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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between a coach's coaching style and team cohesion for high school student-athletes in different sports. A secondary purpose of this study was to examine if there was a difference between a coach's perceived coaching style and their student-athlete's perception. **Methods:** 20 male student-athletes and four coaches of three different sports (baseball, track/field, and tennis) participated in the study. Eligible participants were given consent/assent forms based on their age at the first meeting. At the second meeting the forms were returned and participants were given questionnaires based on what group they belonged to (student-athlete or coach). Participants were instructed on how to fill out the questionnaires and to turn them in at the next meeting. At the next meeting all questionnaires were received. **Results:** The 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 to task cohesion. The same results were found for the baseball team. In regards to the difference between perceived coaching styles by the coaches and the athletes, there was no significant difference between perceived styles between the two groups. **Conclusion:** When comparing coaching styles with social cohesion, training and instruction, social support, and democratic coaching were the only styles found to significantly correlate with team cohesion. Only training and instruction correlated with task cohesion and furthermore, both student-athlete and coach, accurately perceived the coaching styles used. In conclusion, this study found that training and instruction, democratic coaching, and social support significantly correlated with social cohesion, training and instruction significantly correlated with task cohesion, and student-athletes and coaches had similar perceptions of coaching styles used.
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Introduction

Statement of the Problem

In a September 2016 article published on NFHS.org (National Federation of State High School Association), the annual participation survey revealed that high school sports participation had increased for the 27th consecutive year (NFHS, 2016). The staggering total of 7,868,900 high school student-athletes is at an all-time high and could be due to the ever rising popularity in sports. The NFHS believes that high school teach athletes a sense of pride in their community, lessons of teamwork and self-discipline, and facilitates the physical and emotional development of the nation’s youth (NFHS, n.d.). Furthermore sports have been shown to teach sportsmanship, how to cope with loss, improves self-confidence, and one’s ability to handle competitive situations (Neutzling, 2012).

With the rise athletes participating in high school sports, the need for qualified coaches has increased, however their qualifications for the position may be minimal. Previous research suggests that the majority of high school coaches have not received the proper training to assume the role of a youth sport coach (Richards & Lee, 2012; Weirsma & Sherman, 2005). Industry research also indicates that the majority of secondary coaches do not hold any type of coaching certification (NASBE, 2003). In addition, Martens, Flannery, and Retort (2003) concluded that 90% of high school coaches do not have any type of education in sport-related fields. This may be due to a school’s need to fill coaching duties but having no qualified coaches for that specific sport. Due to the growth of high school sports and the lack of qualified coaches, high school athletic directors need to develop strategic plans to recruit and appropriately train future high school coaches in how to build successful teams and help their student-athletes reach their highest potential.
Wattie (2015) stated that there are two keys to successful coaching: building trust and great rapport with student-athletes and being able to motivate them. Fielden (2005) and Turman (2003) examined additional positive qualities of a coach to be serene, disconnected (i.e. overseeing a task and later advising), supportive, mindful, and reflective. However, it may not be always beneficial to be disconnected in regards to newer/beginner athletes. They may not possess the knowledge for the task at hand and need more immediate guidance. This presents a key problem for a coach building trust and motivating their players, especially at the high school level. According to Lerner and Lerner (2007), coaching amateur student-athletes can be the most demanding and complex professional challenge a coach will face. Unlike a professional sports team, a high school coach may only get four years with each player (at most) to build trust and rapport. With limited time/resources a coach must find any opportunity that they can to build trust and help lead the team to victory.

How a coach mentors their players, as well as the type of coaching style used, can be one of the keys in building trust with the team. Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) suggest five key coaching styles, including; a) training and instruction (improving athlete’s performance by facilitating training), b) democratic behavior (allowing athletes to participate in decisions about group goals, practice methods, game tactics, and strategies), c) autocratic behavior (using independent decision making and stressing his or her authority when working with athletes), d) social support (concerning the welfare of athlete’s and building warm interpersonal relationship with them, regardless of performance), and e) positive feedback (consistently praising or rewarding athletes for good performance). These coaching styles defined in the 1980’s have been shown to still be relevant today (Fletcher & Roberts, 2013) and utilized in many recent studies.
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(Altahayneh, 2003; Din, Rashid, & Noh, 2016; Dixon, Turner, & Gillman, 2016). A coach must utilize the right style or combination of these styles to help build trust and rapport with players.

A successful coach may not be the only key attribute to a team’s success. Frequently coaches mention the importance of “teamwork” or “performing as a team.” In a research setting, this “teamwork” can be more commonly referred to as team cohesion. Studies have indicated that team cohesion has many benefits, but one which may interest a coach is the idea that cohesive teams tend to be more successful (Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002). It is for this reason that team cohesion was investigated in this study. A key question to examine was if there was a coaching style that most effectively developed team cohesion?

**Rationale for the Study**

“A coach’s primary function should be not to make better players but to make better people” (Wooden, Yaeger, & Maxwell, 2009, p. 51). This quote originates from one of the most successful coaches in the history of the sport industry, John Wooden. Many coaches may agree with the statement from Coach Wooden, but there is one overall objective that athletic departments, management, and fan bases require: winning. Winning leads to an increase in attendance at games (Davis, n.d.) and in turn, the organization or athletic department would generate more revenue from an engaged fan base.

If a coach’s job is to win, a coach needs to find any advantage they can to create a winning team. One strategy a coach can use to impact their team and help them win is to look at how cohesive their team is. Cohesion is defined by Carron, Brawley, and Widmeyer (1998) as a “dynamic process that is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs.” Cohesion can be broken down into two sub-categories: task cohesion and social
cohesion (Brawley, Carron, & Widmeyer, 1987; Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985; Eys, Loughead, Bray, & Carron, 2009).

According to Hardy, Eys, and Carron (2005), social cohesion can be defined as when team members get along personally, like each other, and consider one another to be friends. The same authors state that task cohesion is when team members work well together and are in agreement on what and how to achieve team success. There are numerous benefits to having a cohesive team such as decreased state anxiety (Eys, Hardy, Carron, & Beauchamp, 2003), increased satisfaction (Spink, Nickel, Wilson, & Odnokon, 2005; Widmeyer & Williams, 1991), increased conformity to group norms (Høigaard, Säfvenbom, & Tønnessen, 2006; Prapavessis & Carron, 1997), increased sacrifices for the sake of the team (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997), increased work output (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997), increased self-esteem (Julian, Bishop, & Fielder, 1996), increased tendencies to share responsibility for team failure (Brawley, Carron, & Widmeyer, 1987), a reduction in perceptions of social loafing by teammates (Høigaard, Säfvenbom, & Tønnessen, 2006; Naylor & Brawley, 1992), increased collective efficacy (Marcos, Miguel, Olivia, Calvo, 2010; Paskevich, Brawley, Dorsch, & Widmeyer, 1995), and greater team success (Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002). Teams without cohesion or lower cohesion may not receive the benefits of cohesion and could perhaps have lower task cohesion and a lower overall team mood (Jordan, Lawrence, & Troth, 2006).

It is clear that cohesion has many benefits, but how can a team increase their cohesion? To increase cohesion, it may be beneficial to look at the different leadership styles that coaches can implement. Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) suggested that coaches may utilize five different categories of leadership styles. However, it can be hard to determine which coaching style is the best to use and when. In multiple studies, the findings have pointed towards a preference in a
combination of social support, positive feedback, training and instruction, and democratic behavior (Alfermann, Lee, & Wurth, 2005; Giancola, 2010; Rodriguez, 2009; Sherman, Fuller, & Speed, 2000).

Although there are preferred coaching styles, preference for style is usually determined on an individual level. In a video from the television show Sports Science (Sportsfan50, 2007), the hosts interviewed athletes such as Ben Roethlisberger, Abby Wambach, and Chad Johnson on their preferred leadership styles. Roethlisberger stated that he preferred a coach who would tell him what he did wrong and instruct him, rather than yelling at him. Johnson stated he preferred a coach who was aggressive and Wambach said a coach who was more likely to yell and “get in her face” made her more focused and attentive. Autocratic coaching can be defined as; “using independent decision making and stressing his or her authority when working with athletes” (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) and research results differ when it comes to the use of autocratic coaching. Use of the autocratic coaching style has the potential to lower satisfaction rate, less commitment, and leads athletes to have a higher desire to quit (Rodriguez, 2009). Furthermore, a study by Bartholomaeus (2012) found that players had less commitment, less motivation to come to practice, and hinder athletic performance.

Should a coach’s athletes have decreased performance, the overall record of the team may be impacted negatively. Coaches have to deal with a variety of external job pressures such as winning after poor performances, from an athletic director, and from fans. Considering a coach could be viewed as a leader for a team or athlete, athletic performance is associated with a coach’s perceived level of effectiveness. An interesting finding is that coaches who are placed in high stakes situations, such as championship game, and experience a string of losses, tend to have less satisfaction from coaching, a lower coaching self-efficacy, and overall low job
satisfaction (Cheton, Reeve, Lee & Lee, 2015). In the same article Cheton, Reeve, Lee, and Lee (2015) found that should a coach experience these negative effects and have increased pressure, they can pass on this pressure to their athletes. This pressure could lead to the coach taking control and being more demanding (autocratic). In turn, this could affect cohesion and success. Therefore, even though coaches may be pressured to get results, passing the pressure to the players may not be the best decision or response by the coach.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a correlation between a coach’s coaching style and team cohesion for high school student-athletes among different sports. A secondary purpose of this study examined if there was a difference between a coach’s perceived coaching style and their student-athlete’s perception.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was completed at a Central Illinois high school during the school’s spring sports season. Generalizations should not be made to schools in other locations.

