

Roles of Coaching Styles, Motivation and Sports Behaviour on Youth Athletes Sport Performance

Ofoke Sunday Mbam^{1*}; Nwankwo Chimezie¹; Oginyi Ronald.C.N¹; Ahamefule Kenneth N.²

1. Department of Psychology Ebonyi state University, PO box 053 Abakaliki South Eastern Nigeria.

2. Federal Teaching Hospital Abakaliki, Ebonyi State South Eastern Nigeria⁴.

Abstract

The study investigated the roles of coaching style, motivation and sports behaviour on youth athletes sport performance. A total of 100 participants comprising of 50 males and 50 females athletes who were randomly selected from Ebonyi State sport stadium and Ebonyi state university, Abakaliki; their mean age was 28.9 with SD age of 11.25. 3 instruments were used: The autonomy supportive & coaching style scale (ASCCSS: Williams, Cox, Kouides & Deci; Grolnick, Ryan & Deci 1991), prosocial and antisocial sport behaviour scale (PASBS; Kavuddan & Boardley, 2009) and validated by Olanrewaju 2014 for Nigerian sample and Athlete sport performance scale (APS; John & Heidi, 2013). The study is a cross sectional design and 3 way analysis of variance statistics were used for data analysis. The result of the study showed that there were statistically significant difference between autonomy-supportive coaching style and controlling climate coaching style on youth athlete performance, $F(1,93) = 25.01$ $P < 0.001$. The result also showed that there were statistically significant difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivated athlete on youth athlete sports performance $F(1,93) = 32.61$, $P < 0.01$. The result also indicates that there was statistically significant difference between prosocial and antisocial sports behaviour on youth athlete performance, $F(1,93) = 29.07$, $P < 0.001$. The implications of these findings for progressive coaching, reduction of performance slumps, sports performance and sports morality were discussed.

Keywords:Autonomy coaching style, controlling climate coaching style, prosocial sport behaviour, antisocial sport behaviour, Athletes.

1. Introduction

In the contemporary world of sports today, the concept of sports behaviour among athletes seem to be regulated by several factors ranging from self-esteem, self-efficacy, competence, morality, level of sport skill, coping strategies, coachings style, motivation, and sport behaviour. However, this work is geared towards examining the moderating roles of coaching styles, motivation and sport behaviour on youths athletes sport performance. The behaviour of our coaches, players and supporters club seem to be creating a lot of psychological problems, such as Anxiety, depression, tension, stigmatization, violence, performance slumps, prosocial and antisocial behaviour towards teammates, and opponents.

Greif (2007) define coaching as question-based enlightening, inspirational and energizing process by a coach to orient a player to the realities of a situation to help the player achieve desired goals. Myles (2012), see coaching as the art and practice of inspiring, emerging, and facilitating the performance, learning and development of the player. Cox, Bachkirova and Clutterbuck (2010), define coaching as a training or developmental process which an individual is supported while achieving a specific personal or professional competence result or goal. The individual receiving coaching may be referred to as coachee. Occasionally, the term coaching may be applied to an informal relationship between two individuals where one has greater experience and expertise than the other and offers advice and guidance as the other goes through a learning process (Morgan, 2012).

Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, and thegersen, 2009; Isoard-Gauthear, Guillet-Descas and Lemyre, 2012) define coaching style as a psychological method adopted by coaches to enhance desirable performance among the players. Bartholomew et al, 2009 and Isoard-Gautheur, et al. 2012), classified coaching style into (a) Autonomy-supportive coaching style and (b) Controlling climate coaching style. An autonomy supportive coaching style is recognized by a coach offering explanations and justifications for their decisions, whilst allowing the sense of autonomy over decisions. An autonomy- supportive coaching style is considered optimal when reducing pressures athletes have to deal with, whether that is internal or external (Bartholomew et al, 2009; Hodge et al, 2011; Isoard Gautheur et al, 2012). While controlling climate coaching style is in some aspects the opposite of an autonomy-supportive style. Rather than allowing the athlete to have autonomy over the session or their training, a controlling coach has a more authoritarian approach. This lack of choice when coupled with a more coercive attitude and style, results in the athlete or individual feeling even less in control of their actions, almost becoming "a puppet on a string". As a consequence, there seem to be an increase in pressure, or desire to please as well as shifting the locus of causality (Bartholomew et al, 2009; Soard-Gautheur et al, 2012). This means that instead of accepting responsibility for defeat or their action they are more likely to become conditions or others. This is obviously a negative trait which if allowed to foster can damage the athlete's attitude long-

term. Matosic, Cox, and Amorose (2014) in their research found that those with scholarship and a controlling coach looked negatively upon the scholarship. This negative view on the scholarship would be seen to be a negative view of their standing in the team, the added pressure which comes from having a scholarship may be heightened by the controlling style of the coach. Although a lot of negativity surrounds the controlling coaching style, there is evidence to suggest that may improve the perception of competence which is one of the 3 key aspects of the self-Determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Matosic et al, 2014).

