

Examination of the Relationship Between Autocratic Coaching Behaviors Perceived By Elite Sportsmen and Their Motive to Approach Success

Turhan Toros

General Directorate of Youth and Sport, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract: The relationship between the autocratic coaching behaviors perceived by elite athletes and the motive to approach success was examined in this research and it was determined whether there were significant differences in terms of age, gender, education, sport type and sport year (sportive experience). In total, 443 sportsmen (consisting of 262 men and 181 women) coming from eight different sports branches (consisting of four individual and four team sports) voluntarily participated in the research by random sampling method. Average age of participants is $22,04 \pm 4,81$ and average sports year is $8,36 \pm 5,13$. Pearson correlation and "t" test analysis were used to analyse data. According to the results of the research, it was found out that there was a positive significant relationship at the level of 0.000 between autocratic coaching behavior and the motive to approach success ($r = .353^{**}$). In addition, it was found out that there was a positive significant relationship at the level of 0.004 between sportive experience and motive to approach success ($r = .134^*$). In conclusion, the autocratic coaching behavior perceived by the sportsmen have a positive effect on increasing motive to approach success.

Key words: Elite Sportsmen • Autocratic Coaching Behavior • Motivation • Motive to Approach Success
• Coach

INTRODUCTION

The coach has an important role on the development of sports and of the sportsmen. The skills acquired by the sportsman are determined by this important role of the coach. The interaction between the coach and the sportsmen has always been regarded as a determinant factor on the performance [1]. Coaching is an art of leadership based on influencing and manipulating others by mutual communication and interaction [2]. Leadership is defined as the behavioral process affecting the individuals and groups for specific purposes [3]. In researches examining the behavior of the leader or the coach, it can be seen that Chelladurai model forms a framework to provide understanding on the factors affecting the coaching behavior. According to Chelladurai, the coaching behaviors are under the influence of three basic qualities (required, actual and preferred) in any case. Also, the coaches are affected by situational obligations to a considerable extent. Coaches of individuals and groups with different objectives will have to exhibit different coaching behaviors. Sportsmen with different objectives will prefer different coaching

behaviors. Thus, the preferences will affect how the coach will actually behave [4, 5]. Coaches with tendency to autocratic behavior are persons who make team-related decisions on their own and bring their authority to the fore in their one-to-one relationships with sportsmen. It represents the coaching behaviors involving independent decision making and personal authority. In autocratic coaching, all decisions are made by the coach himself/herself. According to the assumption underlying this approach, the coach has knowledge and experience, so it's his/her duty to say what the sportsman should do. The role of the sportsman is to listen, perceive and perform [6-9]. Triandis' remarks on autocratic coaches not bringing their theories into argument, approving of severe punishments and being extremely prejudiced brings us to the conclusion that autocratic leadership in sports is a significant factor restraining performance [10]. Another point which is generally agreed upon is that the teams have a personality and a culture of their own and their motivation and efficiency improves with an effective leadership revealing these [11]. Behavior and coaching styles which the coaches exhibit affects the performance of sportsmen to a considerable extent [4]. The level of

success or failure is related to the level of effective or ineffective communication [12]. Psychologists have emphasized the fact that communication is critically important between the sportsmen and the effective coach [13].

Achievement motivation explains why people participate in a physical activity and suffer training which require patience and endurance for a long period of time [14]. Motivation is the process of acquiring possible sources such as skill, time and energy and using them at will [15]. Differences in achievements of persons with the same skills and facilities on the same subject can only be explained by their motivation level [16]. Orders, instruction and external pressures are not effective in sports motivation [17]. Sportsmen have expectations on the sports activity they perform within the process. These expectations must be understood very well in order to motivate them. Because motivation supports the sportsman in acting towards his/her objectives [18-20]. Tendency to seek and avoid exist in the nature of motives. Motives relating to the tendency which outweigh the other emerge. Accordingly, success motive emerges in the form of being successful or avoiding success [14]. In this case, we can define the success motive in sports as tendencies to approach or to avoid competition requirements. It can be seen that different definitions on the subject of motivation include three general factors. These factors can be described as activating, channeling and maintaining the behavior [21].

