

ASSESSMENT OF COACHING BEHAVIOR STYLES AS PREDICTORS OF ATHLETES' OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN COMPETITIVE SPORTS

Maryjane V. Patricio

mary.patricio@cvsu.edu.ph

Cavite State University, Cavite College of Arts and Trades Campus Rosario, 4106, Philippines

Lorna A. Espeso

lorna.espeso@adamson.edu.ph

Adamson University 900 San Marcelino Street, Ermita, Manila, 1000 Metro Manila, Philippines

Abstract

Effective coaching shapes athletes' performance, personal growth, and motivation. This study explored how coaching behavioral styles, based on the DISC model—Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness—relate to athletes' sports performance. Guided by the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the research examined how these behavioral styles influence athletes' sense of autonomy, competence, and connection with their coaches.

The study used a descriptive-correlational design and included 20 coaches and 105 athletes from the main and satellite campuses. Researchers analyzed data using mean, standard deviation, independent t-test, and Pearson correlation. Results showed that all four DISC styles clearly appeared in coaches' behaviors, although coaches rated themselves higher than athletes did. Both groups recognized the importance of physical attributes such as agility, flexibility, strength, and speed, but differed slightly in how they perceived their application in training. Conscientiousness, among the DISC styles, is most strongly connected to athletes' overall performance.

Coaches should enhance communication, feedback, and goal-setting practices to strengthen relationships with athletes. Future training programs can focus on developing conscientious behavior along with leadership and interpersonal skills. Researchers can further explore these relationships in various sports settings to validate and expand the findings.

Keywords: coaching behavioral styles, DISC model, varsity athletes, sports performance, Self-Determination Theory, athlete motivation, physical performance, coach-athlete relationship, coaching leadership, conscientious coaching, perception gap, personalized training, coaching effectiveness, athletic development, coach development programs.

1. Introduction

Coaching behavior plays a crucial role in shaping athletes' development and performance, particularly in the Philippine varsity sports context where coaches serve as technical guides and key sources of motivation and psychological support (Cayubit et al., 2018). This dynamic is evident in Cavite State University (CvSU), where athletes train under coaches with diverse personalities and approaches, yet limited institutional research examines how these behaviors influence athlete outcomes.

The DISC model Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness offers a useful framework for understanding these coaching tendencies. Each style presents distinct behavioral patterns that theoretically influence athlete performance. Dominance reflects assertive, goal-driven leadership that may enhance competitiveness but increase pressure. Influence fosters motivation through communication and relational engagement. Steadiness promotes emotional stability and consistency, contributing to psychological safety. Conscientiousness emphasizes structure, accuracy, and evidence-based training that supports skill mastery. These patterns align with Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which posits that coaching behaviors directly shape athletes' competence, autonomy, and relatedness key elements for sustained performance and motivation (Rocchi & Pelletier, 2018). Studies also highlight that competence-supportive coaching enhances satisfaction and improves performance outcomes (Mertens et al., 2018), while varied leadership behaviors can lead to differing effects across teams and contexts (Jones, 2020).

Despite these insights, research in the Philippines remains scarce, and no known study has explored DISC-based coaching styles within CvSU. Existing local studies tend to generalize leadership effects without examining specific behavioral dimensions or their influence on athlete self-efficacy and performance. These gaps limit the university's ability to design evidence-based coaching programs tailored to athlete needs. This study addresses these gaps by analyzing how DISC coaching behavioral styles predict the overall performance of CvSU varsity athletes. Findings aim to provide context-specific evidence that can inform coaching development, strengthen sports programs, and enhance athlete performance within the university.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the relationship of the coaching behavioral styles and sports performance of Cavite State University varsity athletes. It also aimed to propose a coaching behavioral style that would address the needs of the varsity-athletes to improve or sustain their overall performance.

Specifically, this study sought to answers the following questions:

1. What is the assessment of the coaches' level of coaching behavior style in terms of:
 - 1.1 Dominance,
 - 1.2 Influence,
 - 1.3 Steadiness, and
 - 1.4 Conscientiousness.
2. What is the assessment of the athletes on the level of coaching behavior style of their coaches in terms of:
 - 2.1 Dominance,
 - 2.2 Influence,

2.3 Steadiness, and

2.4 Consciousness.

3. Is there a significant difference between coaches' and athletes'

assessment of coaching behavior style in terms of:

3.1 Dominance,

3.2 Influence,

3.3 Steadiness, and

3.4 Consciousness.

4. What is the coaches' assessment of athletes' performance in terms of:

4.1 agility

4.2 flexibility

4.3 strength

4.4 speed

5. Do coaching behavior styles in terms of Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness significantly predict athletes' overall performance?

6. Based on the findings, what capacity building program for coaching behavior style may be developed to improve/sustain athletes' overall performance?

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This research study utilized a quantitative approach. Specifically, the descriptive correlational research design focused on determining the relationship between coaching behavioral style and the athletes' overall performance.

Quantitative research is the process of collecting and analyzing numerical data. It can be used to find patterns and averages, make predictions, test causal relationships, and generalize results to wider populations (Bhandari, 2023).

According to McCombes (2022) descriptive research design can use a wide variety of research methods to investigate one or more variables. Unlike in experimental research, the researcher does not control or manipulate any of the variables, but only observes and measures them.

Moreover, correlational research is a methodology used to investigate relationships between variables without the researcher controlling or manipulating any of them. A correlation reflects the strength and/or direction of the relationship between two (or more) variables. The direction of a correlation can be either positive or negative.

2.2 Research Instrument

For the research instruments, this study employed a self-made questionnaire to assess the coaching behavior styles as predictors of athletes' overall performance in competitive sports of Cavite State University. The researcher provided a few instructions so that the participants can answer it as precisely as possible. The questionnaire was divided into five (4) parts. Part I is Coaches perceive DISC coaching behavioral style of

coaches in terms of; Dominant, Influencing, Steady and Conscientious. Part II is Athlete's perceive DISC coaching behavioral style of coaches in terms of; Dominant, Influencing, Steady and Conscientious. Part III is coaches' perceived to athletes' performance in terms of: agility, flexibility, speed, and strength. Part VI is athletes' performance in terms of: agility, flexibility, speed, and strength. Further, the researcher instrument will also use a Likert-type four-point scale format with a description of: 1 is strongly disagree, 2 is disagree, 3 is agree, and 4 is strongly agree.

Moreover, before the pilot test of the questionnaire, the researcher will seek validation of the instruments from the expert-research teacher, language editor and statistician to ensure consistency, stability and accuracy of the research instrument. Additionally, the researcher instrument underwent pilot testing and reliability testing to ensure that it measures what it intends to measure accurately and verify its validity and reliability of the research instruments.

To assess the coaching behavioral styles of the respondents, the study utilized a self-made questionnaire based on the DISC (Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness). The instrument consists of Likert-type items that measure the degree to which coaches exhibit specific coaching behaviors aligned with the four DISC dimensions. Each item is rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree), allowing respondents to indicate the extent of their agreement with statements describing various coaching behaviors.

For the coaches' responses, the questionnaire demonstrated excellent internal consistency, yielding a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.9645. According to established reliability standards (≥ 0.90 = excellent; $0.80-0.89$ = good; $0.70-0.79$ = acceptable; < 0.70 = needs improvement), this result indicates that the items are highly consistent in measuring coaching styles. The high reliability coefficient affirms that the adapted instrument is suitable and statistically sound for evaluating the coaching characteristics of the participating coaches.

Similarly, the version of the questionnaire answered by the athletes—which assesses their perception of their coaches' coaching styles—also achieved excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.985. This exceptionally high reliability score reflects that the items are strongly interrelated and consistently measure the athletes' perception of their coaches' behaviors. Thus, the instrument demonstrates strong psychometric quality and can be confidently used to evaluate athlete-perceived coaching styles.

2.3 Data Gathering Procedure

Upon the approval of the instruments that to be used in the study, the researcher sought approval from the Adviser and Office of the Dean (Adamson University Graduate Studies) and subsequently the (researcher requested approval from the University President channeled to the Director for Sports to gather the needed data through a letter of request for this study). After securing a letter of permission, the University President recommended the researcher to the participants for the distribution of the survey questionnaire.

Prior to the distribution of the survey questionnaire, the researcher discussed and oriented the participants regarding the study to ensure that the responses of the respondents were highly authentic and valid. After the orientation, the researcher distributed the survey questionnaire to the respondents. After the distribution of the survey questionnaires, the researcher retrieved and collected all instruments and survey questionnaires. The data were then consolidated using master tally sheets and were summarized into tables which became the basis for the analysis and interpretation of the collected data.

2.4 Statistical Treatment of data

The statistical treatment for data analysis and interpretation employed descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics such as weighted mean, and standard deviation, were used to describe the coaching behavioral style in relation to the athlete's overall performance. Further, inferential statistics,

specifically, Pearson product moment and correlation and T Test of Independent samples, were applied to examine whether there was a correlation between the coaching behavior style, such as dominance, influence, steadiness, and consciousness and the athletes' overall performance. These tests also assessed the perception of the coaches and athletes regarding coaching behavior style.

For the data analysis, the level of coaching behavioral styles of the coaches and the student athlete's sports performance were interpreted based on four categories: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. These categories represented varying degrees of satisfaction with the coaching behavioral styles of their coaches and their overall sports performance which were answered by the student respondents. "Strongly agree" indicated a very high level of agreement with their coach's behavioral style of coaching and sports performance, while "agree" suggested a high level of agreement towards their coach's style of coaching and their sports performance, furthermore, "Strongly disagree" indicated a very strong disagreement towards their coaches' coaching styles, their level of sports performance

These interpretations were used for data analysis to provide a varied understanding of the levels of coaches' coaching behavioral styles and athletes' overall performance, among the student respondents. By categorizing the data into distinct levels, the researcher was able to identify patterns, trends, and potential areas for intervention more effectively. Moreover, these interpretations facilitated the communication of findings in a clear and concise manner, enabling stakeholders to make informed decisions and implement targeted strategies to promote student development and well-being.

2.5 Data Analysis

The researcher reviewed and analyzed the data gathered through the survey questionnaire. The mean score for the level coaching behavioral style and sports performance shall indicated the following descriptions:

Scale	Range of Mean	Verbal Description	Interpretation
4	3.25 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Manifested
3	2.50 – 3.24	Agree	Manifested
2	1.75 – 2.49	Disagree	Lowly Manifested
1	1.00 – 1.74	Strongly Disagree	Not Manifested

t-TEST FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES

T Test for independent samples was used to find whether there was a significant difference between the coaches' and athletes' perception on coaching behavior style

PEARSON R

Pearson R was used to determine the significant relationship between the coaching behavior, such as dominance, influence, steadiness, and consciousness and the athletes' overall performance.

