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This study aims to shed light on the status of coaching within club activities at Japanese junior high schools. To obtain relevant data, a questionnaire was administered to 202 teachers from 50 public schools in I prefecture; at the time of the survey, the teachers were coaching students in the games of soccer, basketball, table tennis, tennis, and baseball. The questionnaires were filled out anonymously, and were distributed and then collected by post. The questionnaire included information on coaching methods (24 items on a five-point scale) based on the Teaching Games for Understanding theory. The results showed the following. (1) About 70% of the teachers did not receive special education in coaching. (2) About 10% of the teachers “did not undergo special education,” “did not have experiences of playing,” and “had experiences of coaching for less than three years.” (3) The teachers differentiated between team sports and individual sports. (4) More than half of the teachers felt a degree of uneasiness about coaching. (5) The self-rating scores were influenced more by the teachers’ playing experience rather than coaching experience. (6) To improve coaching competence, teachers need to acquire such skills as fostering players’ problem-solving capability by using appropriate questions to prompt students’ awareness and ensuring that the aims of practice are met. Future studies should focus on identifying the most crucial aspects of coaching and on analyzing teachers’ behavior in greater detail.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background and purpose

The new government course guidelines for junior high schools in 2008 added “the meaning and points of attention of extracurricular club activities” (MEXT, 2008, p.2 (13)). Consequently, there has been a need to enrich the extracurricular clubs in junior high schools. While the new government course guidelines for junior high schools (MEXT, 2008) explained that it is necessary for teachers to coach appropriately in order to provide an enjoyment of sports, develop students’ fitness and health, and promote human relationships, there is lack of specific instructions for teachers to fulfill these expectations. In addition, the extracurricular clubs provide opportunities to pursue one own interests with depth and in line with the curriculum. For sports club activities, there is a requirement of establishing relevance to physical education (PE) objectives. However, this is unclear as to the status of coaching. In past surveys (Benesse Educational Research and Development Institute, 2007; Chuu-gakusei Koukousei no Sports Katsudou ni Kansuru Chousa Kyouryokusha Kaigi [Research Cooperator Meeting about the Sports Activities of Junior High School and High School Students], 1997), they investigated the conditions of teachers’ induction, the years of coaching experience, and the number of coaching days. Findings have indicated that the specific coaching methods and the relevance to PE have not been examined in detail.

Club activities in Japanese junior high schools are characterized by the fact that “a person who has the position of teacher is coaching” (Kubo, 1992, p.11). According to the “Survey of teachers’ actual work conditions” (Benesse Educational Research and Development Institute, 2007), it reported that 58.5% of teachers are coaching students in sports club activities. However, looking at the ownership of teachers’ license, out of the whole, PE teachers hold 12.6%
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It is assumed that most teachers are not given coach training. Moreover, even if teachers did not have any opportunities to learn the correct coaching methods and knowledge, they still are required to conduct sports coaching. The result of the “Actual conditions survey of teachers in school sports club activities” (Japan Sports Association, 2014) indicated that 45.9% of the teachers in sports club activities are “not PE teachers” and “had no coaching experience,” including 40% of them lacking in technical coaching skills.

In the meantime, studies regarding sports club activities have discussed the educational values through sports club activities (Ueno, 2007; Yamamoto, 2011). Additionally, sociological studies on the management of sports club activities illuminated the circumstances of club activities, and the management system of club activities and coaches (Nakazawa et al., 2008). On either studies, while the importance of teachers’ involvement and the educational significance have been highlighted, it remained unclear the current status of the teachers’ coaching methods in club activities. Further investigation into the coaching methods employed in the current club activities would provide relevant data toward solving the “lack of technical coaching skills” problem. Hence, this study aims to shed light on the status of coaching methods in the club activities at Japanese junior high schools.

1.2 Limitation of participants

A recent survey showed the number of students who were participating in ball games accounts for 81% of Japanese junior high school students (Nippon Junior High School Physical Culture Association, 2013), which means the number of students playing ball games was the highest. The study of ball games can identify many issues; however, this present study focuses on participants who are teacher-coaches. As the coaching system on club activities may vary depending on the region, this study centers the subject area on the I prefecture because it is required that adjust the coaching system according to the region.

