

Examination Of Sport Managers' Self-Efficacy Status And Time Management

Ali ERDOĞAN^{1A}, Erkan Faruk ŞİRİN^{2B}, Pınar KARACAN DOĞAN^{3C}, Ahmet Azmi YETİM^{3D}

¹ Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Karaman/Turkey ²Marmara University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey

²Selçuk University, Faculty of Sport Science, Konya, Turkey.

³Gazi University, Faculty of Sport Science, Ankara, Turkey.

Address Correspondence to E.F. Şirin, e-mail: erkanfaruk@yahoo.com

(Received): 22.10.2019 / (Accepted): 25.12.2019

A:Orcid ID: 0000-0001-8306-5683- B: 0000-0002-6837-7758- C: 0000-0002-2654-2751- D: 0000-0003-0375-8637

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the self-efficacy perceptions and time management belief levels of the public and sports club managers working in Turkey and to examine the relationship between them by examining them according to some demographic variables. In this research, a method for descriptive and relational screening was used to reveal the current situation. The sample group of the public and sports club managers working in Turkey consists of public sports managers (n = 55) and sports club managers (n = 99) who volunteered to participate in the study. Personal Information Form, Sport Managers Self-Efficacy Scale and Time Management Scale were used as data collection tools. In the analysis of data, since the data and groups are not distributed homogeneously and the data is skewed to the left, non-parametric Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis test techniques were used to determine the differences between the groups in the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and time management, and Spearman Correlation Analysis technique was used in the relationship between Sport Managers' Self-Efficacy Scale and Time Management Scale. At the end of the study, there were no significant differences between Sport Managers Self-Efficacy and Time Management beliefs and Personal variables (age, gender, marital status, education level, year of service, management year and sports history), while a significant difference was determined between the time attitude sub-dimension of time management and the sector variable in favor of sports club managers. In addition, a weak positive and significant (p <0.05) relationship was found between general time management and sports managers' self-efficacy (decision-making, personal characteristics, Knowledge and Interpersonal Roles).

Key words: Sports Managers, Self-Efficacy, Time Management.

INTRODUCTION

Self-sufficiency, which is one of the important concepts of Social Learning Theory, is a frequently encountered concept in different disciplines as a research topic in recent years (26,53,84,86). Perceived self-efficacy is expressed by social learning theorists as task-oriented feeling of trust (39). According to Bandura (11), self-efficacy belief is defined as the belief of the person in the ability to perform the job in the best way by organizing the activities required to perform a targeted job. In other words, it refers to the skills and beliefs necessary to organize the person's behaviors and situations that person can

encounter. Therefore, self-efficacy involves the motivation that occurs as a result of the planning of the work, awareness of the skills, and reliance on individual resources. These elements essentially identify self-efficacy with the contribution of one's talent and trust in one's own resources (43,87). It is seen that an individual can learn a lot about time management by knowing his/her own resources, knowing himself/herself and evaluating himself/herself (2). In the studies, it was seen that the perception of self-efficacy affects one's choice of organization, attitude towards problems and obstacles, level of struggle and performance. Individuals with high self-efficacy perception do not

give up easily against negative situations, enter a superior effort to achieve a job and insist on the result (8). These personal efforts bring with it a number of necessary and unnecessary tactics in the current social and working environment, which is one of the factors affecting the efficient use of time (21).

In the light of the above, it can be said that self-efficacy perception has a very important place in the professional life of individuals. From this point of view, it is seen that self-efficacy, which is thought to be important in the education, employment and professional life of the sport managers who direct sports, is an important subject of study.

When sports literature related to self-efficacy is examined in general, studies for physical education and sports teacher candidates draw attention mainly (6,29,43,70,,), whereas there are studies on physical education teachers (12,52), coaches (30,50,51,57) and referees (41,42). However, in the field of sports management, only Çiftçi (22) examined the self-efficacy status of sports managers and Çolak, Başaran, Çolak and Aksu (23) examined the self-efficacy beliefs of sports club managers.

In today's management, the necessity of performance at the highest level of competition conditions has left the organizations and managers under the pressure of using time effectively and increased their desire to control time. The fact that time is a resource that cannot be saved, reversed, replaced and slowed down reveals the complexity and importance of managing it. According to Akatay (2), time management emerged from the needs of management and managers for time. On the basis of effective time management, the self-management of the person, the mastery of the events encountered and the efficient planning in a certain period of time can be considered as the process of managing the events as a result of the self-direction (35). In general terms, time management is an important factor that improves the quality of life and work in the environment in which individuals achieve success by reducing stress, maintaining balance, increasing productivity and achieving their goals. Individuals who do not have good time management experience difficulties not only in their professional work life, but also in the management of all stages of their lives (5). In short, time management is the management of business and activities within a specified time frame.

Time management is an issue that concerns people from every profession, and it has separate importance for organizations and executives (49). In the field of sport management, this issue has been a topic that has been discussed and taken place in different platforms, and the attitudes and behaviors of managers in time and management have been started to be evaluated and investigated in sports institutions and organizations. Whereas there are studies for students of higher education institutions providing sports education in the field of sports related to time management, although not on managers (4,9,20,44), there are also studies on the physical education teachers (16). In the literature, a limited number of studies on time management were found in the sample of sports managers. In the compilation study by İmamoğlu and Çimen (38) on effective time management for sports managers, which is one of the early studies, pointed out that sports managers should make maximum use of time management strategies. In the study of Gökçek (33), one of the recent studies, on the views of the managers of professional football teams on time management, it was stated that there are no significant differences in terms of age, marital status, education level, management task and managerial durations of the managers and management staff in professional football teams. In the study by ÖzsoyToksöz and Oğuzhan (62) on the time management attitudes of people working in public, private and municipal sectors who took part in sports organizations, it was stated that the time management attitudes and skills of individuals taking part in sports organizations have significant differences according to socio-demographic characteristics and sectors.

In relation to the two variables of time management and self-efficacy, Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons (91) stated that it is necessary to be able to feel capable of learning the work within a certain time i.e. to have a high level of self-efficacy perception for learning in order to manage time effectively. Robinson and Godbey (65), with a different proposition, stated that time is a source of stress on individuals of all professions and general self-efficacy is a reflection of an individual's coping skills, while stressing that general self-efficacy may also have an impact on time management. Observing that time management practices reduce stress confirms this proposition. However, Britton and Tesser (14) state that one of the dimensions of time management is related to individuals'

perceptions and attitudes about time management. Therefore, time attitudes include 3 perceptions: "individuals control time", "individuals effectively manage their own time", and "individuals use time as a constructor". These time attitudes reflect a "sense of self-efficacy" which is a natural consequence of occupation with time management behaviors. Therefore, this is also an effective factor in general self-efficacy belief. In this context, it can be assumed that general self-efficacy perception may have an impact on time management.

