



## **RECKONING THE COACHING STYLES OF CAGAYAN STATE UNIVERSITY COACHES**

**Mark John Tabao**

Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus  
[mjtabao204@gmail.com](mailto:mjtabao204@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

For an athlete to achieve success in their chosen sport, the capacity to maintain their motivation is absolutely necessary. One of the many external factors that can have an effect on an athlete throughout their entire career in their sport is the relationship that exists between them and their coach. However, of all of these external factors, the relationship between a coach and an athlete is one of the most important for both motivation and performance. The primary objective of this research is to identify and explain the various coaching styles utilized by university coaches that are currently employed by Cagayan State University. In the design of this study, a descriptive-correlational approach was adopted as the method of inquiry. The objective of the descriptive design is to provide not only a profile of the coaches but also an examination of the coaching style that each of them use. The evaluation is based on five subscales, which include the following: a focus on training and teaching; a democratic style; an autocratic style; a focus on social support; and a focus on feedback and reward. Each subscale is weighted equally in the overall evaluation. The majority of the coaches believe that the primary focus of coaching should be on teaching the athletes and providing instructions on what the sport is all about, as well as how to play the sport and excel at it. This view is supported by the fact that this should be the primary focus of coaching. This might be interpreted as the coaches acknowledging the fact that the athletes know themselves better than anybody else does.

Keyword: coach, coaching styles, player/ athlete, sports

### **Introduction**

The ability to stay motivated is essential for an athlete's success in their chosen sport. The relationship between a coach and an athlete is one of the many external factors that can have an effect on an athlete throughout their entire career in their sport, but it is one of the most important for both motivation and performance (Mageau & Vallerand, 2013). Each year,

<https://ijase.org>



Cagayan State University plays host to tens of thousands of aspiring young athletes who compete in a wide variety of sports at both the national and international levels. Because of this, they will be required to collaborate with a variety of coaches who are also athletes. It is the responsibility of all parties involved—coaches, players, parents, and administrators—to acquire a deeper understanding of how the teaching strategies and behaviors of these coaches effect the athletes with whom they contact. This obligation extends to all parties involved.

In point of fact, research conducted on the topic of coaching effectiveness at Cagayan State University (Cue, 2019) discovered that player and coach perceptions of the quality of coaching are highly correlated with one another. This suggests that there is a robust correlation between the players' and coaches' evaluations of the effectiveness of coaching. According to the findings of the survey, the coaches and athletes from Cagayan State University were given high marks in each of the four measures that measure coaching efficiency. Coaches play such an important part on sports teams because it is their responsibility to create and maintain an environment in which players are able to perform to the best of their abilities and reach their full potential. It is impossible for a coach to capture the interest, respect, and motivation of his or her athletes if they do not build a coaching approach that is capable of doing so.

This research is predicated on a model of coaching styles developed by Van Gastel (2010). This model was derived from Chelladurai and Saleh's Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) (1980). They construct an effective plan for coaching based on the type of leadership that is there. They claim that leadership has a significant amount of application in the <https://ijase.org>



sporting world since the organizational structures of sports teams require managers who are able to convince a group to accomplish certain objectives. The underlying assumption here is that strong leadership is the single most important factor in determining whether or not an atmosphere can be motivated to produce improved levels of performance. The Leadership Scale for Sports is a tool that examines the leadership styles of coaches as well as the leadership styles that athletes perceive to be the most appealing. It is comprised of five different subscales, some of which include the motivating inclinations, social support preferences, and instructional approach of the coach.

After establishing the significance of coaching approaches and techniques, it is absolutely necessary to carry out research that is centered on these aspects of the profession. Due to the influence that coaching methods and demeanor have on athletic performance, it is essential to first have an understanding of these factors. Those constructs may be shown in a different light in furtherance depending on the role that a person plays on a team, whether it be as a coach or as an athlete. This may connect coaches or athletes to who they are, their identity, and how both coaches and athletes work together to achieve a common goal.

