

# Analysing the Self-Efficacy Levels of Coaches of Different Branches

NAHIT ÖZDAYI<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup>Balıkesir University Faculty of Sports , Sciences , Balıkesir, Turkey, Orcid: 0000-0002-5534-3153Correspondence to Dr Nahit ÖZDAYI, Email. [nahitozdayi@balikesir.edu.tr](mailto:nahitozdayi@balikesir.edu.tr), Cell: +90 (266) 612 14 00 (171113)

## ABSTRACT

**Aim:** This paper aims to analyse the self-efficacies of coaches of different branches.

**Methods:** This study, which was conducted by using coach self-efficacy scale, reached totally 192 volunteering coaches who lived in Çanakkale and Balıkesir. The data collected were then analysed on the SPSS programme. The kurtosis and skewness values were examined so as to check the distribution of the data, and consequently, the data were found to have normal distribution.

**Results:** As a result, statistically significant differences were found between the coaches aged 28-32 and coaches aged 33-37 in their levels of self-efficacy in general and in the sub-factor of efficacy in impersonating. Accordingly, the coaches who were in 28-32 age group had higher self-efficacy and efficacy in impersonating than the ones who were in 33-37 age group. On the other hand, there were no statistically significant differences between the participants' levels of self-efficacy according to gender, branch and professional experience.

**Conclusion:** The coaches in the 28-32 age group were found to have higher self-efficacy and efficacy in impersonating than the coaches in the 33-37 age group on examining the results obtained. No differences were found between the participants in the other factors.

**Key Words:** Self-efficacy, coaches, sport

## INTRODUCTION

Coaches are among the most important people who lead athletes' career despite the fact that they are also important actors of sport<sup>8</sup>. Various psycho-social parameters, self-confidence (Atılğan, 2018) 17, communicative skills and emotional intelligence (Adiloğullari et al., 2019) 15, leadership (Ağırbaş et al., 2019) 15, problem-solving skills (Katra an Adiloğullari, 2017) 18 beside professional knowledge and personal characteristics have been investigated by researchers by assuming that they can affect coaches' professional and social performance. Thus, they need to believe in their professional capabilities and they should have the belief that their preparation and experience is sufficient for effective education and teaching. In addition to that, they should also believe in school support and support from the society as well as in athletes' sports capabilities. Therefore, the fact that coach efficacy is a remarkable factor in effective coaching should be taken into consideration.<sup>11</sup> Coaches' psychological goodness and their sense of self-efficacy are thought to have positive effects on athletes (Demir and Kabakçı, 2020) 5. In other words, their feeling that that they are good and competent will be reflected into their behaviours on the field, and naturally athletes will be influenced by it, and the training and competition atmosphere will be shaped accordingly.

Self-efficacy, a psychological concept, is capable of affecting individuals' belief in fulfilling a task and their effectiveness in the task, their efforts, their decisiveness and their achievement. Perception of self-efficacy is defined as individuals' thought about whether or not they have the qualities necessary to perform a duty (Bandura, 1990) 3. Self-efficacy, which is a concept that Bandura (1977) 2 claims to be influential in behaviours, is an individual's judgement of his or her abilities and skills about the extent to which he or she might cope with challenges he or she is probable to encounter in the future. People who are aware of the fact that they can cause differences feel good and therefore they take initiative while people

who consider themselves helpless feel unhappy and they cannot be motivated to display action (Flammer, 2001) 7. Self-efficacy is influential in beliefs, choice of tasks, efforts, insistence, resistance and achievement (Bandura, 1997) 1. (Schunk, 1995) 12. Individuals are at different levels of self-efficacy due to their various experiences, qualities and social supports, and their level of self-efficacy emerge as a factor which direct their target. They evaluate the quality of work that they display in doing a task and thus become aware of their efficacy, and all these play roles in shaping their self-efficacy (Bandura, 2012) 4. In addition to that, it was also reported that coaches' high self-efficacy had positive psychological effects on athletes' skills and self-respect.<sup>9,19</sup> Thus, a coach with high self-efficacy will look better on the field- which will cause athletes to perceive him as a better trainer. Therefore, it may be said that coaches' self-efficacy is reflected into both their psychological state and their professional life. It is known that low self-efficacy causes some people to have negative feelings (such as anxiety, depression, helplessness and so on) and some people to have low self-respect and even pessimistic thoughts. On the other hand, it is also emphasised that individuals with high self-efficacy set greater goals, they progress towards their goals and that the process goes as it was planned (Bandura, 1977) 2.

