



Rekreasyon ve spor yöneticiliği bölümü öğrencilerinin etkinlik ile yönetsel liderlik yönelimleri

Çisem ÜNLÜ¹ , Özlem DEMİRTAŞ² 

¹Hitit Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Spor Yöneticiliği Bölümü

²Hitit Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Rekreasyon Bölümü

Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7740645

Gönderi Tarihi/ Received:

Kabul Tarihi/ Accepted:

Online Yayın Tarihi/ Published:

08.09.2022

14.03.2023

20.03.2023

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı rekreasyon ve spor yöneticiliği bölümü öğrencilerinin liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesidir. Araştırmanın evrenini spor yöneticiliği ve rekreasyon bölümünde öğrenim gören öğrenciler oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma kapsamına dahil edilen öğrenci sayısı ise spor yöneticiliği bölümünden 261 ve rekreasyon bölümünden 139 olmak üzere toplam 400'dür. Araştırmanın örneklemini kolayda örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilmiştir. Çalışmada araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan "Kişisel Bilgi Formu" ile "Çok Yönlü Liderlik Yönelimleri Ölçeği (ÇYLYÖ)" kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde betimsel istatistikler (frekans, aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma), veriler normal dağılım göstermediğinden istatistiki analizlerde; ikili karşılaştırmalarda Mann Whitney-U ve ikiden fazla karşılaştırmalarda Kruskal Wallis-H testleri kullanılmıştır. Yapılan analizler neticesinde; yaş ve sınıf değişkenine göre liderlik yönelimlerinin alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır ($p>0,05$). Cinsiyet değişkeninde yapısal liderlik; bölüm ve liderlik kazanımı değişkenlerinde politik liderlik alt boyutunda; spor yapma durumu değişkeninde politik ve yapısal; organizasyonda liderlik yapma değişkeninde ise politik ve karizmatik liderlik alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılıklar olduğu tespit edilmiştir ($p<0,05$). Çalışmada liderlik yönelimleri bakımından öğrencilerin insan kaynaklı liderlik yönelimlerinin en yüksek olduğu görülmektedir. Buna rağmen en fazla politik liderlik alt boyutunda anlamlı farklılıklar olduğu saptanmıştır. Sonuç olarak; öğrencilerin politik liderlik yönelimlerinin daha yüksek bulunması, liderlik yaptıkları organizasyonlarda fikir ayrılıklarının üstesinden gelebilmek için katılımcıları etkin bir biçimde anlayabilme becerilerini daha iyi kullanmalarından kaynaklanmış olabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çok yönlü liderlik yönelimleri, rekreasyon, spor yöneticiliği.

Activity and managerial leadership orientations of recreation and sport management students

Abstract

The aim of this study is to examine the leadership orientations of the students of the recreation and sports management department. The universe of the research consists of students studying in the sports management and recreation department. The number of students included in the scope of the research is 400, 261 from the sports management department and 139 from the recreation department. The sample of the study was selected by convenience sampling method. In the study, the "Personal Information Form" and the Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale (MLAS) prepared by the researchers were used. In the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics (frequency, arithmetic mean, standard deviation), in statistical analysis since the data do not show normal distribution; Mann Whitney-U tests were used for pairwise comparisons and Kruskal Wallis-H tests were used for more than two comparisons. As a result of the analyzes made; No significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of leadership orientations according to age and class variables ($p>0.05$). Structural leadership in the gender variable; in the sub-dimension of political leadership in department and leadership attainment variables; political and structural in the variable of doing sports; In the variable of leadership in the organization, it was determined that there were significant differences in the political and charismatic leadership sub-dimensions ($p<0.05$). In the study, it is seen that the students' human-based leadership orientations are the highest in terms of leadership orientations. However, it was determined that there were significant differences in the political leadership sub-dimension the most. In conclusion, the higher political leadership orientation of the students may be due to their better use of their ability to understand the participants effectively in order to overcome the differences of opinion in the organizations they lead.

Keywords: Multifaceted leadership orientations, recreation, sport management.

Sorumlu Yazar/ Corresponded Author: Çisem ÜNLÜ E-posta/ e-mail: cisemunlu@hitit.edu.tr

Genişletilmiş Türkçe özet makalenin sonunda yer almaktadır.

INTRODUCTION

Since the early ages, there have always been leaders who have kept societies together, managed and guided them. Leadership is a highly studied subject in organizational culture. Leadership can be defined as the process by which a person influences and directs the activities of others to achieve certain personal or group goals under certain conditions. Therefore, leadership is a process related to the work done by the leader. A leader is a person who directs and influences his/her employees to act in line with the goals and objectives of the organization (Koçel, 2001). It can be said that the leadership orientation of individuals is effective in many issues as well as affecting the decision-making process (Eroğlu & Çeviker, 2022).