1.3 Setting of questionnaire

During the questionnaire design stage, we investigated some studies on the coaching theory in ball games and found many of these studies were based on “Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU)” (Bunker and Thorpe, 1982). TGfU is a new approach with a focus on teaching games in PE lessons. Moreover, TGfU has given consideration to the curriculum, instruction, and evaluation of students’ game performance in Japan as well. On an instructional level, the TGfU approach “aims to understand of game play, not repetition of techniques” (Okade and Yoshinaga, 2000, p.24). Griffin et al. (1997) addressed the essential points that “within each lesson, teachers have students practice skills after they have experienced a game form that presents a tactical problem requiring that skill” and “teachers link the initial modified game and the skill practice through ... [their] questions. The quality of these questions is critical.” It is also assumed that the coaching methods and model based on TGfU would have the possibility to reveal students’ competencies (e.g. an enjoyment of sports and establishing desirable human relationships) that are required to educate students in club activities. For instance, Butler and Griffin (2010) said that the “TGfU approach can also foster the development of life skills (interpersonal, communication, critical-thinking, and problem-solving skills).” Griffin et al. (1997) also said that TGfU has been “allow[ed] players to participate actively in the process of solving problems and making decisions.” Thus, because the coaching methods based on TGfU approach would be a beneficial guide for coaching in club activities, it was adapted into the questionnaire in the present study.

In addition, focusing on a case regarding coach education in the USA, The American Sports Education Program (ASEP) offer training modules such as principles of coaching, coaching tactical and technical skill (ASEP; Martens, 2012). In particular, they suggested that the games approach was a common feature in the TGfU approach. Rainer (2012) mentioned that “the games approach us[es] team sports as examples, but they can be applied to individual sport as well.” It can be seen that the games approach is a required content the coaches and teachers should learn.

From the studies on teachers’ behavior, Taka-hashi et al. (1991) identified the four essential teacher behaviors in the PE class that are “management,” “instruction,” “monitoring,” and “interaction.” Murase and Ambe (2010) showed that stu-
students’ expectation of the teachers’ behavior includes “enriched learning environment,” “equal relationship between teacher and student,” “criticism,” and “encouragement.” Matsui (2014) focused on coach’ feedback, which is one of the “interaction” behaviors (Takahashi et al., 1991). The analysis of the coaches’ feedback affirmed three elements: “praise/encouragement,” “reproach,” and “absence.” In the present study, the questionnaires were mainly composed of items related to “instruction” and “interaction.” Its categories consist of “coaching on using game-based approach,” “coaching on asking questions” and “coaching on students-centered approach,” as these categories constitute a form of evaluation on coaching skills. The “coaching on using game-based approach” category, it entails the description of coaching methods such as fostering tactical problem solving through game-based approach. In “coaching on asking questions” category, it was composed of items using appropriate questions to prompt students’ awareness when they succeeded or failed. In “coaching on students-centered approach” category, it consists of coaching skills such as focusing on the relationship between students and planning practices suitable to the individual level of each student. The questionnaires were designed referring to the coaching methods in “MORE Teaching Games for Understanding” (Butler and Griffin, 2010) that had compiled recent studies of TGfU. Thus, the concept of “coaching skills” in the present study could be a part of teachers’ behavior in sports activities.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

The participants were teachers who coach students in sports club activities specifically ball games at 50 public junior high schools selected randomly in I prefecture. Questionnaires were collected from 27 schools, that is 54% of the total, and the number of respondents was 202 teachers (141 men, 61 women). There were 70 teachers in their twenties, 69 teachers in their thirties, 46 teachers in their forties, and 17 teachers in their fifties. The breakdown number of teachers for sports was 21 in soccer, 42 in basketball, 36 in table tennis, 42 in tennis, 32 in volleyball, and 29 in baseball respectively.

2.2 Procedures

This survey was conducted using questionnaires that were completed anonymously. The questionnaires were sent and collected by post. between April 13th and June 14th, 2013. Participants were asked to select only one answer for each question. Multiple or blank responses were considered invalid. This study protocol was approved by the Ethical Committee of the University of Tsukuba.

