

Investigation of the Relationship between the Leadership Styles Perceived by the Coaches and the Levels of Organizational Commitment

Murat KUL¹, Hakan KIRKBİR²

¹Bayburt Üniversitesi, Bayburt, Türkiye
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6391-8079>

²Bayburt Üniversitesi, Bayburt, Türkiye
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4644-6716>

Email: muratkul@bayburt.edu.tr , hakankirkbir@gmail.com

Türü: Araştırma Makalesi (Alındı: 23.11.2023 - Kabul: 08.12.2023)

Abstract

The research was conducted to examine the relationship between coaches' perceived leadership styles and organizational commitment levels. For this purpose, people who actively continue their coaching duties in different branches and reside in Trabzon were included in the study. Three separate forms were used to collect data in the research. These; Personal Information Form, Multifactor Leadership Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale. SPSS (Version 26) was used in the analysis process of this study, which was carried out in the relational screening model. Among parametric tests, t-test, ANOVA and Pearson correlation analysis were used. According to the research results; There were no differences in the variables of gender, education level, being a national athlete, type of sports branch and region of duty. However, in the transformational leadership sub-dimension; Statistically significant results were obtained depending on the variables of age, marital status, coaching level, institution and tenure. In the transactional leadership sub-dimension; Statistically significant results were obtained depending on the variables of age, perceived income status, coaching level, institution and tenure. In the organizational commitment variable; Statistically significant results were obtained only in the variables of perceived income status, coaching level and tenure. Finally; It was concluded that there was a positive relationship between the leadership styles perceived by the coaches and their organizational commitment levels.

Keywords: Coach, Leadership, Leadership Style, Organization, Organizational Commitment.

Introduction

The phenomenon 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). Needs that change according to the conditions of the day differ in the field of leadership as well as in all areas of life. The need for leaders in many fields also appears in the sports sector, and coaches also assume the role of leaders in the sports sector (Işık & Serinkan, 2020).

A coach who leads a team has the foresight, personality and skills that will influence athletes to reach their potential performance. What coaches do and how they act has a significant impact on athletes' attitudes, emotions, stress and performance (Kul et al., 2020). Athletes who have coaches with leadership qualities appear to be more successful in achieving their goals because they are satisfied with the management (Cotterill & Fransen, 2016). It is possible to call the leadership style of the coach as the set of methods that coaches will use to make their athletes implement the decisions they will make and to lead and direct them (Eskiecek, Bayazıt & Sarı, 2015).

One of the most important factors that is closely related to the coach's leadership style is organizational commitment (Akgül & Gül, 2021). It can be said as another related field in entrepreneurship (Özkara, 2019). Conceptually, organizational commitment; individuals show interest in their organization and feel a sense of belonging (Taşkın & Dilek, 2010). The main point in the success of organizations is related to the unity of employees in the organization towards a common goal and goal and organizational commitment (Zengin, 2021). According to Hunt and Morgan (1994), organizational commitment is individuals' belief in achieving organizational goals, their efforts to achieve these goals, and the feeling of being willingly present 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 purpose, 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, Mowday and others (1982) argued that the worst effect of low commitment is a decrease in job performance. Şahin and others (2021) associated low organizational commitment with low quality of life.

When the relationship between perceived leadership styles and organizational commitment is examined, it is known that there is a relationship between employee-oriented leadership styles such as ethical, transformational, laissez-faire and sustainer leadership styles and organizational commitment (Soyer, Yılmaz & Sarı, 2022; Jung, 2022; Özkul et al., 2022). Although this relationship is directly related to the coach, it also indirectly affects the athletes. Because coaches can benefit athletes in parallel with the leadership styles and organizational commitment levels they perceive within the organization they work for (Atrizka & Pratama, 2022).

The importance of perceived leadership style in sports is quite remarkable due to its relationship with organizational commitment and the consideration of stakeholders affected as a result of this relationship. Based on these data, the main purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between the leadership styles perceived by the coaches working in Trabzon and their organizational commitment levels.

Methodology

Participants

The research group consists of coaches working in Trabzon province, determined by convenience sampling method. All participants were included in the study on a voluntary basis.