The overarching purpose of this study is to identify and explain the coaching behaviors and styles of collegiate coaches working at Cagayan State University. In addition to this, it attempts to evaluate the coach's behavior as well as their coaching style in relation to their profile. In particular, it will attempt to provide responses to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

<https://ijase.org>



- 1.1 Sex
  - 1.2 Age
  - 1.3 Sports being coached
  - 1.4 Years of coaching experience
  - 1.5 Area of specialization (PE / Non-PE)
  - 1.6 Highest competitions participated
2. How do the respondents assess their coaching styles in terms of the following coaching styles dimensions?
- 2.1 Training and Instruction Focused
  - 2.2 Democratic Style
  - 2.3 Autocratic Style
  - 2.4 Social Support Focused
  - 2.5 Feedback and Reward Focused

## **Literature Review**

### **Role of Coaches in Sports**

A person is considered to be a coach if they work with athletes in the form of training, instruction, or advising with the goal of improving the athlete's mental and physical performance in their chosen sport. According to Moen, Hoigaard, and Peters (2014), the major responsibility of the coach is to assist his or her athletes in achieving greater success in their respective competitions. Once an athlete has started their road toward participation in a competitive sport, in many cases, they will spend the majority of their time with their

<https://ijase.org>



coach once they have begun their journey. A coach not only has the responsibility of taking the authoritative role over a team or group of athletes, teaching technical skills, and in most cases winning, but he or she also has the responsibility of motivating athletes, supporting them, and enabling them to fulfill their fullest potential. In addition to these responsibilities, a coach has the responsibility of taking the authoritative role over a team or group of athletes (Kim & Cruz, 2016).

A cognitive activity that demands one to make decisions based on a wide variety of shifting circumstances is required for coaching, which is a major element in the process of increasing the performance of a team or an individual. As a result of the challenging and unpredictability of the environment in which they work, coaches are expected to have the capability to make dynamic decisions, which call for the development of strategic intervention plans and are backed up by an intensive activity that involves reflection, decision, and implementation. However, studies have demonstrated that the formal education programs that are now available do not effectively equip coaches for the tasks that they are responsible for. There is widespread agreement among experts that formal education programs should prioritize.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

A descriptive-correlational approach was taken in the design of this study. The purpose of the descriptive design is to provide a profile of the coaches, as well as an analysis of their coaching style and behavior. On the other hand, the focus of the correlational design was on the collection

<https://ijase.org>



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.

<https://ijase.org>



<b>Campus</b>	<b>Number of Coaches</b>	<b>Number of Coaches who responded</b>
Andrews	34	25
Aparri	19	14
Carig	36	29
Gonzaga	20	17
Lallo	20	15
Lasam	14	10
Piat	21	17
Sanchez Mira	22	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>145</b>

### **Research Instrument**

The researcher used a survey questionnaire for gathering data needed for the study. It is essentially composed of four parts. Part 1 aimed to determine the profile of the coaches. Part 2 of the instrument is the coaching style questionnaire based on the model of coaching styles of Gastel (2010) derived from the Leadership Scale for Sports- LSS of Chelladurai & Saleh (1980). It consists of five subscales that includes; the coach's motivational tendencies: social support focused; the coach's instructional style: training and instruction focused; democratic style; autocratic style; and, feedback and reward focused. The questionnaire is made up of 40 items that measure, as already described above, the five subscales. Nevertheless, it is somehow restricted to just one area of coaching.

### **Data Gathering Procedure**

Following receipt of authorization from the office of the University President, the researcher has communicated with several Campus Executive Officers (CEOs) via way of the Sports Coordinators. The researcher also asked for the cooperation of several instructors on the campuses that he knows personally in order to share the link to the survey to the coaches through their <https://ijase.org>



individual group chats. During this time, several coaches were contacted using the mobile phone numbers and email addresses that were available for them. Every person who took part in the research was personally given a form to sign indicating that they had read and understood the information contained in the consent form, that their participation was entirely voluntary, and that the data they provided would be treated with the strictest confidentiality.

### **Statistical Treatment of the Data**

Descriptive statistics (frequency counts, percentages, means) shall be utilized to analyze the profile of the respondents and their levels of knowledge and implementation of flexible learning. For the coaching behavior and styles, the data will be analyzed using the scale.

