European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences 2022; www.european-science.com
Vol.11, No2 pp. 276-287
ISSN 1805-3602

Coaches' Sense of Efficacy in Sports Competitiveness

Matilde T. Concordia
College of Teacher Education, University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City, Ilocos Sur
Email: matilde.concordia@unp.edu.ph

Received for publication: 17 January 2022.
Accepted for publication: 10 March 2022.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to present important inputs for improving the sports event capabilities of coaches at the University of the Northern Philippines in Vigan City. Specifically, it aimed to assess coaches' self-efficacy using the Coaching Efficacy Scale (CES) established by Feltz, Chase, Moritz, and Sullivan (1999) as a tool. The data were analyzed using frequency count and percentage, mean, and simple bivariate correlation analysis.

Based on the salient findings of the study, it is concluded that most coaches are males as they are the ones typically assigned and usually sent to training in sports. Coaches have a very high level of efficacy as they instill a sense of respect, build team confidence, promote sportsmanship, develop character, and efficiently motivate their athletes. In addition, coaches' efficacy is affected by the different drawbacks that include time constraints resulting from the demands of their teaching and administrative load. Most coaches accept their coaching assignments for self-fulfillment and enjoyment, as they feel proud whenever athletes become successful in their field. Coaches believe that training, seminars, conferences, and tune-up games as university initiatives can help enhance their efficacy. Finally, experienced coaches gain more levels of efficacy in sports competitions.

In order to be more competitive, it is suggested that the university consider involving more females in the coaching pool. Further, reduction of coaches' teaching loads may be reinforced, or inclusion of coaching in their load may be considered for them to have more time to intensify the training of athletes. The University may also consider increasing the funds allotted for the sports program and providing two-day service credits every term as incentives for coaches and increasing allowances for athletes. In addition, coaches should also be sent for more training specifically applicable to coaching to be updated with new trends.

Keywords: Coaching, sports, efficacy, physical education, competition

Introduction

Sports coaches assist athletes in developing their full potential. However, sports coaching is an added assignment given to faculty in an educational institution. It is a task given to them based on their specialization or fortuitous designation. Coaches must be willing to work regardless of how the job is assigned due to the importance of sports activities in the holistic development of the learners.

This is supported by the Philippine mandates on the promotion and development of sports to nurture a healthy, disciplined, and peaceful Filipino citizenry as specified in Section 6-b, RA 6847, Executive Order 64, and Executive Order No. 651. In addition, the U.N. Millennium Development Plan similarly promotes the potential of sports as a tool for development and peace.

As the world becomes driven by fast-paced technology, the Republic Act 9163 or the National Service Training Program (NSTP) Act of 2001 emphasizes health, safety, and recreation among others as dimensions of development (Pardo, and Mendoza, 2018). Thus, all higher education institutions in the country share in promoting sports among students. One of these institutions is the University of the Northern Philippines (UNP) in Vigan City, a state institution of higher learning with a year-round program intended to prepare and train both athletes and coaches to partake in various sports activities at the regional, national, and international levels. As UNP actively participates in many competitions, coaches have the responsibility to develop the knowledge and skills of athletes that would further their competence. With this consideration, coaches' competence and performance can greatly affect the athletes.

Research suggests that a coach who lacks specialized expertise or experience may have a negative impact on the athlete's training. Most coaches are granted this distinction because of their familiarity with and proximity to the game in a challenging situation. An institution also fails to provide formal education for coaches in particular sporting events, besides the many other factors that influence an athlete's performance. Coaches are forced to improvise since they lack sufficient orientation and training. In some cases, the coaches may know what they're doing, but they cannot put it into practice, resulting in confusion. As a result, self-efficacy becomes a crucial aspect of the coaching strategy of athletes because it reflects the link between knowledge and behavior. According to Bandura's (1977) theories, self-efficacy is inextricably linked to athletic performance. The study of Silva and Stevens (2002), as cited by Mackenzie (2020), found that increased self-efficacy resulted in the improved performance of the respondents. As a result, decreases in overall performance limit both performance and education. As elaborated by Fung (2002), self-efficacy is described in four dimensions: motivation, strategy, technique, and character.