Research Design

The relational screening model, one of the descriptive research models, was used in the research. In research conducted in the relational screening model, it is aimed to determine the relationships between variables. In this screening model, researchers conduct statistical analysis to test research hypotheses or to determine the distribution of the answers given to the questions. The data obtained is associated with statistical results and interpreted (Karasar, 2005).

Data Collection

Three separate forms were sent to the participants for data collection purposes in the study. These forms transmitted digitally; "Personal Information Form", "Multifactor Leadership Scale" and "Organizational Commitment Scale".

Personal Information Form: Personal Information Form" was prepared by the researchers to obtain the demographic information of the participants. In this form, participants; There are questions to obtain information such as gender, age, marital status, coaching level, monthly income, education level, years of service, status as a national athlete, institution/organization where one works and the region where one works.

Multifactor Leadership Scale: In the research, the "Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5-x short (MLQ)" scale, developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) and adapted into Turkish by Cemaloğlu (2007), was used to determine the transformational and transactional leadership styles perceived by the coaches. The scale consists of a total of 45 items. The scale consists of 2 sub-dimensions and these are transformational leadership and transactional leadership. Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the sub-dimensions were calculated as $\alpha=.97$ for transformational leadership and $\alpha=.84$ for transactional leadership.

Organizational Commitment Scale: Organizational Commitment Scale was developed by Porter et al. in 1974. Erceylan conducted the Turkish reliability-validity studies of the scale in 2010. The scale consists of a total of 15 items and consists of a single dimension. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was calculated as $\alpha=.88$ (9).

Data Analysis

The raw data obtained in the study was analyzed using SPSS (Version 26). First, descriptive statistics of these data were calculated and it was decided that they were suitable for parametric tests. Then, t-test was used for tests with two groups and ANOVA was used for variables with three or more groups. The use of Pearson correlation analysis in variables such as age and tenure was also used to test the relationship between variables. In all these tests, the margin of error was taken into account within the " $p<0.05$ " value range.

Findings

The findings obtained as a result of the analysis of the data are presented in tables in this section of the research.

Table 1. Frequency and percentage results regarding the demographic information of the research group.

Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Woman	55	21,5
	Man	201	78,5
Monthly Income Level	Bad	72	28,1
	Medium	167	65,2
	Good	17	6,6
Educational Status	High School	19	7,4
	Licence	180	70,3
	Postgraduate	57	22,3
Marital status	Married	154	60,2
	Single	102	39,8
Status of Being a National Athlete	No	216	84,4
	Yes	40	15,6
Type of Sport	Individual	117	45,7
	Team	139	54,3
Coaching Level	1. Level	46	18,0
	2. Level	91	35,5
	3. Level	80	31,3
	4. Level	24	9,4
	5. Level	15	5,9
Type of Institution	Government Institution	158	61,7
	Private Sector	98	38,3
Task Performed Region	Province	161	62,9
	District	95	37,1

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage results regarding the demographic information of the research group. According to this data, 55 (21.5%) of the participants are female, while 201 (78.5%) are male coaches. According to the perceived monthly income level, 72 (28.1%) of the participants are at a bad level, 167 (65.2%) are at a medium level, and 17 (6.6%) are at a good level. Depending on the education level, 19 (7.4%) of the research group have a high school degree, 180 (70.3%) have a bachelor's degree, and 57 (22.3%) have a postgraduate degree. While 154 (60.2%) of the participants are married, 102 (39.8%) are single. Considering the status of being a national athlete, it is seen that 216 (84.4%) answered no and 40 (15.6%) answered yes. According to the type of sports branch, 117 (45.7%) work as individual coaches and 139 (54.3%) work as team sports coaches. Considering the coaching levels, 46 (18.0%) are at the 1st level, 91 (35.5%) are at the 2nd level, 80 (31.3%) are at the 3rd level, 24 (9%) are at the 3rd level. 4) It is seen that they have a 4th level and 15 (5.9%) have a 5th level coaching certificate. According to the type of institution they work in, 158 (61.7%) work in public institutions and 98 (38.3%) work in the private sector. According to the region they work, 161 (62.9%) work in the city center and 95% work in the private sector. (37.1%) work in the district.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the research group data.