As mentioned above, in line with the studies reached, a limited number of studies, in which the concepts of self-efficacy and time management are studied separately on sports managers, in the literature and lack of study specifically examining the relationship between sport managers' self-efficacy and time management makes this research important. However, considering that sports managers, who on the one hand play an active role in the continuation of sports activities, which is an industry branch that is at the forefront of the world economy and on the other hand are involved in the dimensions of a social service and social responsibility through voluntary organization, are effective on the behavior of many organizations and structures in national and international area by controlling the behavioral process, it is important to examine the general self-efficacy perception of sport managers as a cognitive-perceptual factor and time management information. From this point of view, the purpose of the research is to determine the self-efficacy and time management skills of the public and sports club managers working in Turkey and to describe the relationship between them by examining them according to some demographic variables. It is thought that the explanations and suggestions that this research will provide in a framework which will allow the evaluation of this relationship will provide an infrastructure for future academic studies.

METHOD

In this study, descriptive survey model aiming to reveal the current situation, one of the quantitative research approaches, and relational survey model which is one of the general survey models are used.

Population and Sample

The population of the study was composed of sports managers working in public and private

sectors in Turkey. The sample of the study consisted of 154 sports managers, managers working in public sector (Provincial Directorates of Youth Services and Sports n = 11, Federation Director n=31, n=13 under the Ministry of Youth and Sports General Directorate n=55 in total n=55) and sports club managers (n=99). The sample group was selected by simple random sampling method.

Data Collection Tools

Personal Information Form, Sports Managers Self-Efficacy Scale and Time Management Scale were used as data collection tools in the research.

Personal Information Form

In order to determine the personal characteristics of the managers, 7 questions (age, gender, marital status, education level, year of service, management year, and sports history), which are thought to be related to the subject, were created by the researcher through certain surveys.

Sports Managers Self-Efficacy Scale

Sports Managers Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Çiftçi (22). The scale consists of 48 statements and four sub-dimensions. In this study, the scaling was prepared with 11 intervals between 0 and 100 that participants could mark. To make it easier for participants to mark appropriate statements, in the scale, there are statements of 0 "not suitable for me at all", 50 "moderately suitable for me", and 100 "absolutely suitable for me".

It was determined that the factor loadings emerged after the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) conducted by Çiftçi (22) were distributed in four dimensions and the total variance ratio explained was 55.54%. Eigen values of the factors and explained variance amounts are 17.61% for decision-making (20 items) sub-dimension, 14.56% for personal characteristics (6 items) sub-dimension, 12.32% for knowledge (14 items) sub-dimension and 11.38% for the sub-dimension of interpersonal relations (8 items). In order to determine whether the four-dimensional factor structure of the finalized sports managers self-efficacy scale was validated and to support construct validity, first level CFA was performed. The fit index values were RMSEA=0.071, NFI=0.94, NNFI=0.97, CFI=0.97, IFI=0.97, SRMR=0.065 and $\chi^2/df=2.05$. In addition, in the reliability study, internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) values were found to be 0.94 for decision-making sub-dimension, 0.89 for personal

characteristics sub-dimension, 0.89 for Knowledge sub-dimension, 0.81 for interpersonal relations sub-dimension and 0.96 for the whole scale.

Time Management Scale

Time Management Scale was developed by Britton and Tesser (14). The reliability and validity study of the scale for Turkey was conducted by Alay and Koçak (5). The scale consists of 27 statements and three sub-dimensions. 5-point Likert type was used in the Time Management Scale: the form of straight scoring in positive questions was made as *always: 5, frequently: 4, sometimes: 3, infrequently: 2, never: 1* and the form of reverse scoring in negative questions was made as *always: 1, frequently: 2, sometimes: 3, infrequently: 4, never: 5*. The number of items in the Turkish Time Management Scale is 27 and the total score of the scale varies between 5 and 135. A high score means that "time is better managed".

Factor loadings after factor analysis (EFA) conducted by Alay and Koçak (5) were distributed in three dimensions and the total variance ratio explained was 34%. Eigen values of the factors and

explained variance amounts are 20% for Time Planning (Short and Long Term Planning) (16 items), 9% for Time Attitudes (7 items) and 6% for Time Wasters (4 items). In the reliability study for Turkey, internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) values were found to be 0.88 for the Time Planning sub-dimension, 0.66 for the Time Attitudes sub-dimension, and 0.4781 for the Time Wasters sub-dimension and 0.87 for the whole scale. As a result of the analyses, it is seen that the scales are applicable in line with the purpose of the research.

Data Analysis

In the analysis of data, since the data and groups are not distributed homogeneously and the data is skewed to the left, non-parametric Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis test techniques were used to determine the differences between the groups in the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and time management, and Spearman Correlation Analysis technique was used in the relationship between Sport Managers' Self-Efficacy Scale and Time Management Scale.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Related to Self-Efficacy and Time Management Scale and Dimensions

	Sub-dimensions	Mean	Sd	Min	Max
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	8.32	2.63	.00	11.00
	Personal Characteristics	8.37	2.63	.00	11.00
	Knowledge	8.40	2.62	.00	11.00
	Interpersonal Roles	8.41	2.59	.00	11.00
Time management	Time Planning	57.48	13.30	20.00	77.00
	Time Attitudes	22.12	1.80	17.00	29.00
	Time Wasters	8.99	4.88	4.00	20.00
	General Time Management	88.59	11.41	59.00	109.00

When Table 1 is examined, self-efficacy sub-dimension scores of sports managers were determined to have the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of $x = 8.41 \pm 2.59$ in the self-efficacy sub-dimension related to Interpersonal roles, $x = 8.40 \pm 2.62$ in the self-efficacy sub-dimension related to Knowledge, $x = 8.37 \pm 2.63$ in the personal characteristics sub-dimension, $x = 8.32 \pm 2.63$ in self-efficacy sub-dimension related to Decision-making. When the findings are examined, it can be said that sports managers' self-efficacy scores are high in sub-dimensions. In addition, the time management sub-dimension scores of sports managers were found to have the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of $x = 57.48 \pm 13.30$

for Time Planning sub-dimension, $x = 22.12 \pm 1.80$ for Time Attitudes sub-dimension, $x = 8.99 \pm 4.88$ for Time Wasters sub-dimension and $x = 88.59 \pm 11.41$ for General Time Management.

Table 2. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sport managers according to age variable

	Sub-dimensions	Age	n	Rank Mean	Sd	X ²	P
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	< 25	4	36.38			
		26-30	27	85.91			
		31-35	47	78.18	4	4.484	.344
		36-40	50	77.00			
		> 41	26	74.83			
	Personal Characteristics	< 25	4	39.25			
		26-30	27	83.87			
		31-35	47	79.52	4	4.085	.395
		36-40	50	78.31			
		> 41	26	71.56			
	Knowledge	< 25	4	34.75			
		26-30	27	86.61			
		31-35	47	78.12	4	5.053	.282
		36-40	50	77.59			
		> 41	26	73.33			
Interpersonal Roles	< 25	4	40.13				
	26-30	27	83.89				
	31-35	47	77.37	4	3.823	.430	
	36-40	50	79.73				
	> 41	26	72.56				
Time management	Time Planning	< 25	4	38.63			
		26-30	27	84.02			
		31-35	47	79.76	4	4.211	.378
		36-40	50	73.62			
		> 41	26	80.10			
	Time Attitudes	< 25	4	76.63			
		26-30	27	75.26			
		31-35	47	81.26	4	2.469	.650
		36-40	50	71.01			
		> 41	26	85.65			
	Time Wasters	< 25	4	98.63			
		26-30	27	74.76			
		31-35	47	80.33	4	1.695	.792
		36-40	50	77.67			
		> 41	26	71.65			
General Time Management	< 25	4	40.13				
	26-30	27	84.17				
	31-35	47	79.80	4	4.348	.361	
	36-40	50	72.65				
	> 41	26	81.50				

According to the findings in Table 2, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also their mean scores of Time Management, Time Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, and the mean scores of General Time Management were not significantly different according to age variable.

