Volume 18 Issue 9
Originally issued as C2



Global Journal of human-social science: C
Sociology & Culture
Volume 18 Issue 2 Version 1.0 Year 2018
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460x & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Trainers and their Gender-Oriented Attitudes

By Nurgül Özdemir
Adnan Menderes University

Abstract- In this study, it was aimed to reveal the gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers and the variables affecting these attitudes. The research was conducted in the descriptive scanning model. The data of the study was collected by the personal information form and by The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) and adapted into the Turkish language by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002). The sample of the study was composed of 133 trainers, 38 of whom were female and 95 of whom were male, registered to various sports federations. In the analysis of the research data, SPSS 21.00 statistical package program was used. Descriptive statistics were used in data analysis; independent groups t-test was used to determine the significance level of the mean scores of The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and its sub-dimensions according to the variables with two categories, and one-way ANOVA test was used to determine the significance level of the mean scores of The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and its sub-dimensions according to the variables with three or more categories.

Keywords: *gender, trainer*.

GJHSS-C Classification: *FOR Code: 370199*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2018. Nurgül Özdemir. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by - nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Trainers and their Gender-Oriented Attitudes

Nurgül Özdemir

Abstract - In this study, it was aimed to reveal the gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers and the variables affecting these attitudes. The research was conducted in the descriptive scanning model. The data of the study was collected by the personal information form and by The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) and adapted into the Turkish language by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002). The sample of the study was composed of 133 trainers, 38 of whom were female and 95 of whom were male, registered to various sports federations. In the analysis of the research data, SPSS 21.00 statistical package program was used. Descriptive statistics were used in data analysis; independent groups t-test was used to determine the significance level of the mean scores of The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and its sub-dimensions according to the variables with two categories, and one-way ANOVA test was used to determine the significance level of the mean scores of The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and its sub-dimensions according to the variables with three or more categories. As a result of the research, it was found that the gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers were significantly different according to age and sex in both the hostile sexism sub-dimension and the benevolent sexism sub-dimension. Also, it was found that benevolent sexism attitudes of the trainers significantly differed according to the league the trainers were in and their training experience; but did not significantly differ according to branch.

Keywords: gender, trainer

I. Introduction

Gender refers to the social and cultural gender role that we can define independently of the individual's biological gender. In spite of the fact that there is a relationship between gender and social gender, they are in fact independent concepts. According to Bekleviç and Çelik (2013), the sum of the genetic, physiological and biological qualities of an individual according to his/her gender is defined as gender. According to Zorlu (2011), gender defines female and male. Social gender is a defined gender focused on the social roles of man and woman. According to Ecevit and Karkıner (2011), social gender refers to the position of woman and man as a social entity in the sociocultural structure, it is independent of biological gender, and expresses the roles defined in both sexes within society. According to Marshall (1999), social gender explains the social dimension of the differences between the two genders. While social gender is determined by the sociocultural structure, the classes of biological gender are determined by the rules of nature (Tuskan, 2012).

Author: Adnan Menderes University. email: nozdemir974@gmail.com

There are two main perspectives in the definition of social gender as the naturalist approach and the developmental approach. According to naturalist approach, social differences between man and woman are a reflection of biological differences, and according to the developmental approach, gender roles are culturally determined and socially knit.

The naturalist view suggests that there is a division of labor resulting from physical and biological differences between man and woman in the historical process. Within this context, men tend to the tasks based on strength (hunting, war) while women tend to the tasks based on home and emotion (housework, child care etc.) on the nature of their physical weaknesses.

According to developmental view, there are no significant differences between man and woman except giving birth because the muscular power claimed to make the woman weaker than the man does not have any significant difference in today's conditions. Today, as for the technological development, women have been able to do most of the work that man can do and men have been able to do most of the work that women can do.

The physical characteristics we have depending on our gender are not related with our social behaviors. That is to say, our behavior is a reflection of our socio-cultural structure that we grew up in. Hence, Zorlu (2011) emphasized in his study that men should be concerned with the tasks that require power and that are more in the frontline because of the responsibilities that social gender lays the burden on both genders while women should be dealing with the tasks more in the background, at home.

According to Coakley (1972), the individual spontaneously internalizes the gender-oriented social rules within the socialization process that begins with dressing children with different colors of clothes and extends towards directing them to play with different toys.

