transformational leadership and transactional leadership, which are among the leadership styles examined within the scope of our research, the existence of this relationship is observed, but it is seen to be positive (Kara & Bozkurt, 2021; rc & Zeybek 2023). It is thought that this increase in organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life of individuals who perceive transformational and transactional leadership styles is due to the characteristics of their leadership styles. The most basic characteristics of managers/leaders with a transformational leadership style are to be effective in change, to energize employees, to enlighten them and to contribute to the development of new skills. Transactional leaders, on the other hand, try to support followers in achieving the performance expected of them in order to achieve goals within the existing organizational culture (Bass et al., 2003). As a result of the display of this leadership style, which focuses on the organization and its members and does not adopt self-centeredness, it is likely that the organizational commitment levels of employees will increase (Eren & Titizođlu, 2014).

Foreign sources, both in the field of sports and with groups from various fields, have determined that the leadership styles perceived by employees, like domestic sources, affect parameters such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life and that the relevant variables are related. The first of these studies is the study conducted by Ali et al. (2018) in which they examined the mediating role of perceived leadership style in job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the managerial coaching process. The results of this research in question are consistent with our findings. In a similar manner, Jabbar et al. (2020) also examined the effect of transformational and transactional leadership perception on individuals' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of the study conducted by these researchers are also parallel to our findings. Ahmadi et al. (2011) examined both job satisfaction and quality of life variables depending on the perceived leadership style and found that there was a positive correlation between these three variables. Considering all these data, it is thought that the organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life of wrestling coaches are positively affected as a result of the display of transformational and transactional leadership styles.

As a result of the research, it is recommended that managers and leaders exhibit transformational and interactive leadership behaviors in order to increase organizational commitment, job satisfaction and quality of life in the institutions/organizations where the trainers work. Since the leadership style perceived by the trainers affects both their professional and daily lives, the opinions of the employees should be taken from time to time and the situations reflected in the organizational environment should be evaluated within the institution. In addition to individuals and institutions, in future scientific studies, it is recommended that mixed model studies be conducted with the collection of qualitative data in order to examine the sources of these differences depending on the determination of differences between groups depending on various demographic data. In addition, it is recommended that these studies conducted in the province center be repeated with various groups and that the data on the perceived leadership style be increased.

## KAYNAKLAR

Ahmadi, S. A. A., Jalalian, N., Salamzadeh, Y., & Tadayon, A. (2011). To the promotion of work life quality using the paradigm of managerial coaching: the role of managerial coaching on the quality of work life. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(17), 7440.

Akgül, T., & Gül, M. (2021). Sporda liderlik stilleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türk Spor ve Egzersiz Psikolojisi Dergisi*, 1(1), 40-57.

Ali, M., Lodhi, S. A., Raza, B., & Ali, W. (2018). Examining the impact of managerial coaching on employee job performance: mediating role of work engagement, leader-member-exchange quality, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 12(1), 253-282.

Aydın, G. (2019). *Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı, iş tatmini, yaşam tatmini ve psikolojik iyi oluş arasındaki ilişki: Fitness antrenörleri örneği* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Balaji, C. (1988). Organisational commitment of job satisfaction: which explains intent to quit better. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 23(3), 313-328.

Başol, O., & Çömlekçi, M. F. (2020). İş tatmini ölçeğinin uyarlanması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Kırklareli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 1(2), 17-31.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207.

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 277-289.

Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307.

Çelik, D., Paşlı, F., & Zengin, S. (2024). Spor yöneticiliği bölümü öğrencilerinin çatışma yönetim stratejileri ve liderlik özelliklerinin incelenmesi. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15(1), 161-175.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile yıldırma arasındaki ilişki. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(33), 77-87.

Doğan, S., & Kılıç, S. (2007). Örgütsel bağlılığın sağlanmasında personel güçlendirmenin yeri ve önemi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (29), 37-61.

Erceylan, N. (2010). *Yöneticilerin liderlik davranışlarının çalışanların örgütsel bağlılıkları üzerindeki etkileri ve bir araştırma* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Malatya.

Eren, M. Ş., & Titizoğlu, Ö. Ç. (2014). Dönüşümcü ve etkileşimci liderlik tarzlarının örgütsel özdeşleşme ve iş tatmini üzerindeki etkileri. *Sosyal Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 14(27), 275-303.

Eser, E., Fidaner, H., Fidaner, C., Eser, S. Y., Elbi, H., & Göker, E. (1999). WHOQOL-100 ve WHOQOL-BREF'in Psikometrik Özellikleri. *Psikiyatri Psikoloji Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 7(Suppl 2), 23-40.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2021). *IBM SPSS Statistics 27 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*. Routledge.  
Güler, M., & Cinnioğlu, H. (2021). Algılanan otantik liderlik davranışının çalışanların örgütsel bağlılık ve performans düzeylerine etkisi: otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Issues*, 3(2), 124-139.

Hunt, S. D., & Morgan, R. M. (1994). Organizational commitment: one of many commitments or key mediating Construct?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1568-1587.

Jabbar, M. N., Mahmood, W., & Qambar, G. (2020). Mediating role of organizational commitment and work environment on the relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Journal of Talent*

*Development and Excellence*, 12(2), 3974-3988.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: the role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 17-34.

Kalkan, T., & Sarı, İ. (2021). Antrenör davranışları: kuramsal yaklaşımlar, antrenörün sporcuya etkisi ve öneriler. *Egzersiz ve Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 41-54.

Kara, E. & Bozkurt, Ş. (2021). Dönüşümcü liderliğin örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisinin belirlenmesi. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, (87), 143-160.

Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: kavramlar ilkeler teknikleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Kırkbir, F. & Zengin, S. (2022). Investigation of life satisfaction and psychological health of university students according to their sports participation experiences, *International Journal of Eurasian Education and Culture*, 7(18), 1499-1512.

Kul, M., Şipal, O., Aksoy, Ö. F., & Boz, E. (2020). Sporcu algılarına göre halter antrenörlerinin etik liderlik davranışlarının incelenmesi. *Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 247-256.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171.

Orley, J., & Kuyken, W. (1994). *Quality of life assessment: international perspectives*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Örücü, E., & Zeybek, F. (2023). Örgütsel bağlılık ve dönüşümcü liderliğin inovatif davranış eğilimi üzerindeki etkisinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *İzmir İktisat Dergisi*, 38(1), 77-95.

Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational Commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.

Şahin, D., Ekici, Z., & Kayral, İ. H. (2021). Doktorların çalışma yaşam kalitesinin örgütsel bağlılık ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkisi. *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi*, 24(1), 29-42.

Sökmen, A., Kenek, G., & Uğraş, E. (2019). Etik liderlik ve üretkenlik Karşılı İş Davranışı İlişkisi: Örgütsel Bağlılığın Aracı Rolü. *Third Sector Social Economic Review*, 54(4), 1568-1582.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Taylor, R. L. (2018). *Military leadership: in pursuit of excellence*. Routledge.