Table 3. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sport managers according to gender variable

	Sub-dimensions	Gender	n	Rank Mean	Rank Total	U	P
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	Female	38	72.53	2756.00	2015.000	.428
		Male	116	79.13	9179.00		
	Personal Characteristics	Female	38	72.14	2741.50	2000.500	.393
		Male	116	79.25	9193.50		
	Knowledge	Female	38	73.93	2809.50	2068.500	.570
		Male	116	78.67	9125.50		
Interpersonal Roles	Female	38	71.66	2723.00	1982.000	.351	
	Male	116	79.41	9212.00			
Time management	Time Planning	Female	38	83.39	3169.00	1980.000	.347
		Male	116	75.57	8766.00		
	Time Attitudes	Female	38	79.07	3004.50	2144.500	.797
		Male	116	76.99	8930.50		
	Time Wasters	Female	38	68.42	2600.00	1859.000	.141
		Male	116	80.47	9335.00		
	General Time Management	Female	38	79.55	3023.00	2126.000	.743
		Male	116	76.83	8912.00		

According to the findings in Table 3, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also

their mean scores of Time Management, Time Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, and the mean scores of General Time Management were not significantly different according to gender variable.

Table 4. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sport managers according to marital status variable

	Sub-dimensions	Marital Status	n	Rank Mean	Rank Total	U	P
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	Married	113	75.14	8490.50	2049.500	.274
		Single	41	84.01	3444.50		
	Personal Characteristics	Married	113	74.58	8427.50	1986.500	.176
		Single	41	85.55	3507.50		
	Knowledge	Married	113	76.08	8597.50	2156.500	.512
		Single	41	81.40	3337.50		
Interpersonal Roles	Married	113	74.95	8469.00	2028.000	.237	
	Single	41	84.54	3466.00			
Time management	Time Planning	Married	113	78.65	8887.00	2187.000	.596
		Single	41	74.34	3048.00		
	Time Attitudes	Married	113	78.61	8882.50	2191.500	.599
		Single	41	74.45	3052.50		
	Time Wasters	Married	113	77.46	8753.50	2312.500	.987
		Single	41	77.60	3181.50		
	General Time Management	Married	113	79.01	8928.50	2145.500	.484
		Single	41	73.33	3006.50		

According to the findings in Table 4, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also their mean scores of Time Management, Time Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, and the mean scores of General Time Management

were not significantly different according to marital status variable.

Table 5. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sport managers according to educational level variable

	Sub-dimensions	Level of education	n	Rank Mean	Sd	X ²	P
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	Doctorate	11	61.45	4	3.647	.456
		Master's Degree	17	84.76			
		Undergraduate	66	77.38			
		Associate Degree	15	65.40			
		High school	45	82.89			
	Personal Characteristics	Doctorate	11	62.41	4	2.609	.625
		Master's Degree	17	80.50			
		Undergraduate	66	78.80			
		Associate Degree	15	67.07			
		High school	45	81.62			
	Knowledge	Doctorate	11	56.77	4	4.755	.313
		Master's Degree	17	84.44			
		Undergraduate	66	78.78			
		Associate Degree	15	64.20			
		High school	45	82.50			
	Interpersonal Roles	Doctorate	11	63.00	4	3.525	.474
Master's Degree		17	80.15				
Undergraduate		66	77.74				
Associate Degree		15	64.33				
High school		45	84.08				
Time management	Time Planning	Doctorate	11	73.64	4	2.019	.732
		Master's Degree	17	90.41			
		Undergraduate	66	73.77			
		Associate Degree	15	77.83			
		High school	45	78.92			
	Time Attitudes	Doctorate	11	77.00	4	.765	.943
		Master's Degree	17	80.47			
		Undergraduate	66	74.12			
		Associate Degree	15	80.17			
		High school	45	80.57			
	Time Wasters	Doctorate	11	70.36	4	1.717	.788
		Master's Degree	17	73.79			
		Undergraduate	66	82.03			
		Associate Degree	15	80.93			
		High school	45	72.86			
	General Time Management	Doctorate	11	72.14	4	1.669	.796
Master's Degree		17	89.94				
Undergraduate		66	75.45				
Associate Degree		15	79.23				
High school		45	76.53				

According to the findings in Table 5, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also their mean scores of Time Management, Time Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, and the mean scores of General Time Management were not significantly different according to educational level variable.

Table 6. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sport managers according to service year variable

Sub-dimensions	Year of Service	n	Rank Mean	Sd	X ²	P	
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	0-1 year	23	61.78	4	3.539	.472
		2-5 years	37	80.68			
		6-10 years	61	81.47			
		11-20 years	25	77.36			
		21 years and above	8	78.19			
	Personal Characteristics	0-1 year	23	62.35	4	3.609	.461
		2-5 years	37	81.65			
		6-10 years	61	81.75			
		11-20 years	25	75.42			
		21 years and above	8	75.94			
	Knowledge	0-1 year	23	60.61	4	4.188	.381
		2-5 years	37	80.62			
		6-10 years	61	81.04			
		11-20 years	25	76.98			
		21 years and above	8	86.25			
	Interpersonal Roles	0-1 year	23	60.93	4	4.214	.378
		2-5 years	37	82.57			
		6-10 years	61	81.47			
		11-20 years	25	75.30			
		21 years and above	8	78.31			
Time management	Time Planning	0-1 year	23	81.17	4	1.973	.741
		2-5 years	37	82.50			
		6-10 years	61	74.02			
		11-20 years	25	80.00			
		21 years and above	8	62.56			
	Time Attitudes	0-1 year	23	71.20	4	4.739	.315
		2-5 years	37	84.09			
		6-10 years	61	78.20			
		11-20 years	25	65.74			
		21 years and above	8	96.50			
	Time Wasters	0-1 year	23	76.50	4	.823	.935
		2-5 years	37	77.16			
		6-10 years	61	76.51			
		11-20 years	25	76.98			
		21 years and above	8	91.13			
General Time Management	0-1 year	23	78.59	4	.788	.940	
	2-5 years	37	82.30				
	6-10 years	61	75.25				
	11-20 years	25	77.08				
	21 years and above	8	70.69				

According to the findings in Table 6, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also their mean scores of Time Management, Time Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, and the mean scores of General Time Management were not significantly different according to service year variable.

