

IMPACT OF COACHING EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE ON COACHING EFFICACY AMONG MALAYSIAN COLLEGIATE COACHES

Kee, K. M. * and Nur, A. M. K.

Faculty of Sports Science and Recreation, Universiti Teknologi MARA,
Shah Alam, Malaysia

*Email: kee@salam.uitm.edu.my

(Received 10 December 2017; accepted 26 April 2018; published online 3 July 2018)

To cite this article: Kee, K. M. & Nur, A. M. K. (2018). Impact of coaching education and experience on coaching efficacy among malaysian collegiate coaches. *Malaysian Journal of Movement, Health & Exercise*, 7(2), 107-116. <https://doi.org/10.15282/mohe.v7i2.196>
Link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.15282/mohe.v7i2.196>

Abstract

Coaches are the people responsible for helping athletes work towards achieving their full potential. The influence of coaches is associated with positive impacts on athletes by enhancing their performance, character development, athlete satisfaction and other various positive outcomes. In order to develop successful athletes, coaches need to have a high level of coaching efficacy. Many factors may affect coaching efficacy, such as coaching education and experience, and it might play a part in the ability of coaches in coaching their athletes. Hence, the purpose of this study is to determine the impact of coaching experience and education on coaching efficacy among Malaysian collegiate coaches. A total of 331 coaches for SUKIPT 2016 were involved in this study. The Coaching Efficacy Scale (CES) questionnaire was used to measure the coaches coaching efficacy. Overall, Malaysian collegiate coaches showed that their level of coaching efficacy was high for all subscales, namely character building ($M=7.92$, $SD=.83$), technique ($M=7.91$, $SD=.89$), game strategy ($M=7.80$, $SD=.93$), and motivation ($M=7.79$, $SD=.83$). Furthermore, study shows that there was a medium positive correlation between coaching experience ($r=.37$, $n=331$, $p<.001$) and coaching efficacy and the small positive correlation between coaching education ($r=.12$, $n=331$, $p<.05$) and coaching efficacy. In addition, multiple regression results indicated that both coaching experience and coaching education can predict overall coaching efficacy ($F(6, 324)=12.85$, $p<.001$). In conclusion, this study has provided additional information about coaching efficacy that in the context of Malaysian collegiate coaches. From these consequences, Malaysian collegiate coaches are aware that coaching education and coaching experience are important elements for them to become a successful coach.

Keywords: SUKIPT, coaching efficacy, coaching education, coaching experience

Introduction

The ability of coaches to influence athletes in their lives and sports performance is well established (Boardley et al., 2008; Feltz, Chase, Moritz, & Sullivan, 1999). Becoming a coach is a vital and challenging role where their responsibility is not only teaching but also managing various athletes to succeed in their sports performance. They play multiple roles such as teachers, friends, and mentors, and give a great impact towards the development of physical and psychological matters of their athletes (Weller, 2013). In order to fulfill the role as a coach, they need to have certain specific abilities. Among these abilities is coaching efficacy (Santos, Mesquita, Graca, & Rosado, 2010).

Coaching efficacy means coaches' belief in their abilities to give impact towards athlete capabilities and performance (Boardley, Kavussanu, & Ring, 2008; Feltz, Chase, Moritz, & Sullivan, 1999; Maleté, Chow, & Feltz, 2013; Paiement, 2006). It can be reflected in four dimensions: motivation, game strategy, technique and character building. Motivation efficacy subscales referring to the coaches' belief in their capability to give impact towards athletes' learning progression, psychological skills, and mood. Game strategy efficacy is related to the ability of the coaches to prepare and plan for a game by interpreting and developing the most effective tactical and strategy to compete against the opponent. Technique efficacy is about the ability of the coaches in giving instructions and diagnosing their athletes' skills. Lastly, character building efficacy subscales refer to the ability of the coaches to develop a positive attitude among their athletes towards sports and sportsmanship in overall.

Many factors can affect a coaches' coaching efficacy, such as coaching education and experience (Feltz et al., 1999; Maleté & Feltz, 2000). In Malaysia, there are four programs offered by National Coaching Academy (NCA), which is run by the National Sports Institute in order for them to give recognition to Malaysian coaches. One of the programmes provided by NCA is National Coaching Certification Scheme (SPKK), level I, II and III, which offers a systematic coaching education program with the purpose of improving the knowledge and skills required by sports coaches (National Sports Institute, 2018). Every coach who attends this course must go through all the components before they can be certified. It is important to attend these courses because coaching education and licensing programs will increase coaches' coaching efficacy and allows them to be able to coach effectively and lead their athletes to success (Kowalski, 2008).

