

Examination of the Relationship between Coaching Efficacy and Conflict Management Style in Soccer Coaches

Melih Balyan

Faculty of Sports Sciences, Ege University, Turkey

Copyright©2018 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

Abstract The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between coaching efficacy and conflict management style of the soccer coaches. The sample included 224 male soccer coaches ranging in coaching experience from 2 to 15 years. The Coaching Efficacy Scale and The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory were used to measure coaching efficacy and conflict management respectively. Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to examine the relationship among variables. Further, linear regression analyses with stepwise method were used to test the ability of the coaching efficacy to conflict management. Results indicated positive significant association between coaching efficacy and integrating conflict management. Moreover, coaching efficacy has been found to have ability to predict several conflict management styles. Based on the results obtained in the present study, it was concluded that soccer coaches may be more predispose to use certain conflict management styles depending on their coaching efficacy level.

Keywords Soccer Coaches, Conflict Management Style

1. Introduction

Context

In Turkey, in order to be a soccer coach one should have Grassroots Voluntary Leader License or having a soccer carrier as a player and having at least primary school degree. TFF is a member of UEFA JIRA system which was developed with the aim of integrating soccer coaches' education curriculum. Soccer coaches are classified as TFF Grassroots C, UEFA B, UEFA A and UEFA PRO in Turkey and Europa. Coaches may be employed in accordance with their coaching level. Hence, while a soccer coach having UEFA PRO license may be employed

in top leagues levels, a coach having a license TFF Grassroots C licence can be employed in amateur leagues levels.

According to Koludağ, in soccer coaches are primarily responsible for the education and management. Koludağ further stated that soccer coaches also play an important role in the development of players' character. Soccer coaches should also manage groups consisting of individuals (players) having extremely different personality traits and cultural backgrounds which can possible lead to inter individuals conflicts. Therefore, soccer coaches may have to solve or manage these conflicts [1].

Problem

Conflict is defined as an "interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities" [2]. Interpersonal conflicts tend to occur when individuals perceive that others are preventing them from attaining their goals. Satisfying one's needs or interests is an important outcome in the conflict resolution process. This becomes a challenge when parties in the conflict want opposing needs or interests satisfied [3].

In this respect, examination of the soccer coaches' conflict management style is of great importance. Previously, Rahim (2001) identified several styles of handling interpersonal conflict such as integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding [4].

To date only few studies examined soccer coaches' conflict management. Thus, there is a clear need to understand coaches' use of conflict management

Moreover, the conflict management style may be influenced coaches' other psychological characteristics namely coaching efficacy.

One of the most important factors that can possible affect performance is coaching efficacy which is defined as "the extent to which coaches believe they have the capacity to affect the learning and performance of their athletes" [5]. Coaching efficacy as a multidimensional construct which

includes four dimensions namely motivation efficacy, game strategy efficacy, teaching technique efficacy and character building efficacy. In this respect, strategy efficacy refers to coaches' confidence in their coaching during competition and their ability to lead the team to a successful performance. Motivation efficacy was defined as confidence in the ability to change the psychological states and abilities of athletes. Teaching technique efficacy referred to the degree of confidence coaches have in their diagnostic and teaching skills. Finally, character building efficacy involves coaches' perception of their ability to influence their athletes' personal maturation and positive sporting attitudes [6]

To date, studies examining coaching efficacy focused largely on sources of coaching efficacy. However, less is known regarding whether coaching efficacy may be associated with conflict management. Not surprisingly, coaches' ability to convey (teach) technical and tactical skill may play a vital role in team success. Nevertheless, team cohesion should be considered another important factor that can affect team success in soccer. Accordingly, examination of coaches' conflict management style in relation to coaching efficacy is of great importance.

During the early stage of the development processes conflict may occur as they express differences in values and perspectives [7]. Management of any conflict is of great importance for a better team development process.

During a chaotic team development process there are several reasons for the occurrence of conflict. According to Tuckman [7] and Tuckman and Jensen [8] uncertainty in members' roles, efforts to gain independence from the leader and formation of coalitions are the major factors having potential that can give rise to conflict.

