International Journal of Sport Culture and Science

 June 2025
 : 13(2)

 ISSN
 : 2148-1148

 Doi
 : 10.14486/IntJSCS.2025.746



ATHLETES' STATE ANXIETY LEVELS AND THEIR ABILITY TO DEAL WITH STRESS BEFORE THE COMPETITION IN SNOWBOARDING

Mehmet Şirin GÜLER¹, Rıdvan AKSOY², Levent TANYERİ³

¹Kafkas University, Kars, Türkiye https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6014-0636 ²MEB, Kars, Türkiye https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8418-6062 ³Kafkas University, Kars, Türkiye https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4356-5832

Email: mehmet.guler@kafkas.edu.tr, ridvan36ridvan364@gmail.com, ireynat10@hotmail.com

Type: Research Article (*Received:* 09.04.2025 – *Accepted:* 01.06.2025)

Abstract

This study aims to reveal the relationships between the state anxiety levels and stress coping skills of athletes before the competition in snowboarding and various variables. The study was conducted using the screening method, which is one of the quantitative research techniques. The data of our study consists of three sections: Demographic Information of Snowboarders, State Anxiety Inventory and Stress Coping Scale. The universe of this study consists of 158 snowboarders, 49 female and 109 male, in the age groups of U11, U13, U15, +15, out of 250 snowboarders licensed in the Turkish Ski Federation. As a result of determined that the state anxiety and stress coping levels of athletes differed according to their gender, and it was determined that the helpless approach sub-dimension of stress coping differed according to gender and that the helpless approach sub-dimension levels of men were higher than those of women. Another result that the optimistic approach sub-dimension of stress coping of athletes differed according to age. In the study, as a result of the difference analysis of the levels of state anxiety and coping with stress according to their weight, it was determined that the levels of self-confident approach to coping with stress differed according to their weight. It was determined that there was a positive and moderate relationship with the helpless approach sub-dimension levels of the state anxiety and coping with stress scale, and a positive and lowlevel relationship with the submissive approach sub-dimension levels of the state anxiety and coping with stress scale.

Keywords: Anxiety, Coping with stress, Snowboard, Athletes



Introduction

Snowboarding is a recreational activity that involves descending a snow-covered slope while standing on a board attached to the bottom of a person's feet, and is also an Olympic and Paralympic sport. It continues to develop itself by taking inspiration from skateboarding, surfing and skiing. Snowboarding has become a popular and popular sport among athletes all over the world.

Snowboarding is a sport that is more difficult to learn and requires time compared to skiing. There are many types of competitions in snowboarding. In these competitions, athletes generally compete individually. In order to complete the difficult courses in snowboarding competitions in the fastest way and in accordance with the competition rules, it is necessary to be agile and to develop the ability to change direction. These athletes need training applications specific to the snowboarding branch. As in many sports branches, athletes in snowboarding also need jumping, leg and body strength, technical skills specific to the sport and super coordination (Sevim, 2007).

Recently, economic developments in sports and the intense interest of society in sports have been increasing. This also causes some pressure on athletes. For this reason, athletes need to make an effort to prepare themselves psychologically and physically for competitions. Of course, these factors are not enough to win competitions. Because the anxiety and stress levels of athletes before and during the competition are also important factors that seriously affect the results of the competition (Morali and Tiryaki, 1990, 5). Anxiety is a multifaceted emotional state. In addition, anxiety is a normal reaction and can be beneficial in some cases. The emergence of this feeling includes cognitive elements and emotions such as the possibility of danger and the situation of coping with this danger. Physiological and psychological symptoms such as sweating, feeling restless and tense, rapid heartbeat, negative avoidance (Civan, 2001).

Stress is a situation that occurs when the physical and mental limits of the organism are pushed and threatened. It can also lead to feelings such as disappointment, fear, anxiety, anger or depression. Stress can arise from our normal life or a situation such as an illness. Long-term stress or high levels of stress can also lead to a number of mental and physical health problems (Tiryaki, 2000). For these reasons, in this research, we examined many situations such as how and in what situations anxiety and stress occur, how we should cope, what are the symptoms and results. It will also make an important contribution to the studies on snowboarding, which are few in the literature in our country. In addition, it is aimed to examine and reveal the pre-competition anxiety levels of snowboarders and their coping with stress, which is our hypothesis. Depending on this purpose, do snowboarders show significant differences in terms of variables such as age, gender, educational status, height, weight, snowboarding experience, weekly training duration, being a national athlete or not and family income level? Answers to the problems were sought based on the main research problem.

Method and Material

In this section, explanations regarding the research model, universe and sample, data collection and analysis are included.

Ethics Committee Permission

The research was implemented after the ethics committee decision of Kafkas University dated 01.07.2021 and numbered 2021/18 was obtained.



Method of the Research

The study was conducted using the quantitative research method, which is a research method in which measurement methods and observations can be repeated and are carried out with numerical research. The research was conducted using the scanning method, which is one of the quantitative research techniques and aims to describe the facts and events within their own conditions and as they are. Scanning studies vary due to the fact that many factors such as time, interest, incentive, attitude, etc. play a role in the process of participants on a subject. These changes can be expressed as studies applied on larger samples (Karasar 2015).

Universe and Sample

The universe of this research was formed by the participation of snowboard athletes randomly selected as male and female in the age groups of U11, U13, U15, +15 throughout Turkey. The sample of the research was formed by those who participated in snowboard competitions held in Kayseri and Erzurum on different dates during the period in question and who filled out the questionnaires completely and using the formula,

$$n= (N t^2 p q) / (d^2(N-1)+t^2 p q)$$
$$p = 0.50$$

q = 1-p=0.50,

t = 1.96,

S (d) = 0.03 by taking 4

It consisted of 158 athletes.

Assumptions of the Study

It is assumed that the sample in the study represents the universe, the data collection tools meet the purpose of the study, and the opinions expressed by the participants regarding the statements in the scales are accurate and sincere.

Limitations of the Study

The sample of participants included in the study was comprised of 158 snowboarders, and the opinions expressed by these athletes on the "state anxiety" and "coping with stress" scales used as scales.

Data Collection Tools

In our research, the "State Anxiety Inventory", "Stress Coping Scale" and "Personal Information Form" were used to examine the pre-competition state anxiety levels and stress coping of athletes who will compete in the Snowboard stage competitions and the Turkish Championship. Before the surveys were applied, general information about the surveys was given to the athletes.

State Anxiety Inventory

The original inventory was developed by Spielberger and Charles in 1970. The adaptation of the inventory to Turkish was done by Öner and Le Compte in 1985. The inventory consists of 20 questions with 4 Likert scales. The internal consistency values of the inventory are between .94 and .96. There are reverse coded items in the inventory. The responses of the



participants to the items in the inventory are; "1 indicates that the anxiety level is low, while 4 indicates that the anxiety level is high."

In line with the obtained data, it was determined that the normality distribution Skewness-Kurtosis values of the data obtained from the State Anxiety Scale were between $-1.5 \sim +1.5$ and the distribution was normal.

Stress Coping Scale

The original scale is a 4-point Likert-type scale developed by Folkman and Lazarus as an inventory. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Şahin and Duran in 1995. The scale consists of 30 items with 4 Likert-type scales. The scale has 5 sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions of the scale are; "self-confident approach, "helpless approach, "submissive approach "optimistic approach and "seeking social support. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale was reported to be between ".49-.68 for optimistic approach", ".62-.80 for self-confident approach", ".64-.73 for helpless approach", ".47-.72 for submissive approach" and ".45-.47 for seeking social support".

Coping with Stress Scale Normality Distribution Test As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the Skewness-Kurtosis (Skewness-Kurtosis) values indicating normality distribution were between $-1.5 \sim +1.5$ and the distribution was normal.

Analysis of Data

While evaluating the findings obtained in the study, SPSS 22.0 Statistical package program was used for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistical methods (Frequency, Percentage, Average, Standard deviation) were used while evaluating the study data. The relationship between state anxiety and stress coping scales was examined with correlation analysis. In the case of two groups in comparing quantitative data, independent samples t test was used in the comparison of normally distributed parameters between groups, in the case of more than two groups in comparing quantitative data, one way Anova test was used in the comparison of normally distributed parameters between groups and Tukey test was used to determine the group causing the difference. The results were evaluated at a 95% confidence interval and at a significance level of p<0.05.