Hodge, and Lonsdale (2011) highlight the importance of understanding and incorporating both styles depending on the situational demands. They highlight how the supportive style, offering free choice to the athlete may not benefit them in the long term and may be counter productive. As a result, under this situation it would be beneficial to employ a controlling style, on the basis that the interests of the athlete are being put first. It is essential to emphasize that the use of a controlling coaching style is only promoted when the athlete's free choice could have a detrimental effect on either themselves or those around them. On the whole, as evidenced already, the supportive coaching style is favoured for assisting in promoting psychological well-being and fostering positive attitudes of athletes sport performance. Hodge et al (2011), states that an autonomy supportive style has a positive relationship with autonomous motivation. As a result it can be seen that when dealing with children and those vulnerable to potential dropout, it may be of benefit to employ an autonomous-supportive coaching style to prevent burnout. Also that autonomy-supportive coaching style, however, is imperative to understand that there may be situations whereby a controlling approach may be required for the benefit of the individual or the benefit of the team. Empirical evidence about the relationship between coaching style and sport behaviour will provide better understanding of the challenges facing sport performance in Nigeria and set scientific foundations for future intervention and development.

Another interesting variable in this research is motivation. Motivation is defined as a driving force or forces responsible for initiation, persistence, direction and vigour of goal-directed behaviour (Colman, 2003). Hockenbury and Hockenbury (2000) referred motivation as a forces acting on or within an individual or person(s) to cause, initiate or direct behaviour. Westen (1996) considers motivation as a moving force that energizes behaviour. Agulanna and Nwachukwu (2001) view motivation as an internal or external state that energizes a person's behaviour, maintains it and direct it towards a goal so that a state of equilibrium is attained. There are two major types of motivation that posits sport behaviour, or performance which can be extrinsically or intrinsically motivated (Deci and Ryan, 1991; Luc, Michelle, Kim, Nathalic & Marc, 1995). Intrinsic motivation (IM) refers to engaging in an activity purely for the pleasure and satisfaction derived from doing the sport activity (Deci, 1975; Luc, Michelle, Kim Nathalic & marc, 1995). When an individual is intrinsically motivated the person or people tend to perform the behaviour voluntarily, in the absence of material rewards or external constraints (Deci & Ryan, 1985) for instance, Athletes who go to practice because they find it interesting and satisfying to learn more about their sport or athletes who practice their sport for the pleasure of constantly trying to surpass themselves are considered intrinsically motivated towards their sport.

Nnachi (2003) view intrinsic motivation as personal will to do something because that person has considered the act necessary for personal development. It requires personal decision and will on the basis of the benefit the person has assured himself/herself of deriving from the act. Ryan et al (1997) reported that an athlete's initial motivation, whether it be intrinsic (participating in sport for enjoyment) or extrinsic (participating in sport to gain rewards) usually predicts the athlete's attendance and adherence to that particular sports. Extrinsic motivation referred to non-self determined behaviour, also is behaviour that could only be prompted by external contingencies (e.g, rewards).

Ryan. et al (1997) see extrinsically motivated behaviour as those behaviour performed in order to obtain rewards or outcomes that are separate from the behaviour itself. Nnachi (2003) define extrinsic motivation as motivation to engage in an activity as a means to an end. Also as those those are external to the task of the job/activities, such as pay, work condition, triage, benefits, security and promotion, contract of service, the work environment and condition of work. Ryan, Frederick, Lepes, Rubio, and Sheldon (1997) on the study on "intrinsic motivation and exercise adherence" found evidence and enjoyment motive were predictive of stronger adherence and attendance to one's chosen activity, while body-related motives were not associated with strong adherence. Also those extrinsic motives were generally the athlete's reason for beginning participation in a particular sport, while intrinsic motives were most common for continuation in a particular sport.

Gould, Feltz, and Weiss (1985) on their study on "motives for participating in competitive youth swimming" found that several factors motivated children to participate in sports and that female children placed greater emphasis on fun and friendship than males. Also the best performing athletes would show lower levels of intrinsic motivation and higher levels of extrinsic motivation. Akan (2001) investigated the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employees' performance using 100 workers of flour mills of Nigeria. Find that there exist relationship between extrinsic motivation and the performance of employees, while no relationship existed between intrinsic motivation and employee's performance.

Berjum and Lehr (1964) in their research on "monetary incentives and vigilance" found that

participants who received individual incentives (extrinsic) performed better than those participants who did not receive incentives (intrinsic). Bartolome, Cristina, Juan and Pedro (2009) investigated “the analysis and comparison of adolescent athletes motivation: Basketball players vs football players” using 248 athletes from 12 to 17 years of age. Half were from basketball and half were from football. Significant differences were found for variables such as” intrinsic motivation toward accomplishment, external regulation, a motivation, task, ego, and self-determination index (SDI). Basketball players obtained higher values in the SDI, in task, and in IM towards accomplishment than football players. Mehr and Kazen (2012) examine the effect of intrinsic motivation and sport commitment on the performance of Iranian National water polo team, using 28 participants. The results showed there was a significant difference between sport commitment values of successful, less successful and unsuccessful players and there was no significant difference between the intrinsic motivation values of successful, less successful and unsuccessful players. Also the results indicated there is a significant difference between the sport commitment of water polo players and high, middle and low sport records but there is no significant difference between the intrinsic motivation of water polo players and high, middle and low sport records.

Ommundsen and Vaglum (1991) studied 233 twelve to sixteen year old male soccer players and found a relationship between sport enjoyment and perceived sport competence. This finding suggests that positive self-appraisals (intrinsic) are critical for young persons’ enjoyment in sport. Gould & Horn (1984) indicated that young athletes had several motives for their sport participation: Fun, improved skill or fitness level, perceived excitement, to be together with or make new friends, and winning or perceived success. While these are their most frequent motives, young athletes frequently have more than one motives for their participation.

