



<http://doi.org/10.22282/ojrs.2021.77>

EXAMINATION OF THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF VOLLEYBALL COACHES ON THEIR SELF-EFFICACY

*Enes ÖZDEMİR, *Abdurrahman KEPOĞLU, *İlker GÜNEL

Faculty of Sport Science, Usak University, Usak

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the effect of the leadership characteristics of volleyball trainers on their self-efficacy. The target population of this study, which is carried out with general screening management, one of the quantitative research designs, consists of trainers working in the first league, second league and third league. The sample of the study, which was determined with the convenience sampling technique, one of the improbable sampling methods, consists of 60 male trainers working in the first league, second league and third league. The "Self-Efficacy Scale" developed by Riggs, Warka, Babasa, Betancourt and Hooker (1994) and adapted into Turkish by Öcel (2002) and "Sports Leadership Scale" developed by Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) and adapted into Turkish by Tiryaki and Toros (2001) were used. One way Anova, correlation and regression analyzes were

performed by using average values in analyzing the data for determining the leadership and self-efficacy levels of the trainers. Leadership and self-efficacy concepts were explained in detail and the effects of this concept on trainers were examined. As a result, it has been determined that there is a relationship between the leadership styles of the trainers and their self-efficacy. Currently, leadership is quite prominent. The issue of leadership has started to be studied and examined a lot in recent years with the desire of individuals to be leaders in the group, and a lot of studies have been done on this subject. As a result of the studies about leadership, many definitions and assumptions have emerged. With these long years of work, a lot of emphasis has been placed on this issue today, and new ideas have emerged.

Key Words: Self-Efficacy influence, leadership

INTRODUCTION

There is a need for leaders who manage the group well, who will lead the athletes to reveal their talents that they may not be aware of, and who are successful in guiding athletes in order to be successful in any field of sports. In this context, coaching people should have leadership characteristics. Although leaders have a very important place in influencing athletes according to the goals set, they can also vary depending on the communication established between the athlete and the leader.

People are individuals who live in a community and have social characteristics. They need leaders who will lead the communities they create and achieve their goals (Eren 2000). Based on the characteristics of a leader, a leader should share his knowledge, experience and ideas. The leader's ability to communicate in this context must be strong. The leader needs to share his / her acquisitions, lead and mobilize individuals.

Trainers teach their athletes the rules and strategies of sports, train them, explore the abilities of athletes, and develop a discipline that suits their structure. Trainers pass on the knowledge and experience they have to the athletes, give information about the rules of Sports, try to ensure unity and unity in the team. They also observe athletes from outside, spotting their strengths and weaknesses and guiding them (Genç 1998).

The leadership skills of the trainers are one of the most important factors in the realization of the social, physical, emotional and mental capacities of the athletes in a healthy way. Trainers have a great responsibility in this regard, because trainers play an important role in transferring leadership characteristics to athletes or, in other words, to their students.

The aim of our study is to determine the relationship between leadership characteristics and self-efficacy of Volleyball Trainers. The results obtained will contribute to volleyball coach training. In this study, the effect of leadership characteristics of volleyball trainers on their self-efficacy was examined. Considering the results of our study, the effects of trainers on their students will be revealed more specifically, and the leaders will contribute to their development.

