

Coaching Styles and Performance of Athletes in the Division of Pangasinan II

JENNIFER C. CRUZ
Urdaneta City University
Urdaneta City, Pangasinan

Abstract — This study determined the coaching styles and the performance of athletes in the Pangasinan II division. The study used the descriptive method of research and included 112 sports coaches of individual events as respondents. It used percentage, frequency counts, weighted mean, analysis of variance, and Pearson r product-moment coefficient of correlation through SPSS 21 in its statistical treatment.

The study found out that respondent coaches are predominantly males with some units leading to a Master's degree and within 6-10 years in service. The majority of them received gold awards at the division level and decreases as they go to the regional and national levels. There are 14 organizations for individual sports and all coaches are highly proficient concerning democratic, autocratic, and holistic coaching styles. The coaching styles have a very high degree of effect on the performance of athletes.

The study also found out that there is a significant difference in the autocratic coaching style of the coaches concerning sex, length of service, and seminars or training attended. There is no significant difference in the coaching style concerning the highest educational attainment. There is a significant relationship between the autocratic and democratic coaching styles and the awards received in sports at the division level. There is also a significant relationship between the democratic and holistic coaching styles of sports coaches and the awards received in sports at the regional level. But, there are no significant relationships between the coaching styles of sports coaches and the awards received in sports at the national level.

Keywords — *Coaching Styles, Performance, Sports Coaches*

I. Introduction

Sports is one of the celebrated events in the Department of Education. All year round, coaches and athletes prepare for the different activities starting from the school level, division level, regional level, and up to the national level. It is practically a well-known activity that time, money, and effort are greatly invested. Coaches find ways to level up themselves and become the best in their assigned events. Different coaching styles are being utilized just to suit the needs of their athletes. They try to show the best style that could give the wins and dominance.

Coaches play a vital role in their athletes since they must create an environment that would push their athletes to their best condition, physically, mentally, and emotionally to maximize their full potential. The failure to do such things would probably lead to failure both for the coach and the athlete. Coaches are accountable for understanding the impact of their coaching style on the performance of their athletes. The coaching-style of any coach can have a positive or negative

impact on his or her athletes. For this year, the sports event at the regional and national levels is canceled because of the covid-19 pandemic. The setting of the new normal caused by the pandemic disabled the continuation of sports activities as well as many other activities. But surely, once everything is back to the old normal these sports activities will proceed.

The success of any athlete can be anchored on how the coach manages his play. It can never be a one-man team. It is always teamwork between the coach and the athlete. It is also necessary that the relationship should have been tested with the correct combination of style and execution. These and more will give positive results. A coach is considered someone who trains, instructs, or gives advice to an athlete in order to improve their physical and mental performance in their sport. Moen et al. (2014) note the primary role of the coach is to help his or her athletes to improve their performance. In many situations, once an athlete has begun their journey of participating in a competitive sport they will spend a majority of their time with their coach. Not only does a coach have the responsibility of taking the authoritative role over a team or group of athletes, teaching technical skills, and in most cases winning; he or she has the responsibility of motivating athletes, supporting them, and enabling them to fulfill their fullest potential (Hyun-Duck & Cruz, 2016).

A coach's system will work if it is based on sound principles and so long as players work as a team. In sports, like any other situation, a system is all about its people and the willingness of those involved to "buy-in". Clemson University head football coach Dabo Swinney's system involves his players concentrating on their explicit tasks while downplaying the specific opponent at hand. Swinney's system is more about his team, how they prepare and execute, and less about the opponent (Bradley, 2012).

Coaching style is defined where descriptive categorization of an individual aggregates the behavior of a coach. This could be a useful mechanism in analyzing coaching practice or it may be a superficial way of caricaturing the most obvious elements of the behavior of a coach (Lyle, 2003). Coaching style also reflects the value frameworks of coaches. There are different coaching styles, such as laissez-fair and humanistic approaches. But the most common styles used in sports are participative and autocratic coaching styles. Coaching style is the manner in which a coach conducts himself while training, instructing, or advising his athletes (Mageau and Vallerand, 2003).

There are several coaching styles that any individual coach can adopt or adapt as their own while they are in charge of a group of athletes, regardless of their age, sports, or level of skill. Each coaching style tends to exhibit its own specific behaviors and characteristics, resulting in different impacts on the athletes with whom they are associated (Marcone 2017).

In coaching, there are three distinct styles; autocratic, democratic, and holistic. The styles are based upon the studies of Kurt Lewin, a German-American social psychologist (Homer, 2021). The autocratic style of coaching has been likened to a dictatorship where it is the coach's way or

the highway. An autocratic coach makes all the decisions without considering input from the team. The coach only explains the objectives and how to reach them, but ultimately, the team does as the coach says. The coach is in control at all times and mostly has a strict way of doing things. Some insist on similarly completing specific tasks all the time. Autocratic coaching is a style of a leader that takes “command” without an “asking” approach to his team. The autocratic coaching styles were used in a state where the participant needs to learn a specific practice to further enhance their skills.

In democratic coaching, coaches facilitate decision-making and goal setting with input from their athletes instead of dictating to them. This style of coaching is athlete-centered, and the athletes shape their own objectives under a framework outlined by the coach. Democratic coaches give a lot of autonomy to players and teams, who are active collaborators in their own development and direction.

Holistic coaching is also the same as laissez-faire coaching. The holistic coach works to create an environment where players feel comfortable exploring and pursuing skills development on their own time and on their own way. The coach does not act as a central authority and instead allows the team to set their own agenda. This style is best suited to mature players, who have already developed the creativity and self-awareness to be self-guided. For the coach, holistic coaching involves a lot of relationship building and the commitment to each player as a whole athlete person. While this requires some extra work, it can pay dividends for experienced teams with the maturity to handle this hands-off style of coaching.

Literature Review

The study is a descriptive-correlational study wherein the profile of the respondents, coaching styles, and degree of proficiency of the coaches was studied. According to the study conducted by Horn et al. (2011) where they investigated whether athletes’ psychological characteristics would be correlated with the coaching style and behaviors of their respective coaches. The participants for this research consisted of 195 Division III athletes who all completed self-reporting questionnaires regarding their motivation and their perception and preference of their coach’s behaviors. The results showed that athletes who were high in self-determined forms of motivation perceived and preferred their coaches to exhibit a democratic leadership style, provide high amounts of training, and positive feedback.

According to Karakoc, et al. (2011) as cited by Uzum (2017), in terms of the career development of the athletes, the coach can be considered as the person who has a fairly important role in improving the potential of the athlete. A coach should be able to apprehend how the athlete feels in a training setting, during and after the competition, or in cases of winning and loss, and always be able to establish a healthy relationship with the athlete. Further, in the study of Uzum (2018) on the perception of athletes about their coach behaviors and skills in terms of knowledge and skills, fairness, and coaches’ characteristic features, he found out that the sub-dimension of

characteristic features of coaches had the highest mean average and there were significant differences between male and female athletes in both dimensions of characteristic features of coaches, and knowledge and skills.

Cruz and Kim (2017) found out in their study that the athletes liked a coach that used instruction followed by positive feedback. They also said that they preferred democratic coaching styles as well as having a coach that offers social support according to the study. Social support was also an aspect of coaching that the athletes believed to help them do better (performance) because they trusted their coach.

Through the use of the Social Determination Theory (SDT), Huff (2019) found out that both coaches and athletes reported more internal motivations related to their needs and styles. Related factors found out a significant difference between coaches' competence and autonomy, and athletes' competence and autonomy.

Vidic and Burton (2010) concluded that trust between a coach and an athlete happens when the athlete feels a sense of comfort around the coach. Once that foundation is built, the more likely your athletes will want to "go to war" for you.

The study of Moen (2014) emphasized characteristic features that nondemocratic coach behaviors are affecting the performance of the athletes in a negative way.

The study of Warner (2017) found out that coaching styles of social support, training and instruction, and democratic coaching significantly correlated to social cohesion and training, and instruction was the only coaching style that significantly correlated with task cohesion.

According to Naseer (2019) in his study on the leadership style discovery in performance coaching within social context found out that the leadership styles, coaching strategies, and social support as predictor factors significantly influenced the sports achievements of players. The findings revealed positive and highly significant relationships of leadership styles (autocratic and democratic), coaching strategies social support and positive feedback), social support (parents, siblings, peers, and sports teachers) with the sports performance of players.

The study of Becker (2012) examined the effects of a coaching change on a team in a turnaround season. Participants on an NCAA Division 1 basketball team (ages 18-23) were fresh off of a 23-7 season after going 14-17 the year prior. Findings showed that the players gave credit to the coach for having a democratic style of coaching with positive feedback and rarely used autocratic styles. Players also reported that the coach from the year before used a more autocratic style when leading their team. While every coach is different and an autocratic style could be used in a turnaround season, the coach used a democratic style approach that ultimately helped the team win more games in that season.

II. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive method of research. According to Calmorin (2010) descriptive method is used when the study focuses on the present situation. The purpose is to find new truth. It is valuable in providing facts in which scientific judgment may be based in providing essential knowledge about the nature of objects and persons; for closer observation into practices, behavior, methods, and procedures; in playing a large part in the development of instruments for the measurement of many things; and in formulating policies in the local, national or international level.

This method of research involves comparison or contrast and attempts to discover significant differences and relationships between existing variables.

III. Results and Discussion

Table 1- Profile of the Respondents

Sex- The respondent coaches are predominantly males. There are 61 males or 54.5 percent and 51 females or 45.5 percent. This is a typical situation in sports activities which is mostly dominated by males but it is also starting to change because female teachers are now adapting to all the sports activities in the field. This can be easily seen in the slight difference in the number of males against female sports coaches.

Highest Educational Attainment- The majority of the coaches-respondents, 46 of them or 41.1 percent, have some units leading to a Master’s degree. 27 of the respondents or 24.1 percent are Bachelor of Science, 19 or 17 percent MA degree holders, 12 or 10.7 percent Doctoral unit earner, and 8 or 7.1 percent Doctoral Degree holders. The result only implies that the respondent coaches aim for their professional development as it can be seen that the majority of them have pursued post-graduate studies. Hence, the respondent coaches look forward to improving themselves in their chosen field or career path.

Table 1a
 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents across the Variables Sex and Highest Educational Attainment

Variable	Variable Category	Frequency	Percent
Sex	Male	61	54.5
	Female	51	45.5
	Total	112	100.0
Highest Educational Attainment	BS/AB	27	24.1
	Master’s Unit Earner	46	41.1
	Master’s Degree Holder	19	17.0
	Doctorate Unit Earner	12	10.7
	Doctorate Degree Holder	8	7.1
	Total	112	100.0

Length of Service- Thirty-nine (39) or 34.8 percent, a majority of the respondents has 6-10 years of service. Thirty-four (34) or 30.4 percent have 1-5 years of service, 16 or 14.3 percent have 11-15 years of service, and 23 or 20.5 percent have 16 years and above years of service. The data implies that the majority of the coaches are young but experienced and in the prime of their teaching careers.

Relevant Trainings- The majority of the respondent coaches, 59 of them or 52.7 percent had 10 and above number of seminars or training related to sports. 27 or 24.1 percent have 7-9 relevant seminars or training, 15 or 13.4 percent have 4-6 relevant seminars or training, and only 11 or 9.8 percent have 1-3 seminars or training.

Table 1b

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents across the Variables Length of Service and Number of Seminars or Training Attended

Variable	Variable Category	Frequency	Percent
Length of Service	1-5 years	34	30.4
	6-10 years	39	34.8
	7-9 years	16	14.3
	10 years and above	23	20.5
	Total	112	100.0
No. of Seminars or Training Attended	1-3	11	9.8
	4-6	15	13.4
	7-9	27	24.1
	10 and above	59	52.7
	Total	112	100.0

Awards Received- At the division level, the majority of the respondent coaches had earned gold awards with 95 gold awards compared to 92 silver and 93 bronze. In contrast to the regional level, the respondent-coaches had earned more bronze awards with 86 bronze compared to 85 silver and 83 gold. Likewise, at the national level, the majority of the respondent coaches got more bronze awards with 75 bronze compared to 74 silver and 67 gold. There are more gold awards received in the division level referring to championships as compared to more bronze awards in the regional and national level which are referring to 3rd placers in their specific events. The data implies that the respondent coaches performed better at the division level than at the regional and national levels. Looking deeper into the data, with respect to gold awards, there is a decreasing accomplishment from the division level, 31 or 32.6 percent to 26 or 31.3 percent in the regional, and 17 or 25.4 percent in the national level. This also happens in the accomplishment of awards in the silver and bronze awards. There is a decreasing performance from the division to the regional up to the national level. The data shows a realization that the respondent coaches perform better in the division but diminish as it goes to a higher level of competition.

Table 1c

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Variable, Number of Awards Received								
Variable	Award	Variable Category	Division		Regional		National	
			f	%	f	%	f	%
Number of Awards Received in Sports	Gold	3 and below	17	17.9	17	20.5	27	40.3
		4 – 6	22	23.2	19	22.9	10	14.9
		7 – 9	25	26.3	21	25.3	13	19.4
		10 and above	31	32.6	26	31.3	17	25.4
		Total	95	100	83	100	67	100
	Silver	3 and below	16	17.4	17	20.0	30	40.5
		4 – 6	23	25.0	24	28.2	18	24.3
		7 – 9	27	29.3	26	30.6	14	18.9
		10 and above	26	28.3	18	21.2	12	16.2
		Total	92	100	85	100	74	100
	Bronze	3 and below	19	20.4	16	18.6	29	38.7
		4 – 6	20	21.5	22	25.6	18	24.0
		7 – 9	25	26.9	23	26.7	12	16
		10 and above	29	31.2	25	29.1	16	21.3
		Total	93	100	86	100	75	100

Membership to Organizations with Sports Preference- the respondent coaches are members of 10 organizations with sports preference distributed at the division, regional and national levels. The majority of them, 26 or 19.7 percent sports coaches are members of the Amateur Sports Association of Pangasinan II. Only one (1) or .76 percent is a member of the Badminton and Table Tennis Association of Pangasinan II.

Table 1d

Membership to Organization with Sports Preference

Name of Organization	F	Percentage
Panduyucan Arnisadors Society Pangasinan II Arnis Team	8	6.06
Badminton Association of Pangasinan II	9	6.82
Amateur Sports Association of Pangasinan II	26	19.70
Philippine Taekwondo Association	10	7.58
Philippine Taekwondo Incorporated	2	1.52
Philippine Silat Association	5	3.79
Philippine Wrestling Association Pangasinan II	6	4.55
Billiard Association Pangasinan II	10	7.58
Pencak Silat of Pangasinan II	14	10.61
Pang 2 Champs	18	13.64
Pangasinan II Athletic Association	14	10.61
Badminton and Table Tennis Association of Pang 2	1	0.76
Philippine Tennis Association	5	3.79
Pangasinan II Arnis Team	4	3.04
Total	132	100

Table 2- Coaching Styles of Sports' Coaches in Pangasinan II Division along with Democratic Style

Table 2 shows the coaching style of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II division along with the democratic style. Coaches are highly proficient in informing the outline or schedule of activities to their athletes, 3.71 mean. This shows that coaches are conscious of the routing of information regarding the activities in sports to their athletes. This then implies that coaches in the Pangasinan II division particularly in individual events are responsible for the flow of communication and the execution of scheduled activities, and the improvement of the performance of their athletes. Karakoc et al. (2011), supports these results and implications that in terms of career development of the athletes they can be considered as the person who has a fairly important role in improving the potential of the athlete.

Further, coaches allow brainstorming to explore possible strategies and solutions, 3.59 mean, and inform the team of immediate changes and seek their individual reaction, 3.52 mean. In here, you can see the strong sense of respect and care from the coaches with regards to the welfare and opinions of their athletes. This result shows a connection to the study of Horn et al. (2011), indicating that the athletes who were high in self-determined forms of motivation perceived and preferred their coaches to exhibit democratic leadership style, providing a high amount of achievement. Coaches asking the help of the parents or guardians if there are situations that need their immediate attention got the lowest mean, 3.28 but still, their coaching style is described as highly proficient. This implies that the coaches will communicate with the parents of the athletes to solve issues and concerns that are hampering the performance of athletes. The coaches then immediately tap the parents to improve the situations of the athletes and the sports activities as a whole. Confirming this is the study of Smith (2017) which revealed the importance of positive team culture, family support, and the foundation that sport provided in the athletes' lives. This only assures the importance of family as the number one supporter of every athlete.

The overall weighted mean, 3.45 presents that the coaching style of coaches in the Pangasinan II division along democratic style is highly proficient. The result shows that coaches have a very good implementation of their democratic style of coaching. This implies that coaches in the Pangasinan II division display open and free communication to their athletes in the conduct of sports activities. Further, the result implies that the respondent-coaches in individual sports' democratic style of coaching their athletes is one reason for the back-to-back winning accomplishments of the division in the Region I Athletic Association (RIAA) for the recent years. Furthermore, the winning athletes advanced in the Palarong Pambansa competition.

Coaching Styles of Sports' Coaches in Pangasinan II Division along with Democratic Style

Indicator Statements	Mean	Interpretation
1. inform the outline or schedule of activities to my athletes	3.71	HP
2. seek the suggestion of my athletes for the schedule of training and play ideas	3.29	HP
3. allow brainstorming to explore possible strategies and solutions	3.59	HP
4. seek agreement for a common decision	3.29	HP
5. Allow my athlete to build his own strategy based on his potential and capability	3.46	HP
6. resolve issues and concerns by seeking the truth and opinions of all involved	3.46	HP
7. inform the team of immediate changes and seek their individual reactions	3.52	HP
8. ask the help of the parents or guardians if there are situations that need their immediate attention	3.28	HP
Overall Weighted Mean	3.45	HP

Table 3- Coaching Styles of Sports' Coaches in Pangasinan II Division along with Autocratic Style

Table 3 shows the coaching style of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II division along with the autocratic style. Coaches are highly proficient in the set-up of team practices not in individual situations but as a whole, 3.96 mean. The result shows the coach is responsible for ensuring that scheduled practices are being followed. This implies that the coach show authority in setting up schedules for practices in sports. The result concurs with the study of Boardley et al. (2008), of which they have sorted out that coach behaviors motivate the athletes' character, technical knowledge, and game strategy. It can be said that the characters of the coaches are more important than their knowledge and skills accumulation from the athletes' point of view.

Coaches also ensure that the players would strictly follow the schedule of training and playsets, 3.84 mean, and the coaches define what are the things to do and not to do. The result shows that the coach displays a strict adherence to the schedule of training and what must be done. This implies an autocratic coach who sees that everything is executed according to plan and program in sports. This result goes with Castillo et al. (2014), stating that autocratic coaching style has a significant effect in influencing the performance of the individuals, who are still beginning

to master a skill. Hence, the coaches of the Pangasinan II division are influencing the athletes with this style.

The overall weighted mean, 3.56 shows that the coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II division along with autocratic style to highly proficient. This shows that the coaches conduct their coaching style accordingly. The result implies that the respondent coaches in sports require a strict implementation of the rules and guidelines with respect to training, game plans, and playsets.

Coaching Styles of Sports' Coaches in Pangasinan II Division along with Autocratic Style

Indicator Statements	Mean	Interpretation
1. decide on what should be done for the betterment of the play	3.31	HP
2. define what are things to do and not to do	3.79	HP
3. ensure that the players would strictly follow the schedule of training and playsets	3.84	HP
4. require my players to follow the set game plan	3.30	HP
5. ensure that the players would strictly follow the schedule of training and playsets	3.24	P
6. base the set-up of the team practices not on individual situations but as a whole	3.96	HP
7. call the attention of my players individually if there are untoward circumstances that arise in the team	3.50	HP
8. solve issues and concerns right after the moment it is being known or course through to me	3.50	HP
Overall Weighted Mean	3.56	HP

Legend: 3.26 – 4.00; Highly Proficient (HP); 2.51 – 3.25 Proficient (P); 1.76 – 2.50; Slightly Proficient (SP); 1.00 – 1.76 Least Proficient (LP)

Table 4- Coaching Styles of Sports Coaches in Pangasinan II Division along with Holistic Style

Table 4 shows the coaching style of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II division along with holistic style. The coaches are highly proficient in acting with leniency to give personal evaluation and allowing players to set their own game structure, 3.67 mean. This means that coaches are concerned about the feelings and feedback from their athletes. This implies that coaches prefer to see their athletes decide too so that they would be encouraged to perform better in their games. This study shows connection with the study of Uzum (2017) that in terms of the career development of the athletes, the coach can be considered as the person who has a fairly important

role in improving the potential of the athlete. A coach should be able to apprehend how the athlete feels in a training setting, during and after a competition, or in cases of winning and loss, and always be able to establish a healthy relationship with the athlete. Further, coaches ensure happy dispositions to encourage success in the game, 3.66 mean; and coaches create an environment that allows players to feel comfortable and not pressured in the pursuit of their potential. These results show a strong connection between the development of a happy and comfortable environment and maximizing the potential of the athletes. This implies that autocratic coaches allow more athletes to work and decide on their own but balance it with the best results. Vidic and Burton (2010) support this by concluding that the trust between a coach and an athlete happens when the athlete feels a sense of comfortability around the coach. Hence, coaches in the Pangasinan II division see these as a good start in winning in sports competitions.

Coaches allowing players to practice on their own and discover their own weaknesses and strengths got the lowest mean, 2.86 described being proficient. In this, coaches seem to underestimate the capability of athletes to practice and do things on their own. This implies that while coaches allow their athletes to be free in voicing out their ideas, deciding in some situations, and conduct their own practices but still they don't really let them do things fully on their own.

The overall weighted mean, 3.37 indicates that generally, the respondent coaches are highly proficient in the holistic style of coaching in sports. This shows that the autocratic coaching style of coaches in the Pangasinan II division is one of the most implemented coaching styles. This implies that whatever is the performance of athletes in the division is affected by the autocratic coaching style of their coaches.

Coaching Styles of Sports' Coaches in Pangasinan II Division along with Holistic Style

Indicator Statements	Mean	Interpretation
1. ensure happy dispositions to encourage success in the game	3.66	HP
2. allow changes in scheduled training and game sets	3.10	HP
3. allow players to practice on their own and discover their own weaknesses and strengths	2.86	P
4. create an environment that allows players to feel comfortable and not pressured in the pursuit of their potential	3.54	HP
5. act with leniency to give personal evaluation and players to set their own game structure	3.67	HP
6. allow the players to suggest the flow of the games and practices	3.21	P
7. ask the situation of each player so we can adjust best based on their circumstances	3.43	HP

8. build a good relationship not only with my players but also with their parents or guardians	3.50	HP
Overall Weighted Mean	3.37	HP

Legend: *I Interpretation*; **Highly Proficient (HP)** 3.26 – 4.00; **Proficient (P)** 2.51 – 3.25; **Slightly Proficient (SP)** 1.76 – 2.50; **Least Proficient (LP)** 1.00 – 1.76

Table 5- Summary Table on the Coaching Styles of Sports’ Coaches

The table presents the coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II division along democratic, autocratic, and holistic styles to be all highly proficient. This only means that the coaches’ performance displays professionalism and mastery in the practice of their preferred coaching styles. Hence, it is considered that the performance of coaches with respect to their coaching styles is highly regarded to be absorbed by their athletes and would be the reflection of their performance in competitions at the regional and national levels. This implication complements the idea of Marcone (2017) implying that each coaching style tends to exhibit its own specific behaviors and characteristics, resulting in different impacts on the athletes with whom they are associated.

Coaching Styles	Mean	Interpretation
1. Democratic Style	3.45	HP
2. Autocratic Style	3.56	HP
3. Holistic Style	3.37	HP

Legend: *I Interpretation*; **Highly Proficient (HP)** 3.26 – 4.00; **Proficient (P)** 2.51 – 3.25; **Slightly Proficient (SP)** 1.76 – 2.50; **Least Proficient (LP)** 1.00 – 1.76

Table 6- Degree of Proficiency of the Coaching Styles in the Performance of Athletes

Table 6 shows the degree of effect of the coaching styles in the performance of athletes in sports in the Pangasinan II division. The respondent coaches got a “very high” degree of proficiency of the coaching styles in the performance of athletes. The first indicator, “The performance of athletes improved in the different competitions” got the highest mean, 3.66, and the third indicator, “The athletes can come up with their own solutions in immediate circumstances” got the lowest mean 3.26.

This result only presents that all respondent coaches had a very high degree of proficiency in the performance of their athletes with respect to whatever their coaching style. This implies that the respondent coaches perform well in their chosen sports events and look forward to the improvement of their athletes. This can be supported by the outcome of the overall weighted mean.

The results indicate connections to the study of Moen et al. (2014), to which they have noted that the primary role of the coach is to help his or her athletes to improve their performance. In many situations, once an athlete has begun their journey of participating in a competitive sport they will spend a majority of their time with their coach. Further in this present study, since all the indicators had a very high degree of proficiency of the coaching styles in the performance of athletes, this implies that the performance of the coach will be the performance of the athletes.

Degree of Proficiency of the Coaching Styles in the Performance of Athletes

Indicator Statements	Mean	Interpretation
1. The performance of athletes improved in the different competitions	3.66	VH
2. There is a visible improvement in the character and behavior of the athletes	3.65	VH
3. The athletes can discover their own weaknesses and aims in improving them	3.60	VH
4. The athlete can build his own strategy based on his potential and capability	3.59	VH
5. The athletes can decide on their own game plans but follows the coaching plan	3.55	VH
5. The athletes follow the set game plans and execute them perfectly	3.54	VH
6. The athletes became aware of their strengths and weaknesses	3.54	VH
8. The athletes conform to the schedule of training and play ideas	3.41	VH
9. The athlete and the coach established a conducive playing environment	3.29	VH
10. The athletes can come up with their own solutions in immediate circumstances	3.26	VH
Overall Weighted Mean	3.51	VH

Legend: *I* Interpretation; **Very High (VH)** 3.26 – 4.00; **High (H)** 2.51 – 3.25; **Low (L)** 1.76 – 2.50; **Very Low (VL)** 1.00 – 1.76

Table 7- Mean Differences of the Respondent-Coaches across the Variable, Sex

Table 7 shows the t-Test Results on the overall weighted mean differences of the respondent-coaches across the variable, sex.

The data shows that the t-value, $t=-2.348$ yielded a .021 significance level for the autocratic coaching style by the respondent coaches with respect to the variable, sex, is significant at 0.05 level. The other t-values; $t=-0.335$ for the democratic coaching style; $t=-1.169$ for holistic coaching style; and $t=-1.890$ for the degree of proficiency of the coaching style are all not significant at 0.05 level. The result shows that there is a significant difference in the coaching styles of the respondent coaches with respect to sex. This only implies that a male coach has a different performance and his coaching style will have a different effect on his athletes as compared to a female coach or vice versa.

T-Test Results on the OWM Differences of the Respondent- Coaches across the Variable, Sex

Independent Variable	Variable Category	N	Mean	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Democratic Coaching Style	male	61	3.4485	-.02483	.06994	-.355	110	.723
	female	51	3.4733					
Autocratic Coaching Style	male	61	3.3357	-.17241	.07344	-2.348	110	.021*
	female	51	3.5081					
Holistic Coaching Style	male	61	3.3235	-.08630	.07385	-1.169	110	.245
	female	51	3.4098					
Degree of Effect of the Coaching	male	61	3.4549	-.10083	.05335	-1.890	110	.061
	female	51	3.5557					

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 8- Mean Differences of the Respondent-Coaches across the Variable, Highest Educational Attainment

Table 8 presents the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the coaching styles of sports coaches across the variable, highest educational attainment. The $F=2.450$ for the democratic coaching style, $F=1.375$ for autocratic coaching style, and $F=2.075$ for holistic coaching style by the respondent coaches, across the highest educational attainment, is not significant at 0.05 level. This means that there are no differences in the coaching styles of sports coaches despite the differences in their highest educational attainment. The educational attainment of any coach then even at any level does not affect the performance of an athlete. This only means that a higher educational qualification cannot show a significant effect on the performance of an athlete.

ANOVA Results on the Mean Differences of the Respondent-Coaches across the Variable, Highest Educational Attainment

Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Democratic Coaching Style	Between Groups	1.255	4	.314	2.450	.051
	Within Groups	13.708	107	.128		
	Total	14.964	111			
Autocratic Coaching Style	Between Groups	.846	4	.211	1.375	.248
	Within Groups	16.460	107	.154		
	Total	17.306	111			
Holistic Coaching Style	Between Groups	1.215	4	.304	2.075	.089
	Within Groups	15.658	107	.146		
	Total	16.873	111			

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 9- Mean Differences of the Respondent- Coaches across the Variable, length of service

Table 9 presents the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the coaching styles of sports coaches across the variable, length of service. The $F=7.809$ computed value for the autocratic coaching style yielded a .000 level of significance by the respondent-coaches across the profile variable, length of service is significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis “There is no significant difference on the coaching styles of sports coaches in Pangasinan II division across the profile variable, length of service,” is rejected. This means that there are differences in the coaching styles of sports coaches with respect to their length of service. Table 8 also shows that there are no significant differences with the democratic and holistic coaching styles despite the length of service of the sports coaches. Since the ANOVA only points out that there are significant differences in coaching styles, but does not point out where the differences lie, the *post hoc* test LSD is presented in table 10.

ANOVA Results on the Mean Differences of the Respondent- Coaches across the Variable, length of service

Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Democratic Coaching Style	Between Groups	.900	3	.300	2.304	.081
	Within Groups	14.064	108	.130		
	Total	14.964	111			
Autocratic Coaching Style	Between Groups	3.085	3	1.028	7.809	.000*
	Within Groups	14.221	108	.132		
	Total	17.306	111			
Holistic Coaching Style	Between Groups	.424	3	.141	.927	.430
	Within Groups	16.449	108	.152		
	Total	16.873	111			

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 10- Mean Differences of the Respondent-Coaches across the Variable, Length of Service

The results indicate that significant differences in the coaching styles of the respondent coaches are found in all categories indicated for the length of service. Specifically, as it can be seen easily in table 9 that there are significant mean differences as for the length of service in the identified number of years.

Post Hoc LSD Test Results on the Mean Differences of the Respondent-Coaches across the Variable, Length of Service

Variable	(i) Yrs in Service	(j) Yrs. In-Service	Mean difference	Standard Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Length of Service	1-5 years	1-5 years	-.20946	.08466	.015*	.0416	.3772
		10 years and above	-.39514	.0979	.000*	-.5893	-.2009
	6-10 years	1-5 years	-.20946	.08466	.015*	-.3772	-.0416
		10 years and above	-.41569	.09540	.000*	-.6047	-.2265
	11-15 years	10 years and above	-.42730	.1181	.000*	-.6614	-.1931
	16 years and above	1-5 years	.39514	.0979	.000*	.2009	.5893
		6-10 years	.41569	.0954	.000*	.2265	.6047
11-15 years		.42730	.1181	.000*	.1931	.6614	

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 11- Results on the Mean Differences of the Respondent- Coaches across the Variable, number of seminars or training attended related to sports

Table 11 shows the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the coaching styles of sports coaches across the variable, the number of seminars or training attended related to sports. The $F=3.707$ computed value for the autocratic coaching style yielded a .014 level of significance by the respondent-coaches across the profile variable, the number of seminars or training attended related to sports, is significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the hypothesis of the study, “there is no significant difference on the coaching styles of sports coaches in Pangasinan II division across their profile variable, seminars or training attended with sports preference,” is rejected. This implies that there are differences in the autocratic coaching styles of sports coaches with respect to the number of seminars or training attended related to sports. Table 11 also shows that there are no significant differences with the democratic and holistic coaching styles despite the number of seminars or training attended related to sports of the sports’ coaches.

ANOVA Results on the Mean Differences of the Respondent- Coaches across the Variable, number of seminars or training attended related to sports

Dependent Variable	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Democratic Coaching Style	Between Groups	.111	3	.037	.268	.848
	Within Groups	14.853	108	.138		
	Total	14.964	111			
Autocratic Coaching Style	Between Groups	1.615	3	.538	3.707	.014*
	Within Groups	15.690	108	.145		
	Total	17.306	111			
Holistic Coaching Style	Between Groups	.418	3	.139	.915	.437
	Within Groups	16.455	108	.152		
	Total	16.873	111			

*Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 12- Relationships between the Coaching styles of Sports’ Coaches in Pangasinan II Division and the Performance of Athletes in the Different Sports Competition

Table 12 below shows the Pearson r Coefficients of Correlations between the coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II Division and the performance of athletes in the different sports competitions. The data indicate that there is a significant relationship between the autocratic and democratic coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II Division and their profile variable, awards received in sports in the division level in the achievement of gold and silver awards. The computed R-values, .315 and -.218 yielded a .002 and .037 level of significance, respectively. The significant level of the Pearson r coefficient of correlation is below the significance level of 0.05 set at the start of this study. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states, “There is no significant relationship between the coaching styles and the performance of the athletes in different sports competitions,” is rejected. The result means that there is an indicated association between the dependent and the independent variables, whatsoever in the division level. This result implies that the autocratic and democratic coaching styles of sports coaches have an indicated association with the performance of athletes at the division level.

Likewise, at the regional level, the data also show that there is a significant relationship between the democratic and holistic coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II Division and their profile variable, awards received in sports in the division level in the achievement of silver and bronze awards. The computed R-values, -.216 and -.221 yielded .047 and .042 levels of significance, respectively. The significant level of the Pearson r coefficient of correlation is below the significance level of 0.05 set at the start of this study. Therefore, the null hypothesis which states, “There is no significant relationship between the coaching styles and the performance of the athletes in different sports competitions,” is rejected.

Relationships between the Coaching styles of Sports’ Coaches in Pangasinan II Division and the Performance of Athletes in the Different Sports Competition

Independent Variables	Pearson Correlations	Democratic	Autocratic	Holistic
Division - Gold	r-Value	-.066	.315*	.166
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.526	.002	.108
Division - Silver	r-Value	-.218*	.005	-.165
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.037	.965	.117
Division - Bronze	r-Value	-.188	.134	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.072	.202	.882
Regional - Gold	r-Value	.064	-.105	-.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.564	.344	.808
Regional- Silver	r-Value	-.216*	-.100	-.221*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.047	.362	.042
Regional- Bronze	r-Value	-.249*	-.119	-.173

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	.273	.111
National - Gold	r-Value	.159	.143	.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.198	.249	.639
National - Silver	r-Value	-.073	.061	-.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.539	.606	.409
National - Bronze	r-Value	-.139	.026	-.149
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.235	.822	.203

*Significant at 0.05 level

IV. Conclusion

Based on the salient findings, In the profile variables of the respondent coaches, the majority are males with some units leading to a Master's degree and with 6-10 years of teaching service. The majority of the respondent coaches too, had 10 and above the number of training, earned majority gold awards in the division level and decreases as they go to higher competitions and mostly members of Amateur Sports Association in Pangasinan II. The respondent coaches are highly proficient in their sports coaching with respect to democratic style, autocratic style, and holistic style. On the degree of proficiency of the coaching styles in the performance of athletes in the Pangasinan II division, all of the respondent coaches had a very high degree of effect. There is a significant difference in the autocratic coaching style of the respondent coaches with respect to the profile variable, sex. As to the highest educational attainment, there is no significant difference in the respondent-coaches coaching style. For the length of service, there is a significant difference in the coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II division across the profile variable, length of service. Further, there is a significant difference in the coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II division across their profile variable, seminars, or training attended related to sports. There is a significant relationship between the autocratic and democratic coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II Division and their profile variable, awards received in sports in the division level in the achievement of gold and silver awards. Likewise, at the regional level, there is a significant relationship between the democratic and holistic coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II Division and their profile variable, awards received in sports in the division level in the achievement of silver and bronze awards. But at the national level, there are no significant relationships between the coaching styles of sports coaches in the Pangasinan II Division and their profile variable, awards received in sports at the national level.

REFERENCES

- [25] Becker, A. (2012). Collegiate basketball players experienced of being coached during a turnaround season. *Sport psychologist*, March 2012, vol 26, pg 19- 43.
- [26] Bradley, S. (2012). Tigers Focused on Task at Hand for Furman, My Orange Update, September 2012. <https://www.myorangeupdate.com/2012/09/>
- [27] Cruz, A. B., & Hyun-Duck Kim. (2017). Leadership preferences of adolescent players in sport: influence of coach gender. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine*, 16(2), 172–179.

- [28] Delaney, T. (2014). *Classical and contemporary social theory: investigation and application*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall/Pearson
- [29] Homer, M. (2021). What are the three types of coaching styles. <https://www.business2community.com/leadership/what-are-the-3-types-of-coaching-styles-02375996>
- [30] Horn, T. S. et al. (2011). Relationship Between Collegiate Athletes' Psychological Characteristics and Their Preferences for Different Types of Coaching Behavior. *Sport Psychologist*, 25(2), 190-211.
- [31] Huff, Casy-May. (2019) Coaching Styles, Athletes Needs Satisfaction, and Identity: An Analysis of Athlete-Coach Relationship. Digital Commons @ ACU, Electronics Theses and Dissertations. Paper 175.
- [32] Hyun-Duck, K., & 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.
- [33] Marcone, M. (2017). The Impact of Coaching Styles on the Motivation and Performance of Athletes. *Kinesiology, Sports Studies and Physical Education Synthesis Projects*. 21. https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_synthesis/21
- [34] Moen, F., Hoigaard, R., & Peters, D. M., (2014). Performance Progress and Leadership Behavior. *International Journal Of Coaching Science*, 8(1), 69-81
- [35] Moen, F. (2014). The Coach-Athlete relationship and expectations *International journal of humanities and social science*, 4(11), 29-40.
- [36] Naseer, A. et al. (2019). Leadership Style Discovery in Performance Coaching within Social Context. *The Spark*. Vol.4, Issue 1, page 28.
- [37] Smith, A. (2017). The Lived Experiences of Position Specialists in Team Sports Environment. University of Tennessee. https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/4498
- [38] Uzum, H. (2018). Perceived coach attitudes and behavior scale: development and validation study. *Journal of education and training studies*, 6(3), 160-169. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i3.3018>
- [39] Vidic, Z., & Burton, D. (2010). The roadmap: Examining the impact of a systematic goal-setting program for collegiate women's tennis players. *Sport Psychologist*, 24(4), 427-447
- [40] Warner, M.R. (2017). Coaching Styles and Team Cohesion in High School Male Student-Athetes. Masters Thesis. <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2881>