STANDARD DEVIATION

Standard deviation was used during the study to measure how much the responses varied or dispersed. It helped assess the consistency or inconsistency in participants' coaching behavior along with performance ratings. A smaller standard deviation is what indicated responses were clustered close to around the mean with that suggesting agreement among respondents. A larger standard deviation implied that there was a wider range of responses, and that this implied less consensus.

3.

This section discusses the level of coaching behavior as perceived by both coaches and athletes, based on the DISC behavioral framework—Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness. The responses were analyzed to determine how frequently these behavioral styles are manifested in actual coaching practices, as experienced by athletes and reflected upon by coaches themselves. Using weighted means, the level of each

coaching style was interpreted, followed by a comparative analysis through independent samples **t-tests** to assess perception differences between the two groups. This comprehensive evaluation offers insights into the congruence—or discrepancies—between how coaching behaviors are demonstrated and received within the athletic environment.

A. Comparative Analysis of Dominance Style as Perceived by Coaches and Athletes

This subsection presents the comparison between coaches' self-assessed and athletes' perceived levels of the Dominance coaching behavioral style. The Dominance dimension refers to assertiveness, control, and goal-oriented behaviors in coaching. Using weighted mean scores and independent samples t-test, the analysis aims to identify whether there are significant differences in how this style is demonstrated by coaches and interpreted by athletes during training and competition settings.

Table 1- Coaches' Responses on Dominance Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Adjectival Description/ Interpretation	Rank
1. Guide my athletes with clear and concise instructions.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3.5
2. Monitor and correct my athletes' progress.	3.900	0.308	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
3. Am involved in everything they do technically.	3.600	0.503	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	7.5
4. Provide immediate corrective guidance for their development.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3.5
5. Provide clarity on where I stand in terms of their performance.	3.850	0.366	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2
6. Help them solve performance-related problems.	3.600	0.503	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	7.5
7. Keep them informed about how I think and feel about things.	3.500	0.688	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10.5
8. Leave it up to them to decide how to go about doing things.	3.350	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	12
9. I am always around checking their performance.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5
10. I am always available to enhance and support their needs and goals.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
11. Take control of the situation and ensure things go as I planned.	3.500	0.688	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10.5
12. Expect athletes to follow my direction without questioning.	3.200	0.834	Agree/Manifested	13

13. Emphasize strict discipline and order in training and competition.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	7.5
14. Make all the decisions without consulting the athletes.	2.350	0.875	Disagree/Lowly Manifested	15
15. Set high expectations and push my athletes to achieve peak performance.	3.150	0.671	Agree/Manifested	14
Composite Mean	3.497	0.339	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50; disagree/partially manifested; 1.00-1.50strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 1 presents the weighted mean scores and standard deviations (SD) for coaches' self-assessments under the Dominance coaching behavioral style. The overall composite mean of 3.50 (SD = 0.339) indicates that Dominance is "Highly Manifested" among the respondents, suggesting that coaches generally perceive themselves as assertive, confident, and directive in managing athlete performance.

Most indicators scored above 3.00, with the highest mean recorded for the item "Monitor and correct my athletes' progress" (M = 3.90, SD = 0.308), reflecting strong agreement and consistency regarding this behavior. Items related to performance clarity and immediate corrective guidance were also highly rated, emphasizing coaches' focus on structure, oversight, and disciplined execution during training sessions.

However, certain items revealed greater variability, such as "Expect athletes to follow my direction without questioning" (M = 3.20, SD = 0.834) and especially "Make all the decisions without consulting the athletes" (M = 2.35, SD = 0.875). These results imply that while coaches maintain a directive stance, many also value athlete input and tend to avoid rigid, unilateral decision-making, resulting in a more flexible and collaborative expression of Dominance.

The findings parallel those of Jin et al. (2022), who emphasized that directive leadership behaviors enhance clarity, accountability, and athlete motivation when applied constructively. Likewise, Barker et al. (2021) found that athletes respond positively to structured and goal-oriented coaching, especially when dominance is paired with supportive communication. The relatively low ratings on authoritarian decision-making found in the present study reinforce the shift highlighted in prior literature: modern coaches tend to balance directive behaviors with athlete involvement rather than applying pure authoritarian control. This alignment suggests that the Dominance style in CvSU coaches reflects contemporary coaching models that advocate structured guidance without compromising athlete autonomy.

Aligned with the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the results imply important considerations for coaching practice and athlete development. High ratings for corrective feedback and performance monitoring support the SDT need for competence, as athletes gain clear and actionable guidance to enhance their skills. Meanwhile, the variability in items related to strict authority suggests that many coaches recognize the importance of preserving athlete autonomy, avoiding overly controlling behaviors that may undermine intrinsic motivation. The combination of directive behaviors and selective athlete consultation also contributes to relatedness, as athletes perceive their coaches as both authoritative and supportive.

Overall, the data suggest that coaches practice Dominance in a balanced manner that maintains structure while still supporting athlete motivation, engagement, and long-term development in line with SDT principles.

Table 2 Coaches' Responses on Influence Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. train them to be brave.	3.900	0.308	Strongly	2

			agree/Highly Manifested	
2. i interact and motivate them	3.650	0.587	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
3. I help them to be more confident in their sports performance.	3.950	0.224	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
4. communicate with them to know their current situation and the support they needed	3.600	0.503	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13
5. share decision-making with them to help them grow better.	3.850	0.366	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3.5
6. I encourage them to develop new skills.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
7. praise them for a good work.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
8. encourage them to participate in important decisions.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
9. give them special recognition when they do every good work.	3.550	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
10. always cheers me up during competition.	3.850	0.366	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3.5
11. inspire my athletes to take on challenges they might otherwise avoid.	3.550	0.510	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
12. help my athletes see their potential beyond their current abilities.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10
13. encourage my athletes to be role models for others on the team.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
14. influence my athletes' attitudes toward continuous improvement.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
15. empower my athletes to make decisions that positively impact their performance and growth.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
Overall Mean	3.743	0.299	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50;disagree/partially manifested;1.00-1.50strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 2 presents the responses of twenty (20) coaches on the Influence Coaching Behavioral Style across fifteen (15) indicators. The overall weighted mean of 3.74 (SD = 0.299), verbally interpreted as *Highly Manifested*, indicates that influence-driven behaviors are consistently demonstrated by coaches. This suggests that coaches frequently use motivation, positive communication, praise, and shared decision-making as part of their leadership approach. High-scoring indicators such as “I help them to be more confident in their performance” (M = 3.95), “Train them to be brave” (M = 3.90), and “Share decision-making with them to help them grow better” (M = 3.85) imply that coaches actively cultivate athletes’ confidence, courage, and autonomy.

The low SD values for these indicators reveal strong agreement among respondents, indicating that these practices are widely and consistently applied. Meanwhile, indicators such as “Give them special recognition for good work” and “Inspire them to take on challenges” (both M = 3.55) still fall within the *Highly Manifested* category but show greater variability, suggesting differences in how coaches implement recognition or challenge-oriented strategies depending on context or athlete readiness.

These findings are consistent with current literature emphasizing the importance of relational, motivational, and communication-based coaching practices. Côté and Turnnidge (2020) highlight that positive influence and open communication foster trust and psychological safety, which increases athletes’ motivation and engagement. Similarly, Jin et al. (2022) emphasize that supportive and democratic coaching positively affects athlete satisfaction and coach–athlete relationship quality—patterns that align closely with the high mean scores for confidence-building, encouragement, and shared decision-making in the present study.

Barker et al. (2021) further explain that influence-driven coaching involves recognition, collaborative involvement, and constructive feedback, which contribute to emotional resilience and intrinsic motivation. These findings also echo reports from Athlete Assessments (2024), which describe high-Influence coaches as those who celebrate progress, value athlete input, and communicate with enthusiasm, thereby enhancing overall morale. Bozer et al. (2021) similarly found that emotionally intelligent coaches, who emphasize praise and empathy, meaningfully improve athlete confidence and reduce psychological stress—patterns mirrored in this study’s consistently high mean values.

The results also carry important implications for coaching practice, particularly when viewed through the lens of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). SDT posits that optimal athlete development occurs when three basic psychological needs are supported: **autonomy**, **competence**, and **relatedness**. The high manifestation of Influence behaviors reflects strong support for **relatedness**, as coaches build emotional connection, encouragement, and trust. High ratings on confidence-building, recognition, and communication directly nurture **competence**, reinforcing athletes’ belief in their abilities. Indicators such as sharing decision-making and encouraging new skill development support **autonomy**, as athletes are given an active role in their training and growth.

Coaches who consistently provide praise, emotional support, and collaborative guidance thus create an environment that satisfies the psychological needs essential for intrinsic motivation and sustained performance. These results imply that maintaining strong Influence-oriented behaviors in coaching can significantly enhance athletes’ intrinsic motivation, well-being, and long-term development in alignment with SDT.

Table 3 Coaches’ Responses on Steadiness Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. encourage them to take specific roles towards their development.	3.550	0.510	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14
2. provide both high technical instructions and motivational needs.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6

3. promote collaboration within the group of our team.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2.5
4. allow them to share my coaching approach that is appropriate for them.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9.5
5. allow them to consult their needs and provide effective emotional support.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9.5
6. allow them to follow their own idea.	3.300	0.801	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	15
7. always keep the communication open by asking questions.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2.5
8. have a lot of patience for their ideas and suggestions about the skills developing.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9.5
9. always guide them on both technical and emotional front.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
10. allow to take more active role on their own learning.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13
11. encourage athletes to lead by example for their teammates.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2.5
12. As a coach, I help athletes develop leadership skills through mentorship.	3.900	0.308	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
13. trust athletes to make important decisions regarding their performance.	3.750	0.550	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
14. inspire athletes to take ownership of their development process.	3.550	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14
15. foster a culture of respect and trust within the team, promoting personal responsibility.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2.5
Overall Mean	3.697	0.348	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50;disagree/partially manifested;1.00-1.50strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 3 presents the results of coaches' self-assessment of their Steadiness coaching behavioral style, based on fifteen indicators. The overall weighted mean of 3.697 (SD = 0.348) indicates that coaches perceive themselves as consistently demonstrating behaviors associated with Steadiness—patience, dependability, emotional support, and calm communication. The uniformly “Highly Manifested” ratings across all indicators suggest that coaches intentionally cultivate a stable, supportive, and athlete-centered training environment.

Patterns in the data show that mentorship, collaboration, and consistent two-way communication are central features of their coaching behavior. Items rated very highly—such as mentoring athletes to develop leadership skills ($M = 3.90$)—imply that coaches are committed to developmental guidance and relational leadership. Meanwhile, indicators related to athlete autonomy, such as allowing athletes to follow their own ideas ($M = 3.30$), show wider variability, suggesting that while autonomy is acknowledged, its application may differ among coaches.

Overall, the dominance of Steadiness characteristics reflects a coaching profile grounded in emotional stability, collaborative interaction, and nurturance all factors known to support athletes' psychological safety and long-term growth.