Although the social roles attributed to both genders are tried to be explained by biological gender, it is actually a sociocultural formation. Hence, despite the fact that gender does not change, gender-oriented behaviors vary from society to society and from time to time, which is the best evidence. Karkıner and Ecevit (2011) stated that biological differences between genders are not good enough to explain social differences and that according to anthropological data,

© 2018 Global Journals

different societies gave women and men different social roles at different times.

While doing tasks about animals is seen for a girl living in a rural area as part of her life, her social gender role, doing tasks outside home for a girl living in the city is not accepted as they are not believed to be within social gender role behaviors of the environment she belongs to. In short, if social gender roles produce different social behaviors even in different parts of the same society, then, biological gender cannot be the basis of social gender (Bhasin, 2003). According to Watkins (2000), the superior position of man compared to woman is not a natural but a cultural result, and human culture has created its own social rules in culture.

All societies have certain gender stereotypes. Certain behaviors and tendencies are considered together with gender, that is to say, they are considered as specific to gender (Pearson, Turner & Mancillas, 1991).

In the process of socialization, the individual internalizes the social gender roles peculiar to that society. As an extension of this internalization, he displays appropriate thoughts and behaviors. It divides man as logical and woman as emotional (Ölçer, 2003).

According to Bhasin (2003), social gender is a sociocultural classification that defines woman as feminine and male as masculine. In the process of socialization, children acknowledge this distinction that is specific to social gender. According to Kansu (2015), man should earn money, make a living of his home, and rule his wife and children while woman should do housework, and care for her children and husband.

There are many components of gender perception that affects the individual at every phase of life. In the acquisition of gender, the principles of social learning theory are significant. According to this, the individual acknowledges the social norms as well as the gender-oriented behavior patterns of the society in which he lives (Ataman, 2009). In this process, the basis of gender-based discrimination for the individual also begins to be built.

Discrimination is the transformation of negative attitudes towards an individual or group into behaviors (Dökmen, 2004).

Sex discrimination is defined as the fact that women are held in the background in social, cultural, political and economic fields when compared to men as a result of the reflection of negative attitudes towards women in dominant male society (Sakallı, 2002). Gender-oriented discrimination begins within the family. Together with cultural values, girls and boys are directed differently and raised as women and men approving sex inequality. The different level of importance given to the education of women and men is also one of a few important influences on the development and growth of inequality.

Sex discrimination may occur in the form of direct actions or may be realized as hidden or indirect actions. Today, sex continues in an unseen and complicated appearance in the societies where prejudice and discrimination are not welcomed (Dökmen, 2004).

Gender is changeable, not static; it varies according to the society, subculture and time that it is in (Varoğlu, 2001). The establishment of gender continues by institutionalizing in different forms. For example, the division of space has taken its share from sex polarization. The presence of a woman in a place where men are intensely involved may mean that the respectability of the woman is damaged (Ölçer, 2003).

Because of gender stereotypes in all societies, there is a controversy situation about women in many respects regarding access to such services as education, health, sports, and subjects such as working conditions, etc. By the year 2017, while Iceland has the best conditions for women regarding sex discrimination, Pakistan has the worst conditions among the 145 countries in the world (WEF, 2017).

In every society, together with the fact that individuals internalize the gender stereotypes peculiar to that society, they also internalize the gender-oriented division of labor that exists in business life. In this self-realizing internalization process, individuals have defined professions such as pilot or surgeon as man-specific, and professions such as kindergarten teacher, hostess, and nurse as women-specific, and they have positioned themselves in adult life by this conditioning. (Bhasin, 2003). Sports is also one of the fields where this gender-oriented division of labor is encountered.

Inequality arising from differences in age, sex, education, and race is visible in sports participation both in national and international levels (Janssens & Elling, 2009). Sports can also be a field where the athlete, trainer, referee is subjected to gender-oriented discrimination by another athlete, trainer, referee or supporter (Wedgwood, 2011).

