



EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS LEVELS OF ACADEMICIANS: FACULTY OF SPORT SCIENCES AND SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS EXAMPLE

Mehmet Dalli¹

Aydın Pekel²ⁱ

Recep Gürsoy³

¹Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Sports Science Faculty, Turkey

²Istanbul Gelişim University Vocational School, Istanbul, Turkey

³Istanbul Gelişim University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Istanbul, Turkey,

Abstract:

Background/Objective: The purpose of this study is to examine the managerial effectiveness levels of the academicians who work in the sports science faculty and School of Physical Education and Sports.

Methods: In the study, a descriptive scanning method aimed at revealing the current situation has been used. For the purposes of this study, the academicians population of Turkey in the research universities working in sports science and sports colleges with the faculty of physical education, from which a sample is chosen, which is determined by simple random sampling method, which consists of volunteer academicians ($n=178$) working at the faculties of sport sciences and school of physical education and sports of universities such as Erciyes, Selçuk, Ömer Halisdemir, Gaziantep, Dumlupınar, Uşak, Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey, Fırat, Süleyman Demirel, Sakarya, Balıkesir, Gelişim, Esenyurt, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman ve Bingöl universities. A managerial efficacy scale developed by Murry (1993) and implemented in the Turkish version by İra and Şahin (2010) was used to measure managerial effectiveness. The obtained data was recorded with the package program "IBM SPSS 22". Kruskal Wallis analysis was applied as statistical process.

Results: The level of managerial effectiveness of academicians is moderate and advanced, the level of managerial effectiveness is related to age, department, title and professional experience, and also there is a relation between the progress of age, title and professional experience of academicians and the development of managerial effectiveness. It can be assumed that this situation originated from the situations such as the maturity of academicians' knowledge and experience, efforts to improve their skills, the adoption of the management concept of modern life, self-evaluation and autonomy

ⁱ Correspondence: email apekel@gelisim.edu.tr

as well as being able to adapt to scientific, cultural and social changes. The development of managerial effectiveness perceptions and managerial skills of young academics can be supported by managerial development seminars. Determining the managerial perceptions of the faculty members who work in different faculties and higher schools may contribute to the updating of the managerial perspective.

Keywords: academician, managerial effectiveness, university

1. Introduction

Management is a "process". In this process, managers are obliged to reach the organizational goals set out by using their management functions and to supervise the work done by the employees. The management process is defined by the "managerial functions" that make up these processes. These functions are related to each other and include in each different organization - higher education institutions. (Murry, 1993) The academicians who serve at the administrative level of the educational institutions are responsible for the provision of the necessary materials and human resources and the effective use of these resources in order to achieve the aims determined by the institutions. In this process, "*Besides their legal powers, they should have social, technical, cultural and charismatic powers as well*" (Battal ve Sahan, 2002) These forces represent the managerial effectiveness and competence of their people. Managerial effectiveness is the degree of achievement that delivers the right production or output at the right time, thus achieving the goals the management has determined. (Aldemir, 1985) Managerial effectiveness is provided by managerial functions such as planning, supervision, decision making, communication, influence (leadership). (Cook, 2008)

Academic personnel and managers undertake duties in the institutions in which they are located. They contribute to the aims and objectives of institutions. However, the issues faced by academic staff and managers in their working life are different. For example, an academician is obliged to deal with issues such as "*technology and economic challenges, decision making processes, conflict management and organizational effectiveness*" as well as managerial teaching and research commitments. (Tang ve Chamberlain, 1997; Kuo, 2009) The characteristics (age, title, experience, and department) of the academicians can determine whether they show significant differences in perception of managerial effectiveness. It is noteworthy that although there are studies about managerial effectiveness in the literature (Ural, 2001; Ekinci and Yilmaz, 2002; Göksoy, Sağır, Yenipinar, 2013; Karatepe, 2005), there are few studies on academicians. The purpose of working in the context of the statements made is aimed at examining the managerial effectiveness levels of academicians working in sport sciences and physical education and sports school.

