

Apuntes Universitarios, 2023: 13 (1), enero-marzo

ISSN: 2304-0335 DOI: https://doi.org/10.17162/au.v13i1.1311

Comportamiento ético profesional y autoeficacia de las entrenadoras

Professional ethics behavior and self-efficacy of female coaches

Burçak Keskin^{1a}

Yalova University- Faculty of Sports Sciences Coaching Department, Turquía¹

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4313-77201

Recibido: 21 de julio de 2022 **Aceptado:** 29 de septiembre de 2022

Resumen

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo examinar la relación entre la autoeficacia de las entrenadoras y el comportamiento ético profesional y compararlos según los años de experiencia como entrenadoras, la edad y la rama. La muestra de 202 mujeres entrenadoras voluntarias que participaron en jornadas de formación realizadas en 2021-2022. La edad media de los participantes fue de 33,82±8,831 años. Se administró a los participantes la 'Escala de comportamiento ético profesional de entrenadores' y la 'Escala de autoeficacia de entrenadores'. De acuerdo con los resultados de la prueba de Shapiro-Wilk y los valores de asimetría y curtosis, la muestra tenía una distribución normal. Los datos se analizaron mediante estadística descriptiva, medias, desviación estándar, medianas, cuartiles y porcentajes. Los hallazgos sugirieron una relación altamente positiva y significativa entre la autoeficacia de los entrenadores y sus comportamientos de ética profesional, y obtuvieron puntajes promedio altos en las escalas de autoeficacia y comportamientos de ética profesional.

Palabras clave: Deportes, entrenadores, ética profesional, autoeficacia

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the relationship between female coaches' self-efficacy and professional ethics behavior and compare them according to years of coaching experience, age, and branch. The sample consisted of 202 female volunteer coaches who participated in training seminars held in 2021-2022. The mean age of the participants was 33.82±8.831 years. The 'Coaches' Professional Ethics Behavior Scale' and the 'A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale' were administered to the participants. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test results and the skewness and kurtosis values, the sample had a normal distribution. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, means, standard deviation, medians, quartiles, and percentages. The findings suggested

^aCorrespondencia al autor

E-mail: burcak.keskin@yalova.edu.tr

a highly positive and significant relationship between the coaches' self-efficacy and their professional ethics behaviors, and they had high average scores on self-efficacy and professional ethics behaviors scales.

Keywords: Sports, Coaches, Professional ethics, Self-Efficacy

Introduction

The innate abilities of athletes play a vital role in achievement. In addition to innate abilities, a coach is an important figure who shapes an athlete's skills, guides and provides the formation of the athlete's self-perception. (Amman, İkizler, & Karagözoğlu, 2000; Jowett & Meek, 2000). The relationship between the coach and the athlete plays an important role in the physical and psychosocial development of the athlete (Jowett & Cockerill, 2002). Nowadays, the profession of coaching has evolved and become an important sector. The investment and interest in sports have led to a competitive and oppressive environment for coaches, which results in the need for high performance and success.

For the other hand, ethics, also known as moral philosophy, is "the discipline of philosophy dealing with the concept of what we call *morality*." Although ethics is acknowledged as the theory of right or wrong behavior, morality refers to practices (Billington, 2011). In short, ethics; reasoning on value relations between people, determining the right and wrong measures for the past and present (Aydın, 2001). Professional ethics, which is one of the types of ethics, the principles of which are set forth by professional associations, have been discussed over time and accepted as correct, and today it has become an indispensable condition of a profession. Professional ethical behavior requires behaving correctly and at the same time in the practice of the profession. It increases the quality and quality of professional practices. Principles of coaching ethics which is a professional ethics have been determined by many international sports committees and associations (Tuncel, 2014; Namal, 2001; Kultgen, 1988). The approach of the coach, who is an important role model for athletes, within the framework of ethical principles is important for the development of the athlete.

