



HAL
open science

Antecedents of primary school teachers' need-supportive and need-thwarting styles in physical education

Géraldine Escriva-Boulley, Leen Haerens, Damien Tessier, Philippe Sarrazin

► To cite this version:

Géraldine Escriva-Boulley, Leen Haerens, Damien Tessier, Philippe Sarrazin. Antecedents of primary school teachers' need-supportive and need-thwarting styles in physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 2021, 10.1177/1356336x211004627 . hal-03228332

HAL Id: hal-03228332

<https://hal.science/hal-03228332>

Submitted on 17 Jan 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Antecedents of primary school teachers' need-supportive and need-thwarting styles in physical education.

Journal:	<i>European Physical Education Review</i>
Manuscript ID	EPE-20-0066.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Article
Keywords:	controlling teaching, entity theory, self-determination theory, students' engagement, teaching style, teachers' motivation
Abstract:	<p>It is widely acknowledged that teachers' (de)motivating style (what they say, do and how they act) affects students' learning. Understanding what leads teachers to adopt a (de)motivating style is necessary to develop effective training programs. The current study aimed to identify antecedents of teachers' motivating (i.e. need-supportive) and demotivating (i.e. need-thwarting) styles by (1) examining the relationships between five types of pressures and these styles and (2) by investigating the mediating role of motivation. 509 generalist primary school teachers completed a questionnaire about their perceived styles, perceived pressures from above (i.e. time constraints, pressure to display authority), below (i.e. perceptions of students' disengagement) and within (i.e. beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards, and the adherence to entity theory), and their autonomous and controlled motivations to teach physical education. Structural equation modelling showed that a need-supportive style was negatively predicted by students' disengagement and teachers' adherence to entity theory, and this relation was fully mediated by autonomous motivation. A need-thwarting style was positively predicted by pressure to display authority and beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards. Results showed that when pressures from below and from within are reduced, teachers adopt a more need-supportive style, because they are more likely to enjoy and value teaching. Conversely, when pressures from above and from within are prevalent, teachers are more likely to adopt a need-thwarting style. This study identified the pressures to be targeted when developing interventions which aim to modify teachers' (de)motivating styles which in turn could impact students' motivation and behaviors.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 1 RUNNING HEAD: Antecedents of primary school teachers' motivating style
4
5
6 2 Antecedents of primary school teachers' need-supportive and need-thwarting styles in
7
8 3 physical education.
9

10
11
12 4
13
14 5 Géraldine Escriva-Boulley¹, Leen Haerens², Damien Tessier¹ and Philippe Sarrazin¹
16
17
18 6

19
20
21 7 ¹ Univ. Grenoble-Alpes, SENS, F-38000 Grenoble, France
22
23

24 8 ² Ghent University
25
26
27 9

28
29
30 10 Corresponding authors
31

32
33 11 Géraldine Escriva-Boulley and Philippe Sarrazin
34

35
36 12 Laboratory "Sport et Environnement Social" (EA 3742),
37
38

39
40 13 UFR-STAPS, University Grenoble-Alpes, BP 53 - 38041 Grenoble cedex 9, France.
41

42
43 14 Email : geraldine.escriva-boulley@uha.fr or Philippe.sarrazin@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Abstract**

2 It is widely acknowledged that teachers' (de)motivating style (what they say, do and how they
3 act) affects students' learning. Understanding what leads teachers to adopt a (de)motivating
4 style is necessary to develop effective training programs. The current study aimed to identify
5 antecedents of teachers' motivating (i.e. need-supportive) and demotivating (i.e. need-
6 thwarting) styles by (1) examining the relationships between five types of pressures and these
7 styles and (2) by investigating the mediating role of motivation. 509 generalist primary school
8 teachers completed a questionnaire about their perceived styles, perceived pressures from above
9 (i.e. time constraints, pressure to display authority), below (i.e. perceptions of students'
10 disengagement) and within (i.e. beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards, and the adherence
11 to entity theory), and their autonomous and controlled motivations to teach physical education.
12 Structural equation modelling showed that a need-supportive style was negatively predicted by
13 students' disengagement and teachers' adherence to entity theory, and this relation was fully
14 mediated by autonomous motivation. A need-thwarting style was positively predicted by
15 pressure to display authority and beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards. Results showed that
16 when pressures from below and from within are reduced, teachers adopt a more need-supportive
17 style, because they are more likely to enjoy and value teaching. Conversely, when pressures
18 from above and from within are prevalent, teachers are more likely to adopt a need-thwarting
19 style. This study identified the pressures to be targeted when developing interventions which
20 aim to modify teachers' (de)motivating styles which in turn could impact students' motivation
21 and behaviors.

22 **Keywords**

23 controlling teaching, entity theory, self-determination theory, students' engagement, teaching
24 style, teachers' motivation

1 Introduction

2 Grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan and Deci, 2017), many studies have
3 examined physical education (PE) teachers' motivating style, which represents the
4 interpersonal sentiment and behavior teachers use to motivate their students to engage in the
5 learning activities they propose (Reeve, 2016). Specifically, these studies have investigated
6 how PE teachers, through their motivating style, can foster positive or negative motivational
7 and learning experiences (e.g. De Meyer et al., 2014; Haerens et al., 2015; Van den Berghe et
8 al., 2014). The knowledge gained from these studies is crucially important for teachers'
9 professional development programs. Yet, to design and implement such programs, insight into
10 the antecedents of their motivating (i.e. need-supportive) as much as demotivating (i.e. need-
11 thwarting) style is needed. Compared to studies on the consequences of teachers' motivating
12 style, few studies have focused on the antecedents of teachers' demotivating style. In the
13 literature on the antecedents of motivating style of social agents (i.e. parents or teachers;
14 Grolnick, 2003; Pelletier et al., 2002; Reeve, 2009) a distinction is made between pressures
15 from above (i.e. the context), below (i.e. from students) and within (i.e. from teachers
16 themselves). The main aim of the current study was to examine how these three kinds of
17 pressures relate to primary school teachers' (de)motivating style in PE.

18 While all of these pressures can directly affect how teachers interact with their students, they
19 can also do so indirectly through their motivation to teach (see Van den Berghe et al., 2014;
20 Abos et al., 2018). While some studies have revealed that PE teachers' motivation is dependent
21 on the school context they are in (e.g. Fernet et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 2008) and recent
22 evidence has shown that PE teachers' own motivation affects the way they interact with their
23 students (Abos et al., 2018; Roth et al., 2007), few studies (Pelletier et al., 2002; Taylor and
24 Ntoumanis, 2007; Taylor et al., 2008) have examined the full model where teachers' motivation
25 to teach mediates the relation between pressures and teachers' (de)motivating style in PE. Thus,

1 another objective of this study was to extend these findings by examining the mediating role of
2 teachers' motivation in the relation between experienced pressures and their (de)motivating
3 style, hereby distinguishing autonomous and controlled motivation to teach PE.

4 ***Motivating style within SDT***

5 SDT distinguishes two independent aspects of teachers' motivating style, namely need-
6 supportive style (NSS) and need-thwarting style (NTS) (Ryan and Deci, 2017). More precisely,
7 an NSS is defined by the provision of autonomy support, structure and involvement. Autonomy
8 support includes identifying students' personal interests by engaging in a dialogue with them,
9 allowing students to work at their own pace and providing meaningful explanatory rationales
10 (Aelterman et al., 2019; Reeve, 2009). Structure refers to offering guidance, giving positive and
11 constructive feedback to help students build on their skills and sense of competence (Aelterman
12 et al., 2019; Mouratidis et al., 2008). Involvement is evident when teachers invest a considerable
13 amount of time, energy, and resources in their students and offer unconditional affection and
14 care (Skinner and Edge, 2002). In contrast, an NTS is characterized by control, chaos and
15 coldness. Controlling practices comprise relying on external sources to get the students to
16 behave in the way teachers want them to behave – by using rewards or threats, or competitive
17 situations (Grolnick, 2003; Reeve, 2009; Soenens et al., 2012). Chaotic practices encompass
18 providing unclear instructions and vague goals, and delivering confusing feedback (Van den
19 Berghe et al., 2013; Reeve, 2009). Emotionally-cold teaching includes offering conditional
20 affection, favoritism, and being hostile or cold toward the students (Skinner and Belmont,
21 1993).

22 Research in secondary school PE shows that teachers' NSS is related to adaptive
23 behaviors and positive outcomes such as more self-determined motivation and amplified effort,
24 engagement and persistence (see Van den Berghe et al., 2014, for a review). In contrast, an NTS
25 leads to maladaptive behaviors and negative outcomes such as student disengagement, fear of

1 failure and challenge avoidance (Bartholomew et al., 2018; Van den Berghe et al., 2016). When
2 compared to the body of evidence in secondary school PE, studies in a primary school setting
3 are far scarcer and focus on NSS only (Vasconcellos et al., 2020). The relatively small body of
4 evidence highlights similar motivational processes with teachers' motivating style being
5 positively linked with students' effort in PE, either self-reported (Leptokaridou et al., 2016) or
6 objectively measured (Escriva-Boulley et al., 2018).

