Asian Journal of Education and Training
Vol. 8, No. 4, 131-138, 2022
ISSN(E) 2519-5387
DOI: 10.20448/edu.v8i4.4341

Do Self-Efficacy and Moral Intelligence have a Role in the Formation of Sportsmanship Behavior?

Serhat Turan[1]
Ugur Alemdar[2]
Esra Comert[3]
Hacer Ozcan[4]
Kerem Osmanoglu[5]


(✉ Corresponding Author)

[1]*Balıkesir University, Faculty of Sports Science, Balıkesir, Turkey.*
[1]*Email: serhatturan2510@gmail.com*
[2,3]*Sakarya University of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Sakarya, Turkey.*
[2]*Email: uguralemdar@subu.edu.tr*
[3]*Email esracomert@subu.edu.tr*
[4]*Esenkent Ortaokulu, Istanbul, Turkey.*
[4]*Email: ozcanhacer@gmail.com*
[5]*Kadriye Kemal Gurel Ilkokulu, Balikesir, Turkey.*
[5]*Email: kerem4706@gmail.com*

Abstract

The present study is aimed to investigate the effect of empathy, conscience, self-control, kindness and self-efficacy on sportsmanship behaviors, since there is no study that investigated the effects of self-efficacy and moral intelligence on sportsmanship behaviors. For this purpose, the study was carried out according to the relational screening design, which is one of the quantitative research designs. 397 students studying at the faculty of sports sciences participated in the research. "Yakut-Moral Intelligence Scale", "Athlete Self Efficacy Scale" and "Investigation of Sportsmanship Behaviors Scale" were used to carry out the study. Statistical analyzes were made in SPSS 25 program and Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analysis were used. As a result of the analysis, sportsmanship has been determined that it has a significant relationship with empathy, conscience, self-control, kindness and self-efficacy. As another result of the study, while self-efficacy alone explains 13.4% of sportsmanship, self-efficacy, empathy, self-control and kindness together explain 48% of sportsmanship. It was determined that the sub-dimension of conscience did not have a significant effect on sportsmanship. According to these results, in displaying sportsmanship behaviors; Having a high level of self-efficacy, ability to empathize, power to control behaviors and kindness have an important and powerful effect.

Keywords: Athlete self-experience, Empathy, Moral intelligence, Self-efficacy, Sportsmanship behavior, Sportsmanship.

Citation | Turan, S., Alemdar, U., Comert, E., Ozcan, H., & Osmanoglu, K. (2022). Do Self-Efficacy and Moral Intelligence have a Role in the Formation of Sportsmanship Behavior? *Asian Journal of Education and Training, 8*(4), 131–138. 10.20448/edu.v8i4.4341
History:
Received: 27 September 2022
Revised: 18 November 2022
Accepted: 2 December 2022
Published: 15 December 2022

Publisher: Asian Online Journal Publishing Group

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.
Authors' Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.
Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.
Transparency: The authors confirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study; that no vital features of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.
Ethical: This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

Contents

Contribution of this paper to the literature:
In the present study, it is aimed to determine the effect of empathy, conscience, self-control, kindness and self-efficacy on sportsmanship behaviors, since there is no study that investigated the effects of self-efficacy and moral intelligence on sportsmanship behaviors. The absence of such studies in the literature is thought to guide the studies planned to be carried out in the future and to contribute to the literature.

1. Introduction

Sportsmanship is gaining a place in sports as a more important concept with each passing day. As the sports economy grows, athletes can act with the understanding of "winning despite everything" in order to gain more financial gain. Acting with a purely winning mentality may cause immoral behaviors to be exhibited, and this situation harms the spirit that constitutes the essence of sports. In this context, factors such as the belief in the abilities of the athletes, the power to control their behavior, empathy, conscience and kindness come to the fore.

Bandura (2007) defines self-efficacy as people's belief in their ability to organize and execute an action to produce their intended results. According to Gist and Mitchell (1992) people's inferences about their own capacity to complete certain responsibilities and tasks are defined as self-efficacy. At the same time, self-efficacy is the belief in one's own capacity (Morgil, Seçil, Seçken, Yavuz, & Oskay, 2004) and knowing one's self (KOrkmaz, 2008) rather than ability.

Self-efficacy is an important determinant in the success of athletes. Acquired self-efficacy skills cause behavioral changes and are seen as the most important achievement of athletes in achieving success against their opponents (Türedi, 2015). The higher the expectation of proficiency, the higher the athlete's self-confidence. In the opposite case, with failure in high-level performance studies; Negative reactions are experienced, such as a decrease in the interest of the athlete towards sports and alienation from sports (Barut, 2008). The negative reactions that the athlete may exhibit in the field of sports due to the low level of self-efficacy bring the concept of morality to the fore.