	Age	Tenure	Transformational Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Organizational Commitment
Average	38,40	11,01	46,82	33,59	47,50

Standard Deviation	9,980	8,381	18,367	9,541	10,514
Skewness	,221	1,124	-,518	-,104	,094
Kurtosis	,143	1,564	-,447	1,623	-,824
Minimum	18,00	1,00	18,00	12,00	25,13
Maksimum	53,00	33,00	85,26	60,25	70,33

Table 2 contains the descriptive statistics of the data regarding the research group. According to these data, the average age of the participants was 38.40 (± 9.980) and the average tenure was 11.01 (± 8.381). According to the values of the Multi-Factor Leadership Scale sub-dimensions, the average of the transformational leadership sub-dimension was calculated as 46.82 (± 18.367), while the average of the transactional leadership sub-dimension was calculated as 33.59 (± 9.541). The average of organizational commitment was found to be 47.50 (± 10.514). When the skewness and kurtosis values in these data were examined, it was decided to use parametric tests because the obtained values were between -2 and +2 (George & Mallery, 2021).

Table 3. t-Test results for the gender variable of the research group.

	Gender	n	Average	ss.	t	p
Transformational Leadership	Woman	55	50,09	18,320	1,296	,126
	Man	201	45,92	18,323		
Transactional Leadership	Woman	55	35,30	9,933	1,358	,149
	Man	201	33,12	9,402		
Organizational Commitment	Woman	55	48,50	9,975	,824	,448
	Man	201	47,23	10,664		

Table 3 shows the t-test results regarding the gender variable of the research group, and according to these data, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference ($p > 0,05$).

Table 4. Pearson correlation analysis results regarding the research group's transformational leadership, transactional leadership and organizational commitment levels and the age variable.

		Transformational Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Organizational Commitment
Age	r	-,214**	-,170**	-,051
	p	,001	,006	,418
	n	256	256	256

** $p < 0,01$

Table 4 shows the transformational leadership, transactional leadership and organizational commitment levels of the research group and the Pearson correlation analysis results regarding the age variable. According to these data, a low-level negative relationship was found between the age variable and transformational leadership and transactional leadership ($p < 0,01$). However, no relationship was found between organizational commitment and age variable ($p > 0,05$).

Table 5. ANOVA results regarding the educational attainment variable of the research group.

		Sum of Squares	sd.	Mean Squares	F	p
Transformational Leadership	Intergroup	452,224	2	226,112	,669	,513
	Within Groups	85572,457	253	338,231		
	Total	86024,681	255			
Transactional Leadership	Intergroup	145,105	2	72,553	,796	,452
	Within Groups	23071,043	253	91,190		
	Total	23216,148	255			
Organizational Commitment	Intergroup	111,034	2	55,517	,500	,607
	Within Groups	28077,868	253	110,980		
	Total	28188,902	255			

Table 5 shows the ANOVA results regarding the educational status variable of the research group. According to these data, it was found that there was no statistical difference between the groups ($p > 0,05$).

Table 6. ANOVA results regarding the perceived income status variable of the research group.

		Sum of Squares	sd.	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Transformational Leadership	Intergroup	1484,601	2	742,300	2,221	,111	-
	Within Groups	84540,080	253	334,151			
	Total	86024,681	255				
Transactional Leadership	Intergroup	1519,689	2	759,844	8,860	,000*	3 > 2 > 1
	Within Groups	21696,460	253	85,757			
	Total	23216,148	255				
Organizational Commitment	Intergroup	1526,196	2	763,098	7,241	,001*	3 > 2 > 1
	Within Groups	26662,706	253	105,386			
	Total	28188,902	255				

**p < 0,05; 1: Bad Level 2: Medium Level 3: Good Level*

Table 6 shows the ANOVA results regarding the perceived income status variable of the research group. According to these data, it was found that there was no statistical difference between the groups in the transformational leadership sub-dimension ($p > 0,05$). However, it was found that there was a difference depending on the transactional leadership and organizational commitment parameters ($p < 0,05$). These differences arise from the fact that coaches who perceive their average monthly income as good have a higher average score than other groups.

