Educational and Humanities
ISSN Print: 3104-4352
ISSN Online: 3104-4360
CD ISSN: 3104-4379
https://doi.org/10.63313/EH.9030

Optimizing Student Outcomes in Physical Education: A Holistic Model of Coaching Strategies for University Basketball

Guoquan Wang
Polytechnic University of the Philippines
Email: 308491183@qq.com

How to cite this paper: Wang, G. Q. (2025). Optimizing student outcomes in physical education: A holistic model of coaching strategies for university basketball. *Educational and Humanities*, 2(1), 23-33. ISSN Print: 3104-4352; ISSN Online: 3104-4360.
https://doi.org/10.63313/EH.9030
Published: 2025-12-18

Abstract

Guided by the strategic imperatives of "Healthy China," physical education in Chinese universities is undergoing a paradigm shift from isolated skill training to the cultivation of comprehensive psychosocial competencies. However, current instructional practices often suffer from fragmentation, where technical rigor, motivational support, and tactical application are treated as separate, competing priorities. To address this, this paper proposes a holistic conceptual model of coaching strategies designed to optimize student outcomes in university basketball programs. Drawing upon the theoretical frameworks of Self-Determination Theory, Social Cognitive Theory, and Cognitive Load Theory, we synthesize three distinct yet interdependent pillars: Technical Guidance, which serves as a cognitive scaffold for skill acquisition; Autonomy-Supportive Communication, which acts as a motivational engine to sustain engagement; and Scenario Simulation, which provides a representative context for developing adaptability. We argue that these strategies must be implemented synergistically rather than in isolation. Under this integrated framework, technical structure builds the competence necessary for confidence, autonomy support fosters the volition required for persistence, and scenario-based constraints transform static skills into dynamic adaptability. This model offers university instructors and education managers a coherent, evidence-based roadmap for aligning daily pedagogical practices with the multifaceted goals of modern higher education.

Keywords

Coaching strategies; University basketball; Learning adaptability; Sport confidence; Self-determination theory; Holistic education model

1. Introduction

University physical education represents a critical juncture in higher education, serving not merely as a venue for physical training but as a vital environment for fostering lifelong health behaviors and psychosocial resilience. Among the various

disciplines offered, basketball courses are particularly demanding, characterized by high interpersonal confrontation, dense decision-making requirements, and rapid feedback cycles. In this complex setting, every instructional decision—from the clarity of a demonstration to the design of a scrimmage—forms part of an intricate chain affecting how students perceive, decide, and execute movement. As higher education continues to evolve, the pedagogical strategies employed in these courses must also advance to meet broader educational objectives that transcend simple skill acquisition.

1.1. The Shifting Landscape of Physical Education in China

Guided by high-level national strategies such as Healthy China and Building a Leading Sports Nation, physical education in Chinese universities is undergoing a fundamental transformation. The educational mandate has expanded significantly, shifting from a traditional focus on isolated skill acquisition and physical fitness to a comprehensive model that prioritizes the cultivation of healthy behaviors, psychosocial competencies, and sustained engagement (General Office of the CPC Central Committee & General Office of the State Council, 2020). Recent policy directives have explicitly called for the coordinated advancement of classroom instruction, extracurricular training, and intramural competitions to create learning environments that mirror authentic sport settings (State Council, 2021). Under this emerging paradigm, the quality of instruction is no longer evaluated solely by students' technical proficiency or physiological metrics. Instead, instructional efficacy is increasingly judged by whether teaching and training arrangements can sustain high-quality learning motivation, build robust sport confidence, and enable effective adaptation when task demands change (State Council, 2021). This strategic shift necessitates a re-evaluation of how coaching strategies are designed and implemented to ensure they contribute to these multifaceted student outcomes.