In accordance with SDT principles, athletes who are autonomously motivated should behave primarily in line with their true self (Deci & Ryan, 2000) and seek to satisfy their psychological needs of competence (functioning effectively), autonomy (having a sense of personal initiative and volition), and relatedness (connecting with others). For autonomously motivated athletes, enjoyment is in “the process of trying to improve and to well through appropriate means” (Donahue, Miquelon, Valois, Goulet, Buist, & Vallerand, 2006) in choice fully acting in line with their goals and values (e.g; Prosocial Sport Behaviour, Gagne, 2003), and through connecting with others in their sport, not be winning at all cost (e.g., Antisocial Sport Behaviour). This, for autonomously motivated athletes to act in an antisocial manner would run counter to their psychological needs as it would lead them to achieve competence artificially, to act against their sense of autonomy by engaging in behaviours that run counter to their goals and values, and to disconnect from other athletes by cheating and taking unfair advantage of opponents (Donahue et al 2006; Gagne, 2003).

Autonomously motivated athletes should therefore be more likely to behave in line with their sense of self and internalized values which would include respect for others and themselves and, in turn, be more likely to engage in prosocial sport behaviour and less likely to engage in antisocial sport behaviour. Conversely, athletes who are motivated in a ‘controlled fashion would primarily seek to gain ego enhancement, fame, and extrinsic rewards as a substitute for needs satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2002).

Athletes with dominant controlled motivation would not focus as much on the process of the game, but rather on the outcome, which would serve to fulfill their goals of gaining ego enhancement, fame, and rewards and to nourish their contingent self-esteem (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2002; Donahue et al; 2006). Athletes with dominant controlled motives underpinning participation would thus focus primarily on the end result with a strong emphasis on winning; and when winning is everything, athletes will be tempted to do anything to win. They would therefore be more likely to consider engaging in antisocial sport behaviour in an effort to win, and to morally disengage. Considerable research in other life domains indicates that prosocial acts at work, volunteering, or through giving blood, is negatively affected when people feel obligated or controlled by external contingencies (Grant, 2008; Millette & Gagne, 2008).

Another important variable in this study is sport behaviour. Sport behaviour-entials that participants or individuals in sport environment must have the ability to independently regulate his/her thoughts, emotions, and behaviour in line with required sports attitude, roles, regulations, morality and values (e.g; volitionally engage in sport behaviour; Gagne, 2003). As an important socialization agency, sport has a meaningful role to play in this regard. In sport, there exist two different kinds of behaviour and these include prosocial sport behaviour and antisocial sport behaviour which have been used to refer to the proactive and inhibitive aspects of morality (e.g; Kavussanu, & Duda, 2006). Eisenberg and Fabes,1998;Weinstein and Ryan (2010) define prosocial sport behaviour(s) as acts intended to help or benefit another person be it teammate or opponent. Spinrad (2006) define prosocial sport behaviour as “voluntary behaviour intended to help or benefit another individual”. Prosocial behaviour is defined as actions that benefit other people or society as a whole (Twenge, Ciarocco, Baumeister, & Bartels, 2007). It is characterized by helping that does benefits the helper; in fact, prosocial behaviour is often accompanied by costs. Psychologists suggest that one way this behaviour may outweigh the associated costs concerns the human desire to belong to a group. Helping facilitates group work and in turn, provides individuals with immense benefits for the long run (Twenge et al., 2007). Prosocial behaviours in sports

include the behaviour such as “encouraging the teammate”, “helping an injured opponent”. On the other hand, the term “antisocial sport behaviour” is used to refer to behaviour(s) intended to harm or disadvantage another individual; and these behaviour have negative consequences for others and essentially reflect unfair play (Kavussanu, 2005). Antisocial behaviours in sports consist of such behaviours: “Verbally abusing a teammate” and “trying to wind up an opponent” (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009). For example, verbally encouraging a teammate and physically intimidating an opponent are prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport, respectively.

Stams, Rutten, Prinzie, Dekovic, Schuegel and Van. Vugt (2009) in their study on the relation between sport participation and adolescents deviant behaviour: A meta-analysis review. Using a meta-analysis of 54 studies. In their reviews, greater extent of sport participation showed a small but significant positive association with antisocial behaviour ($r = 0.09$), and a small but significant negative association with delinquent behaviour ($r = 0.05$). Sanchez-oliva, Leo, Sanchez-Miguel, Amado and Y-Garcia-Calvo (2012) in their study on motivational antecedents of prosocial and antisocial behaviours in the sport context. Using 216 football players comprising of 114 infantile and 102 Cadet categories. The participant range age were between 13-16 years old with ($M = 15.2$; $SD = 1.28$). The Hierarchical regression analysis perform on motivational antecedents of prosocial and antisocial behaviour predicted positive prosocial behaviours and negatively predicted antisocial behaviour in the sport context. Also mastery climate was a positive predictor of perception of autonomy, competence and relatedness, whereas performance climate positively predicted pressures feelings. Further more, perception of autonomy and relatedness were positive predictors of higher levels of self-determination.

Maria, Alistair and Daniel (2006) in their study on observed prosocial and antisocial behaviours in male Soccer Teams: Age Differences across Adolescence and the role of motivational variables. The participants were 313 adolescent soccer players, recruited from three age groups: under 13, under 15, and under 17. Each age group was represented by eight teams. Players were filmed during a game and completed Questionnaires after the game. Video taped games were analyzed by two observers, who recorded behaviours for each team rather than each individual players; therefore, all data were analyzed only at the group level. The result showed that observed antisocial behaviours were more frequently than prosocial behaviours. The result also indicated significant differences among the three age groups with the oldest group displaying more frequent antisocial and less frequent prosocial behaviours and perceiving a stronger performance climate and a weaker mastery climate in their team compared to the two younger groups.

