

# Examining the Relationship Between Narcissistic Personality Traits and Self-Efficacy Levels of Volleyball Coaches

Onur AKYÜZ<sup>1A</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dicle University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Diyarbakır, TÜRKİYE  
Address Correspondence to Onur AKYÜZ: e-mail: onurakyuz1986@gmail.com

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

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

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

(Date Of Received): 04.04.2024 (Date of Acceptance): 03.08.2024 (Date of Publication): 31.12.2024

A: Orcid ID: 0000-0002-7631-460X

## Abstract

This research aims to examine the narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches in terms of different variables and to determine the relationship between these two variables. The sample group of this research consisted of a total of 277 volleyball coaches, 71 female and 206 male. Survey model was used in the research. Narcissistic Personality Inventory and Coach Competence Scale-II, along with the Personal Information Form, were used as data collection tools. According to the findings of the research, it was determined that the narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches were above the medium level. It has been observed that the narcissistic personality traits of volleyball coaches do not differ according to gender, educational status, coaching year and coaching category variables. It was observed that the self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches did not differ according to gender, educational status, coaching year, and coaching category variables. As a result, it was determined that there was a weak and positive relationship between narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches.

**Keywords:** Volleyball Coach, Narcissism, Self-Efficacy

**Voleybol Antrenörlerinin Narsistik Kişilik Özellikleri ile Öz-Yeterlik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi**

## Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı voleybol antrenörlerinin narsistik kişilik özelliklerini ve öz-yeterlik düzeylerini farklı değişkenler açısından incelemek ve bu iki değişken arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemektir. Araştırmanın örneklem grubunu 71'i kadın, 206'sı erkek olmak üzere toplam 277 voleybol antrenörü oluşturmuştur. Araştırmada tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Veri toplama aracı olarak Narsistik Kişilik Envanteri ve Koç Yetkinlik Ölçeği-II ile Kişisel Bilgi Formu kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın bulgularına göre voleybol antrenörlerinin narsistik kişilik özelliklerinin ve öz yeterlik düzeylerinin orta düzeyin üzerinde olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Voleybol antrenörlerinin narsistik kişilik özelliklerinin cinsiyet, eğitim durumu, antrenörlük yılı ve antrenörlük kategorisi değişkenlerine göre farklılık göstermediği görülmüştür. Voleybol antrenörlerinin öz yeterlik düzeylerinin cinsiyet, eğitim durumu, antrenörlük yılı ve antrenörlük kategorisi değişkenlerine göre farklılık göstermediği görülmüştür. Sonuç olarak voleybol

antrenörlerinin narsistik kişilik özellikleri ile öz yeterlik düzeyleri arasında zayıf ve pozitif bir ilişkinin olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Voleybol Antrenörü, Narsisizm, Öz-yeterlik

## INTRODUCTION

Within the framework of sports, investigating the group or individual behavior of sports workers is a valuable and enlightening study. However, there are very few studies investigating the relationship between narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches. In volleyball, the coach is one of the most important factors that uses his knowledge and experience for the profile of a high-performance athlete and uses this knowledge and experience for sports skills and purposes (20). Almost all coaches have characteristic features such as emotional intelligence, establishing and directing relationships, competence, personality, confidence and courage, which attract the attention of the athletes and regulate their perspective on life (7).

Narcissism, which has been discussed by many researchers, has been intensively discussed in two main structures: normal and pathological (22, 27, 35, 36). In light of all these discussions, there are findings that narcissism benefits the psychological health of the individual and may also have positive emotional consequences (16). Wallace and Baumeister (42) observed in their study that narcissists showed higher performance than other individuals in difficult and stressful tasks. The desire to overcome difficulties and the desire to improve oneself in order to be more successful than other individuals are important characteristics of narcissistic people (33). Narcissistic personality, which uses all kinds of tools to gain self-worth and increase this self-worth, also affects individuals in terms of motivation and gaining power (3). Kohut (26) saw narcissism as a factor in a healthy development process and stated that development could be healthier as a result of correcting the problems experienced in this process. It is stated that having a positive self-perception and gaining the ability to empathize and solve problems produces positive emotional results, which is beneficial for psychological health (2, 12). In light of this information, narcissism can be seen as a valuable and necessary need, unless it reaches dangerous levels. From another perspective, features such as social communication, motivation, competence, being a champion, courage, taking risks, proving oneself and self-confidence are valuable in the sports environment. Therefore, coaches with narcissistic personality traits may be effective in evaluating many opportunities and taking advantage of them in order to nourish these traits (8).

Self-efficacy theory; It argues that functional, emotional, motivational and cognitive processes are governed and controlled by individual beliefs (5). Findings obtained as a result of studies conducted in the literature show that a high level of self-efficacy is positively related to high motivation, high goal setting, positive self-esteem, mood and thoughts (38). If you look at it in the light of this information, the value of the coaches' self-efficacy levels will be more clearly understood.

