

Self-Perceptions of Faculty of Sport Sciences Students on Demographic and Leadership Behaviors in the Fields of Management and Organization: A Critical Approach to Sports Feminism

Betül TOZLU¹, Yener AKSOY², Aydan ERMIŞ³

¹Ondokuz Mayıs University, Yaşar Doğu Faculty of Sports Sciences, Department of Sports Management, PhD student, Samsun/Türkiye, 55.betultozlu@gmail.com

²Ondokuz Mayıs University, Yaşar Doğu Faculty of Sports Sciences, Recreation Department, Samsun/Türkiye, yener.aksoy@omu.edu.tr

³Ondokuz Mayıs University, School of Foreign Languages, Samsun/Türkiye, aydanak@omu.edu.tr

DOI: 10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S01.98

Abstract

Human, time, space, material and physical item, use it in the most efficacious and rational style, the science of management based on collusive people for to some purpose, It is one of the popular notion used in the modern era. "Leadership self-perceiving", which should be evaluated within the discipline of "management science", which includes different methods, It is a versatile discipline in which law, political, economic and social aspects such as decision making, planning, organization, management, coordination and control are examined. It is a fact that there are gender-based criticisms in the fields of sports management and organization as a sub-system of the political systems that this discipline includes, and these criticisms focus on "women" in the context of sports feminism. In this context, it is aimed to determine the self-perceptions of the students of the faculty of sports sciences about the leadership behaviors of the female students who are directed to these fields by passing through a demographic analysis filter, to determine the leadership theories, the position of women in management and organizations in the context of sports feminism, and to trace the gender-based structure. In line with this purpose, it is a study in which undergraduate students of the faculty of sports sciences can evaluate their own self-leadership behaviors. This study was applied to 118 people studying in sports sciences. With the Self-Perceptions of Undergraduate Students' Leadership Behaviors Scale, which consists of four dimensions and twenty items, and the demographic form, the students evaluated their own leadership capacities.

Keywords: Sports Feminism, Management and Organization, Leadership in Sports, Self-Perception.

INTRODUCTION

When we examine sports management and organization books, almost leadership studies are related to men in sports. When you examine sports history and sports sociology books, most of the articles are about the standards of male athletes. Turn on the television to watch sports programs. You can be %90 sure that you see male players rather than female athletes, and it would not surprise us that the commentators participating in the sports game program are male. Suppose we are sitting in a cafe, and when we listen to bands talking about sports there, it is inevitably conducted by men talking about male sports races and games. So what is the actual situation today? Despite the increasing number of women participating in sports and the significant intervention by feminist circles in sports theory, Today, as in the past, much more attention is given to the role of sports in men's lives rather than the position of women in sports and its importance for women. Sports Feminism to the history and sociology of women's sports. It is an effort to introduce female intervention in a political sport. Before the importance of women's leadership qualities in management and organizations, it is necessary to mention the importance of women's sports. Women's sports have witnessed powerful changes in behavioral patterns of the twentieth century. Changes in human consumption and leisure-time relations that make the "body" at the forefront in western culture an excellent subject for broad and social analysis of women's sports, and twentieth-century women as well as nineteenth-century women rely on the relationship between "sport, body, and identity".

Sports today, increasingly involved in the social construction of femininity, but the meanings ascribed to them according to the circumstances of the people, individual biographies and cultures, vary greatly, as do their geography. Most people only know exceptional sportswomen and leaders, but world record-breaking athletes have been identified as "unfeminine" or treated as if it were surprising. Little is known about the various types of women involved in sports and the value they bring to them.

This article looks at sports in the lives of women from working-class and middle-class backgrounds today and examines their role in management and organization: It deals with women of different ethnicities, sports professionals, leaders and coaches, as well as those who participate in all levels of competition and those who participate in other ways and for different reasons. In discussions of women's sports management and organization, there is a strong tendency to focus on reductionist categories (male vs. woman; masculinity vs. femininity, nature vs. culture; aggression vs. collaborative) that obscure the multiple realities of women's lives. Women athletes and leaders are concerned with both experiences in sport and the structural forces that affect participation.

It encompasses institutionalized, tightly organized and highly competitive sporting activities as well as freely conducted sporting activities. It is known that the need for management and organization arises when people establish relationships and work in communities. People's coexistence and working in groups dates back to ancient times. From the Egyptian, Chinese, Greek and Roman periods to the present, the need for management has been met in trade, construction, agriculture, economy, etc. manifested in many places. Although the recognition of management and organization as an activity dates back to ancient times, its emergence and progress as a science occurred in the eighteenth century. Management functions have been called 'the oldest of the arts, the newest of the sciences'. The simplest definition of management, which has many different definitions, is "labor activity through others". Despite the different definitions, all definitions have a few common points. In general terms; It is the most efficient and measured use of human, time, space, material and physical elements in order to achieve organizational goals (Aydm, 2008, Ilkim et al 2021, Ilkim et al 2021). Leadership is required for efficient management. Leadership; It is the process of interpersonal interaction directed to achieve the initially determined goals in an environment where communication takes place. To make a general definition of a leader, the leader; mobilizing a group towards its goals, lead by, leading, All the movement of this person are called leadership. There is also a distinction between management and leadership. Management and leadership are not alternatives to each other, they are complementary. Management mainly focuses on development. On the other hand, the past, present and future process of leadership focuses on change (Saruhan ve Yıldız, 2009: 232, Unver 2022). Research shows that; qualities that a leader should have, authenticity, centeredness, gameness, creativity and ability to manage, economy development, resilience, being innovative, have an impression, communication skill, organizational commitment, risk taking, collaborative ability and impressiveness (Çetin and Beceren, 2007: 123-124, Yurtseven and Duman 2021). In some studies, leaders; steady, feel confident, creator, strong sense of perception, honest, consistent, decided, motivating other people, It consists of people who can solve complex problems, are patient, cooperative, forward-looking and have high communication skills (Wagen, 2007: 219). In a study conducted in the USA, the need for success, intelligence, stability, self-confidence, use of superiority and managerial capacity are important for effective leadership. In another study, a suitable leader; Honest and realistic, has a sense of humor, cares about the health of employees, thinks positively, appreciates achievements and embraces that elements are more important than rules. There are basic features that distinguish leaders from non-leaders, these are; being motivated, having the desire to succeed, being passionate and determined, being sociable, honest and truthful, self-confident, having emotional balance and cognitive ability, and being knowledgeable about business (Yılmaz, 2011: 17-21). As it is seen, the definitions of leadership do not include gender, it is a concept that is specific to both genders and contains basic features.