Table 7. t-Test results of the research group on the marital status variable.

	Marital Status	n	Average	ss.	t	p
Transformational	Married	154	44,80	18,896	-2,220	,027*

Leadership	Single	102	49,87	17,182		
Transactional Leadership	Married	154	31,94	8,963	-3,401	,001
	Single	102	36,08	9,887		
Organizational Commitment	Married	154	46,78	9,854	-1,306	,148
	Single	102	48,58	11,402		

* $p < 0,05$

Table 7 shows the t-test results regarding the marital status variable of the research group. According to these data, it is seen that there is a statistical difference between the groups in the transformational leadership sub-dimension and that this difference arises from the fact that single coaches have a higher average score compared to married coaches ($p < 0,05$; $t = -2.220$). However, it was found that there was no difference depending on the transactional leadership and organizational commitment parameters ($p > 0,05$).

Table 8. t-Test results of the research group on the variable of being a national athlete.

	Status of Being a National Athlete	n	Average	ss.	t	p
Transformational Leadership	No	216	46,99	18,518	,351	,757
	Yes	40	45,91	17,724		
Transactional Leadership	No	216	33,34	9,410	-,923	,360
	Yes	40	34,94	10,238		
Organizational Commitment	No	216	47,16	10,280	-1,101	,276
	Yes	40	49,33	11,666		

Table 8 shows the t-test results regarding the variable of the research group's status as a national athlete, and according to these data, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference ($p > 0,05$).

Table 9. t-Test results for the research group's sport type variable.

	Type of Sport	n	Average	ss.	t	p
Transformational Leadership	Individual	117	48,27	18,126	1,160	,247
	Team	139	45,60	18,544		
Transactional Leadership	Individual	117	34,16	9,301	,875	,382
	Team	139	33,11	9,746		
Organizational Commitment	Individual	117	47,41	10,902	-,117	,907
	Team	139	47,57	10,215		

Table 9 shows the t-test results regarding the sports branch type variable of the research group, and according to these data, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference ($p > 0,05$).

Table 10. ANOVA results regarding the coaching level variable of the research group.

		Sum of Squares	sd.	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Transformational Leadership	Intergroup	9574,194	4	2393,548	7,858	,000*	5 > 4
	Within Groups	76450,487	251	304,584			5 > 1

	Total	86024,681	255				
Transactional Leadership	Intergroup	1375,139	4	343,785			
	Within Groups	21841,009	251	87,016	3,951	,004*	5 > 1
	Total	23216,148	255				
Organizational Commitment	Intergroup	1085,389	4	271,347			
	Within Groups	27103,513	251	107,982	2,513	,042*	5 > 1
	Total	28188,902	255				

* $p < 0,05$; 1: Tier 1 Trainer 4: Tier 4 Trainer 5: Tier 5 Trainer

Table 10 shows the ANOVA results regarding the perceived income status variable of the research group. According to these data, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference in all parameters and these differences resulted in the favor of 5th level coaches ($p < 0,05$).

Table 11. t-Test results regarding the variable of type of institution of the research group.

	Type of Institution	n	Average	ss.	t	p
Transformational Leadership	Government Institution	158	44,70	19,628	-2,368	,019*
	Private Sector	98	50,24	15,623		
Transactional Leadership	Government Institution	158	32,69	10,030	-1,989	,048*
	Private Sector	98	35,03	8,549		
Organizational Commitment	Government Institution	158	47,27	10,769	-,457	,648
	Private Sector	98	47,88	10,130		

* $p < 0,05$

Table 11 shows the t-test results regarding the type of institution variable where the research group works, and according to these data, it was determined that there was a statistically significant difference in both the transformational leadership and transactional leadership sub-dimensions ($p < 0,05$). These differences are due to the fact that coaches working in the private sector achieve higher averages than coaches working in public institutions. No statistical difference was found in the data regarding organizational commitment ($p > 0,05$).

Table 12. Pearson correlation analysis results regarding the transformational leadership, transactional leadership and organizational commitment levels of the research group and the tenure variable.

