



## PERCEPTION OF THE BEHAVIORS OF THE COACHES OF FOOTBALL, VOLLEYBALL AND BASKETBALL PLAYERS

Bünyamin Çayırtepe<sup>1</sup>, Semra Çetin<sup>2</sup>,  
H. Nedim Çetin<sup>2</sup>, Murat Şen<sup>2i</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sakarya University,  
Institute of Social Sciences, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Sakarya University,  
Faculty of Sport Sciences, Turkey

### Abstract:

The aim of this study is to investigate the perception of the amateur football, volleyball, and basketball players and their coaches' behaviour towards them. 100 amateur football, 60 volleyball and 62 basketball players that filled recognition survey fully are included to the study. Turkish version of Coach Behavior Rating Scale was used. One Way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) and LSD (Least Significant Difference) tests were used for statically processing. There is no significant difference found in evaluation of coach behavior of football, volleyball, and basketball players in terms of personal rapport from subscales ( $p>0.05$ ). A significant difference has been revealed in the sum of scale in physical training and goal setting at  $p<0.05$  level and technical skills, mental preparation, competition strategies, negative personal rapport, and scale total score behavior of coach at  $p<0.001$  level. There were differences according to branches. Technical skills and competition strategies have been found in volleyball more high from amateur football and basketball players. Negative personal rapport has been found in amateur footballers lower from volleyball and basketball players. Differences have been found in detection levels of amateur footballers, volleyball, and basketball players for coaches' behaviour against them. A very useful outcome would be for a coach to produce a "Personal Improvement Behaviors" and set goals for the next of behaviours. According to branches, the reasons of differences in detection levels of coaches' behaviors should be determined and eliminated.

**Keywords:** football, volleyball, basketball, detection, behavior

---

<sup>1</sup> Correspondence: email [scetin@sakarya.edu.tr](mailto:scetin@sakarya.edu.tr)

## 1. Introduction

The complexity of high-performance coaching necessitates ongoing cycles of planning, monitoring, implementing, and reviewing to respond to the dynamic characteristics of coaching (Bowes and Jones, 2006). Hence, assessing their work should be done using a multi-dimensional behavioral framework to better reflect their performance. Unfortunately, despite these difficult and complex challenges in high performance coaching, evaluation of sports coaches' effectiveness is mainly focused on performance outcomes such as win-loss records (Mallett and Côté, 2006; Koh et al., 2009). Yardley et al. (1999) have developed the Coach Behaviors Scale for Sport (CBS-S) as a tool for measuring the quality of high-performance coaches' behaviors. CBS-S aims to collect quantitative data on coaches' behaviors, providing feedback to them and guiding their personal development. It has been used in countries like Canada, the USA, Turkey and Australia and found to be useful (Mallett and Côté, 2006). Jowett and Poczwardowski (2007) hold that the most important factor in successful coaching is the need for coaches to be able to develop effective relationships with their athletes, and that this includes thoughtful and respectful communication about issues related to sport and life. Thus, it is critical for athlete's positive participation in sports to have a valid and reliable instrument for the assessment of a coach's ability in developing athletes' critical outcomes (e.g., competence, confidence).

The competitive nature of sport is extremely intense in that there is a constant focus on the performance outcome. It is therefore not surprising that the role of the coach can be critical in influencing athletes' achievement goals. The behavior patterns and beliefs exhibited by coaches can influence the competitive sporting environment and have direct impact on the achievement goals of athletes (Perlus, 2003). The Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S) is designed to evaluate coaches' involvement in developing athletes, taking into considerations the complex training and competition environment. The CBS-S measures seven dimensions of a coach's consistent involvement with the athletes in the complex training and competition coaching environments. They are Physical Training and Planning (the coach's involvement in the athlete's physical training and conditioning for training and competition), Technical Skills (the coach's provisions of feedback, demonstration, and cues), Goal Setting (the coach's involvement in identifying, developing, and monitoring the athlete's goals), Mental Preparation (the coach's involvement in providing the athlete with advice on how to perform well under pressure), Competition Strategies (the coach's constructive interaction with the athlete in competition), Personal Rapport (the coach's approachability, availability, and understanding of the athlete), and negative personal rapport (the coach's use of negative techniques such as fear and yelling for coaching), (Koh et al,2014). Therefore, the work demands for high-performance coaches are significant (Lyle, 2002).

Purpose of this study is to investigate the perception of the amateur football, volleyball, and basketball players and their coaches' behavior towards them.