2. Coaches may decide to not answer the questions truthfully to convey a certain appearance to the researcher.

3. Athletes may decide to not answer truthfully, due to any previous uncomfortable confrontations/situations with their coach or teammates.

4. Athletes’ opinions can change from day to day and could result in different results at different times.

5. The low number of student-athlete participation may have resulted in different results than have been found in other studies.
6. The low number of coach participation may have resulted in different overall results than 
may be expected.

**Delimitations of the Study**

1. The athletes ranged from age 14 to 18 and were limited to high school students.
2. Data were collected during the spring sports season and only included teams competing 
in the 2017 season.
3. All student-athletes were males.

**Basic Assumptions**

1. It was assumed that all student-athletes and coaches answered the questionnaires 
truthfully.
2. It was assumed that all student-athletes and coaches did not allow any prejudices to skew 
their responses.

**Hypothesis**

- **H0**: There will be no significant correlations between coaching styles and team cohesion.
- **H1**: The coaching styles of democratic coaching, training and instruction, social support, 
and positive feedback will positively correlate with team cohesion.
- **H2**: The coaching style of autocratic coaching will negatively correlate with team 
cohesion.
- **H3**: Regardless of the sport, there will be no difference in coaching style and team 
cohesion.
- **H4**: There will be a difference between the coach’s perception of their style and the 
athlete’s perception of their coach’s style.
Definition of Terms

Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS): a questionnaire made up of 40 items that are divided into 5 subscales; used to study athletes' preference for specific leader behavior, athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behavior, and coaches' perception of their own behavior (Van Gastel, 2010).

Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YSEQ): asks participants to indicate their agreement to 18 statements on a 9-point Likert-type scale and is used to study cohesion. The primary 16 items discussed on the instrument are subdivided into the two major dimensions of task and social cohesion (8 items each) (Eys, Loughead, Bray, & Carron, 2009).

Training and Instruction: improving athlete's performance by facilitating training (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

Democratic Behavior: allowing athletes to participate in decisions about group goals, practice methods, game tactics, and strategies (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

Autocratic Behavior: using independent decision making and stressing his or her authority when working with athletes (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

Social Support: concerning the welfare of athlete's and building a warm interpersonal relationship with them, regardless of performance (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

Positive Feedback: consistently praising or rewarding athletes for good performance (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

State Anxiety: the emotional state of anxiety (cognitive and somatic) typically experienced prior to and during competition (Martens, Burton, Vealey, Bump, & Smith, 1990).

Group Norms: standards for the behavior that is expected of members of the group; reflect the organization's/group's consensus about what is considered acceptable (Carron & Eys, 2012).

Self-esteem: how an individual feels about themselves (Jarvis, 1999).
Efficacy: belief one has in being able to execute a specific task successfully (Feltz & Lirgg, 2001).

Cohesion: a dynamic process that is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs (Carron, Brawley, & Widmeyer, 1998).

Social Cohesion: when team members get along personally, like each other, and consider one another to be friends (Hardy, Eys, and Carron, 2005).

Task Cohesion: when team members work well together and are in agreement on what and how to achieve team success (Hardy, Eys, and Carron, 2005).

Teamwork: the range of interactive and interdependent behavioral processes among team members that convert team inputs (e.g., member characteristics, organizational funding, team member composition) into outcomes (e.g., team performance, team member satisfaction) (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001).
Review of Literature

This review of literature will examine the following areas in relationship to the current study: (a) coaching styles, (b) Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) (c) Coaching of Different Generations, (d) team cohesion, (e) negatives of team cohesion, (f) effects of coaching styles and on team cohesion, and (g) a conclusion of the literature review.

Coaching Styles

With the rise in sport popularity and the diverse player backgrounds, coaches have to utilize different techniques of coaching and interacting with their student-athletes. These different techniques of coaching can be referred to as coaching styles. Coaching styles can vary in the types available and the terminology for each style. Fielden (2005) stated that there are only two different types of coaching styles. These coaching styles are directive (the coach teaches and provides feedback and advice) and non-directive (The coach is required to listen, reason about, explore, and probe; it allows a person to be coached coached to problem solve/seek solutions). In a study conducted by Heydarinejad and Adman (2015) coaching styles were categorized as task oriented, relationship oriented, or combined. Considering the different type of coaching styles, an important question to ask is ‘has existing research identified the most effective style to use?’ One way to assess the effectiveness of different coaching styles is through the use of the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS).

Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS)

In a seminal research study by Chelladurai and Saleh (1980), the authors wanted to examine how to define and distinguish different coaching styles. At the time of this study, the authors stated that most of the existing studies only examined autocratic and democratic styles (Lenk, 1977), or coach personality (Sage, 1975). Though there were many different variations of leadership behavior instruments used in other settings (Halpin, 1957; Fleishman, 1957a;
Fleishman, 1957b; Stogdill, 1963) these tools were not believed to be an accurate way to measure leadership styles due to the uniqueness of sport. Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) stated that sports leadership occurred in a different setting than business leadership because athletes will train for long periods of time for a small competition timeframe, reward (winning) is denied to at least one group, and members of an athletic team will only be together for a brief time (three to six months). By using the previously mentioned questionnaires, the LSS was created and focused on five key areas of coaching styles. These styles are, Training and Instruction, Democratic Behavior, Autocratic Behavior, Social Support, and Positive Feedback. When comparing the coaching styles in this study with the previously mentioned coaching styles examined in existing research (Fielden, 2005; Heydarinejad and Adman, 2015) similarities can be found between the coaching style descriptions. However, Chelladurai and Saleh’s analysis (1980) may be of most use because the researchers divided the broad topic of coaching styles into specific areas (i.e. directive being broken down into Training and Instruction and Positive Feedback). The LSS continues to be reliable (Fletcher & Roberts, 2013) and utilized in many recent studies (Altahayneh, 2003; Din, Rashid, & Noh, 2016; Dixon, Turner, & Gillman, 2016).

**Democratic Coaching Style**

One of the first types of coaching styles examined is the democratic coaching style. The democratic coaching style or behavior is defined as “allowing athletes to participate in decisions about group goals, practice methods, game tactics, and strategies” (Chelladurai and Saleh, 1980, p. 41). In simpler terms, this is when a coach will ask the athlete their opinion concerning what is happening or what should happen. In a study by Chelladurai and Quek (1996), it was concluded that a democratic coaching style could lead to a better comprehension of a decision, a greater acceptance of the decision, and a more efficient execution of that decision by both the coach and
athletes. Through the use of the LSS, scales adapted from previous studies (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Kuvaas, 2007; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998), and personal interviews, research suggests that athletes have an overall greater attendance for team events, greater enthusiasm, dedication to development, more excitement to participate, higher satisfaction, and are less likely to quit when the democratic coaching style is employed (Rodriguez, 2009; Giancola, 2010).

Though there are many benefits to the democratic coaching style, there are other coaching styles that can be implemented by a coach. To further analyze the topic of coaching styles, the style of autocratic coaching will be the next style to be covered in this literature review.

**Autocratic Coaching Style**

Autocratic coaching is defined as independent decision making and stressing his or her authority when working with athletes (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). From a definition standpoint this coaching style may sound desirable to use by a variety of coaches. One of the qualities a great leader should have is assertiveness (Teles, 2015), as this shows a leader is not passive in their decisions (Santora, 2007). However, this should not be confused with autocratic coaching. To better understand an autocratic coach, former National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) coach Bobby Knight can be considered a perfect example of an autocratic coach. Coach Knight had a history of being aggressive, such as screaming in a players face or even physically grabbing and hitting players during practice while coaching at Army, Indiana, and Texas Tech (Jadlow & Brew, 2016; Phelps, 2010). Although examples such as Coach Knight or Mike Rice, who was found to be verbally and physically abusive to his athletes at Rutgers University, may be extreme versions of an autocratic coaching style, they are recognizable figures and an accurate example of how an autocratic coach may behave.
Given that an autocratic coach can be overly aggressive and can be very assertive, there are numerous downfalls when it comes to this coaching style such as lower satisfaction, lower commitment, and higher amounts of turnover in athletes (Rodriguez, 2009). Furthermore, Bartholomaus (2012) concluded that coaches who display dominance and disrespectful behavior towards players can actually hinder an athlete's performance. The hindrance of an athlete's performance may actually be due to the controlling nature of the coach. Chelladurai (2011) summarized that higher performance is affected by supporting an athlete's autonomy. Supporting autonomy is a stark contrast to the basis of this style and something to be cognizant of when trying to maximize athlete performance. As a season progresses, a coach should be careful of how their coaching styles change. A coach may be more likely to exert an autocratic style (Bartholomaus, 2012) later in the season. This may be due to a team's record and how well or poorly they are performing. As a team progresses towards playoffs, there is more pressure for the coach and team to perform well. This pressure for the coach may then be passed on to the players and can even lead to an underperformance by the team (Cheton, Reeve, Lee & Lee, 2015). This could lead to a breakdown in the social aspect between athlete and coach, which is the next style covered in the literature review.