In consequence of this research, with the effects of perceived coaching behavior which is considered to be important for coaches, sportsmen and teams determined, a dimension which has been treated very rarely in sports sciences will be brought out to field study.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants: The research included sportsmen coming from 8 different sports branches being individual (athletics, boxing, wrestling, taekwondo) and team sports (basketball, football, handball, volleyball). A total of 443 elite sportsmen (138 from team sports, 305 from individual sports) - 262 male and 181 female - participated in the research. Average age of participants is 22,04=4.81 and average sports year is 8,36=5,13.

Measures

Leadership Scale for Sports: Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) is sportman's version of perceiving coaching behavior. The scale was developed by Chelladurai and

Saleh [22, 23]. in order to evaluate how sportsmen perceive the leadership style and behavior of their coaches in five different scales. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Toros and Tiryaki [24]. In this research, the actual leader behavior form perceived by sportsmen and autocratic behavior sub-dimension was used.

Sports Related Success Motivation Scale: Sports Related Success Motivation Scale developed by Willis in [25]. In order to measure the success motivation was used in this research. Willis' scale consists of two sub-dimensions. The first one of these sub-dimensions is Power Motive (POW) and the second is success related motives. Success related motives are motive to approach success (MAS) and motive to avoid failure (MAF). The adaptation to Turkish sportsmen was made by Tiryaki and Gödelek [26]. Motive to approach success sub-dimension was used in this research.

Data Analysis: Research data were evaluated in computer environment, frequency and percentage distribution table was used for personal information, Pearson correlation analysis for the relationship between dependent variables and "t" test for difference analysis. 0,05 significance level was taken as basis in difference analysis.

RESULTS

According to the results of research, a positive significant correlation of 0.000 was found between the motive of elite sportsmen to approach success and perceived autocratic coaching behavior ($r=.353^{**}$). Based on this result, the increase in the level of motive to approach success depends on the perceived autocratic coaching behavior. Also, a positive significant correlation of 0.004 was found between sportive experience and the motive to approach success ($r=.134^{*}$). And based on this result, it can be said that the sportive experience has a positive effect on the motive to approach success. But the research data shows that there is no significant correlation between sportive experience and perceived autocratic coaching behavior ($r=-,082$).

According to research data, there is a significant difference between the levels of elite sportsmen's motive to approach success in terms of gender and sports branch ($p<0.05$). This difference is due to the fact that the levels of motive of male sportsmen and individual sportsmen to approach success is higher than that of female sportsmen and team sportsmen.

Table 1: Relationship between autocratic coaching behavior perceived by elite sportsmen and the motive to approach success and sports year

n=443		1	2	3
Motive to approach success	r	1		
	p			
Autocratic coaching behavior	r	,353**	1	
	p	,000		
Sports Year (Experience)	r	,134*	-,082	1
	p	,004	,076	

Table 2: Difference analysis on the levels of autocratic coaching behavior perceived by elite sportsmen and their motive to approach success in terms of gender and sports branch

			n	Rank Average	t	p
Motive to Approach Success	Gender	Male	262	252,72	-3,595	,000
		Female	181	207,18		
		Total	443			
	Sports Branch	Team sports	138	205,53	-3,142	,002
		Individual Sports	305	247,47		
		Total	443			
Autocratic Coaching Behavior	Gender	Male	262	241,11	-1,366	,172
		Female	181	223,82		
		Total	443			
	Sports Branch	Team sports	138	202,62	-3,466	,001
		Individual Sports	305	248,85		
		Total	443			

Table 3: Difference analysis on autocratic coaching behavior perceived and the motive of elite sportsmen to approach success in terms of age, sports year and education levels

			n	Rank Average	t	p
Motive to Approach Success	Age Groups	11-15	21	195,03	17,063	,002
		16-20	153	251,19		
		21-25	200	210,11		
		26-30	63	271,23		
		31 and above	6	291,50		
		Total	443			
	Sports Year Groups	1-5	120	241,77	27,956	,000
		6-10	170	200,26		
		11-15	126	250,40		
		16-20	15	283,72		
		21 and above	12	346,61		
		Total	443			
	Education Level	Primary School	14	200,36	6,486	,090
		Secondary education	66	244,87		
		Higher education	350	234,81		
Postgraduate		13	207,50			
Total		443				
Autocratic Coaching Behavior		Age Groups	11-15	21		
	16-20		153	286,52		
	21-25		200	192,17		
	26-30		63	200,49		
	31 and above		6	413,50		
	Total		443			
	Sports Year Groups	1-5	120	251,19	14,586	,006
		6-10	170	228,51		
		11-15	126	238,94		
		16-20	15	243,48		
		21 and above	12	116,88		
		Total	443			
	Education Level	Primary School	14	360,77	29,676	,000
		Secondary education	66	287,62		
		Higher education	350	221,24		
Postgraduate		13	117,50			
Total		443				

While no significant difference observed in the levels of autocratic coaching behavior perceived by the sportsmen ($p>0.05$), there is a significant difference in terms of the distinction between team and individual sports ($p<0.05$). This difference is due to the fact that the autocratic coaching behavior perceived by sportsmen of individual sports is higher than that of team sportsmen.