The secondary position of woman in sports is closely related to the way which the sports activity fed on the biological difference is perceived and evaluated. According to this perception and evaluation, sports represents a high level of performance, skills, ambition, success and superior physical qualities. It is inevitable that women are subordinated to men regarding these qualities in an activity whose boundaries are drawn in this way. As an extension of this point of view, the female body is subject to gender-orientation in sports (Koca, 2006). Defining the male as the dominant power in sports due to his physical characteristics is a reflection of the patriarchal point of view and has an effect that closes sports to the female. Within the context of history, there are examples of lack of tolerance to sportswomen. In ancient Greece, women were not

© 2018 Global Journals

allowed to watch Olympic Games let alone participating in the games (Le Unes, Nation, 1989).

Kağıtçıbaşı (2008) stated that the first socialization experiences at school and in the family play a significant role in gaining roles for both sexes in the society. Hence, the best example for this reverse socialization is that girls are driven away from sports by their parents while boys are encouraged for sports. Another conditioning experienced at sports, as Appleby and Foster (2013) indicated, is the fact that both sexes are exposed to a non-biologic direction; boys are directed to branches such as football and martial arts while girls are directed to branches such as gymnastics and dance.

As women's movements gained momentum and women's participation in social life steadily increased after the 1970s, an increase was experienced in women's participation in sports. It was noticed that women who were pushed out of sports due to their sex in the past provided similar benefits nowadays from the physical activities just as men (Hudson, 1978). In addition to this, the fact that the sports economy is also trying to make the woman customer has an effect that legitimizes and encourages the participation of women in sports. Nonetheless, when the statistics of women and men participating in sports are examined, however, the branches are different, the difference between the numbers of male and female athletes is noteworthy. Therefore, only 2.789.732 of 8.225.209 licensed athletes are female athletes (DSS: Department of Sports Sevices, 2018). Many factors that are disadvantageous to women's participation in sports and that negatively affect their participation continue to be influential today. The factors that increase the disadvantages of women and the advantages of men in sports participation have still impact, though different (Yüksel, 2014). Today, although women are finding more space for themselves in sports, they still do not have the same conditions as men.

Liston (2006), in his Ireland sample, stated that for a very long time, men have struggled not to lose control over combat and team sports, and while doing this, they exhibited behaviors in favor of men to keep women away from both being members of various sports clubs and such duties as referee, trainer, manager, etc.

Because the track used in Turkey Rafting Championship in 2003 was dangerous and risky the participation of the women's team to cross the river was forbidden by the federation officials. No objection was accepted (Koca & Bulgu, 2005). What is the reason for this insecurity that sports institution managers, trainers and male athletes feel for female athletes in this case, which is a perfect example of conservative sexist attitude? Are women perceived as disadvantageous at sports due to women's sports-specific qualities or gender-oriented attitudes internalized since childhood? Based on these questions, this study aimed to determine the gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers in different branches and various variables affecting these attitudes.

II. Method

a) Research Model

The research is descriptive screening model in terms of putting forth the trainers' hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. Surveys in the screening model are the researches based on relatively large samples aiming to describe the participants' past or present thoughts, interests and tendencies as they exist within their own context (Büyüköztürk, 2012; Karasar, 2016).

b) Sample

The sample of the research was composed of 133 trainers, 38 of whom were female and 95 of whom were male, who were registered to various sports federations.

c) Data Collection Tool

In the research, The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) and adapted into Turkish language by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002) was used as the data collection tool. The scale, which is six point Likert type, has two sub-dimensions. There are 22 items totally in the scale, 11 of which measure hostile sexism and 11 of which measure benevolent sexism. There are reversely coded items in the scale. . The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found as r.85 for the whole scale; r.87 for the hostile sexism sub-dimension; and r.78 for the benevolent sexism sub-dimension. High scores gathered from the scale were considered as the indicative of a high level of sexist attitude. In the research, a personal information form prepared by the researcher was used to determine the variables affecting the gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers.

d) Data Analysis

In the analysis of the research data, SPSS 21.00 statistical package program, was used. Descriptive statistics, independent groups t-test and one-way ANOVA were used indata analysis.

III. Findings

As a result of the research, it was determined that gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers were significantly different both in the hostile sexism sub-dimension and in the benevolent sexism sub-dimension according to the age and sex variables. Also, it was observed that the benevolent sexism attitudes of the trainers differed significantly according to the trainers' league of competition and training experience variables, but did not differ significantly according to the branch of the trainers variable.

© 2018 Global Journals

In the research, whether gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers differed significantly according to sex variable was analyzed by t-test, and the results of the analysis were given in Table 1.

