International Journal of Education and Humanities
ISSN: 2770-6702 | Vol. 15, No. 1, 2024

Roles and Responsibilities of Coaches Towards Their Players in a Physical Education Institution in Wuhan China: Basis for Coaches Training Program

Guanghui Chen*

Graduate School, Adamson University, CO 1000, Philippines

* **Corresponding author:** Guanghui Chen (Email: chenguanghui0018@163.com)

Abstract: This dissertation proposal explores the roles and responsibilities of coaches towards their players at the Wuhan Institute of Physical Education, aiming to develop a comprehensive training program for team sports coaches. The study examines key dimensions of coaching, including goal clarification, team situation assessment, option realization, and action planning. Additionally, it evaluates the responsibilities of coaches in ensuring a safe environment, proper athlete matching, supervision, collaboration with parents, and emergency care provision. Utilizing a descriptive-comparative research design, data were collected from 156 coaches and selected athletes through questionnaires and structured interviews. Findings indicate that while coaches generally perform well in goal clarification and action planning, there are areas needing improvement, such as maintaining a safe environment and supporting athletes' professional development. The study highlights the importance of continuous education and standardized practices in coaching to enhance overall effectiveness. Based on the findings, a training program is proposed to address identified gaps, promoting better communication, safety, and strategic planning among coaches. This research underscores the critical role of coaches in athlete development and provides practical recommendations for improving coaching practices in physical education institutions.

Keywords: Coaching Responsibilities, Team Sports, Training Program, Wuhan Institute of Physical Education, Athlete Development.

1. Introduction

Sports coaches assist athletes in developing to their full potential. They are responsible for training athletes in a sport by analyzing their performances, instructing in relevant skills and by providing encouragement. But you are also responsible for the guidance of the athlete in life and their chosen sport.

Consequently, the role of the coach will be many and varied, from instructor, assessor, friend, mentor, facilitator, chauffeur, demonstrator, adviser, supporter, fact finder, motivator, counselor, organizer, planner and the Fountain of all Knowledge.

In relation to sports, the role of the coach is to create the right conditions for learning to happen and to find ways of motivating the athletes. Most athletes are highly motivated and therefore the task is to maintain that motivation and to generate excitement and enthusiasm.

2. Statement of the Problem

This study intends to determine the roles and responsibilities of coaches towards their players at Wuhan Institute of Physical Education at Wuhan China with the end view of developing a training program for team sports coaches.

Specifically, the following problems will be answered:

(1) What is the profile of the coach respondents in terms of:
1) Sex
2) Age
3) Educational Attainment
4) No. of Years as team sports coach

(2) What is the assessment of the coach respondents on their roles as coach to their players in terms of:
1) Clarifying goals and objectives
2) Assessing team's current situation
3) Realizing options and outcomes
4) Moving forward for best actions

(3) Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the coach respondents on their roles as coach to their players when they are grouped according to their profile?

(4) What is the assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players in terms of:
1) Safe and appropriate environment and equipment
2) Proper matching of athletes
3) Adequate supervision of athletes
4) Collaboration with parents
5) Provision for emergency care

(5) Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players when they are grouped according to their profile?

(6) What is the observation of the players or athletes on their respective coaches as regards the performance of their roles and responsibilities being a team coach?

(7) Based from the findings of the study, what comprehensive training program can be proposed to strengthen the roles and responsibilities of the coaches?

3. Synthesis of the Study

In summary, through the literature that was reviewed, it was shown that coaching styles have a significant impact on athlete motivation, specifically the type of motivation. In turn, a relationship was also established within the literature between coaching styles, athlete motivation, and athlete performance. A common theme throughout the reviewed literature review was that of the types of motivation exhibited

through athletes engaging with the different styles of coaches. Autonomy supportive coaches tended to produce intrinsically and self-determined athletes, while the controlling coach produced athletes who displayed signs of being extrinsically motivated in a non-self-determined fashion. Other research works investigated the influence of the quality of the coach-athlete relationship on both interpersonal and intrapersonal outcomes including the athlete's physical and psychosocial development, satisfaction, motivation, collective efficacy, and one's subjective evaluation of performance. The coach-athlete relationship is also critical to coaching effectiveness and efficacy. Hence, coaching education should create educational material detailing the importance of work life and stress-recovery balance. Premediated recovery and/or help seeking strategies may help reduce burnout in coaches. After all, in order to educate the next generation of coaches there must be skilled, experienced, and well-educated coaches available to do so. This will ensure the profession moves forward. Coaches are also urged to read material pertaining to emotions, emotional regulation, and emotional intelligence, reflect on their daily interactions and coaching activities, and discuss these experiences with others. Evidence suggests those who are more emotionally competent are more successful in a multitude of different endeavors.

4. Research Design

This research made use of the descriptive -comparative research. Descriptive - comparative research is an approach in research where a variable is described using numeral data (Bieger & Gerlach, 2016).

"Quantitative research is defined as 'Explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics)'." In their definition, we know that explaining phenomena is a key element of all research. Collecting numerical data in quantitative research is another key element, which is closely connected to the final part of the definition: analysis using mathematically based methods. Therefore, as quantitative research is essentially about collecting numerical data to explain a phenomenon, questions seem immediately suited to being answered using quantitative methods. In education, this research method helps us explain phenomena happened among schools and institutions, administrators, teachers and staffs, and students.

5. Research Locale

This study was conducted in Wuhan Institute of Physical Education which is an undergraduate institution of higher education with a focus on sports in Wuhan, Hubei Province, China.

Wuhan Sports College was established in 1953, formerly known as the Department of Physical Education at Huazhong University founded in 1949. It is one of the earliest sports colleges established in China. The college has undergone multiple reforms and developments, and has now become one of the sports colleges with high reputation and influence.

Wuhan Sports College is located at No. 30 Luoshi Road, Hongshan District, Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China, with a superior geographical location. Wuhan is an important transportation hub and economic center in central China, with rich cultural resources and beautiful natural scenery.

Wuhan Sport University is a undergraduate institution with a focus on sports, dedicated to cultivating sports talents and promoting the development of the sports industry. The college has multiple colleges and research departments, covering multiple disciplines such as physical education, sports training, sports rehabilitation, and social sports.

The college emphasizes the combination of theory and practice, has a high-quality teaching team, and is equipped with modern teaching facilities and sports venues. Students can learn sports science, sports management, sports training and other knowledge in professional courses, and participate in various sports exercises and competitive activities.

In addition, Wuhan Sport University actively conducts scientific research and social services, and conducts academic exchanges and cooperation with multiple universities and institutions at home and abroad. The college is committed to cultivating outstanding sports talents with professional competence and social responsibility, and contributing to the development of China's sports industry.

6. Results, Analysis, and Interpretation

This chapter presents the data analysis and interpretation of the findings from the given questionnaire to the chosen respondents involved in the study. The sequence of the presentation was based on the statement of the problem as stated in Chapter 1, of which the main objective of the researcher was to assess the awareness of student-athletes on their perception of the implementation of the disaster management system.