Esther, Evelin and Jan (2011), in their study on predictors of antisocial and prosocial behaviour in an adolescent sports context. Using 439 adolescent athletes between 14 and 17 years of age (67 teams). Multi-level statistical analyses indicated that team membership explained 20 and 13 percent of the variance in antisocial and prosocial behaviour in the sport context, also team effects suggested that aggregate of antisocial and prosocial adolescents within teams may partially explain differences in antisocial and prosocial behaviour among athletes in the sports context. A trend was found toward a relation between higher levels of moral reasoning within teams, and less antisocial behaviour in the sports context. Favourable moral atmosphere was positively associated with more prosocial behaviour in the sport context. Finally, supportive coach-athlete relationships were associated with both less antisocial and more prosocial behaviour in the sport context.

These research will anchor on achievement goal theory perspective by (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009; Kavussanu, seal, & Phillips, 2006; Kavussanu, Stamp, Slade, & Ring, 2009 and Self-Determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2009). The correlation between contextual factors (i.e., autonomy-supportive coaching style vs controlling climate coaching style) and personal factors (i.e., prosocial sport behaviour vs antisocial sport behaviour) which are explained in self-determination theory (SDT) (Deci & Ryan, 2000; 2002). Recent research has indicated the potential for SDT as a useful motivational framework to explain the psychological under Pinnings of prosocial and antisocial variables in sport (Ntoumanis & Standage, 2009; Vansteenkiste, Mouratidis, & Lens, 2010). The research also investigated a potential mediator of the relationships between prosocial sport behaviour and antisocial sport behaviour (i.e; moral disengagement). Moral disengagement is the selective use of psychosocial maneuvers that allow an individual to transgress moral standards without experiencing negative affect (e.g; guilt), thereby decreasing constraint on future negative sport behaviour (Bandura, 2002). The concept of moral disengagement has recently been examined with respect to prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2007, 2009, 2010; Corrion, Long, Smith, & d'Arripe-Longueville, 2009). Another theory called social cognitive theory of moral thought and action (Bandura, 2006), suggested that in the development of moral agency, individuals adopt standards of right and wrong that serve as guides for conduct. In this self-regulatory process, individuals monitor their conduct and the conditions under which it occurs, judge it in relation to their moral standards and perceived circumstances, and regulate their actions by the consequences they apply to themselves. Bandura (2004), argued that transgress conduct is regulated by two major sources of sanctions, social sanctions and internalized self sanctions, that operate anticipatorily. In fear control, individuals refrain from transgressing because they fear that such conduct will bring them social censure and other adverse consequences (i.e; a controlling environment). Whereas in “self-control, they behave prosocially because it produces self-satisfaction and self-respect and they refrain from transgressing because such conduct will give

rise to self-reproof". It is possible that a coach with good intention could employ controlling behaviours to coerce an athlete to comply with her or his expectations for prosocial behaviour while another coach's use of autonomy-supportive behaviour could inadvertently empower an athlete to freely choose to act in an antisocial manner. However, SDT propositions would predict that such outcomes would be short term and would not lead to authentic autonomously motivated behaviours in the long term (Grant, 2008); due to the lack of concordance with the athlete's psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Gagne, 2003). Bandura (2002) observed, high moral disengagers experience low guilt over immoral behaviours and they are less prosocial. These eight mechanisms of moral disengagement are moral justification, euphemistic labeling, advantageous comparison, displacement of responsibility, dehumanization, attribution of blame, distortion of consequences, and diffusion of responsibility. These eight mechanisms are used by Bandura, 2002; Boardley & Kavussanu, 2007) to explain sport behaviour among youth athlete sport performance.

Moral disengagement has been strongly associated with antisocial behaviours in sport (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2010; Corrion et al, 2009), and inversely linked to prosocial behaviour in team sport (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2009). Long, pantaleon, Bruant, and d'Arripe-Longueville (2006) revealed that young (M=16.5 years) elite athlete employed moral disengagement to minimize personal accountability for antisocial sport behaviours. Sage and Kavussanu (2007) investigated the relevance of prosocial and antisocial sport behaviours in soccer by asking players to indicate how often they engaged in such behaviours over the course of a season. Principal components analysis revealed two factors representing prosocial and antisocial behaviours (Kavussanu, 2006). The researcher also observed that antisocial behaviours were more frequent and more diverse than prosocial ones. In addition, they were positively and strongly correlated with their respective reported acts, a very promising finding given that situational factors specific to the match may have influenced the observed behaviours.

Most research on coaching style, motivation and sport behaviours on youth athlete sport performance were conducted in the western societies with little or none conducted in Nigeria. This present study therefore tends to bridge this gap by examining the role of coaching styles, motivation and sport behaviour among youth athlete in Abakaliki Metropolis, South-Eastern Nigeria. Due to this, the following statement to the problem are raised (i) Does coaching style play significant role on youth athlete sport performance? (ii) Does motivation influence youth athlete sport performance?(iii) Does sport behaviour significantly influence youth athlete sport performance? .The objective to the study are to determine the: (i) Roles of coaching styles on youth athletes sport performance (ii) Roles of motivation on youth athletes sport performance (ii) Role of sport behaviour on youth athletes sport performance. Due to the forgoing literatures, the following hypotheses are stated:

- (i) There will be no statistical significant difference between autonomy supportive coaching style and controlling climate coaching style on youth athlete sport performance.
- (ii) There will be no statistical significant difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on youth athletes sport performance.
- (iii) There will be no statistical significant difference between prosocial and antisocial sport behaviour on youth athletes sport performance.