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Participants

The purpose of this study is to examine the managerial effectiveness levels of the academicians who work in the School of Sport Sciences and the School of Physical Education and Sports. In the study, a descriptive scanning method aimed at revealing the current situation has been used. For the purposes of this study, the academicians population of Turkey in the research universities working in sports science and sports colleges with the faculty of physical education, from which a sample is chosen, which is determined by simple random sampling method, which consists of volunteer academicians ($n=178$) working at the faculties of sport sciences and school of physical education and sports of universities such as Erciyes, Selçuk, Ömer Halisdemir, Gaziantep, Dumlupınar, Uşak, Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey, Fırat, Süleyman Demirel, Sakarya, Balıkesir, Gelişim, Esenyurt, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman ve Bingöl universities.

2.2 Measurements and Procedures

Survey method was used as data collection tool. Personal information form (gender, age, title, department and occupational seniority) and managerial efficacy scale were applied. A managerial efficacy scale developed by Murry (1993), updated in 2009 and implemented in the Turkish version by İra and Şahin (2010) was used to measure managerial effectiveness. The final figure consists of 44 items that are formed from 81 items from which 37 items were subtracted because their factor load values are below 10. It consists of five sub-dimensions, Planning and Decision Making (17 Articles): 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 26, 29, 41., Organizing and Human Resources Management (11 Articles): (1, 4, 11, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 27, 39, 42), Team Work (8 Articles): (24, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40), Communication (4 Articles): (10, 30, 31, 32) and Leadership (4 Articles): (18, 28, 43, 44). The managerial efficacy scale, which was adapted in Turkish by İra and Şahin (2010), has factor loadings between "0,929" and "0,511", the reliability of the factors is like for "Planning and decision making" 0,94, "organizational and human resources management" 0,94, "team work" 0,89, "communication" 0,90 and "leadership" 0,84, and 0,95 for the whole scale, is seen as evidence for the validity and reliability of your scale. Scale items are evaluated on a 5-point Likert-type scale of (1) "Never", (2) "Less", (3) "Sometimes", (4) "Most of the Time", and (5) "Always." Scale results were distributed to a width of 4/5 points. This width is divided into five to determine the levels that determine the cut points of the scale. Later grades were collected at three levels. When considering each option in the measurement tool at these levels, the Managerial Effectiveness Scale; it was determined that I agree and fully agree option is at " Adequate level " (3.40 - 5.00), partially agree options is at " Intermediate level " (2.60 - 3.39), little agree and agree options are at " Insufficient level " (1,00 - 2,59) (İra and Şahin, 2010). Data obtained from the personal information form (gender, age, title, department and occupational seniority) and managerial competence scale was entered into the SPSS22.0 package program and analysis was made through this program. The personal information about the candidates, inventory averages and factor

scores were determined by determining frequency (f) and percentage (%) values. Parametric and nonparametric distribution curves, skewness-kurtosis values of the points are examined by examining the parametric and nonparametric distributions. The data show nonparametric distribution. Kruskal Wallis analysis was used as statistical process.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

When Table 1 is examined it is shown that; when the age of volunteers participating in the study is considered; 16,3% of them are between the ages of 25-30, 22,5% of them were between the ages of 31-36, 28,7% in the age range 37-42, 19,7% in the age range 43-48, 12,9% in the age range over 49, When the titles of participants were examined, it was found that 21,9% were Associate Professors, 50,0% were Assistant Professors and 28,1% were Instructors, when you look at the parts of the participants; 27,6% of the participants were teachers, 14,6% were sports managers, 37,6% were coaches and 20,8% were in the recreation section, 25,8% of the participants were 1-5 years of experience, 21,3% have experience of 6-11 years, 23,6% have 12-17 years, 14,0% have 18-23 years and 15,2% have 24 year experience.

In Table 2, when the scores of the academicians regarding the managerial efficacy scale dimensions are examined, planning and decision making subscale score 2.94 ± 0.81 , organizational and human resources management subscale score 3.13 ± 0.82 , teamwork subscale score 3.29 ± 0.84 , communication subscale score 3.43 ± 0.77 , leadership subscale score is 3.41 ± 0.89 and managerial efficacy score is 3.40 ± 0.69 .

