



The Current Practices and Challenges of Handball Coaching and Its Future Perspectives in Some Selected Zones of Tigray Region

Berhane Tesfay

Lecturer, Department of Sports Science, Adigrat University, Ethiopia.

Received 12th October 2014, Accepted 10th December 2014

Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the current practices and challenges of handball coaching and its future perspectives in some selected zones of Tigray region. The study was employed in descriptive survey research method. The subjects of this study were 120 players, 5 coaches and 5 youth and sport officers of Tigray region. The non probability sampling method was employed to select the event. The data was collected through questionnaire and interviews methods. The data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods by describing statements and frequency counts and percentages. For the interview questions, it was described in qualitative explanation. The findings indicated that, there were lack of facilities and equipments available and used in handball clubs and it was also a limited number of coaches in the Zonal squad. The relationships of players and coaches were good. Finally, the researcher recommended and appealed that the Ethiopian Handball Federation should increase the number of coaches and the concern body should fulfill the facilities and equipment for further development of coaching handball in the country.

Keywords: Coach, Handball, Interview, Questionnaire.

© Copy Right, IJRRAS, 2014. All Rights Reserved.

Introduction

Handball is a fast attacking and defending ball game played in its most popular version, by two teams of seven players in each side that also have five substitutions. The competition is to score more goals than the opponent team within the time allowed to play the game gives it a fascinating feature and also the skillful passing, dribbling of the ball by the player's opportunity and to score a shoot consequently catches ones attention. (Krouse (1996). The game of Handball that we know today has organized in Germany at the end of 19th century and it was Konard Kock, a gymnastics master who introduced the game to the world. However, the development of the game, ever since its introduction has not been smooth. At first it was not recognized as the separate sport. It did not have its own governing body and it comes under the jurisdictions of the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF).

In 1928, eleven Handballs playing Nations met in Amsterdam on the occasions of the Olympic Games and have the result of the meeting of International Amateur Handball Federation were formed. In 1931, attaining separate entity, Handball were included in the program of the game by International committee and the game first held in Berlin in 1936.

Methodology

The aim of this study was to investigate the current practices and challenges of handball coaching and its future perspectives in some selected zones of Tigray region. The study was employed in descriptive survey research method. The non probability sampling method was employed to select the event. The data was collected through questionnaire and interviews methods. The data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methods by describing statements and frequency counts and percentages. For the interview questions, it was described in qualitative explanation. The study was conducted on the Zonal Handball players, Coaches and Youth Sport Officers of Tigray region which contains (120 (male, female) and 5 male officials). Descriptive research method was used in the study since the aim of the research was up to describing fact and insisting on existing condition of the issue under discussion in practices and challenges of coaching Handball Tigray Zonal teams.

Results and Discussions

The information obtained from primary, secondary sources, interviews were coded and responses from the questionnaires were tabulated and analyzed using percentage. The questionnaires were distributed to the subjects (120) players, 5 coaches and 5 for the youth and sport officers.

Correspondence

Berhane Tesfay,
E-mail:berhanetesfay@gmail.com,

Table I. Response of players on the training activities

No	Item	Respondent players	
		No	%
1	Why do you come to training?		
	a. I like training	58	48.33
	b. I have the ability & interest to play	62	51.67
	c. For enjoyment	-	-
	Total	120	100
2	How much you are attending training per week?		
	a. For 2 days	23	19.2
	b. For 3 days	97	80.8
	c. More than it	-	-
	Total	120	100
3	Is the training given on convenient day?		
	a. Yes	109	90.83
	b. No	11	9.17
	Total	120	100
4	How long you have practiced the training?		
	a. 1-2 years	120	100
	b. 2-3 years	-	-
	c. 3 years and above	-	-
	Total	120	100
5	Are you punctual to conduct the training program?		
	a. Always	110	91.67
	b. Often	10	8.33
	Total	120	100
6	Does your coach usually attend the training?		
	a. Always	109	90.83
	b. Often	11	9.17
	Total	120	100
7	Do you have any chance of interaction with the coach rather than training?		
	a. Yes	66	55
	b. No	54	45
	Total	120	100
8	How many coaches train you in the training period?		
	a. One	77	80.8
	b. Two	10	8.33
	c. Three	13	10.87
	Total	120	100
9	Are you happy on the process of the training?		
	a. Yes	112	93.33
	b. No	8	6.67
	Total	120	100