(1) The demographic profile of the coach-respondents in terms of the following:

1) Sex
2) Age
3) Educational Attainment
4) No. of Years as team sports coach

Understanding the demographic profile of coaches is fundamental in comprehending the diverse perspectives and experiences that contribute to coaching practices. This introduction outlines the demographic characteristics of coach-respondents, focusing on sex, age, educational attainment, and years of experience as team sports coaches. Examining coaches' demographics illuminates varied backgrounds shaping coaching. It fosters inclusivity, acknowledging gender dynamics, generational differences, educational pathways, and experience levels. This understanding promotes collaboration and lifelong learning, enriching coaching practices and enhancing athlete experiences within the dynamic landscape of team sports.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of the Coach-Respondents' Profile in Terms of Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	80	51.3%
Female	76	48.7%
Total	156	100.0%

The data in the table outlines the distribution of coach-respondents based on their sex, with a total of 156 respondents. Of these, 80 are male, representing 51.3% of the total, while 76 are female, making up 48.7%. This near-equal distribution suggests a relatively balanced representation of genders among the coaches surveyed, with males slightly outnumbering females by a small margin. This outcome has several implications for the study. First, the relatively even distribution indicates that the coaching profession might be

embracing gender diversity, reflecting broader societal trends toward inclusivity. Such balance in gender representation is encouraging, as it may indicate that coaching roles are accessible to both men and women, with minimal gender bias.

From a research perspective, this balance supports the generalizability of the study's findings. With a nearly equal mix of male and female coaches, the study's results could be more reflective of the broader coaching population, reducing the risk of skewed conclusions due to gender imbalance. Moreover, this distribution allows researchers to examine potential gender-based differences in coaching styles, behaviors, or experiences, providing a rich area for further investigation. The close ratio of male to female coaches also has practical implications for stakeholders in the coaching industry. It suggests that efforts to promote gender equality in coaching roles may be bearing fruit, encouraging continued focus on gender-inclusive practices in recruitment, training, and career advancement. This information can also guide policies and initiatives aimed at supporting gender parity in coaching environments, ensuring that both men and women have equal opportunities for success. The balanced gender distribution among coach-respondents is a positive sign, indicating progress toward gender equality in coaching. It sets a foundation for further research into gender-specific trends and supports the continued promotion of inclusive practices within the coaching profession.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of the Coach-Respondents' Profile in Terms of Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 25 yrs. old	14	9.0%
25 – 35 yrs. old	49	31.4%
36 – 45 yrs. old	40	25.6%
46 – 55 yrs. old	33	21.2%
More than 55 yrs. old	20	12.8%
Total	156	100.0%

The data presented in Table 2 shows the frequency distribution of coach-respondents by age, with a total of 156 respondents. The most populated age group is 25–35 years, encompassing 49 coaches or 31.4% of the sample. The second-largest group is 36–45 years, with 40 respondents (25.6%), while the third-largest group is 46–55 years, with 33 respondents (21.2%). The smallest groups are those under 25 years (9.0%) and those over 55 years (12.8%). This distribution suggests that the majority of coaches are in the early to mid-stages of their careers, indicating a vibrant and active coaching workforce. The lower proportion of coaches under 25 years old might reflect the common pathway of gaining experience or specific qualifications before entering the coaching profession. Similarly, the relatively smaller group of coaches over 55 years old may point to retirement trends or career transitions in later life.

For the study, this age distribution has several implications. Given that the majority of coaches fall within the 25–45 age range, there might be a balance between innovative ideas and experienced approaches in coaching methodologies. This could contribute to a dynamic and adaptable coaching environment. The age distribution also implies that mentorship and knowledge transfer could be key elements within the coaching community, with older coaches guiding younger ones. Additionally, the spread of ages suggests that the coaching workforce has a stable yet evolving trajectory, with potential for ongoing professional development and career growth. The significant presence of coaches in the 25–55 age range could indicate a strong core of experienced professionals, emphasizing the need for continued education and career development to maintain coaching excellence. However, the smaller proportion of under-25 coaches might signal a need to attract younger talent to ensure the sustainability of the coaching profession in the long term. Overall, the age distribution among coach-respondents paints a picture of a coaching workforce with a mix of energy, experience, and room for growth. It highlights the importance of career development and mentorship, with opportunities to foster a sustainable and adaptable coaching community. The age distribution among coach-respondents reflects a diverse workforce, blending youthful energy with experienced insights. This mix underscores the need for robust career development programs and mentorship opportunities to support professional growth. These factors can help build a sustainable coaching community that is adaptable and capable of evolving with industry trends.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of the Coach-Respondents' Profile in Terms of Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	89	57.1%
Bachelor with MA/MS units	24	21.8%
Master's Degree	17	10.9%
Master's Degree with PhD units	9	5.8%
PhD Degree	7	4.5%
Total	156	100.0%

Table 3 presents the frequency distribution of coach-respondents based on their educational attainment among a total of 156 individuals. According to the data, 57.1% of the coaches have a Bachelor's degree, making it the most common educational level in the group. A significant proportion, 21.8%, have completed a Bachelor's degree along with some Master's-level coursework, while 10.9% hold a full Master's degree. Coaches with a Master's degree and some PhD units represent 5.8% of the total, and those with a PhD degree account for 4.5%.

This distribution reflects a diverse range of educational backgrounds among coaches, with a significant proportion pursuing advanced studies beyond the Bachelor's level. The fact that over half of the respondents hold a Bachelor's degree suggests a foundational requirement for entering the coaching profession. The large number of coaches with advanced degrees or additional coursework indicates a culture of ongoing learning and professional development within the coaching community. These trends have several implications for the study. The high proportion of coaches with advanced degrees suggests a workforce with specialized knowledge and a strong commitment to staying current with the latest industry trends. This focus on continuous education may contribute to a higher level of professionalism and expertise among coaches. The range of educational backgrounds within the coaching community also has the potential to foster diverse coaching styles and approaches.

This diversity can lead to innovation and adaptability, benefiting both the coaches and the athletes they train. Moreover, the presence of coaches with higher degrees indicates clear pathways for career advancement and professional growth, which could encourage more individuals

to pursue coaching as a viable and fulfilling career. Given this distribution, further research might explore how educational attainment impacts coaching practices, effectiveness, or career progression. Additionally, the study could consider how continued education contributes to the evolution of coaching techniques and the overall sustainability of the coaching workforce. The educational profile of coach-respondents reflects a diverse and increasingly sophisticated coaching community. With a significant proportion holding advanced degrees or pursuing higher education, this distribution reveals a robust foundation of expertise. This commitment to continued learning and professional development suggests that coaches are dedicated to enhancing their skills and knowledge. Consequently, this dedication fosters an environment of innovation and adaptability, likely contributing to the sustained success and evolution of the coaching profession.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of the Coach-Respondents' Profile in Terms of No. of Years as a team coach

No. of Years as a team coach	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 3 years	23	14.7%
3 – 5 years	16	10.3%
6 – 10 years	36	23.1%
11 – 15 years	26	16.7%
16 – 20 years	28	17.9%
More than 20 years	27	17.3%
Total	156	100.0%

