APPRAIZING THE COACHING BEHAVIORS OF COACHES IN A STATE UNIVERSITY

Mark John Tabao
Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus
mjtabao1204@gmail.com

Abstract

Previous research on coaching behavior concentrated on defining the qualities and types of coaching behaviors as well as the antecedent elements that influence coaching behaviors. Now, research is needed to explain the effects or impacts of coaching behavior. This study was descriptive-correlational. This design describes coaches' profiles and coaching habits. The correlational design aimed to establish the relationship between two or more variables. This study shows the importance coaches have on athlete conditioning. This means training and conditioning programs are only intense during competition seasons. Athletes appreciate coaches' technical ability. In response, coaches emphasize technical skills. It also revealed that university coaches allow athletes to help develop goals and methods. The training and instruction centered coaching approach showed moderate relation to all coaching behaviors, with goal setting highest. This means that if a coach focuses on training and instruction, they also perform other coaching behaviors. Autocratic coaching did not correlate with any coaching behavior. Autocratic coaches avoid training and conditioning, technical skills, mental preparation, and goal planning. Autocratic coaches decide without player input. The coaching behavior scale indicates decision-making practices.

Keyword: coaching behavior, training, coaching, autocratic coaches, conditioning

Introduction

Apart from coaching style, Choi (2020) asserted that coaches' behaviors play a critical role in assisting individuals or groups in achieving their objectives. Although many previous researches on coaching behavior have focused on identifying the qualities and types of coaching behaviors as well as the antecedent variables that influence coaching

behaviors, investigations that explicate the results or impacts of coaching behavior are now required. Several prior researches based on the self-determination theory have repeatedly shown that coaching behavior has an impact on athletes' performance. Athlete burnout is linked to dissatisfaction in the relationship between coaches and athletes, such as disagreements, unsatisfactory communications, and a lack of empathy in coaches,

Moreover, to determine the coaching behavior of the respondents, a coaching behavior scale for sports by Cote et al. (1999, as cited by Carlsson & Lundqvist, 2016) was utilized. Côté et al. (1999) have developed the Coach Behaviors Scale for Sport (CBS-S) as a tool for measuring the quality of high-performance coaches' behaviors. This model of coaching behaviors is suitable for all forms of coaching, including participation and performance (Koh et al,2014). It aims to collect quantitative data on coaches' behaviors, providing feedback to them and guiding their personal development. It has been used in countries like Canada, the USA, Turkey and Australia and found to be useful (Mallett and Côté,2006).

The CBS-S measures four dimensions of a coach's consistent involvement with the athletes in the complex training and competition coaching environments. They are Physical Training and Planning (the coach's involvement in the athlete's physical training and conditioning for training and competition), Technical Skills (the coach's provisions of feedback, demonstration, and cues), Goal Setting (the coach's involvement in identifying, developing, and monitoring the athlete's goals), and, Mental Preparation (the coach's involvement in providing the athlete with advice on how to perform well under pressure).

Therefore, having laid down the importance of coaching behaviors, it is imperative to conduct a study focused on those constructs. It's critical to first understand coaching behavior, because of its impact to athletic performance. Depending on the role that one plays on a team, whether it be a coach or an athlete, those constructs may be shown differently further, connecting coaches or athletes to who they are, their identity, and how both work together to achieve a common goal.

Statement of the Problem

This study generally aims to identify and describe the coaching behavior and coaching styles of collegiate coaches in Cagayan State University. Additionally, it seeks to compare the coaching behavior and coaching styles against their profile. Specifically, it will seek to answer the following questions:

1. How do the respondents assess their coaching behavior in terms of the following dimensions?

    1.1 Physical Training and Conditioning

    1.2 Technical Skills

    1.3 Mental Preparation

    1.4 Goal Setting

2. Is there a relationship between the preferred coaching styles and dominant coaching behavior of the respondents?

Literature Review

Coaching Behavior of University Coaches

"Coaches engage in several interpersonal behaviors when engaging with their athletes," including "autonomy supportive" (AS), "autonomy thwarting" (AT), and "relatedness thwarting" (RT) (Rocchi & Pelletier, 2018). However, these are the three behaviors that are most frequently mentioned in research. Other studies have included additional actions; however, these are the most common ones. Actions that provide the athlete with a choice are referred to as athlete-centered (AS) actions. "rationale for tasks, appreciating athletes' opinions, creating opportunities for initiative, and promoting task involvement" are some of the things that are provided by it (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). When athletic training is performed, instructors have a tendency to create an environment in which they control the rewards; they issue commands for which there is no reason and provide feedback that is scary (Rocchi & Pelletier, 2018). Athletes who have the perception that their coaches have higher levels of AS tend to report higher levels of need satisfaction and autonomous motivation in their sport, whereas athletes who have the perception that their coaches have higher levels of AT report higher levels of need frustration along with controlled motivation. The findings of this research have been found through research conducted on the outcomes of these two variables (Joesaar, Hein & Hager, 2012). The same principle applies to coaches. Their self-motivation to train independently grows in proportion to the degree to which their demands are satisfied. As a result of all of this, it is safe to say that coaches play a significant part in the "individual and team efficacy perceptions through the coach's own perceived efficacy (e.g., modeling high efficacy themselves), feedback provided to athletes (e.g., verbal persuasion), and their behavior

(e.g., leadership style")" (Vargas-Tonsing, Myers, & Feltz, 2004). This assertion is supported by a significant body of research in implying that coaches have significant influence over their players and serve as a primary source of both effectiveness and confidence for those players.

In addition, the coaching behavior scale for sports developed by Cote et al. (1999, which was cited by Carlsson and Lundqvist, 2016) was used in this research work, and it was used to define the coaching behavior that was seen. The Coach Behaviors Scale for Sport (CBS-S) is a tool that was designed by Côté and colleagues (1999) in order to measure the level of quality exhibited by high-performance coaches' behaviors. This model of coaching behaviors is applicable to all types of coaching, including performance and participation coaching (Koh et al,2014). Its purpose is to collect quantitative data on the activities of coaches, with the intention of delivering feedback to those coaches and encouraging their individual growth. According to Mallett and Côté (2006), it has been useful in places like Canada, the United States of America, Turkey, and Australia where it has been implemented.

Research Methodology

Research Design

A descriptive-correlational approach was taken in the design of this study. The descriptive design is utilized for the purpose of describing the coaches' profiles, as well as their coaching behaviors. On the other hand, the focus of the correlational design was on the collection of data or

information to establish the relationship between two or more variables that were the subject of the inquiry. The data were analyzed in this study in order to uncover correlations or relationships between the profiles of the coaches and their coaching styles as well as their conduct. Additionally, there is a correlation between their coaching approaches and the way that they coach.

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in the eight campuses of Cagayan State University (CSU). The university was created by Presidential Decree 1436, subsequently amended by Republic Act No. 8292 by integrating all higher education institutions in the province of Cagayan that were publicly funded. Its eight campuses are strategically located in the three congressional districts of Cagayan; the campuses of Aparri, Lal-Lo and Gonzaga in the 1st District; the campuses of Piat, Lasam and Sanchez-Mira in the 2nd District; and the campuses of Andrews and Carig in Tuguegarao City in the 3rd District.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The respondents of this study were the coaches in various sports in CSU across its campuses. This study used non-probability sampling technique. It specifically used representative sampling because of the pandemic protocols, the researcher can only settle on online administration of the questionnaires. Hence, the response rate was affected since not all coaches can be reachable because of internet connectivity and other coordination

and communication issues. Based on the data acquired by the researcher from the authorities, the table below shows the number of coaches per campus and those who responded.

Research Instrument

In order to collect the necessary information for the study, the researcher made use of a survey questionnaire. The questionnaire that Cote and his colleagues developed to assess coaching conduct will serve as the tool (1999). The Coach Behaviors Scale for Sport, often known as the CBS-S, is a tool that was designed by the authors in order to measure the quality of the behaviors exhibited by high-performance coaches. This model of coaching behaviors is applicable to all types of coaching, including performance and participation coaching (Koh et al,2014). The CBS-S is designed to examine four aspects of a coach's consistent participation with the athletes in the challenging situations of both training and competition. They are known as Technical, Goal Setting, and Mental Preparation, in addition to Physical Training and Planning. In this section of the instrument, there are a total of 26 statements.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION, AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Coaching Behavior

Aside from coaching styles, the coaching behavior was also investigated in this study. The classification of coaching behavior by Cote et al (1999) served as the basis of this study. The authors have developed the Coach Behaviors Scale for Sport (CBS-S) as a tool for measuring the quality of high-performance coaches' behaviors. The CBS-S measures four dimensions of a coach's consistent involvement with the athletes in the

complex training and competition coaching environments. They are Physical Training and Planning, Technical, Goal Setting, and, Mental Preparation. The following table will show the coaching behavior of the coaches in the university.