Social Support

The third coaching style in the LSS is social support. This is described as when a coach is concerned with the welfare of his/her athletes and the building of strong interpersonal relationships with them, regardless of performance (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). In everyday life, social support is seen as valued and needed. The benefits of social support are wide ranging and can include an individual overcoming an abusive atmosphere, dealing with mental illness, (Weisz, Quinn, & Williams, 2016) or it can include less severe topics such as increasing
adherence to exercise (Spink, Ulvick, Crozier, & Wilson, 2014). With the potential positive effects of social support, it is not hard to imagine this coaching style could be considered a key component to being a successful coach. There are four different types of social support that are traditionally applied within the sports setting. Rees and Hardy (2000) identified these four types of social support as tangible support (includes recognition that coaches provide athletes with goods or services), informational support (encompasses recognition of coaches’ provision of information or advice to athletes), emotional support (recognizing coaches’ demonstrations of concern or empathy for athletes), and esteem support (denotes recognition of coaches’ reassurances of athlete’s abilities or self-worth). Researchers have identified additional benefits to social support including, an increase in athlete’s motivation (DeFreese and Smith, 2013), increase in performance (Rees, Ingledew, & Hardy, 1999), increase in self-confidence (Cowan, Slogrove, & Hoelson, 2012), increase perceptions of team cohesion (Carron, Bloom, Loughead, & Hoffmann, 2016; Westre and Weiss, 1991), reduction of athlete burnout (DeFreese and Smith, 2013), reduction of stress (Reese and Freeman, 2007), and assisting athletes with recovery from injuries (Abgarov, Fraser-Thomas, Jeffery-Tosoni, & Baker, 2012; Clement and Shannon, 2011; Lu and Hsu, 2013). This evidence indicates that social support represents a key component to a coach being successful and can help with team cohesion as previously listed (Carron, Bloom, Loughead, & Hoffmann, 2016; Westre and Weiss, 1991).

**Positive Feedback**

Positive feedback is known as consistently praising or rewarding athletes for good performance (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). This can be as simple as telling a player good job after making a shot in basketball, or rewarding an entire team with a day off for a great performance in their previous competition. The main type of feedback a high school athlete will
receive is known as augmented feedback. Augmented feedback occurs when a player receives their information from some type of an external source, such as a coach, video of a performance, or a training apparatus (Hodges & Williams, 2012; Lauber & Keller, 2014). In a study by Lewthwaite and Wulf, (2016) it was found that the effectiveness of feedback of any type depends on three key factors, including the type of focus that is induced (internal or external), the extent that the performer’s need for autonomy is supported (autonomy-supportive or controlling), and its valence (positive or negative). Alone, implementing any of these three support types can be very effective for a coach to use. However, coaches should look to use the types of support in combination. In recent studies (Pascua, Wulf, & Lewthwaite, 2015; Wulf, Chiviacowsky, & Cardozo, 2014; Wulf, Chiviacowsky, & Drews, 2015) when two of the three factors were used, participants increased their learning more than groups who either received one of the three combinations or none at all. Using all three of the factors together has also resulted in an even greater effect than using two factors (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016).

**Attentional Focus**

In a recent study by Wulf (2013) it was concluded that how feedback was directed (whether internally or externally) was a predictor of how well the athlete would perform and how well they would learn the specific sport skill. Providing athletes instructions on their form during competition (i.e. specific mechanics of a baseball swing) leads the athlete to have an internal focus of attention and has been found to actually hinder an athlete’s performance (Zachry, Wulf, Mercer, & Bezodis, 2005; Wulf, 2013). In the study by Zachry et al. (2005) an internal focus resulted in athletes having a decreased accuracy in free throws and less activation of the biceps and triceps muscles. It is believed internal focus reduces the fluidity or “movement
and also hinders the effectiveness of fine motor control, which makes the task to be carried out less successful.

This is in contrast to external focus which actually can enhance a player’s performance and learning (Wulf, 2013). One example of external focus is to tell a player to focus and picture themselves making a game-winning free-throw instead of focusing on their mechanics. The advantages of coaching a player with an external focus are almost immediate (Halperin, Williams, Martin, & Chapman, 2016; Marchant & Greig, 2009; and Porter, Anton, & Wu, 2012) and should be used more than referring to body parts or specific movements in all situations (Wulf, 2016). It should be noted however, that though beginners may see a benefit in external focus, the benefits may not be as immediate (Wulf & Su, 2007). This may be due to the complexity of grasping a new skill such as a golf swing or shooting a jump shot. An individual who is a trained athlete may have the motor skills present and the coordination that those who are beginners do not.

**Autonomy Support**

When coaching an athlete using autonomy support a coach must choose between allowing the athlete to make choices and have control over when they receive their support, which usually allows for enhanced learning/performance, or to control the situation in which the player receives their support (Teixeira, Carraca, Markland, Silva, & Ryan, 2012; Wulf, 2007). Numerous studies (Janele, Kim, & Singer, 1995; Lim, Ali, Kim, Kim, Choi, & Radlo, 2015; Post, Fairbrother, & Barros, 2011; Wulf, Raupach, & Pfeiffer, 2005; Wulf and Adams, 2014) have examined the benefit of not only showing the athlete support but allowing them to choose when they get support or for how long they choose to receive support. For instance, Wulf and
Adams (2014) concluded that something as simple as allowing the athletes to choose the order of their balance exercises helped enhance their learning and performance.

According to Halperin, Chapman, Martain, Abbiss, & Wulf (2016) an act as simple as changing the phrasing of feedback can present a form of more autonomous support. Asking for an opinion, making a suggestion, or providing rationale for your instruction to an athlete is a preferred way to boost their autonomy (Halperin, et al., 2016). In a study by Hooyman, Wulf, and Lewthwaite (2014) using cricket bowlers, they instructed them on their bowling form. Using supportive language (i.e. “you may want to” and giving the benefit as to why they may want to) was found to improve throwing accuracy much more than a controlling language (i.e. “you must” and “do not”). Along with the previously mentioned benefits of enhanced learning or improved performance, there are other benefits as well. Providing autonomous support can be beneficial to those of any demographic (Sanli, Patterson, Bray, & Lee, 2013). Furthermore, Wulf, Freitas, and Tandy (2014) found that providing autonomous support raises an athlete’s motivation to participate in exercise. This could then lead to a higher practice adherence, which has been mentioned earlier as a possible challenge for coaches.

This section is very similar to the psycho-social needs listed in the Self-Determination Theory (SDT). In SDT, an individual feels the need to be autonomous, have mastery, and have social interactions (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Allowing the athlete to have a say in their autonomy and allowing them to create their path to mastery of the task could be a way for a coach to build positive feedback with their athlete. Since the previously listed studies allowed the subjects to have a say in practice time and order of exercise, it could be said that these studies looked at sections of the SDT and that to build autonomy support, a coach should use SDT.
Feedback Valence

The last section of feedback is known as feedback valence or whether the feedback that the athlete receives is actually positive or negative. When using the LSS, this questionnaire only measures positive feedback, which is assumed ideal. However, athletes will not always receive positive feedback. Athletes may receive a more negative style of feedback such as a coach yelling at them for not getting a base hit or being benched for not listening to instructions the first time. This type of feedback is detrimental to an athlete’s learning and can actually hinder motor learning (Avila, Chiviacowsky & Wulf, 2012). Motor learning is hindered by way of lessened mean power frequency or MPF. With a more negative style of feedback, MPF is lessened, motor skills become slower, and the athlete is more conscious of the corrective process (Lewthwaite & Wulf, 2010). This lessening of MPF shows that a coach should think about how they deliver their feedback and perhaps choose a more positive approach.

The most productive means of giving a player feedback is to give feedback with a positive stigma. This can lead to enhanced motor learning (Avila, Chiviacowsky & Wulf, 2012), a rise in intrinsic motivation (Saemi, Wulf, Varzaneh, & Zarghami, 2011), a rise in self-efficacy (Saemi, Porter, Ghotbi-Varzaneh, Zarghami, & Maleki, 2012), enhance movement accuracy (McKay, Lewthwaite, & Wulf, 2012), increase performance of submax tasks (Hutchinson, Sherman, Martinovic, & Tenebaum, 2008), and an increase in balance (Lewthwaite & Wulf, 2010). Giving a player positive feedback instead of negative can lead to an increase in higher performance expectancies for the individual (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016) which has been shown to help a player focus on the task at hand and have a higher success rate at achieving that goal (Mckay, Wulf, Lewthwaite, & Nordin 2015). McKay et al. (2015) (as cited in Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016) found that players who received negative feedback had lower expectation to
achieve their goal and could also lead to anxiety, negative reactions, and hinder neuromuscular activity.