External experiences and the individual's own perception of the outcome of many situations affect self-efficacy. Self-efficacy also significantly affects an individual's success and motivation. Studies argue that self-confidence is task-specific and contextual (6, 24). Individuals with strong self-efficacy believe in their ability to control the outcomes of events in their lives. This belief develops different perspectives in individuals with high self-efficacy levels compared to individuals with low self-efficacy levels. The reason for this is that this emotion has a direct effect on behavior. Therefore, self-efficacy can be a crucial factor in failure and success throughout an individual's life (28). Self-efficacy theory states that the individual's belief in his own abilities to achieve the goals he wants directs him to beneficial behaviors and motivates him to work extra hard (35). When the literature is examined, it is observed that as a result of the studies conducted on coaches, the performance of the teams of coaches with high self-efficacy increases and the team becomes more effective (4, 8, 11, 14, 15, 21, 25, 31, 32, 41).

Volleyball is one of the most followed and loved sports branches in our country, both due to the international successes and the increasing interest in sports day by day. Volleyball, played professionally on

the beach and in the hall, is an entertaining sport that can be played in almost every social environment by the public. In order for the volleyball sport, which has such a high level of interest, to become more successful and to move to a higher level in terms of quality, the education standards of the individuals working in this field need to be raised and more supported. The most prioritized among these individuals should be the coaches who assume the leadership role in the teams (11).

For this reason, examining the relationship between narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches reveals that they will need to acquire a more democratic leadership style and reach a higher level of self-efficacy, and therefore more need for personal and professional training. From another perspective, these studies reveal new information to develop the training programs and models needed by volleyball coaches. The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches.

## METHOD

### Model of the Research

This research was designed as a relational survey model, one of the quantitative research designs. With this research, narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches were determined and it was revealed whether narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels differ according to some demographic characteristics.

### Research Group

The population of the research consisted of volleyball coaches who were actively working within TVF (Turkish Volleyball Federation) in the 2022 - 2023 Volleyball season. The sample group consisted of a total of 277 volleyball coaches, 71 female and 206 male, who were within the research population and could be reached by the researcher. Subjects were selected by random sampling method.

**Table 1.** Findings on Demographic Variables of the Research Group

Variables	Groups	n	%
Educational Status	High school	35	12.6
	University	210	75.8
	Postgraduate	32	11.6
	Total	277	100
Gender	Woman	71	25.6
	Male	206	74.4
	Total	277	100
Coaching Year	1-5 Years	66	23.9
	6-10 Years	89	32.1
	11 years and above	122	44.0
	Total	277	100
Coaching Category	little ones	51	18.4
	Star Team	76	27.4
	Junior Team	56	20.2
	2nd League	51	18.4
	1st League	27	9.7
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	5.8
	Total	277	100

When Table 1 is examined, the frequency and percentage distributions according to the descriptive statistics data of volleyball coaches are seen. According to the educational status variable, 12.6% (n=35) of the volleyball coaches participating in our research are high school graduates, 75.8% (n=210) are university graduates, and 11.6% (n=32) are postgraduates. According to gender, 25.6% (n=71) of the volleyball coaches included in our research are female and 74.4% (n=206) are male. According to the coaching year variable, 23.9% (n=66) of volleyball coaches have been working for 1-5 years, 32.1% (n=89) have been working for 6-10 years, and 44.0% (n=122) have been working for 11 years. He has been coaching for years and more. According to

the coaching category variable, 18.4% (n=51) of the volleyball coaches participating in the research are juniors, 27.4% (n=76) are stars, 20.2% (n=56) are youth team, 18% are junior volleyball coaches. 4 of them (n=51) stated that they were coaching in the 2nd League, 9.7% (n=27) in the 1st League and 5.8% (n=16) in the Efeler and Sultanlar League.

### **Data Collection Tools**

**Personal Information Form:** In this form, the volleyball coaches participating in the research; It will include items regarding gender, coaching age, educational status and classification.

It was redeveloped as 16 questions by Ames, Rose and Anderson at Colombia University (1). Saim Atay (2) made the Turkish adaptation of the inventory in 2009 and found the Cronbach Alpha value of the inventory to be .627. The internal consistency coefficient of NKE-16, which was later adapted by Güngör and Selçuk (19) by making changes and corrections in some items, was recalculated as .74. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was calculated as .64.

**The Coaching Self – Efficacy Scale-2:** The scale developed by Feltz et al., in 1999 to measure the competence levels of coaches (14), was renewed and adapted by Myers et al., (32). The Coaching Self – Efficacy Scale-II, which was adapted to Turkish by Unutmaz and Gençer (39) by verifying its validity and reliability, includes physical condition (3 items), game strategies (4 items), motivation (4 items), character formation (3 items) and technique teaching (4 items), consists of a total of 18 items and 5 sub-dimensions. Participants answered all items of the scale with a 4-point Likert -type rating. There are no negative (reverse) items in the scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the original form of the scale was calculated as .89. In our study, the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale is .88.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

Ethics committee approval was given for the research by Dicle University on 21.09.2021 with approval number 141169. The scales were prepared electronically and delivered to volleyball coaches via virtual network channels (e-mail, social media) during TVF's coach seminars held at TVF Facilities in Ankara in 2022 - 2023.

