African Educational Research Journal
Vol. 9(2), pp. 395-404, April 2021
DOI: 10.30918/AERJ.92.21.059
ISSN: 2354-2160
Full Length Research Paper

The relationship between sports manager behaviour and locus of control: An application on students of faculties of sport sciences

İlker Günel

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Usak University, Usak, Turkey.

Accepted 19 April, 2021

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between the locus of control and the sports manager behavior levels of the students studying in the department of sports management of the faculty of sport sciences. The study was conducted by the correlational survey method, one of the quantitative research designs. Population of the study consists of students studying in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grades in the departments of sports management of the faculties of sport sciences from various state and private universities. The sample of the study conducted using the nonprobability sampling method consists of 718 sports management students (male = 452, female = 266). In the study, data were collected with the sports manager behavior scale and the internal-external locus of control scale. Data were analyzed by means of analysis of normality, t-test, one-way Anova test and multiple regression tests. The study found a significant difference between students' gender, grade levels, university type and sports manager behaviors. There was no significant effect of internal-external locus of control levels on sports manager behaviors. In conclusion, it was found that the students' sport manager behavior and internal-external locus of control levels were quite high, and female students have higher sports manager behavior levels compared to male students, and the higher the level of grade, the higher the levels of sports manager behavior.

Keywords: Sports management, sport sciences, sports management behavior, locus of control.

E-mail: ilker.gunel@usak.edu.tr.

INTRODUCTION

One of the labor-intensive service sectors is sports organizations that produce sports services. For providing sports services, athletes, trainers, facilities and sports managers must be brought together to achieve a predetermined goal. In order to achieve this goal, the behaviors of the sports manager have a very important place in the formation of elements such as making and implementing the decisions in the management processes, bringing synergy and establishing the coordination structure among the staff and units. It can be said that the term 'management' finds its way in all sports activity areas. It aims to introduce all elements of organizational resources on the one hand, and bring their sportive performance to the highest level, on the other hand (Novac, 2014). Under this term, it can be perceived as a leader, a manager, an organizer, an information analyzer, a person who decides on goals and practices, and a person who reinforces these qualities with their behaviors (Svedova et al., 2019). The literature includes many definitions of sports management. However, the vast majority of these definitions are based on the traditional management of key resources with high impact for the realization of sports activities, sports organizations or athletes' missions and goals. Sports management can be defined as an effective decision-making mechanism that ensures the coordination of all factors affecting the achievement of the determined goals (Çiftçi et al., 2015; Retar et al., 2016; Dugalic et al., 2016). In the light of this definition, sports managers have to adapt to changes in management processes and technological innovations by analyzing them using their knowledge, equipment and skills. Therefore, the basic function of management is to

make and implement effective and efficient decisions (Lancu et al., 2016). Two important factors stand out in the quality of the sports manager. The first one is the subjective qualities (knowledge, skills, character and education), and the second one is the skills specific to the content of the activity (more specific and different qualities of the manager stand out (Neferu, 2018). In organizations and clubs that make up the phenomenon of sports and produce sports products, elements such as athletes, managers, trainers, training programs, establishment, and sportive performance should be integrated in accordance with the objectives of the management. Within the framework of all these components, the behavioral aspect of sports managers who have a significant impact on the professional lives and performance of athletes should not be ignored (Yıldızhan and İmamoğlu, 2018). The origin of the locus of control concept is based on social learning theory. This theory involves some assumptions. These assumptions on the locus of control are determined by individuals' attitudes towards events under certain circumstances (Bal et al., 2010). These assumptions express the extent of control of individuals over events that can happen to them during their lives. In other words, it is believed that the source of control in a person's life is determined by a certain adaptation to the individual's personality aspects (internal, external and strong luck) (Angelova, 2016; Holden et al., 2019). We can talk about two different aspects of locus of control, namely internal locus of control and external locus of control, which are also related to the personality structure of individuals. Internal control-focused individuals look for the reasons for the problems they encounter during their lives in themselves and it is easier for them to cope with stress. Some studies (Nowicki and Strickland, 1973) found positive relationship between independence, self-control, self-disciplined working, and academic achievement of internally controlled male individuals. External control-focused individuals see external factors such as luck and fate as responsible for the events that happen to them and accept their own fate (Rutkowska and Gierczuk, 2014). Many studies on locus of control were found in the literature (Kazemi, 2015; Mladenović, 2010; Tsai et al., 2014). However, there is no study examining the relationship between the behavioral characteristics of sports manager candidates and their foci of control. In this respect, it is thought that our study will fill a gap in the literature. This study aims to examine the behavioral characteristics and control foci of sports manager candidates studying in the departments of sports management of the faculties of sport sciences in terms of various variables.