2. Method

2.1 Participants:

Participants for the present study consisted of 100 competitive sport athletes who were selected from Abakaliki sport stadium and Ebonyi state university sport field participated for this study, they comprises of (50 males and 50 females). The ages of the participants ranges from 18-30 years with a mean age of 28.9 years with SD age of 11.25years. Athletes youth were chosen because athletes is a second medium contact sport with many opportunities for social interaction and therefore the potential for engagement in both prosocial and antisocial behaviour. All participants included in this study had participated in a game on the day of data collection. All participants were Christians and literate (with at least secondary school education) and were able to communicate in English language. Mode of selection of the participants was purposive due to restrictive qualifying criterion.

2.2 Instruments:

The following instruments were used for this study:

- (1) Autonomy-supportive and controlling coaching style scale (Williams, Cox, Kouides & Deci; 1999; Grolnick, Ryan, & Deci; 1991).
- (2) Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour in sport scale (PABSS; (Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009 and Validated by Olanrewaju (2013), for Nigeria sample).
- (3) Athlete sports performance scale (ASPS; John & Heid 2013).
- (4) Sport motivation scale (SMS; Luc, Michelle, Kim, & Nathalie, 1995)

(1) Autonomy-supportive and controlling coaching style scale:

The researcher assessed athletes perceptions of autonomy-supportive and controlling coaching styles, exhibited by the coach in their major sport. Participants responded to the statement as follows: “This questionnaire, contains items that are related to your experiences with your coach, coaches have different style in dealing with athletes/players, and we would like to know more about how you have felt about your encounters with your coach”. We adapted 14 items from the Health care climate questionnaire (Williams, Cox, Kouides & Deci, 1999) to assess autonomy-supportive coaching style (e.g. “I feel that my coach provides me choices and options” “my coach provide me with financial assistant during performance Slump”), and 4 items from college students scale (Grolnick, Ryan,& Deci, 1991) to assess controlling climate coaching style (e.g “my coach insists that I do things his/her way”) in competitive sport. Participants responded to each item using a 5-point likert scale (1= strongly disagree,5 = strongly agree.

The instrument’s Cornbach’s alpha for the present study is 0.78 and reliability coefficient of 0.66.

(2) Prosocial and Antisocial behaviour in sport scale (PABSS: Kavussanu & Boardley, 2009) consists of four subscales; (1) prosocial behaviour towards teammate (four items: eg; “congratulated a teammate/training partner”), (ii) prosocial behaviour towards opponents (three items: e.g; “helped an injured opponent”) (iii) Antisocial behaviour towards teammates (five items; e.g, “verbally abused a teamate/training partner”), and (iv) antisocial behaviour towards opponents (eight items: e.g; “physical intimidated an opponent”). The instrument had a Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient values vary from 0.70 to 0.75, Olanrewaji reported Cornbach Alpha reliability of the instrument to be 0.72 for Nigeria sample.

(3) Athlete sport performance scale (ASPS; John & Heidi, 2013): The instrument was used to measure athlete sport performance. It is a 10 item instrument, the instrument contain five point response scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Sample of the items includes “much worse than the rest of the team”. “Much better than the rest of the team. The Cornbach alpha for instrument was 0.83 with reliability co-efficient of 0.71.

(4) Sport motivation scale (SMS; Luc, Michelle, Kim, & Nathalie,1995). The instrument was used to measure intrinsic and extrinsic sport motivation. It is a 28 item instrument containing seven response scale ranging from does not correspond at all to corresponds exactly. Sample item include, “I used to have good reason for doing sport”, I like sport because of the reward I received from participation. Cornbach alpha for instrument was 0.63 with reliability co-efficient of 0.75

2.3 Procedure

Surveys pertaining to the research were made available to coaches in Abakaliki, sport stadium and Ebonyi state university sport unit, Abakaliki, South-Eastern Nigeria. The individual participants were contacted through their coaches and were briefed about the common theme of the research and those who agreed to participate were requested to sign an informed consent: Each participant was administrated with personal information forms, Autonomy-supportive coaching style scale and controlling climate coaching style scale, sport motivation scale, prosocial and antisocial behaviour in sport scale. It takes 2 hour for proper completion of the questionnaire during their sport activity day, after which they were collected from the participants for statistically analysis.

2.4 Design/Statistics

A cross sectional survey research design, with 3 way analysis of variance were adopted as measures to test research hypotheses.

3. Results

Table 1: Means score (X) and standard deviation (SD)of the group levels of coaching style, motivation and sport behaviour on youth athletes sport performance.

Variable	Means (X)	Standard Deviations (SD)
Coaching style:	27.72	6.50
Autonomy supportive	24.56	7.80
Control climate:		
Motivation:		
Intrinsic:	40.40	7.85
Extrinsic:	38.84	7.24
Sport behavior:		
Prosocial	30.50	6.58
Antisocial	25.62	6.01

The results, as shown in table 1 above, showed that mean scores of autonomy supportive coaching style of

participant ($X = 27.72$) $SD = 6.50$ differ from that of controlling climate coaching style with mean scores ($X = 24.56$, $SD = 7.80$) on the other hand, the result also showed that intrinsic motivation had a means score of ($X = 40.40$, $SD = 7.850$) which is higher than the means scores of ($X = 38.84$, $SD = 7.24$) participant. Similarly, the result indicated that mean score of prosocial sport behaviour of ($X = 30.50$, $SD = 7.58$) which is greater than the mean score of antisocial sport behaviour of ($X = 25.62$ $SD = 6.01$).