Vella, Oades, and Crowe (2012) indicate that the movements of coach transition leadership and the coach-athlete relationship have a fine moderate affiliation with growth experiences. Team success has little correlation with an ordinary trip in production. An aggregate of coach transition leadership actions and the consistency of the coach-athlete relationship is a high-quality predictor of developmental experiences. The person concerned, intellectual stimulation, and wonderful role modeling are outstanding leadership behaviors.

Sports are about more than just having a good time with friends and family. As a result of sports culture's emphasis on hard work and dedication, athletes, coaches, parents, and fans alike are drawn to it. Sports may help communities deal with a variety of problems by bringing people together. However, when it comes to sports, competition has been drawn to analyze, direct, and specify the purpose of winning (outcome-oriented) or performing magnificently (skill-oriented), consequently (performance-oriented).

Study Aim and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to present relevant inputs critical to enhancing the capabilities of coaches in sports events at the University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City during the School Year 2013- 2016. It is specifically intended to (1) document profiles of coaches at the university in terms of age, sex, marital status, highest educational attainment, the field of specialization, place of residence, number of years as coach, number of relevant training attended, number of sports participation, and number of awards received by the team during the term as a coach; (2) determine their level of efficacy; (3) identify drawback and deterrents to performing their role as a coach; (4) distinguish reasons for accepting coaching assignment (5) determine the initiatives instituted by the uni-

versity to enhance their coaching duty; and (6) determine the relationship between their profile and level of efficacy.

Literature Review

Competition is frequently described as a contest or a procedure of contesting between two or more events (organisms, individuals, or groups) for a scarce resource or good. To constantly enhance and optimize overall performance, coaching is very essential.

To convey the quality of the team in every competition, coaching plays a quintessential role in the motivation and overall performance of athletes and, thus, challenges their efficiency in the given undertaking or role. The development of the competitiveness of the youth being the most valuable resource of the nation should be given optimum motivation for some training as active agents for quality service by molding their character, their abilities, and ideas in such ways that they become effective and responsible members of the society (Pardo, 2015). Coaches therefore, continues to play a pivotal role in inculcating values demanded by the contemporary social order.

Almost everyone, according to Bandura (1977) as cited by Taban and Cajindos (2018), can identify goals they wish to achieve and things they want to modify. However, the majority of people recognize that putting these plans into effect is challenging. In addition, most researches have found that an individual's self-efficacy has a significant role in attaining objectives, tasks, and problems.

With the intention of portraying it as a Western preoccupation, they report that, even in European studies, coaches have demonstrated no negative outcomes in the place. (Law, Ireland, and Hussain (2007). Coaches work in teaching relationships, barring clear goals. Also, in a changing world where greater emphasis is placed on informal learning, collaborative studying (web 2.0), and emergent learning, teaching may additionally turn out to be much less restrained by goals, particularly specified sub-goals.

A study on the self-efficacy of elite coaches by Gencer (2011) revealed that coaches' trust in self-efficacy and character-building was found to be at the absolute best stage. The tagline "Good Individual, Good Citizen, Good Athlete" used to be one of the main reasons for the formation of the Coca-Cola League. With this phrase in mind, and considering the teams for which coaches work, the simplest ranges of perceived self-efficacy in their sub-scale used to be extremely important.

Myers, Vargas-Tonsing, Tiffanye, and Feltz (2005) investigated the sources of coaching efficacy and the effects of coaching efficacy on group variables and discovered that a coach's gender plays an important role in the relationship between character building and team satisfaction in women's teams. Character-building efficacy was inversely associated with team satisfaction in a group of male coaches.