SPORTS FEMINISM: CAPITALIST AND GENDER

RELATIONS Radical and Marxist Sports Feminist Theory

The "masculine and feminine" discourses in the recent sports feminism literature, brought together gender relations and capitalist relations. It has features in common with the general debates between radical sports feminists and Marxist sports feminists. This common feature is the question of whether patriarchy or capitalism is the primary reason why women are oppressed in sports management organizations and sports fields.

According to radical sports feminism, if it is the patriarchal ideology that produces the cultural, social, economic and political control methods, it is argued that the transformation of capitalism will do nothing to change such power structures. Recent discussion in feminist sports resources has also taken into account the connection between gender relations and capitalist relations. Sport has common features with the general debate between radical sports feminists and Marxist sports feminists. The focal point is whether patriarchy or capitalism is the most important reason why women are marginalized in sports. When we talk about radical sports feminism, if it is patriarchal ideology that increases historical, social, economic and political control systems, it is argued that the transformation of capitalism will not fight to change such power structures.

Marxist sports feminism fights against innate notions of human nature, claiming that class is the root cause of women's marginalization and that any sexual issue is secondary. Radical sports feminists, on the other hand, argue that male-dominated power and female subordination are universal, since sexism in sports has its roots not in capitalism but in previous realities of human biology; Marxist sports feminists argue that the character and scope of women's oppression has historically changed in diverse societies, and that a social division of labor between men and women camouflages the particular forms of exploitation of women in capitalist societies, and the class distinction between women, especially in sports. For them, sexism in sport is perceived as a component of bourgeois ideology that supports the gendered division of labor necessary for the stability of

capitalism. Traditional Marxists do not believe that equality between the sexes in sport can ever be achieved under capitalism. Politicized Women's Sports

Socialism and feminism are associated with liberation. Class domination and sexual domination constitute the two basic structural units of oppression in human history, and socialist feminists seek to abolish both and seek a theory that does not subordinate one to the other. Michele and Barren (1982: 41) Modern Women's Liberation Movement, He dismissed the possibility that it naturally caused our oppression, given only gender differences or economic factors. Shared consciousness, ideology, imagery and symbolism are important to our wars. Definitions of femininity and masculinity are based on the social value of family life and the division of labor based on gender. Feminism has politicized its culture to a unique degree in the anthropological sense of the lived practices of a society in everyday life. Feminism also includes film, art, theatre, etc., known as culture. It politicized various forms of artistic and creative expression that reevaluated and transformed. Concern about the meanings of this sentence is specific to cultural politics, but is almost completely absent from feminist sports theories. For example, very little is known about specific sport structures, or their destruction, such as male hegemony in sport or the ways in which meanings in sport are produced, reproduced, resisted and changed. Sports and sportswomen as a whole did not become prone feminists, and in sport, feminist intervention in sport lagged behind feminist attempts to "politicize" other areas of culture. But today that is changing and sport is becoming part of a larger movement for women's autonomy. The most revolutionary feminism arises from personal experience, and the most radical challenges for women's sports are applied ones. Women are now taking action and reinterpreting sport, offering an optimistic vision of the potential for women to transcend practical and symbolic forms of domination in sport, which supports the view that sport for them is constitutive, creative processes. It should not be forgotten that this is a women's struggle. Progress is not inevitable and in mergers, opposition and failure. Sport is the space of freedom and restriction for women: women gain new opportunities and create meaning in sport, reproduce prejudices and oppression. For women in sport, freedom is appearance, and restraint looks to the past. The history of women's sports can provide an understanding of the origins and causes of women's subordination in sport, and the nature of resistance to variation and the struggle for change. A historical perspective is necessary to understand how the forms of sport produced for women coexist with the dominant and emerging ones. By looking at women's experiences historically, we can better understand men's experiences and the entire history of sports.

Traditionally, Sports Leadership and Female Leadership Approaches

The mainstream literature has produced two competing models of leadership based on studies of men and women. However, they are presented as racially neutral and are assumed to be generalized to all humans (Parker & Ogilvie, 1996). This article presents a review and critique of dominant leadership visions based on these models and develops an inclusive critical approach. Critical communication and feminist perspectives, Feminist framework for race, gender and leadership studies; It distinguishes leadership from the view of leadership as "good management" that pervades the mainstream literature (Rost, 1991). However, it shifts its importance away from structural-functionalist views to addressing founding leadership processes (for example, how leaders and followers have leadership) that occur in racial and gender organizational contexts. A leadership model that strengthens an industrial paradigm in traditional literature is based on the concept of masculine instrumentality. Another concept created as a feminist response to the structural functionalism of traditional literature is based on the concept of feminine cooperation. The racial-neutral theory underlying each of these models influenced those included in studies on leadership (for example, women of color were systematically excluded in sports arenas) and the types of questions asked about leadership behaviors (for example, cultural assumptions about feminine and masculine leadership were rarely questioned). In addition, traditional and specific feminist approaches suggest specific ways of envisioning leadership communication that are less likely to meet the challenges of 21st century organizations. The traditional approach conveys a two-pronged problem arising from structural-functionalist views of industrial leadership. The problems are to conceptualize leadership as (a) good management (Rost, 1991) and (b) ultimately traditionally masculine leadership experiences (Barge, 1994; Fine & Buzzanell, 2001; Marshall, 1993; Rost, 1991; Trethewey, 2000). Feminist approaches criticize the structural functionalism of the traditional paradigm for including women. Also, the more prominent cite women's groups, excluding potentially valuable sources of leadership knowledge, such as the experiences of African American women, as heretical. Yet, as shown later, feminist perspectives when combined in productive ways provide a way to plan for race, gender, and leadership in 21st century management and organizations.