Although many definitions of leadership have been made to date, a consensus definition has not been established yet (Bass, 1990). In every study on leadership, different dimensions and aspects of the concept are explored and different aspects of the concept are studied (Karadağ, Başaran and Korkmaz, 2009). Therefore, despite a lot of research on leadership, this concept is still not fully elucidated (Turan and Bektaş, 2014). A clear definition and list of features for leader and leadership cannot be given (Demirel et al., 2013). For this reason, it is very important to develop the case of "leadership", which is systematically studied intensively and to introduce new approaches to the literature (Eraslan, 2004). According to sociologists, the concept of leadership is the use of personal authority with the goal of influencing social groups. Personal qualities such as personal authority, forward vision, various character traits, certainty, courage, accuracy, intelligence, reliability ensure the quality of leadership (Dönmezler, 1984). People with these qualifications provide leadership, good management and coordination of the community. A leader should look to the future with hope and optimism, take risks when necessary, feel confidence in his subordinates, analyze the environment well, reveal his goals and standards, provide an environment where he can behave freely to his subordinates by avoiding harsh control, and most importantly, he must have leadership skills rather than managing (Wadsworth, 1999). It is possible to gather leadership characteristics under three headings: Intellectual features consist of features such as thinking, general culture, logic, analysis and synthesis, power of intuition, dreaming, judgment. Character features are characteristics such as harmony, care, prudence, assertiveness, memory strength, dynamism, determination, regularity, methodical work, urgency, and seriousness. Social features are features such as appearance, ability to address and understand the group, work order, cooperation, and self-adjustment. (Erdoğan, 2004). The concept of self-efficacy was first mentioned by Albert Bandura. Self-efficacy is expressed as individuals' confidence in their own abilities to achieve their goals. Self-efficacy is defined as "self-judgment about the capacity of an individual to organize the activities necessary to show a certain performance and to do it successfully" (Bandura,1997). Self-efficacy is examined differently from other concepts such as self-worth and self-esteem because self-efficacy is specific to a particular task. "Self-esteem refers to an innate characteristic, self-efficacy refers to the value gained." (Gibbs and Colin, 2002). Self-sufficiency beliefs affect the models of emotions and thoughts that allow people to control events that affect their lives, overcome temporary obstacles,

continue despite difficulties, and make a lot of effort to achieve their goals (Hoy, 1998). Early studies seem to focus more on areas such as psychology and sports. Accordingly, it shows that teachers and students' self-efficacy beliefs related to certain situations have an accumulation of knowledge on behavior and other related variables in the field of education. (Bıkmaz, 2006). Basically, if we summarize the main issues that constitute the general framework of the self-efficacy understanding, it is possible to see that the individual includes such components as planning an action, being aware of the individual's abilities and skills, and grouping and organizing in this direction, and the level of motivation that emerges after considering the benefits that can be obtained. (Erdoğan, 2016).

METHOD

This research is carried out according to the general survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. Screening model is a research method designed to describe past or current situations. A general survey pattern in a target population with a large number of elements is a screening arrangement for the entire population or a group of samples to be obtained from it to draw general conclusions about the population. (Karasar, 2005). The information used in the study was obtained with the participation of the trainers of the first league, the second league and the third league. 60 scales, including 60 men (100%), were eligible for analysis. The scales to be used in the research are as follows:

Self-Efficacy Scale: It is the Self-Efficacy Scale that was introduced by Riggs, Warka, Babasa, Betancourt and Hooker in 1994. Self-efficacy scale was developed with the aim of measuring people's belief in their own capacities. The scale, adapted to Turkish by Öcel (2002), consists of 10 items. The subjects evaluate to what extent they agree with the terms in the items on the 5-point Likert Type scale, and a single qualification score is obtained by summing the numerical values marked for the items. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 10, the highest score is 50, and the high score is considered a strong self-efficacy belief. The internal consistency coefficient calculated by Riggs, Warka, Babasa, Betancourt, and Hooker (1994) and reported by other researchers was expressed as $\alpha = .80$. In the study, the form of "Leadership Scale for Sports" developed by Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) was used by the coach's perception of his own leader behavior. The Leadership Scale for Sports is based on the synthesis of the "path-target" theory and the "Traceability Theory", which is the production of

leadership. The way the coach perceives his own leader behavior was translated into Turkish by Tiryaki and Toros (2001) and a reliability study was conducted. The data were compiled by giving percentage (%) and frequency tables. The normality test of the data was carried out with the One – Sample Kolmogorov– Smirnov test, and the assumption that the data showed a normal distribution was provided. Therefore, the data was analyzed from parametric tests with one-way ANOVA. In this study, the error level was considered as 0.05.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Trainers

Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Male	60	100
	Married	42	70
Marital Status	Single	18	30
	26-35	19	31,7
Age	36-45	28	46,7
	46 and above	13	21,7
	Level 2	8	13,3
Coaching Level	Level 3	34	56,7
	Level 4	15	25
	Level 5	3	5
	League 1	28	46,7
Coached League	League 2	16	26,7
	League 3	16	26,7
	4-10 years	23	38,3
Coaching Working Time	11-20 years	30	50
	21 years and above	7	11,7

n=60

As seen in Table 1, 100% of 60 trainers are men. 70% of the trainers are married and 30% are single. 31.7% of the trainers are between the ages of 26-35, 46.7% are between the ages of 36-45, 21.7% are between the ages of 46 and above. 13.3% of the trainers are at the 2nd level, 56.7% of them are at the 3rd level, 15% of the trainers are at the 4th level, 5.0% of them are at the 5th level. 46.7% of the trainers are working in the 1st League, 26.7% of the trainers are working in the 2nd League and 26.7% of the trainers are working in the 3rd League. 38.3% of the trainers are those who worked between 4-10 years, 50.0% of the trainers are those who worked between 11-20 years, and 11.7% of the trainers are those who worked between 21 years and over.

Table 2. Normality Analysis for Scales

Variables	Kolmogorov-Smirnova		
	Statistics	sd	P
Self-efficacy	0,182	60	,000
Leadership	0,099	60	,200*

*p>0,05

As seen in Table 2, the self-efficacy scores of the trainers did not show a normal distribution ($p < 0.05$), so the skewness and kurtosis values were taken into consideration. Skewness and kurtosis values should be between ± 1.96 in order to show normal distribution. Since Skewness -0.474 and Kurtosis 0.206 values are within these limits, the self-efficacy scores of the trainers showed a normal distribution. The leadership scores of the trainers showed a normal distribution ($p > 0.05$). Due to these results, it was decided to use parametric test statistics in the analysis of variables.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Trainers on the Scales

Scales	n	\bar{x}
Self-efficacy level	60	30,25
Leadership level	60	88,27

As seen in Table 3, it was determined that both the self-efficacy perceptions ($\bar{x} = 30.25$) and leadership perceptions ($\bar{x} = 88.27$) of the trainers were at medium level.

Table 4. Leadership Levels of Trainers

Scale Leadership Types	n	\bar{x}	sd	Minimum	Maximum
Education and training	60	24,90	3,98	18	42
Democratic behavior	60	19,30	2,91	12	30
Authoritarian behavior	60	9,48	1,91	5	13
Social support	60	19,87	3,64	12	29
Positive feedback	60	13,35	2,83	6	18

Training and teaching style leadership of the trainers is low. The democratic behavior leadership of the trainers is medium level. Autocratic behavioral leadership of the trainers is moderate. Social support leadership of the trainers is at a medium level. The positive feedback leadership of the trainers is medium level.

Table 5. Analysis of the Difference Between Trainers' Self-efficacy and Leadership Types

Scale Leadership Types	Averages	sd	F	p
Democratic behavior	Between groups		0,726	0,719
	In-group			
Education and training	Between groups		0,834	0,616
	In-group			
Authoritarian behavior	Between groups	12	1,822	0,072
	In-group	47		
Social support	Between groups		2,445	0,015*
	In-group			
Positive feedback	Between groups		2,323	0,02*
	In-group			

*p<0,05

As can be seen in Table 5, no significant differences have been determined between the leadership types of democratic behavior, education and training, authoritarian behavior, and self-efficacy of trainers. However, a statistically significant difference was determined between positive feedback from the leadership types of the trainers and their self-efficacy (F12-47)= 2,323;p<0,02;p>0,05). However, a statistically significant difference was determined between the leadership types of the coaches and their social support and self-efficacy (F12-47)= 2,445;p<0,015;p>0,05).

Table 6. Analysis of the relationship between leadership types and self-competence of trainers

Scale	Education and training	Democratic behavior	Authoritarian behavior	Social support	Positive feedback
Self-efficacy	0,27*	-0,184*	0,375*	0,486**	0,404**
	0,037	0,16	0,003	0,000	0,001
	60	60	60	60	60

There is a positive relationship between the trainers' self-efficacy and the educational and instructional leadership type (p<0,01). There is a negative relationship between trainers' self-efficacy and democratic behavior leadership type. (p<0,01). There is a positive relationship between trainers' self-efficacy and authoritarian behavior leadership type. (p<0,01). There is a positive relationship between trainers' self-efficacy and social support leadership type. (p<0,01). There is a positive relationship between trainers' self-efficacy and positive feedback leadership type. (p<0,01).