For an athlete to improve, they must receive some constructive feedback that may not always be positive. No player can become great without some type of criticism that will hopefully lead to improved performance. So how can this feedback balance be achieved? The key is constructive criticism. Sources state to effectively use constructive criticism a coach must use the technique called a “praise sandwich” (Sarkany & Deitte, 2017; Wood, Matheson, & Franklin, 2017). The first step is to praise the player for something good they have done. This is because you get the attention of the athlete more effectively than with directly criticizing. This could be something as simple as praising an athlete for their hustle on the playing field. The second step is to then offer up some constructive criticism such as mentioning that had they taken a more efficient route on the playing field, they would not have had to hustle quite as hard. The third step is to then finish with a second round of praise. This could be a tie in of the first two parts, letting the player know that if they work on the negative they will be an even greater player than what you first mentioned.

Should a coach not use this “praise sandwich” with their players; the effects of direct criticism can lead to an athlete becoming demotivated and hinder performance as stated earlier (Avila, Chiviacowsky & Wulf, 2012). It is important to note that if a coach does not use this method of criticism, it does not mean that every other form of criticism is automatically direct criticism. Something as simple as providing an athlete with an example on proper technique after observing improper technique could be considered a form of feedback that is not direct and would give the athlete a reference to guide themselves (Weir, 2017).
Training and Instruction

The final type of coaching style that is commonly used and measured in the LSS is training and instruction. This can be defined as improving athlete’s performance by facilitating training (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). Simply stated, this coaching style is focused on how effective a coach is during a game situation or during practice while teaching skills. Since a game atmosphere can be fairly fast paced, the best time a coach could use training and instruction is during practice.

Proper training and instruction can be a challenge for a coach as each player on a team can have a different level of skill, mental maturity, or physical characteristics (Bernard, Trudel, Marcotte, & Boileau, 1993). In this type of situation, communication was cited as a key in being able to effectively coach youth in sport (Gilbert, Gilbert, & Trudel, 2001). How a coach communicates can vary differently as it can be verbal, visual, or a physical demonstration. Gilbert et al. (2001) also stated that a coach may have to have a different strategy on how to effectively communicate with each individual athlete.

Coaches may want to focus on the make-up of their practice as this can affect their players greatly. There are three different strategies a coach can utilize to format their practice. The three different strategies are visualizing a practice layout in advance, dividing a practice session into smaller blocks, and asking for feedback from their players (Gilbert, Gilbert, & Trudel, 2001). Some strategies such as asking for feedback, can allow a coach to learn from their athletes and let their athletes have a say in what is happening (Gilbert, Gilbert, & Trudel, 2001). In this way a coach is able to combine both effective training and instruction and democratic coaching, which would elicit the benefits of that as well.
Overall, in the area of training and instruction there is very little research in regards to this topic specifically. However, that does not mean that the research in other areas does not reveal important findings related to this topic. A coach should effectively communicate with their athlete. When communicating with an athlete, a coach will eventually give feedback to a player during training and instruction. When a coach allows a player or team to pick how their training and instruction will take place they are allowing a democratic process to take place. Although there is no research specifically on training and instruction, this is because a coach can use the other previously mentioned coaching styles to impact their training and instruction. This would promote the benefits of growing a player’s talents through instruction but also the benefits of a democratic coaching style and giving a player positive feedback as well.

Coaching of Different Generations

In a study by Martens, Flannery, and Retort (2003) the researchers concluded that 90% of high school coaches do not have any type of education in sport-related fields. This presents a problem for those going into the coaching field and possibly for the athletes as well. Those who are in this 90%, may have to then rely on past experiences (i.e. how they were coached in high school/middle school or life events). The question then becomes, will this coaching style be effective? Current research suggests it will not as each generation of athletes is different and has established their own unique set of beliefs and ideas. The four generations that will be covered are baby boomers, Generation X, millennials (aka generation Y), and generation Z. After discussing the generations, their experiences will be compared and analyzed. It is important to note that though years have been included for the upcoming sections, it is hard to pinpoint exactly when one generation begins and another ends. When considering an individual’s
Generation, it may be beneficial to ask individuals their thoughts on their personality or beliefs to match them to the appropriate generation.

**Baby Boomers**

Baby boomers are those individuals who were born between the years of 1946-1964 (Jiri, 2016). As of 2007 there were approximately 85 million baby boomers in the workforce (Trunk, 2007) and though this number has likely lowered since then, they are more likely to hold positions of leadership (Kane, 2015). Key characteristics of baby boomers are that they are loyal and workaholics (Crampton & Hodge, 2007), are self-absorbed (Weil, 2008), feel entitled (Lyons, 2005), and embrace change and growth (Crampton & Hodge, 2007). Many of these characteristics identified may be seen as desirable. The characteristics seem to match what may be considered social support (teamwork, inclusion, and loyalty), democratic (rule-challenging), and positive feedback (embracing growth and valuing success). As shown earlier in the literature review, these are characteristics that are valued in a coach, however, boomers can also be seen as competitive, striving for authority, and having a take charge attitude (Wiedmer, 2015). No research was found in regards to baby boomers and coaching. These characteristics along with being workaholics may make baby boomers seem like autocratic coaches.

**Generation X**

Generation X is defined as any person who is born between the years of 1965 to 1976 (Jiri, 2016). Unlike the generation before them, they were the first generation to be considered computer literate (Paota, Schwartz, & Schwartz, 2007). They have been characterized as a generation who are active, happy, and more family oriented (Swanbrow, 2012). Other characteristics of someone from this generation may include being less loyal to work than baby-boomers (Leibow, 2014), independent thinkers, enjoy fast-paced and engaging work, efficient,
and self-directed (Grimes, 2015). Due to this generation’s age, this group is the most likely to be in a current position of leadership for future generations. Therefore, due to this generation wanting to be independent, self-directing, engaging, and more family oriented, it may be beneficial to a coach to include democratic coaching and social support within their coaching style when coaching members of this generation.

**Generation Y**

The third generation is Generation Y, which includes those born in the years of 1977 to 1995 (Jiri, 2016). Generation Y may also be known as millennials as the majority of this generation reach adulthood in the new generation and include those born in 1980 and later (Johnson, 2015). More than any generation before, this generation is heavy into technology and connects through internet, mobile phones, social media (Gibson, Greenwood, & Murphy Jr., 2009; Wiedmer, 2015). As such, this generation craves instant information, whether that be in athletics, work, or school (Wiedmer, 2015). This generation can be seen as less independent, community oriented, critical thinkers, multitaskers, willing to try new tasks, and wanting a say in how they do things (Martin, 2005; Widmer, 2015). In addition, they need greater supervision, feedback, structure, mentoring, and clearer goals (Widmer, 2015).

Hoffman and Czech (2008) examined millennial college athletes and characteristics they wanted from an “ideal coach.” Through the interviews in that study, millennials wanted a coach that would build relationships with them both in and outside the sports setting. Furthermore, they wanted a coach who would be accessible, aid in academics, clearly communicate, demand a good work ethic, have emotion, be caring, understanding, and be democratic. This fits in with the typical mold of an individual from Generation Y and should be variables that a coach considers when coaching individuals in this age range.
**Generation Z**

The most recent generation, is Generation Z. This generation includes all individuals who were born in 1996 and after (Jiri, 2016). Due to the age of this generation, there are few studies showing their characteristics though there are a few characteristics already identified of this generation. This generation is just as tech savvy as the generation before it and has been connected to friends, data, and entertainment more than generations before (Renfro 2015; Widmer, 2015). Because of this connection, Generation Z individuals tend to need less direction as they use technology to learn and master tasks (Renfro, 2015).

However, this could lead to an issue with learning improper techniques or facts when using technology to learn. The internet can be an unreliable source of information for athletes (Meyer, 2017). Should an individual see this false information without researching all avenues, they may learn incorrect facts and present them as correct to others. It is not hard to believe that an athlete could find videos demonstrating improper or false techniques much like false news is presented to individuals today. Therefore, it is important to guide these individuals to correct information or train them on how to spot incorrect information while using technology.

In a recent study by Parker and Czech (2010) athletes from this generation were interviewed on what they believed was an “ideal coach.” During their interview there were four key themes that all interviewees found important. Generation Z wanted a coach who did not yell and remained calm, was caring and encouraging, involved the team in decision making, and was knowledgeable in the sport they were coaching. Though the athletes in this study were very young at the time, (ages 9 and 10) this study provides valuable knowledge on how this generation may take shape and should be considered when coaching them.
Team Cohesion

Though important, coaching style alone will not determine team success. Success can be determined by how cohesive a team is or their “teamwork.” Those teams who work well together are typically ones who end up the victor in their competition (Harle, 2013). Team cohesion is defined as “a dynamic process that is reflected in the tendency for a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs” (Carron, Brawley, & Widmeyer, 1998, p. 213). Although winning can be an important result of cohesion, there are many other benefits of cohesion. These benefits can include decreased state anxiety (Eys, Hardy, Carron, & Beauchamp, 2003), increased satisfaction (Widmeyer & Williams, 1991), increased conformity to group norms (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997), increased sacrifices for the sake of the team (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997), and increased work output (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997). But are not limited to increased self-esteem (Julian, Bishop, & Fielder, 1996), increased tendencies to share responsibility for team failure (Brawley, Carron, & Widmeyer, 1987), a reduction in perceptions of social loafing by teammates (Naylor & Brawley, 1992), increased collective efficacy (Paskevich, Brawley, Dorsch, & Widmeyer, 1995), and greater team success (Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002). Team cohesion can be divided further into two main components, task cohesion and group cohesion. Most research previously performed in the field of team cohesion has been carried out with a questionnaire called the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) which was created by Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley (1985).

Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ)

Created by Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley (1985) the GEQ was developed with the main goal to better understand team cohesion. Predecessors to the GEQ had attempted to
measure cohesion by way of interpersonal attractions such as group congeniality (Faunce & Beegle, 1948), and presence/absence of a clique (Lenk, 1969). These measurements taken were found to be unreliable or did not dive deep enough and would lead to results that could be interpreted in multiple ways (Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985). According to previous research at that time, previous forms of measuring cohesion failed to look at cohesiveness in negative situations, failed to consider conditions needed for group formation, underestimated other components of cohesion, or were not supported empirically (Eisman, 1959; Escovar & Sim, 1974; Gross & Martin, 1952).

Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley (1985) suggested that cohesion has two key factors, individual attractions to the group (the composite of the individual members' feelings about the group, their personal role involvement) and group integration (represents the closeness, similarity, and bonding within the group as a whole and involvement with other group members). These two factors have two sub-sets called social or task. Social can be defined as a general orientation toward developing and maintaining social relationships within the group, whereas task can be defined as a general orientation toward achieving the group's goals/objectives (Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985). These two key sections along with their sub-sets are the basis of the GEQ today, which is an eighteen item questionnaire. Nine questions are dedicated strictly to task cohesion, and nine questions focus strictly on social cohesion. Task cohesion has the sub-sets of GI-T (group integration-task) and ATG-T (individual attraction to the group-task) whereas social cohesion has the subsets of GI-S (group integration-social), and ATG-S (individual attraction to the group-social). Though this questionnaire has been the popular tool for assessing cohesion and has been used for varying age ranges, the GEQ may be too advanced for youth who are still developing mentally. Eys, Loughead, Bray, and Carron (2009) found that
Youth had issues with comprehending the complex language of the GEQ and also distinguishing between individual-attractors to the group and perceptions of group-integration, which are two sections of the GEQ. Therefore, it is recommended that for accurately measuring youth team cohesion that the Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YESQ) be used.

**Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YSEQ)**

Due to the shortfalls of the GEQ and its use among youth, Eys, Loughead, Bray, and Carron (2009) created what is called the Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire. Similar to the GEQ, the YSEQ is a 16 question questionnaire with questions on a 1-9 Likert scale. This questionnaire is divided into two sections measuring task and social cohesion. Unlike the GEQ which has four sections, the YSEQ only has two sections. The reason for the reduction in sections measured is due to the complexity compared to the age of those filling out a GEQ.

Variables such as the reading level of the participants, the mix of positive and negative items in the GEQ, and children’s changing experiences with their peers further validates the need to use the YSEQ with younger populations, 13-17 years old (Rubin, Bukowski & Parker, 2006; Eys, Carron, Bray, & Brawley, 2007; Eys, Loughead, Bray, and Carron, 2009).

**Task Cohesion**

The first type of cohesion that is typically measured is task cohesion and is defined as when team members work well together and are in agreement on what and how to achieve team success (Hardy, Eys, and Carron, 2005). What a team deems a success can vary, from winning the league championship, to simply winning a single game. In terms of success, it has been suggested that task cohesion has a greater relationship with performance and success than its counterpart, social cohesion (Filho, Dobersek, Gershgoren, Becker, & Tenenbaum, 2014). Since task cohesion has been suggested to have a strong correlation with success, a coach should
attempt to create an atmosphere that promotes leadership behaviors as they have been found to correlate with task cohesion (Callow, Smith, Hardy, Arthur, & Hardy, 2009). These behaviors include fostering acceptance of group goals, promoting team work, having high performance expectations, and individual consideration (Callow et al., 2009). It was further included by the same researchers (Callow et al., 2009) that should a coach effectively promote and exhibit these behaviors of high expectations, the expectations will be transferred to players and higher task cohesion will be generated. Communication, though thought as a component of social cohesion, has been found to play a key role in developing task cohesion. Multiple studies have found that a higher amount of intra-team communication, is related to task cohesion and that communication acceptance and positive conflict have a positive relationship to task cohesion (Smith, Arthur, Hardy, Callow, & Williams, 2013; Sullivan & Feltz, 2003; Sullivan & Short, 2011). For researchers or coaches who wish to gauge their team’s level of task cohesion, it is recommended that they measure task cohesion throughout the season as changes in positive and negative communication effects cohesion (Holt & Sparkes, 2001).

**Social Cohesion**

The second part of overall team cohesion is social cohesion. Social cohesion can be defined as team members getting along personally, like each other, and consider one another to be friends (Hardy, Eys, and Carron, 2005). In a recent meta-analysis it was found that unlike its companion task cohesion, social cohesion does not typically share such a strong correlation to team success (Filho, Dobersek, Gershgoren, Becker, & Tenenbaum, 2014). This result however, is in direct conflict with a meta-analysis by Carron, Coleman, Wheeler, and Stevens (2002) which states that a combination of social and task cohesion are needed for overall group
cohesion. One would think that when examining social cohesion, that it plays just as important of a role, and more research on how meaningful both areas are should be conducted.

It is suggested that a coach has their team take part in group outings that are non-task, socially oriented activities (Carron, Coleman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002). Certain socially oriented (i.e. team building) activities that a coach can have their team take part in include personal growth experiences, team campouts, rope/challenge course, and any social event outside of a sporting arena (Cogan & Petrie, 1995; McClure & Foster, 1991; Meyer, 2000; Yukelson, 1997). Previous research by Brawley and Paskevich (1997) had found that a social intervention with a sports team should be no less than one season in length and a meta-analysis by Martin, Carron, and Burke (2009) found that even greater social cohesion could be obtained in interventions that were longer than just one season (20+ weeks). The authors hypothesized that this is because it can take time to introduce interventions, athletes to gain trust, and for behavior change to occur. Due to the contradictions in cohesion research, both task and social, it seems as though there should be further investigations with these topics to expand the body of knowledge to assist current and future practitioners with building cohesion.

**Negatives of Team Cohesion**

With all of the positives it may be difficult for some to accept the notion that there would be negatives or downsides to team cohesion. In an article by Hardy, Eys, and Carron (2005) the thought of “too much of a good thing” was put forward, and examined what happens when there is high cohesion. Participants in this study (n=105 athletes) believed that there were disadvantages to high levels of cohesion and felt that social cohesion (56%) offers more of a disadvantage than task cohesion (31%).
Though cohesion can help increase conformity to the group, which would help a team be more united on a goal or task, this can actually be a downfall for a team. Since increasing conformity would allow teams to “be on the same page” this may reduce a team member’s creativity or individualization (Frenz, 2017; Buys, 1978a; Buys, 1978b). When an individual loses their creativity or individualization, Frenz (2017) states that the individual will adopt behaviors to fit in on a team and reduce any disagreements that would come up. The behaviors that are adopted then become the group norm. This group norm can lead to what is also known as group think. When a team begins to use group think, they rely on the group as a whole to make a decision, and individuals lose ability to think for themselves.

Should an athlete choose to not completely mold to group norms and hold the same ideals as their teammates, they could adapt an idea called self-handicapping. Self-handicapping is known as the strategies people use to proactively protect their self-esteem by providing excuses for forthcoming events by adopting or advocating impediments to success (Berglas & Jones, 1978). Carron, Prapavessis, and Grove (1994) believed that this self-handicapping could be influenced by the cohesiveness of the group if the cohesiveness was perceived as providing a cost or benefit to the individual. In their article Carron et al. (1994) stated,

Since the cohesive group presents an environment in which the individual is buffered from threats to self-esteem—the threats are diffused among the group’s membership—the need to use self-handicapping strategies [might] be reduced... [also, however] individuals in highly cohesive groups... should experience greater pressure to carry out group responsibilities and satisfy the expectations of highly valued teammates....As a result, the need to proactively set out reasons for potential failure [might] be increased. (p. 248)
This pressure, for an individual could lead to self-handicapping, and in turn less cohesion. It is for this reason that a coach may want to build cohesion carefully and not go overboard with cohesion interventions. Due to the fact that cohesion is generally found to be a positive, (Paskevich, Estabrooks, Brawley, & Carron, 2001) there is limited research studies that focus directly on the negatives of high cohesion among sports teams. While some existing research in this area applies to the business setting, future investigations should be conducted focusing on the differences between the athletic environment and the business setting.

**Coaching Styles and Their Effect on Team Cohesion**

Now that a background of knowledge has been presented in regards to team cohesion and coaching styles individually, the next step is to examine if coaching style affects a team's cohesion. In many studies (Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Heydarinejad & Oman, 2010; Ramzaninezhad & Keshtan, 2009; Vahdani, Sheikhyousefi, Moharramzadeh, Ojaghi, & Salehian, 2012), it has been found that a coach's style can affect a team's level of cohesion for the better or worse. In general, the coaching styles that are desirable to build team cohesion are training and instruction, democratic coaching, social support, and positive feedback, while the autocratic coaching has been linked to negative cohesion (Gardner et al., 1996; Ramzaninezhad & Keshtan, 2009; Vahdani et al., 2012). These findings seem to be validated by the research that was presented earlier in the literature review on these five coaching styles. How coaching styles affect team cohesion is an important place to focus future research to further the knowledge in this area and learn about other factors that may play into the coach-player relationship.