VISIONS OF SELF-LEADING COMMUNICATION IN SPORTS IN THE INDUSTRIAL PARADIGM: RACIAL APPROACHES

There is a triple problem of both traditional literature and sports feminist approaches that constrain the vision of self-leadership in sport and implicitly exclude important self-leadership knowledge literature. The traditional self-leadership literature is at the core of these issues, with (a) its focus on management (as opposed to leadership), (b) the development of ideas that leadership is good management and organization, and finally its reliance on traditionally described male values. Paradoxically, both approaches to sports feminism offer hope for further development in some aspects and overall frameworks of these issues. For

example, feminist approaches criticize the talk about masculine values that reinforce the notions of feminine and masculine self-leadership and duality. In addition, feminist critiques of structural-functionalism surrounding traditional literature offer hope for rescheduling leadership in the post-industrial era. For this reason, an inclusive feminist framework is presented, fusing aspects of social text, performance and dialectics, perspectives of gender, discourse and organization. Within this framework, she conveys a mix of radical, socialist, and post-structuralist feminist perspectives that have been instrumental in destabilizing the normative claims of the feminine achievement leadership model and in a more sophisticated revision of gender and organizational leadership.

Self-Leadership Perception as "Good Management"

Rost (1991: 94-180) in his comprehensive critique of Self-Leadership; He emphasizes that "leadership as good management" is the paradigm of the 20th century and states that "this understanding of leadership makes perfect sense in an industrial economy". It is a leadership vision embedded in the structural functionalism of Western culture that is "rational, management-oriented, male, technocratic, quantitative, goal-oriented, cost-benefit-oriented, personal, hierarchical, short-term, pragmatic, and materialistic." What this view emphasizes is the collaborative nature of self-leadership theory and research over the past century, which claims to alternate between styles and contingency approaches, crucially: "Leaders' leadership to achieve group/organizational goals that reflect excellence, defined as a kind of high-level activity. It can be summarized as "men and women who have preferred features in limited areas that influence followers to create what they want". Rost states that, like ideas and other aspects of humanism, it "transforms into a therapeutic, expressive individualism, helping to culture women in sports management into something that is fundamentally a male leadership model." The view of leadership as a good sports management and organization reveals two problematic issues that have implications for leadership in the complex and ambiguous context of the 21st century. First, this view emphasizes the superiority of the management profession rather than developing a progressive understanding of leadership as distinct from management. Management processes can be distinguished from leadership because the former implies maintaining order through the coordinated action of people in organizationally established authority links, while the latter implies intention to change through mutually considered influence relationships (Jacobs, 1970; Katz & Kahn, 1966/1978). ; Rost, 1991). Focusing on leadership, unlike management, is critical in the post-industrial era of rapid change and globalization, where identities and connections are not fixed but must be negotiated (Fairclough, 1992). Scholars using concept-centered approaches tend to focus on leadership rather than management and organization and thus provide a serious framework for studying post-industrial organizational leadership. The second problem with the idea of leadership as good management encourages an individual, goal-oriented approach to leadership work. Such thinking distracts attention from the understanding of leadership as a contemplated and emerging process. Fairhurst's (2001a) critique of traditional leadership literature has important implications for Rost's (1991) study of excessive individual focus and leadership communication. Fairhurst identified the individual-system dilemma as a formal place among the various dichotomies in leadership communication research, emphasizing the paradoxical nature of leadership theory, research, and practice. He noted, as Rost did, that historically dominant views of self-leadership were influenced by a spiritual worldview in which "the individual is a figure in the figure-ground arrangement and communication is incidental or at best intervening (Fairhurst, 2001b: 383). Linked secondary dichotomies exist in the form of transfer versus concept-centered communication and cognitive output versus speaking practices. The focus on message delivery and cognitive outcomes (e.g., individual focus on leadership traits, cognitions, actions, and one-sided meaning-making) has dominated the leader (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985) leadership literature (Fairhurst, 2001c) and contributes to the romanticization of the perceived role.

Normalizing the Feminine-Male Duality: Self-Leadership Communication as Traditionally Masculine

Focusing on leadership as good management and organization ultimately makes masculine leadership communication paradigms powerful, as management processes are defined in traditionally masculine terms such as authority, structure, and instrumentality. As conceptualized in the leadership literature, the masculine paradigm; It emphasizes a hierarchical approach in which leaders initiate a structure while displaying autonomy, power, self-efficacy, and control (Bern, 1974; Eagly, 1987; Loden, 1985). Accordingly, this paradigm is representative of "male values" and is most associated with traditional understandings of men's socialized forms of communication (Tannen, 1990; Wood, 1998). From this point of view, men use instrumental communication that is more one-sided, manipulatory, and aimed at controlling others. This is consistent with their learned ideas of seeing negotiation as a way of asserting themselves and gaining position (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Distance is common communication views related to male values (Marshall, 1993). Common symbolic representations of the masculine leadership paradigm include characteristics such as aggression, independence, risk taking, rationality, and intelligence (Collins, 1998; Connell, 1995). A traditionally masculine model of leadership communication dominates the mainstream leadership literature. Rost has obtained one of the most comprehensive critiques of this literature and observes, among other things, that this literature reinforces a paradigm of male life. Fine and Buzzanell (2000a), major on service-focused leadership, including adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz and Laurie, 1997; transformational leadership (Burns, 1978), self, and Super Leadership (Sims and Manz, 1996). investigated current approaches. They concluded that these approaches are essentially