FINDINGS

Findings Regarding Personal Information

	Frequency	Percentage	Variable Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
5 hours and under	34	21.5	21.5	21.5
6-9 Hours	62	39.2	39.2	60.8
10-13 Hours	35	22.2	22.2	82.9
14 Hours and above	27	17.1	17.1	100.0
Total	158	100.0	100.0	

Table 1. Distribution according to weekly training duration

Participants' question on how many hours do they train per week is as follows; 39.2% (62 people) 6-9 hours, 22.2% (35 people) 10-13 hours, 21.5% (34 people) 5 hours and below, 17.1% (27 people) 14 hours and above.

Table 2. Distribution according to national team athlete status



	Fraguanay	Percentage	Variable	Cumulative
	Frequency	Tercentage	Percentage	Percentage
A national	5	3.2	3.2	3.2
B national	4	2.5	2.5	5.7
C national	7	4.4	4.4	10.1
Not national	142	89.9	89.9	100.0
Total	158	100.0	100.0	

Participants are seen as 89.9% (142 people) Not National, 4.4% (7 people) C National, 3.2% (5 people) A National, 2.5% (4 people) B National according to their status as national team athletes.

Table 3. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to gender

	Gender	Ν	Mean	Т	Sig.P	
State Anxiety	Female	49	48.2642	0.472	0.627	
	Male	109	48.3445	-0.473	0.637	
Confident	Female	49	3.4752			
Approach	Male	109	3.4220	0.595	0.553	
Optimistic	Female	49	3.2939			
Approach	Male	109	3.3284	-0.320	0.750	
Helpless	Female	49	1.7245			
Approach	Male	109	1.9495	-2.324	0.022	
Submissive	Female	49	1.6327			
Approach	Male	109	1.7813	-1.863	0.065	
Social Support	Female	49	2.5034			
Seeking	Male	109	2.4709	0.190	0.850	
General Stress	Female	49	2.4792	1 - 1 -	0.00 7	
Coping Level	Male	109	2.5618	-1.746	0.085	

The analysis of differences in the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to their gender was examined with Independent T-Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the helpless approach sub-dimension of coping with stress differed according to gender and that men had higher levels of the helpless approach sub-dimension than women (Sig.p.< 0.05).

Table 4. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to age

		Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P
State Anxiety	9-12 Years	38	48.1456	.81955	1.039	0.377



June 2025

	13-16 Years	78	48.3289	.98935		
	17-20 Years	34	48.5359	1.17385		
	21 Years and	34	40.3333	1.17365		
	above	8	48.1361	.69667		
·	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		
	9-12 Years	38	3.2556	.68806		
	13-16 Years	78	3.4524	.49295		
Self-Confident	17-20 Years	34	3.5714	.37878		
Approach	21 Years and	-			2.563	0.057
rippi ouch	above	8	3.6071	.44361		
	Total	158	3.4385	.53211		
	9-12 Years*	38	3.1947	.70747		
	13-16 Years*	78	3.2718	.54508		
Optimistic	17-20 Years**	34	3.4412	.47681		
Approach	21 Years and				3.445	0.018
Арргоасп	above**	8	3.8250	.27124		
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954		
	9-12 Years	38	1.9079	.64179		
	13-16 Years	78	1.9167	.62017		
Desperate	17-20 Years	34	1.7978	.52134	0.472	0 701
Approach	21 Years and	0	1 50 4 4	7 (200	0.473	0.701
	above	8	1.7344	.76309		
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007		
	9-12 Years	38	1.8640	.47276		
	13-16 Years	78	1.7158	.53257		
Submissive	17-20 Years	34	1.6078	.43978	1 7 50	0.150
Approach	21 Years and	0	1.05.10	50025	1.750	0.159
	above	8	1.8542	.58035		
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585		
	9-12 Years	38	2.5702	.95831		
	13-16 Years	78	2.3761	.96004		
Seeking Social	17-20 Years	34	2.5686	1.00681	0.600	0.507
Support	21 Years and	0			0.629	0.597
••	above	8	2.7083	1.27786		
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286		
	9-12 Years	38	2.5145	.24335		
	13-16 Years	78	2.5270	.27980		
General Stress	17-20 Years	34	2.5497	.21742	0.007	0.440
Coping Level	21 Years and				0.906	0.440
10	above	8	2.6724	.22947		
	Total	158	2.5362	.25647		

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to their ages was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the optimistic approach sub-dimension of coping with stress differed according to age (Sig.p.< 0.05). As a result of the post-hoc (Tukey test) analysis performed to determine which age groups caused the difference, it was determined that the optimistic approach sub-dimension levels of the participants aged 17-20 and 21 and above were higher than the participants aged 9-12 and 13-16.

Table 5. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to

 educational status

Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P
---	------	----------------	---	-------



Guler et al., Athletes' State Anxiety...

IntJSCS, 2025; 13(2):218-240

	Elementary School	7	48.1143	1.25242		
	Middle School	72	48.2540	.93776	0.041	0.470
State Anxiety	High School	64	48.4613	1.07373	0.841	0.473
	Undergraduate	15	48.1259	.60802		
	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		
	Elementary School	7	3.3469	.64869		
Self-Confident	Middle School	72	3.3373	.62122	0 5 4 7	0.059
Approach	High School	64	3.5000	.41279	2.547	0.058
	Undergraduate	15	3.7048	.34770		
	Total	158	3.4385	.53211		
	Elementary School	7	3.1143	.78194		
Optimistic	Middle School	72	3.2333	.60047	2.524	0.070
Approach	High School	64	3.3594	.55455	2.524	0.060
	Undergraduate	15	3.6400	.33975		
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954		
	Elementary School	7	1.6071	.67093		
Desperate	Middle School	72	1.9549	.60779	0.017	0.000
Approach	High School	64	1.8984	.61192	2.217	0.088
	Undergraduate	15	1.5667	.49970		
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007		
	Elementary School	7	1.5714	.30211		
Submissive	Middle School	72	1.8171	.52642	1 407	0.004
Approach	High School	64	1.6953	.48755	1.437	0.234
	Undergraduate	15	1.5889	.52654		
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585		
	Elementary School	7	2.1429	1.05158		
Seeking Social	Middle School	72	2.4861	.96079	0.687	0.561
Support	High School	64	2.4479	.94881	0.087	0.301
	Undergraduate	15	2.7556	1.21803		
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286		
	Elementary	7	2.3350	.20758		
	School					
General Stress		72	2.5354	.26331	1 (00	0 100
General Stress Coping Level	School			.26331 .25198	1.609	0.190
	School Middle School	72	2.5354		1.609	0.190

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to their educational status was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the levels of state anxiety and coping with stress did not differ according to their educational status (Sig.p.> 0.05).

Table 6. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to height

		Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P
	130 cm. and below*	19	47.7532	.53302		
	131 cm. and 150 cm.	39	48.2117	.83896		
State Anxiety	151 cm170 cm. below**	61	48.4271	1.01580	3.255	0.023
	171 cm. and above**	39	48.5353	1.13863		
	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		