Coaches should model positive behaviors and attitudes towards their athletes. Athletes constantly observe the behavior of their coaches. For this reason, the fact that coaches can show ethical principles in their behaviors has an important effect on the adoption of these principles by

the athletes (Tuncel, 2014). Coaches are expected to treat equally, prioritize the health and safety of the athletes over their performance, build a good relationship of mutual respect and trust with their athletes, and never ignore rule violations and the use of prohibited substances (Hadley, 2006). Nevertheless, some coaches may encourage their players to cheat and use violence and performance-enhancing drugs. Such coaches may insist on doing excessive training without caring about the academic life of athletes and also cause physical or mental harm (Eitzen, 2012).

The applicability of professional ethics depends on people's self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is characterized by acting in a situation using available knowledge and experience and according to the expected performance (Bıkmaz, 2006). It is also defined as one's belief in himself to show efficacy in a situation. Self-efficacy beliefs affect one's emotions and thoughts to make efforts to achieve goals, not give up despite challenges, overcome temporary obstacles, and control life events. The concept of "efficacy belief" has become an increasingly popular research topic in various disciplines in recent years (Bandura, 1993). In this regard, coach self-efficacy refers to coaches' self-beliefs in the extent to which they influence athlete learning and performance. In parallel with their duties and responsibilities, coaches' professional self-efficacy beliefs affect their efforts, motivation, success, and productivity.

Both self-efficacy and professional ethics are essential for many occupations, including coaching. Several studies address the relationship between self-efficacy and professional ethics in various occupational groups in the literature (Ağırbaş et al., 2020). Kayır and Özbek (2021) found that female coaches were more committed to professional ethics than male coaches, and male coaches had a more challenging temperament than female coaches, who were observed to be much more tolerant and understanding. This study examined the relationship between female coaches' self-efficacy and professional ethics behaviors according to years of coaching experience, age, and branch.

Methodology

Design

The study was conducted on female coaches in Turkey. A total of 202 coaches were included in the study. The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between self-efficacy perceptions and professional ethical behaviors of female coaches according to experience, age and branch.

Within the scope of the study, "Coaches' Professional Ethical Behavior Scale" and "A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale" were applied to the participants.

Participants

The study sample consisted of 202 female coaches, worked different sport clubs, with a mean age of 33.82±8.83 years, a mean coaching experience of 8.39±6.00 years, and a coaching rank of 1 to 5. The branches of the female coaches are tennis, table tennis, karate and wrestling which is one of the individual sports and basketball and volleyball which is one of the team sports. They worked different sports clubs.

Instruments and Data Collection

"Coaches' Professional Ethics Behavior Scale' and 'A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale" were used to collect the data. The 5-point Likert type scale (n-1/n= 5-1/5 = .80) was developed by Kayır and Özbek (2019), and it has 19 items and four dimensions: "professionalism", "respect", "responsibility", and "tolerance". There was no negative item on the scale, and there was no reverse coded item. Scale items are scored between 1 and 5. The minimum and maximum scores obtained from the dimensions are between 9 and 45 points in the "professionalism," between 4 and 20 in the "respect," and between 3 and 15 in the "responsibility and tolerance." The lowest score obtained is 19, and the highest score is 95. The increase in the scores indicates a high commitment to professional ethics.

"A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale". The validity and reliability study of the scale was conducted by Koçak (2020). It has 21 items and five factors: performance efficacy (the items 1-2-3-4), psychological efficacy (the items 5-6-7-8), technical teaching efficacy (the items 9-10-11-12-13), character formation efficacy (the items 14-15- 16-17) and team management efficacy (the items 18-19-20-21). The lowest score obtained from the scale is 21, and the highest score is 105. Mean scores from the scale and self-efficacy can be evaluated in three levels as follows: high level (between 3.34-5.00 points), medium level (between 1.67-3.33 points), and low level (between 0.00-1.66 points). The internal consistency value was 0.88 for this study.

