Determination of the leadership styles of the trainers

Mehmet Ulukan[1,*], Hasan Sahan[2] , Yunus Yildirim[3] , Mustafa Yildiz[2]

[1]*Adnan Menderes University, Physical Education and Sports Academy, Aydin, Turkey,*
[2]*Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Physical Education and Sports Academy, Karaman, Turkey*
[3]*Mustafa Kemal University, Physical Education and Sports Academy, Hatay, Turkey*

Abstract

The aim of this study is to research by determining the leadership styles of the trainers who trained individual athletes in the amateur sports clubs. The surveying group consists of 64 trainers who train the individual athletes, working in Karaman and Konya provinces of a country, Turkey. Firstly, present data, related to the aim of the search, is given systematically by scanning literature. Thus, a theoretical frame is formed about the subject. At the end of the study, it is observed that trainers work in Konya and Karaman and train individual sportsmen behaving autocratic leadership. Besides, when there is a meaningful relation between gender and class, there is not a difference between social comparison levels and gender levels. It can be said with this information that women trainers give more importance to sensitive devotion to provide labor unity than men by tending like a family.

Keywords: Trainer; Leadership; Leadership types.

1. Introduction

People cooperate to make their goals, exceeding their power, come true. To actualize a goal, which requires a common effort, necessitates combining and integrating power and action of more than one individual [1]. Even though these people, who come together to gather these combined powers and manage them, are qualified with their job, provided they do not have group leader at their head they cannot reach desired goals and time, cost and quality standards easily. In this case, a gatherer, authority and founder leader is needed [2]. In this intention businesses, which people are included, have a value of responsibility rather than importance [3]. Leaders in globalizing world are leading lights on accommodating changes of people in society and coping with some problems brought by those changes [4]. Therefore,

_____
*Corresponding author. Tel.: +90-256-585-7724/+90-530-526-4858; fax : +90-256-585-3762.
E-mail address: ulukanmehmet1@gmail.com (M. Ulukan).

there must be leaders in sport who directs and guides players in the team. A method applied to players by leaders differs from leader to leader. Adopting the most leadership method will supply both success and togetherness. By setting off some definitions made about leadership, it can be defined as: "impressing group members about reaching common aims, coordinating, forwarding and managing and having knowledge and skills". Leader, at the same time, is a person who takes into consideration events on determining by putting away sentimentality [5]. Leader and leadership have different meanings. Leader is a person who forwards and manages people in the team in accordance with common aims. On the other hand leadership is the work of leader. In this context, many scientists defined leadership. According to a scientist [6], leadership is a process of one's effecting and directing others' activities to actualize aims of definite person and groups under definite conditions. According to Demirbilek [7], leadership is a sum of knowledge and skills that collect a group of people around definite aims and trigger them to actualize these aims. Person who has knowledge can have responsibility in a case of necessity [8]. On looking leadership with a trainer eye, first it features itself by guiding and directing sportsmen [9]. Leadership types or management chosen by a trainer affects that trainer's efficiency largely. Choosing a proper leadership type provides both individual and organizational aims coming true. Providing inappropriate leadership type and motivation techniques, organizational aims cannot be actualized and players can become hurt, angry, and aggressive and deprived of trust and satisfied senses. On looking trainers as a leader it is seen that leaders at different branches have different leadership behavior types. This elicits definitions of attitudes of trainer's behaviors that they display [10-12]. Mostly leadership has three types:
- Autocratic
- Democratic and
- Liberal type.