Table 7. Analysis of the Effects of Trainers' Self-Efficacy on Leadership Types

Independent variables	Nonstandard Coefficient		Standard coefficient	t	p
	B	Sh	Beta		
Constant	25,785	2,212		11,655	0,000
Education and training	0,196	0,087	0,306	2,258	0,028
Democratic behavior	-0,478	0,103	-0,546	-4,649	0,000
Authoritarian behavior	0,158	0,152	0,118	1,039	0,303
Social support	0,416	0,102	0,595	4,061	0,000
Positive feedback	-0,072	0,144	-0,08	-0,5	0,619

F(5-54)=10,128
p=<0,000
R=,48

Dependent Variable: Self-efficacy

As seen in Table 7, trainers' self-efficacy levels have an effect on their leadership behavior. ($F_{(5-54)}=10,128; p=,000; p<0,01$). 48% of the trainers' self-efficacy is explained by the leadership types they have. When the regression coefficient is examined, trainers' educational-instructive behavior types ($\beta = ,306$), democratic behavior types ($\beta = -,546$), social support types ($\beta = ,595$) have a significant effect on their self-efficacy. According to this result, as the democratic behavior types of the trainers decrease, their self-efficacy increases. Since the type of social support has the highest impact, it was thought that trainers' development of social support behavior type would have a higher effect on self-efficacy.

CONCLUSION

It has been observed that the leadership behaviors of the trainers have a significant effect on their self-efficacy. In the study of Garland and Barry (1987), which is similar to our study, they conducted a research on the effects of leadership behavior on college football players. As a result of the study, it was found that the personal behaviors of the leader (such as educational and instructive, democratic, autocratic, rewarding and social supporter) interact with the performances of the players. In other words, a meaningful relationship between the two variables can be mentioned. In the study conducted by Kavlu (2002), it was observed in the study conducted on 90 judo trainers that most of the trainers were closely interested in their athletes and encouraged them. It has been determined that trainers have an understanding of athletes. It is within the scope of the results obtained as a result of the research that trainers

attach importance to the objections of the opposing athletes and that they care about the feelings and thoughts of each athlete.

In the study conducted by Özgan et al. (2002), it was observed that both groups adopted the view that the trainer should control the discipline of the team during the training process and that the coach should ensure that the players enjoy training within the concept of "Successful Coaching". It was determined that the trainers who showed leadership in the positive feedback type had higher self-efficacy than the trainers who showed leadership in other types. Oguz (2010) concluded that while coaches' self-sufficiency increased, rewarding leadership decreased, or vice versa. In other words, it has been observed that there is a negative relationship between the trainers' self-efficacy and rewarding leadership characteristics. It has been determined that the least preferred leadership style of the trainers is autocratic behavior and the behavior they exhibit is instructive-teaching. In the study, it is seen that autocratic leadership behavior, that is, leadership behavior in which the authority to give orders is in the hands of the trainer, is similar to our study. In our study, it was observed that the coaches who showed leadership in the democratic type had lower self-efficacy than the trainers who showed leadership in other types. It was concluded that there is a relationship between the trainers' self-efficacy and democratic behavior leadership type. When we examined another study examining the leadership styles of boxing trainers, Serin (2016) revealed a statistical difference in terms of coaching levels, ages and experiences of the trainers. It has been concluded that coaches engage in less democratic behavior as their ranks, ages and experience increase. It has been determined that second-level trainers, that is, trainers with 4-7 years of experience, exhibit more democratic behavior. In other words, it is seen in the study that the trainers encourage their subordinates to make decisions except in crisis situations after they come to a certain experience. Although we conclude in our study that trainers with autocratic leadership have low self-efficacy compared to trainers with leadership in other types, and that there is a positive relationship between trainers' self-efficacy and authoritarian behavior leadership type, a different result has been found in the leadership styles of taekwondo trainers examined by Onur (2009). It has been concluded that there is a relationship between the age of the coaches and their autocratic leadership style. It was found that there was no significant relationship with

other leadership styles. While there was an increase in autocratic behaviors in third-level trainers, it was observed that there was an increase in democratic, educational-instructive, social support and rewarding behaviors in fourth-level trainers. In the study, it is seen that as coaches increase their ranks, they move more towards giving them a say than giving orders.

