



# The Examination of Communication Skills and Self-Efficacy of Coaches\*

Selçuk BUĞDAYCI<sup>1A</sup>, Hayri DEMİR<sup>1B</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Selçuk University, Sport Science Faculty, Sports Management Department, Konya, TÜRKİYE

Address Correspondence to S. BUĞDAYCI: e-mail: [sbugday@selcuk.edu.tr](mailto:sbugday@selcuk.edu.tr)

*Conflicts of Interest: The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.*

*Copyright & License: Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.*

*Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.*

*\*This research was produced from the PhD Thesis prepared in the Department of Sports Management at Selçuk University, Institute of Health Sciences.*

*(Date Of Received): 12.09.2023 (Date of Acceptance): 26.12.2023 (Date of Publication): 31.12.2023*

*A ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0606-3654 B ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9496-8992*

## Abstract

This study was conducted to examine the communication skills and self-efficacy levels of individuals working as coaches. The population of this study, which was conducted using a descriptive research model, consisted of coaches working actively in Türkiye, while the sample group consisted of a total of 697 coaches, 203 women and 494 men, on a voluntary basis. The data were obtained by using "Personal Information Form", "General Self-Efficacy Scale" and "Communication Skills Assessment Scale". Independent Samples t test, One Way ANOVA test, Person correlation analysis were used to reach statistical results. It was concluded that the self-efficacy score averages of the coaches participating in the study were higher than the averages of communication skills sub-dimensions. While there was a statistical difference between the education level of the male coaches participating in the study and the communication principles and basic skills sub-dimensions of communication skills, no difference was found in other sub-dimensions. While there was no statistical difference in the communication skills sub-dimensions and the education level of female coaches, a significant difference was found in general self-efficacy scores. Significant differences were found in the coaching levels of male coaches participating in the study and in the sub-dimension of general self-efficacy and communication. In addition, significant differences were found in the coaching levels of female coaches and in the sub-dimensions of self-expression, active listening and non-verbal communication and willingness to communicate. As a result, there is a parallelism between the self-efficacy and communication skills of the coaches participating in the study. In other words, it can be said that as the competence of male and female coaches in their jobs increases, their communication skills also increase. This research was produced from the doctoral thesis of the corresponding author.

**Keywords:** Coach, Communication skills, Self-efficacy

## Özet

### Antrenörlerin İletişim Becerileri ile Öz yeterliliklerinin İncelenmesi

Bu çalışma, antrenör olarak çalışan bireylerin iletişim becerilerini ve öz yeterlilik düzeylerini incelemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Betimsel araştırma modeli kullanılarak gerçekleştirilen bu çalışmanın evrenini Türkiye'de aktif olarak çalışan

antrenörler, örneklem grubunu ise gönüllülük esasına göre 203 kadın ve 494 erkek olmak üzere toplam 697 antrenör oluşturmuştur. Veriler "Kişisel Bilgi Formu", "Genel Öz Yeterlilik Ölçeği" ve "İletişim Becerilerini Değerlendirme Ölçeği" kullanılarak elde edilmiştir. İstatistiksel sonuçlara ulaşmak için Independent Samples t testi, One Way ANOVA testi, Person korelasyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan antrenörlerin öz yeterlilik puan ortalamalarının iletişim becerileri alt boyut ortalamalarına göre daha yüksek olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan erkek antrenörlerin eğitim düzeyleri ile iletişim becerilerinin iletişim ilkeleri ve temel beceriler alt boyutları arasında istatistiksel olarak fark bulunurken, diğer alt boyutlarda fark bulunmamıştır. Kadın antrenörlerin eğitim düzeyleri ile iletişim becerileri alt boyutlarında istatistiksel olarak fark bulunmazken, genel öz yeterlilik puanlarında anlamlı fark bulunmuştur. Araştırmaya katılan erkek antrenörlerin koçluk düzeyleri ile genel öz yeterlilik ve iletişim alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Ayrıca kadın antrenörlerin antrenörlük düzeylerinde ve kendini ifade etme, aktif dinleme ve sözsüz iletişim ve iletişim kurma istekliliği alt boyutlarında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Sonuç olarak, çalışmaya katılan antrenörlerin öz yeterlilikleri ile iletişim becerileri arasında bir paralellik olduğu görülmektedir. Başka bir deyişle, kadın ve erkek antrenörlerin mesleklerindeki yetkinlikleri arttıkça iletişim becerilerinin de arttığı söylenebilir. Bu araştırma sorumlu yazarın doktora tezinden üretilmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Antrenör, İletişim becerileri, Öz yeterlilik