Malaysian coaches strongly agree that having sufficient knowledge of the game, attending seminars conducted regularly, and punctuality are extremely important in helping athletes to enhance their performance (Sharma & Kathuria, 2012). One of the factors for athletes reach their optimal level is their belief in their coaches' efficacy of coaching. There were many studies that measured coaching efficacy, but most of these studies were completed in western context (Bandura, 1999; Barber, 1998; Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003). Furthermore, there have been several studies conducted locally on the influence of coaches efficacies towards performance; however, these studies (Nazarudin, Fauzee, Jamalis, Geok, & Din, 2009; Raja & Kee, 2014) merely focused on athletes' outcomes.

Besides that, some local studies (Azlina, 2001; Chiu, Mahat, Hua, & Radzuwan, 2013; Lim, Nor, Khor, & Radzliyana, 2013) have revealed that the quality of coaching in Malaysia is unfavourable. Local coaches were found to be lacking in term of abilities and require good coaching skills to maintain respectable position of Malaysia world-class athletes. Ayub (2009) concluded that athletes should be trained by the coaches who have expertise in their specific fields so that they are able to guide them to achieve their highest performance. However, Malaysian coaches lack expertise, causing high dependency on foreign coaches. The problems arisen in the coaching industry today are limited in terms of research supporting the coaching efficacy, particularly in Malaysia (Malaysian Digest, 2017). Until today, the involvement of students in sports has been given serious attention in Malaysia. This commitment is taken into account in obtaining a place in local institutions of higher learning. Moreover, annual sports tournaments between higher institutions are conducted to support the provision of talented athletes for the country. In this regard, each institution of higher education has a group of sports coaches to provide institutional teams for the tournament (Chiu et al., 2013). However, the issue which arises here is, do these collegiate coaches have good efficacy skills in coaching the potential athletes for the country? Therefore, this study has been conducted to gather more information with regards to Malaysian collegiate coaches and their coaching efficacy. The current study's aim is to determine the impact of coaching education and experience on coaching efficacy among Malaysian collegiate coaches.

Methods

This study was conducted to obtain empirical evidence about coaching efficacy among collegiate coaches in Malaysia. Specifically, it focuses on coaches' efficacy in coaching athletes during SUKIPT 2016. A total of 331 coaches who coached during SUKIPT 2016 volunteered to serve as participants in this study. These coaches were selected through purposive sampling technique comprising from both individual and team sports. Coaching Efficacy Scale (CES) by Feltz et al. (1999) were selected to measure coaches coaching efficacy. The CES consists of 24-items designed to measure four different subscales (motivation efficacy, character building efficacy, game strategy efficacy, technique efficacy). All items of CES are measure using 9 points Likert scale, where (1) indicates "not confident at all" and (9) indicates "very confident". The reliability for CES in this study is .96.

Results

Data collected was processed and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20 with Pearson-moment correlation and multiple regression analysis with the significant level set at $p < .05$. Pearson-moment correlation and hierarchical multiple regression analysis were used to explain the relationship between independent variables, namely coaching education and coaching experience meanwhile the dependent variable is coaching efficacy level among collegiate coaches. Table 1 shows that among all respondents, 77.6% ($n=257$) were male and 22.4% ($n=74$) were female. The

majority of the coaches were between 31 to 35 years old (28.7%, $n=95$), while a minority were above 41-45 years old (14.2%, $n=47$).

Table 1: Gender and ages of the coaches

Coaches gender/age	Number of coaches (N=331)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	257	77.6
Female	74	22.4
Age (Years)		
<30	79	23.9
31-35	95	28.7
36-40	56	16.9
41-46	47	14.2
>46	54	16.3

In table 2, coaching experience (years) was divided into four groups. Majority of the coaches (36.3%; $n = 120$) had less than two years' experience, 24.2% ($n = 80$) had three to four years, 21.1% ($n = 70$) had five to six years, 18.4% ($n = 61$) had more than seven years. Furthermore, the findings also found that 86.7% ($n = 287$) of the coaches had attended specific sports coaching course. From the total of coaches who had attended the specific coaching course, 57.7% ($n = 191$) had completed beginner level, 23.0% ($n = 76$) had attended intermediate level, and 6.0% ($n = 20$) had attended advance level of specific sport coaching courses.

Table 2: Coaches coaching experience and level of coaching education

Coaches experience/education	Number of coaches (N=331)	Percentage (%)
Coaching experience (years)		
<2 years	120	36.3
3-4 years	80	24.2
5-6 years	70	21.1
>7 years	61	18.4
Level of specific sport certificate		
Did not attend	44	13.3
Beginner level	191	57.7
Intermediate level	76	23.0
Advance level	20	6.0

Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of each subscale in CES. The motivation efficacy showed the lowest mean score ($M = 7.79$, $SD = .83$) achieved by the coaches. This might indicate that Malaysian SUKIPT coaches were less confident in motivating their athletes. However, as shown in the table above, the coaches were more confident in making strategies during competitive games, carrying out the instructional aspects of coaching, and developing the athletes' characters, as reflected by the higher mean score on these three subscales of game strategy efficacy ($M = 7.80$, $SD = .93$),

technique efficacy ($M = 7.91, SD = .89$) and character building efficacy ($M = 7.92, SD = .83$).

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of coaching efficacy score

Scores	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Motivation efficacy	7.79	.83
Technique efficacy	7.91	.89
Game strategy efficacy	7.80	.93
Character building efficacy	7.92	.83
Total efficacy	7.85	.82

Table 4: Correlation between coaching experience and coaching education with coaching efficacy

Variables	<i>Coaching Efficacy</i>
Coaching experience	
Pearson correlation	.369**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
N	331
Coaching education	
Pearson correlation	.123*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.025
N	331

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

* . Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 revealed that there was a medium, positive correlation between coaching experience and coaching efficacy ($r=.37, n=331, p<.001$) and small, positive correlation between coaching education and coaching efficacy ($r=.12, n=331, p<.001$). According to Cohen (1988), the value of the correlation coefficient that lies between the range of $r=.10$ to $r=.29$ will be considered small effect size, $r=.30$ to $r=.49$ is medium effect size, and $r=.50$ to $r=1$ will be considered as a large effect size.

Malete and Sullivan (2009) and Feltz, et al. (1999) indicated that coaching education and coaching experience appear to be the strongest predictors of coaching efficacy. Hence, hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the ability of these two control measures (coaching education and coaching experience) to predict the level of CES. The result explained 7% (.07 x 100) of variance in level of coaching efficacy and after the entry of coaching experience in the model, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 19% (.19 x 100), ($F(6, 324) = 12.85, p<.001$). The two control measures explained an additional 12% of the variance in CES.

Table 5 showed that coaches who had attended beginner level of sport specific coaching course were .18 point higher than coaches who have never attended any sport specific coaching course. For coaching experience, coaches who had less than two years coaching experience scored .44 points higher compared to coaches who had more than seven years of coaching experience in the sports they coached.

Table 5: Summary of hierarchical regression analysis for variables predicting the level of coaching efficacy

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β
Step 1			
Beginner ^a	-3.00	3.21	-.08
Intermediate ^a	8.61	3.63	.18*
Advanced ^a	10.08	5.17	.12
Step 2			
Beginner ^a	-8.12	3.09	-.20*
Intermediate ^a	-3.90	4.06	-.08
Advance ^a	-3.20	5.42	-.04
Less than two years ^b	-17.92	3.62	-.44*
Three to four years ^b	-2.17	3.55	-.04
Five to six years ^b	-1.10	3.31	-.02

Note, $R^2 = .07$ for Step 1; $R^2 = .19$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$)

a. Compared to coaches who did not attending coaching course

b. Compared to coaches with more than seven years coaching experience

B = Unstandardized Coefficient; *SE B* = Standard Error; β = Beta

Discussion

This study aims to determine the impact of coaching education and coaching experience on coaching efficacy among Malaysian collegiate coaches. The study indicated that coaches have a high level of coaching efficacy. The mean score for the level of coaching efficacy was higher compared to other past studies in ASIAN contexts (in this study; Malaysia: 7.85, Kee and Raja (2015); Malaysia: 7.68, Fung (2003); Hong Kong: 6.72, Lee, Malete, and Feltz (2002) Singapore: 7.24). This showed that Malaysian coaches believed that self-confidence in coaching is important in inspiring athletes' performance during competition. This finding supports the study by Raja and Kee (2014), Chiu et al. (2013) and Kuan and Roy (2007) which indicated that Malaysian coaches were confident in their ability to handle coaching tasks. The level of coaching efficacy produced most positive outcomes, which is considered to be aligned with the difficult tasks (Malete & Sullivan, 2009). This study also found that SUKIPT 2016 coaches have the highest character building subscale, as indicated by mean score, when compared to the other three subscales. The result is consistent with studies by Raja and Kee (2014) and Kee and Raja (2015). This indicates that the coaches were able to develop a positive attitude among their athletes towards sports and sportsmanship such as respect for others and fair play during competition because by instilling positive attitude among the athletes, this will lead to successful performances (Fung, 2003).

Apart from that, the findings also suggest that coaching experience and education can be a predictor of coaches' efficacy level (Brailsford, 2015; Mesquita, Borges, Rosado, & Batista, 2012). Several studies (Campbell & Sullivan, 2005; Lee et al., 2002; Malete & Feltz, 2000) supported that coaching education program made them more confident in coaching efficacy compared to other coaches who attended pre-courses or coaches who had not taken any coaching courses. Moreover, Sullivan, Paquette, Holt, and Bloom (2012) and Malete and Feltz (2000) has have shown that coaching education program resulted in

changes of coaching behavior as well as coaching efficacy. Even though results showed coaching education to be one of the predictors that can affect coaches' coaching efficacy, the relationship between coaching education and coaching efficacy in this study is weak. This could be due to an ineffective program content and time constraint. A longer program can lead to a greater impact and deliver greater time for these coaches to master that experience as a coach. They may have more opportunities to learn the use of high-quality feedback techniques, effective instructional skills, and discovering ways to maintain control during simulated issues (Malete & Feltz, 2000).

This study also showed that SUKIPT 2016 coaches who had lesser coaching experience might affect their coaching efficacy level. The result contradicts those of a study by Kee and Raja (2015) where they found that more experienced coaches possessed a higher level of coaching efficacy. They found that more experienced coaches perceive themselves more competent in planning, evaluation, conducting training in the management and training, not only of coaches but also of the athletes compared to novice coaches (Duarte, Garganta, & Fonseca, 2014). Although more experienced coaches are knowledgeable, and have high credibility and confidence, sometimes their knowledge can hinder their learning progress. Because of their long experience and time spent during training, they tend to overlook errors made by the athletes or themselves. These coaches also acquire a little feedback due to the fact that they are doing relatively well in their performance (Liz, 2015). On the other hand, novice coaches who are new to certain things will take smaller steps and be more cautious in performing their tasks. These coaches are less knowledgeable and less experienced but they are full of enthusiasm regarding improving themselves by remaining willing to ask questions, listen and seek guidance from the expert (Christine & John, 2011; Liz, 2015).

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has provided additional information concerning coaching efficacy in the context of Malaysian collegiate coaches. From these consequences, Malaysian collegiate coaches aware that coaching education and coaching experience are important elements for them to become a successful coach. Measuring coaching efficacy is critical because it does not only provide a direct impact on coaching behaviors, but also includes positive and negative influences that a coach may have on the character and athletic development. This study has provided a foundation to build a body of knowledge related to coaching efficacy in the context of SUKIPT 2016 coaches.

References

- Ayub, H. (2009). The predicted factors of cognitive and affective learnings at the level 1 sports science course by the Malaysian National Sports Council. *Universiti Putra Malaysia*.
- Azlina, Z. (2001). *Hubungan antara tingkah laku kepimpinan transformasional jurulatih bola sepak dengan kepuasan prestasi individu pemain-pemain bola sepak sekaolah-sekolah menengah di sekitar daerah Alor Setar, Kedah*. Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asians Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 21-41.
- Barber, H. (1998). Examining gender differences in sources and levels of perceived competence in interscholastic coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, 12(3), 237-252.
- Boardley, I. D., Kavussanu, M., & Ring, C. (2008). Athlete's perceptions of coaching effectiveness and athlete-related outcomes in rugby union: An investigation based on the coaching efficacy model. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22, 269-287.
- Brailsford, K. (2015). *An investigation into coaching efficacy and effectiveness in gymnastics*. (Master of Philosophy), University of Birmingham, University of Birmingham Research Archive.
- Campbell, T., & Sullivan, P. J. (2005). The effect of a standardized coaching education program on the efficacy of novice coaches. *Avante-on-*, 11(1), 38.
- Chiu, L. K., Mahat, N. I., Hua, K. P., & Radzuwan, R. B. (2013). Students-athletes' perception of coaches' coaching competency at the Malaysia public institution of higher learning. *World Journal of Education*, 3(1), p13.
- Christine, N., & John, S. (2011). Insight into experiences: Reflection of an expert and novice coach. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 6(1), 148-161.
- Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd edn)*: Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest* (00336297), 55(3), 215-230.
- Duarte, D., Garganta, J., & Fonseca, A. (2014). Does the experience influence the efficacy of football coach? A perspective from coaches with different levels of experience as player and as coach. *Journal of Human Sport & Exercise*, 9(1), 17-30.