Coach efficacy is defined as coaches' belief in the extent to which they have the potential to influence their athletes' learning and performance (Feltz et al., 1999) 6. Such a belief- which is a psychological property of coaches- also directly influences the team/athlete that coaches train and thus it causes impacts on sports performance. Those effects emerge as a fact that should be taken into consideration. Hence, researchers believe that analysing coaches' levels of self-efficacy according to various factors, determining the differences to emerge and informing coaches and club managers of the differences and thus transferring the theoretical knowledge into the field will be effective in raising awareness of the factor of self-efficacy-which affects sports achievement through

coaches- and in increasing sports achievement. Accordingly, this current study aims to analyse and demonstrate the self-efficacy levels of coaches of different branches from the aspect of various factors.

### MATERIAL & METHODS

192 coaches 139 of whom were male and 53 of whom were female who worked actively in different branches in 2021 took part in this study.

The data were collected online by the researcher in 2021. The participants were included in the study on the basis of volunteering. They were informed of the research through a form prior to filling in the scale forms, their approval was received and then they were included in the research.

The research data were collected with the Coach Self-efficacy Scale developed by Koçak (2020) 10. The scale, which was in a 5-pointed Likert type, consisted of 21 items and 5 sub-factors in total. Cronbach's Alpha found for the whole scale was 0.95.

The data collected were analysed on the SPSS programme, the kurtosis and skewness values ( $\pm 1$ ) were examined and independent samples t-test was used in comparing paired groups while one-way ANOVA test was used in comparing more than two groups. The value of  $p < 0.05$  was considered as the level of significance.

### RESULTS

Table 1. The t-test Table of Coach Self-efficacy Levels according to Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Coachself-efficacy	Female	53	4.43	0.41	1.27	0.20
	Male	139	4.31	0.65		
Performance efficacy	Female	53	4.34	0.51	1.65	0.09
	Male	139	4.16	0.75		
Psychological efficacy	Female	53	4.56	0.47	1.58	0.11
	Male	139	4.39	0.72		
Teaching efficacy	Female	53	4.28	0.65	0.80	0.42
	Male	139	4.19	0.71		
Efficacy in impersonating	Female	53	4.57	0.50	0.83	0.40
	Male	139	4.48	0.75		
Management efficacy	Female	53	4.48	0.46	1.22	0.22
	Male	139	4.35	0.71		

According to Table 1, the coaches' levels of self-efficacy did not differ according to gender ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Table 2. The One-way ANOVA Table of Coach Self-efficacy Levels according to Age

		N	Mean	Sd	F	p	Post-Hoc
Coachself-efficacy	23-27 <sup>a</sup>	65	4.35	0.44	2.31	0.04*	b/c*
	28-32 <sup>b</sup>	48	4.45	0.66			
	33-37 <sup>c</sup>	30	4.05	0.93			
	38-42 <sup>d</sup>	24	4.38	0.37			
	43 and above <sup>e</sup>	25	4.42	0.40			
Performance efficacy	23-27 <sup>a</sup>	65	4.26	0.51	1.96	0.10	
	28-32 <sup>b</sup>	48	4.32	0.76			
	33-37 <sup>c</sup>	30	3.90	1.03			
	38-42 <sup>d</sup>	24	4.27	0.56			

	43 and above <sup>e</sup>	25	4.19	0.56			
Psychological efficacy	23-27 <sup>a</sup>	65	4.45	0.54	1.21	0.30	
	28-32 <sup>b</sup>	48	4.53	0.70			
	33-37 <sup>c</sup>	30	4.21	0.99			
	38-42 <sup>d</sup>	24	4.40	0.45			
	43 and above <sup>e</sup>	25	4.53	0.52			
Teaching efficacy	23-27 <sup>a</sup>	65	4.22	0.65	1.88	0.11	
	28-32 <sup>b</sup>	48	4.34	0.74			
	33-37 <sup>c</sup>	30	3.92	0.93			
	38-42 <sup>d</sup>	24	4.27	0.50			
	43 and above <sup>e</sup>	25	4.28	0.45			
Efficacy in impersonating	23-27 <sup>a</sup>	65	4.47	0.56	2.41	0.04*	b/c*
	28-32 <sup>b</sup>	48	4.63	0.69			
	33-37 <sup>c</sup>	30	4.19	1.11			
	38-42 <sup>d</sup>	24	4.59	0.39			
	43 and above <sup>e</sup>	25	4.65	0.44			
Management efficacy	23-27 <sup>a</sup>	65	4.38	0.54	2.24	0.06	
	28-32 <sup>b</sup>	48	4.52	0.65			
	33-37 <sup>c</sup>	30	4.10	0.99			
	38-42 <sup>d</sup>	24	4.38	0.46			
	43 and above <sup>e</sup>	25	4.51	0.47			

\* =  $p < 0.05$

As clear from Table 2, the participants' score averages for coach self-efficacy in general and for the sub-factor of efficacy in impersonating differ significantly according to age. The results of Post Hoc (Tukey) test- which was done to find the groups with differences, demonstrated that the score averages of coaches aged 28-32 for coach self-efficacy and for the sub-factor of efficacy in impersonating were significantly higher than the score averages of coaches aged 33-37 ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, no significant differences were found in the other sub-factors according to age ( $p > 0.05$ ).