## 2. Material and Method

### 2.1 Participants

100 amateur football, 60 Volleyball, and 62 basketball player that filled recognition survey fully are included to the study. Athletes were from high-level clubs in Marmara region. Participants voluntarily participated in the survey. All athletes were contacted and given information about the purpose of the study and ethical information.

### 2.2 Coach Behavior Rating Scale

Turkish version of Coach Behavior Rating Scale (CBS-S) is used (Yapar and Ince, 2014). CBS-S includes 47 items and 7 sub-dimensions. Each item is rated in 7 point Likert type scale. The Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S) is an instrument that assesses coaching behaviors from athletes' perspectives. The current version of the CBS-S consists of 47 items, 2 measuring seven dimensions of coaching behaviors: Physical Training and Planning (7 items), Technical Skills (8 items), Goal Setting (6 items), Mental Preparation (5 items), Competition Strategies (7 items), Personal Rapport (6 items), and Negative Personal Rapport (8 items). Respondents were asked to rate their coach's behaviors by responding to each of the items on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (always), (Cote et al., 1999; Koh et al., 2014). Cronbach's alpha (>0.87) for all dimensions provided support for the reliability of the CBS-S.

### 2.3 Statistical analyses

The data were analyzed using SPSS (Version 21.0) producing basic descriptive statistics, rankings, means and standard deviations. One Way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) and LSD (Least Significant Difference) tests were used for statically processing. Statistical significance was set at  $p < 0.05$  and  $p < 0.001$ .

## 3. Results

Participants were 222 amateur football, volleyball, and basketball players in Table. Descriptive statistics for the CBS-S subscale and item scores are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

**Table 1:** Demographic Characteristics for Football, Volleyball, and Basketball Player

| Parameter        | Branch of Sports | n   | Mean   | SD    | F/LSD | Mean difference |
|------------------|------------------|-----|--------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Age (Years)      | Football (1)     | 100 | 22.28  | 2.23  | 1.06  | No difference   |
|                  | Volleyball(2)    | 60  | 22.10  | 1.67  |       |                 |
|                  | Basketball (3)   | 62  | 22.26  | 1.35  |       |                 |
| Body height (cm) | Football (1)     | 100 | 173.28 | 7.48  | 3.13* | 3>1,2           |
|                  | Volleyball(2)    | 60  | 172.56 | 7.41  |       |                 |
|                  | Basketball (3)   | 62  | 184.05 | 8.27  |       |                 |
| Body weight (kg) | Football (1)     | 100 | 73.72  | 17.36 | 2.15* | 1<2,3<br>2<3    |
|                  | Volleyball(2)    | 60  | 79.18  | 10.40 |       |                 |
|                  | Basketball (3)   | 62  | 83.19  | 19.24 |       |                 |

\* $p < 0.05$

**Table 2:** Descriptive statistics of the subscales of the Coaching Behavior Scale for Football, Volleyball and Basketball Player

| Dimensions                     | Branch of Sports | Median | Range | Min. | Max. | F/LSD   | Mean difference |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------|-------|------|------|---------|-----------------|
| Physical Training and Planning | Football (1)     | 28     | 40    | 11   | 49   | 7.15*   | 1<2,3           |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 35     | 31    | 15   | 49   |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 36     | 40    | 10   | 49   |         |                 |
| Technical Skills               | Football (1)     | 37     | 43    | 11   | 56   | 16.40** | 2>1,3           |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 46     | 41    | 12   | 56   |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 39     | 42    | 13   | 56   |         |                 |
| Mental Preparation             | Football (1)     | 25     | 34    | 7    | 35   | 12.78** | 2>1,3           |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 29     | 28    | 12   | 35   |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 24     | 29    | 8    | 35   |         |                 |
| Goal Setting                   | Football (1)     | 30     | 39    | 6    | 42   | 6.34*   | 2>1,3           |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 34     | 34    | 12   | 42   |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 30     | 37    | 7    | 42   |         |                 |
| Competition Strategies         | Football (1)     | 39     | 37    | 12   | 49   | 9.41**  | 2>1,3           |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 43     | 35    | 13   | 49   |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 36     | 37    | 11   | 49   |         |                 |
| Personal rapport               | Football (1)     | 34     | 31    | 13   | 42   | 2.40    | No difference   |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 36     | 33    | 10   | 42   |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 34     | 31    | 12   | 42   |         |                 |
| Negative personal rapport      | Football (1)     | 16     | 47    | 7    | 56   | 24.76** | 1<2,3<br>2<3    |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 21     | 40    | 9    | 56   |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 31     | 47    | 7    | 56   |         |                 |
| Scale total score              | Football (1)     | 298    | 209   | 176  | 382  | 61.46** | 1>2,3<br>2>3    |
|                                | Volleyball(2)    | 243    | 148   | 165  | 312  |         |                 |
|                                | Basketball (3)   | 237    | 239   | 92   | 330  |         |                 |