Morality is basically defined as the process of determining the orientations between right and wrong, good and bad, virtue and flaw, which are adopted by the people in the society with common thoughts and compelled to comply (Sengun, 2015) and evaluating the results of these orientations (Nuttall et al., 2011). Demonstrating moral behavior requires moral intelligence. Moral intelligence is a new concept that has recently become popular in research in psychology and management. Moral intelligence means paying attention to human life, economic and social welfare, free, honest, open communication and citizenship rights (Hasanpour, Ghaedi Heidari, & Hasanzadeh, 2017). Lennick and Kiel (2005) on the other hand, consider moral intelligence; It defines it as the type of intelligence that expresses the mental capacity that explains how the universal human dimension principles should be applied to individual values and purposes.

It is seen in the literature that moral intelligence is evaluated as multidimensional (Yakut & Yakut, 2021). Scientists consider moral intelligence in several sub-dimensions in their studies. Borba (2001): moral intelligence includes empathy, conscience, self-control, respect, kindness, tolerance and justice; Khampa (2019): honesty, respect, kindness, conscience and self-control; Oztürk, Saylıgil, and Yıldız (2019): equality, empathy, moral intelligence, justice, tolerance, self-control and kindness; Bhagyalakshmy (2014) on the other hand, examined moral intelligence in several dimensions as empathy, conscience, self-control, respect, kindness, tolerance. In the studies conducted, empathy, conscience, self-control, respect and kindness are considered as common concepts for scientists. Baron-Cohen and Wheelwright (2004) define empathy as the individual's ability to spontaneously and naturally adapt to the thoughts and feelings of the other person. In terms of human relations, empathy is the ability to predict and understand the reactions of others (Keskin, 2014). Self-control is the ability to resist and suppress internal desires and external temptations that prevent individuals from pursuing long-term goals (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004). The capacity to exercise self-control (Napolitano & Job, 2018) includes mental processes that enable individuals to suppress thoughts, feelings and behaviors that conflict with their personal goals (Baumeister, Vohs, & Tice, 2007). Individuals with high self-control tend to use more positive coping strategies than individuals with low self-control, and the use of these positive strategies increases life satisfaction (Li, Delvecchio, Lis, Nie, & Di Riso, 2016). Conscience is defined as a person's display of behaviors in accordance with his/her own belief world with his/her inner voice and the evaluation of these behaviors as right or wrong in the inner court (Bilgiz, 2007). Kindness is an essential value for human survival and well-being. Research in this area shows that helping or sharing to benefit another person (i.e., pro-social behavior) is not only beneficial for the goal of well-being, but also for oneself (Fritz, Walsh, Cole, Epel, & Lyubomirsky, 2021).

Sports ethics is the realization of the sportive event within the limits determined by the written and unwritten rules, far from the understanding of "winning despite everything" regardless of the conditions. Competing in order to make their skills superior within the framework of values both preserves the spirit of sports and provides the excitement inherent in sports. If the rules are not followed, the suspicion that may arise about the sport can cause everyone who actively or passively participates in the sport to move away from the sport. For this reason, the concept of sportsmanship gains importance in the existence and continuation of sports.

Although sportsmanship is the concept used in sports activities today, it is actually expressed as the basic moral judgments that are based on tolerance, respecting the sports environment, desiring to win properly, rejecting illegal manipulative activities (Tel, 2014). The aim of sportsmanship behavior is to reflect the fact that sport is a game by exhibiting more fair play behavior rather than increasing violence in competitions (Haynes, 2002). In this context, athletes should stay away from unfair, non-fair play and ugly actions against their opponents with the motivation to win or gain, and they should respect victory and defeat (Feezell, 1986). In sportsmanship includes sincerity, tolerance, honorable behavior, courage, showing kindness, empathy, respect for the ideas of others, trust and generosity (Keating, 2007; Koç, 2013).

Self-efficacy in the literature; aggression (Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Mofrad & Mehrabi, 2015; Willemse, 2008; Yoosefi, 2012) emotional reactions (Kumar & Ve Lal, 2006; Tahmassian & Ansari, 2009) stress and anxiety (Bahadori Khosroshahi & Hashemi Nosrat Abad, 2012) has been studied from different perspectives (Haynes, 2002).

