

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Why Do Sport Coaches Adopt a Controlling Coaching Style?
The Role of an Evaluative Context and Psychological Need Frustration

Morbée Sofie^a, Vansteenkiste Maarten^a, Aelterman Nathalie^a, and Haerens Leen^b

^aDepartment of Developmental, Personality & Social Psychology, Ghent University, H.
Dunantlaan 2, 9000 Gent, Belgium

^bDepartment of Movement and Sport Science, Ghent University, Watersportlaan 2, 9000 Gent,
Belgium

Author Note

This work was supported by Research Foundation Flanders (FWO) [Grant number
3F023819].

As accepted for publication in *The Sport Psychologist*, ©Human Kinetics

Abstract

In this study, involving 585 youth sport coaches ($M_{\text{age}} = 35.76$), we investigated whether coaches who perceive their environment to be highly evaluative would report acting in a more controlling or pressuring way. In a subsample ($N = 211$, $M_{\text{age}} = 38.14$), we examined the explanatory role of coaches' experiences of psychological need frustration in this relation. We also considered whether years of coaching experience would serve as a buffer against the adverse effects of an evaluative context. In line with the tenets of Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2017), results of structural equation modeling indicated that an evaluative context related to the use of a more controlling coaching style, with experiences of need frustration accounting for this relation. Coaching experience did not play any moderating role, suggesting that even more experienced coaches are vulnerable to the harmful correlates of an evaluative sport context.

Keywords: sport club climate, coach evaluation, interpersonal behavior, basic psychological needs, self-determination theory

Why Do Sport Coaches Adopt a Controlling Coaching Style?

The Role of an Evaluative Context and Psychological Need Frustration

Richard (32 years old), a youth football coach: “Although the club board emphasizes that winning is not the most important thing, I still feel judged and evaluated if my players do not perform well. If I enter the cafeteria after a game, the youth coordinator always first asks about the outcome of the game and he is far less interested in whether my players played well or whether I noticed some progress.” This quote comes from a coach who participated in an intervention on motivating coaching (Reynders et al., 2019) and illustrates that contextual pressures on coaches can be conveyed in subtle ways. Simply asking for the outcome of a game may suffice for some sport coaches to feel evaluated and pressured. Within an evaluative sport context, not only coaches’ own coaching performance, but also the performance of their athletes may form the basis for evaluating coaches (e.g., Cunningham & Dixon, 2003). Hence, it is not surprising that an evaluative sport context is a prominent source of pressure among sport coaches (e.g., Olusoga, Butt, Hays, & Maynard, 2009). Such a pressure-exerting context not only relates to negative outcomes such as burn-out (e.g., Lundkvist, Gustafsson, Hjälm, & Hassmén, 2012), but may also predict the way how coaches interact with their athletes. That is, when facing an evaluative context, coaches may transmit the pressure exerted on them to their athletes, thereby using a more controlling style (Rocchi & Pelletier, 2017; Stebbings, Taylor, Spray, & Ntoumanis, 2012). Grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2017), the present study sought to investigate whether an evaluative context is related to sport coaches’ use of a controlling or pressuring coaching style and whether this association can be explained by the frustration of coaches’ psychological needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence. Moreover, we explored whether more experienced coaches are more capable of dealing with the pressures encountered in their sports. Specifically, we examined whether,

in the event of an evaluative climate, years of coaching experience may buffer against experiences of need frustration and the adoption of controlling behaviors towards athletes.

Controlling Coaching Style

According to SDT, when coaches adopt a controlling approach, they pressure athletes to act, think, or feel in specific and prescribed ways (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). Previous studies reported convincing evidence for the negative effects of a controlling coaching style. For instance, at the cross-sectional level, athletes who perceived their coach as more controlling reported more competitive anxiety (Ramis, Torregrosa, Viladrich, & Cruz, 2017), poor motivation (Haerens et al., 2018), and symptoms of burn-out (Barcza-Renner, Eklund, Morin, & Habeeb, 2016). A controlling style is also characterized by rises and falls across a series of training sessions or games, with these fluctuations being related to parallel fluctuations in athletes' negative affect during training (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, Ryan, Bosch, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2011) and antisocial behavior during games (Delrue et al., 2017).

While most past studies have made use of composite scores of controlling coaching (e.g., Ramis et al., 2017), other studies have adopted a differentiated approach (e.g., Barcza-Renner et al., 2016). Within a differentiated approach, the predictive role of four sets of pressure-exerting practices is investigated (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2010), that is, (1) humiliating and belittling athletes (i.e., intimidation), (2) pushing athletes to engage, persevere, and perform well via material rewards (i.e., controlling use of rewards), (3) interfering in athletes' areas of life that are not directly associated with sports (i.e., excessive personal control), and (4) withholding attention and appreciation if athletes fail to meet expectations (i.e., negative conditional regard). Studies using a differentiated approach showed that intimidation and the controlling use of rewards tend to yield less pronounced relations with external outcomes, such as athletes' quality of motivation and athlete burn-out, when compared to excessive personal control and negative conditional regard (Barcza-Renner et al., 2016;

Cheval, Chalabaev, Quested, Courvoisier, & Sarrazin, 2017). Given these differential associations with athlete outcomes, it is worth exploring whether the different facets of controlling coaching have different antecedents as well.

Evaluative Sport Context

Because of the well-documented costs associated with a controlling coaching style, a new range of studies has begun to identify the sources underlying this style (see Matosic, Ntoumanis, & Quested, 2016 for a review). Three classes of risk factors for the adoption of a controlling style have been proposed (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003; Matosic et al., 2016). That is, the pressure on coaches can arise from below, within, or above. Pressures from below refer to athlete characteristics such as their disengagement or their lack of motivation, pressures from within refer to personal characteristics of the coach, and pressures from above include contextual characteristics such as socio-environmental (e.g., work-life conflict) and external pressures (e.g., time constraints). These contextual pressures are very relevant to focus on because they are most susceptible for change and, hence, carry direct practical implications compared to factors from within or below.

