Original Article

OPEN ACCESS

Investigation of Innovative Perspectives on Sports of Licensed Athletes in the Infrastructure of Clubs affiliated to the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports

Barış Karataş[1A-B]
Abdullah Yavuz Akıncı[2C-D*]

[1]Provincial Directorate of Youth Services and Sports, Isparta, Turkey.
[2*]Faculty of Sport Sciences, Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey.

Authors' contribution:
A. Conception and design of the study
B. Acquisition of data
C. Analysis and interpretation of data
D. Manuscript preparation
E. Obtaining funding

Article History:
Received: *March 1, 2022*
Revision: March 31, 2022
Accepted: *April 8, 2022*
Published: *April 11, 202*

Corresponding author: Abdullah Yavuz AKINCI, Sport Management Department, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta (32100), Turkey
E-mail: ayavuzakinci@gmail.com

How to Cite: Karataş, B & Akinci, A. Y. (2022). Investigation of Innovative Perspectives on Sports of Licensed Athletes in the Infrastructure of Clubs affiliated to the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports, *Indonesian Journal of Sport Management*, 2(1), 74-87. https://doi.org/10.31949/ijsm.v2i1.2276

Abstract. In this study, it is aimed to examine the sports innovation perceptions of licensed athletes in various categories in the infrastructure of sports clubs affiliated to the Provincial Directorates of Youth and Sports, according to some variables. 145 athletes selected by simple random method from 609 licensed athletes in sports clubs affiliated to Provincial Directorates of Youth and Sports in Isparta province participated in the research. Personal information form and Innovation in Sports Scale were used as data collection tools in the research. The personal information of the participants, the scores obtained from the scale and factor scores, frequency (f) and percentage (%) values were determined. In order to determine whether the scores obtained by the athletes from the Innovation in Sports Scale differ according to the independent variables, the T test was applied to independent groups in pairwise comparisons, One-way anova was used to compare three or more variables, and the Bonferroni test was used to determine the difference between groups. In the study, the averages of the Sports Innovation Scale according to age groups, educational status, category, monthly income of the family, the state of hearing the concepts of innovation, innovative, the club's status of providing projects or trainings related to innovation in sports, evaluate the club's view of innovation, innovative perspective performance in sports and analysis were made to determine whether the difference between these averages is significant. As a result, it has been determined that the total score of the Innovation in Sports Scale and its sub-dimensions are above the average.

Keywords: innovation, club, sports

INTRODUCTION

Today, the concept of innovation has become a popular topic, especially with the effect of competition and technological developments. The root of the Latin word "innovare" is "nova", meaning new. The word innovation, which is derived from the Latin word "innovare", is called "renewal". Innovation does not mean exactly “renewal” or “making a new invention”. In other words, innovation means “making something new and different”. The concept of innovation was first mentioned in the literature in the book "The Theory of Economic Development" written by the economist Joseph Schumpeter in 1911. Schumpeter, who was the first to notice the innovation process and its effects on economic development, defined the concept of innovation as "a new combination of production factors" (Schumpeter, 1934).

Product innovation in sports is considered as the introduction of a different product or the development of a product that does not exist. The purpose of product innovation in sports is to benefit active and passive participants. (Schlepper, 2014). Inovation is an exciting area of sports management due to the competitive ness of the global economy and the requirement of creative economic initiatives. Traditionally, innovation has been seen as the end product or output of a process of change (Poutanen et al, 2016).In the Oslo Manual published together with Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the European Commission, which was accepted internationally in 2006, innovation is defined as 'the realization of a new or significantly improved product or process, a new marketing method or a new organizational method in internal business practices, workplace organization or external relations' (Erkaya, 2021).

Technological and sociological developments experienced with globalization have created differences in consumer habits and expectations. In a rapidly increasing competitive environment, consumers are interested in new equipment that is far from ordinary, aesthetic, always offering added value and coming to the fore with its visual features, and most importantly, there are sudden changes in their wishes and desires. Firms have to develop new business models, new strategies and new approaches (Kılıç, 2018). Innovation is a very important competitive tool for companies as it increases efficiency and profitability, enables entering new markets and enlarging the existing market. The economies in which efficient, profitable and highly competitive companies operate develop, evolve and gain competitive advantage on a global scale. Therefore, innovation is the most important factor that guarantees employment growth, sustainable growth, social welfare and quality of life for countries (Elçi, 2006).

LITERATURE REVIEW

When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are different classifications related to innovation types. According to the Oslo Manual, innovation is classified as product or service innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation and organizational innovation (Oslo Manuel, 2006). In this study, the classification made in the Oslo Manual has been considered, and the explanations on the types of innovation are briefly given below.