## INTRODUCTION

Athletes' communication with their coaches is an issue between two individuals and falls within the scope of interpersonal communication. Therefore, the behaviors of individuals towards each other in situations where they are ready, laughing, physical expressions, gestures, facial expressions, verbal and non-verbal expressions include the type of interpersonal communication (27). The approach of coaches to athletes should aim to establish a productive and healthy cooperation with the athlete, because the behaviors of the coaches strengthen the communicative bond and help to eliminate the factors that may negatively affect the performance of the athletes (20).

Considering that both the observable and perceived coach behaviors in the coach-athlete relationship affect the athlete's performance in some way, it is stated that examining the coach-athlete relationships in terms of perceived behaviors will provide important information for successful or effective coaching (6). In addition, it is important for coaches to have high self-efficacy beliefs of coaches since they affect the success and motivation of athletes.

Communication is the process of transferring the messages that people attach meaning to the other party and understanding these messages. In short, it can be defined as the production and transmission of information to the other party and its evaluation. In this respect, verbal expressions, gestures, signs used by individuals in communication, as well as vibrations, signals and smells that animals use can be counted as communication (17). Communication is establishing a dialogue, using gestures and facial expressions, giving written and verbal messages using symbols, and sometimes listening. Not communicating during the day is also a message, an attitude, and it contains a meaning (29). The concepts such as movement, sound, word sequence and attitude that people can comprehend are the facts of communication (4). Effective communication occurs when more than one party exchanges information (33). In daily life, there is no process in which communication is not used. For this reason, it is a tool that individuals can use to come to an agreement within the framework of certain rules (15).

The concept of self-efficacy, which was first introduced by Albert Bandura in 1977, was included in Social Learning Theory (36). Social learning theory, also known as Social Cognitive Theory, emerged by combining cognitive learning theory and behavioral theory (16). With the addition of cognitive dimension by Albert Bandura to the Social Learning Theory put forward by Miller and Dollard in 1941, its boundaries expanded and the theory became more effective in explaining learning (11).

Schunk and Rise (1986) define the concept of self-efficacy as individuals' personal judgement about their performance abilities in a particular activity. It is also defined as individuals' beliefs in their ability to organize and execute action plans necessary to manage possible situations (28).

Self-efficacy is not a perceived or observable skill. It is the inner belief that an individual feels about what he/she can do when he/she asks the question of what he/she can do with his/her skills in certain situations.

Self-efficacy is not a belief in capacity or specific performance. However, it is the belief about what they can do in overcoming situations and changing conditions, using their abilities and skills. Self-efficacy is not simply a means of inference about an individual's performance, not causal characteristics. What is meant by the belief of self-efficacy is the capacity of the person to be able to do it. Self-efficacy is not the same as self-esteem. Self-esteem is generally our beliefs about ourselves and how we feel. Self-efficacy is not an inherited trait (31).

While communicating with athletes, coaches should transform the thoughts (ideas, emotions, intentions) they want to convey into a message suitable for communication and they should do this through a channel. If the athlete understands the content or intention of the message, he/she interprets it and reacts accordingly (30). Athletes receive support from their coaches, club administrators, spectators, teammates and their families on the long and tiring road to high performance. A positive communication that these people will establish in their approach to the athlete is possible with positive thinking, confidence, reinforcing and even rewarding the right behaviors. Effective communication is based on knowing the importance of verbal as well as non-verbal messages and using them correctly and appropriately. It is also important that the messages sent for effective communication are perceived correctly (25). Coaches' behaviors affect athletes positively and negatively, and athletes of coaches who give more tactics, encourage and communicate well are more successful (21).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Ethics Committee Decision

For this study, permission dated 07.11.2016 and numbered 39 was obtained from Selçuk University Faculty of Sport Sciences Ethics Committee.