There are other variables coaches should consider when utilizing their coaching style to promote team cohesion. These can include the gender of the athlete, the level of play, time of
year, and also the outside pressures placed on a coach. When considering the gender of athletes, research has pointed towards differences between males and females. Male athletes will typically find a coach to exhibit autocratic tendencies more than females will, and male coaches are typically seen as significantly more autocratic than their female counterparts (Gardner et al., 1996; Rodriguez, 2009). The level of the athletes' ability along with the level of play also assists in helping build cohesion through coaching styles. In a study by Rodriguez (2009) it was concluded that as the level of play increases (i.e. high school to NCAA Division III, to NCAA Division II, etc.) the perception of autocratic coaching increased as well. This can also be applied to grade levels (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) because within grade levels, coaching styles can be perceived differently (Turman, 2001). The differences within levels of play could be contributed to the outside pressures coaches face. As coaches climb the ranks of the coaching profession, the pressure to win becomes greater, and they can pass this pressure on to the players (Cheton, Reeve, Lee, & Lee, 2015). Finally a coach should consider what stage of the season their team is in. The perceived level of coaching style can change throughout the season and this could elicit different levels of cohesion throughout the year (Bartholomans 2012; Turman, 2003). To stay consistent, a coach should evaluate the effectiveness of their coaching style on a regular basis, and solicit player input as well.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

It is clear that as sports continue to grow in popularity, the need for qualified coaches who can effectively lead athletes and teams will grow as well. To be an effective coach, one must have an effective leadership style and have a team that will perform well as a unit. When developing their style of leadership, coaches should take a few considerations into account. Though they should be the overall leader and the one making the final decision, it may be
beneficial to allow their players to voice their opinions on situation and what they believe is a correct path. Furthermore, they should also support their players both on and off the court and be an overall positive role model for their athletes. With support, any feedback that a player receives should be positive and focus on building autonomy of the athletes. Should any feedback need to be negative, it should be delivered as constructive criticism, showing how an athlete can better themselves and their performance if they make the suggested change. Proper training and instruction should also be taken into account when coaching athletes, though this typically goes hand in hand with the other key points that a coach should use when creating and implementing their style of leadership.

When developing a team into a cohesive, effective unit, a coach should not only work on an overall goal for the team, but also help members of the team get to know one another and enjoy being with one another. Setting an overall goal, or task, for a team can unite the team and result in a higher performance output. This higher performance output then leads to a more successful team. Having a uniting task for a team to commit to may be the best way to build a team's cohesiveness, but coaches should also focus on the social aspect. Having team outings, course challenges, or simple, regular, get-togethers may help build this aspect, which in turn may impact the team's level of social cohesion, and help to further improve their level of task cohesion as well.

When coaching it is important to recognize that different generations have different mind sets. Coaches should work to close the “generation gap” and try to coach more to the current generation, instead of the generation they grew up in, because not adapting to generational differences may impede team cohesion. As the younger generation of athletes emerge coaches should introduce new ways of coaching to these athletes. These younger generations are more in
tune to the use of technology and receiving performance feedback almost immediately. They are also willing to research and find information on their own. A coach may need to involve technology somehow to meet the needs and expectation of this new generation of athletes.

Overall, a coach should realize that the lack of an effective coaching style can negatively impact how cohesive their team will be. This negative cohesiveness has been shown to be detrimental to a team’s ability to accomplish goals and reach levels of desired success. To be an effective coach with a successful team, it is recommended that a coach utilize a democratic coaching style that includes, positive feedback, training and instruction, and social support. These components, in turn, will build team cohesion and lead to a more successful team and a successful coach as well.
Methodology

This study examined the relationship between coaching styles and team cohesion with male high school student-athletes from a Central Illinois high school. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the: (a) participants and setting, (b) instrumentation, (c) procedures, (d) data collection, and (e) data analysis.

Participants and Setting

For this study, the participants were males who were spring sports season student-athletes at a Central Illinois high school. The questionnaire was distributed to approximately 50 student-athletes and approximately seven coaches. After a one week waiting period from when the questionnaires were circulated, 20 completed student-athlete questionnaires were submitted, which created the overall pool of participants (n=20 athletes). The participants could fill out the questionnaire at their personal convenience. Each team's coach was invited to participate in this study along with their athletes. The coaches who participated in this study were from three different sports (baseball, track/field, tennis). The average age of the coaches is 42.75 and had coached their sport for an average of 15.25 years. The average amount of years coached at their high school was 19 years. The questionnaire was distributed to a total of six coaches. After a one week period from when the questionnaires were handed out, four of questionnaires were returned, which created the overall pool of participants (n=4) and all coaches were of the same ethnicity (Caucasian=4).

Instrumentation

During this study, all student-athletes filled out a questionnaire that consisted of three main sections. The first part included demographic questions that asked age, year in school, years played overall in their sport, and their ethnicity. The second part included the Leadership
Scale for Sports (LSS) which measures coaching styles, and the third part included the Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YSEQ) which measures group cohesion. Due to variables such as the reading level of the participants, the mix of positive and negative items in the GEQ, and children's changing experiences with their peers the YSEQ should be implemented with younger populations, 13-17 years old (Rubin, Bukowski & Parker, 2006; Eys, Carron, Bray, & Brawley, 2007; Eys, Loughead, Bray, and Carron, 2009).

Coaches filled out a two-part questionnaire which included demographic questions that asked age, years coached at their current school, years they have coached the sport they currently coach, what sport they coach, and their ethnicity. The second part is a modified LSS which replaces wording from the traditional LSS (i.e. level of agreement with each of the statements regarding your coach and my coach...) and substitutes it so coaches can evaluate their own coaching styles (i.e. check the appropriate response indicating which behavior best represents your leadership style and as a coach I...).

Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS).

The LSS is a 40-question survey that examines a student-athlete's perception of how much they agree with the statement provided, in regards to their coach's leadership style. It is graded on a 1 to 5 Likert scale with 1=never and 5=always. The test is divided into sections correlating to the different types of coaching styles (training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback). To score each section the scores are totaled for that section and then divided by the total number of questions per section. Though the questionnaire is older, it has been shown to be reliable and its use in multiple recent articles shows that it can still be a valid tool to assess coaching styles (Altahayneh, 2003; Din, Rashid, & Noh, 2016; Dixon, Turner, & Gillman, 2016; Fletcher & Roberts, 2013).
Modified Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS).

The LSS is a 40-question survey that examines a coach’s perception of how much they agree with the statement provided, in regards to their coaching style. It is graded on a 1 to 5 Likert scale with 1=never and 5=always. The test is divided into sections correlating to the different types of coaching styles (training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback). To score each section the scores are totaled for that section and then divided by the total number of questions per section.

Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YESQ).

The YSEQ is a 16-question survey that looks at the athlete’s perception of their team and its cohesion. The questionnaire is divided into two sections measuring task cohesion and social cohesion. Every other question asks the athlete’s feelings towards a team’s task cohesion and are answered on a 1 to 9 Likert scale (1=strongly disagree and 9=strongly agree). The second section is scored on the same Likert scale and asked the athlete’s feelings towards their team’s social cohesion. These sixteen questions connect to two different sections that correlate with either group cohesion, or task cohesion. To calculate a score for the two sections the sum of the questions is obtained, which is then reported as a number out of a total possible score of 72.

Procedures

All participants were from one Central Illinois high school and were approached by the researcher before practice. The participants were informed of the experiment and all were given an ascent form if younger than 18 or a consent form for those coaches and those who were 18 and older. Participants were instructed to fill out the form and return it to the researcher the following week at the same time on the same day. At the second meeting those who returned
their consent/ascent form were then given a questionnaire and told what each section was measuring. Participants could take the survey home and complete it during their own free time and were instructed to fill out the form and return it to the researcher the following week at the same time on the same day. Should a participant not return their survey or not turn in their consent/ascent form, they were not allowed to participate in the study.

**Data Collection**

During the first week of the experiment, athletes and coaches were approached at the beginning of practice in the high school gym in order to inform them of the chance to participate in this study. After informing the participants of the study, with associated benefits and risks, they were given a consent form or an ascent form based on how old they were. They were then instructed to have the form filled out and to return it to the investigator at a meeting that was scheduled for the same day and time following week before practice. At the second meeting those coaches and athletes who had a completed consent form or ascent form were then given a questionnaire to fill out.

Participating student-athletes were instructed that the first part of the questionnaire was for demographic purposes only, the second was for coaching styles, and the third was for cohesion. Participating coaches were instructed that the first part of the questionnaire was for demographic purposes and for collecting self-perceptions on their own coaching style. To minimize the time taken out of practice for the coach, the participants were allowed to take the questionnaires with them to fill it out at their convenience with directions to bring them to a meeting that was scheduled for the following week at the same time and day before practice.
Data Analysis

All correlations were analyzed using SPSS version 23 (SPSS, 2015). To receive total mean values for each individual's scores on the LSS, each section was first summed and then the mean was calculated based on how many questions were for each section. To calculate scores on the YSEQ an overall sum of each section was acquired. For each section of coaching style, a two-tailed bivariate correlation was used to find any correlation between the coaching styles and the types of cohesion. This style of analysis was carried out on the group as a whole and the baseball team as well.

Coach's mean LSS values were calculated in the same manner as the athlete version of the LSS. To compare the coach's perception of their style and their athlete's perception, a t-test was carried out to see if there were any differences present. Unlike with the previously mentioned analysis, due to the $n$ size, analysis was only carried out on the group as a whole instead of individual teams.
Results

The purpose of this study was to examine if there would be any correlation present between a coach's style, perceived by the players, and team cohesion for high school student-athletes in different sports. As a second purpose, this study examined if there was a difference between the coach's perceived coaching style and their student-athlete's perception.

Demographics

A total of approximately 50 student-athletes ranging from freshmen to seniors in high school and their coaches were invited to participate in this study. All athletes were current members of their school’s baseball, track/field, or tennis team. After the approximate two week window of data collection, a total of 20 athletes had turned in their questionnaires, creating the participant pool. Four coaches also turned in their questionnaires, leading to a total of four in the coaching pool for this study. Only those who did not return their questionnaires were omitted from the study. The final data analysis included 20 athletes (five freshmen, four sophomores, nine juniors, and two seniors) and included eighteen Caucasian athletes and two Native American athletes, though all ethnicities were allowed to participate. Of the participants in the coaching pool, each sport (baseball, track/field, and tennis) had at minimum one coach turn in a questionnaire, with track/field having a total of two coaching surveys submitted. All statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS version 23 (SPSS, 2015). Tables (1 & 2) have been included, giving the entire breakdown of coach and student-athlete demographics.
Table 1

Demographic Statistics of Student-Athletes \( n=20 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (avg)</th>
<th>16.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Field</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Demographic Statistics of Coaches \( n=4 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (avg)</th>
<th>42.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Field</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years coached (total avg)</td>
<td>15.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years coached (at school avg)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between Coaching Styles and Cohesion

After analyzing the data for each coaching style compared to the two types of cohesion, it was found that there were correlations between some of the coaching styles and team cohesion.

Training and instruction was the variable found to correlate with task cohesion \( (r=.004; p < .05) \), though social support \( (r=.094) \) and democratic \( (r=.092) \) were close to significance. Training and instruction, democratic coaching, and social support were found to have a significant correlation with social cohesion \( (r=.001 \ r=.034 \ r=.004; p < .05) \). When comparing by team, baseball had the
same correlations as the group as a whole for both task and social cohesion. A correlation with track/field and tennis was not available due to the extremely low n size. Data tables have been included of analysis for each section of cohesion and its correlation to the coaching styles by group and team (baseball only).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style and Cohesion</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIS</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIT</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Tl=training & instruction, D=democratic, A=autocratic, SS=social support, PF= positive feedback, S=social cohesion T= task cohesion

*p<.05

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style and Cohesion</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIS</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIT</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Tl=training & instruction, D=democratic, A=autocratic, SS=social support, PF= positive feedback, S=social cohesion T= task cohesion

*p<.05
**Comparison between Athlete & Coach Perception of Coaching Styles**

Prior to conducting the statistical analysis, due to the extremely small sample size available to examine potential mean differences in perceived coaching methods, a statistician was consulted. It was determined that based on the simulation analysis presented in de Winter (2013), and that given the observed equal variances among the coaching variables and the expected and observed effect sizes (e.g. using Cohen’s D), a t-test would be the most appropriate statistical test, to examine the hypothesis. Upon carrying out t-test analysis for each section in comparison to the coach and athlete pool as a whole, it was found that the perceptions of the coach and athlete were the same (i.e. no major difference). A table has been included of analysis for each section of style and its difference to the coaching styles by group. Individual analysis by team was not carried out, due to the small n size ($n < 2$) as stated in de Winter (2013).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Equal Variance Assumed</th>
<th>Equal Variance not Assumed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq 0.05$
Discussion

The discussion is organized into four sections and includes a summary, main discussion and conclusion, future research possibilities, and implications. The summary of the study will include the purpose, a summary of findings, and statistical analyses used to answer the research question. The discussion and conclusions will be in relation to the research questions.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is any correlation between coaching style and team cohesion for high school student-athletes in different sports. As a second purpose, this study examined any potential differences between the coach's perceived coaching style and their athlete's perception. Participants included 20 high school male student-athletes participating in baseball, track/field, or tennis. Furthermore, their coaches were allowed to participate in the study to provide information on their perceived coaching styles. SPSS version 23 (SPSS, 2015) was used for data analysis in this study. For each coaching style section perceived by the athletes, a two-tailed Pearson correlation was used to determine any correlation between each coaching style and each cohesion section. After consulting with a statistician, a t-test was used to determine any significant difference between perceived coaching styles from the athletes and the coaches themselves. It was concluded that training and instruction, social support, and democratic coaching significantly correlated with social cohesion. Training and instruction was the only style that significantly correlated with task cohesion. Finally, both the coaches and athletes accurately perceived the same coaching styles.

The first research question was whether there was a correlation between coaching styles and team cohesion. It was hypothesized that the coaching styles of democratic coaching, training and instruction, social support, and positive feedback would positively correlate with team cohesion. The reason these styles were chosen for the first hypothesis was due to previous research findings (Gardner, Shields, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1996; Hydarinejad & Adman,
indicating these to be the most likely to correlate with team cohesion.

While this hypothesis was correct, only training and instruction, democratic, and social support were found to have a significant correlation to social cohesion, while training and instruction was the only coaching style that significantly correlated to task cohesion as well. This finding leads to a discussion as to why positive feedback did not significantly correlate with cohesion.

There are numerous benefits to using the positive feedback coaching style and multiple studies (Dagne & Assefa, 2014; Murray, 2006; Ramzaninezhad & Hoseini, 2009) concluded that positive feedback does correlate to cohesion overall. Comparing this study against the others that use the GEQ (Dagne & Assefa, 2014; Murray, 2006; Ramzaninezhad & Hoseini, 2009), the one major difference which is the questionnaires used. Due to the newness of the YSEQ, it could be speculated that different results would be obtained when comparing the coaching styles and cohesion together. The differences could be contributed to the changing of wording in the YSEQ as each question could be taken in a different context from its GEQ counterpart.

Furthermore, the measuring of only two areas of cohesion instead of four, could lead to gaps in information, since the situation is not examined from every angle. Furthermore the subjects in this study were of a different region of the country than other studies. Each region is unique in its own way and the difference in beliefs could lead to conflicting results as well (Rentfrow, Gosling, Jokela, Stillwell, Kosinski, & Potter, 2013).

In regards to training and instruction being the only coaching style that significantly correlated with task cohesion, this may be simpler to explain. As a reminder the definition of this coaching style is, improving athlete’s performance by facilitating training (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980). Though there are many different coaching styles that can be used to achieve a goal, (i.e. democratic/autocratic, positive/negative feedback, social support/isolation) the one
common factor needed to reach a goal is training. It is not a farfetched idea to suggest that those who train and receive instruction have a better chance competing and winning than those who do not. Though practices and games may involve the mentioned examples of coaching styles, teams can unite around accomplishing a task or winning through training and bettering themselves. Many athletes improve and contribute their success with training and guidance from coaches or mentors throughout the season (Birch, 2017; Porter 2017). Therefore it is not hard to understand how training and instruction significantly correlated with task cohesion.

A second hypothesis in regards to coaching styles and correlation to cohesion was that autocratic coaching would negatively correlate with team cohesion. Though the analysis did show that there was a negative correlation in both sections of cohesion, it was not significant enough to report. However, due to results from Rodriguez (2009) and this study showing a negative correlation, autocratic coaching may still not be a preferred choice when coaching student-athletes. Once again variables such as the difference in questionnaires and region could have played a role in autocratic coaching not having a significant negative correlation to team cohesion.

However, there may be an explanation for autocratic coaching not having a significant negative correlation to team cohesion. Since this was a negative correlation, one could speculate that as there was less autocratic coaching utilized, there would be more team cohesion. Since most of the participants were baseball players, their coach will be looked at more in depth for this explanation. When speaking with the coach, he stated that this year’s team was underperforming compared to teams of previous years. This underperformance led the coach to wonder if there was anything different he could do and was a driving factor in his participation in this study. Due to the possibilities of the team’s underperformance, this could have led the coach
to become stressed and project his stress onto his team (Cheon, Reeve, Lee, & Lee, 2015). This could have led to more autocratic styled practices. However this seems to not be the case for the baseball coach. Looking back at the data, his players did not have a significant correlation with autocratic coaching and team cohesion. This means that though the team was underperforming, the coach was not exhibiting the characteristics of an autocratic coach to take control and try to increase the team’s performance.

The third hypothesis stated that there would be no difference in coaching style and team cohesion between the individual sports and the group as a whole. This was believed due to other findings in studies reaching very similar conclusions. This was mostly found to be true in this study, however due to the low amount of participants from other sports, only the baseball team’s data was analyzed. Because the participation was low in the other groups, it is impossible to suggest with any degree of certainty that track/field and tennis would correlate the same way. However, it could be speculated that these two sports would be different based on the type of sport. Though all sports involve teamwork to win a game or meet through some type of points system, tennis and track/field are more often individualized sports. Outside of rare occasions in the sport (i.e. tennis doubles and relay teams) the majority of competitions involve one single individual competing against another individual(s). At times this competition can be between teammates. Though these individuals may practice and travel together, there is little time to build social cohesion in the sport setting. However, each athlete has the same task or “goal” as everyone else, which is to win.