Product or Service Innovation

It is the introduction of a good or service that is new or significantly improved based on its current properties or anticipated uses. (Oslo Manuel, 2006). The most important difference that distinguishes product or service innovation is that the elements subject to innovation are tangible or intangible. Products encompassing physical goods are tangible attributes, while services are intangible attributes. Product or service innovation includes the delivery of new or

improved products or services that meet the needs and expectations of consumers (Damanpour, 1996).

Process Innovation

The realization of a new or significantly improved production or delivery method. This innovation includes significant changes in techniques, equipment and/or software (Oslo Manuel, 2006). We can state that the studies on process innovation are closely related to the technology and production processes used in organizations. Because when talking about process innovation, innovation is expressed in terms of technology, product line, marketing, sales, and distribution skills. Process innovation also covers topics such as technological innovation and technology costs (Garcia & Calantone, 2002).

Marketing Innovation

It is a new marketing method that involves significant changes in product design or packaging, product positioning, product promotion or pricing (Oslo Manuel, 2006). Marketing innovation is the application of new marketing methods that include significant changes in the design, positioning, promotion, or pricing of the product and that will give the product a different image. In order to increase the company's sales, it aims to respond more successfully to customer needs, to open new markets or to position a company's product in the market in a new way.

Organizational Innovation

It is the application of a new organizational method in the firm's business practices, workplace organization or external relations (Oslo Manuel, 2006). How managers shape and manage organizational innovation in the organizational innovation process is an important research area in the organizational management literature. In general, organizational innovation is considered as a determinant of organizational growth and superior job performances. Organizational innovations contribute to the structure and culture of businesses. (Hadi Razavi & Attarnezhad, 2013). With globalization, in order for a business to survive in competitive market conditions, it should closely follow the developments in its markets and adapt the developments to its organizations with an innovative approach. For a successful organization, it is necessary to evaluate the innovation power.

Innovation and Sports

Today, it is possible to talk about innovation in every field, and the place covered by innovation in social life is quite large. New methods and plans for achieving life-oriented and beneficial results in the field of sports are called innovations in sports. Many countries are implementing innovation practices in sports with developing technology. This situation has brought about a new reform and renewal in the field of sports. With the developments experienced, not only football but also every branch of sports is perceived as an industry branch and each of the sports clubs is managed like a commercial enterprise. Innovative studies on sports are considered as important issues that bring success, reputation and high profits to countries, institutions, and corporate managers. Great developments and innovations have been made in all areas of sports (Gündoğdu & Sunay, 2012).

Although it has recently started to be an industrial product, nowadays sports represent one of the areas that are closely related to many aspects of life and have various functions. (Savrul, 2014). Innovation takes place in every field of sports, and it is possible to see the effects of innovation in almost every field, from organizations to equipment, from tourism to marketing. In terms of sports management, the effective and efficient functioning of sports institutions and organizations largely depends on their management. There is a need for

qualified managers who are open to continuous change, development and innovation in many dimensions such as managerial developments, economy, facilities, sponsorship, and activities. (Mülhim & Kul, 2020). Innovation is a phenomenon that should be valued in order to effectively manage today's sports organizations. Renewals that can be described as innovations are used by every stakeholder, person or group, spectators, referees and managers involved in sports (Tosun-Tunç & Sevilmiş, 2019).

Today, sports clubs are one of the most important actors of the sports industry. When the target groups of the services offered by the sports clubs and the activities carried out under the umbrella of the sports club are considered, a very wide audience is mentioned (Demir et. al., 2020). Within the scope of sports activities, which have become an important industry in today's competitive world, it is important to satisfy the demands and expectations of this target audience at the highest level, to ensure customer satisfaction and to keep up with the change. In this context, it is important to maintain the existing processes of sports clubs with a continuous renewal and improvement approach. Therefore, incorporating the understanding of innovation into the process systematic of sports clubs and taking steps towards innovation will be important for the sustainability and efficiency of sports clubs.

Table 1. Number of Club Athletes by Branch

Federation	Number of Club Athletes of Isparta Youth and Sports Provincial Directorate		
	Number of club licenses as of 06.01.2022		
	Male	Female	Total
Athletics	26	30	56
Badminton	1	0	1
Basketball	69	31	100
Physically Disabled	8	2	10
Billiards	1	0	1
Bicycle	1	0	1
Bocce, Bowling, and Dart	31	15	46
Gymnastics	1	0	1
Mountaineering	17	8	25
Wrestling	41	2	43
Handball	28	0	28
Karate	1	2	3
Ski	88	72	160
Sled	8	4	12
Kick Box	1	0	1
Table Tennis	35	16	51
Orienteering	17	6	23
Taekwondo	1	0	1
Triathlon	0	1	1
Volleyball	17	4	21
Swimming	15	9	24
Total	407	202	609

When Table-1 is examined, it is seen that there are 609 active licensed athletes in various branches in the clubs affiliated to the Isparta Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports. Sports branches that do not have any active licensed athletes are not included in the table. The report was created on 06.01.2022 from the Sports Information System of the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports.

