Journal of Sports and Games
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2020, PP 17-27
ISSN 2642-8466

Investigation of Corporate Sports Centers Instructors in Terms of Professional Vitality, Leader Effectiveness, Self Control and Self Management

Filiz Nur Akin*

Bartın University, Institute of Social Sciences, Physical Education and Sports Science Department, Turkey

***Corresponding Author:** Filiz Nur Akin, Bartın University, Institute of Social Sciences, Physical Education and Sports Science Department, Turkey*

ABSTRACT

In this study, the relationships between self-control and self-control, leader effectiveness and professional vitality levels of trainers working in corporate sports centers and sports fields were investigated using a questionnaire method. Self-control and self-control refer to one's beliefs about performing a task and can influence the choice of activity, effort, persistence, and success. By funding past experiences, personal qualities and social support, people can engage in activities with varying levels of self-control and self-control. Thus, when sports trainers work on tasks, it is extremely important to learn about how well they are performing. This knowledge affects self-control and self-control for continued learning and professional vitality. Self-control and self-control affect the competence of sports trainers and are explained by research using interventions that include models, goal setting and feedback for these effects. Regardless of field of study in all branches, research shows that self-control and self-control emphasize the important role played by leadership effectiveness and professional vitality.

In this study, it was observed that there was no significant difference between female and male sports trainers at p <0.05 significance level in the whole of the Leader Effectiveness Scale (LEO) of corporate sports trainers. However, in the whole Self-Control-Self-Management Scale (X = 4.1775; t = -1.251) and the entire Occupational Vitality Scale (MCÖ) (X = 1.7322; t = -2.205), p <0.05 significance was found in favor of male sports trainers. There was a significant difference in the level. It is hoped that this study will serve as a guide for future research as well as the effects of theory and research for education and training.

Keywords: *Sports trainers, professional vitality, self-control and self-management, leader effectiveness*

INTRODUCTION

Plato explains the reason for the existence of society in his work called "Republic" as people need other people and people cannot be self-sufficient on their own. And thus, he says that the partnership that emerges as a result of the mutual assistance of people due to the need creates the social order (Plato, 409 BC - 405 BC). In order for a society to maintain its order, the existence and managerial power of leaders are very important.

Leaders are people who have the ability to influence people for a specific purpose and support their efforts to achieve goals. In order for the concept of leadership to be formed, there must be two elements, an affected group and an influencer. Based on these explanations, leadership includes behavioral guidance to individuals in order to achieve a goal within the framework of predetermined conditions. The ability to demonstrate one's leadership in a behavioral way is related to leadership power. Leader's strength depends primarily on individual characteristics, knowledge, leadership skills and dignity (Kılınç & Dursun 2009).

Leadership was defined by Kousez and Posner (1987) as the relationship between the leader and his followers in general. At the same time, they have revealed five important characteristics in a successful leader: being able to master the process, create an inspiring common vision, support the action of his followers, reveal a path to the process, and encourage individuals to do their job.

Leader activity is called the ability of the leader to offer creative ideas to solve the problems they have by making various directions to the people he leads. It is very difficult to determine the leader's effectiveness, as measuring the leader's effectiveness on his followers includes the

behavior of the leader and the effect and consequences of these behaviors on his followers. (Yılmaz, 2014).

Leader effectiveness depends on a leader who has the skills to demonstrate the necessary behaviors in order to give adequate responses to the expectations of the business environment and situational requests and demands. When it comes to leader activity, basically leaders' planning skills come up. It is known that structured behaviors are required for a group to be planned. There are two situations related to the leader's structured behavior. Firstly, the leader's structured behavior depends on the conditions of the task performance. Secondly, the performance of the group members depends on the activities that the leader has structured. In addition, it is not enough for leaders to set goals and reveal the ways to achieve these goals, but the main thing is to set the right goals and to follow the right and best ways to achieve these goals (Marta, 2005).

In sports, it is extremely important to control one's impulses or behavioral tendencies for top performance. For example, athletes need to reduce their anxiety levels in high stress environments (eg sports competitions) to be calmer and more focused (Hill et al., 2010). However, self-management doesn't always work. Baumeister et al. (1994, 1998) defines a self-management action as a process in which an individual attempts to voluntarily control or override dominant behaviors or reaction tendencies in order to achieve a certain goal.

Individuals also differ instantaneously in the amount of self-control power available (ie, state self-control power; Tangney et al., 2004). After working on a self-control task, the power may be temporarily exhausted and may not be refreshed immediately. This temporary state of self-control depletion is called ego depletion (Baumeister et al., 1994).