Table 1 clearly shows that CSU coaches strongly agree that they need to focus on physical training and conditioning for their athletes with a mean score of 4.35. The highest rated statements are providing the athletes with physically challenging conditioning program, while providing athletes with programs they are confident came second. This implies the gravity that coaches put into the conditioning programs of their athletes. Elofson (2019) stated that strength training and conditioning makes athletes less prone to injuries, thus, the data reflects the measures done by coaches for athletes to less likely to suffer from injuries. However, it can be noticed that the provision of annual training program received a relatively low rating. This suggests that training and conditioning programs are heightened only during competition seasons and becomes dormant through out the year.

Table 1. Coaches behavior on emphasizing on physical training & conditioning

Physical Training and Conditioning	Mean	Description
I provide my athletes with a physical conditioning program in which they are confident.	4.47	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with a physically challenging conditioning program.	4.53	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with a detailed physical conditioning program.	4.39	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with a plan for their physical preparation.	4.42	Strongly Agree
I ensure that training facilities and equipment are organized.	4.44	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with structured training sessions.	4.33	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with an annual training program.	3.83	Agree

Overall Weighted Mean	4.35	Strongly Agree

On the other hand, the table below shows that coaches at CSU aim to develop the technical skills of athletes with a mean score of 4.45. This is slightly higher than the overall mean in physical training and conditioning. This data suggests that the coaches' practice the provisions of feedback, demonstration, and cues to their athletes. Specifically, from the same table, the most practiced are using verbal examples that describe how a skill should be done and giving athletes specific feedback for correcting technical errors. Cue (2019), who studied coaching efficacy in Cagayan State University, mentioned that athletes value the technical skills of their coaches. Having this said, the inclination of coaches towards technical skills actually responds to the findings of Cue (2019). Linking this finding to related studies, it has been shown by Boardley, Kavussanu and Ring (2008) that technique effectiveness predicted player task, self-efficacy and pro-social behaviors within athletes.

Table 2. Coaches assessment of their behavior on emphasizing on Technical Skills

Technical Skills	Mean	Description
I provide my athletes with advice while they are performing a skill.	4.33	Strongly Agree
I give my athletes specific feedback for correcting technical errors.	4.53	Strongly Agree
I give my athletes reinforcement about correct technique.	4.47	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with a feedback that helps them improve their technique.	4.44	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes visual examples to show how a skill should be done.	4.39	Strongly Agree
I use verbal examples that describe how a skill should be done.	4.53	Strongly Agree
I make sure my athletes understand the techniques and strategies they are being taught.	4.44	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with immediate feedback.	4.50	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.45**	**Strongly Agree**

Meanwhile, Table 3 presents the assessment of the coaches of their behavior in

terms of mental preparation. In general, the coaches strongly approve of the coaching behavior on emphasizing mental preparation of athletes. Coaches strongly agree that athletes should be provided with advices on how to be mentally tough, perform under pressure, stay focused. This finding mirrors the results of Cue (2019). The author concluded that there is a generally positive assessment towards the coaches' efficacy in terms of motivation skill as perceived by the coaches themselves and the athletes. Moreover, Fatiha et al (2016) suggest that preparing athletes mentally by people who knows the process, leads to improved performance; hence, it is good that CSU coaches apply this in their trainings.

Table 3. Coaches assessment of their behavior on emphasizing on mental preparation

Mental Preparation	Mean	Description
I provide my athletes advice on how to perform under pressure.	4.58	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes advice on how to be mentally tough.	4.50	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes advice on how to stay confident about their abilities.	4.58	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes advice on how to stay positive about themselves.	4.53	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes advice on how to stay focused.	4.58	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.56**	**Strongly Agree**

Table 4 shows that CSU coaches believe on the needs of setting goals for the team manifested by a mean rating of 4.43. This implies that the coaches in the university are allowing the athletes to be participatory in identifying strategies to achieve their goals. Furthermore, the coaches help their athletes identify target dates for attaining their goals.