Table 1Demographic of Participants

Variables		F	%
	1 st rank	32	15.8
	2 nd rank	85	42.1
Coaching Rank	3 rd rank	64	31.7
	4 th rank	15	7.4
	5 th rank	6	3.0
	1-3 years	46	22.8
Coaching Experience	4-6 years	60	29.7
	7 years and above	96	47.5
	18-24 years	40	19.8
	25-31 years	43	21.3
Age	32-38 years	59	29.2
	39 years and older	60	29.7
D 1	Individual	146	72.3
Branch	Team	56	27.7
TT d to the time of time of the time of time of the time of time o	Course	119	58.9
How they receive the coaching certificate	Accreditation	83	41.1

Analysis of data

The Statistical data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, means, standard deviation, medians, quartiles, and percentages on SPSS 22.0 software. The Shapiro-Wilk test results and the skewness and kurtosis values showed that the sample had a normal distribution. Therefore, independent groups t-test and ANOVA, which are parametric test techniques, were used to compare the differences between the variables.

Ethical criteria

In this study, all rules stated to be followed within the scope of "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed. Ethical Review Board Name: Yalova University Human Studies Ethics Committee. Date of Ethics Evaluation Decision: 02.05.2021 Ethics Assessment Document Issue Number: 2021/62. Before the study, the participants were informed about the purpose of the research. Participants participated in the study voluntarily. Written informed consent for the experiment was provided by all participants.

Results

Table 2Distribution of scale scores

Scales	Number of Items	N	Avg. ± Sd	Skewness	Kurtosis	C.Alpha
Coaches' Professional Ethics Behavior Scale	19	202	4.59±.381	-1.093	1.223	0.893
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	21	202	4.47±.385	556	040	0.881

Table 3 *Correlation analysis results*

SCALES		Performance Efficacy	Psychological Efficacy	Technical Teaching Efficacy	Character Formation Efficacy	Team Management Efficacy
	_	.415**	.468**	.484**	.729**	.648**
Professional Ethics Behavior Scale Total	•	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Scores	N	202	202	202	202	202

The skewness and kurtosis values indicated that the data had a homogeneous distribution with a range of \pm 1.5 (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2013), so parametric test techniques were preferred in data analysis. As seen in Table 2, female coaches' self-efficacy and professional ethics behavior average scores were high. According to the correlation analysis in Table 3, there is a highly significant positive correlation between the two scales.

Table 4 *ANOVA Analysis results by age*

		Age	N	Avg. \pm Sd.	F	p
		18-24 years	40	4.60±.350		
Coaches' Profe	ssional Ethics	25-31 years	43	4.56±.451	.251	.860
Behavior Scale Tot	al Scores	32-38 years	59	$4.58 \pm .413$.231	.800
		39 years and older	60	$4.62 \pm .313$		
		18-24 years	40	$4.34 \pm .559$		
	Performance	25-31 years	43	4.31±.583	200	751
	Efficacy	32-38 years	59	$4.28 \pm .577$.399	.754
		39 years and older	60	$4.40 \pm .567$		
		18-24 years	40	$4.58 \pm .504$		
	Psychological	25-31 years	43	$4.44 \pm .486$.538	.657
	Efficacy	32-38 years	59	4.52±.449	.538	.037
		39 years and older	60	$4.50 \pm .522$		
	Taskuisal	18-24 years	40	$4.35 \pm .459$		
A Coaching Self-	Technical	25-31 years	43	$4.26 \pm .495$.348	.791
Efficacy Scale	Teaching Efficacy	32-38 years	59	$4.33 \pm .628$		
	Efficacy	39 years and older	60	$4.38 \pm .553$		
	Character	18-24 years	40	$4.71 \pm .364$		
	Character	25-31 years	43	$4.64 \pm .488$.542	.654
	Formation Efficacy	32-38 years	59	$4.70 \pm .457$		
	Efficacy	39 years and older	60	$4.75 \pm .386$		
	Team	18-24 years	40	$4.45 \pm .522$		
		25-31 years	43	$4.41 \pm .519$	1.235	.298
	Management Efficacy	32-38 years	59	$4.46 \pm .477$		
	Efficacy	39 years and older	60	$4.58 \pm .415$		

