

Coaches Need More: team communication, recognition and school-owned follow-through

Historical review of team communication and school-owned follow-through.

The current editorial-first publication model was not evaluated.

Research by Education Angel Group. Last substantive review: September 19, 2026.

Education Angel Group is developing Coaches Need More and has an interest in the proposed product. This review does not establish its effectiveness.

Historical research scope. This September 19, 2026 report examines the earlier Coaches Need More guidance proposition. The current entities are editorial-first publications: Education Needs More is the editorial umbrella within Education Angel Group, and the individual Need More publications sit beneath it. This report does not evaluate the newer editorial model. The findings, proposed mechanisms and prior tagline below belong to the earlier research scope, not a claim about current product effectiveness or availability.

Prepared by Education Angel Group (EAG), with AI-assisted research and drafting. Research date: September 19, 2026. EAG is developing Coaches Need More and has an interest in its success. This report examines its proposed role and relevant evidence; it is not an independent evaluation, a coaching credential or evidence that an EAG tool improves athlete outcomes.

1. Proposition, audience and what remains proposed

In the earlier proposal, Coaches Need More was intended to help a coach move from a team need to useful context, appropriate communication, culture or recognition options, and a concrete action or proposal within school authority. The immediate task is preparation for something a coach can responsibly do or bring to an athletic director. It is not a sports-performance platform, recruiting service or public showcase of athletes.

The intended users include head coaches, assistants, volunteers and athletic directors. Their authority differs. An assistant may recognize a communication problem without permission to change program policy. A head coach may be able to adjust an ordinary team discussion while needing school approval for a new recognition practice. An athletic director may need to adapt or reject a proposal. The service should help clarify these boundaries rather than treat every adult associated with a team as an interchangeable decision-maker.

EAG's definition excludes coach payouts, athlete ranking, medical or training prescriptions, public rosters by default and performance guarantees. Anonymous guidance and offline preparation need no account. In the wider portfolio, Coach is a Team management role rather than a new public Coach profile; sign-in alone

grants neither roster access nor student-publication consent. The accepted Teachers Need More proof remains a separate activation dependency. These are governing product definitions, not implemented capabilities. EAG scope authority, A0

Overview. Youth-sport research makes adult communication and interpersonal practice reasonable subjects for careful attention. It does not establish that an independent preparation website improves team culture, reduces anxiety or increases participation. Existing coaching resources already offer practical guidance. Coaches Need More would need to show that it helps an adult prepare a feasible, school-safe action with enough added value to justify the effort, while checking participant experience separately from coach satisfaction.

2. Research questions and the outcomes that should not be conflated

This report asks five questions:

1. What does a coach need to clarify before choosing a team-culture or communication action?
2. Which adult-development findings are relevant, and how strong are their causal and transfer claims?
3. What resources already offer usable coaching guidance?
4. How can preparation lead to a concrete action without bypassing school roles or exposing students?
5. What would establish usefulness, burden and equitable participation in a future test?

A prepared action, changed adult behavior, athlete comfort, team cohesion, continued participation and sport performance are different outcomes. A coach finding an article useful does not establish that students experience the resulting action positively. A team completing an activity does not establish inclusion. A favorable questionnaire result does not demonstrate a win-loss benefit, clinical treatment effect or lasting behavior change.

The distinction between a proposal and permission also matters. A detailed plan can still require school review. The service should make the remaining decision explicit instead of presenting a polished output as institutional approval. It should remain useful if the appropriate next step is to adapt, defer or reject the idea.

Recognition raises a further question: who defines the behavior being acknowledged, and who bears the consequences of being visible? A recognition practice can appear positive to the adult while feeling embarrassing, exclusionary or compulsory to a participant. This report treats that possibility as a design and evaluation concern. It has not collected athlete accounts or measured recognition effects in this product.

3. Need and context: a team problem is not always a performance problem

The proposed service begins with a specific team need. "Improve culture" is too broad to identify an action or evaluate a result. A clearer concern might be inconsistent information reaching families, uncertainty about how athletes can ask questions, or a recognition practice whose criteria are unclear. These are illustrative examples, not findings from a school needs assessment.

A coach-facing tool could help distinguish what has been observed from what is inferred. If athletes rarely speak during a discussion, the observation does not by itself establish disinterest. The format, timing, audience or power relationship may matter. The service should help the coach frame a question and consider alternatives before assigning motives to students.