In relation to the pressure exerted by the context, which is central in the current study, prior studies (Rocchi & Pelletier, 2017; Stebbings et al., 2012) have found that sport coaches who encounter more demanding job characteristics (e.g., higher work-life conflict, more time constraints) report engaging in more controlling coaching. Yet, no studies to date focused on the pressuring role of the broader club climate in relation to coaches' reliance on a controlling style. In an evaluative club climate, coaches' own performance as well as the performance of their athletes are continuously monitored, evaluated, and judged by their colleagues and the club board. Because prior work indicated that teachers (Pelletier, Séguin-Lévesque, & Legault, 2002; Soenens, Sierens, Vansteenkiste, Dochy, & Goossens, 2012) or parents (Wuyts, Vansteenkiste, Mabbe, & Soenens, 2017) who feel or are experimentally made accountable for

their children's performance use more controlling strategies, it can be expected that an evaluative climate may also relate to a more controlling coaching style in sports.

Basic Psychological Need Frustration as an Explanatory Mechanism

According to the Basic Psychological Needs Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2017; Vansteenkiste, Ryan, & Soenens, 2020), a subtheory of the Self-Determination Theory, when coaches are facing an evaluative context, their psychological needs may get frustrated. That is, if coaches feel judged and are made accountable for their players' performances, they may feel pressured to deliver training sessions in certain ways (autonomy frustration), they may question their skills as a coach (competence frustration), and feel not well understood by or even alienated from board members and other coaches (relatedness frustration) (Vansteenkiste & Ryan, 2013). In the context of sports, coaches' need frustration has been found to relate to coaches' experience of negative affect and emotional and physical exhaustion (e.g., Stebbings et al., 2012). In addition to these disadvantages for coaches' personal functioning, experiences of need frustration may also affect the way how they interact with others, for instance, by eliciting a more prejudicial way of interacting (e.g., Costa, Ntoumanis, & Bartholomew, 2015). In fact, coaches' need frustration has been identified as an important predictor of a controlling coaching style (e.g., Delrue et al., 2019; Silva et al., 2017). As such, experiences of need frustration may serve as an explanatory mechanism (i.e., mediator), thereby accounting for the transmission of the pressure coaches experience from the club board to the pressure imposed onto their athletes (e.g., Rocchi & Pelletier, 2017; Stebbings et al., 2012). At the same time, the contextual pressures placed upon coaches may be directly imitated by coaches in the interaction with their athletes. That is, the dynamics between board members and coaches would serve as a model and script for the interaction between coaches and athletes (i.e., a modelling process).

The Role of Coach Experience

While a pressure-exerting context may on average relate to higher need frustration and more controlling coaching (Rocchi & Pelletier, 2017; Stebbings et al., 2012), not all coaches may be equally vulnerable to this dynamic. SDT recognizes that personal characteristics may determine individuals' sensitivity for a pressuring context, with some factors buffering and others amplifying the effects of contextual pressure (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Because anecdotal evidence and laymen beliefs suggest that coaches' experience may alter the correlates associated with contextual pressures, this issue was considered herein. Specifically, we reasoned that more experienced coaches may have co-determined the performance targets or have developed a better understanding for the board members' reasons to impose (high) performance targets such that they experience an evaluative context as less pressuring (i.e., less autonomy frustration) and socially alienating (i.e., less relatedness frustration). Also, more experienced coaches may have experienced that successes, but also failures are transitory and fragile, so they are less vulnerable to hinge their feelings of competence upon others' performances (i.e., less competence frustration). Indeed, previous research has shown that coaching experience is a source of coaching efficacy, suggesting that experienced coaches have more confidence in their coaching skills (Feltz, Hepler, Roman, & Paiement, 2009). Yet, whether coaching experience is negatively related to need frustration and the use of a controlling style, or whether it moderates the effects of a pressure-exerting context on coaches' experienced need frustration and their controlling coaching style, has not received any attention so far.

The Present Study

The present study aimed at investigating the role of a pressure-exerting sport context in the prediction of a controlling coaching style. We extended the extant literature by considering performance-based evaluations as a sport-specific manifestation of a pressure-exerting context, by examining its role in the prediction of both a composite score of controlling coaching as

well as its various constituting facets (i.e., intimidation, controlling use of rewards, excessive personal control and negative conditional reward; see e.g., Barcza-Renner et al., 2016; Cheval, 2017), and by treating psychological need frustration as an explanatory underlying mechanism and coaching experience as a potential buffer in this relationship. Hereby, we pursued three hypotheses. First, we hypothesized that a perceived evaluative sports context is linked to sport coaches' use of a controlling coaching style (Hypothesis 1). Second, we investigated whether an evaluative context has an indirect effect on a controlling style through the frustration of the basic psychological needs (Rocchi & Pelletier, 2017; Stebbings et al., 2012). We also expected the direct effect to remain significant as a controlling coaching style may not only be rooted in the encountered need frustration, but may also directly come from the exposure to an evaluative context (Hypothesis 2). Finally, we sought to explore whether the relationship between an evaluative context and a controlling style is moderated by coaching experience (Hypothesis 3). That is, among more experienced coaches the encounter of an evaluative context may less easily give rise to experiences of need frustration and the use of a controlling style.