Table 5 *ANOVA Analysis results by year of coaching experience*

Scales		Coaching Year	N	Avg. \pm Sd.	F	p
Coachas, Professio	onal Ethics Behavior	1-3 years	46	4.69±.348		
Scale Total Scores	onai Eunes Benavior	4-6 years	60	$4.58 \pm .383$	2.110	.124
Scale Total Scores		7 years and above	96	$4.55 \pm .389$		
	Performance	1-3 years	46	$4.46 \pm .523$		
	Efficacy	4-6 years	60	$4.28 \pm .624$	1.546	.216
	Efficacy	7 years and above	96	$4.30 \pm .552$		
	Psychological Efficacy	1-3 years	46	$4.58 \pm .500$		
		4-6 years	60	$4.57 \pm .410$	2.329	.100
		7 years and above	96	$4.43 \pm .520$		
	Technical Teaching Efficacy	1-3 years	46	$4.46 \pm .576$		
A Coaching Self- Efficacy Scale		4-6 years	60	4.21±.524	2.984	.053
Zillowoj zoulo		7 years and above	96	$4.35 \pm .531$		
	Character Formation	1-3 years	46	$4.75 \pm .353$		
		4-6 years	60	$4.71 \pm .450$.335	.716
	Efficacy	7 years and above	96	$4.68 \pm .444$		
	Team Management Efficacy	1-3 years	46	$4.54 \pm .448$		
_		4-6 years	60	$4.47 \pm .502$.439	.645
		7 years and above	96	4.46±.482		

^{*}p < .05

Table 6 *T-Test Analysis results by coaches' branches*

Scales	Branch	n	Avg. ± Sd.	t	p	
Coaches' Profess	Individual	146	4.63±.346	1.918	.059	
Scale Total Scores	Scale Total Scores			$4.50 \pm .451$	1.916	.039
	Danfannan as Efficacy	Individual	146	$4.38 \pm .559$	1.871	.063
	Performance Efficacy	Team	56	$4.21 \pm .587$.003
	Psychological Efficacy	Individual	146	$4.53 \pm .475$	1.350	.178
		Team	56	$4.43 \pm .522$		
A Coaching Self-	Technical Teaching	Individual	146	$4.37 \pm .545$	1.694	.092
Efficacy Scale	Efficacy	Team	56	$4.23 \pm .540$		
	Character Formation	Individual	146	$4.76 \pm .382$	0.571	012*
	Efficacy	Team	56	$4.57 \pm .501$	2.571	.012*
	Team Management	Individual	146	$4.53 \pm .428$	2.179	.032*
	Efficacy	Team	56	4.35±.577		

^{*}p < .05

As seen in Table 4, there was no statistically significant difference between female coaches' self-efficacy and professional ethics behavior by age (p>0.05). According to the analysis results in Table 5, there is no statistically significant difference between the two scales by the year of coaching experience (p>0.05). As seen in Table 6, while there was no significant difference in the total professional ethics scale scores by branch (p>0.05), a statistically significant difference was found in the "Character Formation Efficacy" and "Team Management Efficacy" sub-dimensions (p<0.05). According to Table 7, there was no significant difference in the professional ethics behavior scale total scores by how the coaches received their coaching certificate (p>0.05). However, a statistically significant difference was found in the "Team Management Efficacy" sub-dimension (p<0.05).

Table 7 *T-Test Analysis results according to how the coaches received the coaching certificate*

		The way to get a				
Scales		coaching	N	Avg. \pm Sd.	t	p
		certificate				
Coaches' Professiona	al Ethics Behavior Scale	Course	119	4.58±.409	357	.721
Total Scores		Accreditation	83	$4.60 \pm .337$	337	./21
	Doufournon on Efficacy	Course	119	$4.29 \pm .592$	1 220	.224
	Performance Efficacy	Accreditation	83	$4.39 \pm .533$	-1.220	.224
	Psychological	Course	119	$4.50 \pm .510$	204	777
	Efficacy	Accreditation	83	$4.52 \pm .459$	284	.777
A Coaching Self-	Technical Teaching	Course	119	$4.29 \pm .575$	-1.329	.185
Efficacy Scale	Efficacy	Accreditation	83	$4.39 \pm .496$		
	Character Formation	Course	119	$4.69 \pm .472$	491 -2.376	.624
	Efficacy	Accreditation	83	$4.72 \pm .350$		
	Team Management	Course	119	$4.42 \pm .505$		
	Efficacy	Accreditation	83	$4.58 \pm .426$		