It has been observed that the sub-dimensions of moral intelligence are used separately in studies on sportsmanship. Empathy, which is the sub-dimension of moral intelligence; It has been determined that it is associated with displaying negative behavior (Gleichgerrcht & Young, 2013) acquiring moral norms (Cushman, 2013) violence (Broidy, Cauffman, Espelage, Mazerolle, & Piquero, 2003; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004) bullying (Zych, Gómez-Ortiz, Fernández Touceda, Nasaescu, & Llorent, 2020) and helping (Jordan, Amir, & Bloom, 2016). It has been determined that the sub-dimensions of kindness and conscience, which are another sub-dimension of moral intelligence, are studied with aggression (Arsenio, 2014; Jambon & Smetana, 2020) and pro-social behavior (DeSteno, 2015; Marsh, 2019) within the scope of moral feelings. Finally, there are studies with the self-control sub-dimension of moral intelligence is used with adaptation and behavior problems (Lengua, Bush, Long, Kovacs, & Trancik, 2008; Lengua & Long, 2002) decision making (Mead, Baumeister, Gino, Schweitzer, & Ariely, 2009) and physical aggression (Ciairano, Gemelli, Molinengo, Musella, & al, 2007). However, no study has been found in the literature on the extent to which all sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and moral intelligence together affect sportsmanship. In Turkey; There are 18 million 85 thousand 943 students at pre-school, primary and secondary education levels (Ministry of National Education (MEB), 2021). Sports educators, managers and coaches who will train these students are trained in 100 sports science faculties and colleges in Turkey. Therefore, it is very important to determine the sportsmanship levels of sports people who will shape the sports ethics of millions of young individuals and to illuminate the factors affecting sportsmanship. For this reason, it is aimed to determine whether there is a change in sportsmanship behavior as self-efficacy and moral intelligence levels increase in this study, which is carried out in relational screening design.

2. Material and Method

2.1. Research Model

Relational survey model was used in the research to examine the relationship between the levels of conscience, self-control, courtesy, self-efficacy and sportsmanship. Relational screening model: It is a research model that aims to determine the relationship between two or more variables (Karasar, 2013).

2.2. Universe and Sample of the Study

The universe of this research consists of students studying at 100 sports science faculties and schools in Turkey. It is thought that approximately 10000 students' study in these faculties and colleges. The sample of the study should be at least 370 people according to the 95% confidence interval and 5% margin of error. In the study, the sample is formed according to the simple random sampling method and the study is carried out with 397 students from three different faculties of sports sciences. 397 volunteer students (age=20.45±2.35) studying at the faculty of sports sciences participated in the research. Information about the students is given in Table 1. At the beginning of the study, necessary permissions (Number: E- 26428519-044-65457) are obtained from Sakarya University of Applied Sciences Ethics Committee.

Table 1. Demographic information.

Variables	Subgroups	Frequency	%
Gender	Female	160	40.3
	Male	237	59.7
Sports Age	1-4 years	94	23.7
	5-8 years	116	29.2
	9 years and over	124	31.2
Branch	Individual Sports	160	40.3
	Team Sports	237	59.7
Total		397	100

Table 1 presents that 59.7% of the participants are male, 31.2% are 9 years and over, and 59.7% are students who do team sports.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

"Ruby-Moral Intelligence Scale", "Athlete Self-Efficacy Scale (ASES)" and "Sportsmanship Behaviors Examination Scale" are used as data collection tools. Detailed information on data collection tools is given below.

2.3.1. Personal Information Form

The "Personal Information Form" created by the researchers is used to determine demographic information. In this form, it is aimed to reach information such as gender, sports branch, age and sports age of athlete students.

2.3.2. Yakut-Moral Intelligence Scale

The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) value of the "Yakut-Moral Intelligence Scale" developed by Yakut and Yakut (2021) is calculated as .776 and the Bartlett test value as 1263,083, and the chi-square value is found to be significant. As a result of their analysis, they identified four factors called "empathy" (α= .827), "conscience" (α= .791), "self-control" (α= .803) and "kindness" (α= .772). The total variance explained by the scale is 57.436%, and the factor loads of the items vary between .443 and .836. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale, which consists of a total of 20 items, is measured as .845. With this aspect, it is possible to state that the scale has a high level of reliability and to emphasize its usefulness. The highest score that can be obtained from the scale, in which all items are positively scored, is 100, and the lowest score is 20. A high score indicates the presence of a high level of moral intelligence.

In this study, information about the scale is given in the Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of Yakut-Moral intelligence scale points.

Dependent Variable	Substanca Number	$\overline{X}$	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach Alpha
Empathy	5	3.95	0.64	-0.713	1.157	0.76
Conscience	5	4.22	0.62	-0.771	0.775	0.84
Self-Control	5	3.64	0.75	-0.285	0.189	0.84
Kindness	5	4.11	0.63	-0.648	0.996	0.83
Yakut-Moral Intelligence Scale	20	4.00	0.47	-0.249	0.175	0.89

Table 2 presents that the total mean score of the participants on the Ruby-Moral Intelligence scale is 4.00. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was .76 for empathy, .84 for conscience, .84 for self-control and .83 for kindness. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the general scale was calculated as .89. The skewness and kurtosis values being in the range of ± 1.5 provide the necessary prerequisite for the normal distribution.

2.3.3. Athlete Self Efficacy Scale (ASES)

The Athlete Self Efficacy Scale developed by Kocak (2020) consists of 16 items. Scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions: Sports Discipline Competence, Psychological Competence, Professional Thought Competence, and Personality Compentence dimensions. The lowest score to be obtained from the scale is 16 and the highest score is 80. It shows the average scores and self-efficacy levels to be obtained from the scale. The fact that the average of the scale is in the range of 3.34–5.00 points refers to the high athlete's self-efficacy level, and the average of 1.67–3.33 points is the middle athlete's self-efficacy level and the average of 0.00-1.66 points is the low athlete's self-efficacy level.