METHOD

This study, which aims to examine the sports manager behavioral characteristics and control foci of the students studying at the Faculties of Sport Sciences according to various variables, used the correlational survey method from the quantitative research designs. The purpose of choosing this research design is to analyze the differences between dependent and independent variables. The study used a non-experimental design, one of the quantitative research methods, aiming to determine whether there is a relationship or difference between two or more independent variables (Karasar, 2016). Population of the study consists of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade students who study sports management in the Departments of Sports Management of Faculties of Sport Sciences from various Public and Private Universities. The sample of the study, which was conducted with the nonprobability sampling method using 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error, consists of 718 sports management students (male = 452, female = 266). This study used a personal information form containing the demographic information of the students, and “Sports Manager Behavior Scale” developed by Kepoglu and Bayansalduz (2021). The 5-point Likert type scale consists of 5 subscales: managerial approach, self-efficacy approach, supportive approach and hierarchical approach. One participant scores a minimum of 21 and a maximum of 105 points on the scale. The internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scale were determined as Sports Manager behavior scale general (α = .87), managerial approach (α = .85), self-efficacy approach (α = .82), supportive approach (α = .63), hierarchical approach (α = .57), respectively. In our study, the Sports Executive behavior scale was determined as general (α=.87) managerial approach (α = .80) self-efficacy approach (α = .79), supportive approach (α = .63), and hierarchical approach (α = .57). When these results are examined, it can be said that the reliability of the scale items regarding the internal consistency among themselves is high. The other data collection tool used in the study was “Internal External Locus of Control Scale”. The scale developed by Nowicki and Strickland (1973) was adapted to Turkish by Öngen (2003). The Turkish form consists of 29 items and 5 subscales, which are foci of control for family relationships, success, peer relationships, superstition, and fate. Internal-external locus of control scale (α = .82) was determined as foci of control (α = .74) for family relationships, (α = .59) for success, (α = .61) for peer relationships, (α = .62) for superstition, and (α = .47) for fate. In our study, the internal-external control scale was determined as (α = .70) for general, (α = .60) for family relationships, (α = .71) for success, (α = .69) for peer relationships, (α=.74) for superstition, and (α = .72) for fate. Considering these results, it can be said that the reliability of the locus of control scale regarding the internal consistency between its items is quite high. According to the scoring, students who scored 1 to 59 on the internal-external locus of control scale were considered as externally controlled, and students who scored 60 to 116 as internally controlled.

As seen in the Table 1, 63% of the students who participated in the study are male, 37% are women, 82.2% are students between the ages of 18-23, 58.6% are first grade students, 60.9% are students of a department of sports management in a State University and 39.1% are students of a department of sports management in a Private University.

As seen in the Table 2, the fact that the median and mean values are close to each other, kurtosis and skewness values are in the range of ±1.96 (Büyüköztürk, 2016) and data is concentrated around the linear line in the QQ pilot chart indicates that the data are in conformity with the normal distribution. Therefore, it was decided to perform parametric tests within the scope of data analyzes.

As seen in the Table 3, it can be said that the students who participated in the study generally showed a high level of sports manager behavior. According to the mean, it can be said that the majority of the students have both internal and external control features.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics on the scale and subscales regarding the participants.

Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Male	452	63
	Female	266	37
Age	18-22	590	82.2
	23-27	92	12.8
	27 or above	36	5.0
Grade	1st Grade	421	58.6
	2nd Grade	157	21.9
	3rd Grade	80	11.1
	4th Grade	60	8.4
Type of University	State University	437	60.9
	Private University	281	39.1

n = 718.

Table 2. Analysis of normality for the scale and its subscales.

Scales	Scales and Subscales	$\bar{x}$±ss	Median	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
Sports manager behaviour scale	Sports Manager Behaviour General	89.87±8.64	90.00	74.65	-.554	1.337
	Managerial Approach	30.50±3.23	31.00	10.47	-.735	1.143
	Self-efficacy Approach	30.48±3.21	31.00	10.35	-.600	.495
	Supporting Approach	17.27±2.17	17.00	4.75	-.810	.856
	Hierarchical Approach	11.61±2.13	12.00	4.57	-.145	-.452
Internal-external locus of control scale	Internal-External locus of control general	80.41±13.13	82.00	172.42	-.808	1.164
	Locus of control for family relationships	23.33±4.59	24.00	21.09	-.390	-.180
	Locus of control for success	15.23±4.75	15.00	23.10	.849	.876
	Locus of control for peer relationships	21.34±4.83	22.00	23.38	-.563	.250
	Locus of control for superstition	6.89±2.32	7.50	5.41	-.476	-.719
	Locus of control for fate	13.60±3.59	14.00	12.95	-.376	-.205

Table 3. Descriptive statistics on the scale and subscales regarding the participants.