	Transformational Leadership	Transactional Leadership	Organizational Commitment
r	-,227**	-,179**	,286*
p	,000	,004	,021
n	256	256	256

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

Table 12 shows the research group's transformational leadership, transactional leadership and organizational commitment levels and the Pearson correlation analysis results regarding the tenure variable. According to these data, a low-level negative relationship was found between the tenure variable and transformational leadership and transactional leadership ($p < 0,01$). However, a low-level positive relationship was found between organizational commitment and the age variable ($p < 0,05$).

Table 13. t-Test results regarding the region variable of the research group.

	Task Performed Region	n	Average	ss.	t	p
Transformational Leadership	Province	161	47,02	18,445	,228	,820
	District	95	46,48	18,325		
Transactional Leadership	Province	161	33,85	9,589	,570	,569
	District	95	33,14	9,494		
Organizational Commitment	Province	161	47,40	10,788	-,200	,841
	District	95	47,67	10,085		

Table 13 shows the t-test results regarding the variable of the region where the research group worked, and it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference according to these data ($p > 0,05$).

Table 14. Pearson correlation analysis results for the research group's transformational leadership, transactional leadership and organizational commitment levels.

	Transformational Leadership	Transactional Leadership
Organizational commitment	r	,439**
	p	,000
	n	256

** $p < 0,01$

Table 14 shows the Pearson correlation analysis results regarding the research group's transformational leadership, transactional leadership and organizational commitment levels. According to these data, a positive high level relationship was found between organizational commitment and transformational leadership, and a positive low level relationship was found between transactional leadership ($p < 0,01$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The first of the results obtained as a result of this study, which was conducted to examine the relationship between coaches' perceived leadership styles and organizational commitment levels, is related to the gender variable. According to these data, it was concluded that there was no difference in both perceived leadership styles and organizational commitment levels. There are studies stating that there is no difference as a result of examining the perceived leadership style specifically for the gender variable obtained as a result of the evaluation of the organizational members (Çöp & Doğanay, 2020). Contrary, there is difference between gender variable and leadership orientation (Altınışik & Çelik, 2022).

According to the research results on the age variable, it was determined that there was a low-level negative relationship between transformational leadership and transactional leadership and the age variable. No relationship was found depending on the age variable of the coaches regarding their organizational commitment levels. Contrary to our research findings, Hıdıroğlu (2018) did not obtain results based on the age variable. Similarly, Topaloğlu and Dalgın (2013) also stated that perceived leadership style will not differ depending on the age variable. Zengin and Somoğlu (2022) can't find any relation depending on the age variable. As a result of examining the data on organizational commitment in terms of biological age, findings that did not coincide with our research findings were found (Yaşar, 2015). Hatipoğlu and Zengin (2018) stated that the relationship between the perceived leadership styles of

Generation Y and Generation X and their organizational commitment is stronger than that of individuals from Generation.

It was concluded that there was no difference in the perceived leadership styles and organizational commitment levels of the participants according to the educational level variable. There are various results regarding this variable in the literature on the subject. One of these studies is the research of Altınöz and others (2011). In this study, they found that the level of organizational commitment differed depending on the educational level and that participants whose education level was primary school had a higher level of organizational commitment. Researchers have stated that this situation may vary depending on the leadership style perceived by the participants (Hemedoğlu & Evliyaoğlu, 2012). and his colleagues obtained data contrary to our research findings and found that there were statistical differences depending on the level of education. However, like other research findings, they also stated that educational status does not have a definitive predictive feature, that leadership style is a personal characteristic and cannot be predicted based on education level.

It has been determined that there are differences in the leadership styles perceived by the coaches in our research group depending on variables such as income level, marital status, coaching level and professional tenure (Mutlu et al., 2019). found that there was no statistical difference regarding the variables mentioned. Hedemoğlu and Evliyaoğlu (2012) found that there was no difference in all of these variables. Although this diversity of data in the literature is not specific to domestic sources, foreign research findings have not reached a consensus on the predictive properties of these variables as a result of a definitive classification (Kim et al., 2019). In addition to all the data, various researchers have stated that this diversity depends on the working conditions, the climate within the organization, and certainly the leadership style of the manager or leader of the organization (Çakınberk & Demirel, 2010; Yolaç, 2011; Akgül & Gül, 2021). In the light of these data, it is thought that it is possible to obtain various data on the variables mentioned, depending on both the individual differences of the research groups and the working conditions and the behavior of the organization manager/leader.