June 2025

	130 cm. and below*	19	3.8271	.35819		
Self-Confident	131 cm. and 150 cm.*	39	3.1245	.64405	_	
	151 cm170 cm. below*	61	3.4262	.46254	10.468	0.000
Approach	171 cm. and above**	39	3.5824	.39788	_	
	Total	158	3.4385	.53211	_	
	130 cm. and below**	19	3.8000	.35277		
Optimistic	131 cm. and 150 cm. between*	39	3.0308	.62330	0.650	0.000
Approach	151 cm170 cm. below*	61	3.2721	.57623	- 9.659	0.000
••	171 cm. and above**	39	3.4410	.44291	_	
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954	_	
	130 cm. and below*	19	1.4934	.42384		
Desperate	131 cm. and 150 cm. between**	39	2.0128	.57482	2 4 4 0	0.010
Approach	151 cm170 cm. below**	61	1.9262	.62265	- 3.440	0.018
	171 cm. and above	39	1.8622	.64303		
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007		
	130 cm. and below	19	1.5351	.40665		
Submissive	131 cm. and 150 cm.	39	1.8889	.45777	2.542	
	151 cm170 cm. below	61	1.7459	.54058		0.058
Approach	171 cm. and above	39	1.6624	.50796		
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585		
	130 cm. and below	19	1.9123	1.24644		
Seeling Secial	131 cm. and 150 cm.	39	2.5641	.80624		
Seeking Social Support	151 cm170 cm. below	61	2.5574	.91433	2.479	0.063
	171 cm. and above	39	2.5556	1.04946		
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286		
	130 cm. and below	19	2.5064	.16217		
General Stress	131 cm. and 150 cm.	39	2.4881	.27874		
Coping Level	151 cm170 cm. below	61	2.5483	.28139	0.968	0.409
Coping Level	171 cm. and above	39	2.5800	.22707		
	Total	158	2.5362	.25647		

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to their heights was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the state anxiety and coping with stress levels differed according to their heights (Sig.p. < 0.05). As a result of the post-hoc (Tukey test) analysis performed to determine which height groups the difference originated from,

• The state anxiety levels of the participants whose heights are 151-170 cm. and 171 cm. and above were higher than the participants whose heights are 130 cm and below,

• The self-confident approach to coping with stress sub-dimension levels of the participants whose heights are 151-170 cm. and above were higher than the other participants,

• The optimistic approach to coping with stress sub-dimension levels of the participants whose heights are 130 cm and below and 171 cm and above were higher than the other participants,

• The optimistic approach to coping with stress sub-dimension levels of the participants whose heights are 131-150 cm. and 151-170 cm. It was determined that the levels of the helpless approach to coping with stress sub-dimension of the participants whose height was between 130 cm and below were higher than the participants who were 130 cm and below.

Table 7. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to weight

Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P



State Anxiety 50-60 kg. 47 48.4887 1.12994 61-70 kg. 18 48.5006 .90402 1.145 0.333 71 kg. and above 26 48.2312 .75089 .7089							
State Anxiety 61-70 kg. 18 48.5006 .90402 1.145 0.333 71 kg. and above 26 48.2312 .75089		49 kg. and below	67	48.1867	.96976		
71 kg. and above 26 48.2312 .75089 Total 158 48.3196 .98430 49 kg. and below 67 3.3923 .60012 50-60 kg.* 47 3.3131 .49901 61-70 kg. 18 3.5873 .48727 71 kg. and above ** 26 3.6813 .30854 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 49 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495 Total 158 3.3177 .57954 49 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 49 kg. and below 67		50-60 kg.		48.4887	1.12994		
Total 158 48.3196 .98430 Self-Confident Approach 49 kg. and below 67 3.3923 .60012 50-60 kg.* 47 3.3131 .49901 61-70 kg. 18 3.5873 .48727 71 kg. and above** 26 3.6813 .30854 70 ptimistic Approach 70 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 .5637 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 .563 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495 .563 Total 158 3.3177 .57954 .563 .49 49 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 .60422 .61-70 kg. .18 .17431 .54985 .2.786 .470 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 .50543 .64422 .61-70 kg. .18 .64922 .6170 kg. .6170 kg. .618 .2.786 .470 71 kg. and abov	State Anxiety	61-70 kg.	18	48.5006	.90402	1.145	0.333
Self-Confident Approach 49 kg. and below 67 3.3923 .60012 50-60 kg.* 47 3.3131 .49901 61-70 kg. 18 3.5873 .48727 71 kg. and above** 26 3.6813 .30854 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 49 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.213 .52459 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495 Total 158 3.3177 .57954 49 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7596 .54535 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54542 61-70 kg. <th></th> <td>71 kg. and above</td> <td>26</td> <td>48.2312</td> <td>.75089</td> <td></td> <td></td>		71 kg. and above	26	48.2312	.75089		
Self-Confident Approach 50-60 kg.* 47 3.3131 .49901 61-70 kg. 18 3.5873 .48727 3.469 0.018 Total 158 3.6813 .30854 3.469 0.018 Optimistic Approach Total 158 3.4385 .53211 3.469 0.018 Mathematical expension of the second expension expension of the second expension expensis expension expension expension expension expensio		Total	158	48.3196	.98430		
Self-Confident Approach 61-70 kg. 18 3.5873 .48727 71 kg. and above** 26 3.6813 .30854 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 Optimistic Approach 49 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 71 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 71 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49866 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54542 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 Sobofo kg. 47 2.4975 1.04		49 kg. and below	67	3.3923	.60012		
Approach 71 kg. and above** 26 3.6813 .30854 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 Optimistic Approach 49 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495 Total 158 3.3177 .57954 49 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7596 .54535 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54542 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 Total 158 1.7352 .504542		50-60 kg.*	47	3.3131	.49901		
Approach above** 71 kg. and above** 26 3.6813 .30854 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 Total 158 3.4385 .53211 49 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 47801 3.563 0.420 Total 158 3.3177 .57954 3.563 0.420 Total 158 3.3177 .57954 3.563 0.420 Mage: and below 67 1.8172 .60000	Self-Confident	61-70 kg.	18	3.5873	.48727	2 460	0.010
Above** Total 158 3.4385 .53211 49 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 3.563 0.420 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495 3.563 0.420 71 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 2.786 0.470 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 6.1-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54355 2.786 0.470 71 kg. and above 26 1.7595 .54535 2.786 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.527 71 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 50-60 kg.	Approach	71 kg. and	26	2 (912	20054	3.409	0.018
Optimistic Approach 49 kg. and below 67 3.2299 .66356 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495 Total 158 3.3177 .57954 49 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 2.786 0.470 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 2.786 0.470 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 2.786 0.470 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 2.786 0.470 71 kg. and above 26 1.6852 .48470 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.5255 0.490 Support Total 158 1.7352 .50585 0.902 0.902		above**	26	3.0813	.30854		
Optimistic Approach 50-60 kg. 47 3.2213 .52459 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 3.563 0.420 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495 3.563 0.420 Desperate Approach 49 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 2.786 0.470 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 2.786 0.470 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 2.786 0.470 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54542 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.527 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 2.4975 1.04184 .83541 0.192 0.902 91 kg. and above 26 2.5897 <th></th> <td>Total</td> <td>158</td> <td>3.4385</td> <td>.53211</td> <td></td> <td></td>		Total	158	3.4385	.53211		
Optimistic Approach 61-70 kg. 18 3.5556 .47801 3.563 0.420 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495		49 kg. and below	67	3.2299	.66356		
Approach 61-70 kg. 18 5.555 4.4801 5.565 0.420 71 kg. and above 26 3.5538 .38495	Ontinuistia	50-60 kg.	47	3.2213	.52459		
Image: Amage:		61-70 kg.	18	3.5556	.47801	3.563	0.420
Desperate Approach 49 kg. and below 67 1.8172 .60000 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54532 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .50585 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 50-60 kg. 47 2.4184 .83541 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above	Approach	71 kg. and above	26	3.5538	.38495		
Desperate Approach 50-60 kg. 47 2.0878 .64422 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 2.786 0.470 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 .61007 .61007 Mathematical Support 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 .470 .61007 Submissive Approach 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 .470 .61007 Submissive Approach 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 .4870 .6107 Submissive Approach 49 kg. and below 67 2.4947 .61028 .48470 .744 .527 Support 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 .50-60 kg. 47 2.4184 .83541 .0192 0.902 .902 Seeking Social Support 50-60 kg. 47 2.4184 .83541 .0192 0.902 .902 General Stress Coping Level 49 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 .27781 .1094		Total	158	3.3177	.57954		
Desperate Approach 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431 .54985 2.786 0.470 Approach 71 kg. and above 26 1.7596 .54535 0.470 Submissive Approach 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 .4985 .61007 .49866 .49866 .49866 .49866 .49866 .49866 .49866 .6170 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 0.527		49 kg. and below	67	1.8172	.60000		
Approach 61-70 kg. 18 1.7431	D (50-60 kg.	47	2.0878	.64422		
Mathematical Stress Mathematical Above 26 1.7396 .34335 Total 158 1.8797 .61007 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54542 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.744 0.527 Total 158 1.7352 .50585 0.744 0.527 Seeking Social Support 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 General Stress 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 <		61-70 kg.	18	1.7431	.54985	2.786	0.470
Submissive Approach 49 kg. and below 67 1.7413 .49686 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54542 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 Total 158 1.7352 .50585 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 50-60 kg. 47 2.4184 .83541 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 71 kg. and above 26 2.4956 .26033 61-70 kg. 158 2.4810 .98286 49 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353	Approach	71 kg. and above	26	1.7596	.54535		
Submissive Approach 50-60 kg. 47 1.8050 .54542 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.744 0.527 Total 158 1.7352 .50585 0.744 0.527 Seeking Social Support 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 83541 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 0.192 0.902 General Stress Coping Level 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 1.094 0.353		Total	158	1.8797	.61007		
Submissive Approach 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.527 0.744 0.527 Seeking Social Support 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 0.192 0.902 1 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.04040 0.192 0.902 1 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 General Stress Coping Level 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 1.094 0.353		49 kg. and below	67	1.7413	.49686		
Approach 61-70 kg. 18 1.6852 .48470 0.744 0.527 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 0.527 0.744 0.527 Seeking Social Support 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 0.192 0.902 1 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04040 0.192 0.902 Support 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 0.192 0.902 General Stress 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 0.353 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353		50-60 kg.	47	1.8050	.54542		
M 71 kg. and above 26 1.6282 .47448 Total 158 1.7352 .50585 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 50-60 kg. 47 2.4184 .83541 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.4956 .26033 0.192 0.902 General Stress 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 71 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763 1.094 0.353		61-70 kg.	18	1.6852	.48470	0.744	0.527
Total 158 1.7352 .50585 49 kg. and below 67 2.4975 1.04184 50-60 kg. 47 2.4184 .83541 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 Total 158 2.4910 .98286 General Stress 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .26033 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353	Approach		26	1.6282	.47448		
Seeking Social Support 50-60 kg. 47 2.4184 .83541 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 Total 158 2.4810 .98286 98286 0.192 0.902 General Stress Coping Level 49 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 1.094 0.353 71 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763 1.094 0.353			158	1.7352	.50585		
Seeking Social Support 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 0.192 0.902 Total 158 2.4810 .98286 0.902 0.902 General Stress Coping Level 49 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 0.192 0.902 1004 0.192 0.902 0.902 0.902 0.902 0.902		49 kg. and below	67	2.4975	1.04184		
Support 61-70 kg. 18 2.4259 1.04040 0.192 0.902 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 1 <th>a 1. a . i</th> <td>50-60 kg.</td> <td>47</td> <td>2.4184</td> <td>.83541</td> <td></td> <td></td>	a 1. a . i	50-60 kg.	47	2.4184	.83541		
Support 71 kg. and above 26 2.5897 1.07624 Total 158 2.4810 .98286 49 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 71 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763 1.094 0.353	0	61-70 kg.	18	2.4259	1.04040	0.192	0.902
Total 158 2.4810 .98286 49 kg. and below 67 2.4956 .26033 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 71 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763 1.094 0.353			26	2.5897	1.07624		
General Stress Coping Level 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 71 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763 1.094 0.353			158		.98286		
General Stress 50-60 kg. 47 2.5547 .27781 Coping Level 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 T1 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763 1.094 0.353		49 kg. and below					
General Stress 61-70 kg. 18 2.5594 .21601 1.094 0.353 Coping Level 71 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763 1.094 0.353		0					
Coping Level 71 kg. and above 26 2.5915 .22763		0				1.094	0.353
Total 158 2.5362 .25647		U	158				