Scales	Minimum	Maximum	$\bar{x}$	Sd
Sports manager behaviour general	48	105	89.87	8.64
Internal-external locus of control general	32	111	80.41	13.13

$\bar{x}$= mean; sd: standard deviation; n=718.

RESULTS

As seen in the Table 4, a significant difference was found between the general scores of the sports manager behavior scale and the gender of the students ($t_{(716)}$ = -2.390; p = .017; p < 0.05). Sports manager behavior levels of female students ($\bar{x}$ = 90.88) was found to be slightly higher compared to the male students ($\bar{x}$ = 89.29).

A significant difference was found between the managerial approach subscale scores and the students' gender ($t_{(716)}$= -2.321; p=.021; p<0.05). Managerial approach styles of female students ($\bar{x}$ = 30.87) was found to be higher compared to male student ($\bar{x}$ = 30.29). A significant difference was found between the self-efficacy approach subscale scores and the students' gender ($t_{(716)}$ = -2.421; p = .016; p < 0.05). Female students' self-

Table 4. Discriminant analysis of students' sport manager behavior and internal-external locus of control scales on the basis of gender.

Scales and subscales	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	Levene's Test		t	df	*p*
					F	p			
Sports manager behavior general	Male	452	89.29	8.65	0.048	0.827	-2.390		**0.017***
	Female	266	90.88	8.55					
Managerial approach	Male	452	30.29	3.27	1.484	0.224	-2.321		**0.021***
	Female	266	30.87	3.15					
Self-efficacy approach	Male	452	30.26	3.24	0.515	0.473	-2.421		**0.016***
	Female	266	30.86	3.15					
Supportive approach	Male	452	17.08	2.20	0.002	0.968	-3.189		**0.001****
	Female	266	17.61	2.11					
Hierarchical approach	Male	452	11.66	2.12	0.001	0.980	0.736		0.462
	Female	266	11.54	2.17					
Internal-external locus of control general	Male	452	80.88	13.52	2.012	0.157	1.240	716	0.215
	Female	266	79.62	12.43					
For family relationships locus of control	Male	452	23.06	4.56	0.06	0.806	-2.070		**0.039***
	Female	266	23.80	4.62					
For success locus of control	Male	452	15.63	4.94	0.6	0.439	2.907		**0.004***
	Female	266	14.56	4.49					
For peer relationships locus of control	Male	452	21.28	4.87	0.061	0.805	-0.445		0.656
	Female	266	21.45	4.78					
For superstition locus of control	Male	452	7.27	2.19	4.563	0.033	5.606		**0.000****
	Female	266	6.26	2.42					
For fate locus of control	Male	452	13.64	3.65	1.025	0.312	0.255		0.799
	Female	266	13.56	3.51					

**p < 0.01; *p < 0.05; $\bar{x}$ = mean; sd: standard deviation; df: degree of freedom; n = 718.

efficacy ($\bar{x}$ = 30.86) was found to be higher compared to the male students ($\bar{x}$ = 30.26). A significant difference was found between the supportive approach subscale scores and the students' gender ($t_{(716)}$ = -3.189; p = .001; p < 0.01). Female students' supportive approach styles ($\bar{x}$ = 17.61) was found to be higher compared to the male student ($\bar{x}$ = 17.08) However, no statistically significant difference was found between the hierarchical approach subscale scores and the gender of the students (p = .462; p > 0.05). No significant difference was found between the students' gender and their mean scores from the internal-external locus of control scale general (p = .215; p > 0.05) and the subscales peer relations (p = .656; p > 0.05) and fate control (p = .799; p > 0.05). A significant difference was found between the superstition focus subscale mean scores and the students' gender ($t_{(716)}$ = 5.606; p=.000; p < 0.01).Male students' superstition locus of control levels ($\bar{x}$ = 7.27) were found to be higher compared to the female students ($\bar{x}$ = 6.26). A significant difference was found between Family Relations subscale mean scores and students' gender ($t_{(716)}$ = -2.070; p = .039; p < 0.05). Female students' locus of control levels for family relationships ($\bar{x}$ = 23.80) were found to be higher compared to the male students ($\bar{x}$ = 23.06). A significant difference was determined between the Success Relationships subscale mean scores and the students' gender ($t_{(716)}$ = -2.907; p = .004; p < 0.05). Male students' success relationships locus of control levels ($\bar{x}$ = 15.76) were found to be at a higher compared to the female students ($\bar{x}$ = 14.56).