“Individuals are not exactly alike,” he says in *Quantum Leadership in the 21st Century*. “Some personality types are more comfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity than others. Others have a higher threshold for chaos than others. Some want to be creative, think and act outside the box, while others panic when expected to do so “Leadership at the extremes” also means being able to bring out the best of both types and utilize the strengths of each as a whole” (Zohar, 2018).

Leadership is a multifaceted concept. Therefore, it is thought that it is necessary to examine leadership behaviors to make leadership more understandable. When the literature on leadership is examined, it is seen that leadership behaviors are examined under two main headings as “Traditional Leadership Styles” and “Modern Leadership Styles” (Özler, 2013). While traditional leadership behaviors were divided into three groups as “Autocratic Leadership”, “Democratic Leadership” and “Liberal/Laissez-faire Leadership” by Kurt Lewin in the 1930s (Newton & Bristoll, 2015), modern leadership styles are “Transformational Leadership”, “Transactional Leadership”, “Visionary Leadership”, “Ethical Leadership”, “Charismatic Leadership”, “Spiritual Leadership”, “Servant Leadership”, “Authentic Leadership” and “Quantum Leadership” (Şişman, 2018; Tuğsal, 2019).

In the literature, studies examining leadership orientations in different fields and on different parameters are frequently encountered. Therefore, in this study, it is aimed to examine and discuss the relationship between the leadership orientations of recreation and sport manager candidates, where leadership behaviors are prioritized, on different variables. It is thought that the characteristics determined in leadership orientations will give an idea in terms of having a guiding identity both in students' student lives and in their future professional careers. Although there are many studies in the literature on leadership and leadership orientations; It is seen that

there are few studies on sports management and recreation department students whose leadership characteristics are thought to be very important in their future profession. For this reason, we believe that this research will provide added value to the literature.

METHOD

In this study, which aims to examine the leadership orientations of recreation and sport management department students, the general survey model was used. General survey model is defined as the survey arrangements made on the whole universe or a group, sample or sample to be taken from it in order to make a general judgment about the universe in a universe consisting of a large number of elements (Karasar, 2018).

Research group (population-sample)

Power analysis was performed to determine the sample size. As a result of the analysis, the sample number determined for 99% confidence level and 5% margin of error was determined as 239 students in the Department of Sports Management and 111 students in the Department of Recreation. Students were reached through simple random sampling. The study was conducted on a total of 400 university students studying in the Faculty of Sports Sciences, Recreation and Sports Management departments of Hitit University in the spring semester of the 2021-2022 academic year. The study was approved by Hitit University Non-Interventional Research Ethics Committee (Date: October 10, 2021, Number: 2021-225).

Data collection tools

In the study, the “Multifaceted Leadership Orientations Scale (MLAS)” developed by Dursun et al. (2019) together with the personal information form consisting of the independent variables of the study was applied to the students of the department of recreation and sport management. MLAS consists of 19 items in total and consists of “Political Leadership” (3, 6, 9, 10, 11), “Human Resource Leadership” (2, 8, 12, 14, 17), “Charismatic Leadership” (13, 15, 16, 18, 19) and “Structural Leadership” (1, 4, 5, 7) sub-dimensions. The items in the ESLLS are graded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”. The high scores obtained from the sub-dimensions of the scale, which is evaluated within the scope of sub-dimensions, indicate that the person has a high tendency towards that leadership orientation (Dursun et al., 2019).

Data collection/processing method

After the students were informed about the study and the scale, the study was applied face-to-face to those who wanted to participate voluntarily.

Data analysis

The analyses applied for the data obtained from the “Personal Information Form” and “Multifaceted Leadership Orientations Scale (MLAS)” within the scope of the research were carried out by means of SPSS 20.0 program. Kolmogrov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were performed to determine the analyzes to be used in the research data and it was determined that the data were not normally distributed ($p < 0.05$). Descriptive statistics (standard deviation, frequency, arithmetic mean) were used as a statistical method in the evaluation of the obtained data. Since the data did not show normal distribution, Mann Whitney-U tests were used for pairwise comparisons and Kruskal Wallis-H tests were used for more than two comparisons.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Socio-demographic distribution of students

		N	%
Gender	Female	148	37.0
	Male	252	63.0
Age	16-18 Years	21	5.3
	Age 19-21	232	58.0
	22-24 Years	124	31.0
	25 Years and Over	23	5.8
Classroom	Grade 1	109	27.3
	Grade 2	101	25.3
	Grade 3	108	27.0
	Grade 4	82	20.5
Department	Recreation	139	34.8
	Sport Management	261	65.3
Doing Sports	Yes	287	71.8
	No	113	28.3
State of leadership in the organization	Yes	239	59.8
	No	161	40.3
Leadership Acquisition	Innate	99	24.8
	Acquired Later	99	24.8
	Both	202	50.5
Total		400	100

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the participants are predominantly male (252 people, 63.0%), between the ages of 19-21 (232 people, 58.0%), enrolled in the department of sport management (261 people, 65.3%), first year students (109 people, 27.3%), engaged in sports (287 people, 71.8%), leading in organizations (239 people, 59.8%) and thinking that leadership is both innate and acquired (202 people, 50.5%).