Table 4. Coaches assessment of their behavior on emphasizing on goal setting

Goal Setting	Mean	Description

I help my athletes identify strategies to achieve their goals.	4.61	Strongly Agree
I monitor their progress towards their goals.	4.47	Strongly Agree
I help my athletes set-short term goals.	4.19	Agree
I help my athletes identify target dates for attaining their goals.	4.50	Strongly Agree
I help my athletes set long-term goals.	4.31	Strongly Agree
I provide my athletes with support to attain their goals.	4.47	Strongly Agree
Overall Weighted Mean	**4.43**	**Strongly Agree**

Relationship between Coaching Style and Coaching Behavior

One of the objectives of this study is to look at the relationship between the coaching styles and coaching behavior of the respondents. Looking at table 5, certain types of coaching styles are significantly related to their coaching behavior. For the sake of discussion, those pairs with high correlation will be discussed. In general, the relationships identified are all positive but the strength of association differs.

Looking at the same table, the training and instruction focused coaching style exhibited moderate association to all types of coaching behavior, having goal setting as the highest. This implies that if a coach tends to exhibit a training and instruction focused coaching style, they also tend to practice the acts indicated in all types of coaching behavior. Meanwhile, it is interesting to note that the autocratic style of coaching did not significantly relate to any of the coaching behavior. This implies that autocratic coaches tend to behave away from coaching behaviors that are related to training and conditioning, technical skills, mental preparation, and goal setting. In autocratic style, coaches make decisions with little to no input from the player or players. The statements in the coaching behavior scale

indicate practices that allows the athletes to make decision. Hence, the result.

In general, it can be argued that coaching styles are indeed associated to coaching behavior. This may be the case as far as the present study is concerned because there are limited to scarce published literature and studies that probed the relationship of coaching styles and coaching behavior. This study could be the first attempt of correlating the said two constructs. In certain literature, coaching styles and behavior are studied independently and some authors treat coaching styles and behavior interchangeably.

Table 5. Test of Relationship between Coaching Style and Coaching Behavior

COACHING BEHAVIOR		COACHING STYLE				
		Training and Instruction focused	Autocratic Style	Democratic Style	Social Support Focused	Feedback and Reward focused
Physical Training and Conditioning	Pearson Correlation	.689**	.187	.273	.544**	.410*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.274	.108	.001	.013
Technical Skills	Pearson Correlation	.613**	.141	.378*	.516**	.473**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.414	.023	.001	.004
Mental Preparation	Pearson Correlation	.577**	.067	.335*	.462**	.503**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.696	.046	.005	.002
Goal Setting	Pearson Correlation	.709**	.218	.492**	.587**	.521**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.201	.002	.000	.001

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Conclusion

The researcher has arrived at the following conclusion based on the findings of this study: the coaches at Cagayan State University demonstrate a dynamic mix of the various coaching styles that are available. They have a propensity to place an emphasis on feedback and rewards, and may often be described as coaches who are primarily concerned with providing training and instruction. It has also been noted that autocratic coaching approaches are the least preferred by the coaches. [Case in point:] [Case in point:] In addition, when it comes to coaching behavior, each of the coaches exhibits the same level of consistency across the board in terms of the various coaching behaviors. They take steps to ensure that their athletes receive training that includes not just physical training and fitness but also mental preparation, goal planning, and the development of technical abilities. It has been discovered that there is a substantial relationship between coaching styles and coaching behaviors, two separate but connected concepts. In addition, the study comes to the conclusion that the coaching styles of the coaches only differ based on the age of the coaches and the level of competitiveness that they have achieved.

Recommendation

Some suggestions for future research and the practical implications of the present findings are outlined below:

1. Coaches are recommended to continue the style and behavior they are implementing for their athletes as it have been found to maximize their performance.

2. Revisiting a sports development plan is also deemed necessary. Sports coordinators may propose to the executives a long-term development plan for sports. The plan should include infrastructure projects, training designs, athletes' development, and professional development of coaches and other related areas.

REFERENCES

Amorose, A. J., & Horn, T. S. (2001). Pre-to post-season changes in the intrinsic motivation of first year college athletes: Relationships with coaching behavior and scholarship status. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 13(4), 355-373.

Becker, A. J. (2009). It's not what they do, it's how they do it: Athlete experiences of great coaching. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 4(1), 93-119.