SPSS 22.00 package program was used in the analysis of research data. T-Test was used for the difference in means between two variables, ANOVA test was used for the comparison of three or more independent variables. Tukey and Scheffe Post Hoc tests were used to determine which groups the difference originated from. Pearson Correlation test was used to reveal the relationship between narcissistic personality traits of coaches and self-efficacy levels.

## RESULT

**Table 2.** T-Test Results for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NCI) and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Gender Variable of the Research Group

<b>Table 2.</b> T-Test Results for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NCI) and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Gender Variable of the Research Group							
Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	T	df	p
<b>Superiority</b>	Female	71	0.31	0.35	0.09	275	0.37
	Male	206	0.30	0.32			
<b>Exhibitionism</b>	Female	71	0.33	0.36	1.75	275	0.05
	Male	206	0.26	0.30			
<b>Authority</b>	Female	71	0.46	0.40	1.34	275	0.41
	Male	206	0.39	0.37			
<b>Claiming Rights</b>	Female	71	0.11	0.25	0.34	275	0.44
	Male	206	0.09	0.23			
<b>Exploitativeness</b>	Female	71	0.39	0.33	1.25	275	<b>0.01**</b>
	Male	206	0.34	0.28			
<b>Self Sufficiency</b>	Female	71	0.29	0.20	-1.58	275	0.61
	Male	206	0.34	0.24			
<b>Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Total)</b>	Female	71	0.32	0.19	1.10	275	0.11
	Male	206	0.29	0.16			

\*\*  $p < 0,01$  \*  $p < 0,05$

Table 2 shows the T-Test results conducted to determine whether the narcissistic personality inventory and its sub-dimensions differ according to gender. According to the applied t-test, it was determined that the average scores of the volleyball coaches on the "Narcissistic Personality Inventory" did not differ statistically according to the gender variable. As a result of the applied T test, while no significant difference was observed in the "Superiority, Exhibitionism, Authority, Assertiveness and Self-Sufficiency" sub-dimensions of the narcissistic personality inventory, the average scores of female coaches were statistically significantly higher than male coaches in the "Exploitativeness" sub-dimension. It has been determined that.

**Table 3.** T-Test Results for the Coaching Self – Efficacy Scale -II and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Gender Variable of the Research Group

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	T	df	p
<b>Physical Condition</b>	Female	71	3.36	0.54	-0.48	275	0.75
	Male	206	3.39	0.53			
<b>Game Strategies</b>	Female	71	3.27	0.51	-2.31	275	0.42
	Male	206	3.42	0.45			
<b>Motivation</b>	Female	71	3.48	0.42	-0.79	275	0.24
	Male	206	3.52	0.41			
<b>Character Creation</b>	Female	71	3.73	0.38	0.02	275	0.69
	Male	206	3.73	0.37			
<b>Technical Education</b>	Female	71	3.59	0.39	-0.10	275	0.69
	Male	206	3.60	0.39			
<b>Competency Scale (Total)</b>	Female	71	3.48	0.36	-1.05	275	0.47
	Male	206	3.53	0.34			

\*  $p < 0,05$

Table 3 includes the T test results performed to determine whether the Coaching Competence Scale - II and its sub-dimensions differ according to gender. According to the applied t-test, it was determined that the average scores of the volleyball coaches on the "Coaching Competency Scale - II" did not differ statistically according to the gender variable. As a result of the applied T test, it was determined that there was no significant difference in the average scores of volleyball coaches according to gender type in the "Physical Condition, Game Strategies, Motivation, Character Formation and Technical Teaching" sub-dimensions of the Coaching Competency Scale - II.

**Table 4.** ANOVA Results for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NCI) and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Educational Attainment Variable of the Research Group

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Educational Status	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	f	p
Superiority	High school	35	0.35	0.30	0.82	0.44
	University	210	0.30	0.33		
	Postgraduate	32	0.25	0.33		
Exhibitionism	High school	35	0.31	0.31	1.91	0.15
	University	210	0.29	0.32		
	Postgraduate	32	0.18	0.27		
Authority	High school	35	0.41	0.39	0.04	0.97
	University	210	0.41	0.37		
	Postgraduate	32	0.39	0.40		
Claiming Rights	High school	35	0.11	0.27	0.20	0.82
	University	210	0.10	0.23		
	Postgraduate	32	0.08	0.18		
Exploitativeness	High school	35	0.41	0.29	0.78	0.46
	University	210	0.34	0.30		
	Postgraduate	32	0.38	0.31		
Self Sufficiency	High school	35	0.35	0.21	0.71	0.49
	University	210	0.31	0.24		
	Postgraduate	32	0.35	0.19		
Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Total)	High school	35	0.33	0.16	1.10	0.34
	University	210	0.30	0.17		
	Postgraduate	32	0.28	0.16		