Table 2. Results of the distribution of leadership styles

Leadership styles	Order of items in the scale	Mean Score Received	d.f.	Swkness	Kurtosis	Cronbach
Political Leadership	3. 6. 9. 10. 11.	3.80	0.70	-1.509	1.388	0.721
Human Resource Leadership	2. 8. 12. 14. 17.	4.12	0.65	-1.541	0.994	0.701
Charismatic Leadership	13. 15. 16. 18. 19.	3.88	0.69	-1,511	1.347	0.724
Structural Leadership	1. 4. 5. 7.	4.06	0.70	-1.498	1.074	0.708

When Table 2 is examined, it is described that in terms of leadership orientations according to the mean scores of the students' MLAS sub-dimension scores, their human-based leadership orientation (4.12±0.65) is more dominant than other leadership dimensions and they have structural leadership (4.06± 0.70), charismatic leadership (3.88±0.69), political leadership (3.80±0.70) orientations respectively. It is seen that the skewness and kurtosis scores do not fall between -1.5 and +1.5 values. Therefore, the fact that skewness and kurtosis scores do not fall between -1.5 and +1.5 values in the literature is assumed to be not normally distributed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). When the reliability coefficients of the scales are examined, it is seen that the scale and its sub-dimensions are 0.70 and above. This result shows that the scale and its sub-dimensions are in the reliable range.

Table 3. Mann-Whitney-U test results according to the gender variable of the students

Dimension	Gender	N	Mean	$\bar{x}_{sıra}$	$\sum_{sıra}$	U	z	p
Political Leadership	Female	148	3.81	203.49	30117.00	18205.00	-0.398	0.69
	Male	252	3.79	198.74	50083.00			
Human Resource Leadership	Female	148	4.17	212.73	31484.50	16837.50	-1.636	0.10
	Male	252	4.09	193.32	48715.50			
Charismatic Leadership	Female	148	3.90	204.27	30232.00	18090.00	-0.502	0.62
	Male	252	3.87	198.29	49968.00			
Structural Leadership	Female	148	3.97	212.73	31484.50	16083.50	-2.315	0.02*
	Male	252	4.11	193.32	48715.50			

*p<0.05

When Table 3 is examined, according to the results of Mann Whitney-U Test conducted according to gender variable, there was no statistically significant difference between female and male students in the dimensions of political leadership (z=-0.398, p=0.69>0.05) human resource leadership (z=-1,636, p=0.10>0.05), and charismatic leadership (z=-0.502, p=0.62>0.05), there was a significant difference in the dimension of structural leadership (z=-2.315, p=0.02<0.05), (p>0.05).Table 4. Kruskal Wallis-H test results according to students' age variable.

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis-H test results according to age variable

Dimension	Age	N	Mean	\bar{x}_{sira}	χ^2	d.f.	p
Political Leadership	16-18 Years	21	3.47	155.02	5.742	3	0.13
	19-21 Years	232	3.79	195.96			
	22-24 Years	124	3.86	213.41			
	25 Years and Over	23	3.86	218.24			
Human Resource Leadership	16-18 Years	21	4.05	187.07	1.520	3	0.68
	19-21 Years	232	4.15	205.47			
	22-24 Years	124	4.09	197.15			
	25 Years and Over	23	3.99	180.67			
Charismatic Leadership	16-18 Years	21	3.70	167.50	2.101	3	0.55
	19-21 Years	232	3.88	201.54			
	22-24 Years	124	3.92	205.63			
	25 Years and Over	23	3.83	192.50			
Structural Leadership	16-18 Years	21	3.79	160.88	6.118	3	0.10
	19-21 Years	232	4.04	194.01			
	22-24 Years	124	4.15	215.54			
	25 Years and Over	23	4.11	221.09			

p<0.05

When Table 4 is examined, according to the results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test conducted according to the age variable of the students; political leadership ($\chi^2=5.742$, $p=0.13>0.05$), human resource leadership ($\chi^2=1.520$, $p=0.68>0.05$), charismatic leadership ($\chi^2=2.101$, $p=0.55>0.05$) and structural leadership ($\chi^2=6.118$, $p=0.10>0.05$), no statistically significant difference was found ($p>0.05$).