Results of the research show that there are significant differences in elite sportsmen's levels of motive to approach success in terms of age groups and sports year ($p<0.05$). If we examine the cause of these differences, we can see that it is because those in the age group of 11-15 have a lower level of motive to approach success than that of those in other age groups and that those in the sportive experience group of 21 and above have a higher level of motive to approach success than that of those in other groups. No significant difference was found in elite sportsmen's levels of motive to approach success in terms of education levels ($p>0.05$). Based on the results of the research, significant differences were observed in the levels of autocratic coaching behavior perceived by the sportsmen in terms of age groups, sports year groups and education levels ($p<0.05$). These differences are due to the fact that the levels of perceived autocratic coaching behavior are higher in the age group of 31 and above than other groups, lower in the sports year group of 21 and above than other groups, higher in the education level group of primary school than secondary education, higher education and lower in the postgraduate group than other groups.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research was made in order to examine the relationship between the autocratic coaching behaviour perceived by elite athletes and their motive to approach success and test whether there are significant differences in terms of age, gender, education, the type of sport and the sporting year (sportive experience).

According to the results of research, a positive significant correlation of 0.000 was found between the motive of elite sportsmen to approach success and perceived autocratic coaching behavior ($r=.353^{**}$). Based on this result, the increase in the level of motive to approach success depends on the perceived autocratic coaching behavior. Perceived coaching behavior affects the level of achievement motivation. In a study related to coaching behavior and motivational climate, motivational climates of teams were observed to be higher, if the sportsmen perceive that the coach exhibit positive

feedback behavior, social support, democratic behavior and training-instruction behavior to a high extent [12]. Achievement motivation of sportsmen who perceive a high level of autocratic behavior and frequent punishment-oriented feedback in coaches and a tendency to omit giving reinforcers or to ignore faults is lower [5]. Coaches are persons with a tendency to frequently exhibit performance improving behaviors [27]. Also, a positive significant correlation of 0.004 was found between sportive experience and the motive to approach success ($r=.134^{*}$). And based on this result, it can be said that the sportive experience has a positive effect on the motive to approach success. But the research data shows that there is no significant correlation between sportive experience and perceived autocratic coaching behavior ($r=-.082$). According to this result the sportive experience gained by the sportsmen reduces the effect of perceived coaching behavior. According to research data, there is a significant difference between the levels of elite sportsmen's motive to approach success in terms of gender and sports branch ($p<0.05$). This difference is due to the fact that the levels of motive of male sportsmen and individual sportsmen to approach success is higher than that of female sportsmen and team sportsmen. While no significant difference observed in the levels of autocratic coaching behavior perceived by the sportsmen ($p>0.05$), there is a significant difference in terms of the distinction between team and individual sports ($p<0.05$). This difference is due to the fact that the autocratic coaching behavior perceived by sportsmen of individual sports is higher than that of team sportsmen. Results of the research show that there are significant differences in elite sportsmen's levels of motive to approach success in terms of age groups and sports year ($p<0.05$). If we examine the cause of these differences, we can see that it is because those in the age group of 11-15 have a lower level of motive to approach success than that of those in other age groups and that those in the sportive experience group of 21 and above have a higher level of motive to approach success than that of those in other groups. No significant difference was found in elite sportsmen's levels of motive to approach success in terms of education levels ($p>0.05$). Based on the results of the research, significant differences were observed in the levels of autocratic coaching behavior perceived by the sportsmen in terms of age groups, sports year groups and education levels ($p<0.05$). These differences are due to the fact that the levels of perceived autocratic coaching behavior are higher in the age group of 31 and above than other groups, lower in the sports year group of 21 and above