The above research shows that instilling athletes with a sense of self-efficacy boosts their belief in their ability to perform well under pressure. In light of this, the researcher was inspired to conduct a similar study to determine the drawbacks and deterrents to performing their coaching role, and initiatives were instituted by the researcher, including age, gender, marital status, highest educational attainment, specialty, place of residence, number of years as coach, number of relevant training attended a number of participation in sports, and number of awards received during the term as coach.

So far, studies similar to this have not been given much attention, thus resulting in mediocre to poor performance of coaches. This study was then premised on the belief that financial considerations impact the performance and holistic development of athletes and coaches. Moreover, it addressed the significance of coaches' efficacy as designated by academic institutions. The results of this study will aid in the selection of coaches who will prepare and train a deserving sports team and

its athletes. In addition, it may provide useful information for planning the sports program's structure to be more comprehensive and systematic.

Materials and Methods

This study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design. The respondents consisted of coaches, co-coaches, and student-athletes of the different sporting events at the University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City. A survey instrument was used in the study.

Part I looked into the profiles of the coaches and co-coaches, while Part II investigated the respondents' self-efficacy using the Coaching Efficacy Scale (CES) developed by Feltz et al. (1999). Part II comprises 24 items distributed into sub-scales: motivation efficacy (7 items), game strategy efficacy (7 items), teaching technique efficacy (6 items), and character-building efficacy (4 items). These were measured using a Likert Scale of 10 points, where (1) indicates "not at all confident" and (10) indicates extremely confident. Part III measured the drawbacks or deterrents to coaching, reasons for accepting coaching assignments, and initiatives instituted to enhance coaching. However, slight revisions or modifications were made and validated to suit the needs of the present study.

The author personally distributed the instrument to the coaches and provided detailed information on the purpose of the study and the manner in which the questionnaire would be completed. Retrieval was done after the respondents had answered the questionnaire.

To treat the data gathered, the following statistical tools were used: frequency count and percentage to describe the profile of the respondents; deterrents and initiatives; and reasons for accepting the coaching assignment; mean to describe the coaches' level of efficacy; and simple bivariate correlation analysis to determine the relationship between the profile of the respondents and their level of efficacy. The study used the work text in statistics developed by Cadorna and Cadorna (2009) as guide in the statistical analysis of data.

Results and Discussion

Profile of the Respondents

Based on the findings, the study reveals that the profile of coaches in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, field of specialization, marital status, number of years as coach, relevant training attended, participation in sports, and awards received by the team are similar across all age groups.

Generally, most of the coaches are relatively young. Specifically, 13 (27.66%) coaches are 41–50 years old; 12 (25.53%) are 31–40 years old and 21–30 years old, respectively. On sex, the majority (78.7%) of the respondents are male. In terms of the highest educational attainment, it is noteworthy that a large percentage (42.55%) of the coaches have finished their master's degrees. However, a little more than half of the coaches (51.07%) have bachelor's degrees and have not yet finished their M.A. In terms of field of specialization, most (85.11%) of the coaches are non-PE majors. According to marital status, the majority (78.72%) of the coaches are married. Furthermore, a marked percentage (53.19%) has served as a coach for five (5) years or less.

On the number of relevant trainings attended, the majority of the coaches (63.83%) have attended five (5) or less trainings in coaching. On participation, the majority of them (55.32%) have participated in national sports competitions. On awards received, the faculty respondents have coached teams that garnered ten (10) or fewer gold medals (57.45%), ten (10) silver medals (51.06%), and ten (10) bronze medals (46.81%).