When compared with previous literature, the present findings strongly align with existing evidence on relational and supportive coaching. Côté and Turnnidge (2020) assert that relational coaching environments

enhance emotional security and motivation—echoing the current finding that communication, respect, and guidance are “Highly Manifested.” Jowett and Shanmugam (2021) emphasize that empathetic, consistent communication fosters belonging and commitment, which is evident in the coaches’ high ratings for collaboration and open dialogue.

Similarly, Barker et al. (2021) found that emotionally steady leadership lowers anxiety and strengthens self-efficacy, a pattern reflected in coaches’ strong emphasis on providing both technical instruction and motivational support. Evidence from Athlete Assessments (2024) also highlights Steadiness-oriented coaches as stabilizers who maintain team calmness under pressure, consistent with the present data. Collectively, these studies support the current findings and show no major contradictions, reinforcing that Steadiness remains a critical relational strength in effective coaching practice.

In terms of implications for coaching practice and athlete development—particularly when aligned with Self-Determination Theory (SDT)—the findings strongly suggest that Steadiness behaviors foster the three basic psychological needs essential for optimal motivation: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. High ratings in mentorship, collaboration, and emotional support indicate strong fulfillment of relatedness, which SDT identifies as a major factor in sustaining athlete engagement and commitment. The balance between technical guidance and encouragement supports athletes’ sense of competence.

However, the slightly lower and more variable ratings on autonomy-supportive indicators (e.g., allowing athletes to follow their own ideas) highlight an area for improvement. SDT emphasizes that athletes thrive when they are granted meaningful choices, ownership of learning, and opportunities for self-direction. Thus, while Steadiness behaviors greatly enhance relational quality and psychological safety, coaches could further strengthen athlete motivation and long-term development by consistently integrating autonomy-supportive strategies.

Overall, the results imply that Steadiness-driven coaching forms a strong foundation for SDT-aligned athlete development, promoting emotional stability, confidence, and sustained internal motivation across training environments.

Table 4 Coaches’ Responses on Conscientiousness Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. provide a well-structured plan and environment.	3.550	0.510	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10
2. provide tools and programs that can help them execute the drills and training.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
3. maintain a well-organized and efficient flow of training.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
4. trust their judgment on technical decisions.	3.400	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	12.5
5. allow them to solve their challenges in a way that suits them	3.500	0.607	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11
6. allow them to develop and enhance their own skills.	3.600	0.754	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9
7. give them time to re-think the way they do things	3.700	0.571	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
8. give some instructions and let them do the rest.	3.350	0.875	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
9. allow them to retain ownership of their challenges and solutions.	3.400	0.681	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	12.5

10. give them a lot of space in directing their technical behavior.	3.350	0.745	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
11. I ensure that my athletes understand the purpose behind every drill or exercise.	3.850	0.366	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2
12. emphasize the importance of preparation and planning for competitions.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3
13. encourage my athletes to stay disciplined and follow through on commitments.	3.900	0.308	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
14. help my athletes break down complex tasks into manageable steps.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
15. expect my athletes to consistently follow a set routine or system to achieve progress.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
Overall Mean	3.613	0.406	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50;disagree/partially manifested;1.00-1.50strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 4 show that coaches rated themselves highly on the Conscientiousness coaching behavioral style, with an overall weighted mean of 3.613 (SD = 0.406), interpreted as “Highly Manifested.” This indicates that coaches perceive their behavior as consistently organized, disciplined, and detail-oriented. The high means across all fifteen indicators suggest that coaches regularly implement precise planning, structured training sessions, and well-organized instructional strategies. The low to moderate standard deviations reveal that while most behaviors are widely practiced, some areas—particularly those related to offering autonomy—show greater variability.

Indicators such as encouraging discipline (Mean = 3.900), clarifying the purpose of drills (Mean = 3.850), and emphasizing preparation (Mean = 3.800) reflect a strong commitment to systematic coaching. Meanwhile, higher variability in items like allowing athletes to develop skills independently suggests differing levels of comfort among coaches in granting autonomy during training.

These findings align strongly with existing research. Horn (2020) emphasized that conscientious coaches who prioritize structure and performance monitoring enhance athlete confidence and consistency—supporting the current results. Baker et al. (2021) similarly reported that systematic planning fosters technical proficiency, echoing the high ratings for clarity and preparation found in this study. Côté and Turnnidge (2020) also highlighted that meticulous and goal-oriented coaching improves athletes’ learning efficiency and self-regulation, consistent with the coaches’ strong emphasis on organization and standards.

Bozer et al. (2021) noted that blending structured planning with emotional support boosts athlete well-being and performance—partially reflected in the present results, although variability in autonomy-giving behaviors shows that not all coaches may balance structure with autonomy equally. Findings from Athlete Assessments (2024) affirm that Conscientious coaches typically enforce systematic evaluation and high standards, matching the strong manifestation of precision and discipline in the current data. Overall, the results reinforce prior literature rather than contradict it, indicating convergence in describing the behaviors of highly conscientious coaches.

Aligned with the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the high manifestation of Conscientiousness has meaningful implications for coaching practice and athlete development. SDT posits that athletes thrive when their needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are supported. Conscientious behaviors such as providing clear objectives, structured training plans, and performance feedback directly nurture competence,

helping athletes feel capable and confident. However, the higher variability in autonomy-related indicators suggests that some coaches may offer less support for autonomy, which could limit intrinsic motivation if not balanced carefully. A conscientious approach becomes most effective when structure does not become controlling but instead creates an environment where expectations are clear, progress is monitored, and athletes understand the purpose behind each task all of which support both competence and autonomy.

For coaching practice, this implies that while strong organizational skills are essential, conscientious coaches must also intentionally incorporate autonomy-supportive strategies (e.g., guided choices, athlete input, self-directed drills) to align fully with SDT principles. Doing so will strengthen athlete motivation, engagement, and long-term development.

50

Table 5. Athletes' Responses on Dominance Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Guides me with clear and concise instructions.	3.705	0.479	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3
2. Monitors and corrects me and my progress.	3.743	0.439	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
3. Is involved in everything I do technically.	3.438	0.634	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10
4. Provides immediate corrective guidance for my development.	3.648	0.537	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5
5. Provides clarity on where I stand with terms of my performance.	3.686	0.487	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4
6. Helps me to solve work related problems.	3.419	0.690	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
7. Keeps me informed about how they think and feel about things.	3.457	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
8. Leaves it up to me to decide how to go about doing things.	3.457	0.572	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
9. Is always around checking my performance.	3.543	0.589	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
10. Is always available to enhance and support my needs and goals.	3.524	0.590	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	7
11. Takes control of the situation and ensures things go as planned.	3.419	0.676	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
12. Expects me to follow their direction without questioning.	3.343	0.677	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13
13. Emphasizes strict discipline and order in training and competition.	3.667	0.474	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2
14. Makes all the decisions without consulting me.	2.914	0.931	Agree/Manifested	15
15. Sets high expectations and pushes me to meet them.	3.286	0.805	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14
Overall Mean	3.483	0.426	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50; disagree/partially manifested; 1.00-1.50 strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 5 presents the athletes' perception of their coaches' Dominance behavioral style across 15 indicators, revealing an overall weighted mean of 3.48 (SD = 0.426), interpreted as "Highly Manifested." This

indicates that athletes commonly observe their coaches as assertive, directive, and performance-driven—attributes central to the Dominance dimension of the DISC model. The low standard deviation further suggests consistent perceptions across respondents. High-rated indicators such as “Monitors and corrects me and my progress,” “Emphasizes strict discipline and order,” and “Provides clarity on where I stand in terms of my performance” show that athletes perceive their coaches as structured, disciplined, and responsive.

These behaviors reflect a leadership pattern that provides order and immediate feedback, which athletes value for maintaining strong performance standards. In contrast, the lowest-rated indicator, “Makes all the decisions without consulting me,” which obtained a mean of 2.914 (SD = 0.931), reveals that while dominance is evident, coaches do not consistently exclude athletes from decision-making. The higher variability shows diverse athlete experiences, implying that autonomy is not entirely suppressed. This indicates a balanced form of directive leadership in which coaches maintain authority but still allow space for athlete input.

These findings align partially—but not entirely—with contemporary research. Hao Jin et al. (2022) report that autocratic leadership does not inherently enhance motivation or coach–athlete relationships unless appropriately balanced with supportive communication, which mirrors the present finding that pure unilateral decision-making is not strongly manifested. Rui Liu et al. (2024) similarly emphasize that clear instruction and consistent performance monitoring—behaviors reflected in the highest-rated items—are associated with improved outcomes, especially when coaches sustain strong relationships and reduce psychological fatigue.

Meanwhile, Youngs and Jowett (2022) caution that overly authoritarian approaches may hinder athlete autonomy and satisfaction. The present results neither fully support nor contradict these studies; instead, they suggest a moderated form of dominance where structure and direction are valued but excessive control is avoided. Thus, dominance appears effective when paired with open communication, fairness, and athlete engagement.

From the perspective of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the findings imply important considerations for coaching practice. SDT posits that athletes’ motivation and well-being depend on the satisfaction of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. The high manifestation of clarity, performance monitoring, and structured guidance supports the need for competence, helping athletes feel capable and confident. Meanwhile, the relatively low manifestation of unilateral decision-making suggests that coaches are not fully undermining autonomy, allowing athletes some input and shared responsibility, which prevents the controlling behaviors that typically reduce intrinsic motivation.

Furthermore, corrective feedback delivered promptly and constructively can enhance relatedness, as athletes may perceive coaches as genuinely invested in their growth. Thus, the pattern of results indicates that a dominance-oriented coaching style can be motivationally adaptive when it provides structure and feedback without becoming overly controlling. For athlete development, this means that dominance when balanced with autonomy-supportive behaviors can foster discipline, clarity, and performance while still meeting the psychological needs outlined in SDT.

Table 6. Athletes’ Responses on Influence Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. gives me courage.	3.724	0.537	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3
2. interacts and motivates me	3.648	0.476	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5
3. helps me to be more confident in my sports performance.	3.752	0.549	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
4. communicates with me to know my current situation and supports me	3.667	0.521	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	12
5. shares decision-making with me and	3.638	0.479	Strongly agree/Highly	6.5

helps me grow better.			Manifested	
6. encourages me to develop new skills.	3.705	0.633	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4
7. praises me for a good work.	3.571	0.582	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
8. encourages me to participate in important decisions.	3.600	0.622	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11
9. gives me a special recognition when I do every good work.	3.486	0.580	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	15
10. always cheers me up during competition.	3.610	0.561	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10
11. inspires me to take on challenges I might otherwise avoid.	3.619	0.539	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9
12. helps me see my potential beyond my current abilities.	3.695	0.602	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2
13. encourages me to be a role model for others on the team.	3.571	0.521	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
14. influences my attitude toward continuous improvement.	3.638	0.542	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6.5
15. empowers me to make decisions that positively impact my performance and growth.	3.629	0.462	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8
Overall Mean	3.637	0.537	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50;disagree/partially manifested;1.00-1.50strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 6 presents the responses of 105 athletes regarding their coaches' Influence Coaching Behavioral Style based on fifteen behavioral indicators. The overall weighted mean of 3.64 (SD = 0.537), verbally interpreted as Highly Manifested, indicates that athletes consistently perceive their coaches as demonstrating strong influence-oriented behaviors such as motivation, emotional support, empowerment, and recognition. The consistently high means across all indicators suggest that influence-based strategies are firmly embedded in coaching practice, with athletes frequently experiencing encouragement and interpersonal support.