7 Although an abundant amount of literature supports the benefits of an NSS and the
8 drawbacks of an NTS, prior research has revealed that there is room for PE teachers to act in a
9 more need-supportive and a less need-thwarting way (Haerens et al., 2013). More precisely,
10 some prior studies show that teachers (Reeve, 2009) and PE teachers (Sarrazin et al., 2006) tend
11 to use a controlling motivating style; in particular the use of rewards or threats is a relatively
12 commonly used controlling strategy. Given the consequences of (de)motivating style on
13 students' motivation and behaviors, there is a need to investigate why teachers adopt an NSS
14 and/or an NTS.

15 *Antecedents of motivating style*

16 Antecedents of teachers' motivating style are usually divided into three categories: (a) pressures
17 from above, (b) pressures from below and (c) pressures from within (Grolnick, 2003; Pelletier
18 et al., 2002; Reeve, 2009). Pressuring factors from above refer to the demands teachers
19 encounter within the wider school environment (Pelletier et al., 2002). Results from qualitative
20 (Taylor et al., 2009) and cross-sectional (Taylor et al., 2008) studies investigating secondary
21 PE teachers show that time constraints are perceived as a barrier to implementing autonomy-
22 supportive strategies such as taking time to listen to students' opinions. If teachers are tempted
23 to teach "in a rush" they can also be inclined to urge students to understand, learn and move as
24 quickly as possible (i.e. controlling), give quick and vague instructions (i.e. chaotic) or leave
25 aside students who cannot follow (i.e. chaotic and cold) to save time. To our knowledge, only

1
2
3 1 one study (Taylor et al., 2008) has examined associations between time constraints and a
4
5 2 dimension of teachers' NSS (i.e. autonomy support), and no studies have investigated the link
6
7 3 between time constraints and the adoption of an NTS.
8
9

10 4 Another pressure from above is the pressure to display authority. Many teachers think
11
12 5 that one of the teacher's main roles is to exercise authority by controlling their class (Reeve,
13
14 6 2009). Taylor et al. (2009), for instance, show that PE teachers emphasize the need for teachers
15
16 7 to show to school actors (e.g. heads, parents, colleagues) that they are authoritarian and can
17
18 8 successfully manage their class. These teachers may be convinced that control and hostility
19
20 9 (e.g. use of punishment or an aggressive tone) provide them with the necessary authority. As
21
22 10 such, one may speculate that the perception that a good teacher needs to display authority may
23
24 11 pressure teachers towards adopting a more NTS. Also, they may fear that an NSS will open the
25
26 12 door to permissiveness, disrespect and chaos (Aelterman et al., 2019; Reeve, 2009). To date no
27
28 13 study has examined the relationship between this pressure and PE teachers' (de)motivating
29
30 14 style.
31
32
33
34

35 15 Among the pressures from below, cross-sectional research in secondary schools shows
36
37 16 that students' motivation and attitudes in the classroom (e.g. Pelletier et al., 2002; Sarrazin et
38
39 17 al., 2006; Taylor et al., 2008) and their (dis)engagement (Van den Berghe et al., 2016; Van den
40
41 18 Berghe et al., 2015) relate to teachers' motivating style. These studies reveal that when students
42
43 19 are highly engaged in PE, teachers may be more inclined to adopt an autonomy-supportive (e.g.
44
45 20 Pelletier et al., 2002; Sarrazin et al., 2006; Taylor et al., 2008) or an NSS (Van den Berghe et
46
47 21 al., 2016; 2015) and be less inclined to act in a controlling or a need-thwarting way (Sarrazin et
48
49 22 al., 2006; Van den Berghe et al., 2016). In contrast, when students are disengaged, this behavior
50
51 23 could be perceived as a pressure that teachers react to by adopting an NTS (Sarrazin et al., 2006;
52
53 24 Van den Berghe et al., 2016).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 Finally, teachers may also experience pressures from within which are related to their
4
5 2 own beliefs. Research has shown that teachers adopt a particular motivating style because they
6
7 3 believe that style to be beneficial for their students (Reeve et al., 2014). Teachers generally
8
9 4 believe that a controlling style is more effective when compared to an autonomy-supportive
10
11 5 one. This is particularly due to teachers' beliefs regarding the effectiveness of rewards to
12
13 6 motivate students (Reeve, 2009). Nevertheless, to our knowledge, no study has tested the
14
15 7 relationship between beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards and teachers' motivating style.
16
17 8 One can expect that teachers who hold this belief about the effectiveness of reward are more
18
19 9 inclined to adopt an NTS and less inclined to adopt an NSS.
20
21
22

23
24 10 Teachers could also hold distinct beliefs about whether students' ability in PE is fixed
25
26 11 or malleable. In that respect, Dweck (1999) distinguishes two theories of ability to which
27
28 12 individuals can adhere. Some see ability as a fixed quality (i.e. entity theory) – i.e. linked to a
29
30 13 gift and unlikely to change over time. Others see it as a malleable quality (i.e. incremental
31
32 14 theory), likely to evolve over time according to the effort made. The few studies carried out in
33
34 15 real (Leroy et al., 2007) or simulated (Rattan et al., 2012) classes show that such beliefs are
35
36 16 related to teachers' instructional practices. Leroy et al. (2007) show that generalist primary
37
38 17 school teachers who adhere to entity theory are inclined to rely less strongly on an autonomy-
39
40 18 supportive and more strongly on a controlling style. Rattan et al. (2012) show that teachers who
41
42 19 endorse entity (vs. incremental) theory may be more likely to evaluate students' ability upon a
43
44 20 single test score and, when the score is low, to use teaching strategies such as telling them that
45
46 21 not everyone can be talented in the subject (i.e. mathematics), assigning less homework or
47
48 22 talking about dropping the class, that is they adopt an NTS. To our knowledge, no study has
49
50 23 been carried out in the field of PE, and none has linked the teachers' theory about ability in PE
51
52 24 and self-reported NSS and NTS.
53
54
55
56
57

58 25 ***Mediating role of motivation within SDT***
59
60

1
2
3 1 A theoretical question that has been asked in three studies in secondary schools (Pelletier
4
5 2 et al., 2002; Taylor and Ntoumanis, 2007; Taylor et al., 2008) is whether the link between these
6
7 3 pressures from above, below and within, and an NSS and an NTS, may not be direct, but
8
9 4 mediated by motivational variables, such as teachers' motivation to teach. SDT conceptualizes
10
11 5 motivation in terms of a continuum of self-determination ranging from autonomous motivation
12
13 6 to controlled motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2017). Autonomous motivation, the most self-
14
15 7 determined form of motivation, is characterized by a sense of volition and approbation towards
16
17 8 specific activities and refers to two types of regulations, intrinsic motivation (i.e. the inherent
18
19 9 pleasure and interest derived from the activity) and identified regulation (i.e. the recognition of
20
21 10 the values and importance of a behavior). Controlled motivation is characterized by feelings of
22
23 11 pressure to participate in certain activities, and involves introjected regulation (i.e. internal
24
25 12 pressure such as a desire to avoid feelings of guilt and feeling better about oneself) and external
26
27 13 regulation (i.e. external pressure such as a desire to obtain rewards or to avoid criticism) (Ryan
28
29 14 and Deci, 2017).

30
31
32
33
34
35 15 Past studies show relationships between secondary teachers' self-determined motivation
36
37 16 (using a self-determination index) and their motivating style. Teachers who are more
38
39 17 autonomously motivated to teach rely more on autonomy support (e.g. Radel et al., 2010; Taylor
40
41 18 and Ntoumanis, 2007; Taylor et al., 2008), structure and/or involvement (Abos et al., 2018) and
42
43 19 use a less controlling style (Soenens et al., 2012). By contrast, teachers with controlled
44
45 20 motivation tend to rely less on autonomy support and structure and/or interpersonal
46
47 21 involvement (Abos et al., 2018; Van den Berghe et al, 2014), while they are more willing to
48
49 22 use an NTS (Van den Berghe et al., 2013). Other studies reveal links between perceived
50
51 23 pressures and teachers' motivation. For example, primary and/or secondary teachers'
52
53 24 perceptions of time constraints (Fernet et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 2008), or of pressure to display
54
55 25 authority (Pelletier et al., 2002) are negatively linked to teachers' self-determined motivation,
56
57
58
59
60

1 while students' engagement is positively linked to teachers' self-determined motivation
2 (Pelletier et al., 2002, Taylor et al., 2007, 2008). Given these results, a mediating role of
3 teachers' motivation between pressures and motivating style is expected. None of these studies
4 examine the relationship between pressures from within (e.g. teachers' beliefs about the
5 effectiveness of rewards and beliefs about the nature of students' ability) and teachers'
6 motivation.