Table 3 presents the levels of managerial effectiveness of academicians participating in the study according to age variation. The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in the dimension of planning and decision making [$X^2 (4) = 7,352$; $P > 0.05$], the dimension of teamwork [$X^2 (4) = 6,791$; $P > 0.05$] and the dimension of leadership [$X^2 (4) = 7,611$; $P > 0.05$], while the dimension of organization and human resources management [$X^2 (4) = 11,761$; $P < 0.05$], the dimension of communication [$X^2 (4) = 11.618$; $P > 0.05$] and the managerial effectiveness total score [$X^2 (4) = 9.853$; $P > 0.05$] were significantly different according to age. When managerial effectiveness sub-dimensions are examined according to age groups; a statistically significant difference was found between 25-30 years age and 31-36 years age in the dimension of organization and human resources management, between 25-30 years age and 31-36 years age, between 31-36 years age and 43-48 years age, between 43- years age and 49 and above years age in communication dimension, between 25-30 years age and 31-36 years age, between 31- years age and 43-48 years age in the total score of managerial effectiveness ($p < 0.05$). There were no significant differences found in team work and leadership dimensions ($p < 0.05$). Table 4 presents the managerial effectiveness levels of the academicians participating in the study according to the department variable. The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in communication dimension [$X^2 (3) = 2.656$; $P > 0.05$], while the dimension of planning and

decision making d [χ^2 (3) = 9,960; P <0.05], organizational and human resources management dimension [χ^2 (3) = 8,737; P <0.05], team work dimension [χ^2 (3) = 9,330; P <0.05], the dimension of leadership [χ^2 (3) = 8,344; P <0.05] and the managerial effectiveness total score [χ^2 (3) = 8,925; P <0.05] were significantly different according to the department variable. When managerial effectiveness sub-dimensions are examined according to the departments; statistically significant differences was found between the sports manager and the coaching department in planning and decision-making dimension, between sports management and recreation department in organizing and human resources management dimension , between the coaching and recreation department in the dimension of team work, between the coaching department and the recreation department in the dimension of leadership and between the sport management and the coaching department in the total score of managerial effectiveness (p<0.05).

Table 5 presents the levels of managerial effectiveness according to the title variable of the academicians participating in the study. The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in teamwork dimension [χ^2 (2) = 2,095; P> 0,05], in the communication dimension [χ^2 (2) = 1,279; P> 0,05] and in the leadership dimension [χ^2 (2) = 211; P> 0,05] while planning and decision making dimension [χ^2 (2) = 6,928; P <0.05], organizational and human resources management dimension [χ^2 (2) = 6,352; P <0.05] and the managerial effectiveness total score [χ^2 (2) = 6,082; P <0.05] shows significant difference according to the title variable. When order average scores are evaluated according to the titles of the participants; Associate Professors have the highest level of managerial efficacy and Instructors have the lowest level of managerial efficacy. When examining the managerial effectiveness dimensions according to their titles; a statistically significant difference was found between the Associate Professor and Assistant Associate Professor in the dimension of planning and decision making, between the Associate Professor and the Instructor in terms of organization and human resources management, and between the Associate Professor and the Associate Professor in the managerial effectiveness total score and between the Associate Professor and the Instructor (p<0.05).

Table 6 presents the levels of managerial effectiveness of the academicians participating in the study according to their professional experience. The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in organizational and human resources management dimension [χ^2 (4) = 3,923; P> 0,05] teamwork dimension [χ^2 (4) = 3,380; P> 0,05] and communication dimension [χ^2 (4) = 4,303; P> 0,05] while planning and decision making dimension [χ^2 (4) = 7,424; P <0,05], leadership dimension χ^2 (4) = 10,099; P <0.05] and the managerial effectiveness total score [χ^2 (4) = 9,239; P <0.05] shows a significant difference according to the experience variable. When the order average scores are compared to the occupational experience of the participants, the academicians who have 18-23 years of experience have the highest level of managerial efficiency while the academicians who have 1-5 years of experience have the lowest managerial efficiency. When examining managerial effectiveness dimensions according to experience; a statistically significant difference was found between 1-5 years and 24

and above years, between 12-17 years and 24 and above years in the planning and decision-making dimension, between 1-5 years and 18-23 years, between 1-5 years and 24 and above years, between 6-11 years and 18-23 years in the dimension of leadership, between 1-5 years and 6-11 years, between 6-11 years and 18-23 years, between 12-17 years and 18-23 years ($p<0.05$).