Table 4 provides an overview of the coaching experience among 156 coach-respondents by examining the number of years they've served as team coaches. The largest group, comprising 23.1% of respondents, has been coaching between 6 and 10 years, suggesting a substantial cohort of moderately experienced coaches. Following this, the second-largest group (17.9%) consists of coaches with 16 to 20 years of experience, closely aligned with those with over 20 years (17.3%). The smaller proportions represent those with less than 3 years (14.7%), 3 to 5 years (10.3%), and 11 to 15 years (16.7%). This distribution illustrates a wide range of coaching experience, with the majority of respondents having significant tenure in the field. The largest segment, comprising coaches with 6 to 10 years of experience, indicates a solid core of professionals who are established but still growing. The substantial presence of those with 16 or more years of experience (35.2% combined) reveals a strong backbone of seasoned coaches, pointing to stability and continuity within the coaching profession. The smaller percentages of newer coaches indicate that while the field is attracting fresh talent, it remains largely driven by experienced professionals. The implications of this distribution are manifold. The substantial presence of veteran coaches suggests a rich environment for mentorship, with experienced coaches providing guidance to their less experienced counterparts. This environment can foster knowledge transfer and continuity of effective coaching practices. The significant spread of coaching tenures indicates that coaching can be a long-term career, with ample opportunities for growth and career satisfaction. Moreover, this varied range of coaching experience implies a blend of traditional methods and innovative approaches, contributing to a dynamic and adaptable coaching culture. The diversity of coaching tenures suggests a potential for collaborative learning and the sharing of best practices among coaches with different levels of experience. This collaborative culture can drive innovation and adaptability within the coaching profession. Given these observations, the study could explore how coaching experience impacts coaching styles, effectiveness, or outcomes. It might also investigate whether more experienced coaches tend to use different methodologies compared to those with fewer years of experience. Additionally, the study could consider the role of coaching tenure in adopting new technologies or evolving coaching strategies, providing insights into the sustainability and progression of the coaching profession.

(2) The assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coach to their players

Within the realm of team sports, coaches play a crucial role in guiding and supporting their players to achieve success both individually and collectively. This assessment focuses on four key aspects of the coach-player relationship. Firstly, coaches are tasked with clarifying goals and objectives, providing a clear direction for their team to strive towards. This involves articulating specific targets and milestones that align with the team's overarching mission. Secondly, coaches must continually assess the team's current situation, evaluating strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. By understanding the team's dynamics and performance, coaches can make informed decisions to optimize their strategies and tactics. Thirdly, coaches need to help players realize their options and potential outcomes, fostering critical thinking and decision-making skills. By exploring various scenarios and consequences, coaches empower players to make effective choices both on and off the field. Lastly, coaches facilitate forward momentum by guiding players towards the best course of action. This involves motivating and inspiring players to take initiative, persevere through challenges, and continuously strive for excellence. Together, these roles form the foundation of effective coaching, shaping the development and success of both individual players and the team as a whole.

The data in Table 5 assesses how coach-respondents view their role in clarifying goals and objectives for their players. The composite mean score of 3.16 (SD = 0.93) indicates that coaches generally believe they are successfully fulfilling their roles in this regard. Among the aspects evaluated, the highest-ranked, with a mean score of 3.19, pertains to "identifying and clarifying the type of goal through an understanding of ultimate goals, performance goals, and progress goals." This suggests that coaches are adept at helping players understand different types of goals and guiding them toward achieving these objectives. The second-highest ranked aspect, with a mean score of 3.18, relates to "helping players become aware of internal issues and interpret the 'unwritten rules.'" This indicates that coaches are generally successful in fostering an understanding of team dynamics and internal structures. Conversely, the aspect with the lowest mean score (3.10) involves "finding out how the athlete wishes to develop in terms of professional or career growth." This lower score suggests an area where coaches could improve by engaging more with players about their long-term career aspirations and development pathways. Other aspects, such as "providing understanding of principal aims and aspirations" and "clarifying the desired result from the session with players," each with a mean score of 3.15, indicate that coaches are generally consistent in practicing these roles.

Table 5. Assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coach to their players in terms of Clarifying goals and objectives

Clarifying Goals and Objectives	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
identify and clarify the type of goal through an understanding of ultimate goals, performance goals and progress goals along	3.19	0.87	True of Me	Practiced	1
provide understanding of principal aims and aspirations.	3.15	0.94	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
clarify the desired result from the session with players	3.15	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
find out how the athlete wishes to develop in terms of professional or career growth.	3.10	0.95	True of Me	Practiced	5
help the players become aware of the internal issues and happenings within the team and interpret the "unwritten rules" that may be crucial to the player/athlete	3.18	0.90	True of Me	Practiced	2
Composite Mean	3.16	0.93	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

However, the moderate variability in standard deviations across the aspects (ranging from 0.87 to 0.96) indicates that some coaches may be more consistent in their practices than others. The implications for the study are that while coaches seem to be generally effective in clarifying goals and objectives, there is a need for greater emphasis on supporting athletes' professional growth and career development. This could involve additional training for coaches or a greater focus on career planning within the coaching framework. Overall, the results indicate that coach-respondents are generally proficient in guiding players in understanding goals and objectives. Nonetheless, there are areas where more attention could be directed, particularly in helping athletes with their long-term career growth. These insights could be used to develop targeted training programs to enhance coaching practices and improve overall effectiveness.

Table 6. Assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coach to their players in terms of Assessing Teams' Current Situation

Assessing Team's Current Situation	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
assess the current situation in terms of the action taken so far	3.09	0.95	True of Me	Practiced	1
clarify the results and effects of previously taken actions.	3.04	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	3
provide understanding of internal obstacles and blocks currently preventing or limiting progression	3.06	0.98	True of Me	Practiced	2
show motivation by giving positive feedback to boost the player's morale in facing current situations	3.01	0.95	True of Me	Practiced	4.5
determine future implications of what is currently happening in the team	3.01	1.01	True of Me	Practiced	4.5
Composite Mean	3.04	0.97	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

Table 6 presents an assessment of coach-respondents' roles in terms of assessing their teams' current situations. The composite means of 3.04 and a standard deviation of 0.97 indicate that, on average, coaches believe they perform adequately in this role, with a moderate level of consistency. The highest-ranked aspect, with a mean score of 3.09 and an SD of 0.95, is "assessing the current situation in terms of the action taken so far." This suggests that coaches are generally confident in evaluating the progress and effectiveness of the actions already taken by their teams. The second-ranked aspect, "providing understanding of internal obstacles and blocks currently preventing or limiting progression," with a mean score of 3.06, points to coaches' ability to identify and understand hurdles within the team environment. However, there are areas where coaches could improve. The aspects with the lowest mean scores, each with a mean of 3.01, are "showing motivation by giving positive feedback to boost the player's morale" and "determining future implications of what is currently happening in the team." These scores suggest that coaches may need to focus more on encouraging their players through positive reinforcement and considering the future impact of current team dynamics. The range in standard deviations, from 0.95 to 1.01, indicates some inconsistency in how coaches approach these aspects, reflecting varying levels of effectiveness. This variability might be due to differences in coaching style, experience, or even team dynamics. The implications for the study are that while coaches generally do well in assessing the current situation, there's room for growth in areas related to motivation and strategic planning. Coaches who can provide positive reinforcement and think ahead about the team's future trajectory are likely to contribute more effectively to team success. Recommendations might include offering additional training to coaches on giving effective positive feedback and developing a strategic outlook. The

study could also explore the factors that contribute to the variability in coaching effectiveness when assessing teams' current situations. Addressing these areas could lead to more consistent and successful coaching practices, benefiting teams and athletes alike.

