IMPEDIMENTS OF COACHING PRACTICES IN THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

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

Abstract

It's possible that an athlete's level of motivation is one of the most important factors in determining whether or not they will be successful. Athletes are subjected to a wide range of external pressures throughout the entirety of their time spent competing in a sport, and each of these influences has the potential to have an effect on the athletes' level of motivation as well as their overall performance. The methodology that was used in the formulation of this study was one that focused on description and correlation. The descriptive design is used with the intention of characterizing the coaches' profiles, as well as their coaching styles and behaviors, in order to better understand the relationship between the two. The research approach was utilized in order to successfully complete this task. On the other hand, the primary focus of the correlational design was on the gathering of data or information to establish the link between two or more variables that were the subject of the inquiry. This relationship was the subject of the inquiry. Using the design itself to carry out research allowed us to achieve this goal. The study provided evidence to support the hypothesis that coaches' pedagogical approaches differ according to their age and the level of competition they have attained. It also suggests that the profiles of the coaches are not essential to an understanding of the differences in the approaches that coaches take to teaching, which is also true with regard to coaching styles. According to what has been observed, coaches face scheduling conflicts in two different ways. One concern is how effectively they divide their time between coaching and carrying out their responsibilities as a teacher in the classroom. The author came to the conclusion that a lack of equipment and facilities is one of the difficulties that are experienced by both coaches and players. It cannot be denied that proper coaching and training need facilities and equipment that are both practical and suitable for the purpose. This will, as a direct consequence, lead to improved athletic performance.

Keywords: impediments, coaching practices, athletic performance, athlete's level of performance

Introduction

The level of motivation an athlete possesses can be a significant factor in whether or not they are

successful. Throughout their time spent participating in a sport, athletes are exposed to a variety

of external forces, each of which can have an impact on their level of motivation and performance.

However, the relationship that develops between an athlete and their coach is one of the most influential of these factors (Mageau & Vallerand, 2013). At Cagayan State University, every year tens of thousands of young athletes compete in several competitive sports, either at the school level or at the national level. Because of this, students will have to interact with a wide array of coaches who are themselves athletes. Everyone involved in the sport, including players, coaches, parents, and administrators, has a duty to educate themselves regarding the impact that some coaches, as well as the coaching methods and behaviors they employ, have on the athletes with whom they are associated.

In point of fact, a study that was conducted at Cagayan State University on the topic of coach efficacy (Cue, 2019) found that there is a considerable correlation between the coaches' and athletes' judgments of coaching efficacy. This indicates that there is a strong correlation between the players' reports on the effectiveness of the coaching and the coaches' reports on the effectiveness of the coaching. According to the poll, both the coaches and the players at Cagayan State University received great ratings across all four criteria that measure the effectiveness of coaching. The reason why coaches play such an important part in sports teams is because it is their job to establish and preserve conditions that are conducive to each player realizing their maximum potential in the sport. It is highly improbable that a coach will be able to inspire his or her players to perform up to their full potential if the coach does not establish a coaching style that is capable of garnering the attention and respect of his or her players as well as the players' desire to improve. This set of conditions served as the impetus for the conduct of this study, which seeks to determine the coaching behaviors and styles of those employed at Cagayan State University.

When in charge of a team of players, each individual coach, regardless of their age, sport, or level of expertise, has access to a variety of coaching philosophies that they are free to choose or modify as their own personal approach. Each method of coaching has its own distinctive set of behaviors and characteristics, which can have a variety of different impacts on the athletes who are taught using that method. The two fundamental coaching styles that can be described in the context of sports are the controlling style and the autonomous supporting approach. Each of these approaches has its own unique set of benefits and drawbacks, and each of them has the potential to influence the level of motivation and performance exhibited by athletes. Previous research, such as Deci and Ryan's study of Self-Determination Theory from 2002, has described a variety of psychological demands placed on athletes. If these demands aren't met, it can lead to motivation and performance that aren't always what the athlete wants, and it can also lead to injuries.