than other groups, higher in the education level group of primary school than secondary education, higher education and lower in the postgraduate group than other groups. Researchers have suggested that there is a complex interpersonal relationship between sportsmen and coaches [9, 28]. This relationship has always affected them. Coaches may have deep influences over the sportsmen whatever their level. Therefore, behaviors and the tone of the coach must be in tune with the physical and psychological development of the sportsmen [29, 30]. In addition to all these, considering the effect of coaching approach, behavior and support on the performance, it can be easily understood how significant an issue the competence of the coach is. A democratic coach encouraging the sportsmen and appreciating their opinions will have a positive effect on their success motivation. In addition, a coaching behavior involving positive and informative feedback, training-instruction and social support will ensure the increase in the success motivation of the sportsmen. In researches carried out by Tharp and Gallimore [31] and Bloom, Crumpton anderson [32] with elite basketball coaches and by Cote, Salmeda, Trudel, Baria and Russell [33]. with elite gymnastics coaches accompanied by in-depth interviews and also by Smith, Smoll and Curtis [34]. on coaching behaviors, it was understood that there is no direct relationship between the coaching behavior and evaluative reactions of the sportsmen.

In conclusion, perceived coaching behavior has a positive effect on the increase of success motivation. Based on this conclusion, the increase in the success motivation level depends on the coaching behavior. Also, sportive experience raises the success motivation levels of sportsmen, while reducing the need for coaching support. While the gender factor has no effect on the coaching behavior perceived by the sportsmen, the higher the education level, the lower is the level of perceived coaching behavior. It can be said that the individual sportsmen with higher levels of coaching behavior perception than team sportsmen are in more need of coaching support.

Researchers are more interested in especially which are the specific behavior of coaches that are effective or the satisfaction or anxiety of the coach than the definition of coaching behaviors or its effects on the motivation. Still, there is no study on the performance of coaches in sport [35]. Therefore, it is supposed that many longitudinal researches should be made in order to define coaching behaviors and determine its effects on the motivation in all aspects.

REFERENCES

1. Serpa, S., 1999. Relationship Coach-Athlete: Outstanding Trends In European Research, *Motricidade Humana. Portuguese Journal of Human Performance Studies*. V.12, N.1, P.7-19 Jan/Jun.
2. Başer, E., 1994. *Futbolda Psikoloji ve Başarı*. Yayınevi Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
3. Barrow, J., 1977. The Variables of Leadership, A Review And Conceptual Framework. *Academy Of Management Review*, 2: 231-251.
4. Horn, T., 2002. Coaching Effectiveness In The Sport Domain, In T. Horn (Ed.), *Advances In Sport Psychology*, (2nd Ed., pp: 309-354). Champaign, Il. Human Kinetics.
5. Toros, T., 2009. Genç Erkek Basketbolcularda Bir Sezon Boyunca Sporcuların Algıladıkları Antrenörlük Davranışı, Hedef Yönelimleri, Takım Sargınlığı, Algılanan Motivasyonel İklim Ve Kolektif Yeterlik İlişkisi, *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri ve Teknolojisi, Ankara.
6. Chelladurai, P., 1990. Leadership in Sports, A Review. *International Journal of Sport Psychol.*, 21: 328-354.
7. Chelladurai, P. and H.A. Riemer, 1998. Measurement of Leadership in Sport”, In J. L. Duda (Ed.), *Advances In Sport And Exercise Psychology* (pp: 227-253). Morgantown, Wv: Fitness Information Technology.
8. Toros, T. and A. Duvar, 2011. The Relationship Between Perceived Coaching Behaviors, Collective Efficacy and Goal Orientation Among Fencer Players in Turkey. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Dergisi*.
9. Martens, R., 1990. *Successful Coaching*. Champaign Illinois, Leisure Press.
10. Williams, J.M., 1993. *Applied Sport Psychology*. 2nd Ed., California: Mayfield Publishing Co., 98-120
11. Oakland, J.S., 1993. *Total Quality Management: The Road To Improving Performance*, Oxford, Butterworth - Heinemann Ltd.
12. Weinberg, R.S. and D., Gould, 2003. *Goal Setting, Foundations of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. Champaign, Ill. Human Kinetics.
13. Yukelson, D., 1997. Principles of effective team building interventions in sport: A direct services approach at Penn State University. *J. Appl. Sport Psychol.*, 9: 73-96.
14. Aktop, A., 2002. Spora Özgü Başarı Motivasyonu İle Psikolojik ve Yapısal Özellikler Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, *Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, 6-15, Antalya.