Autocratic leaders, in the main issue, keep group members out on managing. In other words, group members have no voice in determining aims, plans and policies. They are only in charge of fulfilling orders given by leader. Then, all the managing authority is gathered in leader [13]. Autocratic leaders are hard tempered and authoritarian. On the other hand, Individual interest size makes the individuals feel valuable [14]. Filled with ambition to succeed, behaviors of intolerant, punitive and harsh frugal coaches include this group [15]. However, these types of leaders do not as for others' ideas and view but they give orders and make them do. It is extremely hard to ask for these expectations from autocratic leaders [16]. Democratic leaders tend to share managing authority with group members. They try to hinder privileges and statute dissimilarities within group members [17]. On these grounds, leader attaches importance to set leadership behaviors in accordance with his/her underlings on determining aims, plans and policies, and sharing jobs and fulfilling orders. Democratic leaders are people who give importance to ideas and opinions of his/her underlings while making a decision. Leader at democratic management is an administrator guide, is more a delegate and is a person who involves in group and coordinate control group efforts [18, 19]. Athletes always try to behave to their leaders respectfully and follow their leaders happily. Submission of the future vision loaded value to enable athletes to follow the leader [20], it relates with the use of suitable images and symbols to focus on the work of the employees and trying to make workers feel importance of their work. Democratic leaders always try to solve all problems in the new ways. But encouraging being creative to think of old problems in new ways and for this one, it relates with creating an environment with the tolerance [21, 22]. Inspirational motivation is the time, increased the optimism and effort and confidently told his/her vision by a leader [23]. Establishment of high standards reports the expectations of

higher performance [24]. On the other hand, liberal leaders is a person who needs the least management authority, leaves group members on their own, and gives opportunity to group members to do their plans aims and programs. In other words, free leaders leave the owner of authority and using the authority to their underlings [13, 22-25].

2. Methodology

In order to reach the aim of this research, the leadership types form, which was developed by David R. Frew in 1977, was used to assess leadership types of trainers who trains individual sportsman. Questionnaire questions asked to trainers were prepared upon fivefold Likert scale. Findings were analyzed with SPSS 16.0 for Windows statistics packet program. Through SPSS program, Chi-Square Tests were marked the trainers who train individual sportsman and significance was sought in their answers to each sentence.

3. Findings

3. 1. Reliability analysis

In the reliability analysis, the reliability of the scale was found as 84.5%.

3. 2. Demographic features of subjects

Below, there are some demographic features of trainers with tables who attended the study.

Table 1. Marital status of trainers

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Drift Percentage
Married	49	76.6	76.6	76.6
Single	13	20.3	20.3	96.9
Divorced	2	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total	64	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 shows the marital status of the trainers who joined the questionnaire. According to this, it is seen that 76.6% of the trainers are married, 20.3% are single and 3.1% are divorced.

Table 2. Education status of trainers

Education Status	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Drift Percentage
High School	14	21.9	21.9	21.9
Vocational High School	4	6.2	6.2	28.1
College	46	71.9	71.9	100.0
Total	64	100.0	100.0	

It is stated that trainers', who joined the questionnaire, 21.95 are at the level of high school, 6.25 are at the level of Vocational High School and 71.95 are at the level of college. Trainers, who have primary school level and have trainer certificate, are so little or no.

Table 3 shows the age dispersion of the trainers who joined the questionnaire. According to the table trainers' 18.8% are between the ages of 21 and 29, 45.3% are between the ages of 30 and 39, 25.0% are between the age of 40-49 and 10.9% are at the age of 50 and more. As seen Table 3, trainers', who works at amateur clubs, average age is between 30 and 49 and shows 70.3% dispersion.

Table 3. Age dispersion of trainers

Age Segment	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Drift Percentage
21-29 age	12	18.8	18.8	18.8
30-39 age	29	45.3	45.3	64.1
40-49 age	16	25.0	25.0	89.1
50 and over	7	10.9	10.9	100.0
Total	64	100.0	100.0	

3. 3. Determining the leadership types of trainers

In this part of the study, answers are shown with tables which were given with sections used with the aim of determining the leadership types of trainers who trains individual sportsmen. Besides, it was shown the Chi-Square Test in Table 4.

As we see in Table 4 for 1, 17.9% of the trainers certainly agreed, 57.1% of the trainers agreed, 21.4% of the trainers disagreed and 3.6% of the trainers certainly disagreed to the statement. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). In the second sentences, 6, 25.0% of the trainers certainly agreed, 67.9% of the trainers agreed to the statement. On the other hand, 7.1% of the trainers disagreed to the statement. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 3 sentences, 67.9% of the trainers certainly agreed, on the other hand 3.6% of the trainers disagreed to the statement. There was no answer on certainly disagreeing. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 4 sentences, 25.0% of the trainers certainly agreed, 67.9% of the trainers agreed and 3.6 of the trainers has no idea of the statement while 3.5% of the trainers disagreed to the statement. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 5 sentences, 32.1% of the trainers certainly agreed, 53.6% of the trainers agreed and 3.6% of the trainers have no idea to the statement. While 5.9% of the trainers disagreed, none of the trainer certainly disagreed to the statement which attracts attention. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 6 sentences, 25.0% of the trainers certainly agreed while 67.9% of the trainers disagreed to the statement. 3.6% of the trainers have no idea to the statement. But the disagreeing answer is at 14.3%. Certainly disagreeing is 0%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 7 sentences, 3.6% of the trainers certainly agreed, 17.9% of the trainer agreed, 10.7% of the trainers have no idea to the statement. On the other hand, 42.9% of the trainer disagreed and 25.0% of the trainer certainly disagreed to the statement. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 8 sentences, while 21.4% of the trainers certainly agreed, 42.9% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 10.7%. But agreeing answer is at 21.4%. Certainly disagreeing is at 3.6%. On the other hand, 7.1% of the trainer disagreed to the statement. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 9 sentences, while 10.7% of the trainer certainly agreed, 53.6% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 3.6%. But agreeing answer is at 21.4%. Certainly disagreeing is at %10.7%. According to Chi-Square Test, yet a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership

Table 4. Chi-Square Test results

Sentences Asked To The Trainers.	I certainly agree	I agree	I have no idea	I don't agree	I certainly disagree	Total	Chi-Square Tests Value	Df	As. Sig.
I expect being done what I want from my sportsmen without any question. I am in charge of what are being done not my sportsmen.	17.9%	57.1%	0.0%	21.4%	3.6%	100%	5.77	4	0.22
Over controlled trainer is more harm than good. When sportsmen are given self-controlled exercise, they do their best.	25.0%	67.9%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	100%	3.93	4	0.42
Despite discipline is important in organization, active trainer should moderate discipline process by making good use of knowledge of sportsmen and situation that he/she is in.	67.9%	28.6%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0 %	100%	1.36	4	0.85
Trainers should try his/her best to define sportsmen's mission in sub divisions properly.	25.0%	67.9%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%	100%	1.99	4	0.74
If a sportsman who has a leadership character helps to trainer, democratic process can work.	32.1%	53.6%	3.6%	10.7%	0.0%	100%	6.27	4	0.18
As a trainer I am totally in charge of all of the actions of the team. I should be rewarded when matches are resulted in favor of our club.	25.0%	57.1%	3.6%	14.3%	0.0 %	100%	7.05	4	0.13
Sportsmen need controlling by a careful trainer.	3.6%	17.9%	10.7%	42.9%	25.0%	100%	1.99	4	0.74
Trainers can share his/her authority with team captain and branch responsible head.	21.4%	42.9%	10.7%	21.4%	3.6%	100%	8.57	4	0.07
Trainers have the authority of administrating sportsmen from the contract with the club.	10.7%	53.6%	3.6%	21.4%	10.7%	100%	3.20	4	0.52
In order to discipline the team trainers need trying to solve the entire discipline problem in a democratic way.	7.1%	32.1%	14.3%	21.4%	25.0%	100%	12.8	4	0.01
Disorganization problems related to division of labor within team has a less importance. On many conditions sportsmen do their best with designate their mission.	35.7%	50.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	100%	9.18	4	0.06
The leader chosen between the sportsmen must be a member of group and should coordinate the activities of the group and should also represents the team at the organizations.	3.6%	50.0%	10.7%	28.6%	7.1%	100%	9.75	4	0.05
Trainer needs controlling over sportsmen.	25.0%	57.1%	3.6%	10.7%	3.6%	100%	4.09	4	0.39
There should be only one granted leader.	49.0%	41.7%	3.1%	4.2%	2.1%	100%	0.54	4	0.97
A good trainer should build special discipline system accurately and should practice it.	17.9%	39.3%	0.0%	35.7%	7.1%	100%	6.55	4	0.16
Every discipline rules should be flexible and should set facilities to special occasions given by the trainer for each situation.	53.6%	35.7%	3.6%	7.1%	0.0 %	100%	2.66	3	0.45
Basically, people are responsible for their own. For this reason, a good trainer cannot blame his/her sportsmen or ignore them	21.4%	42.9%	7.1%	28.6%	0.0 %	100.0 %	4.74	4	0.32
A trainer's mission is to have a relation between his/her under liabilities to reach aims, to discuss the way to success with them and to help for the aim of reaching a successful result.	21.4%	35.7%	10.7%	21.4%	10.7%	100%	4.70	4	0.32
Trainer is responsible to his/her sportsmen.	57.1%	35.7%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0 %	100%	5.42	3	0.14