2.3 Measures

The questionnaire was composed of 24 items based on referenced studies (Butler and Griffin, 2010) on the coaching methods in TGfU. Unless mentioned otherwise, participants responded to the items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all true for me) to 5 (very true for me), where they indicated to what extent their own coaching for the current team as a whole had fulfilled the criteria in the questionnaire items. Based on the overall high score in their self-ratings, we concluded that the teacher-participants perceived themselves as having coaching skills. With regard to the participants’ attributes, we solicited information on gender, age, subject in which they majored, the sport they coach now, existence of a coaching license, existence of playing experience concerning the sport they coach currently, and past coaching experience. In addition, a survey conducted during Chuugakusei Koukousei no Sports Katsudou ni Kansuru Chousa Kyouryokusha Kaigi [Research Cooperator Meeting about the Sports Activities of Junior High School and High School Students] (1997) showed that only 2.1% of the teachers answered “Nothing” to a question regarding worries they had about coaching, and it was clarified that most of the teachers had troubles such as “I do not have much time for coaching because I have a lot of school affairs” and “I lack technical coaching skills.” Accordingly, we added the question “Do you feel any uneasiness about coaching?” in order to investigate how many teachers experienced “uneasiness”, including the “troubles” mentioned above, and the characteristics of such “uneasiness.” For this study, we assumed that feeling of uneasiness reflected teachers’ interests and will to solve various “troubles.”
2.4 Statistical analyses

To examine the factor structure of the 24 questionnaire items, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted using the Major factor method, promax rotation. The determination of the factors, it is considered an eigenvalue and ease of interpretation comprehensively. In addition, items with the absolute value of factor loading showing less than .40 and showing more than .35 in plural factors, are deleted before the same factor analysis is conducted again. To determine the internal consistency of the retained factors, the internal consistencies, as indexed by Cronbach’s alpha, were calculated. Finally, the correlation between two factors was calculated using the Pearson r correlations.

Therefore, the participants were divided into two groups between PE teachers + qualifiers by the Japan Sports Association (Coaches group) or others (Teachers group). Subsequently, we compared the average self-rated score between the two groups using t test \((p<0.05)\) to clarify the relationship between coaching skill and formal coach training. In addition, calculated effective dose to judge degree of the difference. We conducted a similar analysis on the comparison of playing experience (with/without experience) with the sports they coach currently. Furthermore, we compared the average self-rated score with the total number of years they have been coaching using one-way ANOVA \((p<0.05)\). The coaching years were categorized into four groups: “no experience,” “1-4 years,” “5-9 years,” and “more than 10 years.” In the event that there is a significant difference in the ANOVA test, we conducted multiple comparison via Bonferroni as the sub effect tests \((p<0.05)\). For data processing, the SPSS statistics Ver.21 was used.

3. Results

3.1 Basic attributes of participants

The pie chart (Figure 1) illustrated features of the participants’ basic attribute. First, 63 participants were teachers who were “PE teachers” or “had coaching qualification” (Coach group), at 31%. In contrast, 139 participants were teachers who are “not PE teacher” and “did not have coaching qualification” (Teacher group), at 69%. Then, we examined the existence of playing experience. In the Coach group, 42 participants had playing experience (21%), and 21 participants did not have playing experience (10%). In the Teacher group, 74 participants had playing experience (37%), while 65 participants did not have playing experience (32%). Furthermore, we focused on the Teacher group with no playing experience of which 27 participants had no coaching experience or have experience less than three years: this makes up to 13% of the total. In other words, it was revealed that approximately 10% of teachers “did not undergo special education,” “did not have playing experience” and “had coaching experience less than three years.”

Second, the bar chart (Figure 2) details information on the percentage of participants for each sport. It showed that the proportion of numbers was different depending on the sports. For instance, while half of the teachers who coached in the soccer club belonged to the Coach group, most of the teachers who coached in the table tennis club belonged to the Teacher group. Moreover, 60% of the teachers in the table tennis club were “not PE teachers,” “did not have coaching license” and “did not have playing experience.”