7 ***The present study***

8 Currently, the field of research on the antecedents of teachers' (de)motivating style, albeit
9 growing rapidly, is still in its infancy. The first aim of the present study was to examine the
10 relationship between five pressures and teachers' NSS and NTS (Figure 1). The second aim
11 was to examine the mediating role of autonomous and controlled motivation in the relation
12 between pressures and teachers (de)motivating style. Since some pressures/beliefs have not
13 been studied to date, we have considered indirect as much as direct paths (full, partial or no
14 mediation). Based on previous research and SDT, our first hypothesis was that an NSS would
15 be negatively predicted and an NTS would be positively predicted by perceived time
16 constraints, pressure to display authority, students' disengagement, beliefs about the
17 effectiveness of rewards, and adherence to entity theory. Our second hypothesis was related to
18 links between pressures and teachers' motivation. When teachers experience pressures, they are
19 less likely to enjoy and value teaching and they are expected to teach because of the pressures
20 they perceive, which in turn would be related to less NSS and more NTS. The complete model
21 and assumptions are presented in Figure 1.

22 **Methods**

23 ***Participants***

24 The sample consisted of 509 French generalist primary school teachers (421 females, 88 males,
25 $M_{age} = 42.81$, $SD = 9.23$ years; range: 22-65 years old) who were assigned to teach 108 hours

1 of PE a year according to the curriculum (see recruitment protocol in the supplementary
2 material). Participants had an average experience in teaching of 16.99 years (SD = 9.95 years;
3 range: 0-44 years) and taught from kindergarten to 5th grade¹.

4 **Measures**

5 *Motivating style.* In order to assess teachers' motivating style and to reduce the burden for the
6 primary school teachers, 14 items that best reflected primary school teaching in PE were
7 adapted from the items used in the Teacher as Social Context Questionnaire (Belmont et al.,
8 1992), the Learning Climate Questionnaire (Black and Deci, 2000) and from a previously
9 validated observation tool (Reeve et al., 2004). Teachers completed seven items assessing the
10 three dimensions of an NSS (e.g. "I explain to my students the value of what there is to learn in
11 PE") and seven items assessing the three dimensions of an NTS (e.g. "In PE, to encourage my
12 students to work, I promise them rewards"; for details see Table 1 in the supplementary
13 material). Responses to all items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to
14 5 (always).

15 *Pressures and beliefs.* Five pressures were measured using 15 items (three items per dimension)
16 based on previous work (Table 1 in the supplementary material). For instance, items related to
17 time constraints (e.g. "I think there is not enough time dedicated to PE to allow my students to
18 progress as they should") were based on Taylor et al.'s (2008) work. Three dimensions were
19 created for the purposes of the present study, that is pressure to display authority (e.g. "As a
20 teacher, I am expected to manage my class"), students' (dis)engagement (e.g. "In PE, I
21 constantly need to push my students if I want them to be engaged in PE") and beliefs about the
22 effectiveness of rewards (e.g. "I think that rewards are a good way to motivate students").

¹ In French primary schools, grades are combined in learning cycles. The 1st cycle includes kindergarten, the 2nd cycle includes 1st to 3rd grades, and the 3rd cycle includes 4th to 5th grades. Of the teachers in the present study, 144 taught 1st cycle (28.3%), 155 taught 2nd cycle (30.5%), 132 taught 3rd cycle (25.9%), 77 taught 1st and 2nd cycles or taught 2nd and 3rd cycles (15.1%) and one teacher did not report her teaching grade.

1 Beliefs about students' ability (e.g. "I think that students may have a certain amount of
2 competence and I really can't do much to change it") was an adapted version of Dweck's (e.g.
3 1999) questionnaire. Teachers were asked to rate each item on a 6-point Likert scale ranging
4 from 1 (completely disagree) to 6 (completely agree).

5 *Motivation.* Primary school teachers' motivation was measured using the French version of the
6 Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers (WTMST; Fernet et al., 2008). The stem "I teach
7 PE..." was followed by 12 possible reasons/items (three for each dimension) which represent
8 teachers' intrinsic motivation (e.g. "...because I find it interesting to do"), identified regulation
9 (e.g. "... because I find it important for the academic success of my students"), introjected
10 regulation (e.g. "... because I would feel guilty not doing it"), and external regulation (e.g. "...
11 because I'm paid to do it"). Teachers rated each item on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1
12 (does not correspond at all) to 7 (corresponds completely). The composite scores for
13 autonomous and controlled motivation were calculated.

15 ***Data Analysis***

16 AMOS statistical software was used to perform the analyses. First, Confirmatory Factor
17 Analyses (CFA) were carried out to examine the factorial structure of all the scales. Structural
18 Equation Modeling (SEM) was performed to test a model in which all five antecedents were
19 entered as predictors of an NSS and an NTS (Figures 1 and 2), and another model in which
20 autonomous motivation and controlled motivation were added as mediators (Figures 1 and 3).
21 To evaluate model fit, we relied on multiple indices of fit, including the Goodness of Fit Index
22 (GFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the comparative fit index (CFI) and the root-mean-square
23 error of approximation (RMSEA). For GFI, TLI and CFI values greater than 0.90 are considered
24 acceptable and for RMSEA values equal to or less than 0.08 are considered acceptable (Marsh

1 et al., 2004). Students' age was included in the model as a controlling variable given that
2 teachers could use a different motivating style according to students' age (Taylor et al., 2009).

3

4 **Results**

5 *Preliminary analysis*

6 For reasons of brevity, the results of the CFA are not presented here but are available in Table
7 1 in the supplementary material. After inspection of the standardized loadings and modification
8 indices, and after revision of the scales, all measurement models were found to have acceptable
9 model fit. However, because of their factor loadings and the modification indices, items from
10 the "chaos" dimension were removed. Factor loadings for the remaining items were between
11 .39 and .50. Except for an NTS scale ($\alpha = .49$) all dimensions had an acceptable ($\alpha > .70$) or
12 marginally acceptable ($\alpha > .60$) internal consistency (Table 1). We retained items from the NTS
13 scale because none of them would have substantially increased the alpha coefficient if they
14 were deleted and because the factor loadings of the observed indicators on the need-thwarting
15 factor were satisfactory (i.e. $> .40$; Ford et al., 1986).

16 To increase the stability of the parameter estimates and improve the ratio of sample size
17 to estimated parameters, construct-specific parcels were created for the NSS and the NTS
18 scales. Each parcel represented unweighted average scores created by pairing stronger loading
19 items with weaker loading items from the same scale (Little et al., 2002). In line with SDT
20 principles, the two autonomous motivation subscales (i.e. intrinsic motivation and identified
21 regulation) and the two controlled motivation subscales (i.e. introjected regulation and external
22 regulation) were used as indicators of a general autonomous motivation and a general controlled
23 motivation latent variable, respectively.

24

1 *Descriptive analysis*

2 Descriptive analyses (mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach alphas) are presented in Table 1
3 and factor loadings are presented in Table 1 and Table 2 in the supplementary material. For the
4 five antecedents, the highest score was related to pressure to display authority and the lowest
5 was related to teachers' beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards. Results from correlation
6 analysis (Table 2) showed that an NSS was negatively correlated to an NTS ($r = -.20; p < .001$).
7 An NSS was correlated positively to autonomous motivation ($r = .43; p < .001$) and negatively
8 to controlled motivation, pressure to display authority, students' disengagement, belief in the
9 effectiveness of rewards and adherence to entity theory ($r_s < -.10; p_s < .032$). The inverse
10 pattern of relation was found for an NTS with a negative correlation found with autonomous
11 motivation ($r = -.16; p < .001$) and positive correlations found with controlled motivation and
12 the four previously mentioned dimensions of pressure ($r_s > .12; p_s < .009$). Time constraints
13 was the only pressure that was not related either with an NSS ($r = .05; p = .236$) or an NTS (r
14 $= .01; p = .843$) and thus was not included in further analyses. Autonomous motivation was
15 negatively related to controlled motivation, and pressure to display authority, students'
16 disengagement, belief in the effectiveness of rewards and to adherence to entity theory ($r_s < -$
17 $.11; p_s < .010$). Controlled motivation was positively correlated to pressure to display authority,
18 student disengagement, belief in the effectiveness of rewards and adherence to entity theory (r_s
19 $> .13; p_s < .004$).

20 *Results from Structural Equation Modeling*

21 Model fit for the hypothesized model 1 (Figure 2) was satisfactory ($\chi^2/df = 2.23$, GFI = .94, TLI
22 = .93, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .05). Results revealed four significant paths ($p < .05$). An NSS was
23 negatively associated with students' disengagement ($\beta = -.19$) and adherence to entity theory
24 ($\beta = -.22$). An NTS was positively associated with pressure to display authority ($\beta = .73$) and

1 beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards ($\beta = .28$). This model explained 14% of the variance
2 for an NSS and 60% of variance for an NTS.

3 Model fit for the hypothesized model 2 (Figure 3) was satisfactory ($\chi^2/df = 2.62$, GFI =
4 .92, TLI = .90, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .06). Results revealed eight significant paths² ($p < .05$).
5 The direct paths from pressure to display authority ($\beta = .73$), and from beliefs about the
6 effectiveness of rewards ($\beta = .28$) to an NTS remained significant even after the inclusion of
7 autonomous and controlled motivation. These models explained 60% of variance for an NTS,
8 32% for an NSS, 21% for autonomous motivation and 18% for controlled motivation. The
9 addition of motivation to the model improved the explained variance for the NSS (from 14% to
10 32%).