3.2. Discussion

When the scores of the academicians regarding the managerial efficacy scale dimensions are examined, planning and decision making subscale score 2.94 ± 0.81 , organizational and human resources management subscale score 3.13 ± 0.82 , teamwork subscale score 3.29 ± 0.84 , communication subscale score 3.43 ± 0.77 , leadership subscale score is 3.41 ± 0.89 and managerial efficacy score is 3.40 ± 0.69 . When the perceptions about the managerial effectiveness dimension levels of the academicians are evaluated; planning and decision making, organizational and human resource management and team work are at moderate levels, whereas communication, leadership subscale and managerial effectiveness are at a sufficient level. When the literature is examined, it is seen that in the study carried out by Dalkiran (2014) to the faculty of physical education and sports, the instructors perceive "partially agree" on all sub-dimensions of managerial effectiveness and have moderate managerial effectiveness. The level of planning and decision making, organizing and human resources management and teamwork in our findings is parallel to this study. In the study conducted by Tinaz (2014), managers and teachers' perceptions of managerial effectiveness were moderate in the dimension of planning and decision making, in organizational and human resources management, team work, communication and leadership. In addition, managerial effectiveness perceptions were found to be sufficient. İra (2011) found in the study, in the "Organizational Culture and Administrative Effectiveness in Education Faculties", the instructors perceived all levels of "managerial effectiveness" in the "partially agree" range. Koçak and Helvacı (2011) found that school administrators working in primary and secondary schools were "very" effective in all dimensions of managerial effectiveness. There are similarities and differences between our findings. It can be concluded that the academicians' perception of managerial effectiveness is sufficiently moderate and good that they perceive communication, leadership and managerial competence to a sufficient level and it can be concluded that the managerial competence levels are in the desired level in terms of managerial effectiveness.

The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in the dimension of planning and decision making, the dimension of teamwork and the dimension of leadership, while the dimension of organization and human resources management, the dimension of communication and the managerial effectiveness total were significantly different according to age. When managerial effectiveness sub-dimensions are examined according to age groups; a statistically significant difference was found between 25-30 years age and 31-36 years age in the dimension of organization and human resources management, between 25-30 years age and 31-36

years age, between 31-36 years age and 43-48 years age, between 43- years age and 49 and above years age in communication dimension, between 25-30 years age and 31-36 years age, between 31- years age and 43-48 years age in the total score of managerial effectiveness ($p<0.05$). The highest score in the managerial efficacy score and all sub-dimensions belong to the age group of 43-48 and the lowest score belongs to the 31-36 age groups. When the literature is examined, the work done by Dalkiran (2014), it has been shown that the dimension of planning and decision making does not differ significantly according to the age variable while organizational and human resources management dimension, teamwork dimension, communication dimension and leadership dimension differ significantly according to age variable. Dalkiran (2014) stated that age and managerial effectiveness in terms of "Organizational and human resources management", "team work", "communication", "leadership" dimensions, the perceptions of managers' proficiency levels increased with age. When similar studies are evaluated not in academic organizations but in the study conducted by Tinaz (2014) on managers and teachers working in primary and secondary schools, the perception of managerial effectiveness differs significantly according to the age of the participants and the perceptions of managerial effectiveness of participants aged 41 and over were found to be higher than perceptions of participants from other ages. Nurluöz, Birol and Silman (2010) reported that the perceptions of the academic staffs over the age of 42 were better than the academic staff in the other age groups. It is seen that the studies in literature show differences and parallelism with our findings. According to the findings obtained, the managerial effectiveness of the academicians increased with age as managerial effectiveness levels increased in the same direction. This situation is parallel to similar studies in the literature. This may be due to the fact that the level of experience, competence, maturity and self-actualization of the participants differs, as well as the change in perception and management perception reflecting age and worldview.

The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in communication dimension, while the dimension of planning and decision making, organizational and human resources management dimension, team work dimension, the dimension of leadership and the managerial effectiveness total score were significantly different according to the department variable. When managerial effectiveness sub-dimensions are examined according to the departments; statistically significant differences was found between the sports manager and the coaching department in planning and decision-making dimension, between sports management and recreation department in organizing and human resources management dimension, between the coaching and recreation department in the dimension of team work, between the coaching department and the recreation department in the dimension of leadership and between the sport management and the coaching department in the total score of managerial effectiveness. It is seen that the highest score in the dimension of planning and decision making, organizing and human resources belongs to the academicians who work in the department of sports management, the lowest score belongs to academicians who work in the coaching department; The highest score in the

