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ABSTRACT

Both researchers and practitioners agree the development of athletic talent is dependent upon quality coaching (Bloom, 1985; Cote, Baker & Abernathy, 2003). Likewise, the quality is often determined by how coaches behave in all aspects of their sport. Coaching behaviors in practice, at games, and away from the sport have strong influences on players (Murray, 2006) and can impact both players' performances and continued participation. As early as 1978, Chelladurai and Carron wrote that sport performance would be positively affected if coaches adapted their behaviors to comply with athletes' preferences Iso-Ahola and Hatfield (1986) noted that player satisfaction in sport is often a direct result of coaching behavior, not successful team performance. They further noted that positive coaching behavior was a key factor in many aspects of athletic performance. Stewart (1993) found that coaches exhibiting positive behaviors were remembered by their athletes as being strong role models Kenow and Williams (1999) stated that surprisingly little research had been reported on the consequences of coaching behaviors and its effectiveness. In their study, they found players who perceived their coaches as being more compatible, evaluated the coaches' communication ability and player-support levels more favorably. Conversely, if athletes disagreed with the coach's goals, personality, and/or beliefs, some of the psychological needs of the players were not met. That failure often resulted in frustration and a loss of self-concept by the player. During this same period, Newton and Duda (1999)m stated that athletes' perception of coach behavior was the foundation of their evaluation of their athletic environment. The more positive the athletes perceived their coaches' behaviors, the more positive was their athletic experience.
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INTRODUCTION
In order to better understand the coach-athlete relationship, studies have been conducted and efforts have been made to develop the most reliable frameworks to measure the effects of coaching behaviors and leadership styles on athletes’ outcomes. Having considered the association between coaches’ and players’ behaviors (Tharp & Gallimore, 1976; Danielson, Zelhart, & Drake; 1975), one may consider that some players’ unwanted or negative actions may also be related to coaches’ behaviors. Coaches help people perform tasks. Coaching is pervasive throughout the life course, from childhood (e.g., a parent helping a child learn to ride a tricycle), through schooling (e.g., a teacher coaching a student in the proper conduct of a chemistry experiment), and into adulthood (e.g., a fitness coach helping with an exercise regime or a supervisor coaching an employee in improving his or her job performance). The main body of research about coaching is found in the training literature, and it focuses almost entirely on individual skill acquisition (Fournies, 1978). Except for the many popular books and articles that extract lessons for team leaders from the experiences of athletic coaches, relatively little has been published that specifically addresses the coaching of task-performing teams.

Here we propose a theory of team coaching that is amenable to empirical testing and correction. The theory has three distinguishing features. One, it focuses on the functions that coaching serves for a team, rather than on either specific leader behaviors or leadership styles. Two, it explicitly addresses the specific times in the task performance process when coaching interventions are most likely to “take” and have their intended effects. Three, it explicitly identifies the conditions under which team-focused coaching is most likely to facilitate performance. Overall, we show that the impact of team coaching—whether provided by a formal team leader or by fellow group members—depends directly and substantially on the degree to which the proper coaching functions are fulfilled competently at appropriate times and in appropriate circumstances.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

To investigate effect of Coaching Behavior on soccer players’ satisfaction
To identify the type of coaching behavior displayed by coaches mostly.

**REVIEW OF LITRATURE**

This section will describe the literatures which describe the topic. what coaching is, factors affecting coaching behavior, team coaching, leadership behavior model, multidimensional model of leadership, athletes satisfaction model, performance and coaching behavior and coaching behavior and player performance in sport are reviewed.

**WHAT IS COACHING?**

This question is difficult to answer. Depending upon the ages of the players, coaching may be seen as a management and facilitating process while others see it as developing and nurturing talent. Whatever the perspective, we can answer the question simply by stating that coaching is an activity aimed at influencing the way soccer is played and the people who play it. The basis for coaching is observation. All coaching begins with an analysis of the game and the causes and effects which determine the eventual outcome of the game. The ability to articulate the events or
actions seen in a game and re-create those situations in training requires the coach to have a keen sense of observation and a good memory. It can be said that a coach is like a camera - always taking pictures of situations within the game so they can accurately assess the needs of their players and team. The development of a coach is similar to that of a player.