1.2. Current Challenges in University Basketball Instruction

Despite these aspirational goals, the practical implementation of basketball instruction often suffers from pedagogical fragmentation. The inherent nature of the sport involves a continuous "perception-decision-execution" chain, yet current instructional practices frequently isolate these components. Traditional approaches may heavily prioritize Technical Guidance—focusing on clear demonstrations and repetitive drills—which efficiently addresses the "execution" phase but often neglects the psychological needs required for sustained engagement (Evans et al., 2024; Han et al., 2022). Conversely, while contemporary educational discourse emphasizes Autonomy-Supportive Communication to foster motivation, its application can sometimes be detached from the rigorous technical structure required for performance, potentially leaving students motivated but technically ill-equipped (Vasconcellos et al., 2020). Furthermore, Scenario Simulation (e.g., small-sided games) is recognized for improving tactical behaviors and decision-making (Clemente et al., 2021), yet it

is often treated as a supplementary activity rather than an integrated core of the curriculum. This lack of integration means that students may master isolated skills without developing the Sport Confidence to apply them under pressure, or they may possess general enthusiasm without the specific Learning Adaptability needed to navigate real-world competitive constraints.

1.3. Purpose of the Proposed Framework

In response to these challenges, this paper proposes a holistic conceptual model of coaching strategies tailored for university basketball education. We argue that optimizing student outcomes requires moving beyond isolated pedagogical tools toward a synergistic system where coaching strategies function as complementary dimensions of effective instruction. Specifically, this framework integrates three observable domains of practice: (a) Technical Guidance (providing clarity and competence support), (b) Autonomy-Supportive Communication (facilitating internal motivation through rationale and choice), and (c) Scenario Simulation (creating representative learning contexts). By synthesizing theoretical perspectives from Self-Determination Theory, Social Cognitive Theory, and Cognitive Load Theory, we aim to explicate how these strategies, when implemented together, synergistically influence three critical outcomes: Motivation, Sport Confidence, and Learning Adaptability. This theoretical exploration seeks to provide a coherent roadmap for university instructors and education managers to align daily teaching behaviors with the comprehensive, student-centered goals of modern physical education.

2. Theoretical Underpinnings

To construct a comprehensive understanding of how coaching strategies influence student outcomes, this study anchors its proposed model in three complementary theoretical frameworks: Self-Determination Theory (SDT), Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) integrated with Vealey's Model of Sport Confidence, and Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) aligned with the Constraints-Led Approach. Rather than operating in isolation, these theories provide intersecting explanations for the mechanisms through which instructional environments shape students' psychological states and behavioral adaptability.

2.1. Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination Theory serves as the primary lens for understanding the motivational dynamics within the basketball classroom. Central to this theory is the premise that the quality of human motivation—ranging from amotivation to intrinsic motivation—depends heavily on the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Vasconcellos et al., 2020). In the context of university physical education, the instructional climate plays a decisive role in either supporting or thwarting these needs. Research consistently demonstrates that when

instructors adopt an autonomy-supportive style—characterized by acknowledging student perspectives, providing rationales for tasks, and minimizing controlling language—they facilitate the internalization of external regulations (Bureau et al., 2022). This process of internalization is crucial for transforming mandatory course attendance into active, volitional engagement. Furthermore, teacher motivational styles are not fixed traits; interventions focused on providing structure in an autonomy-supportive way have been shown to effectively reduce amotivation and foster identified regulation among students (Cheon et al., 2020; Viksi & Tilga, 2022). Consequently, SDT provides the theoretical justification for positioning Autonomy-Supportive Communication as a critical driver for sustaining high-quality student motivation.

2.2. Social Cognitive Theory and Sport Confidence

While SDT elucidates the "why" of participation, Social Cognitive Theory addresses the mechanisms underlying students' belief in their capabilities. Bandura's framework posits that self-efficacy is cultivated through four principal sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. This perspective integrates seamlessly with Vealey's multidimensional conceptualization of sport confidence, which encompasses confidence in physical skills, cognitive efficiency, and resilience (Chun et al., 2022). Within our proposed framework, technical instruction is theorized to directly activate these sources. Specifically, clear demonstrations and the use of key cues provide vital vicarious experiences, enabling students to construct a mental blueprint of success before execution (Oppici et al., 2021). Moreover, informational feedback functions as a targeted form of verbal persuasion that guides learners toward mastery experiences. Recent evidence underscores the importance of the coach-athlete relationship in this process, suggesting that perceived support and precise feedback are instrumental in building cognitive efficiency and buffering against the anxiety associated with complex tasks (Coussens et al., 2024). Thus, SCT provides the rationale for linking structured Technical Guidance directly to the development of robust sport confidence.

2.3. Cognitive Load Theory and Constraints-Led Approach

To explain the development of learning adaptability in complex environments, we draw upon Cognitive Load Theory and the Constraints-Led Approach. CLT posits that human working memory is limited, and effective instruction must manage intrinsic load while strictly minimizing extraneous load to facilitate schema acquisition (Evans et al., 2024). Traditional drills often reduce load by isolating skills, but this frequently results in a failure to transfer skills to the dynamic context of a game. The Constraints-Led Approach addresses this by advocating for "representative learning design," where the environment is manipulated to guide student behavior without explicitly prescribing movement solutions. By adjusting task con-

straints—such as rules, space, and player numbers in small-sided games—instructors create scenarios that maintain the coupling of perception and action (Clemente et al., 2021). This approach prevents the cognitive overload of full-game complexity while retaining the necessary decision-making demands, thereby forcing students to constantly recognize changes and switch strategies. Empirical syntheses suggest that such game-centered pedagogies enhance decision-making quality and tactical knowledge more effectively than isolated training (Manninen et al., 2025). Therefore, this theoretical perspective justifies the inclusion of Scenario Simulation as the essential context for fostering cognitive, behavioral, and emotional adaptability (Xiao & Jiang, 2024).

3. The Integrated Holistic Model

Based on the theoretical underpinnings outlined above, we propose an integrated conceptual model comprising three interdependent pillars. These pillars correspond to the observable domains of coaching strategies identified in the literature: Technical Guidance, Autonomy-Supportive Communication, and Scenario Simulation. Rather than functioning as separate pedagogical tools, these strategies are conceptualized here as components of a unified system, each serving a distinct function in the development of the student-athlete.

3.1. Technical Guidance as the Cognitive Scaffold

The first pillar, Technical Guidance, functions as the "cognitive scaffold" for student learning. In the high-speed, information-rich environment of university basketball, novice learners often face significant cognitive demands. This domain is defined by the clarity of demonstrations, the strategic use of key instructional cues, and the provision of precise informational feedback. From a cognitive load perspective, effective technical guidance operates by reducing extraneous load, thereby allowing students to focus their limited attentional resources on essential movement patterns. Research indicates that when instructors utilize clear video demonstrations and explicit cues, they direct student attention to relevant perceptual information, which facilitates faster anticipation and more accurate decision-making (Zhao et al., 2022). Furthermore, the quality of feedback is paramount. Meta-analytic evidence supports the superiority of informational and prescriptive feedback over general praise, particularly when the feedback frequency is matched to the learner's stage of development (Corbett et al., 2024; Han et al., 2022). By providing this structural guidance, instructors ensure that students possess the foundational competence required to navigate complex tasks, directly contributing to the "Physical Skills" dimension of Sport Confidence.

3.2. Autonomy-Supportive Communication as the Motivational Engine

While technical structure provides the capability to perform, the second pillar, Au-

tonomy-Supportive Communication, acts as the "motivational engine" that sustains the will to engage. This strategy involves clarifying the goals of training sessions, providing meaningful rationales for specific drills, and offering students reasonable choices within the training structure. Empirical studies in physical education demonstrate that when teachers adopt an autonomy-supportive style—as opposed to a controlling one—students experience significantly more positive emotions and higher classroom satisfaction (Leisterer & Langer, 2022). This approach is particularly effective in university settings, where students are transitioning to adulthood and place a high value on personal agency. Interventions that train teachers to use non-controlling language and acknowledge student perspectives have been shown to enhance students' perceived need satisfaction, which in turn fuels intrinsic and identified regulation (Tilga et al., 2021). Consequently, this pillar is essential for transforming passive compliance into the active, long-term effort required for skill mastery.

3.3. Scenario Simulation as the Context for Adaptability

The third pillar, Scenario Simulation, provides the necessary "context for adaptability." This strategy moves instruction beyond static repetition by employing representative learning designs, such as small-sided games (SSGs), where constraints—including rules, space, time, and player numbers—are manipulated to replicate competitive demands. Unlike isolated drills, scenario simulation maintains the critical coupling of perception and action. For instance, reducing player numbers (e.g., 3v3 versus 5v5) has been shown to increase the frequency of technical actions and decision-making opportunities without inducing excessive physiological exhaustion (Li et al., 2025). Comparative studies reveal that such contextualized training produces superior outcomes in technical execution and tactical behavior compared to non-contextual conditioning formats (Arslan et al., 2022; Zeng et al., 2022). By constantly exposing students to variable constraints—such as removing the dribble to encourage passing or altering court dimensions—instructors create a volatile environment that forces students to inhibit pre-planned responses and develop real-time Behavioral and Cognitive Adaptability (Ferioli et al., 2020).

4. Discussion

The novelty of this framework lies not merely in the identification of individual coaching strategies, but in their synergistic integration. We argue that optimizing student outcomes requires the concurrent application of all three pillars, as the absence of any single component compromises the efficacy of the entire pedagogical system.

4.1. From Support to Engagement

The interaction between Autonomy-Supportive Communication and Technical

Guidance is critical for determining the quality of student motivation. Technical training, when stripped of autonomy support, risks becoming a mechanical compliance exercise. While students may perform the drills, without a sense of volition, their engagement is likely to remain at the level of external regulation or even regress to amotivation. However, when technical feedback is delivered with a clear rationale—for instance, explaining why a specific footwork pattern enhances safety and efficiency—it satisfies the need for cognitive structure while simultaneously respecting the student's need for autonomy (Banerjee & Halder, 2021). This combination fosters "Agentic Engagement," where students do not merely participate passively but actively contribute to the learning process (Reeve et al., 2020). Conversely, providing autonomy without sufficient technical structure can lead to a chaotic learning environment where students feel supported but incompetent, ultimately undermining their intrinsic motivation due to a lack of progress.

4.2. From Guidance to Belief

Sport confidence is not a static trait but a dynamic state influenced by the immediate instructional climate. Our model posits that distinct coaching strategies target different facets of this confidence. Technical Guidance provides the necessary "Mastery Experiences" through successful skill execution, serving as the foundational bedrock of belief. However, technical mastery in isolation is insufficient for the unpredictable nature of basketball. Scenario Simulation complements this by testing these skills under pressure, thereby building "Resilience" and cognitive efficiency. Research highlights that perceived coach support, when combined with clear roles and team goals, significantly enhances team cohesion and individual self-efficacy (Wang et al., 2024). A pedagogical approach that relies solely on technical drills may produce students who are confident in practice but fragile in competition; conversely, exposing students to complex scenarios without the scaffold of technical guidance may lead to repeated failure and anxiety (Liu et al., 2024). Therefore, robust sport confidence emerges only when students are equipped with skills (Guidance) and successfully test them in context (Simulation).

4.3. From Simulation to Application

Ultimately, the goal of university physical education is to cultivate Learning Adaptability—the capacity to transfer skills and psychological competencies to novel situations. Cognitive flexibility in sports is enhanced when students are required to generate options and self-regulate in real-time (Başoğlu et al., 2025). By manipulating constraints within Scenario Simulation—such as altering court dimensions or modifying scoring rules—instructors force students to inhibit pre-planned responses and adjust their behaviors. This process turns the basketball court into a laboratory for adaptability. However, this adaptability is predicated on the motivational and technical foundations established by the other two pillars. Without the motivation to

persist through errors (supported by Autonomy) and the technical repertoire to execute new solutions (supported by Technical Guidance), the challenges presented in scenarios would likely overwhelm the learner rather than stimulate adaptive growth (Xiao and Jiang, 2024).

5. Implications and Conclusion

The theoretical integration presented in this study extends beyond academic discourse, offering tangible pathways for reshaping the delivery of physical education in Chinese universities. By delineating the specific functions of technical guidance, autonomy support, and scenario simulation, this model provides a blueprint for moving from intuitive coaching to evidence-based pedagogical design.

5.1. Practical Implications for Instructors

For university instructors, this framework necessitates a departure from the traditional "demonstrate-practice-play" routine toward a more intentional instructional design. The classroom must be viewed as an ecosystem where psychological support and technical rigor coexist. In practice, this implies that lesson planning should explicitly map out how each of the three pillars is addressed. For instance, rather than viewing "scrimmages" merely as a time for students to run freely, instructors should design these segments as Scenario Simulations with specific constraints—such as limiting touches or modifying scoring rules—to target specific adaptive behaviors. Simultaneously, the delivery of Technical Guidance should be coupled with Autonomy-Supportive rationales. When a coach corrects a technical error, adding a brief explanation of how that correction serves the student's personal improvement goals can transform a potentially controlling interaction into a supportive one. This shift requires instructors to become not just drill-masters, but architects of a learning environment that systematically builds competence, motivation, and adaptability.

5.2. Implications for Educational Management

Beyond the immediate classroom, these findings hold significant weight for educational management and policy implementation. Current evaluation systems often prioritize summative outcomes, such as final exam scores or physical fitness test results. However, this model suggests that the process of instruction is equally vital for cultivating psychosocial competencies. Administrators should consider incorporating process-oriented indicators into quality assurance mechanisms, such as monitoring the frequency of autonomy-supportive behaviors or the implementation of representative learning designs. Furthermore, resource allocation must align with these pedagogical needs. The implementation of Scenario Simulation, specifically small-sided games, requires flexible facility management to accommodate multiple concurrent games, rather than the traditional full-court utilization. Professional de-

velopment programs should also be recalibrated; rather than focusing solely on technical updates, training modules should equip teachers with the communication strategies necessary to support student autonomy effectively.

5.3. Conclusion

In the broader landscape of Chinese higher education, the mission of physical education is evolving from simple physical training to the holistic development of the student. This study argues that this mission cannot be achieved through fragmented teaching methods. By synthesizing Technical Guidance, Autonomy-Supportive Communication, and Scenario Simulation into a holistic model, we provide a theoretical basis for a more sophisticated approach to basketball instruction. This integrated framework ensures that students are not only technically proficient but also psychologically resilient and adaptable to change. As universities continue to implement national health strategies, adopting such a synergistic coaching model represents a critical step toward nurturing a generation of students who possess both the capability and the confidence to thrive in complex environments.

References

[1] Arslan, E., Kilit, B., & Clemente, F. M. (2022). Effects of small-sided games training versus high-intensity interval training approaches in young basketball players: Psychological and physiological responses. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(5), 2931. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19052931

[2] Banerjee, R., & Halder, S. (2021). Amotivation and influence of teacher support dimensions: A self-determination theory approach. Heliyon, 7(7), e07410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07410

[3] Başoğlu, B., Keyf, E., Vural, M., Gül, M., Doğan, A., Karakaş, F., Arıkan, G., & Çamiçi, F. (2025). Does cognitive flexibility enhance decision-making in sports? Journal of Men's Health, 21(5), 39–45. https://doi.org/10.22514/jomh.2025.066

[4] Bureau, J. S., Howard, J. L., Chong, J. X. Y., & Guay, F. (2022). Pathways to student motivation: A meta-analysis of antecedents of autonomous and controlled motivations. Review of Educational Research, 92(1), 46–72. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211042426

[5] Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2020). When teachers learn how to provide classroom structure in an autonomy-supportive way: Benefits to teachers and their students. Teaching and Teacher Education, 90, 103004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103004

[6] Chun, D. R., Song, H., & Khoo, S. (2022). The mediated effect of sports confidence on competitive state anxiety and perceived performance of basketball players. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 20(1), 334. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20010334

[7] Clemente, F. M., Afonso, J., Sarmento, H., & Figueiredo, A. J. (2021). Effects of small-sided game interventions on the technical execution and tactical behaviors of young and youth team sports players: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 667041. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.667041

[8] Corbett, R., Kerr, D. A., & Fairclough, S. J. (2024). A systematic review of coach augmented verbal feedback use in developmental and performance sport. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/17479541231218665