\*  $p < 0.05$

One-Way ANOVA results showing significant differences in the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and sub-dimensions of the scale regarding the educational level of the participating volleyball coaches; It was determined that there was no significant difference in the narcissistic personality inventory averages and sub-dimensions of the scale according to the educational level of the participating volleyball coaches ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 5.** ANOVA Results for the Coaching Self – Efficacy Scale -II and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Educational Attainment Variable of the Research Group

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Educational Status	n	$\bar{x}$	ss	f	p
Physical Condition	High school	35	3.34	0.49	0.21	0.81
	University	210	3.38	0.52		
	Postgraduate	32	3.43	0.61		
Game Strategies	High school	35	3.46	0.52	0.78	0.46
	University	210	3.37	0.46		
	Postgraduate	32	3.33	0.48		
Motivation	High school	35	3.56	0.38	0.80	0.45
	University	210	3.52	0.42		
	Postgraduate	32	3.44	0.43		
Character Creation	High school	35	3.74	0.36	0.07	0.94
	University	210	3.72	0.38		
	Postgraduate	32	3.74	0.33		
Technical Education	High school	35	3.59	0.38	0.10	0.90
	University	210	3.59	0.39		
	Postgraduate	32	3.63	0.40		
Competency Scale (Total)	High school	35	3.54	0.35	0.12	0.89
	University	210	3.51	0.34		
	Postgraduate	32	3.50	0.36		

\*  $p < 0.05$ 

One-Way ANOVA results showing significant differences in the Coach Competency Scale - II and the sub-dimensions of the scale regarding the educational level of the participating volleyball coaches in Table 5; It was determined that there was no significant difference in the averages of the Coach Proficiency Scale-II and the sub-dimensions of the scale depending on the educational level of the participating volleyball coaches ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 6.** ANOVA Results for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NCI) and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Coaching Year Variable of the Research Group

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Coaching Year	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	f	p	Scheffe
Superiority	1-5 Years (1)	66	0.29	0.33	0.76	0.52	
	6-10 Years (2)	89	0.34	0.35			
	11 years and above (3)	122	0.28	0.31			
Exhibitionism	1-5 Years (1)	66	0.34	0.33	2.50	0.06	
	6-10 Years (2)	89	0.31	0.35			
	11 years and above (3)	122	0.22	0.28			
Authority	1-5 Years (1)	66	0.42	0.40	0.67	0.57	
	6-10 Years (2)	89	0.43	0.36			
	11 years and above (3)	122	0.39	0.37			
Claiming Rights	1-5 Years (1)	66	0.13	0.28	2.31	0.08	
	6-10 Years (2)	89	0.13	0.26			
	11 years and above (3)	122	0.06	0.17			
Exploitativeness	1-5 Years (1)	66	0.37	0.31	3.10	0.03*	2-3
	6-10 Years (2)	89	0.42	0.29			
	11 years and above (3)	122	0.30	0.29			
Self Sufficiency	1-5 Years (1)	66	0.28	0.24	1.11	0.35	
	6-10 Years (2)	89	0.32	0.22			
	11 years and above (3)	122	0.35	0.24			
Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Total)	1-5 Years (1)	66	0.31	0.17	2.29	0.08	
	6-10 Years (2)	89	0.33	0.18			
	11 years and above (3)	122	0.27	0.15			

\*  $p < 0.05$ 

One-Way ANOVA showing significant differences in the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and sub-dimensions of the scale regarding the years of coaching of the participating volleyball coaches; It is observed that the average scores of the narcissistic personality inventory of the participating volleyball coaches do not differ at a statistically significant level according to the variable of years of coaching. No significant differentiation was determined in the sub-dimensions of the narcissistic personality questionnaire, "Superiority, Exhibitionism, Authority, Assertiveness and Self-Sufficiency". In the "Exploitativeness" sub-dimension of the narcissistic personality inventory, the average scores of those who have been coaching volleyball for 6-10 years are statistically significantly higher than those of volleyball coaches who have been coaching for 11 years or more ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 7.** ANOVA Results for the Coaching Self – Efficacy Scale -II and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Coaching Year Variable of the Research Group