Table 1: T-test Analysis Results of Gender-oriented Attitudes According to Gender Variable

Sub-dimensions	Gender	n	x	S	t	p
Hostile Sexism	Male	95	4.45	8.09	2.63	.00
	Female	38	3.88	8.45		
Benevolent Sexism	Male	95	4.28	8.30	7.19	.00
	Female	38	2.90	6.13		
The Scale in General	Male	95	4.37	12.2	2.31	.00
	Female	38	3.39	13.6		

When Table 1 was analyzed, it was found that the mean scores of male trainers were higher than those of female trainers on the scale in general and in the sub-dimensions of the scale. That is to say, they had higher levels of gender-oriented attitudes. When the mean scores of the trainers' gender-oriented attitude level was examined; gender-oriented attitude mean score of male trainers was (x: 4.45; I strongly agree) in the hostile sexism sub-dimension, while the mean score of female trainers was (x: 3.88, I am neutral). In the benevolent sexism sub-dimension, it was seen that the mean score of male trainers was (x: 4.28, I strongly agree), while the mean score of female trainers was (x: 2.90, I disagree). On the scale in general, it was found that the mean score of the gender-oriented attitudes of male trainers was (x: 4.37, I strongly agree), while the mean score of female was (x: 3.39; I disagree). As a result of the statistical analysis, it was found that there was a significant difference between the gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers ($p<0.05$).

Whether gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers differed significantly according to age variable was analyzed by one way ANOVA test. The results of the analysis were given in Table 2.

Table 2: ANOVA Analysis Results of Gender-oriented Attitudes According to Age Variable

Sub-dimensions	Age	n	x	s	f	p
Hostile Sexism	20-30 years of age	37	4.48	8.5	4.17	.00
	31-40 years of age	33	4.62	7.4		
	41-50 years of age	32	4.00	6.53		
	51 years and above	31	3.80	5.2		
Benevolent Sexism	20-30 years of age	37	3.70	9.18	5.62	.00
	31-40 years of age	33	3.83	7.4		
	41-50 years of age	32	4.12	8.25		
	51 years and above	31	4.82	7.29		

When Table 2 was analyzed, it was seen that gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers were significantly different according to age variable in both the hostile sexism sub-dimension and the benevolent sexism sub-dimension ($p < .00$). According to the results of the Schfee analysis conducted so as to determine the source of the difference between the groups, it was observed that there was a difference between the scores of the trainers of 51 years and above and the trainers of other age groups. When the mean scores of the trainers' gender-oriented attitudes according to age were analyzed; it was found that the group with the lowest gender-oriented attitude in terms of hostile sexism sub-dimension belonged to the trainers of 51 years of age and above (x: 3.80, I am neutral). In terms of the benevolent sexism sub-dimension, it was also found that the group with the highest gender-oriented attitude belonged to the trainers of 51 years of age and above (x: 4.82; I strongly agree). According to the results of the Schfee analysis conducted so as to determine the source of the difference between the groups, it was observed that there was a difference between the scores of the trainers of 51 years and above and the trainers of other age groups.

Whether gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers differed significantly according to training experience variable was analyzed by one way ANOVA test. The results of the analysis were given in Table 3.

© 2018 Global Journals

Table 3: ANOVA Analysis Results of Gender-oriented Attitudes According to Training Experience Variable

Sub-dimensions	Training Experience	n	x	s	f	p
Hostile Sexism	10 years and below	69	4.38	9.40	.68	.54
	11-21 years	36	4.26	6.47		
	21 years and above	28	4.08	8.15		
Benevolent Sexism	10 years and below	69	3.84	9.23	4.12	.02
	11-21 years	36	4.20	8.25		
	21 years and above	28	4.61	8.00		

When Table 3 was analyzed, it was found that gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers were significantly different according to training experience variable in the benevolent sexism sub-dimension ($p < .00$). According to the results of the Schfee analysis conducted so as to determine the source of the difference between the groups, it was observed that there was a difference between the scores of the trainers with 10 years of training experience and below and the trainers of other age groups. When the mean scores of gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers according to training experience were examined, it was found that the group with the lowest level of gender-oriented attitude in the benevolent sexism sub-dimension belonged to the trainers with 10 years of training experience and below (x: 3.84; I strongly agree); and the highest belonged to the trainers with 21 years of training experience and above.