Method

Sample

Participants were recruited in two waves, in season 2015-2016 ($N = 374$) and 2016-2017 ($N = 211$). The total sample comprised 585 sport coaches (30.6% female, $M_{\text{age}} = 35.76$, $SD = 12.94$, range = 13-74 years) who had, on average, 9.05 ($SD = 8.45$) years of experience and spent 5.76 ($SD = 5.03$) hours per week coaching. All coaches were affiliated with an official sports club. They were coaching teams competing at various levels of performance (35.9% no competition or recreational, 34.4% provincial or nationwide, and 29.7% national or international) and 77.1% of them had a coach diploma. The sample included coaches of different age categories (46.5% coached athletes younger than 12 years old, 36.3% coached athletes between 12 and 18 years old, and 17.2% coached athletes older than 18 years old), and

of both team (58.9%) and individual sports (41.1%).

Procedure

Participants were recruited through a governmentally funded project on motivating coaching called ‘Coach with the M-factor’ project, with M referring to motivation. This project aims at ameliorating coaches’ motivating style by offering three skill-oriented workshops as to increase the long-term motivation of *BLINDED* youth for organized sport participation. All coaches who were interested in the workshops were asked to complete an online questionnaire at home, prior to participation in the workshop trajectory. Completing the questionnaire took less than half an hour. The 585 participating coaches completed self-report questionnaires regarding the perceived evaluative context and their own use of controlling behaviors. In the subsample of coaches recruited in the second wave ($N = 211$, 26.1% female, $M_{\text{age}} = 38.14$, $M_{\text{experience}} = 8.77$), experiences of need frustration were additionally measured. The research was conducted according to the ethical rules presented in the General Ethical Protocol of the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences of *BLINDED* University. All participants actively agreed that they were informed about the purpose of the research and gave permission to the researchers to use their answers for research purposes.

Measures

Perceived evaluative context. Coaches’ perceived degree of being judged and evaluated by their sport club based on their athletes’ performances was assessed by a sport-specific adaptation of the Constraints at Work Scale (Pelletier et al., 2002) that has already been successfully used in the sport context (Rocchi, Pelletier, & Couture, 2013). Four items (e.g., “My club will judge me negatively if my athletes do not perform well”) were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha = .73$) was acceptable. We allowed the residuals of two items that are conceptually most closely related (i.e., “I am held responsible for the performance of my athletes” and “My club will

judge me negatively if my athletes do not perform well”) to covary. Although the other two items (i.e., “I feel that I have to perform better than my fellow coaches to prove myself to my club” and “If my athletes perform poorly this is bad for my image”) still contain characteristics of an evaluative context, these items emphasize less explicitly the pressure from the club board in relation to athletes’ performances. The model fit of this four-item model ($\chi^2(1) = .08$, $p = .78$, RMSEA = 0.00, CFI = 1.00, SRMR = 0.002) was acceptable, with all indicator loadings being above .46, $p < .001$.

Psychological need frustration. Coaches’ psychological need frustration was measured with the Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction Need Frustration Scale (Chen et al., 2015). The items were adapted by making them applicable for sport coaches and the scale was shortened to 6 items, which has proven valid in previous studies in sports contexts (e.g., Delrue et al., 2019). The scale measures the frustration of the needs for autonomy (2 items; e.g., “The fact that I cannot choose my own way of coaching athletes frustrates me”), relatedness (2 items; e.g., “Coaching athletes creates tension with people who are important to me”) and competence (2 items; e.g., “Sometimes I feel like I will never succeed in coaching”). Because the frustration of each need was assessed with a limited number of items, we created a composite score of need frustration. Responses were reported on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Reliability analysis revealed a Cronbach’s alpha of .67. We allowed the residuals of two autonomy and relatedness frustration items to covary, since in the literature the support and thwarting of the needs for relatedness and autonomy are often strongly related (e.g., Niemiec et al., 2006). As such, the model fit was acceptable ($\chi^2(7) = 12.82$, $p = .08$, RMSEA = .06, CFI = .91, SRMR = .05. All indicator loadings were above .31, $p < .01$.

Controlling coaching. Coaches completed the Controlling Coach Behaviors Scale (Bartholomew et al., 2010), which consists of four subscales: intimidation (4 items; e.g., “I shout at my athletes in front of others to make them do certain things”), controlling use of

rewards (4 items; e.g., “I only use rewards/praise so that my athletes complete all the tasks I set in training”), excessive personal control (3 items; e.g., “I expect my athletes’ whole life to center on their sport participation”) and negative conditional regard (4 items; e.g., “I am less friendly with my athletes if they don’t make the effort to see things in my way”). Responses were reported on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (does not describe me at all) to 7 (describes me completely). The total set of 15 items yielded an acceptable Cronbach’s alpha of .79, with internal consistencies for the subscales varying between .61 (i.e., excessive personal control) and .79 (i.e., negative conditional regard). To examine the internal structure of this questionnaire, a higher-order CFA was conducted thereby modeling the items as indicators of the four first-order factors that in turn served as indicators for one higher-order factor of controlling coaching. This higher-order model fitted the data well ($\chi^2(86) = 165.30$, $p < .001$, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .94, SRMR = .05). All indicator loadings were above .31, $p < .001$.