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Coaching Year	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	f	p
Physical Condition	1-5 Years	66	3.41	0.55	0.30	0.74
	6-10 Years	89	3.40	0.50		
	11 years and above	122	3.36	0.54		
Game Strategies	1-5 Years	66	3.30	0.53	1.38	0.26
	6-10 Years	89	3.38	0.47		
	11 years and above	122	3.42	0.44		
Motivation	1-5 Years	66	3.51	0.42	0.14	0.87
	6-10 Years	89	3.53	0.46		
	11 years and above	122	3.50	0.39		
Character Creation	1-5 Years	66	3.73	0.37	0.25	0.78
	6-10 Years	89	3.70	0.38		
	11 years and above	122	3.74	0.37		
Technical Education	1-5 Years	66	3.55	0.44	0.61	0.55
	6-10 Years	89	3.61	0.38		
	11 years and above	122	3.61	0.38		
Competency Scale (Total)	1-5 Years	66	3.49	0.37	0.19	0.83
	6-10 Years	89	3.52	0.35		
	11 years and above	122	3.52	0.33		

\*  $p < 0.05$ 

Scale - II of the participant volleyball coaches' years of coaching and the One-Way test showing the significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the scale. According to ANOVA results; It was determined that there was no significant difference in the coach competency scale-II averages and sub-dimensions of the scale according to the years of coaching of the participating volleyball coaches ( $p > 0.05$ ).

**Table 8.** ANOVA Results for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NCI) and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Coaching Category Variable of the Research Group

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Coaching Category	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	f	p
Superiority	Little ones	51	0.25	0.34	0.47	0.80
	Star Team	76	0.32	0.34		
	Junior Team	56	0.33	0.32		
	2nd League	51	0.28	0.32		
	1st League	27	0.32	0.31		
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	0.27	0.33		
Exhibitionism	Little ones	51	0.35	0.36	1.60	0.16
	Star Team	76	0.25	0.29		
	Junior Team	56	0.27	0.32		
	2nd League	51	0.33	0.34		
	1st League	27	0.20	0.27		
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	0.19	0.27		
Authority	Little ones	51	0.33	0.40	0.98	0.43
	Star Team	76	0.39	0.38		
	Junior Team	56	0.38	0.37		
	2nd League	51	0.48	0.37		
	1st League	27	0.44	0.40		
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	0.47	0.29		
Claiming Rights	Little ones	51	0.12	0.28	0.98	0.43
	Star Team	76	0.08	0.20		
	Junior Team	56	0.14	0.28		
	2nd League	51	0.06	0.19		
	1st League	27	0.11	0.21		
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	0.06	0.17		
Exploitativeness	Little ones	51	0.37	0.30	1.05	0.39
	Star Team	76	0.35	0.30		
	Junior Team	56	0.38	0.31		
	2nd League	51	0.41	0.32		
	1st League	27	0.26	0.25		
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	0.29	0.27		
Self Sufficiency	Little ones	51	0.31	0.25	1.16	0.33
	Star Team	76	0.32	0.23		
	Junior Team	56	0.35	0.24		
	2nd League	51	0.27	0.24		
	1st League	27	0.33	0.16		
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	0.42	0.23		
Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Total)	Little ones	51	0.30	0.17	0.27	0.93
	Star Team	76	0.29	0.16		
	Junior Team	56	0.31	0.18		
	2nd League	51	0.31	0.18		
	1st League	27	0.28	0.14		
	League of Efes and Sultans	16	0.29	0.16		

\*  $p < 0.05$

In Table 8, according to the results of One-Way ANOVA showing significant differences in the sub-dimensions of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and the scale regarding the category levels in which the participating volleyball coaches work; It was determined that there was no significant difference in the narcissistic personality inventory averages and sub-dimensions of the scale according to the educational level of the participating volleyball coaches ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 9.** ANOVA Results for the Self – Efficacy Scale-II and its Sub-Dimensions According to the Coaching Category Variable of the Research Group

Scale and Sub-Dimensions	Coaching Category	n	$\bar{X}$	ss	F	p	tukey
Physical Condition	Little ones (1)	51	3.33	0.56	1.64	0.15	
	Star Team (2)	76	3.33	0.52			
	Junior Team (3)	56	3.41	0.52			
	2nd League (4)	51	3.33	0.54			
	1st League (5)	27	3.48	0.51			
	League of Efes and Sultans (6)	16	3.69	0.45			
Game Strategies	Little ones (1)	51	3.21	0.51	2.80	0.02*	5-1
	Star Team (2)	76	3.39	0.44			
	Junior Team (3)	56	3.42	0.49			
	2nd League (4)	51	3.34	0.42			
	1st League (5)	27	3.57	0.43			
	League of Efes and Sultans (6)	16	3.52	0.51			
Motivation	Little ones (1)	51	3.48	0.41	0.29	0.92	
	Star Team (2)	76	3.51	0.43			
	Junior Team (3)	56	3.55	0.43			
	2nd League (4)	51	3.50	0.41			
	1st League (5)	27	3.56	0.39			
	League of Efes and Sultans (6)	16	3.45	0.42			
Character Creation	Little ones (1)	51	3.76	0.37	0.69	0.63	
	Star Team (2)	76	3.75	0.41			
	Junior Team (3)	56	3.73	0.35			
	2nd League (4)	51	3.65	0.38			
	1st League (5)	27	3.78	0.32			
	League of Efes and Sultans (6)	16	3.67	0.34			
Technical Education	Little ones (1)	51	3.56	0.40	0.84	0.53	
	Star Team (2)	76	3.58	0.40			
	Junior Team (3)	56	3.59	0.38			
	2nd League (4)	51	3.57	0.38			
	1st League (5)	27	3.65	0.41			
	League of Efes and Sultans (6)	16	3.77	0.37			
Competency Scale (Total)	Little ones (1)	51	3.46	0.36	1.05	0.39	
	Star Team (2)	76	3.51	0.36			
	Junior Team (3)	56	3.54	0.35			
	2nd League (4)	51	3.48	0.33			
	1st League (5)	27	3.60	0.32			
	League of Efes and Sultans (6)	16	3.61	0.34			