Whether gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers differed significantly according to league of competition variable was analyzed by one way ANOVA test. The results of the analysis were given in Table 4.

Table 4: ANOVA Analysis Results of Gender-oriented Attitudes According to the League of Competition Variable

Sub-dimensions	League	n	x	s	f	p
Hostile Sexism	Super league	38	4.32	8.45	.04	.56
	2nd League	37	4.4	8.05		
	3rd League	58	4.37	7.3		
Benevolent Sexism	Super league	38	4.29	7.15	4 .08	.02
	2nd League	37	4.29	8.365		
	3rd League	58	3.75	7.37		

When Table 4 was examined, it was found that gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers were significantly different according to league of competition variable in the benevolent sexism sub-dimension ($p < .00$). According to the results of the Schfee analysis conducted so as to determine the source of the difference between the groups, it was observed that there was a difference between the scores of the trainers in the 3rd League and the scores of the trainers in the Super League and 2nd League. When the mean scores of the trainers' gender-oriented attitudes according to league of competition variable was analyzed, it was found that the group with the lowest level of gender-oriented attitude in the benevolent sexism sub-dimension belonged to the trainers in the 3rd league (x: 3.75; I strongly agree).

IV. Conclusion and Discussion

Not only the individual characteristics of the trainer but also the characteristics of the athlete or the team have great importance for the trainer to conduct a proper relationship with the athlete or the team. Within this context, the characteristics of the trainer have a decisive role in terms of the performance of the athlete (Doğan, 2005).

For the athlete to perform perfectly and achieve the high-performance targets, the support and point of view of the trainer mainly, teammates, family, club executives, supporters, media, etc. are influential. For example about the media that we can consider as one of factors of success or failure aside from the athlete, Başaran (2017) expressed in a non-pluralistic and unilateral sports media that a lot of crimes, ranging from sexism to crime of hatred, have been committed and sports have been made a field that all masculine values are reproduced. With this behavior, the media forms performance barriers in different ways in the minds of not only the society but also the supporters, trainers, and athletes. For instance, the communication between the trainer and the athlete that includes prejudices will prevent the trainer from providing the athlete with the necessary guidance and support from the technical, tactical, mental and psychological aspects. Spickard Prettyman (2006) stated that while the language that the

© 2018 Global Journals

trainer used communicating the athlete extended the man's sovereignty territory while legitimizing gender perception. Therefore, the fact that some trainers use metaphors for their male athletes who cannot achieve the desired performance insulting women and simulating male dominance is the best example for this. Elitok Kesici and Kızılkaya (2016) emphasized this point in their study. Gender-oriented attitudes are also one of these prejudices. In this research, which aimed to determine gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers and various variables affecting these attitudes, it was found that trainers perceived sports as a field necessitating masculine features and an activity field for women in some branches.

As a result of the research, it was seen that gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers differed according to genders of the trainers both in benevolent and in hostile sexism sub-dimension. In the studies of Yıldırım et al. (2017), Seçgin et al. (2011), Vefikuluçay et al. (2007), Kalaycı et al. (2012), Yılmaz et al. (2009), Altuntaş and Altınova, (2015), Ilhan et al. (2017), Öngen and Aytaç (2013), and Glick et al. (2000), similar conclusions were found, too. According to this result, it was determined that male trainers had more hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes than female trainers. It was seen that male trainers had a hostile sexist attitude which accepted women as second class beings or a benevolent sexist attitude that we could define as an implicit sexism, which regarded women as inadequate well-beings in need of protection. In this case, it can be said that the support that male trainers with gender-oriented attitudes give to female athletes will be prejudiced and inadequate.

When the mean scores of the trainers' gender-oriented attitudes according to age were examined in the study, it was seen that as the age increased, the mean scores of hostile sexism attitude decreased and the mean scores of benevolent sexism attitude increased. In the studies of Yıldırım et al. (2017) and İlhan et al. (2017), no significant difference was detected in the social gender attitude scores of the participants according to age. This change observed in the gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers according to age in our study is due to the change in the social roles and responsibilities of the trainers as they grow older and thus, the change in their attitudes and values. It can also be said that as the age increases, the fact that the tolerance of the trainer towards the athlete increases, that the trainer feels stronger and indigenizes traditional value judgments more leads to the increase of the trainer's benevolent behaviors and the change in the attitude.