Research Questions and Objectives

Teams having difficulty in solving conflicts may not develop the trust between members as well as team cohesion [9].

As the cohesion [10] may play an important role in teams' performance such as win-lose percentage, coaches' ability in managing or solving conflicts may have an important effect on teams' success.

Therefore, understanding coaches' preferences to manage conflicts is of great importance. It is the first aim of the present study to examine soccer coaches' conflict management in terms of coaching efficacy.

Hypothesis

Based on the aforementioned theoretical background it was expected on association between coaching efficacy and conflict management. Specifically, a positive and significant correlation was hypothesized between general coaching efficacy and integrating conflict management. It was also expected that coaching efficacy dimensions have the ability to predict integrating and obliging management style of conflict.

2. Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 224 Turkish male soccer coaches from different Turkish Leagues, founded in the 2014-2015 soccer season. The average age of participants was 42, 3 (12, 4). Data for the study was collected using the Coaching Efficacy Scale (CES) and The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II).

Coaching Efficacy Scale (CES)

The instrument used for assessing coaching efficacy was the CES developed by Fletch, Chase, Moritz and Sullivan [11]. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Gençer, Kiremitçi and Boyacıoğlu [12]. The Scale contains 24 items scored on a 10-point scale with 0 indicating "not at all" and 9 indicating "extremely confident". The 24 items could be grouped into four dimensions. Sample items for each dimension are as follows, Motivating Athletes: "Maintain confidence in athletes", and "Mentally prepare athletes for competition"; Strategy Use: "Make critical decisions during competitions", and "Maximize own athletes' strength during competition"; Coaching Technique: "Detect skill errors", and "Teach the skill of the sport"; Character Building: "Instill an attitude of fair play among athletes", and "Promote good sportsmanship". When the internal consistency of the Scale was examined, internal consistency coefficients of the subscales were .82 for Motivating Athletes, .86 for Strategy Use, .87 for Coaching Technique, .84 for Character Building and .94 for entire scale.

The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II)

The instrument used for assessing conflict management styles was the "Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II)" developed by Rahim [13]. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Neiderauer [14]. ROCI II measures the 5 conflict management styles (integrating, avoiding, dominating, obliging and compromising). It consists of 28 statements on a 5-point Likert scale measuring five independent dimensions. A higher score represents greater use of a conflict style. When the internal consistency of the Scale was examined, internal consistency coefficients of the subscales were .72 for integrating (IN), .53 for compromising (CO), .62 for dominating (DO), .76 for avoiding (AV) and .65 for obliging (OB).

3. Results

Data Analysis

In order to analyze obtained data set descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation coefficient and linear regression

analyses were carried out. In Table 1 and 2 descriptive statistics in relation to ROCI and CES were summarized.

First Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated amongst Coaching Efficacy subscales and ROCI- II. Several significant correlations were found between these two measures. Most remarkable correlation was between Total Coaching Efficacy score and interpretation style of conflict management. Thus, there was a relative strong positive association ($r=.45, p=.001$) between overall Coaching Efficacy score and integration. Based on this correlation, a linear regression analyses was conducted. Results show that coaching efficacy may predict significant amount of variance in integration style of

conflict management ($R^2=.20, F(1,222) = 56.83, p=.001$).

Based on the significant correlations between coaching efficacy and conflict management a series of linear regression with stepwise method were conducted to explore the predictive ability of coaching efficacy dimension for conflict management. Results showed that overall coaching efficacy score was able to predict significant amount of variance in integrating [$R^2_{Adj}=.20; F(1,223) = 56, 84, p=.001$] and obliging dimensions [$R^2_{Adj}=.09; F(1,223) = 23, 39, p=.001$] of ROCI II. In addition, game strategy efficacy explained significant amount of variance in compromising dimension of ROCI II [$R^2_{Adj}=.04, F(1,223) = 10.47, p=.001$]

Table 1. Depictive statistics of ROCI II

Coaching Certificate	Integrating		Compromising		Dominating		Avoiding		Obliging	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
UEFA A	57.29	4.41	55.48	5.20	49.25	3.33	33.74	2.94	8.15	.52
UEFA B	57.82	4.98	56.52	5.19	50.18	3.76	33.98	3.18	8.27	.61
TFF C	56.14	5.62	53.98	6.57	48.31	5.25	33.09	3.71	7.98	.75