\*  $p<0.05$

One-Way ANOVA results showing significant differences in the Coach Competency Scale-II and sub-dimensions of the scale belonging to the category levels in which the participating volleyball coaches work; It is observed that the average scores of the coach competency scale-II of the participating volleyball coaches do not differ at a statistically significant level according to the category variable in which they work. No significant differentiation was determined in the "Physical Condition, Motivation, Character Formation, Technical Education" sub-dimensions of the narcissistic personality inventory. In the "Game Strategies" sub-dimension of the Coach Competency Scale -II, the average scores of volleyball coaches in the 1st League category are statistically significantly higher than those of volleyball coaches in the Junior category ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 10.** Results of Simple Correlation Analysis Between Narcissistic Personality Traits and Self-Efficacy Levels of Volleyball Coaches

Competency Scale (Total)	Narcissistic Personality Inventory	
	r	0.20**
	p	0.01

\*\*  $p < 0.01$

Table 10 shows that there is a weak relationship between the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and the Coach Efficacy Scale-II, according to the responses of the volleyball coaches participating in the study to the scales.

## Discussion

This study aimed to examine the relationship between the level of narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy levels of coaches who are thought to have a high impact in volleyball. The study group consists of a total of 277 volleyball coaches, 71 of whom are female and 206 of whom are male, working in different categories (Minis, Stars, Youth, 1st League, 2nd League, Efeler and Sultans League). In this section, interpretations of the findings obtained from the research will be discussed and suggestions will be made regarding the results of the study.

In the study, it was determined that the narcissistic personality traits of volleyball coaches did not differ according to gender ( $p > 0.05$ ). However, it was observed that the average scores of female coaches in the exploitativeness sub-dimension of the narcissistic personality inventory were higher than those of male coaches ( $p < 0.05$ ). At this point, it is possible to say that female coaches develop their social skills in order to achieve their goals and gain appreciation. In their study where Cankurtaran and Berisha (8) examined the relationship between narcissistic personality traits and education levels of coaches, they found that female coaches obtained higher scores than male coaches in the exploitativeness sub-dimension. Rosenthal and Pittinsky (37) stated in their study that the average scores of male coaches in the assertion subscale were higher than those of female coaches. In the study, although the average narcissistic personality inventory scores of female volleyball coaches were high, studies conducted by Atay (2), Kiraz (23), Öngün and Demirağ (34) found that there was no significant difference between the gender variable and narcissistic personality tendency.

In the study, as a result of the statistical test performed in terms of the gender variable of volleyball coaches, it was determined that the coach competence levels did not differ ( $p > 0.05$ ). Coaching inherently involves leadership, and all coaches, male or female, have a normal level of narcissistic personality traits. Contrary to our study, the study conducted by Marback et al. (30) found that the competence levels of male coaches were lower than female coaches. In the study conducted by Cankurtaran and Berisha (8) on the narcissistic personality traits and competence levels of coaches, they observed that the competence averages of the coaches did not differ according to the gender variable, and this also supports our study.

Another finding obtained in the research was that narcissistic personality traits did not differ according to the education levels of volleyball coaches ( $p > 0.05$ ). This situation can be explained by the fact that the data were mostly obtained from individuals with a high level of education. In their study on narcissism in managers, Çoban and İrmiş (10) stated that managers with associate degree education have higher exhibitionism characteristics than managers with graduate and undergraduate education. Again, contrary to our study, Uzun (40) observed in his study that the assertion and superiority sub-dimensions of individuals with a university education level were higher than individuals with other education levels. In support of our

study, Atay (3) and Çakır (9) reported in their research that there was no significant difference between narcissistic personality traits and education level.

According to the findings obtained from the study, no statistically significant difference could be detected between the volleyball coaches' trainer self efficacy levels according to their education levels ( $p>0.05$ ). This is thought to be due to the high level of education of the participating coaches and the fact that all of the coaches received the same training and became experts by the volleyball federation. Contrary to our study, Maleté et al., (29) found in their study on the competence levels of coaches that there was a significant relationship between education and training and coaching competence. In their research with athletes, teams and coaches, Feltz et al. (15) determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the competency levels and education levels of the coaches. This study also supports our work.