The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient is found as .89 for the scale.

In the present study, the information of the scale is given in the Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of athlete self-efficacy scale (ASES) scores.

Dependent Variable	Substance Number	$\overline{X}$	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach Alpha
ASES	16	3.90	0.61	-0.504	0.925	0.91

It is seen that the total average score of the participants from the Athlete Self Efficacy Scale (ASES) is 3.90. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is calculated as .91. The location of the skewness and kurtosis values in the range of ± 1 provides a prerequisite required for normal distribution.

2.3.4. Investigation of Sportsmanship Behaviors Scale

It is developed to determine the university students the sportsmanship behavior by Gumus, Saracli, Yagmur, Isik, and Ersoz (2020). The scale consists of 27 items and 5 sub -dimensions. These five factors explain 62.29 %of the total variance. The scale of five Likert types is scored between 1 'absolutely disagree' and 5 'absolutely agree'. The high score obtained from the scale shows that the level of sportsmanship is high. The total Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale is calculated as 0.94.

In the present study, the information of the scale is given in the Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution of investigation of sportsmanship behaviors scale (ISBS) scores.

Dependent Variable	Substance Number	$\overline{X}$	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach Alpha
ISBS	27	3.73	0.54	-0.580	0.448	0.92

Table 4 presents the total mean score of the participants from the Sportsmanship Behaviors Examination Scale (ISBS) as 3.73. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .92. The fact that the skewness and kurtosis values are in the range of ± 1 provides the necessary prerequisite for the normal distribution.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

The data collected in the online environment were coded and transferred to the SPSS program and the normality distribution was examined. The skewness and kurtosis values of the data were taken into account in the analyzes and the values obtained were found in the range of -1.5,…,+1.5.These values are accepted in accordance with normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In statistical analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analysis are used. The level of significance in the study is taken as $p<.01$ and $p<.001$.

3. Findings

In this part of the study, the relationships between the variables are tested and the effects of conscience, self-control, kindness and self -efficacy variables on sportsmanship behaviors are examined.

Table 5 presents the results of the Pearson correlation analysis performed to determine the relationships between the variables.

Table 5 presents as a result of Pearson correlation analysis, sportmanship has a significant relationship with empathy ($r=0.491$, $p<.001$), conscience ($r=0.447$, $p<0.001$), self-control ($r=0.458$, $p<.001$), kindness ($r=0.619$, $p<.001$), self-efficacy ($r=0.370$, $p<0.001$).

Table 6 sub-dimensions of self-efficacy and moral intelligence; presents the effects of empathy, conscience, self-control and courtesy on sportsmanship.

Table 5. Pearson correlation analysis results.

Dimensions	Empathy	Conscience	Self-control	Kindness	Self-efficacy
Conscience	0.539*	1			
Self-control	0.272*	0.234*	1		
Kindness	0.468*	0.461*	0.487*	1	
Self-efficacy	0.217*	0.287*	0.391*	0.283*	1
Sportsmanship	0.491*	0.447*	0.458*	0.619*	0.370*

Note: *p<.001.

Table 6. Multiple regression analysis results about the effect of sportsmanship.

No.	Variable	R	R^2_{adj}	F	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
1	Stable				2.463	0.177	---	13.891	0.000
	Self-efficacy	0.137	0.134	52.662	0.326	0.045	0.370	7.257	0.000**
2	Stable				0.564	0.192		2.933	0.004
	Self-efficacy				0.121	0.039	0.137	3.110	0.002*
	Empathy				0.164	0.042	0.195	3.963	0.000**
	Conscience	0.488	0.480	62.447	0.083	0.043	0.096	1.938	0.053
	Self-control				0.105	0.034	0.147	3.082	0.002*
	Kindness				0.320	0.044	0.373	7.304	0.000**

Note: **p<.001, *p<.01.
Method: Stepwise.

Table 6 presents while self-efficacy explains 13.4 %of sportsmanship alone, self-efficacy, empathy, self-control and kindness explain 48 %of sportsmanship together. It is found that the lower dimension of conscience has no significant effect on sportsmanship.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In the present study, the effects of athlete's self-efficacy, empathy, conscience, self-control, and kindness on sportsmanship behaviors are investigated. In the study, the participants showed that the levels of the participants had high levels of Moral Intelligence ($\overline{X}$ =4.00±.47), Athlete Self Efficacy Scale ($\overline{X}$ =3.90±.61), and Sportsmanship Behaviors ($\overline{X}$ =3.73±.54). As a result of regression analysis, it is determined that self-efficacy alone explained 13.4% of sportsmanship and that self-efficacy, empathy, self-control, and kindness explained 48% of sportsmanship together. It is found that the lower dimension of conscience has no significant effect on sportsmanship. The findings of the studies made as a result of the study findings and the literature screening are discussed below.