11 Results showed a direct path from pressure to display authority ($\beta = - .13$) to an NSS.
12 Bootstrap analyses showed that autonomous motivation fully mediated the relationship between
13 students' disengagement and an NSS ($\beta = - .12$) and between adherence to entity theory and an
14 NSS ($\beta = - .15$). Students' disengagement ($\beta = - .26$) and adherence to entity theory ($\beta = - .32$)
15 was negatively associated with autonomous motivation, which in turn was positively associated
16 with an NSS ($\beta = .46$). In addition, students' disengagement ($\beta = .32$) and teachers' adherence
17 to entity theory ($\beta = .11$) were positively associated with controlled motivation (See Table 3 for
18 more details), yet controlled motivation did not mediate any of the direct paths.

19 20 **Discussion**

² Results revealed 16 nonsignificant paths (age → need-supportive and need-thwarting styles, age → autonomous and controlled motivations, effectiveness of rewards → need-supportive style, effectiveness of rewards → autonomous and controlled motivations, pressure to display authority → autonomous and controlled motivations, adherence to entity theory → need-supportive and need-thwarting styles, students' disengagement → need-supportive and need-thwarting styles, controlled motivation → need-supportive and need-thwarting styles, and autonomous motivation → need-thwarting style). When age is removed from the analyses, results revealed the same remaining significant paths (effectiveness of rewards → need-supportive style, effectiveness of rewards → autonomous and controlled motivations, pressure to display authority → autonomous and controlled motivations, adherence to entity theory → need-supportive and need-thwarting styles, students' disengagement → need-supportive and need-thwarting styles, controlled motivation → need-supportive and need-thwarting styles, and autonomous motivation → need-thwarting style)

1
2
3 1 A substantial body of evidence has proved that teachers' motivating style affects students'
4
5 2 motivation and learning in PE. In order to understand why teachers adopt a (de)motivating style,
6
7 3 it is necessary to identify the antecedents of these styles. To this purpose, the aim of the current
8
9 4 study was twofold: (1) to examine the relationship between five pressures and teachers' NSS
10
11 5 and NTS and (2) to examine the mediating role of autonomous and controlled motivation in
12
13 6 these relationships.
14
15
16
17
18

19 8 ***Direct paths from pressures to an NSS***

20
21 9 Regarding pressures from above, time constraints were not related to either an NSS or an NTS.
22
23 10 This is contrary to our hypothesis and unlike findings from prior studies in secondary schools.
24
25 11 We can only speculate on the reasons for these findings. In French primary schools, teachers
26
27 12 are not required to evaluate students' learning by giving grades. Although teachers have to teach
28
29 13 skills and develop motor competences, learning can be evaluated as "acquired", "in the process
30
31 14 of being acquired", or "not acquired". Additionally, skills are developed within cycles (e.g. 1st
32
33 15 to 3rd grades represent the first cycle) not within grades, perhaps leaving more flexibility in the
34
35 16 time frame for acquiring the necessary skills and motor competences. This is different in
36
37 17 secondary schools where teachers evaluate and give grades. The findings did reveal that primary
38
39 18 teachers do feel the pressure of time constraints (Table 1). Yet, this time pressure could be due
40
41 19 to the fact that teachers feel they do not have enough time to teach PE as they sense they are
42
43 20 expected to focus on more "academic" subjects. This may explain why this pressure is not
44
45 21 related to the motivating style adopted in PE. Future studies could investigate this pressure in
46
47 22 different subjects (e.g. mathematics, the sciences) and its consequences regarding teachers'
48
49 23 motivating style in these subjects compared to PE. Given that this result is not in line with
50
51 24 previous research in secondary schools, another perspective could be to compare the relation
52
53 25 between pressures and motivating style in primary schools and secondary schools.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 As expected, students' disengagement was negatively related to an NSS. When students
4
5 2 are highly engaged in PE, teachers might be more inclined to adopt an NSS, which in turn could
6
7 3 help students to maintain or increase their engagement. By contrast, when students are
8
9 4 disengaged, teachers may be less inclined to adopt an NSS and consequently students could
10
11 5 maintain or increase their disengagement, resulting in a negative spiral. Our results are in line
12
13 6 with previous research in secondary school PE (e.g. Taylor and Ntoumanis, 2007; Taylor et al.,
14
15 7 2008; Van den Berghe et al., 2016) which shows that students' engagement (or high level of
16
17 8 self-determined motivation) and disengagement (or low level of self-determined motivation)
18
19 9 are positively and negatively related, respectively, to teachers' NSS. It is possible that students'
20
21 10 (dis)engagement could be both an antecedent and a consequence of the teacher's motivating
22
23 11 style. In other words, students' disengagement could affect teachers' motivating style which in
24
25 12 (re)turn could affect students' disengagement. Because of the present study design, a causal
26
27 13 relationship could not be clearly established. Future studies should investigate if this link is
28
29 14 reciprocal or univocal.
30
31
32
33
34

35 15 As for adherence to entity theory, results showed that this belief was negatively related
36
37 16 to an NSS. Similar to a previous study (Leroy et al., 2007), results confirm that teachers who
38
39 17 adhere to entity theory, which means that they believe that it is pointless to try to improve
40
41 18 students' competences, report that they rely less strongly on an NSS. Teachers may be less
42
43 19 inclined to support students' needs because these students are perceived as lost causes and time
44
45 20 and energy allocated to teach them can be perceived as a waste of time. Along similar lines,
46
47 21 Vermote et al. (2020) show that when high school teachers believe that school success is mainly
48
49 22 determined by differences in students' intelligence, an NSS might not be seen as functional
50
51 23 because such strategies do not influence achievement but rather interest and motivation. Two
52
53 24 prior intervention studies (Aelterman et al., 2014; Reeve and Cheon, 2016) show that teachers'
54
55 25 pressure from within can be changed through professional training. As such, it would be
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 interesting for future studies to investigate similar interventions in order to try to modify this
4
5 2 belief related to the adherence to entity theory.
6
7

8
9 3 Contrary to our hypotheses, pressure to display authority and beliefs about the
10
11 4 effectiveness of rewards were not associated with an NSS, yet these were closely linked to an
12
13 5 NTS as will be discussed in the next section.
14
15

16 6

17
18
19 7 ***Direct path from pressures to an NTS***

20
21 8 Results confirmed the expected positive relation between pressure to display authority and
22
23 9 beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards and an NTS. The fact that teachers report
24
25 10 experiencing significant pressure to display authority reinforces the findings from Taylor et al.
26
27 11 (2009)'s qualitative study: teachers attach great importance to showing to all school actors that
28
29 12 they are competent and capable of managing their class, because they are powerful and
30
31 13 authoritarian. The results of the current study add to previous work by showing this pressure
32
33 14 experienced by teachers positively relates to their engagement in an NTS.
34
35
36
37

38
39 15 In accordance with previous studies (De Meyer et al., 2016; Reeve et al., 2014), results
40
41 16 showed that one of the reasons to adopt an NTS is the belief that promising rewards is an
42
43 17 effective strategy to motivate students. Prior studies show that an intervention which aims to
44
45 18 modify teachers beliefs, e.g. aims to increase the beliefs about efficacy of an NSS, is efficient
46
47 19 and results in an increase of teachers' self-reported adoption of autonomy support (Reeve and
48
49 20 Cheon, 2016) and structure (Aelterman et al., 2014). Teachers' beliefs may be indicative of
50
51 21 teachers' acceptance or internalization of the proposed alternative way of teaching. Future
52
53 22 intervention studies including teachers' professional training could focus on modifying beliefs
54
55 23 by discussing the deleterious effects of an NTS, emphasizing the benefits of an NSS and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 explaining to teachers how to implement strategies related to this style in an effective and
4
5 2 feasible way.
6
7

8
9 3 In line with previous results which show that an NTS correlates negatively to students'
10
11 4 engagement and positively to students' disengagement or low level of self-determined
12
13 5 motivation (Sarrazin et al., 2006; Van den Berghe et al., 2016), students' disengagement
14
15 6 showed a significant positive correlation with an NTS. Yet, this association disappeared when
16
17 7 using SEM analysis, leaving two other pressures, namely the pressure to display authority and
18
19 8 beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards, as more important predictors. It is worth noting that
20
21 9 all three predictors were significantly correlated. It is thus likely that teachers experience more
22
23 10 pressure to display authority, and are more convinced of the effectiveness of rewards, when
24
25 11 they experience their students as being more disengaged.
26
27
28
29