In the study, a statistically significant difference is observed between the narcissistic personality traits of volleyball coaches and the years of coaching in the exploitative dimension of the narcissistic personality traits of volleyball coaches who have been working for 6-10 years and volleyball coaches who have been working for 11 or more years ( $p<0.05$ ). It is thought that this is because individuals' ability to control their emotions becomes stronger with age. In Gülmez's study on narcissism in 2009, he found that there was a relationship between duration of experience and narcissistic personality (18). In their study on the narcissistic personality traits of coaches, Cankurtaran and Berisha (8) did not observe a statistical difference in the narcissism levels of the coaches according to the variable of years of experience, supporting our study.

In this study, no difference was observed between the coaching years and self efficacy levels of volleyball coaches ( $p>0.05$ ). It is thought that this is because self-efficacy is a personal characteristic and coaching experience is not a determining factor on self-efficacy. In the study by Ermiş et al. (13), in which they investigated the self efficacy levels of tennis coaches, they stated that as the tenure of coaches increases, their self efficacy levels also increase. In support of our study, Dumangöz and Sanlav's (11) study on the professional self-efficacy of volleyball coaches found that the self-efficacy levels of the coaches did not differ in terms of the year of the experiment.

Another finding obtained in the research was that the narcissistic personality traits of volleyball coaches did not differ according to the category in which they worked ( $p>0.05$ ). Contrary to our study, Cankurtaran and Berisha (8), in their study examining the narcissistic personality traits of coaches, found a statistically significant difference between the coaching levels of the coaches and their narcissistic personality traits. In Atay's study on the narcissistic personality traits and positions of managers, he found that middle-level managers had more narcissistic personality traits than upper-level managers in the exhibitionism sub-dimension, but in general, he did not observe a significant relationship between managers' positions and narcissistic personality traits (3). This result also supports our study.

In the study, no difference was observed between the category in which volleyball coaches worked and their self efficacy levels ( $p>0.05$ ). Contrary to our study, Göral's (17) study titled "Examination of the Relationship Between the Efficacy of Football Coaches, Decision-Making Strategies and Team Performances" observed that as the ranks of the coaches increase, their competence levels also increase. In their study on volleyball coaches, Ateş and Ateş (4) determined that the self-efficacy levels of volleyball coaches did not differ statistically according to the coaching category, which supports our study. This study supports the result of the research.

As a result, it was determined that there was a weak, positive relationship between the narcissistic personality traits of volleyball coaches and their self-efficacy ranking. Although the relationship between the narcissistic personality traits of volleyball coaches and their self-efficacy level seems weak, self-efficacy, which is an important psychological feature in terms of narcissistic personality traits and self-efficacy management, should be increased and supported by sports psychologists and mental performance coaches. This research, which can be supported in the future, can provide more effective results by expanding the size of its order and observing different branch coaches. A more detailed examination in terms of many demographic characteristics will provide valuable information to the relevant field in terms of the relationship between narcissistic personality and self-efficacy. In addition, examining the narcissistic personality traits and self-

efficacy levels of coaches in terms of leadership styles will make important contributions to the literature and will make important contributions to the understanding of the personality traits of coaches.