As seen in the Table 5, a significant difference was found between the sports manager behavior scale

Table 5. Discriminant analysis of students' sport manager behavior and internal-external locus of control scales on the basis of grade variable.

Scale and subscales	Grade	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	sd	F	*p*	Difference
Sports manager behavior general	1st Grade	421	90.09	8.00		7.377	**0.000****	1<4 2<4 3<4
	2nd Grade	157	89.06	9.01				
	3rd Grade	80	87.34	10.40				
	4th Grade	60	93.90	8.08				
Managerial approach	1st Grade	421	30.59	3.04		8.021	**0.000****	1<3 1<4 2<4 3<4
	2nd Grade	157	30.19	3.33				
	3rd Grade	80	29.49	3.86				
	4th Grade	60	32.05	2.80				
Self-efficacy approach	1st Grade	421	30.64	3.04		5.920	**0.001****	1<3 2<4 3<4
	2nd Grade	157	30.11	3.30				
	3rd Grade	80	29.54	3.74				
	4th Grade	60	31.62	3.09				
Supportive approach	1st Grade	421	17.49	2.02		4.919	**0.002***	1<3
	2nd Grade	157	17.01	2.37				
	3rd Grade	80	16.59	2.43				
	4th Grade	60	17.37	2.22				
Hierarchical approach	1st Grade	421	11.36	2.07		9.387	**0.000****	1<4 2<4 3<4
	2nd Grade	157	11.75	2.17				
	3rd Grade	80	11.73	2.13				
	4th Grade	60	12.87	2.14				
Internal-external locus of control general	1st Grade	421	80.55	12ç57	3 714	2.712	**0.044***	2<4
	2nd Grade	157	81.85	13.55				
	3rd Grade	80	80.00	11.88				
	4th Grade	60	76.23	16.48				
Locus of control for family relationships	1st Grade	421	23.27	4.58		3.416	**0.017***	3<4
	2nd Grade	157	23.55	4.55				
	3rd Grade	80	24.33	4.11				
	4th Grade	60	21.88	5.10				
Locus of control for success	1st Grade	421	14.87	4.22		3.837	**0.010***	1<2
	2nd Grade	157	16.36	5.63				
	3rd Grade	80	14.88	4.52				
	4th Grade	60	15.28	6.20				
Locus of control for peer relationships	1st Grade	421	21.61	4.82		2.052	0.105	
	2nd Grade	157	21.34	4.70				
	3rd Grade	80	20.93	4.64				
	4th Grade	60	20.05	5.38				
Locus of control for superstition	1st Grade	421	6.96	2.19		6.269	**0.000****	1<4 2<4
	2nd Grade	157	7.27	2.40				
	3rd Grade	80	6.61	2.58				
	4th Grade	60	5.82	2.43				

Table 5. Continues.

Locus of control for fate	1st Grade	421	13.84	3.43	1.404	0.240
	2nd Grade	157	13.32	3.87		
	3rd Grade	80	13.26	3.47		
	4th Grade	60	13.20	4.11		

**p < 0.01; *p < 0.05; n = 718; 1 = 1st grade; 2 = 2nd grade; 3 = 3rd grade; 4 = 4th grade.

general mean scores and the grade levels of the students ($F_{(3-714)}$ = 7.377; p = .000; p < 0.01). There are significant differences among the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade students. Sports manager behavior level of the 4th grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 93.90) was found to be higher compared to the 1st Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 90.09), 2nd Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 89.6) and 3rd Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 87.34) students. A significant difference was found between the students' grade levels and the managerial approach, which is one of the subscales ($F_{(3-714)}$ = 8.021; p = .000; p < 0.01). There is a significant difference between 1st grade and 3rd and 4th grades, and between 2nd grade and 4th grade, and between 3rd grade and 4th grade. Managerial approach showing level of the 4th grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 32.05) was found to be higher compared to 1st Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 30.59), 2nd Grade ($\bar{x}$=30.19), and 3rd Grade ($\bar{x}$=29.54) students. A significant difference was found between the self-efficacy approach and the grade levels the students ($F_{(3-714)}$= 5.920; p=.001; p<0.01). There is a significant difference between 1st grade and 3rd and 4th grades, between 2nd grade and 4th grade, and between 3rd grade and 4th grade. Self-efficacy approach showing level of the 4th grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 32.05) was found to be higher compared to 1st Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 30.64), 2nd Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 30.11) and 3rd Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 29.49) students. A significant difference was found between the supportive approach and the grade levels the students ($F_{(3-714)}$ = 4.919; p = .002; p < 0.05). There is significant difference between 1st grade and 3rd grade. Supportive approach showing level of the 1st grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 17.49) was found to be higher compared to 2nd Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 16.59) students. A significant difference was found between the hierarchical approach and the students' grade levels ($F_{(3-714)}$ = 8.021; p = .000; p < 0.01). There is a significant difference between 1st grade and 3rd and 4th grades, between 2nd grade and 4th grade, and between 3rd grade and 4th grade. Managerial approach showing level of the 4th grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 12.87) was found to be higher compared to 1st Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 11.36), 2nd Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 11.75), and 3rd Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 11.73) students. A significant difference was found between the general average scores of locus of control and the students' grade levels ($F_{(3-714)}$ = 2.712; p = .044; p < 0.05). There is a significant difference between 2nd Grade and 4th Grade. Locus of Control levels of the 2nd Grade Students ($\bar{x}$ = 81.85) was found to be higher compared to 4th Grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 76.23). A significant difference was found between the locus of control subscale for success relationships and the students' grade levels ($F_{(3-714)}$ = 3.837; p = .010; p < 0.05). There is a significant difference between 1st and 2nd grades. Locus of control levels for success relationships of the 2nd grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 16.36) were found to be higher compared to the 1st grade students. A significant difference was founded between the Superstition Focus subscale and the grade levels of the students ($F_{(3-714)}$ = 6.269; p = .000; p < 0.01). There is a significant difference between 1st and 2nd grades. Locus of control levels for success relationships of the 2nd grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 16.36) were found to be higher compared to the 1st grade students. There is a significance difference between 1st and 2nd grades, and 4th grade. The level of superstition focus of the 2nd grade students ($\bar{x}$ = 7.27) was found to be higher compared to 1st Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 6.96) and 4th Grade ($\bar{x}$ = 5.82) students.

As seen in the Table 6, no significant difference was found between the type of university and the students' sports manager behavior characteristic (p = .182; p > 0.05) and subscales managerial approach (p = .173; p > 0.05), self-efficacy approach (p = .064; p > 0.05), Supportive approach (p = .117; p > 0.05), and a hierarchical approach. A significant difference was found between the internal-external locus of control general score averages and the type of university ($F_{(716)}$ = 7.317; p = .000; p < 0.05). Levels of locus of control of students studying at public universities ($\bar{x}$ = 83.19) were found to be higher compared to students studying at private universities ($\bar{x}$ = 76.10). A significant difference was found between the type of university and the locus of control scores for family relationships ($F_{(716)}$ = 6.913; p = .000; p < 0.05). Levels of locus of control of students studying at public universities ($\bar{x}$ = 24.26) were found to be higher compared to the students studying at private universities ($\bar{x}$ = 21.90). A significant difference was found between the type of university and the locus of control scores for peer relationships ($F_{(716)}$ = 6.351; p = .000; p < 0.05). Levels of locus of control of students studying at public universities ($\bar{x}$ = 22.20) were found to be higher compared to students studying at private universities ($\bar{x}$ = 20.01). A significant difference was found between the superstition locus of control scores and the type of university ($F_{(716)}$ = 3.818; p = .000; p < 0.05). Levels of locus of control of students studying at public universities ($\bar{x}$ = 7.15) were found to be higher compared to students studying at private universities ($\bar{x}$ = 6.50). A significant difference was found between the type of university and the locus of control scores for fate ($F_{(716)}$ = 4.870; p = .000; p < 0.05). Levels of locus of

Table 6. Discriminant analysis of students' sport manager behavior and internal-external locus of control scales on the basis of university type variable.

Scale and subscales	Type of university	n	$\bar{x}$	sd	Levene's Test F	Levene's Test p	t	df	p
Sports manager behaviour general	State University	437	90.22	8.57	0.106	0.745	1.335		0.182
	Private University	281	89.34	8.73					
Managerial approach	State University	437	30.64	3.27	0.843	0.359	1.364		0.173
	Private University	281	30.30	3.17					
Self-efficacy approach	State University	437	30.66	3.18	0.021	0.884	1.852		0.064
	Private University	281	30.21	3.27					
Supportive approach	State University	437	17.38	2.13	0.204	0.652	1.57		0.117
	Private University	281	17.11	2.25					
Hierarchical approach	State University	437	11.55	2.22	6.797	0.009	-1.050		0.283
	Private University	281	11.72	2.01					
Internal-external locus of control general	State University	437	83.19	13.46	0.332	0.564	7.317	716	**0.000****
	Private University	281	76.10	11.35					
Locus of control for family relationships	State University	437	24.26	4.38	3.49	0.062	6.913		**0.000****
	Private University	281	21.90	4.55					
Locus of control for success	State University	437	15.48	4.97	4.073	0.044	1.746		0.081
	Private University	281	14.85	4.52					
Locus of control for peer relationships	State University	437	22.20	5.06	6.668	0.01	6.351		**0.000****
	Private University	281	20.01	4.13					
Locus of control for superstition	State University	437	7.15	2.46	12.36	0	3.818		**0.000****
	Private University	281	6.50	2.05					
Locus of control for fate	State University	437	14.11	3.79	4.196	0.041	4.870		**0.000****
	Private University	281	12.84	3.14					

**p < 0.01; *p < 0.05; n = 718.

control of students studying at public universities ($\bar{x}$ = 14.11) were found to be higher compared to students studying at private universities ($\bar{x}$ = 14.84).

As seen in the Table 7, 64% of male students and 36% of female students are externally controlled. 62% of male students and 37% of female students are controlled supervised. In general, it was found that 93.03% of the students are internally controlled and 6.96% externally controlled.

As seen in the Table 8, the model made to measure the effect of students being internally or externally controlled on sports manager behavior is significant. The study found no significant impact of students' being internally or externally controlled on the sports manager behavior levels.

Table 7. Distribution of internally and externally controlled students on the basis of gender.

Focus type	n/%	Male	Female
Externally controlled	n	32	18
	%	64.00	36.00
Internally controlled	n	420	248
	%	62.90	37.10
Total	n	452	266
	%	63.00	37.00

Table 8. Analysis of the effect of internal-external locus of control subscales on sports manager behavior.

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	*p*	Collinearity statistics	
Independent variables	**β**	**SH**	**β**			**Tolerance**	**VIF**
Fixed	153.679	101.90		1.508	.137		
Internally Controlled	-0.647	1.875	-0.115	-0.345	.731	0.139	7.205
Externally Controlled	-0.361	0.421	-0.285	-0.858	.395	0.139	7.205

Dependent variable: Sports manager behavior

$F = 5.060$; $p = 0.010$; $p < 0.05$

$R^2 = .125$

Durbin Watson = 2.272; VIF < 10

** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$; Standardized values were used.

DISCUSSION

When examined the conceptual level regarding the scale and subscales of the students participating in this study, which aims to examine the sports manager behaviors and locus of control of sports manager candidates studying in the departments of sports management of the faculties of sport sciences, it can be said that the students' sports manager behavior levels and locus of control are high.

Our study found a significant difference in favor of female students between the genders of the students and the sports manager behavior scale and its subscales including managerial, self-efficacy and supportive approaches. It was found that women are at a higher level compared to men in terms of participation in managerial processes, self-efficacy in having managerial behaviors as well as motivating and supporting their staff. A significant difference was found in favor of the 4th grade students between the students' grade levels and the sports manager behavior scale and its subscales: managerial, self-efficacy, supportive and hierarchical approaches. According to this result, it can be said that as the students' grade level including their theoretical knowledge about management increases, their level of knowledge and resources on this subject increases as well as their level of featuring the elements that support hierarchical structuring and their staff. It was found that 93.03% of the students studying in the department of sports management were internally controlled and 6.96% were externally controlled. Since the vast majority of the students are internally controlled according to this result, they are more independent in their decisions, and questioning persons who do not accept everything from outside as they are, and who seek the reasons for the problems they encounter in their lives in themselves rather than external influences (chance, fate, etc.) and try to solve them by analytical thinking method. No significant difference was found between the variable of university where the students study and the sports manager behavior characteristics or its subscales. The literature includes no study analyzing the relationship between the sports manager behavior scale and the variables included in our study.

Our study found a significant difference between the genders of the students and the locus of control subscales, namely locus of control for family relationships, success, and superstition. It was found that women's locus of control levels for family relationships are higher compared to the men. According to this result, since female students are internally controlled, they have a voice in family relationships, especially about the course of things at home, can make their parents accept their own thoughts and wishes more easily, and think, question and analyze the reasons and solutions for their parents' reactions and possible problems that may arise in such cases within themselves rather than external effects. In other subscales, it was found that male students had a higher level of locus of control for success and superstition focus compared to female students. According to this result, it can be said that since men have an internally controlled structure, they are more willing to be successful in any subject or academic achievement and they make more effort to think about and solve their problems, compared to female students. In respect of superstitions, since male students are more internally controlled compared to female students, male students do not act according to superstitions (such as good luck charm or chance), and they question, reason out and find solutions for the problems they encounter during their lives rather than relying on superstitions. In their studies, Nwankwo et al. (2017), Gasic-Pavisic et al. (2006), İnan et al. (2015) and Parsons and Betz (2011) found that women have higher locus of control levels compared to men. It is in line with the results of our study. Unlike our study, Guszkowska and Kuk (2012) and Mcleod (1995) found no significant difference between locus of control and gender in their sports injury study. The reason for its difference from our study is thought to be the different sample group (60 elite male and female

basketball players) of study.

A significant difference was found between the students' grade levels and internal-external locus of control and the subscales: locus of control for superstition, for family relationships, and for success. According to this result, it was found that the 2nd grade students in the department of sports management have high levels of internal-external locus of control and locus of control for success. It was found that 4th grade students have higher locus of control level for superstition, and 3rd grade students have higher locus of control level for family relationships. According to this result, the 2nd grade students search, question and solve the reasons for the problems and failures they encounter in their education process within themselves, as their level of internal control is higher compared to the 4th grade students. In respect of the locus of control for superstition, it can be said that the 2nd grade students question their problems within the framework of reason and logic rather than believing in superstitions and thinking accordingly in their efforts to solve problems compared to the 1st or 3rd grade students. In respect of the locus of control for family relationships, since 3rd grade students have higher levels of internal control compared to 4th grade students, it can be said that they are more dominant in their relationships with their parents and their persuasion skills are higher. They think and make an effort to find a solution accordingly. The study by Sarıçam et al. (2012) which has results similar to the results of our study, found a significant difference between the 1st and 4th grade students in terms of the internal-external control locus of control. There are no studies in the literature, which do not support our study. A significant difference was found in favor of the state university between the variable of university type and internal-external locus of control and subscales for family relations, peer relations, superstition and fate.

It was found that the students studying at the departments of sports management of the faculties of sport sciences at state universities have higher internal-external locus of control, as well as locus of control for family relationships, peer relationships, superstition, and fate compared to sports management students studying at private universities. According to this result, it can be suggested that the students studying at state universities are internally controlled, and therefore, they are capable of producing solutions for the problems they face in their family relationships and the process of achieving success by internal questioning rather than from external factors compared to the private university students. Furthermore, they think about their problems and possible solutions without being influenced by superstitions, they can think independently, and they do not accept their problems as fate, and reason out and try to solve their problems within the framework of reason and logic. The literature includes no studies that support or do not support our study. It was found that the students' behavioral patterns specific to internally-externally controlled personality have no significant effect on sports manager behavior levels. It is thought that this is due to the fact that the students are sports manager candidates and they are in the stage of sports management education and they do not practice sports management as a profession.

CONCLUSION

It can be said that the students who participated in this study, which examined the relationship between sports manager behavior levels and foci of control of sports manager candidates, typically have high levels of sports manager behavior and locus of control It was found that, since female students are more internally controlled compared to male students, they are independent in their decisions and have analytical thinking and questioning skills against the problems they encounter during their lives. In our study, 93.03% of the students are internally controlled and 6.96% are externally controlled, and those who are internally controlled are more independent in their decisions, and they have the potential to search for the reasons for the problems they encounter within themselves by self-criticism rather than external factors and to produce analytical solutions. On the other hand, externally controlled students believe that their problems are caused by external influences. As the level of theoretical education that students receive on sports management increases, their sports manager behavior levels increase. The insignificance of students' internal-external locus of control on sports manager behavior is due to the fact that the students are still in the education stage and lack of knowledge and experience that have not been put into practice. It was found that, since the students studying at state universities have an internally controlled personality, they have a student profile that does not accept things as they are but question and think, compared to the students studying at private universities.

REFERENCES

Angelova, N. V. (**2016**). Locus of control and its relationship with some social-demographic factors. Psychological Thought, 9(2): 248-258.