field of team work, communication, leadership and managerial effectiveness belongs to the academicians who work in the recreation section and the lowest score belongs to the academicians who work in the coaching department. When the literature is examined, it is seen that the teachers who participated in the Dalkiran (2014) study did not differ significantly in terms of the sub-dimensions of "planning and decision making", "organizational and human resources management" and "team work" sub-dimensions in the perceptions of managerial effectiveness while "communication" and "leadership" sub-dimension levels were found to be significantly different according to the departmental variable they were working in. When we look at studies done on different sample groups; in the study conducted by Tinaz (2014), teachers' perception of managerial effectiveness in planning and decision making, organizational and human resources management, team work and communication dimensions did not show any significant difference compared to their teaching career. It is seen that the studies in the literature are partially parallel but generally not similar. As a result of our findings, it appears that the course content of the departments influenced the knowledge and levels of managerial perceptions and management of the graduate trainings and academics received. From the difference in planning and decision making, organizational and human resources management, team work, leadership dimension and managerial effectiveness total score; it is thought that recreational and sports organizations are rooted in the theory and practice in the planning and execution activities of the academicians working in sports management and recreation departments.

The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in teamwork dimension, in the communication dimension and in the leadership dimension while planning and decision making dimension, organizational and human resources management dimension and the managerial effectiveness total score shows significant difference according to the title variable. When order average scores are evaluated according to the titles of the participants; Associate Professors have the highest level of managerial efficacy and Instructors have the lowest level of managerial efficacy. When examining the managerial effectiveness dimensions according to their titles; a statistically significant difference was found between the Associate Professor and Assistant Associate Professor in the dimension of planning and decision making, between the Associate Professor and the Instructor in terms of organization and human resources management, and between the Associate Professor and the Associate Professor in the managerial effectiveness total score and between the Associate Professor and the Instructor. When the literature is examined, it is seen that in the study made by Dalkiran (2014), in the perceptions of managerial effectiveness according to the titles, the sub-dimension levels of "planning and decision making", "organizing and human resources management", "team work", "communication" did not significantly differ according to the title variable; and "planning and decision making" sub-dimension levels were found to differ significantly according to the title variable. This study is partially parallel to our findings.

It has been determined that there is no significant difference in the perceptions of the levels of "planning and decision making", "organizational and human resources",

"teamwork", "communication" and "leadership" dimensions according to the title of lecturers in the study conducted by İra (2011). In the study conducted by Kasapoğlu (2013), there was no significant difference between the opinions of the department heads of the academic staff with different titles (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Research Professor) about managerial effectiveness levels. Nurluöz, Birol and Silman (2010), there is no significant difference in the perception of the behaviors of academic staff of according to their academic titles. In the study conducted by Al (2007), it was determined that there is no significant difference between the general managerial competence averages in terms of the title change in State and Foundation Universities. These studies do not seem to be in the same direction as our findings. This situation can be considered as the reason for the active duty and responsibility of the Associate Professors during the planning and execution of the management activities and during the utilization of the human power in the direction of the evaluation of the academic personnel and the aim of the university.

The managerial effectiveness measure did not differ significantly, in organizational and human resources management dimension, teamwork dimension and communication dimension while planning and decision making dimension, leadership dimension and the managerial effectiveness total score shows a significant difference according to the experience variable. When the order average scores are compared to the occupational experience of the participants, the academicians who have 18-23 years of experience have the highest level of managerial efficiency while the academicians who have 1-5 years of experience have the lowest managerial efficiency. When examining managerial effectiveness dimensions according to experience; a statistically significant difference was found between 1-5 years and 24 and above years, between 12-17 years and 24 and above years in the planning and decision-making dimension, between 1-5 years and 18-23 years, between 1-5 years and 24 and above years, between 6-11years and 18-23 years in the dimension of leadership, between 1-5 years and 6-11 years, between 6-11 years and 18-23 years, between 12-17 years and 18-23 years. When the literature is examined, in the work done by İra (2011); it has been found that there is no significant difference in the perception of the level of "team work" and "communication" according to the seniority of the instructors but there is a significant difference in the level of "planning and decision making", "organization and human resources" and "leadership" according to the rank. In the study conducted by Tinaz (2014), as school managers' views on managerial effectiveness and self-improvement function increased in seniority, these functions were achieved in a positive way. This result is parallel to our findings. It was determined that the perceptions of managerial effectiveness of the instructors differed significantly according to the occupational seniority variable in the study conducted by Dalkıran (2014). It has been reported that the managerial efficacy levels of the instructors with occupational seniority over 26 years in administrative efficacy sub-dimensions are high (Dalkıran, 2014). In our study, it is seen that the sub-dimensions of administrative efficiency level belonged to academicians is high with 18-23 year experience. This may be due to the fact that the professional experience is related to age and title, and that the

academicians, based on their professional experience, title, proficiency, knowledge and skills, are taking part in the faculty of sport sciences and management of physical education and sports school.