Choi (2020) argued that coaches' behaviors play an important role in supporting individuals or groups in reaching their goals, in addition to the coaching style being used. Even though the majority of the coaching behavior research that has been done in the past has concentrated on determining the characteristics and categories of coaching behaviors, as well as the antecedent variables that have an effect on coaching behaviors, it is now necessary to conduct studies that explicate the results or impacts of coaching behavior. It has been demonstrated in a number of earlier studies based on the self-determination theory that coaching behavior does, in fact, have an effect on the performance of athletes. According to Cresswell and Eklund (2007) and Gustafsson et al. (2008) qualitative investigations, athlete burnout is linked to dissatisfaction in the relationship between coaches and athletes. This dissatisfaction can take the form of

disagreements, unsatisfactory communications, and a lack of empathy on the part of the coaches. Negative social interactions, in particular, were discovered to be significant predictors of athlete burnout. These negative social interactions include offering unwanted advice or intervention, failing to provide support when an athlete asks for it, and showing disrespect for those who are prominently noticed in sports (Defreese & Smith, 2014). It's possible for coaches to be personable, sociable, and positive; on the other hand, they could be cold and unapproachable. According to a study conducted by Mageau and Vallerand, each of the aforementioned actions has been linked to higher levels of both intrinsic and self-determined extrinsic motivation (2003).

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 accomplish a common goal.

Statement of the Problem

1. Is there a relationship between the coaching styles and behavior of the respondents to their profile?

2. What are the problems encountered by the respondents with respect to their practice as coaches in the university?

Research Methodology

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 styles and 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. This research was carried out throughout all eight campuses that make up Cagayan State University (CSU). In accordance with Presidential Decree No. 1436, which was later revised by Republic Act No. 8292, the university was established by consolidating all of the higher education institutions in the province of Cagayan that received financial support from the government. The campuses of Aparri, Lal-Lo, and Gonzaga are located in the first congressional district of Cagayan; the campuses of Piat, Lasam, and Sanchez-Mira are located in the second congressional district; and the campuses of Andrews and Carig in Tuguegarao City are located in the third congressional district of Cagayan. The participants in this study were the CSU coaches who were in charge of different sports at each of the university's campuses. In this investigation, a sampling method that did not include probability was applied. Due to the pandemic procedures, the researcher was only able to employ online administration of the surveys. Because of this, the study made use of a unique sampling method known as representative sampling. As a result, the

https://ijase.org

response rate was impacted due to the fact that not all coaches can be reached due to challenges with internet connectivity as well as other difficulties with coordination and communication. The researcher obtained the data below from the relevant authorities, and the table presents the results in the form of the number of coaches on each campus as well as those who answered.

The researcher utilized a survey questionnaire as a means of data collection in order to acquire the information required for the investigation. The instrument that will be used to evaluate coaching behavior is a questionnaire that was produced by Cote and his colleagues (1999). The Coach Behaviors Scale for Sport, more commonly referred to as the CBS-S, is a tool that was designed by the authors in order to measure the quality of the behaviors that are exhibited by high-performance coaches. The authors' goal was to determine whether or not certain behaviors were indicative of high-quality coaching. This model of coaching behaviors is relevant to all different kinds of coaching, including performance coaching and participation coaching (Koh et al,2014). The CBS-S is intended to evaluate four facets of a coach's consistent participation with the athletes in the demanding circumstances of both training and competition. These facets include: In addition to physical practice and strategic planning, these aspects of preparation are referred to as Technical, Goal Setting, and Mental Preparation. There are a total of 26 statements that can be found in this part of the instrument.

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.

Range	Descriptive Value
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.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, INTERPRETATION, AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Relationship of Coaching Styles and Behavior to the Profile Variables

Aside from the relationship between coaching styles and coaching behavior, the relationship between the said two constructs is tested against the profile variables. Looking at the table, only age and highest competition attended is significantly associated to the coaching styles of the respondents. This suggests that the coaching styles of the coaches vary in terms of their age and level of competition reached. This justifies the findings Favor (2011) who argued that coaches who were able to reach higher level of competition tend to exhibit coaching styles that are democratic and training focused. Favor (2011) added that this is due to the nature of athletes in higher level of competitions. Amateur athletes need more supervision from coaches compared to the elite ones. This is due to the fact that elite athletes are more experienced and can make decisions by themselves.

For the rest of the variables, no significant relationships have been found. This implies that the profile of the coaches is not critical in explaining the variance in coaching behavior of the coaches and goes also true with coaching styles.