Table 5. Mann-Whitney-U test results according to the department variable of the students

Dimension	Department	N	Mean	\bar{x}_{sira}	$\sum sira$	U	z	p
Political Leadership	Recreation	139	3.90	216.77	30131.00	15878.00	-2.062	0.04*
	Sport Management	261	3.74	191.84	50069.00			
Human Resource Leadership	Recreation	139	3.17	207.72	28872.50	17136.50	-0.919	0.36
	Sport Management	261	3.09	196.66	51327.50			
Charismatic Leadership	Recreation	139	3.88	201.35	27988.00	18021.00	-0.108	0.91
	Sport Management	261	3.88	200.05	52212.00			
Structural Leadership	Recreation	139	4.11	203.79	28327.50	17681.50	-0.419	0.68
	Sport Management	261	4.04	198.75	51872.50			

*P<0.05

When Table 5 is examined, according to the results of Mann Whitney-U Test conducted according to the department variable; political leadership ($z=-2.062$, $p=0.04<0.05$). human resource leadership ($z=-0.919$, $p=0.36>0.05$), charismatic leadership ($z=-0.108$, $p=0.91>0.05$) and structural leadership ($z=-0.419$, $p=0.68>0.05$), ($p>0.05$).

Table 6. Kruskal Wallis-H test results according to students' class variable

Dimension	Grade	N	Ort.	$\bar{x}_{sıra}$	x^2	d.f.	p
Politik Liderlik	Grade 1	109	3.80	199.90	1.574	3	0.67
	Grade 2	101	3.86	211.75			
	Grade 3	108	3.79	197.69			
	Grade 4	82	3.72	191.14			
İnsan Kaynaklı Liderlik	Grade 1	109	4.20	215.47	7.623	3	0.06
	Grade 2	101	4.11	203.16			
	Grade 3	108	4.17	205.45			
	Grade 4	82	3.96	170.80			
Karizmatik Liderlik	Grade 1	109	3.93	210.54	5.222	3	0.16
	Grade 2	101	3.86	196.29			
	Grade 3	108	3.94	211.68			
	Grade 4	82	3.75	177.62			
Yapısal Liderlik	Grade 1	109	4.04	197.27	3.361	3	0.95
	Grade 2	101	4.04	197.22			
	Grade 3	108	4.10	203.56			
	Grade 4	82	4.06	204.79			

P<0.05

When Table 6 is examined, according to the results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test conducted according to the class variable of the students; political leadership ($x^2=1.574$, $p=0.67>0.05$), human resource leadership ($x^2=7.623$, $p=0.06>0.05$), charismatic leadership ($x^2=5.222$, $p=0.16>0.05$) and structural leadership ($x^2=0.361$ $p=0.95>0.05$), no statistically significant difference was found ($p>0.05$).

Table 7. Mann-Whitney-U test results according to the students' sporting status

Dimension	Sport Status	N	Mean	$\bar{x}_{sıra}$	$\sum_{sıra}$	U	z	p
Political Leadership	Yes	287	3.84	208.60	59867.00	13892.0	-2.241	0.03*
	No	113	3.68	179.94	20333.00			
Human Resource Leadership	Yes	287	4.15	205.54	58989.00	14770.00	-1.401	0.16
	No	113	4.04	187.71	21211.00			
Charismatic Leadership	Yes	287	3.91	206.33	59216.00	14543.00	-1.613	0.11
	No	113	3.80	85.70	20984.00			
Structural Leadership	Yes	287	4.11	208.22	59759.00	14000.00	-2.144	0.03*
	No	113	3.95	180.89	20441.00			

*P<0.05

When Table 7 is examined, according to the results of the Mann Whitney-U Test conducted according to the status of doing sports; While there were significant differences in the dimensions of political leadership ($z=-2.241$, $p=0.03<0.05$) and structural leadership ($z=-2.144$, $p=0.03<0.05$), ($p>0.05$), no statistically significant difference was found in the dimensions of human resource leadership ($z=-1.401$, $p=0.16>0.05$) and charismatic leadership ($z=-1.613$, $p=0.11>0.05$).

Table 8. Mann-Whitney-U test results according to the students' leadership status in the organization

Dimension	Organization Leadership	N	Mean	\bar{x}_{sira}	$\sum sira$	U	z	P
Political Leadership	Yes	239	3.89	216.91	51842.50	15316.500	3.474	0.00*
	No	161	3.65	176.13	28357.50			
Human Resource Leadership	Yes	239	4.12	202.36	48365.00	18794.000	3.396	0.69
	No	161	4.11	197.73	31835.00			
Charismatic Leadership	Yes	239	3.96	214.95	51372.00	15787.000	-3.057	0.00*
	No	161	3.76	179.06	28828.00			
Structural Leadership	Yes	239	4.09	206.31	49308.00	17851.000	-1.234	0.22
	No	161	4.02	191.88	30892.00			

*P<0.05

When Table 8 is examined, according to the results of the Mann Whitney-U Test conducted according to the students' leadership status in an organization; while significant differences were obtained between the students in the dimensions of political leadership ($z=-3.474$, $p=0.001<0.05$) and charismatic leadership ($z=-3.057$, $p=0.002<0.05$); ($z=-3.396$, $p=0.69>0.05$) and structural leadership ($z=-1.234$, $p=0.22<0,05$), ($p>0.05$) no statistically significant difference was found.