### Study group

In order to obtain the research data, 697 coaches (203 females, 494 males) from individuals working in different branches in different geographical regions of Turkey were determined as the study group. Information about the personal characteristics of the study group is given in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Personal characteristics of the Study group

Variables	Groups	n	%
Gender	Female	203	29,1
	Male	494	70,9
Education Level	Primary-Secondary education	17	2,4
	High School	147	21,1
	Undergraduate	441	63,3
	Postgraduate	92	13,2
Coaching Level	1st Level	129	18,5
	2nd Level	302	43,3
	3rd Level	227	32,6
	4th Level	28	4
	5th Level	11	1,6

Table 1 shows that 29.1% of the coaches participating in the study are women and 70.9% are men, and that the coaches mostly receive education at the undergraduate level and have 1-3 levels of coaching.

### Data Collection Tools

#### General Self-efficacy Scale

The scale, which is expressed as a valid and reliable measurement tool in determining the general self-efficacy of adults, was developed by Sherer et al. in 1982. The adaptation study of the scale to Turkish society was conducted by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010). The scale, which consists of 17 items in total, is in a Likert format in which answers ranging from "not at all" to "very well" can be given on a five-point scale to the question "How well does it describe you". The reliability of the scale was calculated as (Cronbach's alpha = .80).

### Communication Skills Scale (CSS)

The "Communication Skills Scale" (CSS) used in this study was developed by Korkut (24) based on the Communication Skills Assessment Scale (CSAS) previously developed by Korkut 1996. A 5-point Likert-type scale was used to express the level of agreement with the items in the scale. The scale consists of 25 items and a four-factor structure. These factors are named as Communication Principles and Basic Skills, Self-Expression, Active Listening and Nonverbal Communication and Willingness to Communicate. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for the internal consistency reliability of the scale and the internal consistency coefficient of the 25-item scale was calculated as .88. The internal consistency coefficients for the sub-factors of the scale were found to be .79 for Communication Principles and Basic Skills, .72 for Self-Expression, .64 for Active Listening and Nonverbal Communication and .71 for Willingness to Communicate.

### Data Analysis

The data obtained from the scales used in the study were coded in the computer environment and statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS 22.0 package program. Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality tests were performed to determine whether the research data were normally distributed. Kurtosis-Skewness values were examined for the data sets that did not show normal distribution, and since the values were between +1.5 / -1.5, it was determined that the data showed normal distribution. Independent Samples t test was used to compare paired groups, One Way ANOVA was used for multiple groups, Post Hoc LSD test was used to determine between which groups the difference was, and Person correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between two variables.

### FINDINGS

In this section, the comparisons of the data obtained from the scales in terms of the variables of gender, branch status, age, education level, years of coaching and coaching level, and the findings showing the relationship between coaches' communication skills and self-efficacy are given in tables and explanations under the table.

**Table 2.** Comparison of the self-efficacy and communication skills scores of coaches by gender

	Gender	n	mean.	sd	t	P
General Self-efficacy	Female	203	63,72	10,24	-,472	,637
	Male	494	64,13	10,29		
Communication Principles and Basic Skills	Female	203	40,44	6,02	-,990	,323
	Male	494	40,94	5,91		
Self-Expression	Female	203	16,74	2,89	-,835	,404
	Male	494	16,94	2,69		
Active Listening and Non-Verbal Communication	Female	203	24,53	3,86	,042	,967
	Male	494	24,52	4,00		
Willingness to Communicate	Female	203	19,92	3,39	-1,125	,261
	Male	494	20,24	3,45		

