International Journal of
Disabilities Sports and Health Sciences
e-ISSN: 2645-9094

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Relationship of the Leadership Styles of Sports Business Managers and Their Levels of Crisis Management

Harun AYAR[1*] and Ebru BARUT[2]

[1]Istanbul Gelisim University, College of Physical Education and Sports, Recreation, Istanbul / Türkiye
[2] Ministry of Youth and Sports, Swimming Coaching, Istanbul / Türkiye
Corresponding author: hayar@gelisim.edu.tr

Abstract
The purpose of this study was to investigate the correlations between sports managers' levels of crisis management and their leadership styles. Additionally, it was investigated whether managerial traits including age, gender, marital status, and length of employment affect the managers' leadership and crisis management capacities. The research's target population consists of in private and public organizations people managing sports in Istanbul in 2023. Among quantitative research techniques, the relational scanning model was used for this study. The scanning strategy in the relational scanning model tries to identify the presence of co-variation between two or more variables. The convenience sampling method was used to select 212 people from the identified universe who willingly agreed to take part in the study. An online data collecting instrument that included a personal information form, a self-leadership scale, and a crisis management scale was used to gather data for the study. On a computer, the collected data was examined using the statistical program SPSS 22.0. Correlation analysis was used to look at the connections between sports managers' leadership philosophies and how well they handle crises. The significance level for statistical procedures was set at 0.05. The study found that while sports managers' crisis management is at a moderate level, their leadership styles are displayed at a high level. Only two of the eight leadership attributes examined in the study were shown to have an effect on crisis management: setting self-reminders and focusing on intrinsic rewards p<0,05. It was shown that these dimensions increased crisis management by 51.3%.

Keywords
Sports, Crisis Management, Sports Management, Leader Management, Leadership Models

INTRODUCTION

States and societies interact; in today's world, where economic, social, sporting, and cultural interactions are inevitable, the structures of institutions and organizations providing goods and services can become complex over time.

Due to the rapid development of technology, new needs arise, and consequently, new demands are formed. In addition to the demand for commodities, various products, tools, etc., there is also an increasing demand to improve living standards so that employees can live under better conditions, as well as to enhance their personal rights. To meet these needs, public or private institutions and organizations in the relevant sectors need to develop various strategies, taking competition into consideration. The proposed strategy should be analyzed sufficiently, and the process should be managed appropriately in the event of a crisis. Managers with high self-confidence and the ability to make timely and appropriate decisions should be trained, and those with this ability should be given opportunities to manage, guide, and lead (Atılgan ve Kaplan 2018).

Within the framework of technology and interactivity, crises such as natural disasters and economic downturns that happen anywhere

Received: 16 September.2023 ; **Accepted:** 17 October 2023; **Online Published:** 25 October 2023
[1]**ORCID:** 0000-0002-7123-8695 , [2]**ORCID:** 0000-0004-6007-4922

How to cite this article: Ayar, H. and Barut, E. (2023 Relationship of the Leadership Styles of Sports Business Managers and Their Levels of Crisis Management. *Int J Disabil Sports Health Sci*;2023;Special Issue 1:414-422. https://doi.org/10.33438/ijdshs.1361603

globally have an impact on all sectors, including social, cultural, and sports. When dealing with a crisis, it's crucial in crisis management to navigate the situation with minimal losses, derive lessons from the process, and plan for the future. Sports, in contemporary times, serve as a benchmark for advancement and prestige. A crisis in sports management generally causes sports organizations to lose their value and prestige. Sports managers should thoroughly assess the past and establish a decision-making mechanism through strategic evaluation (Atılgan & Kaplan 2018).

The impact of sports managers' leadership styles on their levels of crisis management has become a focal point in both academic and applied research in recent years. The dynamic and constantly evolving nature of the sports sector necessitates that sports managers deal with a wide array of complex challenges. Many of these issues can be unexpected situations and crises. From this perspective, there are several factors determining the effectiveness of sports managers in crisis management, with perhaps their leadership styles being the most significant (Yıldız, 2022).