Table 2: ANOVA summary table of coaching style, motivation and sport behaviour on youth athlete sports performance

Variables	SS	DF	MS	Fratio	Sign
Coaching style (A)	25.50	1	25.50	25.01	*
Motivation (B)	217.12	1	217.12	32.61	*
Sport behavior (C)	109.05	1	109.05	29.07	*
AxB	39.05	1	39.05	3.19	
AxB	0.61	1	0.61	1.76	
AxBxC	0.80	1	0.80	3.90	
Error	377.41	93	377.41		
Total	769.54	100			

P< 0.001

*=Significance

Table 2: showed that there was statistically significant difference between autonomy supportive coaching style and controlling climate coaching style on youth athlete sport performance, $F(1,93) = 25.01$, $P < 0.001$. The result also showed that there was statistically significant difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on youth athlete performance, $f(1, 93) = 32.61$ $P < 0.001$. The result also indicated that there was statistically significant difference between prosocial and antisocial sport behaviour on youth athlete performance ($1, 93) = 29.07$, $P < 0.001$.

4. Discussion

In the current study on roles of coaching styles, motivation and sport behaviour on youth athletes sport performance in Ebonyi State, South-Eastern Nigeria. The researchers found that there were statistically significant difference between autonomy supportive and controlling climate coaching style on youth athlete sport performance $F(1,93) = 25.01$, $P < 0.001$. This finding is consistent with the finding of Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, and Baldes (2010) they found that autonomy supportive coaching style had a moderate positive association with athletes sport performance. Other research that supported this findings includes: Bartholomew et al,2009;Hodge et al,2011;Ryan et al,2000;Ofoke et al,2015 and Isoard-Gauthier et al,2012.

The researchers also found that sport motivation was statistically significant towards athlete sport performance especially the intrinsically motivated athlete $F(1,93) = 32.61$, $P < 0.001$. This research is consistent with Ryan, Frederick, Lepes, Rubio, & Sheldon (1997). Other researches that support this finding includes (Ommundsen & Vaglum,1991; Mchr & Kazen,2012; Nnach,2003; Gould,Feltz & Weiss,1985; Mehr & Kazen,2012).

Researchers also found that sport behaviours was positively significant towards athlete sport performance $F(1,93) = 29.07$. This research was consistent with Sage and Kavilssanu (2007) they found that prosocial sport behaviour was statistically significant with sport performance. Ken and Cris, (2011) in their study on "prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour: the role of Coaching Style, autonomous vs controlled motivation and moral disengagement" found that autonomy supportive coaching style was associated with prosocial behaviour towards teammates. Kavussanu and Boardley, (2009) in their study in "The prosocial and Antisocial behaviour in sport scale" found that prosocial sport behaviour correlate significantly with autonomy supportive coaching style than controlling climate coaching style. Deci and Ryan, (2000), also found that an autonomy-supportive motivational style supports athletes need for autonomy, competence and relatedness which in turn enhances self-determined motivation and heightens desired outcome. Also autonomy supportive coaching style and prosocial sport behaviour leads to positive affective, cognitive, and behaviour consequences among athletes.

Weinstein and Ryan (2010) found that controlling climate coaching style, extrinsic motivation and antisocial sport behaviour were statistically difference on youth athlete sport performance (e.g; Ntoumais & Standage, 2009). Implication of the study: It was implicated in this study that coaching style, sport motivation and sport behaviour is imperative for sports morality, longevity and development. It was also implicated in the study that antisocial sports behaviour is a cog in the wheel of sports development and should be discouraged. Conclusions:

The present study was to investigate the roles of coaching styles, motivation and sports behaviour among youth athletes in Abakaliki metropolis, South-Eastern Nigeria. The results indicated that autonomy coaching style play a significant roles on athletes sport performance as compared to climatic coaching style. Also intrinsic motivation had influence on youth athletes' performance. The result also showed that prosocial sports

behaviour among youth athletes enhances sport performance among athletes. This study recommended that more attention should be given to the climatic coaching style, extrinsic motivation and anti social sport behaviour since it result to decrease in sport performance among youth athletes in our society today. Coaches should be educated about ways to improve the quality of autonomy supportive coaching style for their athletes and to provide a coaching style conducive for developing the athlete's sense of autonomy and self-regulation. Also, stakeholders in sports should emphasize the proper application of the spirit of sportsmanship by athletes in the field of play to reduce rancor, crisis and other forms of antisocial behaviour. Also intrinsic motivation should be encourage so as to enhance spirit of sportsmanship in our society.

5. Conclusion

The research reviewed here clearly shows that autonomy supportive coaching style have a beneficial impact on athlete youth sport performance than controlling climate coaching style, which are important determinants of sport performance and persistence to achievements; paradoxically, it would appear that in African culture, athletes constantly adjust and thwart their need for autonomy supporting coaching style to satisfy their coach's desires, themselves, fans and expectations of well-wishers in sport.