The relevant unit is also larger than the coach alone. Parents, assistants, school roles and participants may encounter different messages or expectations. An action that makes sense in one conversation can conflict with another if the adults have not agreed on the purpose and boundaries. The proposed service should therefore ask who needs to understand the action and who can authorize it, without turning that question into automatic outreach.

School context changes what can be inferred from community-sport research. A school program has institutional policies, staff responsibilities and education-related purposes that a community league may not share in the same form. Even where the activity looks similar, an external study cannot settle local permission, privacy or participant-support questions.

Capacity matters as well. A volunteer with limited preparation time may need a short, usable action, while a recurring program issue may require a longer school process. The research here does not establish an optimal preparation time or prove that a brief guide reduces workload. A small first step is a proposed practical choice that should be evaluated against the actual work it creates.

The entity's rationale is strongest when a concrete action can be prepared without collecting identifiable athlete information or adding another management system. It is weaker if the user must create a profile, upload a roster or generate public content before receiving useful guidance. None of those steps is necessary to establish whether a source-backed preparation sheet helps with the first job.

4. Existing alternatives and the value a new service must demonstrate

Figure 1

Existing routes cover much of the preparation job

Positive Coaching Alliance | S3

Public communication and culture checklist

Direct guidance is already available. Provider claims do not establish a checklist effect.

NFHS course outline | S4

Interscholastic parent communication preparation

Official outline describes meetings and communication methods. Current enrollment and price remain unverified.

School or athletic director | A0

Local permission and adaptation

The actual school process controls unresolved decisions. This report has not verified a local route.

Source-described alternatives and EAG authority boundaries. The proposed service must add value beyond these routes.

Existing routes cover much of the preparation job

Source-described alternatives and EAG authority boundaries. The proposed service must add value beyond these routes.

- S3
 - S4
 - A0. EAG product definition
-

These equivalents accompany the reader figures. Source IDs refer to the report references. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Figure 1. Existing routes cover much of the preparation job

Source-described alternatives and EAG authority boundaries. The proposed service must add value beyond these routes.

Positive Coaching Alliance | S3: Public communication and culture checklist. Direct guidance is already available. Provider claims do not establish a checklist effect.

NFHS course outline | S4: Interscholastic parent communication preparation. Official outline describes meetings and communication methods. Current enrollment and price remain unverified.

School or athletic director | A0: Local permission and adaptation. The actual school process controls unresolved decisions. This report has not verified a local route.

Sources: S3, S4, A0.

Figure 1. Existing resources and institutional roles compared by purpose. Current course enrollment and local school procedures have not been verified. No effectiveness ranking is implied. Text and data alternative

Positive Coaching Alliance's public *Checklist for Positive Coaches* includes listening, specific feedback, team acknowledgment, athlete input into values and parent expectations. The page is directly accessible and provides a concrete alternative to a new guide. Its broad promotional claims about lifelong impact are not treated as evidence that this checklist produces those effects. No publication date was displayed.

Positive Coaching Alliance, S3

The official NFHS *Engaging Effectively with Parents* course outline describes written and verbal communication, preseason meeting preparation and coach-parent resources. It is particularly relevant as an interscholastic-athletics alternative. The retrieved one-page flyer is undated and does not verify current course availability, enrollment, price or delivery. It establishes the described approach, not a completed course review or measured effect. NFHS, S4

The school's own athletic director or established process is a third route. EAG product definition retains that authority rather than replacing it. This report has not audited a particular school's procedure, and a general national resource cannot identify the correct local decision-maker by itself. EAG institutional boundary, A0

These alternatives suggest that Coaches Need More should not compete on the number of tips it can publish. A plausible contribution is helping a coach choose one relevant action, understand its assumptions, prepare the wording or materials and identify the remaining school decision. It might be useful precisely because it narrows the task rather than expands the resource list.

A direct route should remain visible when it already answers the need. A coach who needs the PCA checklist should be able to use it. Someone seeking current course enrollment needs a verified current NFHS destination, not an old flyer presented as an active offering. Someone facing a policy question may need the athletic director before any activity plan.

EAG's interest in related services should not change that ordering. The preparation should produce a useful result before an optional Runstr Team or other portfolio handoff. A coach who leaves with an offline question for the school has not failed merely because the visit produced no account, referral or public artifact.

5. Evidence and counterevidence: adult training is not a web-tool effect

Figure 2

Youth sport outcomes have different evidence

Team social cohesion | 4 studies

Hedges $g = 0.38$; 95% CI 0.25 to 0.51

Published standardized effect estimate for adult-development interventions, not a percentage improvement.

Fun and enjoyment | 5 studies

Hedges $g = 0.15$; 95% CI 0.06 to 0.25

A distinct outcome with a smaller published estimate. It does not measure retention or performance.

Autonomous motivation | 5 studies

Hedges $g = 0.01$; 95% CI -0.30 to 0.33

Interval includes zero. Inconclusive evidence does not establish equivalence or an exact absence of effect.

Selected Table 1 outcomes from Bengtsson et al. (2024; online 2023). Mixed designs, few studies and low power limit interpretation.

Youth sport outcomes have different evidence

Selected Table 1 outcomes from Bengtsson et al. (2024; online 2023). Mixed designs, few studies and low power limit interpretation.

- S2

Figure 2. Youth sport outcomes have different evidence

Selected Table 1 outcomes from Bengtsson et al. (2024; online 2023). Mixed designs, few studies and low power limit interpretation.

Team social cohesion | 4 studies: Hedges g = 0.38; 95% CI 0.25 to 0.51. Published standardized effect estimate for adult-development interventions, not a percentage improvement.

Fun and enjoyment | 5 studies: Hedges g = 0.15; 95% CI 0.06 to 0.25. A distinct outcome with a smaller published estimate. It does not measure retention or performance.

Autonomous motivation | 5 studies: Hedges g = 0.01; 95% CI -0.30 to 0.33. Interval includes zero. Inconclusive evidence does not establish equivalence or an exact absence of effect.

Sources: S2.

Figure 2. Selected Table 1 results from Bengtsson and colleagues. Hedges g is a standardized effect size, not a percentage improvement. Confidence intervals and study counts are retained. The outcomes do not estimate Coaches Need More's effect. Text and data alternative

Bengtsson and colleagues' 2024 review, published online in November 2023, identified 33 studies and meta-analyzed 27. Searches extended through January 18, 2023. Most studies were quasi-experimental (58%) and involved team sports (79%); all were in Western settings. Selected standardized estimates were positive for cohesion and enjoyment, while several other outcomes were inconclusive. The review found no included study met its usual 80% power criterion and had too few studies per outcome for moderator analysis. These are findings about adult-development programs, not standalone websites.

Bengtsson and colleagues, S2, methods, Table 1 and limitations

The pattern argues for specificity. If a proposed action aims to make communication more understandable, it should be tested on that aim. It should not borrow an effect from team cohesion to imply better motivation or retention. An interval spanning zero does not establish that an effect is exactly absent, but it does prevent confident claims of a reliable benefit from that estimate alone.

Smoll, Smith and Cumming's 2007 combined coach-parent study illustrates the narrower evidence beneath broad claims. It used matched community basketball programs, not random assignment. The final sample included 151 athletes ages 9-15: 82 intervention and 69 control completers. Only intervention families attending the parent workshop were included; missing late-season data and relatively affluent, highly educated catchments limit transfer. The authors reported favorable performance-anxiety change after combined workshops, but could not isolate parent versus coach contributions or directly observe their behavior. Potential subscale-label inconsistencies between tables make detailed charting inappropriate here. Smoll, Smith and Cumming, S1, methods and discussion

This example is not a basis for offering anxiety treatment or promising symptom reduction through an EAG action sheet. Workshop participation, parent selection and the social setting differ from an anonymous coach reading a guide. The study belongs to the literature summarized by the later review, so the two sources should not be counted as independent replications of a product mechanism.

The evidence also leaves unresolved how much supported practice matters. Adult-development programs can include workshops, feedback and opportunities to try new behavior. A website that removes those supports may be delivering a materially different intervention even if its written advice resembles the program's principles. Shorter delivery might be more convenient while being less effective, or it might still be useful for a narrowly defined preparation job. The current evidence cannot choose between those possibilities.

The most defensible conclusion is that communication and interpersonal practice deserve a focused test with honest outcome boundaries. No retained source evaluates Coaches Need More, its proposed recognition process or its school follow-up. No source establishes comparative benefit over direct use of PCA, NFHS or a school's existing resources.

6. Proposed mechanism: one action with a named decision owner

Figure 3

A prepared action retains school authority

Conceptual only. Every link is proposed.

Preparation hypothesis

1. Name one non-sensitive team need
↓ proposed link
2. Compare a relevant action and source limits
↓ proposed link
3. Specify audience, time, materials and prerequisites
↓ proposed link
4. Act within role or bring a proposal to the school owner

Unknown: added preparation value, follow-through and participant experience.

A valid adjustment

1. Consent, authority or fit is missing
↓ proposed link
2. Revise, seek school clarification or stop

No automatic approval, contact, public artifact or personal coach value.

EAG conceptual mechanism. Preparation, enacted behavior and athlete outcomes require separate evidence.

A prepared action retains school authority

EAG conceptual mechanism. Preparation, enacted behavior and athlete outcomes require separate evidence.

- A0. EAG product definition
-

Figure 3. A prepared action retains school authority

EAG conceptual mechanism. Preparation, enacted behavior and athlete outcomes require separate evidence.

Preparation hypothesis. Name one non-sensitive team need → Compare a relevant action and source limits → Specify audience, time, materials and prerequisites → Act within role or bring a proposal to the school owner. Unknown: added preparation value, follow-through and participant experience.

A valid adjustment. Consent, authority or fit is missing → Revise, seek school clarification or stop. No automatic approval, contact, public artifact or personal coach value.

Sources: AO.

Figure 3. EAG conceptual mechanism, not an evaluated causal chain. A prepared proposal does not create school approval, student consent, an outreach lead or a coach payout. Text and data alternative

The proposed path starts with a non-sensitive description of the team need. The coach identifies the intended change, reviews a relevant source and compares practical options. An action plan states the audience, time and materials, any approval prerequisite and how the coach will know whether the immediate purpose was understood. Unresolved decisions remain with the appropriate school role.

The product hypothesis is that this structure makes a useful next action easier to prepare without increasing exposure or unnecessary administration. The output could be a plan for an ordinary conversation, a clearer explanation of expectations or a recognition proposal for review. The benefit would be preparation quality and feasibility before any claim about athlete outcomes.

For example, a hypothetical coach wants families to understand how to ask routine program questions. A preparation guide could help identify the message's purpose, the existing school-approved channel, when a question belongs elsewhere and what the coach can promise in response. It should not generate a contact list, message parents or define a new complaint policy. This example is not a source-tested intervention.

A team-culture action needs the same discipline. The coach should be able to explain the behavior the action is meant to support without assigning labels to individual athletes. If the action requires participant input, its audience, voluntariness and use should be clear. If the coach lacks permission, a proposal to the athletic director may be the complete appropriate output.

Follow-through should allow adaptation. The school may clarify a policy, a participant may decline visibility or the coach may find the action impractical. Revising or stopping can show that the boundaries worked. A product that treats all such endings as failed engagement would be measuring the wrong result.

7. Design concepts and recognition choices worth testing

Figure 4

Recognition needs more than a positive label

Criteria

What is recognized and who can be overlooked?

Define the behavior, examine opportunity to demonstrate it and avoid popularity or performance proxies.

Audience and choice

Can the participant decline visibility?

Private acknowledgment and public exposure are different decisions. Do not penalize an opt-out.

Correction and owner

Who can change or stop the practice?

Make correction practical and retain school/AD authority. No tested recognition effect is claimed.

EAG proposed recognition safeguards from its earlier product definition, not a validated award or culture intervention.

Recognition needs more than a positive label

EAG proposed recognition safeguards from its earlier product definition, not a validated award or culture intervention.

- A0. EAG product definition
-

Figure 4. Recognition needs more than a positive label

EAG proposed recognition safeguards from its earlier product definition, not a validated award or culture intervention.

Criteria: What is recognized and who can be overlooked? Define the behavior, examine opportunity to demonstrate it and avoid popularity or performance proxies.

Audience and choice: Can the participant decline visibility? Private acknowledgment and public exposure are different decisions. Do not penalize an opt-out.

Correction and owner: Who can change or stop the practice? Make correction practical and retain school/AD authority. No tested recognition effect is claimed.

Sources: AO.

Figure 4. EAG recognition questions derived from the product's authority boundaries. They are proposed safeguards, not evidence that a recognition intervention improves culture. Text and data alternative

The first candidate is a compact action brief. It would state the team need, explain a source-backed option, identify the coach's role and name the next decision. It would remain useful as an offline preparation artifact. The brief should avoid collecting rosters, health details, schedules or identifiable stories simply to tailor general guidance.

A second candidate is a communication rehearsal. The coach could prepare what they intend to say and check whether it explains purpose, expectations and the appropriate question route. A hypothetical example is a short preseason explanation of ordinary communication channels. The output would remain a draft for the adult's review, not a sent message or a school-approved policy.

A third candidate is a recognition review. Before choosing an acknowledgment, the coach would identify what is being recognized, how the criteria are applied, who sees it, whether the participant can decline and how mistakes can be corrected. This structure comes from EAG's scope and equity requirements. The retained research does not validate a particular award, ceremony or public-recognition format.

Criteria should be understandable without relying on popularity, competitive results or recruiting visibility. Even apparently neutral criteria may advantage students with more opportunities to display the behavior. Testing should examine how the coach notices contributions and whose work can be overlooked, rather than assume that a positive label removes bias.

Audience is a separate decision from merit. A participant may appreciate a private acknowledgment while disliking public attention. The product should not equate refusal of visibility with lack of team commitment. An opt-out needs to be practical, understandable and free of a penalty that undermines the choice. Those requirements should be examined with appropriate youth safeguards, not assumed from coach intention.

The smallest first test should choose one communication or culture action before adding a broad recognition system. A system introduces recurring records, comparison and correction duties that a single preparation task may not need. The report proposes testing the usefulness of the first task, not expanding into team administration or public athlete content.

8. Risks, equity and adult burden

Coach satisfaction is incomplete. A coach may like a guide because it gives a clear plan. Students may experience that plan differently. Any later evaluation of participant experience should have an appropriate school-governed design and a way to distinguish voluntary feedback from pressure to please an adult.

School authority can be blurred. A polished document may appear approved even when it contains unresolved policy or consent questions. The guide should state what the coach can do and what remains a proposal. Signing into an account is not proof that the user can publish an athlete's image, change a school process or accept resources.

Recognition can create comparison. A positive acknowledgment may become a de facto ranking if criteria favor visible performances or a small group repeatedly receives attention. The product should not hide that risk behind a celebration theme. A correction route and a review of who is missed are part of the proposed approach, not optional decoration.

Support can become disclosure. Questions about how a participant is doing may elicit private information. A general team-culture tool should not invite public explanations of health, injury, discipline or family circumstances. Topics outside ordinary coaching preparation belong to current school and qualified support processes; this report supplies no medical, mental-health, disciplinary or training prescription.

Time can move rather than disappear. A shorter coach preparation task can create more work for assistants, families or school staff. Evaluation should count planning, review, explanation and follow-up rather than only minutes on the page. It should also record when an action was not used because it did not fit available time or authority.

Research populations may not fit. The small combined intervention's catchments and selection conditions do not represent all schools. The larger synthesis is still geographically limited and dominated by team sports. Different resources, languages, age groups and coaching arrangements need direct consideration. A universal statement about youth sport would exceed this evidence.

Financial and portfolio incentives can redirect the job. EAG's product boundary excludes personal coach value and leaves institutional resources with school approval. The site should not turn a culture concern into fundraising, a payout or compulsory Runstr activity. Its first action should work without an onward product handoff.

Performance measures can displace the purpose. Wins, rankings and recruitment are not suitable proxies for the promised preparation or participant experience. They are influenced by many factors and may reward exactly the pressure the culture guidance is intended to question. A bounded communication outcome is more informative for the first test.

9. Evaluation and criteria for changing direction

The first evaluation should examine whether a coach can prepare a feasible action within role. No Coaches Need More trial has been conducted. Research involving actual athletes would require separate approval, school and participant safeguards, and a purpose that justifies any information collected.

Start with realistic, non-identifying scenarios and coaches with different responsibilities. Compare the proposed brief with a relevant existing resource or ordinary school preparation process. The comparison should be credible: a coach who would normally use an existing checklist should not be evaluated against an artificial condition of no guidance.

Define a useful output before inspecting results. It should identify the specific need, intended action, audience, source limit, time or material implications and decision owner. It should recognize when approval is missing or an option does not fit. A correct decision to bring a question to the athletic director can be more useful than an overconfident plan to proceed.

Ask the coach to explain the action in ordinary language. If the explanation depends on copying the tool's wording, the output may be less usable than it appears. Check whether the guide adds clarity beyond the original source and whether the user can distinguish general guidance from local authority.

Measure total preparation and follow-up effort separately from satisfaction. Record which parts were used, which were ignored and what additional adult support was needed. A brief that saves reading time but produces repeated school clarification may not reduce burden. A user who stops because an existing process is better has supplied useful evidence about fit.

Only after the preparation task works should a later approved study examine enacted behavior or participant experience. That study should not assume that coach intention equals athlete comfort. Recognition research would need to ask whether criteria and audience are understood, whether declining visibility is possible and whether correction works. It should not default to collecting public comments, rosters or clinical anxiety scores to evaluate a simple preparation tool.

Continue if the guide produces clearer, feasible, appropriately owned actions with justified effort. Revise if coaches misunderstand consent, copy formal wording without understanding it or find the options too generic. Narrow the scope if the tool works for one role or action but requires different expertise elsewhere.

Stop or reconsider if existing resources do the job as well with less work, if the proposed value requires collecting sensitive athlete records, or if the service repeatedly encourages actions outside coach authority. Claims about sustained participation, team cohesion or psychological outcomes would require direct evidence beyond the first preparation test.

10. Methods, limitations, references and corrections

This was a focused, question-led review completed September 19, 2026, not a systematic review or a current inventory of every coaching service. The EAG product definition defined product scope. Original empirical work, an original synthesis and first-party alternatives were retained for specific questions. All four external source groups were reopened for this report.

The 2007 journal PDF was read for design, selection, attrition and interpretation. It is the combined coach-parent study, distinct from the same authors' separate coach-only article. The combined study's subscale tables appear inconsistent in labeling, so no subscale effect chart or numeric anxiety recommendation is produced. The source's broad reported pattern is presented cautiously with its design limits. A limited October 2, 2026 parsed-content comparison found that Worry and Concentration Disruption labels appear inconsistent across tables and results. Affected numeric subscales remain excluded; no corrected ordering is assumed.

The September 19 review recorded reading the later synthesis in its final published form through the SDU repository. It appeared online November 20, 2023, in a 2024 journal volume; those dates differ from its search cutoff and the years of included studies. The selected figure values are direct Table 1 transcriptions. The original review recorded an anxiety confidence-interval discrepancy between table and narrative; that outcome remains excluded. This edition's limited October 2 source recheck could not freshly resolve the discrepancy or certify the current publisher version because full-text retrieval was blocked or timed out. It was not a comprehensive literature refresh. No inference about clinical care follows from the review.

The figure retains Hedges g , study counts and confidence intervals without converting them to percentage improvements or a forecast. Positive estimates and inconclusive estimates are shown together. A nonsignificant result is not equivalence, and the selected outcomes are not an exhaustive summary of the synthesis. The older combined study and newer review overlap in literature and are not independent tests of EAG.

The PCA page establishes a current public checklist, not the effectiveness of that checklist. The NFHS flyer establishes a described course approach, not current enrollment or pricing. USOPC framework pages were discovery leads that failed direct retrieval in the scout and are excluded from substantive claims. No videos, current paid course experience or complete accessibility audit was assessed.

No school-specific user study, athlete feedback, adoption evidence, sustained follow-through result or verified local approval process was obtained. These gaps are material to the proposed service. Source availability also does not grant rights to reproduce provider materials.

Corrections should identify the exact claim, source version and locator and update its figure and alternative together. Apparent source-table discrepancies should be retained until resolved by the publisher rather than silently repaired. No comprehensive correction or retraction registry search was performed; absence of a visible notice is not proof of no correction.

Retained references

- **A0.** Education Angel Group, Coaches Need More product definition, reviewed September 19, 2026 for this report. Defines intended scope, not implementation or effectiveness.
- **S1. Smoll, F. L., Smith, R. E., and Cumming, S. P.** *Effects of Coach and Parent Training on Performance Anxiety in Young Athletes: A Systemic Approach*, 2007, *Journal of Youth Development*. DOI: 10.5195/jyd.2007.358. Original full article.
- **S2. Bengtsson, D., Stenling, A., Nygren, J., Ntoumanis, N., and Ivarsson, A.** *The effects of interpersonal development programmes with sport coaches and parents on youth athlete outcomes*, 2024, published online November 20, 2023. DOI: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2023.102558. Final published full text.
- **S3. Positive Coaching Alliance.** *Checklist for Positive Coaches*, undated page retrieved September 19, 2026. Public checklist.
- **S4. NFHS.** *Engaging Effectively with Parents*, undated course-outline flyer, retrieved September 19, 2026. Official outline.

Figure text and data alternatives

Complete semantic alternatives accompany each figure in this reader and its text download. Source IDs refer to the references in this report. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Corrections and entity context

Readers identifying an error can contact EAG with the section, disputed statement and supporting source. Coaches Need More provides the public entity context, not an external citation for EAG's product claims.