4. Conclusion

As a result, it is shown that the level of managerial effectiveness of academicians is moderate and advanced, the level of managerial effectiveness is related to age, department, title and professional experience, and also there is a relation between the progress of age, title and professional experience of academicians and the development of managerial effectiveness. It can be assumed that this situation originated from the situations such as the maturity of academicians' knowledge and experience, efforts to improve their skills, the adoption of the management concept of modern life, self-evaluation and autonomy as well as being able to adapt to scientific, cultural and social changes. The development of managerial perceptions and managerial skills of young academics can be supported by managerial development seminars. Determining the managerial perceptions of the faculty members who work in different faculties and higher schools may contribute to the updating of the managerial perspective.

References

1. Al A. The Investigation of Administrative Proficiency Level of Administrators of Foreign Language Units in Universities and Organizational Commitment Level of English Language Teaching Staff. Kocaeli, Kocaeli University, Master Thesis, 2007.
2. Aldemir C. Organizations and Management: A Macro Approach, Izmir, Bilgehan Printing House. 1985.
3. Battal N, Sahan H. Assessment of the managerial education course organized at Balikesir University Necati Bey Education Faculty. Balıkesir, Journal of Social Sciences, 2002; 5 (7): 22-33.
4. Cook MD. Exploring the Impact of Management Functions on Indigenous Policy. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, North Central University, 2008.
5. Dalkiran E., relationship between Organizational Commitment and Administrative Effectiveness in Teaching Staff of Physical Education and Sports, Graduate Thesis, Institute of Health Sciences, Selcuk University, Department of Sports Management. Konya, 2014, 151.
6. Ekinci H, Yılmaz A. A Research on Increasing Administrative Efficiency in Public Organizations, Erciyes University İ.B.F. 2002, 19.35-50.
7. Göksoy S., Sağır M., Yenipınar. Administrative Effectiveness of Primary and Secondary School Administrators. Bartın University Education Faculty Journal, 2013; 2 (1): 18-31.

8. İra N., Şahin S. Adapting the managerial efficiency measure into Turkish. Buca Education Faculty Journal, 2010; 28.16-29
9. İra, N. (2011). Organizational Culture and Administrative Effectiveness in Education Faculties, Doctorate Thesis. Izmir: Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
10. Karatepe S. Managerial effectiveness: The dimension of managerial efficacy in school management in relation to subordinates. Süleyman Demirel University. İİBF Magazine. 2005; 10 (2): 307-26.
11. Kasapoğlu H. Administrative Effectiveness Levels of Teaching Staff in Universities, Higher Education Journal, 2013; 3 (2): 90-96.
12. Koçak, F. ve Helvacı, M. A. (2011). The Effectiveness of School Administrators (Usak Province Case). Journal of Educational Sciences Research. 1 (1), 33-55.
13. Kuo, H. (2009). "Understanding Relationship between Academic Staff and Administrators: An Organizational Culture Perspective". Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management Vol. 31. No 1. February, ss: 43-54.
14. Murry, J. (1993). "Development of Assessment Criteria to Determine the Managerial Effectiveness of Community and Technical College Administrators". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Arkansas.
15. Nurluöz. Ö., Birol, C. ve Silman, F. (2010). Investigation of Management Behaviors of Educational Administrators in Universities according to Instructor and Student Opinions. Educational Management in Theory and Practice. 16 (4), 579-599.
16. Tang, T. L., Chamberlain, M. (1997). "Attitudes toward Research and Teaching: Differences between Administrators and Faculty Members". The Journal of Higher Education. C:68, S:2. ss:212-227.
17. Tinaz S. The Relationship between Administrative Effectiveness and Organizational Commitment Perceptions of Administrators and Teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools (Şanlıurfa Example), M.Sc. Thesis, Harran University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Şanlıurfa, 2014. 267.
18. Ural, A. (2001-2). Administrative efficiency levels of public administrators. Abant Izzet Baysal University Journal of Social Sciences, Issue: 3.