The sports trainer, as his team's coach, must ensure that the team achieves performance levels at scales that cannot be achieved without his support. Considering professional vitality, it should be aimed to develop the highest physical potential in athletes. However, the role of developing the habits and capacities of the body and mind, which will affect and enrich the later years, will only be possible with professional vitality. In addition to motivating the athletes in the team with professional vitality, creating a suitable environment and the right conditions for learning to take place are among the duties of the sports instructor as well. With professional vitality, sports trainers have always been evaluative and consultant to team members throughout their coaching career. Therefore, responsibilities should be handled with enthusiasm and the sports coach should be a good planner and organizer, facilitator, trainer and mentor to the team(Lin, 2014).

The sports trainer should adopt the style of collaboration coaching with his team. This style should be sportsperson-centered and allow two-way communication between the fitness instructor and the sportsperson. Although sportspersons have the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, the sports trainer should facilitate the practice sessions. In this way, the sports trainer should make the process more important than the result and present it as an approach that will provide excellent performance results (Rushall 2008, 213). Trust should be an essential component of coaching practice that is structured and flexible. Thanks to flexibility, it has been found that in the long term, the motivation of all athletes increases and less harm is experienced. In addition to the social skills and problem-solving abilities of the team members, the team management and self-esteem of the individual players should be developed and individual abilities should be revealed. Using these strategies, outstanding results can be achieved in quality coaching and performance.

METHOD

Two main approaches were used in the research. In this study, the deductive approach is chosen. In order to examine and analyze the corporate fitness center trainers in Turkey the trainers in terms of professional vitality, leader effectiveness, self-control and self-management, questionnaires were applied to individuals first. Online data collection method was used in the study. After the survey form was prepared, it was published electronically via the internet. The questionnaires were delivered to the participants online in order to reach more participants. The questionnaire consists of 45 questions. Professional vitality and customer relations, professional experience and job satisfaction levels, sports instructor's leadership qualities and satisfaction, self-control and self-management competencies, etc. questions were asked to the participants. The results of the research were analyzed by SPSS.

Professional Vitality Scale

The Turkish validity and reliability study of the Professional Vitality Scale created by Harvey,

(2002) was conducted by Uzunbacak and Akçakanat (2018). The scale consists of 17 items and 4 sub-dimensions: passion, vigor, mastery and job satisfaction. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, Y,2 of the total variance was explained. The factor loads of the scale range between .45 and .77. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated as .72 for passion dimension, .71 for vigor dimension, .71 for mastery dimension and .80 for job satisfaction dimension. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .89. Item analysis revealed that the corrected item-total score correlations of the subscales varied between .31 and .69.

Leader Effectiveness Scale

The Turkish validity and reliability study of the leader effectiveness scale developed by Chen and Tjosvold (2005) was conducted by Yılmaz (2014). As a result of the factor analysis, a single factor structure was obtained. The scale consists of 4 items. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.94.

Self-Check Self-Control Scale

The Turkish validity and reliability study of the self-check and self-control scale developed by Mezo (2009) was conducted by Ercoşkun (2016). The scale consists of 3 dimensions and 16 items: self-empowerment, self-evaluation and self-observation. The Cronbach Alpha value for the whole scale was found to be .87. The Cronbach's Alpha value for the self-empowerment sub-dimension was found to be .81, 0.73 for the self-evaluation sub-dimension, and .80 for the self-observation sub-dimension.

FINDINGS

Table1. *Comparison of PVS, SCSCS and LES scores of sports center trainers according to their gender*

	Gender	n	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	Z	p
PASSION	Female	156	164,85	25716,50	13470,5	-1,560	0,119
	Male	191	181,47	34661,50			
	Sum	347					
VIGOR	Female	156	163,74	25543,50	13297,5	-1,743	0,081
	Male	191	182,38	34834,50			
	Sum	347					
MASTERY	Female	156	179,15	27948,00	14094,0	-0,874	0,382
	Male	191	169,79	32430,00			
	Sum	347					
JOBSATISFACTION	Female	156	160,51	25040,00	12794	25040	0,021
	Male	191	185,02	35338,00			
	Sum	347					
SELF EMPOWERMENT	Female	154	177,33	27308,50	13732,5	-0,902	0,367
	Male	189	167,66	31687,50			
	Sum	343					
SELF EVALUATION	Female	154	153,91	23702,00	11767	-3,134	0,002
	Male	190	187,57	35638,00			
	Sum	344					
SELF OBSERVATION	Female	154	177,02	27261,00	13934	-0,762	0,446
	Male	190	168,84	32079,00			
	Sum	344					
LEÖ	Female	156	175,11	27317,00	14569	-0,273	0,785
	Male	190	172,18	32714,00			
	Sum	346					

Table 1 shows the results of the **Mann-Whitney U test** conducted to compare the scores of the trainers of sports centers according to their gender from the Professional Vitality Scale (MCI), Self-control and Self-Management Scale (AAS) and Leader Effectiveness Scale (LES). It was determined that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the trainers of sports centers participating in the study from the job satisfaction sub-dimensions of the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS) and the self-evaluation dimension from the Self-control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS) sub-dimensions ($p < 0.05$).

Table2. *Comparison of PVS, SCSMS*

Group of Scales Age		n	$\bar{x}$	S	Min	Max	X^2	p
PASSION	20-24	101	1,5198	,46055	1,00	3,25	15,17	0,004
	25-29	108	1,5417	,41511	1,00	2,50		
	30-34	70	1,7143	,50592	1,00	3,00		
	35-40	43	1,7733	,46552	1,00	2,50		
	41-50	30	1,5417	,36603	1,00	2,50		
	Sum	352	1,5980	,45797	1,00	3,25		
VIGOR	20-24	101	1,5718	,61475	1,00	3,00	14,751	0,005
	25-29	108	1,6667	,50465	1,00	3,25		
	30-34	70	1,9286	,70601	1,00	3,50		
	35-40	43	1,7849	,59156	1,00	3,50		
	41-50	30	1,8250	,79911	1,00	3,50		
	Sum	352	1,7195	,62869	1,00	3,50		
MASTERY	20-24	101	1,6267	,53308	1,00	3,60	7,60	0,107
	25-29	108	1,7116	,44990	1,00	3,20		
	30-34	70	1,7362	,45264	1,00	3,00		
	35-40	43	1,7070	,34737	1,00	2,40		
	41-50	30	1,5533	,40915	1,00	2,80		
	Sum	352	1,6781	,46306	1,00	3,60		
JOBSATISFACTION	20-24	101	1,5272	,81386	1,00	5,00	21,53	0,000
	25-29	108	1,8426	,74851	1,00	4,25		
	30-34	70	1,9536	,89209	1,00	4,75		
	35-40	43	1,8140	,91302	1,00	5,00		
	41-50	30	1,6750	,83602	1,00	5,00		
	Sum	352	1,7564	,83640	1,00	5,00		
SELF EMPOWERMENT	20-24	99	4,9833	,96804	1,20	6,00	9,36	0,053
	25-29	107	4,8243	,91804	2,00	6,00		
	30-34	69	4,8116	,84914	2,20	6,00		
	35-40	43	4,8093	,86184	2,40	6,00		
	41-50	30	4,3800	1,12078	2,00	5,80		
	Sum	348	4,8269	,93948	1,20	6,00		
SELF EVALUATION	20-24	99	2,5131	1,45467	1,00	6,00	3,703	0,448
	25-29	107	2,3664	1,26117	1,00	6,00		
	30-34	70	2,2971	1,06253	1,00	5,00		
	35-40	43	2,0047	,81004	1,00	3,60		
	41-50	30	2,0267	,94063	1,00	4,40		
	Sum	349	2,3203	1,21993	1,00	6,00		
SELF OBSERVATION	20-24	99	5,2374	,67052	3,17	6,00	15,433	0,004
	25-29	107	5,0997	,84111	1,67	6,00		
	30-34	70	4,9210	,70245	2,00	6,00		
	35-40	43	5,1860	,48004	4,33	6,00		
	41-50	30	4,6667	1,19866	2,00	6,00		
	Sum	349	5,0763	,78476	1,67	6,00		
LEÖ	20-24	101	3,6939	1,05949	1,00	5,00	23,62	0,000
	25-29	108	3,6065	1,03795	1,00	5,00		
	30-34	69	3,3116	,98929	1,00	5,00		
	35-40	43	3,7442	1,01987	1,00	5,00		
	41-50	30	2,7667	,95803	1,00	5,00		
	Sum	351	3,5188	1,05617	1,00	5,00		

And LES scores of sports center trainers by age

Group of Scales Age		n	$\bar{x}$	S	Min	Max	X^2	p
PASSION	20-24	101	1,5198	,46055	1,00	3,25	15,17	0,004
	25-29	108	1,5417	,41511	1,00	2,50		
	30-34	70	1,7143	,50592	1,00	3,00		
	35-40	43	1,7733	,46552	1,00	2,50		
	41-50	30	1,5417	,36603	1,00	2,50		

	Sum	352	1,5980	,45797	1,00	3,25		
VIGOR	20-24	101	1,5718	,61475	1,00	3,00	14,751	0,005
	25-29	108	1,6667	,50465	1,00	3,25		
	30-34	70	1,9286	,70601	1,00	3,50		
	35-40	43	1,7849	,59156	1,00	3,50		
	41-50	30	1,8250	,79911	1,00	3,50		
	Sum	352	1,7195	,62869	1,00	3,50		
MASTERY	20-24	101	1,6267	,53308	1,00	3,60	7,60	0,107
	25-29	108	1,7116	,44990	1,00	3,20		
	30-34	70	1,7362	,45264	1,00	3,00		
	35-40	43	1,7070	,34737	1,00	2,40		
	41-50	30	1,5533	,40915	1,00	2,80		
	Sum	352	1,6781	,46306	1,00	3,60		
JOBSATISFACTION	20-24	101	1,5272	,81386	1,00	5,00	21,53	0,000
	25-29	108	1,8426	,74851	1,00	4,25		
	30-34	70	1,9536	,89209	1,00	4,75		
	35-40	43	1,8140	,91302	1,00	5,00		
	41-50	30	1,6750	,83602	1,00	5,00		
	Sum	352	1,7564	,83640	1,00	5,00		
SELF EMPOWERMENT	20-24	99	4,9833	,96804	1,20	6,00	9,36	0,053
	25-29	107	4,8243	,91804	2,00	6,00		
	30-34	69	4,8116	,84914	2,20	6,00		
	35-40	43	4,8093	,86184	2,40	6,00		
	41-50	30	4,3800	1,12078	2,00	5,80		
	Sum	348	4,8269	,93948	1,20	6,00		
SELF EVALUATION	20-24	99	2,5131	1,45467	1,00	6,00	3,703	0,448
	25-29	107	2,3664	1,26117	1,00	6,00		
	30-34	70	2,2971	1,06253	1,00	5,00		
	35-40	43	2,0047	,81004	1,00	3,60		
	41-50	30	2,0267	,94063	1,00	4,40		
	Sum	349	2,3203	1,21993	1,00	6,00		
SELF OBSERVATION	20-24	99	5,2374	,67052	3,17	6,00	15,433	0,004
	25-29	107	5,0997	,84111	1,67	6,00		
	30-34	70	4,9210	,70245	2,00	6,00		
	35-40	43	5,1860	,48004	4,33	6,00		
	41-50	30	4,6667	1,19866	2,00	6,00		
	Sum	349	5,0763	,78476	1,67	6,00		
LEÖ	20-24	101	3,6939	1,05949	1,00	5,00	23,62	0,000
	25-29	108	3,6065	1,03795	1,00	5,00		
	30-34	69	3,3116	,98929	1,00	5,00		
	35-40	43	3,7442	1,01987	1,00	5,00		
	41-50	30	2,7667	,95803	1,00	5,00		
	Sum	351	3,5188	1,05617	1,00	5,00		

In the table, the results of the **Kruskal-Wallis test**, which was conducted to compare the scores of the trainers of sports centers included in the study, on the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS), Self-control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS) and Leadership Effectiveness Scale (LES) are given. According to their age status, a statistically significant difference was found between the scores of the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS) sub-dimensions except the mastery dimension ($p<0.05$). In addition, a statistically significant difference was found between the scores of the Self-Control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS) sub-dimensions and the self-observation dimension ($p <0.05$).

Table3. *Comparison of MCÖ, ÖKYÖ and LEÖ scores according to the socio-economic status of sports center trainers*

Group of Socio-Scales Economic		n	$\bar{x}$	S	Min	Max	X^2	p
Passion	Low	9	1,3611	,28260	1,00	1,75	15,01	0,005
	Middle Lower	53	1,7406	,47526	1,00	3,00		
	Middle	207	1,5700	,44057	1,00	3,00		
	Upper Middle	69	1,6630	,50517	1,00	3,25		
	Upper	14	1,3036	,22315	1,00	1,50		

	Sum	352	1,5980	,45797	1,00	3,25		
Vigor	Low	9	1,5833	,51539	1,00	2,75	4,26	0,371
	Middle Lower	53	1,8066	,70820	1,00	3,50		
	Middle	207	1,6957	,59253	1,00	3,50		
	Upper Middle	69	1,7971	,69567	1,00	3,50		
	Upper	14	1,4464	,49204	1,00	2,25		
	Sum	352	1,7195	,62869	1,00	3,50		
Mastery	Low	9	1,9556	,69841	1,20	3,60	25,76	0,000
	Middle Lower	53	1,8415	,42672	1,00	2,80		
	Middle	207	1,6869	,45280	1,00	3,20		
	Upper Middle	69	1,5812	,43226	1,00	2,60		
	Upper	14	1,2286	,32208	1,00	1,80		
	Sum	352	1,6781	,46306	1,00	3,60		
Job Satisfaction	Low	9	1,9167	,97628	1,00	3,25	7,075	0,132
	Middle Lower	53	2,0849	1,05149	1,00	5,00		
	Middle	207	1,6643	,70596	1,00	5,00		
	Upper Middle	69	1,7826	,93336	1,00	5,00		
	Upper	14	1,6429	,90253	1,00	3,00		
	Sum	352	1,7564	,83640	1,00	5,00		
Self Empowerment	Low	9	5,1778	,55176	4,40	5,60	19,07	0,001
	Middle Lower	53	4,3396	,99583	2,20	6,00		
	Middle	204	4,8402	,96794	1,20	6,00		
	Upper Middle	68	5,0699	,71415	3,40	6,00		
	Upper	14	5,0714	,84710	3,60	6,00		
	Sum	348	4,8269	,93948	1,20	6,00		
Self Evaluation	Low	9	2,0444	,69841	1,00	3,00	7,646	0,105
	Middle Lower	53	2,3509	,87170	1,00	3,80		
	Middle	205	2,2634	1,20281	1,00	6,00		
	Upper Middle	68	2,2294	1,20410	1,00	6,00		
	Upper	14	3,6571	2,06126	1,00	6,00		
	Sum	349	2,3203	1,21993	1,00	6,00		
SelfObservation	Low	9	5,0556	1,02740	3,33	6,00	7,852	0,097
	Middle Lower	53	4,8050	,92608	2,00	5,83		
	Middle	205	5,0854	,77326	1,67	6,00		
	Upper Middle	68	5,2324	,62204	3,00	6,00		
	Upper	14	5,2262	,75845	4,17	6,00		
	Sum	349	5,0763	,78476	1,67	6,00		
Leader Effectiveness Scale	Low	8	2,3438	1,06852	1,00	3,50	10,03	0,040
	Middle Lower	53	3,4434	1,10140	1,00	5,00		
	Middle	207	3,6123	,98552	1,00	5,00		
	Upper Middle	69	3,5121	1,04390	1,00	5,00		
	Upper	14	3,1250	1,51515	1,00	5,00		
	Sum	351	3,5188	1,05617	1,00	5,00		

The results of the **Kruskal-Wallis test** conducted in order to compare the scores of the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS), Self-control and Self-management Scale (SCSMS) and Leadership Effectiveness Scale (LES) according to the socio-economic status of the sports center trainers included in the study is given in Table 3.

A statistically significant difference was found between the scores they got from the dimensions of passion and mastery from the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS) sub-dimensions. ($p < 0.05$).

In addition, a statistically significant difference was found between the scores of the self-control and self-management scale (SCSMS) sub-dimensions of self-empowerment ($p < 0.05$). Also, a significant difference was found between the scores of the Leader Effectiveness Scale (LES) as well ($p < 0.05$).

Table4. *Comparison of PVS, SCSMS and LES scores according to the educational status of sports center trainers*

Group of Education Scales Status		n	$\bar{x}$	S	Min	Max	X^2	p
Passion	High School	30	1,5917	,45240	1,00	2,50	4,61	0,100
	University	273	1,6209	,46232	1,00	3,25		

	Master Degree	49	1,4745	,42465	1,00	3,00		
	Sum	352	1,5980	,45797	1,00	3,25		
Vigor	High School	30	1,4417	,50294	1,00	3,00	7,89	0,019
	University	273	1,7317	,63711	1,00	3,50		
	Master Degree	49	1,8214	,61450	1,00	3,50		
	Sum	352	1,7195	,62869	1,00	3,50		
Mastery	High School	30	1,5667	,49294	1,00	2,80	2,92	0,231
	University	273	1,6955	,45047	1,00	3,60		
	Master Degree	49	1,6490	,51077	1,00	3,20		
	Sum	352	1,6781	,46306	1,00	3,60		
Job Satisfaction	High School	30	1,6167	,98858	1,00	5,00	4,340	0,114
	University	273	1,7747	,84158	1,00	5,00		
	Master Degree	49	1,7398	,70519	1,00	4,75		
	Sum	352	1,7564	,83640	1,00	5,00		
Self Empowerment	High School	30	4,8333	1,14118	2,40	6,00	4,36	0,113
	University	269	4,7768	,94942	1,20	6,00		
	Master Degree	49	5,0980	,68693	2,80	6,00		
	Sum	348	4,8269	,93948	1,20	6,00		
Self Evaluation	High School	30	1,8200	,81596	1,00	3,60	5,86	0,053
	University	270	2,3563	1,24549	1,00	6,00		
	Master Degree	49	2,4286	1,23221	1,00	5,60		
	Sum	349	2,3203	1,21993	1,00	6,00		
Self Observation	High School	30	5,2722	1,00999	2,00	6,00	9,281	0,010
	University	270	5,0599	,79757	1,67	6,00		
	Master Degree	49	5,0469	,50721	3,67	5,83		
	Sum	349	5,0763	,78476	1,67	6,00		
Leader Effectiveness Scale	High School	30	3,4917	1,13806	1,00	5,00	9,28	0,806
	University	272	3,5058	1,04914	1,00	5,00		
	Master Degree	49	3,6071	1,06189	1,00	5,00		
	Sum	351	3,5188	1,05617	1,00	5,00		

Table 4 shows the results of the **Kruskal-Wallis test** conducted to compare the scores of the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS), Self-control and Self-management Scale (SCSMS) and Leadership Effectiveness Scale (LES) according to the educational status of the sports center trainers included in the study.

It was determined that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the Vitality dimension of the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS) sub-dimensions. ($p < 0.05$). In addition, a statistically significant difference was found between the scores of the Self-Control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS) sub-dimensions and the self-observation dimension ($p < 0.05$). Also, it was found that there was no significant difference between the scores of Leader Effectiveness Scale (LES) ($p > 0.05$).

Table5. *T-Test results regarding the attitudes of sports center trainers towards Leader Effectiveness*

LEADEREFFECTIVENESSSCALE	**Test Value =3**					
	t	**Sd.**	**P dual**	**Mean Difference**	**Average**	**SS.**
Q 1) My manager (supervisor) properly performs leadership roles.	8,43	350	0,000	0,515	3,51	1,14
Q 2) My manager fulfills his responsibilities well as a leader.	8,28	348	0,000	0,507	3,50	1,14
Q 3) I am satisfied with my manager's overall effectiveness as a leader.	7,41	350	0,000	0,464	3,46	1,17
Q 4) I can work effectively under the leadership of my manager.	9,43	348	0,000	0,601	3,60	1,19

Sports center trainers' attitudes towards their attitudes towards Leadership Effectiveness were examined with a single sample t-test (Test value: 3). A 5-point Likert scale was used. (1: Never, 2: Rarely, 3: Occasionally, 4: Often, 5: Always). The results were evaluated at the 5% significance level.

According to the test results in Table 5, "*My manager (supervisor) fulfills the leadership roles properly*" (t: 8.43, Pdual: .000 Average .: 3.51, SD: 1.14), "*My manager fulfills his responsibilities as a leader well* "(t: 8.28, Pdual: .000 Average .: 3.50, SD: 1.14),"*I am satisfied with the overall effectiveness of my manager as a leader*" (t: 7 , 41,

Pdual: .000 Average .: 3.46 SD: 1.17), *"I can work effectively under the leadership of my manager*" (t: 9.43, Pdual: .000 Average .: 3.60, SD. : 1.19), it is understood that they have declared a positive opinion.

Table6. *Independent sample T-test results regarding the attitudes of sports center trainers towards Self-Control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS)*

	Sex	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Self Empowerment	Female	154	4,9039	,86749	1,118	0,012
	Male	189	4,7902	,98937		
Self Evaluation	Female	154	2,0584	1,00429	-3,479	0,004
	Male	190	2,5105	1,33500		
Self Observation	Female	154	5,1180	,73182	0,855	0,253
	Male	190	5,0454	,82155		
(ÖKYÖ)	Female	154	4,0950	,51530	-1,251	0,049
	Male	190	4,1775	,67446		

As can be seen in Table 6, when examined by considering the gender variable, it was seen that there is a significant difference at the level of significance p <.05 in favor of female sports trainers in the sub-dimensions of "Self Empowerment" (X = 4.9039; t = 1.118). In the "Self Evaluating" (X = 2.510; t = -3.479) sub-dimensions, it was observed that there was a significant difference at p <.05 significance level in favor of male sports trainers.In the whole of the "Self-Control-Self-Management Scale" (X = 4.1775; t = -1.251), it was observed that there was a significant difference at p <.05 significance level in favor of male sports trainers. Therefore, **H_0**: "*There is no significant difference at the level of self-control and self-management according to the gender differences of the trainers of women's and men's in sports centers*." hypothesis was rejected and **H_1**: "*There is a significant difference at the level of self-control and self-management according to gender differences of female and male sports center trainers*." hypothesis was accepted.

Table7. *Independent sample T-test results regarding the attitudes of sports center trainers towards the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS)*

	Sex	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Passion	Female	156	1,5481	,42797	-1,863	0,748
	Male	191	1,6401	,48022		
Vigor	Female	156	1,6474	,59560	-1,775	0,651
	Male	191	1,7657	,63486		
Mastery	Female	156	1,6944	,43732	0,571	0,559
	Male	191	1,6657	,48940		
JobSatisfaction	Female	156	1,5913	,61702	-3,241	0,000
	Male	191	1,8743	,93713		
(MCÖ)	Female	156	1,6231	,40520	-2,205	0,044
	Male	191	1,7322	,49793		

As can be seen in Table 7, when examined by considering the gender variable, it was seen that there is a significant difference at the level of significance p <.05 in favor of male sports trainers from the "job satisfaction" sub-dimension (X = 1.8743; t = -3.241). It was observed that there was a significant difference at p <.05 significance level in favor of male sports trainers in the entire "Professional Vitality Scale (MCÖ)" (X = 1.732; t = -2.205). Therefore, **H_{01}**: "*There is no significant difference in Professional Vitality level according to the gender differences of men and women sports center trainers*." hypothesis was rejected and **H_{11}**: "*There is a significant difference at the level of Professional Vitality according to the gender differences of men and women sports center trainers*." His hypothesis was accepted.

Table8. *Independent sample T-test results regarding the attitudes of sport center trainers towards Leader Effectiveness Scale (LES)*

	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	s	t	p
Leader Effectiveness Scale	Female	156	3,5449	1,01936	0,410	0,227
	Male	191	3,4978	1,09665		

It was observed that there was no significant difference between male and female sports trainers at p <.05 significance level in the entire "Leadership Effectiveness Scale (LES)". Therefore, **H_{02}**: "*There is no significant difference at the Leadership Effectiveness level according to gender differences of men and women sports center trainers*." hypothesis was accepted and **H_{22}**: "*There is a significant difference at the Leadership Activity level according to the gender differences of the men and women sports center trainers*." hypothesis was rejected.

RESULT AND EVALUATION

According to the results of the research, it was determined that most of the sports trainers are men and the marital status of the 25-29 age group is mostly single or related, their education level is university graduates, and their income level is medium. In addition, the vast majority of sports trainers live with their family, and very few of them stay in the dormitory or with their friends. The vast majority live in the metropolitan area as a social life space.

With the scales used in line with the main purpose of the study, besides the scales of professional vitality, the quality of the working environment and the quality of sports trainers, the self-control and self-management and leader effectiveness scale were also used in the study. As a result of the research conducted in this direction, it was determined that the subscales of the scales, which are generally called "Professional Vitality Scale (PVS)" and "Self-control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS)", are also valid and reliable measurement tools.

For the participants participating in the study, an average of 1.75 points from the job satisfaction sub-dimension in the Occupational Vitality Scale (PVS), an average of 5.07 points from the self-monitoring dimension in the Self-control and Self-management Scale (SCSMS), and an average of 3.51 points from the Leader Effectiveness Scale (LES) was obtained. According to these results, it was determined that the job satisfaction levels of sports trainers were positive and higher than other levels of passion, vigor and mastery. Therefore, it can be said that sports trainers love their job. In addition, positive feedback was obtained from other levels of passion, vigor and mastery as well in the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS), and a positive result was obtained in general. However, the average score they got from the self-evaluation dimension in the Self-Control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS) is 2.32 points. The low average score is due to the reverse order of answers in the questions asked in this sub-dimension. Accordingly, it was determined that sports trainers are strong in self-evaluation. The high level of scores obtained from the self-observation sub-dimension in the same scale and the high level of self-evaluation support the research results.

In case of differentiation regarding the age groups of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in other subscales, except for the mastery subscale in the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS). When the results obtained were examined, it was determined that the middle age 30-40 group was more dominant among these factors. It has been determined that this age group has high levels of passion, vigor and job satisfaction, while their mastery and skill levels are almost the same for all age groups. In case of differentiation regarding the socio-economic levels of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in the passion and mastery sub-dimensions of the Professional Vitality Scale (PVS).

It has been determined that this differentiation is dominant in lower-middle and lower income levels. In the case of differentiation regarding the training groups of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in the vigor sub-dimension of the Professional Vitality Scale. It has been determined that this differentiation is at the postgraduate level. In the case of differentiation regarding the age groups of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in the self-observation sub-dimension of the Self-Control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS). When the results obtained were examined, it was determined that this differentiation was dominant in the 20-24 age group. In the case of the differentiation regarding the socio-economic levels of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in the self-empowerment sub-dimension of the Self-control and Self-Management Scale (SCSMS). It has been determined that this differentiation is dominant in upper-middle, upper and lower income levels. In case of differentiation regarding the education level of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in the vigor sub-dimension of the self-control and self-management (SCSMS) scale. It has been determined that this differentiation is at the level of university education. In case of differentiation regarding the age groups of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in the Leader Effectiveness Scale (LES). When the obtained results are

examined, it has been determined that the middle age group 35-40 is more dominant on this factor. In case of differentiation regarding the socio-economic levels of sports trainers, a significant difference was found in the Leadership Effectiveness Scale (LES). It has been determined that this differentiation is dominant in the middle and middle-income level.

In the literature research conducted in accordance with the purpose of the study, the most important factor affecting the satisfaction and satisfaction levels of those receiving service from sports enterprises was determined as the quality of sports trainers. Studies on the role of stress on the effect of self-control and self-management on hope levels in coaches and professional vitality and relative vitality are presented. Some of these studies are: Uyar (2020) examined the factors affecting customer satisfaction of individuals who are members of sports facilities of local governments in terms of various variables in his master's study titled "Examining the Factors Affecting the Satisfaction of Individuals Receiving Service from Sports Enterprises Belonging to Local Governments". In the study, it has been assessed that the most important factors determining the satisfaction perception of the individuals from the facilities are the sports trainers' facility quality management and services. Gürbüz (2019), in his master's study titled "Determination of Satisfaction Levels of Individuals Receiving Service in Private Sports Enterprises", conducted a research on determining the satisfaction levels of individuals who receive service in private sports enterprises, investigating the effects of personal characteristics on the satisfaction of individuals and revealing the causality relationship between factors affecting customer satisfaction. Sucan (2019) investigated the role of stress on the effect of self-control and self-management on the hope level in his article titled "The Mediating Role of Stress on the Effect of Self-Control and Self-Management on 'Level of Hope in Coaches".

As a result of the correlation analysis, a positive and significant relationship was found between the coaches' self-control and self-management skills and their hope level scores. In this study, it was investigated that perceived stress directly affects self-control and self-management. Salama-Younes, Montazeri's study (2009), "The factor structure and internal consistency of the 12-item General Health Questionnaire (GSA-12) and the Subjective Vitality Scale (VS) and the relationship between them: a study from France." includes a research on professional and relative vitality. The aim of this study was to test the factor structure and internal consistency of the 12-item General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) and the Subjective Vitality Scale (VS) in elderly French, and to test the relationship between these two questionnaires, to provide information about vitality. In this context, the findings obtained in the literature research support the purpose of this study and the results obtained.

Considering the research results, the following suggestions can be made:

Today, it has become very important to survive in this intense competitive environment for sports centers, whose number is increasing day by day. For this, sports businesses must first determine the needs of sports trainers, the factors that affect their physical and emotional behavior, personal development and professional vitality. Determining the needs and expectations of sports trainers in the best way can create a presentation opportunity for alternative programs specific to sports businesses.

In this study, the majority of sports trainers are male (54.3%) and the ratio of female trainers is (44.3%). Therefore, there is no deviation in the findings due to the dominance of a single gender. The homogeneity of the sample in the study contributed to the validity and reliability of the scales revealed.

Based on the findings of the study, it has been observed that as the psychological and physical development and quality of sports trainers increase, their satisfaction will increase. It will be beneficial in increasing the quality and performance of sports center trainers to follow up frequently about their development, to provide information, and also to train sports trainers. It should be ensured that trainers / coaches working in sports centers are kept up-to-date on the programs they are assigned to and that they improve themselves. In addition, in the future, service quality related to instructor satisfaction, corporate image and behavioral intentions can be considered as dependent variables, and studies can be conducted on how the general satisfaction perception will affect these dependent variables.

REFERENCES

[1] Baumeister, R. F. (1984). "Choking under pressure: self-consciousness and paradoxical effects of incentives on skillful performance." *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 46, 610–620. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.610

[2] Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., and Tice, D. M. (1994). "*Losing Control: How and Why People Fail at Self-Regulation*." San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

[3] Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., and Tice, D. M. (1998). "Ego depletion: is the active self a limited resource?"*J. Pers. Soc. Psychol*. 74, 1252– 1265. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1252

[4] Gürbüz, C. (2019). "*Özelsporişletmelerinde-hizmetalanbireylerinmemnuniyetdüzeylerininbelirlenmesi"*. SelçukUniversity / Graduate School of Health Sciences / Sports Management Department PostgraduateThesis. Konya.

[5] Hill, D. M., Hanton, S., Matthews, N., and Fleming, S. (2010). "Choking in sport: a review". *Int. Rev. Sport Exerc. Psychol.* 3, 24–39. doi: 10.1080/17509840903301199

[6] Kılınç, M., Dursun, S., &Hiperlink (Firm). (2009). "Etkinliderlik": Vol. 1. bs.

[7] Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). "The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations (1st ed.)". San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.K

[8] Lin, L., & Warren, S. J. (2014). "Ethical Considerations for Learning Game, Simulation, and Virtual World Design and Development".

[9] Rushall, B. S. (2008). "Psychological Factors and Mental Skills in Wrestling". 375-399.

[10] Salama-Younes, M., Montazeri, A. (2009), "12 maddelikGenelSağlıkAnketi (GSA-12) veÖznel Zindelik Ölçeği'nin (VS) faktöryapısıveiçtut-arlılığıvearalarındakiilişki: Fransa'danbirçalı-şma". *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*. Volume No: 7, Article No: 22.

[11] Sucan, S. (2019). "The Mediating Role of Stress on the Effect of Self-Control and Self-Management on Level of Hope in Coaches". *Journal of Education and Learning*, v: 8 n: 2 p: 279-285.

[12] Plato, (2014). "The Republic". TutkuYayınevi. 1. Basım: January.

[13] Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., and Boone, A. L. (2004). "High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal successs". *J. Pers.* 72, 271–324. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x

[14] Uyar, D. (2020). "*Yerelyönetimlereaitsporişletme-lerindenhizmetalanbireylerinmemnuniyetlerineetkie denfa ktörlerinincelenmesi"*. Selçuk University / Graduate School of Health Sciences / SportsM anagement Department Postgraduate Thesis. Konya.

[15] Yılmaz, T. (2014). "LiderEtkinliği Ölçeğinin Türkçeye Uyarlanması Çalışması".

Citation: *Filiz Nur Akin, "Investigation of Corporate Sports Centers Instructors in Terms of Professional Vitality, Leader Effectiveness, Self Control and Self Management", Journal of Sports and Games, 2(1), 2020, pp 17-27.*