The highest-rated item—"helps me to be more confident in my sports performance" (M = 3.752, SD = 0.549)—implies that coaches are seen as critical sources of confidence-building, a key relational behavior that strengthens athlete trust. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated yet still Highly Manifested indicator—"gives me special recognition when I do good work" (M = 3.486, SD = 0.580)—reflects slightly more variability in how consistently athletes perceive recognition practices. The moderate SD range across indicators (0.462–0.633) suggests that while influence behaviors are widespread, some athletes may experience them with varying degrees of frequency or intensity.

The results align with and reinforce prior research emphasizing the role of motivational and relational coaching behaviors in enhancing athlete performance and well-being. The 2023 study on coaching leadership and athlete grit reported that supportive and instructional coach behaviors positively correlate with athletes' perseverance and consistency, affirming that confidence-building actions—similar to the highest-rated indicator—contribute to psychological resilience.

Findings from the 2024 research on coach–athlete relationships and motor behavior highlight that closeness, commitment, and communication strengthen athletes' competence, autonomy, and relatedness, which are core components of positive influence-based coaching. The present results further echo studies such

as “Moderators of the Coach Leadership and Athlete Motivation Relationship” (2022), which noted that variability in how athletes perceive certain coach behaviors may depend on contextual factors such as age, tenure with the coach, and competitive experience, consistent with the slightly wider SD observed for recognition-related indicators in this study.

Coaching practice and athlete development, the findings strongly support the application of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which emphasizes the fulfillment of autonomy, competence, and relatedness as essential drivers of motivation. Influence-based behaviors such as empowering athletes to make decisions and helping them develop confidence directly nurture autonomy and competence, while consistent emotional support and encouragement strengthen relatedness.

However, the variability in recognition-related behaviors suggests the need for coaches to apply influence strategies more consistently to ensure that all athletes experience equitable motivational support. Strengthening recognition practices may enhance feelings of competence and belonging, especially for athletes who may currently feel overlooked. Overall, the results imply that coaches who consistently manifest influence-driven behaviors aligned with SDT’s psychological needs framework are more likely to foster intrinsically motivated, confident, and engaged athletes, ultimately contributing to improved performance and long-term athletic development.

Table 7. Athletes’ Responses on Steadiness Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. encourages me to take specific roles towards my development.	3.571	0.552	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	7
2. provides both high technical instructions and motivational needs.	3.610	0.546	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4
3. promotes collaboration within the group of our team.	3.619	0.544	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2
4. allows me to share a coaching approach that is appropriate for me.	3.581	0.551	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
5. allows me to consult my needs and provides effective emotional support.	3.552	0.604	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10
6. allows me to follow my own idea.	3.438	0.619	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	15
7. always keeps the communication open by asking questions.	3.629	0.559	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
8. has a lot of patience for my ideas and suggestions about the skills I am developing.	3.533	0.606	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
9. always guides me on both technical and emotional front.	3.486	0.637	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14
10. allows me to take more active role on my own learning.	3.543	0.572	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
11. encourages me to lead by example for my teammates.	3.514	0.574	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13
12. helps me develop leadership skills through mentorship.	3.543	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
13. trusts me to make important decisions regarding my performance.	3.533	0.556	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
14. inspires me to take ownership of my development process.	3.590	0.532	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5

15. fosters a culture of respect and trust within the team, promoting personal responsibility.	3.648	0.519	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3
Overall Mean	3.559	0.470	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50;disagree/partially manifested;1.00-1.50strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 7 presents the athletes' perceptions of their coaches' Steadiness coaching behavioral style, yielding an overall weighted mean of 3.559 (SD = 0.470), interpreted as "Highly Manifested." This indicates that athletes consistently observe calm, patient, and supportive behaviors that characterize the Steadiness domain of the DISC framework. The low standard deviation further suggests strong agreement among athletes, reinforcing that their coaches demonstrate a stable and emotionally consistent approach during training and competition. The highest-rated indicators such as promoting team collaboration, fostering respect and trust, and maintaining open communication highlight a coaching climate marked by cooperation, psychological safety, and relational warmth. Even items related to athlete autonomy (e.g., allowing athletes to follow their own ideas and take an active role in learning) received high ratings, showing that the steady coaching style successfully balances structure with opportunities for independence. The moderate range of SDs across items suggests that these behaviors are not only present but widely recognized by most athletes.

When compared with existing literature, the results strongly support previous findings. Studies by Jowett and Shanmugam (2020) emphasize that consistency, emotional support, and open communication strengthen the coach–athlete relationship—patterns also evident in the current data. Similarly, Alcaraz et al. (2021) reported that coaches who demonstrate calmness and empathy enhance athletes' psychological safety and motivation, aligning with the high ratings for trust and collaboration in this study. Knight et al. (2023) further showed that emotional stability in coaching enhances athlete resilience under stress, while Ivarsson et al. (2022) highlighted that predictable and patient coaching reduces anxiety and improves cohesion. Collectively, these studies affirm rather than contradict the present findings, indicating that Steadiness-oriented behaviors are consistently linked with positive athlete outcomes.

The strong manifestation of Steadiness behaviors suggests that such coaching practices contribute meaningfully to athlete development by reinforcing emotional security, consistent guidance, and a collaborative sport environment. These qualities align closely with Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which posits that athletes thrive when their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are supported. The steady coaching style enhances relatedness through trust and respectful communication, supports competence through patient instruction and stable expectations, and indirectly fosters autonomy by providing a safe structure in which athletes feel confident making decisions.

This alignment with SDT implies that Steadiness is not only beneficial for performance but also for sustaining intrinsic motivation and long-term engagement in sport. Consequently, coaches should intentionally cultivate patience, emotional regulation, and collaborative team management to reinforce motivational climates that promote sustained athlete growth and well-being.

Table 8. Athletes' Responses on Conscientiousness Coaching Behavioral Style

INDICATORS	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. provides a well-structured plan and environment.	3.600	0.511	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10
2. provides tools and programs that can help execute the drills and training.	3.705	0.479	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
3. maintains a well-organized and efficient flow of training.	3.667	0.531	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
4. trusts my judgment on technical	3.505	0.590	Strongly agree/Highly	15

decisions.			Manifested	
5. allows me to solve my challenges in a way that suits to me.	3.610	0.509	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9
6. allows me to develop and enhance my own skills.	3.638	0.521	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8
7. gives me time to re-think the way I do things	3.648	0.480	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	7
8. gives some instructions and let me do the rest.	3.571	0.552	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11
9. allows me to retain ownership of my challenges and solutions.	3.552	0.519	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13
10. gives me a lot of space in directing my technical behavior.	3.533	0.538	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14
11. ensures that I understand the purpose behind every drill or exercise.	3.676	0.509	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3
12. emphasizes the importance of preparation and planning for competitions.	3.667	0.513	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
13. encourages me to stay disciplined and follow through on commitments.	3.695	0.502	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	2
14. helps me break down complex tasks into manageable steps.	3.562	0.570	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	12
15. expects me to consistently follow a set routine or system to achieve progress.	3.657	0.477	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	6
Overall Mean	3.619	0.423	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50; disagree/partially manifested; 1.00-1.50 strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 8 presents the athletes' assessment of their coaches' behaviors under the Conscientiousness coaching behavioral style, specifically in relation to speed development. The overall weighted mean of 3.619 (SD = 0.423), interpreted as "Highly Manifested," indicates that athletes consistently perceive their coaches as structured, organized, and meticulous in preparing training sessions that support performance improvement. The low standard deviation further suggests strong agreement among athletes, implying that these conscientious behaviors are not isolated to a few coaches but are broadly experienced across teams. This pattern highlights that athletes recognize their coaches' deliberate efforts to implement training that is systematic and technically grounded—features essential for developing speed proficiency.

The individual indicators reinforce this interpretation. The highest-rated behaviors include providing tools and programs necessary for training (M = 3.705), promoting discipline and commitment (M = 3.695), and ensuring athletes understand the purpose behind each drill (M = 3.676). These results imply that coaches not only design well-structured sessions but also foster cognitive clarity and purposeful engagement among athletes. The presence of slightly lower yet still "Highly Manifested" ratings—such as trusting the athlete's technical judgment (M = 3.505) and breaking down complex tasks into manageable parts (M = 3.562)—suggests some variation in how consistently coaches apply autonomy-supportive strategies. Nevertheless, the overall high means confirm that conscientious coaching traits remain dominant in shaping well-organized training environments that benefit speed development.

When compared with previous studies, these findings align strongly with existing literature. Santos et al. (2020) emphasized that conscientious coaches enhance athlete performance through disciplined planning

and structured guidance, which mirrors the athletes' perceptions in this study. Horn and Gilbert (2021) similarly found that organized coaching promotes training efficiency and athlete accountability, supporting the current results that highlight the value of structured practices. Lyle et al. (2022) likewise reported that deliberate, systematic feedback drives long-term skill refinement, reinforcing the importance of conscientious leadership in technical sports development. The consistency of the present findings with these studies indicates that the manifestation of conscientious behaviors among coaches is not only recognized locally but also supported globally. No contradicting evidence appears in the reviewed literature, strengthening the conclusion that conscientious coaching is a significant facilitator of speed-related performance.

Coaching practice and athlete development are substantial. Coaches who exhibit conscientious behaviors create predictable, well-structured training environments that facilitate learning, reduce uncertainty, and promote mastery. Such environments build discipline, reinforce technical precision, and enhance athletes' psychological readiness all critical for sports requiring speed efficiency. Importantly, these results align with the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which posits that athletes flourish when their needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness are supported. Conscientious coaching directly satisfies the need for competence by providing organized instruction and clear skill pathways; it also indirectly supports autonomy when coaches explain the purpose of drills, enabling athletes to internalize goals and take ownership of their development. When combined, these elements promote intrinsic motivation, sustained engagement, and long-term athletic growth.

Overall, the findings confirm that the conscientious behavioral style of coaches is not only highly evident but also instrumental in shaping environments that optimize speed development. Supported by previous research and aligned with SDT principles, conscientious coaching emerges as a critical component of effective practice design and athlete performance progression.