30 12 Although the association between teachers' adherence to entity theory and an NTS was
31
32 13 in the expected direction, the strength of this association was weaker than expected. When
33
34 14 teachers believe that whatever they do a student's level won't change, they may think that being
35
36 15 need-thwarting is useless and a waste of time. Rather than adopting a more need-thwarting
37
38 16 style, teachers seem to particularly adopt a less "active" motivating style. It would be interesting
39
40 17 to also include a measure of a need-indifferent style (Vansteenkiste and Ryan, 2013). When
41
42 18 teachers adopt a need-indifferent style, they talk in a motivationally "empty" manner, they are
43
44 19 unresponsive to students' opinions and feelings or they ignore students with a low level of
45
46 20 ability and unlikely to improve. In a sport setting, a study showed that coaches' need-indifferent
47
48 21 style could affect athletes' outcomes (i.e. irrelevant thoughts, exhaustion) as much as other
49
50 22 styles (Bhavsar et al., 2019). This finding could be similar in a PE setting. Further research is
51
52 23 needed to examine the need-indifferent style, and its antecedents and consequences in a PE
53
54 24 setting.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1
4
5
6 2***Mediating role of teachers' motivation***

7 3 In the current study, we hypothesized that teachers' motivation would mediate the relationship
8 4 between the pressures experienced and their (de)motivating style. This hypothesis was only
9 5 partially confirmed. Results showed that teachers who rated their students as higher on
10 6 disengagement, or who held stronger entity beliefs, enjoyed and valued teaching less, which in
11 7 turn led them to adopt a less NSS. Such findings are in line with previous work (e.g. Abos et
12 8 al., 2018; Pelletier et al., 2002; Radel et al., 2010; Taylor and Ntoumanis, 2007; Taylor et al.,
13 9 2008), revealing that teachers' own motivation may affect the quality of their interactions with
14 10 their students. In other words, the more teachers teach PE for pleasure or because they value
15 11 teaching, the more they support students' needs, and teachers are more likely to teach for
16 12 autonomous reasons if they themselves experience less pressure. Teachers' motivation did not
17 13 mediate the relationships between pressures experienced and teachers' NTS. One would expect
18 14 controlled motivation in particular to mediate this relationship, yet controlled motivation did
19 15 not display a strong correlation with an NTS. Perhaps a different pattern of findings would
20 16 emerge if we had included amotivation in addition to controlled motivation.

17

Practical implications

18
19 Findings from the present study can help develop effective teacher training. Such
20 training can focus on pressures and can aim to modify adherence to entity theory, to highlight
21 the deleterious effect of rewards and to raise awareness of the possible reciprocal link between
22 their style and students' motivation. As intervention studies show that students can be trained
23 to adhere to incremental theory (Paunesku et al., 2015; Yeager and Walton 2011), positive
24 effects may be expected with teachers as well. According to these studies, providing

1 opportunities to participants to advise a student who thinks he/she does not have enough skills
2 to succeed could lead to an increase in adherence to incremental theory. Also, teacher training
3 could present the components of an NSS and an NTS and raise awareness of what causes the
4 adoption of these styles. This could help teachers to identify their (de)motivating style and
5 better understand why they adopt an NTS and how to modify it. The present study could also
6 be useful for school authorities and school heads as it highlights the links between teachers'
7 (de)motivating style and the pressures they experience. This can be taken into account by
8 adjusting timetables or informing teachers about effective pedagogical practices (e.g. avoiding
9 the use of rewards and acting in an authoritarian manner). Alternatively, they can use the
10 questionnaire on pressures with their teachers in order to identify the most prevalent pressures
11 and find ways to decrease them or keep them at a low level.

12 ***Strengths, limitations and future directions***

13 The present study has several strengths. First, it adds to the literature by examining a specific
14 sample, i.e. generalist primary school teachers. Few previous studies have been conducted in
15 primary schools (Leroy et al., 2007) or have distinguished primary schools from secondary
16 schools in their analyses (Fernet et al., 2012). Second, although previous studies have examined
17 pressures in isolation (e.g. Fernet et al., 2012; Pelletier et al., 2002; Taylor and Ntoumanis,
18 2007; Taylor et al., 2008), our study examined several pressures simultaneously, thereby
19 allowing us to examine whether each type of pressure is as strongly related to teachers'
20 motivating style. A third strength consisted of investigating all dimensions of teachers'
21 (de)motivating style, while previous studies predominantly focused on autonomy support and
22 did not take into account structure and involvement (e.g. Pelletier et al., 2002; Taylor and
23 Ntoumanis, 2007; Taylor et al., 2008). Finally, the present study adds to this field of research
24 by investigating both NSS and NTS. Although it is well known that an NSS and an NTS are
25 distinct processes, most previous antecedent studies have focused on the former and to date

1
2
3 1 only two studies have investigated the antecedents of an NTS (Sarrazin et al., 2006; Van den
4
5 2 Berghe et al., 2013).

6
7
8 3 Despite these strengths, some limitations must also be acknowledged. First, although
9
10 4 the sample size for the present study is comparable to sample sizes used in similar studies and
11
12 5 acceptably large for the statistical analysis conducted, it was relatively low in reference to the
13
14 6 number of teachers who were contacted. Descriptive results therefore need to be interpreted
15
16 7 with caution. It is, for instance, possible that teachers who answered the questionnaire were
17
18 8 more interested in teaching PE and were thus more autonomously motivated than teachers who
19
20 9 did not answer. Additionally, the sample is largely composed of women. Although previous
21
22 10 studies conducted in primary and/or secondary schools showed that gender is not related to
23
24 11 teachers' style (Cheon et al., 2018; Escriva-Boulley et al., 2018; Reeve et al., 2018), future
25
26 12 studies should try to increase the response rate and/or focus on including more male primary
27
28 13 school teachers.

29
30
31
32
33
34 14 Second, given the research design adopted (i.e. a cross-sectional study), it was not
35
36 15 possible to make causality inferences and thus to rule out the possibility that relationships are
37
38 16 reciprocal or influenced by uncontrolled variables. Intervention studies designed to reduce
39
40 17 teachers' pressures, to change teachers' beliefs and/or (de)motivating style should be carried
41
42 18 out in order to test the causal links between the variables.

43
44
45
46
47 19
48
49
50 20 Third, the use of self-reported measures (i.e. questionnaires) from the same source (i.e.
51
52 21 teachers) is another limitation. This raises questions about the sincerity of responses and
53
54 22 problems of shared variance. To avoid teachers' self-bias, future studies could complement data
55
56 23 from the teachers' questionnaire with data from questionnaires completed by their students or
57
58 24 with observations of their behaviors for a more comprehensive analysis.

1 Fourth, the NTS alpha coefficient was somewhat problematic. However, all the
2 hypothesized associations emerged significant in the correlation matrix and in the expected
3 direction. Also, SEM analysis takes into account the measurement errors of the measured
4 variables, thus the low internal consistency of the NTS is less of an issue. Future studies would
5 benefit from using tools whose internal consistency seems very satisfactory (e.g. Bhavsar et al.,
6 2019; Vermote et al., 2020).

7 Fifth, we did not investigate all the components of the motivational sequence presented
8 in SDT as we did not investigate teachers' amotivation, or their need satisfaction/frustration.
9 These variables could be added as mediators in addition to teachers' autonomous and controlled
10 motivations in future studies which would aim to examine the relation between pressures and
11 teachers' NSS and NTS.

12 We assumed that, as previous studies in primary school settings and in secondary school
13 settings highlighted similar motivational processes with teachers' motivating style being linked
14 with students' investment, the motivational processes we investigated
15 (pressure→motivation→style) would also be similar. Although most of our results confirmed
16 this assumption, some differences appeared (e.g. time constraints, pressure to display authority
17 and beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards and an NSS). An important difference between
18 primary and secondary school PE is that in primary PE, generalist school teachers who are often
19 not PE specialists, teach the lessons. It would be worthwhile for future studies to examine
20 whether this difference in teachers' backgrounds affects how they experience different
21 pressures.