## REFERENCES

- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 As A Short Measure of Narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40 (4), 440-450.
- Atay, S. (2009). Narsistik Kişilik Envanteri'nin Türkçe'ye Standardizasyonu. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(1), 181-196.
- Atay, S. (2010). Çalışan Narsist. Örgütler, Liderler, Yöneticiler ve Astarlar. İstanbul: Nammay Yayınları.S.33- 41-55-80.
- Ateş, H., ve Ateş, N. (2023). Voleybol Antrenörlerinin Psikolojik İyi Oluş Düzeyleri ile Öz Yeterlik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1-Cumhuriyet'in 100. Yılı Özel Sayısı), 1045-1059.
- Bandura A (1977): Self-Efficacy: Toward A Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura A (1986): Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Beswick, B. (2016). Focused For Soccer. (Çev. Süren, E.) Odak Noktamız Futbol. Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- Cankurtaran, Z., ve Berisha, M. (2021). Antrenörlerin Narsistik Kişilik Özellikleri ile Yeterlilik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Spor Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(1), 1-12.
- Çakır, B. (2018). Yetişkinlerde Sosyal Medya Bağımlılığı, Narsisizm ve Empati Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Üsküdar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çoban, H. ve İrmış, A. (2018). Yöneticilerde Narsisizm Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat Ve İşletme Dergisi*, 14(1), 123-145.
- Dumangöz, P. D. ve Sanlav, R. (2021). Voleybol Antrenörlerinin Mesleki Öz Yeterlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Demografik Özelliklere Göre İncelenmesi. *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 251-264.
- Eldoğan, D. (2016). Hangi Narsizm? Büyükleme ve Kırılgan Narsizmin Karşılaştırılmasına İlişkin Bir Gözden Geçirme. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 19(37), 1-10.
- Ermış, E., Satıcı, A., Bostancı, Ö., İmamoğlu, O., & Taşmektepligil, M. Y. (2019). Tenis Antrenörleri Yeterlilik Düzeyinin Araştırılması. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(20), 1-1.
- Feltz, D. L., Chase, M. A., Moritz, S. E., & Sullivan, P. J. (1999). A Conceptual Model of Coaching Efficacy: Preliminary Investigation and Instrument Development. *Journal Of Educational Psychology*, 91(4), 765- 776.
- Feltz, D., Short S., & Sullivan P. (2008). Self-Efficacy in Sport: Research and Strategies for Working with Athletes, Teams and Coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(2), 293-295.
- Foster, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2007). Are There Such Things As "Narcissists" in Social Psychology? A Taxometric Analysis of The Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(6), 1321-1332.
- Göral, K. (2014). Futbol Antrenörlerinin Yeterlilikleri, Karar Verme Stratejileri ve Takım Performansları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Doktora Tezi. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Gülmez, N. (2009). Narsistik Liderlik. Phd Thesis. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Marmara Üniversitesi- İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Yönetim ve Organizasyon Bilim Dalı. İstanbul.
- Güngör, N. D., ve Selçuk, F. Ü. (2015). Narsistik Kişilik Envanteri (NKE-16) Türkçe Uyarlaması.
- Horn, T. S. (2008). Coaching Effectiveness in The Sport Domain. In T. S. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in Sport Psychology* (3rd Ed., Pp. 239-268). Champaign, IL: Human Knetics.
- Hoyt, C. L., Murphy, S. E., Halverson, S. K., & Watson, C. B. (2003). Group Leadership: Efficacy and Effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7(4), 259.
- Kenow, L. J., & Williams, J. M. (1992). Relationship Between Anxiety, Self-Confidence, and Evaluation of Coaching Behaviors. *The Sport Psychologist*, 6(4), 344-357.
- Kiraz, C. (2011). Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Empatik Eğilimleri ile Narsistik Kişilik Özellikleri (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher Efficacy Research 1998–2009: Signs of Progress or Unfulfilled Promise?. *Educational Psychology Review*, 23, 21-43.
- Koçak, Ç. V. (2019). Antrenör Adaylarının Antrenör Öz Yeterlik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Sportmetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 17(1), 55-62.
- Kohut, H. (1971). Kendiliğin Çözülmesi, Narsistik Kişilik Bozukluklarının Tedavisine Sistemli Bir Yaklaşım, (Çev. Cem Atbaşoğlu, Banu Büyükkal, Cüneyt İşcan,1998), Metis Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Koroğlu, E. ve Bayraktar, S. (2007) Kişilik Bozuklukları. HYB: Ankara.
- Luszczynska, A., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General Self-Efficacy in Various Domains of Human Functioning: Evidence from Five Countries. *International Journal of Psychology*, 40(2), 80-89.
- Malete, L., Sullivan, P., & La Forge, K. (2013). The Relationships Between Coaching Efficacy, Experience, and Behaviors Among Scholastic Coaches in Botswana. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 7(1), 40-55
- Marback, T. L., Short, S. E., Short, M. W., & Sullivan, P. J. (2005). Coaching Confidence: An Exploratory Investigation of Sources and Gender Differences. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 28(1), 18-35.
- Moen, F., & Allgood, E. (2009). Coaching and The Effect on Self-Efficacy. *Organization Development Journal*, 27(4), 69.

32. Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L., Chase, M. A., Reckase, M. D., & Hancock, G. R. (2008). The Coaching Efficacy Scale II—High School Teams. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68(6), 1059-1076.
33. Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement Motivation: Conceptions of Ability, Subjective Experience, Task Choice, and Performance. *Psychological Review*, 91(3), 328.
34. Öngün, E. ve Demirağ, A. (2018). Narsistik Kişilik Envanteri Açısından Özçekim Yapma Tutumu Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(2), 71-87.
35. Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of Personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556-563.
36. Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A Principal-Components Analysis of The Narcissistic Personality Inventory and Further Evidence of Its Construct Validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 890.
37. Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 617-633.
38. Tojjari, F., Esmaili, M. R., & Bavandpour, R. (2013). The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Job Satisfaction of Sport Referees. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(2), 219-225.
39. Unutmaz, V., ve Gençer, T. (2017). Antrenör Yeterlilik Ölçeği II'nin Türkçe Uyarlama Çalışması. *Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 69-78.
40. Uzun, K. U. (2019). Narsisizm ve Dindarlık İlişkisi (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
41. Vurgun, N., Özçelik, İ. Y., & Aldırmaz, C. (2023). Hentbol Antrenörlerinin Öz Yeterlik Düzeyleri ile Çok Yönlü Liderlik Yönelimleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 18(2), 683-701.
42. Wallace, H. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The Performance of Narcissists Rises and Falls with Perceived Opportunity for Glory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 819. Doi.10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.819.