Leadership is a process that ensures an organization achieves its objectives. In this process, leaders engage with individuals and groups, coordinating and guiding their activities. Sports managers can utilize various theories and models to comprehend the effects of their leadership styles and implement them effectively. The leadership styles of managers enable them to handle various situations and challenges. In crisis situations, the leadership styles of managers are particularly crucial as they determine their ability to manage and resolve crises.

The ability to respond to a crisis and manage the post-crisis recovery process is a significant indicator of the success of sports managers. Hence, understanding the impact of sports managers' leadership styles on their levels of crisis management is crucial. Different leadership styles can elicit varied responses to various crisis types and situations, ultimately influencing the overall performance and success of the organization.

This study examines the leadership styles of sports managers and their impact on crisis management levels. It also discusses the influence of effective crisis management on the success of sports organizations and how leadership styles can play a role in this process.

Based on this information, the research question for this study has been determined as: 'What is the relationship between the leadership styles of sports business managers and their levels of crisis management?'

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Model

Among quantitative research techniques, the relational scanning model was used for this study. The scanning strategy in the relational scanning model tries to identify the presence of co-variation between two or more variables. According to Karasar (2012), the relational scanning model aims to ascertain whether the variables change concurrently and, if so, how. This study looked at the connections between the leadership philosophies of sports managers and how they handle crises.

The consent of all volunteers was obtained, and their participation was ensured regularly. This study is approved by the Istanbul Gelisim University (IGU) and Ethics Committee of the IGU (Approvel Nummer: 2022/16). All participants gave their written informed consent, and our study was carried out following the Helsinki Declaration.

At the same time, this study, conducted with the aim of determining the differentiation of sports managers' leadership styles and crisis management levels based on demographic characteristics, is a causal comparative research. 'According to Büyüköztürk et al. (2018), causal comparative researches are studies done to identify the factors that contribute to or are affected by the causes of an existing or naturally occurring condition or event.'

Universe and Sampling

The population of the research consists of managers working in sports complexes located on the European side of Istanbul. The sample, determined using the convenience sampling method, consists of 212 voluntary participating sports managers.

A non-random selection technique known as 'convenience sampling' relies on the researcher's judgment to choose the sample group from the larger population. According to Aaker et al. (2007), convenience sampling is the easiest,

quickest, and most economical method of gathering data from the general population.

Data Collection Tools

In the research, data was collected through the survey method. The survey form in question consisted of a personal information form, a crisis management scale, and a self-leadership scale. Surveys prepared online were delivered to managers via smartphones.

Personal Information Form

The personal information form, created by the researcher, contained 6 questions aimed at determining descriptive information such as age and gender of sports managers.

Crisis Management Scale

In order to examine participants' levels of crisis management, the 'Crisis Management Scale,' developed by Sayın (2008) and subjected to validity and reliability studies, was used. The scale consists of 45 five-point Likert-type items under 6 dimensions. The scale items are categorized as follows: '1=Never (1.00-1.79), 2=Very Rarely (1.80-2.59), 3=Sometimes (2.60-3.39), 4=Often (3.40-4.19), and 5=Always (4.20-5.00).' Sayın (2008) found a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.85 for the entire scale in the reliability analysis conducted. In the research, the factor structure of the scale was used, but the reliability analysis was conducted again. The reliability of the Crisis Management scale was found to be Cronbach's Alpha = 0.845.

Self-Leadership Scale

In examining the leadership qualities of sports managers in the research, the Self-Leadership scale was utilized. The Self-Leadership Scale was developed by Anderson and Prussia (1997) and has been subjected to confirmatory studies by Houghton and Neck (2002). It was translated into Turkish by Tabak, Sığrı, and Türköz (2013), and validity and reliability studies were conducted. The scale consists of 29 five point Likert-type propositions under 8 dimensions. The reliability value of the scale dimensions ranged from 0.61 to 0.80. In this study, the existing factor structure of the scale was used, but the reliability analysis was conducted again. In this research, the reliability of the Self-Leadership Scale was found to be Cronbach's Alpha = 0.903.