Table 7. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sport managers according to management year variable

	Sub-dimensions	Management Year	n	Rank Mean	Sd	X ²	P
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	1-4 years	44	77.61	3	2.383	.497
		5-9 years	68	77.63			
		10-14 years	34	82.31			
		15 years and above	8	55.31			
	Personal Characteristics	1-4 years	44	76.84	3	3.529	.317
		5-9 years	68	79.07			
		10-14 years	34	81.75			
		15 years and above	8	49.69			
	Knowledge	1-4 years	44	79.01	3	.173	.982
		5-9 years	68	76.21			
		10-14 years	34	78.82			
		15 years and above	8	74.56			
Interpersonal Roles	1-4 years	44	78.48	3	1.660	.646	
	5-9 years	68	78.32				
	10-14 years	34	79.22				
	15 years and above	8	57.81				
Time management	Time Planning	1-4 years	44	86.30	3	3.682	.298
		5-9 years	68	70.68			
		10-14 years	34	81.16			
		15 years and above	8	71.56			
	Time Attitudes	1-4 years	44	79.08	3	3.274	.351
		5-9 years	68	72.85			
		10-14 years	34	79.21			
		15 years and above	8	101.13			
	Time Wasters	1-4 years	44	66.08	3	6.247	.051
		5-9 years	68	88.26			
		10-14 years	34	69.72			
		15 years and above	8	81.88			
General Time Management	1-4 years	44	82.83	3	1.468	.690	
	5-9 years	68	72.97				
	10-14 years	34	80.13				
	15 years and above	8	75.50				

According to the findings in Table 7, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also their mean scores of Time Management, Time

Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, and the mean scores of General Time Management were not significantly different according to management year variable.

Table 8. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sports executives according to the status of doing sports with license

	Sub-dimensions	Sports History	n	Rank Mean	Rank Total	U	P
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	I did	93	75.86	7055.00	2684.000	.573
		I didn't	61	80.00	4880.00		
	Personal Characteristics	I did	93	76.68	7131.00	2760.000	.777
		I didn't	61	78.75	4804.00		
	Knowledge	I did	93	74.41	6920.50	2549.500	.288
		I didn't	61	82.20	5014.50		
Interpersonal Roles	I did	93	76.79	7141.50	2770.500	.807	
	I didn't	61	78.58	4793.50			
Time management	Time Planning	I did	93	70.32	6540.00	2169.000	.014
		I didn't	61	88.44	5395.00		
	Time Attitudes	I did	93	76.38	7103.00	2732.000	.691
		I didn't	61	79.21	4832.00		
	Time Wasters	I did	93	78.16	7269.00	2775.000	.817
		I didn't	61	76.49	4666.00		
	General Time Management	I did	93	69.94	6504.50	2133.500	.009
		I didn't	61	89.02	5430.50		

According to the findings in Table 8, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also the mean scores of Time Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, were not significantly different according to the status of doing sports with license.

Time Planning mean score, one of the time management sub-dimensions, and General Time Management mean score of the managers who do sports with license is higher than the mean score of managers who do sports without license, and the difference between the scores were statistically significant ($p < 0,05$).

Table 9. Comparison of self-efficacy and time management scores of sport managers according to the sector variable

	Sub-dimensions	Sector	n	Rank Mean	Rank Total	U	P
Self-efficacy	Decision-making	Sports Club Managers	99	80.14	7933.50	2461.500	.324
		Public Sports Managers	55	72.75	4001.50		
	Personal Characteristics	Sports Club Managers	99	78.57	7778.50	2616.500	.689
		Public Sports Managers	55	75.57	4156.50		
	Knowledge	Sports Club Managers	99	81.80	8098.00	2297.000	.108
		Public Sports Managers	55	69.76	3837.00		
Interpersonal Roles	Sports Club Managers	99	79.93	7913.00	2482.000	.364	
	Public Sports Managers	55	73.13	4022.00			
Time management	Time Planning	Sports Club Managers	99	82.03	8121.00	2274.000	.090
		Public Sports Managers	55	69.35	3814.00		
	Time Attitudes	Sports Club Managers	99	83.79	8997.50	2297.500	.049
		Public Sports Managers	55	69.77	3837.50		
	Time Wasters	Sports Club Managers	99	78.04	7726.00	2669.000	.837
		Public Sports Managers	55	76.53	4209.00		
	General Time Management	Sports Club Managers	99	83.03	8219.50	2175.500	.039
		Public Sports Managers	55	67.55	3715.50		

According to the findings in Table 8, it was determined that sports managers' mean scores of Decision-making, Interpersonal Roles, Knowledge and Personal Characteristics dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and also

the mean scores of Time Attitudes and Time Wasters dimensions, which are among the sub-dimensions of time management, were not significantly different according to sector variable. Time Planning mean score, one of the time management sub-dimensions,

and General Time Management mean score of the Sports Club Managers is higher than the mean score of Public Sports Managers, and the difference

between the scores were statistically significant ($p<0,05$).

Table 10. The relationship between general time management and self-efficacy scale and dimensions

	Decision-making	Personal Characteristics	Knowledge	Interpersonal Roles	
General Time management	r	.184*	.168*	.197*	.180*
	p	.022	.037	.015	.025
	N	154	154	154	154

Considering that $0\leq r\leq 0.25$ is a very weak relationship, $0.26\leq r\leq 0.50$ is a weak relationship, and $0.51\leq r\leq 0.75$ is a moderate relationship, $0.76\leq r\leq 0.95$ is a strong relationship, $0.96\leq r\leq 1$ is a very strong relationship (Senocak, 1986), when the findings in

Table 10 were evaluated, a very weak, positive and significant relationship was found between General Time Management and Decision-making, Personal Characteristics, Knowledge and Interpersonal Roles dimensions of self-efficacy scale.

CONCLUSION

In this research, it was tried to determine the self-efficacy and time management skills of the public and sports club managers working in Turkey and examine them according to some demographic variables and reveal the relationship between them.

For this purpose, the following conclusions have been reached:

It was found that sports managers perceived themselves to be "highly sufficient" regarding their self-efficacy belief levels. This can be considered as the reason for their high belief in their competence in relation to their work since people at the management level received specific training and their experience improved their level of knowledge and skills. When the studies on the managers were examined, Işık and Gümüş (36) stated the general self-efficacy beliefs of the school administrators were high, Çiftçi (22) stated same for sports administrators, Uyanıker (81) for executive nurses, and Okutan and Kahveci (58) state it for the primary school principals.

In addition, it can be said that sports managers have "high" mean scores showing their opinions on "General Time Management" and its sub-dimensions (Time Planning, Time Attitudes and Time Wasters), in other words, it can be said that sports managers manage their time well. When the relevant literature on managers is examined, in their studies on the time management skills, likewise, Şahin and Gümüş (76) identified high time management scores of primary school administrators, Kıdak (47) for hospital managers, Gökçek (33) for professional

football teams managers, and Uyanıker (81) for the administrative nurses. It is also important to note that the Time Consuming Things sub-dimension, which includes questions about wasting time, has the lowest value. The most important factor that wastes time for managers is the desire not to continue the habits and activities that do not benefit. This may also indicate that the time they devote to management tasks is more than the time they devote to their own private business. Time Wasters can be caused by deficiencies in the social and cultural sphere. However, this is not the only reason for this. In this context, in this study, it was investigated whether time management beliefs change according to the personal structure of sport managers (age, gender, marital status, education level, year of service, managerial year and sports history). The next part of the study is devoted to evaluations on this subject.