<b>Range</b>	<b>Descriptive Value</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Strongly Agree
3.40 – 4.19	Agree
2.60 – 3.39	Undecided
1.80 – 2.59	Disagree
1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Disagree

Meanwhile, the inferential questions on the relationship of the coaching styles and coaching behavior and to the profile variable, Pearson-R moment correlation and Chi-square test were used. All tests were analyzed at 0.05 level of significance.

## **Chapter 4**

### **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION, AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

<https://ijase.org>





### **Profile of the Respondents**

One of the goals of this research is to compile a profile of the coaches, including information about their gender, age, the sports they coach, and a number of other factors. This is vital so that we can determine whether or not there is a connection between their coaching methods and conduct and these variables. To begin, Table 1.1 provides a breakdown of the respondents in terms of their ages, genders, and the activities in which they are involved as coaches. The table illustrates that out of a total of 145 coaches at Cagayan State University, 101, or 69.4%, are male, while 44, or 30.6%, are female. The ages of these coaches are presented in the following way: According to the same statistics, the ages of the coaches varied anywhere from 22 to 62 years old. According to these numbers, the average age is 37.25 years old. In terms of sexuality, the findings provide credence to the assertion made in Flanagan's (2017) piece, which indicated that males continue to hold the majority of coaching positions in the sports industry. In addition, it is very evident that the majority of coaches at CSU work with team sports, which accounts for 51.72% of them, while only 44 of them work with individual sports, which accounts for 30.34% of them. Twenty-six out of the total number of coaches, which accounts for 17.93%, manage sports. It is considered that this is due to the fact that a relatively high number of team sports are played at the university in comparison to the total number of sports performed there. In addition, as team sports require a large number of participants, additional coaches are essential for their organization and management.

**Table 1.1.** Demographic Profile of respondents in terms of sex, age, and type of sports being coached.

**Profile Variables**

**Descriptive Statistics**

<https://ijase.org>



<b>Sex</b>		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
	Male	101	69.4
	Female	44	30.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Age</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>
	22	62	37.25
<b>Type of Sports being Coached</b>		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
	Individual Sports	44	30.34
	Dual Sports	26	17.93
	Team Sports	75	51.72
	<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100.0</b>

On the other hand, Table 1.2 shows the profile of the respondents in terms of years of coaching experience, area of specialization, and highest competition attended. It is reflected in the table that the years of experience coaches have are between 1 and 20 years with a mean value of 8.94. Interestingly, the table also shows that there are more coaches specialized in Non-Physical education field at 66.7% or 97 coaches, while there are 48 or 33.3% who are aligned in the field of Physical Education. This finding is explained by the fact that coaches in the university can come across different colleges other than the College of Human Kinetics. Some coaches have had actual athletic experience even though they did not specialize in physical education. Their experience in sports gave them the privilege of becoming part of the coaching team. Meanwhile, the same table presents that only a few or 4.83% of CSU coaches were able to participate in competitions at the international level, while majority at 35.86% were able to participate in national meets. Forty-eight or 33.10 % were able to reach university meets, and 38 or 26.21% out of the total number of coaching were able to coach athletes at the regional level. The data on highest competition attended by the coaches speak of the victory of the university during regional meets and

<https://ijase.org>

eventually qualifying to the National SCUAA. Cagayan State University has been holding the championship among SUCs in the region for several years.

**Table 1.2.** Demographic Profile of respondents in terms of years of coaching experience, area of specialization, and highest competition attended

<b>Profile Variables</b>	<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>		
<b>Years of Coaching Experience</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>
	1	20	8.94
<b>Area of Specialization</b>		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
	Physical Education	48	33.3
	Non-Physical Education	97	66.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Highest Competition Attended</b>		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
	University Meet	48	33.10
	Regional Meet	38	26.21
	National Meet	52	35.86
	International Meets	7	4.83
	<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### Coaching Styles