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and stress coping levels according to their weight was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the levels of self-confident approach to coping with stress differed according to their weight (Sig.p. < 0.05). As a result of the post-hoc (Tukey test) analysis performed to determine which weight groups caused the difference, it was determined that the participants weighing 71 kg and above had higher levels of self-confident approach to coping with stress than the participants weighing 50-60 kg.

Table 8. Difference analysis of state anxiety and stress coping levels according to snowboard age category

		Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P
	U-11	22	47.9889	.84869		
	U-13	48	48.2197	.96853		
State Anxiety	U-15	36	48.6614	.89256	2.511	0.061
	+15	52	48.3152	1.06566		
	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		



1000 + C 1000						
	U-11	22	3.4286	.73771		
Self-Confident	U-13	48	3.3185	.58140	-	
Approach	U-15	36	3.3929	.47365	2.276	0.082
Арргоасп	+15	52	3.5852	.38087	-	
	Total	158	3.4385	.53211	-	
	U-11	22	3.2818	.79919		
	U-13	48	3.2833	.53129	-	
Optimistic	U-15*	36	3.0889	.56658	4.400	0.005
Approach	+15**	52	3.5231	.45702	-	
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954	-	
	U-11*	22	1.6307	.57019		
D (U-13	48	1.9635	.59192	-	
Desperate	U-15**	36	2.0521	.63764	2.978	0.033
Approach	+15	52	1.7885	.58919	-	
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007	-	
	U-11	22	1.7576	.47623		
G I ! ! !	U-13	48	1.7604	.45986	-	
Submissive	U-15	36	1.8287	.62677	1.109	0.347
Approach	+15	52	1.6378	.46174	-	
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585	-	
	U-11	22	2.3485	1.07140		
Cooling Coolin	U-13	48	2.4583	1.00970	-	
Seeking Social	U-15	36	2.4537	.85134	0.312	0.817
Support	+15	52	2.5769	1.02287	-	
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286	-	
	U-11	22	2.4498	.24067		
Comonal Stars	U-13	48	2.5273	.27300	-	
General Stress	U-15	36	2.5498	.28885	1.220	0.304
Coping Level	+15	52	2.5716	.21908	-	
	Total	158	2.5362	.25647	-	

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to the snowboarding age category was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the levels of the optimistic approach and helpless approach sub-dimensions of coping with stress differed according to the snowboarding age category (Sig.p. < 0.05). As a result of the post-hoc (Tukey test) analysis performed to determine which categories caused the difference, it was determined that the participants in the over 15 age category had higher levels of the optimistic approach sub-dimension of coping with stress of the participants in the U-15 age category, and the helpless approach sub-dimension of coping with stress of the participants in the U-15 age category was higher than the participants in the U-11 age category.

Table 9. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to snowboarding duration

		Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P
	0-3 years	32	48.5639	1.22890		
	4-7 years	85	48.2444	.91168		
	8-11 years	35	48.3403	.95863		
State Anxiety	12-15 years	4	47.7722	.12256	0.928	0.449
	16 years and above	2	48.3389	.76210		
	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		
Self-Confident	0-3 years*	32	3.1473	.68318	5.086	0.001
Approach	4-7 years	85	3.4319	.48844	5.080	0.001

June 2025



Guler et al., Athletes' State Anxiety...

IntJSCS, 2025; 13(2):218-240

	8-11 years**	35	3.6571	.36701		
	12-15 years	4	3.8214	.21429		
	16 years and above	2	3.7857	.10102		
	Total	158	3.4385	.53211		
	0-3 years*	32	3.0563	.66086		
	4-7 years	85	3.3106	.56611		
	8-11 years**	35	3.5143	.46345		
Optimistic	12-15 years	4	3.8500	.30000	3.724	0.006
Approach	16 years and above	2	3.3000	.14142		
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954		
	0-3 years	32	1.9961	.71736		
	4-7 years	85	1.9074	.59266		
—	8-11 years	35	1.7893	.54803		
Desperate	12-15 years	4	1.2188	.15729	1.757	0.140
Approach	16 years and above	2	1.7500	.35355		
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007		
	0-3 years	32	1.7656	.48241		
	4-7 years	85	1.7784	.54335		
	8-11 years	35	1.6381	.42872		
Submissive	12-15 years	4	1.4167	.31914	0.901	0.465
Approach	16 years and above	2	1.7500	.82496		
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585		
	0-3 years	32	2.7292	.99258		
	4-7 years	85	2.2863	.98286		
	8-11 years	35	2.6762	.90923		
Seeking Social	12-15 years	4	2.6667	1.21716	1.907	0.112
Support	16 years and above	2	3.0000	.47140		
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286		
	0-3 years	32	2.4849	.29324		
	4-7 years	85	2.5298	.26667		
	8-11 years	35	2.5980	.20399		
General Stress	12-15 years	4	2.4914	.07646	0.950	0.437
Coping Level	16 years and	2	2.6379	.07315		
	above					

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to the duration of snowboarding was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the levels of the self-confident approach and optimistic approach sub-dimensions of coping with stress differed according to the duration of snowboarding (Sig.p. < 0.05). As a result of the post-hoc (Tukey test) analysis performed to determine which categories caused the difference, it was determined that the participants who had been snowboarding for 8-11 years had higher levels of the self-confident approach and optimistic approach sub-dimensions of coping with stress than the participants who had been snowboarding for 0-3 years.