"manstory" (Gergen, 1990; Marshall, 1989) that often involve solitary searches for fulfillment and use. "Serving others as a means of developing followers who can assist in achieving managerial-organizational or societal goals". Even so-called "alternative" approaches such as servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977) and some "feminine perspectives" are either primarily male-centered or indirectly reinforce traditional understandings of men's socialized communication patterns and worldview (Fine & Buzzanell 2001a:143). For example, Fine and Buzzanell describe servant leadership as an alternative to traditional approaches, while Greenleaf "universifies the seeker's experience, sustains organizational structures, and how gender relations can make servant leadership a very different process for men and women" (Fine & Buzzanell 2001b:143). states that he never questioned it. Moreover, some feminist perspectives indirectly reinforce a traditionally masculine appearance and are favored by masculine purposes, some would argue. A feminist critique of structural-functionalism's industrial paradigm suggests an alternative vision of leadership communication that seeks to view "feminine" leadership as having a relation rather than an instrumental orientation (Helgesen, 1990; Lunneborg, 1990; Rosener, 1990). However, some scholars have convincingly argued that modern organizations standardize feminization while taking a gender-neutral stance (Fondas, 1997; May, 1997). Despite the view that feminist leadership approaches implicitly adopt a masculine view as the final measure of effectiveness, the arguments for evaluating feminine leadership as an alternative to masculine leadership clearly reinforce the feminine-masculine dichotomy. That is, feminine leadership is portrayed as the opposite of masculine leadership. Thus, these approaches reject the types and possibilities of feminine-masculine dichotomy (for example, both/and approaches) between the experiences of women (or men) that shape self-leadership knowledge. While it is not based on the implicit image of the big man, as in the industrial paradigm, the dominant vision of feminine self-leadership is implicitly based on an ideal white woman.

VISIONS OF WOMEN IN SELF-LEADING

Feminist bakış açıları, sosyal düzenlemelerde erkek egemenliğinin kalıcılığını yargılar ve var olan durumu olduğu gibi sürdürür ve savunur (Calas & Smirich, 1996a). However, despite the shared focus on change and criticism, there is a range of feminist approaches, liberal, radical, psychoanalytic, Marxist, socialist, poststructuralist, and postmodern and postcolonial. These feminist approaches vary in their ontology, epistemological position, and stage of political criticism, and thus differ in the type of influence on leadership theory. Feminist visions of variation range from 'reforming' organizations to transforming our previous understandings of what constitutes and organizations that 'transform' society, Calas & Smirich, 1996b: 219).

Overview of Feminist Approaches

Feminist approaches to leadership approaches began to appear in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It is part of the voluminous literature on "women in management" that began to accumulate at a time when the number of White middle-class women in government was growing. These approaches differ from the liberal feminist views of the 1960s and 1970s. Essentialist views of leadership in management as feminine and masculine, advocating emulating women to the more recent radical, psychoanalytic and socialist views, deconstructive poststructuralist and postmodern feminisms that imitate the masculine language of management, developing alternatively feminist approaches to leadership (albeit from a variety of epistemological stances). When the universalization of the "feminine" is combined in productive ways, as discussed later, feminist perspectives offer hope to inform a more comprehensive and sufficiently complex framework for planning leadership in 21st century management and organizations. Moreover, it is argued that the wise vision of feminist leadership is one that reinforces symbolic images of white, middle-class American women and actually suppresses women of various ethnicities, races, and class positions. The so-called "women's achievement" approach to leadership that has emerged from radical and psychoanalytic feminisms argues that a "distinctly feminine" leadership style makes women better leaders than men (Helgesen, 1990a; Lunneborg, 1990a; Rosener, 1990). According to this view, feminine leadership is a result of the gender role socialization of girls and women, which produces passive, nurturing, relationship-oriented leaders. According to this view, socialized leadership of men and aggressive, rational, strong, independent leaders are in stark contrast (Helgesen, 1990b; Loden, 1985b; Rosener, 1990b). However, the main argument is that the feminine style based on feminine values is more appropriate than the male hierarchical approach for leading modern complex contexts such as relating, interdependence, and other-orientedness, but is dominated by the existing, male-dominated structure that values hierarchy, independence, and self-efficacy processes. drowns (Grossman & Chester, 1990; Helgesen, 1990c; Lunneborg, 1990b). As distinct from a masculine approach, the feminine view of leadership contributes to its embodiment in popular consciousness in popular literature on leadership (books and articles by management consultants and organizational development experts) as well as in organizational research. Helgesen's (1990d), 'The Feminine Advantage', is an example. In it, she defined what she called the "feminine principles of management" to show caring, making intuitive decisions, and viewing leadership from a non-hierarchical perspective. Helgesen argued that although male-dominated organizations are almost always hierarchical, women tend to think of organization in terms of art. It is a network of relationships where leadership is not at the top of a pyramid but at the center of the network. The female supremacy argument provides an important critique of patriarchal discourses that exclude women's experiences. Moreover, it is problematic because it is presented as a racially neutral, universal representation of all women based on the socialized experiences of middle-class white women (Parker & olgieve, 1996). Most importantly, it fails to recognize that the notions of the feminine and

masculine are social, cultural and historical products, constructed according to the racial and sexual ideologies that compel women, and the embodied identities of men (Trethewey, 2000). Given that socially constructed landscapes of women have historically been used in the systematic domination of Black women (Morton, 1991), Developing a feminine leadership paradigm regarding the gender identity of white women essentially excludes Black women's experiences of constructing gender identity and thus excludes Black women's voices in theorizing about leadership. Thus, in an attempt to raise the voice of women in management and organizational leadership, the feminine advantage model contributes to silencing marginalized groups, including but not limited to Black women. The feminine superiority paradigm does not criticize the controlling images of the woman as the helper and the man as the assertive status seeker. Instead, in many ways, it tries to reify patriarchal authority and perpetuate its distortions of men and women as 'feminine' or 'masculine', and men as masculine leaders (aggressive, rational, strong, independent leaders) and women as passive, nurturing centered around the notion that they are divided into two as relationship-oriented leaders. (Helgesen, 1990e; Loden, 1985c; Rosener, 1990c).

METHOD

In this study, quantitative research method was used. The aim of the study is that undergraduate students studying in the field of sports sciences can evaluate their own leadership self-perceptions. In this context, it is aimed to determine the self-perceptions of the leadership behaviors of female students who are directed to these fields by passing through the analysis filter of sports management students, to determine their leadership theories, to determine the position of women in management and organizations in the context of sports feminism, and to trace the gender-based structure.