In this study, it is aimed to examine the innovative perspectives of the athletes between the ages of 11-17, who are in the infrastructure of the sports clubs affiliated to the Isparta Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports, in the 2021-2022 season.

METHOD

In the study, it was aimed to reveal the current situation by using the descriptive survey method. The research approach that aims to describe a past or present situation as it is, is called descriptive survey models. The research subject events, individuals or objects are tried to be defined as they are in their own conditions. No effort is made to change or influence it in any way (Karasar, 2004).

In this study, the research group was formed by convenient sampling method. The convenient sampling method, which is based on accessibility and convenience, is a preferred method in order to collect information quickly on some research subjects. (Büyüköztürk et. al.., 2010). The study was carried out with the participation of 145 athletes playing in various categories in the infrastructures of the Regional Sports Club, Professionals Sports Club, Iyaş Sports Club, Isparta Municipality Sports Club and Yalvaç Çınar Sports Club operating in Isparta in the 2021-2022 season.

Questionnaire method was used as data collection tool in this study. In the first part of the questionnaire, there were socio-demographic questions for the participants, while the innovation scale in sports was used in the second part. Eight questions including information about age, education level, category, family income and innovation of the athletes participating in the study were applied.

This scale was developed by Mathiu Charity Kanario in 2017 and was used in the master's thesis titled "Influence of Sports Innovation on Organizational Performance: A Case of Football Kenya Federation". The current scale was adapted into Turkish by Demir et. al., 2020 and used in this study by obtaining the necessary permissions from the authors. The scale consists of 30 items and 3 sub-dimensions. The first 10 items are 'sports innovation in clubs' (SIC), the next 10 items are 'difficulties of innovation in sports in sports clubs'(DIC) and the last 10 items are 'strategies to facilitate the acceptance of sports innovation in clubs (STR). A 5-point Likert scale was used for the items in the scale. Based on the findings obtained from the validity and reliability analyzes of the Turkish form of the Sports Innovation Scale, it was concluded that the 30-item Likert-type scale, each of which consists of three sub-dimensions of 10 items, can be used as a valid and reliable tool for measuring innovation in sports. (Demir et. al., 2020).

SPSS 22.0 statistical package program was used to evaluate the data and find the calculated values. Since it was determined that the obtained data showed normal distribution according to the normality test, parametric tests were applied. T-test was used to compare binary variables and Anova test was used to compare 3 or more variables and the Bonferroni test was used to determine the difference between groups. In this study, the error level was taken as .05.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. Demographical Information of the Participants

	Variables	n	%
Age	11	14	9,7
	12	16	11,0
	13	35	24,1
	14	10	6,9
	15	27	18,6
	16	25	17,2
	17	18	12,4
	Total	145	100,0
Education Status	Primary Ed.	62	42,8
	High School Ed.	77	53,1
	University Ed.	6	4,1
	Total	145	100,0

Category	U13	58	40,0
	U14	13	9,0
	U15	20	13,8
	U16	32	22,1
	U17	22	15,2
	Total	145	100,0
Family Monthly Income	3000-	22	15,2
	3001-6000	78	53,8
	6001-10000	33	22,8
	10001+	12	8,3
	Total	145	100,0
Have you heard of "Innovation, Renewal, Innovativeness" Concepts Before?	Yes	106	73,1
	No	39	26,9
	Total	145	100,0
Does your club provide projects or trainings related to innovation in sports?	Yes	108	74,5
	No	37	25,5
	Total	145	100,0
How do you evaluate your club's approach to innovation/renewal in sports?	Low	6	4,1
	Average	69	47,6
	High	70	48,3
	Total	145	100,0
How does an innovative perspective in sports affect your performance?	Effective	5	3,4
	Undecided	93	64,1
	Not Effective	47	32,4
	Total	145	100,0

