Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise /
Türk Spor ve Egzersiz Dergisi
http://dergipark.gov.tr/tsed
Year: 2021 - Volume: 23 - Issue: 3 - Pages: 359-373
DOI: 10.15314/tsed.995904

Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise
Türk Spor ve Egzersiz Dergisi
ISSN: 2147-5652
https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tsed

Examination of Teaching Styles Used by Physical Education Teachers and Trainers and their Perceptions of These Styles: An Example From Edirne

Şengül DEMİRAL[1]

[1]*Trakya Üniversitesi Kırkpınar Spor Bilimleri fakültesi, Edirne*
Address Correspondence to Ş. Demiral : e-mail: senguldemiral@trakya.edu.tr

(Received): 15/09/2021/ (Accepted): 30.12.2021

A:Orcid ID: 0000-0001-9771-6846

Abstract

With the increasing recognition of the constructivist nature of learning as well as the diversity of student learning styles, the need for teachers to use different teaching styles is emphasized, while little is known about teachers' use and perception of various teaching styles. In parallel with this, it is seen that there are much less studies about the use and perception of teaching styles by trainers. Therefore, In this study, the extent to which trainers and physical education teachers used teaching styles and their value perceptions related to these styles were examined by comparison according to gender, education level, age and group variables. Moreover, the effect of the teachers' and trainers' use of these styles on their value perceptions was investigated. A total of 129 participants, of whom 90 were teachers employed by the Ministry of National Education and 39 were trainers employed by the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports in the centre of Edirne, took part in the study based on the principle of voluntariness. Of the participants, 72 were male, and 57 were female. According to the findings, the most valued styles were command and practice, while the least valued styles were self-teaching and student initiation It was seen that the most used styles were command and practice, while the least used styles were self-teaching and student initiation. In the dimensions of providing "Enjoyment", "Learning" and "Motivation" for students, it was seen that the most valued styles in terms of motivation were command, practice and reciprocal styles; the most valued styles in terms of learning were command, practice and participation styles; and the most valued styles in terms of enjoyment were command, practice and participation styles. The findings revealed that significant differences were seen as a result of comparison of the mean scores for value perceptions of the styles and for use of the styles according to the group (physical education teachers and trainers), gender and age variables, whereas no significant differences were seen following comparison according to the education level variable. In conclusion, the reason for the choice of the command and practice styles as the most used and valued styles can be regarded as the fact that teachers' and trainers' desire to increase their authority over students directed them towards these styles. Therefore, it is recommended that preservice teachers and trainers attending physical education teaching and coaching education programmes gain experience by giving them the opportunity for practice in the different courses that they take throughout their periods of study, and by enabling them to discover the areas of strategic use of the other teaching styles, and that professional development programmes are prepared in accordance with this.

Keywords: Trainer, Physical Education, Teacher, Style, Perception.

Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenleri ve Antrenörlerin Kullandıkları Öğretim Stilleri ve Stillere İlişkin Algılarının İncelenmesi (Edirne Örneği)

Özet

Öğrenci öğrenme stillerinin çeşitliliğinin yanısıra öğrenmenin yapılandırmacı doğasının artan tanınırlığı ile birlikte öğretmenlerin farklı öğretim stilleri kullanma ihtiyacı vurgulanır iken öğretmenlerin çeşitli öğretim stillerini ve algılaması hakkında çok az şey bilinmektedir. Buna paralel olarak antrenörlerin öğretim stilleri kullanması ve algılaması hakkında çok daha az çalışmanın olduğu görülmektedir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmada antrenörlerin ve beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin öğretim stillerini kullanma düzeyleri ve stillere ilişkin değer algılarının, grup, cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim durumları değişkenlerine göre karşılaştırarak incelenmiştir. Edirne merkezde MEM'de çalışan 90 öğretmen ile GSİM'de çalışan 39 antrenör olmak üzere toplam 129 katılımcı, kolayda örneklem yöntemi ile seçilmiş ve gönüllük ilkesine göre katılmışlardır. Bulgulara göre en çok değer verilen stiller, komut ve alıştırma, en az değer verilen stiller ise kendi kendine öğretme ve öğrencinin başlatması olarak sıralanmıştır. En çok kullanılan stiller komut ve alıştırma, en az kullanılan stiller ise kendi kendine öğretme ve öğrencinin başlatması olarak sıralandığı görülmektedir. Stillerin öğrencilere "Eğlenme", "Öğrenme" ve "Motivasyon" sağlama boyutlarında; motivasyon açısından komut, alıştırma ve eşli çalışma, öğrenme açısından komut, alıştırma ve katılım, eğlence açısından komut, alıştırma ve katılım stillerine en fazla değer verildiği görülmektedir. Bulgular grup, cinsiyet ve yaş değişkenlerine göre stillere ilişkin değer algıları ve kullandıkları öğretim stilleri ortalama puanlarının karşılaştırılması sonuçlarında anlamlı değişikler olduğu görülmüştür. Sonuç olarak, en çok kullanılan ve değer verilen stiller olarak komut ve alıştırma stillerinin seçilmesi, öğretmen ve antrenörün öğrenciler üzerinde kontrolün daha fazla arttırma istekleri, bu stillere yönelten temel sebep olarak görülebilir. Bu nedenle beden eğitimi öğretmenliği ve antrenörlük programında öğrenimlerini sürdüren öğretmen ve antrenör adaylarının öğrenim süreleri boyunca aldıkları farklı derslerde uygulama imkanı bulmaları için fırsatlar verilerek, diğer öğretim stillerinin stratejik kullanım alanlarının keşfetmeleri sağlanarak, deneyim kazanmaları ve mesleki gelişim programlarının bu doğrultuda hazırlanması önerilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Antrenör, Beden eğitimi, Öğretim, Stil, Algı,

INTRODUCTION

When our country's Olympic medal performance results are compared with other countries in the world, there is a big difference. When we think about the factors affecting these differences, many reasons may come to our mind. However, in Arnold Gesell Maturation Theory, the importance of the appropriate environment for successful development and the role of the educational processes that complement it is emphasized (Orhan and Sinan, 2018). f the development processes of all children in the world are in the same direction at similar ages, why are some countries more successful in terms of sports? At this point, when the countries that are successful in the Olympics or other sports competitions are examined, it is seen that there are suitable sports fields, sports culture has developed since childhood, and appropriate education-teaching environments and appropriate programs are designed (Orhan and Sinan, 2018; Onur, 1995). While designing appropriate educational environments and programs, increasing the recognition of the constructivist nature of learning and emphasizing the need for teachers to use different teaching styles, it has not been sufficiently studied about teachers' use and perception of various teaching styles, and accordingly, much less work has been done on coaches' use and perception of teaching styles. It can be seen when the literature is reviewed (Onur, 1995). In this study, the teaching styles used by physical education teachers and coaches were examined. The similar and different aspects of the teaching styles used by physical education teachers and coaches working in appropriate education-teaching fields were examined. Mosston and Ashworth (2008), in their work named "Physical Education Teaching-Teaching Physical Education", which is used in the field of education and sports, which are available and frequently used, and the teaching styles used by teacher training institutions and physical education teachers until today were examined. In the related literature, physical education is a part of general education and there is a similarity between the objectives and it is seen that they complement each other. It can contribute to contemporary education with its general and specific goals by contributing to the development of all characteristics of students in a democratic environment.Psychologists, educators, and researchers have debated for many years about the definition of learning and teaching and how it happens. In the developing, growing and changing world, different definitions and arguments are presented for the concept of learning and teaching, as in many other subjects. Different teaching methods based on these different approaches have been developed (Temizöz and Özgü, 2009).