Statistical Analysis of Data

The obtained data in the study was analyzed using the SPSS 22.0 statistical software in a computer environment. Frequency and percentage analyses were performed to assess the descriptive characteristics of the participating managers in the study, and mean and standard deviation statistics were employed to analyze scale data. Measures of kurtosis and skewness of the distribution of the data were investigated in order to decide the analysis to be done to the research's data.

RESULTS

Managers are distributed as 104 (49.1%) male and 108 (50.9%) female according to their gender. Managers are distributed as 22 (10.4%) associate's degree or lower, 142 (67.0%) bachelor's degree, and 48 (22.6%) master's degree or higher according to their education level. Managers are distributed as 14 (6.6%) in the age group 18-25, 50 (23.6%) in the age group 26-35, 116 (54.7%) in the age group 36-45, and 32 (15.1%) in the age group 46-55 according to their age. Managers are distributed as 138 (65.1%) married and 74 (34.9%) single according to their marital status. Managers are distributed as 32 (15.1%) with 5 years and less of total work experience, 34 (16.0%) with 6-10 years, 76 (35.8%) with 11-15 years, and 70 (33.0%) with 16 years and more. Managers are distributed as 64 (30.2%) with 1 year and below of working duration in sports facility, 90 (42.5%) with 1-5 years, 24 (11.3%) with 6-10 years, and 34 (16.0%) with over 10 years.

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of managers

Groups	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	104	49.1
Female	108	50.9
Education Level		
Associate's Degree or Lower	22	10.4
Bachelor's Degree	142	67.0
Master's Degree or Higher	48	22.6
Age		
18-25	14	6.6
26-35	50	23.6
36-45	116	54.7
46-55	32	15.1
Marital Status		
Married	138	65.1
Single	74	34.9
Total Work Experience		
5 Years and Less	32	15.1
6-10 Years	34	16.0
11-15 Years	76	35.8
16 Years and More	70	33.0
Working Duration in Sports Facility		
1 Year and Less	64	30.2
1-5 Years	90	42.5
6-10 Years	24	11.3
10 Years and More	34	16.0

When correlation analyses were examined between participants' crisis management and self-leadership scores;

A positive weak relationship was found between ‘Self-Leadership in General’ and ‘Crisis Management in General’ with r=0.449 (p=0.000<0.05), a positive weak relationship between ‘Preparation and Prevention’ with r=0.374 (p=0.000<0.05), a positive weak relationship between ‘Preventing Damage Spread’ with r=0.434 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between ‘Recovery and Resilience’ with r=0.247 (p=0.000<0.05), and a positive weak relationship between ‘Learning’ with r=0.361 (p=0.000<0.05).

A positive weak relationship was found between ‘Self-Leadership in General’ and ‘Crisis Management in General’ with r=0.367 (p=0.000<0.05), a positive weak relationship between ‘Preparation and Prevention’ with r=0.41 (p=0.000<0.05), a positive weak relationship between ‘Preventing Damage Spread’ with r=0.25 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between ‘Recovery and Resilience’ with r=0.143 (p=0.000<0.05), and a positive weak relationship between ‘Learning’ with r=0.346 (p=0.000<0.05).

A very weak positive relationship was found between ‘Self-Reward’ and ‘Crisis Management General’ with r=0.219 (p=0.001<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between ‘Preparation and Prevention’ with r=0.165 (p=0.016<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between ‘Preventing Damage Spread’ with r=0.202 (p=0.003<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between ‘Learning’ with r=0.17 (p=0.013<0.05), a high positive relationship between ‘Self-Leadership in General’ with r=0.739 (p=0.000<0.05), and a moderate positive relationship between ‘Setting Personal Goals and Envisioning Successful Performance’ with r=0.652 (p=0.000<0.05). Goals and Envisioning Successful Performance’ with r=0.652 (p=0.000<0.05).