Plan of Analysis

To address the three hypotheses, we used the statistical program Mplus Version 8 (Muthén, Muthén, & Asparouhov, 2017). In a first model, we examined the role of an evaluative context in the prediction of both a composite score of controlling coaching (Model 1a) as well as its four constituting facets (Model 1b) through structural equation modeling (SEM), making use of the robust MLR estimator. Several indices were employed to evaluate the model fit, namely the χ^2 test, the comparative fit index (CFI), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). An acceptable fit was indicated by χ^2 /df ratio of 2 or below, CFI values of .90 or above, and SRMR and RMSEA values of .08 or below (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Second, we investigated the mediating role of need frustration in relation to both the composite score (Model 2a) as well as the four facets of controlling coaching (Model 2b) through Bayesian Structural Equation Modeling (BSEM). Model fit of the BSEM models was assessed using the Posterior Predictive

p-value (PPP), which permits a direct measure of the discrepancy between the obtained sample and general population. An excellent fitting model is expected to have a PPP-value around 0.5 (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2012). Furthermore, model convergence was assessed with the Potential Scale Reduction Factor. PSR-factors equal or less than 1.1 are considered evidence of convergence (Gelman, Carlin, Stern, & Rubin, 2004). In our third model, we explored the moderating role of coaching experience in the relationship between an evaluative context and experiences of need frustration (Model 3a), overall controlling coaching (Model 3b) and its four facets (Model 3c). To conduct these moderation analyses, the Bayes estimator and same fit indices as in Model 2 were used. Likewise, we tested an integrated model (combining Model 2 and 3) through moderated mediation analyses.

Throughout the analyses, we made use of the maximum amount of data. Specifically, since experiences of need frustration were only assessed among coaches of the second wave, the analyses in which need frustration is included (Model 2a, 2b, 3a, integrated model) were only performed on this subsample ($N = 211$). Yet, analyses in which need frustration is not included (Model 1a, 1b, 3b, 3c) were performed on the full sample ($N = 585$). Although Model 1 and 3 consisted of latent constructs, Model 2 and the integrated model - given they were based on the limited subsample - made use of manifest constructs.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents the descriptive results and the correlations between measured variables. In a set of preliminary analyses, a MANOVA including the perceptions of an evaluative context, the use of a controlling style and its four indicators as dependent variables, revealed that the multivariate effects of athletes' age group (Wilks's $\lambda = .92$, $F(10, 1100) = 4.83$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$), level of performances (Wilks's $\lambda = .88$, $F(10, 1100) = 7.47$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$), type of sport (Wilks's $\lambda = .97$, $F(5, 550) = 2.96$, $p \leq .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$), and coach gender

(Wilks's $\lambda = .96$, $F(5, 550) = 4.47$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$) were significant. Test of between-subjects effects showed that coaches of the youngest age group (< 12 years) experienced less contextual pressure compared to coaches of older athletes ($F(2,554) = 8.05$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, coaches of the middle age group (12–18 years old) scored highest on (indicators of) a controlling style ($F(2, 554) = 8.30$, $p < .001$; see Appendix A). Coaches training athletes at an (inter)national level reported the least intimidation ($F(2, 554) = 3.33$, $p < .05$) and controlling use of rewards ($F(2, 554) = 8.57$, $p < .001$), but the most excessive personal control ($F(2, 554) = 16.04$, $p < .001$; see Appendix A). Team sport coaches reported more intimidation than coaches of individual sports ($F(1, 554) = 8.66$, $p < .01$). Male coaches reported more intimidation ($F(1,554) = 4.77$, $p < .05$), controlling use of rewards ($F(1, 554) = 7.12$, $p \leq .01$), excessive personal control ($F(1, 554) = 6.23$, $p \leq 0.1$), and the use of a controlling style overall ($F(1, 554) = 8.79$, $p < .01$). Analysis of variance on the subsample in which need frustration was measured, revealed that qualified coaches experienced less need frustration compared to unqualified coaches ($F(1, 202) = 5.01$, $p < .05$).

Primary Analyses

In all models, all (non-)significant findings remained identical after taking into account relevant covariates (i.e., coach diploma, gender, level of performances, age group, experience, hours of contact and type of sport). As such, results of analyses without covariates are reported.

Hypothesis 1. When treating controlling coaching as a second order composite score in Model 1a, the fit was acceptable ($\chi^2(146) = 269.28$, $p < .001$, χ^2/df ratio = 1.84, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .93, SRMR = .05; Hu & Bentler, 1999) with standardized factor loadings of all items ranging from $\beta = .31$, $p < .001$ to $\beta = .86$, $p < .001$ on their proposed latent constructs. Similarly, when considering the separate indicators of controlling coaching in Model 1b, the fit was acceptable ($\chi^2(141) = 257.58$, $p < .001$, χ^2/df ratio = 1.83, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .93, SRMR = .05; Hu & Bentler, 1999) with standardized factor loadings ranging from $\beta = .32$, $p < .001$ to β

= .80, $p < .001$. Results of Model 1a showed that an evaluative context related positively to coaches' self-reported use of a controlling coaching style ($\beta = .57$, $p < .001$), a relation that emerged for all four facets in Model 1b, as a unique relation was found with intimidation ($\beta = .40$, $p < .001$), controlling use of rewards ($\beta = .22$, $p \leq .001$), excessive personal control ($\beta = .38$, $p < .001$), and negative conditional regard ($\beta = .51$, $p < .001$).

Hypothesis 2. Building on the above models, we investigated the explanatory role of psychological need frustration (Figure 1, Table 2). Results of Model 2a revealed a significant indirect effect of an evaluative context to the self-reported use of a controlling coaching style through the frustration of the basic psychological needs. In the case of the differentiated model Model 2b, there was similar evidence for need frustration as an explanatory mechanism in the case of intimidation and negative conditional regard, but not in the case of excessive personal control and the controlling use of rewards.

Hypothesis 3. Next, we explored the moderating role of coaching experience. For this type of analyses, the PPP-value is not provided by Mplus. However, the range of the PRS-factor was acceptable, ranging between 1.03 and 1.08. The results of these three models revealed that the number of years of coaching experience did not play a moderating role in the relation between an evaluative context and the experiences of need frustration (Model 3a; interaction term $\beta = -.06$, 95% CI [-.23, .13]), neither in the relation between an evaluative context and a controlling style (Model 3b; interaction term $\beta = -.02$, 95% CI [-.12, .09]) or any of its four indicators (Model 3c). The absence of interaction effects indicates that more experienced coaches are not resilient to an evaluative context. In terms of main effects, we found that more experienced coaches made less use of a controlling style ($\beta = -.16$, 95% CI [-.25, -.06]), with specifically less intimidation ($\beta = -.15$, 95% CI [-.25, -.05]) and negative conditional regard ($\beta = -.15$, 95% CI [-.23, -.06]). Yet, experience was unrelated to experiences of need frustration ($\beta = -.08$, 95% CI [-.24, .06]), the controlling use of rewards ($\beta = -.04$, 95%

CI [-.15, .05]) and excessive personal control ($\beta = .03$, 95% CI [-.05, .12]).

Finally, we tested an integrated model through moderated mediation analyses. The results of this integrated model are the same as those of Model 2 and 3 considered separately, with an indirect significant effect for controlling coaching, intimidation and negative conditional regard and no significant interaction effect for coaching experience (see Table 3).

Discussion

Although perceived controlling or pressuring coaching has been found to relate positively to athletes' competitive anxiety (Ramis et al., 2017), antisocial behavior (Delrue et al., 2017) and poor motivation (Haerens et al., 2018), fewer studies have shed light on the factors that explain coaches' use of a controlling motivating style. The present study aimed to fill this void by investigating the role of an evaluative context as a risk factor, with experiences of need frustration accounting for this association. In line with our hypotheses and prior research in other life domains (Pelletier et al., 2002; Wuyts et al., 2017), we found that sport coaches' perception of an evaluative sport context related to a controlling coaching style (Hypothesis 1). When deconstructing the composite score of controlling coaching into its facets (i.e., intimidation, controlling use of rewards, excessive personal control, negative conditional regard; Bartholomew et al., 2010), an evaluative sport context was found to relate to the use of each of the four facets, suggesting that coaches turn to a variety of pressuring strategies in response to encountered pressures themselves. The relationship between the evaluative context and controlling use of tangible rewards was slightly less pronounced compared to the relation with the three other indicators. Whereas the three other practices (i.e., intimidation, excessive personal control, negative conditional regard) represent more domineering controlling strategies, thereby targeting the athlete as a person, the use of rewards is somewhat less controlling, as the focus is on athletes' behavior (Delrue et al., 2019). Possibly, an evaluative climate predicts especially more intrusive practices.

Further, as expected, we found that a controlling coaching style is rooted in experiences of need frustration, but also directly arises from the exposure to an evaluative context (Hypothesis 2). Hereby, we suspect that coaches may adopt the interaction style between club board members and themselves as a script for their way of approaching their athletes. Looking at the separate subscales of controlling coaching, the current study suggests that need frustration is especially important as an underlying explanatory mechanism for intimidation and negative conditional regard. In contrast, need frustration did not play an explanatory role in the case of excessive personal control. In spite of the negative consequences of this controlling strategy, these behaviors may also be well-meant by highly committed coaches who want to bring discipline to their players. As such, the exertion of excessive control is not necessarily grounded in coaches' experiences of need frustration. Another possible explanation is that these behaviors, compared to the other controlling strategies, are most similar to the evaluative pressures that coaches encounter. Therefore, through a process of modeling, coaches immediately mirror and project these controlling behaviors of the context onto their athletes, such that the role of their own psychological needs gets minimized. However, these explanations cannot be inferred with certainty from the present findings and are therefore rather speculative.

Since SDT recognizes that personal characteristics may play a distinctive role and even serve as a buffer against contextual pressures (Ryan & Deci, 2017), we explored whether more experienced coaches display a more adaptive pattern of functioning. Results revealed that more experienced coaches engage in less controlling behaviors in general, and less intimidation and negative conditional regard in particular. It may be the case that experienced coaches have found out that such controlling behaviors do not have a sustainable positive impact on athletes (e.g., Gonzáles, García-Merita, Castillo, & Balaguer, 2016), leading them to withdraw from such pressuring practices. While evidence was found for a main effect of years of coaching

experience, it did not function as a buffer against an evaluative context (Hypothesis 3). That is, coaches, either being experienced or being new to the role, experienced similar degrees of need frustration and engaged in a similar dose of controlling coaching behaviors in response to a pressure-exerting context.

In a set of preliminary analyses, we also examined whether the variation in coaches' perceived evaluative context differed as a function of different sport-specific characteristics. Regarding type of sport (individual versus team) no differences in the perception of an evaluative context were found. It could be thought that coaches of team sports experience more pressure, as they have the task of supporting the performance of each individual within the team, taking into account everyone's personal preferences and expectations (Karabatsos, Malousaris, & Apostolidis, 2006). Yet, these pressures that are perhaps typical for team sports were not captured by our measures and are perhaps more closely related to the pressure from below (e.g., number of athletes), rather than the experienced pressure from above (e.g., evaluative club climate) (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). On the other hand, in a team situation the pressure could get divided across team members, whereas the coach and athlete are the only ones involved in an individual sport, with the pressure thus being higher as oriented to only one person. Anyhow, these hypothetical explanations require more research.

Next, we did not find any difference in terms of the level at which athletes are performing. Yet, coaches of older athletes (> 12 years) perceived the club climate to be more evaluative compared to coaches of athletes younger than 12 years old. Presumably, as athletes get older, the expectations in terms of discipline, diligence and performance hold by club boards may increase, which explains the elevated pressure reported by these coaches.

Limitations and Future Directions

First, no conclusion can be drawn about the direction of relationships given the cross-sectional nature of the study. A longitudinal design is recommended to examine whether

changes in an evaluative climate precede changes in coaches' controlling coaching style. Furthermore, experimental research could expose coaches to real pressures to examine how they subsequently interact with their athletes. These more advanced methods are less liable to social desirability and can confirm the herein observed cross-sectional relationships.