Table 9. Kruskal Wallis-H test results according to students' leadership thinking status

Dimension	Leadership	N	Ort.	\bar{x}_{sira}	x^2	d.f.	p	LSD
Political Leadership	¹ Innate	99	3.98	230.29	9.062	3	0.01*	1>2
	² Acquired Later	99	3.70	185.90				
	³ Both	202	3.75	193.06				
Human Resource Leadership	¹ Innate	99	4.23	221.72	4.685	3	0.10	
	² Acquired Later	99	4.10	197.46				
	³ Both	202	4.07	191.59				
Charismatic Leadership	¹ Innate	99	3.91	205.21	.225	3	0.89	
	² Acquired Later	99	3.87	199.66				
	³ Both	202	3.86	198.60				
Structural Leadership	¹ Innate	99	4.18	218.75	3.621	3	0.16	
	² Acquired Later	99	4.08	199.60				
	³ Both	202	3.99	192.00				

*P<0.05

When Table 9 is examined, according to the results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test conducted according to the students' leadership thought status; While a significant difference was found in the dimension of political leadership ($x^2=9.062$, $p=0.01<0.05$), no statistically significant difference was found in the dimensions of human resource leadership ($x^2=4.685$, $p=0.10>0.05$), charismatic leadership ($x^2=0.225$, $p=0.89>0.05$) and structural leadership ($x^2=3.621$ $p=0.16>0.05$) ($p>0.05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

When the research findings are analyzed, it is seen that there were 400 students, 252 of whom were male and 148 of whom were female. According to the mean scores of the students in terms of leadership orientations according to the sub-dimension scores of the Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale, it was described that their human-based leadership orientation (4.12 ± 0.65) was more dominant than other leadership dimensions and they had structural leadership (4.06 ± 0.70), charismatic leadership (3.88 ± 0.69), political leadership (3.80 ± 0.70) orientations respectively (Table 1). When the scale scoring results of the students studying in the departments of sport management and recreation are evaluated, it is seen that the highest score is “People-based leadership” and the lowest score is “Political leadership” (Table 2). Considering this result, it can be said that students behave in a human-based manner and their level of political behavior is low. In parallel with our study, when the results of the studies conducted in the literature were evaluated, the human-based leadership sub-dimension was found to be the highest sub-dimension (Arslan & Uslu, 2014; Semiz, 2011; Sezer & Kahraman, 2018).

When the findings are analyzed according to gender variable, it is seen that men are significantly higher than women in the structural leadership sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$). No significant difference was found in other sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$) (Table 3). When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are different results related to gender variable and leadership. While there was no significant difference between men and women in some studies (Senger & Kaya, 2017; Mcardle, 2008, Thompson, 2000); on the other hand, it was found that men had higher scores than women in human resource leadership sub-dimensions (Aydın et al., 2016; Özdenk, 2015). In the study titled The Relationship Between Multidimensional Leadership and Emotion Regulation, no significant difference was found between multidimensional leadership orientations and sub-dimension scores according to gender (Bayrakdaroğlu et al., 2022).

There was no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) in the sub-dimensions of Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale according to age and grade variables (Table 4 and Table 6). In their study, Atar and Özbek (2009) concluded that there was no significant difference when leadership tendencies between classes were analyzed. Arslan and Uslu (2014) found that the leadership sub-dimensions of students studying in upper grades were higher. In a different study conducted on athletes, it was concluded that there was no significant difference according to age (Cevahircioğlu & Çakıcı, 2022). When analyzed according to the department variable, it

was found that the students studying in the recreation department were significantly higher than the sports management department in the political leadership sub-dimension ($p<0.05$), while there was no significant difference in other sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$) (Table 5). When Beltekin and Kuyulu (2019) compared the leadership characteristics of sport sciences faculty students in terms of departmental variables; they found that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimension of leadership towards structure.

When the findings were analyzed according to the sporting status variable, it was seen that the political and structural leadership sub-dimensions were significantly higher in the students who did sports than those who did not ($p<0.05$). No significant difference was found in the human resource leadership and charismatic leadership sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$) (Table 7). It is seen in the literature that there are similar results with our study. Especially in the political leadership sub-dimension, it was concluded that those who practiced sports were significantly higher (Güllü & Arslan, 2009; Durukan et al., 2007). In another study, when examined according to the variable of years of doing sports, it was concluded that as the year of sports increased, leadership orientations decreased (Zengin & Somoğlu, 2022).