Table 2. Correlation Analysis between Leadership and Crisis Management Scores

		'Crisis Management in General'	'Early Warning Signal Gathering'	'Preparation and Prevention'	'Crisis Moment'	'Preventing Damage Spread'	'Recovery and Resilience'	'Learning'
'Self-Leadership in General'	r	0.449**	-0.002	0.374**	-0.064	0.434**	0.247**	0.361**
	p	0.000	0.972	0.000	0.352	0.000	0.000	0.000
'Setting Personal Goals and Envisioning Successful Performance'	r	0.367**	-0.021	0.410**	-0.010	0.250**	0.143*	0.346**
	p	0.000	0.756	0.000	0.883	0.000	0.037	0.000
'Self-Reward'	r	0.219**	-0.019	0.165*	0.101	0.202**	0.099	0.170*
	p	0.001	0.779	0.016	0.143	0.003	0.152	0.013
'Self-Talk'	r	0.403**	0.127	0.427**	0.014	0.197**	0.244**	0.305**
	p	0.000	0.065	0.000	0.836	0.004	0.000	0.000
'Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas'	r	0.388**	-0.041	0.233**	-0.163*	**0.551****	0.211**	0.287**
	p	0.000	0.557	0.001	0.017	0.000	0.002	0.000
'Self-Punishment'	r	0.295**	0.034	0.237**	0.186**	0.165*	0.141*	0.252**
	p	0.000	0.624	0.000	0.007	0.016	0.040	0.000
'Self-Observation'	r	0.371**	-0.010	0.214**	-0.192**	**0.502****	0.215**	0.289**
	p	0.000	0.888	0.002	0.005	0.000	0.002	0.000
'Setting Self-Reminders'	r	**0.656****	0.430**	0.331**	0.118	0.160*	0.332**	0.760**
	p	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.088	0.020	0.000	0.000
'Focusing on Natural Rewards'	r	0.532**	0.144*	0.120	0.029	0.297**	0.406**	**0.640****
	p	0.000	0.037	0.081	0.679	0.000	0.000	0.000

*<0.05; **<0.01; Pearson Correlation Analysis

A positive weak relationship was found between 'Self Talk' and 'Crisis Management in General' with r=0.403 (p=0.000<0.05), a positive weak relationship between 'Preparation and Prevention' with r=0.427 (p=0.000<0.05), a positive very weak relationship between 'Preventing Damage Spread' with r=0.197 (p=0.004<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Recovery and Resilience' with r=0.244 (p=0.000<0.05), and a positive weak relationship between 'Learning' with r=0.305 (p=0.000<0.05).

A weak positive relationship was found between 'Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas' and 'Crisis Management in General' with r=0.388 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas' and 'Preparation and Prevention' with r=0.233 (p=0.001<0.05), a very weak negative relationship between 'Crisis Moment' with r=-0.163 (p=0.017<0.05), a moderate positive relationship between 'Preventing Damage Spread' with r=0.551 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Recovery and Resilience' with r=0.211 (p=0.002<0.05), and a weak positive relationship between 'Learning' with r=0.287 (p=0.000<0.05).

A weak positive relationship was found between 'Self-Punishment' and 'Crisis Management in General' with r=0.295 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Self-Punishment' and 'Preparation and Prevention' with r=0.237 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Crisis Moment' with r=0.186 (p=0.007<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Preventing Damage Spread' with r=0.165 (p=0.016<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Recovery and Resilience' with r=0.141 (p=0.040<0.05), and a weak positive relationship between 'Learning' with r=0.252 (p=0.000<0.05).

A weak positive relationship was found between 'Self-Observation' and 'Crisis Management in General' with r=0.371 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Self-Observation' and 'Preparation and Prevention' with r=0.214 (p=0.002<0.05), a very weak negative relationship between 'Self-Observation' and 'Crisis Moment' with r=-0.192 (p=0.005<0.05), a moderate positive relationship between 'Self-Observation' and 'Preventing Damage Spread' with r=0.502 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Self-Observation' and 'Recovery and Resilience' with r=0.215 (p=0.002<0.05), and a weak positive relationship between 'Self-Observation' and 'Learning' with r=0.289 (p=0.000<0.05).

A moderate positive relationship was found between 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Crisis Management in General' with r=0.656 (p=0.000<0.05), a weak positive relationship between 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Early Warning Signal Gathering' with r=0.43 (p=0.000<0.05), a weak positive relationship between 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Preparation

and Prevention' with r=0.331 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Preventing Damage Spread' with r=0.16 (p=0.020<0.05), a weak positive relationship between 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Recovery and Resilience' with r=0.332 (p=0.000<0.05), and a high positive relationship between 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Learning' with r=0.76 (p=0.000<0.05).

A moderate positive relationship was found between 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' and 'Crisis Management in General' with r=0.532 (p=0.000<0.05), a very weak positive relationship between 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' and 'Early Warning Signal Gathering' with r=0.144 (p=0.037<0.05), a weak positive relationship between 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' and 'Preventing Damage Spread' with r=0.297 (p=0.000<0.05), a weak positive relationship between 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' and 'Recovery and Rehabilitation' with r=0.406 (p=0.000<0.05), and a moderate positive relationship between 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' and 'Learning' with r=0.64 (p=0.000<0.05). Statistically significant relationships were not found among the other dimensions (p>0.05).

The regression analysis conducted to examine the impact of the dimensions 'Setting Personal Goals and Envisioning Successful Performance,' 'Self-Reward,' 'Self-Talk,' 'Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas,' 'Self-Punishment,' 'Self-Observation,' 'Setting Self-Reminders,' and 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' on 'Crisis Management in General,' as shown in Table 3, was found to be statistically significant (F=37.539; p=0.000<0.05). The total variation in 'Crisis Management in General' level is explained by 'Setting Personal Goals and Envisioning Successful Performance,' 'Self-Reward,' 'Self-Talk,' 'Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas,' 'Self-Punishment,' 'Self-Observation,' 'Setting Self-Reminders,' and 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' at a rate of 58.1% (R2=0.581). The 'Setting Personal Goals and Envisioning Successful Performance' dimension does not significantly impact the 'Crisis Management in General' level (p=0.280>0.05). The 'Self-Reward' dimension does not significantly impact the 'Crisis Management in General' level (p=0.778>0.05). The 'Self-Talk' dimension does not significantly impact the 'Crisis Management in General' level (p=0.061>0.05). The 'Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas' dimension does not significantly impact the 'Crisis Management in General' level (p=0.089>0.05). The 'Self-Punishment' dimension does not significantly impact the 'Crisis Management in General' level (p=0.081>0.05). The 'Self-Observation' dimension does not significantly impact the 'Crisis Management in General' level (p=0.534>0.05). The 'Setting Self-Reminders' dimension positively influences the 'Crisis Management in General' level (ß=0.492). The 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' dimension positively influences the 'Crisis Management in General' level (ß=0.259).

The regression analysis conducted to examine the influence of 'Self-Leadership in General' on 'Crisis Management in General' as shown in Table 4, is found to be significant (F=53.127; p=0.000<0.05). The total variation in Crisis Management in General' level is explained by 'Self-Leadership in General' to the extent of 19.8% (R2=0.198). The 'Self-Leadership in General' dimension positively influences the 'Crisis Management in General' level (ß=0.449).

Table 3. The impact of sub-dimensions of self-leadership on 'Crisis Management in General'

Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	p	95% Confidence Interval	
	B	SE	ß			Lower	Upper
Stable	1.847	0.110		16.813	0.000	1.630	2.064
'Setting Personal Goals and Envisioning Successful Performance'	-0.037	0.035	-0.076	-1.082	0.280	-0.106	0.031
'Self-Reward'	-0.008	0.028	-0.021	-0.282	0.778	-0.063	0.047
'Self-Talk'	0.052	0.028	0.107	1.886	0.061	-0.002	0.107
'Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas'	0.063	0.037	0.151	1.708	0.089	-0.010	0.136
'Self-Punishment'	0.069	0.027	0.159	1.742	0.081	0.016	0.122

'Self-Observation'	0.024	0.039	0.053	0.623	0.534	-0.053	0.101
'Setting Self-Reminders'	0.159	0.016	0.492	9.658	**0.000**	0.126	0.191
'Focusing on Natural Rewards'	0.067	0.013	0.259	5.005	**0.000**	0.041	0.093

*Dependent Variable = 'Crisis Management in General', R = 0.772; R2 = 0.581; F = 37.539; p = 0.000; Durbin-Watson Value = 1.928

Table 4. The impact of self-leadership on 'Crisis Management in General'

Stable	2.226	0.144		15.482	0.000	1.942	2.509
'Self-Leadership in General'	0.264	0.036	0.449	7.289	**0.000**	0.193	0.335

*Dependent Variable = 'Crisis Management in General', R = 0.449; R2 = 0.198; F = 53.127; p = 0.000; Durbin-Watson Value = 1.836

Sequential regression analysis was conducted to determine how the dimensions of 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' changed the R2 level based on these obtained results. The results obtained are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. The impact of the Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' dimensions on 'Crisis Management in General' is as follows:

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	ß	t	p	F	Model (p)	R^2
Crisis Management in General	Stable	2.555	44.093	0.000	158.855	**0.000**	0.428
	Setting Self-Reminders	0.656	12.604	**0.000**			
Crisis Management in General	Stable	2.391	39.954	0.000	111.972	**0.000**	0.513
	Setting Self-Reminders	0.528	10.063	**0.000**			
	Focusing on Natural Rewards	0.321	6.123	**0.000**			

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-and-effect relationship between setting self-reminders and crisis management in general was found to be significant (F=158.855; p=0.000<0.05). The total variation in the General Crisis Management level is explained by setting self-reminders by 42.8% (R2=0.428). Setting Self-Reminders increases the crisis management in general level (ß=0.656).

The regression analysis conducted to determine the cause-and-effect relationship between setting self-reminders, focusing on natural rewards and crisis management in general was found to be significant (F=111.972; p=0.000<0.05). The total variatio in the Crisis Management in General level is explained by setting self-reminders and focusing on natural rewards by 51.3% (R2=0.513). Setting Self-Reminders increases the crisis management in general level (ß=0.528). The Focusing on Natural Rewards dimension positively influences the crisis management in general level (ß=0.321).

DISCUSSION

According to the results of the study regarding the relationship between the leadership styles of sports managers and their crisis management levels, it is observed that the 'Setting Self-Reminders' dimension has a high level of relationship with 'Crisis Management in General'. The conclusion drawn from the study is that as managers increase their ability to set self-reminders, their crisis management levels also increase. Conversely, when the level of setting self-reminders decreases, crisis management levels tend to increase. Research conducted on different sample groups in the literature also supports the findings of this study, indicating a relationship between crisis management and leadership (Aksu, 2009; Ulutaş, 2010; Balaban, 2018; Düzgün, 2020; Ercan and Aksu, 2022).

When examining the impact of sports managers' leadership styles on their crisis management levels in the study, it is observed that the dimensions of setting self-reminders and focusing on natural rewards have a positive effect on overall crisis management. However, it is also

observed that other leadership styles do not have a positive impact. 'Setting Self-Reminders' increases crisis management by 42.8%, and when 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Focusing on Natural Rewards' dimensions are considered together, they jointly increase the level of crisis management by 51.3%. The current study, which partially yielded similar results, suggests that leadership styles do not predict crisis management, which aligns with the findings of Düzgün (2020). Balaban (2018) found that individuals with more leadership qualities are more effective in crisis management skills. The current study shows partial similarity to this finding. Indeed, the regression analysis conducted in the current study also indicates that the setting self-reminders leadership dimension has a significant impact on overall crisis management. It is recommended that sports managers who aim to effectively manage crises should work on improving their leadership skills, especially in the dimension of setting self-reminders. It is noteworthy that only the leadership styles of 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Focusing on Natura Rewards' have a significant impact on crisis management. It is recommended that managers who want to effectively manage crises should improve themselves in the leadership dimensions of 'Setting Self-Reminders' and 'Focusing on Natural Rewards.'

Conflict of interest

The authors have not declared any conflicts of interest. Furthermore, no financial assistance was given.

Ethics Committee

The Ethics Committee of the IGU (Approval Number: 2022-16) and Istanbul Gelisim

Author Contributions

This research was adapted from Ebru Barut's master's program with thesis in Sports Management, Department of Coaching Education, Istanbul Gelisim University.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D.A., Kumar,V. & Day, G.S., (2007). Marketing Research, (9. Edition). John Wiley & Sons, Danvers.

Atilgan, D., & Kaplan, T. (2018). Management In Sport. *The Journal of International Civilization Studies*, *3*(1), 72-79.

Anderson, J. S. & Prussia, G. E. (1997). The Self-Leadership Questionnaire: Preliminary Assessment of Construct Validity. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(2), 119-143.

Aksu, A. (2009). Crisis Management and Visionary Leadership. Yaşar University E-Journal, *4* (15), 2435-2450.

Ercan, F. & Aksu, A. (2022). Strategic Leadership and Crisis Management Skills of Secondary School Principals. Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Sciences, 114-139. Doi: 10.51460/Baebd.1118084

Atılgan, D. & Kaplan, T. (2018). Crisis Management in Sports. International Journal of Civilization Studies, 3(1), 72-79.

Balaban, S. (2018). A Research on Leadership in Crisis Management and the Effect of Leadership Characteristics on Crisis Management, Master's Thesis, Istanbul Gelisim University, Institute Of Social Science, Istanbul.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çokluk, Ö. & Köklü, N. (2018). *Statistics for Social Sciences. Ankara: Pegem Academy*.

Demirci, N., Yıldırım, İ., Toptaş Demirci, P. & Ersöz, Y. (2018). Why Should We Do Physical Activity? More Active People for a Healthier World. *Int J Disabil Sports Health Sci*;1(2);1-14.

Barut, E. (2023). Examining the Leadership Styles and Crisis Management Levels of Sports Business Managers, Master's Thesis, Istanbul Gelisim University, Postgraduate Education Institute, Istanbul.

Houghton, J. D. & Neck, C. P. (2002). The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire: Testing A Hierarchical Factor Structure For Self-Leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *17*(8), 672-691.

Düzgün, A. (2020). Determining Effective Leadership Style in Crisis Management: Erzurum Province Example. Black Sea Journal of Social Sciences, 12 (23), 492-514. Doi: 10.38155/Ksbd.806878

Karasar, N. (2012). *Scientific Research Method. Ankara: Nobel Publications.*

Sayın, N. (2008). *Examination of Crisis Management Strategy in Secondary Education Institutions (Istanbul Province Example). (Master's Thesis). Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Istanbul.*Tabak, A. & Sığrı, Ü. (2013). *Organizational Behavior. (Editor: Ünsal*

Sığrı and Sait Gürbüz), Istanbul: Beta Basım.

Ulutaş, S. (2010). *Crisis Management and Transformational Leadership (Master's Thesis). Dokuz Eylül University / Institute of Educational Sciences, Izmir.*Yıldız, M.S. (2022). *Examining the Leadership Skills of Sports Managers in Crisis Management. Editor (Karakuş, S), Istanbul: Sıra Bookstore.*

This work is distributed under https: // creative commons. Org/ licenses /by-sa/4.0/