Table 10. Difference analysis of state anxiety and stress coping levels according to weekly training duration

Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P



June 2025

	5 hours and below	34	48.4049	1.28051		
Stata Anviaty	6-9 hours	62	48.0921	.86862		
State Anxiety	10-13 hours	35	48.4194	.85073	2.111	0.101
	14 hours and	27	48.6053	.90632		01101
	above	4.50	10.010.1			
	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		
	5 hours and below	34	3.5504	.49753		
	6-9 hours	62	3.4677	.56387		
Self-Confident	10-13 hours	35	3.3959	.52097	1.391	0.248
Approach	14 hours and above	27	3.2857	.49961		
·	Total	158	3.4385	.53211		
	5 hours and		5.4505	.55211		
	below	34	3.3765	.60255		
Optimistic	6-9 hours	62	3.3903	.55448		
Approach	10-13 hours	35	3.2971	.60851	1.706	0.168
rippiouch	14 hours and above	27	3.1037	.54454		
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954		
	5 hours and below	34	1.9596	.69544		
	6-9 hours	62	1.7460	.56083		
Desperate	10-13 hours	35	1.8607	.58847	2.568	0.056
Approach	14 hours and				210 000	01000
	above	27	2.1111	.57943		
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007		
	5 hours and					
	below	34	1.7892	.61861		
	6-9 hours	62	1.6505	.47016		
Submissive	10-13 hours	35	1.7238	.47819	1.428	0.237
Approach	14 hours and above	27	1.8765	.44720		
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585		
	5 hours and below	34	2.1765	1.02899		
	6-9 hours	62	2.4839	1.13027		
Seeking Social	10-13 hours	35	2.4839	.80637	1.715	0.166
Support	14 hours and				1./13	0.100
	above	27	2.6049	.67328		
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286		
	5 hours and below	34	2.5751	.25407		
a	6-9 hours	62	2.5017	.25552		
General Stress	10-13 hours	35	2.5350	.25674	0.773	0.511
Coping Level	14 hours and above	27	2.5683	.26459		
	Total	158	2.5362	.25647		
	iotai	1.00	2.3302	.23047		

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and stress coping levels according to the weekly training duration was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the state anxiety and stress coping levels did not differ according to the weekly training duration (Sig.p.> 0.05).

Table 11. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to nationality status



Guler et al., Athletes' State Anxiety...

IntJSCS, 2025; 13(2):218-240

		Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P
	A national	5	47.8711	.39437		
	B national	4	49.0194	1.46536		
State Anxiety	C national	7	47.9524	.53820	1.364	0.256
	Not national	142	48.3338	.99420		
	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		
Self-Confident	A national	5	3.9143	.19166		
	B national	4	3.9643	.07143		
	C national	7	3.5306	.58154	3.036	0.206
Approach	Not national	142	3.4024	.53116		
	Total	158	3.4385	.53211		0.215
	A national	5	3.7600	.32863		
O- timistic	B national	4	3.6000	.36515		
Optimistic	C national	7	3.4286	.43861	1.505	
Approach	Not national	142	3.2887	.59096		
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954		
	A national	5	1.2750	.16298		
Democrate	B national	4	1.5313	.32874		
Desperate	C national	7	1.6607	.50885	2.680	0.095
Approach	Not national	142	1.9217	.61627		
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007		0.206
	A national	5	1.3333	.26352		
Submissive	B national	4	1.2917	.28464		
	C national	7	1.7381	.49868	2260	0.084
Approach	Not national	142	1.7617	.50855		
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585		
	A national	5	2.4000	1.14018		
a 1. a . i	B national	4	3.5833	.50000		
Seeking Social	C national	7	2.9048	.68622	2.296	0.080
Support	Not national	142	2.4319	.98354		
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286		
	A national	5	2.4690	.18665		
G	B national	4	2.6379	.16051		
General Stress	C national	7	2.5616	.08840	0.345	0.793
Coping Level	Not national	142	2.5345	.26624		
	Total	158	2.5362	.25647		

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to their status as national team athletes was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the levels of state anxiety and coping with stress did not differ according to their status as national team athletes (Sig.p.> 0.05).

Table 12. Difference analysis of state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to family income status

		Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.P
	501-1000 TL	3	48.0000	.78323		
	1001-1500 TL	4	49.4361	2.45161		
State Anxiety	1501-2000 TL	11	48.3444	.89121	1.890	0.134
State Anxiety	2001 TL and above	140	48.2926	.92723	1.890	0.134
	Total	158	48.3196	.98430		
Salf Confident	501-1000 TL	3	3.2857	.28571		
Self-Confident	1001-1500 TL	4	3.4643	.41033	0.364	0.779
Approach	1501-2000 TL	11	3.2987	.57305		



5 10 Optimistic	2001 TL and above Total 501-1000 TL 001-1500 TL 501-2000 TL 2001 TL and	140 158 3 4 11	3.4520 3.4385 3.3333 3.4000	.53770 .53211 .30551		
10Optimistic11	01-1000 TL 001-1500 TL 501-2000 TL	3 4	3.3333			
10Optimistic11	001-1500 TL 501-2000 TL	4		30551		
Optimistic 1:	501-2000 TL		3 4000	.50551		
		11	5.1000	.23094		
Approach 2	2001 TL and		3.2727	.58837	0.049	0.986
	above	140	3.3186	.59295	0.049	0.980
	Total	158	3.3177	.57954		
5	01-1000 TL	3	2.5417	.52042		
10	001-1500 TL	4	1.9375	.41458		
Desperate 13	501-2000 TL	11	1.8523	.62704	1 225	0.202
Approach 2	2001 TL and above	140	1.8661	.61212	1.225	0.303
	Total	158	1.8797	.61007		
5	01-1000 TL	3	1.8333	.16667		
10	001-1500 TL	4	1.7083	.67185		
Submissive 1:	501-2000 TL	11	1.6970	.33181	0.062	0.090
Approach 2	2001 TL and above	140	1.7369	.52020	0.062	0.980
	Total	158	1.7352	.50585		
5	01-1000 TL	3	2.4444	.69389		
10	001-1500 TL	4	2.5833	1.06719		
Seeking Social 1:	501-2000 TL	11	2.3030	.60470	0.141	0.936
Support 2	2001 TL and above	140	2.4929	1.01505	0.141	0.936
	Total	158	2.4810	.98286		
5	01-1000 TL	3	2.7011	.29327		
10	001-1500 TL	4	2.5776	.28348		
General Stress 1	501-2000 TL	11	2.4608	.28572	0.763	0.517
Coping Level 2	2001 TL and above	140	2.5374	.25370	0.703	0.517
	Total	158	2.5362	.25647		

The difference analysis of the participants' state anxiety and coping with stress levels according to family income levels was examined with One-Way ANOVA Test. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the state anxiety and coping with stress levels did not differ according to family income levels (Sig.p.> 0.05).

Table 13. Relationship between state anxiety and stress coping levels

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	r.	1						
State Anxiety	p.							
Self-Confident	r.	374**	1					
Approach	p.	.000						
Optimistic	r.	484**	.726**	1				
Approach	p.	.000	.000					
	r.	.373**	449**	456**	1			
Desperate Approach	p.	.000	.000	.000				
Submissive	r.	.210**	348**	299**	.627**	1		
Approach	p.	.008	.000	.000	.000			

June 2025



Guler et al., Athletes' State Anxiety...