As indicated in the above table 1, beyond fifty percent that is 62 (51.67%) players have the ability and interest to play handball game, 58 (48.33%) of the players are participating the training because of the interest of the game. In item 2 all most all i.e. 97(80.8%) replied that they were attending regular training for three days per week. But 23(19.2%) respondents were attending training for two days for a week. In item 3 the above most players 109(90.83%) responded the training were given on convenient day 11(9.17%) the players replied that the training were not given on convenient day. The item no. 4 indicated 120(100%) responded they

were attending the training. 110 (91.67%) players in item 5 they were punctual to attend the training but 10 (8.33%) players replied they were not punctual to attend the training days. In item 6 shown 109(90.83%) that coaches were usually attend the training program always, 11(9.17%) respondents replied they were not usually attend the training program always. In item 7 indicated 66(71.67%) that players replied they was have a chance of interaction with their coaches, but 54(45%) did not get a chance to interact with their coach rather than training. Players in item 8, 77(80.8%) responded was trained by one coach and 10 (8.33%) respondents responded that

they were trained by two coaches, but 13(10.87%) players were conducted their training by more than two coaches. 112(93.33%) players indicates they were happy about the process of the game of handball game, but 8(6.67%) did not happy about the process of the game of handball. Generally from the above items the players

joined the training by having ability and interest according the data. Even though there is a convenient training day was given by the coaches, still there are few problems. So, gradually the problems have to be minimized. According to the data which is gathered from the players indicated the way of coaching is low.

Table II. Respondents on the Recruitment and Selection Process

No	Items	Respondents	
		Players	
1	Do you gain life skill/education from your coach additional to the training?		
	a. Yes	100	83.33
	b. No	20	16.67
	Total	120	100
2	Have you got social value or encouragement from families, friends and communities?		
	a. Yes	-	-
	b. No	120	100
	Total	120	100
3	How do you see the attitude of the community for the handball game?		
	a. High	20	16.67
	b. Low	100	83.33
	c. Very low	-	-
	Total	120	100
4	Does the coach teach you about the level of handball game results winning, losing and equal?		
	a. Yes	114	95
	b. No	6	5
	Total	120	100
5	Do you get ample supply in logistics?		
	a. Yes	-	-
	b. No	120	100
	Total	120	100
6	Did the coach qualified in the handball game?		
	a. Yes	74	61.67
	b. No	46	38.33
	Total	120	100
7	Are there high ranking teams in your region?		
	a. Yes	4	3.33
	b. No	116	96.67
	Total	120	100
8	Do you like looking / watching handball game or competition?		
	a. Yes	74	61.67
	b. No	46	38.33
	Total	120	100
9	Is there conducive and well structured handball game?		
	a. Yes	63	52.5
	b. No	57	47.5
	Total	120	100

As shown in the above table II, all the players of handball i.e.100 (83.33) involved a life skills & vision from their coach. 20(16.66%) players replied there was not gain a life skill & vision from their coach. With regard the above table 2 item2, 120(players responded they would not got social value /encouragement from their families, friends & community to play the game of

handball .In item 3, 120(100%) players indicated that the attitude of the community on the game of handball is low. In the 4th item 114(95%) of the respondents got a full information the game result like winning, losing & equal happening during the competition, but 6(5%) of the players were not get the chance of that information. In the 5th item according the data 120(100%) of the

players observed they were testing games with sister teams. According the above table item 6, 120(100%) replied all in all they agreed for not getting ample supply in logistics from the concerned body. As indicated the above item 7, 74(61.67%) said their coaches are qualified in handball coaching. but 46(38.33%) of players replied their coaches are not qualified in coaching of hand ball game. As it is stated in the above table item 8, 116(96.67%) the majority players said they are not a high ranking teams in their region. As the data tabulated in the above table 9th item 74(61.67%) they like watching handball competition, on the other hand 46(38.33%) responded they do not like to watch handball

game. The last item 9, the majority of the players 63(52.5%) indicated there is conducive and well structured handball court. On the contrary 57(47.5%) replied there is no conducive and well organized handball court. understanding of the above data the trainees was not got social value or encouragement from their families, friends, managements and community for the game of handball. In addition to this the clubs of the zones does not made a friendship competition with sister teams, to evaluate the performance of the players, so that this shows that no one give emphases for the game of handball for its resistance and there was no means of controlling of its progress.