Educational approaches, educational methods and teaching models developed in the field of education in general have been reorganized due to its structure based on kinetic (motor) development and teaching through physical activities, as well as being used in the field of physical education. When the literature on physical education in education is scanned, in the organization of learning and teaching activities; It is seen that concepts such as strategy, approach, model, method, technique, style and tactics come to the fore and are used (Cengiz & Serbes, 2014). The concept of "style" nowadays; In the education system where individual differences are gaining importance, in general terms, it is seen that the preference of the individual in using his talents is expressed as the way he prefers to use when applying his knowledge and skills (Fer, 2005). teaching style; It is expressed as the behaviors that teachers display continuously and consistently in their communication and interactions with their students during the learning and teaching process (Grasha, 2002). teaching style; It is an indicator of how the teacher presents information and the quality of communication and interaction with students (Felder, 2002). Teaching style and teaching method are two different but complementary terms. As a sports trainer, the physical education teacher is an expression of the trainer's style, personal philosophy and goals, and individuality. In some cases, teaching style and teaching method are confused. Teaching method is related to the techniques and ways the teacher uses, such as books, auditory and visual aids, to reveal a certain subject or skill (Demirhan, 2006). Style, in other words, style is the personal characteristic of the individual. Therefore, it generally contains an invariable feature (Dunn et al., 1989). In order to understand the structure of teaching styles, it is necessary to know each of its sub-stages. This structure, which is built on effectiveness, also shows an attitude that values attitude, reveals the level of awareness and prioritizes being vigilant while doing all these. In this case, the teacher should consider this situation first for himself, then for his class, then for others and his environment (Butler, 1987).

The main goal of trainers and physical education teachers is to help students reach the desired goals in terms of psychomotor, cognitive and affective aspects. To maximize learning efficiency, coaches and physical education teachers must determine which type of goal will yield results for a larger number of students. Choosing the appropriate goals is one of the most important decisions teachers have to make, but it is also one of the most overlooked. It is stated in the literature that the practical practices of trainers are based on a theoretical framework and this theoretical framework provides a general design and logical approach to teaching and learning (Lyle, 2002; Mosston & Ashworth, 2002). It also provides clarity on the purpose and organization of activities that increase student interest, collaboration, and managerial effectiveness and encourage more legitimate assessments of learning (Metzler, 2000; Mosston & Ashworth, 2002). Teaching strategies can be named as any method and technique used by teachers and coaches to achieve the goals of the lesson or training (Guven, 2008). As it is seen that teaching strategies vary from teacher to teacher, from coach to coach, the way they are used can also change from environment to environment (Şahin, 2007).

Table 1. Relation of Basic Teaching Approaches-Method/Technique-Outcome

Approaches	Method/Techniques	Gains		
		Cognitive	Affective	Psychomotor
Presentation	Lectures, Demonstration, Question and answer, Interview, Case study, Symposium, Discourse	Knowledge	Taking	arousal
Finding	Discussion, Case study, Scenario, Question and answer, Interview, Debate, Opposition panel	Comprehension, Analysis, Synthesis	Do not react Valuation	All steps
Research review	Problem Solving, Project, Travel Observation, Demonstration, Case Study,Experiment, Brainstorming, Interview	Application, Analysis, Synthesis, Evaluation	Organizing Personalizing	All steps

Expository Teaching Approach; It is a teaching method in which the student is secondary. In this method, their roles are clearly defined, the teacher or coach makes decisions and the students follow these rules, the teacher and the coach are the leaders (Demirhan, 2006). It can be said that the teaching approach by presentation is an effective teaching

method as it facilitates the establishment of learning on solid foundations and increases permanence (Bilen, 1999). Students are given information that is very carefully arranged in a specific sequence, in a specific order, and using a regular hierarchy. It refers to the process of giving in a ready-to-receive condition by students. The information is explained by the teacher and it expresses the process interpreted by the students (Fidan, 1998; Kaya, Erdik, 2014). It is known that in the presentation strategy, it is directed by asking questions to attract the attention of the student. It is stated in the studies that the student learns when he pays attention and attention is directed, even if he does not have sufficient motivation. In order to organize meaningful learning in the presentational teaching process; The information to be taught must have integrity and meaning in itself, and there must be a positive preparation from the students for meaningful learning (Özakpınar, 1987; Kaya, Erdik, 2014). The approach to teaching by presentation; It is seen as an important feature as it can provide students with a large amount of information in a short time and ensure that students learn by making sense of the information. However, if student and teacher interaction is not sufficient, it is an important point to consider that it turns into a completely teacher-centered teaching process (Aydın, 2001; Erden and Akman, 1997; Ausubel and Robinson, 1969).

Invention Teaching Strategy; The main goal in this learning is that the individual is active in the learning process. In this process, the importance of turning the desire to learn into an internal motivation by the individual becomes evident. Invention method; It refers to the teaching process, which includes the process in which the teaching environment is organized in a way to choose the subject and give the students the opportunity to make inventions. In learning by discovery, it is argued that the desire to learn is an internal motif and that the individual can find the source and reward of this motif in his own work. It is mentioned that internal reinforcements are more important than external reinforcements in learning. It is emphasized that the pleasure of success as a result of solving a question on the subject on one's own without direct help from any individual, realizing a new knowledge by oneself, and discovering knowledge is an internal reinforcement that increases motivation for that individual (Bruner, 1968). The discovery teaching strategy is inductive and requires more attention when applying than the presentation approach. It is seen that the correct use of the given directives, the teachers and trainers having sufficient knowledge and skills about this strategy constitute important technical issues for successful results in this method (Bilen, 1993).

As a result; In the literature, "Physical Education Teaching-Teaching Physical Education", in their work Mosston and Ashworth (2008), it has been used by teacher training institutions and physical education teachers, where the styles for physical education teaching are explained.

This book describes 11 teaching styles used in physical education teaching. These styles are styles A through K; A; command style, B; practice style, C; working style, D; self-monitoring style, E; participation style, F; directed invention style, G; problem solving (one right style), H; problem solving (different paths generation style), I; student's design style, J; student initiation style, K; self-teaching style. The previously acquired knowledge from A to E is re-disclosed; These are the styles in which basic skills are acquired, traditional culture is continued, previous achievements are put forward by the student, definitions and classifications are made, and mostly past and present information are dealt with. From F-to-K are seen as teaching styles in which new information is produced. Styles F and G involve the discovery of single-correct concepts, while styles H to K involve students' exploration, alternative constructs and interacting with new concepts. In short, styles from F to K include experiences of discovering information (Mosston & Ashworth, 2008; Saraç & Mustu, 2013). It is seen in the literature that physical education teachers and coaches mainly use teaching methods based on behavioral approaches in skill teaching (Cassidy et al., 2009; Cothran, Kulinna and Ward, 2005; Demirhan et al., 2008). Mosston's teaching styles provide a conceptual perspective of the teaching methods used by coaches and physical education teachers. Although it is primarily designed for physical education teachers, it is stated that it is also suitable for use in other fields of sports education (Mosston & Ashworth, 2008; 2002). If the development processes of all children in the world are in the same direction at similar ages, why are some countries more successful in terms of sports? At this point, when the countries that are successful in the Olympics or other sports competitions are examined, it is seen that there are suitable sports

fields, sports culture has developed since childhood, and appropriate educational environments and programs have been designed. For this reason, in this study, it is aimed to examine the subject on the education and training department. It has been tried to find answers to some questions about education programs by researching the teaching styles of physical education teachers and coaches working in appropriate education-training areas. Mosston and Ashworth (2008) in their work named "Physical Education Teaching-Teaching Physical Education" used in the field of physical education and sports, in which the styles of physical education teaching are explained and the teaching styles used by teacher training institutions and physical education teachers until today, physical education teachers in this study. analyzed comparatively for teachers and coaches.

