

The impact of extroverted and introverted coach on the functions of observational learning of teenage Basketball players

Behrooz Golmohammadi, Ph.D.
Assistant professor at Semnan University

Behrooz Abdoli, Ph.D.
Associate Professor at Shahid Beheshti University

Zahra Godeyni
Student of Semnan University.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the current research was to investigate the effect of a coach's personality type on the functions of observational learning of adolescent basketball players from the selected clubs of Tehran identified by Myers Briggs after completing the questionnaire have extroverted and introverted coaches. The male adolescent athletes at the ages ranging between 18 \pm 16 years were included in the research. A total of 31 of students were selected by the convenient sampling method among the volunteers based on the research objectives and research inclusion criteria. The participants were assigned into two groups to be trained by two coaches with different personality types. The results revealed a significant difference between the effect of EFJS personality type and the ISTJ personality type on the functions of observational learning of basketball players ($p < 0.05$). Finally, based on the results obtained, ESFJ personality type of coach had a positive effect on the functions of observational learning ($p \leq 0.05$). Thus, it can be concluded that instructors having more interaction with their students during training hours will have a significant effect on learners' functions of observational learning.

Keywords: Trainer, Training Instructor, Sports Psychology, Observational Learning.

Introduction

Empirical studies on the basic principles of education have traditionally investigated to know how teachers and their background characteristics have affected the students' functions in standard tests (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Todd & Wolpin, 2003). However, much evidence suggests that students' learning processes are multidimensional. In addition to the knowledge they acquire, various factors influence their short-term or long-term success during learning and after it. For example, psychologists have found that emotions and

personalities affect the quality of thinking (Baron, 1982), or how much a child learns at school (Duckworth et al., 2015). Experienced trainers not only increase the scores and provide the conditions to show the excellent performance in tests, but also, they create emotionally supportive environments, they help students develop social and emotional styles and manage classroom behaviors, provide accurate contents, and support critical thinking (Cohen, 2011; Lampert, 2011; Pianta and Hemre, 2009).

Teaching and learning theories emphasize the key role of teachers and trainers on supporting their students' progress not only in the learning area but also in areas beyond it. For example, Pianta and Hemre (2009) defined high-quality teaching as a set of emotional supports and organizational techniques, that are important to teachers as educational approaches. They argue that teachers can help students achieve personal desires, learning motivations and take risk by providing "emotional support and a predictable, consistent and safe environment". Over the last years, two research methods have emerged to test this theory using empirical evidence. The first research method focuses on the classroom observations to identify the unique areas of education (Blazar et al., 2015; Hamre et al., 2013). The second research method focuses on the estimation of teachers' involvement in students' outcomes, often called as "teacher effects" (Chetty et al., 2014; Hanushek and Riokin, 2010).

This study is developed in isolation and is among the first studies conducted to integrate these two research traditions. Its aim is to minimize the threats to internal credibility and to unlock the "black box" of the teacher` impacts to know if it affects some of the dimensions of education such as the personality of the trainer, attitudes and behaviors, and factors influencing learners' learning or not.

Methods

The used research method in the current study was comparative-causal type. The research population included all volunteer boys aged 16-18 years old in the selected basketball classes of Tehran. The participants arbitrarily and without knowing which coach had what kind of personality type and character, only enrolled in a basketball training class that was advertised for one month in the area around the club; The participants had been registered and had classes for 10 weeks in the summer of 2018. The participants did not know that they were involved in a research project, and they were told that there were classes at a certain time in the clubs. Finally, the participants were assigned into two groups being trained by two coaches with different personality types. The statistical sample was selected by the convenience sampling method of 31 male students.

To collect the data, 17-item questionnaire of observational learning functions was used. Three observational learning functions included: 1) Skill consisting of 6 questions, 2) Strategy consisting of 5 questions, and 3) implementation consisting of 6 questions. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of this study was obtained about 0.7. In addition, 25-item Baker Thomas, Gaver, Santanestsu questionnaire was used. First, the participants announced their consent to get participated in the research. The samples were divided into two groups: one group was trained by a trainer having Myers-Briggs's personality type, and a team was trained by a trainer with the ESFJ personality type of Myers-Briggs. Another group was trained by a trainer with ISTJ personality type of Myers-Briggs, and they were trained for basketball for 10 weeks.

In this research, the analysis of variance test was used for trainer personality type and accurate assessment of observational learning. The data was analyzed by SPSS software, version20, and the significance level for all variables was considered as $p \leq 0.05$.

Results

There is a significant difference between the effect of the ESFJ personality type and the ISTJ personality type trainers on the effects of observational learning of basketball players (Table1).

Table 1: Multivariate tests results

Trace		Value	F	Hypothesis degree of freedom	Error degree of freedom	Significance
Group	Pillais	.326	6.777	2.000	28.000	.004
	Wilks Lambda	.674	6.777	2.000	28.000	.004
	Hotelling's trace	.484	6.777	2.000	28.000	.004
	Roy's largest root	.484	6.777	2.000	28.000	.004

It can be seen that the values of F group (Table1), in each of the four tests are significant at the significance level of less than 0.05. Therefore, it can be stated that there is a significant difference between the effects of the ESFJ personality type and the ISTJ personality type of the trainer in at least one of the variables of the observational learning functions of basketball players.

Table 2: Multivariate tests results

Trace		Value	F	Hypothesis degree of freedom	Error degree of freedom	Significance
Group	Pillais	.314	4.110	3.000	27.000	.016
	Wilks Lambda	.686	4.110	3.000	27.000	.016
	Hotelling's trace	.457	4.110	3.000	27.000	.016
	Roy's largest root	.457	4.110	3.000	27.000	.016

As can be seen, the values of F group (Table2), in each of the four tests are significant at the significance level of less than 0.05. Therefore, it can be stated that there is a significant difference between the effects of the ESFJ personality type and the ISTJ personality type of trainer in at least one of the variables of the observational learning functions of basketball players.

Table 3: Multivariate analysis of variances

Source	Dependent variable	Sum of squares	df	Mean of squares	F	Significance level	Eta squared
Group	skill	82.586	1	82.586	6.067	.020	.173
	Strategy	7.420	1	7.420	.314	.580	.011
	Implementation	177.275	1	177.275	4.464	.043	.133

As seen, given the significance levels of less than 0.05, observational learning functions and implementations are significantly different in basketball players (Table3). The significance level of the skill is 0.02, and the significance level of the implementation is 0.043, which is smaller than 0.05. In addition, the significance level of the strategy is 0.58 which is larger than 0.05, so it is not significant.

Discussion

The obtained means suggest that the observational learning functions of skill and implementation are higher in the ESFJ group. The skill mean is 38.31 in ESFJ group and it is 35 in ISTJ group (Table3).

The mean of the implementation is 35.85 in ESFJ group and 31 in ISTJ group (Table3).

ETA squared values indicate that the placement in ESFJ group and the ISTJ group explains 17.3% of the variations in skill and 13.3% of the variations in implementation (Table3).

In general, observational learning functions of skill and implementation are affected by trainer personality type. Based on the results, observational learning functions of the skill and implementation have a significant difference in basketball players. The means suggest that the observational learning functions of the skill and implementation are higher in ESFJ group (Table3). ETA squared values indicate that the ESFJ group and the ISTJ group explain 17.3% of the variations in skill and 13.3% of variations in implementation groups (Table3).

Conclusion

Given the statistical results of the present research, it can be concluded that the trainer's personality influences observational learning of athletes, as Rice (2006) stated that interpersonal relationships between teacher and students form a kind of psychological space around the teaching-learning processes, which can lead to the desired outcomes of education for the student and teacher. It can also prevent the learning progress of students, both in cognitive and skill areas. In addition, the results showed that observational

learning of the athletes trained by ESFJ personality had higher significance level compared to those trained by the ISTJ personality type. It is consistent with Rushton, Morgan, and Richard (2007) hypothesis, which suggests students in the classroom with extroverted teachers, obtained academic scores in cognitive learning.

References

- Baron, J. (1982). Personality and intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of human intelligence* (pp. 308–351). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Blazar, D., Braslow, D., Charalambous, C. Y., & Hill, H.C. (2015). Attending to general and content-specific dimensions of teaching: Exploring factors across two observation instruments (Working paper). Cambridge, MA: National Center for Teacher Effectiveness. Retrieved
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the impacts of teachers, I: Evaluating bias in teacher value-added estimates. *American Economic Review*, 104, 2593–2632.
- Cohen, D. K. (2011). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Duckworth, A.L., &Yeager, D.S. (2015) Measurement matters: Assessing personal qualities other than cognitive ability for educational purposes. *Educational Researcher*, 44, 237–251.
- Hamre, B. K., Pianta, R. C., Downer, J. T., DeCoster, J., Mashburn, A. J., Jones, S. M., & Brackett, M.A. (2013). Teaching through interactions: Testing a developmental framework of teacher effectiveness in over 4,000 classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 113, 461–487.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2010). Generalizations about using value-added measures of teacher quality. *American Economic Review*, 100, 267–271.
- Lampert, M. (2001). *Teaching problems and the problems of teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pianta, R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2009). Conceptualization, measurement, and improvement of classroom processes: Standardized observation can leverage capacity. *Educational Researcher*, 38, 109–119.
- Rice J.K. (2006). *Teacher Quality. Understanding the Effectiveness of Teacher Attributes*, Washington DC.
- Rushton, S., Morgan, J., & Richard, M. (2007). Teachers' Myers-Briggs's personality profiles: Identifying personality traits. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 432-441.
- Todd, P. E., & Wolpin, K. I. (2003). On the specification and estimation of the production function for cognitive achievement. *The Economic Journal*, 113, F3–F33.