22 Finally, our findings reveal that it is necessary to raise teachers' awareness about the
23 link between (1) their beliefs (especially related to the theory of ability), (2) the pressures they
24 may feel and their motivating style. In addition, it is necessary to raise teachers' awareness

1
2
3 1 about the link between their motivating style and students' outcomes. One way to do so is to
4
5 2 include in teachers' training empirical and theoretical knowledge as well as concrete
6
7 3 illustrations of the benefits of an NSS, the deleterious effects of an NTS and the link that
8
9 4 antecedents have with these (de)motivating styles.
10
11
12
13 5
14
15

16 **Conclusions**

17
18
19 7 The results of this study shed new light on the antecedents of primary school teachers'
20
21 8 motivating style in PE. Particularly, pressures from below (i.e. student disengagement) and
22
23 9 within (i.e. beliefs about students' ability) were related to teachers' NSS. If these students'
24
25 10 characteristics-related pressures were more prevalent, teachers valued and enjoyed teaching less
26
27 11 and were in turn less inclined to adopt an NSS. Contrary to our expectations, the pressures from
28
29 12 above (i.e. experienced time constraints, pressure to display authority) were not related to
30
31 13 primary school teachers' NSS. As for teachers' engagement in an NTS, except for time
32
33 14 constraints, results showed particularly that pressures from above (i.e. pressure to display
34
35 15 authority) and within (i.e. beliefs about the effectiveness of rewards) were positively and
36
37 16 directly related to teachers' engagement in an NTS. These results must be taken into account
38
39 17 both theoretically and from an applied perspective when developing and implementing
40
41 18 interventions aimed at changing teachers' motivating style via professional development
42
43 19 programs.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 20
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Descriptive analysis: scales, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alphas

	Scale	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation	Alpha
Need-supportive Style	1-5	1	5	3.75	.57	.78
Need-thwarting Style ³	1-5	1	3	1.42	.37	.49
Autonomous motivation	1-7	1	7	5.43	1.15	.89
Controlled motivation	1-7	1	7	3.03	1.45	.81
Time constraints	1-6	1	6	3.49	1.04	.77
Entity theory	1-6	1	6	2.73	.94	.83
Pressure to display authority	1-6	1	6	3.97	.95	.64
Effectiveness of rewards	1-6	1	5	1.91	.80	.67
Students' disengagement	1-6	1	6	2.62	1.00	.82

³ Because of their factor loadings and the modification indices, items from the "chaos" dimension were removed. Factor loadings for the remaining items were between .39 and .50.

1 Table 2. Pearson’s correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Need-supportive Style									
2. Need-thwarting Style	-.17***								
3. Autonomous motivation	.44***	-.08							
4. Controlled motivation	-.19***	.12**	-.38***						
5. Time constraints	.05	.01	.06	-.03					
6. Entity theory	-.25***	.16***	-.32***	.15***	.16***				
7. Pressure to display authority	-.10*	.26***	-.14***	.16***	.12**	.16***			
8. Effectiveness of rewards	-.20***	.37***	-.11**	.13**	.08	.24***	.16***		
9. Students’ disengagement	-.27***	.25***	-.30***	.28***	.09*	.32***	.30***	.39***	
10. Students’ age	.15***	.13**	-.01	.01	.14***	.06	.03	-.01	-.09*

2 Notes. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Peer Review

1 Table 3. Estimate, confidence interval and p-value for total, direct and indirect effect

	Total effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect
Need-supportive Style → Entity theory	-.22 (IC 95%: [-.35,-.08]; $p < .01$)	-.08 (IC 95%: [-.20, .08]; $p = .33$)	-.15 (IC 95%: [-.23,-.09]; $p < .01$)
Need-thwarting Style → Entity theory	-.04 (IC 95%: [-.21, .12]; $p = .63$)	-.02 (IC 95%: [-.21, .16]; $p = .84$)	-.02 (IC 95%: [-.08, .04]; $p = .48$)
Autonomous motivation → Entity theory	-.32 (IC 95%: [-.44,-.19]; $p = .01$)	-.32 (IC 95%: [-.44,-.19]; $p = .003$)	
Controlled motivation → Entity theory	.11 (IC 95%: [-.01, .25]; $p = .06$)	.11 (IC 95%: [-.01, .25]; $p = .06$)	
Need-supportive Style → Students' disengagement	-.19 (IC 95%: [-.33,-.01]; $p = .04$)	-.07 (IC 95%: [-.21, .01]; $p = .42$)	-.12 (IC 95%: [-.21,-.04]; $p < .01$)
Need-thwarting Style → Students' disengagement	-.11 (IC 95%: [-.34,.18]; $p = .37$)	-.11 (IC 95%: [-.35, .17]; $p = .40$)	-.01 (IC 95%: [-.07, .06]; $p = .72$)
Autonomous motivation → Students' disengagement	-.26 (IC 95%: [-.43,-.08]; $p < .01$)	-.26 (IC 95%: [-.43,-.08]; $p = .01$)	
Controlled motivation → Students' disengagement	.32 (IC 95%: [.13,.53]; $p = .01$)	.32 (IC 95%: [.13, .53]; $p = .01$)	
Need-supportive Style → Pressure to display authority	-.09 (IC 95%: [-.23, .08]; $p = .34$)	-.13 (IC 95%: [-.26, .01]; $p = .07$)	.04 (IC 95%: [-.03, .13]; $p = .27$)
Need-thwarting Style → Pressure to display authority	.73 (IC 95%: [.52, .96]; $p < .01$)	.73 (IC 95%: [.50, .95]; $p = .008$)	.01 (IC 95%: [-.01, .60]; $p = .36$)
Autonomous motivation → Pressure to display authority	.09 (IC 95%: [-.07, .26]; $p = .27$)	.09 (IC 95%: [-.07, .26]; $p = .27$)	
Controlled motivation → Pressure to display authority	-.03 (IC 95%: [-.20, .16]; $p = .83$)	-.03 (IC 95%: [-.20, .16]; $p = .83$)	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Need-supportive Style → effectiveness of rewards	.01 (IC 95%: [-.13, .16]; $p = .88$)	.03 (IC 95%: [-.09, .20]; $p = .64$)	-.02 (IC 95%: [-.11, .04]; $p = .56$)
Need-thwarting Style → effectiveness of rewards	.28 (IC 95%: [.12, .47]; $p = .004$)	.28 (IC 95%: [.11, .48]; $p = .003$)	.00 (IC 95%: [-.03, .04]; $p = .87$)
Autonomous motivation → effectiveness of rewards	-.04 (IC 95%: [-.21, .11]; $p = .63$)	-.04 (IC 95%: [-.21, .11]; $p = .63$)	
Controlled motivation → effectiveness of rewards	.12 (IC 95%: [-.03, .29]; $p = .12$)	.12 (IC 95%: [-.03, .29]; $p = .12$)	
Need-supportive Style → Autonomous motivation	.46 (IC 95%: [.32, .57]; $p < .01$)	.46 (IC 95%: [.32, .57]; $p = .005$)	
Need-thwarting Style → Autonomous motivation	.07 (IC 95%: [-.12, .26]; $p = .47$)	.07 (IC 95%: [-.12, .26]; $p = .47$)	
Need-supportive Style → Controlled motivation	-.01 (IC 95%: [-.11, .14]; $p = .99$)	-.01 (IC 95%: [-.11, .14]; $p = .98$)	
Need-thwarting Style → Controlled motivation	.03 (IC 95%: [-.11, .24]; $p = .61$)	.03 (IC 95%: [-.11, .24]; $p = .61$)	

1
2
3 **1 References**
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 2
3 Abos Á, Haerens L, Sevil, J, et al. (2018) Teachers' motivation in relation to their
4 psychological functioning and interpersonal style: A variable- and person-centered approach.
5 *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74: 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.010>
- 6 Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, Haerens,L, et al. (2019) Toward an integrative and fine-
7 grained insight in motivating and demotivating teaching styles: The merits of a circumplex
8 approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(3): 497-521.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000293>
- 10 Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, Van den Berghe L, et al. (2014) Fostering a need-supportive
11 teaching style: Intervention effects on physical education teachers' beliefs and teaching
12 behaviors. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36(6), 595-609. doi: 10.1123/jsep.2013-
13 0229
- 14 Bartholomew K J, Ntoumanis N, Mouratidis A, et al., (2018) Beware of your teaching style:
15 A school-year long investigation of controlling teaching and student motivational
16 experiences. *Learning and Instruction*, 53: 50-63. doi :10.1016/j.learninstruc.2017.07.006
- 17 Belmont M, Skinner E, Wellborn J, et al. (1992) Teacher as social context (TASC). *Two*
18 *measures of teacher provision of involvement, structure, and autonomy support* (Technical
19 Report). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester.
- 20 Bhavsar N, Ntoumanis N, Quested E, et al. (2019) Conceptualizing and testing a new
21 tripartite measure of coach interpersonal behaviors. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 44:
22 107-120

- 1
2
3 1 Black A E and Deci E L (2000) The effects of instructors' autonomy support and students'
4
5 2 autonomous motivation on learning organic chemistry: A self-determination theory
6
7 3 perspective. *Science education*, 84(6): 740–756.
8
9
10
11 4 Cheon S H, Reeve J, Lee Y, et al. (2018). Why autonomy-supportive interventions work:
12
13 5 Explaining the professional development of teachers' motivating style. *Teaching and Teacher*
14
15 6 *Education*, 69: 43-51.
16
17
18 7 De Meyer J, Soenens B, Vansteenkiste M, et al. (2016). Do students with different motives
19
20 8 for physical education respond differently to autonomy-supportive and controlling teaching?
21
22 9 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22: 72-82.
23
24 10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.06.001>
25
26
27
28 11 De Meyer J, Tallir I B, Soenens B, et al. (2014) Does observed controlling teaching behavior
29
30 12 relate to students' motivation in physical education? *Journal of Educational Psychology*,
31
32 13 106(2): 541-554. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034399>
33
34
35
36 14 Dweck C S (1999) Caution–Praise Can Be Dangerous. *American Educator*, 23(1) : 4–9.
37
38
39 15 Escriva-Boulley G, Tessier D, Ntoumanis N, et al. (2018) Need-supportive professional
40
41 16 development in elementary school physical education: Effects of a cluster-randomized control
42
43 17 trial on teachers' motivating style and student physical activity. *Sport, Exercise, and*
44
45 18 *Performance Psychology*, 7(2) : 218-234. <http://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000119>
46
47
48
49 19 Fernet C, Guay F, Senécal C, et al. (2012) Predicting intraindividual changes in teacher
50
51 20 burnout: The role of perceived school environment and motivational factors. *Teaching and*
52
53 21 *Teacher Education*, 28(4): 514-525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.013>
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Fernet C, Senécal C, Guay F, and al. (2008) The Work Tasks Motivation Scale for Teachers
4 (WTMST). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16(2): 256–279.
5
6 2
7
8 3 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305764>
9
10
11 4 Ford J K, MacCallum R C and Tait M (1986) The application of exploratory factor analysis in
12 applied psychology: A critical review and analysis. *Personnel psychology*, 39(2): 291–314.
13
14 5
15
16 6 Grolnick W S (2003) *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting*
17
18 7 *backfires*. Psychology Press.
19
20
21
22 8 Haerens L, Aelterman N, Vansteenkiste M, et al. (2015) Do perceived autonomy-supportive
23 and controlling teaching relate to physical education students' motivational experiences
24 through unique pathways? Distinguishing between the bright and dark side of motivation.
25
26 10
27
28 11 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 16: 26-36 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.08.013>
29
30
31
32 12 Haerens L, Aelterman N, Van den Berghe L, et al. (2013) Observing physical education
33 teachers' need-supportive interactions in classroom settings. *Journal of Sport and Exercise*
34
35 13
36 14 *Psychology*, 35(1): 3–17.
37
38
39
40 15 Leptokaridou E T, Vlachopoulos S P, and Papaioannou A G (2016) Experimental longitudinal
41 test of the influence of autonomy-supportive teaching on motivation for participation in
42 elementary school physical education. *Educational Psychology*, 36(7) : 1135-1156.
43
44 17
45
46 18 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2014.950195>
47
48
49
50 19 Leroy N, Bressoux P, Sarrazin P, et al. (2007) Impact of teachers' implicit theories and
51 perceived pressures on the establishment of an autonomy-supportive climate. *European*
52
53 20
54 21 *Journal of Psychology of Education*, 22(4): 529-545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173470>
55
56
57 22 Little T D, Cunningham W A, Shahar G, et al. (2002) To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring
58 the question, weighing the merits. *Structural equation modeling*, 9(2): 151–173.
59
60 23

- 1
2
3 1 Marsh H W, Hau K T, and Wen Z (2004) In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-
4
5 2 testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu
6
7 3 and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural equation modeling*, 11(3): 320–341.
8
9
10 4 Mouratidis A, Vansteenkiste M, Lens W, et al. (2008) The motivating role of positive
11
12 5 feedback in sport and physical education: Evidence for a motivational model. *Journal of Sport*
13
14 6 *and Exercise Psychology*, 30(2): 240-268. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.30.2.240>
15
16
17 7 Paunesku D, Walton G M, Romero C, et al. (2015). Mind-set interventions are a scalable
18
19 8 treatment for academic underachievement. *Psychological Science*, 26: 784–793. [https](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615571017)
20
21 9 [://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615571017](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615571017).
22
23
24 10 Pelletier L G, Séguin-Lévesque C, and Legault L (2002) Pressure from above and pressure
25
26 11 from below as determinants of teachers' motivation and teaching behaviors. *Journal of*
27
28 12 *Educational Psychology*, 94(1): 186-196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.1.186>
29
30
31 13 Radel R, Sarrazin P, Legrain P, et al. (2010) Social contagion of motivation between teacher
32
33 14 and student: Analyzing underlying processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3):
34
35 15 577-587.
36
37
38 16 Reeve J (2009) Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how
39
40 17 they can become more autonomy supportive. *Educational psychologist*, 44(3): 159-175.
41
42 18 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520903028990>
43
44
45 19 Reeve J (2016). *Autonomy-supportive teaching: What it is, how to do it. In Building*
46
47 20 *autonomous learners* (pp. 129-152). Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-630-0_7)
48
49 21 [287-630-0_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-630-0_7)
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Reeve J and Cheon S H (2016) Teachers become more autonomy supportive after they
4
5 2 believe it is easy to do. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22: 178–189.
6
7 3 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.08.0011469-0292/>
8
9
10
11 4 Reeve J, Jang H R, and Jang H (2018) Personality-based antecedents of teachers' autonomy-
12
13 5 supportive and controlling motivating styles. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 62: 12-22.
14
15
16 6 Reeve J, Vansteenkiste M, Assor A, et al. (2014) The beliefs that underlie autonomy-
17
18 7 supportive and controlling teaching: A multinational investigation. *Motivation and Emotion*,
19
20 8 38(1): 93–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-013-9367-0>
21
22
23
24 9 Roth G, Assor A, Maymon K, et al. (2007) Autonomous motivation for teaching: How self-
25
26 10 determined teaching may lead to self-determined learning. *Journal of Educational*
27
28 11 *Psychology*, 99(4): 761e774. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.4.761>.
29
30
31
32 12 Ryan R M and Deci E L (2017) *Self-determination theory: Autonomy and basic psychological*
33
34 13 *needs in human motivation, social development, and wellness*. In New York: Guilford.
35
36
37 14 Sarrazin P G, Tessier D P, Pelletier L G, et al. (2006) The effects of teachers' expectations
38
39 15 about students' motivation on teachers' autonomy-supportive and controlling behaviors.
40
41 16 *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 4(3): 283–301.
42
43
44
45 17 Skinner E A and Belmont M J (1993) Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of
46
47 18 teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational*
48
49 19 *Psychology*, 85(4): 571-581. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.85.4.571>
50
51
52
53 20 Skinner E and Edge K (2002) Parenting, Motivation, and the Development of Children's
54
55 21 Coping. *Agency, motivation, and the life course*, 48: 77-143.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Soenens B, Sierens E, Vansteenkiste M, et al. (2012) Psychologically controlling teaching:
4
5 2 Examining outcomes, antecedents, and mediators. *Journal of Educational Psychology*,
6
7 3 104(1): 108-120. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025742>
8
9
10
11 4 Taylor I M and Ntoumanis N (2007) Teacher motivational strategies and student self-
12
13 5 determination in physical education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(4): 747-760. doi:
14
15 6 10.1037/0022-0663.99.4.747
16
17
18 7 Taylor I M, Ntoumanis N and Smith B (2009) The social context as a determinant of teacher
19
20 8 motivational strategies in physical education. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10: 235–243.
21
22 9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.09.002>
23
24
25
26 10 Taylor I M, Ntoumanis N and Standage M (2008) Determination theory approach to
27
28 11 understanding the antecedents of teachers' motivational strategies in physical education.
29
30 12 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 30(1): 75-94.
31
32
33
34 13 Van den Berghe L, Cardon G, Tallir I, et al. (2016) Dynamics of need-supportive and need-
35
36 14 thwarting teaching behavior: The bidirectional relationship with student engagement and
37
38 15 disengagement in the beginning of a lesson. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 21(6):
39
40 16 653-670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2015.1115008>
41
42
43
44 17 Van den Berghe L, Soenens B, Vansteenkiste M, et al. (2013) Observed need-supportive and
45
46 18 need-thwarting teaching behavior in physical education: Do teachers' motivational
47
48 19 orientations matter? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(5): 650–661.
49
50 20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.04.006>
51
52
53
54 21 Van den Berghe L, Tallir I B, Cardon G, et al. (2015) Student (Dis)Engagement and Need-
55
56 22 Supportive Teaching Behavior: A Multi-Informant and Multilevel Approach. *Journal of Sport*
57
58 23 *and Exercise Psychology*, 37(4): 353-366. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2014-0150>
59
60

- 1
2
3 1 Van den Berghe L, Vansteenkiste M, Cardon G, et al. (2014) Research on self-determination
4
5 2 in physical education: Key findings and proposals for future research. *Physical Education and*
6
7 3 *Sport Pedagogy*, 19(1): 97-121. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2012.732563>
8
9
10 4 Vansteenkiste M and Ryan R M (2013) On psychological growth and vulnerability: Basic
11
12 5 psychological need satisfaction and need frustration as a unifying principle. *Journal of*
13
14 6 *Psychotherapy Integration*, 23(3): 263–280. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032359>
15
16
17
18 7 Vasconcellos D, Parker P D, Hilland T, et al. (2020) Self-determination theory applied to
19
20 8 physical education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational*
21
22 9 *Psychology*, 112(7): 1444–1469. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000420>
23
24
25
26 10 Vermote B, Aelterman N, Beyers W, et al. (2020) The role of teachers' motivation and
27
28 11 mindsets in predicting a (de-) motivating teaching style in higher education: a circumplex
29
30 12 approach. *Motivation and Emotion*, 44 (2): 270-294.
31
32
33
34 13 Yeager D S and Walton G M (2011) Social-psychological interventions in education: They're
35
36 14 not magic. *Review of Educational Research*, 81: 267–301.
37
38 15 <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311405999>.
39
40
41
42 16
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1 Author biographies
4
5