The findings of the study revealed that age was not an effective variable on the self-efficacy beliefs of sports managers. Individuals complete their social-emotional and cognitive development as their age progresses, and their self-assessment about their environment and themselves becomes more realistic and their self-awareness increases. In other words, considering the effects of past experiences (experience, life experience, success) on self-efficacy, age factor is expected to affect self-efficacy perception. However, research findings do not support this. This can be considered as a natural result of not being differentiated according to age variable by virtue of the responsibility and the

nature of the work owing to the responsibility of fulfilling the management duty due to the fact that the study is conducted in the sample of the manager. In addition, although self-efficacy beliefs are seen as an increasing function of age, age may be associated with other variables such as experience and amount of knowledge in psychological structures. In the study by Çiftçi (22) in order to examine the self-efficacy beliefs of sports managers, which supports our research findings, it was stated that age variable did not affect general self-efficacy perceptions. When the related literature is reviewed, while the findings of the study were similar to the findings of the research (54,71,63) on different samples, they differed with some research findings (82,3,59,80).

Similarly, time management skills of sport managers do not vary according to age. In the study of Gökçek (33), which supports our research findings, on the examination of the time management skills of the managers working in professional football teams, it was stated that the age variable did not affect the time management skills. When the related field is reviewed, while the findings of the study were similar to the findings of the research done in different samples (19,26,27,45), it differed with some of the research findings (10,13,15,56,61,67,72,76,90).

Another result of the study is that gender is not an effective variable on the self-efficacy beliefs of sport managers. This finding may be due to the convergence of job descriptions and behavioral characteristics of women and men socially, and the fact that women occupy managerial positions. In addition, the fact that the self-efficacy perceptions of female sports managers showing similarity with male sports managers may be due to the similarity in relation to factors such as effective communication, cooperation, teamwork and employee motivation, which are the perceptions in women's beliefs in competence in Interpersonal Relationship resulting from the characteristics of sports. Although there is not much research on the managers' self-efficacy perception, in the study conducted by Çiftçi (22) in order to examine the self-efficacy beliefs of sports managers, which support our research findings, it was stated that gender variable does not affect general self-efficacy perceptions. In the study of Izgar and Dilmaç (37), which differ from our research findings, conducted by the aim of examining the self-efficacy perceptions of the manager candidate teachers, it was

determined that there was a difference between the genders in favor of male manager candidate teachers. It is a predictable outcome that gender self-efficacy varies from profession to profession and according to the socio-cultural structure of society. However, the fact that female sports managers have similar perceptions to male managers in self-efficacy perceptions points to a positive situation in the field.

In addition, time management skills of sports managers do not vary depending on gender. That is, the opinions of male managers and female managers on Time Planning and Time Attitudes and Skills are similar. At the same time, it can be argued that male and female managers show similar behaviors in planning short and long term work and controlling time. When the relevant literature is examined, the findings of the study are similar to the findings of the research (68,45) done in different samples, but differ with some research findings (15,19,25,28,34,47,48,61,72,77,75,90).

Another result of the study is that being married or single of sports managers does not affect self-efficacy beliefs. In the study conducted by Çiftçi (22) in order to investigate the self-efficacy beliefs of sports managers, which support our research findings, it was stated that the marital status variable did not affect the general self-efficacy perceptions. These findings are consistent with the studies of Sergek and Sertbaş (71) and Pekmezci (63) conducted in different samples in the literature, and that being married or single is not effective on the general self-efficacy belief levels of the manager.

In addition, it was seen that the marital status of sports managers is not a determinant factor in whether or not they use time effectively in this study, that is, the time management skills of managers do not differ according to marital status. In the study by Gökçek (33), in support of our research findings, conducted by the aim of examining the time management skills of the managers working in professional football teams, it was stated that marital status variable does not affect time management skills. These findings are consistent with the studies of Bahçecik ve ark (10), Sarp ve ark (67), Kıdak (47), Bülbül (15), Karasu (45) and Döner (24) done in different samples in the literature, which determined that marital status is not an effective factor on time management attitudes. Contrary to the results of analysis, Sökmen (72) found that married health managers were more

positive in Time Attitudes but fell more intensely into time traps.

Education levels were not a variable affecting the self-efficacy beliefs of sport managers in this study. Considering the contribution and advantages for higher level educated individuals while carrying out the sports management, they are expected to have higher self-efficacy scores, contrary to the research findings. Based on this finding, this can be explained by the fact that these people do not receive field training in administration and management, even though their education levels are high. Moreover, the fact that education levels of sports managers are not a determinant factor in the self-efficacy can be explained by the fact that the expected differences between sports managers are neutralized by the experiences acquired in the work process (field experiences, development studies under the leadership of successful people, experiences in different organizations, etc.) and thus their self-efficacy levels have become almost close.

The results show that the educational status of sports managers does not affect time management skills. In the study of Gökçek (33), conducted to examine the time management skills of the managers working in professional football teams, it was stated that the educational status variable did not affect the time management skills. When the studies (69,46,47,24,7) conducted in different sectors are examined, it was found that the effective use of time behaviors did not show significant difference according to education level. Contrary to the results of the analysis, it differs from some research findings (1,10,13,15,72,74,75). This difference in the results of the study may be due to sample groups.

In the research, self-efficacy beliefs of sport managers do not show significant differences according to service and management years. The fact that the beliefs of sports managers do not differ according to the year of service and the year of management suggests that they are related to the resources (sports backgrounds, necessity of having certain competencies of the sports manager duty, occupational preferences, etc.) that constitute self-efficacy for sports managers. Sullivan and Kent (73) show that past coaching experiences positively affect the self-efficacy of coaches. As a result of the research conducted by Yılmaz and Gürçay (88) on teacher candidates, it was found that teacher candidates' self-efficacy of teacher, general self-efficacy, self-efficacy beliefs related to field teaching

and self-efficacy beliefs related to their fields are at a high level. The reason for the difference between the findings of the study can be thought that other environmental, behavioral and personal factors, which affect the change of self-efficacy status of the sport manager, during the managerial period, and previous performance situations, indirect experiences, verbal persuasion and emotional state sources may be effective. In addition, the fact that the sport managers' self-efficacy status does not change according to their total managerial periods also supports the findings that the self-efficacy status does not change according to the year of service in the institution.

Furthermore, in this study, time management skills of sport managers do not vary depending on the years of service and management. Kıldak (47) showed that there is no difference between the time management attitudes of hospital managers and their working hours. Similarly, Karasu (45) found that their professional experience was not an effective factor on time management attitudes. Other studies with different results (13,15,24,25,48,49,64,69,88,89) show that time management skills are related to past experience.