A significant relationship was found between the trainers' self-efficacy and their instructive-instructive behavior. As the instructive-instructive behavior styles of the trainers increase, their self-efficacy also increases. Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) defined instructive-instructive behavior as a leader behavior that improves the performance of the athlete by facilitating and giving importance to difficult education, by teaching skills, techniques and tactics in sports, by explaining the relationships between members, and by planning and integrating members' activities from top to bottom. The increase in the training and education behavior of the trainers means that they can better absorb the sports branch they are coaching and show more professional development. In this respect, a trainer can improve himself / herself in the sport he / she is a trainer, and his / her self-efficacy may increase. Choi et al. (2003) concluded in their study that there is a relationship between supportive leadership style and self-efficacy and that supportive leadership style increases self-efficacy. Choi and his friends conducted this study in West America. This difference between the two studies may be due to culture differences. In addition, there is a significant relationship between the trainers' democratic behavior scores and social supportive behavior scores. Democratic behavior expresses to what extent the trainer allows the decision-making process of the athletes (Tiryaki and Toros 2001). The reason for this result may be that the trainer, who gives his athletes a voice, can create a moderate organizational environment and consequently establish warm relationships with his athletes. Therefore, when democratic behavior increases, social supportive behavior increases.

As can be seen in our study, it is seen that the number of trainers with autocratic leadership is low, and in the same way, in another study examined by Köksal (2008), the relationship between coaches' leadership styles and self-efficacy was discussed. It is understood that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and educational behavior. It has been determined that there is no significant relationship between other leadership styles. It has been observed that self-efficacy improves with increasing age in trainers. In general, it was

concluded that the trainers preferred educative-instructive behavior the most, and the least preferred leadership style was determined as autocratic behavior. As seen in this study, it was observed that self-efficacy progress with increasing age. This means that their experience will increase. It can be said that the older the trainers during the time they are coaching, the more their experience increases. In addition, with a lot of educational behavior and less autocratic behavior, we see that coaches prefer to move forward by teaching more than by giving orders. When the effect of coaching levels of trainers on leadership levels is examined in the study, social support, democratic, instructive-instructive, autocratic and positive feedback come in order. When we examine the study conducted by Yurt (2009), the behavior of taekwondo trainers is listed as follows: democratic, educational-instructive, autocratic, socially supportive and rewarding behavior. As seen in the study, it is seen that they mostly use the type of behavior that encourages subordinates to make decisions and gives them the opportunity. When we start from the demographic characteristics in the study, it is seen that the study is carried out on men because it is difficult for a male individual to enter the areas where female trainers are located and communicate. It has been observed that the average age of coaches between the ages of 36-45 is in the majority and they are generally married due to their middle age. In general, it was observed that coaches in the 1st League and 2nd level participated in the study. As a result of the results of the study, it was seen that the leadership and self-efficacy perceptions of the trainers were at a medium level. It has been determined that the leadership of the trainers in education and teaching style is low. Other autocratic behavioral leadership, social support leadership and positive feedback leadership were observed to be moderate.

As a result, it was determined that there is a difference between the leadership styles of the trainers and their self-efficacy perceptions. It was observed that the autocratic type and democratic type of leadership trainers have equal or low self-efficacy compared to the other types of leadership. It was observed that the trainers who show leadership in the type of social support and positive feedback have higher self-efficacy than the coaches who show leadership in other types. In line with these results, there is a relationship between the leadership styles of the trainers and their self-efficacy.

REFERENCES

Eren, E. (2000). *Organizational Behavior and Management Psychology*. İstanbul: Beta Publications.