Second, only self-report measures were used. Although the Harman's Single-Factor Test offered some counter-evidence for common method variance, such shared variance may have artificially boosted some of the observed relations. By asking club board members to report on the club climate and to rate coaches' controlling behaviors, it could be examined whether the obtained pattern of findings would hold across informants. Also, future research may validate the current findings against observations, which have been found to be fairly discrepant from what socializing agents indicate themselves (Aelterman, Vansteenkiste, Van den Berghe, De Meyer, & Haerens, 2014).

Third, years of coaching experience had a very wide range (0-47 years) and showed a positive skewness. Although we used a Bayesian approach to address this limitation, future research should gather a more normally distributed sample to examine whether the current pattern is replicated. The same limitation applies for the examination of mean-level differences in the perception of an evaluative context as a function of sport-specific characteristics. Further research should gather a more balanced sample and possibly take other factors into account such as the timing during a sports season, as the pressure exerted by the club board may vary depending on the period within a season. For example, club board members can start the season by communicating strict rules and sanctions to coaches, but interfere less as the season progresses. Alternatively, club board members can let coaches do their thing as the season begins, but increase the pressure on coaches as the season progresses.

Further, it would be useful to include several antecedents of a controlling coaching style simultaneously. By including factors at all three levels (i.e., below, within, and above), a more

comprehensive picture can be obtained. That way, it becomes possible to investigate the unique and interactive contribution of the different pressures and to assess which category of pressures is the most decisive in the prediction of a controlling coaching style. Next, it is recommended to examine the basic psychological needs separately to gain more refined insight into the mechanism underlying the contribution of contextual antecedents in the prediction of a controlling coaching style. Although supplementary analyses showed that the results held for each of the three needs, this issue can be re-examined in future research as need frustrations were assessed with a limited number of items per need. Finally, the fact that need frustration was only assessed in the second subsample (because of space limitations in the questionnaire package in the first subsample) limits the generalizability of the documented (moderated) mediational model to the entire sample.

Practical Implications

The present findings point to the importance of taking the club context into account when seeking to understand the variation in coaches' controlling coaching style, as coaches who experience a higher degree of an evaluative work context felt more pressured (i.e., autonomy frustration), questioned their capacities as a coach more (i.e., competence frustration) and experienced more relational tension (i.e., relatedness frustration), which in turn made coaches specifically apply behaviors that are perceived as avowedly controlling (i.e., intimidation and negative conditional regard). These results emphasize the harmful correlates of a need-thwarting coaching context and demonstrate that it is important to gain more insight into which contextual factors relate to the frustration of coaches' basic psychological needs.

As experienced coaches have not necessarily learned to deal more adaptively with a pressure-exerting context, future intervention work (e.g., Cheon, Reeve, Lee, & Lee, 2015; Maleté & Feltz, 2000; Reynders et al., 2019) may include a section that raises coaches' awareness of the pressures exerted on them. Interventions could teach coaches the necessary

466 skills to get their basic psychological needs met and to constructively handle the encountered
467 pressures. Although such coach training may be useful, it may be more efficient to intervene
468 at the club level as the creation of a different club culture may activate a different motivational
469 chain, to the benefit of both coaches and their athletes. In this way, sports clubs' board members
470 can be taught how to avoid creating a need thwarting environment for coaches so that coaches
471 are not inclined to resort to demotivating coaching behaviors. Although competition and
472 striving for excellence are almost inherent components of sports, the degree to which athletes
473 and coaches get evaluated based on their successes varies widely across clubs. The present
474 study suggests that the more evaluative and judgmental components of competition can better
475 be minimized. This, however, does not mean that coaches and athletes cannot be provided with
476 any targets, yet, by preference in need-supportive ways. For instance, club boards can ask for
477 the input of coaches when setting performance standards (autonomy) that are challenging yet
478 attainable (competence) and they may avoid ranking and directly comparing coaches to prevent
479 tensions (relatedness). Although targets potentially have high informational value, thereby
480 pointing towards coaches' strengths and points of progress, they may also be used in more
481 evaluative ways such that coaches feel pressured, inferior or incompetent (see Vansteenkiste,
482 Mouratidis, & Lens, 2010), with the cascading negative effects for athletes as was shown
483 herein.

References

- Aelterman, N., Vansteenkiste, M., Van den Berghe, L., De Meyer, J., & Haerens, L. (2014). Fostering a need-supportive teaching style: Intervention effects on physical education teachers' beliefs and teaching behaviors. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36, 595-609. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2013-0229>
- Barcza-Renner, K., Eklund, R. C., Morin, A. J., & Habeeb, C. M. (2016). Controlling coaching behaviors and athlete burnout: Investigating the mediating roles of perfectionism and motivation. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 38, 30-44. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0059>
- Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R. M., Bosch, J. A., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2011). Self-determination theory and diminished functioning: The role of interpersonal control and psychological need thwarting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 1459-1473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211413125>
- Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2010). The controlling interpersonal style in a coaching context: Development and initial validation of a psychometric scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 32, 193-216. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.32.2.193>
- Chen, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Beyers, W., Boone, L., Deci, E. L., Van der Kaap-Deeder, J., ... & Ryan, R. M. (2015). Basic psychological need satisfaction, need frustration, and need strength across four cultures. *Motivation and Emotion*, 39, 216-236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-014-9450-1>
- Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., Lee, J., & Lee, Y. (2015). Giving and receiving autonomy support in a high-stakes sport context: A field-based experiment during the 2012 London Paralympic Games. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 19, 59-69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.02.007>