4.1. Self-Efficacy and Sportsmanship

In the findings of the study, self-efficacy has a significant effect on sportsmanship behavior. The belief in the potentials and abilities of athletes can give clues to what behaviors he can use to achieve a conclusion. The athlete who believes in his skills will stay away from the understanding of winning in spite of everything and will try to reach the result by exhibiting behavior within the limits determined by sportsmanship. Anderson and Bushman (2002) state that the attitudes and self-efficacy of the individual in the general aggression model have a significant impact on aggression behaviors, namely non-sportsmanic behaviors. In addition, Kumar and Ve Lal (2006) state that self-efficacy affects the individual's choice of behavior and emotional reactions. Tahmassian and Ansari (2009) argue that people who have a high self-efficacy, confident of their knowledge of their abilities, enjoy a real social connection and have the ability to control and manage their emotions. On the contrary, individuals with low self-efficacy can lead to increasing stress and anxiety by perceiving events more complex than the fact (Bahadori Khosroshahi & Hashemi Nosrat Abad, 2012). In his study, Yoosefi (2012) found that there is a negative relationship between awareness and aggression and stated that perception of events as complex could cause aggression behaviors. Luszczynska, Gutiérrez-Doña, and Schwarzer (2005) found that there is positive relationship between the general self-efficacy and optimism; negative relationship between depression and anxiety in the research of participants from five countries. In his study, Willemse (2008) states that there is a negative high level of relationship between aggression behaviors and self-efficacy. In another study, there are results showing that there is a negative relationship between self-efficacy and aggression, and it is emphasized that by increasing self-efficacy, aggression will decrease (Mofrad & Mehrabi, 2015). The results of the researches in the literature seem to be compatible with this study.

4.2. Empathy and Sportsmanship

As a result of the study, it is determined that empathy have a significant effect on sportsmanship. Empathy skills create more sensitivity to the suffering of others and support the mercy to be shown against the individual to be exhibited (Condon & DeSteno, 2011; Klimecki, Vuilleumier, & Sander, 2016). Fort his reason, empathic interest, concern and compassion for others, cooperation (Preston & De Waal, 2002) the acquisition of moral norms (Cushman, 2013) and opposing harmful actions (Gleichgerrcht & Young, 2013) by expressing the tendency to the athletes more gentle to the competitors of the athletes affects their approach. Athletes may be subjected to disabled interventions by the opponent in sporting competitions. As a result, they can be injured and stay away from the fields. It is thought that the athletes put themselves in place of the opponent and do not move away from sportsmanship while exhibiting a behavior of the athletes due to such negativities. When the literature is examined, high empathy is found to be protective against violence (Broidy et al., 2003). In a meta-analysis study, it is determined that those who use violence had low empathy (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004). High empathy is seen as a protective factor for bullying and cyber bullying (Zych et al., 2020). McPhedran (2009) found that the relationship between low empathy and violence is positive and revealed connections between empathy and pro -community behavior. There are many studies showing that continuous empathic interest, helping (FeldmanHall, Dalgleish,

Evans, & Mobbs, 2015; Jordan et al., 2016) pro-community behaviors (Contreras-Huerta, Lockwood, Bird, Apps, & Crockett, 2022) and positive social behaviors (Bach, Defever, Chopik, & Konrath, 2017; Chopik, O'Brien, & Konrath, 2017; Eckland, Huang, & Berenbaum, 2020). It has been determined that individuals with low empathy levels have high antisocial properties and are not worried about damage to the victim or the rescue of the group (Conway, Goldstein-Greenwood, Polacek, & Greene, 2018; Maranges, Hasty, Maner, & Conway, 2021). The findings of the studies in the literature are similar to the results of our research.

4.3. Kindness, Conscience, and Sportsmanship

In the present study, it is determined that kindness had a significant effect on sportsmanship. Due to the widespread of digital vehicles in sports, every behavior of athletes can be seen by everyone forces the athlete to behavior towards sportsmanship. Otherwise, athletes know that they will be excluded by sports fans. This situation increases the incidence of kindness containing behaviors and this contributes positively to sportsmanship. Because moral emotions are emotions associated with the benefit of a person other than society or perceived (Haidt, Davidson, Scherer, & Goldsmith, 2003). Moral emotions help to prevent aggressive behaviors by predicting negative consequences (Arsenio, 2014). The literature suggests that physical aggression can be reduced by developing moral emotions (Jambon & Smetana, 2020). The sense of compassion from moral emotions is also linked to pro-community behaviors (DeSteno, 2015).

As a result of the study, it is found that conscience had no significant effect on sportsmanship behaviors. Conscience can be expressed as an important element in the occurrence of behaviors. However, since the sense of competition in the sport comes to the forefront from time to time, athletes can exhibit behaviors with the understanding of "winning at any cost". In this case, conscience can remain in the second place. Today, the success value can be seen as the most important value for many athletes. In order to continue their sporting lives and maintain their existence, athletes can act with focus on success rather than the value of conscience.