As a result of the evaluation according to the status of leadership in organizations, it was concluded that the students working in organizations were significantly higher in political and charismatic leadership sub-dimensions ($p<0.05$). When other sub-dimensions were examined, no significant difference was found ($p>0.05$) (Table 8). It can be thought that students who take part in an organization contribute positively to the development of their leadership characteristics.

When the statistical results of whether leadership is innate or acquired, a significant difference was found in the political leadership sub-dimension. The average of those who think that leadership is innate is significantly higher ($p<0.05$). No significant difference was found in other sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$) (Table 9).

The limitation of our study is that it was applied to a single university and only two departments. Leadership is very important in departments that provide sports education. Therefore, it is thought that to develop this trait, necessary courses should be put in place and students should take part in platforms that develop these aspects such as taking part in organizations that can reveal their leadership qualities.

Recommendations

Students of recreation and sport management departments can be brought together with people who have worked in these platforms. Students in these departments can be assigned in organizations where they can develop their leadership qualities. Finally, this study was designed according to the quantitative approach. Future studies can be designed according to qualitative or mixed approach.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

GİRİŞ

İlk çağlardan bu yana toplumları bir arada tutan, yöneten, onlara yol gösteren liderler hep var olmuştur. Liderlik organizasyon kültürü içinde de oldukça çalışılan bir konudur. Liderlik, belirli şartlar altında, belirli kişisel veya grup amaçlarını gerçekleştirmek üzere, bir kimsenin başkalarının faaliyetlerini etkilemesi ve yönlendirmesi süreci olarak tanımlanabilir. Dolayısıyla liderlik, liderin yaptığı işlerle ilgili bir süreçtir. Lider ise, çalışanlarını buldukları kurumun hedefleri ve amaçları doğrultusunda davranmaya yönlendiren ve onları etkileyen kişidir (Koçel, 2001). Liderlik uygulamalı bir iştir. Dolayısıyla liderliğin ne olduğu ve hangi yetenekleri gerektirdiği konusunda çok fazla teori bulunmaktadır. Liderlik ile ilgili alan yazın incelendiğinde liderlik davranışlarının “Geleneksel Liderlik Tarzları” ve “Modern Liderlik Tarzları” olmak üzere iki ana başlık altında incelendiği görülmektedir (Özler, 2013). Dolayısıyla bu çalışmada, liderlik davranışlarının ön planda tutulduğu rekreasyon ve spor yöneticisi adaylarının liderlik yönelimleri arasındaki ilişkinin farklı değişkenler üzerine incelenmesi ve tartışılması amaçlanmaktadır. Liderlik yönelimlerinde belirlenen özelliklerin hem öğrencilerin öğrencilik yaşamlarında hem de ileride sahip olacakları mesleki kariyerlerinde yol gösterici kimliğe sahip olma açısından fikir vereceği düşünülmektedir. Bu sebeple bu araştırmanın literatüre katma değer sağlayacağı inancındayız.

YÖNTEM

Rekreasyon ve spor yöneticiliği bölümü öğrencilerinin liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesinin amaçlandığı bu çalışmada genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. 2021-2022 Eğitim yılı bahar döneminde Hitit Üniversitesi bünyesinde yer alan Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Rekreasyon ve Spor Yöneticiliği bölümlerinde öğrenim gören toplam 400 üniversite öğrencisi üzerinde yapılmıştır. Çalışmada, araştırmanın bağımsız değişkenlerinden oluşan kişisel bilgi formu ile birlikte Dursun ve arkadaşları (2019) tarafından geliştirilen “Çok Yönlü Liderlik Yönelimleri Ölçeği (ÇYLYÖ)” rekreasyon ve spor yöneticiliği bölümü öğrencilerine

uygulanmıştır. Alt boyutlar kapsamında ele alınarak değerlendirilen ölçeğin alt boyutlarından alınan puanların yüksek olması kişinin o liderlik yönelimine meylinin yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir. Verilerin analizinde betimsel istatistikler (frekans, aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma), veriler normal dağılım göstermediğinden istatistiki analizlerde; ikili karşılaştırmalarda Mann Whitney-U ve ikiden fazla karşılaştırmalarda Kruskal Wallis-H testleri kullanılmıştır.

BULGULAR

Ölçek puanlama sonuçları değerlendirildiği spor yöneticiliği ve rekreasyon bölümünde okuyan öğrencilerin puan ortalaması incelendiğinde en yüksek puanın “İnsan kaynaklı liderlik” en düşük puan ise “Politik liderlik” olduğu görülmektedir. Yapılan analizler neticesinde; yaş ve sınıf değişkenine göre liderlik yönelimlerinin alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır ($p>0,05$). Cinsiyet değişkeninde yapısal liderlik; bölüm ve liderlik kazanımı değişkenlerinde politik liderlik alt boyutunda; spor yapma durumu değişkeninde politik ve yapısal; organizasyonda liderlik yapma değişkeninde ise politik ve karizmatik liderlik alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılıklar olduğu tespit edilmiştir ($p<0,05$).

TARTIŞMA VE SONUÇ

Yapılan analizler sonucunda yaş ve sınıf değişkenine göre liderlik yönelimlerinin alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır ($p>0,05$). Cinsiyet değişkeninde yapısal liderlik; bölüm ve liderlik kazanımı değişkenlerinde politik liderlik alt boyutunda; spor yapma durumu değişkeninde politik ve yapısal; organizasyonda liderlik yapma değişkeninde ise politik ve karizmatik liderlik alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılıklar olduğu tespit edilmiştir ($p<0,05$). Çalışmada liderlik yönelimleri bakımından öğrencilerin insan kaynaklı liderlik yönelimlerinin en yüksek olduğu görülmektedir. Buna rağmen en fazla politik liderlik alt boyutunda anlamlı farklılıklar olduğu saptanmıştır. Sonuç olarak; öğrencilerin politik liderlik yönelimlerinin daha yüksek bulunması, liderlik yaptıkları organizasyonlarda fikir ayrılıklarının üstesinden gelebilmek için katılımcıları etkin bir biçimde anlayabilme becerilerini daha iyi kullanmalarından kaynaklanmış olabilir.

Bu çalışmada rekreasyon ve spor yöneticiliği bölümü öğrencilerinin liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Literatürdeki çalışmaların sonuçları çalışmamızla paralel olarak değerlendirildiğinde insan temelli liderlik alt boyutu en yüksek alt boyut olarak bulunmuştur (Arslan & Uslu, 2014; Semiz, 2011; Sezer & Kahraman, 2018). Bazı araştırmalarda (Senger & Kaya, 2017; Mcardle, 2008, Thompson, 2000) kadın ve erkekler arasında anlamlı fark bulunmazken; Öte yandan insan temelli liderliğin alt boyutlarına yönelik

yapılan araştırmalarda erkeklerin kadınlara göre daha yüksek puan aldığı tespit edilmiştir (Aydın ve ark., 2016; Özdenk, 2015).

Arslan ve Uslu (2014) yaptıkları çalışmada üst sınıflarda öğrenim gören öğrencilerin liderlik alt boyutlarının daha yüksek olduğunu bulmuşlardır. Beltekin ve Kuyulu (2019) spor bilimleri fakültesi öğrencilerinin liderlik özelliklerini bölüm değişkeni açısından karşılaştırdıklarında; yapıya yönelik liderlik alt boyutunda anlamlı bir farklılık olduğunu bulmuştur. Özellikle siyasi liderlik alt boyutunda anlamlı düzeyde spor yapanların yüksek olduğu sonucuna varmışlardır (Güllü & Cengiz, 2009; Durukan ve ark., 2007). Özellikle spor eğitimi bölümlerinde liderlik çok önemlidir. Dolayısıyla bu özelliğin geliştirilmesi için gerekli derslerin verilmesi ve öğrencilerin örgütlerde çalışma gibi liderlik özelliklerini geliştiren platformlarda yer almaları gerektiği düşünülmektedir.

REFERENCES

- Arslan, H., & Uslu, B. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenme stilleri ile liderlik yönelimleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 39(173), 340-353.
- Atar, E., & Özbek, O. (2009). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin liderlik davranışları. *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(2), 51-59.
- Aydın, R., Bozkuş, T., & Kul, M. (2016). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokullarındaki öğrencilerin liderlik özelliklerinin cinsiyet değişkenine göre incelenmesi. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 4 (Special Issue 1), 122-131.
- Bayrakdaroğlu, Y., Şenel, E., & Karakuş, K. (2022). Çok yönlü liderlik ile duygu düzenleme arasındaki ilişki. *Spor Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(3), 228-239.
- Beltekin, E., & Kuyulu, İ. (2019). Spor bilimleri fakültelerinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin liderlik yönelim düzeylerinin incelenmesi (Erciyes Üniversitesi örneği). *Herkes için Spor ve Rekreasyon Dergisi*, 1(1), 26-29.
- Cevahircioğlu, B., & Çakıcı H.A. (2022). Sporcuların karakter özelliklerine göre liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(2), 688-701.
- Dursun, M., Günay, M., & Yenel, İ.F. (2019). Çok yönlü liderlik yönelimleri ölçeği (ÇYLYÖ): Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi*, 2(2), 333-347
- Durukan, E., Can, S., Göktaş, Z., & Arıkan A.N. (2006). Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin cinsiyete bağlı olarak liderlik davranışı (yapıyı kurma boyutu) yönünden karşılaştırılması. *Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi*, 6(1), 25-32.
- Eroğlu, Ş., & Çeviker, A. (2022). Examination of the issues related to the decision-making characteristics of sports managers: A systematic review. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results*, 13(Special Issue 8), 2241-2246.
- Güllü, M., & Arslan, C. (2009). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik stilleri/leadership styles of physical education teachers. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(11), 352-367.