One other aim of this research is to characterize the various approaches of coaching taken by the respondents. The evaluation of the coaches' coaching styles is presented in the tables that follow. The evaluation is based on five subscales, which include the following: a focus on training and teaching; a democratic style; an autocratic style; a focus on social support; and a focus on feedback and reward. To begin, a glance at Table 2.1 makes it quite evident that the coaches' evaluations of their own coaching styles as being focused on training and instruction are favorable. The coaches are overwhelmingly in agreement (mean score of 4.53) that the primary focus of coaching should

be on training the athletes and offering instructions on what the sport is all about, as well as how to play the sport and excel at it. This lends credence to the findings of the study carried out by DeMarco (1999), which indicated that coaches should encourage and counsel athletes, as well as the findings of the study carried out by Sherman et al. (2002), which indicates that coaches need to be competent in order to guide more specialized physical, technical, tactical, and psychological preparation of top athletes through their coaching approach.

**Table 2.1.** Coaches assessment of their styles on being Training & Instruction Focused

2

<b>Training and Instruction Focused</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Description</b>
See to it that every athlete is working to his capacity	4.67	Strongly Agree
Explain to each athlete the techniques and tactics of the sport	4.64	Strongly Agree
Pay special attention to correcting athletes' mistakes	4.56	Strongly Agree
Make sure that his part in the team is understood by all the athletes	4.44	Strongly Agree
Instruct every athlete individually in the skills of the sport	4.56	Strongly Agree
Figure ahead on what should be done	4.56	Strongly Agree
Explain to every athlete what he should and should not do	4.67	Strongly Agree
Expect every athlete to carry out his assignment to the last detail	4.39	Strongly Agree
Point out each athlete's strengths & weaknesses	4.50	Strongly Agree
Give specific instructions to each athlete as to what he should do in every situation	4.44	Strongly Agree
See to it that the efforts are coordinated	4.50	Strongly Agree
Explain how each athlete's contribution fits into the whole picture	4.50	Strongly Agree
Specify in detail what is expected of each athlete	4.44	Strongly Agree
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

3

The coaches who took part in this research agreed, with a mean score of 3.53, as presented in Table 2.2, that their approach to coaching is more of a democratic one. According to the

chart, the statement that received the highest rating is the one that advocates for giving players a voice in the decision-making process. This suggests that the coaches acknowledge the fact that the athletes know themselves better than anyone else does.

**Table 2.2.** Coaches assessment of their styles on being Democratic

<b>Democratic Style</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Description</b>
Ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions	4.28	Strongly Agree
Get group approval on important matters before going ahead	4.28	Strongly Agree
Let his athletes share in decision making	4.33	Strongly Agree
Encourage athletes to make suggestions for ways of conducting practices	4.28	Strongly Agree
Let the group set its own goals	4.14	Agree
Let the athletes try their own way even if they make mistakes	4.00	Agree
Ask for the opinion of athletes on important coaching matters	4.06	Agree
Let athletes work at their own speed	4.06	Agree
Let the athletes decide on the plays to be used in the game	3.94	Agree
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Table 2.3 indicates the assessment of the coaches of the autocratic style of coaching. It can be inferred from the table that the coaches slightly approve of the autocratic style of coaching. It can be observed that the highest rated statement is the coach working independent of the athletes. This shows that coaches in the university prefer to make decisions by themselves and do not allow the athletes take responsibility of their own performance. However, it cannot be discounted that the coaches are undecided in most of the statements. It is Noticeable from the table that the coaches are undecided when they are asked if they don't explain their action, refuse to compromise a point, and keeping ideas to

themselves. This suggests that coaches do have the tendency to be autocratic but they have reservations to these themselves. In relation to similar studies, Misasi et al (2016) revealed that male athletes prefer autocratic style of coaching while female athletes see democratic style to be better, thus, CSU coaches are probably seeking a balance between democratic and autocratic styles to cater on the diversity of the athletes.