As can be seen from Table 2, there was no statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the self-efficacy and communication skills of the coaches participating in the study in terms of gender ( $p>0.05$ ). Considering the general self-efficacy scores of the coaches, it was found that the mean of women was ( $63.72\pm 10.24$ ) and the mean of men was ( $64.13\pm 10.29$ ). In the sub-dimension of communication principles and basic skills, the mean of women was ( $40.44\pm 6.02$ ) and the mean of men was ( $40.94\pm 5.91$ ). In the self-expression sub-dimension, the mean of women was ( $16.74\pm 2.89$ ) and the mean of men was ( $16.94\pm 2.69$ ), and in the Active Listening and Nonverbal Communication sub-dimension, the mean of women was ( $24.53\pm 3.86$ ) and the mean of men was ( $24.52\pm 4.0$ ). In the Willingness to Communicate sub-dimension, the mean of women was ( $19.92\pm 3.39$ ) and the mean of men was ( $20.24\pm 3.45$ ).

**Table 3.** Comparison of male coaches' self-efficacy and communication skills scores by education level

		KT	sd	KO	F	p	Difference
<b>General Self-efficacy</b>	Between groups	197,841	3	65,947	,622	,601	
	In-group	51985,125	490	106,092			
	Total	52182,966	493				
<b>Communication Principles and Basic Skills</b>	Between groups	338,608	3	112,869	3,280	,021	3-1,4-1 3-2,4-2
	In-group	16860,447	490	34,409			
	Total	17199,055	493				
<b>Self-Expression</b>	Between groups	39,128	3	13,043	1,813	,144	
	In-group	3524,170	490	7,192			
	Total	3563,298	493				
<b>Active Listening and Non-Verbal Communication</b>	Between groups	117,702	3	39,234	2,474	,061	
	In-group	7771,634	490	15,860			
	Total	7889,336	493				
<b>Willingness to Communicate</b>	Between groups	88,727	3	29,576	2,501	,059	
	In-group	5795,607	490	11,828			
	Total	5884,334	493				

Groups: 1st group: primary school, 2nd group: high school, 3rd group: university, 4th group: postgraduate

Table 3 shows the comparison of male coaches' scores obtained from the sub-dimensions of general self-efficacy and communication skills scale in terms of education level. While there was no difference in the general self-efficacy scores of male coaches in terms of education level, a significant difference was found in the communication principles and basic skills sub-dimension ( $p < 0.05$ ). In the sub-dimension of communication principles and basic skills, it was determined that the scores obtained by male coaches with university and postgraduate education were higher than those with primary and high school education.

**Table 4.** Comparison of female coaches' their self-efficacy and communication skills scores by education level

		KT	sd	KO	F	p	Difference
<b>General Self-efficacy</b>	Between groups	546,437	3	182,146	2,755	,007	2-1 3-1 4-1
	In-group	20650,115	199	103,769			
	Total	21196,552	202				
<b>Communication Principles and Basic Skills</b>	Between groups	7,671	3	2,557	,070	,976	
	In-group	7310,428	199	36,736			
	Total	7318,099	202				
<b>Self-Expression</b>	Between groups	20,632	3	6,877	,587	,624	
	In-group	2332,057	199	11,719			
	Total	2352,690	202				
<b>Active Listening and Non-Verbal Communication</b>	Between groups	57,233	3	19,078	1,287	,280	
	In-group	2949,309	199	14,821			
	Total	3006,542	202				
<b>Willingness to Communicate</b>	Between groups	32,846	3	10,949	,952	,416	
	In-group	2287,893	199	11,497			
	Total	2320,739	202				

Groups: 1st group: primary school, 2nd group: high school, 3rd group: university, 4th group: postgraduate

Table 4 shows the comparison of the scores obtained by female coaches from the sub-dimensions of the general self-efficacy and communication skills scale in terms of the education variable. While there was no difference in the sub-dimension scores of the female coaches' communication skills scale in terms of education

level, a significant difference was found in the general self-efficacy scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). In general self-efficacy scores, it was determined that female trainers with primary school education achieved lower scores than other groups.