[9] Coussens, A. H., De Jaegher, H., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2024). Coach–athlete relationships,

self-confidence, and psychological wellbeing: The role of perceived and received coach support. European Journal of Social Psychology. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsc.12226

[10] Evans, P., Vansteenkiste, M., Parker, P. D., Kappe, R., & Martin, A. J. (2024). Cognitive Load Theory and its relationships with motivation: A Self-Determination Theory perspective. Educational Psychology Review, 36, Article 9841. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09841-2

[11] Ferioli, D., Rucco, D., Rampinini, E., La Torre, A., Manfredi, M. M., & Conte, D. (2020). Combined effect of number of players and dribbling on game-based-drill demands in basketball. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 15(6), 825–832. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2019-0645

[12] General Office of the CPC Central Committee, & General Office of the State Council. (2020). Opinions on deepening the integration of sports and education to promote the healthy development of adolescents. [Policy Document].

[13] Han, Y., Zhang, Z., & Wang, L. (2022). Feedback for promoting motor skill learning in physical education: A trial sequential meta-analysis. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(22), 15361. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192215361

[14] Leisterer, S., & Langer, M. (2022). Increased perceived autonomy-supportive teaching in physical education classes changes students' positive emotional perception compared to controlling teaching. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 1015362. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1015362

[15] Li, T., Wang, S., Martinho, D. V., Silva, R. M., Gouveia, É. R., & Clemente, F. M. (2025). Can different small-sided game formats impact physiological, physical, technical, and tactical demands in basketball players? A systematic review with meta-analysis. Biology of Sport, 42(3), 283–302. https://doi.org/10.5114/biolsport.2025.147012

[16] Liu, M., Lin, P., Chen, D., Zhu, Z., & Guo, W. (2024). Basketball self-evaluation matrix: Discrepancy between self-confidence and in-game decision-making performance. Frontiers in Sports and Active Living, 6, 1404701. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2024.1404701

[17] Manninen, M., Magrum, E., Campbell, S., & Belton, S. (2025). The effect of game-based approaches on decision-making, knowledge, and motor skill: A systematic review and a multilevel meta-analysis. European Physical Education Review, 31(1), 18–32. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X241245305

[18] Oppici, L., Carson, H. J., Renshaw, I., & Raab, M. (2021). When is knowledge of performance (KP) superior to knowledge of results (KR)? International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 15(1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2021.1986849

[19] Reeve, J., Cheon, S. H., & Yu, T.-H. (2020). An intervention-based program of research on teachers' motivating styles. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 44(4), 325–338. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025420911103

[20] Tilga, H., Kalajas-Tilga, H., Hein, V., & Koka, A. (2021). Web-based and face-to-face autonomy-supportive intervention for physical education teachers and students' experiences. Journal of Sports Science & Medicine, 20(4), 672–683. https://doi.org/10.52082/jssm.2021.672

[21] Vasconcellos, D., Parker, P. D., Hilland, T., Cinelli, R., Owen, K. B., Kapsal, N., Antczak, D., Lee, J., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R. M., & Lonsdale, C. (2020). Self-determination theory applied to physical education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 112(7), 1444–1469. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000414

[22] Viksi, A., & Tilga, H. (2022). Perceived physical education teachers' controlling behaviour and students' physical activity during leisure time: The role of teachers' need-supportive behaviour. Behavioral Sciences, 12(9), 342. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12090342

[23] Wang, L., et al. (2024). The impact of team cohesion on the engagement of college basketball players: The moderating effects of paternalistic leadership styles. Frontiers in Psychology. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1473506

[24] Xiao, H., & Jiang, D. (2024). Multiple object tracking training affects the executive function in basketball players: The role of instant feedback. BMC Psychology, 12, 331. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01786-7

[25] Zeng, J. S., Xu, J., Zhou, W., & Xu, F. (2022). Effects of 4-week small-sided games vs high-intensity interval training with changes of direction in female collegiate basketball players. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 17, 366–375. https://doi.org/10.1177/17479541211032739

[26] Zhao, J., Gai, Y., Shicai, H., & Fan, X. (2022). Effects of video-based training on anticipation and decision-making in football players: A systematic review. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 16, 945067. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.945067