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of CES

Coaching certificate	Motivation Efficacy (ME)		Game Strategy Efficacy (GSE)		Teaching Technique Efficacy (TTE)		Character Building Efficacy (CBE)		Total Coaching Efficacy (TCE)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
UEFA A	57.29	4.41	55.48	5.20	49.25	3.33	33.74	2.94	8.15	.52
UEFA B	57.82	4.98	56.52	5.19	50.18	3.76	33.98	3.18	8.27	.61
TFF C	56.14	5.62	53.98	6.57	48.31	5.25	33.09	3.70	7.98	.75

Table 3. The relationship between conflict management styles and coaching efficacy

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1) Total Coaching Efficacy (TCE)	-								
2) Character Building Efficacy (CBE)	.68**	-							
3) Teaching Technique Efficacy (TTE)	.89**	.50**	-						
4) Motivation Efficacy (ME)	.88**	.55**	.68**	-					
5) Game Strategy Efficacy (GSE)	.90**	.43**	.80**	.70**	-				
6) Integrating	.45**	.31**	.45**	.37**	.40**	-			
7) Compromising	.19**	.07	.16*	.16*	.21**	.42**	-		
8) Dominating	.08	-.01	.06	.05	.13	.25**	.42**	-	
9) Avoiding	.00	-.04	-.04	.05	.03	.12	.50**	.43**	-
10) Obliging	.31**	.19**	.27**	.30**	.27**	.56**	.52**	.21**	.34**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Discussion and Results

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between coaching efficacy and conflict management style of the soccer coaches.

The main findings of the present study was that the moderate relationship between coaching efficacy and integrating and obliging style of coaching management. In other words coaches who prefer to the use of integrating and obliging style of conflict management reported higher level of coaching efficacy or vice versa.

One of the most important duties of the coaches is to solve or manage interpersonal conflicts and direct individuals efforts to a desired target. In this respect, coaches belief regarding their ability to develop character, teaching technique and game strategy have been found to be associated with integrating conflict management style which means that coaches who have higher level self-efficacy may possible create integrate different individuals in one team.

Previous results from other fields indicated similar results and demonstrated that emotional intelligence and achievement perception also can give rise to integrating conflict management style [15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

The obtained results from the present study may have some implications for the researchers, coaches as well as other practitioner.

The institutions having responsibility for the coaching education should revise their programs to increase coaching efficacy. In this respect, new courses and seminars regarding the teaching skills of techniques and tactics can make an important contribution of coaches' efficacy belief. Moreover, coaches' efficacy may be enhanced via developing interpersonal communication skills. However, it must be noted that efficacy is individuals' own subjective perception regarding their ability in a specific area [20] which means that in some cases the level of efficacy may not reflect actual ability.

Therefore, coaches' efficacy belief should be based upon high level of field information.

This study also includes several limitations. First, the sample of the present study included only male soccer coaches. However, gender can be a significant factor with a potential to mediate the relationship between conflict management and coaching efficacy. Second, in the present study only coaching efficacy was considered as a possible correlate of conflict management. Examination of coaches' conflict management in relation to other psychological variables such as emotional may lead to better understanding of the topic.

The present study includes several limitations. First, in the current study only coaching efficacy was considered as a possible predictor of conflict management. However there may be other individual differences that can possibly influence coaches' conflict management styles such as personality and gender. Further, the sample of the present study included only male coaches, which prevents to

generalize the results to the female coaches.

In future studies it is highly recommended to include female coaches and other psychological variables with potential to influence conflict management style.