Table 7. Assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coach to their players in terms of Realizing Options and Outcomes

Realizing Options and Outcomes	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
identify the possibilities and alternatives of any action within the team	2.88	1.05	True of Me	Practiced	5
outline and present a variety of strategies for progression	2.92	1.05	True of Me	Practiced	4
offer ideas only after I have push them to do so	2.94	1.01	True of Me	Practiced	1
assess the pros and cons of the different options presented in achieving the goal of the team	2.93	1.07	True of Me	Practiced	2.5
outlines possible future obstacles and challenges within the context of the team performance	2.93	0.98	True of Me	Practiced	2.5
Composite Mean	2.92	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

Table 7 examines the role of coach-respondents in helping their players realize options and outcomes. The composite mean of 2.92 and a standard deviation of 1.03 indicate that coaches generally consider themselves moderately competent in this area, though the spread in scores suggests varying degrees of consistency across respondents. The highest mean score, 2.94, corresponds to the aspect "offer ideas only after I have pushed them to do so." This result suggests that while coaches can propose ideas, they often need external prompting, pointing to a less proactive approach. The two aspects tied for second place, both with a mean of 2.93, involve assessing the pros and cons of different options and outlining possible future obstacles and challenges. These scores indicate that coaches possess a basic understanding of strategic analysis, but they might struggle with detailed scenario planning and preempting potential hurdles. The lowest mean score, 2.88, relates to "identify the possibilities and alternatives of any action within the team." This result indicates that coaches may find it challenging to generate a wide array of possible strategies or approaches, suggesting limited creativity or flexibility in their coaching practices.

The composite mean score and relatively high standard deviation reflect a moderate level of competency in realizing options and outcomes, but with notable inconsistency among coaches. This inconsistency could be due to differences in coaching styles, experience levels, or the specific contexts in which coaches operate. The implications for the study are that while coaches demonstrate some ability to assess options and outcomes, there's considerable room for improvement. Given the lower mean scores, coaches might benefit from additional training in strategic thinking, brainstorming, and evaluating a broader range of possibilities. Improving in these areas could lead to more effective coaching and better outcomes for teams and athletes. Recommendations for the study might include developing targeted training programs to enhance coaches' skills in these critical areas. Such programs could focus on fostering a more proactive approach to offering ideas, encouraging coaches to think more strategically, and expanding the range of options considered. Further research could explore the underlying factors contributing to the observed variability in coaching performance, providing insights into how to create a more consistent and effective coaching approach.

Table 8. Assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coach to their players in terms of Moving Forward for Best Actions

Moving Forward for Best Actions	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
provide understanding of what has been learned and what can be changed to achieve the initial goal	3.10	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	3
create a summary and plan of action for implementation of the identified steps	3.11	0.97	True of Me	Practiced	2
consider the continued achievement of the goals, and the support and development that may be required	3.12	1.00	True of Me	Practiced	1
estimate the certainty of commitment to the agreed actions	3.08	0.92	True of Me	Practiced	4
highlight how accountability and achievement of the goals will be ensured	3.07	0.89	True of Me	Practiced	5
Composite Mean	3.10	0.95	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

Table 8 examines coach-respondents' roles in terms of moving forward with the best actions, The composite mean

score is 3.10, with a standard deviation of 0.95, indicating that coaches generally believe they are effective in guiding their players toward future actions, but with some variability in their approaches. The aspect with the highest mean score, 3.12, is "consider the continued achievement of the goals, and the support and development that may be required." This suggests that coaches are adept at considering the broader picture and understanding the ongoing needs for achieving goals. This focus on continuity and support is critical for long-term success. The second-highest aspect, with a mean score of 3.11, is "create a summary and plan of action for implementation of the identified steps." This indicates that coaches are fairly consistent in summarizing key points and outlining actionable steps, essential for guiding their teams in a clear direction. The lower mean scores are found in "estimate the certainty of commitment to the agreed actions" (3.08) and "highlight how accountability and achievement of the goals will be ensured" (3.07). These scores suggest that coaches may struggle with ensuring commitment to plans and maintaining accountability, areas crucial for effective team management.

The range in standard deviations, from 0.89 to 1.00, points to some variability in coaches' consistency when it comes to moving forward with best actions. This inconsistency might be due to variations in coaching style, experience, or team dynamics. The implications for the study are that while coaches generally feel capable of moving forward with best actions, they could improve in areas related to commitment and accountability. These aspects are key to ensuring that plans are executed effectively and goals are met. Given these findings, recommendations for the study might include providing additional training for coaches to strengthen their skills in maintaining team commitment and ensuring accountability. This could help improve the consistency and overall effectiveness of coaching practices. Further research could also explore the factors contributing to the observed variability, offering insights into how to create a more cohesive approach to guiding teams toward best actions.

Table 9. Summary of the Assessment of the coach-respondents on their Roles as coach to their Players

Roles as Coach to their Players	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
Clarifying goals and objectives	3.16	0.93	True of Me	Practiced	1
Assessing team's current situation	3.04	0.97	True of Me	Practiced	3
Realizing options and outcomes	2.92	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	4
Moving forward for best actions	3.10	0.95	True of Me	Practiced	2
Composite Mean	3.06	0.97	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

Table 9 provides an overview of how coach-respondents evaluate their roles in coaching players, with mean scores, standard deviations (SD), qualitative descriptions, interpretations, and rankings for four key aspects. The composite mean of 3.06, with a standard deviation of 0.97, indicates that coaches generally perceive themselves as competent, though there is variability in performance across different aspects of coaching. The area with the highest mean score, 3.16, is "Clarifying goals and objectives." This suggests that coaches feel confident in helping players understand their goals and the overall direction of the team. The ability to set clear goals is crucial for guiding a team effectively, indicating that this is a strength among coach-respondents. Ranking second, with a mean of 3.10, is "Moving forward for best actions." This involves guiding players toward the next steps after setting goals, creating action plans, and considering ongoing support. Coaches seem to be relatively adept at translating goals into actionable plans, which is an important skill for achieving successful outcomes. The third-ranked aspect, "Assessing team's current situation," has a mean score of 3.04. This score suggests that coaches are reasonably competent in evaluating the current state of their teams but may face challenges in consistently assessing team dynamics and identifying areas for improvement. The lowest mean score, 2.92, is for "Realizing options and outcomes." This score indicates that coaches might struggle with presenting a variety of strategies and guiding players through different pathways to success. This lower score could point to a need for enhanced flexibility and creativity in coaching practices.

The composite mean score, along with the variability indicated by the standard deviation, highlights that while coaches are generally competent, there is room for improvement, especially in areas related to exploring options and assessing team dynamics. This inconsistency could stem from variations in coaching experience, style, or specific team contexts. The implications for the study suggest that coaches generally excel at clarifying goals and guiding players toward actionable plans. However, the lower scores in realizing options and outcomes indicate a potential need for additional training in strategic thinking and problem-solving. The variability in standard deviation suggests that some coaches may require further support to achieve greater consistency in their practices. Recommendations could include targeted training to help coaches improve in areas with lower scores, focusing on fostering creativity, flexibility, and a broader approach to strategic planning. Further research could also investigate the reasons behind the observed variability in coaching performance, providing insights into achieving a more consistent approach across the coaching profession.

The test of difference in the assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coach to their players when grouped according to profile.