Seeking Social	r.	.155	147	190*	.130	.120	1	
Support	p.	.051	.065	.017	.103	.132		
General Stress	r.	.016	.289**	.257**	.561**	.576**	.383**	1
Coping Level	p.	.844	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	

The relationship between state anxiety and levels of coping with stress was examined using correlation analysis. As a result of the analysis, a statistically significant relationship was found between the sub-dimensions of state anxiety and levels of coping with stress (Sig.p. < 0.05). The directions and levels of these relationships are as follows;

• It was found that there was a negative and moderate relationship between the state anxiety and the self-confident approach sub-dimension levels of the coping with stress scale (r: -0.374; Sig.p<0.05).

• It was found that there was a negative and moderate relationship between the state anxiety and the optimistic approach sub-dimension levels of the coping with stress scale (r: -0.484; Sig.p<0.05).

• It was found that there was a positive and moderate relationship between the state anxiety and the helpless approach sub-dimension levels of the coping with stress scale (r: 0.373; Sig.p<0.05). It was found that there was a positive and low-level relationship between the state anxiety and the submissive approach sub-dimension levels of the coping with stress scale (r: 0.210; Sig.p<0.05).

Discussion and Conclusion

It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the precompetition state anxiety inventory total score averages of snowboard athletes in terms of gender. When we look at the literature, there are parallel and opposite results with ours. Terzioğlu et al. (2013) found that the pre-competition state anxiety levels of male folk dancers were higher than female folk dancers. Again, in the study conducted by Hacıcaferoğlu et al. (2015), it was stated that male folk dancers had higher pre-competition state anxiety scores. They found that the anxiety levels of male athletes were higher than the anxiety levels of female athletes. There are also some studies where the state anxiety levels of female athletes were higher than male athletes (Başaran et al., 2009). Dönmez (2013) determined in a study that he conducted that the pre-match state anxiety levels of female basketball players were higher than male basketball players. Karadeniz (2005) and Özbaş et al. (2012) also determined that female students have higher state anxiety before exams than male students. Again, Çankıroğlu (2007) found that female students have higher test anxiety when compared to male students. There are studies that give similar results to our study. According to Engür (2002), in the study titled "The Effect of Success Motivation on State Anxiety Levels in Elite Athletes", no significant difference was found when state anxiety levels were compared according to gender. Başaran et al. (2009) stated that no significant difference was found in the state anxiety scores of male athletes compared to female athletes. While no significant difference was found in the self-confident approach, optimistic approach, submissive approach, seeking social support and general stress coping levels of the stress coping methods scale sub-dimensions in terms of gender among snowboard athletes, it was found that men had higher levels of the helpless approach sub-dimension than women, Coruh (2003) reported that there were significant differences between male and female students in the Faculty of Education. It was stated that females used the strategies of "taking refuge in religion", "seeking external help" and "escape and abstraction" more than men, while male students used the strategy of "active planning" more. Aslan and Agbuga (2014) observed that gender



June 2025

affected the stress coping methods of athletes doing taekwondo. It was found that male athletes doing taekwondo used more effective stress coping methods than female athletes. In the same study, male athletes were found to have higher scores on the self-confident approach and optimistic approach subscales, which are effective methods for coping with stress, than female athletes. Reevy and Maslach (2001) determined in their study that girls have higher expectations of receiving social support than male athletes. Based on our findings, the fact that female athletes are more confident and optimistic than male athletes may be due to women seeking help from their surroundings during a problem and consulting others to solve the problem. However, male athletes tend to think like they can do it themselves, are introverted and do not consult anyone, which may cause stress in male athletes in terms of gender.

There was no statistically significant difference in the total state anxiety inventory scores of snowboarders according to their age. In parallel with our results, Engür (2002) found that there was no relationship between the ages of the athletes and their "state anxiety" levels. Considering the experience of the athletes, the lack of a relationship between the "state anxiety" levels is similar to the results of this study in the age variable. Again, Acar (2019) found no significant difference in the state and trait anxiety scores of team and individual athletes according to the age variable. Arseven and Güven (1992) analyzed the data on the anxiety levels of athletes in different branches (basketball, handball, volleyball and athletics) divided into two groups according to age (over 20 and under 20), in the competition environment, and found no significant relationship between the results. Although these results support our study, considering that there are some findings in the opposite direction, more studies of this kind should be conducted. For example, in the study conducted by Doğan and Eygü (2018) titled "Examination of Competition Anxiety Levels of Athletes Doing Winter Sports", it was determined that there was a significant difference between age variables and anxiety levels. It was determined that the anxiety levels of older athletes were higher than those of younger athletes, which is not similar to our study (Doğan and Eygü, 2018). It was determined that the optimistic approach sub-dimension of snowboard athletes coping with stress varied according to age. In our study, it was determined that the optimistic approach sub-dimension levels of athletes aged 7-20 and 21 and above were higher than those of athletes aged 9-12 and 13-16. Bebetsos and Antoniou (2003) revealed that older athletes were better prepared for negativities in coping with stress than younger athletes and showed higher success in emotional control. They think that the reason for this is mostly due to experience. Başakçıoğlu (2019) did not find any significant difference in terms of the sports age variable in the stress coping strategies of amateur league athletes in terms of sports age. Özbekçi (1989) examined basketball, volleyball and track and field athletes in terms of state anxiety scores and did not find a relationship between age and competition stress levels. In the study conducted by Koca and Yıldız (2018), which is similar to our study in terms of results, examining the relationship between factors that push football referees to stress, job satisfaction and job performance, it was concluded that stress increases as age decreases. Although there was no significant difference between stress factors and the age variable in this study, when the averages were examined, it was seen that stress averages decreased as age increased in the totality of individual, environmental and organizational factors. Söylemez (2019) also observed a significant difference in the submissive approach sub-dimension of the stress coping style sub-dimension in his study. It is observed that the submissive approach sub-dimension mean scores of referees between the ages of 18-25 are higher than those of referees between the ages of 26-35. In our study, athletes between the ages of 7-20 and 21 and above may participate in and experience such competitions more than athletes between the ages of 9-12 and 13-16, and they may be more optimistic before the competition because they



are used to the conditions in which the competition takes place. The fact that athletes between the ages of 9-12 and 13-16 are separated from their families, meet new people, and have negative thoughts about the competition result may cause stress in athletes.

In snowboarders, there was no significant difference between pre-competition state anxiety scores and sub-dimensions of the stress coping scale according to their educational status. When we look at the literature, Uslu (2018), who found similar results to ours, stated that pre-competition state anxiety scores of folk dancers did not show a statistically significant difference according to their educational status. However, in the same study, differences were found between the groups in the sub-dimension of the stress coping scale. This result contradicts our study. Öztürk (2020) did not find a significant difference in the comparison of stress coping levels according to educational status in the study he conducted to determine the mobbing and stress coping levels of folk dance referees. Another study contradicting ours was Çelik (2010), who evaluated the pre-competition state anxiety levels of high-level judokas and found that there was a difference according to their educational status. It was observed that athletes who graduated from primary school had the lowest anxiety level and that the anxiety level increased and athletes with master's degrees, high school degrees, undergraduate degrees and finally athletes with associate degrees had the highest anxiety score.

It has been determined that snowboarders' state anxiety and coping with stress levels differ according to their height. The differences obtained are shown below.

• It has been determined that participants who are 151-170 cm. and 171 cm. and above have higher state anxiety levels than participants who are 130 cm. and below,

• Participants who are 151-170 cm. and above have higher levels of the self-confident approach to coping with stress sub-dimension than other participants,

• Participants who are 130 cm. and below and 171 cm. and above have higher levels of the optimistic approach to coping with stress sub-dimension than other participants,

• Participants who are 131-150 cm. and 151-170 cm. and above have higher levels of the helpless approach to coping with stress sub-dimension than participants who are 130 cm. and below.