**Table 5.** Comparison of self-efficacy and communication skills scores of male coaches by coaching levels

		KT	sd	KO	F	p	Difference
<b>General Self-efficacy</b>	Between groups	655,924	4	163,981			
	In-group	51527,042	489	105,372	2,556	,018	3-1
	Total	52182,966	493				4-1
<b>Communication Principles and Basic Skills</b>	Between groups	224,085	4	56,021			
	In-group	16974,970	489	34,714	1,614	,170	
	Total	17199,055	493				
<b>Self-Expression</b>	Between groups	49,737	4	12,434			
	In-group	3513,560	489	7,185	1,731	,142	
	Total	3563,298	493				
<b>Active Listening and Non-Verbal Communication</b>	Between groups	115,599	4	28,900			
	In-group	7773,737	489	15,897	1,818	,124	
	Total	7889,336	493				
<b>Willingness to Communicate</b>	Between groups	75,018	4	18,755			
	In-group	5809,316	489	11,880	1,579	,009	4-1, 5-1
	Total	5884,334	493				4-2, 5-2

Groups: 1st group: 1st level, 2nd group: 2nd level, 3rd group: 3rd level, 4th group: 4th level, 5th group: 5th level

Table 5 shows the comparison of male coaches' scores obtained from the sub-dimensions of general self-efficacy and communication skills scale in terms of coaching level. While there was no difference in the communication skills scale communication principles and basic skills, self-expression, active listening and non-verbal communication sub-dimensions of male coaches in terms of coaching level, there was a significant difference in the willingness to communicate sub-dimension and general self-efficacy scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). In general self-efficacy scores, it was determined that male coaches with coaching levels 3 and 4 achieved higher scores than those with levels 1 and 2. In the sub-dimension of willingness to communicate, it was determined that male coaches with levels 4 and 5 coaching levels obtained higher scores than those with levels 1 and 2 coaching levels.

**Table 6.** Comparison of female coaches' self-efficacy and communication skills scores by coaching levels

		KT	sd	KO	F	p	Difference
<b>General Self-efficacy</b>	Between groups	166,169	2	83,085			
	In-group	21030,382	200	105,152	,790	,455	
	Total	21196,552	202				
<b>Communication Principles and Basic Skills</b>	Between groups	5,002	2	2,501			
	In-group	7313,097	200	36,565	,068	,934	
	Total	7318,099	202				
<b>Self-Expression</b>	Between groups	54,163	2	27,081			
	In-group	1636,517	200	8,183	3,310	,039	3-2
	Total	1690,680	202				
<b>Active Listening and Non-Verbal Communication</b>	Between groups	138,221	2	69,110			
	In-group	2868,321	200	14,342	4,819	,009	3-2
	Total	3006,542	202				
<b>Willingness to Communicate</b>	Between groups	95,738	2	47,869			
	In-group	2225,001	200	11,125	4,303	,015	3-1
	Total	2320,739	202				3-2

Groups: 1st group: 1st level, 2nd group: 2nd level, 3rd group: 3rd level

Table 6 shows the comparison of the scores obtained by the female coaches from the sub-dimensions of the general self-efficacy and communication skills scale in terms of the coaching level variable. While there was no difference in the general self-efficacy and communication principles and basic skills sub-dimension of the female coaches in terms of coaching level, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension scores of active listening and non-verbal communication, self-expression and willingness to communicate ( $p < 0.05$ ). In the sub-dimension of self-expression, it was determined that female coaches with coaching level 3 obtained higher scores than those with level 2. In the sub-dimension of active listening and non-verbal communication, it was determined that female coaches with coaching level 3 obtained higher scores than those with level 2. In the sub-dimension of willingness to communicate, it was determined that female coaches with coaching level 3 obtained higher scores than those with levels 1 and 2.

**Table 7.** Comparison of male coaches' self-efficacy and communication skills scores

		CCBS	SE	ALNVC	WTC
<b>General Self-efficacy</b>	r	,349**	,460**	,347**	,379**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000
<b>Communication Principles and Basic Skills</b>	r		,764**	,800**	,751**
	p		,000	,000	,000
<b>Self-Expression</b>	r			,773**	,806**
	p			,000	,000
<b>Active Listening and Non-Verbal Communication</b>	r				,740**
	p				,000

n=494, \*\*p<0.01

Table 7 shows the relationship between male coaches' communication skills and self-efficacy. Accordingly, a moderately positive relationship was found between male coaches' communication skills and self-efficacy beliefs. Therefore, it can be said that when coaches' self-efficacy increases, their communication skills also increase. Strong positive relationships were found between the sub-dimensions of the communication skills scale of male coaches. Therefore, it can be said that when communication skills increase in one dimension, other dimensions also increase.