![Figure 1](image.png) The participants’ basic attributes
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uneasiness</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) (df=1)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-2.6**</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-2.6**</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 202, **: p < .01, *: p < .05 (two-side test)

3.2 Uneasiness about coaching

A total of 114 teachers (56.4%) answered “Yes” to the question, “Do you feel any uneasiness about coaching?”, while 88 teachers (43.6%) answered “No”. Moreover, Table 1 shows that there was a significant relationship (\( \chi^2 = 6.866, p < .05 \)) between the existence of uneasiness and the existence of attending a training course (the existence of special education). Specifically, 27 teachers “felt uneasiness” and “underwent special education”; 87 teachers “felt uneasiness” and “did not undergo special education”; 36 teachers “did not feel uneasiness” and “underwent special education”; and 52 teachers “did not feel uneasiness” and “did not undergo special education”. The residual analysis showed significant findings and indicated that among the teachers who “felt uneasiness”, there was a lower frequency of individuals who “underwent special education” (z = -2.6, p < .01) and a greater frequency of teachers who “did not undergo special education” (z = -2.6, p < .01). Among the teachers who “did not feel uneasiness”, there was a greater frequency of people who “underwent special education” (z = 2.6, p < .01) and a lower frequency of teachers who “did not undergo special education” (z = 2.6, p < .01).

3.3 Factor structure of the questionnaire

As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, four factors were selected, resulting in a final total of 12 items (Table 2). The first factor was named “Understanding/Problem-Solving” because it was composed of items describing coaching methods such as promoting problem-solving skills and understanding positions and roles during games. The second factor was named “Questioning” because it was composed of items related to asking questions when a student succeeded or failed. The third factor was named “Involvement” because it was composed of items expressing students’ relationship. The fourth factor was named “Individuality” because it was composed of items related to students’ individuality and personalized teaching/coaching. Furthermore, the item “practice depends on each student” in the fourth factor comprised not only the practice techniques but also the overall physical activities of the club. Internal consistencies were satisfactory with Cronbach’s alphas more than 0.7 for “Understanding/Problem-Solving,” “Questioning,” and “Individuality.” Cronbach’s alphas for “Involvement” did not reach 0.7, but it was positively correlated at \( r = .46, p < .01 \). The correlations among the four factors were positively correlated in range of \( r = .20-.05 \).

3.4 Comparison between coach group and teacher group

Table 3 showed the result of the comparison of the average self-rated score between Coach group and Teacher group. In “Understanding/Problem-Solving,” the Coach group’s score was higher than the score for the Teacher group significantly (t (200) = 2.79, p < .01). The extent of the difference was
Table 2  Questionnaire of teachers’ coaching skills (Promax-rotated factor analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Understanding/Problem-Solving (α=.83)</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to make students understand the aim of practice.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look for technical problems in which students should improve.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to make students solve tactical problems in the flow of the games.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I conduct practice sessions that attach importance to understanding positions and roles during games.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach “off the ball” movement.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Questioning (α=.70)</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask the student “Why did you succeed?” when the student succeeds.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give students a chance to review past plays during matches and practice.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask the student “What should you improve?” when the student fails.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Involvement (α=.63)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give students a chance to discuss practice plans with other students.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I promote student’s autonomy during activities.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Individuality (α=.70)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach step-by-step techniques.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan practice sessions that are suitable to the individual level of each student.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderate level (ES = .59). There were no significant differences in other factors; the figures on Coach group were higher than the figures on Teacher group in all factors.

3.5 Comparison with the existence of playing experience

Table 4 showed a result of the comparison of the average self-rated score between teachers who had playing experience on the sport they coach now and teachers with no playing experience. If a teacher had been playing the sport for more than a year, the teacher would be categorized as “had playing experience.” As a result, teachers with playing experience had higher average score than teachers with no playing experience in all four factors. There is a significant difference in “Understanding/Problem-Solving” (t (200) = 6.04, p < .01, ES = 1.21) and “Questioning” (t (200) = 2.83, p < .01, ES = .57).

Table 3  Comparison of the average self-rated score between Coach group and Teacher group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Coach (n=63)</th>
<th>Teacher (n=139)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/Problem-Solving</td>
<td>4.24 0.50</td>
<td>3.99 0.65</td>
<td>2.79** .59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>3.96 0.75</td>
<td>3.82 0.71</td>
<td>1.28 .27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.85 0.77</td>
<td>3.80 0.75</td>
<td>0.44 .09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality</td>
<td>3.87 0.74</td>
<td>3.72 0.75</td>
<td>1.29 .27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = mean; SD = standard deviation; ES = effect size **: p < .01