- 509 Cheval, B., Chalabaev, A., Quested, E., Courvoisier, D. S., & Sarrazin, P. (2017). How
510 perceived autonomy support and controlling coach behaviors are related to well-and ill-
511 being in elite soccer players: A within-person changes and between-person differences
512 analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 28, 68-77.
513 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.10.006>
- 514 Costa, S., Ntoumanis, N., & Bartholomew, K. J. (2015). Predicting the brighter and darker
515 sides of interpersonal relationships: Does psychological need thwarting matter? *Motivation
516 and Emotion*, 39, 11-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-014-9427-0>
- 517 Cunningham, G. B., & Dixon, M. A. (2003). New perspectives concerning performance
518 appraisals of intercollegiate coaches. *Quest*, 55, 177-192.
519 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2003.10491798>
- 520 Delrue, J., Reynders, B., Vande Broek, G., Aelterman, N., De Backer, M., Decroos, S., ... &
521 Haerens, L. (2019). Adopting a helicopter-perspective towards motivating and demotivating
522 coaching: A circumplex approach. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 40, 110-126.
523 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.08.008>
- 524 Delrue, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Mouratidis, A., Gevaert, K., Vande Broek, G., & Haerens, L.
525 (2017). A game-to-game investigation of the relation between need-supportive and need-
526 thwarting coaching and moral behavior in soccer. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 31, 1-
527 10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.03.010>
- 528 Feltz, D. L., Hepler, T. J., Roman, N., & Paiement, C. (2009). Coaching efficacy and volunteer
529 youth sport coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, 23, 24-41. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.23.1.24>
- 530 Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S. & Rubin, D. B. (2004). *Bayesian data analysis*. Second
531 edition. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall.
- 532 González, L., García-Merita, M., Castillo, I., & Balaguer, I. (2016). Young athletes' perceptions
533 of coach behaviors and their implications on their well-and ill-being over time. *The Journal*

- 534 of Strength & Conditioning Research, 30, 1147-1154.
 535 <https://doi.org/10.1519/jsc.0000000000001170>
- 536 Haerens, L., Vansteenkiste, M., De Meester, A., Delrue, J., Tallir, I., Vande Broek, G., ... &
 537 Aelterman, N. (2018). Different combinations of perceived autonomy support and control:
 538 identifying the most optimal motivating style. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 23,
 539 16-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2017.1346070>
- 540 Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
 541 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: a*
 542 *Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- 543 Karabatsos, G., Malousaris, G., & Apostolidis, N. (2006). Evaluation and comparison of
 544 burnout levels in basketball, volleyball and track and field coaches. *Studies in Physical*
 545 *Culture & Tourism*, 13.
- 546 Lundkvist, E., Gustafsson, H., Hjälm, S., & Hassmén, P. (2012). An interpretative
 547 phenomenological analysis of burnout and recovery in elite soccer coaches. *Qualitative*
 548 *Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 4, 400-419.
 549 <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676x.2012.693526>
- 550 Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational
 551 model. *Journal of Sports Science*, 21, 883-904.
 552 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0264041031000140374>
- 553 Malete, L., & Feltz, D. L. (2000). The effect of a coaching education program on coaching
 554 efficacy. *The Sport Psychologist*, 14, 410-417. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.14.4.410>
- 555 Matosic, D., Ntoumanis, N., & Quested, E. (2016). Antecedents of need supportive and
 556 controlling interpersonal styles from a self-determination theory perspective: A review and
 557 implications for sport psychology research. *Sport and Exercise Psychology Research*, 145-
 558 180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-803634-1.00007-8>

- 559 Muthén, B., & Asparouhov, T. (2012). Bayesian structural equation modeling: a more flexible
560 representation of substantive theory. *Psychological methods*, 17, 313.
561 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026802>
- 562 Muthén, B. O., Muthén, L. K., & Asparouhov, T. (2017). *Regression and mediation analysis*
563 *using Mplus*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- 564 Niemiec, C. P., Lynch, M. F., Vansteenkiste, M., Bernstein, J., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M.
565 (2006). The antecedents and consequences of autonomous self-regulation for college: A
566 self-determination theory perspective on socialization. *Journal of adolescence*, 29(5), 761-
567 775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.11.009>
- 568 Olusoga, P., Butt, J., Hays, K., & Maynard, I. (2009). Stress in elite sports coaching: Identifying
569 stressors. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21, 442-459.
570 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200903222921>
- 571 Pelletier, L. G., Séguin-Lévesque, C., & Legault, L. (2002). Pressure from above and pressure
572 from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviors. *Journal of*
573 *Educational Psychology*, 94, 186. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0663.94.1.186>
- 574 Ramis, Y., Torregrosa, M., Viladrich, C., & Cruz, J. (2017). The effect of coaches' controlling
575 style on the competitive anxiety of young athletes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 572.
576 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00572>
- 577 Reynders, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Van Puyenbroeck, S., Aelterman, N., De Backer, M., Delrue,
578 J., ... & Vande Broek, G. (2019). Coaching the coach: intervention effects on need-
579 supportive coaching behavior and athlete motivation and engagement. *Psychology of Sport*
580 *and Exercise*, 43, 288-300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.04.002>
- 581 Rocchi, M., & Pelletier, L. G. (2017). The Antecedents of Coaches' Interpersonal Behaviors:
582 The Role of the Coaching Context, Coaches' Psychological Needs, and Coaches'
583 Motivation. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 39, 366-378.

<https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2016-0267>

Rocchi, M. A., Pelletier, L. G., & Couture, A. L. (2013). Determinants of coach motivation and autonomy supportive coaching behaviours. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*, 852-859.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.07.002>

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Silva, M. N., Sánchez-Oliva, D., Brunet, J., Williams, G. C., Teixeira, P. J., & Palmeira, A. L. (2017). “What Goes Around Comes Around”: Antecedents, Mediators, and Consequences of Controlling vs. Need-Supportive Motivational Strategies Used by Exercise Professionals.

Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 51, 707-717. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-017-9894-0>

Soenens, B., Sierens, E., Vansteenkiste, M., Dochy, F., & Goossens, L. (2012). Psychologically controlling teaching: Examining outcomes, antecedents, and mediators. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*, 108-120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025742>

Stebbing, J., Taylor, I. M., Spray, C. M., & Ntoumanis, N. (2012). Antecedents of perceived coach interpersonal behaviors: The coaching environment and coach psychological well-being and ill-being. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 34*, 481-502. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.34.4.481>

Vansteenkiste, M., Mouratidis, A., & Lens, W. (2010). Detaching reasons from aims: Fair play and well-being in soccer as a function of pursuing performance-approach goals for autonomous or controlling reasons. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 32*, 217-242. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.32.2.217>

Vansteenkiste, M., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). On psychological growth and vulnerability: Basic psychological need satisfaction and need frustration as a unifying principle. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 23*, 263. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032359>

Vansteenkiste, M., Ryan, R. M., & Soenens, B. (2020). Basic psychological need theory:

- 609 Advancements, critical themes, and future directions. *Motivation and Emotion*, in press.
- 610 Wuyts, D., Vansteenkiste, M., Mabbe, E., & Soenens, B. (2017). Effects of social pressure and
- 611 child failure on parents' use of control: An experimental investigation. *Contemporary*
- 612 *Educational Psychology*, 51, 378-390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.09.010>

Figure 1

Results of the Mediation Analyses

< INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE >

Note. *95% CI does not include zero; IE: indirect effect.

The straight lines represent relations of Model 2a, while the dotted lines and number between brackets represent relations of Model 2b.

For clarity reasons, non-significant indirect effects are omitted.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations

| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Years of Coaching Experience | 9.05 | 8.45 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Age of the Coach | 35.76 | 12.94 | .59** | - | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Number of Athletes | 14.74 | 11.01 | .07 | .08 | - | | | | | | | |
| 4. Number of Contact Hours | 5.76 | 5.03 | .13** | .09* | .27** | - | | | | | | |
| 5. Evaluative Context | 2.09 | .71 | -.07 | -.16** | -.05 | .18** | - | | | | | |
| 6. Need Frustration | 1.91 | .54 | -.10 | -.07 | -.10 | .01 | .38** | - | | | | |
| 7. Controlling Coaching | 2.35 | .57 | -.14** | -.11** | -.00 | .11* | .40** | .41** | - | | | |
| 8. Intimidation | 2.09 | .74 | -.15** | -.14** | .05 | .00 | .24** | .39** | .72** | - | | |
| 9. Controlling Use of Rewards | 2.76 | .87 | -.10* | -.01 | .00 | -.03 | .18** | .08 | .65** | .28** | - | |
| 10. Excessive Personal Control | 2.17 | .83 | .03 | -.03 | -.01 | .30** | .32** | .11 | .63** | .25** | .23** | - |
| 11. Negative Conditional Regard | 2.37 | .88 | -.16** | -.14** | -.04 | .02 | .35** | .58** | .76** | .54** | .27** | .27** |

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

Table 2

Results of the Mediation Analyses

| | a-path β (SD) | b-path β (SD) | c-path β (SD) | c'-path β (SD) | Indirect path B (SD) | PPP | PSRF |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----|------|
| Model 2a | | | | | | | |
| Evaluative Context -> Need Frustration -> Controlling Coaching | .38 (.06)* | .35 (.07)* | .34 (.06)* | .21 (.06)* | .13 (.04)* | .25 | 1 |
| Model 2b | | | | | | | |
| Evaluative Context -> Need Frustration -> Intimidation | .36 (.05)* | .34 (.07)* | .28 (.06)* | .14 (.06) | .16 (.04)* | | |
| -> Controlling Use Rewards | .36 (.05)* | .01 (.07) | .18 (.06)* | .18 (.07)* | .00 (.04) | | |
| -> Excessive Personal Control | .36 (.05)* | -.01 (.07) | .27 (.06)* | .26 (.06)* | -.01 (.04) | .25 | 1.05 |
| -> Negative Conditional Regard | .36 (.05)* | .55 (.05)* | .26 (.07)* | .05 (.06) | .32 (.06)* | | |

Note. *95% CI does not include zero.

PPP = Posterior Predictive p-value; PSRF = Potential Scale Reduction Factor.

Table 3

Results of the Moderated Mediation Analyses

| | Need Frustration β (<i>SD</i>) | Controlling Coaching β (<i>SD</i>) | Intimidation β (<i>SD</i>) | Controlling Use of Rewards β (<i>SD</i>) | Excessive Personal Control β (<i>SD</i>) | Negative Conditional Regard β (<i>SD</i>) |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Evaluative Context x Experience | -.16 (.29) | -.15 (.25) | -.00 (.26) | -.11 (.28) | -.06 (.28) | -.25 (.23) |
| Indirect Effect | | | | | | |
| Low Experience | | .13 (.05)* | .17 (.06)* | -.00 (.05) | -.01 (.05) | .37 (.11)* |
| Moderate Experience | | .12 (.04)* | .16 (.05)* | -.00 (.05) | -.01 (.04) | .35 (.09)* |
| High Experience | | .11 (.04)* | .14 (.05)* | -.00 (.04) | -.01 (.04) | .30 (.09)* |
| PPP | | .50 | .50 | .50 | .50 | .50 |
| PSRF | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Note. *95% CI does not include zero.

PPP = Posterior Predictive p-value; PSRF = Potential Scale Reduction Factor.