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Abstract

The present study was designed to assess the coaching behaviour between individual and team game female athletes. Total six hundred (N=600) female athletes were selected as subject who had participated in Panjab University, Chandigarh’s inter-college competitions. Their age was ranged between 17 to 28 years. The Coaching Behaviour Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ) developed by Scott B. Martin (2005) was used to assess the behaviour of coaches with their athletes. T-test was applied to find out the significant differences between individual and team game female athletes. The level of significance was set at 0.05. Results revealed significant differences between individual and team game athletes on the sub-variables i.e. reinforcement, mistake continent encouragement, keeping control, organization and coaching behaviour (total) (p<0.05). However, no significant differences were found on the sub-variables i.e. non-reinforcement, mistake contingent technical instruction, punishment, punitive technical instruction, ignoring mistakes, general technical instruction, general encouragement and general communication (p>0.05).
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1. Introduction

Coach is a person who identifies the specific goal in their players and helps them to reach their targeted goal with more ease and faster. He/she develops the learning process of an athlete with enthusiasm. Sometimes coach may works as a counselor and advisor for his/her team. A coach can be like a camera, who tries to capture all the movements of the game. Coaching makes an individual more conscious. It may be defined as the process of guiding, motivating and preparation of the athletes by the coach. It may enhance the performance of athlete and also may build up the athlete's career. Effectiveness of coaching behaviour may depend on different situations like characteristics and experience of athlete and coach. Behaviour in any field is the product of human’s environment and their genetic characteristics. The general behaviour of a coach should be that he/she must provide proper guidance and supervision to the athletes. Coaches are to perform their duties like planning, organizing, controlling, harmonizing and influencing players to achieve the team goal. A particular behaviour of a coach on a given time may not work in another setting or in team environment. Coaching behaviour involves all the interactions between coach and athlete as well as physical and psychological preparation for training and participation in competitive sports. There are many styles of coaching behaviour including training, instructive behaviour, democratic behaviour, autocratic behaviour and rewarding behaviour. Bai et al. (2013) [1] stated that team coach is the most important element that is effective on sports team’s success or failure, because in sport teams, coach has a dynamic and positive brain, plays undesirable role on fate determination and getting the highest possible output. Coach’s natural behaviour should be for helping the athletes. Whatever coaches use positive action behaviour and natural behaviours in showing feedback to athletes, athlete’s anxiety is decreased and subsequently success motivation and athletes’ ability motivation is increased and finally improves their performance. Smith et al. (1978) [9] stated that coach may be role model to impart the knowledge, transmitting a behaviour and attitude to the adult athletes. Behaviour may have punitive or rewarding nature. In the life of coach and athlete, the competition experiences are important for the development of some important factors such as participation in high level
competition for maximum duration, achievement motivation and ability to tolerate frustration. Satisfaction and confidence developed during their long term participation. Llewellyn and Blucker (1982) [5] acknowledged that coach should comment freely on athlete’s performance, particularly in the early stage of his or her career. Coaches must make sure that the environment is free of distractions so that these receptors can effectively pick up cues to learning and performance. Therefore, the present study was designed to analyze the coaching behaviour between individual and team game female athletes.

2. Objective of the study
To find out the significant differences between individual and team game female athletes on the variable coaching behaviour.

3. Methodology

3.1 Sample
Total six hundred (N=600) female athletes who had participated in inter-college competitions were selected as subjects through random sampling technique. They consist of individual and team game female athletes. Individual game female athletes i.e Wrestling (n=100), Boxing (n=100) and Judo (n=100) and team game female athletes i.e Basketball (n=100), Handball (n=100) and Football (n=100). The age of subjects was ranged between 17 to 28 years.

3.2 Tool
The Coaching Behaviour Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ) developed by Scott B. Martin (2005) [6] was used to assess the behaviour of coaches with their athletes.

3.3 Statistical Application
To find out the significant differences between individual and team game female athletes, the ‘t’ - test was applied. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

4. Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SEDM</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement (R)</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>4.96*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Reinforcement (NR)</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistake Contingent Encouragement (MCE)</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>5.93*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistake Contingent Technical Instruction (MCTI)</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment (P)</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitive Technical Instruction (PTI)</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring Mistakes (IM)</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping Control (KC)</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>4.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Technical Instruction (GTI)</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Encouragement (GE)</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization (O)</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>4.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Communication (GC)</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Behaviour (Total)</td>
<td>158.83</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>152.79</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05 level, t >1.96 (df=598)

It is illustrated from the Table-1 that the calculated ‘t’ values of coaching behaviour between individual and team game female athletes on the sub-variables; reinforcement, mistake contingent encouragement, keeping control, organization and on the variable coaching behaviour (total) (p<0.05) were found to be statistically significant. However, no significant differences were found on the sub-variables i.e. non-reinforcement, mistake contingent technical instruction, punishment, punitive technical instruction, ignoring mistakes, general technical instruction, general encouragement and general communication (p>0.05).