Table 5. Test of Relationship between coaching styles and behavior and profile variables.

Profile Variables	Coaching Styles	Coaching Behavior

	Pearson Chi-square Value	Sig. Value	Pearson Chi-square Value	Sig. Value
Age	104.986	**0.001****	34.621	0.344
Sex	3.704	0.448	1.492	0.474
Years of coaching experience	48.655	0.606	25.700	0.480
Sports being coached	12.199	0.430	5.992	0.424
Area of specialization (PE / Non-PE)	4.582	0.333	0.595	0.743
Highest competitions participated	24.362	**0.018***	6.278	0.393

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

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

Problems Encountered by the Coaches

Ultimately, Table 6 presents that the top 5 problems encountered by coaches as coaches of the university are scheduling conflicts, student athletes who lose their focus and attention, athletes' misbehavior, uniforms and sports equipment, and the lack of proper coaching facilities. Other problems include lack of support from the administration, lack of training provided for coaches, upset and disgruntled parents, student athletes who violate school policies, conflicts with other coaches, lack of commitment among athletes, insufficient time for monitoring purposes, and lack of sports program provided by the university.

Based on observation, coaches experience scheduling conflicts in two ways. One is how they manage their time in coaching and fulfilling their task as a teacher in the classroom. The second one is how they can arrange time for all students to be present in

trainings and games. Parker et al (2012) noted that coaches juggle their team responsibilities with challenging academic workloads, school activities and commitments, and social interests. Moreover, most of the coaches experienced having athletes lose their focus and attention. Parker et al (2012) highlighted in their paper that coaches too struggle from balancing their work life, sports life and being a member of a family. Relationship problems, difficult classes, and problems at home are just a few quick examples of issues coaches regularly experience, prompting coaches to help themselves beyond just sports.

In general, the results on table 6 mirrors the findings of Cue (2019) which was also conducted in Cagayan State University. The author concluded that one of the problems encountered by both coaches and athletes is the lack of equipment and facilities. It is undeniable that training and coaching necessitates for appropriate and functional equipment and facilities. This in turn will result to increased sports performance. These problems all together suggests some improvements and changes in the sports development in the university. This may include stronger protection policy for coaches which includes their academic workloads and personal safety. Structured system on training and coaching schedules is also deemed necessary. More than the monetary incentives, a conducive,

functional, and supportive training environment will be more than enough than the awards given to the coaches and athletes.

Table 6. Problems encountered by the respondents with respect to their practice as coaches in the university

Problems	Frequency	Percentage
Scheduling Conflicts	49	14.85
Student athletes who lose their focus and attention	44	13.33

Athletes Misbehavior	36	10.91
Uniforms and Sports Equipment	36	10.91
The facilities for coaching are not available or sufficient	35	10.61
Support from Administration	25	7.58
Coaches' preparation and skills for coaching	24	7.27
Upset and disgruntled Parents	18	5.45
Student athletes who violate school policies/rules	16	4.85
Conflicts with other school coaches	15	4.55
Lack of commitment and passion of athletes	11	3.33
Insufficient time to monitor athletes due to academic loads	10	3.03
Lack of sports program like regular training	10	3.03
Total	**330**	**100**

Conclusion and Recommendation

In addition to the relationship that exists between coaching styles and coaching behavior, the relationship that exists between the aforementioned two constructs is examined in reference to the profile variables. According to the findings of the study, the only factors that have a significant association with the coaching styles of the respondents are age and the greatest competition they have attended. This would imply that the coaching styles of the different coaches differ in accordance with their ages as well as the levels of competitiveness that they have attained. This lends credence to Favor's (2011) results, in which he posited that coaches who are successful in elevating their teams to higher levels of competition tend to employ leadership styles that are democratic and centered on training. No significant correlations have been established between the remaining variables and any of the other factors. This suggests that the profiles of the coaches are not particularly important in attempting to explain the variation in coaching behavior exhibited by the coaches, and the same holds true for coaching styles.

Last but not least, the challenges that CSU coaches face were brought to light. In descending order, the top five challenges are as follows: scheduling conflicts; student athletes who lose their focus and attention; athletes' misbehavior; a lack of uniforms and sports equipment; and a lack of proper coaching facilities.

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.