^{*}p < .05

Discussion

This study addressed the relationship between female coaches' self-efficacy and professional ethics behaviors and found that the mean scores of coaches' self-efficacy and professional ethics behaviors were high, suggesting that female coaches' inclination not to exhibit unethical behaviors that may negatively affect the athletes (Table 2). The findings also suggest that female coaches were focused on improving the athletes' performance and were aware of their competence. In their study, Kayır and Özbek (2021) stated that the coaches' behaviors were morally appropriate to rule ethics. Ermis et al. (2019) also concluded that tennis coaches had a moderate level of self-efficacy.

This study found a positive and highly significant relationship between the two scales (Table 3). Accordingly, as the coach's self-efficacy increased, so did the professional ethics behaviors. It can be inferred that as the professional knowledge of coaches increases, they tend to follow any written and unwritten rules in sports to enhance athletes' performance. No statistically significant difference was found between the scales by age (Table 4). Koçak (2019) concluded that the self-efficacy levels of coach candidates did not differ significantly according to the age variable. Similarly, Dumangöz and Sanlav (2021) found no significant difference in volleyball coaches' total

scale and sub-dimension scores according to age. In another study conducted on coach candidates, no significant relationship was found between age and general self-efficacy levels of the participants (Akyüz, 2020). However, Ermiş et al. (2019) reached a statistically significant difference in coaches' motivation, game strategies, technical teaching, character formation, and physical condition according to age and that the coaches' efficacy increased in parallel with the age in all factors. Köksal (2008) also found in his study that self-efficacy increases with age, and the difference between the age and self-efficacy of coaches is statistically significant.

No statistically significant difference was found in both scales according to the years of coaching experience (Table 5). In Akıncı's study (2020), no significant difference was found between the ethical leadership perceptions of the participants according to the variable of the participants' years of service. According to Dumangöz and Sanlav (2021), coaching experience did not affect the volleyball coaches' scores on the professional self-efficacy scale. In the study conducted by Sağlam and Çeviker (2022), it was determined that the self-efficacy of the coaches did not change according to the years of working in coaching. Aydıner's study (2011) also found that the self-efficacy beliefs of the individuals participating in the research did not differ in terms of the age variable. Unlike our study, Ermiş et al. (2019) pointed out a statistically significant difference in motivation, game strategies, technical teaching, character formation, and physical condition factors according to the year of coaching experience, and the coaches' efficacy increased over the years.

In terms of the branches, it was seen that the character formation and team management self-efficacy mean scores of the coaches in individual sports were higher than the team sports coaches (Tablo 6). There was no difference in professional ethics behaviors between the individual and team sports coaches (Tablo 6). The difference observed in the sub-dimensions of the coaching self-efficacy scale might result from the fact that individual sports coaches spend much time with athletes, and the communication between coach and athlete in individual sports is better than that in team sports. It may be difficult for a coach to deal with each athlete's performance and motivation individually in team sports.

On the contrary, in individual sports, a coach has the opportunity to improve an athlete's personality and sports ethics since individual sports focus on a single athlete. Besides, individual sports coaches have higher control over themselves and athletes. Similar to our study, Sarı and Altın (2021) indicated that individual sports coaches' self-efficacy mean scores were significantly

more positive than team sports coaches. However, Certel, Alkış, and Gürpınar (2018) found no difference in commitment to ethical principles according to being an individual, team, or combat sports coach. In his study, Koçak (2019) examined the self-efficacy levels of coach candidates and stated that individual sports coaches had higher self-efficacy levels in technical teaching than team sports coaches.

Unlike our study, in their study on athletes' and coaches' opinions about the professional ethics behaviors of coaches, Kayır and Özbek (2021) underlined that the individual sports athletes found their coaches more committed to professional ethics than team sports coaches. In another study, a significant difference was found between the ethics and justice, clarification of duties and roles, power sharing sub-headings and the total scores of ethical leadership perceptions of trainers who are interested in team sports and individual sports. It has been determined that this difference is in the direction of the coaches who are interested in team sports (Akıncı, 2020).

While there was no significant difference in the professional ethics behavior scale total score according to how the coaches received their coaching certificate, a statistically significant difference was measured in the "Team Management Efficacy" (Table 7). Accordingly, the average scores in team management efficacy of those who received the coaching certificate with accreditation were higher than those who received the coaching certificate by attending a course. According to the findings, it can be suggested that the coach candidates who graduate from the department of physical education and sports and have a specialization in a specific branch are more competent in the issues surrounding management, equality of opportunity, justice, career goals, and team works. Unlike this study, Dumangöz and Sanlav (2021) reached no significant difference in volleyball coaches' professional self-efficacy total scale and sub-dimension scores according to the source of a coaching certificate.

Conclusion

Age and coaching experience did not make any difference in coaching self-efficacy and professional ethical behavior, but the coaches' branches and how they received their coaching certificates play a role in coaching self-efficacy. The coaches' high self-efficacy contributed to athletes' physical and mental development. In the light of findings, it is essential to improve coaches' self-efficacy- in other words, their faith in professional competency and capacity- as they are influential in improving athletes' ethical behaviors and characters, which is a critical element

of fair play. In this respect, we can suggest that as coaches' self-efficacy increases, so do their professional ethics behaviors.

The sample of this study was limited to 202 female coaches. It is recommended that new studies should keep the participant level high and include male coaches in the study. Since it causes mood changes in future studies only on women, taking it into account in the menstrual cycle may affect the results of the study positively. At the same time, studies can be conducted to examine the self-efficacy and professional ethical behaviors of coaches on a branch basis. And parameters such as whether the trainer has a sports background or whether he is at the national level can be added.

References

- Akıncı, A. Y. (2020). Gençlik Hizmetleri ve Spor İl Müdürlüklerinde Görev Yapan Antrenörlerin Etik Liderlik Algısının Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. *Spor Eğitim Dergisi*, 4 (2), 131-140. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/seder/issue/54136/745581
- Akyüz, H. (2020). Antrenör adaylarının genel öz yeterlilik ve iletişim düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies-Social Sciences*, *15* (8), 3371-3386. https://doi.org/10.47356/TurkishStudies.45935
- Amman, T., İkizler, H. C., & Karagözoğlu, C. (2000). Sporda Sosyal Bilimler. Ankara: Alfa.
- Aydın, İ. P. (2001). Yönetsel Mesleki ve Örgütsel Etik. Ankara. Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Aydıner, B. B. (2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam amaçlarının alt boyutlarının genel özyeterlilik yaşam doyumu ve çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [Unpublished Master Thesis, Sakarya University Institute of Educational Sciences].
- Bıkmaz, F. H. (2006). Öz Yeterlik İnançları. Y. Kuzgun, and D. Deryakulu (Ed.), *Eğitimde Bireysel Farklılıklar* (ss. 291-310). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Billington, R. (2011). Felsefeyi Yaşamak Ahlak Düşüncesine Giriş. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Certel, Z., Alkış, A., & Gürpınar, B. (2018). Antrenörlerin Mesleki Etik İlkelere Uyma Düzeylerinin Antrenör Ve Sporcu Gözüyle Değerlendirilmesi. *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, 8 (2), 223-231. https://doi.org/10.13114/mjh.2018.418
- Dumangöz, P. D., & Sanlav, R. (2021). Voleybol Antrenörlerinin Mesleki Öz Yeterlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Demografik Özelliklere Göre İncelenmesi. *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4 (2), 251-264. https://doi.org/10.38021/asbid.956931