Nacar (2011) conducted a study investigating the anxiety levels of handball players in terms of some variables, and when we looked at the anxiety levels of athletes in terms of their height, it was determined that those with heights of 150–160 cm had 63%, 161–170 cm had 76%, and 171–180 cm had 61% "high anxiety" levels. In our study, those with heights of 151–170 cm and 171 cm and above had higher anxiety levels than those with heights of 130 cm and below. When we looked at the literature, we could not find any studies on the effects of height on coping with stress and state anxiety.

It has been determined that snowboarders' state anxiety and coping with stress levels differ in terms of their self-confident approach to coping with stress according to their weight. It has been determined that participants weighing 71 kg and above have higher levels of self-confident approach to coping with stress compared to athletes weighing 50-60 kg. When the literature is reviewed, Judge et al. (2016) found that according to the total of the competition anxiety test SCAT (Sports Competition Anxiety Test) according to weight classes, the weight of the athlete has no effect on competition anxiety (F = 0.269, p = 0.977). There are also studies finding the opposite of this result. For example, in a study conducted by Nacar (2011) investigating the anxiety levels of handball players in terms of some variables, when we look at the anxiety status of athletes according to their weight, it has been stated that those



weighing 50-60 kg (76%), 61-70 kg (69%), and 81 kg and above (60%) are at the "high anxiety" level. In our study, the reason why athletes weighing 71 kg and above had a higher self-confident approach than athletes weighing 50-60 kg may be due to their physical wellbeing, their stronger body, their high self-confidence, and the fact that athletes of this weight are older.

It has been determined that the levels of state anxiety and coping with stress of snowboard athletes differ according to the snowboarding age category, and the levels of the optimistic approach and helpless approach sub-dimensions of coping with stress differ according to the snowboarding age category. It has been determined that the levels of the optimistic approach sub-dimension of coping with stress of athletes over the age of 15 are higher than those of the U-15 age category, and the helpless approach sub-dimension of athletes in the U-15 age category are higher than those of the U-11 age category. When the literature is examined, according to the research conducted by Alkan (2019), the anxiety levels of female and male athletes competing in the senior category are higher than those of other categories. The reason for this is that the athletes' self-confidence and belief in their ability to overcome pressure are somewhat weak both under pressure and before the competition, and it can be said that the athletes are engaged in this branch at a high level and these Turkish Championships, which are in the nature of selecting the national team for the World and Olympic Championships, are of great importance to the athlete and therefore increase the level of anxiety (Alkan 2019). When we look at the results of our study, the fact that the optimistic approach of athletes over the age of 15 is higher than that of the U15 age category may be due to experience or more competition experience than athletes in the lower category.

It has been determined that the levels of state anxiety and coping with stress of snowboarders differ according to the duration of snowboarding, and the levels of the self-confident approach and optimistic approach sub-dimensions of coping with stress differ according to the duration of snowboarding. The findings obtained show that the levels of the self-confident approach and optimistic approach sub-dimensions of coping with stress of athletes who have been snowboarding for 8-11 years are higher than those of athletes who have been snowboarding for 0-3 years. Similar results to the results obtained in our study, (Uslu 2018) found significant differences in terms of the duration of folk dancers' involvement in folk dances in terms of the sub-dimensions of coping with stress such as taking refuge in religion, escaping, isolation (biochemical) and acceptance-cognitive restructuring. Again, Bulut (2009), in his study examining the stress coping situations of teachers by looking at their length of service in their profession, reported that teachers who have been working for 16-20 years have a positive effect on coping with stress and that teachers who have been working for 6-10 years use a more self-confident coping style. He emphasized that as teachers' length of service in their profession increases, their experience also increases, which provides an advantage for teachers in terms of problem solving and using active methods in coping with stress. Atmaca (2020) found in his study that there was a significant difference between the scores of referees who have been referees for 6-10 years and 16 years and above in terms of organizational factors between referees' years of service and stress factors. He also found that the organizational factor scores of referees who have been referees for 16 years and above were lower than the scores of referees who have been referees for 6-10 years. All of these studies are consistent with our study. We can say that one of the most important reasons for this is experience. If we have been doing the same thing for years and have become professional at it, if the work we do is both materially and spiritually present in our lives, it can cause us to do it comfortably and without stress. There is a study in the literature that found different results than ours, for example, in the study conducted by Güllü and Yıldız (2019) examining



the effect of stress sources on the performance of football referees, no significant relationship was found between the year of refereeing and the level of stress.

When we look at the weekly training durations of snowboarders, (%21.5) train for 5 hours or less, (%39.2) for 6-9 hours, (%22.2) for 10-13 hours, (%17.1) for 14 hours or more per week. According to these durations, no difference was found in the pre-competition state anxiety levels and stress coping scale sub-dimensions of snowboarders. When we look at the literature, the study by Çelik (2010) contradicts us and when we look at the weekly training durations of high-level judokas, it is stated that athletes who train for 0-2 hours have the lowest anxiety scores and as the weekly training duration increases, the anxiety scores of the athletes also increase. Therefore, significant differences were observed in the study.

When we look at the status of snowboarders being national team athletes, 5 people are A national, 4 people are B national, 7 people are C national, and 142 people are not national athletes. No significant difference was found between the state anxiety scores of the athletes and the sub-dimensions of the stress coping scale. Öztürk (2019), in this study conducted to examine the effects of state and trait anxiety states of athletes involved in darts on performance, did not show a significant difference in his research according to their national status, parallel to ours. Similarly, Doğan and Eygü (2018), who reached the same conclusion as us, did not determine a significant difference in their national status in their study titled "Examination of competition anxiety levels of athletes doing winter sports". The study contradicting ours was determined by Engür (2002) in which a statistically significant difference was found between the "state anxiety" average scores of national and non-national athletes. The average scores of non-national athletes regarding "state anxiety" were found to be statistically significantly higher than the average scores of national athletes, which is not similar to our study.

When we examined snowboard athletes according to their family monthly income levels, it was determined that snowboard athletes did not differ in terms of pre-competition state anxiety levels and stress coping methods sub-dimensions. In the study conducted by Öztürk (2020) to investigate the relationship between the existence of the concept of mobbing and stress coping styles in folk dance referees, no significant difference was observed in the comparison of stress coping levels according to income levels. In another study that found the same result as ours, Bozkuş (2017) found that there was no significant difference between the pre-competition and post-competition state anxiety levels of elite wrestlers in his study on comparing their pre-competition and post-competition state anxiety scale scores of wrestlers with different monthly income levels. The one who found a different result with us was Uslu (2018). When the state anxiety scores of folk dancers were compared before the competition in terms of their monthly income, it was seen that the state anxiety scores were the lowest in those with high monthly incomes, and the mean score in question was the highest in folk dancers with the lowest monthly incomes. This contradicts our study. Again, the similarity with ours in this study was that the income level variable did not create a significant difference in terms of the sub-dimensions of methods of coping with stress.

As a result of the relationship between state anxiety and levels of coping with stress, it was determined that there was a negative and moderate relationship with the self-confident approach sub-dimension levels of the state anxiety and coping with stress scale, a negative and moderate relationship with the optimistic approach sub-dimension levels of the state anxiety and coping with stress scale, a positive and moderate relationship with the helpless approach sub-dimension levels of the state anxiety and coping with stress scale, a positive and moderate relationship with the helpless approach sub-dimension levels of the state anxiety and coping with stress scale, and a positive



and low-level relationship with the submissive approach sub-dimension levels of the state anxiety and coping with stress scale.

These changes in the results are likely to cause athletes to experience excessive stress and anxiety, especially during the competition periods in snowboarding, as in other sports. Personality traits, mental states, the importance of the competition, the athlete's competition experience, the competitive situation with their opponents, fear of injury, family pressure and environmental factors can cause athletes to experience anxiety and stress before the competition. If stress and anxiety levels are experienced intensely in snowboarders, this anxiety can create fear in the athlete and cause the athlete to make mistakes. This causes the athlete to fail. If our state anxiety level is low or moderate, this can give us positive results. Because a moderate level of anxiety can motivate the athlete in the face of negativity, make them think solution-oriented and help them stay calm. These can also contribute to the athlete achieving more successful results.