Table 3. The t-test Table of Coach Self-efficacy Levels according to Coaches' Branches

	Coaches' branches	N	Mean	Sd	t	p
Coachself-efficacy	Team sport	115	4.32	0.68	-0.67	0.50
	Individual sport	77	4.38	0.45		
Performance efficacy	Team sport	115	4.23	0.73	0.56	0.57
	Individual sport	77	4.17	0.65		
Psychological efficacy	Team sport	115	4.39	0.74	-1.09	0.27
	Individual sport	77	4.50	0.51		
Teaching efficacy	Team sport	115	4.17	0.73	-1.08	0.28
	Individual sport	77	4.28	0.63		
Efficacy in impersonating	Team sport	115	4.48	0.75	-0.61	0.54
	Individual sport	77	4.54	0.59		
Management efficacy	Team sport	115	4.35	0.73	-0.96	0.33
	Individual sport	77	4.44	0.50		

It is evident from Table 3 that coaches do not differ significantly in their levels of self-efficacy according to their branch ( $p>0.05$ ).

Table 4. The One-way ANOVA Table of Coach Self-efficacy Levels according to Professional Experience

		N	Mean	Sd	F	p
Coachself-efficacy	1-5 years	96	4.30	0.65	0.84	0.84
	6-10 years	45	4.37	0.67		
	11-15 years	18	4.44	0.43		
	16-20 years	21	4.35	0.43		
	21 years and more	12	4.44	0.31		
Performance efficacy	1-5 years	96	4.15	0.77	0.78	0.78
	6-10 years	45	4.31	0.71		
	11-15 years	18	4.26	0.59		
	16-20 years	21	4.25	0.51		
	21 years and more	12	4.18	0.53		
Psychological efficacy	1-5 years	96	4.40	0.72	0.85	0.85
	6-10 years	45	4.47	0.70		
	11-15 years	18	4.48	0.46		
	16-20 years	21	4.38	0.58		
	21 years and more	12	4.60	0.40		
Teaching efficacy	1-5 years	96	4.19	0.77	0.76	0.76
	6-10 years	45	4.24	0.73		
	11-15 years	18	4.38	0.52		
	16-20 years	21	4.11	0.51		
	21 years and more	12	4.30	0.37		
Efficacy in impersonating	1-5 years	96	4.44	0.76	0.65	0.65
	6-10 years	45	4.50	0.73		
	11-15 years	18	4.61	0.52		
	16-20 years	21	4.65	0.39		
	21 years and more	12	4.62	0.52		
Management efficacy	1-5 years	96	4.33	0.70	0.75	0.75
	6-10 years	45	4.42	0.73		
	11-15 years	18	4.48	0.43		
	16-20 years	21	4.42	0.52		
	21 years and more	12	4.54	0.42		

According to Table 4, the participants' score averages for coach self-efficacy in general and for the sub-factors of the scale do not differ significantly according to their years of professional experience ( $p>0.05$ ).

## DISCUSSION

This study, which aimed to analyse coaches' levels of self-efficacy, found no significant differences according to gender. Despite this, female coaches were found to have higher self-efficacy scores than the male ones in all sub-factors of the scale.

It was also found here that the coaches aged 28-32 had significantly higher self-efficacy scores and efficacy in impersonating scores than the coaches aged 33-37. On the other hand, no significant differences were found in the other age groups. Ağırbaş et al (2020)15 also report that

there are no significant differences between self-efficacies of age groups. Thus, the results obtained in this study for the variable of age were in parallel to the ones obtained in the literature- except for the 28-32 and 33-37 age groups. The finding that the coaches of 28-32 age group had higher self-efficacy and efficacy in impersonating scores than the coaches of 33-37 age group was thought to stem from the fact that the scales used were different and that the groups and number of samples had different characteristics. In addition to that, the coaches of 33-37 age group were the group with the lowest coach self- efficacy. They were neither the group who had just started doing the job nor the group who had experience in the job. Therefore, the lowest perceptions of self-efficacy of the age group which was in the middle might be attributed to various factors (such as becoming unemployed, pandemic, etc.).