Our final findings, which are thought to define our research problem, are that there is a positive relationship between the transformational and transactional leadership styles perceived by the coaches in the research group and organizational commitment. In this context, it should be noted that many researchers agree that there is a relationship between perceived leadership style and organizational commitment level (Sökmen, Kenek & Uğraş, 2019; Güler & Cinnioğlu, 2021). 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 and it is seen to be positive (Kara & Bozkurt, 2021; Örucü & Zeybek, 2023).

It is thought that this increase in the organizational commitment 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 their development of new skills. Transactional leaders, on the other hand, try to support followers in achieving their expected performance in order to achieve their goals within the existing organizational culture. It is possible that the organizational commitment levels of employees will increase as a result of exhibiting this leadership style, which focuses on the organization and its members and does not embrace self-centeredness.

In this section, provide a concise summary of the main findings and their implications. Reiterate the key contributions of your study and how they align with the research objectives or hypothesis. Emphasize the practical significance of your results and their potential impact on the field. Avoid introducing new information or ideas in this section; instead, focus on summarizing what has been discussed in the previous sections. Consider addressing any limitations and suggesting directions for future research. End with a strong concluding statement that leaves a lasting impression on the reader, reinforcing the importance of your work.

References

- Akgül, T., & Gül, M. (2021). Examining the Relationship Between Leadership Styles in Sports and Organizational Commitment. *International Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1(1), 40-57.
- Altınışik, Ü., & Çelik, A. (2022). Investigation of the Relationship Between Leadership Orientations and Emotional Intelligence Levels of Faculty of Sport Sciences Students. *Journal of Sport Sciences Researches*, 7(1), 225-236.
- Altınöz, M., Çöp, S., & Sığadı, T. (2011). The Relationship between Perceived Organizational Commitment and Organizational Cynicism: A Research on Four and Five Star Accommodation Establishments in Ankara. *Journal of Social Economic Research*, 11(21), 285-316.
- Atrizka, D., & Pratama, I. (2022). The Influence of Organizational Leadership and Coaches on Indonesian Athletes' Adversity Quotient (Intelligence). *Revista de Psicología del Deporte (Journal of Sport Psychology)*, 31(1), 88-97.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). The Relationship Between School Administrators' Leadership Styles and Mobbing. *Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal*, 33(33), 77-87.
- Ceylan, R., & Ünlü, Ç. (2022). Examination of the Organizational Commitment Levels and Exposure to Mobbing of the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports Employees. *Gümüşhane University Journal of Health Sciences*, 11(1), 63-74.
- Cotterill, S. T., & Fransen, K. (2016). Athlete Leadership in Sport Teams: Current Understanding and Future Directions. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 9(1), 116-133.
- Çakınberk, A., & Demirel, E. T. (2010). Leadership as a Determinant of Organizational Commitment: The Example of Healthcare Workers. *Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, (24), 103-119.
- Çöp, S., & Doğanay, A. (2020). The Effect of Perceived Leadership Communication on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction: A Research on 4 and 5 Star Hotel Employees. *Istanbul Gelişim University Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 34-49.
- Erceylan, N. (2010). *The effects of managers' leadership behaviors on employees' organizational commitment and a research* (Master's Thesis). İnönü University, Social Sciences Institute, Malatya.
- Eskiecek, C. G., Bayazıt, B., & Sarı, İ. (2015). Examination of Preferred Coach Leadership Behaviors in Athletes in Terms of Age, Gender and Sports Branch (Diyarbakır Sample). *SSTB International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health & Medical Sciences*, 15(5), 27-42.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2021). *IBM SPSS Statistics 27 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference*. Routledge.
- Güler, M., & Cinnioğlu, H. (2021). The Effect of Perceived Authentic Leadership Behavior on Employees' Organizational Commitment and Performance Levels: A Research in Hotel Businesses. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Issues*, 3(2), 124-139.
- Hatipoğlu, Z., & Zengin, A. A. (2018). The Effect of Perceived Leadership Style on Quality of Work Life: Comparison between Generations X and Y. *Journal of Finance, Economics and Social Research*, 3(2), 400-421.