4.4. Self-Control and Sportsmanship

In the present study, it is seen that self-control had a significant effect on sportsmanship behaviors. The dominance of the individual's behavior prevents the exhibition of non-moral behaviors. Self-control plays a role in reducing the effects of stress factors in advance (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997) and can prevent negative behaviors from being displayed. In the literature, it is stated that individuals with low self-control level experiences more harmony and behavioral problems than those with high levels of self-control (Lengua et al., 2008; Lengua & Long, 2002). Sources of self-control play an important role in the process of ethical decision making (Mead et al., 2009). It has been found that self-control has a positive relationship with positive social skills (Eisenberg et al., 1997) and emotional-behavioral harmony (Tangney et al., 2004). Individuals with low self -control experiences more emotional problems such as anxiety and depression and as a result, they show negative behavior towards the external environment (Eisenberg et al., 2001). Adolescents with a higher level of self -control activity show lower physical aggression to their peers compared to all other adolescents (Ciairano et al., 2007). In this respect, the findings of the literature and the findings of our study are similar.

As a result; self-efficacy, empathy, self-control and kindness contribute significantly to sportsmanship behaviors. The high beliefs of the athletes towards their skills, have the power of control over their behavior, perform their behavior by putting them in place of their opponent and remain within the limits of courtesy.

5. Recommendations

Empathy has a structure that can emerge self-emergence (De Waal & Preston, 2017) pre-arranged (Cameron et al., 2019; Zaki, 2014) and also developed (Cameron et al., 2019). For this reason, empathy-developing studies can be used in sports fields. Proficiency levels can be improved with applications where the athlete can taste the feeling of success. Thus, the belief in self-efficacy is developed to exhibit prosocial behaviors. In addition, one of the limitations of this research is to obtain data by survey method. In the following studies, the use of complementary methods such as observation and interview is also recommended to support the study.

References

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 27-51.

Arsenio, W. (2014). Moral emotion attributions and aggression. *Handbook of Moral Development, 2*, 235-255.

Aspinwall, L. G., & Taylor, S. E. (1997). A stitch in time: Self-regulation and proactive coping. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*(3), 417.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.121.3.417.

Bach, R. A., Defever, A. M., Chopik, W. J., & Konrath, S. H. (2017). Geographic variation in empathy: A state-level analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality, 68*, 124-130.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.12.007.

Bahadori Khosroshahi, J., & Hashemi Nosrat Abad, T. T. (2012). The relationship between social anxiety, optimism and self-efficacy with psychological well-being in students. *Studies in Medical Sciences, 23*(2), 115-122.

Bandura, A. (2007). Much ado over a faulty conception of perceived self–efficacy grounded in faulty experimentation. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 26*(6), 641-658.

Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathy quotient: An investigation of adults with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism, and normal sex differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 34*(2), 163-175.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1023/b:jadd.0000022607.19833.00.

Barut, A. I. (2008). *The Relationship between superstitious behavior and self-efficacy in sports.* Master Thesis, Mersin University Institute of Health Sciences, Mersin.

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(6), 351-355.

Bhagyalakshmy, R. (2014). *Influence of moral ıntelligence on certaincognitive &affectivevariables of student teachers of primary level.* Kotteyam: Mahatma Gandhi University.

Bilgiz, M. (2007). Conscience and Its value in terms of the Qur'an (pp. 13-14). March Istanbul: Declaration Publications.

Borba, M. (2001). *Building moral ıntelligence. The seven essential virtuesthatteach kids to do the right thing.* San Francisco: Jossey–Basspublications.

Broidy, L., Cauffman, E., Espelage, D. L., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (2003). Sex differences in empathy and its relation to juvenile offending. *Violence and Victims, 18*(5), 503-516.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2003.18.5.503.

Cameron, C., Hutcherson, C., Ferguson, A., Scheffer, J., Hadjiandreou, E., & Inzlicht, M. (2019). Empathy is hard work: People choose to avoid empathy because of its cognitive costs. *Journal of Experimental psychology. General, 148*(6), 962-976.

Chopik, W. J., O'Brien, E., & Konrath, S. H. (2017). Differences in empathic concern and perspective taking across 63 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 48*(1), 23-38.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116673910.

Ciairano, S., Gemelli, F., Molinengo, G., Musella, G., & al, e. (2007). Sport, stress, self-efficacy and aggression towards peers: Unravelling the role of the coach. *An Interdisciplinary Journal. Cognitie, Creier, Comportament / Cognition, Brain, Behavior, 11*(1), 175-181.

Condon, P., & DeSteno, D. (2011). Compassion for one reduces punishment for another. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(3), 698-701.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.11.016.

Contreras-Huerta, L. S., Lockwood, P. L., Bird, G., Apps, M. A., & Crockett, M. J. (2022). Prosocial behavior is associated with transdiagnostic markers of affective sensitivity in multiple domains. *Emotion, 22*(5), 820-835.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000813.