Table III. Responses on the program activity

No	Item	Respondents	
		Coaches	
1	What is your aim in coaching the players of handball?		
	a. For pride	-	-
	b. For bringing top performer players	6	100
	c. For the sake of benefit	-	-
	Total	6	100
2	Do you have annual, weekly and daily training plan?		
	a. Yes	4	66.66
	b. No	2	33.33
	Total	6	100
3	Do you evaluating your training whether you attain your objective /not?		
	a. Yes	6	100
	b. No	-	-
	Total	6	100
4	Do you think that the training of physical fitness should be supported and the coach concerns the relation of it with Anatomy, Physiology and psychology?		
	a. Yes	6	120
	b. No	-	-
	Total	6	120

As the above table III item 1 shows that the maximum number 6(100%) replied all in all the coaches involved to bringing capable & responsible players. The response of having the annual, weekly and daily plans for easily management before real training program of handball game to item 2 table 3, 4(66.66%) replied yes and 2(33.33%) of them said no. Item number 3 in table 3 was designed to know whether the coaches are

evaluating the training how they can achieve their object or not and 6(100%) replied they are use evaluation mechanism. In the 4th item according the data 6(100%) responded in all requests the coaches think about the training on physical fitness should be supported and coaches designed the relation of the game with anatomy, physiology, physiology and psychology.

Table IV. Responses of coaches on selection of training

No	Item	Respondents	
		Coaches	
1	Is there the availability of equipments /logistics/?		
	a. Yes	1	16.66
	b. No	3	50
	c. Some of them	2	33.33
	Total	6	100
2	Do you have training plan?		
	a. Yes	4	66.66
	b. No	2	33.33

	Total	6	100
3	Are you applying the principle of training?		
	a. Yes	1	16.66
	b. No	5	83.33
	c. Not at all	-	-
	Total	6	100
4	How many times you are conducting your training for a week?		
	a. For 2 weeks	1	16.66
	b. For 3 days	5	83.33
	c. For more than 4 days	-	-
	Total	6	100
5	How do you can solve the problems of the players?		
	a. Through discussion	4	66.66
	b. Informing to the concerned body	-	-
	c. Giving decision myself	2	33.33
	Total	6	100
6	What looks like the interaction with your players?		
	a. As parent	1	16.66
	b. As a coach	5	83.33
	c. As friend	-	-
	Total	6	100
7	Which style of coaching are you using?		
	a. Autocrat	2	33.33
	b. Democrat	4	66.66
	c. Lucifer	-	-
	Total	6	100
8	If you player, at which level you played?		
	a. School, Kebele, Wereda and Zone	6	100
	b. Clubs	-	-
	c. National level	-	-
	Total	-	-
9	Are you encouraged by officers, managers and the community?		
	a. Yes	-	-
	b. No	5	83.33
	c. Often	1	16.66
	Total	6	100

From the above the above table IV, half of the coaches 3(50%) replied they were not availability of equipments to train the game. In the 2nd item 4(66.66%) coaches have a plan for the training session and 2(33.33%) coaches responded they use a plan for the training. According table 4 item 3, most of the coaches 5(83.33%) were not use the principles of training to train their trainees, but 1(16.66%) of them were use the value/principles of training to train their players. In table 4 item 4th the majority coaches 5(83.33%) responded they were conducted their training program 3 times per week while 1(16.66%) of them were conducted their training program 2 times per week.

As shown in table IV, item 5, 4(66.66%) coaches were solved the problem of the players through discussion, 2(33.33%) coaches were solved the problem of their player by decide the coach by himself. In the 5th item the majority coaches 5(83.33%) responded the interaction of the coach and players were as a coach and

1 (16.66%) coach responded the interaction of them were as parents.

From the above table IV item 6 all most 4 (66.66%) coaches indicated they were used the style of democrat, but 2(33.33%) of the coaches replied they were followed the style of Autocrat. In the 5th table 8th item the majority coaches 6(100%) respondent were played in School, Kebele, woreda and Zone. As the above table 5 item 8 shown 5(83.33%) coaches were not encouraged by officers, managers and community and 1(16.66%) responded sometimes they were encouraged by officers, managers & the community. From the above table, the scholar reviewed that there were not appropriate facilities and equipments at the zonal teams. So, the concerned body must provide the materials in order to increase the competency of the athletes and the necessary training inputs such as such as manuals, videos to follow scientific way of training.

Table V. Responses on coaches' appraisal system

No	Item	Respondents	
		Players	
1	Coaches evaluation so as to improve training process is		
	a. Low	80	66.66
	b. Moderate	30	25
	c. High	10	8.33
	Total	120	8.33
2	Training performance appraisal based on well established & clear criteria?		
	a. High	15	12.5
	b. Moderate	30	25
	c. Low	75	62.5
	Total	120	100
3	Informing the strength & weaknesses of training through evaluation		
	a. High	15	12.5
	b. Moderate	45	37.5
	c. Low	70	58.33
	Total	120	100
4	Selecting results have been free from biases and favoritism		
	a. Its free	60	50
	b. Almost free	20	16.66
	c. There is not democrat	40	33.33
	Total	120	100
5	Placement of players based on their performance		
	a. High	45	37.5
	b. Low	15	12.5
	c. Moderate	70	58.33
	Total	120	100

From the above table the above Table V, 1st item most of the players 80(66.66%) replied the evaluation of coaches as to improve the training process were low and 30(25%) players responded coaches evaluation were moderate as to improve the training process, while 10(8.33%) players said coaches evaluation so as to improve the training process were high. As indicated in the table 6 item 2, the majority 75(62.5%) players shown the training performance appraisal were low based on well established and clear criteria and 30(25%) players replied the appraisal were moderate based on well established and clear criteria, while 15(12.5%) players responded the training performance appraisal were high based on well established and clear criteria.

According the above table 6, item 3, 70(58.33%) players indicated “Low” for the informing the strength & weaknesses of training through evaluation, 45(37.5%) players shown “ Moderate” about informing the strengths & weaknesses of training through evaluation and 15(12.5%) players replied “High” for informing the strengths and weaknesses of training through evaluation. As shown in the above table 6, item 4th the maximum 70(58.33%) players responded the replacement of players based on their performance were moderate and 45(37.5%) players shown the replacement of players based on their performance were high, while 15(12.5) players indicated the replacement of players based on their performance

were low.

Having the above data the Scholar recommended there were low coaches evaluation so as to improve the training, informing the strengths and weaknesses of the training process as well as low during the appraisal and establishment of clear criteria, it has negative impact all over the training system of the game of handball.

Responses of the Zonal youth and sport officers in the interview part

All the officers gave similar answers it was according to the plan that they had periodic and fixed day supervised and followed the training process. They had criteria such as license of coaching level, educational level and experience of coaching. The main challenges failed by the officers were: lack of facility, educational background of the players, the age of the players and the economy status of the player.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. The number of coaches in the selected Zones was not enough. There was shortage of facilities and equipment in the teams of handball.
2. There was no appropriate coaching recruitment plan in advance the coaching, training, motivating, attracting and retaining of trainees were practiced

without the knowledge of predetermined base of training principles.

3. The selected Zones have special favorable weather to produce famous handball players. The coaches of handball had the required knowledge and experience. Even though the number of female coach was low, there no female coach in the selected Zones of handball teams.

Recommendations

Depending upon the findings of the study, the following recommendations were drawn.

1. For effective work, the office of youth and sport should increase the number of coaches.
2. Handball Federation and the concerned bodies should fulfill facilities and equipment in order to bring good result in the game of handball. Even if the relation between among players and coaches are good, this is not enough still.
3. The concerned body must give workshop by inviting educators for both athletes and coaches.
4. Ethiopia handball federation must facilitate for the coaches to the next level to increase their knowledge and also consider the hike of allowance of coaches.
5. The concerned and responsible body should make attractive packages for the athletes and this pave way for them to do better in their profession.

References

1. Allen Wade, (1994), The F.A guide to train and coaching. London
2. Allyu and Bacon, (1996) teaching strategies of handball. Boston, London, Toronto.
3. Asia football Federation (AFF), (200). Asia handball coaching manual. A-License.
4. Bucher.C.A. (1991). Foundation of physical Education. The C.V. Mosy Co. New York.
5. Colin E. Schmidt, (1992). Advanced handball drills. Human Kinetics. United States of America.
6. Crookes (1991), Communication Skills: Uk; Macmillan co.
7. FIFA, (2001 -2002), Football Coaching Manual.
8. Frank.W. Dick, (1997). Sport training principles. Third Edition.
9. George C. Krast, (1995), Coaching the fundamentals of Handball. New York.
10. Manual of international DFB- Coaching Course 2008(B- License).
11. National Soccer Coaches Association of America, (2004). The handball coaching Bible. Human Kinetics. United States of America.
12. Peter J.L. Thompson, (1991). Introduction of coaching Theory (IAAF). Roy Rees and Cor van der meer, (1997). Coaching handball successfully. Human Kinetics.
13. Sigi Schmid, Bob Alejo, (2002). Complete Conditioning for handball. Human Kinetics. United States.
14. Team of Writers, (1982). Principles of sports Training. Sportverlag Berlin.
15. Wondimu Tadesse and Damen Hailemariam, (2004). Football performance. Addis Ababa, Addis Ababa University.
16. Wondimu Tadesse, (1990). The modern way of football training. (unpublished)
17. <http://www.brianmac.co.uk/commun.htm>
18. <http://www.livestrong.com/article/principles-athletic-training>.
19. <http://www.humanKinetics.com/excerpts/training-principles>.