- Hemedođlu, E., & Evliyaođlu, F. (2012). Examining the Effects of Employees' Transformational Leadership Perceptions on Their Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Business Research*, 4(1), 58-77.
- 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.
- Iřık, Ö., & Serinkan, C. (2020). Leadership Approaches and Leadership in Sports Management. *Pamukkale University Journal of Business Research*, 7(2), 308-332.
- Jung, J. Y. (2022). The Effect of Authentic Leadership of Deans and Directors on Sustainable Organizational Commitment at Universities: Mediated by Organizational Culture and Trust. *Sustainability*, 14(17), 11051.
- Kara, E., & Bozkurt, ř. (2021). Determining the Effect of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Commitment. *EKEV Academy Journal*, (87), 143-160.
- Karasar, N. (2005). Scientific Research Method: Concepts, Principles, Techniques. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Kim, M., Kim, A. C. H., Newman, J. I., Ferris, G. R., Perrewé, P. L. (2019). The Antecedents and Consequences of Positive Organizational Behavior: The Role of Psychological Capital for Promoting Employee Well-Being in Sport Organizations. *Sport Management Review*, 22(1), 108-125.
- Kul, M., řipal, O., Aksoy, Ö. F., & Boz, E. (2020). Examining the Ethical Leadership Behaviors of Weightlifting Coaches According to Athletes' Perceptions. *Journal of Sports Sciences Research*, 5(2), 247-256.
- Mutlu, T. O., Akođlu, H. E., řentürk, H. E., Ađırönü, A., & Özbey, Ö. (2019). Examining the Communication and Leadership Skills of Coach Candidates. *SPORMETRE Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, 17(1), 167-177.
- Örücü, E., & Zeybek, F. A. Research to Determine the Effect of Organizational Commitment and Transformational Leadership on Innovative Behavior Tendency. *Izmir Journal of Economics*, 38(1), 77-95.
- Özkara, A. B. (2019). Spor lisesi öđrencilerinin, sportif etkinliklere katılımlarına göre girişimcilik yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi. *MANAS Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi*, 8(1), 1304-1312.
- Özkul, R., Dođan, Ü., Abdurrezzak, S., & Yıldızbař, Y. V. (2022). Examining the Relationship Between School Administrators' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Organizational Commitment and Organizational Trust Levels. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(82), 584-602.
- Soyer, F., Yılmaz, M., & Sarı, İ. (2022). The Relationship Between Ethical Leadership and Organizational Commitment: A Research on the General Directorate of Sports and Provincial Organizations. *İnönü University Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, 9(3), 50-65.
- Sökmen, A., Kenek, G., & Uđrař, E. The Relationship Between Ethical Leadership and Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment. *Third Sector Social Economic Review*, 54(4), 1568-1582.
- Taylor, R. L. (2018). Military Leadership: In Pursuit of Excellence. Routledge.

Topalođlu, C., & Dalgın, T. (2013). The Relationship Between Perceived Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment, An Application on Five Star Hotel Enterprises in Marmaris. *Balikesir University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, 16(29), 277-301.

Yaşar, O. M. (2015). *Examining the job satisfaction levels and organizational commitment of football youth coaches working in the Central Anatolia region* (Master's Thesis). Ankara University, Institute of Health Sciences, Ankara.

Yolaç, S. (2011). The Role of Leader-Member Interaction in the Relationship Between the Manager's Perceived Leadership Style and Trust in the Manager. *Suggestion Journal*, 9(36), 63-72.

Zengin, S., & Somođlu, B. (2022). Investigation of Leadership Tendencies of Students in Sports Science. *Mediterranean Journal of Sports Sciences*, 5(1), 483-502.

Zengin, S. (2021). *Commitment in Sports Organizations*. İstanbul: Efe Academy Publishing.