In the study, it was found that gender-oriented attitudes of the trainers did not differ in hostile sexism sub-dimension according to training experience, but differed significantly in benevolent sexism sub-dimension on behalf of the trainers with 10 years of experience and below. According to this result, it was observed that as the training experience increased, the benevolent sexism attitude mean scores of the trainers increased, too.

It is noteworthy that while the trainers' hostile sexism attitudes were at a high level during the first years of their careers, their benevolent sexism attitudes increased in the following years. Thus, we can say that the trainers' gender-oriented attitudes change due to changes in the living conditions, but do not disappear. This conclusion can be explained related to the fact that male trainers regard the existence of women in sports as a threat to their existence in the first years of their careers. Besides, the hostile sexism attitude towards women's existence in sports leaves its place to benevolent sexism attitude due to the increasing experience in time. The reason for this can be explained as the fact that the trainers tend to show increased benevolent behavioral tendencies as a consequence of the change in their responsibilities and roles (spouse and children) in their lives.

In the research, when the mean scores of the trainers' gender-oriented attitudes were examined according to the league of competition, it was found that benevolent sexism mean scores in the scale were significantly different. It was observed that this difference was on behalf of the trainers in the 3rd league. This result seems to be consistent with the results obtained regarding the age and training experience variables. The fact that the trainers in the lower leagues are more focused on winning and putting high expectations on the players can be said to lead to a high level of hostile sexism attitudes.

There is a considerable amount of injustice for women and men's participation in sports in all countries of the world (Sportscotland, 2001). As in all other fields, it is necessary to prevent women from being marginalized and to encourage women to participate (as an athlete, referee, trainer, manager, supporter) more in sports (Mulan, 2004).

It can be said that removing the barriers in front of the representation and existence of women in sports just as in many other social areas is possible only if the trainers and of course the whole society have a correct gender attitude and perspective. Therefore, it is necessary to design a training process that will dominate this perspective both in the trainers and in the whole society.

Taking Olympic bodies (muscular and masculine enclosed with social gender attitude) into consideration, it is necessary to re-examine the gender perception that is imposed on the bodies of female athletes because female body in sports is constantly compared with the traditional image of women and the question of 'Is this woman a male?' is confronted. In

© 2018 Global Journals

fact, gender itself is a gendered classification (Öztürk, 2012).

Sports is a field that represents both the numerical and cultural superiority of men. In the recent years, together with the fact that there is an increase in the visibility of women in the field of sports and physical activity, this change is very slow. The number of women in all the components of sports (supporters, athletes, trainers, experts and managers) is much behind the number of men (Koca et al., 2012). According to Global Gender Gap Report of World Economic Forum (2017), Turkey has dropped to 131st in rank out of 144 countries in gender parity ranking. According to the report, 15% of executive managers and 39% of professional and technical workers are women in Turkey. While gender inequality increased in 60 countries compared to the previous year, it decreased in 82 countries. One of the areas where inequality is experienced is the inequality of wages. According to the report, wage inequality between men and women can close up only after 217 years if the conditions continue like this. Investigating what the roles attributed to women and men in sports where the reflections are most intense mean for the trainers, exploring the views of the trainer on social gender parity is significant in terms of shaping the views on the social gender roles in sports on an equalitarian platform. Therefore, in order to eliminate social gender inequality in sports, there is a need to create a sports policy that is far from sexism and to reflect these on public budgets. Moreover, in order to be the pioneer of the policies to prevent social gender inequality and discrimination in sports that is increasing day by day, it is necessary to redefine the social gender perception of all the components of sports, not just the trainers, and to reform the traditional social gender roles, values, behaviors, and attitudes.