Table 4  Comparison of experienced with non-experienced teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Experienced (n=116)</th>
<th>Not Experienced (n=86)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/Problem-Solving</td>
<td>4.28 0.51</td>
<td>3.78 0.65</td>
<td>6.04** 1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>3.98 0.69</td>
<td>3.70 0.73</td>
<td>2.83** .57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.84 0.76</td>
<td>3.78 0.74</td>
<td>0.57 .11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality</td>
<td>3.82 0.68</td>
<td>3.69 0.83</td>
<td>1.26 .25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = mean; SD = standard deviation; ES = effect size **: p < .01

ES = |t|/(1/n₁ + 1/n₂)
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4. Discussion

First of all, we will describe the attributes of the participants. According to Japan Sports Association (2014), they reported the fact that 45.9% of teachers who coach in sports club activities were “not PE teacher” and “no playing experience,” and they indicated the issue that teachers are required to coach in the sport that they have never played before. In the present study, the findings revealed the new fact that more than 10% of the teachers “did not undergo special education,” “did not have playing experiences” and “had coaching experiences less than three years.” In contrast, it is true that there are teacher who had coaching license and a wealth of coaching/playing experience. Next, in Figure 2, there was a remarkable difference of the participants’ attributes according to the sport type. It could be surmised that team sports clubs such as baseball and soccer had better coaching arrangements well compared to individual sports clubs, for example tennis and table tennis. Hence, it is very likely that the quality of sports education may vary depending of the sport type and the assigned teacher: team sports have more qualified and experienced coaches. The situation should not be prevalent in school-based education; therefore, we need affirmative actions immediately.

To tackle the issue, we will discuss about what and how teachers should learn for coaching in club activities. For a start, the analysis showed that the differences in coaching skill depend on whether the teachers had undergone special coach education. Consequently, there is an outstanding difference on the “Understanding/Problem-Solving” category. The coaching skill related to “Understanding/Problem-Solving” meant that teachers comprehended specific tactical problems for the sport type. Aside from that, the coaching skill can effectively contribute to improving students’ performance during games. While it has been said that a lack of technical coaching skills is a big issue, it was truly a lack of concreteness in the mentioned skills. In the present study, the coaching methods that promote students’ problem-solving skills and create opportunities for students to understand the aims of practice and the positions during in the game would be one of the technical coaching skills teachers should learn. On the other hand, there were not much difference in the coaching skill related to “Involvement” and “Individuality.” Hence, it can be assumed that teachers acquired these coaching skills in their daily school life such as teaching subjects and being involved with students even if teachers did not undergo special education on sports coaching. Moreover, there was a significant relationship between the existence of uneasiness and the existence of special education (Table 1). Although it remains unclear what this uneasiness entailed, it presumably stemmed from a lack of technical coaching skills since there was a significant difference in coaching skills among the teachers who underwent special education.

In addition, when compared with the existence of playing experience, the number of teachers with playing experience of the sport they coach now exceeded the number of teachers with no playing experience in all the factors analyzed. However, there were no significant differences in “Involvement” and “Individuality” as well. Due to the fact that there were significant differences in “Understanding/Problem-Solving” and “Questioning,” the aspects of coaching that appear most differentiated between teachers with playing experience and teachers with no playing experience, would be items related to technical coaching skill. At this point, we focused on the correlation between the factors, because the highest correlation coefficient was “Understanding/Problem-Solving” and “Questioning.” This can be construed that if a teacher acquires the coaching skills to promote students’ understanding and problem solving, at the same time, the teacher can master the corresponding skills such as appropriate questioning and prompting students’ awareness. Subsequently, to investigate the extent past coaching experience had an effect on coaching skills, we compared the average self-rated score with the total number of years they have been coaching. The ANOVA results indicated that the main effect was not accepted in any factors (“Understanding/Problem-Solving”: F (3,198) = 3.08, “Questioning”: F (3,198) = 0.67, “Involvement”: F (3,198) = 0.91, and “Individuality”: F (3,198) = 2.61). Looking at all the factors, only in “Understanding/Problem-Solving,” the number of years of coaching experience correlates with the self-rated score (no experience = 3.93, more than a year = 4.01, more than five years = 4.21, more than ten years = 4.24). However, with regard to “Involvement,” while the score of teachers with no coaching experience was the highest, the score of teachers with coaching ex-
experience of more than ten years was the lowest (no experience = 3.88, more than a year = 3.74, more than five years = 3.91, more than ten years = 3.69). It means that teachers with less coaching experience tend to actively encourage interaction among students. On the other hand, it can be assumed that the teachers with considerable experience used a coaching style that is authoritative and teacher-centered. Van den Berghe et al. (2013) said that “experienced teachers tended to engage more frequently in need-thwarting behavior and in particular in cold interactions with their students.” The present investigation implies that there is a similar situation in Japanese sports club activities. Owing to this, the present study also points to the need for teacher re-education program regardless of the existence of a special education and playing experience in the teachers.