Table 1. Level of Efficacy of Respondents

Coaching Efficacy	Athletes		Coaches		As a Whole	
		DR		DR		DR
I maintain the confidence of my athletes.	7.95	HC	7.98	HC	7.96	HC
I recognize opposing team's strength during competition.	7.71	HC	7.87	HC	7.77	HC
I mentally prepare athletes for game/meet strategies.	8.01	EC	8.17	EC	8.06	EC
I understand competitive strategies.	7.97	HC	8.19	EC	8.04	EC
I instill an attitude of good moral character.	7.89	HC	8.49	EC	8.09	EC
I build the self-esteem of my athletes.	7.88	HC	8.23	EC	8.00	HC
I demonstrate the skills of the sport.	7.97	HC	8.04	EC	7.99	HC
I adapt to different game/meet situations.	7.72	HC	8.09	EC	7.84	HC
I recognize opposing team's weakness during competition	7.87	HC	8.00	HC	7.91	HC
I motivate my athletes.	8.10	EC	8.51	EC	8.24	EC
I make critical decisions during competition.	7.79	HC	8.26	EC	7.94	HC
I build team cohesion.	8.01	EC	8.17	EC	8.06	EC
I instill an attitude of fair play.	7.91	HC	8.52	EC	8.11	EC
I coach individual athletes on technique.	7.99	HC	8.04	EC	8.01	EC
I build the self-confidence of my athletes.	7.93	HC	8.43	EC	8.09	EC
I develop athletes' abilities.	7.97	HC	8.23	EC	8.06	EC
I maximize my team's strengths during competition.	7.84	HC	8.28	EC	7.99	HC
I recognize talents of athletes.	8.03	EC	8.38	EC	8.15	EC
I promote good sportsmanship.	8.06	EC	8.60	EC	8.24	EC
I detect skill errors.	7.82	HC	8.02	EC	7.89	HC
I adjust my game/meet strategy to fit the team's talent.	7.94	HC	8.19	EC	8.02	EC
I teach the skill of the sport.	8.00	HC	7.98	HC	7.99	HC
I build team confidence.	8.17	EC	8.47	EC	8.27	EC
I instill an attitude of respect for others.	8.14	EC	8.60	EC	8.29	EC
Overall	7.94	H	8.24	VH	8.04	VH

Norms: Range of Scores Descriptive Rating Over-all Rating

Measurement Criteria

8.01-10.0	Extremely Confident (EC)	Very High ((VH)
6.01-8.00	Highly Confident (HC)	High (H)
4.01-6.00	Moderately Confident (MC)	Average (A)
2.01-4.00	Low Confident (LC)	Low (L)
1.00-2.00	Very Low Confident (VLC)	Very Low (VL)

As a whole, the level of efficacy of the coaches as perceived by the respondents is "Very High" as evidenced by the overall mean of 8.04. Taking the two groups of respondents individually,

the coaches rated their efficacy higher (=8.24, very high) compared to the athletes who gave them the mean rating of 7.94 (High). This means that the perceived efficacy of athletes' coaches is lower than that of their own coaches.

The findings of this study are comparable to those of Myers & Feltz (2004), who believe that if athletes' goals and beliefs aligned with those of the coach, satisfactory interaction between coaches and athletes would ensue. They also highlighted that if players' and coaches' opinions differ, some psychological needs of athletes may not be satisfied. This may cause them to become frustrated and lose their efficacious feelings. These emotions could arise as a result of greater incompatibility between coaches and athletes, which prevents similar perceptions of coaching conduct interactions. For example, the coach may assume that his or her vocal teaching is both positive and informative. The athlete, on the other hand, may feel singled out and consequently receive unfavorable feedback. This leads to dissatisfaction with the coach or the skill, as well as diminished efficacy judgments. As a result, athletes' efficacy levels may be influenced by how similar their perceptions are to those of their coach.

Looking closely at the items, items 24, 23, and 19, respectively, obtained the highest mean rating, which ranges from 8.01–10.00. This shows that the coaches and athletes believed that there was an extraordinarily excessive level of efficacy in implanting a sense of respect, constructing crew confidence, and promoting sportsmanship in the athletes. Furthermore, the coaches efficiently construct personalities and high-quality motivation for their athletes.

Rieke, Hammermeister, and Chase (2008) found that players who viewed their coach as autonomy-supportive had higher levels of motivation and that there was a substantial positive link between perceived autonomy-supportive coaches and the number of seasonal wins. Simply put, these findings show that athletes with self-determined motivation as a result of these coaches outperform the controlling coach and their athletes.

On the other hand, items 2, 8, and 20 obtained the lowest mean ratings. This means that the coaches are more confident in recognizing opponents' sturdy points at some stage in competitions, adapting to one-of-a-kind game/meet situations, and identifying skill errors. This implies that coaches need more training and experience to improve their in-game approach and educating techniques.

Most understandings of coaching are underpinned by the view of coaching as a collaborative relationship formed between a coach and the coachee for the purpose of achieving professional or private development outcomes that are valued by the coachee, according to Spencer and Grantz (2007), as cited by Grant (2012). They stressed that coaching is a goal-oriented activity; clients come to coaching because they are having difficulty achieving what they want or desire, and they need assistance formulating and enacting solutions to that problem.

The coaching-style that a coach develops or adopts can have a positive or negative impact on their athletes, so it is vital to understand how attitude, demeanor, personality, and overall management style affect athletes. According to studies on coaching effectiveness and behavior, a number of favorable outcomes for athletes can be attributed to good coaching practices.According to Keatlholetswe (2019), coaches' self-ratings on technique efficacy influenced player evaluations of the coaches' usage of all six leadership styles. The efficacy of the game method predicted better team spirit and performance. Player assessments of the coaches' use of various leadership styles were unrelated to player assessments of motivation efficacy. However, character-building efficacy was low.

Further, Turnnidge and Côté (2016) stress that, in comparison to absolute achievement, the aims of youth sports participation are concerned with promoting high-quality adolescent growth. In particular, transformational leadership practices have been potentially associated with high-quality

behavioral outcomes in the context of formative years' sports. At the same time, the coach-athlete partnership is a key instrument used by coaches who attempt to train younger athletes' existing talent. Thus, when it comes to training young athletes, coaches consider the coach-athlete connection a significant tool.

Drawbacks and Deterrents of Coaches

Drawback and Deterrents in Performing the Role as Coaches

Table 2. Different identified drawbacks and deterrents of coaches

Drawbacks and Deterrents	f	%	Final Rank
Time constraints and competing demands (e.g., teaching administrative work	29	65	1
Lack of sufficient knowledge in coaching the game/team.	9	19	6
Funding constraints in the maintenance of a competitive tea	21	45	2
Emphasis on the traditional style of training.	11	23	5
Lack of motivation.	12	26	4
Lack of incentives and privileges	13	28	3

Table 2 indicates that the drawbacks or deterrents to performing their role as the university coach are time constraints and competing demands on their teaching or administrative assignments and limited sports funds. They added that if they are given a load reduction, it will be easier for them and the athletes to design a common time for extra intensive training, which certainly will give them a higher competitive edge in sports events.

Moreover, the respondents believe that there is a need for training allowances to augment the meal and snack allowances, so they supply the entire add-ons and the best trendy sports gear due to the fact that these will contribute to achieving the ultimate goal. The lack of incentives and privileges and lack of motivation ranked third and fourth, respectively. The university offers cash incentives for the winning team, including coaches. However, they said that it should not solely be limited to the financial aspect of giving due recognition.

The emphasis on traditional training methods and a lack of sufficient knowledge of coaching the game or team were deemed the least important. Not all coaches are physical education majors who are well-versed in the sports they are in charge of or assigned to. Others earned their skills and potential through their experience as athletes during their time. Some had been solely assigned due to their ardor for sports, which they believe affects their performance. In addition, they believe that attendance at training, seminars, and conferences in their discipline may additionally assist them in upgrading their knowledge, skills, and strategies scientifically to meet the new needs and patterns in sports science. Although normal patterns are still significant, it is imperative to reflect on the modern-day vogue in this millennial stage to let student-athletes exhibit their best.

Distinguished Reasons for Accepting Coaching Assignment

Self-fulfillment and enjoyment (35, or 74.5%) ranked as the main reasons given by faculty for accepting their respective coaching assignments. This may perhaps be due to the happiness and self-pride that they get when they hone the athletes' skills, guide them as their second children, and develop the athletes' discipline in becoming functional citizens in society.

Identified as a second compelling reason is the chance to see other places for free (9 or 19.1%) where these competitions are held. The following reasons are: "they were asked to do so," (6 or 12.8%) "earn additional points in the NBC," (4 or 8.5%) "other personal reasons" (3 or 6.4%), which the respondents did not specify, and finally "accepting the task as it forms part of the total faculty workload" (2 or 4.3%).

Table 3. Reasons for Accepting Coaching Assignment

Reasons	f	%	Rank
Self-fulfillment and enjoyment	35	74.5	1
A chance to go and see other places free for competition	9	19.1	2
Earn additional points in the NBC (for promotion)	4	8.5	4
Additional faculty load	2	4.3	6
I was asked to do so	6	12.8	3
Others	3	6.4	5

Determined Initiatives Instituted by the University to Enhance their Coaching Duty

Table 4 reveals the initiatives of the University in enhancing the coaching duties of coaches.

Table 4. Initiatives of the University to Enhance Efficacy of Coaches

Initiatives	f	%	Rank
Reduction of load(s)	3	6.4	6
Tune-up games/tournaments	14	29.8	2
Upgrade athletic equipment	7	14.9	3.5
Attend training, conferences, seminars	19	40.4	1
Post evaluation	7	14.9	3.5
Incentives	6	12.8	5

The respondents considered attendance at training, conferences, and seminars (19 or 40.4%) as the number one initiative the university provides to faculty to enhance their coaching capabilities. They believe that attending seminars and training, among others, will provide them with updates on new trends and insights on how to deliver their services as coaches. Ranked second among the initiatives is the holding of tune-up games and tournaments (14 or 29.8%), as this will provide coaches with the vantage points to look into playing areas that need to be fine-tuned and give the athletes the best preparation for actual games and tournaments. Sharing in the third rank is an upgrade of equipment and post-evaluation (7 or 14.9%), followed by the giving of incentives (6 or 12.8%), and a reduction of load (3 or 6.9%) as the last.

Significant relationship between the Profile of Coaches and their Level of Efficacy Table 5 presents the association between the profile and the level of efficacy of respondents.

Table 5. Relationship of the Profile of Respondents and their Efficacy Level

Profile	Efficacy		
	r-value	r-prob	Interpretation
Age	.211	.169	Not significant
Sex	-.010	.948	Not significant

Profile	Efficacy		
	r-value	r-prob	Interpretation
Marital Status	.049	.744	Not significant
Educational Attainment	-.075	.616	Not significant
Field of Specialization	-.118	.430	Not significant
Number of Years as Coach	.354*	.020	Significant
Number of Related Training Attended	0.300*	.040	Significant
Level of Sports Competition Participated	-.017	.908	Not significant
Number of Awards Received by Team	-.204	.170	Not significant

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Among the profiles of the respondents, only the number of years as coaches (r = 0.354, p .05) and several related trainings attended (r = 0.300, p. 05) are found to be significantly related to the efficacy of coaches.

This means that the more years the faculty has served as a coach, the more they have learned or even mastered the games' strategies and techniques, the higher their level of coaching efficacy. It further implies that the more relevant training attended, the higher the level of coaching efficacy.

The number of years as a coach and the number of related training sessions attended proved significant in coaching efficacy, probably because mastery of the game strategy and techniques is enhanced and increased with training and experience. Accordingly, coaches develop the confidence to deliver quality service to the athletes within themselves.