Table 9 Difference between the Coaches' and Athletes' Perception on Coaching Behavior Style

Coaching Behavior Style	Group	Mean	Sd	t-value	p-value	Remarks
Dominance	Coaches	3.50	0.34	-0.13	0.894	Not Significant
	Athletes	3.48	0.43			
Influence	Coaches	3.74	0.30	-0.99	0.324	Not Significant
	Athletes	3.64	0.46			
Steadiness	Coaches	3.70	0.35	-1.24	0.217	Not Significant
	Athletes	3.56	0.47			
Consciousness	Coaches	3.61	0.41	0.06	0.956	Not Significant
	Athletes	3.62	0.42			

Table 9 presents the comparison between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of the four DISC Coaching Behavioral Styles—Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness—using independent samples t-tests. Results revealed that all p-values exceeded the 0.05 significance level (Dominance $p = 0.894$; Influence $p = 0.324$; Steadiness $p = 0.217$; Conscientiousness $p = 0.956$), indicating no significant difference between the two groups' perceptions. This suggests that coaches and athletes hold a highly aligned view of how these behavioral styles are demonstrated in practice. The consistently "Manifested" or "Highly Manifested" ratings across all styles, along with minimal mean differences (0.01–0.14), imply perceptual harmony—showing that the behavioral expressions observed by athletes closely match those intended or recognized by coaches. This alignment reflects clear communication, stable relational dynamics, and a shared understanding of behavioral expectations during training and competition.

When compared with existing literature, the findings support previous research emphasizing the value of perceptual congruence in the coach–athlete relationship. Studies by Jowett and Poczwadowski (2020) and Gledhill and Harwood (2021) highlight that aligned perceptions strengthen trust, communication, and

relational quality—factors essential for sustained performance. Similarly, Lorimer and Dorsch (2022) found that congruence in behavioral expectations predicts greater athlete engagement and perceived competence, while Evans et al. (2023) reported that perceptual harmony enhances psychological safety and collaboration. The current results align closely with these conclusions, reinforcing that shared perceptions between coaches and athletes facilitate smoother interactions and minimize relational conflict.

Grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT), these findings carry meaningful implications for coaching practice and athlete development. SDT posits that athletes thrive when their basic psychological needs autonomy, competence, and relatedness are supported. The perceptual alignment revealed in this study reflects a relational environment where athletes likely feel understood (relatedness), receive consistent behavioral cues that enhance skill mastery (competence), and operate within a predictable and supportive coaching climate that can enable independent decision-making (autonomy). When coaches and athletes interpret Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness similarly, it reduces ambiguity, fosters motivation, and encourages athletes to take ownership of their performance. Thus, the acceptance of the null hypothesis not only confirms perceptual consistency but also reinforces the importance of coherent behavioral communication in cultivating an SDT-aligned environment that promotes holistic athlete growth and optimal performance.

I. Evaluation of Athletes' Performance Based on Coaches' Perceptions of Key Physical Attributes

This section presents the evaluation of athletes' performance as perceived by their coaches, focusing on four key physical attributes: agility, flexibility, strength, and speed. Using weighted mean analysis, this part of the study aims to determine how consistently these attributes are observed and valued by coaches in the context of athletic training and performance development.

Table 10 Coaches' Perceived Level of Athletes' Agility Performance

Performance Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Encourage my athletes to focus on improving their agility.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3
2. Provide agility drills that are challenging and effective.	3.700	0.571	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
3. Give feedback on agility training that helps athletes refine their skills.	3.700	0.571	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
4. Motivate my athletes to enhance their quickness and agility.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
5. Regularly assess agility, helping athletes track their progress.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
6. Design agility drills that meet the specific requirements of the sport.	3.650	0.671	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
7. Focus on agility, which has led to noticeable improvements in athletes' performance.	3.550	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
8. Ensure training sessions effectively balance agility with other areas of fitness.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
9. Provide guidance that helps athletes feel more agile during competitions.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5

10. Support consistent improvement in agility through my leadership.	3.700	0.571	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
11. Encourage athletes to include agility drills in their routine.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
12. Adapt agility training to match each athlete's current skill level.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
13. Integrate agility training with the strategic aspects of the sport.	3.550	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
14. Give constructive criticism to improve agility techniques.	3.600	0.754	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	11.5
15. Set clear goals for agility development and monitor progress.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1
Overall Mean	3.667	0.415	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50; disagree/partially manifested; 1.00-1.50strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 10 presents coaches' perceptions of their athletes' agility, measured across 15 specific performance indicators. The overall weighted mean of 3.67 (SD = 0.415), interpreted as "Highly Manifested," suggests that coaches consistently recognize and prioritize the development of agility in their athletes. This high rating indicates that agility-related competencies are not only emphasized in training but are also effectively reinforced through coaching practices. The two highest-rated indicators—"Motivate my athletes to enhance their quickness and agility" and "Set clear goals for agility development and monitor progress" (M = 3.80, SD = 0.410)—reflect strong agreement among coaches, highlighting the critical role of motivation and structured goal-setting in promoting athletes' skill acquisition and performance.

Other indicators, including providing challenging agility drills, giving feedback, offering guidance during competitions, and supporting consistent improvement, received slightly lower but still high means (M = 3.70, SD = 0.470–0.571). These moderate variations suggest that while coaches generally agree on their importance, differences in coaching style, athlete needs, or available resources may influence the degree of application. Indicators such as giving constructive criticism (M = 3.60, SD = 0.754) and designing sport-specific drills (M = 3.65, SD = 0.671) showed higher variability, implying that some practices are less consistently implemented. The lowest-rated items—focusing on observable performance improvements and integrating agility with strategic play (M = 3.55, SD = 0.605)—remain highly rated but may represent opportunities for further refinement to maximize athlete development. Overall, the data imply that coaches actively engage in structured, goal-oriented, and motivational strategies to enhance agility, demonstrating both a commitment to and understanding of its central role in athletic performance.

Comparing these findings with previous research, the results are largely supportive. Sheppard and Young (2020) emphasize that agility combines physical quickness with cognitive decision-making, highlighting the necessity of structured coaching and feedback, which aligns with coaches' goal-setting and monitoring practices observed in this study. Similarly, Farrow and Robertson (2021) note that agility improves when coaches combine technical drills with decision-making exercises, reflecting the multi-faceted approach reported by coaches here. Lloyd et al. (2022) argue that sport-specific training is most effective, which supports the need for designing customized agility drills, although implementation may vary. Ezeh et al. (2023) further underscore the importance of regular monitoring and motivational support, reinforcing the role of feedback and encouragement in fostering agility. Collectively, these studies corroborate the current findings, indicating that structured, feedback-driven, and motivational coaching methods enhance athlete agility.

These findings suggest that coaches should continue to employ SDT-aligned strategies that support athletes' autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Setting clear goals and providing feedback satisfies

athletes' need for competence, while motivational support nurtures intrinsic motivation, both of which are essential for sustained skill development and self-directed improvement. For coaching practice, this means integrating agility training with clear objectives, regular feedback, and personalized guidance to cultivate athletes' confidence, engagement, and overall performance in alignment with the Self-Determination Theory framework.

Table 11 Coaches' Perceived Level of Athletes' Flexibility Performance

Performance Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Encourage my athletes to prioritize flexibility in their training routine.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
2. Recommend stretching routines that have improved flexibility.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5.5
3. Provide clear guidance on how to safely increase flexibility.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5.5
4. Motivate my athletes to consistently work on their flexibility.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
5. Give constructive feedback that helps enhance flexibility.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10.5
6. Design flexibility exercises specific to each sport's needs.	3.850	0.366	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1.5
7. Ensure that the flexibility drills in training are well structured.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5.5
8. Regularly assess flexibility and offer advice for improvement.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10.5
9. Provide guidance that helps athletes feel more flexible and less prone to injury.	3.650	0.587	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10.5
10. Promote a balanced approach to flexibility and overall athletic performance.	3.700	0.571	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
11. Incorporate flexibility training into the overall conditioning program.	3.850	0.366	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1.5
12. Set realistic and achievable flexibility goals for my athletes.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3.5
13. Help athletes understand the long-term benefits of improved flexibility for their sport.	3.800	0.410	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	3.5
14. Give timely and actionable feedback on flexibility exercises.	3.600	0.754	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
15. Encourage athletes to maintain flexibility routines even outside of training sessions.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	10.5
Overall Mean	3.717	0.393	Highly Manifested	

Legend: Significant at the 0.05 level of significance

Table 11 presents the coaches' perceptions of their athletes' performance in terms of flexibility, based on fifteen key performance indicators. The overall weighted mean of 3.72 (SD = 0.393), falling within the "Highly Manifested" category, indicates that coaches consistently observe flexibility as a well-developed and essential component of athletic performance. The relatively low variability in responses suggests a strong

consensus among coaches regarding the importance of flexibility in training. All indicators fell within the "Highly Manifested" range, highlighting the comprehensive attention given to flexibility across various dimensions of conditioning. Items such as "Design flexibility exercises specific to each sport's needs" and "Incorporate flexibility training into the overall conditioning program" received the highest scores (mean = 3.85, SD = 0.366), demonstrating that coaches prioritize sport-specific and integrated approaches to flexibility. Similarly, "Set realistic and achievable flexibility goals for my athletes" and "Help athletes understand the long-term benefits of improved flexibility" scored 3.80 (SD = 0.410), reflecting a goal-oriented and educational strategy in flexibility development. Slightly higher variability was observed in items related to providing timely feedback (mean = 3.60, SD = 0.754) and encouraging athletes to maintain routines outside formal training (mean = 3.65, SD = 0.489), suggesting some differences in coaches' feedback frequency or external monitoring.

These findings imply that coaches adopt a structured and deliberate approach to flexibility, emphasizing both technical execution and athlete understanding. When compared to existing research, the results support prior studies that highlight flexibility as a core component of athletic performance. McGuigan et al. (2022) reported that strength and conditioning coaches view flexibility and mobility work as fundamental alongside strength and speed training, while McNeill and Eldridge (2024) found that integrated flexibility interventions improve range of motion and movement efficiency when incorporated into structured programs. Truesport (2023) further emphasized individualized, sport-specific flexibility training as key to injury prevention and performance enhancement. The current results align with these findings, reinforcing that coaches' systematic application of flexibility practices mirrors evidence-based recommendations.

From a practical and theoretical perspective, these findings have significant implications for coaching and athlete development within the framework of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). By setting realistic goals, providing individualized exercises, and educating athletes on the long-term benefits of flexibility, coaches are supporting athletes' autonomy, competence, and relatedness—the core components of SDT. Athletes are more likely to internalize the value of flexibility, engage in self-directed practice, and experience increased intrinsic motivation, which can enhance performance, adherence to training, and long-term development. Overall, the data suggest that a consistent, evidence-informed, and autonomy-supportive approach to flexibility contributes not only to immediate performance gains but also to sustainable athletic growth and well-being.