The research also indicated that athletes' intrinsic motivation in sport play a significant role in youths athletes sport performance than extrinsic motivation in sport performance due to the fact that it is self motivated, and not induced by external factor such as incentive and rewards. The result of the study also showed that although pro-social behaviours to occur in the sport context, antisocial ones are much more frequent and diverse, and they becomes more pronounced among the youth athletes. Findings of the research indicated prosocial behaviour increases sport performance among athletes youth sport performance than antisocial sport behaviour and it should encouraged.

Future research may attempt to manipulate those factors as to test their causal role, as well as to increase the primitive value of sports for social development and functioning in youths sport empowerment.

Acknowledgment

We thank academic planning administrators at Ebonyi state University, Abakaliki, South-Eastern Nigeria for giving us excess to EBSCO-mobile to sources for materials.

We also appreciate Ebonyi State University undergraduates for participating in this research which allowed us to collect the necessary data needed for this research.

References

- Agulanna, G.G., & Nwachukwu, F.J. (2001). *Psychology of learning: Putting theory into practice*. Mbaise: New Vision publishers.
- Akanbi, P.A. (2001). Influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employees' performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106*, 193-197.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W.M. Kurtines & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds). *Handbooks of moral behaviour and development; Theory Research, and Applications* (vol 1, 77-129). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*, 164-180.
- Barkoukis, V., Lazuras, L. Tsorbatzoudis, H., & Rodafinos. A (2011). Motivational and sportspersonship profiles of elite athletes in relation to doping behaviour. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 205-212*.
- Bartolome, J.A., Cristina, C., Juan, A.M., & Pedro, S.L. (2009). Analysis and comparison of adolescent athletes motivation: Basketball players vs football players. *Revista de Psicologia de'l Deporte, vol 18*, pp 353-356.
- Bartholomew, J.K., Ntoumanis, N.& Thegersen-Ntoumani, C. (2009). A review of controlling motivational strategies from a self-determination theory personpective: implications for sport coaches. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology; 2*, 215-233.
- Bartholomew, K.L., Ntoumanis, N., & Thegersen (2010). The controlling interpersonal style in a coaching context. Development and initial validation of a psychometric scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology. 23*, 193-216.
- Bergum, B., & Lehr, J. (1984). Monetary incentives and vigilance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, No.7*, 197-198.
- SSBoardley, I.D., & Kavussanu, M. (2007). Development and validation of the moral dis-engagement in sport scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 29*, 608-628.
- Boardley, I.D., & Kavussanu, M. (2009). The Moral disengagement in sport scale. Short. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 26*, 1507-1517.
- Boardley, I.D., & Kavussanu, M. (2010). Effects of goal orientation and perceived value of topughness on antisocial behaviour: The mediating role of moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 32*, 176-192.
- Colamn, A.M. (2003). *Oxford Dictionary of Psychology*. Oxford: University press.
- Cox, E., Bachkirova, T., Clutherbuck, D. (2010) *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*. London press.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dientsbier (Ed), Nebraska Symposium on motivation: Vol.38. *Perspectives on Motivation* (pp. 237-288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska

- press.
- Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
- Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (Eds). (2002). *Handbook of Self-Determination Research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1024-1037.
- Donahue, E.G., Miquelon, P., Valois, P., Goulet, C., Buist, A., & Vallerand, R.J., (2006). A motivational model of performance-enhancing substance use in elite athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 28, 511-520.
- Eisenberg, N. & Fabess, R.A. (1998). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg (Ed), *Handbook of child psychology*. Vol 3: *Social, Emotional, and Personality Development* (701-778). NY: Wiley.
- Esther, A.R., Evelien, D., & Fan, B.H. (2011). Predictors of antisocial and prosocial behaviour in an adolescent sports context. *Social Development*, 20, 1, 294-315.
- Fabes, R.A., Fultz., J., Eisenberg, N., May-Plumlee, T., & Christopher, F.S. (1989). Effects of rewards on children’s prosocial motivation: *A Socialization Study Developmental Psychology*, 25, 509-515.
- Gagne, M. (2003). The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in prosocial behaviour engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, 27, 199-223.
- Gagne, M., Ryan, R. & Bargmann, K. (2003). Autonomy support and need satisfaction in the motivation and well-being of gymnasts. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15, 372-390.
- Gillet, N., Vallerand, R.J., Amoura, S., & Baldes, B. (2010). Influence of coaches 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, 155-161.
- Gillet, N., Vallerand, R.J. Paty, E., Gobance, L., & Berjot, S. (2010). French validation and adaptation of the perceived autonomy support scale for exercise settings to the sport context. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 8, 117-728.
- Gould, D., Feltz, D., & Weiss, M. (1985). Motives for participating in competitive youth Swimming. *International Journal of Sports Psychology*, 16, 126-140.
- Gould, D., & Horn, T. (1984). Participation motivation in young athletes. In J.M. Silva, & R.S. Weinberg (Ed.), *Psychological Foundation of Sport* (pp. 369-370). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Greif, S. (2007). Advances in research on coaching outcomes: International coaching psychology. *Review* 2(3): 222-249.
- Grolnick, W.S., Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L., (1991). The inner resources for school performance: Motivational mediators of children’s perceptions of their parents. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 508-517.
- Hodge K. & Lonsdale, C. (2011). Prosocial and Antisocial behaviour in sport: The role of coaching style, autonomous vs controlled motivation, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 33, 527-547.
- Hockenbury, D.H; & Hockenbury, S.E. (2000). *Psychology* (end Eds.). New York: Worth publishers.
- Isoard-Gauthier, S., Guillet-Descas, E., & Lemyre, P. (2012). A prospective study of the influence of perceived coaching style on burnout propensity in high level your athletes: using a self-determination theory perspective. *The Sport Psychologist*, 26, 282-298.
- John, G., & Heidi, A. W (2013) Evaluation strategies, self-esteem, and athletic performance. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 21, 12-36.
- Kavussanu, M, & Spray, C.M. (2006). Contextual influences on moral functioning of male youth footballers. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 1-23.
- Kavussanu, M. (2006). Motivational predictors of prosocial and antisocial behaviour in football. *Journal of sport sciences*, 24, 575-588.
- Kavussanu, M. (2007) *Morality in Sport Social Psychology in Sport* (pp. 265-278) champaign, IL. Human Kinetics.
- Kavussanu, M., & Boardley, I. (2009). The prosocial and Antisocial behaviour in sport scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 31, 97-117.
- Kavussanu, M., Stamp, R. Slade, G., & Ring, C. (2009). Observed prosocial and antisocial behaviours in male and female soccer players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*. 21, 562-576.
- Kavussanu, M, Seal, A., & Phillips, D. (2006). Observed prosocial and antisocial behaviours in male soccer teams: Age differences across adolescence and the role of motivational variables. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 18, 326-344.
- Kavussanu, M. (2006). Motional predictors of prosocial and antisocial behaviour in football. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24, 575-588.
- Ken, H. & Chris, L. (2011). Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour in sport: The Role of coaching style, Autonomous vs controlled motivation, and moral Disengagement. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 33, 527-547.
- Long, T., Pantaleon, N., Bruant, G., Grano, C., & d’Arripe-Longueville, F., (2006). A qualitative study of moral reasoning of young elite athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 330-347.
- Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Rose, E.A. (2008). The development of the behavioural regulation in sport questionnaire (BRSQ): Instrument development and initial validity evidence. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 30, 323-335.
- Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Rose, E. (2009). Athlete burnout in elite sport. A self-determination perspective. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 27, 785-795.
- Luc, G.P., Michelle, S.F., Kim, M.T., Nathalic, M.Bi, & Marc, R.B. (1995). Towards a new measure of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and a motivation in sports: The sport motivation scale (SMS). *Journal of Sport and Exercise*