Much on-going practice must occur for the coach to gain the skills and techniques necessary for teaching and coaching. Becoming a good coach has much to do with the experiences gained through numerous practice and game situations. Individuals who have played soccer often have an advantage in understanding the game. However, many former professional players who later went into coaching failed because of their inability to relate the game to players who were less talented than themselves.

Coaching and teaching young players requires more than just knowledge of the game, it requires the ability to apply that knowledge within a structure that creates a challenging and rewarding experience for the players. Learning to coach can be divided into 5 different phases:

1. Knowledge and understanding of the game
   First and foremost the coach must be familiar with the game. They must understand how the game functions as well as the principles and concepts that govern the game.

2. Reading the game
   This means seeing what happens and listening to what is being said by the players. The ability to observe and hear what is occurring in the game is a fundamental requirement for every coach. The ability of the coach to concentrate on the game and what is happening is crucial to enable the coach to accurately read the game. The coach must be able to detach from the many emotions of the game in order to stay focused and objective.

3. Determining objectives
   The coach must determine which objectives, both individual and collective, need attention. These objectives come from the game and are established by the coach through observation. Careful observation provides numerous objectives, both of a positive and negative perspective. The coach must then ask which objectives are worthy of more detailed consideration.

4. Setting priorities
   After determining the objectives the coach must establish the priorities for improving or correcting the situations from the game. The more experienced a coach is, the more soccer problems they will encounter. However, the broader the coaches experience, the easier it will be to determine and establish priorities. Because of the limited amount of time available to correct problems, the coach must determine the priorities of the situation. Sometimes a minor problem must be corrected before moving on to a more complicated one. Understanding the game aids the coach in determining the priority and how to correctly address the problem.

5. Planning
   It is clear that the coach must plan carefully to achieve goals and objectives, especially in terms of player development. Coaches need to make a plan of action at the beginning of each year or season. By doing so they have an outline of what they want to achieve by the end of the year and how they intend to accomplish it. Coaching without a plan, especially at youth levels often
results in players not receiving instruction or practice in areas that are the basis for future development.

**FACTORS AFFECTING COACHING BEHAVIOR**

**Coach’s personal characteristics**
Here we have to consider any of the coach’s personal characteristics that could have a positive or negative influence on the coaching process. These could include the coach’s philosophy, style, beliefs, perceptions and even personal life. Each of these can impact on the coaching process and therefore directly affect the attainment of the goal.

**Athlete’s personal characteristics and level of development**
The athlete’s character and level of development can have a direct effect on the attainment of the goal; indeed the nature of the athlete will have a direct bearing on the coaching process adopted by the coach. Within this component, we need to consider such issues as the athlete’s learning style, stage of learning, motivation, personal abilities, identity and acquisition of skills.

**Contextual factors**
A saying often applied to sport is ‘control the controllable’. Many aspects of the coaching process may be controlled. Some, such as illness and environmental conditions, may not be fully controllable but can still be addressed by both the coach and the athlete. Those factors that neither the coach nor athlete can control are termed contextual factors. An example of a contextual factor would be losing a competition as a result of a poor ruling from an official or referee. The athletic component may have been controlled, but the decision of the official is not controllable, and may be something that has to be accepted without necessarily agreeing with it. Contextual factors can have a profound positive or negative effect on the coaching process and the attainment of the goal.