- Genç D.A. (1998) *Sports Law*, Alfa Publications, İstanbul.
- Bass, B.M., (1990). *Bass&Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 3.Edition, The Free Press, New York
- Karadağ, E., Başaran, A. ve Korkmaz, T. (2009). The Relationship between the Leadership Styles and Job Satisfaction As Perceived By Teachers in Turkish Elementary Schools, *Balıkesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 12 (21), 32- 4
- Turan, S., Karadağ, E., Bektaş, F. ve Yalçın, M. (2014). Knowledge Production in Educational Administration in Turkey: An Overview of Researches in Journal of Educational Administration: Theory and Practice -2003 to 2013- *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 20 (1), 93-119.
- Demirel, E , Yatkın, A , Düşükcan, M , Derin, N , Çakınberk, A , Güven, M . (2012). A Study on the Adaptation of A Servant Leadership Scale For The Leaders in Local Politics, the Mayors. *Journal of Academic Approaches*, 3(2), 67-83 . Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ayd/issue/3328/46171>
- Eraslan, L. (2004). A post-modern paradigm in leadership: transformational leadership *Journal Of Human Science*,1(1), 1-32.
- Erdoğan, İ. (1991). *Business Behavior*, istanbul university business faculty
- Dönmezer, S. (1994). *Sociology*. Beta Publishing Distribution.
- Wadsworth, Walter J., (1999). *Leadership Guide of the Attack Manager*. (Translated by: E. Sabri Yarmalı), İstanbul: Hayat Publishing.
- Erdoğan, İ. (2004). *School Management and Instructional Leadership*. İstanbul: Sistem Publishing, 5th Edition.
- Bandura A. (1997) *Self Efficacy: Theexercise of Control*. New York: Freeman, 45-48.
- Gibbs, Colin, (2002). “*Effective Teaching: Exercising Self-Efficacy and Thought Control of Action*”, at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Exeter, England.
- Hoy, A. Woolfolk, Tschannen- Moran, M. K. Hoy, W. (1998), “*Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning And Measure*” *Review of Educational Research*, S: 68, No. 2, ss. 202-248, The Ohio State Universitesi
- Bıkmaz, H. F., (2006). *Self-Efficacy Belief*. Kuzgun, Y. &Deryakulu, D. (Ed.), *Individual Differences in Education*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing Distribution.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Scientific Research Method*. Nobel Publishing Distribution. Ankara.
- Öcel H. (2002). *Relationships Between Collective Competence, Self-Efficacy and Embarrassment and Perception and Expectations of Achievement in Team Sports Players*, HÜ. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara.

- Ritter, J.; Boone, W.; Rubba, P. (2001). *Development of An Instrument To Assess Prospective Elementary Teacher*. S.177
- Tiryaki Ş, Toros Z. (2001). *The Validity and Reliability Study of the Leadership Scale for Sports, Coach's Perception of Own Leader Behavior Form*, 2nd International Sport Psychology Symposium, İzmir.
- Yurt O, (2009). *Leadership Styles of Taekwondo Coaches*. Master Thesis, Selcuk University Institute of Health Sciences, Konya.
- Garland, D.J., Barry, J.R. The Effects of Personality and Perceived Leader Behaviors on Performance in Collegiate Football. *Psychol Rec* **38**, 237–247 (1988).
- Kavlu M (2002) Investigation of Trainer Behavior in Sports Education (Judo Model), M. Ü. Institute of Health Sciences, Unpublished PhD Thesis, İstanbul.
- Özgan Y, Müniroğlu S ve Tanılkan K (2002) Examining the opinions of football players and coaches in different categories on the concept of successful coaching in professional leagues in Ankara, 7th International Sport Sciences Congress, 67, Antalya.
- Choi JN, Price RH and Vinokur AD (2003) Self-efficacy changes in groups effect of diversity leadership and group climate, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, (24), 357-372.
- Chelladurai P, Saleh S (1980) Dimensions of leader behavior in sports. Development of a leadership style, *Journal of Sport Psychology* 2, 34-45.
- Köksal, F.(2008). *The Relationship Between Coaches' Leadership Styles and Self-Efficacy*, Selçuk University, Institute of Health Sciences, Sports Management Department, Master's Thesis, Konya
- Hasançebioglu T (2002) Examining Teachers' Leadership Styles, Computer Attitudes and Relationships, Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis, İstanbul.
- Serin K. (2016). *Determining the Leadership Styles of Boxing Trainers*, Institute of Health Sciences, Sports Management Department. Master Thesis, Selcuk University, Konya: