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Abstract

This study advanced the understanding of relationships among coach leadership and collegiate softball players’ self-confidence and motivation. The purpose of this study was to examine if there was a correlation between perceived coach leadership and softball player’s self-confidence and motivation. Ninety-seven U.S. collegiate female softball student-athletes completed a Basic Demographic Survey, the Trait Sport-Confident Inventory (TSCI), Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS), and Sport Motivation Scale (SMS). Multiple linear regression analyses results indicated that LSS and SMS subscales explained 45 percent of the variance in TSCI scores. Pearson correlation coefficients were computed and significant moderate positive relationships were found between the LSS subscales, SMS subscales, and TSCI scores. These results indicate that there is a relationship between perceived coach leadership and a softball student-athlete’s self-confidence and motivation. The research findings can be used to aid coaches in developing a coaching style that is well perceived by softball athletes. This will assist coaches in developing techniques (i.e., communication skills, motivational factors, correctional feedback, mental toughness) that will motivate and give their softball athletes high levels of self-confidence while performing.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

When it comes to an athlete’s self-confidence and motivation, a coach can be a vital and influential asset (Altahayneh, 2013). Over the past few decades, a large number of studies have been conducted to examine coaching styles in relation to an athlete’s self-confidence as well as motivation (e.g., Altahayneh, 2013; Saville et al., 2014; Weinberg & Gould, 2011). Self-confidence is the belief that an athlete or person can successfully perform a behavior or task (Weinberg & Gould, 2011). Motivation is how people act and the conditions and processes that occur to facilitate persistence, performance, and healthy development (Deci & Ryan, 2008). A coach has the ability to increase or decrease an athlete’s self-confidence and motivation by his/her coaching style or leadership role.

There are many forms of coaching leadership widely used today. The most researched coaching styles are autocratic and democratic. The autocratic coaching style, also known as authoritative or controlling, is defined as high amounts of punishment feedback and little to no social support toward the athlete as well as total control from a coach (e.g., “my way or the highway mentality”) (Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Horn, Bloom, Berglund, & Packard, 2011). An advantage to this coaching style allows athletes to be uniform and not question the decisions made from the coaches. A disadvantage to this coaching style can cause an athlete to not feel important as a team member.

The democratic coaching style, also known as autonomy-supportive style, is defined as high amounts of training, social support, and positive and informational feedback from coach to athlete (Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Horn et al., 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2000). For example, a coach that gives athletes the ability to have a say on and off the field. Research suggests that most
athletes prefer the democratic style over the autocratic style due to the social support as well as training and positive feedback which would allow an athlete to develop strong psyche (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thogersen-Ntoumani, 2010; Horn et al., 2011; Saville et al., 2014; Weinberg & Gould, 2011). An advantage to the democratic coaching style stems from a relationship standpoint. Athletes get more of a say in decisions (food, uniforms, practice gear, etc.) which allows athletes to express themselves and feel heard. A disadvantage to this coaching style is the possibility of having no control over a team an essentially turning a program into a free for all. Both coaching styles have their advantages and disadvantages, however it is up to a coach to find what works to motivate and give confidence to their athletes.

Being self-confident can be a challenge when sports continuously stack the odds against athletes. One error in a critical moment can ultimately change how confident an athlete could be in the final moments of a game. Weinberg and Gould, (2011) believe that a coaches’ expectations play a significant role in an athlete’s self-confidence. This happens by coaches forming expectations of players through person cues (e.g., an individual’s appearance, performance, race, socioeconomic status, etc.). The expectations influence an athlete’s behavior and the interaction between coach and athlete (Weinberg & Gould, 2011).

An athlete’s success or failure in sport can often be determined by the type of motivation within (Deci & Ryan, 2008). There are three types of motivation, amotivation, intrinsic and extrinsic. Amotivation can be caused by athlete’s not perceiving contingencies between their actions and the outcome of their actions, such as, athletes no longer identifying with why they train (Pelleiter et al., 1995). Intrinsic motivation derives from internal rewards and allow for a greater feeling of autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1985). For example, practicing extra because an athlete enjoys being on the field. Extrinsic motivation is defined as an external regulation, in
which one’s behavior is based on external rewards or punishments, (e.g., an athlete does not want to make an error because the coach will make the whole team run) (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Often times, motivation, whether amotivation, intrinsic or extrinsic, within an athlete derives from coaching leadership (Hodge, Henry, & Smith, 2014).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived coach-leadership and the effects of self-confidence and motivation in collegiate softball. The research focused on one main question:

1. Is there a relationship between perceived coach-leadership, player’s self-confidence, and motivation in softball student-athletes?

This research question was designed to investigate the relationship between how a coach is perceived and how softball athletes were affected. By identifying if there is a relationship between the three variables (coach-leadership, self-confidence, motivation), coaches could use this research as a way to develop and advance the way softball athletes are coached.

The research findings will be utilized to aid coaches in developing a coaching style that is well perceived by softball athletes. This will help coaches develop techniques (i.e., communication skills, motivational factors, correctional feedback, mental toughness) that will motivate and give their softball athletes high levels of self-confidence while performing.

**Limitations**

The method in which questionnaires were distributed via e-mail to head coaches potentially enabled, non-eligible or injured individuals to complete the survey thus skewing the data collection. Also, due to participation anonymity, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division, I, II, III were not recorded, therefore equal participation from any
division is not known. Another limitation within this study consisted of transfer students and first year athletes. First year athletes as well as transfers have a limited amount of time with their coach therefore limiting the time to adapt to a specific coaching style. Lastly, it was not recorded if a coach had transferred and if another coach with another style had taken their place.

**Delimitations**

Delimitations consisted of only using NCAA schools when conducting the study because the primary researcher had no previous connections to any other divisions. Junior colleges were not used due to the fact that athletes only participate for two years opposed to four year institutions.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The literature related to perceived coach-leadership, self-confidence and motivation in sports will be reported in this chapter. For organizational purposes, the literature will be presented under the following topics: (1) Self-determination theory, (2) Leadership in sport, (3) Self-confidence, and (4) Motivation.

Self-Determination Theory

Self-determination theory (SDT) is defined as a theoretical approach that could explain the implications of the social environment on the well-being of athletes (Bartholomew et al., 2010; Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Horn et al., 2011; Isoard-Gautheur, Guillet-Descas, & Lemyre, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT is based off of two distinct coaching styles: autonomy supportive (democratic; team involvement) and controlling (autocratic; decision made only by the coach) (Isoard-Gautheur et al., 2012; Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011). Autonomy supportive coaches shape the environment in which athletes carry out responsibilities as well as affect communication skills and basic psychological needs (San et al., 2012). There are three types of psychological needs that are essential for facilitating optimal functioning for growth, social development, and personal well-being: a need for relatedness, competence, and autonomy (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The need for relatedness is the feeling of closeness in an athlete’s primary relationships (San et al., 2012). An individual’s need for competence is considered to be the feeling of being skillful and effective (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Finally, the need for autonomy is having control of one’s own life and having the ability to make choices (San et al., 2012). According to San and colleagues (2012), by satisfying all three psychological needs (relatedness, competence, and autonomy) athletes are provided with better well-being. The relationship
between leadership style and the basic psychological needs can ultimately help an athlete succeed in sports.

**Leadership in Sport**

The multidimensional leadership model for sports was developed to identify the leadership styles preferred by athletes, the leadership styles required by athletes, and the actual leadership styles used by coaches (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Jowett & Chaundy, 2004; Turman, 2001). There are five dimensional leadership styles; autocratic, democratic, positive feedback, social support, and training and instruction.

Turman (2001) conducted a study on success through athlete maturity and coaching styles over time. His research investigated the coaching process by using athletes’ preferences and perceptions and the impact of years of experience as well as skill level throughout an athletes’ season. By using the multidimensional leadership model, Turman (2001) examined the five dimensional leadership styles; autocratic, democratic, positive feedback, social support, and training and instruction. Utilizing a Likert-type scale, the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) developed by Chelladurai & Saleh (1980) was used to measure satisfaction, frequency, etc. Turman (2001) found that athletes’ perceptions of coaches’ use of demographic, positive feedback training and instructional leadership styles were not affected by success and athlete experience levels throughout the season; however, a significant effect showed when measuring the effects of success on the autocratic leadership style during follow-up procedures and found that athletes’ perceptions of their coaches’ use of an autocratic leadership style were affected by team success. Winning teams saw no difference in autocratic style and claimed the style had not changed throughout the season. Unsuccessful teams found that coaches’ autocratic style increased significantly from the beginning of the season. This could be because coaches feel a
sense of not being in control of their team’s success. Turman (2001) examined athletes’
perceptions of coaches’ social support leadership style, he found that this was the only measure
that had a significant effect for athlete experience levels throughout the season. First, second,
third, and fourth year athletes seemed to perceive less social support from the beginning of the
season compared to the rest of the season.

Coaches’ use of the five leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, social support, and
training and instruction) did not have any significant effect for successful and unsuccessful
teams, meaning coaches’ did not change their leadership style throughout the season (Turman,
2001). Coaches’ perceptions using the positive feedback leadership style matches the athletes’
preferences and perceptions based on team success (Turman, 2001). Turman’s (2001) findings
show that athletes see more social support toward the end of their season potentially due to the
relationship that develops over time between coach and athlete.

In another study, Turman and Schrodt (2004) investigated the relationships between
coaches’ leadership behaviors and student athletes’ affective learning; stating relationships
among coaches and their athletes can impact the way young athletes learn from their
participation in sports. Affective learning can be defined as the internalization of positive
attitudes consisting of course content, course subject, and instructor (Turman & Schrodt, 2004).
Turman and Schrodt (2004) examined five coaching leadership styles; autocratic, democratic,
social support, positive feedback, and training and instruction. A majority of coaches will adopt a
combination of all five styles; however, one leadership style will often surface more than the
rest. Turman and Schrodt (2004) then surveyed athletes with questions in relation to their
coaches’ leadership behaviors, individual and team success. The results indicated that all five
leadership styles were associated with athletes’ affective learning. They also found that coaching contributes to athletes’ affective learning including team and individual success.

Interestingly enough, Turman and Schrodt (2004) discovered that autocratic leadership combined with moderate to high levels of positive feedback could increase an athletes’ affective learning; however, the sole use of autocratic leadership could result in the decline of an athletes’ affective learning. Due to an athlete’s preference of coaching styles, coaches can implement an autocratic leadership style and still be successful only if the pair that coaching style with one of the other four (democratic, social support, positive feedback, and training and instruction).

Coaching Styles

Autonomy supportive coaching (democratic) gives coaches an option to involve their team; allowing the athletes to experience volition, choice, and self-endorsement (Bartholomew et al., 2010). This type of coaching style provides a sense of worth to an athlete and can be used as a form of positive motivation. For example, a coach allowing athletes to decide between two practice times for the following day could result in the athletes practicing harder. On the other hand, controlling coaching (authoritative, autocratic) uses an authoritative way to impose a specific way of thinking and behaving, often using forms of pressure and coercive tactics (Bartholomew et al., 2010). This type of coaching style can often lead to belittlement upon an athlete if a certain task is not performed in a certain manner.

Bartholomew and colleagues (2010) wanted to develop and evaluate a measure designed to assess coaches’ controlling interpersonal style using the SDT. Bartholomew et al. (2010) developed the Controlling Coach Behaviors Scale (CCBS) to assess four different controlling motivational strategies within sport; the controlling use of rewards, negative conditional regard, intimidation, and excessive personal control. After surveying young athletes, Bartholomew and
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colleagues (2010) found that controlling coaches would have a larger amount of variance than autonomy-supportive strategies. Controlling strategies have the ability to deter athletes’ feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness; causing a negative impact on the athletes’ as a whole as well as their work ethic and performance. The CCBS was supported and could be used as a beneficial tool in addressing issues of motivation and psychological well-being for an athlete (Bartholomew et al., 2010). San, Soyer, and Yiğiter (2012) investigated the relationship between sport coaches’ perceived leadership behaviors, as well as athletes’ communication skills and satisfaction of athletes’ basic psychological needs (SDT). Leadership style coaches shape the environment in which athletes carry out responsibilities as well as affect communication skills and basic psychological needs (San et al., 2012). According to San and colleagues, (2012) when these three psychological needs are met, an athletes’ well-being increases. Coaches that allow athletes to take part in the decision-making process enhance the autonomy in their athletes. San et al. (2012) used multiple questionnaires to survey athletes; Leadership Scale for Sport (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), Basic Psychological Needs Scale (Ilardi et al., 1993), and the Communication Skills Evaluation Scale (Korkut, 1996). San and colleagues (2012) found no significance between genders in terms of need for relatedness, competence, autonomy and coaching styles. They also found that women used communication skills and expressed themselves better than males.

The relationship between leadership style and the basic psychological needs showed negative significant correlation between need for relatedness and competence and positive feedback behavior, the need for competence and social support, and the need for competence and training and instruction behaviors. This means that more positive feedback behavior creates more satisfaction of need for relatedness and competence. San et al. (2012) found positive feedback
increased intrinsic motivation and enjoyment in the way athletes’ feel. Ultimately, positive feedback contributes to athletes’ competence compared to negative feedback. San and colleagues (2012) also found that SDT has a positive significant correlation between need for competence and autonomy and autocratic behavior. This means that there is a lower psychological well-being in athletes’. In other words, autocratic coaching styles are not good for well-being of athletes. San et al. (2012) state, depending on cultural background, an athlete’s preference of his or her coach’s coaching style can differ; however positive feedback and social support could lead to better communication skills between coach and athlete.

**Coaching style vs. athletes’ behavior.** Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) examined the relationships between contextual factors (autonomy-supportive vs. controlling coaching style) and personal factors (autonomous vs. controlled motivation) based off of Self-Determination Theory. They concluded that SDT was related to prosocial and antisocial behaviors toward teammates and opponents. These researchers also examined the relationships with prosocial and antisocial behavior in which they called moral disengagement. The term moral disengagement is the use of psychosocial maneuvers that allow an individual to transgress moral standards without experiencing negative effects, which led to decreasing constraint on negative behavior in the future (Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011). While researching the personal motivational factors, Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) found that athletes with the autonomous motivation would behave in a way related to their true self and satisfy their own psychological needs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness ergo expressing self-confidence. For example, athletes with autonomous motivation would essentially find happiness and confidence in improving and doing well for themselves. The researchers also examined athletes with control motivation. Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) stated, athletes that are motivated in a controlled setting would seek to gain ego enhancement,
fame, and extrinsic rewards instead of self-satisfaction. Therefore, athletes would not focus on
the process of the game, but the overall outcome.

After carefully reviewing the results of the experiment conducted, Hodge and Lonsdale
(2011) found that autonomy-supportive coaching style had a moderate positive association with
autonomous motivation and a weak-moderate negative relationship with controlled motivation.
This means, autonomy-supportive coaching is linked to an athlete’s autonomous motivation but
is not necessarily linked to athletes with controlling motivations. In the results of prosocial and
antisocial behavior in relation to coaching style, Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) found that
autonomy-supportive coaching had weak-negative relationships with antisocial behavior toward
teammates and opponents; meaning there was no significant relation with autonomy-supportive
coaches and antisocial athletes. Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) also found that autonomy-supportive
coaching was related to prosocial behavior towards teammates but not prosocial behavior
towards opponents. Controlled motivation was positively associative with antisocial behavior
toward teammates and opponents, meaning that there was a strong link between antisocial
athletes and controlled motivation. In conclusion to the research, coaching styles can influence
athletes’ behaviors (prosocial or antisocial), however, depending on the type of motivation an
athlete has, can influence an athlete as well.

Athletes’ preferences. All athletes are different, which means that an athlete may prefer
one style while their teammate may prefer something different. Horn et al. (2011) examined the
psychological characteristics in an athlete and their preferences for different types of coaching
behaviors. By using a series of self-report questionnaires (preferred coaching behavior,
motivational orientation, and competitive trait anxiety), Horn et al. (2011) were able to assess the
preferences of coaching behaviors; democratic or autocratic. They found that ultimately there is a
relatively large body of research that shows the behavior of coaching styles, in practice and competition, have a significant impact on their athlete’s ability to perform (Horn et al., 2011). Horn and colleagues (2011) found that athletes who are underdeveloped prefer the autocratic form because of the organization of a set schedule that it provides, including the negative feedback and punishments. This form of coaching could be great for the underdeveloped athletes because it gives them a sense of direction to improve their skills as well as providing exterior motivations to perform better. If a player makes a mistake, for example, the coach would use punishment and negative feedback to address the mistake. However, given extreme cases, the autocratic style of coaching can be questioned on how far is too far. But depending on the success of the program, this style of coaching will not be questioned until necessary.

Horn et al. (2011) researched the preference in coaches regarding the higher elite levels of athletes. They found that these types of athletes prefer democratic style coaching due to the social support factor, training, and positive and informational feedback. Elite level athletes have more intrinsic motivation to perform at the higher level thus, not needing the negative punishment and feedback because they are already hard on themselves. By adding social support and positive feedback, this provides the athlete with encouragement that they do not give themselves within. By taking these examples into consideration, we can see that depending on the level of success an athlete is at, will depend on their preference on coaching styles. Given that one team does not hold the same types of athletes, makes a coach’s job relatively harder to pick a certain coaching style. Coaches, however, must beware that the type of style they choose can increase or decrease an athlete’s self-confidence and motivation.
Self-Confidence

In sports, as well as life, self-confidence is a fickle subject. Self-confidence (SC) can be defined as a feeling of belief in one’s abilities and qualities to be successful in sport (Feltz, 1988). Too often people read on social media or hear on the news about body shaming, lack of talent or skill, etc. Lacking self-confidence in athletics can be detrimental to an athlete’s performance (Hays, Thomas, Maynard, & Butt, 2010). The benefits of self-confidence allow athletes to arouse positive emotions, master concentration, set goals, increase effort, focus more in games and at practices, and maintain momentum (Weinberg & Gould, 2011). As an athlete, these benefits can contribute to developing a consistent confidence that can be applied in crucial moments of their careers. There are three constructs studied in the sport exercise psychology literature related to confidence; self-efficacy, state, and trait self-confidence (Vealey, 1986).

Self-efficacy is the belief of one’s ability to succeed in a specific area or accomplish a specific task (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy differs from other forms of confidence in that it is context-, task-, and domain-specific (Bandura, 1977). For example, a softball player might be confident in her hitting ability, but her self-efficacy for getting a hit during a given at-bat may be increased or decreased depending on the skill level of the opposing pitcher or the number of outs when she steps up to bat. According to Feltz, (1988) self-confidence and self-efficacy both cause and effect sport performance. However, prior performance and behavior, as well as other factors, are also influential in sport performance (Feltz, 1988). This means that an athlete’s degree of success on a previous performance can greatly impact self-efficacy (Feltz, 1988).

Vealey (1986) describes state self-confidence as the feelings of self-worth an athlete has at a given point and trait self-confidence as the way an athlete generally feels about themselves. An individual’s nature toward being self-confident in sport can influence state sport-confidence.
Vealey (1988) found that athletes high in trait-sport confidence who held a competitive performance orientation were also high in state sport-confidence. Using the baseline research of Vealey (1986;1988), Martin and Gill (1991) examined the relationship among competitive orientation, sport-confidence, self-efficacy, anxiety, and performance. Through their research, Martin and Gill (1991) found that the trait-sport confidence inventory (TSCI) predicted state sport confidence in athletes, thus confirming that how an athlete feels and talks about themselves will determine how they behave.

Coaches influence self-talk which is, how an athlete speaks to oneself (Hatzigeorgiadis et al., 2009). Self-talk has played a crucial role in cognitive behavioral modification, meaning what people say to themselves affects the way they behave (Hatzigeorgiadis et al., 2009). Using the Competitive State Anxiety Inventory-2 revised (CSAI-2R; Cox et al., 2003) to assess self-confidence and anxiety in athletes, Hatzigeorgiadis and colleagues (2009) found that participants using motivational self-talk increased self-confidence and decreased anxiety, thus promoting an increase in sport-performance. Coaches that promote motivational self-talk will see an increase in their athletes’ behavior allowing an athlete to continue to strive for optimal performance and self-confidence.

A coach’s expectations can play a factor in an athlete’s self-confidence and performance as well (Weinberg & Gould, 2011). This happens by coaches forming expectations of players through person cues, such as: an individual’s appearance, race, or socioeconomic status. The expectations influence an athlete’s behavior and the interaction between coach and athlete. Then the coaches’ behavior towards the athlete affects the athlete’s performance. Lastly, the athlete’s performance confirms the coaches’ expectations (Weinberg & Gould, 2011). This continuous
cycle, between coach and athlete, is why there is a need to educate others about athlete self-confidence.

Nine ways a coach could help an athlete build self-confidence are; focusing on performance accomplishments (e.g., actual game scenarios), acting confident, thinking confidently, imagery such as, visualizing success, goal mapping (e.g., setting personal and team goals), optimizing physical training, preparing, social climate such as, social support, and building team efficacy (e.g., group dynamic) (Weinberg & Gould, 2011). All athletes are different and respond to different strategies to optimize performance. What may work for one athlete may not work for another. As a coach, acknowledging and understanding that change does not happen immediately will benefit an athlete and their progress toward self-confidence (Hays, Thomas, Maynard, & Butt, 2010). Coaches employing these strategies may find this increased self-confidence in their athletes translates to an increase in athlete’s motivation as well (Carpentier & Mageau, 2016).

**Motivation**

Motivation allows athletes to have a reason to act or accomplish a task (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Motivated athletes strive to achieve goals that they have set. Some athletes struggle to create their own goals and rely on their coaches to help influence their motivation. Through different forms of motivation (intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation) as well as different strategies (change-oriented feedback, contextual, and personal motivation) coaches can find ways to continue pushing their athletes to strive for success.

Intrinsic motivation (IM) refers to participating in an activity for the pleasure and simple satisfaction of doing the activity. Pelletier and colleagues (1995) found three types of intrinsic motivation and have been identified as IM to know, IM to accomplish, and IM to experience
stimulation. IM to know can be described as performing an activity for the pleasure of learning something new, to understand, and explore what is not known to them. For example, an athlete learning a new training technique for the pleasure they experience while learning something new (Pelletier et al., 1995). IM to accomplish refers to an athlete participating in an activity for the pleasure of accomplishing or creating something (e.g., mastering a difficult training technique). Lastly, IM to experience stimulation can occur when an athlete engages in an activity in order to gain experience as well as fun and excitement (Pelletier et al., 1995). For example, athletes that participate in sport to live exciting experiences.

Pelletier and colleagues (1995) defined extrinsic motivation (EM) as a means to an end, often receiving a reward for the completed behavior. Three types of extrinsic motivation have been identified as EM identified, EM introjected, and EM external regulation. EM identified is internally regulated but described as extrinsic because an athlete comes to value and judge the behavior as important (e.g., an athlete contributes to a sport because they feel their involvement contributes to their development) (Pelletier et al., 1995). EM introjected occurs when behaviors are reinforced through internal pressures of guilt or anxiety. For example, athletes who participate in sport for aesthetic reasons and feel pressure to be in good shape (Pelletier et al., 1995). Lastly, Pelletier and colleagues (1995) define EM external regulation as behavior controlled by external resources. For example, athletes that participate in sport to receive praise from a coach or parent.

The last form of motivation is amotivation. Amotivation can be defined as learned helplessness (Pelletier et al., 1995). Often times, athletes who are amotivated are neither intrinsically nor extrinsically motivated. Pelletier et al. (1995) state that amotivated athletes no
longer identify good reasons of why they continue to train, thus resulting to withdraw from training all together.

Coaches can influence their athletes’ motivation by applying change-oriented feedback. Change-oriented feedback can be defined as behavior that needs to be modified and conveyed to an athlete to achieve their goals (Carpentier & Mageau, 2016). Change-oriented feedback is important because it can increase an athlete’s desire to perform optimally in the future as well as help athletes focus on changes they need to make (Carpentier & Mageau, 2016). Carpentier and Mageau’s (2016) study contributed to previous research that change-oriented feedback works best with autonomy supportive coaching because positive feedback creates positive consequences and adds to self-confidence within an athlete.

Coaches can use the role of contextual and personal motivation to push an athlete as well (Healy et al., 2014). Healy et al., (2014) sought to clarify mixed results in previous literature exploring coach behavior, basic psychological needs, goal motivation, and well- and ill-being. Using four questionnaires, (perceptions of coach behaviors, basic psychological needs satisfaction and thwarting, goal-related variables, and well-being and ill-being), Healy and colleagues (2014) found how goal motives relate coach behavior through the satisfaction of the basic needs. Healy et al. (2014) found that when coaches were autonomy supportive, athletes reported greater satisfaction of their basic psychological needs and strive for their goals with higher autonomous motives. Healy and colleagues (2014) found that autocratic style coaches increase extrinsic motivation within athletes, thus confirming Horn and colleagues (2011) research that athletes have more intrinsic motivation to perform at the higher level when supportive coaches are involved and not needing the negative punishment and feedback because they are already hard on themselves.
As previously stated, coaches play a vital role in an athlete’s career. It is important to investigate coach leadership, athlete self-confidence and motivation to aid softball coaches around the world in developing ways to understand and communicate with their athletes. By learning if these constructs (coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation) are related, coaches can build programs based on how each athlete corresponds to a particular coaching style.
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Methods

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of a collegiate softball player’s perceived coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation. The methods of this study were organized as follows: procedures and protocols, participants, instruments, and data analysis.

Participants

To be eligible to complete the survey, participants had to be varsity softball student-athletes currently participating on an NCAA college or university softball team 18 years old. Participants came from a variety of institutions participating in the NCAA Division I, II, & III athletics based throughout the United States. Out of the 174 participants who started the survey, only 97 female softball student-athletes completed all questionnaires. Therefore, data from 77 participants were eliminated from analyses because the data were too incomplete. Participants mean age was 19.6 years (SD = 1.28). Table 1 presents frequencies for participants’ years of softball playing experience, current year in school, and years played for a specific collegiate coach. Because the NCAA divisions were not asked in the basic demographic questionnaire (Appendix C), the number of participants from each division or how many institutions participated is unknown.
Table 1. Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Playing Softball</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Year in School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time with Current Coach</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protocols and Procedures

After approval to conduct the study was obtained from the IRB, participants were recruited by e-mails (Appendix A) sent out to all current head coaches within the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I, II, & III colleges and universities from the primary investigator. Coaches were located through the NCAA.org Sport Sponsorship website. The primary investigator used convenience sampling through the NCAA website as well as asked other coaches to forward the recruitment e-mail (Appendix A). Approximately 200 coaches were contacted throughout NCAA Division I, II, & III. In the recruitment e-mail (Appendix A) head coaches were instructed to distribute the survey via e-mail to current softball athletes participating on collegiate teams using the Qualtrics online software where the questionnaires (Appendix C) were stored. The Qualtrics online software allowed the primary investigator to conduct online data collection and analysis for the research on the relationship of a softball player’s perceived coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation. At the start of the survey, the Informed Consent Sheet (Appendix B) explained all data being collected would be
confidential and gave the primary investigator's address and phone number if they were to have questions regarding the study. The Informed Consent Sheet (Appendix B) explained why information was being collected, that their participation in the study was voluntary, and they could discontinue at any time without penalty. The survey was distributed in January 2016 which was the start of the spring semester and data collection remained open for three months.

**Instruments**

Four instruments were administered in this study. First, a Basic Demographic Questionnaire created by the primary investigator, followed by the Trait Sport-Confidence Inventory (TSCI) developed by Vealey (1986), then the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) constructed by Chelladurai & Saleh (1980), and the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS) developed by Pelletier et al. (1995). These instruments are further described below.

**Basic Demographic Questionnaire**

The first questionnaire used in this study was the Basic Demographic questionnaire created by the primary investigator to gage how old the participants were, how long the subject had played softball, the current year in school, and the length of time played for that coach (Appendix C).

**Trait Sport-Confident Inventory**

The second survey used in this study was the Trait Sport-Confident Inventory (TSCI; Vealey, 1986). The TSCI (Vealey, 1986) is a 13-item measure developed to assess how confident athletes feel when they compete. Athletes rate their confidence on how they perform in different situations of the sport on a scale from 0 to 9, with 0 representing low confidence, and 9 representing high self-confidence. The TSCI was found to have a coefficient alpha of .86,
respectively (Vealey, 1986). The TSCI was found to be valid through examination of concurrent validity (Appendix D).

**Leadership Scale for Sport Survey**

The third instrument used in this study was the Leadership Scale for Sport survey (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). The LSS is a 40-item measure developed to assess how an athlete perceives their coach as a leader. Athlete’s rate their perceived level of agreement regarding their coach on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being never agreeing, and 5 representing always agreeing with their coach. The five subscales of the LSS contain multiple items for each, and are: training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback. The LSS was determined to be valid through examination of factorial and content validity (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) (Appendix E).

**Sport Motivation Scale**

The final instrument used in this study was the Sport Motivation Scale (SMS; Pelletier et al., 1995). The SMS is a 28-item measure developed to assess how motivated an athlete is to practice in their sport. Athletes rate their motivation on a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 representing not corresponding at all, and 7 representing corresponding exactly to why athletes practice their sport. The seven subscales of the SMS contain four items each, and are: intrinsic motivation – to know, intrinsic motivation – to accomplish, intrinsic motivation – to experience stimulation, extrinsic motivation – identified, extrinsic motivation – introjected, extrinsic motivation – external regulation, and amotivation. These seven subscales were found to have a mean coefficient alpha of .75, respectively. The SMS was found to be valid through examination of construct validity (Pelletier et al., 1995) (Appendix F).
Data Analysis

Data were first screened to determine if the assumptions were met for a multiple linear regression and Pearson’s correlation coefficients. A multiple linear regression was calculated to determine if trait-sport confidence could be predicted from scores on the LSS subscales and SMS subscales. Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationships between perceived coach-leadership, self-confidence, and motivation.
CHAPTER IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of a collegiate softball player's perceived coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation. This study was designed to specifically examine the relationship of a softball player’s perceived coach leadership (Leadership Scale for Sport; LSS), self-confidence (Trait-Sport Confidence Inventory; TSCI), and motivation (Sport Motivation Scale; SMS) by using a multiple linear regression as well as Pearson’s correlation coefficients.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 represents TSCI levels and frequencies. Table 3 presents means and standard deviations of all constructs investigated.

Table 2. Participants’ Degree of Trait Sport Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics: Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSCI, LSS subscales, and SMS subscales</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSCI Total</td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td>16.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and instruction</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic behavior</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic behavior</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic - to know</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic - to accomplish</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic - to experience stimulation</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic – identified</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic – introjected</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic - external regulation</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Linear Regression

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict participants’ self-confidence based on their perceived coach leadership and motivation. A significant regression was found ($f(12,84) = 5.802, p < .001$), with an $R^2$ of .453. TSCI is equal to $22.105 + 8.136$ (TRAINING AND INSTRUCTION) + 2.710 (DEMOCRATIC) + .422 (AUTOCRATIC) + 1.608 (SOCIAL SUPPORT) – 2.011 (POSTIVE FEEDBACK) + 1.046 (INTRINSIC – TO KNOW) - .743 (INTRINSIC – ACCOMPLISH) + 3.727 (INTRINSIC – EXPERIENCE) – 2.816 (EXTRINSIC – IDENTIFIED) – 1.322 (EXTRINSIC – INTROJECTED) + 3.914 (EXTRINSIC – EXTERNAL) - .323 (EXTRINSIC – AMOTIVATION). The LSS subscales and SMS subscales were found to explain approximately 45 percent of the variance in TSCI score.

Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Correlational analyses were performed to examine the total Trait Sport-Confidence Inventory and the subscales of the Leadership Scale for Sport and Sport Motivation Scale. A total of 169 correlations were computed; the most interesting correlations are reported in table 4. A significant moderate positive correlation was found between autocratic behavior and intrinsic (to accomplish) and extrinsic (external) motivation. A significant weak positive correlation was found between autocratic behavior and intrinsic (to experience) and extrinsic (identified and introjected) motivation.
### Table 4. *Pearson Correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TSCI Total</th>
<th>Sig. (1-tailed)</th>
<th>Amotivation</th>
<th>Sig. (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSCI Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.288</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and instruction</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic behavior</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic behavior</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.302</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>-0.288</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic - to know</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic - to accomplish</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic - to experience stimulation</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic – identified</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic – introjected</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic - external regulation</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of a collegiate softball student-athlete’s perceived coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation. The results of this study are discussed further in depth as well as limitations and future research.

Data from each participant were summed to compute a total score for the TSCI. These totals were then categorized as very low, moderate, or very high levels of trait sport confidence. Eighty-nine participants in this study fell into the very high category. This means that when those 89 participants compete in softball, they generally feel very confident. Vealey (1988) confirms that elite levels of female athletes often feel more confident when competing because gender roles are less important, thus female athletes possess more masculine characteristics as well as high confidence as seen in male athletes. This means that it is no surprise that female athletes feel very confident when competing in their sport.

The research question guiding this study was: is there a relationship between perceived coach-leadership in softball athletes and player’s self-confidence and motivation? The results of the multiple linear regression revealed that the LSS subscales (training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback) and SMS subscales (amotivation, intrinsic: to know, to accomplish, to experience, and extrinsic: identified, introjected, external regulation) explained 45 percent of the variance in TSCI scores. This means that an athlete’s motivation and perceived coach leadership can contribute to nearly half of a collegiate softball players’ self-confidence. Therefore, the remaining 55 percent of an athlete’s confidence is accounted for by other variables, such as: self-talk, successful experiences, and feelings of competence (Vealey, 1986). These results are important because 45 percent of the
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variability in confidence is actually pretty high (Vealey, 1986). This means that if athletes perceive their coach’s leadership as being low on the LSS subscales, a coach can greatly impact a softball student-athlete’s confidence. These results provide additional support for self-determination theory, that coaches can impact how athletes feel by satisfying their needs for relatedness, competence, and autonomy (San et al., 2012). The results of this study are important because knowing how an athlete functions, can ultimately increase their confidence and motivation to compete. All athletes are different and respond to different types of coaching styles, knowing how to coach them and satisfy their needs can lead to better individual success as well as overall team success.

The results of the Pearson’s correlations indicate that there were significant moderate positive relationships between TSCI scores, LSS subscales and SMS subscales. This means that there is a significant relationship between trait-sport confidence, coach leadership, and motivation within softball student-athletes. Results showed a significant moderate negative correlation between TSCI scores, autocratic behavior, and amotivation. Meaning that there was no relationship between trait-sport confidence, autocratic behavior in coaches and amotivation in softball athletes. These results confirm previous research that coaches can influence self-confidence and motivation within an athlete, and when the three psychological needs (need for relatedness, need competence, and need for autonomy) are met overall athlete well-being increases (Hodge, Henry & Smith, 2014; Horn et al., 2011; San et al., 2012; Turman, 2001; Turman & Schrodt, 2004). These results confirm Horn and colleagues (2011) research that the different types of coaching styles (autocratic and democratic) depend on athlete preferences.

There were significant weak to moderate positive correlations between autocratic behavior and SMS subscales. This means that there was a relationship between autocratic
coaching behavior and motivation. One explanation for this could be due to the athletes’ amount of collegiate experience, which would agree with Horn and colleagues’ (2011) findings that underdeveloped athletes prefer autocratic behaviors in coaches for the strict organization and set schedules it provides. Motivation provided by the coach can ultimately increase how an athlete wants to perform. For example, an autocratic coach that makes the team run a sprint for every run given up in the game, can motivate an athlete to play harder so they have to run less. Another example would be if a coach were to give their player a “hit and run” at practice, where the batter has to swing no matter the pitch to make contact and the runner has to run, if the player were to miss the “hit and run” they would have to run the rest of practice. This helps motivate an athlete to perform when it comes to situations in a game.

Significant weak negative correlations were found between amotivation, TSCI, training and instruction, democratic behavior, social support, positive feedback, intrinsic: to know, to accomplish, to experience, and extrinsic: identified. Meaning that there was no relationship found between an amotivated athlete, trait-sport confidence, training and instruction, democratic coaching behavior, social support, positive feedback, intrinsic, and extrinsic motivation. Amotivated athletes are neither intrinsically nor extrinsically motivated, thus a democratic coach would have a harder time increasing motivation with positive feedback and social support (Pelletier et al., 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2000). However, there were significant moderate positive correlations between amotivation, autocratic behavior, and extrinsic: introjected motivation, as well as a significant weak positive correlation between amotivation, and extrinsic: external regulation motivation. This means that a relationship was found which is interesting because amotivated athletes have a lack of motivation. However, the autocratic coaching style is based on controlling or authoritative approach, therefore it can be assumed that external motivation has
more of an effect on an athlete because it is what the coach demands of them (Healy et al., 2014). For example, an athlete pressured to continue to work out to look good (Pelletier et al., 1995). Overall, athletes respond to how they perceive their coach. Building relationships with athletes can motivate them to trust and feel confident within themselves as well as their coaches (Turman, 2001).

**Limitations**

There are a number of limitations for this study. First, the questionnaires were distributed at the beginning of the season, therefore freshman and transfer students only had approximately three to four months with their current coach. As the season was only beginning, the only games the younger athletes had played in college was fall season (if they had one). This could contribute to how an athlete feels about themselves as well as how motivated they were as compared to in-season play. According to Turman, (2001) a team progresses through the course of a season. The more interaction time athletes have with their coach, the more the coach can influence the athletes’ confidence and motivation. The younger athletes in this study only had a limited time with their coaches, which could play a role in their needs being met by the coaches (Turman, 2001). Turman, (2001) found that upperclassmen, junior and seniors, are more comfortable with their coach; therefore, the coaches have a greater impact on the athlete’s motivation.

The questionnaires were unclear if a different coach had transferred to another school. This could affect the results of the study by an athlete being recruited by one type of coach and having a different coach with a different style replace the previous coach. Pate, Stokowski, and Hardin (2011) found that coaching changes enhance burdens on athletes due to inconsistent coaching leadership and control coaches have over their team. Coaching changes can affect
building relationships with coaches and teammates, team unity, and motivating the team toward goal accomplishment (Pate et al., 2011). The basic demographic survey never specified what level an athlete played, therefore limiting if other factors were involved with confidence and motivation.

**Future Research**

Despite the above limitations, future studies could examine softball athletes during season as well as after season to see if the relationship between coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation change. This will provide insight to coaches how their athletes perceive them in the beginning, middle, and end of their season. Knowing this would allow coaches to effectively communicate with their athletes and allow self-confidence and motivation to grow within. It would also be interesting to examine off-season procedures as well as contact with their coach to see if that increases or decreases an athlete’s self-confidence and motivation towards the upcoming season. Lastly, future research could look into how different divisions (I, II, and III) compare to each other.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceived coach-leadership and the effects of self-confidence and motivation in collegiate softball. After initial analyses, a relationship was found between perceive coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation within a softball player. The LSS subscales and SMS subscales were found to explain approximately 45 percent of the variance in TSCI score. The results of the Pearson’s correlation showed significant correlation between TSCI scores, LSS subscales and SMS subscales. Overall these results indicated a relationship between perceived coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation within softball student-athletes.
This study was the first to investigate coach leadership, self-confidence, and motivation within softball players. This study provides data to aid softball coaches in developing a coaching style that is well perceived by their softball athletes. This can help coaches develop techniques (i.e., communication skills, motivational factors, correctional feedback, mental toughness) that will motivate and give their softball athletes high levels of self-confidence and motivation while performing.
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Appendix A: Recruitment E-mail

Hello, my name is Jacquelyn Sernek and I am a Graduate Student in the Department of Kinesiology and Sports Studies at Eastern Illinois University. I am working on a study examining an athlete’s perceived coach-leadership in relationship to motivation and self-confidence.

If you would, kindly forward this email to individuals over the age of 18 who are currently participating on an intercollegiate softball team between November 2015 and May 2016.

The purpose of this study is to examine the correlation between coaching leadership and the effects of athlete motivation and self-confidence in collegiate softball. Previous studies have found a relationship between confidence, motivation, and coach-leadership. However, very few studies have examined the sources of confidence and motivation within collegiate softball. Participating in this study can lead to valuable information that may assist softball players and their coaches improve training, and ultimately performance.

Participation entails completing several online questionnaires anticipated to take between 30 and 45 minutes to complete. Participants will not be asked to provide a name on the questionnaires, and any information provided will be kept confidential.

If you have questions about this study, you may contact Jacquelyn Sernek at (773) 255-0929 or at Jsernek@eiu.edu.

Thank you so much for your help with this research study!

Link to the study:

{Link will be inserted once the questionnaire is live, following IRB approval}
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Appendix B: Informed Consent

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jacquelyn Sernek from the Kinesiology and Sports Studies Department. The purpose of this study is to explore athlete motivation and self-confidence in relation to perceived coach-leadership. Participation in this study is voluntary and you may discontinue participation in the study at any time without any penalty.

PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to:

1. Complete several online questionnaires anticipated to take between 15-20 minutes to complete.

CONFIDENTIALITY, RISKS, AND PROTECTION MEASURES

There are no known risks associated with participation in this study. All efforts will be made to maintain confidentiality and anonymity. Data will be stored securely and any data that results from your participation will be made anonymous.

BENEFITS

By participating in this study you will gain a better understanding of your perceived coach-leadership, self-confidence and motivation throughout the duration of your softball career. This information could be used by yourself or your coach to improve your training for future games, and ultimately your performance as well. Additionally, results from this study will add to the sport and exercise psychology literature on softball self-confidence and motivation.

CONTACT INFORMATION
If you have questions you may contact Jacquelyn Sernek at (773) 255-0929 or at Jsernek@eiu.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact the Office of Research Compliance Officer at (217) 581-2125.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT

Click here if you have read the above information and agree to participate in this study.
Appendix C: Basic Demographic Questionnaire

What is your current age? ________________________________

How many years have you been playing softball? ________________________________

What is your current year in school (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, senior)? __________

Length of time spent (in month or years) playing for current coach? ____________________
Appendix D: Trait Sport-Confidence Inventory

Think about how self-confident you are when you compete in sport.

Answer the questions below based on how confident you generally feel when you compete in your sport. Compare your self-confidence to the most self-confident athlete you know.

Please answer as you really feel, not how you would like to feel. Your answers will be kept completely confidential.

WHEN YOU COMPETE, HOW CONFIDENT DO YOU GENERALLY FEEL? (circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO EXECUTE THE SKILLS NECESSARY TO BE SUCCESSFUL to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO MAKE CRITICAL DECISIONS DURING COMPETITION to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO PERFORM UNDER PRESSURE to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO EXECUTE SUCCESSFUL STRATEGY to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO CONCENTRATE WELL ENOUGH TO BE SUCCESSFUL to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO ADAPT TO DIFFERENT GAME SITUATIONS AND STILL BE SUCCESSFUL to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO ACHIEVE YOUR COMPETITIVE GOALS to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO BE SUCCESSFUL to the most confidential athlete you know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO CONSISTENTLY BE SUCCESSFUL to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO THINK AND RESPOND SUCCESSFULLY DURING COMPETITION to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO MEET THE CHALLENGE OF COMPETITION to the most competition athlete you know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO BE SUCCESSFUL EVEN WHEN THE ODDS ARE AGAINST YOU to the most confident athlete you know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Compare your confidence in YOUR ABILITY TO BOUNCE BACK FROM PERFORMING POORLY AND BE SUCCESSFUL to the most confident athlete you know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix E: Leadership Scale for Sport Survey

Using the following scale, please circle a number from 1 to 5 to indicate agreement with each of the statements regarding your COACH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Never</th>
<th>2 Seldom 25% of the time</th>
<th>3 Occasionally 50% of the time</th>
<th>4 Often 75% of the time</th>
<th>5 Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sees to it that every athlete is working to his/her capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Explains to each athlete the techniques and tactics of the sport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pays special attention to correcting athlete's mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Makes sure that his/her part in the team is understood by all the athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructs every athlete individually in the skills of the sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Figures ahead on what should be done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Explains to every athlete what he/she should and what he/she should not do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Expects every athlete to carry out his assignment to the last detail.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Points out each athlete's strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gives specific instructions to each athlete as to what he/she should do in every situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sees to it that the efforts are coordinated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Explains how each athlete's contribution fits into the total picture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Specifies in detail what is expected of each athlete.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Asks for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lets his/her athletes share in decision making. useful to me in other areas of my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Encourages athletes to make suggestions for ways of conducting practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lets the group set its own goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lets the athletes try their own way even if they make mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Asks for the opinion of the athletes on important coaching matters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Lets athletes work at their own speed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Lets the athlete decide on the plays to be used in a game.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Works relatively independent of the athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Does not explain his/her action.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Refuses to compromise a point.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Keeps to himself/herself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Helps the athletes with their personal problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Helps members of the group settle their conflicts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Looks out for the personal welfare of the athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Does personal favors for the athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Expresses affection he/she feels for his/her athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Encourages the athlete to confide in him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Encourages close and informal relations with athletes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Invites athletes to his/her home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Compliments an athlete for his/her performance in front of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tells an athlete when he/she does a particularly good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Sees that an athlete is rewarded for a good performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Expresses appreciation when an athlete performs well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Gives credit when credit is due.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Sport Motivation Scale

Using the scale below, please indicate to what extent each of the following items corresponds to one of the reasons for which you are presently practicing your sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For the pleasure I feel in living exciting experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For the pleasure it gives me to know more about the sport that I practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I used to have good reasons for doing sport, but now I am asking myself if I should continue doing it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For the pleasure of discovering new training techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I don’t know anymore; I have the impression of being incapable of succeeding in this sport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Because it allows me to be well regarded by people that I know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Because, in my opinion, it is one of the best ways to meet people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Because I feel a lot of personal satisfaction while mastering certain difficult training techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Because it is absolutely necessary to do sports if one wants to be in shape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. For the prestige of being an athlete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Because it is one of the best ways I have chosen to develop other aspects of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For the pleasure I feel while improving some of my weak points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. For the excitement I feel when I am really involved in the activity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Because I must do sports to feel good myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. For the satisfaction I experience while I am perfecting my abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Because people around me think it is important to be in shape.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Because it is a good way to learn lots of things which could be useful to me in other areas of my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. For the intense emotions I feel doing a sport that I like.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It is not clear to me anymore; I don't really think my place is in sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. For the pleasure that I feel while executing certain difficult movements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Because I would feel bad if I was not taking time to do it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To show others how good I am at my sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. For the pleasure that I feel while learning training techniques that I have never tried before.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Because it is one of the best ways to maintain good relationships with my friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Because I like the feeling of being totally immersed in the activity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Because I must do sports regularly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. For the pleasure of discovering new performance strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I often ask myself, I can't seem to achieve the goals that I set for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>