Reported knowledge of coaches varies considerably according to sport types. In general, it is seen that the strategy method in which the trainer is in the center, that is, behaviorist and learning is centered, and it is based on social, cognitive and constructivist (humanistic) learning theories (Kılıç and İnce, 2019). In order to better understand what kind of learning the teaching strategies developed by the trainers in the field of training serve, it is necessary to understand the basic approaches on which these learnings are based. For this reason, are there any similarities or differences between physical education teachers and coaches' perceptions of the teaching styles and styles they use in developing educational approaches? When the literature is scanned to reach the answers to these questions, it is seen that many studies focus on teachers' teaching styles and studies covering coaches' teaching styles are not sufficient.

As a result of scanning and examining the literature, the aim of this study is to examine the level of use of teaching styles by physical education teachers and coaches and their value perceptions regarding these styles, by comparing them according to group, gender and age variables. In addition, the second aim is to discuss how teachers' and coaches' use of styles and their value perceptions about styles can affect 'Physical Education Teacher and Trainer Education Programs'. The research questions that guide this research are: 1) What are the similarities and differences in the teachers' and coaches' level of use of teaching styles and their perceptions of value? 2) Does the group, gender (male, female), age, educational background (language, postgraduate) of teachers and coaches make a difference in their level of use of teaching styles and in the effect of teaching styles on value perceptions? 3) Is there a difference between teachers' and coaches' perceptions of the styles according to their use of teaching styles (using or not using them)?

In this study, it is aimed to create new resources for the field by examining the teaching styles of physical education teachers and coaches, to make necessary suggestions for trainers and physical education teachers training programs based on the findings, and to be a reference resource for trainers and physical education teachers and candidates.

METHOD

Sample

In this study, a total of 129 participants, 90 teachers working in the Directorate of National Education in the center of Edirne and 39 trainers working in the Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports, were selected by convenience sampling method and participated on a voluntary basis. The teachers and coaches in the sample group have undergraduate and graduate education, minimum 5 years of professional experience and their own life stories. In addition, as Mosston and Ashworth (2008) stated in their book "Physical Education Teaching-Teaching Physical Education", it was assumed that they understood the teaching styles and formed a philosophy accordingly. The sample of the study consisted of 129 physical education teachers (90) from Edirne Provincial Directorate of National Education (centre) and trainers (39) working in Edirne Provincial Directorate of Youth Services and Sports in 2019, who agreed to participate in the study voluntarily. Of the participants, 72 (55.8%) were male and 57 (44.20%) were female. 3.9% of the participants are in the 20-25 age range, 11.6% are in the 26-30 age range, 24.0% are in the 31-35 age range, 19.4% are in the 36-40 age range, and 41% ,1 of them are over 41 years old. 93.8% of the participants have undergraduate and 6.2% graduate education.

Data collection tool

As a data collection tool, the “Physical Education Teachers’ Use of Teaching Styles and Perceptions of Styles Questionnaire” (Kulinna and Cothran, 2003) adapted into Turkish by İnce and Hünük (2010) and the "Teaching Methods Scale of Trainers Used by Trainers" developed by Kılıç and İnce (2019) “Coaches’ Use of Teaching Methods

Scale – Athlete Perception Version (CUTEMS – ATHLETE)" is used. It is limited to features measured on this scale. While the 11 teaching styles in the data collection form specific to teachers are divided into 11 factors (İnce & Hünük, 2010), the scale form adapted for coaches collects 11 styles into 3 factors (Kılıç & İnce, 2019). A questionnaire form containing a total of 11 scenarios belonging to each teaching style and 4 questions answered on a 5-point Likert scale (never, rarely, sometimes, often, always) was used. Survey questions; In order to evaluate the level of using the teaching style of physical education teachers and coaches, the question "I am teaching physical education lesson with this method" is the first question, and the second, third and fourth questions; There are questions that enable physical education teachers and coaches to determine the "value perceptions" of the style, related to the fact that the relevant style makes the lesson fun for students (entertainment), helps to learn skills and concepts (learning), and motivates students to learn (motivation). The item assessing the level of using the teaching style of physical education teachers and coaches is analyzed in two ways. While the first is examined by taking the average value on a 5-point Likert scale, the second is those who give the answer "never" and do not use, and those who answer as "rarely", "sometimes", "often" and "always" are coded as users, and those who give the answer "never" are used and those who do not use it. This is done by creating "groups". Value perception levels are examined by taking the average of the value obtained from the sum of the three related items (minimum 3, maximum 15) and the value (minimum 1, maximum 5) obtained from each item (entertainment, learning, motivation) (İnce and Hünük, 2010).

Data collecting

T.U. After obtaining approval from the Social Sciences Ethics Committee, necessary official permissions were obtained from the Edirne Directorate of National Education and the Edirne Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports. While evaluating the findings of this study, it is necessary to pay attention to some limitations regarding the sample selection and data collection tool in the study. The study sample includes Edirne NED physical education teachers and YSPD trainers, and the findings can be generalized to this sample only. Since the data collection tool is a questionnaire, the limitations of the studies conducted by means of questionnaire data collection are also valid for the findings of this study. The limitations of the studies on the teaching styles used by the trainers and the value perceptions of the styles should also be taken into consideration. The questionnaires were applied to physical education teachers by visiting schools in Edirne Center and by going to the training work areas of Edirne YSPD trainers. After explaining the content of the study to physical education teachers and trainers, it was stated that participation in the study was on a voluntary basis. The questionnaires were filled in by the teachers and coaches who volunteered to participate in the study and delivered to the researcher. The time it takes physical education teachers and coaches to fill out the questionnaires is approximately 15 minutes.

Data analysis

First of all, using descriptive statistical methods, "the level of use of physical education teachers and coaches' teaching styles, their value perceptions about styles" was analyzed. Before the analysis of the data set, it was tested whether the relevant variables fit the normal distribution in order to determine the statistical method to be used. At this stage, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were used. The critical value was p=0.05. As a result of the test, it was accepted that if the p values obtained for the relevant variables were greater than 0.05, the data conformed to the normal distribution, and if it was small, it did not conform to the normal distribution. Since the data set did not conform to the normal distribution, non-parametric methods "Kruskal-Wallis" and "Mann-Whitney U" tests were used for comparisons between groups. The first research question was analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) methods, first of all, the differences in "the level of teachers' and coaches' use of teaching styles and their perceptions of value regarding styles". Depending on this question, the differences and similarities between the use of different teaching styles and between value perceptions (comparing) were examined using the MANN-WHITNEY test. The second research question was analyzed with the KRUSKAL-WALLIS and MANN-WHITNEY tests, in terms of the different and similar aspects (comparing) of the teachers and coaches on the level of using teaching styles according to group, gender, age, educational status and the effect of teaching styles on value perceptions. The third research question was to examine the "different and similar aspects (comparing) between the value perceptions of the styles according to the teachers' and coaches'

use of teaching styles", and for teachers and coaches those who do not use each teaching style (Never) and "Users" (Rarely, Occasionally). sequence, Frequently, and Always). Then, the value perceptions of those who do not use each style and those who use it were compared using the MANN-WHITNEY test (p<.05). İnce and Hünük (2010) found the internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha) of the questionnaire in the dimension of value perception of each style between .86 and .95. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient value = 0.820.