Suggestions

Within the scope of this thesis, the pre-competition state anxiety levels of snowboarders and their methods of coping with stress were examined in terms of different variables. In this sense, it is thought that it will contribute positively to the literature, in addition to the very few studies on snowboarding, and will prepare the groundwork for future studies in this field.

- This study is on all athletes doing winter sports and a more comprehensive study can be conducted by measuring the anxiety and stress levels of the athletes after the competition.
- Coaches can be given training on anxiety and stress. It is also recommended that professional guidance and counseling services be provided in clubs or teams.
- Coaches having athletes train close to the competition can also bring stress and anxiety levels to normal levels.
- Athletes can be made to do activities and events that will reduce their stress and anxiety levels before the competition.
- Coaches and clubs taking athletes to many national and international competitions can help keep athletes' pre-competition anxiety and stress levels at a manageable level.
- Sports psychologists within the Turkish Ski Federation and other sports federations can be actively assigned by the federations to keep the anxiety and stress levels of athletes under control before the competition.



REFERENCES

Acar, F. (2019). Çalışanların stresle başa çıkması ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki: antalya ili örneği. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Acar, K. (2019). Takım ve bireysel sporcuların iletişim becerileri ve kaygı düzeylerinin çatışma eğilimi ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi.

Alkan, B. (2019) Elit taekwondocularda kaygının sportif performans üzerine etkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi (Selçuk üniversitesi sağlık bilimleri enstitüsü rekreasyon anabilim dalı) Konya.

Arseven, A. and Güven, Ö.(1992). Sporcuların Müsabaka Ortamındaki AnksiyeteDüzeyleri. Spor Bilimleri II Ulusal Kongresi Bildirileri, ISSTR-SC. 144-151.

Aslan, S., & Agbuga, B. (2014). Elit Taekwondo Sporcularının Stresle Başa Çıkma Tarzlarının İncelenmesi. International Journal of Sport Culture and Science, 2(Special Issue 1), 111-118.

Atmaca, E. (2020). Hentbol hakemlerinin stres faktörlerinin incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

Başaran, M.H., Taşğın, Ö., Sanioğlu, A., Taşkın, A.K. (2009). Sporcularda durumluk ve sürekli kaygı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 21, 533-542.

Bebetsos, E., & Antoniou, P. (2003). Psychological skills of Greek badminton athletes. Perceptual and motor skills, 97(3_suppl), 1289-1296.

Bulut, İ. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi (Dicle ve Fırat Üniversitesi Örneği). Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (14), 13-24.

Civan, A. (2001). Bireysel ve Takım Sporlarında Yer Alan Sporcuların Müsabaka Öncesi ve Sonrası Durumluk ve Sürekli Kaygılarının Karşılaştırılması, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, S.Ü. Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.

Çankıroğlu, S. B. (2007). Üniversite adayı ergenlerin stresle başa çıkma ve sınav kaygılarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Sakarya Üniversitesi).

Çelik, G. (2010). Üst düzeydeki judocularda müsabaka öncesi durumluk kaygı düzeylerinin değerelendirilmesi (Master's thesis, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

Çoruh Y. (2003). Denetim Odağı İle Stresle Başa Çıkma Arasındaki İlişki. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Entitüsü. Erzurum.

Doğan, E. K., Eygü, H. (2018). Kış sporları yapan sporcuların yarışma kaygı düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Uluslararası Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, Cilt 2, Sayı 2 (Ağustos 2018).

Dönmez, K. H. (2013). "Samsun İlinde Yapilan Üniversitelerarası Basketbol Müsabakalarına Katılan Sporcuların Durumluk Kaygı Ve Sürekli Kaygı Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi." The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies.

Engür, M. (2002). Elit sporcularda başarı motivasyonun, durumluk kaygı düzeyleri üzerine etkisi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ege Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü. İzmir.

Folkman, S. & Lazarus, R.S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: Study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. Journal of Personality and Social



Psychology, 48, 150-170.

Güllü, S., & Yıldız, S. M. (2019). Stres kaynaklarının futbol hakemlerinin performansına etkisinin incelenmesi. Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 17(1), 146-155.

Hacıcaferoğlu, S., Hacıcaferoğlu, B., Seçer, M. (2015). Halk oyunları branşına katılan sporcuların yarışma öncesi kaygı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. International Journal of Science Culture and Sport, 4, 288-297.

Judge, L. W., Urbina, L. J., Hoover, D. L., Craig, B. W., Judge, L. M., Leitzelar, B. M., ... & Bellar, D. M. (2016). The impact of competitive trait anxiety on collegiate powerlifting performance. Journal of strength and conditioning research, 30(9), 2399-2405.

Karadeniz, E. (2005). Üniversite Giriş Sınavına Hazırlanan Lise Son Sınıf Öğrencileri ve Velilerinin Kaygı Düzeyleri, Baş Etme Yolları ve Denetim Odağı Arasındaki İlişki. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Karasar, N. (2015). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri (28. basım). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Koca, S., ve Yıldız, S.M. (2018). Futbol hakemlerini strese iten faktörler, iş tatmini ve iş performansı ilişkisinin incelenmesi. Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 3(2), 195-207.

Moralı, S. ve Tiryaki, Ş. (1990). Genç sporcularda yarışma performas kaygısı ve bu kaygı ile başa çıkma davranışlarının araştırılması, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri 1. Ulusal Sempozyumu, Ankara, s.5.

Nacar, E., Mahmut, A. Ç. A. K., & Karahüseyinoğlu, M. F. (2011). Hentbolcuların sürekli kaygı düzeylerinin bazı degişkenler açısından araştırılması. Sport Sciences, 6(1), 1-12.

Öner, N. ve Lecompte, A. (1983). Süreksiz Durumluk/Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri El Kitabı. İstanbul: Boğaziçi.

Öner, N. ve LeCompte, A., (1985), Durumluk-Sürekli Kaygı Envanteri El Kitabı. 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları:333.

Özbaş, A.A., Sayın, A., Coşar, B. (2012). Üniversite sınavına hazırlanan öğrencilerde sınav öncesi kaygı düzeyi ile erken dönem uyumsuz şema ilişkilerinin incelenmesi. Bilişsel Davranışçı Psikoterapi ve Araştırmalar Dergisi, 1, 81-89.

Özgün, A., Yaşartürk, F., Ayhan, B., & Bozkuş, T. (2017). Hentbolcuların spora özgü başarı motivasyonu ve mutluluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. Uluslararası Kültürel ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi (UKSAD), 3(Special Issue 2), 83-94.

Öztürk, B. (2020). Halk oyunları hakemlerinde mobbing kavramı ve stresle başa çıkma yolları arasındaki ilişkinin araştırılması (Master's thesis, Kış Sporları ve Spor Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

Öztürk, S. E. (2019). Dart sporcularının durumluk ve sürekli kaygı düzeylerinin performansa etkisinin incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Bartın Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

Reevy, G. M., & Maslach, C. (2001). Use of social support: Gender and personality differences. Sex roles, 44(7), 437-459.

Sevim, Y. (2007). Antrenman Bilgisi. Yayın No 358. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Söylemez, Ö. F. (2019). Türkiye'deki hokey hakemlerinin iletişim beceri düzeyleri ile stresle başa çıkma tarzları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).



Spielberger, C., Charles, D. (1970). Stress and Anxiety in Sports, Anxiety in Sports: An International Perspective. Hemisphere Publishing, New York, USA.

Şahin, N. H. & Durak, A., (1995). Stresle Başaçıkma Tarzları Ölçeği: Üniversite Öğrencileri için Uyarlanması. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 10(34), pp. 58-73.

Şahin, N. H. (1998). Stresle Başa Çıkma: Olumlu Bir Yaklaşım Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Terzioğlu, E.A., Koç, Y., Yazıcı, M. (2013). Halk oyunları oynayanların durumluk ve sürekli kaygı düzeyleri (Erzincan yöresi örneği). Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 6(2), 361-370.

Tiryaki, Ş. (2000). Spor Psikolojisi. Kavramlar kuramlar ve Uygulama. Ankara: Eylül Kitabevi.

Uslu, M. S. (2018). Halk oyuncularının yarışma öncesi durumluk kaygı düzeyleri ve stresle başa çıkma yöntemleri arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü).