

Leadership Support of the School Heads on the Motivation and Success of the Student-Athletes Through the Teacher-Coaches Coaching Practices

Reziel Sueña Ramirez

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: reziel.ramirez001@deped.gov.ph

Abstract—This study aimed to examine the relationships among leadership support from school heads, teacher-coaches' practices, student-athletes' motivation, and student-athletes' success in selected schools in Laguna for the school year 2025–2026. Descriptive, correlational, and moderation analyses were conducted to determine the strength and direction of relationships among the study variables. Participants included at least 62 teacher-coaches and 183 student-athletes selected through purposive sampling. Provided an objective aiming to determine how school heads support teacher-coaches, influencing coaching practices that enhance student-athlete motivation and success. School heads' leadership support was found to have a weak and mostly indirect relationship with student-athletes' motivation and success, with professional development identified as the most effective form of support. Teacher-coaches' practices emerged as the strongest and most consistent predictors of student-athletes' motivation and success, directly influencing academic, athletic, personal, and team outcomes. Leadership factors such as supervision, motivation, and trust did not significantly impact this relationship. Recreational activities were shown to enhance the positive effects of coaching, serving as a contextual booster rather than a standalone factor. The study concludes that the quality of teacher-coaches' practices, especially when supported by professional development and a positive, recreational environment, is the main driver of student-athlete motivation and success. Leadership support from school heads plays an important but indirect role by enabling effective coaching through resources and professional learning opportunities. School heads may prioritize continuous professional development for teacher-coaches, customize leadership support to address coaching and athlete needs, and promote recreational activities to enhance motivation. Teacher-coaches may also focus on athlete-centered coaching and include recreational elements to increase enjoyment. At the policy level, institutions should adopt a balanced approach that values both performance and recreation, assessing leadership effectiveness through coaching quality and athlete growth. Finally, future research may long-term effects, explore contextual moderators, and include broader perspectives from student athletes and parents to enrich understanding.

Keywords— leadership support, school heads, teacher-coaches, student-athletes, motivation, athletic success, professional development, coaching practices

I. INTRODUCTION

Sports make a significant contribution to the holistic development of students, contributing to their physical, mental, and emotional well-being alongside academics. Student-athletes who juggle academic responsibilities with the rigorous demands of sports require significant guidance and

support from their institutions to achieve success both on and off the field. At the center of this guidance lies the school leadership, particularly the school heads, whose leadership practices profoundly influence the motivation and overall success of student-athletes.

In the broader context, effective school leadership has been extensively recognized as a critical determinant of student success across various domains. Transformational leadership practices, which include inspiring and motivating teachers, providing vision, and fostering a collaborative environment, lead to improved educational outcomes (Bass & Avolio, 2018). When narrowed down to the context of sports, the influence of school heads becomes even more pivotal as they orchestrate the support structures necessary for the development of both academic and athletic programs.

The role of teacher coaches cannot be understated in this dynamic. Positioned as mentors who bridge educational and athletic spheres, teacher coaches provide students with the expertise, structure, and encouragement needed to thrive. However, the effectiveness of teacher-coaches often depends on the level of leadership support provided by school heads. Leadership practices such as fostering a growth-oriented environment, providing resources, and recognizing the achievements of student-athletes are critical components of this support. Effective coaching practices are those that emphasize positive reinforcement, goal-setting, and individualized attention, which are significantly enhanced by strong institutional support.

The study analyzes leadership strategies, teacher-coach interactions, and student-athlete outcomes to provide insights into fostering athletic and academic achievement. It highlights how leadership behaviors influence coach performance and, in turn, student-athlete success Jones et al., (2019). Emphasizing the transformational role of school leaders, the research advocates for their active involvement in shaping young athletes' futures. Ultimately, the findings offer practical recommendations for educational leadership and sports management, contributing to holistic student development.

This research leadership support of the school heads on the motivation and success of the student-athletes through the teacher-coaches' coaching practices, aiming to determine how school heads support teacher-coaches, influencing coaching practices that enhance student-athlete motivation and success.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This research aimed to determine the relationship between school heads' leadership support and the motivation and success of student-athletes through teacher-coaches' coaching practices.

This sought to answer the following questions;

1. What is the extent of the leadership support of the School heads in terms of;
 - 1.1 Professional Development;
 - 1.2 Resource Allocation;
 - 1.3 Empowerment Motivation;
 - 1.4 Communication Coordination;
 - 1.5 Leadership Practices; and
 - 1.6 Goal Setting?
2. What is the level of motivation of the student-athletes in terms of;
 - 2.1 Goal Orientation;
 - 2.2 Self Discipline;
 - 2.3 Coach Support; and
 - 2.4 Competitive Drive?
3. What is the level of Student Success of the athletes in terms of
 - 3.1 Academic Achievement;
 - 3.2 Athletic Performance;
 - 3.3 Personal Growth; and
 - 3.4 Team Contribution?
4. What is the level of the teacher-coaching practices in terms of;
 - 4.1 Institutional;
 - 4.2. Motivational;
 - 4.3 Building Trust/Rapport; and
 - 4.4 Recreational?
5. Does the leadership support of the school heads significantly correlate with the motivation of the student-athletes?
6. Does the leadership support of the school heads significantly correlate with the success of the student-athletes?
7. Do the teacher-coaching practices intervene in the relationship between the leadership support of the school head and the motivation and success of the student-athlete?

II. METHODOLOGY

Descriptive, correlational, and moderation analyses were conducted to determine the strength and direction of relationships among the study variables. Participants included at least 62 teacher-coaches and 183 student-athletes selected through purposive sampling..

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data on the relationship between the leadership support of school heads and the motivation and success of student-athletes through the coaching practices of teacher-coaches. The data presentation begins with quantitative results on leadership support dimensions such as resource provision, recognition, communication, and involvement, followed by qualitative insights that capture participants experiences, providing a

comprehensive view of leadership, coaching, and student-athlete outcomes.

The Extent the Leadership Support of the School Heads

The presentation of data focuses on the extent of leadership support provided by school heads and its influence on the motivation and success of student-athletes through the coaching practices of teacher-coaches. The following tables summarize the quantitative results gathered from survey responses, showing the levels of leadership support across key dimensions such as resource provision, recognition, communication, and involvement. These tables serve as the foundation for interpreting how leadership actions translate into effective coaching practices and, ultimately, into the academic and athletic achievements of student-athletes.

Table 1 shows the extent leadership support of school heads in terms of professional development. The weighted mean for the extent of leadership support of school heads in terms of professional development is 6.34 with a standard deviation of 0.57, with a verbal interpretation of Very High.

The overall weighted mean of 6.34 (SD = 0.57), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that school heads provide consistent and strong support for teachers' professional growth through encouragement, training opportunities, recognition, and the creation of a learning-oriented environment. This finding suggests that professional development is institutionally valued and systematically promoted within the school context, pointing to enhanced teacher competence and readiness to apply newly acquired knowledge and skills in instructional and coaching practices.

Table 1. Extent of Leadership Support of School Heads in terms of Professional Development

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school heads...			
...encourages teachers to attend professional development workshops and seminars.	6.42	0.64	Strongly Agree
...provides opportunities for teachers to participate in training programs related to their field.	6.38	0.58	Strongly Agree
...allocates resources for professional development activities.	6.22	0.72	Strongly Agree
regularly informs staff about available professional development opportunities.	6.36	0.70	Strongly Agree
...supports teachers in applying new knowledge and skills gained from training.	6.44	0.71	Strongly Agree
...recognizes and appreciates teachers' efforts in pursuing professional growth.	6.45	0.64	Strongly Agree
...creates an environment that promotes continuous learning among staff.	6.45	0.61	Strongly Agree
...invites experts or resource persons for in-house professional development activities.	6.02	0.97	Agree
...provides feedback and guidance to teachers after professional development activities.	6.33	0.94	Strongly Agree
...considers teachers' professional development needs when planning school activities.	6.40	0.76	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.34		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Among the indicators, the highest mean ratings were recorded for recognizing and appreciating teachers' efforts in

pursuing professional growth and creating an environment that promotes continuous learning (both $M = 6.45$), demonstrating that recognition and a culture of learning are the most evident leadership practices related to professional development. Conversely, the indicator inviting experts or resource persons for in-house professional development activities obtained the lowest mean ($M = 6.02$), indicating that while professional development support is generally strong, expert-led in-house activities may be constrained by availability, scheduling, or resource limitations.

Along with the result, it indicates that school heads generally provide strong resource support for student-athlete programs, including budget, equipment, event participation, and other forms of assistance. The very high level of support suggests that resource allocation is consistently practiced and is an important part of how school heads sustain athletic programs.

Table 2. Extent of Leadership Support of School Heads in terms of Resource Allocation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The School heads....			
...ensures that sufficient budget is allocated for athlete training and competition needs.	5.82	1.15	Agree
...provide adequate sports equipment and facilities for student-athletes	5.80	1.20	Agree
resources for the professional development of teacher-coaches are made available by the school head.	5.77	1.14	Agree
...provide resources for the professional development of teacher-coaches are made available by the school head.	5.83	1.00	Agree
...prioritizes student-athlete welfare by ensuring access to medical and nutritional support.	5.95	1.13	Agree
...consistently allocates funds for travel and participation in inter-school athletic events.	5.97	0.99	Agree
...ensured timely allocation of financial, material, and human resources to support student-athlete programs.	5.92	0.95	Agree
...there is timely distribution of resources (financial, material, and human) to support student-athlete programs.	5.91	1.07	Agree
...support staff (such as trainers or assistants) are made available to teacher-coaches.	5.80	1.17	Agree
...the school head provides incentives or recognition for the achievements of student-athletes and their coaches.	6.10	0.93	Agree
Weighted Mean	5.89		
SD	0.95		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 2 presents the extent of leadership support of school heads in terms of resource allocation. The overall weighted mean of 5.89 ($SD = 0.95$), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that school heads generally provide substantial support for student-athlete programs through financial, material, and human resources. This suggests that resource allocation is consistently practiced as part of school leadership, contributing to the continuity and sustainability of athletic programs and supporting student-athletes' participation in training and competitions.

Among the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for providing incentives or recognition for the achievements of student-athletes and their coaches ($M = 6.10$,

$SD = 0.93$). This indicates that recognition-based resource allocation is the most evident form of support, reinforcing motivation and acknowledging performance outcomes. In contrast, the indicator allocating resources for the professional development of teacher-coaches obtained the lowest mean ($M = 5.77$, $SD = 1.14$), suggesting that resource support is more heavily directed toward immediate athletic participation needs (e.g., competitions, travel, equipment) than toward long-term capacity-building of teacher-coaches.

Despite the findings showing that school heads demonstrate a very high commitment to resource allocation, particularly in supporting student athlete participation, the motivational impact of these resources. In contrast to the expectation that more resources automatically enhance motivation, teacher coaches explained that effectiveness depends on how well resources align with coaching realities and address both student athlete and teacher coach's needs. Furthermore, the lower emphasis on professional development for teacher coaches helps explain statistical relationships observed between resource allocation and motivation.

Certainly, the assumption that more resources automatically enhance motivation, teacher-coaches explained that effectiveness depends on how well resources align with coaching realities and address both athlete and coach needs. Likewise, the emphasis on professional development for teacher-coaches helps explain the statistical relationships observed between resource allocation and motivation.

Table 3 presents the extent of leadership support of school heads in terms of empowerment motivation. The overall weighted mean of 6.05 ($SD = 1.01$), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that school heads consistently promote a motivational climate characterized by encouragement, goal setting, recognition, and a positive school environment. This finding suggests that empowerment motivation is a key leadership approach used to strengthen student-athletes' confidence, persistence, and drive toward excellence.

Including the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for actively supporting teacher-coaches in motivating student-athletes ($M = 6.13$, $SD = 1.02$). This result highlights that empowerment motivation is most strongly manifested through leadership actions that enhance teacher-coaches' capacity to motivate, guide, and influence student-athletes. In contrast, the indicator facilitating motivational workshops or seminars for student-athletes obtained the lowest mean ($M = 5.92$, $SD = 1.31$), suggesting that structured and formal motivational programs are less emphasized compared to informal, day-to-day encouragement and recognition practices.

While empowerment motivation was rated very high in the quantitative analysis, the interview data helped explain why it showed statistical relationships with certain motivational and performance outcomes. Teacher-coaches emphasized that empowerment is most effective when it is experiential and relational rather than delivered just through formal activities. They described empowerment as being felt through consistent encouragement and motivation in daily leadership interactions.

The numerical and interview findings indicate that school heads provide a very high level of empowerment motivation, primarily through relational leadership practices that

strengthen confidence, goal orientation, and trust among student athletes and teacher coaches. However, the motivational effects of empowerment are dependent, since they rely on how consistent empowerment is surrounded in daily practices and supported by structured initiatives. In addition, this reveals how enabling conditions like empowerment interact with coaching practices and other factors to influence outcomes.

Table 3. Extent of Leadership Support of School Heads in terms of Empowerment Motivation

Statements The School heads ..	Mean	SD	Remarks
...encourages teacher-coaches to use empowerment strategies in their coaching practices.	5.95	1.23	Agree
...encourages student-athletes to set ambitious personal and team goals.	6.10	1.09	Agree
...fosters a culture where student-athletes feel confident in their abilities.	6.09	0.96	Agree
...actively supports teacher-coaches in motivating student-athletes.	6.13	1.02	Agree
regularly communicates high ...expectations and belief in the potential of student-athletes.	6.00	0.97	Agree
...the school head supports a positive school environment that inspires student-athletes to pursue excellence.	6.09	0.97	Agree
...recognizes and celebrates the achievements and efforts of student-athletes.	6.10	1.08	Agree
...provides opportunities for student-athletes to take leadership roles within their teams.	6.08	1.22	Agree
...facilitates motivational workshops or seminars for student-athletes.	5.92	1.31	Agree
...approachable and responsive to the motivational needs of student-athletes.	6.02	1.39	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.05		
SD	1.01		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 4 presents the extent of leadership support of school heads in terms of communication coordination. The overall weighted mean of 6.23 (SD = 0.77), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that school heads demonstrate a consistently high level of communication and coordination practices in managing athletic programs. This finding suggests that leadership communication is well-established, particularly in disseminating timely updates, clarifying schedules, and coordinating activities among teacher-coaches, student-athletes, and other stakeholders.

Between the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for providing timely, clear communication regarding training, competition, and other athletic schedules (M = 6.30, SD = 0.79). This result indicates that schedule clarity and timeliness are the most prominent communication practices of school heads, facilitating better preparation and reducing uncertainty for teacher-coaches and student-athletes

In contrast, the lowest mean ratings were observed for actively facilitating open channels of communication between the administration and athletic staff (M = 6.16, SD = 0.99) and encouraging feedback from teacher-coaches and student-athletes (M = 6.16, SD = 0.92). This suggests that while information dissemination is highly effective, two-way communication and feedback mechanisms are comparatively less emphasized.

Table 4. Extent of Leadership Support of School Heads in terms of Communication Coordination

Statements The School heads..	Mean	SD	Remarks
...regularly communicates important updates regarding athletic programs to teacher-coaches and student-athletes.	6.29	0.73	Strongly Agree
...effectively coordinates meetings among teacher-coaches, student-athletes, and parents to discuss team progress and concerns.	6.23	0.85	Strongly Agree
...provides timely, clear communication regarding training, competition, and other athletic schedules.	6.30	0.79	Strongly Agree
...actively facilitates open channels of communication between the administration and athletic staff.	6.16	0.99	Strongly Agree
...ensures that information from higher authorities (e.g., district, division) is accurately relayed to teacher-coaches and student-athletes.	6.23	0.74	Strongly Agree
...encourages feedback from teacher-coaches and student-athletes about coaching programs and support services.	6.16	0.92	Strongly Agree
...efficiently and promptly resolves teacher-coach and student-athlete concerns.	6.19	0.91	Strongly Agree
The school head promotes collaboration among teacher-coaches to enhance team strategies and athlete development.	6.23	0.97	Strongly Agree
...the school head uses various platforms (e.g., meetings, bulletins, digital tools) activities and disseminate information.	6.18	0.95	Strongly Agree
...have clear, timely communication ensures teacher-coaches and student-athletes feel informed and supported.	6.27	0.98	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.23		
SD	0.77		
Verbal Interpretation			Extremely High

Table 5. Extent of Leadership Support of School Heads in terms of Leadership Practices

Statements The School heads ...	Mean	SD	Remarks
...demonstrates visionary leadership in the management of athletic programs.	6.41	0.92	Agree
...sets clear goals and expectations for teacher-coaches and student-athletes.	6.42	0.93	Agree
...models ethical standards and sportsmanship for teacher-coaches and student-athletes.	6.44	0.71	Agree
...empowers teacher-coaches to make decisions regarding the training and welfare of student-athletes.	6.49	0.69	Agree
...regularly monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of coaching practices and athletic programs.	6.39	0.89	Agree
...builds an environment of trust, respect, and collaboration among all stakeholders in athletic activities.	6.41	0.90	Agree
...provides professional guidance and mentorship to teacher-coaches.	6.40	0.99	Agree
...encourages innovation and continuous improvement in coaching methods and practices.	6.31	1.00	Agree
...recognizes and addresses challenges faced by teacher-coaches and student-athletes.	6.32	0.99	Agree
...demonstrates commitment to the holistic development of student-athletes, including academic and personal growth.	6.46	0.74	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.40		
SD	0.80		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 5 presents the extent of leadership support of school heads in terms of leadership practices. The overall weighted

mean of 6.40 (SD = 0.80), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that school heads consistently demonstrate strong leadership practices in managing athletic programs. These practices are manifested through clear direction-setting, ethical modeling, empowerment of teacher-coaches, mentoring, monitoring of programs, and coordination among stakeholders. This finding suggests that leadership practices are firmly embedded in the day-to-day governance of school athletic programs.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for empowering teacher-coaches to make decisions regarding the training and welfare of student-athletes (M = 6.49, SD = 0.69). This result highlights that participatory and empowering leadership is a central feature of school heads' practices, enabling teacher-coaches to exercise professional judgment and autonomy in supporting student-athletes. Conversely, the lowest mean was observed for encouraging innovation and continuous improvement in coaching methods and practices (M = 6.31, SD = 1.00), suggesting that while leadership direction and monitoring are strong, opportunities for experimentation and innovation may be relatively less emphasized.

Table 6. Extent of Leadership Support of School Heads in terms of Goal Setting

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The School heads			
...clearly communicates the goals of the athletic programs to teacher-coaches and student-athletes.	6.25	0.93	Agree
...encourages the alignment of athletic goals with the overall vision and mission of the school.	6.26	0.92	Agree
...help the Teacher coaches prioritize and reconcile competing goals.	6.20	0.99	Agree
...regularly reviews progress towards the set goals with teacher-coaches and student-athletes.	6.35	0.92	Agree
...provides the necessary support to enable teacher-coaches and student-athletes to achieve their goals.	6.17	0.97	Agree
...recognizes and celebrates accomplishments when athletic goals are achieved.	6.30	0.93	Agree
...sets clear short-term and long-term goals for the development of athletic programs.	6.26	1.01	Agree
...motivates teacher-coaches and student-athletes by sharing success stories related to goal achievement.	6.19	0.97	Agree
...actively helps teacher-coaches and student-athletes to overcome obstacles in pursuit of their goals.	6.24	0.97	Agree
...encourages regular reflection and adjustment of goals to ensure continuous improvement in athletics.	6.32	0.99	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.25		
SD	0.91		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The findings help explain why leadership practices, despite being rated very highly descriptively, showed limited or inconsistent statistical relationships with certain motivational and successful outcomes in the quantitative analysis. Teacher-coaches acknowledged that leadership practices provide structure, clarity, and accountability; however, they emphasized that these practices are often directive and stability-focused, prioritizing compliance, organization, and ethical standards over experimentation.

Table 6 presents the extent of leadership support of school heads in terms of goal setting. The overall weighted mean of 6.25 (SD = 0.91), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that school heads consistently practice goal-oriented leadership by clearly communicating program goals, aligning athletic objectives with the school's vision, reviewing progress, recognizing achievements, and encouraging reflection and continuous improvement. This suggests that goal setting functions as a core leadership mechanism for guiding teacher-coaches and student-athletes toward desired outcomes.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for regularly reviewing progress toward set goals with teacher-coaches and student-athletes (M = 6.35, SD = 0.92), highlighting monitoring and follow-through as the most evident practices. This finding indicates that goals are not only articulated but actively tracked and discussed to ensure accountability and progress. In contrast, the lowest mean was observed for providing the necessary support to enable teacher-coaches and student-athletes to achieve their goals (M = 6.17, SD = 0.97). Although still rated very high, this suggests that while goal clarification and monitoring are strong, the provision of concrete support mechanisms (e.g., targeted resources, coaching assistance, or time allowances) is comparatively less emphasized.

Table 7 shows the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of instructional supervision.

Table 7. Level of Practices of Teacher-Coaches in terms of Instructional Supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher-Coaches ...			
...uses a variety of instructional strategies to address the different learning needs of student-athletes	6.36	0.77	Agree
...provides clear demonstrations and explanations of athletic skills during practice sessions.	6.33	0.86	Agree
...promotes reflective learning by encouraging student-athletes to discuss and analyse their own performance.	6.37	0.86	Agree
...incorporates goal-setting techniques into training to help student-athletes improve their performance.	6.38	0.82	Agree
...uses feedback effectively to guide student-athletes' skill development.	6.30	0.79	Agree
...introduces innovative methods and drills to keep the training engaging and effective.	6.28	0.81	Agree
...adapts training sessions to address individual strengths and weaknesses among student-athletes	6.25	0.82	Agree
...integrates team-building activities into the coaching program to enhance group cohesion and motivation.	6.29	0.80	Agree
...regularly evaluates the effectiveness of instructional strategies and adjusts them as needed.	6.26	0.82	Agree
...Utilizes instructional technology (videos, apps, etc.) to supplement traditional coaching methods.	6.36	0.82	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.31		
SD	0.75		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The overall weighted mean of 6.31 (SD = 0.75), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that teacher-coaches consistently demonstrate strong instructional supervision practices in the conduct of athletic training. This finding suggests that teacher-coaches employ a wide range of pedagogical and instructional strategies that support skill development, performance monitoring, and learner engagement among student-athletes.

Amid the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for incorporating goal-setting techniques into training to help student-athletes improve their performance (M = 6.38, SD = 0.82), highlighting that structured goal-setting is the most evident instructional supervision practice.

This reflects teacher-coaches' strong emphasis on continuous improvement, performance targets, and reflective progress tracking. Conversely, the indicator adapting training sessions to address individual strengths and weaknesses among student-athletes obtained the lowest mean (M = 6.25, SD = 0.82). Although still rated very high, this suggests that individualized training adjustments are somewhat less emphasized compared to general instructional strategies, demonstrations, and group-based learning activities.

Table 8 presents the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of motivational coaching techniques. The overall weighted mean of 6.56 (SD = 0.58), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that teacher-coaches demonstrate an exceptionally strong capacity to motivate student-athletes through positive reinforcement, goal setting, recognition of achievements, and encouragement of personal responsibility for improvement.

Table 8. Level of Practices of Teacher-Coaches in terms of Motivational Coaching Techniques

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher Coaches...			
...uses positive reinforcement (such as praise and encouragement) to boost student-athletes' confidence.	6.65	0.59	Strongly Agree
...sets clear and achievable goals to increase the motivation of student-athletes	6.61	0.60	Strongly Agree
...regularly recognizes and celebrates individual and team achievements.	6.60	0.65	Strongly Agree
...encourages student-athletes to take ownership of their personal and team improvement.	6.63	0.63	Strongly Agree
...creates a supportive and inclusive environment that motivates student-athletes to participate.	6.47	0.66	Agree
...provides constructive feedback that focuses on effort and progress rather than just outcomes.	6.49	0.74	Agree
...helps student-athletes overcome setbacks by maintaining a positive attitude and offering guidance.	6.51	0.69	Strongly Agree
...uses motivational talks or stories to inspire student-athletes before or after competitions.	6.48	0.70	Agree
...identifies and addresses individual motivational needs among student-athletes.	6.51	0.69	Strongly Agree
...fosters team spirit and unity to enhance each student-athlete's motivation to succeed.	6.61	0.65	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.56		
SD	0.58		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

This finding suggests that motivation-building is deeply embedded in the coaching process and is consistently experienced by student-athletes during training and competition.

Among the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for using positive reinforcement, such as praise and encouragement, to boost student-athletes' confidence (M = 6.65, SD = 0.59). This highlights that affirming and supportive feedback is the most prominent motivational strategy practiced by teacher-coaches.

Conversely, the lowest mean rating was observed for creating a supportive and inclusive environment that motivates student-athletes to participate (M = 6.47, SD = 0.66). This suggests that while direct motivational strategies are strongly emphasized, broader inclusivity and participation climate may receive less attention.

Table 9 shows the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of building trust and rapport. The weighted mean for the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of building trust and rapport is 6.63 with a standard deviation of 0.60, with a verbal interpretation of Extremely High.

Table 9. Level of Practices of Teacher-Coaches in terms of Building Trust and Rapport

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The teacher-Coaches..			
...encourages open communication and actively listens to the concern of student-athletes.	6.69	0.60	Strongly Agree
...shows genuine care and interest in the personal well-being of each student-athlete.	6.68	0.63	Strongly Agree
...fosters a sense of trust and mutual respect with student-athletes.	6.64	0.66	Strongly Agree
...creates an environment where student-athletes feel valued and included regardless of skill level.	6.67	0.63	Strongly Agree
...the teacher-coach builds positive rapport by regularly interacting with student-athletes outside the formal training sessions.	6.59	0.65	Strongly Agree
...supports student-athletes in balancing academic responsibilities with athletic commitments.	6.56	0.70	Strongly Agree
...helps student-athletes develop strong interpersonal skills and teamwork.	6.63	0.66	Strongly Agree
Resolves conflicts among student-athletes in a fair and empathetic manner.	6.58	0.67	Strongly Agree
...motivates student-athletes by acknowledging both their athletic and personal achievements.	6.59	0.67	Strongly Agree
...encourages a supportive peer culture among student-athletes to enhance motivation and success.	6.68	0.60	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.63		
SD	0.60		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

This represents the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of building trust and rapport. The overall weighted mean of 6.63 (SD = 0.60), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that teacher-coaches consistently demonstrate strong trust-building practices through open communication, empathy, fairness, and sustained interpersonal support. This finding suggests that trust and rapport are deeply embedded in coach-athlete interactions and are regularly experienced by student-athletes within athletic programs. Among the

indicators, the highest mean was recorded for encouraging open communication and actively listening to the concerns of student-athletes (M = 6.69, SD = 0.60). This result highlights that active listening and open dialogue are the most salient trust-building practices of teacher-coaches, reinforcing athletes' sense of being heard, respected, and valued. Conversely, the lowest mean was observed for supporting student-athletes in balancing academic responsibilities with athletic commitments (M = 6.56, SD = 0.70).

Although still rated extremely high, this suggests that academic-athletic balance support is slightly less emphasized compared to emotional support, communication, and inclusion practices.

Table 10 shows the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of recreational activities. The weighted mean for the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of recreational activities is 6.49 with a standard deviation of 0.70, with a verbal interpretation of Very High. It presents the level of practices of teacher-coaches in terms of recreational activities. The overall weighted mean of 6.49 (SD = 0.70), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that teacher-coaches consistently demonstrate strong support for recreational activities by motivating participation, organizing varied games, promoting enjoyment, and ensuring safety and guidance during activities

Table 10. Level of Practices of Teacher-Coaches in terms of Recreational Activities

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher- Coaches ...			
...motivates students to participate in recreational activities for enjoyment.	6.54	0.71	Strongly Agree
...organizes a variety of recreational games that cater to different interests.	6.51	0.78	Strongly Agree
...monitors and assesses the progress of student-athletes' skill improvement.	6.55	0.75	Strongly Agree
...promotes a fun and supportive environment during recreational activities.	6.51	0.80	Strongly Agree
...encourages friendly competition in recreational games.	6.50	0.73	Agree
...emphasizes safety during all recreational activities.	6.45	0.77	Agree
...provides guidance on the basic rules and skills necessary for participation in recreational activities.	6.46	0.77	Agree
...recognizes and appreciates the effort of all participants, regardless of skill level.	6.44	0.74	Agree
...facilitates group activities that develop teamwork and camaraderie among students.	6.44	0.77	Agree
...the teacher-coach actively seeks feedback from students to improve future recreational activities.	6.52	0.76	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.49		
SD	0.70		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

This finding suggests that recreational activities are not treated merely as leisure pursuits but are intentionally integrated as part of athlete development and engagement within school sports programs.

Among the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for monitoring and assessing the progress of student-athletes' skill improvement (M = 6.55, SD = 0.75). This result indicates that teacher-coaches strongly integrate

skill development and performance awareness even within recreational contexts, highlighting that recreation serves both enjoyment-based and developmental purposes. In contrast, the lowest mean ratings were observed for recognizing and appreciating the effort of all participants regardless of skill level (M = 6.44, SD = 0.74) and facilitating group activities that develop teamwork and camaraderie among students (M = 6.44, SD = 0.77). Although still rated very high, these findings suggest that inclusivity-focused recognition and teamwork-centered activities are slightly less emphasized relative to structured participation and skill monitoring.

Table 11 presents the level of motivation of student-athletes in terms of goal orientation. The overall weighted mean of 6.51 (SD = 0.49), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that student-athletes demonstrate a very strong goal-directed motivation characterized by clear goal setting, action planning, perseverance, and continuous improvement. This finding suggests that goal orientation is deeply embedded in student-athletes' training behaviors and serves as a central driving force for sustained athletic engagement and performance development.

Table 11. Level of Motivation of Student-Athletes in terms of Goal Orientation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The teacher-Coaches..			
...helps student-athletes set clear, specific, and challenging athletic goals.	6.60	0.50	Strongly Agree
...discusses both short-term and long-term goals with student-athletes to guide their progress.	6.45	0.68	Agree
...collaborates with student-athletes to create realistic action plans for achieving their goals.	6.54	0.51	Strongly Agree
...regularly reviews and adjusts goals based on the evolving abilities and progress of student-athletes.	6.56	0.54	Strongly Agree
...motivates student-athletes to focus on personal improvement rather than just winning.	6.47	0.62	Agree
...encourages student-athletes to reflect on their goals and evaluate their own performance.	6.48	0.59	Agree
...emphasizes the importance of perseverance and resilience while pursuing athletic goals	6.52	0.61	Strongly Agree
...the teacher-coach celebrates milestones and achievements that result from goal-setting efforts.	6.48	0.61	Agree
...uses setbacks and failures as opportunities to reinforce the importance of goal commitment and continuous improvement.	6.45	0.61	Agree
...connects the achievement of sport-related goals to broader life skills and academic success for student-athletes.	6.53	0.57	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.51		
SD	0.49		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Among the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for helping student-athletes set clear, specific, and challenging athletic goals (M = 6.60, SD = 0.50). This result highlights that goal clarity and challenge are the most salient contributors to student-athletes' goal orientation, indicating that well-defined goals function as strong guides for training focus and progress. In contrast, the lowest mean ratings were observed for discussing both short-term and long-term goals with student-athletes (M = 6.45, SD = 0.68) and using

setbacks and failures as opportunities to reinforce goal commitment and continuous improvement (M = 6.45, SD = 0.61). Although still rated extremely high, these findings suggest that long-term planning discussions and resilience-focused goal reinforcement are slightly less emphasized than immediate goal clarity and action planning.

Table 12. Level of Motivation of Student-Athletes in terms of Self-Discipline

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher-Coaches ...			
...consistently emphasizes the importance of following training ...schedules and routines to develop self-discipline among student-athletes.	6.54	0.59	Strongly Agree
models self-discipline through punctuality, preparation, and professional behavior.	6.47	0.61	Agree
...helps student-athletes set personal standards for attendance, effort, and conduct.	6.47	0.58	Agree
...encourages student-athletes to practice self-control and focus during training and competition.	6.47	0.65	Agree
...supports student-athletes in managing their time effectively for sports, academics, and other responsibilities.	6.40	0.63	Agree
...motivates student-athletes to maintain consistency in their performance and commitments.	6.44	0.64	Agree
...provides strategies for student-athletes to overcome distractions and stay committed to their goals.	6.39	0.64	Agree
...recognizes and rewards examples of responsible and disciplined behavior among student-athletes.	6.49	0.57	Agree
...fosters a culture where self-discipline is valued as much as skill and talent.	6.43	0.67	Agree
...guides student-athletes in making positive choices that reflect self-discipline both on and off the field.	6.52	0.55	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.46		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 12 presents the level of motivation of student-athletes in terms of self-discipline. The overall weighted mean of 6.46 (SD = 0.52), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that student-athletes consistently demonstrate strong self-discipline, reflected in adherence to training routines, self-control during practices and competitions, and responsible behavior both on and off the field. This finding suggests that self-discipline is a well-established motivational attribute that supports consistency, reliability, and long-term performance development among student-athletes.

Among the indicators, the highest mean rating was obtained for consistently emphasizing the importance of following training schedules and routines (M = 6.54, SD = 0.59). This result highlights that structure, routine, and consistency are the most dominant contributors to student-athletes' self-discipline. In contrast, the lowest mean rating was recorded for providing strategies for student-athletes to overcome distractions and stay committed to their goals (M = 6.39, SD = 0.64). Although still rated very high, this suggests that while disciplined behavior is strongly reinforced through rules, routines, and expectations, explicit

strategy-based training for managing distractions receives comparatively less emphasis.

Table 13 presents the level of motivation of student-athletes in terms of coach support. The overall weighted mean of 6.45 (SD = 0.53), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that student-athletes experience a consistently strong level of coach support, particularly through emotional encouragement, approachability, guidance, and responsiveness during challenging situations. This finding suggests that coach support is a central motivational factor that helps student-athletes maintain confidence, cope with setbacks, and remain engaged in both training and competition.

Table 13. Level of Motivation of Student-Athletes in terms of Coach Support

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher-Coaches...			
Provides consistent emotional support to student-athletes, especially during challenging times.	6.54	0.57	Strongly Agree
Approachable and available for student-athletes who need guidance and assistance.	6.47	0.67	Agree
Encourages student-athletes to express their needs, concerns, and aspirations.	6.44	0.63	Agree
Supports student-athletes in balancing sports with academics and other commitments.	6.47	0.64	Agree
Offers words of encouragement that help boost the confidence of student-athletes.	6.42	0.63	Agree
Gives constructive feedback to help student-athletes improve both skills and motivation.	6.41	0.63	Agree
Recognizes individual and team achievements, fostering a sense of accomplishment.	6.39	0.66	Agree
Responds positively to failures by helping student-athletes learn and recover from setbacks.	6.45	0.58	Agree
Shows understanding and flexibility when student-athletes face personal or academic challenges.	6.40	0.72	Agree
Builds a supportive team atmosphere where every athlete feels motivated to participate and succeed.	6.48	0.60	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.45		
SD	0.53		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Between the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for providing consistent emotional support to student-athletes, especially during challenging times (M = 6.54, SD = 0.57). This result highlights that emotional presence and psychological reassurance are the most prominent forms of coach support perceived by student-athletes. In contrast, the indicator recognizing individual and team achievements to foster a sense of accomplishment obtained the lowest mean (M = 6.39, SD = 0.66). Although still rated very high, this suggests that coach support is expressed more strongly through guidance, encouragement, and emotional availability than through formal recognition of achievements.

Table 14 presents the level of motivation of student-athletes in terms of competition drive. The overall weighted mean of 6.49 (SD = 0.54), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that student-athletes possess a strong desire to excel, maintain focus under competitive conditions, and persist when facing performance demands and pressure

situations. This finding suggests that competition drive is a salient and consistently reinforced motivational dimension among student-athletes, contributing to sustained effort during both training and competitive events.

Table 14. Level of Motivation of Student-Athletes in terms of Competition Drive

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher-Coaches...			
...inspires student-athletes to strive for excellence during both practice and competitions.	6.58	0.61	Strongly Agree
...creates a competitive training environment that motivates student-athletes to improve their performance.	6.49	0.71	Agree
...encourages student-athletes to set personal and team goals for competitive success.	6.56	0.58	Strongly Agree
...helps student-athletes develop a strong desire to win while emphasizing fair play and sportsmanship.	6.51	0.63	Strongly Agree
...uses competitive scenarios in practice sessions to boost motivation and engagement.	6.45	0.65	Agree
...motivates student-athletes to overcome challenges and perform their best in competitions.	6.47	0.56	Agree
...promotes healthy competition among team members to stimulate growth and learning.	6.33	0.76	Agree
...teaches student-athletes to handle both victory and defeat with resilience and respect.	6.56	0.54	Strongly Agree
...recognizes and rewards competitive achievements, increasing student-athletes' drive,	6.44	0.71	Agree
...helps student-athletes maintain focus and intensity during competitive matches or events.	6.55	0.56	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.49		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The indicator with the highest mean was inspiring student-athletes to strive for excellence during both practice and competitions (M = 6.58, SD = 0.61). This result highlights that the pursuit of excellence and high-performance standards is the most evident manifestation of competition drive, indicating that student-athletes are strongly oriented toward personal achievement and focused performance improvement. In contrast, the lowest mean rating was recorded for promoting healthy competition among team members to stimulate growth and learning (M = 6.33, SD = 0.76). Although still rated very high, this suggests that internal peer competition as a structured learning strategy is less emphasized compared to excellence-driven motivation and individual performance focus.

Table 15 presents the level of success of student-athletes in terms of academic achievement. The overall weighted mean of 6.51 (SD = 0.54), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that student-athletes demonstrate a very high level of academic success supported by strong academic emphasis, structured monitoring, time-management assistance, and coordinated support from teacher-coaches and school leaders. This finding suggests that academic achievement is consistently prioritized alongside athletic performance within the school sports program.

With the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for consistently emphasizing the importance of academic

achievement alongside athletic performance (M = 6.58, SD = 0.61). This result highlights that academic success is most strongly reinforced through clear messaging that education and athletics are equally important, guiding student-athletes to value scholastic responsibilities while pursuing competitive sports. In contrast, the indicator recognizing and celebrating academic achievements among student-athletes obtained the lowest mean (M = 6.44, SD = 0.68). Although still rated extremely high, this suggests that academic success is more strongly supported through monitoring, guidance, and expectation-setting than through formal recognition or celebratory practices.

Table 15. Level of Success of Student-Athletes in terms of Academic Achievement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher-Coaches ...			
...consistently emphasizes the importance of academic achievement along with athletic performance.	6.58	0.61	Strongly Agree
...assists student-athletes in managing their time effectively between sports and academic responsibilities.	6.52	0.69	Strongly Agree
...monitors academic progress.	6.55	0.57	Strongly Agree
...the teacher-coach sets clear expectations for academic standards that student-athletes must meet.	6.50	0.65	Agree
...encourages student-athletes to excel in their studies, in addition to their sports commitments.	6.48	0.63	Agree
...the teacher-coach collaborates with teachers and school heads to support the academic needs of student-athletes	6.46	0.64	Agree
...recognizes and celebrates academic achievements among student-athletes.	6.44	0.68	Agree
...advises student-athletes on how sports participation can positively impact their academic motivation and skills.	6.52	0.65	Strongly Agree
...helps student-athletes develop study habits and strategies to succeed academically.	6.53	0.59	Strongly Agree
...provides guidance on the importance of balancing athletics with education for long-term success.	6.52	0.66	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.51		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Table 16 shows the level of success of student-athletes in terms of athletic performance. The weighted mean for the level of success of student-athletes in terms of athletic performance is 6.54 with a standard deviation of 0.50, with a verbal interpretation of Extremely High. This result indicates that student-athletes demonstrate an extremely high level of athletic performance success, supported by clear training programs, continuous motivation, individualized planning, and consistent performance monitoring.

The overall weighted mean of 6.54 (SD = 0.50), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that student-athletes demonstrate a very high level of athletic performance success.

This success is supported by clear and structured training programs, continuous motivation, individualized performance planning, constructive feedback, and systematic monitoring of athletic progress. The extremely high rating suggests that athletic development is intentionally prioritized and

consistently reinforced through effective coaching practices and performance-oriented expectations.

self-confidence and positive self-esteem (M = 6.59, SD = 0.50).

Table 16. Level of Success of Student-Athletes in terms of Athletic Performance

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher-Coaches...			
...provides clear and effective training programs that enhance the athletic performance of student-athletes	6.51	0.67	Strongly Agree
...continually motivates student-athletes to reach their highest potential in sports.	6.55	0.66	Strongly Agree
...develops individualized performance plans tailored to the strengths and areas for improvement of each athlete.	6.58	0.58	Strongly Agree
...uses constructive feedback to help student-athletes improve their athletic skills and techniques.	6.53	0.59	Strongly Agree
...sets measurable and achievable goals for athletic improvement.	6.51	0.58	Strongly Agree
...educates student-athletes on proper nutrition and recovery practices to optimize performance.	6.55	0.55	Strongly Agree
Monitors athletic progress and makes necessary adjustments to training routines.	6.52	0.67	Strongly Agree
...fosters an environment of high expectations regarding discipline, dedication, and hard work in athletics.	6.61	0.53	Strongly Agree
...recognize rewards improvements and achievements in athletic performance.	6.52	0.59	Strongly Agree
...supports student-athletes during competitions and helps them manage pressure to perform well.	6.58	0.54	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.54		
SD	0.50		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for fostering an environment of high expectations regarding discipline, dedication, and hard work in athletics (M = 6.61, SD = 0.53). These finding highlights that a discipline-centered performance culture is the most evident contributor to athletic success, indicating that consistent standards of effort, accountability, and commitment strongly support performance outcomes. In contrast, the lowest mean ratings were observed for providing clear and effective training programs (M = 6.51, SD = 0.67) and setting measurable and achievable goals for athletic improvement (M = 6.51, SD = 0.58). Although still rated extremely high, this suggests that while program structure and goal setting are well established, the athletic performance success of student-athletes is more strongly driven by individualized coaching and disciplined training culture than by general program design alone.

Table 17 presents the level of success of student-athletes in terms of personal growth. The overall weighted mean of 6.55 (SD = 0.48), verbally interpreted as Extremely High, indicates that student-athletes experience a very high level of personal development through their participation in athletic programs. This finding reflects strong growth in leadership skills, self-confidence, resilience, communication, values formation, and holistic well-being, demonstrating that athletic participation contributes meaningfully beyond performance outcomes. Incorporating the indicators, the highest mean rating was observed for guiding student-athletes in building

Table 17. Level of Success of Student-Athletes in terms of Personal Growth

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher- Coaches ...			
...helps student-athletes develop self-discipline and responsibility in both sports and daily life.	6.50	0.64	Agree
...fosters leadership skills and qualities among student-athletes.	6.56	0.61	Strongly Agree
...guides student-athletes in building self-confidence and positive self-esteem.	6.59	0.50	Strongly Agree
...teaches student-athletes effective communication and teamwork skills for use both on and off the field.	6.57	0.50	Strongly Agree
...provides opportunities for student-athletes to develop resilience in facing challenges and setbacks.	6.51	.62	Strongly Agree
...promotes respect, empathy, and ethical values in daily interactions with student-athletes.	6.56	0.50	Strongly Agree
...encourages student-athletes to reflect on their experiences for continuous personal development.	6.52	0.63	Strongly Agree
...creates an environment where student-athletes feel safe to express themselves and grow as individuals.	6.58	0.51	Strongly Agree
...supports student-athletes in balancing sports with personal interests and relationships for holistic growth.	6.51	0.63	Strongly Agree
...encourages student-athletes to set personal goals beyond athletics and supports them in achieving those goals.	6.58	0.51	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.55		
SD	0.48		
Verbal Interpretation	Extremely High		

This result highlights confidence-building as the most evident personal growth outcome, suggesting that student-athletes perceive consistent encouragement, affirmation, and emotional support that strengthen their self-belief.

Conversely, the lowest mean was recorded for helping student-athletes develop self-discipline and responsibility in both sports and daily life (M = 6.50, SD = 0.64). Although still extremely high, this suggests that responsibility- and discipline-focused development is slightly less emphasized compared to psychological and interpersonal growth outcomes such as confidence, leadership, and communication.

Table 18 presents the level of success of student-athletes in terms of team contribution. The overall weighted mean of 6.47 (SD = 0.55), verbally interpreted as Very High, indicates that student-athletes consistently exhibit strong team-oriented behaviors, including cooperation, shared responsibility, respectful communication, and active participation in achieving team goals. This finding suggests that teamwork is a well-established outcome of the athletic program and plays an important role in shaping collective performance and team cohesion. Connecting the indicators, the highest mean rating was recorded for addressing conflicts constructively and encouraging respectful communication within the team (M = 6.52, SD = 0.53).

This result highlights that effective conflict management and respectful dialogue are the most evident contributors to

team contribution, suggesting that team’s function more effectively when issues are resolved constructively and communication remains respectful. In contrast, the lowest mean was observed for motivating student-athletes to support and uplift their teammates during both practices and competitions (M = 6.42, SD = 0.73). Although still rated very high, this suggests that deliberate peer-support and uplifting behaviors are slightly less emphasized compared to structural processes such as conflict resolution and shared accountability.

Table 18. Level of Success of Student-Athletes in terms of Team Contribution

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The Teacher-Coaches...			
...encourages all student-athletes to contribute to the team's goals and objectives actively.	6.50	0.82	Agree
...fosters a sense of teamwork and unity among student-athletes.	6.47	0.75	Agree
...promotes the value of each member's role and ensures everyone feels included in team activities.	6.44	0.85	Agree
...motivates student-athletes to support and uplift their teammates during both practices and competitions.	6.42	0.73	Agree
...teaches student-athletes the importance of sharing responsibilities and working collaboratively.	6.44	0.53	Agree
...provides opportunities for student-athletes to demonstrate leadership within the team.	6.49	0.63	Agree
...addresses conflicts constructively and encourages respectful communication within the team.	6.52	0.53	Strongly Agree
...recognizes and rewards students who show outstanding teamwork and cooperation.	6.47	0.66	Agree
...helps student-athletes appreciate diversity and leverage different strengths within the team.	6.44	0.61	Agree
...sets clear expectations regarding sportsmanship, cooperation, and collective team success.	6.45	0.61	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.47		
SD	0.55		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 19 presents the relationship between leadership support of school heads and the motivation of student-athletes. Overall, the findings indicate that there is a statistically significant linear relationship between leadership support and student-athlete motivation. The results further show that the nature of these relationships varies across leadership dimensions and motivational components, highlighting a complex and non-uniform pattern of influence.

The analysis reveals no significant linear relationship between leadership practices of school heads and student-athletes’ motivation in terms of self-discipline (r = -.060, p = .144), coach support (r = -.030, p = .187), and competition drive (r = .085, p = .073). This indicates that leadership practices, regardless of their level, do not correspond to changes in these three motivational dimensions. Consequently, improvements or declines in leadership practices alone do not predict variations in student-athletes’ self-discipline, perceived coach support, or competitive drive.

However, leadership practices show a significant but very weak positive correlation with goal orientation (r = .040, p =

.039). This suggests that when school heads demonstrate stronger leadership practices, student-athletes may become slightly more focused on goals and performance targets, even though the magnitude of this effect is limited. This finding aligns with Lawrence (2025), who emphasized that supportive leadership, particularly when aligned with structured goal-setting approaches such as SMART goals, can enhance students’ focus and direction, even if the direct motivational impact remains modest.

Table 19. Significant relationship between leadership support of school heads and motivation of student-athletes

		Goal Orientation	Self-Discipline	Coach Support	Competition Drive
Professional Development	Pearson Correlation	.168**	.085**	.115*	.126**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.022	.037	.007
	N	164	164	164	164
Resource Allocation	Pearson Correlation	.023**	-.022**	-.010**	.039**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
Empowerment Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.034**	.048**	-.120**	-.070**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
Communication Coordination	Pearson Correlation	.051**	.038**	-.020**	.039**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.003	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
Leadership Practices	Pearson Correlation	.040*	-.060**	-.030**	.085**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	.144	.187	.073
	N	164	164	164	164
Goal Setting	Pearson Correlation	.007**	-.020**	-.030**	-.020**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.004	.001
	N	164	164	164	164

Pearson Correlation:Indicates the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. Values range from -1 (perfect negative correlation) to +1 (perfect positive correlation), with 0 indicating no correlation.Sig. (2-tailed):The p-value indicating the significance of the correlation.A value less than 0.05 (*) indicates statistical significance at the 0.05 level.A value less than 0.01 (**) indicates statistical significance at the 0.01 level. N:The total number of observations or sample size used in the correlation analysis. Legend for Significance:* p < 0.05 (significant at 0.05 level)** p < 0.01 (significant at 0.01 level)

Including all leadership dimensions, professional development emerges as the most consistently beneficial factor. Leadership support in terms of professional development shows significant and positive correlations with all motivational dimensions: goal orientation (r = .168, p = .001), self-discipline (r = .085, p = .022), coach support (r = .115, p = .037), and competition drive (r = .126, p = .007). Although these relationships are very weak, their consistency suggests that professional development exerts a broad, reinforcing influence on student-athlete motivation.

These findings imply that when school heads engage in sustained professional development initiatives such as training programs, coaching clinics, and continuous learning

opportunities, student-athletes tend to exhibit better goal orientation, improved self-regulation, stronger perceptions of coach support, and increased competitive drive. From an embedded qualitative perspective, professional development likely enhances teachers' and coaches' capacity to implement motivational strategies effectively, thereby indirectly supporting student-athletes' motivation. This interpretation is consistent with contemporary research highlighting professional development as a key mechanism for fostering learning-oriented goals, self-regulation, and adaptive motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Nicolau, 2025).

Resource allocation demonstrates very weak but highly significant correlations with all motivational dimensions. It is positively correlated with goal orientation ($r = .023, p < .001$) and competition drive ($r = .039, p < .001$), suggesting that adequate resources such as facilities, equipment, and financial support are associated with increased goal focus and competitiveness among student-athletes. These positive relationships imply that access to resources can enhance athletes' readiness to pursue performance goals and remain motivated to compete.

Conversely, resource allocation shows negative correlations with self-discipline ($r = -.022, p < .001$) and coach support ($r = -.010, p < .001$). This counterintuitive pattern suggests that greater availability of resources does not automatically strengthen internal regulation or perceived coach support. One embedded qualitative explanation is that when resources are abundant, student-athletes may rely more on external inputs and less on personal discipline or the coach-athlete relationship. Alternatively, in resource-limited contexts, stronger self-discipline and coach dependence may develop as compensatory mechanisms.

Studies by Tipon et al. (2021) and Perez (2022) support this interpretation, demonstrating that the motivational impact of resources depends heavily on how they are managed, distributed, and integrated into coaching and athlete development processes. Empowerment motivation shows very weak but significant positive correlations with goal orientation ($r = .034, p < .001$) and self-discipline ($r = .048, p < .001$), indicating that autonomy, decision-making opportunities, and empowerment may support goal-directed behavior and self-regulation among student-athletes.

However, motivation is negatively correlated with coach support ($r = -.120, p < .001$) and competition drive ($r = -.070, p < .001$). This pattern suggests that increased autonomy may reduce reliance on coaches and, in some cases, weaken competitive drive if empowerment is not balanced with structured guidance and performance expectations. This interpretation aligns with David and Laguna (2020), who emphasized that empowerment must be carefully supported to enhance motivation without diminishing relational or performance-driven factors.

Similarly, communication coordination exhibits positive but very weak correlations with goal orientation ($r = .051, p < .001$), self-discipline ($r = .038, p = .001$), and competition drive ($r = .039, p < .001$), while showing a negative correlation with coach support ($r = -.020, p = .003$). From an embedded qualitative perspective, structured and

system-based communication may improve clarity and self-regulation but may simultaneously lessen perceived direct support from coaches. Estrella (2023) supports this interpretation by emphasizing that communication systems enhance coordination but must be complemented by interpersonal support to sustain relational motivation.

Leadership support in terms of goal setting has a very weak but significant positive correlation with goal orientation ($r = .007, p < .001$), confirming that administrative emphasis on goal setting can sharpen student-athletes' focus on targets. However, goal setting is negatively correlated with self-discipline, coach support, and competition drive, suggesting that externally imposed goals may reduce internal regulation, perceived coaching support, or competitive intensity if not aligned with athlete autonomy and coaching involvement. Nicolau (2025) explains that goal-centered leadership is most effective when goals are individualized, meaningful, and supported by ongoing coach-athlete interaction.

The findings demonstrate that leadership support of school heads is significantly related to student-athlete motivation, professional development stands out as the most consistently positive leadership dimension, while other forms of leadership support exhibit mixed and sometimes contradictory effects. This suggests that leadership actions influence motivation indirectly, through how they shape coaching practices, autonomy structures, resource use, and relational dynamics, rather than through direct linear effects.

Table 20. Significant relationship between leadership support of school heads and success of student-athletes

		Academic Achievement	Athletic Performance	Personal Growth	Team Contribution
Professional Development	Pearson Correlation	.120**	.250**	.011**	.108**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.000	.020
	N	164	164	164	164
Resource Allocation	Pearson Correlation	.065**	-.030**	.054**	.185**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
Empowerment Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.041**	-.080**	-.080**	.059**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
Communication Coordination	Pearson Correlation	.066**	-.010**	-.090**	.089**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164
Leadership Practices	Pearson Correlation	.023*	-.020**	-.040**	-.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	.015	.013	.123
	N	164	164	164	164
Goal Setting	Pearson Correlation	.065**	.003**	.053**	.130**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001
	N	164	164	164	164

Legends: Pearson Correlation: Strength and direction of the linear relationship between variables. Sig. (2-tailed): Probability value (p-value) indicating

significance of the correlation. * $p < 0.05$ (significant) ** $p < 0.01$ (highly significant) N: Number of respondents (sample size).

Table 20 presents the relationships between leadership support of school heads and the success of student-athletes across four domains: academic achievement, athletic performance, personal growth, and team contribution. Overall, the findings indicate that leadership support is significantly related to student-athlete success.

Leadership support in terms of professional development shows significant and positive correlations with all indicators of student-athlete success: academic achievement ($r = .120, p = .003$), athletic performance ($r = .250, p < .001$), personal growth ($r = .011, p < .001$), and team contribution ($r = .108, p = .020$). Although these relationships range from very weak to weak, professional development emerges as the most consistently supportive leadership dimension in relation to student-athlete success.

These results imply that when school heads invest in ongoing professional development such as instructional improvement, coaching enhancement, and leadership learning student-athletes benefit academically, athletically, and socially.

Resource allocation demonstrates low but highly significant correlations with academic achievement ($r = .065, p < .001$), personal growth ($r = .054, p < .001$), and team contribution ($r = .185, p < .001$), indicating that adequate resources contribute modestly to holistic success outcomes. However, resource allocation is negatively correlated with athletic performance ($r = -.030, p < .001$), suggesting an unexpected and counterintuitive pattern. This result may indicate that increased resources do not automatically translate into higher athletic performance and may, in some contexts, reduce performance emphasis if resources are poorly aligned with training demands. Alternatively, it may suggest that performance excellence emerges from disciplined practice and efficient use of limited resources rather than resource abundance alone.

Empowerment motivation shows positive but very weak correlations with academic achievement ($r = .041, p < .001$) and team contribution ($r = .059, p < .001$), but negative correlations with athletic performance ($r = -.080, p < .001$) and personal growth ($r = -.080, p < .001$). These mixed patterns suggest that empowerment may strengthen academic engagement and collaborative behaviors while potentially reducing performance intensity or structured development if autonomy is not balanced with guidance.

Similarly, communication coordination is positively correlated with academic achievement ($r = .066, p < .001$) and team contribution ($r = .089, p < .001$) but negatively correlated with athletic performance ($r = -.010, p < .001$) and personal growth ($r = -.090, p < .001$). These findings imply that system-based communication may enhance coordination and academic alignment but may weaken individualized performance focus and personal development if communication becomes overly procedural.

This study suggests that structured empowerment and communication systems, while beneficial for organization and participation, may unintentionally reduce intensity, resilience,

or personalized growth if not integrated with strong coach-athlete interaction.

Leadership practices show a very weak but significant positive correlation with academic achievement ($r = .023, p = .045$), but negative correlations with athletic performance ($r = -.020, p = .005$) and personal growth ($r = -.040, p = .013$), and no significant relationship with team contribution. This suggests that leadership practices may support academic structure but do not necessarily enhance athletic or personal development and may even constrain them under certain leadership styles.

In contrast, leadership goal setting demonstrates positive correlations across all success domains, including academic achievement, athletic performance, personal growth, and team contribution. Although the strength of these relationships remains very weak, goal setting appears to be the most stable and consistently positive leadership factor, supporting Lawrence's (2025) assertion that structured goal-setting practices (e.g., SMART goals) foster clarity, persistence, and multi-domain success.

In addition, leadership support influences student-athlete success indirectly, primarily through its effects on coaching practices, learning climate, motivation structures, and relational dynamics rather than through direct linear effects. Improvements in leadership do not automatically result in improved outcomes unless supports are implemented in ways that strengthen self-discipline, maintain coach involvement, and align autonomy with performance expectations.

The analysis was conducted to examine whether instructional supervision moderated the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and the motivation and success of student-athletes. The interaction term was not significant ($b = 0.05098, SE = 0.0937, p = 0.586$), indicating that instructional supervision does not alter the strength or direction of this relationship. However, teacher-coaches' practices remained a strong and significant predictor of student-athlete motivation and success ($b = 0.89985, SE = 0.0371, p < .001$).

This result confirms that teacher-coach practices exert a direct and substantial influence on student-athlete outcomes, regardless of the level of instructional supervision. This study suggests that day-to-day coaching behaviors, rather than oversight structures, are the primary drivers of motivation and success.

Table 21 presents the moderation analysis examining whether instructional supervision moderates the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and the motivation and success of student-athletes. The results indicate that teacher-coaches' practices independently and significantly predict student-athletes' motivation and success, demonstrating a very high effect on the outcome variables. In contrast, instructional supervision does not have a significant moderating effect, as reflected by a non-significant interaction term ($b = 0.05098, SE = 0.0937, p = 0.586$) and a non-significant main effect ($b = -.00114, SE = 0.037, p = 0.975$).

These findings suggest that teacher-coaches' practices exert a direct and robust influence on student-athletes' motivation and success regardless of the level of instructional

supervision. This result confirms that coaching behaviors themselves are the primary drivers of motivation and success, rather than supervisory structures applied above them. This aligns with earlier interview data emphasizing that student-athletes respond most strongly day to day coaching behaviors, including encouragement, feedback, personalization, fairness, and emotional support. Athletes consistently attributed their motivation, performance, and personal development to direct interactions with their coaches, rather than to formal oversight or supervisory mechanisms. This helps explain why instructional supervision did not function as an effective moderator in the statistical model.

Table 21. Moderation Analysis Predicting Motivation and Success of Student-Athletes Using Instructional Supervision as Moderating Variable

Predictor	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		Z	p
			Lower	Upper		
TC	0.89985	0.0371	0.8271	0.9726	24.2325	<.001
I	-0.00114	0.037	-0.0736	0.0713	-0.031	0.975
TC*I	0.05098	0.0937	-0.1326	0.2345	0.5443	0.586

Note: TC – Teacher-Coaches Practices; I – Instructional Supervision; and TC*I is the interaction between Teacher-Coaches Practices and Instructional Supervision

Although instructional supervision did not show a moderating effect against interpreting this as evidence that supervision lacks value. Rather, it suggests that the influence of instructional supervision may be indirect, operating through long-term capacity building, professional reflection, and leadership flexibility, rather than immediate changes in athlete outcomes.

Also, indicates that teacher-coaches’ practices remain the strongest and most reliable predictors of student-athletes’ motivation and success, independent of instructional supervision levels. Instructional supervision does not alter this relationship, confirming that effective coaching operates primarily through relational, motivational, and instructional interactions with athletes.

At the same time, the interpretation suggests that instructional supervision retains strategic importance by shaping the conditions under which coaching practices develop. Its impact is likely longitudinal and developmental, influencing coaching quality over time rather than moderating short-term outcomes.

Therefore, this clarifies why instructional supervision did not emerge as a moderator while remaining conceptually valuable. This integration strengthens the overall interpretation by distinguishing between direct predictors of student-athlete outcomes and contextual support structures that sustain coaching effectiveness.

Table 22 presents the results of the moderation analysis examining whether motivational practices moderate the relationship between teacher-coaches’ practices and the motivation and success of student-athletes. The findings indicate that the interaction between teacher-coaches’ practices and motivational practices is not statistically significant (b = 0.0736, SE = 0.0426, p = 0.084). This result

demonstrates that motivational practices do not alter the strength or direction of the relationship between teacher-coaches’ practices and student-athlete outcomes.

Table 22. Moderation Analysis Predicting Motivation and Success of Student-Athletes Using Motivational Practices as Moderating Variable

Predictor	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		Z	p
			Lower	Upper		
TC	0.8641	0.0372	0.79109	0.9371	23.2	<.001
M	-0.0295	0.0225	-0.07354	0.0145	1.31	0.189
TC*M	0.0736	0.0426	-0.00979	0.1571	1.73	0.084

Note: TC – Teacher-Coaches Practices; M – Motivational Practices; and TC*M is the interaction between Teacher-Coaches Practices and Instructional Supervision

Despite the non-significant moderating effect, teacher-coaches’ practices remain a strong and highly significant predictor of student-athletes’ motivation and success (b = 0.8641, SE = 0.0372, p < .001), confirming their substantial and direct influence. In contrast, motivational practices alone are not a significant predictor of motivation and success (b = -0.0295, SE = 0.0225, p = 0.189). These results suggest that teacher-coaches’ overall practices independently predict student-athletes’ motivation and success, regardless of the level of motivational practices applied.

The study findings indicates that teacher-coaches’ practices represent the primary and most influential predictor of student-athletes’ motivation and success, independent of motivational practices as a separate construct. Motivational practices, when detached from broader coaching behaviors, do not significantly strengthen or weaken this relationship.

Table 23. Moderation Analysis Predicting Motivation and Success of Student-Athletes Using Building Trust as Moderating Variable

Predictor	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		Z	p
			Lower	Upper		
TC	0.87384	0.0345	0.8062	0.9415	25.322	<.001
BT	-0.01961	0.0344	-0.0869	0.0477	0.5709	0.568
TC*BT	0.00343	0.087	-0.1672	0.174	0.0394	0.969

Note: TC – Teacher-Coaches Practices; BT – Building Trust; and TC*I is the interaction between Teacher-Coaches Practices and Instructional Supervision

Table 23 presents two moderation analyses examining whether Building Trust and Recreational Practices moderate the relationship between Teacher-Coaches’ Practices and the motivation and success of student-athletes.

The first analysis investigated whether building trust moderates the relationship between teacher-coaches’ practices and student-athlete motivation and success. The results show that the interaction between Teacher-Coaches’ Practices and Building Trust is not statistically significant (b = 0.00343, SE = 0.087, p = 0.969). Additionally, Building Trust itself is not a significant predictor (b = -0.01961, SE = 0.0344, p = 0.568). In contrast, Teacher-Coaches’ Practices remain a strong and significant predictor of motivation and success (b = 0.87384, SE = 0.0345, p < .001).

These findings indicate that building trust does not moderate the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and student-athlete outcomes. This implies that while trust is an essential component of effective coaching, its presence alone does not strengthen or weaken the already strong effect of teacher-coaches' practices on motivation and success. Teacher-coaches' practices exert a direct and robust influence, regardless of the level of trust perceived by student-athletes.

The second analysis examined whether the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and student-athletes' motivation and success. In contrast to building trust, the results reveal a statistically significant interaction between Teacher-Coaches' Practices and Recreational Practices ($b = 0.07988$, $SE = 0.0385$, $p = 0.038$). This indicates that recreational practices do moderate the relationship between coaching practices and student-athlete outcomes.

Notably, the strength of the relationship increases as the level of recreational practices increases, indicating that recreational activities amplify the positive effects of teacher-coaches' practices on student-athlete motivation and success.

The result standpoint highlights the unique and facilitative role of recreational practices in athlete development. The result emphasized that activities create low-pressure, enjoyable, and socially supportive environments where student-athletes are more receptive to coaching guidance. When effective coaching practices are combined with recreational opportunities that promote enjoyment, inclusion, and social bonding, athletes demonstrate higher motivation, stronger engagement, and more holistic success.

The findings demonstrate a clear distinction between the two moderators examined in Table 23. Building Trust does not moderate the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and student-athlete outcomes because trust is already embedded within effective coaching itself. In contrast, Recreational Practices significantly moderate and strengthen this relationship, indicating that the effectiveness of coaching practices is enhanced when delivered within supportive, enjoyable, and developmentally appropriate recreational contexts.

These findings reinforce the central conclusion of the study: Teacher-coaches' practices are the primary drivers of student-athlete motivation and success, but their impact can be amplified by contextual factors, particularly recreational activities that promote enjoyment, inclusion, and holistic engagement.

This synthesizes the results of the moderation analyses examining whether Instructional Supervision, Motivational Practices, Building Trust, and Recreational Practices influence the relationship between Teacher-Coaches' Practices and the motivation and success of student-athletes.

The results indicate that Teacher-Coaches' Practices consistently emerge as a strong and significant positive predictor of student-athletes' motivation and success across all models. This confirms that higher levels of teacher-coaches' practices are associated with higher levels of motivation and success among student-athletes, regardless of contextual or organizational conditions.

Table 24. Moderation Analysis Predicting Motivation and Success of Student-Athletes Using Recreational Practices as Moderating Variable

	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		Z	p
			Lower	Upper		
TC	0.91952	0.0337	0.85356	0.9855	27.325	<.001
R	-0.0083	0.0203	-0.04808	0.0315	-0.409	0.683
TC*R	0.07988	0.0385	0.00451	0.1553	2.077	0.038

Note: TC – Teacher-Coaches Practices; R – Recreational Practices; and TC*I is the interaction between Teacher-Coaches Practices and Instructional Supervision

The analyses show that instructional supervision, motivational practices, and building trust do not moderate the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and student-athlete outcomes. In addition, these variables do not independently predict motivation and success in the moderation models. This indicates that the positive effect of teacher-coaches' practices remain stable whether these factors are at low or high levels.

The result suggests that these variables are foundational or integrative elements of effective coaching rather than amplifying mechanisms. Instructional supervision, motivational practices, and trust are already embedded within high-quality coaching behaviors. As a result, they do not function as separate forces that strengthen or weaken coaching effectiveness once strong practices are in place.

In contrast, practices demonstrate a significant moderating effect on the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and student-athlete motivation and success. The findings indicate that: The positive effect of Teacher-Coaches' Practices increases as the level of Recreational Practices increases, and Recreational Practices alone are not a significant independent predictor of motivation and success ($b = -0.0083$, $SE = 0.0203$, $p = 0.683$).

This means that while recreational practices by themselves do not directly affect motivation and success, they enhance and strengthen the effectiveness of teacher-coaches' practices when combined. In contexts where recreational activities are more prominent, the already strong influence of coaching practices becomes even more pronounced.

Together, the findings summarized in Table 24 demonstrate that: teacher-coaches' practices are the dominant and most reliable predictors of student-athlete motivation and success.

Table 25. Simple Slopes of Teacher-Coaches Practices Predicting Motivation and Success of Student-Athletes at Levels of Recreational Practices

Level of Recreational Practices	Estimate	SE	95% Confidence Interval		Z	p
			Lower	Upper		
Average	0.92	0.0338	0.853	0.986	27.2	<.001
Low (-1SD)	0.859	0.0519	0.757	0.96	16.5	<.001
High (+1SD)	0.98	0.0363	0.909	1.051	27	<.001

Note. shows the effect of the predictor (Teacher-Coaches Practices) on the dependent variable (Motivation and Success of Student-Athletes) at different levels of the moderator (Recreational Practices)

The consolidated findings of the moderation analyses, highlighting the unique role of recreational practices in strengthening the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and the motivation and success of student-athletes. The results clearly demonstrate that recreational practices significantly moderate this relationship, such that the positive effect of teacher-coaches' practices on student-athletes' motivation and success increase as the level of recreational practices increases. This indicates that teacher-coaches' practices are more effective when implemented within environments that actively support recreational engagement. In contrast, Instructional supervision, motivational practices, and Building Trust do not significantly strengthen or weaken the relationship between teacher-coaches' practices and student-athlete outcomes. While these factors remain important components of effective coaching environments, they do not function as moderators in the statistical models. This suggests that the foundational impact of teacher-coaches' practices remain stable and direct, regardless of variations in supervision, motivational strategies, or trust levels.

Concurrently, the findings in Table 25 reinforce a central conclusion of the study: Teacher-Coaches' Practices are the primary and most consistent predictors of student-athletes' motivation and success. However, the effectiveness of these practices is context-sensitive. Recreational practices significantly enhance the impact of coaching by providing a developmental environment that supports enjoyment, engagement, and holistic participation.

Hence, the results imply that while improving teacher-coaches' practices should remain the primary focus of intervention and policy, strengthening recreational practices can further magnify their positive effects. Recreational activities do not replace structured coaching; rather, they create conditions that allow coaching practices to achieve their full motivational and developmental potential. This integrated analysis clarifies why only recreational practices function as a moderator and provides a coherent, theory-aligned explanation of how teacher-coaches' practices lead to heightened motivation and success among student-athletes.

These results examine how leadership support of school heads, teacher-coaches' practices, student-athletes' motivation, and student-athletes' success relate to one another, including the moderating roles of selected contextual variables.

Overall, the findings reveal a clear pathway: leadership support indirectly influences outcomes by shaping teacher-coaches' practices, which in turn serve as the primary and strongest predictors of student-athletes' motivation and success. Among leadership dimensions, professional development emerged as the most consistently beneficial, showing positive though weak relationships with multiple motivation and success indicators.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Leadership support of school heads influences student-athletes indirectly. Leadership actions, particularly professional development, create enabling conditions that strengthen teacher-coaches' capacity, but leadership alone

does not directly determine student-athletes' motivation or success. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It implies that schools should focus on supporting teacher-coaches to enhance student-athlete outcomes.

The leadership and contextual factors like supervision, motivation, and trust form the foundation of effective coaching; they do not further influence outcomes when strong coaching is already in place. In contrast, recreational activities add unique value by making coaching more effective and boosting student-athlete motivation and success. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that while leadership and contextual factors such as supervision, motivation, and trust are essential for establishing effective coaching, their influence plateaus once strong coaching practices are present. Conversely, incorporating recreational activities uniquely enhances coaching effectiveness, further increasing student-athlete motivation and success.

Teacher-coaches' practices are the most powerful determinants of student-athletes' motivation and success. Regardless of leadership conditions or supervisory structures, effective coaching practices consistently predict positive outcomes. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. This implies that the practices of teacher-coaches are the key drivers of student-athletes' motivation and success. Regardless of school leadership or supervision, effective coaching directly leads to better student-athlete outcomes. This suggests that schools should prioritize improving and supporting coaching practices to maximize student-athletes' motivation and achievement.

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

Prioritize sustained professional development for teacher-coaches, focusing on instructional strategies, athlete motivation, and holistic development rather than administrative compliance alone.

Review the implementation of leadership supports, ensuring that resource allocation, empowerment, communication, and goal setting are aligned with coaching needs and athlete development rather than imposed uniformly.

Strengthen recreational components of athletic programs, recognizing their role in enhancing motivation and engagement.

Sustain and refine high-quality coaching practices, emphasizing individualized feedback, emotional support, fairness, and athlete-centered instruction.

Integrate recreational activities intentionally into training programs to reduce pressure, increase enjoyment, and strengthen receptiveness to coaching.

Design athletic programs that balance performance and recreation, ensuring that competitive goals do not overshadow opportunities for enjoyment, inclusion, and social bonding.

Align leadership evaluation systems with indicators of coaching effectiveness and athlete development rather than solely administrative metrics.

Examine longitudinal effects of leadership support and coaching practices on student-athlete development over time. Investigate additional contextual moderators, such as athlete

personality, sport type, or school culture, to further explain variability in outcomes.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2018). Transformational Leadership: A Response to Critiques. *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*.
- [2]. David, C. C., & Laguna, J. L. (2020). Empowerment and motivation of school heads: Implications for effective school leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7176/JEP/11-14-09>
- [3]. Estrella, J. R. (2023). Psychological empowerment and leadership styles among basic education school heads. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 26(1).
- [4]. Jones, G., Hanton, S., & Connaughton, D. (2019). What is this thing called Mental Toughness? An Investigation of Elite Sport Performers. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*.
- [5]. Lawrence, A. (2025). SMART goal setting in health and well-being coaching: Participant outcomes and engagement. University of Lincoln Theses. <https://bpbeuw2.wpmucdn.com/blogs.lincoln.ac.uk/dist/e/8583/files/2025/02/AliceLawrence-Complete-21.01.25.pdf>
- [6]. Nicolau, R. (2025). Managerial coaching and personal goal setting: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, 23(1), 67–81. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17521882.2024.2397380>
- [7]. Perez, A. (2022). The Role of a School Principal's Practice of Resource Allocation. Lindenwood University Theses. <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1103&context=ela>
- [8]. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860