5. Discussion
It is depicted from the results that significant differences were noticed on the sub-variables such as reinforcement, mistake contingent encouragement, keeping control, organization and on the variable coaching behaviour (total) between individual and team game female athletes. While comparing the mean values of both the groups, it has been observed that individual game female athletes were found significantly better on the sub-variables i.e. reinforcement, mistake contingent encouragement, keeping control, organization and on the variable coaching behaviour (total) than their counterpart team game female athletes. However, no significant differences have been observed on the sub-variables i.e. non-reinforcement, mistake contingent technical instruction, punishment, punitive technical instruction, ignoring mistake, general technical instruction, general encouragement and general communication between individual and team game female athletes. It can be safely summarized that both the groups were equally developed on the above said sub-variables.

The above results might be due to the fact that individual game female athletes might get verbal praise from the coach after athlete’s well performance, more encouragement even after making a mistake. Coach might have showed reinforcement to the individual game female athletes for desired behavior, had shown more focus on their training, problems faced by them and had applied more tactics and strategies for individual game female athletes than their counterpart team game female athletes. Llewellyn and Blucker (1982) [5] stated that the coach or teacher must remember that different performers need different kinds of reinforcement; he or she should try to accommodate each participant. Weinberg and Gould (2014) [12] stated that players demonstrate more self-esteem at the end of the season when they played for coaches who frequently use mistake contingent encouragement. Cloes et al. (2001) [2] focused on the interactive decisions and analyse the goals and factors inducing the decisions of coaches of basketball and volleyball. They concluded that calling time out, player substitutions, and tactical cues were the most frequently analysed decisions. Adapting the team strategy and providing information or directives were the priority goals of the decisions of the coaches. Kenow and Williams (1999) [4]
indicated that players who felt more compatible with their coach perceived fewer negative cognitive/attentional and somatic effects from their coach’s game behaviour compared to those players who felt less compatible with the coach. Higher compatibility also correlated with perceiving more supportive behaviour from the coach and better communication and emotional composure. Williams (2015) [15] found that positive interactions caused the players to be more confident, feel valued, important, and cared for. These findings expose the fact that what a coach does verbally as well as nonverbally, affects the psychological well being of the player. A player can carry one compliment from one practice with them for four years. This shows the power of the actions and words the coaches use actually have. Weiss et al. (2009) [14] stated that coaching behaviours that are more positive, informational, and encouraging are associated with higher self-perceptions, affect, and motivation among athletes. Turman (2010) [11] revealed that positive coach-athlete interaction has the possibility of dramatically improving not only the quality of the experience athletes obtain during participation in sports, but also the quality of many other life experiences. Smith et al. (1983) [16] explored that coaches most frequently engaged in reinforcement, general encouragement and general technical instruction behaviours. However, punitive responses (punishment and punitive technical instruction) occurred far less frequently and comprised only six percent of all behaviours. Erickson and Gilbert (2013) [3] stated that coaches exert a positive or negative influence on their athletes primarily through their interactive behaviours. Philippe et al. (2011) [8] showed that the evolution and the gradual change in the power relation in the coach-athlete dyad had a positive impact on the athletes’ personal growth and mental strength as well as on their development as athletes. Weiss and Friedrichs (1986) [13] while examining the relationship of collegiate basketball player’s perceptions of coach behaviour, coach attributes, and institutional variables to team performance and athlete satisfaction revealed that neither institutional nor coach attribute variables were significantly related to team performance or satisfaction. Leader behaviours were significantly related to the team outcomes. Positive feedback was found as the most predictive of team satisfaction. They concluded that school size, coach attributes, and leader behaviours were predictive of athlete satisfaction. Athletes were found to be more satisfied with coaches who engaged in frequent rewarding behaviour, social support behaviour, and democratic behaviour. Mesquita et al. (2011) [7] revealed that high experienced coaches perceived planning, conducting the training and team administration in competition as more important than the less experienced coaches. Zadeh et al. (2013) [16] found that the best predicting variable in the model for motivating of athletes were coach behaviour, democratic style and mistake encouragement.

6. Conclusions
It is concluded that individual game female athletes had demonstrated significantly better on the sub-variables i.e. reinforcement, mistake continent encouragement, keeping control, organization and on the variable coaching behaviour (total) than their counterpart team game female athletes. However, both the groups were equally developed on the sub-variables i.e. non-reinforcement, mistake contingent technical instruction, punishment, punitive technical instruction, ignoring mistake, general technical instruction, general encouragement and general communication.
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