One of the important results of the study is that doing sports with license does not have a significant effect on the self-efficacy beliefs of sports managers. Considering the contributions and advantages for the managers, who do sports, in terms of their past life and field experiences while carrying out sports management, they are expected to have a higher self-efficacy score in contrast to the research findings. Based on this finding, it can be said that doing sports, that is, knowledge of the field (specific information about athletes, coaches, referees, facilities, competitions and all other elements of sports environment) will not be sufficient for performing sports management alone. In the study of Öcal and Aydın (60), which supports the findings of the study even though they are in a different sample group, on the relationship between the perception of collective competence, self-efficacy and sincerity in sports teams, and the perception and expectations of success, it was determined that self-efficacy belief had no effect on athletes' perceptions of past success and expectations for future success.

In addition, there is no significant relationship between sub-dimensions of Time Attitudes, Time Wasters of time management skills and "doing

sports with license". However, in our study, there was a significant difference between dimension of Time Planning of time management skills and General Time Management and the status of doing sports with license in the past. Accordingly, managers doing sports as licensed in the past, compared to those who do sports without it, are better in doing daily, weekly, periodic plans, clarity in plans, and determining aims and priorities. In the study of Samuk (66), which supports the findings of the study, which examined academics' understanding of time management according to their participation in physical activities, it was found that there was a significant difference in the Time Planning sub-dimension in favor of those doing sports.

No difference in self-efficacy beliefs of sports managers according to the task sector and generally similarity in self-efficacy scores of public and sports club managers may be due to the fact that the people in the positions have certain education and experience and the high and similar belief in their competence in relation to their work. In the study of Çiftçi (22) on the examination of the self-efficacy beliefs of sports managers, which partially supports the findings of the study, it was determined that the managers working in public or sports clubs did not affect their self-efficacy perceptions about Personal Characteristics, Knowledge and Interpersonal Roles, and Decision-making self-efficacy scores of sports managers working in the public field were higher than sports club managers.

In addition, no significant relationship was determined between the time management and time management skills' sub-dimensions of Time Planning and Time Wasters of sports managers and the sector. However, in our study, significant differences were found between Time Attitudes dimension of time management skills and General Time Management, and the sector. General Time Management and Time Attitudes of sports managers working in sports clubs are significantly better than sports managers working in public areas. According to this, managers working in sports clubs are better at being aware of their degree of competence in attitudes, behaviors and approaches to using time, in making decision-making skills and avoiding engagements that prevent their essential business than managers working in the public field. They can also be said to use their time better. In the study by Fidan (31), which supports our research findings

although it is in a different sample group, on the examination of the time management behaviors of private sector and public managers, it was determined that private sector SME managers are more sensitive to time management than public sector managers.

According to the findings of the study, there is a very weak, positive and significant relationship between General Time Management and self-efficacy skills dimensions of Decision-making, Personal Characteristics, Knowledge and Interpersonal Roles, which shows parallelism with the results obtained from the studies of Terry (78), Claessens (18), Garson (32), Zimmerman and Cleary (91), Welsh (83), Terry and Doolittle (79), Uyaniker (81). Accordingly, general self-efficacy perceptions of sports managers are effective on time management perceptions, while time management perceptions are also effective on general self-efficacy perceptions. A weak positive relationship was observed between General Time Management and all dimensions of Self-Efficacy (Decision-making, Personal Characteristics, Knowledge and Interpersonal Roles), which also shows that the studies that will increase the perception of time management will increase the self-efficacy belief level.

The findings of this study, which aims to examine the relationship between self-efficacy of sport managers and time management, are important in terms of emphasizing the importance of sport managers on the success and effectiveness of sport organizations. However, the study has some limitations. Firstly, in this study, self-efficacy and time management were determined based on the perceptions of sports managers. More reliable results can be achieved by determining the sports manager's self-efficacy by associating them with more objective indicators such as relationship with time management, organizational success or the perceptions of stakeholders of sports organizations (such as sports professionals, employees and/or athletes) about these behaviors (self-efficacy, time management). Failure to evaluate these behaviors is the main limitation of this and many other studies. However, it should be kept in mind that the failure to carry out such a study plan due to its some possible implementation and ethical problems is also a problem.

In addition to determining the self-efficacy and time management skills of sport managers,

qualitative research should be conducted on issues such as how to develop self-efficacy and time management skills and how to provide training to support them. In this context, a training to be given especially to the newly appointed public sports managers can be considered to have contribution. However, it can be said that an in-service training environment where sports managers who have gained experience in time management and who use managerial time efficiently in the organization and newly appointed managers can work together can be beneficial.

As a result, based on the current literature, it is seen that the time management of those with high self-efficacy beliefs is relatively better and the self-efficacy beliefs of those with high time management

are relatively high. It is thought that sports managers with these characteristics show a more effective performance in dealing with the problems that may be encountered in the public and club management, that they improve public and sports clubs service quality, contributing positively to not only sport managers but also managed employees, and that expanding the existing educational curricula of higher education institutions, providing training for sport manager and sport manager candidate to cover these issues more improves the quality of sports management. In this direction, it is recommended to increase the effectiveness of the training provided for the sports managers to improve themselves.

REFERENCES

1. Acuner AM, Sarp N, Çifteli FG, Determining The Agent Factors Related with Time Management of Responsible Doctors and Nurses in Clinics at Ankara University, *World Hospitals and Health Services*, 42(1), 2006, pp. 26-29.
2. Akatay A, Örgütlerde zaman yönetimi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2003, 10:281-300.
3. Akgül N, Sivas İl Merkezi Birinci Basamak Sağlık Kurumlarında Çalışan Sağlık Personelinin Sağlıklı Yaşam Biçimi Davranışları ve Öz-Etkililik-Yeterlilik Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesi. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Anabilimdalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2008.
4. Alay S, Koçak S, Üniversite öğrencilerinin zaman yönetimleri ile akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki, *Eğitim Yönetimi*, 2003, 35, 326-335.
5. Alay S, Koçak S, Validity and reliability of time management questionnaire. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2002, 22, 9-13.
6. Altuntaş EA, Kul M, Karataş İ, Beden Eğitimi Öğretmeni Adaylarının Öğretmenlik Mesleğine İlişkin Tutumları İle Öz Yeterlilikleri Arasındaki İlişki, *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies (IntJCES)*, 2016, 2 (2),196-215.
7. Ardıç C, "Zaman Yönetimi ve Zaman Yönetiminde Dönüştürücü Liderlerin Davranışlarını Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma", Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2010.
8. Aşkar P, Umay A, İlköğretim matematik öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin bilgisayarla ilgili öz-yeterlilik algısı. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2001, 21,1-8.
9. Bahadır Z, Reviewing Emotional Intelligence Levels and Time Management Skills among Students of School of Physical Education and Sports, *Journal of Education and Learning*, 2018, 7(4), 114-121.
10. Bahçecik N, Öztürk H, Şerbetçi GK, "Yönetici Hemşireler İçin Zaman Yönetimi Ölçeği ve Zaman Yönetimini Etkileyen Faktörler." *Yönetim Dergisi*, 2004, 15, 49.
11. Bandura A, Self-efficacy in changing societies. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
12. Block ME, Hutzler YS, Barak S, Klavina A, Creation and validation of the self-efficacy instrument for physical education teacher education majors toward inclusion. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 2013, 29, 184-205.
13. Boduç N, Hemşirelerde Zaman Yönetimi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul 2016.
14. Britton, B. K., & Tesser, A. (1991). Effects of time-management practices on college grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(3), 405-410.
15. Bülbül A, Sağlık Çalışanlarında Zaman Yönetimi (Kırkırelili Örneği) (Beykent Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul 2014.
16. Caz Ç, Tunçkol HM, Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Zaman Yönetimi Becerilerinin İncelenmesi, *Spor ve Performans Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2015, 6(2), 91-100.
17. Caz Ç, Tunçkol HM, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmeni Adaylarının Zaman Yönetimi Becerilerinin İncelenmesi, *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2013, 8(2), 23-29.
18. Claessens BJC, Perceived Control of Time: Time Management and Personal Effectiveness at Work. Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Doctoral Thesis, UK, 2004.
19. Çelebi K, Etkili Zaman Yönetiminin Hizmet Sektöründe Verimlilik Algısına Pozitif Katkısı Üzerine Görgül Bir Araştırma: Bir Hastane Örneği, (Çağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Yönetimi ABD, Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Mersin 2017.
20. Çelik OB, İlhan EL, Esentürk OK, Investigation of time management skills of college students who play sports and don't play sports, *Science, Movement and Health*, 2015,15 (2, Supplement), 602-609.
21. Çetin F, Basım HN, İzlenim yönetimi taktiklerinde öz yeterlilik algısının rolü. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2010, 35:255-269.
22. Çiftçi S, Spor Yöneticilerinin Öz Yeterlilik Durumlarının Belirlenmesi, *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Bolu, 2013.