RESULTS

Use of Instructional Styles and Value Perceptions of Styles

* The lowest value that the use of teaching styles can be taken is 1 and the highest value is 5.

** The lowest value from which the perception of values for styles can be obtained is 3, and the highest value is 15.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Table for "Use" and "Value Perceptions" Scores

	Use			Value Perceptions		
Use	n	Mean	sd.	n	Mean.	sd
Command	**129**	**4,02**	**1,02**	**129**	**12,43**	**2,24**
Exercise	**129**	**3,58**	**1,23**	**129**	**11,82**	**3,01**
Co-Working	129	2,84	1,01	129	10,18	2,55
Self-Control	129	2,75	1,16	129	9,37	3,31
Participation	129	3,14	1,23	129	10,43	3,19
Directed Invention	129	2,81	1,27	129	9,69	3,29
Problem Solving: One Straight	129	2,69	1,21	129	9,65	3,14
Problem Solving: Different Paths Generation	129	2,86	1,20	129	9,73	3,01
Student's Design	129	2,68	1,22	129	9,52	3,27
Student Initiation	**129**	**2,47**	**1,37**	**129**	**8,66**	**3,74**
Self-Teaching	**129**	**1,81**	**1,18**	**129**	**6,67**	**3,70**

As can be seen in Table 2, the most used styles are command (avg:4.02; sd.1.029 and practice (avg: 3.58; sd: 1.23), the least used styles are self-teaching (avg: 1. 81; sd: 1.18) and student's initiation (average: 2.47; ss: 1.37). Also the most valued styles are command (avg:12.43;nd:2.24) and practice (avg:11.82;nd:3.01), while the least valued styles are self-teaching (avg:6.67;nd:3, 70) and student's initiation (average:8.66;sd:3.74).

Table 3. Ranking the Average Value Perceptions of the Styles for Students in the Dimensions of Providing "Entertainment", "Learning" and "Motivation" from High to Low

Entertainment			Learning			Motivation		
Learning Styles	Ort.	ss.	Learning Styles	Ort.	ss.	Learning Styles	Ort.	ss.
Command	3,93	1,01	Command	4,14	,87	Command	4,36	,69
Exercise	3,80	1,20	Exercise	3,92	1,01	Exercise	4,10	1,08
Participation	3,44	1,17	Participation	3,47	1,12	Participation	3,62	,99
Co-Working	3,24	,91	Co-Working	3,32	,91	Participation	3,53	1,19
Problem Solving: Generating Different Paths	3,17	1,05	Student's Design	3,25	1,13	Directed Invention	3,46	1,20
Directed Invention	3,05	1,16	Problem Solving: Generating Different Paths	3,22	1,02	Problem Solving: One Straight	3,39	1,17
Problem Solving: One Straight	3,05	1,13	Problem Solving: One Straight	3,22	1,11	Problem Solving: Generating Different Paths	3,34	1,11
Student's Design	3,02	1,15	Directed Invention	3,18	1,14	Self-Control	3,28	1,23
Self-Control	2,99	1,12	Self-Control	3,10	1,16	Student's Design	3,25	1,24
Student Initiation	2,71	1,26	Student Initiation	2,96	1,31	Student Initiation	2,99	1,38
Self-Teaching	2,21	1,29	Self-Teaching	2,20	1,24	Self-Teaching	2,26	1,34

As seen in Table 3, in the dimensions of providing students "Entertainment", "Learning" and "Motivation"; command in terms of motivation (avg: 4.36; sd: .69), practice (avg: 4.10; ss: 1.08) and paired work (avg: 3.62; sd: .99), command in terms of learning (mean:4.14; nd: .87), practice (avg: 3.92; nd: 1.01) and participation (avg: 3.47; sd: 1.12), command in terms of entertainment (avg: 3. 93; nd: 1.01), exercise (mean: 3.80; nd: 1.20) and participation (mean: 3.44; nd: 1.17) styles were given the highest value.

Table 4. The Mann-Whitney Test Results Regarding the Comparison of the Value Perceptions of Styles and the Average Scores of the Teaching Styles Used by the Group (Teacher and Ant: Trainer) Variable

	Value Perceptions Regarding Styles						Use of Instructional Styles				
	Group	n	Mean	sd.	Z	p	n	Mean	sd.	Z	p
Command	Teacher	90	12,88	2,15	**-3,573**	**0,001***	90	4,30	,77	**-4,432**	**0,001***
	Coach	39	11,38	2,10			39	3,36	1,20		
Exercise	Teacher	90	11,86	3,34	-1,31	0,191	90	3,73	1,23	**-2,438**	**0,015***
	Coach	39	11,74	2,09			39	3,23	1,16		
Co-Working	Teacher	90	9,90	2,87	-1,852	0,064	90	2,81	1,08	-0,505	0,613
	Coach	39	10,82	1,41			39	2,92	,84		
Self-Control	Teacher	90	9,08	3,75	-1,054	0,292	90	2,62	1,25	-1,761	0,078
	Coach	39	10,05	1,85			39	3,05	,86		
Participation	Teacher	90	10,19	3,58	-0,919	0,358	90	3,07	1,33	-0,789	0,43
	Coach	39	11,00	1,97			39	3,31	,95		
Directed Invention	Teacher	90	9,46	3,46	-1,354	0,176	90	2,67	1,27	**-1,984**	**0,047***
	Coach	39	10,23	2,84			39	3,15	1,23		
Problem Solving: One Straight	Teacher	90	9,24	3,38	**-2,302**	**0,021***	90	2,66	1,30	-0,628	0,53
	Coach	39	10,59	2,28			39	2,77	,99		
Problem Solving: Generating Different Paths	Teacher	90	9,13	3,16	**-3,242**	**0,001***	90	2,69	1,21	**-2,26**	**0,024***
	Coach	39	11,10	2,06			39	3,26	1,12		
Student's Design	Teacher	90	9,42	3,67	-0,582	0,561	90	2,67	1,31	-0,462	0,644
	Coach	39	9,74	2,07			39	2,72	1,02		
Student Initiation	Teacher	90	8,29	4,01	**-1,956**	**0,050***	90	2,42	1,45	-0,851	0,395
	Coach	39	9,51	2,87			39	2,56	1,19		
Self-Teaching	Teacher	90	5,50	3,30	**-5,619**	**0,001***	90	1,53	,96	**-3,954**	**0,001***
	Coach	39	9,38	3,15			39	2,46	1,37		

* Use; The lowest value that can be taken is 1 and the highest value is 5.
** Value Perceptions; The lowest value that can be taken is 3 and the highest value is 15.