Research Group

The study group of the research consisted of 118 people studying at the sports sciences faculty of Ondokuz Mayıs University in the 2021-2022 academic year. The study group was selected from among the students enrolled in the school by convenience sampling method. Of the participating students, 39% were women (46 people), and 61% were men (72 people). 34.7% of the participants are between the ages of 16-20 (41 people), 61% are between the ages of 21-25 (72 people), 4% (5 people) are 29 years old and over. 11% of the participants (13 people) are studying in the department of coaching education, 52.5% (62 people) in the department of recreation, and 36.4% (43 people) in the department of sports management. 89.8% (106 people) of the participants do sports, 66.1% (73 people) do sports at least 1-3 days a week, and 81.4% (96 people) have been doing sports for more than 4 years and 61.1% (78 people) did not have a history of doing sports in their family. 62.7% (74 people) of the participants do not smoke and 75.4% (89 people) do not drink alcohol.

Data Collection Tools and Implementation Process

In line with the purpose of the study, first of all, literature review on the concept of leadership and feminism was conducted. In the second stage, the "Self-perceptions of undergraduate students' leadership behaviors: A scale development study", which was developed by researchers from a randomly selected group of 118 students studying at the faculty of sports sciences, and the "demographic form" organized in Google form, and by Özbek and Kızılyallı (2017). The evaluation options and scores of the items in the scale form are five-point Likert scale type, "I strongly disagree (1)", "I agree little (2)", "I agree moderately (3)", "I agree a lot (4)", "I fully agree (5)". The scale has 4 sub-dimensions: Participatory leader, Confident Leader, Principled Leader and Determined Leader. The "demographic form and the self-perception scale of the leadership behaviors of undergraduate students" transferred to the Google form format from randomly selected students for the research were quickly sent and shared on social networking platforms.

Analysis of Data

Percentage/frequency values, one of the descriptive statistical methods, were calculated in the analysis of the data obtained with the "demographic form" used to determine the demographic characteristics of sports science students. In the study, it was evaluated with descriptive statistical analysis whether the total scores of the scale, including the students, differ in terms of research group, gender, age, doing sports, years of doing sports, sports history in the family and faculty departments. The total scores obtained from the scale sub-dimensions were analyzed with the independent sample t test. Research findings were expressed as n (%), mean and standard deviation, median and minimum-maximum values, and the findings were considered significant at the $P < 0.05$ significance level. All statistical calculations were made in SPSS 22.0 V. statistical package program.

Findings

In this section, there are findings regarding the distribution levels of undergraduate students based on "demographic form and undergraduate students' self-perceptions about leadership behaviors: Scale development study".

Table 1 shows the distribution of the Ondokuz Mayıs University Yaşar Doğu sports sciences faculty students in terms of research group, gender, age, doing sports, frequency of doing sports, sports history in the family and faculty departments. In the study, 100% of the students of the faculty of sports sciences were included in the research group, 39% were female, 61% were male and 89,8% were doing sports, 45,8% were recreational, 41,5% were coaching and It was determined that 11 of them were educated in the department of physical education and teaching (Table 1).

Table 1. Frequency and percentage distributions regarding the demographic characteristics of the participants

Research Group	n	%	How many years have you been doing sports?	n	%
Participants	118	100	1-3 year	12	10,2
			4-6 year	106	89,8
Total	118	100,0	Total	118	100,0
Gender	n	%	Sports History in Your Family	n	%
Woman	46	39,0	Yes	40	33,9
Male	72	61,0	No	78	66,1
Total	118	100,0	Total	118	100,0
Age	n	%	In Which Section Are You Studying?	n	%
16-20	41	34,7	Recreation Department	54	45,8
21-25	77	61,0	Coaching Department	50	41,5
			Department of Sports Management	14	11,9
Total	118	100,0	Total	118	100,0
Doing Sports Status	n	%			
Yes	106	89,8			
No	12	10,2			
Total	118	100,0			

The Differences of Undergraduate Students' Self-Perceptions of Leadership Behaviors According to their Demographic Characteristics

The distribution of the scale total scores of the Faculty of Sports Sciences students participating in the research in terms of research group, gender, age, doing sports, year of doing sports, sports history in the family and faculty departments are given.

Leadership Self-Perception Scale Sub-dimensions of undergraduate students' self-perceptions regarding leadership behaviors are shown according to the gender variable. There was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of participatory leader, self-confident leader and principled leader according to the gender variable ($p > 0.05$). However, there was a significant difference between gender variables in the sub-dimension of the determined leader ($p < 0.05$). It is seen that the said difference is in favor of women (20.9 ± 3.31) (Table 2).

Table 2. Leadership Self-Perception Scale Distribution of undergraduate students self-perceptions of leadership behaviors sub-dimensions according to gender variable

Sub-Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean±Std	f	T	df	p
Participatory Leader	Woman	46	25,0 ± 4,13	0,783	1,687	116	0,094
	Male	72	23,6 ± 4,44				
Self-Confident Leader	Woman	46	15,0 ± 2,92	2,127	1,872	116	0,064
	Male	72	13,9 ± 3,47				
Principled Leader	Woman	46	26,3 ± 3,70	0,282	1,746	116	0,083

	Male	72	25,0 ± 4,12				
Determined Leader	Woman	46	20,9 ± 3,31	4,348	2,169	110,9	0,032
	Male	72	19,4 ± 4,21				

Leadership Self-Perception Scale The data of the sub-dimensions of the undergraduate students self-perceptions regarding leadership behaviors are shown according to the age variable. There was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of participatory leader, self-confident leader, principled leader and determined leader according to the age variable ($p > 0.05$) (Table 3).

Table 3. Leadership Self-Perception Scale Distribution of undergraduate students' self-perceptions of leadership behaviors sub-dimensions according to age variable

Sub-Dimensions	Age	N	Mean±Std	f	t	df	p
Participatory leader	16-20	41	23,9 ± 4,37	0,021	-,502	116	0,617
	21-25	77	24,3 ± 4,37				
Self-Confident Leader	16-20	41	13,8 ± 2,71	2,886	-1,387	116	0,168
	21-25	77	14,6 ± 3,56				
Principled Leader	16-20	41	25,5 ± 3,73	0,196	-,064	116	0,949
	21-25	77	25,6 ± 4,16				
Determined Leader	16-20	41	19,9 ± 3,86	0,291	-,178	116	0,859
	21-25	77	20,0 ± 4,00				

Leadership Self-Perception Scale The data of the sub-dimensions of undergraduate students self-perceptions regarding leadership behaviors are shown according to the variable of doing sports. There was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of participant leader and self-confident leader according to the variable of doing sports ($p > 0.05$). However, there is a significant difference between the variables of doing sports in the principled leader and determined leader sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$). It is seen that the said difference is significant in leadership (25.8 ± 3.95), (20.2 ± 3.89) in the state of doing sports (Table 4).