**Team coaching**
Team coaching is an act of leadership, but it is not the only one or necessarily the most consequential one. Team leaders engage in many different kinds of behaviors intended to foster team effectiveness, including structuring the team and establishing its purposes, arranging for the resources a team needs for its work and removing organizational roadblocks that impede the work, helping individual members strengthen their personal contributions to the team, and working with the team as a whole to help members use their collective resources well in pursuing team purposes. Leaders vary in how they allocate their time and attention across these activities, depending on their own preferences; what they believe the team most needs; and the team’s own level of authority, initiative, and maturity. Only the last two sets of activities (helping individual members strengthen personal contributions and working with the team to help use resources well) are coaching behaviors, however, focusing respectively on individual team members and on the team as a whole. In this paper we deal exclusively with the fourth—team coaching—which we define as direct interaction with a team intended to help members make coordinated and task-appropriate use of their collective resources in accomplishing the team’s work. Although team coaching is a distinct and often consequential aspect of team leadership, recent
evidence suggests that leaders focus their behavior less on team coaching than on other aspects of the team leadership portfolio.

Leadership behaviour model

The leadership behaviour model (LBM) (Smoll and Smith, 1989) is the closest example that fits with the coaching process model proposed by Côté et al (1995). The LBM attempts to knit together the coach’s behaviour to the athlete’s perception of the coach’s behaviour, resulting in the athlete’s responses to these perceptions. This approach is very similar to that proposed in the multidimensional model of leadership. There are, however, some striking differences. The LBM suggests ways in which the ‘central process’ can be affected by various factors, all playing a role in the coach/athlete relationship and thereby athlete performance. The contributing factors include: coach and athlete individual differences; the coach’s perception of the athlete’s ability; and specific situational factors. Having viewed a number of models of leadership and coaching behaviour, we have identified several key principles, the most fundamental of which is the importance of the coach/athlete relationship.

The coach/athlete relationship

A strong coach/athlete relationship is associated with high levels of athlete performance and satisfaction. If we look at a poor relationship or incompatibility between the coach and athlete, we will begin to appreciate the characteristics associated with strong relationships. The two primary variables associated with poor relationships are lack of communication and lack of rewarding behaviour from the coach. Poor coach/athlete relationships are associated with lack of mutual respect, no real appreciation for either person’s role and perhaps the most serious of all, lack of honesty between both parties when communication does occur. Given that it is clear what makes a poor relationship, it should be clear what makes a strong relationship: good communication, mutual respect, rewarding behaviour from the coach and a strong appreciation for each other’s role. This is easier said than done, but they are fundamental to the coach/athlete relationship.

Communication – the key to success

Open dialogue between the coach and athlete is associated with greater degrees of athlete satisfaction and better performances. Good performances should be praised, with the coach providing insightful information on that performance. A poor performance should not be openly criticized; instead, the coach should highlight any good aspect of the performance, no matter how minor and praise that. They should then use communication skills to apply constructive criticism to the performance, allowing the athlete to learn and theoretically correct mistakes that were made. This praise and criticism approach to coaching can only come about through a solid coach/athlete relationship built on mutual respect.
The Multidimensional Model of Leadership

Coaches’ leadership behavior is an important factor affecting athletes’ psychological outcomes. The multidimensional model of leadership proposes that group performance and member satisfaction are functions of the congruence among three states of leader behavior: required, actual, and preferred behavior (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990, Chelladurai & Riemer, 1998).

According to Chelladurai, effectiveness of coaching behaviors is a function of situational, member, and leader characteristics. Situational characteristics (i.e., parameters of the organization and/or its environment, such as the goals of the team, the formal organizational structure of the team, social norms, and cultural values) would require that the coach behave in certain ways. Member characteristics (e.g., age, gender, ability) primarily influence athletes’ preferred coaching behaviors, while the coach’s personal characteristics (e.g., gender, age, personality characteristics, and years of experience) influence the coach’s actual behaviors (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990, 1999; Chelladurai & Riemer, 1998).