Conway, P., Goldstein-Greenwood, J., Polacek, D., & Greene, J. D. (2018). Sacrificial utilitarian judgments do reflect concern for the greater good: Clarification via process dissociation and the judgments of philosophers. *Cognition, 179*, 241-265.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.04.018.

Cushman, F. (2013). Action, outcome, and value: A dual-system framework for morality. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 17*(3), 273-292.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868313495594.

De Waal, F., & Preston, S. D. (2017). Mammalian empathy: Behavioural manifestations and neural basis. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 18*(8), 498-509.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2017.72.

DeSteno, D. (2015). Compassion and altruism: How our minds determine who is worthy of help. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 3*, 80-83.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.02.002.

Eckland, N. S., Huang, A. B., & Berenbaum, H. (2020). Empathic accuracy: Associations with prosocial behavior and self-insecurity. *Emotion, 20*(7), 1306-1310.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000622.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Spinrad, T. L., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Reiser, M., . . . Guthrie, I. K. (2001). The relations of regulation and emotionality to children's externalizing and internalizing problem behavior. *Child Development, 72*(4), 1112-1134.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00337.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Murphy, B. C., Guthrie, I. K., Jones, S., . . . Maszk, P. (1997). Contemporaneous and longitudinal prediction of children's social functioning from regulation and emotionality. *Child Development, 68*(4), 642-664.Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/1132116.

Feezell, R. M. (1986). Sportsmanship. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 13*(1), 1-13.

FeldmanHall, O., Dalgleish, T., Evans, D., & Mobbs, D. (2015). Empathic concern drives costly altruism. *Neuroimage, 105*, 347-356.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.10.043.

Fritz, M. M., Walsh, L. C., Cole, S. W., Epel, E., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2021). Kindness and cellular aging: A pre-registered experiment testing the effects of prosocial behavior on telomere length and well-being. *Brain, Behavior, & Immunity-Health, 11*, 100187.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbih.2020.100187.

Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review, 17*(2), 183-211.Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1992.4279530.

Gleichgerrcht, E., & Young, L. (2013). Low levels of empathic concern predict utilitarian moral judgment. *PloS One, 8*(4), e60418.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0060418.

Gumus, H., Saracli, S., Yagmur, R., Isik, O., & Ersoz, Y. (2020). The investigation of sportsmanship behaviors of university students. *Sport Psychology Journal, 29*(1), 13–20-13–20.

Haidt, J., Davidson, R. J., Scherer, K. R., & Goldsmith, H. H. (2003). Handbook of affective sciences. In The moral emotions (pp. 852-870). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hasanpour, M., Ghaedi Heidari, F., & Hasanzadeh, A. (2017). Emotional intelligence of nursing students in different educational levels. *Journal of Nursing Education, 6*(2), 33-40.Available at: https://doi.org/10.21859/jne-06025.

Haynes, F. (2002). Ethics in education (1st ed., pp. 20-22). Istanbul: Details Publications.

Jambon, M., & Smetana, J. G. (2020). Self-reported moral emotions and physical and relational aggression in early childhood: A social domain approach. *Child Development, 91*(1), e92-e107.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13174.

Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2004). Empathy and offending: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(5), 441-476.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2003.03.001.

Jordan, M. R., Amir, D., & Bloom, P. (2016). Are empathy and concern psychologically distinct? *Emotion, 16*(8), 1107.

Karasar, N. (2013). *Scientific research method* (25th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Publication Distribution.

Keating, J. W. (2007). Sportsmanship as a moral category. *Ethics in Sport*(Ed. 2), 141-151.

Keskin, S. C. (2014). From what isn't empathy to empathic learning process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 4932-4938.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1052.

Khampa, D. (2019). Development and standardization of moral intelligence scale. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(4), 657-665.

Klimecki, O. M., Vuilleumier, P., & Sander, D. (2016). The impact of emotions and empathy-related traits on punishment behavior: Introduction and validation of the inequality game. *PloS One, 11*(3), e0151028.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151028.

Koç, Y. (2013). Physical education lesson sportsmanship behavior scale (BEDSS): Validity and reliability study. *Journal of Erzincan University Faculty of Education, 15*(1), 96-114.

Kocak, C. V. (2020). Athlete self-efficacy scale: Development and psychometric properties. *Balt J Health Phys Act, 12*(4), 41-54.

KOrkmaz, S. (2008). *An application on the factors affecting the motivation of doctors.* Nurses and Midwives in Hospitals (Master's Thesis). Çağ University Institute of Social Sciences.

Kumar, R., & Ve Lal, R. (2006). The role of self-efficacy and gender difference among the adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 32*(3), 249– 254.

Lengua, L. J., Bush, N. R., Long, A. C., Kovacs, E. A., & Trancik, A. M. (2008). Effortful control as a moderator of the relation between contextual risk factors and growth in adjustment problems. *Development and Psychopathology, 20*(2), 509-528.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579408000254.

