

COACHING STYLES, MOTIVATION, AND SPORTS PERFORMANCE

LAURENCE ANTHONY BARREDO LABADAN

Physical Education Department, College of Education, Bukidnon State University, Malaybalay City, Bukidnon, PHILIPPINES.

Email: laurencelabadan18@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Labadan, L.A.B. (March 2021). Coaching styles, motivation, and sports performance. Journal of Physical Education Research, Volume 8, Issue I, 01-13.

Received: January 13, 2021

Accepted: March 22, 2021

ABSTRACT

The study determined the relationship between coaching style, motivation, and sports performance of the Physical Education student-athletes. It was conducted at Bukidnon State University – Physical Education Department, Fortich Street, Malaybalay City, for the SY 2019-2020. Descriptive method research design and Pearson-product correlation were utilized in this study. Findings from analysis of data, based on a survey questionnaire on coaching style and motivation, revealed that the majority of the student-athletes preferred a coach to be autonomy-supportive and were highly motivated. The study showed that student athletes' motivation is positive as well as having a high level of sports performance. In addition, there is a significant relationship between coaching styles, motivation, and sports performance. Results showed that extrinsic motivation best predicts sports performance. The study concludes that coaches are committed to their complex task to the athletes through provisions of motivation and that an effective coach can handle both responsibilities to transfer sports skills through training as well as shape character. Lastly, the study provides coaches better awareness of the effect of their coaching styles on athletes' motivation which greatly influences the latter's sports performance.

Keywords: Sports participation, demographic coaching, psychomotor, games.

1. INTRODUCTION

As an athlete before, this researcher experienced various types of coaches; and indeed, their coaching styles differ from each other. However, each of them affects how each player plays their games. There are coaches who check wrong actions of an athlete; there are coaches who stay quiet when an athlete makes a mistake, there are coaches who encourage athletes to be better and coaches who inspire athletes to do well in their sports. Even if an athlete is encouraged by the coach, it is still up to the athlete on how he/she plays the game. That is whether that athlete is motivated or not to play. Some of the coaches I had before, would give reward if I win a game. However, mostly, I play because I want to achieve a best performance in the sports (Mohammad, & Ahsan, 2016).

Accordingly, coaching is as difficult and demanding as any other aspect of the sports. It affects the individual athlete or a team that can be magnified out of the part to the coaching way itself, whether it is good or poor. The whole and well-trained sports coach is seemingly a multidimensional personality, possessing a wide range of technical, communication, and interpersonal skills. An athlete's motivation can be the key to his/her success. Various influences affect an athlete's performance throughout his/her sports experience which includes coach-athlete relationship, which is one of the most important effects on athlete motivation and performance (Marcone, 2017).

According to Britton, Hill, and Ward (2017), if there are tens of millions of young athletes participating in athletics throughout the year, it means that many of them are interacting with various coaches. Other stakeholders connected to sports must be responsible for gaining knowledge that will help them better understand that coaches acquire coaching styles and their coaching styles have on the athletes whom they are associated.

There are numerous coaching styles that an individual coach can adapt as his/her own while in charge of a group of athletes, regardless of their age, sport, or level of skill. Each coaching style tends to exhibit its exact behaviors and characteristics, resulting in different effects on the athletes with whom they had been connected. The two main styles of coaching that have been recognized in sports are the autonomy-supportive styles and the controlling style. Each of these styles used in coaching has its own positive and negative qualities, and each style influences an athlete's motivation and performance.

A study conducted by Deci and Ryan's on Self Determination Theory (2000), discussed several psychological needs of athletes, which, they are not met, may result in a no desirable outcome. Characteristics and behaviors of the athletes have been understood by the coaches so that different styles of coaching will be exhibited, which is vital when talking about the significant effect on athlete motivation and performance. Autonomy supportive coaches tend to be accessible and very positive.

Also, coaches, athletes, parents, and league administrators have the responsibility of gaining knowledge to better recognize that coaches and their coaching styles affect their athletes. Coaches play a vital role in team sports because they are accountable for creating and preserving an ideal condition for players to fulfill their full potential. A coach must have different coaching styles for him to gain attention, respect from his athlete's and for them to have their own will on improving their performances, likely he or she will not be able to motivate them in any form, which leads to a lack of success.

Inborn skills do not usually command whether or not athletes will produce a great performance, but it should be the combination of their physical abilities and their strong desire to be better in the field. Coaches can be effective when it comes to instruction, communication, and leading their followers. Leaders had been made to endure communication characteristics, give valuable instructions, be a role model, and to be an informative instructor. These characteristics are functions that have been learned with time. Sports represent a significant achievement domain for young people, with over 40 million youth participating in organized competitive sports each year. Sports are taken extremely by both athletes and their fans and are usually appreciated compared to other non-sport organizations (Smith, & Smoll, 2002).

An athlete's performance improves when there is constant and effective communication between the athlete and the coach. Coaches' communication with their athletes must expand because it affects athletes of any sport, age, gender, and social status. Sports performance may increase when they are help coming from the coach (Mohammad, & Ahsan, 2016). Coaching styles, expectations, specific sports, age groups, divisions, size of team, self-determination, and motivation incentives are only some of many aspects that determine the change in one's performance ability.

The study was anchored on the following theories, namely Self-determination theory, Behaviorism, cognitivism, and other theories related to this study. The Self-Determination Theory (Ryan, & Deci, 2000) identifies the psychological needs of any individual, which, if met, contributes to self-determined motivation. These needs were identified as autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Autonomy is simply the feeling that one influences what happens or a feeling of freedom. An example would be an athlete's feeling that influences over decisions that are made regarding his team. Competence is defined as the feeling one

has about the skills necessary to be successful, and that they are capable of performing the skills necessary to be good at their specific sport. While relatedness is the feeling of connection with other people. An athlete needs to feel that he is connected with the coach of their team and as well as their teammates, they are participating with every day.

The researcher wanted to pursue this study to investigate coaching styles, motivation and its effects on athlete's sports performance. As an educator, this study will help to improve my coaching style upon finding the results of this study. It will also be beneficial to other teachers, parents, coaches, and the athlete's. This study can be a basis of data that could guide the school administration towards understanding the relationship between coaching styles, motivation, and sports performance.

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1 Research Design

This study investigated the relationship between coaching styles, motivation, and sports performance. The researcher used a descriptive correlational method in this study and causal research design to determine if there is a relationship of coaching style, motivation, and sports performance.

2.2 Research Setting

The study was conducted at Bukidnon State University, specifically the Physical Education Department of the College of Education. Said department, headed by a Chairperson, has a total of 210 students and 20 faculty members. Bukidnon State University is located at the heart of Malaybalay City, Bukidnon.

2.3 Participants of the Study and Sampling Procedure

The participants for the test of the relationship of coaching styles, motivation, and sports performance were 100 student-athletes in Bukidnon State University under the college of Education-Physical Education Department. This study used purposive sampling for data gathering on coaching style, motivation, and sports performance.

2.4 Research Instruments

The researcher used a survey questionnaire which consists of Part I. Student-Athletes Profile, Part II. Coaching Style and Part III. Motivation. The researcher questionnaire is from Barnes (2003) and Gocotano (2018); adopted with permission from the authors.

The validity entails the extent to which the research instrument measures what has been intended to be measured. Reliability refers to the degree to which scale produces consistent results when repeated measures have been made (Surbhi, 2017).

To establish the validity of the survey instrument, it underwent content validation by a respectable panelist during the research proposal. After the inputs of experts and finalization of the questionnaire, a reliability test for pretesting. was utilized. The research survey questionnaire had various parts which are: Part I. Student-Athletes Profile, Part II. Coaching Style and Part III. Motivation. Coaching style part and Motivation part were tested using the Cronbach alpha. The coaching-style has 40 items which got 0.745 Cronbach alpha value, and the motivation part has 30 items which got 0.807 Cronbach alpha value.

2.5 Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher followed the proper research protocol during the data gathering to ensure the quality and reliability of research findings; the researcher observed the following University research protocol: First, permission from the University President of Bukidnon State University has been asked. Upon approval, this has been forwarded to the office of the Dean of College of Education, where the study was conducted. The researcher conducted an orientation among the student athletes. This is to orient them about the purpose and importance of the study. After the orientation, the student-athletes has been given parents' consent that was signed by their parents in letting their son and daughters be the respondent of the study.

2.6 Statistical Treatment

Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation and Pearson- Product Correlation were the statistical treatment which were used to facilitate the analysis of the interpretation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher followed the proper research protocol during the data gathering to ensure the quality and reliability of research findings; the researcher observed the following University research protocol. The researcher used a survey questionnaire which consists of Part I. Student-Athletes Profile, Part II. Coaching Style and Part III. Motivation. The researcher questionnaire is from Barnes (2003) and Gocotano (2018); adopted with permission from the authors. The participants for the test of the relationship of coaching styles, motivation, and sports performance are the 100 student-athletes in Bukidnon State University under the college of Education-Physical Education Department. This study investigated the relationship between coaching styles, motivation, and sports performance. The researcher used a descriptive correlational method in this study and causal research design to determine if there is a relationship of coaching style, motivation, and sports performance.

Problem no. 1: Which is the type of coaching in terms of the following is preferred by athletes:

1.1 Autonomy Supportive Coaching

Table 1: The types of coaching in terms of Autonomy supportive coaching and Controlling coaching

Indicators	Mean	SD	Qualitative Interpretation
1. Spends time helping athletes who are having trouble improving their performance.	3.77	0.489	Highly Positive
2. Instructs athletes on needed strategies for an upcoming competition.	3.76	0.638	Highly Positive
3. Instructs athletes on how to correct mistakes or flaws in their technique or performance.	3.64	0.732	Highly Positive
4. Greets athletes when they finish a performance with encouragement and support.	3.62	0.736	Highly Positive
5. Verbally praises the team and individual athletes after they have successfully executed a play/skill.	3.59	0.726	Highly Positive
6. Demonstrates techniques that athletes need to learn for improved performance.	3.57	0.714	Highly Positive

7. Makes comments such as “shake it off” or “that’s all right” after a mistake is made.	3.54	0.61	Highly Positive
8. Keeps athletes on task to accomplish the overall objectives and goals.	3.53	0.611	Highly Positive
9. Assigns athletes’ individual responsibilities during practices and competitions.	3.5	0.718	Highly Positive
10. Has a sense of humor during practices and competitions.	3.5	0.689	Highly Positive
11. Has practices organized and running smoothly.	3.47	0.658	Positive
12. Talks with athletes about academic problems.	3.46	0.758	Positive
13. Provides athletes information on their technique after a successful performance.	3.46	0.578	Positive
14. Takes the time to help athletes with competitive plans.	3.44	0.808	Positive
15. Says things like “keep trying” when athletes make a mistake on a new performance task that was introduced.	3.44	0.833	Positive
16. Yells things such as “keep hustling” when the team is doing well.	3.39	0.737	Positive
17. Provides athletes with positive feedback even if a mistake was made.	3.34	0.781	Positive
18. Discusses strategies for specific athletes prior to a game.	3.34	0.7	Positive
19. Makes statements such as “way to go” when athletes perform well.	3.32	0.584	Positive
20. Expresses pride in the efforts of athletes as well as in their successes.	3.27	0.874	Positive
21. Prepares athletes by informing them of their schedules and tasks.	3.27	0.874	Positive
22. Praises athletes for trying hard after a mistake is made.	3.22	0.76	Positive
23. Pulls athletes aside to let them know they are doing a good job.	3.13	0.895	Positive
24. Singles athletes out as role models because they have been trying hard at practice.	2.99	0.745	Positive
25. Screams instructions at athletes following a mistake to motivate them to perform up to their potential.	2.89	0.994	Positive
26. Stops practice to emphasize techniques or strategies needed for upcoming competitions.	2.66	0.924	Positive
27. Makes athletes “run laps” or “do push-ups” following a mistake.	2.56	0.795	Positive
Overall Mean	3.36	0.739	Positive
The Controlling coaching			
1. Is willing to discuss relationship problems that affect athletes’ performance.	3.57	0.671	Highly positive
2. Does not yell encouragement during the game.	2.86	0.954	Positive
3. Breaks up any arguments that may occur at practice or during competition.	2.72	0.817	Positive
4. Uses physical intimidation following a technical mistake to get athletes to perform up to their potential.	2.72	0.965	Positive
5. Does not vocally praise athletes after they execute a good play/strategy.	2.39	0.952	Negative
6. Only helps athletes when a mistake is made.	2.37	0.917	Negative
7. Punishes athletes in front of their teammates following a mistake.	2.36	1.097	Negative
8. Shows no emotion when athletes make a mistake.	2.3	0.969	Negative
9. Ignores technical errors that athletes make during a competition.	2.19	0.825	Negative
10. Voices disappointment regarding athlete’s performance following a mistake.	2.1	0.905	Negative
11. Does not make comments about good performances.	1.98	0.738	Negative
12. Pays no attention to athletes’ mistakes.	1.87	0.861	Negative
13. Belittles athletes who perform skills incorrectly.	1.77	0.941	Negative
Overall mean	2.40	0.893	Negative
Grand mean	3.05	0.78	Positive

Legend

Scale	Range	Descriptive Ratings	Qualitative Interpretation
4	3.50-4.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Positive
3	2.50-3.49	Agree	Positive
2	1.50-2.49	Disagree	Negative
1	1.00-1.49	Strongly Disagree	Highly Negative

Table on Summary of coaching style in terms of Autonomy Supportive Coaching and Controlling Coaching.

Coaching styles	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Interpretation
Autonomy Supportive Coaching	3.36	0.258	Positive
Controlling Coaching	2.24	0.453	Negative
Over all Mean	2.80	0.355	Positive

Table 1 shows the coaching styles preferred by the student-athletes. As reflected in the Table, the majority of the respondents rated their coach as an autonomy-supportive coach with a mean average of (3.36; Agree) with a qualitative interpretation that positive. This means that student athletes prefer a coach who has a positive outlook on sports. However, student-athletes manifested a mean of (2.24; disagree) in controlling coaching, which shows an undesirable interpretation.

Most athletes strongly agree to a coach who “instructs athletes on needed strategies for an upcoming competition” with a mean of 3.76. However, does the prefer coach or disagree to a coach who “belittles athletes who perform skills incorrectly” with a mean of 1.77. The result implies that the coaching style develops a good relationship between the coach and athlete associated with a positive response.

The researcher also found out that various types of athletes prefer coaches who are positive and approachable. One specific coaching style may not be appropriate or effective for all athletes, but through the study examined, it is evident that the coaching style contributes the most positive effect to athlete performance is the autonomy-supportive coach (Mageau and Vallerand, 2003).

Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) stated that autonomy-supportive coaching style was associated with prosocial behavior toward teammates; this relationship has been mediated by autonomous motivation. The controlled motivation was associated with antisocial behavior toward teammates and antisocial behavior toward opponents, and these two relationships have been mediated by moral disengagement. The results provide support for research investigating the effect of autonomy-supportive coaching interventions on athletes’ prosocial and antisocial behavior.

A study conducted by Panganiban (2019) reveals that coaching style greatly influences the student’s athlete’s performance. Since coaching style has been identified as a reason that coaches will take the lead, they carry the roles and responsibilities as a trainer. Furthermore, the nature of a trainer who utilizes a style of coaching is conducting directions of what must be done by the athletes during their practice games. The study recommended various types of activities that would improve the student athlete’s performance. Activities like seminars, workshops, and team buildings have been proposed to strengthen not just the coaching styles but also the communication, socialization, and relationship of the athletes to their athletes.

Problem no. 2: What is the level of motivation among student-athletes?

Table 2: The level of motivation of student athletes as Intrinsic and extrinsic

Indicators	Mean	SD	Qualitative Interpretation
1. To get better performance in sports, I will practice harder.	3.91	0.288	Highly Motivated
2. To improve my skill.	3.88	0.383	Highly Motivated
3. To be physically fit.	3.80	0.449	Highly Motivated

4. Sports contributes a lot to whole human beings.	3.74	0.485	Highly Motivated
5. My most wanting is to get best performance in sports.	3.73	0.510	Highly Motivated
6. In sport participation, I would like to have some challenging materials and they will make me learn more.	3.72	0.451	Highly Motivated
7. If I have correct learning pattern to learn in sport, I will learn it better.	3.71	0.498	Highly Motivated
8. To me, attending trainings can improve my overall sport performance.	3.69	0.506	Highly Motivated
9. If I have enough time to practice my sport, I will have better performance.	3.64	0.560	Highly Motivated
10. Because it makes me happy.	3.56	0.756	Highly Motivated
11. The skills I learn from my chosen sports can be applied in other areas.	3.49	0.522	Motivated
12. I must do sports to feel good about myself.	3.45	0.642	Motivated
13. To do my personal best.	3.40	0.586	Motivated
14. If I do not perform better in sports. I believe it is my fault.	3.20	0.853	Motivated
15. I believe that I will have excellent performance in sports.	3.18	0.757	Motivated
16. Sports act as a sport release.	3.18	0.627	Motivated
17. I believe that I can learn different skills in sports by my own.	2.58	0.713	Motivated
18. In sports, I will have negative thought that I am inferior than other athletes.	2.48	0.835	Not Motivated
Overall Mean	3.46	0.579	Motivated
Extrinsic			
1. Because it helps me maintain a status.	3.31	0.813	Motivated
2. I perform better when given rewards by my coach.	3.29	0.729	Motivated
3. Because I like to win.	3.20	0.651	Motivated
4. Because someone who is close to me approves my sport activity.	3.12	0.742	Motivated
5. Because I am required to stay fit.	3.09	0.753	Motivated
6. To achieve the looks others expect of me.	2.92	0.918	Motivated
7. To be the best in the group.	2.61	0.827	Motivated
9. Because I get rewarded when doing it.	2.60	0.791	Not Motivated
10. I want to get other people's recognition so I get better performance in sports.	2.44	0.795	Not Motivated
11. To beat my friends.	2.27	0.874	Not Motivated
12. Because I get paid to do it.	2.20	0.943	Not Motivated
Overall mean	2.82	0.813	Motivated
Grand mean	3.21	0.673	Motivated

Legend

Scale	Range	Descriptive Ratings	Qualitative Interpretation
4	3.50-4.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Motivated
3	2.50-3.49	Agree	Motivated
2	1.50-2.49	Disagree	Not Motivated
1	1.00-1.49	Strongly Disagree	Highly Not Motivated

Table on Summary of the level of Motivation among Student Athlete's

Motivation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Interpretation
Intrinsic	3.46	0.198	Positive
Extrinsic	2.82	0.472	Positive
Over all Mean	3.14	0.335	Positive

Table 2 shows the mean, standard deviation, and the qualitative interpretation on the level of motivation of student-athletes in terms of Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In the 40 indicators, one indicator got the highest mean of 3.91 "To get better performance in sports, I will practice harder.", rated as strongly agree. The result implies that motivation develops

respectable sports performance. On the other hand, one indicator ranks the lowest, which has a mean of 2.20 “Because I get paid to do it,” rated as disagree. Most of the respondents do not perform well because they have something to get in return, but they are self-motivated.

These imply that the level of motivation of the student-athletes is positive, which means that they motivated to perform well in their game. The majority of the student-athletes are intrinsically motivated while others are extrinsically motivated. (McLeod 2016) hierarchical theory of human need stated that students need to feel emotionally and physically safe and accepted within the group where he belongs to progress and reaches their potential.

Sheehan, Herring, and Campbell (2018) state that motivation is the main determinant of behavior in sport. It is a complex construct, with athletes having diverse and dynamic motives for initiating, directing, sustaining, and terminating effort. Athletes has been motivated by internal or external factors or a combination of both, which may vary by context and time.

Research has shown that intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation are significant concepts for understanding motivational processes in sport settings (Medic; et al. 2010). When athletes are intrinsically motivated, they tend to participate out of pleasure or enjoyment. Achievement goal theory has provided research that indicates a predominant task goal orientation is associated with high levels of intrinsic motivation and, consequently, higher levels of self-determination in sport Dzikas (2013).

On the other hand, Canfield and Zastavka (2010) note that students with a performance goal orientation are motivated by a desire for extrinsic approval, i.e., performing well compared to others and surpassing tangible performance goals. If athletes are extrinsically participative, they are looking for some type of reward that is external to the activity, such as social, behavioral, or financial. Externally regulated behaviors reflect the least self-determined form of extrinsic motivation whereby behavior is perceived to be controlled by outside sources

According to Eliot (2011) regarding competence and the motivation theory, individuals are attracted to participate in activities at which they feel competent or capable. If the goal is for the athlete to be motivated to be physically active or to strive for performance excellence, it will be necessary to design environments that will enhance their perception of competence. It is also enhanced competence, which has been achieved when individuals experience success at optimally challenging tasks and when they receive positive, encouraging, consistent, and information-based feedback from their coaches and significant others within that environment (Horn, 2014).

The study of Amorose and Anderson-Butcher (2015) reveal that positive motivational responses increased as perceptions of autonomy support increased—particularly when the athletes also perceived a relatively lower level of controlling behaviors, and the most positive motivational outcomes were associated with the perceptions of relatively higher autonomy support and relatively lower controlling behaviors. According to Neil (2012), regarding the relation of a coach’s motivation, a coach is not always the producer of techniques and tactics. Athletes become productive that they can construct their tactics during crucial competitions.

Problem no. 3: What is the level of student athletes’ performance?

Table 3: Summary of Student Athletes’ Performance

	Mean	SD
Students Athletes’ Performance	2.170	1.035
Over all Mean	2.170	1.035

Sports Performance	
Sports Participation	Rank
Basketball (M)	2 nd
Basketball (W)	2 nd
Baseball (M)	1 st
Sepak takraw (M)	1 st
Sepak takraw (W)	3 rd
Soccer (M)	3 rd
Volleyball (M)	4 th
Volleyball (W)	1 st

Table 3 presents the summary of student athletes' performance; its mean is 2.170 and a standard deviation of 1.035. The table also shows the sports participation and rank of the athletes during their Intramurals. Most of them rank from 1st to fourth; Basketball Men ranked 2nd, Basketball Women ranked 2nd, Baseball Men and Sepak Takraw ranked 1st, Sepak Takraw Women and Soccer Men ranked 3rd, Volleyball Men ranked 4th and Women ranked. These imply that most of the student-athletes had upright sports performance because they have been guided by their coach, and they are motivated. Sports foster social values, and character development coaches should help athletes' practice and maintain their characters (Lumpkin eta 2012). Most of the student-athletes belong to team sports perform well when they are positively encouraged and approached by their coaches and when they are motivated.

A study by Moen, Høigaard, and Peters (2014) states that student-athletes emphasized that they get right performance when they have a supportive coach and when they are self-motivated. They can influence the athlete's self-confidence even with a single word. They are giving positive feedback and a positive environment to players in order not to decrease their self-confidence. If the athletes have to face is too hard, they get frustrated, and they could give up. Athletes must be aware of their skills for them to know how they can overcome a challenge. Coaches may mentally prepare the players during practice games and games properly. Players mold during training in order for them to be equipped to achieve their goals (White, 2012). Trocado and Gomes (2013) state that sports success was associated with athletes' positive evaluation of coaches' leadership, satisfaction with coaches' strategy, and higher perceived goal attainment.

Problem no. 4: Is there a significant relationship between the type of coaching, level of motivation, and student-athletes' performance?

Table 4: Relationship between type of coaching, motivation and sports performance

Variables	Pearson Correlation	P-Value	Qualitative Interpretation
Autonomy Supportive Coaching	.061	.549	Significant
Controlling Coaching	-.054	.593	Significant
Intrinsic Motivation	.106	.293	Significant
Extrinsic Motivation	.299**	.003	Significant

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

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

Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to measure the association between the dependent variable and the independent variable in the study.

Table 4 presents the relationship between types of coaching style, motivation, and sports performance. The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between the

variables with value ranges from $r=-0.054$ to $r=0.299$ ($p<0.003$ - $P<0.593$). These entail that a coach who is supportive and approachable may result in a well-motivated student-athlete ‘who will strive to win a game. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between coaching style, motivation, and sports performance was rejected. Along with it, measured variables like Autonomy supportive coaching $r=0.61$, ($p<0.549$), controlling coaching has $r=-0.054$, ($p<0.593$), Intrinsic motivation has $r=0.106$, ($p<0.293$) and Extrinsic $r=0.299^{**}$, ($p<0.003$) revealed similar relationship.

Athletes who were coach by an autonomy-supportive coach with self-determined motivation shows positive result in every performance. It means to say that coaching and motivation would greatly influence the sports performance of an individual. It was found out that those athletes who have high levels of self-determined motivation, which in this case would be the act of actively playing or competing in the sport. All of this language is just stating that athletes who display high levels of self-determined motivation that has been developing through interaction with an autonomy-supportive coach perform better in situations where they are participating in or competing in their respective sport (Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, & Baldes, 2010). Furthermore, this study shows that an autonomy-supportive coach had the most positive effect on the performance of athletes. The autonomy-supportive coach exhibits behaviors and tendencies that allow for the psychological needs of athletes was met in order to feel that they have freedom, the necessary skills to participate, and are connected to the individuals with whom they are associated with when participating in a sport. Pressure from above, pressure from below, and coach motivation predict coaches’ reported use of autonomy-supportive behaviors (Rocchi, Pelletier, & Couture (2013).

The athletes who display signs of their psychological needs have been met to display characteristics of self-determined motivation, where they find enjoyment in the activity or sport and the determination and desire to improve. When these athletes continue to find enjoyment and desire to improve in their sport, they tend to bring this sense of self-determined motivation forward when competing in their sport, resulting in a more positive and successful performance. Moen, Høigaard, and Peters (2014) indicated that the athletes who are most satisfied with their performance progress, evaluate their coaches’ leadership behavior higher in the following domains: Training and Instruction, Democratic behavior, Social Support, and Positive Feedback. Findings from the present study highlight the importance of coaches’ training and instruction behavior. It also highlights that the coach-athlete relationship must entail elements of reciprocity, trust, as well as being of a genuine and helping nature, and that coach’s democratic behavior, supportive style, and their ability to give positive feedback seem to support such values.

Problem no. 5: What variable best predicts the student-athletes’ performance?

Table 6: Regression analysis of autonomy supportive coaching, controlling coaching, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation on student’s athlete’s performance

Predictor	.Coef	SE Coef	T-Value	P-Value
Constant	2.170	0.100	21.70	0.000
Autonomy Supportive Coaching	0.011	0.105	0.11	0.916
Controlling Coaching	-0.131	0.104	-1.26	0.211
Intrinsic Motivation	-0.030	0.112	-0.27	0.789
Extrinsic Motivation	0.347	0.113	3.06	0.003

Dependent Variable: sports performance

S	R-sq	T-value	P-value
1.00011	10.45%	6.68%	1.99%

Table 5 presents the regression analysis for such variables as autonomy-supportive, controlling, intrinsic, and extrinsic motivation. Autonomy Supportive coaching has a P-value of 0.916, Controlling Coaching has 0.211, Intrinsic Motivation has 0.789, and Extrinsic Motivation has 0.003. These imply that the best variable that predicts the athlete's sports performance is extrinsic motivation. Furthermore, we can say that coaching style, motivation, and sports performance has a significant relationship.

According to Hodge and Lonsdale (2011), an autonomy-supportive coaching style is the best variable that predicts sports performance and motivation. The motivation was associated with antisocial behavior toward teammates and antisocial behavior toward opponents, and these two relationships have been mediated by moral disengagement. The results provide support for research investigating the effect of autonomy-supportive coaching with motivation to the sports performance.

Coaches are the ones who can understand athletes and their play in the climax. They know precisely how to teach athletes to try hard in compliance with the rules of the game. Coaching is a behavioral process in which a coach pressures athlete to perform their desired responses. However, coaching is much more than what a coach tells athletes to do. A good coach also knows what things he or she should tell the athletes about and how. Coaching differs considerably from any other job. It is a hard, expectation-generating profession, which requires a variety of uncommon skills (Adams, 2017).

“Social factors should be taken into account because they was posited to have a deep impact on athletes' motivation” (Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, & Blades, 2010). Motivation is a major influential component in sports. Coach and athletes agree that motivation is one of the vital elements that will facilitate not only performance but also a positive experience in the sports area. Motivation can vary throughout a game or competition. Some athletes are more motivated by intrinsic factors, while others are more motivated by extrinsic factors. Athletic coaches can increase the performance of their athletes by having a better understanding of their motivators.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it is concluded that, the coaches are committed to their complex task to the athletes through provisions of motivation that shows effective coach can handle both responsibilities to transfer sports skills through training as well as shaping character. The student-athletes strongly agree that motivation greatly influences the sports performance, and when athletes are highly motivated, a high performance in their game follows. There is a significant relationship between coaching style, and sports performance and a good coach may influence the sports performance. There is a significant relationship between motivation and sports performance, therefore when an athlete is motivated, it may influence the sports performance; therefore, coaches should develop a positive outlook towards coaching to develop a good relationship with their athletes.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the findings and conclusions of the result of the study, the following recommendations are presented:

- Coaches are encouraged to possess different coaching styles and approaches in dealing with their athletes that can be motivated, build individual character, strategy during games and create techniques, and to develop relevant sport systems and programs that intend to maintain positive motivation towards Sports.

- Survey students' athlete's performance and attitude towards sports as early as the opening of the new school year. These are to determine those students who have a negative attitude and motivation in sports so that early intervention may be given to them to change this negative attitude into a positive one.
- The result of the study can help coaches better understand how their coaching style relates to sports performance. Extend moral support, giving inspiration and encouragement of their children to strive hard for excellence in their sports performance.
- The results of this study can help in improving the sports system in our department and create meaningful and systematic sports programs. It has been suggested that future studies on the coaching styles may consider another demographic and psychographic variable such as athletes' experience, level of competition, self-efficacy, and attitude towards sports, and family background that may have influenced the perceptions of student-athletes.
- Augment the number of respondents to establish a more comprehensive generalization. The result of the study provides coaches with better awareness of the effect of their coaching styles on performance and help determine which style or styles are most effective.

6. REFERENCES

- Adams, I. (2017). James Curran: Ethereal Scottish athlete and American coaching legend. *Staps*, (1), 73-81.
- Amorose, A. J., & Anderson-Butcher, D. (2015). Exploring the independent and interactive effects of autonomy-supportive and controlling coaching behaviors on adolescent athletes' motivation for sport. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 4(3), 206.
- Barić, R., & Bucik, V. (2009). Motivational differences in athletes trained by coaches of different motivational and leadership profiles. *Kinesiology*, 41(2).
- Brinton, C. S. (2015). *Authoritative coaching: Building youth through athletics*.
- Dzikas, M. (2013). *A study of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation among division III athletes*.
- Gillet, N., Berjot, S., Vallerand, R. J., & Amoura, S. (2012). The role of autonomy support and motivation in the prediction of interest and dropout intentions in sport and education settings. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 34(3), 278-286.
- Gillet, N., Vallerand, R. J., & Rosnet, E. (2009). Motivational clusters and performance in a real-life setting. *Motivation and Emotion*, 33(1), 49-62.
- 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.
- 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.
- Hatzigeorgiadis, A., Zourbanos, N., Galanis, E., & Theodorakis, Y. (2011). Self-talk and sports performance: A meta-analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(4), 348-356.
- Heydarinejad, S., & Adman, O. (2010). Relationship between coaching leadership styles and team cohesion in football teams of the Iranian university league. *Studies in Physical Culture and Tourism*, 17(4), 367-72.
- 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. (2000). Intrinsic motivation Relationships with collegiate athletes' gender, scholarship status, and perceptions of their coaches behavior. *Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology*, 22, 63-84.
- 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.

- Koh, K. T., Kawabata, M., & Mallett, C. J. (2014). The coaching behaviour scale for port: Factor structure examination for Singaporean youth athletes. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 9(6), 1311-1324.
- Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Science*, 21(11), 883-904.
- Marcone, M. (2017). *The impact of coaching styles on the motivation and performance of athletes*.
- Marshall, M. (2012). *Discipline without stress, punishments, or rewards: How teachers and parents promote responsibility & learning*. Piper Press.
- Mata, R. T., & da Silva Gomes, A. R. (2013). Winning or not winning: The influence on coach-athlete relationships and goal achievement. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, 8(4), 986-995.
- Mattera, R. (2017). *Motivation, workout and performance-a model for amatorial sports*.
- Moen, F., Høigaard, R., & Peters, D. M. (2014). Performance progress and leadership behavior. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 8(1), 69-81.
- Mohammad, A., & Ahsan, M. (2016). A comparative study of exercise motivation between male and female under 17 years soccer players. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sports Science*, 2(3), 74-80.
- Panganiban, T. D. (2019). Sports Coaching Styles of Trainers in Public Junior High School. *International Journal of Recent Innovations in Academic Research*, 3(5), 142-154.
- 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.
- Pope, J. P., & Wilson, P. M. (2015). Testing a sequence of relationships from interpersonal coaching styles to rugby performance, guided by the coach–athlete motivation model. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 13(3), 258-272.
- Rajabi, Z. (2012). Relationship of coach's leadership style and player performance outcomes. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 2(4), 1134-1136.
- Rocchi, M. A., Pelletier, L. G., & Couture, A. L. (2013). Determinants of coach motivation and autonomy supportive coaching behaviours. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(6), 852-859.
- Roulier, R. (2014). *Feedback in Athletic Coaching–Part. Feedback*.
- Sheehan, R. B., Herring, M. P., & Campbell, M. J. (2018). Associations between motivation and mental health in sport: A test of the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 707.
- Surujlal, J., & Dhurup, M. (2012). Athlete preference of coach's leadership style: sport management. *African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 18(1), 111-121.
- Turman, P. D. (2003). Coaches and cohesion: The impact of coaching techniques on team cohesion in the small group sport setting. *Journal of Sport Behaviour*, 26(1), 86-104.
- West, L. (2016). *Coach-athlete communication: Coaching style, leadership characteristics, and psychological outcomes*.
- Zaker, N. A., & Parnabas, V. A. (2018). The correlation between coach-athlete relationship and motivation among Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Shah Alam athletes. *Malaysian Journal of Movement, Health & Exercise*, 7(1).
- Ziberi, B., & Avdiaj, B. (2019). Job satisfaction, motivation and performance of teams in self-managing perspective.