Multidimensional Model of Leadership: Coaching Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ)

Evolving from the sport leadership research on the coding of observed coaching behaviors and the multidimensional approach to leadership, Martin and Barnes (1999) developed the Coaching Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ). Along the same lines as with the LSS, the CBQ was developed to measure three states of leader behavior: (a) required, (b) actual, and (c) preferred. The CBQ is comprised of two parts: (a) a 12-item demographic section, and (b) a 48-item coaching behavior section. The 12-item demographic section includes questions about the athlete’s age, gender, race, education level, sport most played, and number of years participating in the sport most played. In addition, items were included that related to preference of coach gender and age. Therefore the 12-item demographic section contains items related to the athlete and athlete preferences of coach characteristics. The 48-item coaching behavior section includes twelve subscales of coaching behaviors. The same 48 items are used for all three versions of the CBQ, only the stem to the items change. The required version starts with “A coach (at this level) ...” , the actual version begins with “My coach ...”, and the preference version starts with “I prefer a coach who ...”. The twelve subscales are based upon the twelve coaching behavior categories represented in the CBAS (see above; Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977). Therefore, the CBQ integrates the multidimensionality of the LSS and the coaching behavior categories utilized in the CBAS to measure self-reported states of leadership behaviors.

Kravig, Ludtke and Martin (2002) administered the preference version of the CBQ to high school and college female athletes. They used the classification system developed by Cox (1990) to separate athletes based on the type of sport in which they participated. The classification system places sports on various points of a continuum based on interdependence among team members. Sport teams with low interdependence are considered coactive, which denotes that the tasks performed by members of the team require little interaction among them for success (Goldman, Stockbauer, & McAuliffe, 1977). Coactive sports include bowling, golf, and wrestling. Bowling provides a perfect example of this, since the performance of team members is unrelated to how well they interact (Cox, 1990). On the other end of the spectrum, sport teams with high interdependence are considered interactive, which signifies that the tasks performed by members of the team require considerable interaction among them for success (Cox, 1990).
Interactive sports are those such as basketball, soccer, and volleyball. Volleyball provides a good illustration of this, since success depends on both team and individual performance (Cox, 1990). For example, successful spiking is related to the quality of the set delivered by the setter and the setter’s performance is related to the quality of the “bump” made by the athlete receiving the serve (Cox, 1990). There are, of course, degrees of coactive and interactive sports. *Mixed* sports such as track and field, and swimming contain both interactional demands in the relays and independent functions in various field events, diving, and individual races (Cratty, 1989). Teams may also vary as to the degree to which roles are similar or differentiated (Cratty, 1989). For example, pairs rowing contains highly similar role requirements, whereas American football or baseball contain highly differentiated roles (Cratty, 1989). Therefore, the CBQ integrates the multidimensionality of the LSS and the coaching behavior categories utilized in the CBAS to measure self-reported states of leadership behaviors. The CBQ is comprised of twelve behavioral categories:

a. **Reinforcement**: A positive, rewarding reaction, verbal or nonverbal, to a good play or good effort;

b. **Non-reinforcement**: Failure to respond to a good performance

c. **Mistake Contingent Encouragement**: Encouragement given to an athlete following a mistake.

d. **Mistake Contingent Technical Instruction**: Instruction or demonstration to an athlete on how to correct a mistake he or she has made.

e. **Punishment**: A negative reaction, verbal or nonverbal, following a mistake

f. **Punitive Technical Instruction**: Technical instruction following a mistake given in a punitive or hostile manner.

g. **Ignoring Mistakes**: Failure to respond to an athlete mistake.

h. **Keeping Control**: Reactions intended to restore or maintain order among team members.

i. **General Technical Instruction**: Spontaneous instruction in the techniques and strategies of the sport – not following a mistake

j. **General Encouragement**: Spontaneous encouragement that does not follow a mistake

k. **Organization**: Administrative behavior that sets the stage for play by assigning duties or responsibilities.

l. **General Communication**: Interactions with players unrelated to the game.
Athlete Satisfaction Model

Satisfaction is an integral part of sport participation and enjoyment. Without satisfaction, athletes would turn to other sources for potential success and enjoyment (Maday, 2000). Satisfaction in sport has been studied extensively in combination with several variables, mostly leadership (Chelladurai, 1984; Chelladurai et al., 1988; Coffman, 1999; Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Horne & Carron, 1985; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Riemer & Toon, 2001; Schliesman, 1987; Sriboon, 2001; Yusof, 1999). Several scholars in sport psychology have included athlete satisfaction as an antecedent or outcome variable in their work. For example, the multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990) includes satisfaction as an outcome variable along with performance.