\*p<0.05 \*\*p<0.01

**Table 3:** Total scores of the CBSS subscales according to branches and average for each question of the CBS-S

| Dimensions                     | Branch of Sports | Sub-dimension score | Average for each question |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Physical Training and Planning | Football         | 29.11               | 4.16                      |
|                                | Volleyball       | 33.88               | 4.84                      |
|                                | Basketball       | 32.91               | 4.70                      |
| Technical Skills               | Football         | 37.53               | 4.69                      |
|                                | Volleyball       | 46.25               | 5.78                      |
|                                | Basketball       | 38.96               | 4.87                      |
| Mental Preparation             | Football         | 23.6                | 4.72                      |
|                                | Volleyball       | 27.55               | 5.51                      |
|                                | Basketball       | 23.82               | 4.76                      |
| Goal Setting                   | Football         | 29.04               | 4.84                      |
|                                | Volleyball       | 32.93               | 5.49                      |
|                                | Basketball       | 30.09               | 5.02                      |
| Competition Strategies         | Football         | 35.66               | 5.09                      |
|                                | Volleyball       | 40.77               | 5.82                      |
|                                | Basketball       | 35.04               | 5.01                      |
| Personal rapport               | Football         | 30.91               | 5.15                      |
|                                | Volleyball       | 32.68               | 4.67                      |
|                                | Basketball       | 29.85               | 4.26                      |
| Negative personal rapport      | Football         | 19.85               | 2.48                      |
|                                | Volleyball       | 24.95               | 3.12                      |
|                                | Basketball       | 31.94               | 3.99                      |
| Scale total score              | Football         | 287.92              | 6.13                      |

|  |            |        |      |
|--|------------|--------|------|
|  | Volleyball | 238.23 | 5.07 |
|  | Basketball | 221.83 | 4.72 |

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

Table 1 shows that there are 222 athletes in the amateur footballers 22.28, Volleyball 22.10, and basketball player 22.26 years age. Body height are for footballers 173.28 cm, for volleyball players 172.56 cm, and for basketball players 180.05 cm. Body weight are footballers 73.72 kg, Volleyballs 79.18 kg, and basketball player 83.19 kg. While there is a significant difference in between height and weight at  $p < 0.05$  level, there is none in age.

Imamoglu et al (2016) found no significant difference in evaluation of coach behavior of taekwondo fighters and wrestlers in terms of mental preparation from subscales, goal setting, competition strategies ( $p > 0.05$ ). Imamoglu et al (2016) found a significant difference revealed in the sum of scale in physical training and planning in terms of technical skills at  $p < 0.05$  level and negative behavior of coach at  $p < 0.001$  level. Egemen et al (2016) found no significant difference found in evaluation of coach behavior of taekwondo fighters and wrestlers in terms of mental preparation from subscales, goal setting, competition strategies ( $p > 0.05$ ). A significant difference revealed in the sum of scale in Physical Training and Planning in terms of technical skills at  $p < 0.05$  level and negative behavior of coach at  $p < 0.001$  level. İmamoğlu and Çetin (2016) in study is no significant difference found in evaluation of coach behavior of taekwondo fighters, wrestlers, and basketball player in terms of personal rapport from subscales ( $p > 0.05$ ). A significant difference revealed in the sum of scale in physical training and goal setting at  $p < 0.05$  level and technical skills, mental preparation, competition strategies, negative personal rapport, and scale total score behavior of coach at  $p < 0.001$  level. In this study is no significant difference found in evaluation of coach behavior of footballers, volleyball, and basketball player in terms of personal rapport from subscales ( $p > 0.05$ ). A significant difference revealed in the sum of scale in physical training and goal setting at  $p < 0.05$  level and technical skills, mental preparation, competition strategies, negative personal rapport, and scale total score behavior of coach at  $p < 0.001$  level (Table 2). The results are different from İmamoğlu and his friends. It is similar to Egemen and his friends.

Means of the scores ranged as follows: from 2.48 to 6.13 for means. The items with the lowest mean scores were from negative personal rapport. The lowest mean total scores were for basketball player (221.83). Highest mean total scores were for Footballers (287.92). Highest mean total Sub-dimension score were technical skills and competition strategies for footballers, Volleyball, and basketball player (Table 3). In one study, found in different levels of elite wrestlers and skiers for coaches' behaviour against them (Koca, 2017).

