



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/0000-0003-4313-7720>¹

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 $33,82 \pm 8,831$ 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, İközler, & 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 1
Demographic of Participants

Variables		F	%
Coaching Rank	1 st rank	32	15.8
	2 nd rank	85	42.1
	3 rd rank	64	31.7
	4 th rank	15	7.4
	5 th rank	6	3.0
Coaching Experience	1-3 years	46	22.8
	4-6 years	60	29.7
	7 years and above	96	47.5
Age	18-24 years	40	19.8
	25-31 years	43	21.3
	32-38 years	59	29.2
Branch	39 years and older	60	29.7
	Individual	146	72.3
How they receive the coaching certificate	Team	56	27.7
	Course	119	58.9
	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 2
Distribution 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
Coaches' Professional Ethics Behavior Scale Total Scores	r .415**	.468**	.484**	.729**	.648**
	p .000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N 202	202	202	202	202

The skewness and kurtosis values indicated that the data had a homogeneous distribution with a range of ± 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. ± Sd.	F	p
Coaches' Behavior Scale Total Scores	Professional Ethics	18-24 years	40	4.60±.350	.251	.860	
		25-31 years	43	4.56±.451			
		32-38 years	59	4.58±.413			
		39 years and older	60	4.62±.313			
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Performance Efficacy	18-24 years	40	4.34±.559	.399	.754	
		25-31 years	43	4.31±.583			
		32-38 years	59	4.28±.577			
		39 years and older	60	4.40±.567			
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Psychological Efficacy	18-24 years	40	4.58±.504	.538	.657	
		25-31 years	43	4.44±.486			
		32-38 years	59	4.52±.449			
		39 years and older	60	4.50±.522			
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Technical Teaching Efficacy	18-24 years	40	4.35±.459	.348	.791	
		25-31 years	43	4.26±.495			
		32-38 years	59	4.33±.628			
		39 years and older	60	4.38±.553			
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Character Formation Efficacy	18-24 years	40	4.71±.364	.542	.654	
		25-31 years	43	4.64±.488			
		32-38 years	59	4.70±.457			
		39 years and older	60	4.75±.386			
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Team Management Efficacy	18-24 years	40	4.45±.522	1.235	.298	
		25-31 years	43	4.41±.519			
		32-38 years	59	4.46±.477			
		39 years and older	60	4.58±.415			

Table 5
ANOVA Analysis results by year of coaching experience

Scales	Coaching Year	N	Avg. ± Sd.	F	p	
Coaches' Professional Ethics Behavior Scale Total Scores	1-3 years	46	4.69±.348	2.110	.124	
	4-6 years	60	4.58±.383			
	7 years and above	96	4.55±.389			
	Performance Efficacy	1-3 years	46	4.46±.523	1.546	.216
		4-6 years	60	4.28±.624		
		7 years and above	96	4.30±.552		
	Psychological Efficacy	1-3 years	46	4.58±.500	2.329	.100
		4-6 years	60	4.57±.410		
		7 years and above	96	4.43±.520		
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Technical Teaching Efficacy	1-3 years	46	4.46±.576	2.984	.053
		4-6 years	60	4.21±.524		
		7 years and above	96	4.35±.531		
	Character Formation Efficacy	1-3 years	46	4.75±.353	.335	.716
		4-6 years	60	4.71±.450		
		7 years and above	96	4.68±.444		
	Team Management Efficacy	1-3 years	46	4.54±.448	.439	.645
		4-6 years	60	4.47±.502		
		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' Professional Ethics Behavior Scale Total Scores	Individual	146	4.63±.346	1.918	.059	
	Team	56	4.50±.451			
Performance Efficacy	Individual	146	4.38±.559	1.871	.063	
	Team	56	4.21±.587			
Psychological Efficacy	Individual	146	4.53±.475	1.350	.178	
	Team	56	4.43±.522			
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Technical Teaching	Individual	146	4.37±.545	1.694	.092
	Efficacy	Team	56	4.23±.540		
Character Formation Efficacy	Individual	146	4.76±.382	2.571	.012*	
	Team	56	4.57±.501			
Team Management Efficacy	Individual	146	4.53±.428	2.179	.032*	
	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

Scales	The way to get a coaching certificate	N	Avg. ± Sd.	t	p
Coaches' Professional Ethics Behavior Scale Total Scores	Course	119	4.58±.409	-.357	.721
	Accreditation	83	4.60±.337		
Performance Efficacy	Course	119	4.29±.592	-1.220	.224
	Accreditation	83	4.39±.533		
Psychological Efficacy	Course	119	4.50±.510	-.284	.777
	Accreditation	83	4.52±.459		
A Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale	Technical Teaching Course	119	4.29±.575	-1.329	.185
	Technical Teaching Accreditation	83	4.39±.496		
Character Formation Efficacy	Course	119	4.69±.472	-.491	.624
	Accreditation	83	4.72±.350		
Team Management Efficacy	Course	119	4.42±.505	-2.376	.018*
	Accreditation	83	4.58±.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. Aydın'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). *Yönetmel Mesleki ve Örgütsel Etik*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Aydiner, B. B. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam amaçlarının alt boyutlarının genel öz yeterlilik yaşam doyumu ve çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi* [Unpublished Master Thesis, Sakarya University Institute of Educational Sciences].
- Bıkmaz, F. H. (2006). Öz Yeterlilik 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 Yeterlilik 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 Yeterlilik 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 Pennsylvania 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.