Studies based on the multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990) have been largely concerned with linking leadership dynamics with athlete satisfaction. Satisfaction as an outcome has been employed in different leadership studies based on the multidimensional model of leadership (Chelladurai, 1984; Chelladurai et al., 1988; Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Eichas, 1992; Horne & Carron, 1985; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Riemer & Toon, 2001; Schliesman, 1987; Sriboon, 2001). In the multidimensional model (Chelladurai, 1980, 1990), leadership behaviors were suggested to be antecedents of member satisfaction. The model suggests that the discrepancy between athletes’ perceived and preferred leadership style would impact their level of satisfaction.

In 1997, Chelladurai and Riemer proposed the model “A Classification of Facets of Athlete Satisfaction.” The purpose of the model was to study the needs, benefit, and treatment that were provided for intercollegiate athletics. Based on Chelladurai and Riemer’s (1997) classification of facets of athlete satisfaction, Riemer and Chelladurai (1998) developed, a multiple-item, multiple-dimension scale to measure athlete satisfaction, the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ). The development of the ASQ resulted in a final scale with 15 facets, or subscales, and a total of 56 items on the scale.

The format of the scale allows researchers to include those dimensions of satisfaction most salient for a particular situation (Riemer & Toon, 2001). Satisfaction was evaluated using 4 of the ASQ’s 15 subscales: training and instruction satisfaction, personal treatment satisfaction, team performance satisfaction, and individual performance satisfaction. The first two subscales concentrate on satisfaction with the process of coaching behavior, while the second two assess satisfaction with outcomes associated with the processes of leadership (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998). Training and instruction satisfaction refers to satisfaction with the training and instruction provided by the coach. Personal treatment satisfaction refers to satisfaction with those coaching behaviors that directly affect the individual yet indirectly affect team development. It includes social support and positive feedback. Team performance satisfaction refers to athlete’s satisfaction with his or her team’s level of performance. Task performance includes absolute performance, goal achievement, and implies performance improvements. Finally, individual performance satisfaction refers to athlete’s satisfaction with his or her own task performance. Task performance includes absolute performance, improvements in performance, and goal achievement (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998)
Training and Instruction Satisfaction: Refers to satisfaction with the training and instruction provided by the coach (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Personal Treatment Satisfaction: Refers to satisfaction with those coaching behaviors that directly affect the individual yet indirectly affect team development. It includes social support and positive feedback (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Team Performance Satisfaction: Refers to athlete’s satisfaction with his or her team’s level of performance (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Individual Performance Satisfaction: Refers to athlete’s satisfaction with his or her own task performance (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998).

Is Performance Related to Coaching Behaviour?

While there are various aspects of performance that affect the manner in which the sports team will perform, a critical aspect of coaching is considered to be the manner in which the coach behaves. The behaviour of the coach can make a significant difference to the performance of the team as well as the psyche, the motivation and the team bonding too.

Performance: is quite central to the level to which a sportsperson or an athlete can perform. The coach is responsible for five key areas of performance coaching viz tactical, technical, mental, physical and lifestyle and also social outcomes as a result of their coaching behaviour. This can have a positive or negative effect on the performance of the athlete and the team. Coaches need to be aware how each of their actions can affect the team dynamics. Sadly, most coaches themselves seem to be fairly oblivious of the kind of effect their behaviour has on their team.

There are many philosophies regarding coaching behaviour. Behaviour that has worked in one specific setting or situation for a coach may not work in another setting or team environment. In fact, sometimes a coach needs to be able to modify his behaviour based on the needs of a specific player. The coach needs to align his/her coaching behaviour with his or her coaching philosophy and then ensure whether these behaviours are consistent throughout the season. Many coaches have strong beliefs about the manner in which they go about their coaching. Some tend to make assumptions about the manner in which athletes want to be trained. Instead the coach should attempt to understand the needs of the players. Athlete or player-centric performance of coaching requires the coach to continuously focus on understanding on the strengths and weaknesses of the individual and team. An effective coach should revisit his behavior and have his coaching behavior assessed by someone in his management team or an external individual. This is important feedback to ensure that the coach is on track. Assuming that one coaching style is the best is a mistake many coaches make.

There does not a specific model that is best suited for performance of coaching at all levels. However, one critical aspect of coaching must be kept in mind at all times: A good coach needs to understand how the players interpret his coaching behavior. A coach needs to have an awareness of his own coaching behavior and the consequences of his/her
actions as well as get feedback of what the players think about coaches behaviors to ensure performance achieved.

Coaching Behavior and players performance in sport

To achieve improvement in athletic performance, it may be necessary for the coach to engage in coaching behaviors to which the athlete is receptive. What may be an appropriate coaching behavior to one athlete may be an ineffective approach for another. Similarly, specific behavior by the coach may be more productive of certain outcomes than others (Tinning, 1982). Different needs and preferences from individual athletes within the team confront coaches of team sports. The coach may adopt either a homogenous approach that treats all athletes equally, or alternatively create a heterogeneous style that provides differential treatment to individual athletes. As a result of this, it is important for the coach to be aware of the coaching preferences of his/her athletes in order to provide satisfactory experiences and improve athletic performance. According to Chelladurai and Carron (1978), if a coach adapts his or her behavior to comply with the athletes’ preferred behavior, the athlete may be more readily inclined to repay the coach through an improved performance. Effective coaching behavior varies across specific contexts as the characteristics of the player and the prescribed situation change (Chelladurai, 1978). The context of the sport situation and the characteristics of the coach and the players themselves dictate appropriate coaching behavior.

To achieve improvement in athletic performance, it may be necessary for the coach to engage in coaching behaviors to which the athlete is receptive. What may be an appropriate coaching behavior to one athlete may be an ineffective approach for another. Similarly, specific behavior by the coach may be more productive of certain outcomes than others (Tinning, 1982). Different needs and preferences from individual athletes within the team confront coaches of team sports. The coach may adopt either a homogenous approach that treats all athletes equally, or alternatively create a heterogeneous style that provides differential treatment to individual athletes. As a result of this, it is important for the coach to be aware of the coaching preferences of his/her athletes in order to provide satisfactory experiences and improve athletic performance. According to Chelladurai and Carron (1978), if a coach adapts his or her behavior to comply with the athletes’ preferred behavior, the athlete may be more readily inclined to repay the coach through an improved performance.

Conclusion

Coaches’ that understand their own athletes’ preferences for coaching behaviors may be more effective at maintaining and/or improving athlete satisfaction (Reimer & Chelladurai, 1998). The main purpose of this study was to investigate what effect has come to players due to coaching behavior of their coach, the relationship between coaches’ behaviors, and levels of satisfaction experienced by soccer players in the country and to examine how coaches’ behavior were related to satisfaction. The many varied managerial function of coach including, organizing, budgeting, scheduling, recruiting, public relations, leadership, etc. Of these, leadership is defined by Barrow (1977) as “the behavioural process of influencing individuals and group towards set goals” is the most significant because others functions are performed away from the actual coaching context. The leadership provided by the coach is mainly instrumental in enhancing the
motivational state of the group (House 1971) and in turn the motivational state of the group is the ultimate basis of performance effectiveness. Chelladurai (1978) the effectiveness of the coaching behaviour is contingent on its congruence with the preferences of the members as well as the dictates of the situational characteristics.
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