This conforms to Riboroso, et al (2018) who revealed that the older students have a higher mathematics self-efficacy than the younger ones. In addition to this, Kavusannu et al. (2008), found that coaching experience is significantly related to the level of character-building efficacy. Likewise, Feltz et al. (2009) agree that coaches with more extensive playing and coaching backgrounds are better because of their years of teaching. Similarly, Sullivan, Paquette, Holt, and Bloom (nd) found that coaching efficacy is linked to the environment of coaching and the quality of coaching education.

Other variables such as age, sex, marital status, educational attainment, specialization, level of sports competition participated in, and awards received did not yield a significant relationship with coaches' efficacy.

Gencer (2011) found that the efficacy and efficacy-related subscales of coaches in the study did not differ by age group, level of education, athletic career, or years coaching soccer. Coaches' belief in efficacy demonstrated a significant difference in marital status (t = 2.417, p =.021) and coaching license (t = 2.186, p =.032) when related to the approach sub-scale. When it came to the motivation sub-scale, coaches' trust in efficacy differed significantly by the category (t = 2.049, p =.046).

Furthermore, Chiu, Mahat, Marzuki, and Hua (2014) agree that there is no significant difference in perceptions of coaching competency among male and female student-athletes. In all categories of coaching competency, there were found to be no significant differences between male and female student-athletes. Hence, gender is not a criterion that can distinguish competency among coaches.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study has identified a whole range of areas that should shape the current and future challenges and based on the results of the analysis of the data, most of the coaches are young, male, have finished their master's degrees, non-PE majors, married, and have coached for five (5) years or less, and have attended few pieces of training in coaching, but they have participated in national sports competitions, and they have received a few medals.

As a whole, the coaches have a very high level of efficacy. Moreover, time constraints and competing demands in their teaching or administrative assignments and limited sports funds are some of the drawbacks or deterrents to performing their role. They accepted their coaching assignment because of self-fulfillment and enjoyment. Attending training, conferences, and seminars and involvement in tune-up games and tournaments are the main initiatives of the university to enhance their coaching capabilities. Among the profiles of the respondents, only the number of years as a coach and the number of related training sessions attended are found to be significant. This means that the longer they serve as coaches and the more training, conferences, and seminars they attend, the higher their coaching efficacy.

Concerning the results and conclusions, it is recommended that the university may consider including more females in the coaching pool. Coaches should also be encouraged to attend more relevant training in order to stay current with new trends and adapt to new game techniques and teaching styles to enhance further their coaching efficacy. Furthermore, it is suggested that coaches' teaching loads be reduced in order for them to focus more on athlete training, that the budget allotted for a sports program be increased, and that incentives to coaches and athletes be strongly encouraged, such as providing two days of service credits to coaches per term. Further conduct of studies by broadening the scope of the study is advised to confirm whether the factors included are connected.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). *Psychological Skills Training Theories.*

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, U.S.: Prentice Hall, Inc. 2019 American Psychological Association.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co. University of Kentucky.

Alicar-Cadorna, E. & Cadorna, E. F.. (2009). Development and Validation of a Worktext in Statistics for Nursing Students. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 2*(1). Retrieved from http://www.ejournals.ph/form/cite.php?id=7399

Chiu, L.K., Mahat, N.I., Marzuki, N.A., & Hua, K.P. (2014). Student-athletes evaluation of coaches' coaching competencies and their sports achievement motivation. *Review of European Studies*. Research Gate NSIT.