When the comparison of value perceptions regarding styles according to the group variable in Table 4 is examined, the "Command ($p<0.01$)" style average scores differ from the average score of the teachers (average:12.88;sd:2.15), and the mean score of the coaches (mean:11,38; nd:2,10) is seen to be significantly high. "Problem solving: One Right ($p<0.05$)" style mean score is significantly higher than the mean score of teachers (mean:9.24; sd:3.38), and the mean score of coaches (mean:10.59;sd:2.28). low, "Problem Solving: Different Ways Production ($p<0.01$)" style mean score of teachers (average: 9.13; sd:3.16) is higher than the mean score of coaches (mean:11.10; sd:2.06). In terms of "Student Initiation ($p<0.05$)" style mean score, which is significantly lower, the mean score of teachers (mean: 8.29; sd: 4.01) is higher than the mean score of coaches (mean 9.51; sd :2.87), the average score of the teachers (mean:5.50;sd:3.30) in terms of the "Self-Teaching ($p<0.01$)" style average score, which was significantly lower than the mean score of the coaches (average: 2.87) :9.38; ss:3.15) is seen to be significantly lower.

In addition, when the average scores of the teaching styles they use according to the "Group" variable are compared, the average score of the teachers in terms of the "Command ($p<0.01$)" style average score is compared to the average score of the coaches (average: 4.30; sd: .77). mean: 3.36; sd: 1.20), the mean score of teachers (mean: 3.73; sd: 1.23) in terms of "Exercise ($p<0.05$)" style mean scores, which was significantly higher, compared to coaches. significantly higher than the mean score (mean: 3.23; SD: 1.16), In terms of "Guided Invention ($p<0.05$)" style average scores, the average score of the teachers (mean: 2.67; sd: 1.27) is higher than the mean score of the coaches (mean: 3.15; sd: 1.23). In terms of "Problem Solving: Generating Different

Ways (p<0.05)" style mean score, the mean score of the teachers (mean: 2.69; sd: 1.21) is significantly lower than the mean score of the coaches (mean: 3 ,26; sd: 1.12), the mean score of teachers (mean: 1.53; sd: .96), the mean score of coaches in terms of "Self-Teaching (p<0.01)" style mean scores score (mean: 2.46; sd: 1.37) is seen to be significantly lower.

Table 5. Mann-Whitney Test Results Regarding the Comparison of the Average Scores of Teaching Styles, Value Perceptions and Use of Teaching Styles by Gender

	Value Perceptions Regarding Styles						Use of Instructional Styles				
Gender (value perceptions).	Gender	n	Mean	sd.	Z	p	n	Mean	sd.	Z	p
Command	Male	72	12,43	2,32	-0,104	0,917	72	4,13	,89	-0,995	0,32
	Female	57	12,42	2,15			57	3,88	1,15		
Exercise	Male	72	11,86	3,20	-0,555	0,579	72	3,64	1,26	-0,798	0,425
	Female	57	11,77	2,78			57	3,51	1,20		
Co-Working	Male	72	9,89	2,55	-1,806	0,071	72	2,81	,99	-0,544	0,586
	Female	57	10,54	2,52			57	2,89	1,05		
Self-Control	Male	72	9,17	3,34	-0,726	0,468	72	2,67	1,10	-0,839	0,402
	Female	57	9,63	3,29			57	2,86	1,23		
Participation	Male	72	10,28	3,32	-0,668	0,504	72	3,06	1,23	-0,903	0,367
	Female	57	10,63	3,05			57	3,25	1,23		
Directed Invention	Male	72	9,35	3,26	-1,269	0,204	72	2,65	1,29	-1,613	0,107
	Female	57	10,12	3,32			57	3,02	1,23		
Problem Solving: One Straight	Male	72	9,65	3,17	-0,266	0,79	72	2,71	1,20	-0,31	0,757
	Female	57	9,65	3,13			57	2,67	1,23		
Problem Solving: Generating Different Paths	Male	72	9,60	2,87	-0,538	0,591	72	2,79	1,17	-0,659	0,51
	Female	57	9,89	3,19			57	2,95	1,25		
Student's Design	Male	72	9,75	3,28	-1,073	0,283	72	2,78	1,15	-1,188	0,235
	Female	57	9,23	3,25			57	2,56	1,31		
Student Initiation	Male	72	8,61	3,74	-0,091	0,928	72	2,53	1,40	-0,534	0,593
	Female	57	8,72	3,76			57	2,39	1,33		
Self-Teaching	Male	**72**	**6,04**	**3,42**	**-2,159**	**0,031***	**72**	**1,63**	**1,00**	**-1,956**	**0,05***
	Female	**57**	**7,47**	**3,92**			**57**	**2,05**	**1,34**		

As can be seen in Table 5, the average score of the "Self-Teaching (p<0.05)" style of teaching style value perceptions according to the variable of "Gender" for men (mean: 6.04; sd: 3.42) was compared to women. It is seen that it is significantly lower than the mean score (mean: 7.47; sd: 3.92) of In addition, according to the "Gender" variable, the use of teaching styles in terms of the "Self-Teaching (p<0.05)" style mean score for men (mean: 1.63; sd: 1.00), compared to the mean score for women (mean: 2.05; ss: 1.34) is seen to be significantly lower.

Table 6. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results on the Comparison of Value Perceptions of Styles According to the Variable of "Age Group" and the Average Scores of the Teaching Styles They Use

	Value Perceptions Regarding Styles							Use of Instructional Styles					
	Age group	n	Mean	Sd.	Chi Square	p	Difference	n	Mean	sd.	Chi Square	P	Difference
Commond	20-25	5	12,20	1,10	2,908	0,573	-	5	4,20	,45	2,579	0,631	-
	26-30	15	12,60	2,50				15	4,00	1,13			
	31-35	31	12,10	1,92				31	3,81	1,11			
	36-40	25	13,00	1,87				25	4,28	,79			
	41 ve üzeri	53	12,32	2,56				53	4,00	1,06			
Exercise	20-25	5	9,60	3,29	4,039	0,401	-	5	2,60	,89	5,091	0,278	-
	26-30	15	12,00	2,56				15	3,40	1,30			
	31-35	31	11,71	2,81				31	3,52	1,34			
	36-40	25	11,32	3,97				25	3,56	1,36			
	41-	53	12,28	2,66				53	3,77	1,09			
Co-Working	20-25	5	10,20	4,09	2,516	0,642	-	5	3,00	1,22	0,664	0,956	-
	26-30	15	10,53	2,20				15	2,80	1,08			
	31-35	31	10,10	2,29				31	2,84	,82			
	36-40	25	9,64	2,43				25	2,92	1,04			
	41 -	53	10,38	2,73				53	2,81	1,09			
Self-Control	20-25	5	6,20	3,27	5,48	0,241	-	5	2,00	1,00	3,072	0,546	-
	26-30	15	10,00	2,80				15	3,00	1,25			
	31-35	31	9,16	3,11				31	2,71	1,04			
	36-40	25	9,12	3,32				25	2,72	1,31			
	41 -	53	9,74	3,48				53	2,79	1,15			
Participation	20-25	5	8,80	3,27	7,406	0,116	-	5	2,80	1,30	6,933	0,139	-
	26-30	15	11,53	2,70				15	3,73	1,16			
	31-35	31	9,32	3,53				31	2,77	1,20			
	36-40	25	10,48	2,71				25	3,20	1,29			
	41 -	53	10,91	3,19				53	3,19	1,19			
Directed Invention	20-25	5	8,60	4,62	6,183	0,186	-	5	2,80	1,64	2,979	0,561	-
	26-30	15	11,07	3,17				15	3,00	1,46			
	31-35	31	9,55	3,03				31	2,87	1,15			
	36-40	25	8,80	3,48				25	2,44	1,26			
	41 -	53	9,91	3,22				53	2,91	1,27			
Problem Solving: One Straight	20-25	5	9,60	2,51	2,026	0,731	-	5	2,40	1,52	2,183	0,702	-
	26-30	15	10,27	3,97				15	2,87	1,51			
	31-35	31	9,84	3,24				31	2,52	1,00			
	36-40	25	8,88	3,55				25	2,56	1,33			
	41 -	53	9,74	2,69				53	2,83	1,17			
Problem Solving: Generating Different Paths	20-25	5	8,80	4,02	4,193	0,381	-	5	2,60	1,52	5,416	0,247	-
	26-30	15	10,40	3,14				15	3,27	1,22			
	31-35	31	9,84	2,96				31	3,03	1,08			
	36-40	25	8,64	3,51				25	2,48	1,36			
	41 -	53	10,08	2,59				53	2,85	1,15			
Student's Design	20-25	5	7,40	3,21	**11,044**	**0,026***	**2-1 2-3**	5	2,00	1,22	**14,43**	**0,006***	**2-1 2-3 2-4**
	26-30	15	11,20	3,41				15	3,47	1,13			
	31-35	31	8,35	3,27				31	2,23	1,06			
	36-40	25	9,08	3,15				25	2,44	1,08			
	41 -	53	10,13	3,01				53	2,91	1,27			
Student Initiation	20-25	5	8,20	4,09	4,42	0,352	-	5	2,20	1,64	5,509	0,239	-
	26-30	15	10,13	4,56				15	3,20	1,74			
	31-35	31	8,06	3,22				31	2,10	1,11			
	36-40	25	7,84	4,00				25	2,36	1,38			
	41 -	53	9,02	3,58				53	2,55	1,32			
Self-Teaching	20-25	5	6,00	3,32	3,919	0,417	-	5	1,60	,89	4,363	0,359	-
	26-30	15	6,47	4,31				15	1,60	1,24			
	31-35	31	6,48	3,45				31	1,71	1,04			
	36-40	25	5,96	4,19				25	1,68	1,25			
	41 -	53	7,25	3,51				53	2,02	1,23			