Bal, B. S., Singh, B., and Singh, O. (**2010**). Achievement motivation and locus of control of university level individual and team sport players - A prognostic study. Journal of Physical Education and Sport Management, 1(3): 33-36.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (**2016**). Data analysis handbook (22nd Edition), Pegem Academy Publishing House: Ankara

Çiftçi, S., Gökçel, B., and Demirkıran, Y. (**2015**). Analyse of the expectations of the sports management students in terms of quality. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 174: 2602-2609.

Dugalic, S., and **Lazarevic**, S. (**2016**). The impact of sports manager education on sport transition: An exploratory study. In 1st International Conference, Sport, Recreation, Health, Book of Proceedings (58-69).

Gasic-Pavisic, S., Joksimovic, S., and Janjetovic, D. (**2006**). General self-esteem and locus of control of young sportsmen. Zbornik

Instituta za Pedagoska Istrazivanja, 38(2): 385-400.
Guszkowska, M., and **Kuk**, A. (**2012**). Health locus of control of polish undergraduates: gender, faculty and type of physical activity differences. Baltic Journal of Health and Physical Activity, 4(3): 189.
Holden, S. L., Forester, B. E., Williford, H. N., and Reilly, E. (**2019**). Sport locus of control and perceived stress among college student-athletes. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16(16): 2823.
İnan, M., Karagözoglu, C., Dervent, F., and Arslantas, B. (**2015**). Examination of socialization level of university students engaged in sports activities according to their locus of control. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 3(3): 51-60.
Karasar, N. (**2016**). Scientific Research Method (31st edition), Ankara: Nobel Academic Publishing.
Kazemi, M., Noredini, M., and Moghadam, M. K. (**2015**). The relationship between the locus of control and mental health in athlete and non-athlete students of Tehran University. International Journal of Basic Sciences and Applied Research, 4(10): 599-605.
Kepoglu, A., and **Bayansalduz**, M. (**2021**). Validity and reliability study of sports manager behavior scale in sports manager education. International Journal of Applied Exercise Physiology, 10(2): 52-63.
Lancu, D., Robescu, O., Istrate, C., and Lancu, A. G. (**2016**). Management of sports organizations: Concepts, skills, knowledge. Valahian Journal of Economic Studies, 7(3): 75.
Mladenović, M. (**2010**). The link of a coach's perception of locus of control and his/her motivational approach to athletes. SportLogia, 6(2): 35-42.
Neferu, F. (**2018**). The importance of the manager's qualities in developing the sports Organization. Annals-Economy Series, 2: 109-114.
Novac, C. (**2014**). Some personality traits that entail the efficiency of sports manager behavior. Journal of Sport and Kinetic Movement, 23(1): 83-85.
Nowicki, S., and **Strickland**, B. A. (**1973**). Locus of Control Scale for Children. Consult Clinical Psychology, 40: 148-154.
Nwankwo, B. C., Okechi, B. C., and Kalu, O. E. (**2017**). Role of locus of control and gender on psychological well-being among youth athletes. Journal of Psychology and Sociological Studies, 1(1): 177-185.
Öngen, D. (**2003**). Validity and reliability of the locus of control scale. Educational Administration in Theory and Practice, 35(35): 436-447.
Parsons, E. M., and **Betz**, N. E. (**2001**). The relationship of participation in sports and physical activity to body objectification, instrumentality, and locus of control among young women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25(3): 209-222.
Retar, I., Pisot, R., and Kolar, E. (**2016**). The definition of sports management. Facta Universitatis, Series: Physical Education and Sport, 13(2): 275-281.
Rutkowska, K., and **Gierczuk**, D. (**2014**). Locus of control in specific sports situations in beginner wrestlers. Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology, 3(14): 33-41.
Sarıçam, H., Duran, A., Çardak, M., and Halmatov, M. (**2012**). The examination of pre-school teacher candidates' academic locus of control levels according to gender and grade. Mevlana International Journal of Education, 2(2): 67-74.
Svedova, P. M., Vargova, M. T. D. and Matusíkova, P. D. (**2019**). Sports manager in physical education and sports and its management method. Journal of Global Science, 4(1): 1-7.
Tsai, J. J., Wang, C. H., and Lo, H. J. (**2014**). Locus of control, moral disengagement in sport, and rule transgression of athletes. Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 42(1): 59-68.
Yıldızhan, Y. Ç., and **İmamoğlu**, A. F. (**2018**). The effect of sports managers' managerial behavior on athlete performance, (1st Edition), Nobel Scientific Works: Ankara.

Citation: Günel, İ. (2021). The relationship between sports manager behaviour and locus of control: An application on students of faculties of sport sciences. African Educational Research Journal, 9(2): 395-404.