Koca (2017) in his study shows that the scores ranged as follows: from 3.43 to 5.67 for means. There is no significant difference found in evaluation of coach behavior of wrestlers and skiers in terms of physical training and planning, goal setting,

competition strategies, and negative personal rapport from subscales ( $p>0.05$ ). A significant difference revealed in technical skills at  $p<0.05$  level and mental preparation and personal rapport score behavior of coach at  $p<0.001$  level. There were differences according to branches. Technical skills and mental preparation, and personal rapport found in wrestlers more high from skiers. Gül et al (2015) found among 4.95-5.81 basic factors of training and competitions for wrestlers. Egemen et al (2016) found among 4.64-4.92 basic factors of training and competitions for male basketball player. İmamoğlu and Çetin (2016) study found among 4.14-5.81 basic factors of training and competitions for athletes. In this study found among 4.16-5.82 basic factors of training and competitions for athletes. Gül et al (2015) found among 3.20-3.57 negative coaching behavior for wrestlers. Egemen et al (2016) found 4.92 negative coaching behaviour for male basketball player. Egemen et al (2016) found 4.92 negative coaching behavior for male basketball player. İmamoğlu and Çetin (2016) study found among 2.47-3.98 negative coaching behavior for athletes. In this study found among 2.48-3.99 negative coaching behavior for athletes. There are several practical implications from this study. There were differences according to branches. Technical skills and competition strategies found in volleyball more high from footballers and basketball players. Negative personal rapport found in footballers lower from volleyball and basketball players.

Coach Behavior Rating Scale has been considered practically useful to provide feedback to coaches about their practice in football, volleyball and basketball player's settings. Differences found in detection levels of amateur football, volleyball, and basketball player for coaches' behavior against them. A very useful outcome would be for a coach to produce a "Personal Improvement Behaviors" and set goals for the next of Behaviors. According to branches, the reasons of differences in detection levels of coaches' behaviors should be determined and eliminated.

## References

1. Bowes, I., & Jones, R. L. (2006). Working at the edge of chaos: Understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *The sport psychologist, 20*(2), 235-245.
2. Ermiş E., İmamoğlu O. Erilli A.N., (2016). Üniversiteli Basketbolcuların Antrenörlerinin Kendilerine Karşı Davranışlarını Algılama Düzeyi, 14th International Sport Sciences Congress, Books of Abstract, 1-4 November, Belek/Antalya/ Turkey, p.608.
3. Gül, M., Türkmen, M., & Ağaoğlu, S. A. (2015). The Analysis of Wrestling Coaches' Behavior towards Their Athletes in Turkey. *International Journal of Wrestling Science, 5*(2), 75-78.
4. İmamoğlu, O., & Cetin, H. N. (2016). Perception of the Behaviors of the Coaches Of Elite Taekwondo Fighter, Wrestlers, And Basketball Player Against To Them. *International Journal of Academic Research, 8*.

5. Jowett, S., & Poczwardowski, A. (2007). Understanding the Coach-Athlete Relationship. In S. Jowett & D. Lavallee (Eds.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 3–14). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
6. Koca F. (2017). "Perception of the behaviors of the coaches of elite wrestler and skiers against to them", *Journal of Education and Sociology*, 8(1), 3-5.
7. Koh, K. T., Kawabata, M., & Mallett, C. J. (2014). The coaching behavior scale for sport: Factor structure examination for Singaporean youth athletes. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 9(6), 1311-1324.
8. Koh, K. T., Mallett, C., & Wang, C. J. (2009). Examining the ecological validity of the coaching behavior scale (sports) for basketball. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4(2), 261-272.
9. Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: A framework for coaches' behaviour*. Routledge. London, Pages.
10. Mallett, C., & Côté, J. (2006). Beyond winning and losing: Guidelines for evaluating high performance coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20(2), 213-221.
11. Perlus, H. S. (2003). *Elite Alpine Ski Racing Coaches' Achievement Goal Orientations as Predictors of Their Coaching Behavior* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida).
12. Yapar, A., & İnce, M. L. (2014). Sporcular İçin Antrenör Davranışlarını Değerlendirme Ölçeğinin Türkçe Uyarlaması (Saddö): Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 25(4), 203-212.
13. Yardley, J., Hay, J., Sedgwick, W., & Baker, J. (1999). An exploratory examination of the coaching behavior scale for sport. *Avante*, 5(3), 82-92.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).