As seen in Table 6, the average value of the participants in the 26-30 age group (mean: 11.20; sd: 3.41) in terms of the average scores of the "Student's Design ($p<0.05$)" style according to the "Age Group" variable).

It is seen that the average values of the participants in the 20-25 (mean:7.40; SD: 3.21) and 31-35 (mean:8.35; SD: 3.27) age groups are significantly higher than the average values.

Table 7. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results on the Comparison of Value Perceptions of Styles and Average Scores of Teaching Styles According to the Variable of "Educational Status"

		Value Perceptions Regarding Styles					Use of Instructional Styles				
	Educational Status	n	Mean	sd.	Z	p	n	Mean	sd.	Z	P
Commond	Degree	121	12,44	2,20	-0,125	0,901	121	4,03	,98	-0,256	0,798
	Graduate	8	12,25	2,92			8	3,75	1,49		
Exercise	Degree	121	11,81	2,95	-0,576	0,564	121	3,56	1,22	-0,877	0,38
	Graduate	8	12,00	4,11			8	3,88	1,46		
Co-Working	Degree	121	10,17	2,57	-0,243	0,808	121	2,85	1,03	-0,358	0,72
	Graduate	8	10,38	2,39			8	2,75	,71		
Self-Control	Degree	121	9,30	3,36	-0,656	0,512	121	2,75	1,18	-0,015	0,988
	Graduate	8	10,50	2,27			8	2,75	,89		
Participation	Degree	121	10,49	3,16	-0,681	0,496	121	3,18	1,24	-1,744	0,081
	Graduate	8	9,63	3,78			8	2,50	,76		
Directed Invention	Degree	121	9,79	3,32	-1,363	0,173	121	2,83	1,29	-0,651	0,515
	Graduate	8	8,13	2,53			8	2,50	,93		
Problem Solving: One Straight	Degree	121	9,65	3,16	-0,212	0,832	121	2,68	1,23	-0,583	0,561
	Graduate	8	9,63	2,92			8	2,88	,99		
Problem Solving: Generating	Degree	121	9,69	3,01	-0,534	0,593	121	2,85	1,22	-0,382	0,702
	Graduate	8	10,25	3,20			8	3,00	1,07		
Student's Design	Degree	121	9,43	3,31	-1,211	0,226	121	2,65	1,24	-1,266	0,206
	Graduate	8	10,88	2,30			8	3,13	,83		
Student Initiation	Degree	121	8,70	3,71	-0,428	0,669	121	2,48	1,39	-0,348	0,728
	Graduate	8	8,00	4,34			8	2,25	1,16		
Self-Teaching	Degree	121	6,69	3,71	-0,222	0,824	121	1,80	1,17	-0,137	0,891
	Graduate	8	6,50	3,85			8	2,00	1,41		

When looking at the comparison of the value perceptions of the styles and the average scores of the teaching styles they use according to the variable of "Educational Status" in Table 7, Command", "Exercise", "Paired Work", "Self-Control", "Participation", "Guided Invention", " Problem Solving: One Right", It is seen that there is no statistically significant difference ($p>0.05$) in terms of the mean scores of value perceptions related to "Problem Solving: Generation of Different Ways", "Student Design", "Student Initiation", "Self-Teaching" styles.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study revealed the teaching styles used by coaches and physical education teachers in Edirne in 2019 and their value perceptions regarding these styles. According to the findings, the most valued styles were command and exercise, and the least valued styles were self-teaching and student initiation. It is seen that the most used styles are command and exercise, and the least used styles are self-teaching and student initiation. In the dimensions of providing students "Entertainment", "Learning" and "Motivation"; In terms of motivation, command, exercise and co-working, command, practice and participation in terms of learning, command, exercise and participation styles in terms of entertainment are seen the most valued. As a result, the choice of command and exercise styles as the most used and valued styles, and the desire of teachers and coaches to increase control over students can be seen as the main reason for these styles. For this reason, it is