23. Çolak S, Başaran Z, Çolak TA, E, The Investigation of Sports Managers' Self-Efficacy Levels of Sportsmen Management And Sports Clubs, The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology. 2016, 1003-1007.
24. Döner H, Hastane Yöneticilerinin Zaman Yönetimi Tekniklerinin İncelenmesi, (Namık Kemal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sağlık Yönetimi ABD, Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Tekirdağ, 2016.
25. Ebrahimi H, Hosseinzadeh, R, Zaghari T, Mansoreh HS, Time management behaviors of head nurses and staffnurses employed in Tehran Social Security Hospitals, Iran in 2011, Iranian Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Research, 2(19), 2014, pp. 193-198.
26. Eldeklelioğlu J, Ergenlerin Zaman Yönetimi Becerilerinin Kaygı, Yaş ve Cinsiyet Değişkenleri Açısından incelenmesi, ilköğretim Online, Sayı: 7(3), 2008, ss. 656-663.
27. Erdem R, Pirinççi E, Dikmetaş E, ("Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Zaman Yönetim Davranışları ve Bu Davranışların Akademik Başarı İle İlişkisi", Mana Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 2005, 14, s.167-177.
28. Erdem R, Zaman Yönetimi ve Hastane Üst Düzey Yöneticileri Açısından Bir Uygulama, (Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bilim Uzmanlığı Tezi), Ankara 1997.
29. Eroğlu C, Ünlü H, Self-efficacy: Its effects on physical education teacher candidates' attitudes toward the teaching profession. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 2015, 15 (1), 201-212.
30. Feltz D, Short S, Sullivan P, Self-efficacy in sport: Research and strategies for working with athletes, teams and coaches. International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 2008, 3(2), 293-295.
31. Fidan Y, Özel Sektör Ve Kamu Yöneticilerinin Zaman Yönetimi Davranışlarının Karşılaştırılması, Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2011, 4(6), 47-74.
32. Garson GD, Logistic regression. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 2006.
33. Gökçek A, Profesyonel Futbol Takımlarında Görev Yapan Yöneticilerin Zaman Yönetimi (Ankara Örneği), Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Öğretmenliği Yüksek Lisans Tezi Ankara, 2013.
34. Gözel E, "İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin zaman yönetimi hakkındaki görüşlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi", Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (İLKE) Bahar, 2010, 24, 67- 84.
35. Güçlü N, Stres yönetimi. Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt 21, 1 2001, 91-109.
36. Işık AN, Gümüş E, Yönetici Öz-Yeterliliği ve Okul Etkililiği Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 2017, 25(1), 419-434.
37. Izzar, H, Dilmaç B, Yönetici aday öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik algıları ve epistemolojik inançların incelenmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2008, 20, 437-446.
38. İmamoğlu AF, Çimen Z, Spor yöneticileri için etkili zaman yönetimi. Bed. Eğt. Spor Bil. 1998, 1: 51-58.
39. Jinks J, Morgan V, Children's perceived academic self-efficacy: An inventory scale. Clearing House, 1999, 72(4), 224.
40. Kafkas ME, Açak M, Çoban B, Karademir T, (Beden eğitimi öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlik algıları ile mesleki kaygıları arasındaki ilişki. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2010, 11,2, 93-111.
41. Karaçam A, Pulur A, Hakem öz yeterlik ölçeği'nin (HÖYÖ) Türkçeye uyarlama çalışması. Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2017, 11, Sayı 1,118-128.
42. Karaçam A, Pulur A, Hakemlerin Problem Çözme Becerileri İle Öz Yeterlikleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2019, 4(1), 115-130.
43. Karademir N, Coğrafya öğretmenlerinin alanlarına ilişkin öz-yeterlik algılarının incelenmesi. e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 2010, 5(4):2034-2048.
44. Karaoğlu B, Erciyes Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Zaman Yönetimi Davranışlarının Farklı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Erciyes Üniversitesi, 2015.
45. Karasu, G, Yönetici Hemşirelerde Zaman Yönetiminin İncelenmesi, (Haliç Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul 2015.
46. Khodam H, Kolagari SH. Influence of workshop skills education, time management behaviors on its application by nursing management. J Nurs Res. 2010;4:12-13
47. Kıdak LB, Hastane Yöneticilerinin Zaman Yönetimi Tutumlarının Belirlenmesi: İzmir İli Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastaneleri Uygulaması, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Sayı: 25, 2011, ss. 159- 172.
48. Kılıç SS, Zaman Yönetimi ve Zamanı Etkin Kullanma (Rize Aile Hekimliği Çalışanları Örneği), (Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İşletme Yönetimi ABD, Hastane ve Sağlık Kurumları Yönetimi Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul 2015.
49. Kocabaşı İ, Erdem R, "Yönetici aday öğretmenlerin kişisel zaman yönetimi davranışları", Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 2003, 13, Sayı: 2, s.203-210.
50. Koçak ÇV, Antrenör adaylarının antrenör öz yeterlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi, spormetre, 2019, 17(1),55-62.
51. Koçak ÇV, Güven Ö, Voleybol antrenörü mesleki öz yeterlik ölçeği geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması, spormetre, 2018, 16(2),162-177.
52. Koparan Ş, Öztürk F, Korkmaz HN, Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin öz yeterlik ve beden eğitimi öğretmeni yeterliğinin incelenmesi [Special Issue]. VAN/ YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Özel Sayısı, 2011, 52-61.
53. Koray Ö, Yaratıcı düşünceye dayalı fen öğretiminin öğretmen adaylarının öz yeterlik, yaratıcılık ve problem çözme düzeylerine etkisi, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara,2003.
54. Kumar R, Lal R, The role of self-efficacy and gender difference among the adolescents. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 2006, 32(3):249-254.
55. Lay CH, Schouwenburg, HC, . Trait procrastination, time management, and academic behavior. Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 1193, 8, 647-662.
56. Misra R, Mckean M, Collage students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, Time management and leisure satisfaction. American Journal of Health Studies, 2000,, 16(1): 41-51.