The second research question involved the coaches and their perception of style in comparison to their athlete’s perception. It was hypothesized that there would be a difference between how the coaches perceived their styles and how the student-athletes perceived their
coach’s style. The results showed there was no difference between coaches and players' perception. This result may indicate a transparency between coaches and student-athletes that accurately allow student-athletes to perceive their coach’s attitudes. Had there been a difference in participation this could have been a reason why there were slightly different perception from athletes in regards to coaching styles and team cohesion. However, variables such as location, experience, and school size could play a factor in the slight difference. Furthermore, due to the size of the school, many of these student-athletes had already had experience with their coach’s style’s for a few years. Some had played for their coach since junior high, which allowed for them to build familiarity and understanding their coach’s style. The importance of this analysis is that if a coach has an autocratic coaching style and the athlete believes they have a democratic coaching style then one of them may not be understanding of the coach/athlete relationship dynamics which could interfere with the development of team cohesion the student-athlete’s full potential and the “success” of the coach as measured by athletes’ success.

**Future Research**

The goal of this study was to gain a better understanding of the relationships between cohesion and coaching styles. A similar study could be performed with more participants or with different sports so that there is a larger data pool that might generate more generalizable results. Another study that could be performed is to determine if females have the same correlations between coaching styles and cohesion as males. In addition, creating a YSEQ version geared more towards coaches would allow for a researcher to assess cohesion from a coach’s point of view. Further research in these areas could provide coaches and researchers with a better understanding of how their coaching styles will correlate with team cohesion. The creation of a coaching YSEQ, would allow for a researcher to examine how cohesive they feel their team is.
This would allow further investigation of the coach/athlete relationship to see if team cohesion needs to be built amongst a team. The building of team cohesion could then help coaching styles to be implemented more effectively and help the student-athletes achieve their full potential.

**Implications**

Coaching is no easy task for newcomers and veterans alike. Every year a coach inherits or selects a new group of players and a new situation. Overall the main goal of a coach is to put his or her team in the best position they can to win. From drills, to weightlifting, to studying game film, there are endless methods that a coach can use to turn his or her team into a championship caliber team. Of course players will typically only respond to certain coaching styles and this study can aid in guiding a coach to preferred or ideal styles to promote a higher level of overall cohesion and effectiveness. This study aids in a coach's ability to speculate how they should lead by seeing what styles athletes may prefer and to determine what will elicit the strongest cohesion, and in turn, produce the best performance results on the field or court.
COACHING STYLES AND COHEION IN MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES
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Appendices
Appendix A

Student-Athlete Demographic Questionnaire
The following questions are demographic questions only*

1. What is your age? 
   
   ______________________

2. What year are you in High School? (circle one) 
   
   Freshman    Sophomore    Junior    Senior

3. How many years have you played the sport that you participate in? 
   
   ______________________

4. What sport do you play? 
   
   ______________________

5. What ethnicity do you identify with? (circle one) 
   
   Caucasian
   Hispanic or Latino
   African American
   Native American
   Asian/Pacific Islander
   Other
   Prefer not to respond
Appendix B

Leadership Scale for Sports (Student-Athlete Version)
Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS)

Using the following scale, please circle a number from 1 to 5 to indicate your level of 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My coach...

1. Sees to it that every athlete is working to his/her capacity.  | 1 2 3 4 5
2. Explains to each athlete the techniques and tactics of the sport. | 1 2 3 4 5
3. Pays special attention to correcting athlete's mistakes. | 1 2 3 4 5
4. Makes sure that his/her part in the team is understood by all the athletes. | 1 2 3 4 5
5. Instructs every athlete individually in the skills of the sport. | 1 2 3 4 5
6. Figures ahead on what should be done. | 1 2 3 4 5
7. Explains to every athlete what he/she should and what he/she should not do. | 1 2 3 4 5
8. Expects every athlete to carry out his assignment to the last detail. | 1 2 3 4 5
9. Points out each athlete's strengths and weaknesses. | 1 2 3 4 5
10. Gives specific instructions to each athlete as to what he/she should do in every situation. | 1 2 3 4 5
11. Sees to it that the efforts are coordinated. | 1 2 3 4 5
12. Explains how each athlete's contribution fits into the total picture. | 1 2 3 4 5
13. Specifies in detail what is expected of each athlete. | 1 2 3 4 5
14. Asks for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions. | 1 2 3 4 5
15. Gets group approval on important matters before going ahead. | 1 2 3 4 5
16. Lets his/her athletes share in decision making. | 1 2 3 4 5
17. Encourages athletes to make suggestions for ways of conducting practices. | 1 2 3 4 5
18. Lets the group set its own goals. | 1 2 3 4 5
19. Lets the athletes try their own way even if they make mistakes. | 1 2 3 4 5
20. Asks for the opinion of the athletes on important coaching matters. | 1 2 3 4 5
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 athletes 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. 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>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 performance in front of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Tells an athlete when he/she does a particularly good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sees that an athlete is rewarded for a good performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Expresses appreciation when an athlete performs well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Gives credit when credit is due.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS)

Dimensions

Training and instruction (item #1 to #13)
Democratic behavior (item #14 to #22)
Autocratic behavior (item #23 to #27)
Social support (item #28 to #35)
Positive feedback (item #36 to #40)

Note: Add the item score to obtain a score for that particular dimension. Divide by the number of items per dimension to get a score out of 5.
Appendix C

Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire
Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire

Directions: The following questions ask about your feelings toward your team. Please CIRCLE a number from 1 to 9 to show how much you agree with each statement.

1. We all share the same commitment to our team's goals.¹
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

2. I invite my teammates to do things with me.²
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

3. As a team, we are all on the same page.¹
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

4. Some of my best friends are on this team.²
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

5. I like the way we work together as a team.¹
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

6. We hang out with on another whenever possible.²
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

7. As a team, we are united.¹
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

8. I contact my teammates often (phone, text message, internet).²
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

9. This team gives me enough opportunities to improve my own performance.¹
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

10. I spend time with my teammates.²
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree
11. I am going to keep in contact with my teammates after the season ends.\(^2\)

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I am happy with my team's level of desire to win.\(^1\)

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. We stick together outside of practice.\(^2\)

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. My approach to playing is the same as my teammates.\(^1\)

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. We contact each other often (phone, text message, internet).\(^2\)

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. We like the way we work together as a team.\(^1\)

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Task cohesion item - Add all together to get a task cohesion score out of 72.

\(^2\) Social cohesion item - Add all together to get a task cohesion score out of 72.

Appendix D

Coach’s Demographic Questionnaire
*The following questions are demographic questions only*

1. What is your age? 

2. How many years have you coached at your current school?

3. How many years have you coached the sport you currently coach?

4. What sport do you coach?

5. What ethnicity do you identify with? (circle one)
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - African American
   - Native American
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - Other
   - Prefer not to respond
Appendix E

Leadership Scale for Sports (Coach's Perception Version)
Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS)
(Coach’s Perception of Own Behavior)

Each of the following statements describe a specific behavior that a coach may exhibit. For each statement there are five alternatives:

1. ALWAYS
2. OFTEN (about 75% of the time)
3. OCCASIONALLY (50% of the time)
4. SELDOM (about 25% of the time)
5. NEVER

For each item please check the appropriate response indicating which behavior best represents your leadership style in coaching. There are no right or wrong answers. Your first response is most likely the best response. Your spontaneous and honest responses are important for the success of the study.

Thank you for participating!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As a coach I:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. See to it that athletes work to capacity.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Help athletes with their personal problems.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compliment an athlete for good performance in front of others.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explain to each athlete the techniques and tactics of the sport.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan relatively independent of the athletes.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Help members of the group settle their conflicts.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pay special attention to correcting athletes’ mistakes.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Get group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tell an athlete when the athlete does a particularly good job.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a coach I:</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. See to it that athletes work to capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Help athletes with their personal problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Explain to each athlete the techniques and tactics of the sport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Help members of the group settle their conflicts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Pay special attention to correcting athletes' mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Get group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tell an athlete when the athlete does a particularly good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Let the athletes set their own goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Express any affection felt for the athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Expect every athlete to carry out one's assignment to the last detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Let the athletes try their own way even if they make mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a coach I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Encourage the athlete to confide in the coach.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Point out each athlete's strengths and weaknesses.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Refuse to compromise on a point.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Express appreciation when an athlete performs well.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Give specific instructions to each athlete on what should be done in every situation.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Ask for the opinion of the athletes on important coaching matters.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Encourage close and informal relations with athletes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. See to it that the athletes' efforts are coordinated.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Let the athletes work at their own speed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Keep aloof from the athletes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Explain how each athlete's contribution fits into the total picture.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Invite the athletes home.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Give credit when it is due.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Specify in detail what is expected of athletes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Let the athletes decide on plays to be used in a game.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Speak in a manner which discourages questions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>