Table 10. Differences in the Assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coach to their players when grouped according to profile

Profile	Types	Mean	SD	Computed T/F-value	Sig	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Sex	Male	3.09	.603	.850	.397	Accept Ho	Not Significant
	Female	3.00	.648				
Age	Less than 25 yrs. Old	3.01	.542	1.027	.395	Accept Ho	Not Significant
	25 – 35 yrs. old	2.93	.698				
	36 – 45 yrs. old	3.14	.557				
	46 – 55 yrs. old	3.17	.607				
	More than 55 yrs. Old	2.97	.640				
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	3.05	.610	1.294	.275	Accept Ho	Not Significant
	Bachelor's Degree With MA/MS Units	3.16	.618				
	Master's Degree	2.82	.722				
	Master's Degree With PhD Units	3.26	.381				
	PhD Degree	2.83	.780				
Length of Years as coach	Less than 3 years	3.00	.603	.676	.642	Accept Ho	Not Significant
	3 – 5 years	3.06	.700				
	6 – 10 years	2.94	.636				
	11 – 15 years	3.21	.576				
	16 – 20 years	3.11	.691				
	More than 20 years	3.01	.570				

Table 10 examines the assessment of coach-respondents on their roles as coaches to their players when grouped according to various profiles, including sex, age, educational attainment, and length of years as coach.

The table reports the mean scores, standard deviations (SD), computed T/F-values, significance (Sig) levels, the decision on the null hypothesis (Ho), and the interpretation regarding statistical significance. Across all these profile groupings, there are no statistically significant differences in the assessment scores, indicating that coaches tend to assess their roles similarly regardless of their demographic background or experience level.

For the sex grouping, the mean score for male coaches is 3.09 (SD = 0.603), while for female coaches, it is 3.00 (SD = 0.648). The computed T-value of 0.850 with a significance level of 0.397 suggests no significant difference in assessment scores based on gender.

Regarding age, the 46–55 years group has the highest mean score (3.17), while the 25–35 years group has the lowest (2.93). However, the computed F-value of 1.027 and a significance level of 0.395 indicate that these differences are not statistically significant.

In terms of educational attainment, the highest mean score is among coaches with a Master's degree with PhD units (3.26), while the lowest is for those with a Master's degree (2.82). The computed F-value of 1.294 with a significance level of 0.275 shows that these differences are not significant either.

Similarly, for the length of years as coach, there is no significant difference. The 11–15 years group has the highest mean score (3.21), and the 6–10 years group has the lowest (2.94). The computed F-value of 0.676 and a significance level of 0.642 indicate no statistically significant difference based on coaching experience. These findings suggest that coaches tend to evaluate their roles consistently across different demographic and experience-related profiles.

This uniformity in assessment is noteworthy as it implies that factors like gender, age, education, and coaching experience do not significantly influence how coaches view their roles. This consistency could be a positive sign, indicating that coaching practices and expectations are standardized across the board. Given these findings, the study could explore other variables that might impact coaching effectiveness or satisfaction. Areas such as coaching philosophy, team dynamics, or specific coaching techniques could provide further insights into what contributes to successful coaching practices. The uniformity in assessment among coaches across various profiles suggests that the coaching profession has established a set of common practices and standards that create a cohesive framework for coaching. This consistency indicates that coaches, regardless of gender, age, educational background, or years of experience, are likely to adhere to similar principles and methodologies. It points to standardization in coaching roles and expectations, reflecting a broader industry consensus on effective coaching practices. This uniformity could result from professional training programs, certifications, or industry-wide guidelines, fostering a shared understanding of coaching responsibilities that supports consistency and reliability in coaching outcomes.

(3) The assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players

Table 11 presents an assessment of coach-respondents on their responsibilities as coaches in terms of providing a safe and appropriate environment and equipment for their players. It provides mean scores, standard deviations (SD), qualitative descriptions, interpretations, and rankings for six aspects.

Table 11. Assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players in terms of Safe and appropriate environment and equipment

Safe and appropriate environment and equipment	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
conduct practices and games in a safe physical environment	2.88	1.00	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
use of safe and appropriate equipment	2.83	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	6
ensure all players wear shin pads and have removed all jewelry before going on to a game	2.95	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	2
provide a sports environment for my team that is free of drugs, tobacco, alcohol, and I will refrain from their use at all sports events.	2.99	1.04	True of Me	Practiced	1
maintain the equipment and regularly check for potential faults or wear. They	2.88	1.02	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
supervise athletes in practice areas, sports fields, changing rooms and while on transport to events.	2.87	1.04	True of Me	Practiced	5
Composite Mean	2.90	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

The composite mean score of 2.90, with a standard deviation of 1.03, Indicates that coaches generally feel they are practicing safety and using appropriate equipment, though there is considerable variability in performance. Among the different aspects, the highest mean score is 2.99, for “provide a sports environment for my team that is free of drugs, tobacco, alcohol, and I will refrain from their use at all sports events.” This result suggests that coaches prioritize maintaining a clean and drug-free sports environment, which is critical for player safety and health. The second-highest mean score, 2.95, is for “ensure all players wear shin pads and have removed all jewelry before going on to a game.” This shows that coaches are attentive to immediate safety measures to protect players from injuries. The aspects with lower mean scores, both at 2.88, are “conduct practices and games in a safe physical environment” and “maintain the equipment and regularly check for potential faults or wear.” These scores suggest that coaches might need to improve in creating and maintaining safe practice and game environments, as well as in regularly checking and maintaining equipment. This could be due to varying resources, experience, or practices in different teams or sports environments. The aspect with the lowest mean score, 2.83, is “use of safe and appropriate equipment.” This result indicates that coaches may struggle with ensuring the consistent use of safe equipment, which could pose risks to player safety.

The composite mean score of 2.90 and the standard deviation of 1.03 suggest that while coaches generally strive to create a safe and appropriate environment, there is significant variability, indicating inconsistency in safety practices. This inconsistency could be due to differences in resources, knowledge, or attention to safety protocols. Given these findings, the study might focus on why certain aspects, like the use of safe equipment and maintaining a safe physical environment, have lower scores.

Addressing these areas is crucial for ensuring player safety and avoiding injuries. Recommendations for the study could include developing training programs to improve coaches' skills in creating safe environments and maintaining equipment. Further research could explore the factors contributing to the variability in safety practices, providing insights into how to achieve greater consistency and effectiveness. By addressing these areas, coaches can create a safer and more secure environment for players, contributing to a more positive coaching experience. A focus on safety in sports environments is essential, as injuries can have significant long-term impacts on athletes' careers and well-being. Developing targeted training programs can help coaches enhance their skills in identifying potential hazards, maintaining equipment, and promoting safe practices. This training might include regular safety audits, proper equipment usage, and emergency response protocols. Additionally, further research could explore factors influencing inconsistent safety practices among coaches, such as resource limitations, knowledge gaps, or differing organizational cultures. By addressing these issues, the coaching community can work toward a more standardized approach to safety, leading to a more positive and secure environment for athletes and promoting overall well-being.