B. Elements

a. Figures and Tables

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Participants

		Frequency	Percentage
Age	25-30	29	16,3
	31-36	40	22,5
	37-42	51	28,7
	43-48	35	19,7
	<u>49 and above</u>	23	12,9
	Total	178	100,0
Academic Title	Assoc. Dr.	39	21,9
	Asst. Assoc. Dr.	89	50,0
	Instructor	50	28,1
	Total	178	100,0
Department	Teaching	48	27,0
	Sports Management	26	14,6
	Coaching	67	37,6
	Recreation	37	20,8
	Total	178	100,0
Experience	1-5 Year	46	25,8
	6-11 Year	38	21,3
	12-17 Year	42	23,6
	18-23 Year	25	14,0
	<u>24 and above</u>	27	15,2
	Total	178	100,0

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Participants' Response to Scales

		n	Min	Max	$X \pm Sd$
Managerial Effectiveness	Planning and Decision Making	178	1,24	5,00	$2,94 \pm 0,81$
	Organizing and Human Resources Management	178	1,36	5,00	$3,13 \pm 0,82$
	Teamwork	178	1,38	5,00	$3,29 \pm 0,84$
	Communication	178	1,25	5,00	$3,43 \pm 0,77$
	Leadership	178	1,00	5,00	$3,41 \pm 0,89$
	Managerial Effectiveness	178	1,48	5,00	$3,40 \pm 0,69$

Table 3: Evaluation of Administrative Effectiveness Levels With Respect To the Age of Participants

	Age	n	Order Avg.	Sd	χ^2	P	Difference
Planning and Decision Making	25-30 ¹	29	89,09				
	31-36 ²	40	84,30				
	37-42 ³	51	89,80	4	7,352	,118	-
	43-48 ⁴	35	103,09				
	<u>49 and above⁵</u>	23	82,50				
Organizing and Human Resources Management	25-30 ¹	29	109,34				
	31-36 ²	40	70,29				

Mehmet Dalli, Aydn Pekel, Recep Gürsoy
 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS LEVELS OF ACADEMICIANS:
 FACULTY OF SPORT SCIENCES AND SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS EXAMPLE

	37-42 ³	51	87,86	4	11,761	,019	1-2
	43-48 ⁴	35	100,59				
	49 and above ⁵	23	84,65				
Teamwork	25-30 ¹	29	99,53				
	31-36 ²	40	73,83				
	37-42 ³	51	87,25	4	6,791	,147	-
	43-48 ⁴	35	101,36				
	49 and above ⁵	23	91,04				
Communication	25-30 ¹	29	104,47				
	31-36 ²	40	72,50				1-2
	37-42 ³	51	81,22	4	11,618	,020	2-4
	43-48 ⁴	35	104,86				4-5
	49 and above ⁵	23	95,20				
Leadership	25-30 ¹	29	107,45				
	31-36 ²	40	76,59				
	37-42 ³	51	86,25	4	7,611	,107	-
	43-48 ⁴	35	98,16				
	49 and above ⁵	23	83,35				
Managerial Effectiveness	25-30 ¹	29	104,09				
	31-36 ²	40	71,80				
	37-42 ³	51	86,61	4	9,853	,043	1-2
	43-48 ⁴	35	103,51				2-4
	49 and above ⁵	23	86,42				
Total							

Table 4: Evaluation of Administrative Effectiveness Levels with Respect to the Department of the Participants

	Department	n	Order Avg.	Sd	X ²	P	Difference
Planning and Decision Making	Teaching ¹	48	86,15				
	Sport	26	110,04				
	Management ²			3	9,960	,019	2-3
	Coaching ³	67	77,43				
	Recreation ⁴	37	101,28				
Organizing and Human Resources Management	Teaching ¹	48	84,29				
	Sport	26	106,00				
	Management ²			3	8,737	,033	2-4
	Coaching ³	67	79,01				
	Recreation ⁴	37	103,65				
Teamwork	Teaching ¹	48	85,21				
	Sport	26	96,87				
	Management ²			3	9,330	,025	3-4
	Coaching ³	67	78,73				
	Recreation ⁴	37	109,39				
Communication	Teaching ¹	48	88,10				
	Sport	26	91,98				-