6 2 Geraldine Escriva-Boulley, PhD in Physical Education and promotion of physical activity,
7
8 3 Laboratory “Sport et Environnement Social”, University Grenoble-Alpes and associate
9
10 4 professor in Haute-Alsace University.
11
12

13
14 5 Leen Haerens, Associate Professor in Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy at the
15
16 6 Department of Movement and Sports Sciences, Ghent University
17
18

19 7 Damien Tessier, Associate professor at the Department of Teacher Education and member of
20
21 8 the Laboratory “Sport et Environnement Social”, University Grenoble-Alpes
22
23

24
25 9 Philippe Sarrazin, Professor of Psychology of Sport and Exercise, at the School of Human
26
27 10 Movement & Sport Sciences, « Sport et Environnement Social » Lab., Univ. Grenoble Alpes,
28
29 11 Grenoble, France. His research focuses on motivation in Physical Education, exercise and
30
31 12 sport context.
32
33

34
35 13
36
37

38 14 Acknowledgements
39
40

41 15 This study was facilitated by the educational authorities of the department of Drôme and
42
43 16 Voiron (southeast France) as well as by the union of teachers SNUipp-FSU from the French
44
45 17 departments of Drôme, Hérault, Isère, Rhône, Savoie and Haute-Savoie.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Figure 1 Hypothesized model of relations between pressures, styles and motivations
4

5 Figure 2 Results of structural equation modelling for relations between pressures and styles
6

7 Figure 3 Results of structural equation modelling for relations between pressures, styles and motivations
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46





Figure 1 Hypothesized model of relations between pressures, styles and motivations
 Note. solid line represents direct path, dashed line represents indirect path



38 Figure 2 Results of structural equation modelling for relations between pressures and styles

39 Notes. *** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$. Only significant paths are shown.

40 Time constraints was the only pressure that was not related either with need-supportive style nor with need-thwarting style and thus was not integrated
41 in further analysis




Figure 3 Results of structural equation modelling for relations between pressures, styles and motivations
 Notes. $***p < .001$, $*p < .05$. Only significant paths are shown.
 Time constraints was the only pressure that was not related either with need-supportive style nor with need-thwarting style and thus was not integrated in

1
2
3 Supplementary material
4
5

6 Recruitment protocol
7
8

9 The study was approved and supported by the academic authorities based on its scientific and ethical characteristics. A total of 2512
10 primary schools were contacted by email and asked to participate in a research study about their teaching in PE. School principals were given
11 detailed information about the goals of the study and the contents of the online questionnaire. Then, they were asked to forward to their
12 colleagues the numerical link to access the questionnaire. The response rate was 4%. Participants who completed the surveys were volunteers,
13 and their anonymity was guaranteed.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 1. Items and factors loading for motivating styles and pressures

			Loading	Indices fit
Need Supportive Style	<i>Autonomy</i>	I explain to my students the value of what there is to learn in PE.	.79	$\chi^2/df = 4.51,$ GFI = .97, TLI = .91, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .08
	<i>support</i>	I explain to my students why it is important to make PE efforts.	.71	
	<i>Structure</i>	In PE, I am specific about the exercises to be performed (e. g., the purpose, instructions for completion...)	.47	
		In PE, I give advice adapted to the difficulties of my students	.55	
	<i>Involvement</i>	I provide constructive feedback to help my students progress in PE	.61	
		I am attentive to my students' frustrations when they are in difficulty in PE.	.51	
		I spend time with my students in PE	.45	
Need Thwarting Style	<i>Control</i>	When students do not want to work in PE, I use to punishment.	.43	$\chi^2/df = 1.88,$ GFI = .99, TLI = .95, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .04
	<i>Chaos</i>	In PE, to encourage my students to work, I promise them rewards	.44	
		In PE, I don't know what to teach my students.	.19	
	<i>Cold environment</i>	In PE, I sometimes I have hard time to explain the exercises	.23	
		In PE, I sometimes do favoritism.	.43	
		In PE, I sometimes make fun of students who are not perform well.	.33	
Pressures	<i>Time constraints</i>	In PE, I sometimes talk to my students in a harsh way even aggressive.	.54	
		I feel that I don't have enough time in PE to improve my students' skill as I would like.	.63	$\chi^2/df = 2.54,$ GFI = .95, TLI = .94, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .06
	I think there is not enough time dedicated to PE to allow my students to progress as they should	.73		
	<i>Entity theory</i>	I find that the duration of the PE courses does not allow me to help the students to progress as I would like.	.82	
		I consider that students' level of PE is something that does not change much.	.71	
		You can certainly teach new thing to a student in PE, but I don't think you can really change his or her overall level.	.79	
	<i>Pressure to</i>	I think that students may have a certain amount of competence and I really can't do much to change it	.86	
As a teacher, I am expected to manage my class		.61		

1			
2			
3			
4	<i>display</i>	My profession as a teacher requires me to demonstrate authority in PE.	.67
5	<i>authority</i>	"I decide and the students apply" fits quite well with my philosophy of teaching PE	.45
6		I think that rewards are a good way to motivate students	.71
7	<i>Effectiveness of</i>	In PE, I quite agree with the idea that the higher the reward expected by the student,	.80
8	<i>rewards</i>	the more motivated he or she will be.	
9		I consider that to motivate students to practice in PE, it is useful to offer them rewards.	.47
10	<i>Students'</i>	In PE, I feel that I must constantly be behind my students in order for them to practice	.80
11	<i>disengagement</i>	correctly.	
12		In PE, I feel that my students are unable to work independently.	.67
13		In PE, I constantly need to push my students if I want them to be engaged in PE	.86
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			

Confirmatory Factor analysis

Motivating style

CFA for need support showed a marginally adequate goodness-of-fit $\chi^2/df = 6.45$, GFI = .95, TLI = .86, CFI = .91, RMSEA = .10. After inspection of the standardized loadings and modification indices, covariation between two items related to how teachers take into account the students need to understand what they do and why (“In PE, I give advices which is adapted to the students’ issues” and “I explain the interest of what they learn in PE”). CFA for need support improved and showed adequate goodness-of-fit $\chi^2/df = 4.51$, GFI = .97, TLI = .91, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .08). Regarding need-thwarting, CFA showed inadequate goodness-of-fit $\chi^2/df = 8.37$, GFI = .94, TLI = .44, CFI = .63, RMSEA = .12. Two items were deleted from all further analyses because their factor loading were below .40 : “In PE I don’t know what to teach to my students” ($\beta = .29$, $p = .003$) and “In PE, sometimes I have trouble to explain what students have to do” ($\beta = .21$, $p = .006$). After deletion of these two items, and the addition of a covariation between two items that highlighted teachers behaviors related to punishments (“When students do not want to work, I punish them”, “In PE, sometimes I used an aggressive tone”), CFA showed adequate goodness-of-fit $\chi^2/df = 1.88$, GFI = .99, TLI = .95, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .04). The Cronbach coefficient assessing the internal consistency was acceptable for need-support style ($\alpha = .78$). For the NTS the coefficient was $\alpha = .49$. We retained the five remaining items because, none of them would have substantially increased the alpha coefficient if it was deleted and because their factor loadings of the observed indicators on the need-thwarting factor were satisfactory (i.e., $>.40$; Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986)

Pressures and beliefs

CFA was performed and results showed adequate goodness-of-fit ($\chi^2/df = 3.12$, GFI = .94, TLI = .91, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .07). All dimensions had an acceptable ($\alpha > .70$) or marginally acceptable ($\alpha > .60$) alpha coefficient, except for the subscale measuring teachers' beliefs with regard to the authority they display ($\alpha = .58$). The deletion of one item (i.e., "I decide and students obey, correspond quite well to my teaching philosophy in PE") improved the internal consistency ($\alpha = .64$). After deletion, CFA showed better goodness-of-fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.54$, GFI = .95, TLI = .94, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .06).

Motivation

CFA showed that one item (i.e., "... because if I don't teach PE, I will feel bad") loaded poorly on controlled motivation latent factor ($\beta = .14$; $p = .005$). Consequently, this item was deleted from all further analyses. After deletion, and addition of covariation between two items of intrinsic motivation, two item of identified regulation and two items of introjected regulation, CFA showed adequate goodness-of-fit ($\chi^2/df = 4.43$, GFI = .94, TLI = .94, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .08). Internal consistency was acceptable ($\alpha = .80$).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 2. Descriptive analysis: Loading factors for parcels

	<u>Loading</u>
Need-supportive Style	
Parcel 1	.52
Parcel 2	.65
Parcel 3	.77
Parcel 4	.86
Need-thwarting Style ¹	
Parcel 1	.48
Parcel 2	.39
Parcel 3	.61

Peer Review

¹ Because of their factors loading and the modification indices, items from the dimension “chaos” were removed. Factor loading for remaining items were between .39 and .50.