Table 12 presents the assessment of coach-respondents on their responsibilities in terms of properly matching athletes. It includes mean scores, standard deviations (SD), qualitative descriptions, interpretations, and rankings for six aspects. The composite mean score of 2.91, with a standard deviation of 1.03, indicates that coaches generally perceive themselves as adequately fulfilling their responsibilities in this area, though there is notable variability in their responses. The aspect with the highest mean score, 3.04, is "proper matching of athletes in practices and games by size, experience, and ability." This suggests that coaches focus on aligning athletes appropriately to ensure fair play and safety, which is crucial for preventing injuries and promoting a balanced competitive environment. However, several aspects rank lower, indicating potential areas for improvement. The aspect with the second-highest mean score, 2.97, is "show motivation by giving positive feedback to boost the athlete's morale." This implies that coaches generally recognize the importance of positive reinforcement but might struggle with consistency in this practice. The aspect with the lowest mean score, 2.84, is "treat each player as an individual, remembering the large range of emotional and physical development for the same age group." This score suggests that coaches might need to improve their ability to tailor their approach to individual athlete needs, particularly in recognizing the diverse developmental stages within the same age group. Another aspect with a lower mean score is "place the emotional and physical well-being of my

players ahead of a desire to win," which has a mean of 2.87. This indicates that while coaches understand the importance of prioritizing athletes' well-being, they may need further guidance in balancing competitive goals with athlete welfare.

Table 12. Assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players in terms of Proper matching of athletes

Proper matching of athletes	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
proper matching of athletes in practices and games by size, experience and ability	3.04	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	1
put emphasis on building a relationship based on mutual respect and trust	2.88	1.04	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
show motivation by giving positive feedback to boost the athlete's morale	2.97	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	2
place the emotional and physical well-being of my players ahead of a desire to win.	2.87	1.12	True of Me	Practiced	5
treat each player as an individual, remembering the large range of m emotional and physical development for the same age group	2.84	1.04	True of Me	Practiced	6
promote gender sensitivity program and activities	2.88	1.02	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
Composite Mean	2.91	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

The composite mean of 2.91, along with the standard deviation of 1.03, implies that while coaches generally believe they meet their responsibilities for properly matching athletes, there's room for improvement in several areas. The variability in standard deviations suggests inconsistency in coaching practices, potentially due to differing levels of experience, resources, or coaching philosophies.

Given these findings, recommendations for the study could include targeted training to help coaches better understand and address individual athlete needs, focusing on aspects such as personalized coaching and gender sensitivity. Further research could explore the factors contributing to the variability in practice, providing insights into achieving greater consistency and effectiveness. Addressing these areas is crucial for creating a more supportive and inclusive coaching environment, leading to better outcomes for athletes and a more positive coaching experience.

Table 13. Assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players in terms of Adequate supervision of athletes

Adequate supervision of athletes	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
use of current knowledge of proper skills and methods of coaching	2.95	0.99	True of Me	Practiced	4.5
motivate the team after losing a game, or obtaining disappointing results, and help individuals who are looking, for example, to improve their race time or performance.	2.94	0.98	True of Me	Practiced	6
proper short- and long-term planning	3.00	0.98	True of Me	Practiced	1.5
respect and protect the confidentiality of players' personal records	2.95	1.05	True of Me	Practiced	4.5
help develop the professional interests and create career goals for the individual.	3.00	0.92	True of Me	Practiced	1.5
find out how the athlete wishes to develop in terms of professional or career growth	2.99	1.02	True of Me	Practiced	3
Composite Mean	2.97	0.99	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

The data in the table outlines the coaches' assessment of their responsibilities for the adequate supervision of athletes, focusing on various dimensions like skill application, team motivation, planning, and confidentiality.

The mean scores across the board are quite close, ranging from 2.94 to 3.00, suggesting that coaches generally believe they are fulfilling their supervisory roles adequately. The standard deviation for these scores, ranging from 0.92 to 1.05, shows moderate consistency among responses, indicating some variations in practice but not significant enough to cause concern.

In terms of ranking, proper short- and long-term planning, and helping athletes develop their professional interests and career goals, both top the list with a mean of 3.00. This indicates that coaches emphasize structured planning and career development as core aspects of their role, which aligns with the broader objectives of sports coaching: nurturing athletes for both present performance and future growth.

Next in rank is exploring athletes' preferences for professional development, with a mean of 2.99. This score underscores the importance of understanding individual athlete goals and aligns with the collaborative approach many coaches aim for in their mentorship roles. Coaches' use of current knowledge and their efforts to protect players' confidentiality share a mean score of 2.95, indicating that while these aspects are well-regarded, they might not be as highly prioritized as planning or career guidance. This suggests an opportunity for coaches to stay updated with coaching techniques and emphasize athletes' confidentiality further.

Lastly, team motivation, with a mean score of 2.94, ranks lowest. This doesn't necessarily indicate neglect but could reflect the intrinsic challenges in maintaining team morale after setbacks. This area could benefit from additional focus, perhaps through improved training methods in motivational techniques or peer-sharing of successful strategies.

Overall, the data suggests that while coaches generally meet their responsibilities for supervising athletes, there are areas for improvement, particularly in team motivation and skill updates. By enhancing focus in these lower-ranked areas and maintaining strong practices in planning and career development, coaches can ensure a more balanced approach to athlete supervision.

Table 14. Assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players in terms of Collaboration with parents

Collaboration with parents	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
provide warnings to parents and athletes of risks inherent in sport participation.	3.09	0.90	True of Me	Practiced	4
examine the motivationally relevant behaviors of coaches, parents, and peers in specializing sport participants	3.08	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	5
outline and present a variety of programs and strategies for progression of the players	3.10	0.95	True of Me	Practiced	3
organize meetings with parents and careers to plan away games and trips to compete in other locations. They may organize coaching clinics and individual assessments.	3.11	0.93	True of Me	Practiced	1.5
ccoordinate with the athlete’s parent for consultation on player problems	3.01	0.94	True of Me	Practiced	6
help the parents become aware of the internal issues and happenings within the team and interpret the “unwritten rules” that may be crucial to the players or athletes	3.11	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	1.5
Composite Mean	3.08	0.94	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

Table 14 presents the assessment of coach-respondents on their responsibilities as coaches to their players in terms of collaboration with parents. It provides mean scores, standard deviations (SD), qualitative descriptions, interpretations, and rankings for six different aspects. The composite mean score of 3.08, with a standard deviation of 0.94, indicates that coaches generally believe they are effectively collaborating with parents, though some variability exists. Among the aspects assessed, two are tied for the highest mean score, each with a mean of 3.11. The first is "organize meetings with parents and careers to plan away games and trips to compete in other locations." This suggests that coaches are proactive in involving parents in logistical aspects of sports participation, which is crucial for planning and coordination. The second aspect with the same score, "help the parents become aware of the internal issues and happenings within the team and interpret the 'unwritten rules' that may be crucial to the players or athletes," indicates that coaches play a significant role in helping parents understand the team's dynamics. The third-ranked aspect, with a mean score of 3.10, is "outline and present a variety of programs and strategies for progression of the players." This aspect reflects coaches' ability to communicate developmental plans to parents, fostering transparency and alignment on player progression. The aspect with the lowest mean score, 3.01, is "coordinate with the athlete's parent for consultation on players' problems." This lower score suggests that coaches might need to improve their communication with parents regarding individual players' issues or challenges, which is essential for a supportive coaching environment.

The composite mean of 3.08, along with the standard deviation of 0.94, implies that while coaches generally collaborate with parents, there's room for improvement in certain areas. The variability in standard deviations suggests inconsistency in how coaches approach parent collaboration, which might stem from differences in experience, communication skills, or team culture. Given these results, the study could explore why certain aspects, like coordination with parents for individual consultations, have lower scores. Addressing these areas is crucial for building a solid parent-coach partnership, leading to a better overall environment for athletes.