57. Moen F, Allgood E, Coaching and the effect on self-efficacy. *Organization Development Journal*, 2009, 27 (4), 69-82.
58. Okutan M, Kahveci A, İlköğretim Okul Müdürlerinin Genel Öz Yeterlik İnançlarının Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi (Rize Örneği). *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 2012, 20 (1), 27-42.
59. Otacıoğlu SG, Müzik öğretmenliği okul deneyimi uygulamalarına katılan öğretmen adaylarının öz etkililik-yeterlilik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2008, 32(1):163-170.
60. Öcal H, Aydın O, Spor takımlarında kolektif yeterlik, öz-yeterlik ve sargınlık algıları ile başarı algı ve beklentileri arasındaki ilişkiler, *Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2009, 26 (2); 155-174.
61. Öncel C, Büyüköztürk Ş, Özçelikay G, Serbest Eczacıların Zaman Yönetimi, *Ankara Eczacılık Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt: 3, Sayı: 34, 2005, ss.191-206.
62. Özsoy D, Toksöz İ, Oğuzhan A, "Spor Organizasyonlarında Görev Yapan Bireylerin Zaman Yönetimi, Tutum ve Becerilerinin İncelenmesi". *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2015, 346-357.
63. Pekmezci GU, Hemşirelerin Örgütsel Bağlılıkları ile Öz yeterlilik Algısı Arasındaki İlişkiler. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Hastane ve Sağlık Kuruluşlarında Yönetim Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul, 2010.*
64. Pepe SJ, Farnese ML, Avalone F, Vecchione M, Work self efficacy scale and search for work self efficacy scale: A validation study in spanish and italian cultural context. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 2010, 26 (3), 201-210.
65. Robinson J, Godbey GC, Time for life, the surprising ways Americans use their time (2nd ed.), Pennsylvania State Press, University Park 1999.
66. Samuk E, Üniversitelerde Görev Yapan Akademik ve İdari Personelin Fiziksel Aktivitelere Katılmalarının Zaman Yönetimi Açısından İlişkinin Araştırılması, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor A.B.D., Kütahya, 2014.
67. Sarp N, Yarpuzlu AA, Mostame F, Assessment of time management attitudes among health managers. *The Health Care Manager*, 2005, 24(3):228-232.
68. Say B, Bekiroğlu N, Hastane Yöneticilerinin Zaman Yönetimi Konusundaki Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi, 17. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı, 2009, ss. 848-854.
69. Sayan İ, Yönetici hemşirelerde zaman yönetimi. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul, 2005.
70. Seçkin, A, Başbay M, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmeni Adaylarının Öğretmenlik Mesleğine İlişkin Öz-Yeterlik İnançlarının İncelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, 2013, 8(8): 253-270.
71. Sergek E, Sertbaş G, SSK hastanesinde çalışan hemşirelerin sosyodemografik özellikleri ve öz-etkililik, yeterlilik düzeyleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 2006, 9(1):41-48.
72. Sökmen A, Yöneticiler Zamanı Nasıl Yönetiyor? Ankara'daki Hastanelerde Bir Uygulama, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Sayı: 4/4, 2012, ss. 126-140.
73. Sullivan PJ, Kent A, Coaching efficacy as a predictor of leadership style in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 2003, 15 (1), 1-11.
74. Süsin M, İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin zaman yönetimi hakkındaki görüşleri. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Çanakkale On Sekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale, 2012.
75. Şahin DC, Verimli Örgüt Yönetimi İçin Zaman Yönetimi: Bir Özel Hastane Örneği, (Atılım Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme ABD, İşletme Yönetimi Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Ankara 2015.
76. Şahin ve Gümüş, İlkokul Yöneticilerinin Zaman Yönetimi Hakkındaki Görüşlerinin İncelenmesi, *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2016, 9(2), 24-49.
77. Tektaş M, Tektaş N, "Meslek yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin zaman yönetimi ve akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki", *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2010, Sayı:23 s.221-229.
78. Terry KP, Doolittle PE, Fostering self-efficacy through time management in an online learning environment. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 2008, 7(3):195-207.
79. Terry KP, The Effects of Online Time Management Practices on Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Self-Efficacy. Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Doctoral Thesis, USA, 2002.
80. Uğur E, Yönetici Hemşirelerin Koçluk Becerileri Ve Öz-Etkililik-Yeterlilik Algılamaları. *Marmara Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul, 2010.*
81. Uyaniker EA, Yönetici Hemşirelerin Genel Öz Yeterlilik İnançları İle Zaman Yönetimi Arasındaki İlişki, (Haliç Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul 2014.
82. Ünal Keskin G, Orgun F, Öğrencilerin öz etkinlik-yeterlilik düzeyleri ile başa çıkma stratejilerinin incelenmesi. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 2006, 7:92-99.
83. Welsh JB, Identifying Factors that Predict Student Success in A Community College Online Distance Learning Course. University of North Texas, Department of Learning Technologies, Doctoral Thesis, USA, 2007.
84. Wenner G, Science and mathematics efficacy beliefs held by practicing and prospective teachers: a 5-year perspective, *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 2001, 10(2), 181-187.
85. Yanık M, Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmeni adaylarının öğretmen öz yeterlilik inançları, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2017, 19(4):148-161.
86. Yavuz M, Sünbül AM, "İlköğretim Okulu Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerinde İş Doyumu, Denetim Odağı ve Demografik Faktörlerin Zaman Yönetimiyle İlişkisi", *Selçuk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2004, 16, (18) s.367-380.
87. Yıldırım F, İlhan İÖ, Genel öz yeterlilik ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 2010, 21(4):301-308.
88. Yılmaz M, Gürçay D, .Biyoloji ve fizik öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen özyeterliliklerini yordayan değişkenlerin belirlenmesi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2011, 40 (1), 53-56.
89. Yüksel AK, Hemşirelerde zaman yönetimi ve zaman yönetimini etkileyen faktörler, (İstanbul Medipol

Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Hemşirelik ABD, Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul, 2016.

90. Ziapour Arash, Khatony Alireza, Jafari Faranak, Kianipour Neda, "Evaluation of Time Management Behaviors and Its Related Factors in the Senior Nurse Managers, Kermanshah-Iran" *Global Journal of Health Science*, Vol: 2, No: 7, 2015, pp. 366-373.

91. Zimmerman BJ, Cleary TJ, Chapter 2: Adolescents' Development of Personal Agency - The Role of Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Self-Regulatory Skill. In: *Self-efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*. Eds: Pajares F., Urdan T., Information Age Publishing, 2006, 45-69.