Table 4. Leadership Self-Perception Scale Distribution of undergraduate students' self-perceptions of leadership behaviors sub-dimensions according to the variable of doing sports

Sub-Dimensions	Doing Sports Status	N	Mean±Std	f	T	df	p
Participatory leader	Yes	106	24,4 ± 4,35	0,045	1,86	116	0,064
	No	12	22,0 ± 3,86				
Self-Confident Leader	Yes	106	14,5 ± 3,28	0,084	1,53	116	0,127
	No	12	13,0 ± 3,33				
Principled Leader	Yes	106	25,8 ± 3,95	0,092	2,15	13,8	0,049
	No	12	23,3 ± 3,82				
Determined Leader	Yes	106	20,2 ± 3,89	0,193	2,76	14,3	0,015
	No	12	17,3 ± 3,47				

Leadership Self-Perception Scale One-Way ANOVA Test data is shown according to the sub-dimensions of the self-perception scale of undergraduate students' leadership behaviors according to the variable of duration of doing sports (years). There was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the scale according to the duration of doing sports (year) ($p > 0.05$) (Table 5).

Table 5. Leadership Self-Perception Scale The distribution of undergraduate students' self-perceptions of leadership behaviors sub-dimensions according to the variable of duration of doing sports

Sub-Dimensions	How many years have you been doing sports?	N	Mean±Std	f	df	p
Participatory leader	3 year	12	24,6 ± 3,93	0,150	1	0,699
	4 year	106	24,1 ± 4,41		116	
Self-Confident Leader	3 year	12	14,2 ± 3,59	0,021	1	0,885
	4 year	106	14,4 ± 3,29		116	

Principled Leader	3 year	12	27,1 ± 2,58	2,083	1	0,152
	4 year	106	25,4 ± 4,10		116	
Determined Leader	3 year	12	20,0 ± 3,79	0,000	1	0,994
	4 year	106	19,9 ± 3,97		116	

Leadership Self-Perception Scale the data of the sub-dimensions of undergraduate students' self-perceptions regarding leadership behaviors are shown according to the variable of family history of doing sports. There was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of participatory leader, self-confident leader, principled leader, and determined leader according to the history of doing sports in the family ($p > 0.05$) (Table 6).

Table 6. Leadership Self-Perception Scale Distribution of undergraduate students' self-perceptions of leadership behaviors sub-dimensions according to the variable of family history of doing sports

Sub-Dimensions	Sports History in Your Family	N	Mean±Std	f	T	df	p
Participatory leader	Yes	78	24,6 ± 4,26	0,555	1,624	116	0,107
	No	40	23,3 ± 4,45				
Self-Confident Leader	Yes	78	14,2 ± 3,31	0,000	-,807	116	0,421
	No	40	14,7 ± 3,30				
Principled Leader	Yes	78	25,7 ± 3,47	7,967	,617	116	0,539
	No	40	25,2 ± 4,90				
Determined Leader	Yes	78	19,8 ± 3,92	0,005	-,558	116	0,578
	No	40	20,2 ± 4,00				

Leadership Self-Perception Scale the data of the sub-dimensions of the undergraduate students' self-perceptions regarding leadership behaviors are shown according to the faculty departments variable. There was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of participatory leader, self-confident leader and principled leader according to the faculty departments variable ($p > 0.05$). However, there is a significant difference between the faculty-departmental variables in the stable leader sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$) (Table 7).

Table 7. Leadership Self-Perception Scale Distribution of undergraduate students' self-perceptions of leadership behaviors sub-dimensions according to faculty departments variable

Sub-Dimensions	In Which Section Are You Studying?	N	Mean±Std	f	df	p
Participatory leader	Recreation Department	54	24,7 ± 4,50	1,460	2	0,237
	Department of Sports Management.	14	22,5 ± 4,66		115	
	Coaching Department	50	24,0 ± 4,06			
Self-Confident Leader	Recreation Department	54	14,1 ± 3,40	0,921	2	0,401
	Department of Sports Management.	14	13,7 ± 3,29		115	
	Coaching Department	50	14,8 ± 3,20			
Principled Leader	Recreation Department	54	25,8 ± 4,21	2,218	2	0,113
	Department of Sports Management.	14	23,5 ± 4,10		115	
	Coaching Department	50	25,8 ± 3,62			
Determined Leader	Recreation Department	54	20,3 ± 3,96	3,933	2	0,022
	Department of Sports Management.	14	17,2 ± 3,95		115	
	Coaching Department	50	20,3 ± 3,67			

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ARGUMENT

It can be said that 39,0% of undergraduate female students participating in the research are examined and when their gender distribution is examined, it can be said that the self-leadership "decisive leader" perceptions of female students are more significant than males. Considering from this point of view that the undergraduate students are between 61.0% and 21-25%, it is thought that they have a "decisive leader" level based on their experiences, since the female self-leader perception levels participating in the research are in this age range ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, it can be said that according to the "decisive leader" dimension of leadership self-perceptions of women studying in sports sciences; It can be seen that they are extroverted, have high persuasion abilities, are goal-oriented in acting decisively, encourage their friends to be innovative and creative, and work result-oriented.

89.8% of the students who make up the research group do sports. 89.8% of them do sports for 4-6 years. There was no significant difference between the scores obtained from the sub-dimensions of the scale according to the status of doing sports of undergraduate students, according to the variable of doing sports in the sub-dimensions of "Participatory leader, Self-confident leader". However, there is a significant difference between the variables of doing sports in the principled leader and determined leader sub-dimension ($p < 0.05$). It has been observed that there is a significant difference in favor of those who do sports in leadership. It can be said that women who do sports have the dimensions of "Principled leader and determined leader", who go to the end for what they believe in, keep their promises, appreciate the work done, are frank, like to help their friends and close circle, and give importance to moral values.