Recommendations for the study might include targeted training for coaches to improve communication and collaboration with parents, especially in areas with lower mean scores. Further research could explore factors contributing to the observed variability, providing insights into how to ensure a more consistent and effective approach to parent collaboration. By addressing these areas, coaches can create a more cohesive and supportive environment for athletes and their families.

Table 15. Assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players in terms of Provision for emergency care

Provision for emergency care	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
ensure activities sensitive to the health and well-being of athletes under our care	3.04	0.97	True of Me	Practiced	5
provide appropriate emergency care	3.03	0.97	True of Me	Practiced	6
pprevent harassment and discrimination by coaching staff and athletes	3.06	0.93	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
report suspected abuse to proper authorities	3.15	0.98	True of Me	Practiced	1
be largely responsible for preparing the plans and activities needed for coaching	3.06	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	3.5
review and practice the basic first aid principles needed to treat injuries of my players.	3.12	0.97	True of Me	Practiced	2
Composite Mean	3.08	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

Table 15 explores coach-respondents' assessment of their responsibilities in terms of providing emergency care, with mean scores, standard deviations (SD), qualitative descriptions, interpretations, and rankings for six specific aspects.

The composite mean score is 3.08, with a standard deviation of 0.96, suggesting that coaches generally believe they are fulfilling their responsibilities regarding emergency care, but with some variability in performance. The highest-ranked aspect, with a mean score of 3.15, is "report suspected abuse to proper authorities." This indicates that coaches feel confident in identifying and reporting abuse, which is crucial for athlete safety and well-being. The aspect with the second-highest mean score, 3.12, is "review and practice the basic first aid principles needed to treat injuries of my players." This reflects coaches' readiness to handle basic injuries, demonstrating a proactive approach to emergency care. The aspects with lower mean scores are "ensure activities sensitive to the health and well-being of athletes under our care" (3.04), "provide appropriate emergency care" (3.03), and "prevent harassment and discrimination by coaching staff and athletes" (3.06). These scores suggest that while coaches generally meet these responsibilities, there's potential for improvement. Ensuring activities are health-sensitive involves careful planning, while providing emergency care requires quick thinking and appropriate resources. Preventing harassment and discrimination is essential for maintaining a safe and inclusive environment. The composite mean of 3.08, with a standard deviation of 0.96, indicates that while coaches generally fulfill their responsibilities regarding emergency care, there's some inconsistency in practice.

The variability in standard deviations suggests that different factors may influence coaching practices, such as training, experience, or available resources. The implications for the study are that while coaches generally believe they are competent in providing emergency care, there is room for growth in specific areas. Addressing these areas is vital for ensuring athlete safety and promoting a positive coaching environment.

Recommendations for the study might include additional training or resources to improve coaches' skills in emergency care, focusing on the areas with lower mean scores. Further research could explore factors contributing to variability in emergency care practices, providing insights into how to achieve greater consistency and effectiveness. By addressing these gaps, coaches can better ensure the health, safety, and well-being of their players.

Table 16. Summary of the Assessment of the coach respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players

Respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description	Interpretation	Rank
Safe and appropriate environment and equipment	2.90	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	4
Proper matching of athletes	2.91	1.03	True of Me	Practiced	5
Adequate supervision of athletes	2.97	0.99	True of Me	Practiced	3
Collaboration with parents	3.08	0.94	True of Me	Practiced	1.5
Provision for emergency care	3.08	0.96	True of Me	Practiced	1.5
Composite Mean	2.99	0.99	True of Me	Practiced	

Legend: 3.26-4.00 Very True of Me/Highly Practiced 2.51-3.25 True of Me/ Practiced
1.76-2.50 Slightly True of Me/Slightly Practiced 1.00-1.75 Not True of Me/ Not Practiced

Table 16 provides a summary of the assessment of coach-respondents regarding their responsibilities as coaches to their players, focusing on five key areas: providing a safe environment, proper matching of athletes, adequate supervision, collaboration with parents, and provision for emergency care. The table reports mean scores, standard deviations (SD), qualitative descriptions, interpretations, and rankings for these aspects.

The composite mean score of 2.99, with a standard deviation of 0.99, indicates that coaches generally feel they are fulfilling their responsibilities, albeit with some variation in performance. The two aspects with the highest mean scores, both at 3.08, are "Collaboration with parents" and "Provision for emergency care." These scores suggest that coaches are confident in engaging with parents and ensuring emergency care provision, which are vital for creating a supportive environment and maintaining athlete safety. The third-highest mean score is for "Adequate supervision of athletes" (2.97), indicating that coaches generally believe they are providing sufficient oversight, although the variability in the standard deviation suggests some inconsistency in practice. However, the lower mean scores for "Proper matching of athletes" (2.91) and "Safe and appropriate environment and equipment" (2.90) point to areas where coaches may face challenges. Proper matching involves aligning athletes based on factors like skill level and age, ensuring fair competition and safety, while maintaining a safe environment and equipment is fundamental to athlete well-being.

The overall composite mean and the standard deviation indicate that while coaches believe they meet their responsibilities, there is room for improvement in certain areas. The variability in standard deviations suggests that coaching practices are not entirely consistent, which could be due to differences in experience, resource availability, or team dynamics. Given these results, the study could explore why certain aspects, such as proper matching of athletes and maintaining a safe environment, have lower scores. Addressing these areas is crucial for creating a safe and equitable experience for athletes. Recommendations for the study might include developing targeted training programs to improve coaches' skills in areas where mean scores are lower. Further research could also focus on factors contributing to the observed variability, providing insights into how to ensure a consistent and high-quality coaching environment. By addressing these areas, coaches can enhance their overall effectiveness, leading to better outcomes for athletes and a more reliable coaching framework.

7. Conclusion

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1) The nearly equal mix of male and female coaches is more reflective of the broader coaching population, reducing the risk of skewed conclusions due to gender imbalance. And the age distribution also implies that mentorship and knowledge transfer could be key elements within the coaching community, with older coaches guiding younger ones. At the same time, the range of educational backgrounds within the coaching community also has the potential to foster diverse coaching styles and approaches. And the significant spread of coaching tenures indicates that coaching can be a long-term career, with ample opportunities for growth and career satisfaction.

2) The composite mean score, along with the variability indicated by the standard deviation, highlights that while coaches are generally competent, there is room for improvement, especially in areas related to exploring options and assessing team dynamics.

3) There are no differences in the assessment of the coach-respondents on their roles as coaches to their players when grouped according to profile because it implies that factors like gender, age, education, and coaching experience do not significantly influence how coaches view their roles. This consistency could be a positive sign, indicating that coaching practices and expectations are standardized.

4) The variability in standard deviations that coaching practices are not entirely consistent could be due to differences in experience, resource availability, or team dynamics.

5) There are no differences in the assessment of the coach-respondents on their responsibilities as coach to their players when grouped according to profile because the computed F-value of 0.772 with a significance level of 0.571 indicates no significant differences based on coaching experience. And there is a consistent approach to assessing coaching responsibilities, regardless of gender, age, educational background, or coaching experience.

6) Coaches can perform their role and responsibility to the athletes, but they still need to be strengthened and improved.

8. Recommendations

1) It is recommended to promote good coaching to the athletes to inspire them to become coaches when the time comes.

2) It is recommended to include targeted training to help coaches improve in areas with lower scores, focusing on fostering creativity, flexibility, and a broader approach to strategic planning. Further research could also investigate the reasons behind the observed variability in coaching performance, providing insights into achieving a more consistent approach across the coaching profession.

