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Purposes of Study

• To examine the Sport Commitment Model (SCM; Scanlan et al., 1993a; Scanlan et al., 2009) to see if it provides a viable model to assess coaches’ commitment to coaching.

• To assess enjoyment as a potential mediator to sport (coaches’) commitment.

• To determine the factors that contribute to soccer coaches’ commitment to coaching.
In the Literature

1. Youth Sports
   a) Athletes
   b) Coaches

2. Sport Psychology
   a) Coming to the surface in 70’s
   b) Social Exchange Theory/Investment Theory
   c) Sport Commitment with athletes
   d) Sport Commitment with coaches
Theoretical Framework

Coaches’ Commitment - the desire and intent to continue coaching by engaging in educational learning opportunities, designing developmentally appropriate activities, and embracing an athlete-centered philosophy.

Scanlan et al., 1993a; Scanlan et al., 2009
Methods

1) Theory Driven, non-experimental

2) Hypothesized Models

3) Pilot Study

4) Data Collection Procedures

5) Data Analysis Procedures – SEM, Regression
Results

1) Descriptive Data Analysis

2) Standardized Measurement Model

3) Regression Analysis
Descriptive Data Analysis

- $N = 1654$, 72% NSCAA, 26% USYSA, 2% SAY Soccer
- 89% Caucasian
- 91% Male
- < 95% had athletic playing experience
- 90% had coached more than 5 years
- 11% novice, 46% experts
- 70% considered themselves part-time
- 37% reported being paid-professional
- 96% fall, 68% winter, 85% spring, 71% summer
Coaches’ Commitment - the desire and intent to continue coaching by engaging in educational learning opportunities, designing developmentally appropriate activities, and embracing an athlete-centered philosophy.
Regression Analysis

• Using Sport Commitment Constructs
  – $F(6,1647)=348$, $\rho < .001$, $R^2 = .56$
  – **56%** coaches commitment was predicted
  – **Valuable Opportunities** #1 predictor
  – Social support was not statistically significant

• Adding Coaching Efficacy, Age & Experience
  – $F(8,1645) = 269$, $\rho < .001$, $R^2 = .57$
  – **57%** coaches commitment was predicted
  – Coaching Efficacy, Age and Experience are statistically significant, but do not trump commitment constructs
What does this mean?

1) Coaches in this study greatly value the opportunities to work with their athletes, and dedicate much time and effort to their coaching.

2) Coaches in this study with high commitment who value their continued involvement have more fun and less alternatives than those with less commitment.

3) Although significant, coaches in this study may not feel obligated to coach.

4) Committed coaches in this study are not influenced significantly by their social support structure.
What does this mean?

5) Coaching efficacy, age and coaching experience were significant predictors of coaches’ commitment.

6) Coaching commitment and sport commitment could possibly mean different things. Athletes participate for the fun while coaches are investing in the athlete.
Future Research

1) Modification to Coaches Commitment Instrument

2) Studies with a more heterogeneous population

4) Group Analysis

5) Longitudinal studies – Commitment over time

6) New Models
Future Research

• Maybe an interactive piece
Thank you!

“My classroom was the basketball court. It was there that I taught everything from correct hand and foot movement to values and attitudes, including enthusiasm, loyalty, self-control, and more.”

(Wooden & Jamison, 2007, p.58)
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