- Eitzen, D. S. (2012). *Fair And Foul: Beyond the Myths and Paradoxes of Sport*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Ermiş, E., Satıcı, A., Bostancı, Ö., İmamoğlu, O., & Taşmektepligil, M. Y. (2019). Tenis Antrenörleri Yeterlilik Düzeyinin Araştırılması. *Opus Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14 (20), 1211-1227. https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.605062
- Hadley, P. (2006). Duty of Care. In Ferrero F. (Ed.), *British Canoe Union, Coaching Handbook*. Wales: Pesda Press.
- Horn, T. S. (2008). Coaching Effectiveness İn The Sports Domain. In T.S. Horn (Ed.), *Advances İn Sport Psychology* (3rd Ed., pp. 239-268). Champaign, Ill: Human Kinetics.
- Johansson, S. (2013). Coach-Athlete Sexual Relationships: If No Means No, Does Yes Mean Yes? *Sport, Education, and Society, 18* (5), 678-693. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2013.777662
- Jowett, S. & Meek, G. A. (2000). The Coach–Athlete Relationship in Married Couples: An exploratory Content Analysis. *The Sport Psychologist*, 14, 157–175. https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.14.2.157
- Jowett, S. & Cockerill, I. (2002). Incompatibility in the Coach–Athlete Relationship. In: Cockerill I (Ed.), *Solutions in Sport Psychology*. London: Thompson Learning.
- Karakoç, Ö., Yüksek, S., Aydın, A. D., Karakoç, B., Yetiş, Ü., & Baydil, B. (2011). Milli Takım Düzeyindeki Erkek Judocuların Kulüp Antrenörlerinde Gözlemledikler Etik Dışı Davranışlar. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 19 (1), 321-332. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/817581
- Kayır, B., & Özbek, O. (2019). Antrenörlerin Meslek Etiği Davranışları Ölçeği: Ölçek Geliştirme Ve Geçerlik Çalışması. *Spormetre*, 17 (3), 134-144. https://doi.org/10.33689/spormetre.601953
- Kayır, B., & Ozbek, O. (2021). Antrenörlerin Meslek Etiği Davranışlarına İlişkin Antrenör Ve Sporcu Görüşleri. *Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6 (1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.25307/jssr.869391
- Koçak, Ç. V. (2019). Antrenör Adaylarının Antrenör Öz Yeterlik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17 (1), 55-62. https://doi.org/10.33689/spormetre.520507

- Koçak, Ç. V. (2020). Antrenör Öz Yeterlik Ölçeği: Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 25 (4), 313-329. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/gbesbd/issue/57046/764452
- Köksal, F. (2008). Antrenörlerin liderlik tarzları ile öz-yeterlilikleri arasındaki ilişki [Master's Thesis, Selcuk University, Institute of Health Sciences].
- Kultgen, J. (1988). Ethics and Professionalizm. Philadelphia: University of Pennslyvania Press.
- Namal, A. (2001). Etik mi etikçilik mi? Bilim Teknik, 271.
- Özsarı, A., & Altın, M. (2021). Öz Yeterlik Ve Stresle Başa Çıkma (Bireysel Ve Takım Sporları Antrenörleri Araştırması). *Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, *15* (3), 399-411. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/bsd/issue/66415/957466
- Sağlam, C., & Çeviker, A. (2021). Antrenörlerin Öz Yeterlilik ve Antrenörlüğe Yönelik Tutum Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11 (2), 662-676. https://doi.org/10.37989/gumussagbil.1097639
- Seçkin-Ağırbaş, İ., Erel, S., & Belli, E. (2020). Antrenörlerin öz yeterlilikleri ile iletişim becerileri ilişkisi. *Anatolia Sport Research*, *1* (1), 25-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/anatoliasr.3
- Stewart, C. C. (2014). Sportsmanship, Gamesmanship, And the Implications for Coach Education, Strategies. *A Journal for Physical and Sport Educators*, 27 (5), 3-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/08924562.2014.938878
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell. L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6. Ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Tuncel, S. D. (2014). Spor Etiği. Atak S, Kenan G. S. (Ed.), *In: Meslek Etiği Kavramlar* (ss. 473-98). Adalet Yayınevi.