Lengua, L. J., & Long, A. C. (2002). The role of emotionality and self-regulation in the appraisal–coping process: Tests of direct and moderating effects. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 23*(4), 471-493.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/s0193-3973(02)00129-6.

Lennick, D., & Kiel, F. (2005). *Moral intelligence: Enhancing business performance and leadership success. (Ş. Alpagut, E. Nal, & H. Nal, Çev.).* İstanbul: CSA Global Publishing.

Li, J.-B., Delvecchio, E., Lis, A., Nie, Y.-G., & Di Riso, D. (2016). Positive coping as mediator between self-control and life satisfaction: Evidence from two Chinese samples. *Personality and Individual Differences, 100*(97), 130-133.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.042.

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.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590444000041.

Maranges, H. M., Hasty, C. R., Maner, J. K., & Conway, P. (2021). The behavioral ecology of moral dilemmas: Childhood unpredictability, but not harshness, predicts less deontological and utilitarian responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 120*(6), 1696.

Marsh, A. A. (2019). The caring continuum: Evolved hormonal and proximal mechanisms explain prosocial and antisocial extremes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 70*, 347-371.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103010.

McPhedran, S. (2009). A review of the evidence for associations between empathy, violence, and animal cruelty. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*(1), 1-4.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.07.005.

Mead, N. L., Baumeister, R. F., Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., & Ariely, D. (2009). Too tired to tell the truth: Self-control resource depletion and dishonesty. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(3), 594-597.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.02.004.

Ministry of National Education (MEB). (2021). National education statistics formal education 2021/'22. Retrieved from: https://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2022_09/15142558_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2021_2022.pdf.

Mofrad, S. K., & Mehrabi, T. (2015). The role of self-efficacy and assertiveness in aggression among high-school students in Isfahan. *Journal of Medicine and Life*, *8*(Spec Iss 4), 225-231.

Morgil, İ., Seçil, A., Seçken, N., Yavuz, S., & Oskay, Ö. Ö. (2004). The influence of computer-assisted education on environmental knowledge and environmental awareness. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, *5*(2), 99-110.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1039/b3rp90032k.

Napolitano, C. M., & Job, V. (2018). Assessing the implicit theory of willpower for strenuous mental activities scale: Multigroup, across-gender, and cross-cultural measurement invariance and convergent and divergent validity. *Psychological Assessment*, *30*(8), 1049-1064.

Nuttall, P., Arnold, S., Carless, L., Crockford, L., Finnamore, K., Frazier, R., & Hill, A. (2011). Understanding music consumption through a tribal lens. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *18*(2), 152-159.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2010.12.007.

Oztürk, H. l., Saylıgil, O., & Yıldız, Z. (2019). New concept in clinical care: Proposal of a moral intelligence scale. *Acta Bioethica*, *25*(2), 265-281.Available at: https://doi.org/10.4067/s1726-569x2019000200265.

Preston, S. D., & De Waal, F. B. (2002). Empathy: Its ultimate and proximate bases. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *25*(1), 1-20.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x02000018.

Sengun, M. (2015). *Moral thought and judgment*. Ankara: Nobel Academic Publishing.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Ma: Pearson.

Tahmassian, K., & Ansari, A. (2009). The relation between domains of self-efficacy and dpression in adolescence.

Tangney, J., Baumeister, R., & Boone, A. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, *72*(2), 271-324.Available at: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315175775-5.

Tel, M. (2014). Fair play in Turkish society life. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, *2*(1), 694-704.

Türedi, E. (2015). *The relationship between self-efficacy, self-esteem and assertiveness level -a study on public and private school teachers in terms of gender and experience*. Master Thesis, Toros University Institute of Social Sciences, Mersin.

Willemse, M. (2008). *Exporing the relationship betwen self-efficacy and aggression in a group of adolescents in the Peri-Urban Town of Worcester*. Unpublish Master of Art Thesis. University of Stellenbosch.

Yakut, S., & Yakut, I. (2021). Ruby-moral intelligence scale. *Journal of International Social Research*, *14*(76), 836-842.

Yoosefi, N. (2012). Effect of religious-based cognitive therapy and logotherapy on reducing the depression, anxiety, and aggression symptoms in university students. *Counseling Culture and Psycotherapy*, *3*(10), 137-158.Available at: https://doi.org/10.22054/qccpc.2012.6074.

Zaki, J. (2014). Empathy: A motivated account. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*(6), 1608.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037679.

Zych, I., Gómez-Ortiz, O., Fernández Touceda, L., Nasaescu, E., & Llorent, V. J. (2020). Parental moral disengagement induction as a predictor of bullying and cyberbullying: Mediation by children's moral disengagement, moral emotions, and validation of a questionnaire. *Child Indicators Research*, *13*(3), 1065-1083.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-019-09670-2.