- Feltz, D. L., Chase, M. A., Moritz, S. E., & Sullivan, P. J. (1999). A conceptual model of coaching efficacy: Preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(4), 765-776.
- Fung, L. (2003). Assessment: Coaching efficacy as indicators of coach education program needs. *The Online Journal of Sport Psychology, 5*(1), 12-18.
- Kee, K. M., & Raja, N. J. (2015). Factors influencing coaching efficacy among youth team sport coaches. *2nd International Colloquium on Sports Science, Exercise, Engineering and Technology (ICoSSEET 2015)*.
- Kowalski, C. (2008). The volunteer coaching game plan. Success and self-efficacy drive volunteer coaches. *Parks and recreation-west virginia, 43*(1), 22.
- Kuan, G., & Roy, J. (2007). Goal profiles, mental toughness and its influence on performance outcomes among wushu athletes. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine, 6*(2), 28-33.
- Lee, K. S., Malete, L., & Feltz, D. L. (2002). The strength of coaching efficacy between certified and noncertified singapore coaches. *International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences, 14*(1), 55-67.
- Lim, K. C., Nor, I. M., Khor, P. H., & Radzliyana, R. (2013). Student-athletes' perception of coaches' coaching competency at the malaysian public institution of higher learning. *World Journal of Education, 3*, 1.
- Liz, W. (2015). The difference between coaching rookies and veterans. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Former national footballer criticizes new head coach, nelo vingada. (2017). *malaysiandigest.com*. Retrieved from <http://malaysiandigest.com/features/678422-former-national-footballer-criticizes-new-head-coach-nelo-vingada.html>
- Malete, L., Chow, G. M., & Feltz, D. L. (2013). Influence of coaching efficacy and coaching competency on athlete-level moral variables in botswana youth soccer. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*(10), 2107-2119.
- Malete, L., & Feltz, D. L. (2000). The effect of a coaching education program on coaching efficacy. *The Sport Psychologist, 14*, 410-417.
- Malete, L., & Sullivan, P. J. (2009). Sources of coaching efficacy in coaches in botswana. *International Journal of Coaching Science, 3*(1), 17-27.
- Mesquita, I., Borges, M., Rosado, A., & Batista, P. (2012). Self-efficacy, perceived training needs and coaching competences: The case of portuguese handball. *European Journal of Sports Science, 12*(2), 168-178.

- National coaching academy. (2018). from <http://www.isn.gov.my/en/national-coaching-academy/>
- Nazarudin, M. N., Fauzee, M. S. O., Jamalis, M., Geok, S. K., & Din, A. (2009). Coaching leadership style and athletes satisfaction among malaysian university basketball team. *Research Journal of International Studies*(9).
- Paiement, C. A. (2006). An assessment of the factors predicting coaching efficacy and coaching satisfaction in youth sports. *Department of Kinesiology*.
- Raja, N. J., & Kee, K. M. (2014). Influence of playing experience and coaching education on coaching efficacy among malaysian youth coaches. *World Applied Sciences Journal 30 (Innovation Challenges in Multidisciplinary Research & Practice)*, 414-419.
- Santos, S., Mesquita, I., Graca, A., & Rosado, A. (2010). Coaches' perceptions of competence and acknowledgement of training needs related to professional competences. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 9, 62-70.
- Sharma, K., & Kathuria, S. (2012). Lawn ball: An indian survey. *Journal of education and Practice*, 3(4), 21-29.
- Sullivan, P. J., Paquette, K., Holt, N., & Bloom, G. (2012). The relation of coaching context and coaching education to coaching efficacy and perceived leadership behaviors in youth sport. *Sport Psychologist*, 26(1), 122.
- Weller, G. V. (2013). Youth sport coaching efficacy: Coaching education level as a predictor of coaching efficacy. *Educational Administration: Theses, Dissertations and Student Research*, 164.