- Psychology*, 17, 35-53.
- Maria, K., Alistair, R.S., & Daniel, R. Phillips (2006). Observed prosocial and antisocial behaviours in mael soccer teams: Age differences across, adolescence and the role of motivational variables. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 18, 326-3344.
- Matosic, D., Cox, A.E., & Amorose, A.J. (2014) scholarship status, controlling coaching behaviour, and intrinsic motivation in collegiate Swimmers: A test of cognitive evaluation theory. *Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology*, 3, 1-12.
- Mehr, A.H.N., & Kazem, D.S. (2012). The effect of intrinsic motivation and sport commitment on the performance eof Tranian national water polo team. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 3(6), 1173-1177.
- Millette, V., & Gagne, M. (2008). Designing colunteers' tastks to maximize motivation satisfaction and performance: The impact of job characteristics on volunteers engagement. *Motivation and Emotion*, 32, 11-22.
- Morgan, S. (2012). *Should a Life Coach Have First*: The New York Times
- Nnachi, R.O. (2003). An introduction to psychology in education. Okigwe Whytem publisher Nigeria.
- Ntoumanis, N., & Standage, M. (2009). Morality in sport: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*: 21, 365-380.
- Nwankwo, B.C., Oginyi, R.C. & Ofoke, S.M. (2014). Coaching styles as coreelates of sports behaviour among youth athletes in Abakaliki Metropolis . unpublished paper.
- Olanrewaju, I. (2014). Coaching style and it implication in Nigeria content. *International Council for health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport, and Dance*. Volume viii No2 fall and Winter.
- Ommundesen, Y., & Vaglum, P. (1991). Soccer competition anxiety and enjoyment in young boy players. The influence of perceived competence and significant other's emotional involvement. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 22, 35-49.
- Reinboth, M., Duda, J.I., & Ntoumanis, N. (2004). Dimensions of coaching behaviour, need satisfaction, and the psychological and physical welfare of young athletes. *Motivation and Emotion* 28, 297-313.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci. E.L. (2000). Self determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Ryan, R.M., & Connell, J.P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 57, 749-761.
- Rayn, R.M., Frederick, C.M., Lepas, D., Rubio, D., & Sheldon, K.S. (1997). Intrinsic motivation and exercise adherence. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28, 355-354.
- Sage, C., Kavussanu, M., & Duda, J.L. (2006) Goal orientations and moral identity predictors of prosocial and antisocial functioning in male association, football players. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 24, 455-466.
- Sanchez-Oliva, D., Leo, M.F.M., Sanchez-Miguel, P.A., Amado, A.D. & Y-Garcia-Calvo, T. (2012). Motivational antecedents of prosocial and antisocial behaviours in the sport conter. *Revista Internacional de Medicinay Ciencias de la actividad fisica yel Deporte* vol 12 (46), 253-270.
- Stams, G.J.J.M., Rutten, E.A., Prinzie, P., Dekovic, M., Schuegel, C., & Van-Vugt, E.S. (2009). The relation between sport participation and adolescents deviant behaviour: A meta-analysiso manuscript submitted for publication.
- Twenge, J.M., Ciaroclo, N.J., Baumeister, R.F., & Bartels, M.J. (2007). Social exclusive decreases prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 56-66.
- Westen, D. (1996). *Psychology: Mind, Brain and culture*: New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