Feltz, D.L. Chase, M.A., Moritz, S.E., and Sullivan, P.J. (1999). A conceptual model of coaching efficacy: preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-conceptual-model-of-coaching-efficacy% 3A-and-Feltz Chase/of43640d4941b959c3dea518b9fof3531e6e5486

Feltz, D.L., Hepler, T.J., Roman., and Paiement, C. (2009). Coaching efficacy and volunteer youth sport coaches. *Human Kinetics Journals.* https: journals. humankinetics.com/doi/abs/10.1123/tsp.23.1.24

Feltz, D.L., and Lirgg, C.D. (2001*). Self-efficacy beliefs of athletes, teams, and coaches.* Michigan State University and the University of Arkansas. https:/citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?=10.1.1.473.6239&rep1&type=pdf

Frank, M., (2001). Self-efficacy: The key to success in sports. *Excel at life. Pursuing excellence in life, relationship, sports, and career.* https://www.excelatlife.com/articles/self-efficacy2.htm

Fung, L., (2002). Task familiarity and task efficacy: A study of sports coaches. *Perceptual and motor skills*, *95*(2), 367-372.

Gencer, R. Timucin. (2011). A study on the self-efficacy of elite coaches working at the Turkish Coca-Cola Academy League. *Academic/Sports Journal*. http://thesportjournal.org/article/a-study-on-the-self-efficacy-of-elite-coaches-working-at-the-Turkish-coca-cola-academy-league/

Grant, A. (2012). The Efficacy of Coaching. The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Coaching and Mentoring. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287277247

Keatlholetswe, L. and Malete, L. (2019). *Coaching Efficacy, Player Perceptions of Coaches' Leadership Styles and Team Performance in Premier League Soccer.* https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2018.1563277

Kavussanu, M., Boardley, I., Jutkienicz, N., Samantha, V. & Ring, C. (2008). Coaching efficacy and coaching effectiveness: Examining their predictors and comparing coaches' and athletes' reports. *The Sport Psychologist*. https:core.ac.uk/download/pdf/1631166.pdf

Law, H.C., Ireland, S, and Hussain, Z. (2007). *The psychology of coaching, mentoring, and learning*. New York, NY, U.S.: John Wiley, and Sons Ltd. PDF. https://epdf.pub/the-psychology-of-coaching-mentoring-and-learning.html

Loche, E.A. and Lathan, G.P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. A 35-year Odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57* (9) 705-717. The University of Toronto.https://www-2.rotman.Utoronto.ca/facbios/file/09%20-%20loche%20latham%202002%20AP. pdf

Mackenzie, B. (2020). *Psychological Skills Training.* https://www.brianmac.co.uk/articles/article.001.htm

Myers, N.D., Vargas-Tonsing. M., Tiffanye., & Feltz, D.L. (2005). Psychology of sport and exercise. *Programs and Projects of the Philippine Sports Commission*. http://www.web.psc.gov.ph/Budget%20Reports/Programs%20and%20Projects.pdf

Pardo, C.G. (2015). Understanding Students' Values: A Way of the National Service Training Program, University of Northern Philippines, *IAMURE International Journal of Education, 15,* 91-103.

Pardo, C.G., and Mendoza, L.P. (2018). National Service Training Program in the University of Northern Philippines. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 9*(11), November-2018 ISSN 2229-5518, https://www.ijser.org/research-paper-publishing-november-2018_page3.aspx

Riboroso, R.A., Llagas, R.M., and Taan, J.R., (2018). Mathematics Self Efficacy and Anxiety and Mathematics Performance of Elementary Education Students, *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 9*(11), https://www.ijser.org/researchpaper

Sullivan, P., Paquette, K.J., Holt, N.L., and Bloom, G.A. (nd). The relation of coaching context and coach education to coaching efficacy and perceived leadership behaviors in youth sport. *Human Kinetics journals*.

Taban, J. and Cajindos, R. (2018). Self-efficacy, Stressors and Performance of Mathematics Faculty of Selected SUC's in Region I. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *1*(2). ISSN 2651-6691 https://asianjournal.org/online/index.php/ajms/article/view/53/29

Turnnidge, J. and Côté, J. (2016). *Applying transformational leadership theory to Coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review*. https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2016.1189948

Vella, S., Oades, L. and Crowe, T. (2012). *The relationship between coach leadership, the coach-athlete relationship, team success, and the positive developmental experiences of adolescent soccer players.* https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2012.726976