types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 10 sentences, while 7.1% of the trainer certainly agreed, 32.1% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at %14.3%. But disagreeing answer is at 21.4%. Certainly disagreeing answer is at 25.0%. According to Chi-Square Test,

a meaningful relation could be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 11 sentences, while 35.7% of the trainer certainly agreed, 50.0% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 0.0%. But agreeing answer is at 14.3%. Again certainly disagreeing is at 0.0%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 12 sentences, while 3.6% of the trainer certainly agreed, 50.0% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 10.7%. But disagreeing answer is at 28.6%. Certainly disagreeing is at 7.1%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation was found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 13 sentences, while 25.0% of the trainer certainly agreed, 57.1% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 3.6%. But disagreeing answer is at 10.7%. Certainly disagreeing is at 3.6%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 14 sentences, while 46.4% of the trainer certainly agreed, 42.9% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 3.6%. But disagreeing answer is at 3.6%. Certainly disagreeing is at 3.6%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 15 sentences, while 17.9% of the trainer certainly agreed, 39.3% of the trainer agreed to the statement. There is no one to have no idea. But disagreeing answer is at 35.7%. Certainly disagreeing is at 7.1%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 16 sentences, while 53.6% of the trainer certainly agreed, 35.7% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 3.6%. But disagreeing answer is at 7.1%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 17 sentences, while 21.4% of the trainer certainly agreed, 42.9% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 7.15%. But disagreeing answer is at 28.6%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On analyzing for 18 sentences, while 21.4% of the trainer certainly agreed, 35.7% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 10.7%. But disagreeing answer is at 21.4%. Certainly disagreeing is at 10.7%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05). On the last analyzing, while 57.1% of the trainer certainly agreed, 35.7% of the trainer agreed to the statement. Having no idea is at 3.6%. But disagreeing answer is at 3.6%. According to Chi-Square Test, a meaningful relation could not be found between answers given to the question and leadership types (p > 0.05).

4. Discussion and conclusion

There were important factors which effected business lives of trainers like other managers. These were family life, education level, communication and leadership types that they adopted. Trainers who had steady family life were more concerned and efficient to the sportsmen. For this reason, family had an importance for leadership. Right along with family life, leaders' education had an importance, too. But, education level of trainer posed an obstacle because trainer could improve his/herself by attending seminary, conference or other activities.

In order to reach the goals that the trainer determined, trainer should communicate with sportsman in a best way. Communication interacted directly with leadership types of trainer

and had a mission of bridge which would lead the team to success. Some trainer job was not easy who worked with sportsmen that had no material expectations because sportsmen who had no material expectations expected a good communication with trainers. Most of the trainers who joined this search did sport before being a trainer. This made more effective and impressive study between trainer and sportsmen. It was seen that trainers, who transferred his/her gained experiences at sportsmanship life to their trainer life, were more successful. In this research it was seen that trainer who trained individual sportsman had more autocratic leadership life. For having few players in the team of trainers who trained individual sportsman, trainers had more close interaction than trainers who trained team and had more chance to know well. For this reason, trainers, who mastered personality features, used different leadership types according to characters of sportsmen. In this study it was seen that most of the trainers took an autocratic line towards sportsmen. It was not a real problem to adopt an autocratic line to individual sportsmen trained by autocratic trainer. The only reason was that in individual sports trainers were in one to one interaction and had a chance to cut out the problem by generating solution to it immediately [26-31].

In conclusion, it was understood that trainers' leadership types who trained individual sportsmen could change due to features of sportsmen in the team and other factors. What was important was to use different types for places and times. Because while using a democratic type to a sportsman who had deficiency of confidence was wrong, also an autocratic approach was wrong. For this reason, using different types to different sportsman impressed positively both success and togetherness.