Belmerabet, F., & Benchehida, K. (2016). Why mental preparation is so important on directing of athletic performance?. European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science.

Carlsson, A., & Lundqvist, C. (2016). The C oaching B ehavior S cale for S port (CBS‐S): A psychometric evaluation of the S wedish version. Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports, 26(1), 116-123.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 2(1), 34-45.

Choi, H., Jeong, Y., & Kim, S. K. (2020). The Relationship between Coaching Behavior and Athlete Burnout: Mediating Effects of Communication and the Coach–Athlete Relationship. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health,

17(22), 8618.

Côté, J. (1999). The influence of the family in the development of talent in sport. The sport psychologist, 13(4), 395-417.

Cresswell, S. L., & Eklund, R. C. (2007). Athlete burnout: A longitudinal qualitative study. The sport psychologist, 21(1), 1-20.

Cue, P.J. (2019). Efficacy of Cagayan State University Coaches. Unpublished Masters Theses. Cagayan State University, Carig Campus

De Marco, G. M. P. (1999). Physical education teachers of the year. What they are, what they think, say and do. Teaching Elementary Physical Education, 10(2), 11-13.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. Journal of research in personality, 19(2), 109-134.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). Self-determination research: Reflections and future directions.

DeFreese, J. D., & Smith, A. L. (2014). Athlete social support, negative social interactions, and psychological health across a competitive sport season. Journal of sport and exercise psychology, 36(6), 619-630.

Elofson, S. (2019, July 31). The importance of strength and conditioning for specialized athletes. https://www.racmn.com/blog/the-importance-of-strength-and-conditioning-for-specialized-athletes

Favor, J. K. (2011). The relationship between personality traits and coachability in NCAA divisions I and II female softball athletes. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 6(2), 301-314.

Gillet, N., Vallerand, R. J., Amoura, S., & Baldes, B. (2010). Influence of coaches' autonomy support on athletes' motivation and sport performance: A test of the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Psychology of sport and exercise, 11(2), 155-161.

Gustafsson, H., Hassmén, P., Kenttä, G., & Johansson, M. (2008). A qualitative analysis of burnout in elite Swedish athletes. Psychology of sport and exercise, 9(6), 800- 816.

Hodge, K., & Lonsdale, C. (2011). Prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport: The role of coaching style, autonomous vs. controlled motivation, and moral disengagement. Journal of sport and exercise psychology, 33(4), 527-547.

Horn, T. S., Bloom, P., Berglund, K. M., & Packard, S. (2011). Relationship between collegiate athletes' psychological characteristics and their preferences for different types of coaching behavior. The Sport Psychologist, 25(2), 190-211.

Ignacio III, R. A., Montecalbo-Ignacio, R. C., & Cardenas, R. C. (2017). The relationship between perceived coach leadership behaviors and athletes satisfaction. International Journal of Sports Science, 7(5), 196-202.

Joesaar, H., Hein, V., & Hagger, M. (2012). Youth athletes' perception of autonomy support from the coach, peer motivational climate and intrinsic motivation in sport setting: One-year effects. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13, 257-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.12.001

Kim, H. D., & Cruz, A. B. (2016). The influence of coaches' leadership styles on athletes' satisfaction and team cohesion: A meta-analytic approach. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 11(6), 900-909.

Koh, K. T., Kawabata, M., & Mallett, C. J. (2014). The coaching behavior scale for sport: Factor structure examination for Singaporean youth athletes. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 9(6), 1311-1324.

Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2013). The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational model. Journal of sports science, 21(11), 883-904.

Mallett, C., & Côté, J. (2006). Beyond winning and losing: Guidelines for evaluating high performance coaches. The Sport Psychologist, 20(2), 213-221.

Misasi, S. P., Morin, G., & Kwasnowski, L. (2016). Leadership: Athletes and coaches in sport. The Sport Journal, 19.

Moen, F., Høigaard, R., & Peters, D. M. (2014). Performance progress and leadership behavior. International Journal of Coaching Science, 8(1), 69-81.

Parker, K., Czech, D., Burdette, T., Stewart, J., Biber, D., Easton, L., ... & McDaniel, T. (2012). The preferred coaching styles of generation Z athletes: A qualitative study. Journal of Coaching Education, 5(2), 5-23.