As seen in Table-2, when the distribution of the athletes by age groups is examined; the rate of people aged 11 years is 9.7%, the rate of people aged 12 is 11%, the rate of people aged 13 is 24.1%, the rate of people aged 14 is 6.9%, the rate of people aged 15 is 18.6%, the rate of people aged 16 is 17,2%, while the rate of people in the 17 ages group is 12.4%. When the distribution by education level is examined, the rate of primary school graduates is 42.8%, the rate of high school graduates is 53.1%, and the rate of university graduates is 4.1%. When the distribution by categories is examined, the rate of U13 is 40%, the rate of U14 is 9%, the rate of U15 is 13.8%, the rate of U16 is 22.1%, and the rate of U17 is 15.2%. When the distribution by family income is examined, the rate of those with an income of less than 3000 TL is 15.2%, the rate of those with an income of 3001-6000 TL is 53.8%, the rate of those with an income of 6001-10000 TL is 22.8%, while the rate of those with an income of more than 10000 TL is 8.3%. 73.1% of the athletes stated that they had heard the concepts of innovation, renewal, and innovativeness before, while 26.9% stated that they had not. While 74.5% of the athletes stated that they provided projects or trainings related to innovation in sports in their clubs, 25.5% stated that such projects or trainings were not provided. When the evaluations of the athletes' clubs towards innovation in sports are examined; The rate of those who are low is 4.1%, the rate of those who state it as average is 47.6%, and the rate of those who rate it as high is 48.3%. When evaluating how the innovative perspective of athletes in sports affects their performance, the rate of those who state that it is not effective is 32.4%, the rate of those who state that they are undecided is 64.1%, and the rate of those who state that it is effective is 3.4%.

Table 3. Skewness and kurtosis values of the participants' scale scores

Sports Innovation Scale	n	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov
Sports Innovation in Clubs	145	-,572	.704	,001
Difficulties of Innovation	145	,269	-,121	,025
Strategies	145	-,087	,857	,003
Total	145	,344	1,139	,000

When the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results are examined, it is observed that the scores obtained from the scales of the participants' attitudes towards innovation in sports have significant deviations from normality (Table. 3). When the normal distribution curves were examined, it was observed that there were no extreme deviations from normality. In the literature, while George & Mallery (2016) explain that skewness and kurtosis values are acceptable between ±1 ideally, Demir et al., (2016), on the other hand, explained that these values are in the range of ±2 as a suitable situation in terms of normality.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of the scores obtained from the scales

Sports Innovation Scale	n	Min.	Max.	X±Sd
Sports Innovation in Clubs	145	19.00	60.00	45,7172±8,20713
Difficulties of Innovation	145	10.00	50.00	31,2552±8,68970
Strategies	145	14.00	50.00	36,2345±6,72166
Total	145	54.00	160.00	113,2069±18,57788

It was determined that the participants had Sports Innovation 45.7172±8.20713, DIC 31.2552±8.68970, strategies 36.2345±6.72166 scores which are sub-dimensions of the sports innovation scale, and total score was 113.2069±18.57788 (Table 4).

Table 5. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports by Age Variable

Sports Innovation Scale		**n**	**X± Sd**	**f**	**p**	**Bonferroni**
	11[a]	14	45,5000±4,32791			
	12[b]	16	44,0000±9,59861			
	13[c]	35	46,4000±8,13200			
Sports Innovation in Clubs	14[d]	10	47,4000±5,16828	,840	,541	
	15[e]	27	43,4444±9,12028			
	16[f]	25	46,0000±9,23760			
	17[g]	18	48,1667±7,79329			
	11[a]	14	33,6429±5,61053			
	12[b]	16	30,3125±8,96451			
	13[c]	35	29,6286±8,05527			
Difficulties of Innovation	14[d]	10	38,1000±8,29257	2,664	,018	e>d
	15[e]	27	27,9630±7,43940			
	16[f]	25	33,9200±10,02879			
	17[g]	18	30,8333±9,24344			
	11[a]	14	35,9286±4,81127			
	12[b]	16	34,6250±6,70199			
	13[c]	35	35,5143±7,65572			
Strategies	14[d]	10	40,9000±7,30981	1,724	,120	
	15[e]	27	34,4074±5,15348			
	16[f]	25	37,2400±7,32735			
	17[g]	18	38,0556±6,06312			
	11[a]	14	115,0714±13,51048			
	12[b]	16	108,9375±18,61350			
	13[c]	35	111,5429±18,76220			d>b,c,e
Total	14[d]	10	126,4000±18,47641	2,184	,048	f>e
	15[e]	27	105,8148±14,02481			g>e
	16[f]	25	117,1600±23,28927			
	17[g]	18	117,0556±16,53329			

When the perceptions of innovation in sports according to the age variable of the participants were examined, a significant difference was found between the DIC sub-dimension and the total scores (p<0,05) (Table 5).

Table 6. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports by Education Variable

Sports Innovation Scale		n	X± Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Sports Innovation in Clubs	Primary Ed.[a]	62	45,5806±8,36963	1,068	,346	
	High School Ed.[b]	77	45,4545±8,18462			
	University Ed.[c]	6	50,5000±6,18870			
Difficulties of Innovation	Primary Ed.[a]	62	31,0000±8,11192	,135	,874	
	High School Ed.[b]	77	31,5584±9,33231			
	University Ed.[c]	6	30,0000±6,63325			
Strategies	Primary Ed.[a]	62	35,6774±7,24235	3,047	,051	c>a
	High School Ed.[b]	77	36,1818±6,15529			
	University Ed.[c]	6	42,6667±5,64506			
Total	Primary Ed.[a]	62	112,2581±18,79478	,942	,392	
	High School Ed.[b]	77	113,1948±18,76309			
	University Ed.[c]	6	123,1667±12,20519			

Statistically, a p value in the range of 0.10 to 0.05 means marginally significant. In this direction, when the perceptions of innovation in sports according to the education variable of the participants in Table 6 are examined, a significant difference was determined in the Strategies sub-dimension at the border.

Table 7. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports by Category Variable

Sports Innovation Scale		n	X± Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Sports Innovation in Clubs	U13[a]	58	45,7414±8,06674	1,702	,153	
	U14[b]	13	46,8462±6,14880			
	U15[c]	20	41,7000±9,00351			
	U16[d]	32	46,2500±8,25012			
	U17[e]	22	47,8636±8,27098			
Difficulties of Innovation	U13[a]	58	30,5862±8,27178	2,474	,047	b>c
	U14[b]	13	36,6923±7,75010			
	U15[c]	20	27,5500±7,03731			
	U16[d]	32	32,0000±9,19327			
	U17[e]	22	32,0909±9,69491			
Strategies	U13[a]	58	35,5000±6,94906	1,273	,283	
	U14[b]	13	38,5385±8,38267			
	U15[c]	20	34,5000±5,44349			
	U16[d]	32	36,5313±6,06409			
	U17[e]	22	37,9545±6,82766			
Total	U13[a]	58	111,8276±18,38777	2,641	,036	
	U14[b]	13	122,0769±18,67468			b>c
	U15[c]	20	103,7500±14,41445			d>c
	U16[d]	32	114,7813±18,82643			e>c
	U17[e]	22	117,9091±19,29695			

When the participants' perceptions of innovation in sports were examined according to the category variable, a significant difference was found between the DIC sub-dimension and the total scale scores (p<0,05) (Table 7).

Table 8. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports by Family Income Variable

Sports Innovation Scale		n	X± Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Sports Innovation in Clubs	-3000 TL	22	44,9545±6,11382	,562	,641	
	3001-6000 TL	78	45,2051±8,59229			
	6001-10000 TL	33	46,6970±8,41310			
	10001 TL+	12	47,7500±8,79178			

Difficulties of Innovation	-3000 TL	22	34,1818±7,87786	3,323	,022	b>a d>b d>c
	3001-6000 TL	78	30,1282±8,20098			
	6001-10000 TL	33	29,9394±9,80095			
	10001 TL+	12	36,8333±7,38344			
Strategies	-3000 TL	22	36,4545±6,89877	,839	,474	
	3001-6000 TL	78	35,4744±6,55194			
	6001-10000 TL	33	37,5758±6,28505			
	10001 TL+	12	37,0833±8,64931			
Total	-3000 TL	22	115,5909±18,78870	1,429	,237	
	3001-6000 TL	78	110,8077±17,25294			
	6001-10000 TL	33	114,2121±19,71794			
	10001 TL+	12	121,6667±22,27650			

In Table 8, when the perceptions of innovation in sports according to the family income variable are examined, a significant difference was found in the DIC sub-dimension (p<0,05).

Table 9. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports According to the Variable of Hearing the Concepts of "Innovation, Renewal, Innovative"

Sports Innovation Scale		n	X± Sd	t	p
Sports Innovation in Clubs	Yes	106	46,5189±8,14889	,008	,930
	No	39	43,5385±8,06828		
Difficulties of Innovation	Yes	106	31,4811±9,32506	9,016	,003
	No	39	30,6410±6,73360		
Strategies	Yes	106	36,8585±7,10391	1,763	,186
	No	39	34,5385±5,26581		
Total	Yes	106	114,8585±19,07701	,532	,467
	No	39	108,7179±16,55286		

In Table 9, when the athletes' perceptions of innovation in sports were examined according to the variable of having heard the concepts of "innovation, renewal, innovative" before, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of DIC (p<0,05).

Table 10. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports According to the Variable of Organizing Projects or Trainings Related to Innovation in Sports of the Club

Sports Innovation Scale		n	X± Sd	t	p
Sports Innovation in Clubs	Yes	108	47,4815±7,15056	4,949	,028
	No	37	40,5676±8,99241		
Difficulties of Innovation	Yes	108	31,0185±9,21091	2,742	,100
	No	37	31,9459±7,01564		
Strategies	Yes	108	37,0278±6,46552	,610	,436
	No	37	33,9189±7,00547		
Total	Yes	108	115,5278±17,90654	,367	,546
	No	37	106,4324±19,08394		

When the participants' perceptions of innovation in sports were examined according to the Variable of Projects or Trainings Related to Innovation in Sports of the Club, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of Sports Innovation in Clubs (p<0,05) (Table 10).

Table 11. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports According to the Variable of Evaluating the Club's Perspective on Innovation

Sports Innovation Scale		n	X± Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
Sports Innovation in Clubs	Low[a]	6	28,6667±3,55903	38,306	,000	b>a c>a,b
	Average[b]	69	43,0580±6,92371			
	High[c]	70	49,8000±6,56870			
Difficulties of Innovation	Low[a]	6	30,0000±6,32456	,145	,865	
	Average[b]	69	31,6087±7,04235			
	High[c]	70	31,0143±10,27096			
Strategies	Low[a]	6	27,1667±4,87511	8,883	,000	b>a

	Average[b]	69	35,3913±6,39443			c>a
	High[c]	70	37,8429±6,46425			
	Low[a]	6	85,8333±8,23205			
Total	Average[b]	69	110,0580±16,97133	12,145	,000	b>a
	High[c]	70	118,6571±18,06421			c>a,b

According to Table 11, when the innovation perceptions of the sportsmen were examined according to the Variable of Evaluating the Club's View of Innovation, a significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions of SIC, Strategies, and scale total scores. (p<0,05).

Table 12. Athletes' Perceptions of Innovation in Sports According to the Variable of Innovative Perspective on Performance in Sports

Sports Innovation Scale		n	X± Sd	f	p	Bonferroni
	Effective[a]	5	29,0000±5,70088			
Sports Innovation in Clubs	Undecided[b]	93	48,8817±6,75801	36,165	,000	b>a,c
	Not Effective[c]	47	41,2340±6,74767			c>a
	Effective[a]	5	27,8000±5,63028			
Difficulties of Innovation	Undecided[b]	93	31,1183±9,53124	,530	,590	
	Not Effective[c]	47	31,8936±7,08407			
	Effective[a]	5	29,2000±3,56371			
Strategies	Undecided[b]	93	37,4194±6,56957	5,882	,004	b>a,c
	Not Effective[c]	47	34,6383±6,57209			c>a
	Effective[a]	5	86,0000±10,12423			
Total	Undecided[b]	93	117,4194±17,15044	11,144	,000	b>a,c
	Not Effective[c]	47	107,7660±18,34834			c>a

A significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions of SIC, Strategies, and the total scores when the participants' perceptions of innovation in sports were examined according to the variable of Innovative Perspective on Performance in Sports (p<0,05) (Tablo 12).

Discussion

Although innovation in sports occurs at different levels, different types of innovation can affect different aspects of sports organizations, business, and marketing. It is important for sports organizations to realize and maintain various innovations in various fields such as product, service, process, organization and marketing channels in order to dominate the sports market, to facilitate the organization's operation and to facilitate services (Tosun-Tunç & Sevilmiş, 2019).

When the literature is reviewed, it has been seen that various studies have been carried out in areas such as economy, management, organization, and production regarding the concept of innovation, but there has not been enough work in the field of sports. In the study, the average of the Sports Innovation Scale according to the age, education, category, family income status, hearing the concepts of innovation before, the club's status of providing projects or trainings related to innovation in sports, the evaluation of the club's perspective on innovation, the effect of the innovative perspective in sports on the performance, and the significance of the difference has been analyzed.

According to the findings we obtained as a result of the research, the participants' scores with SIC, DIC and Strategies from the sub-dimensions of the Innovation in Sports Scale; it has been determined that the total scores of the Innovation in Sports Scale are above the average (Table 4).

When the obtained data is examined; According to the age variable of the participants, a significant difference was found between the sub-dimension of the DIC and the total scores of the perceptions of sports innovation. Demir (2020) stated in her study that the difference between the averages according to age groups is significant in athletes. Mülhim & Kul (2020)

stated that as the age of the participants gets older, their resistance to change decreases, their tendency to take ideas and risk increases, and this is due to the experiences gained as the age gets older. In the studies of Atılgan & Tükel (2021), according to the age variable, the level of resistance to change of the participants in the 20-30 age group is significantly higher than the participants between the ages of 31-40 and those over the age of 41. In this case, it can be said that the participants under the age of 30 have higher anxiety about change and innovation, the resistance to change decreases due to the experience gained as the age progresses, and the openness to innovation increases. In the study conducted by Özkan et al., (2020), it was determined that the perceptions of participants aged 29 and under were significantly higher in the sub-dimension of resistance to change, while in the study conducted by Kunze et al., (2013), it was stated that older people showed less resistance to change than their younger colleagues. In addition to these studies, Aslan and Sü (2018) found that the 18-24 age group had the highest individual innovativeness characteristics, while the older participants had the lowest individual innovativeness characteristics. Besides these studies Karadağ (2018), Öztürk (2015) and Köroğlu (2014) concluded that the scores given to the total innovativeness scores and sub-dimensions of the participants did not show a significant difference according to their age.

In the current study, when the perceptions of sports innovation were examined according to the education level variable, a significant difference was found in the strategies sub-dimension. Demir (2020) concluded in her study that there was no significant difference in athletes according to their educational status. In their study, Atılgan & Tükel (2021) stated that as the education level of the participants increases, they have higher scores in the dimension of resistance to change, and the tendency to adopt innovativeness decreases as the education level decreases. On the contrary, in the study conducted by Özkan et al., (2020), it was found that as the level of education decreases, the perceptions of the sub-dimension of resistance to change increase significantly. In the study of Kulanşi (2019), in the sub-dimension of openness to experience, there was a significant difference in the direction of those with a low level of education, and in the sub-dimension of resistance to change, a significant difference was found in the direction of those with a high level of education. In Montenegro (2018) study; It was determined that educational status did not differ significantly in the sub-dimensions of opinion leadership and openness to experience, and those with low education levels showed a significant difference in the sub-dimension scores of resistances to change. Öztürk (2015), on the other hand, found that the educational status of the participants did not make a significant difference in the total scores of innovativeness, opinion leadership, openness to experience, and risk-taking sub-dimension scores, and that those with a low level of education showed more resistance to innovation than those with a high level of education. In addition to these studies, no significant difference was found according to the education variable in Atalay's (2018) study.

When the participants' perceptions of sports innovation according to the category variable were examined, a significant difference was found between the DIC sub-dimension and the total scores. Contrary to this situation, Demir (2020) stated that the sub-dimensions of the Innovation in Sports Scale and the total score did not differ significantly according to the category variable, and accordingly, there was no change in sports innovation in athletes according to the category.

When the participants' perceptions of sports innovation according to the family income variable were examined, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of the DIC. In the study conducted by Demir (2020), which supports the current study, the total and sub-dimensions of the innovation scale in sports differed significantly according to the income of the family. Accordingly, she stated that the innovation scale and sub-dimensions in sports are significantly higher for those with high income than those with low income.

When the participants' perceptions of sports innovation were examined according to the variable of hearing the concepts of "innovation, renewal, innovative" before, a significant

difference was found in the sub-dimension of the DIC. In Demir's (2020) study; While the total score of the innovation scale in sports and the SIC and Strategies in Clubs sub-dimensions differed significantly according to the state of hearing the concepts of "innovation, renewal, innovative" before, he concluded that the DIC sub-dimension did not show a significant difference.

According to the data, when the sports innovation perceptions of the participants were examined according to the variable of the club's status of providing projects or trainings related to innovation in sports, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of SIC. Supporting ours, in the study of Demir (2020), the general level of innovation in sports and the sub-dimensions of Sports Innovation and Strategies in Clubs were found to be significantly higher than those who did not provide such training or projects.

In the current study, when the participants' perceptions of sports innovation were examined according to the variable of evaluating the club's perspective on innovation, a significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions of SIC, strategies, and scale total scores. Demir (2020) stated that for the Innovation in Sports Scale and its sub-dimensions, those who evaluate the club's view of innovation as high are significantly higher than those who evaluate it as low and medium.

When the participants' perceptions of sports innovation were examined according to the variable of the effect of innovative perspective in sports on performance, a significant difference was found between the sub-dimensions of SIC, strategies and scale total scores. In support of our study, Demir (2020) stated that the total score of the Innovation in Sports Scale and the sub-dimension of SIC and Strategies differ significantly according to the effect of innovative perspective in sports on performance.

CONCLUSION

In this study, it is aimed to examine the sports innovation perceptions of licensed athletes in various categories in the infrastructure of sports clubs affiliated to the Provincial Directorates of Youth and Sports, according to some variables. As a result, it was determined that there was a significant difference according to the variables of age, education level, category, family income status in the study conducted with the pilot of Isparta province. It was understood that the participants of the study had heard about the concept of innovation before, projects and trainings related to innovation were organized in their clubs, their clubs had a positive view of the concept of innovation, but they were undecided about how innovation affects their personal performance. It is thought that this situation stems from the education level they are in, and the importance given to innovative activities by the clubs. It is inevitable for sports clubs to give more importance to innovative areas such as products, services, and organizations and to continue these innovation activities in order for their activities to be more effective and efficient.

Suggestions from this research are:

- Since the data obtained from the sports clubs of Isparta province were analyzed in the study, they show similarities and differences with other studies, and one should act cautiously and prudential at the point of generalization of the results.
- In order to reveal more clearly the contribution of innovation in sports to sports businesses and organizations, research examining the innovation perceptions of various sports employees can be conducted.
- With the rapidly developing technology, sports organizations should be encouraged to produce more innovative solutions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thank you to all the participants who are willing to complete this research.

REFERENCES

Aslan, E., ve SÜ, S. E. (2018). Kırsal turizmde yenilik ve kırsal turizm işletmecilerinin bireysel yenilikçilik düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler (katılımcılara ve işletmelere ilişkin) açısından incelenmesi: Kocaeli/Kartepe örneği. MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 7(2), 537-562.

Atalay, A. (2018). Gençlik Hizmetleri ve Spor İl Müdürlüğü Çalışanlarının Bireysel Yenilikçilik Düzeyi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, *13*(10), 87-108.

Atılgan, D., & Tükel, Y. (2021). Antrenör Ve Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Bireysel Yenilikçilik Algıları. Ekev Akademi Dergisi, (86), 171-208.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, K. E., Akgün, E. Ö., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2010). Scientific Research Methods, Ankara: Pegem Akademi, 206-207.

Damanpour, F. (1996). Organizational complexity and innovation: Developing and testing multiple contingency models. Management Science, 42(5), 693–716.

Demir, A., (2020). Spor Kulüplerinin Futbol Alt Yapı Performans Yönetimi Yaklaşımlarının İnovatif (Yenilikçi) Açıdan İncelenmesi. Doktora Tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi.

Demir, A., Sertbaş, K., ve Sivrikaya, K. (2020). Sporda İnovasyon Ölçeği nin (SİÖ) Türkçeye Uyarlama Çalışması. Eurasian Research in Sport Science, 1(5), 16–25.

Elçi, Ş. (2006). İnovasyon Kalkınma ve Rekabetin Anahtrarı. In Genişletilmiş Baskı, Nova Basın Yayın.

Erkaya, D. (2021). Sosyal İnovasyon İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkide Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı İle İyi Oluş Halinin Rolü. Yüksek lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi.

Garcia, R., & Calantone, R. (2002). A critical look at technological innovation typology and innovativeness terminology: A literature review. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 19(2), 110–132.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). IBM SPSS Statistics 23 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference (14th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gündoğdu, F., & Sunay, H. (2012). İnovayon ve Türk Spor Yönetiminde İnovasyon Uygulamaları. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2, 61–66.

Hadi Razavi, S., & Attarnezhad, O. (2013). Management of Organizational Innovation. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 4(1), 226–232.

Karadağ, T.F. (2018). Türkiye'deki spor federasyonları çalışanlarının örgütsel öğrenme ve bireysel yenilikçilik profillerinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı.

Karasar, N. (2004). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. Nobel yayıncılık, Ankara, 52.

Kılıç, F. (2018). Açık İnovasyon Kavramı ve Etkileri Üzerine Birr Uygulama. Yüksek lisans Tezi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi.

Köroğlu, A.Y. (2014). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ve öğretmen adaylarının bilişim teknolojileri öz yeterlik algıları, teknolojik araç gereç kullanım tutumları ve bireysel yenilikçilik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Kulanşi, E. (2019). Kış spor tesislerinde örgütsel yenilikçilik. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi, Kış Sporları ve Spor Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Kunze, F., Boehm, S., & Bruch, H. (2013). Age, resistance to change, and job performance. Journal of

Managerial Psychology, 28(7-8), 741-760.

Mülhim M. A. ve Kul M., (2020). Beden Eğitimi ve Sporda Yenilikçilik, Hakan Sunay, Ender Yörükoğlu (Ed.), *Sporun Yönetimi ve Psiko-sosyal Boyutları* içinde (s.10-134). Mauritius: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.

Oslo, Klavuzu. (2006). 3. Baskı, Tübitak (Issue Yenilik Verilerinin Toplanması ve Yorumlanması İçin İlkeler).

Özkan, O., Özlem, Ö. ve Özmen, S. (2020). Sağlık çalışanlarında bireysel yenilikçilik özelliklerinin incelenmesi: Özel Bir Hastanede Uygulama. İnönü Üniversitesi Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek Yüksek Okulu Dergisi, 8 (2), 302-311.

Öztürk, Z. (2015). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin bireysel yenilikçilik düzeyleri ve bu düzeylere etki eden etmenlerin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gaziantep: Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). The Theory of Economic Development. Ursula Backhaus (Tr.) Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Tosun-Tunç, G., ve Sevilmiş, A. (2019). Sporda İnovasyon: Bir Derleme Çalışması. Türk Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2(1), 39–46.