REFERENCES

- [1] Koludar S (1988). Futbol'da Antrenörlük ve Eğitim-Öğretim İlkeleri. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi. Ankara.
- [2] Rahim, M. A. (1992). Managing conflict in organizations (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- [3] Antonioni D (1998). Relationship between the big five personality factors and conflict management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 9(4):336-355, <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022814>
- [4] Rahim MA, Antonioni D, Psenicka C (2001). A structural equations model of leader power, subordinates' styles of handling conflict, and job performance. *International Journal of Conflict Management*. 12(3): 191–211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/eb022855>
- [5] Feltz DL, Chase MA, Moritz SE, Sullivan PJ (1999). A conceptual model of coaching efficacy: preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 91(4): 765-776. <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/edu/91/4/765/>
- [6] Sullivan PJ, Kent A (2003). Coaching efficacy as a predictor of leadership style intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*. (15):1-11. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10413200305404>
- [7] Tuckman BW (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*. (63)6: 384-399. <http://openvce.net/sites/default/files/Tuckman1965Developmentalsequences.pdf>
- [8] Tuckman BW, Jensen MAC (1977). Stages of small-group development revisited. *Group & Organization Management*. 2(4):419-427. Copyright 1977 by Sage Publications. Reprinted by permission of Sage Publications. <http://gom.sagepub.com/content/2/4/419.short?rss=1&source=mfr>
- [9] Tekleab AG, Quigley NR, Tesluk PE (2009). A longitudinal study of team conflict, conflict management, cohesion, and team effectiveness. *Group and Organization Management*, 34(2):170-205. DOI: 10.1177/1059601108331218
- [10] Hinkson J (2001). *The Art of Team Coaching*. Warnick Publishing Inc. Canada.
- [11] Feltz D L, Chase MA, Moritz SE, Sullivan PJ (1999). A conceptual model of coaching efficacy: Preliminary investigation and instrument development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 91:675-776. <http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=buy.optionToBuy&id=1999-15231-018>
- [12] Gencer RT, Kiremitci O, Boyacioglu H (2009). Psychometric properties of coaching efficacy scale (CES): a study on Turkish coaches. *E-Journal of New World Sciences*

Academy Sport Sciences. 4(2):143-153.

http://www.newwsa.com/download/gecici_makale_dosyala ri/NWSA-1553-2-8.pdf

- [13] Rahim M A, Magner NR (1995). Confirmatory factor analysis of the styles of handling interpersonal conflict: first-order factor model and its invariance across groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 80(1):122-132. http://www.communicationcache.com/uploads/1/0/8/8/10887248/confirmatory_factor_analysis_of_the_styles_of_handling_interpersonal_conflict_first-order_factor_model_and_its_invariance_across_groups_pbl.pdf
- [14] Neiderauer S (2006). Üniversite Üst Düzey Yöneticilerinin Kişilik Tipleri ve Örgütsel Çatışmayı Çözme Stratejileri. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir: Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi. İzmir.
- [15] Chan JC, Sit EN, Lau WM (2014). Conflict management styles, emotional intelligence and implicit theories of personality of nursing students: A cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*. 34(6):934-939. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24225346>
- [16] Legkauskas V, Skučaitė R (2013). Links between conflict management styles and romantic relationship self-efficacy among university student (English). *International Journal of Psychology: A Biopsychosocial Approach / Tarptautinis psichologijos žurnalas: Biopsichosocialinis požiūris*. 12:51-70. <http://www.psyjournal.vdu.lt/wp/2013-no-12/links-between-conflict-management-styles-and-romantic-relationship-self-efficacy-among-university-students/>
- [17] Kantek F, Gezer N (2009). Conflict in schools: student nurses' conflict management styles. *Nurse Education Today*. 29(1):100-107. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23249515_Conflict_in_schools_Student_nurses'_conflict_management_styles
- [18] Pinchevsky N, Bogler R (2014). The influence of teachers' perceived self-efficacy and role impact on their preferences in adopting strategies to resolve conflict situations with students. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*. 42(2):111-125. <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/97394714/influence-teachers-perceived-self-efficacy-role-impact-their-preferences-adopting-strategies-resolve-conflict-situations-students>
- [19] Somech A (2008). Managing conflict in school teams: the impact of task and goal interdependence on conflict management and team effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 44(3):359-390. <http://eaq.sagepub.com/content/44/3/359.short>
- [20] Bandura A (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*. 84(2), 191-215. <https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1977PR.pdf>