References

 [1] Aydin M. Education Management. Hatiboglu Print House, Ankara, Turkey, 1998 [Turkey].
 [2] Akat I, Budak G. Business Management. Baris Publication Faculties Bookstore. Izmir, Turkey, pp 212-2131999 [in Turkish].
 [3] Metin M. The examinations of teachers' attitude towards performance assessment with respect to the different variables. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2011;3:269–284.
 [4] Sisman M. Instructional Leadership. Pegem publication, Ankara, Turkey, 2002 [in Turkish].
 [5] Belker LB. First Step Management (Translated by Seyma Senbabaoglu). Inkilap Bookstore, Istanbul, Turkey, 1999 [in Turkish].
 [6] Kocel T. Business Management. Beta Publication, Istanbul, Turkey, 1995 [in Turkish].
 [7] Demirbilek T. A study on types of leadership in terms of trade union managers. Dokuz Eylul Univ J Inst Soc Sci 2003;5:22-30.
 [8] Larsson S, Ronnmark L. The concept of charismatic leadership its application to an analysis of social movements and a voluntary organization. Int J Public Sector Manage, 1999:9:7,32-34.
 [9] Ikizler C. Sport Social Sciences. Alfa Publication, Istanbul, Turkey, 2000 [in Turkish].
[10] Baser E. Psychology and achievement in football. Bagirgan Publication, Ankara, Turkey, 1996 [in Turkish].
[11] Yigit N. Developing presentation skills of student teachers through micro-teaching method. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2010;2:55–74.
[12] Emirhan N. Worked at the school of military leadership behaviors related to physical education teachers' lesson in-a study on students approaches. Master's Thesis, Gazi Universitesity, Institute of Health Sciences. Ankara, Turkey, 1998 [in Turkish].
[13] Eren E. Management and Organization. Beta Publication, Istanbul, Turkey, 1998 [in Turkish].
[14] Kuchinke KP. Leadership and culture: Work–related values and leadership styles among one company's US and German telecommunication employees. Human Res Develop Quart 1999;10: Paper no. 2.
[15] Koc S. Sports Psychology. Saray Bookstore, Izmir, Turkey, 1994 [in Turkish].

[16] Demirbas A. Social, economic, environmental and policy aspects of biofuels. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2010;2:75–109.

[17] Celik V. Educational leadership. Pegem Publication, Ankara, Turkey, 2003 [in Turkish].

[18] Martens R. Coaches guide to sport psychology. Human Kinetics Publishers, Illinois, USA,1987.

[19] Dikmenli M, Cardak O, Oztas F, Yakisan M. High school students' images of an environmental scientist. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2010;2:187–210.

[20] Toros T. Examination of self-esteem, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in employees of sports federations. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2012;4:537-548.

[21] Prabhakar P. Switch leadership in projects; an empirical study reflecting the importance of transformational leadership on project success across twenty- eight nations. Project Manage J 2005:36:53-60

[22] Yimaz B, Kilinc M, Sahan H. Examination of the organizational commitment and the levels of job satisfaction in accordance with specific variables. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2012;4:169-176.

[23] Salman MN. The importance of sport of university syudents during campus life. Energy Educ Sci Technology Part B 2012;4:495-500.

[24] Lawler J, Fred O, Walumbwa B, Peng W. Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. A comparative study of Kenyan and US financial firms". Human Res Develop Quarterly 2005:16: Paper no. 2.

[25] Oztas F. The effects of educational gains of vocational school of health students on their environmental attitudes. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2010;2:147-159.

[26] Ulukan M. The democratic leadership in the football clubs. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2012;4:531-536

[27] Kaya Y. Effect of late coming during the lecture on the rate of learning performance. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2011;3:221–228.

[28] Kaya Y. The effect of regulator and stiffener exercises for speaking mechanics on the stuttering education and therapy. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2011;3:253–268.

[29] Koral O. The effectiveness of problem-based learning supported with computer simulations on academic performance about buoyancy. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2011;3:293–304.

[30] Sevindik T. Prediction of student academic performance by using an adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2011;3:635–646.

[31] Kentli FD, Sahin Y. An SVM approach to predict student performance in manufacturing processes course. Energy Educ Sci Technol Part B 2011;3:535–544.