**Table 2.3.** Coaches assessment of their styles on being Autocratic

<b>Autocratic Style</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Description</b>
Work relatively independent of the athletes	4.28	Strongly Agree
Not explain his action	3.11	Undecided
Refuse to compromise a point	3.25	Undecided
Keep to himself	3.28	Undecided
Speak in a manner not to be questioned	3.75	Agree
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Table 2.4 presents that CSU Coaches agree (3.83) that their coaching style is social support focused. This goes to show that the coaches in the university acts beyond their role in training and improving the athletic performance of their athletes. From the table, it can be seen that the coaches are involved to some extent in the personal lives of their athletes. The highest rated statement is looking out for the personal welfare of the athletes followed by helping the athletes settle conflicts. This result is very evident from the coaches based on observation. In fact, the university totally supports the participation of students to sports. This is demonstrated by the provision of food, training needs, and other important stuff that could affect their performance. Meanwhile, the coaches are undecided if they will invite athletes to their homes. This means that the coaches, though they are social supporters, respect the boundaries between coaches and athletes.

Results from previous studies show that social support is an important coping resource for athletes dealing with psychological recovery from an injury. Social support could “buffer” the effect of stress on injured athletes and thus indirectly influence their emotional wellbeing. The provision of social support to athletes is highly important as Poucher et al (2018) have determined that athletes are highly dependent of the support they receive from their coaches, hence, leads to athletic success.

**Table 2.4.** Coaches assessment of their styles on being social support focused

<b>Social Support Focused</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Description</b>
Help the athletes with their personal problems	4.08	Agree
Help members of the group settle their conflicts	4.36	Strongly Agree
Look out for the personal welfare of the athletes	4.39	Strongly Agree
Do personal favors to the athletes	3.28	Undecided
Express affection he feels for his athletes	3.81	Agree
Encourage the athlete to confide in him	3.86	Agree
Encourage close and informal relations	3.67	Agree
Invite athletes to his home	3.22	Undecided
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Table 2.5 clearly shows that coaches apply a feedback and reward focused coaching style with a mean score of 4.47. This mean score is second to the training and instruction focused coaching style. It can be inferred therefore that the coaches in the university reinforces an athlete by recognizing and rewarding good performance. In fact, the coaches strongly agree that athletes must be shown with appreciation by giving them rewards for a good performance. This can be in a form of affirmative words, compliments, or even material rewards. This result is interesting because Ignacio et al (2017) suggest that a rewarding behavior of coaches is the best predictor of team performance and satisfaction. A

study on this may provide insight on the outstanding performance of CSU athletes during competitions.

**Table 2.5.** Coaches assessment of their styles on being feedback and reward focused

<b>Feedback and Reward Focused</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Description</b>
Compliment an athlete on his performance in front of others	4.31	Strongly Agree
Tell an athlete when he does a particularly good job	4.47	Strongly Agree
See that an athlete is rewarded for a good performance	4.53	Strongly Agree
Express appreciation when an athlete performs well	4.58	Strongly Agree
Give credit when credit is due	4.47	Strongly Agree
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

## **Conclusion and Recommendation**

### **Conclusions**

Basing on the results of this study, the researcher hereby concludes that coaches in Cagayan State University exhibit a dynamic of the different types of coaching styles. They can be generally characterized as Training and Instruction Focused coaches with an inclination to give emphasis on feedback and rewards. It is also observed that autocratic coaching practices are the least preferred by the coaches. In addition, in terms of coaching behavior, the coaches behave equally with respect to the various types of coaching behavior. They act towards the inclusion of physical training and conditioning, mental preparation, goal setting, and technical skills development in the trainings of their athletes. These two constructs, coaching styles and coaching behaviors, have been found to be significantly related. Furthermore, the study concludes that the coaching styles of the coaches vary only





in terms of their age and level of competition reached.

### **Recommendations**

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

1. Most of the coaches have experienced scheduling conflicts due to their tasks as coaches. To solve this problem, it is recommended to assess the academic workload given to coaches and ensure that there is a balance between their teaching loads and coaching schedules, to give them ample time to monitor the development of student-athletes.
2. Additionally, coaches also considered students who lose focus and attention as a problem. This calls for a training or seminar among athletes that is designed to improve their motivation, focus, and grit during a game. A specialized guidance program may also be developed for the athletes.

### **REFERENCES**

<https://ijase.org>



- 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 Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S): A psychometric evaluation of the Swedish 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.