References Références Referencias

1. Appleby, K. M, & Foster, E. (2013). Gender and sport participation. In Ea Raper (Eds.), Gender relations in sport. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
2. Altuntaş, O., & Altınova, H. H. (2015). Toplumsal cinsiyet algısı ile sosyoekonomik değişkenler arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi. Turkish Studies International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 10(6), 83-100.
3. Ataman, H. (2009). LGBTT hakları insan haklarıdır. Ankara: İnsan Hakları Gündemi Derneği Yayını.
4. Başaran, K. (2017). Tribünde cinsiyetçi söylemler önlenebilir mi ?. Hürriyet Newspaper (Retrieved from http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/sporarena/tribunde-cinyi - setci-soylem-onlenebilir-mi-40458417 on 19.2017).
5. Bekleviç Çelik, A. (2013). Bir üniversite hastanesi araştırma görevlilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri tutum ölçeği ve çalışma yaşamında toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri algısının değerlendirilmesi. Unpublished master's thesis, Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi, Zonguldak.
6. Bhasin, K. (2003). Toplumsal cinsiyet bize yüklenen roller (Kader Ay Trans.). İstanbul: Kadınlarla Dayanışma Vakfı Yayınları.
7. Büyüköztürk, Ş., Akgün, E., Kılıç, Çakmak, E., Demirel, F., & Karadeniz, Ş. (2012). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri (11th Ed.). Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.
8. Doğan, O. (2005). Spor psikolojisi. Adana: Nobel Kitabevi.
9. Dökmen Y. Z. (2004). Toplumsal cinsiyet sosyal psikolojik açıklamalar. İstanbul: Sistem Yayınları.
10. Ecevit,Y., & Karkıner, N. (2011). Toplumsal cinsiyet sosyolojisi. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını.
11. Elling, A., & Janssens, J. (2009). Sexuality as a structual principle in sport participation, International Review For The Sociology, 44(1). DOI: 10.1177/ 1012690209102639. (© Copyright ISSA And SAGE Publications, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, http://İrs.Sagepub.Com, Accessed on 19.06.2017).
12. Elitok Kesici, A., & Kızılkaya, A. (2016). Medya okuryazarlığı dersine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. Eğitimi Teknolojisi Kuram ve Uygulama, 6(2), 174-189.
13. Glick, P., & Fiske, T. S. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 491-512.
14. Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun, B., Osagie, J. E., Akande, A., Alao, A., Brunner, B., Willemsen, T. M., Chipeta, K., Dardenne, B., Dijksterhuis, A., Wigboldus, D., Eckes, T., Six-Materna, I., Expósito, F., Moya, M., Foddy, M., Kim, H., Lameiras, M., Sotelo, M. J., Mucchi-Faina, A., Romani, M., Sakallı, N., Udegbe, B.,Yamamoto, M., Ui, M., Ferreira, M. C., & López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 763-775.
15. SGM (2017) http://sgm.gsb.gov.tr/ Erişim Tarihi :22 .01.2018
16. Hudson, J. (1978). Physical Parameters Used For Female Exclusion From Law Enforcement And Athletics. In C. Oglesby (Eds.), Women And Sport From Myth To Reality. Philadelphia: Lea And Febiger.
17. İlhan, M., Dikmen, N., Uğraş, A., & Ak, N. (2017). Toplumsal cinsiyet algısının değerlendirilmesi. IJSHS, 2017, 1(2), 108-121.
18. Kağıçıbaşı,Ç.(2008) Günümüzde İnsan ve İnsanlar, Sosyal PsikolojiyeGiriş,11.Basım, ISBN:978-975-503-27-7Evrim Yayınevi,İstanbul
19. Kalaycı, N., Hayırsever F., & Özcan, F. Z. (2012). İlköğretim Okulu Öğrencilerinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet

© 2018 Global Journals

Rollerine İlişkin Algıları. 2. Ulusal Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Kongresi, Bolu.
20. Karasar, N. (2016)Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
21. Kansu, A. (2015)Sağlık çalışanlarına göre toplumsal cinsiyet: Nazilli Devlet Hastanesi örneği. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
22. Koca, C., & Bulgu, N. (2005). Spor ve toplumsal cinsiyet: Genel bir bakış. Toplum ve Bilim. Der.Koca, C. (2006) Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Alanında Toplumsal Cinsiyet İlişkileri. Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, 17(2), 81-99.
23. Koca, C., Öztürk, P., & Arslan, B. (2012). Kadınların spor ve fiziksel aktiviteye katılımı. Ankara: KASFAD.
24. Le Unes, A. D., & Nation, J. R. (1989). Sport psychology: An introduction. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
25. Liston, K. (2006). Sport and gender relations. Sport in Society, 9(4), 616-633.
26. Marshall, G. (1999). Sosyoloji sözlüğü (Osman Akınhay & Derya Kömürcü Trans). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
27. Mulan, R. (2004). Kadına karşı her türlü ayrımcılığın önlenmesi. Uluslararası Sözleşmesi, UNICEF, Türkiye.
28. Coakley, A. (1972). Sex, gender and society. London: Temple Smith.
29. Ölçer, E. (2003). Türkiye masallarında toplumsal cinsiyet ve mekan ilişkisi. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent Üniversitesi, Ankara.
30. Öngen, B., & Aytaç, S. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin tutumları ve yaşam değerleri ilişkisi. Sosyoloji Konferansları, 48(2), 1-18.
31. Öztürk, P. (22.07.2012) Londra Cinsiyet Oyunları, Radikal İki Eki: Online erişim: http: //www . radi kal. com.tr/radikal2/londra_cinsiyet_oyunlari-
32. Pearson, J. C., Turner, L. H., & Mancillas, W. T. (1991). Gender and communication. New York: Brown Publishers.
33. Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 17(49), 47-58.
34. Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). ODTÜ-Psikoloji bölümü öğrencilerinin Türk kadın ve erkekleri hakkındaki kalıp yargıları. Unpublished research.
35. Seçgin, F., & Tural, A. (2011). Sınıf öğretmenliği bölümü öğretmen adaylarının toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin tutumları. E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy Education Sciences, 6(4), 2446-2458.
36. Spor Genel Müdürlüğü (2018). Retrieved from http://sgm.gsb.gov.tr/ on 05.02.2018.
37. Spıckard Prettyman, S. (2006). If you beat him, you own him, he's your bitch: Trainers, language, and power. In S. Spickard Prettyman & B Lampman (Eds.), Learning culture through sports: Exploring the role of sports in society. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
38. Sportscotland (2001). Sports participation in Scotland 2000 Research Diegest. 84.In Grant J. (Eds.), Sport, culture and society: An introduction. Oxon: Routledge.
39. Tuskan, A. A. (2012). Toplumsal cinsiyet toplumda kadına biçilen roller ve çözümleri. Türkiye Barolar Birliği Dergisi. (Retrieved from http:// tbbdergisi. barobirlik.org.tr/m2012-99-1179 on 20.02. 2017).
40. Watkins, G. (2000). Feminizm herkes içindir. İstanbul: Çitlenbik Yayınları.
41. Wedgwood, N. (2011). Can anybody play? An introduction to the sociology of sport and disability. In S. Georgakis & K. Russell (Eds.), Youth Sport in Australia (pp. 97-114). Sydney: Sydney University Press.
42. World Economic Forum (2017). Küresel cinsiyet eşitsizliği raporu (Retrieved from http:// reports. org /global-gender-gap-report-2016/rankings/ on 30. 06. 2017)
43. Varoğlu Bacacı, D. (2001). Örgütsel yaşamda toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri. In Yönetim ve Organizasyon (Ed: Salih Güney). Ankara: Haber Yayın Dağıtım.
44. Vefikuluçay, D., Demirel, S., Taşkın, L., & Eroğlu, K. (2007). Kafkas Üniversitesi son sınıf öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin bakış açıları, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi, 14(2): 12–27.
45. Yıldırım, İ. E., Ergüt, Ö., & Çamkıran, C. (2017). Toplumsal cinsiyet eşitsizliği konusundaki farkındalığın belirlenmesine yönelik akademisyenler üzerine bir araştırma. Marmara Üniversitesi Kadın v Toplumsal Cinsiyet Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2, 37-46 .DOI: 10.26695/ Mukatcad.2018.10
46. Yılmaz, D. V., Zeyneloğlu, S., Kocaöz, S., Kısa, S., Taşkın, L., & Eroğlu, K. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin görüşleri. Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 6(1). Retrieved from http://www.insanbilimleri.com
47. Yüksel, M. (2014). Cinsiyet ve spor. Tarih Okulu Dergisi, 7(19), 663-684, DOI: http:// dx.doi . org /10. 14225/Joh581
48. Zorlu, R. (2011). Toplumsal cinsiyet olgusunun farklı eğitim düzeyindeki hemşireler üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi. Unpublished master's thesis, Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

© 2018 Global Journals