Table 12 Coaches' Perceived Level of Athletes' Strength Performance

Performance Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Motivate my athletes to consistently improve their strength.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1.5
2. Design strength training programs that effectively increase power.	3.650	0.587	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9.5
3. Provide clear and effective instructions for proper strength training techniques.	3.750	0.550	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1.5
4. Push my athletes to regularly challenge their strength limits.	3.600	0.503	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
5. Emphasize an approach to strength training that has significantly improved performance.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9.5
6. Emphasize the importance of strength	3.750	0.550	Strongly	1.5

training for overall athletic success.			agree/Highly Manifested	
7. Organize strength exercises in a well-structured and efficient manner.	3.550	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	15.5
8. Give feedback during strength training sessions to help athletes lift more effectively.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
9. Regularly evaluate strength progress and adjust training programs accordingly.	3.550	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	15.5
10. Guide and help my athletes feel stronger and more confident in their physical abilities.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5.5
11. Integrate strength training with other aspects of the overall fitness program.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9.5
12. Set challenging yet attainable strength training goals for my athletes.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	9.5
13. Help athletes understand the role of strength in enhancing sport-specific skills.	3.700	0.571	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	5.5
14. Incorporate a focus on both explosive power and endurance in strength training.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
15. Give personalized recommendations to address specific strength weaknesses.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1.5
Overall Mean	3.660	0.417	Highly Manifested	

Legend: Significant at the 0.05 level of significance

Table 12 presents the coaches' assessment of their athletes' performance in terms of strength, evaluated across fifteen performance indicators. The computed overall weighted mean of 3.66, with a standard deviation of 0.417, is interpreted as "Highly Manifested," indicating that coaches perceive their athletes as consistently demonstrating well-developed strength. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a high level of agreement among coaches, reflecting consistent evaluation practices and a shared recognition of strength as a critical component of athletic performance.

All fifteen indicators were rated as "Highly Manifested," with the highest-rated items—such as motivating athletes to improve strength, providing clear instructions for proper techniques, emphasizing the importance of strength for overall athletic success, and giving personalized recommendations—receiving means of 3.75 and low standard deviations (0.444–0.550). This consensus demonstrates that coaches not only prioritize strength development but also actively engage in motivational and instructional strategies that support individualized athlete growth. Other items, including guiding athletes to feel stronger and more confident ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 0.470$) and helping athletes understand the role of strength in sport-specific skills ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 0.571$), underscore coaches' recognition of the psychological as well as physical benefits of strength training. Additionally, items addressing the regular evaluation of progress and integration of strength training with other fitness components ($M = 3.55$ – 3.65 , $SD = 0.489$ – 0.605) suggest that coaches adopt a holistic, responsive approach to athlete development.

These results imply that coaches consistently apply structured strength-training practices that foster both competence and confidence among athletes, aligning with the principles of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which emphasizes the importance of satisfying athletes' basic psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness. By providing clear guidance, personalized feedback, and opportunities for mastery, coaches support intrinsic motivation, which is crucial for sustained engagement and performance improvement. Comparatively, these findings are consistent with contemporary sport science research. Cormie, McGuigan, and Newton (2023) highlight that well-structured strength programs enhance force production and movement efficiency, while Lesinski et al. (2023) demonstrate that individualized goal-setting, monitoring, and feedback contribute to consistent strength gains—supporting the uniform “Highly Manifested” ratings observed in this study. Similarly, Cross et al. (2022) report that integrating strength training with sport-specific skill development and regular assessment enhances performance, reflecting the coaches' holistic approach.

Coaching practice is clear by structured, individualized, and motivationally supportive strength training not only develops physical capacity but also nurtures athletes' psychological engagement and self-efficacy. By systematically applying these strategies, coaches create an environment that supports athlete autonomy, competence, and intrinsic motivation, thereby fostering sustained performance improvement and overall athletic development in line with SDT principles.

Table 13 Coaches' Perceived Level of Athletes' Speed Performance

Performance Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Motivate my athletes to work on increasing their speed.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
2. Design speed drills that effectively improve quickness.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1.5
3. Provide clear instructions on techniques to improve speed.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
4. Encourage my athletes to focus on speed as a key component of their training.	3.600	0.503	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
5. Give feedback that helps refine speed training and improve performance.	3.600	0.598	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	13.5
6. Incorporate specific drills aimed at enhancing speed into training sessions.	3.650	0.587	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
7. Regularly assess speed to help athletes track their progress.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
8. Emphasis on speed has led to noticeable improvements in athletic performance.	3.550	0.605	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
9. Provide speed-focused exercises that are varied and effective.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
10. Guide and help my athletes feel faster and more agile during competitions.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
11. Integrate speed training effectively into the overall fitness program.	3.650	0.489	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
12. Set clear speed goals to help athletes track their progress.	3.750	0.444	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	1.5

13. Help athletes understand how improving speed benefits their overall performance.	3.700	0.470	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	4.5
14. Provide strategies to overcome plateaus in speed development.	3.650	0.587	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	8.5
15. Give timely and constructive feedback on how to enhance speed.	3.550	0.759	Strongly agree/Highly Manifested	14.5
Overall Mean	3.650	0.449	Highly Manifested	

Legend: 3.51-4.00 strongly agree/highly manifested ; 2.51-3.50 agree/manifested; 1.51-2.50; disagree/partially manifested; 1.00-1.50 strongly disagree/not manifested

Table 13 presents coaches' perceptions of their athletes' performance in terms of speed, assessed across fifteen indicators. The results reveal an overall weighted mean of 3.65 with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.449, interpreted as "Highly Manifested." This indicates that coaches consistently recognize speed as a crucial component of athletic performance and actively observe its development across training contexts. The relatively low SD reflects strong agreement among coaches regarding the consistent emphasis and implementation of speed-oriented training strategies.

All fifteen indicators fell within the "Highly Manifested" range, demonstrating that coaches prioritize speed development and integrate it systematically within conditioning programs. Specifically, the highest-rated indicators—"Design speed drills that effectively improve quickness" and "Set clear speed goals to help athletes track their progress"—both with a mean of 3.75 and SD of 0.444, suggest that coaches not only emphasize practical skill development but also establish measurable, goal-oriented approaches to monitor progress. Additionally, items such as "Motivate my athletes to work on increasing their speed" and "Help athletes understand how improving speed benefits their overall performance," with a mean of 3.70 and SD of 0.470, reflect that coaches support athletes' psychological and cognitive understanding of speed development, which aligns with the SDT principle of fostering autonomy and competence by helping athletes recognize the value of their efforts.

While the overall findings are highly positive, some variability exists. For instance, "Give timely and constructive feedback on how to enhance speed" received a slightly lower mean of 3.55 with the highest SD of 0.759, suggesting that although feedback is recognized as important, its application may vary across coaches. Similarly, "Emphasis on speed has led to noticeable improvements in athletic performance" also scored a mean of 3.55 with an SD of 0.605, indicating that differences in sport-specific contexts or athlete responsiveness may influence observed outcomes.

In comparison with previous studies, these findings are consistent with research on elite sprint coaches, which emphasizes structured speed drills, clear goal setting, and systematic performance monitoring as essential components of effective training (Agudo-Ortega et al., 2024). Likewise, Yang et al. (2024) highlight that the combination of targeted drills, timely feedback, and integration of speed training within broader athletic programs significantly enhances performance outcomes. The slight variability in feedback practices observed in the current study aligns with prior evidence suggesting that contextual factors, such as coaching experience, athlete readiness, or sport specialization, may affect the consistency of implementation. Overall, the study supports and reinforces existing literature, demonstrating that deliberate and systematic coaching approaches positively influence speed development.

Coaches who design structured, goal-oriented speed training, provide feedback, and emphasize the relevance of speed to overall performance foster both the competence and autonomy of athletes, key elements of SDT. By understanding the importance of speed and being actively involved in their own improvement, athletes are more likely to experience intrinsic motivation, engagement, and sustained effort, ultimately enhancing performance outcomes. For coaching practice, these findings suggest that consistent application of speed-focused strategies, coupled with educational and motivational support, can optimize athlete development and align with evidence-based, theoretically grounded approaches to sports performance.

Table 14. Coaches' Coaching Behavior Styles as Predictors of Athletes' Overall Performance
Linear Regression

Model Summary - OVERALL

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	RMSE
M ₀	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.382
M ₁	0.939	0.881	0.850	0.148

Note. M₁ includes DOMINANCE, INFLUENCE, STEADINESS, CONSCIENTIOUS

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
M ₁	Regression	2.446	4	0.612	27.886	< .001
	Residual	0.329	15	0.022		
	Total	2.775	19			

Note. M₁ includes DOMINANCE, INFLUENCE, STEADINESS, CONSCIENTIOUS

Note. The intercept model is omitted, as no meaningful information can be shown.

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
M ₀	(Intercept)	3.673	0.085		42.984	< .001
M ₁	(Intercept)	0.347	0.461		0.754	0.463
	DOMINANCE	-0.124	0.160	-0.110	-0.776	0.450
	INFLUENCE	-0.023	0.312	-0.018	-0.074	0.942
	STEADINESS	0.360	0.281	0.328	1.280	0.220
	CONSCIENTIOUS	0.696	0.192	0.740	3.624	0.002

Table 14 presents the regression analysis examining whether the four DISC coaching behavioral styles—Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness—significantly predict the overall performance of athletes. The combined results from the Model Summary, ANOVA, and Coefficients tables indicate that the DISC model has a strong predictive capacity, with Conscientiousness emerging as the dominant behavioral predictor. The comparison between the baseline model (M₀) and the full model (M₁) demonstrates a substantial improvement in explanatory power once the four coaching behaviors are included.

Specifically, while M_0 accounts for none of the variance in athlete performance ($R^2 = 0.000$), M_1 explains 88.1% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.881$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.850$), with a marked decrease in RMSE from 0.382 to 0.148, indicating significantly enhanced prediction accuracy. This implies that coaches who exhibit conscientious behaviors—characterized by organization, structured planning, and consistent feedback—play a crucial role in optimizing athlete performance, as athletes likely benefit from the clarity, guidance, and measurable goals provided by such coaching.

Closer examination of the coefficients reveals that Conscientiousness is the only significant positive predictor ($\beta = 0.740$, $p = .002$), suggesting that structured and systematic coaching promotes athlete competence, confidence, and readiness—key components of performance as aligned with Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which emphasizes the fulfillment of competence, autonomy, and relatedness needs. Steadiness shows a positive but non-significant effect, indicating that calm and patient coaching may support a supportive environment but does not directly drive performance outcomes in this context. In contrast, Dominance and Influence exhibit negative, non-significant effects, implying that assertive or highly expressive coaching styles may not enhance performance and could, in some cases, limit athlete autonomy, corroborating studies that caution against overly controlling or motivationally forceful coaching approaches (Côté et al., 2022; Bartholomew et al., 2022).

Compared to previous studies, these findings align with recent evidence emphasizing that structured, feedback-oriented, and relationally supportive coaching practices are critical for athlete development and competitive success (Langan et al., 2022; Rodrigues et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024). The results highlight the importance of promoting athlete autonomy, competence, and intrinsic motivation through conscientious coaching, reinforcing SDT principles in practice. For coaching practice, this implies that coaches should prioritize organized planning, clear communication of expectations, consistent monitoring of progress, and precise feedback to cultivate high performance while supporting athlete psychological needs. Overall, the findings underscore that systematic and conscientious coaching behaviors are the most effective in fostering optimal athletic performance, offering practical guidance for developing training programs that align with both performance goals and athlete well-being.

Table 15. Athletes' Perceived Coaching Behavior Styles as Predictors of Their Overall Performance

Linear Regression

Model Summary - Overall Performance

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	RMSE
M_0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.426
M_1	0.905	0.819	0.812	0.185

Model Summary - Overall Performance

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	RMSE
-------	---	----------------	-------------------------	------

Note. M₁ includes Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, Conscientious

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
M ₁	Regression	15.426	4	3.856	113.245	< .001
	Residual	3.405	100	0.034		
	Total	18.831	104			

Note. M₁ includes Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, Conscientious

Note. The intercept model is omitted, as no meaningful information can be shown.

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p
M ₀	(Intercept)	3.639	0.042		87.620	< .001
M ₁	(Intercept)	0.210	0.167		1.257	0.212
	Dominance	0.168	0.070	0.168	2.403	0.018
	Influence	0.219	0.077	0.238	2.838	0.006
	Steadiness	0.043	0.099	0.047	0.429	0.669
	Conscientious	0.523	0.096	0.520	5.443	< .001

Table 15 presents the results of the regression analysis, indicating that when the four coaching behavioral-style dimensions Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness were entered simultaneously, the overall model (M₁) significantly predicted athletes' overall performance. With an R² of .819 (adjusted R² = .812) and a notably reduced RMSE of 0.185, the model explains approximately 82% of the variance in performance, suggesting that coaching behaviors collectively account for the majority of differences in athlete outcomes. The ANOVA further confirmed the robustness of the model (F = 113.245, p < .001), indicating that the combination of behavioral dimensions significantly improves predictive accuracy beyond chance.

Analysis of the individual coefficients revealed that three of the four dimensions had significant positive relationships with athlete performance: Dominance ($\beta = .168$, p = .018), Influence ($\beta = .238$, p = .006), and Conscientiousness ($\beta = .520$, p < .001), while Steadiness did not reach significance ($\beta = .047$, p = .669). This pattern suggests that athletes perform better when coaches exhibit directive and assertive behaviors (Dominance), provide motivational and relationship-oriented support (Influence), and maintain structured,

organized, and detail-oriented approaches (Conscientiousness). The particularly strong effect of Conscientiousness underscores the importance of systematic and goal-focused coaching, whereas the significant roles of Dominance and Influence highlight the value of combining clear authority with interpersonal motivation. The non-significance of Steadiness may indicate that, in the context of varsity sports performance, consistent and supportive behavior alone is insufficient to strongly drive measurable outcomes without concurrent goal orientation or motivational engagement.

When compared with previous studies, these findings are largely consistent with contemporary research. For instance, a large-scale study in China demonstrated that leadership behaviors encompassing instruction, structured training, social support, and positive feedback were positively associated with athlete performance, partially mediated by coach–athlete relationship quality and reduced psychological fatigue. Similarly, a 2023 longitudinal study on youth team-sport athletes found that supportive interpersonal coaching enhanced resilience, which in turn predicted higher individual and team performance. Moreover, 2025 research based on the “3Cs theory” suggests that trustful, supportive coach–athlete relationships improve team outcomes through emotional intelligence and athlete engagement, highlighting the pivotal role of coaching behaviors in fostering both performance and engagement.

These results carry meaningful implications for coaching practice and athlete development. Coaches who balance directive authority with motivational engagement and structured guidance can foster environments that promote competence, autonomy, and relatedness—the core tenets of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). By satisfying these basic psychological needs, athletes are more likely to experience intrinsic motivation, heightened engagement, and improved overall performance. Consequently, the findings support the integration of structured, motivational, and assertive coaching strategies to optimize athlete outcomes while maintaining alignment with SDT principles, emphasizing that effective coaching extends beyond physical training to encompass psychological support and interpersonal influence.

4. Conclusion

Based on the findings, several conclusions were drawn. The demographic profile revealed that most coach respondents were male and possessed coaching experience ranging from one to twenty years. Athlete respondents were predominantly from team sports and included both male and female participants. This diversity provided a solid foundation for understanding the coaching dynamics and athletic environments represented in the study.

The results showed that three DISC coaching behavioral styles—Dominance, Influence, and Steadiness—were perceived as Highly Manifested by both coaches and athletes. This indicates that these behavioral tendencies are consistently present in the

training environment. However, significant differences in perception emerged between the two groups, suggesting that coaches and athletes do not view these behaviors in the same way. Conscientiousness, while still evident, was identified as the least manifested behavioral style. This finding implies that greater emphasis on structure, clarity, systematic instruction, and individualized autonomy may be necessary to better align coaching practices with athlete expectations. The tendency of coaches to rate themselves higher across all DISC dimensions further highlights the presence of a perceptual gap that may influence communication and effectiveness.

Regarding physical performance, agility, flexibility, strength, and speed were all perceived as Highly Manifested by both coaches and athletes. This suggests that essential components of athletic conditioning are regularly integrated into training. Nevertheless, significant perceptual differences again emerged, indicating that although these areas are emphasized, athletes may not fully recognize the level of intensity, structure, or individualization that coaches believe they are applying. This discrepancy underscores the need for clearer communication and more transparent performance-tracking practices.

The study confirmed that DISC coaching behavioral styles significantly contribute to athletes' overall performance. However, the consistent perception gaps between coaches and athletes emphasize the importance of improving communication strategies, enhancing feedback mechanisms, and strengthening collaborative goal-setting. Addressing these areas can lead to more synchronized expectations, more efficient training execution, and more meaningful coach-athlete relationships.

Finally, the study demonstrated a clear link between three key coaching behaviors Dominance, Influence, and Conscientiousness and athletes' perceived performance. Conscientiousness emerged as the strongest predictor of performance, highlighting the crucial role of organization, strategic planning, discipline, and attention to detail in effective coaching. In contrast, Steadiness, although valued, did not independently predict performance outcomes. This suggests that while consistency and emotional stability are beneficial, they may not directly translate to improved performance without stronger directive, motivational, and structured coaching elements.

In conclusion, the findings underscore the need for coaches to strengthen conscientious behaviors while balancing assertive and motivational approaches. Coach development programs should prioritize enhancing these skills to ensure holistic, evidence-based, and performance-oriented coaching practices. Future research should explore how these behavioral styles interact across competitive conditions, sport types, and time frames to deepen understanding and further refine coaching interventions that elevate athlete performance.

5. Recommendation

In light of the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen coaching practices and enhance athlete performance: First, because the study revealed significant perceptual gaps between coaches and athletes across DISC behavioral styles and physical performance variables, it is recommended that the athletic department implement regular communication- and feedback-focused programs. These may include structured one-on-one consultations, periodic performance reviews, and reflective sessions to ensure that coaching intentions and athlete perceptions become more closely aligned.

Second, given that Dominance, Influence, and Steadiness were highly manifested while Conscientiousness was the least evident among the DISC dimensions, sports program coordinators should conduct capacity-building workshops on the DISC framework. These sessions will help coaches recognize their dominant behavioral tendencies, strengthen underutilized styles particularly conscientiousness and make evidence-based adjustments that respond to athlete needs. Practical strategies such as explicit goal-setting, rationalizing training plans, and involving athletes in planning and evaluation should be emphasized to reinforce structured and detail-oriented coaching.

Third, since both coaches and athletes perceived agility, flexibility, strength, and speed as highly manifested yet differed in their evaluation of training structure and intensity, it is recommended that coaches provide clearer explanations of training objectives and demonstrate how each performance component contributes to overall athletic development. Strength and conditioning coaches should also ensure that program goals are communicated transparently to prevent misunderstandings and improve athlete engagement.

Fourth, considering that coaching behaviors significantly influence athlete performance, it is strongly advised to integrate mental performance professionals, such as sports psychologists, into the athletic program. Their involvement can help enhance athletes' motivation, confidence, and emotional regulation while supporting coaches in developing healthier and more effective coach-athlete relationships.

Finally, since the study affirmed the value of DISC coaching behaviors but also highlighted context-specific gaps, future researchers are encouraged to replicate the study across multiple institutions, competitive levels, and sporting disciplines. Incorporating qualitative methods such as interviews, focus groups, or field observations may yield deeper insights into how coaching behaviors shape athlete development, perceptions, and performance over time.

6. References

Amorose, A. J., & Anderson-Butcher, D. (2007). Autonomy-supportive coaching and self-determined motivation in high school and college athletes: A test of self-determination theory. *Psychology of*

Sport and Exercise, 8(5), 654-670.

Anderson, L., & Morris, T. (2018). Coaching strategies for enhancing team dynamics and performance.

Journal of Effective Coaching, 11(2), 34-46.

Athlete Assessments (2024) - "Research Findings: The Use of DISC Behavioral Profiling in

Balague, G. (1999). Understanding identity, value, and meaning when providing coaching. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13(3), 230-242.

Barker, D., & Associates. (2021). *The role of dominant and influential coaching on athlete motivation*.

Journal of Sports Psychology. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1521025119869849>

Barker, D., Mellalieu, S., & McCarthy, P. (2021). Integrating dominance and influence in coaching to enhance athlete performance. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 43(2), 125-140.

Beam, J., Wilson, W., & Chen, S. (2020). Situational leadership and its effectiveness in rising athletic performance. *Journal of Leadership in Sports*, 34(2), 112-128.

Beedu, G. (2021) - "A Study on the Effectiveness of DISC Personality Test." URL:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333807123_A_Study_on_the_Effectiveness_of_DISC_Personality_Test

Black, S. J., & Weiss, M. R. (1992). The relationship among perceived coaching behaviors, perceptions of ability, and motivation in competitive age-group swimmers. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 14(3), 309-325.

Boardman, N. et al. (2024) - "Towards a Critical Consideration of the Effects of Coaching Practice on

Athletic Retirement: A Poststructuralist Perspective." URL: [Towards a Critical Consideration of the Effects of Coaching Practice on Athletic Retirement](#)

Bozer, G., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2021). The effects of pre-coaching motivational factors on athlete engagement. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 33(1), 62-78.

Bozer, G., Sarros, J., & Santora, J. C. (2021). *Exploring the impact of leadership styles on the motivation factors of athletes*. Human Resource Development Quarterly.

Brinton, C. S., Hill, B. J., & Ward, P. J. (Spring, 2017). Authoritative coach: Building youth through sport.

Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 35(1), p. 51- 65.

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/2006817230?pq-origsite=gscholar>

Carter, A., & Rethman, N. (2021). Enhancing team communication and strategy in sports through behavioral assessments. *Journal of Sports Management*, 35(4), 300-318.

Cayubit, R., Reyes, M, Lagundino, M. & Cleofe, M. (2018). Psychological resilience and depressive symptoms: their relationship among selected Filipino collegiate athletes. Retrieved from:

<http://surl.li/bxrbv>

- Chia, S., & Wu, L. (2015). *Consistency of leadership behavior in sports coaching: Effects on team performance*. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01123/full>
- Christy, S. (2023) - "DiSC Assessment Impact on Communication and Understanding of Self and Team." Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. URL:
<https://theses.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-05252023-123456/>
- Concordia, M (2022). Coaches' Sense of Efficacy in Sports Competitiveness. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences* 2022; www.european-science.com Vol.11, No2 pp. 276-287, ISSN 1805-3602 DOI:10.1177/1747954116676117
- Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations. (2021). Emotional intelligence as a predictor of coaching effectiveness. Retrieved from <https://www.eiconsortium.org/>
- Côté, J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4(3), 307-323.
- Davis, L., & Carter, A. (2021). Exploring the relationship between coaching leadership styles and athlete motivation. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 16(1), 123-134.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1747954120986774>
- Forward Pathway (2024) - "Coaching Philosophies and Athlete Development in Team Sports." URL:
 Coaching Philosophies and Athlete Development in Team Sports
- Gill, L. J., & Williams, L. (2017). Combining authoritative and participative coaching styles to enhance athlete engagement and performance. *Journal of Sports Psychology*, 29(4), 512-526.
- Gould, D., & Carson, S. (2008). Life skills development through sport: Current status and future directions. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1(1), 58-78.
- Gould, D., & Maynard, I. (2009). Psychological preparation for the Olympic Games. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27(13), 1393-1408.
- Grant, M., & Franklin, A. (2020). Strategic insights in sports coaching through DISC profiling. *Sports Leadership Review*, 17(2), 22-35.
- Green, S., & Dorsch, K. (2019). Communication and coach-athlete relationships: Contextual considerations for enhancing performance. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 10(2), 123-131.
- Greene, T., & Hill, A. (2020). Motivational impacts of coaching styles on athlete readiness. *Sports Psychology International*, 31(1), 89-104.
- Hanrahan, S. J., & Biddle, S. (2002). Cultural and gender differences in the implications of competition for

- early adolescent friendship. *Motivation and Emotion*, 26(4), 272-289.
- Harwood, C., & Knight, C. (2015). Stress in youth sports: A developmental investigation of tennis parents. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 16, 170-179.
- Horn, T. (2008). Coaching effectiveness in the sport domain. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22(2), 309-322.
- How coaches can impact athlete focus. Northcentral University. (2018, February 7).
<https://www.ncu.edu/blog/how-coaches-can-impact-athlete-focus#gref>. Jones, K. (n.d.). Coaching styles and its effect on team performance. Digital Commons @Brockport.
https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_synthesis/120/.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413200.2019.1668493>
- Hughes, M., & Lee, S. (2018). Building trust between coaches and athletes: Strategies for strengthening sport teams. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 30(3), 432-446.
- IJNRD (2024) - "Impact of Coaching on Athlete's Behavioral Development and Team Success." URL: Impact of Coaching on Athlete's Behavioral Development and Team Success
- International Journal of Sports Science. (2023). The role of learning-oriented coaching environments in athlete development. Retrieved from <https://www.ijss-journal.com/>
- Johnson, M., & Thompson, B. (2019). Conscientiousness and its impact on developing athlete performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 31(4), 437-455.
- Jones, K. (2020) - "Coaching Styles and its Effect on Team Performance." URL:
<https://soar.suny.edu/handle/20.500.12648/3947>
- Jones, K. (2020). *Balancing dominant and influential coaching strategies for improved athlete discipline and motivation*. Sports Training Review. <https://soar.suny.edu/handle/20.500.12648/3947>
- Jones, K. (2020). Continuous education and adaptability in coaching. *Sports Education Journal*.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hrdq.21462>
- Journal of Sport Behavior. (2022). The impact of communication on athlete motivation and performance. Retrieved from <https://www.jsbonline.org/>
- Jowett, S., & Cockerill, I. M. (2003). Olympic medallists' perspective of the athlete-coach relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 4(4), 313-331.
- Jowett, S., & Ntoumanis, N. (2004). The Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q): Development and initial validation. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 14(4), 245-257.
- Kassiana, N (2022) What is Purposive Sampling? Definition & Examples. Published on 12 August 2022
 Revised on 10 October 2022.
- Knight, C. J., & Harwood, C. G. (2009). Understanding gender differences in coach-athlete relationships:

- Implications for coaching. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 1(2), 62-74.
- Kocak CV. (2020) Athlete self-efficacy scale: Development and psychometric properties. *Balt J Health Phys Act.* 2020;12(4):41-54. doi: 10.29359/BJHPA.2020.Suppl.1.05
- Kramer, T., & Erickson, K. (2021). The role of feedback in athletic coaching: Practices and perspectives. *Sports Coaching Review*, 9(1), 76-92.
- Kwon, S. H., Choi, J. S., and Shin, J. T. (2018). Exploring the top figure skater's psychological strengths reflected on the pathway to the Olympics. *Korean J. Sports Sci.* 29, 203–221. doi: 10.24985/kjss.2018.29.1.203
- Lane, A. M., Thelwell, R. C., Lowther, J., & Devonport, T. J. (2010). Emotional intelligence and psychological skills use among athletes. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 38(5), 697-703.
- Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: A framework for coaches' behaviour*. Routledge.
- Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 21(11), 883-904.
- Marcone, R. (2017). *Democratic vs. autocratic coaching: Implications for athlete psychology*. Trine University Sports Journal. <https://www.trine.edu/news/2017/coaching-styles.aspx>
- Martin, D., & Bal, V. (2012). The effectiveness of DISC profiling in executive coaching. *Journal of Behavioral Coaching*, 29(3), 123-133.
- Martin, D., Simmons, E., & Paull, G. (2021). The impact of coach conscientiousness on athlete engagement. *Journal of Sports Behavior*, 44(3), 330-345.
- Masen, E., & Others. (2022). Integration of coaching behaviors and athlete performance. *International Journal of Sports Psychology*.
- Mertens, N., Boen, F., Vande Broek, G., Vansteenkiste, M., & Fransen, K. (2018). An experiment on the impact of coaches' and athlete leaders' competence support on athletes' motivation and performance. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 28(12), 2734–2750. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13273>
- Mitchell, T. O., & Newall, P. S. (2018). Coaching adaptability: A necessity for the development of high-performance athletes. *Sports Coaching Review*, 7(1), 1-19.
- Outlaw, J., & Toriello, P. (2014). Adaptive coaching behaviors and athlete outcomes. *Journal of Coaching Dynamics*. Retrieved from <https://joc.org/issues/adaptive-coaching-behaviors>
- Owen, J. et al. (2020) - "Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness (DISC) Assessment Tool." In: Zeigler-Hill, V., Shackelford, T.K. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*.

- Springer, Cham. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24612-3_25
- Patel, D., & Jackson, S. (2019). Adaptability in coaching: Adjusting styles to athlete needs for peak performance. *The Sport Psychologist*, 33(2), 142-151.
- Pritha Bhandari (2023). What Is Quantitative Research? | Definition, Uses & Methods Published on June 12, 2020 by Pritha Bhandari. Revised on June 22, 2023.
- Rocchi, M., & Pelletier, L. (2018). How does coaches reported interpersonal behavior align with athletes' perceptions? Consequences for female athletes' psychological needs in sport. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 7(2), 141-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spy0000116>
- Rosario, M. (2023) - "Perception of Athletes in the Coaching Behavior and Leadership Style of Metro Manila Coaches." URL: <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/perception-of-athletes-in-the-coaching-behavior-and-leadership-style-of-metro-manila-coaches/>
- Rostamzadeh, F., & Zehsaz, F. (2020). Investigation of the relationship between PGC-1 α gene polymorphism and athletic performance in non-athlete boys. *Koomesh Journal*, 22(3), 492-496. <https://doi.org/10.29252/koomesh.22.3.492>
- Ryba, T. V., & Wright, H. K. (2005). From mental game to cultural praxis: A cultural studies model's implications for the future of sport psychology. *Quest*, 57(1), 192-212.
- Schinke, R. J., et al. (2008). Adaptation processes affecting performance in elite sport. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, 2(3), 233-245.
- Shona McCombes. (2022). Descriptive Research Design | Definition, Methods & Examples Published on 5 May 2022 by Shona McCombes. Revised on 10 October 2022.
- Simmons, R., & Paull, G. (2018). Grit and self-control in sports teams: The role of conscientiousness. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(1), 160-178.
- Sivrikaya, H. (2019). The Role of Self-efficacy on Performance of Sports Skills of Football Players. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(12), 79-75. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i12a.3952>
- Smith, J., & Smoll, F. (2019). The impact of psychological safety on athlete performance in competitive environments. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 31(4), 378-394.
- Smith, M., & Smoll, F. (2017). Feedback orientation in coaching: Impacts on athlete development. *Sports Psychology Today*, 12(1), 45-59.
- Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (1990). Self-esteem and children's reactions to youth sport coaching behaviors: A field study of self-enhancement processes. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(6), 987-993.
- Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Curtis, B. (1977). Coaching behaviors in Little League baseball. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 48(4), 590-604.

- Soar, P. (2022). *Comparative effects of different coaching methods on athlete motivation and performance*. Sports Performance Journal. <https://soar.suny.edu/impact-of-coaching-styles>
- Solomon, G. B., & Bump, L. A. (1989). The role of the coach in influencing athlete motivation. *Coaching Review*, 1(1), 23-27.
- Sport." URL: <https://www.athleteassessments.com/research-findings-the-use-of-disc-behavioral-profiling-in-sport>
- Sullivan, P., & Strode, J.P. (2019). Anxiety management in athletic performance: The role of structured coaching environments. *Journal of Anxiety and Performance*, 13(2), 112-126.
- Thompson, B., & Roberts, S. (2020). The role of data analytics in sports performance insights. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 16(4), 275-287.
- Thompson, H., & Worrall, L. (2019). The psychological impacts of mismatched coaching styles and athlete expectations. *Athlete Development Studies*, 7(1), 98-112.
- Weinberg, R., & Gould, D. (2015). Foundations of sport and exercise psychology. Human Kinetics.
- Weiss, M. R., & Fretwell, S. D. (2005). The parent-coach/child-athlete relationship in youth sport: Cordial, contentious, or conundrum? *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 76(3), 286-305.
- Welty Peachy, J., & Others. (2015). Enhancing psychological resilience through conscientious coaching behaviors. *Journal of Sports Science*.
- Wrisberg, C. A., & Anshel, M. H. (2009). Coping with sports challenges: An examination of the current state of the literature and a framework for future research. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21(4), 491-509.
- Yenen, E. et al. (2023) - "Exploring Leadership Behaviors of the Coaches of Champion Teams." URL: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1091703/full>
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Reliability and validity of self-efficacy for learning form (SELF) scores of college students. *Journal of Psychology*, 215(3), 157-163.