When the studies specific to the research field are examined, it has been determined that doing sports regularly or participating in physical activities is related to concepts such as personality structure of individuals, self-confidence and developing positive attitudes. (Er et al., 1999; Slutzky, Simpkins, 2009, Demirel, 2013, Bisgin & Üstün, 2013). It is thought that doing sports and female self-leadership perceptions will help undergraduate candidates to be more self-confident in their education and to express themselves easily. Güner (2015) states in his study, Evaluation of the problems of participation in sports and leisure time activities of women, that the factors that determine the orientation of women to sports and leisure activities are perceived social support. He emphasized that the decrease in perceived social support negatively affects their willingness to participate in sports and leisure activities. One of the important issues in leadership evaluations is women's participation in sports with their own selves. It is thought that women prefer to do sports in order to strengthen their leisure time activities regarding self-leadership perceptions and their leadership skills in the field of sports.

Uslu and Hasırcı (1999), in the framework of their research on students studying in secondary education in Bursa, concluded that students who do sports are more compatible than students who do not. Şenduran (2006), in her study, examined the general adjustment status of students who are athletes and non-athletes, and it is stated that sports students show personality traits that are more compatible with themselves and their social environment than non-athletes. In addition, in a study conducted, it was determined that 3 out of 5 people in the problematic category in the experimental group and 26 out of 49 people in critical condition fell into the normal category thanks to their participation in sportive activities, and it was found that the perceptions of social cohesion increased and improved in those who participated in a sportive activity(Çankaya and Tozlu; 2021). In Aytan's (2013) research titled "Examination of Women's Interest in Sports", it was understood from the answers given to the survey questions that women who do not do sports have more difficulty in achieving social cohesion than those who do sports. It has been determined that those who do sports can make more positive decisions in the face of various events and have more happiness in their social lives. Women who lead in sports, on the other hand, can serve as models for their individual abilities as leaders and decision makers over other women, especially in societies where traditional male authority dominates. The intense interest of women in sports can make a decisive contribution to social life and personality development (United Nations, 2007). As a result of another study; Asci et al. (1993), in their study on high school students who do and do not do sports, found that participation in sports has a serious effect on self-concept. Therefore, it can be said that sports activities have an effect on the perception of self-leadership. Leadership Self-Perception Scale the data of the sub-dimensions of undergraduate students' self-perceptions regarding leadership behaviors are shown according to the variable of family history of doing sports. There was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of participatory leader, self-confident leader, principled leader, determined leader according to the history of doing sports in the family. There are different situations in field studies. In the study carried out on the youth camp female leader candidates; It was determined that there was a significant difference in favor of female leader candidates whose fathers had a secondary education level. However, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the scores obtained from the self-confidence scale according to the professional indecision of the female youth camp leader candidates, their frequency of doing sports and the factor in their orientation to sports (Esentaş, M. and Ark., 2017).

Leadership Self-Perceptions Scale Undergraduate students' self-perceptions of leadership behavior sub-dimensions according

to the faculty departments variable, whereas there was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of participatory leader, self-confident leader and principled leader compared to the faculty departments variable ($p>0.05$). However, there is a significant difference between the variables of faculty departments in the sub-dimension of determined leader ($p<0.05$). Therefore, according to the "decisive leader" dimension of leadership self-perceptions of women studying in sports sciences; It can be said that they are extroverted, have high persuasion abilities, are goal-oriented in acting decisively, encourage their friends to be innovative and creative, and work result-oriented.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is a study aimed at evaluating the self-perceptions of the undergraduate students of the Faculty of Sports Sciences of Ondokuz Mayıs University regarding their leadership (participatory, self-confident, principled, determined) behaviors. It is of great importance for sports science students to question and evaluate their self-leadership behaviors during their undergraduate education, to be aware of their own talents and abilities as well as to be aware of their shortcomings, and to gain an objective and holistic perspective. Moreover, within the scope of this research, in which students can evaluate and question their own self-leadership behaviors, for universities aiming to train future female leaders, besides knowledge and skills training, it may be beneficial to prepare course content that will be beneficial for female students to develop their leadership aspects, and to create activities and environments where they can demonstrate leadership behaviors.