Thus, as a whole, it was shown that the self-rating scores were influenced the most by the teachers’ playing experience. In particular, learning the coaching skill such as fostering student’s problem-solving capability and making students’ understand the positions and roles during games would be one of the tasks for teachers. It would be viable if we could consider elevating the priority of playing experience as a prerequisite for coaching in order to enrich the management of sports club activities. For example, physical activity modules are integrated into the tertiary curricula as a required credit for coach license application, or making it compulsory for participation in sports at the tertiary level. Moreover, it is proposed that teachers should not only acquire playing experience but also learn coaching methods based on the TGfU because teachers could improve their coaching skills and bring out the students’ competencies (e.g. an enjoyment of sports and the desirable human relationships) that are required in club activities. With regard to continuous education for in-service teachers, in particular, it would appear that we need to reconsider coaching methods that are focused on the interaction with students and the relationship between students. For instance, university faculty members conduct systematic management such as playing the role of a mentor for teachers. The mentoring system has been conducted for development of human resources in the area of nursing, education, and business. In a recent study, it was suggested that the mentoring system would be successful in the field of sports coaching (Jones et al., 2009). Normally, it is generally agreed that an experienced teacher would support the new teacher as the mentor. It is hoped that university teachers, PE teachers with playing/coaching experience or qualified coaches in the local community provide assistance to the teachers as mentors.

5. Limitations

This study had a number of shortcomings. First, this sample size of this study cannot represent the whole population of the sports clubs in the Japanese junior high schools. The participants were selectively teachers of sports clubs playing ball games in the I prefecture. Therefore, it is recommended that a national level survey be conducted all sport types. Second, concerning the question, “Do you feel any uneasiness about coaching?”, there was an assumption that the teachers had some troubles and that the components of uneasiness included pressures of school affairs, environmental factors such as facilities and instruments, and relationships with students’ parents, among others. There were also some implicit interpretations about what “feeling uneasiness” meant. While “feeling uneasiness” signifies negative feelings such as “I do not know what to do” or “I do not have confidence”, it is also possible that teachers had positive feelings such as “interest” or “a desire to improve.” There is little doubt that most teachers experience a certain amount of “troubles”, as documented in the extant literature, but it could be that some did not necessarily feel “uneasiness”, perhaps because they were “not interested” in tackling their troubles. In the present study, we assumed that many teachers tried to solve their “troubles” because half of them felt “uneasiness”. Third, it is necessary to include students’ evaluation as concurrent data for analysis and as “an instrument for formative evaluation” (Takahashi et al., 1994). Fourth, there is also a shortcoming regarding the validity of the scale, specifically, the internal consistency of the “Involvement” was low. In addition, it was difficult to say that this scale described all coaching methods and behaviors in the actual club activities. Accordingly, it is suggested that future studies should focus on identifying the most crucial aspects of coaching and analyzing teachers’ behavior in greater detail such as the study that Takahashi et al. (1996) conducted by observing teacher’s manners of expressions. In the present study, we collected data on the coaching proficiency
level focusing on the games approach; however, there is a need for another scale measuring “the traditional approach” (Bunker and Thorpe, 1982) which is often referenced as a comparative approach against the TGfU. The features of “the traditional approach” (Bunker and Thorpe, 1982) emphasize on the practice technique by repetition, and not related to game playing; hence, students might rely heavily on the teachers. It is not unlikely that an experienced teacher used a coaching style using the traditional approach, yet this needs further verification through future studies. Based on the results that indicate some negative scales of coaching skills, we will be able to isolate new problems and conduct future research. Finally, we emphasized the need for teacher education program, hence, in future studies it will be required to investigate the type of training that can maximize the learning benefits for teachers.
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