- Karasar, N. (2018). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Kitabevi.
- Koçel, T. (2001) *İşletme yöneticiliği*. 8. Baskı İstanbul: Beta Yayınevi.
- Mcardle, M.K. (2008). *Leadership orientations of community college presidents and the administrators who report to them: a frame analysis*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, College of Education] Florida.
- Newton, P., & Bristoll, H. (2015). Leadership theories. Team FME. 10.08.2022, <http://www.free-management-ebooks.com/dldebk/dlld-leadtheory.htm> .
- Özdenk, S. (2015). *Bireysel ve takım sporuyla uğraşan sporcular ile spor yapmayan bireylerin duygusal zekâ ve liderlik özelliklerinin incelenmesi*. [Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği A.B.D.] Ankara.
- Özler, N.D. (2013). *Liderlik*. Koparal, C., & Özalp, İ. (Ed.), *Yönetim ve organizasyon* (s. 94-123). Anadolu Üniversitesi Web.
- Semiz, H. (2011). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinde sporun liderlik üzerine etkisi: Hendek örneği*. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor A.B.D.] Sakarya.
- Senger, K., & Kaya, H.İ. (2017). Öğretmenlerin liderlik yönelim algılarının yaş ve cinsiyet değişkenleri açısından incelenmesi. *Turan: Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi*, 9(36), 168-175.
- Sezer, G.O., & Kahraman, P.B. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının liderlik yönelimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 26(5), 1551-1560.
- Şişman, M. (2018). *Öğretim liderliği*. Pegem Yayınları, Ankara.
- Tabachnick B.G & Fidell L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (sixth ed.) Pearson, Boston.
- Thompson, M.D. (2005). Organizational climate perception and job element satisfaction: A multi-frame application in a higher education setting. *E-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership*, 4(1), 1-15.
- Tuğsal, T. (2019). *Liderlik teorileri ve özellikler yaklaşımı*. Tuğsal, T. (Ed.), *Liderlik ve kurumsal yönetim teori ve güncel araştırmalar* içinde (s. 15-30). Gazi Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Zengin, S., & Somoğlu, M.B. (2022). Spor bilimlerinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi. *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6. *Akademik Spor Araştırmaları Kongresi Özel Sayısı*, 483-502.
- Zohar, D. (2018). *21. Yüzyılda kuantum liderlik*. İstanbul: The Kitap Yayınları.

KATKI ORANI CONTRIBUTION RATE	AÇIKLAMA EXPLANATION	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR CONTRIBUTORS
Fikir ve Kavramsal Örgü <i>Idea or Notion</i>	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak <i>Form the research hypothesis or idea</i>	Çisem ÜNLÜ Özlem DEMİRTAŞ
Tasarım <i>Design</i>	Yöntem ve araştırma desenini tasarlamak <i>To design the method and research design.</i>	Çisem ÜNLÜ Özlem DEMİRTAŞ
Literatür Tarama <i>Literature Review</i>	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak <i>Review the literature required for the study</i>	Çisem ÜNLÜ Özlem DEMİRTAŞ
Veri Toplama ve İşleme <i>Data Collecting and Processing</i>	Verileri toplamak, düzenlemek ve raporlaştırmak <i>Collecting, organizing and reporting data</i>	Çisem ÜNLÜ Özlem DEMİRTAŞ
Tartışma ve Yorum <i>Discussion and Commentary</i>	Elde edilen bulguların değerlendirilmesi <i>Evaluation of the obtained finding</i>	Çisem ÜNLÜ Özlem DEMİRTAŞ

Destek ve Teşekkür Beyanı/ Statement of Support and Acknowledgment

Bu çalışmanın yazım sürecinde katkı ve/veya destek alınmamıştır.

No contribution and/or support was received during the writing process of this study.

Çatışma Beyanı/ Statement of Conflict

Araştırmacıların araştırma ile ilgili diğer kişi ve kurumlarla herhangi bir kişisel ve finansal çıkar çatışması yoktur.

Researchers do not have any personal or financial conflicts of interest with other people and institutions related to the research.

Etik Kurul Beyanı/ Statement of Ethics Committee

Bu araştırma, Hitit Üniversitesi Etik Kurulunun 04.10.2021 tarihli ve 2021-78 sayılı kararı ile yürütülmüştür.

This research was carried out with the decision of Hitit University Ethics Committee dated 04.10.2021 and dated 2021-78.



Bu eser [Creative Commons Atıf-Gayri Ticari 4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) ile lisanslanmıştır.