REFERENCES

1. Adair J. (2005). *Kışkırtıcı Liderlik*. P. Ozaner (çev). İstanbul: Alteo Yayıncılık.
2. Aydın, A. H. (2001). *Yönetim Fonksiyonları*. S. Güney (ed.). İçinde *Yönetim ve Organizasyon*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
3. Aydın, A. H. (2008). *Yönetim bilimi* (2.Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin, s.21.
4. Basım N. ve Argan M., (2009). *Spor Yönetimi*. Detay Yayınları, Ankara
5. Basım, H. N. ve Şeşen, H. (2009). "Yönetim Fonksiyonları", *Spor Yönetimi*. (Editör: H.N.Basım ve M.Argan) Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.
6. Bern, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
7. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
8. Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1996). From the "Woman's" point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 218-257). London: Sage.
9. Collins, E.H. (1998b). Toward a new vision: Race, class, and gender as categories of analysis and connection. In M. L. Anderson & E.H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (pp. 213-223). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
10. Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.
11. Çak, Ş. E. (2010). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Feminizm Teorileri Bağlamında Türkiye'deki Reklam Filmleri ve Popüler Müzik Videoları*. YEDİ Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi Dergisi, 4, 101-110.
12. Çetin G.N ve Beceren Ertan. (2007). "Lider Kişilik: Gandhi", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Yıl. 3. Sa. 5. ss. 110-132.
13. Demir, Z. (1996). *Modern ve Postmodern Feminist Akımlar*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kırıkkale: Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
14. Demren, Ç. (2008). Kadınlik Dolayısıyla Erkeklik Öznelliği. *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 32 (1), 73–92.
15. Doğan, S. (2007), *Vizyona Dayalı Liderlik*, Kare Yayınları, İstanbul.
16. Düzer, A. (2008). *Liderlik*. Yayınlanmamış Araştırma Notu, Ankara
17. Eagly, A. H. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
18. Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. S. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 685-710.
19. Ekenci, G., ve İmamoglu, A. F. (2002). *Spor İşletmeciliği*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
20. Erdemli A. (1996). *İnsan, Spor ve Olimpizm, Spor felsefesi Yazıları*. Sarmal Yayınevi, İstanbul
21. Eren, E. (2003). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon – Çağdaş ve Küresel Yaklaşımlar*. Beta Yayıncılık, İstanbul
22. Eren, E., (2003). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon – Çağdaş ve Küresel Yaklaşımlar*, Beta Yayıncılık, İstanbul
23. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.
24. Fairhurst, G. T. (2001). Dualisms in leadership research. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 379–439). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
25. Fidan, Fatma. Zehra. (2015). "Tesettürlü Kadının Eril Zihniyet Aynasındaki Görüntüsü: Yeniden Oluşan Zihinsel Estetik Kalıplar" içinde *Kadın Bedeni ve İstismarı*, Editörler: Fatma Zehra Fidan & Duygu Alptekin, 1. Baskı, İstanbul: Opsiyon Yayınları.
26. Fine, M., & Buzzanell, E (2000). Walking the high wire: Leadership theorizing, daily acts, and tensions. In R. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 128-156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
27. Fondas, N. (1997). Feminization unveiled: Management qualities in contemporary writings. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 257-282.
28. Genç, N. (2004). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon – Çağdaş Sistemler ve Yaklaşımlar*. Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.
29. Gergen, M. (1990). Baskets of reed and arrows of steel: Stories of chaos and continuity. In S. Srivastva (Ed.), *Symposium: Executive and organizational continuity*. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, Weatherhead School of Management, Department of Organizational Behavior
30. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
31. Grossman, H., & Chester, N. (1990). *The experience and meaning of work in women's lives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
32. Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
33. Heifetz, R. A., & Laurie, D. L. (1997). The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(1), 124-134.
34. Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.
35. Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.

36. Ilkım M., Çelik T., Mergan B.(2021) Investigation of Sports Management Students' Perceptions and Attitudes towards the COVID-19 Pandemic, Pakistan Journal Of Medical & Health Sciences, Volume15 Issue 2 Page799-803,
37. Ilkım M.,Özoğlu F.,Kalaycı M C.,(2021) Evaluation Of Sports Awareness Of Parents Of Individuals With Autism Attending To Sports Clubs, International Journal Of Life Science And Pharma Research, Special Issue,14,page 76-80
38. Jacobs, T. O. (1970). Leadership and exchange in formal organizations. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.
39. Katz, D., &Kahn, R. L. (1966/1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
40. Loden, M. (1985). Feminine leadership or: How to succeed in business without being one of the boys. New Yori: Times Books.
41. Lunneborg, P (1990). Women changing work. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
42. Marshall, J. (1989). Re-envisioning career concepts: A feminist invitation. In M. B. Arthur, D. T Hall, &B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), Handbook of career theory (pp. 275-291). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
43. May, S. K. (1997). Silencing the feminine in managerial discourse. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
44. Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. Ad_ministrative Science Quarterly, 30, 78-102.
45. Morton, P (1991). Disfigured images: The historical assault on Afro-American women. New York: Greenwood Press.
46. Özbek, O., & Kızılyalı, M. (2017). Lisans öğrencilerinin liderlik davranışlarına ilişkin öz algıları: Ölçek geliştirme çalışması. Journal of Human Sciences, 14(4), 4112-4122. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i4.4635
47. Parker, R.S. &Ogilvie, d. t. (1996). Gender, culture, and leadership: Toward a culturally distinct model of African-American women executives' leadership strategies. Lead_ership Quarterly, 7(2), 189-214.
48. Rost, J. C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. Westport, CT: Praeger.
49. Saruhan C.Ş. ve Yıldız L.M. (2009). Çağdaş Yönetim Bilimi. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın Dağıtım.
50. Sims, H. P, Jr., & Manz, C. C. (1996). Company of heroes: Unleashing the power of self-leadership. New York: John Wiley
51. Tabak, A. (2006), Lider ve Takipçileri. Asil Yayıncılık, Ankara.
52. Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York: William Morrow.
53. Trethewey, A. (2000). Revisioning control: A feminist critique of disciplined bodies. In R Buzzanell (Ed.), Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from femi_nist perspectives (pp. 107-127). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
54. Wagen Van Der L. (2007). Human Resource Management For Events. First Edition. USA: Elsevier Ltd.
55. Wood, J. T. (1998). Gendered lives: Communication, gender and culture (2nd ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.
56. Yılmaz H. (2011). Güçlendirici Liderlik. B. 1. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın.
57. Er, G., Çamlıyer, H., Çamlıyer, H., Çobanoğlu G., Er, N. (1999). Çocuk ve Ergenlerde Spor Etkinliklerinin Davranış ve Sosyal Gelişim Üzerine Etkileri, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 3(3), 29-38.
58. Slutzky, C.B. Simpkins, S.A. (2009). The Link Between Children's Sport Participation and Sws Self-Esteem: Exploring The Mediating Role of Sport Self-Concept, Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10: 381-389.
59. Çankaya, S. & Tozlu, B. (2021). Zorunlu Göçmen Grupların Toplumsal ve Spor Aktivitelerinde Sosyal Uyum ve Çok Kültürlülük Algısı: Samsun İli Örneği . Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi , 12 (3) , 264-283
60. Esentaş, M. , Işıkgöz, E. , Karacan Doğan, P. & Şahin, H. M. (2017). Gençlik Kampı Kadın Lider Adaylarının Özgüven Düzeyleri . Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi , 25 (1) , 315-328
61. Ünver R., A Quantitative Study on the Score and Technical Analysis of the 2021 Olympic Games and 2021 World Championships Olympic Weights-Men's Freestle Wrestling, Pakistan Journal of Medical & Health Sciences, ol. 16 No. 05, 464-469 (2022).
62. Yurtseven C.N.,Duman F.K., Evaluation of Boss Phubbing in Sports Businesses, Pakistan Journal Of Medical & Health Sciences, 15(2).2021, 839-844