3) It is recommended standardization in coaching roles and expectations, reflect a broader industry consensus on effective coaching practices. This uniformity could result from professional training programs, certifications, or industry-wide guidelines, fostering a shared understanding of coaching responsibilities that supports consistency and reliability in coaching outcomes.

4) It is recommended that the study include developing targeted training programs to improve coaches' skills in areas where mean scores are lower. Further research could also focus on factors contributing to the observed variability, providing insights into how to ensure a consistent and high-quality coaching environment. By addressing these areas, coaches can enhance their overall effectiveness, leading to better outcomes for athletes and a more reliable coaching framework.

5) It is recommended a consistent approach to assessing coaching responsibilities, regardless of gender, age, educational background, or coaching experience. This uniformity could indicate that the coaching profession has established common standards and expectations, leading to a relatively standardized view of coaching responsibilities.

6) It is recommended to pilot testing of the proposed training program for coaches which is the output of this study.

References

[1] Arnold, R., Fletcher, D., & Daniels, K. (2013). Development and validation of the organizational stressor indicator for sport performers (OSI-SP). Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 35(2), 180–196.

[2] Barcza-Renner, K., Eklund, R. C., Morin, A. J., & Habeeb, C. M. (2016). Controlling coaching behaviors and athlete burnout: Investigating the mediating roles of perfectionism and motivation. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 38(1), 30–44.

[3] Bennie, A. and O'Connor, D. (2012). Coach-Athlete Relationships: A Qualitative Study of Professional Sport Teams in Australia. International Journal of Sport and Health Science Vol. 10, 58-64, 2012. http://taiiku-gakkai.or.jp/.

[4] Brinton, C. S., Hill, B. J., & Ward, P. J. (2017). Authoritative Coach: Building Youth Through Sport. Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 35(1), 51-65.

[5] Brinton, C. S., Hill, B. J., & Ward, P. J. (2017). Authoritative coach: Building youth through sport. Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 35(1), 51–65. https://doi.org/10.18666/jpra-2017-v35-i1-7296.

[6] Chelladurai, P. (2012). Measurement of Leadership in Sport. In J. L Duda (Ed.), Advances in Sport and Exercise Psychology Measurement. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

[7] Chiu, Y. & Huang, M. (2011). The Application of Paternalistic Leadership of Table Tennis Coach. The 12th ITTF Sports Science Congress May 5-7, 2011, Rotterdam. The Netherlands. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/mUZZim.

[8] Davis, L., & Jowett, S. (2014). Coach–Athlete attachment and the quality of the coach athlete relationship: Implications for athlete's well-being. Journal of Sports Sciences, 32(15), 1454–1464.

[9] DeFreese, J., & Smith, A. L. (2014). Athlete social support, negative social interactions, and psychological health across a competitive sport season. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 36(6), 619–630.

[10] Enoksen, E., Fahlström, P. G., Tore, B., Hageskog, C., Behrend, B. & Høigaard, R. (2014). A Study of the Leadership and Coaching Behaviors of High-Level Hurling Coaches. Scandinavian sport studies forum ISSN 2000-088x volume five, 2014. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/C0KCoZ.

[11] Ganaden, A., Ejaus, E., De Guzman, M. (2017). Leadership Behaviors of Sports Coaches in Public Elementary Schools of District 2, San Felipe, Zambales, Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, Vol. 4 No. 1 January 2017.

[12] Gillet, N., Vallerand, R. J., Amoura, S., & Baldes, B. (2010). Influence of coach's autonomy support on athletes' motivation and sport performance: A test of the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11(2), 155–161.

[13] Guardion, F. (2012). Practice of Leadership among High School Coaches and Its Impact on Athlete Satisfactions with Individual Performance. Journal of International Council for Health, Physical Education, Recreation Sport and Dance. 38(1).

[14] Gustafsson, H., DeFreese, J. D., & Madigan, D. J. (2017). Athlete burnout: Review and recommendations. Current Opinion in Psychology,16,109–113.

[15] Hampson, R., & Jowett, S. (2014). Effects of coach leadership and coach– Athlete relationship on collective efficacy. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 24(2), 454–460.

[16] Horn, T. S., Bloom, P., Berglund, K. M., & Packard, S. (2011). Relationship Between Collegiate Athletes' Psychological Characteristics and Their Preferences for Different Types of Coaching Behavior. Sport Psychologist, 25(2), 190-211.

[17] How coaches can impact athlete focus. Northcentral University. (2018, February 7). https://www.ncu.edu/blog/how-coaches-can-impact-athlete-focus#gref.

[18] Hyun-Duck, K., & Cruz, A. B. (2016). The influence of coaches' leadership styles on athletes' satisfaction and team cohesion: A meta-analytic approach. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 11(6), 900-909.

[19] Isoard-Gautheur, S., Trouilloud, D., Gustafsson, H., & Guillet-Descas, E. (2016). Associations between the perceived quality of the coach–Athlete relationship and athlete burnout: An examination of the mediating role of achievement goals. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 22, 210-217

[20] JafarMoosavi, S. & Ghotnian, S. (2012). Study and Comparison Leadership Styles of Coaches and Satisfaction of Male and Female Athletes in the Sport of Karate and Taekwondo. International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences © 2012 Available online at www.irjabs.com ISSN 2251-838X / Vol, 3 (S): 2633-2636 Science Explorer Publications. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/3B8ON3

[21] Jones, K. (n.d.). Coaching styles and its effect on team performance. Digital Commons @Brockport. https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_synthesis/120/.

[22] Kajal, F., Hemmatinezhad, M., & Razavi, S. M. H. (2013). Relationship between Leadership styles of Physical Education Department Managers with Sports Volunteers' Satisfaction. Annals of Applied Sport Science, 1(2).

[23] Light, R. L., Harvey, S., & Mouchet, A. (2014). Improving 'at-action'decisionmaking in team sports through a holistic coaching approach. Sport, Education and Society, 19(3), 258–275.

[24] Lorimer, R., & Jowett, S. (2010). Feedback of Information in the Empathetic Accuracy of Sport Coaches. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11.

[25] MacDonald, L. A., & Minahan, C. L. (2016). Indices of cognitive function measured in rugby union players using a computer-based test battery. Journal of Sports Sciences, 34(17) 1–6.

[26] Marcone, M. (n.d.). The impact of coaching styles on the motivation and performance of athletes. Digital Commons @Brockport. https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/pes_synthesis/21/.

[27] 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

[28] Moen, F., Hoigaard, R., & Peters, D. M. (2014). Performance Progress and Leadership Behavior. International Journal of Coaching Science, 8(1), 69-81.

[29] Nash, C, Sproule, J & Horton, P 2008, 'Sport coaches' perceived role frames and philosophies', International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 539-555. https://doi.org/10.1260/174795408787186495

[30] Rhind, D. J., & Jowett, S. (2010). Initial evidence for the criterion-related and structural validity of the long versions of the Coach–Athlete Relationship Questionnaire. European Journal of Sport Science, 10(6), 359–370.

[31] Shohani, M. H., Nabati, M., Shirzadi, R., Majedi, S. M., & Nasiri, M. (2014). The Relationship between Leadership Styles of Coaches and Sport Commitment among Iran's Footballers

Premiership League. Pelagia Research Library European Journal of Experimental Biology, 2014. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/xYL0Ys.