Mehmet Dalli, Aydn Pekel, Recep Gürsoy
 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS LEVELS OF ACADEMICIANS:
 FACULTY OF SPORT SCIENCES AND SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS EXAMPLE

	Management ²		3	2,656	,448		
	Coaching ³	67		83,54			
	Recreation ⁴	37		100,35			
	Teaching ¹	48		87,26			
	Sport	26		98,08			
Leadership	Management ²		3	8,344	,039	3-4	
	Coaching ³	67		78,16			
	Recreation ⁴	37		106,91			
	Teaching ¹	48		84,35			
Managerial Effectiveness	Sport Yöneticiliği ²	26		104,19		2-3	
Total	Coaching ³	67		78,81	3	8,925	,030
	Recreation ⁴	37		105,22			3-4

Table 5: Evaluation of Administrative Effectiveness Levels with Respect to the Titles of the Participants

	Title	n	Order Avg.	Sd	X ²	P	Difference
	Assoc. Dr. ¹	39	108,67				
Planning and Decision Making	Asst. Assoc. Dr. ²	89	83,79	2	6,928	,031	1-2
	Instructor ³	50	84,72				
	Assoc. Dr. ¹	39	107,35				
Organizing and Human Resources Management	Asst. Assoc. Dr. ²	89	86,43	2	6,352	,042	1-3
	Instructor ³	50	81,04				
	Assoc. Dr. ¹	39	100,04				
Teamwork	Asst. Assoc. Dr. ²	89	86,49	2	2,095	,351	-
	Instructor ³	50	86,63				
	Assoc. Dr. ¹	39	97,08				
Communication	Asst. Assoc. Dr. ²	89	88,79	2	1,279	,528	-
	Instructor ³	50	84,85				
	Assoc. Dr. ¹	39	90,03				
Leadership	Asst. Assoc. Dr. ²	89	90,83	2	,211	,900	-
	Instructor ³	50	86,72				
	Assoc. Dr. ¹	39	107,42				
Managerial Effectiveness	Asst. Assoc. Dr. ²	89	85,11	2	6,082	,048	1-2
Total	Instructor ³	50	83,34				1-3

Table 6: Evaluation of Administrative Effectiveness Levels with Respect to the Experience of the Participants

	Experience	n	Order Avg.	Sd	X ²	P	Difference
	1-5 year ¹	46	83,26				
Planning and Decision Making	6-11 year ²	38	89,00				
	12-17 year ³	42	81,73	4	7,424	,658	1-5
	18-23 year ⁴	25	96,20				3-5

Mehmet Dalli, Aydn Pekel, Recep Gürsoy
 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS LEVELS OF ACADEMICIANS:
 FACULTY OF SPORT SCIENCES AND SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS EXAMPLE

	24 and above ⁵	27	98,57				
Organizing and Human Resources Management	1-5 year ¹	46	95,18				
	6-11 year ²	38	85,26				
	12-17 year ³	42	78,94	4	3,923	,417	-
	18-23 year ⁴	25	97,40				
	24 and above ⁵	27	89,78				
Teamwork	1-5 year ¹	46	95,22				
	6-11 year ²	38	85,46	4	3,380	,496	-
	12-17 year ³	42	80,27				
	18-23 year ⁴	25	100,90				
	24 and above ⁵	27	89,24				
Communication	1-5 year ¹	46	96,45				
	6-11 year ²	38	82,66				
	12-17 year ³	42	79,65	4	4,303	,366	-
	18-23 year ⁴	25	97,66				
	24 and above ⁵	27	91,65				
Leadership	1-5 year ¹	46	79,04				
	6-11 year ²	38	86,36				1-4
	12-17 year ³	42	89,76	4	10,099	,027	1-5
	18-23 year ⁴	25	102,00				2-4
	24 and above ⁵	27	99,54				
Managerial Effectiveness Total	1-5 year ¹	46	83,13				
	6-11 year ²	38	87,72				1-2
	12-17 year ³	42	91,72	4	9,239	,019	2-4
	18-23 year ⁴	25	103,94				3-4
	24 and above ⁵	27	99,35				

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](#).