important that teachers and coach candidates who continue their education in the physical education teaching and coaching program are given the opportunity to find application in different courses they take during their education period, and that other teaching styles are explored and experienced strategically. When the literature is examined, it is seen that they prefer to use presentational styles more in their teaching style preferences (Cothran et al., 2005; Hein et al., 2012), whereas in the study conducted in Finland, teachers' "Command", "Exercise", "Problem Solving: different roads production" styles (Kullina and Cothran, 2003; Jaakkola, 2011). In our study, it is seen that the most used styles and their value perceptions are similar. In the study conducted on Turkish and American teachers, it is stated that teachers in Turkey prefer experts, authoritarians and guides at a high level, personal models and representatives at a moderate level, while teachers in the USA prefer them low in authority and high in other dimensions (Güncel, 2013). In general, student-centered teaching styles are preferred more than teacher-centered teaching styles, the most preferred teaching style is guidance teaching style, and the least preferred teaching style is personal teaching style (Süral, 2013). In another study, it is stated that guiding, expert and representative teaching styles are preferred at a high level (86.2%), while personal and authoritative teaching styles are preferred at a moderate level (Altay, 2009). In the study of Bilgin and Bahar (2008), expert, guiding and representative stated that they were high, personal model and authoritarian teaching styles were moderate. Many international studies have been conducted on the teaching styles put forward by Mosston and Ashworth (2008), and these studies have compared the styles with each other. The findings of these studies, for example; Problem Solving: Different Ways Generating Style revealed that it had a positive effect on students' producing different solutions to the problem (Papaioannou, Theodosiou, Pashali, & Digelidis, 2012; Kolovelonis, Goudas and Gerodimos, 2011). Studies conducted in our country in the field of physical education have also revealed that teachers prefer teacher-centered styles (Demirhan et al., 2008; Yoncalık, 2009). In addition, in Mendoza's (2004) study, it was stated that the majority of teachers preferred teacher-centered teaching styles. It differs with the work done. Because the most used styles in the study are command and exercise, and the least used styles are self-teaching and student initiation. It is also seen that the least valued styles are student initiation and self-teaching (Table 2). In the study in which "teaching styles used by pre-service teachers studying in physical education teaching and certificate programs" were examined, there was no difference in terms of styles used and value perception according to the gender variable (Yıldızer et al. 2017), it is seen that they are not similar to our study. Because, when the values given to the teaching styles in our study were analyzed according to the gender variable, it was seen that the average score of the self-teaching style was significantly lower than the mean score of the women in terms of the mean score of the self-teaching style, and the mean score of the men was higher than the mean score of the women in terms of the mean scores of the use of teaching styles. appears to be significantly low. Continuing to examine according to the gender variable, Saraç and Mustu (2013) stated in their study that female participation style, student design and self-teaching styles were preferred more by male candidates. In addition, in the value perceptions of male and female physical education teacher candidates towards teaching styles, there is a difference in the male candidates' more positive value perception in participation, Student Design and Self-Teaching styles compared to female candidates. At this point, it appears to be similar to our study (Table 5).

In the study on the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and job satisfaction; While it was stated that all teaching styles were mostly preferred at a high level, only the authoritative teaching style was preferred among female and male teachers in favor of female teachers (Dinçer et al., 2017), while the perception of value and the styles used in the study were dominated by command and exercise styles (Dinçer et al., 2017). Table 2). In studies examining the relationships between teaching style variables and different demographic variables, it was observed that there was no significant difference between age and teaching style preference (Maden, 2012; McCaskey, 2009; Üredi, 2006; Watkins, 2006), while the mean score for men and the mean score for women in the study. It is seen that the score is significantly lower than the score (Table 5). In addition, it is seen that the most preferred teaching style in the game and physical activities lesson is the command and practice style (Dedeşah, 2020) and it is similar to the study.

As a result, the choice of command and exercise styles as the most used and valued styles, and the

desire of teachers and coaches to increase control over students can be seen as the main reason for these styles. For this reason, it is important that teachers and coach candidates who continue their education in the physical education teaching and coaching program are given the opportunity to find application in different courses they take during their education period, and that other teaching styles are explored and experienced strategically.

CONCLUSION

In this study, it is seen that the most used styles by coaches and physical education teachers and the values, command and exercise styles related to these styles. In ordering the average value perceptions of the styles in the dimensions of providing students with "Entertainment", "Learning" and "Motivation" from high to low, the most common styles are command, practice and co-work in terms of motivation, command, practice and participation in terms of learning, command, exercise and participation styles in terms of entertainment. appears to be valued. The fact that command and exercise styles increase the teacher's and coach's dominance over the student may be the main reason for these styles. In addition, the fact that teacher and coach candidates who continue their education in physical education teaching and coaching program have the opportunity to practice in different lessons they take during their education can be shown as the main reason that leads them to these styles such as "Problem solving: production of different ways". In addition, Grasha (1996) revealed in his studies that there is a relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles. For this reason, it would be beneficial to examine the relationship between physical education teachers and coaches' teaching styles and their learning styles as a new research topic and to share the findings as a literature. The teaching methods used by trainers are very important in the development of athletes in competitive sports environments. For this reason, it is necessary to examine the teaching methods used by coaches in different sports environments. Therefore, it will be useful in determining the professional needs of coaches.

This study should enable the development of a questionnaire that allows the use of teaching styles and value perceptions of trainers and physical education teachers in Turkey to be evaluated reliably and validly, and to compare them with the relevant characteristics of trainers and teachers in other countries. In addition, the education program of trainers and physical education teachers should support this in order to bring the multi-faceted development of individuals to the forefront in the curriculum, so that the student's learning by doing, experiencing and practicing can be highlighted in the restructured programs. It is recommended that the application dimension of learner-centered methods be transferred through in-service trainings before trainers and teachers start their profession. The reasons for the experienced teachers in the literature and the teacher candidates in this study to prefer teacher-centered styles should be examined in depth. In the training program, attention should be drawn to the use of styles in the method of invention of trainers. It should be noted that since the trainers are given training on developing the special skills of the students specific to the sports branch, they should be used to increase the performance in technical and tactical studies. As a result, it is thought that the results of this research will contribute to the making of new researches, and that the qualitative and quantitative studies to be conducted on this subject will contribute to the literature with comparisons.

REFERENCES

1. Altay, S. (2009). "Examination of Teaching Styles of Fifth Grade Teachers in Social Studies Lesson". Unpublished Master's Thesis, Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences, Adana.
2. Ausubel, D. P. & Robinson, F. G. (1969). School learning: An İntroduction To Educational Psychology. NewYork: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
3. Aydın, A. (2001). The Psychology of Handling and Learning (3rd Edition). Istanbul, Alfa Press Publishing House. Distribution Ltd. Sti.
4. Azar, A, Chepni, S. (1999). The change of teaching activities used by physics teachers according to professional experience. Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal, 16 (16),. Retrieved from http://dergipark.gov.tr/hunefd/issue/7821/102791
5. Bilen, M. (1999). Instruction from Plan to Practice, Ankara: TAKAV Printing.
6. Bilen, M. Teaching from Plan to Practice. Ankara: Takav Printing, 1993: 23 94.
7. Bilgin, İ. & Bahar, M. (2008). Examining the Relationship Between Teaching and Learning Styles of Classroom Teachers. Journal of Gazi Education Faculty, 28(1), 19-38.
8. Butler, K A. Learning and Teaching Style In Theory and Practice. Columbia: The Learner's Dimension. 1987: 15
9. Cassidy, T., Jones, R.L. and Potrac, P. (2009). Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice, 2nd edn., Routledge, London, 2009.
10. Cengiz, C., Serbes, Ş. (2014). Preferred Teaching Styles and Value Perceptions of Physical Education Teacher Candidates in Turkey. Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences, 5(2).
11. Cothran, D. J., Kulinna, P. H., Banville, D., Choi, E., Amade-Escot, C., MacPhail, A., Macdonald, D.,

12. Richard, J. F., Sarmento, J. F., & Kirk, D. (2005). A Cross-Cultural İnvestigation Of The Use Of Teaching Styles. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 76(2), 193-201.
13. Cothran, D., Kulinna, P. H., & Ward, E. (2000). Students' Experiences With And Perceptions Of Teaching Styles. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 34(1), 93-103.
14. Dedeşah, U.E. (2020). Determination and Perceptual Analysis of Teaching Styles Used in Game and Physical Activities Lesson. Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching, Department of Physical Education and Sports Bartın University
15. Demirhan, G. (2006). Fundamentals of Sports Education. Ankara: Bağırgan Yayımevi, s:32
16. Demirhan, G. Fundamentals of Sports Education. Ankara: Bağırgan Yayınevi, 2006: 32
17. Demirhan, G., Bulca, Y., Altay, F., Şahin, R., Güvenç, A., Aslan, A., Açıkada, C. (2008). Comparison Of The Views Of Partners Regarding The Physical Education Curriculum And İt's Delivery. Hacettepe Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 19(3), 157-180.
18. Dinçer, B., Saracaloğlu, A. S., Karademir, Ç. A., & Dedebali, N. C. (2017). Determination of Teachers' Teaching Styles, Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction. Education Sciences, 12(1), 58-85. ID:2017.12.1.1C0669
19. Dunn, R. Beududy, J.S. Clavas, A. Survey of Research on Learning Styles &Education Leadership 1989: 52
20. Erden, M. ve Akman, Y. (1997). Educational Psychology: Development-Learning-Teaching (4. Press). Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınevi.
21. Ertan, H., & Çiçek, Ş. (2003). Student Achievement Evaluation Approaches İn Elementary Physical Education Courses İn Turkey, Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 25, 76-83.
22. Felder, R. M. (2002). How Student Learn: Adapting Teaching Styles to Learning Styles. IEEE-ASEE
23. Frontiers in Education Conference Proceedings, 89-493. Raleigh, North Carolina.(1988)
24. Fidan, M. (1998). learning and teaching at school, Ankara: Yelkentepe Yayınları.
25. Gencel E. I. (2013). Teachers' Preferences for Teaching Styles: Turkey-USA Comparison [Teachers' Teaching Styles Preferences: Turkey-USA Comparison]. Turkish Studies - International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic ,Volume 8(8), 635-648.
26. Grasha, A. F. (2002). Teaching With Style. San Bernadino: Alliance Publishers.
27. Grasha, A. F. (1996). Teaching with style: a practical guide to enhancing learning by Understanding teaching and learning styles. San Bernardino, CA: Alliance Publishers.
28. Güven, M. (2008). The relationship between learning styles and learning strategies. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Eskişehir: Anadolu University Institute of Educational Sciences.
29. Hein, V., Ries, F., Pires, F., Caune, A., Emeljanovas, A., Ekler, J. H., & Valantiniene, I. (2012). The Relationship Between Teaching Styles And Motivation To Teach Among Physical Education Teachers. Journal of Sports Science and Medicine, 11(1), 123-130.
30. İnce, M.L., Hünük, D. (2010). Experienced Physical Education Teachers' Perceptions of Teaching Styles and Styles Used in the Education Reform Process, Education and Science, Cilt 35, Sayı 157, 128-139.
31. İnce, M. L., Ok, A. (2005). Moving prospective physical education teachers to learner centered
32. teaching: can it be stimulated in a traditional context?, Journal of International Council for
33. Health, Physical Education, Sport and Dance, (XLI), 1, 6-12.
34. Jaakkola, T., Watt, A. (2011). Finnish physical education teachers' self-reported use and perceptions of Mosston and Ashworth's teaching styles. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 30(3), 248- 262.
35. Kaya, İ , Erdik, C . (2014). Types of Leadership that Teachers Have According to the Teaching Strategies They Use. Journal of Gazi University Gazi Education Faculty, 34 (2), 185-209. DOI: 10.17152/gefd.42427
36. Kulinna, P. H., Cothran, D. J. (2003). Physical Education Teachers' Self-Reported Use And Perceptions Of Various Teaching Styles. Learning and Instruction, 13, 597-609.
37. Kılıç, K., İnce, M.L. (2019) 'Development of the Scale of Teaching Methods Used by Trainers - Athlete Perception Version (AKÖY - ATHLETE). International Journal of Sport, Exercise & Training Science Cilt 5, Sayı 3, 119–128, e-ISSN 2149-8229.
38. Kolovelonis, A., Goudas, M., Gerodimos, V. (2011). The effects of the reciprocal and the self Check styles on pupils' performance in primary physical education. European Physical Education Review. 17, 35-50.
39. Lyle, J. (2002). Sports Coaching Concepts: A framework for coaches' behaviour. New York: Routledge.
40. Maden, S., (2012). Teaching Styles of Turkish Teachers. International Journal of Turkish Literature, Culture and Education, 1(1), 178-200.
41. McCaskey, S.J., (2009). Teaching Styles and Learning Strategies of Illinois Secondary Career and Technical Education Teachers. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Southern Illinois University Carbondale. UMI. 3372543.
42. Mendoza, S., (2004). Teaching Styles of Technological Institutes Faculty in El Salvador. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Capella University. UMI. 3127201.
43. Metzler, M. W. (2000). Instructional models for physical education. Boston DC: Allyn & Bacon. Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. Teaching physical education (3th ed.). 2002, Columbus: Merrill Pub. Co.
44. Mosston, M., & Ashworth, S. Teaching Physical Education (First Online Edition),2008.
45. Orhan, R., & Sinan, A. (2018). Sports Pedagogy in Terms of Psycho-Motor and Developmental Theories. Kırıkkale University Journal of Social Sciences, 8(2), 523-540.
46. Onur, B. (1995). Developmental psychology. Imge Bookstore, Ankara, 152.
47. Özakpınar, Y. Attention problem in teaching. 1987, Konya: Selcuk University Press
48. Papaioannou, A., Theodosiou, A., Pashali, M., Digelidis, N. (2012). Advancing task involvement, intrinsic motivation and metacognitive regulation in physical education classes: the self-check style of teaching makes a difference. Advances in Physical Education. 2(3), 110-118.
49. Salvara, M. I., & Bironé, E. N. (2002). Teachers' Use of Teaching Styles: A Comparative Study between Greece and Hungary. International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences, 14(2).
50. Saraç, L., Muştu, E. (2013). Investigation of Teacher Candidates' Levels of Use of Physical Education Teaching Styles and Value Perceptions of Styles. Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences, Vol.4, No.2, Pg:112-124
51. Süral, S. (2013). The Relationship Between Teaching Styles of Primary School Teachers, Classroom Management Approaches and Attitudes Towards Teaching Profession. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Adnan Menderes University, Aydın.
52. Şahin, İ. (2011). Development of Survey Of Technologıcal Pedagogıcal And Content Knowledge (TPACK). Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 10(1), 97–105.

53. Temizöz, Y, Özgün-Koca, S. (2009). Opinions of Mathematics Teachers on the Application of Teaching Approach in Teaching Mathematics. Elementary Online, 8 (1), 88-102.Retrieved fromhttp://dergipark.gov.tr/ilkonline/issue/8599/107053
54. Üredi, L., (2006). Primary Education I. and II. An Investigation of Level Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Teaching Profession According to Teaching Style Preferences. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences.
55. Watkins, J.B., (2006). The Educational Beliefs and Attitudes of Title I Teachers in Tulsa Public Schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.
56. www.spectrumofteachingstyles.org/
57. Yıldızer, G., Yılmaz, İ., Yalız Solmaz, D., Şimşek, D. (2017). Teaching Styles Used by Pre-service Teachers Studying in Physical Education Teaching and Certificate Programs, Hacettepe University Journal of the Faculty of Education. (H. U. Journal of Education) 33(1): 90-106 [2018] doi:10.16986/HUJE.2017027901
58. Yoncalık, O. (2009). The effects of three teaching styles on elementary sixth grade students' achievement in physical education lesson. Selcuk University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 11(3), 33-46.