**Table 8.** The relationship between self-efficacy and communication skills sub-dimensions of female coaches.

		CCBS	SE	ALNVC	WTC
<b>General Self-efficacy</b>	r	,371**	,447**	,425**	,341**
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000
<b>Communication Principles and Basic Skills</b>	r		,687**	,746**	,756**
	p		,000	,000	,000
<b>Self-Expression</b>	r			,753**	,659**
	p			,000	,000
<b>Active Listening and Non-Verbal Communication</b>	r				,745**
	p				,000

n=203, \*\*p<0.01

Table 8 shows the relationship between communication skills and self-efficacy of female coaches. Accordingly, a moderately positive relationship was found between communication skills and self-efficacy beliefs of female coaches. Therefore, it can be said that when coaches' self-efficacy increases, their communication skills also increase. A strong positive relationship was found between the sub-dimensions of

the communication skills scale of female coaches. Therefore, it can be said that when communication skills increase in one dimension, it increases in other dimensions.

## CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

697 coaches actively working in 32 sports branches from 24 cities of Türkiye participated voluntarily in this study conducted to reveal the relationship between communication skills and self-efficacy of coaches.

As a result of the analyses, it was determined that there was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the self-efficacy and communication skills of the coaches in terms of the gender variable. In his study on coaches, Köksal (26) found that there was no difference between the self-efficacy of male and female coaches. Similarly, in the study conducted by Hodges and Carron (22), it was stated that there was no difference between gender variable and self-efficacy. Bozkurt (10) examined the self-efficacy levels of athletes and found that there was no difference in terms of gender. In their study, Telef and Karaca (32) found that the general self-efficacy of the participants did not differ significantly according to gender. Canpolat and Çetinkalp (12) determined that self-efficacy beliefs did not differ in terms of gender in their study. Gülbahçe (19) found in their study that the communication skills of girls and boys participating in the communication skills training program were affected by many factors such as age, intelligence, psychosocial maturity, while gender was not an effective factor. Edward (14) compared male and female adolescents in the Communication Skills Scale applied to 471 female and 377 male adolescents and found that there was no significant difference between them in terms of gender.

The results of the above studies are in parallel with the results of our study. Therefore, it can be said that there is no parallelism between the gender variable and self-efficacy of coaches.

No statistically significant difference was found between the educational level variable and self-efficacy scores of male coaches participating in the study. In terms of the education level of female coaches, it was determined that those with primary school education achieved lower scores than other groups in general self-efficacy scores. In the sub-dimensions of communication principles and basic skills, which are among the sub-dimensions of communication skills of male coaches, it was determined that the scores of male coaches with university and postgraduate education were higher than those with primary and high school education. There was no significant difference between the education level of female coaches and any of the sub-dimensions of communication skills. In his study, Toklu (35) indicated that the self-efficacy levels of tennis coaches did not change in terms of education level. In the study conducted by Cengiz et al. (13), it was stated that the self-efficacy beliefs of taekwondo coaches did not differ in terms of education level. Abakay (1) examined the communication skills of coaches in terms of athlete perceptions and found that communication skills increased as the level of education increased. Tutuk et al. (34) found that the communication skills perceived by students increased as the years of education increased. Afyon and Işıkdemir (5) did not find a relationship between the communication skills of coaches and their education level in their study.

While statistically significant differences were found between the coaching levels and self-efficacy scores of the male coaches participating in the study, no difference was found in the female coaches. In male coaches, on the other hand, significant differences were found in the dimension of willingness to communicate, which is one of the sub-dimensions of communication skills. In female coaches, significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions of self-expression, active listening-non-verbal communication and willingness to communicate. Studies in the sports environment show that techniques based on successful experiences are effective in increasing both self-efficacy beliefs and performance (18). In his study, Barut (9) states that those with high levels of expertise in sports also have high self-efficacy scores. An individual's experiences affect self-efficacy judgments through cognitive information processing (8). If individuals gain the belief that they have the necessary competencies to achieve success, they become more resilient when they face difficulties (7). The results of this study are partially similar to the results of our study. It can be thought that as the coaching level increases, self-efficacy scores also increase. In two different studies conducted by Abakay and Kuru (3) and Abakay and Kuru (2), it was concluded that as the years of playing sports of male and female football players increase, their communication skills with the coach also increase. It is considered as a normal result that the increase in experience has positive effects on communication skills for both athletes and coaches.



Kabadayı (23) stated in his study conducted with coaches who have 4th and 5th level coaching certificates that they generally perceive the communication skills of the coaches as high.

The results of the above studies support the results of our study. Accordingly, it can be thought that the increase in coaching level will contribute to the coaches to have more effective communication skills.

The relationship between self-efficacy and communication skills of male and female coaches was analyzed by correlation analysis. As a result of the statistical analysis, it can be said that when the general self-efficacy of male and female coaches increases, their communication skills also increase. In the correlations between the sub-dimensions of the communication skills scale, it was seen that all features had strong positive relationships. Therefore, it is thought that an increase in communication skills in one dimension may lead to the increase in other dimensions.

In the light of this study, the following recommendations can be made. Considering that women in our country have difficulty in finding a place for themselves as coaches due to the socio-cultural role given to women in the family and the social structure, encouraging measures can be taken for female coaches to gain more place in the relevant field. It is observed that self-efficacy and communication skills of coaches increase as their education level increases. The minimum level of education required in coaching courses can be increased. Working opportunities and areas of coaches should be increased and permanent and effective communication skills and self-efficacy belief can be increased with the necessary arrangements to be made in training programs. Coaches should be supported to improve themselves by participating in not only national but also international training programs, seminars, courses and panels. In order to increase the effective communication between coaches and their athletes, it can be effective to spend quality time and to prepare environments where sharing is increased. Coach exchange programs can be organized through agreements with coaches from countries that have achieved international success.

## REFERENCES

1. Abakay U. Futbolcu-Antrenör İletişiminin Farklı Statülerdeki Futbolcuların Başarı Motivasyonu ile İlişkisi. Doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2010; Ankara.
2. Abakay U, Kuru E. Profesyonel ve Amatör Futbolcuların Antrenörleri ile olan İletişim Düzeyi Farklılıklarının Karşılaştırılması. Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilim Dergisi. 2011; 13 (1), 125-131.
3. Abakay U, Kuru E. Kadın Futbolcularda Antrenörle İletişim Düzeyi ve Başarı Motivasyonu İlişkisi, Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences, 2013; 12(1), 20-33.
4. Açıkalın A. Toplumsal Kuramsal ve Teknik Yönleriyle Okul Yöneticiliği. 3. Basım. Pegem Yayınları, Ankara, 1997.
5. Afyon, Y A. Işıkdemir. Futbol antrenörlerinin iletişim becerileri, tükenmişlik düzeyleri ve yaşam tatminleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Journal of Human Sciences, 2013; 10(1), 1705-1716.
6. Altıntaş A, Çetinkalp Z, Aşçı H. Antrenör- Sporcu İlişkisinin Değerlendirilmesi: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2012; 23(3), 119-128.
7. Bandura A. Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachandran (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Human Behavior, 1994; 4, 71-81.
8. Bandura A. Self-efficacy in changing societies. In Bandura, A. (Ed.) Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies, New York, Cambridge University Press. 1997; 1-45.
9. Barut Aİ. Sporda batıl davranış ve Öz yeterlilik ilişkisi. Yüksek lisans tezi, Mersin Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2008; Mersin.
10. Bozkurt Ş. Okul sporlarına katılan öğrencilerin katılım motivasyonu, başarı algısı ve Öz yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi. Yüksek lisans tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2014; Antalya.
11. Büyükduman Fİ. İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının İngilizce ve öğretmenlik becerilerine ilişkin Öz yeterlilik inançları arasındaki ilişki. Doktora tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, 2016; İstanbul.
12. Canpolat AM, Çetinkalp ZK. İlköğretim II. Kademe Öğrenci-Sporcuların Başarı Algısı ve Öz-Yeterlilik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki. Selçuk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilim Dergisi, 2011; 13 (1), 14-19.
13. Cengiz R, Aytan GK, Abakay U, 2. Taekwondo Sporcularının Algıladığı Liderlik Özellikleri ile Öz yeterlilik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki. NWSA-Sports Sciences, 2012; 7(4), 68-78.
14. Edward MC. A. Modeling and self efficacy: A test of Bandura's Model, Journal of Sport Psychology. 1985; 7(3), 283-295.
15. Erdoğan İ. İşletmelerde Davranış. 4. Baskı, Beta Basın Yayın, İstanbul, 1994.
16. Derman A. Kimya öğretmeni adaylarının Öz yeterlilik algıları ve öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları. Doktora tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2007; Konya.

17. Dökmen Ü. Sanatta ve Günlük Yaşamda İletişim Çatışmaları ve Empati. 39.Baskı, Remzi Kitapevi, 2008; İstanbul,
18. Feltz, D. L. Understanding motivation in sport: A self-efficacy perspective. *Motivation in Sport And Exercise*, 1992; 93-105.
19. Gülbahçe O. K.K. eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin iletişim becerilerinin incelenmesi, *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2010; 12 (2), 12- 22.
20. Güven A. Ansiklopedik Spor Dünyası. 4.Cilt, Serhat Yayınları, 1982; İstanbul,
21. Harter S. Effectance Motivation Reconsidered. *Human Development*, 1978; 21(1), 34-64.
22. Hodges L, Carron A. Collective efficacy and group performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*. 1992; 23, 48-76.
23. Kabadayi, A. Investigating demographic characteristics and teaching perceptions of Turkish preschool teachers. *Early child development and care*, 2010; 180(6), 809-822.
24. Korkut FO, Bugay, A. İletişim Becerileri Ölçeği'nin geliştirilmesi: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2014; 10 (2), 51-64.
25. Kuter M, Öztürk F. Antrenör ve Sporcu El Kitabı. 2.Baskı, Bağrırgan Yayınevi, Bursa, 1997;
26. Köksal F. Antrenörlerin liderlik tarzları ile Öz yeterlilikleri arasındaki ilişki. Yüksek lisans tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2008; Konya.
27. Lazar J. İletişim Bilimi. Çev. Anık C. 1.Baskı, Vadi Yayınları, Ankara, 2001.
28. Pajares F. Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Academic Settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 1996; 66 (4), 543-578.
29. Peker Ö, Aytürk N. Etkili Yönetim Becerileri. Yargı Yayınevi 2000; Ankara,
30. Martens R. Başarılı Antrenörlük. Çev: Tuncer Büyükonat. 2.Baskı, Beyaz Yayıncılık, İstanbul. 1998.
31. Synder CR, Lopez S. *Handbook of positive psychology*. Oxford University, Press US. 2002.
32. Telef BB, Karaca R. Ergenlerin Öz Yeterliliklerinin ve Psikolojik Semptomlarının İncelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2011; 8 (16), 499- 518.
33. Tutar H. Profesyonel Sekreterlik ve Büro Uygulamaları. 1.Baskı, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2001; Ankara,
34. Tutuk, A, Al, D, Doğan, S. Hemşirelik öğrencilerinin iletişim becerisi ve empati düzeylerinin belirlenmesi. *C.Ü. Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 2002; 6(2): 36-41.
35. Toklu O. Tenis Antrenörlerinde Liderlik Özellikleri ve Öz yeterlilikleri Arasındaki İlişkinin Belirlenmesi. Yüksek lisans tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2010; Konya.
36. Yüzen A. Meslek Kararı Verme Öz yeterliliğinin Artırılmasına Yönelik Multimedya Tasarımı. Yüksek lisans tezi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2016; Balıkesir.