Ermiş et al (2019) 13 in their study concerning tennis coaches' self-efficacy, Koçak and Güven (2019) 14 in their study concerning volleyball coaches' self-efficacy and Güllü and Donuk (2019) 8 in their study concerning football coaches' self-efficacy reported the finding that the coaches in older age group had significantly higher self-efficacy than the ones in younger age group.

There were no significant differences between self-efficacies of coaches of individual sports and coaches of team sports. Despite this, the coaches of individual sports were found to have higher scores than the coaches of team sports in all the sub-factors of the scale except for the sub-factor of performance efficacy. Considering the fact that coaches of individual sports did not work in teams (in groups of 8-10) as in the case of team sports, they might be obliged to be versatile in their professional development and to be more competent.

No significant differences were found between coaches' of differing professional experience in terms of self-efficacy. Ağırbaş et al (2020) 15 report that female coaches have significantly higher self-efficacy than male coaches. Accordingly, the result obtained in this current study was not consistent with the ones reported in the literature. The differences in results were thought to stem from the fact that measurement tool used in Ağırbaş et al (2020) 15 was different from the one used in this study.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study found that the coaches of 28-32 age group had significantly higher self-efficacy in general and efficacy in impersonating than the coaches of 33-37 age group. Yet, no significant differences were found in the other sub-factors.

## REFERENCES

1. Bandura A (1997): Self efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W. H. Freeman.
2. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
3. Bandura, A. (1990). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. *Journal of applied sport psychology*, 2(2), 128-163.
4. Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. *Journal of Management*, 38(1), 9-44.
5. Demir, A., & Kabakçı, A. C. (2020). Analysing the Correlations between Canoeing Coaches' Psychological

- Strength, perceived self-efficacy and Life Satisfaction: *International Journal of Exercise Psychology*, 2(1), 21-28.
6. Feltz, D. L., Chase, M. A., Moritz, S. E., and Sullivan, P. J. (1999). A conceptual model of coaching efficacy: Preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(4), 765-776.
  7. Flammer, A. (2001). Self-efficacy.
  8. Güllü, S., & Donuk, B. (2019). Analysing the Correlations between Football Coaches' Emotional Labour and coaching Efficacy. *Journal of the School of History (TOD)*, 12(38), 58-79.
  9. Horn, T. S. (2002): Coaching effectiveness in the sport domain. In T. S. Horn, (ed.), *Advances in sport psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
  10. Koçak, Ç. V. (2020) Coach Self-efficacy Scale: Validity and Reliability Test. *Journal of Gazi Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, 25(4), 313-329.
  11. Koçak, Ç. V., & Güven, Ö. (2018). Validity and Reliability Test for Volleyball Coaches Professional Self-efficacy. *Sport meter, the Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, 16(2), 162-177.
  12. Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy and education and instruction. In J. E. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 281-303). New York: Plenum Press.
  13. Ermiş, E., Satıcı, A., Bostancı, Ö., İmamoğlu, O., & Taşmektepligil, M. Y. (2019). Investigating Tennis Coaches' Levels of Efficacy i. *OPUS International Journal of Community Research*, 14(20), 1211-1227.
  14. Koçak, Ç., & Güven, Ö. (2019). Volleyball Coaches' Volleyball Coaches' Professional Efficacy.
  15. Ağırbaş, İ. S., Savaş, E., & Belli, E. (2020). Antrenörlerin Öz Yeterlilikleri İle İletişim Becerileri İlişkisi/The Relationship Between Coaches' Self-Efficacy And Communication Skills. *Anatolia Sport Research*, 1(1), 25-36.
  16. Adiloğulları, İ, Görgülü, R, Şenel, E . (2019). Does Emotionally Intelligent Coach Predict Better Communication Skills in Your Football Team? . *International Journal of Sport Exercise and Training Sciences - IJSETS*, 5 (1) , 46-57 . DOI: 10.18826/useeabd.534341.
  17. Atılğan, D. (2018). Analysing the Correlations between Physical Education Teachers' and coaches' Self-Confidence Levels and Decision-making Styles. *Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences*, 20 (4) , 8-22
  18. Katra, H., Adilogullari, I. (2017). The Effects of Football Coaches' Stai Anxiety Level on Problem Solving Skill. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*,3(8), 14-25.
  19. Salehian, M.H., Arandan, M. (2021). Comparison of virtual training and physical exercise on self-confidence and the acquisition of a basketball shot by high school female students, MA in Sport Psychology, Tabriz Islamic Azad University, Iran.