15. Martin, J.J. and C.A. Mushett, 1996. Social Support Mechanisms Among Athletes With Disabilities, *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 13: 74-83.
16. Seifriz, J.J., J.L. Duda and L. Chi, 1992. The Relationship of Perceived Motivational -Climate To Intrinsic Motivation and Beliefs About Success İn Basketball, *J. Sport and Exercise Psychol.*, 14: 375.
17. Amman M.T. and H.C. İkizler, 2000. 3.Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi, 11-13 Mayıs, İstanbul.
18. Mungan Ay, S., 1995. Sporda Motivasyon Faktörü Olarak Ödül ve Ceza, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi S.B.E. Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul.
19. Aydın, A., 2001. Gelişim ve Öğrenme Psikolojisi, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.
20. Er, N., G. Çobanoğlu, G. Er, A. Zekioğlu and İ. Yazıcılar, 2003. Sporda Başarı Motivasyonunun Cinsiyetler Açısından Analizi, *Beden Eğitimi ve Sporda Sosyal Alanlar Bildiriler Kitabı*, Gazi Üniversitesi BESYO, Ekim, Ankara, 459-460.
21. Steers, M. Richard, Mowday, T. Richard and Shapiro, L. Debra, 2004. The Future of Work Motivation Theory, *Academy of Management Review*, 29: 379-387.
22. Chelladurai, P. and S. Saleh, 1978. Preferred Leadership in Sports, *Canadian J. Appl. Sport Sci.*, 3: 85-92.
23. Chelladurai, P. and S. Saleh, 1980. Dimensions of Leadership Behavior in Sport, *Development of A Leadership Scale. J. Sport Psychol.*, 2: 34-45.
24. Toros, T. and Ş. Tiryaki, 2006. Sporda Liderlik Ölçeği'nin - Antrenör Davranışlarını Algılaması Versiyonunun- Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. 9. Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Kongresi, 3-5 Kasım, Muğla, Türkiye.
25. Willis, J.D., 1982. Three Scales To Measure Competition-Related Motives İn Sports, *J. Sport Psychol.*, pp: 338-353.
26. Tiryaki, Ş. and E. Gödelek, 1997. Spora Özgü Başarı Motivasyonu Ölçeğinin Türk Sporcuları İçin Uyarlanması Çalışması, I. Uluslararası Spor Psikolojisi Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitapçığı, Bağırhan Yayınevi, Ankara, pp: 128-141.
27. Carr, S. and D.A. Weigand, 2001. Parental, Peer, Teacher and Sporting Hero İnceleme on The Goal Orientations of Children in Physical Education, *European Physical Education Review*, 7: 305-328.
28. Bloom, G.A., R.J. Schinke and J.H. Salmela, 1998. Assessing The Development Of Perceived Communication Skills By Elite Basketball Coaches and Athletes, *Coaching and Sport Sci. J.*, 2(3): 3-10.
29. Jowett, S. and L. Cockerill, 2002. Incompatibility İn The Coach-Athlete Relationship, In I. Cockerill (Ed.), *Solutions İn Sport Psychology* (pp: 16-31). Andover, Uk. Thomson Learning.
30. Smith, R.E. and F.L. Smoll, 1996. Way To Go Coach: A Scientifically-Proven Approach To Coaching Effectiveness. Portola Valley, Ca: Varde.
31. Tharp, R.G. and R. Gallimore, 1976. What A Coach Can Teach A Teacher. *Psychology Today*, 9: 74-78.
32. Bloom, G.A., R. Crumpton and J.E. Anderson, 1999. A Systematic Observation Study of The Teaching Behaviors of An Expert Basketball Coach, *The Sport Psychologist*, 13: 157-170.
33. Cote, J., J. Salmela, P. Trudel, A. Baria and S. Russell, 1995. The Coaching Model, A Grounded Assessment of Expert Gymnastic Coaches' Knowledge. *J. Sport and Exercise Psychol.*, 17: 1-17.
34. Smith, R.E., F.L. Smoll and B. Curtis, 1979. Coach Effectiveness Training: A Cognitive-Behavioral Approach To Enhancing Relationship Skills İn Youth Sports Coaches, *J. Sport Psychol.*, 1: 59-75.
35. Reimer, H.A. and P. Chelladurai, 1995. Leadership And Satisfaction İn Athletics, *J. Sport and Exercise Psychol.*, pp: 276-293.