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#### Abstract

Summary.-The purposes of this study were to discover what technical and tactical actions of the young basketball players at different formative stages most prefer in practices and in games, and to asses players' satisfaction in performing in different game situations. The sample was composed of 832 basketball players in formative years registered in leagues of the Spanish Basketball Federation (49.7\% mini-basketball, 25.0\% under-14, and $25.3 \%$ under-16). Results indicate that shooting is the action that players most like to do both in games and in practices, the two game situations associated with the highest satisfaction were 5-on-5 and 3-on-3, the situation associated with the least satisfaction was 1 -on- 0 , and players preferred offense to defense.


The constructivist method revolves around the needs, priorities, and progression of the players. It is based on cognitive learning styles that attempt to create teaching and learning situations that propose distinct game situations and involves working on technique and tactical approaches (Collier, 2005; Richard \& Wallian, 2005; Turner, 2005). This method strives to have players learn and understand how to use different game actions, creating an active involvement in the players' learning process (American Sport Education Program, 2001; Collier, 2005; Hanlon, 2005; Mitchell, Oslin, \& Griffin, 2006). For this development, objectives and content must be clearly established by the coaches according to priorities, players' preferences, and players' development (Ortega, Cárdenas, Sainz de Baranda, \& Palao, 2006a, 2006b). This will allow an active participation of the players in their learning process. The purposes of this study were to find out what technical and tactical actions of the game young players at different stages of the formation process most enjoy in practices and in games, and to asses the satisfaction that players have in carrying out different game situations.

## Method

The sample was composed of 832 basketball players in formative years registered in leagues of the Spanish Basketball Federation ( $49.7 \%$ mini-basketball, $25.0 \%$ under-14, and $25.3 \%$ under-16). The Basketball Player Satisfaction Survey ("Cuestionario de Satisfacción de Jugadores de Baloncesto") was used. The questionnaire has two subscales "Players' preferences for technical and tactical actions" and "Satisfaction according to competition level." For the first, the

[^0]players indicated the action that they most liked to do (one answer permitted). For the second, the players indicated the level of satisfaction that they had for each game situation (Little, Some, Quite a bit, or A lot). This survey was designed and validated by Ortega, Olmedilla, Méndez, and Martínez (2006).

## Results and Discussion

Preferences for technical and tactical actions by these basketball players in their formative years are shown in Table 1. Preferences for game situations are shown in Table 2. Results show that shooting was the action that players most enjoy in practice and in competition in all age groups. These data confirm the theoretical proposals of many authors, who consider shooting to be the most important action of the game and the action which should receive the most attention in practices. In addition, shooting is considered to be the action that provides the most motivation and satisfaction among young players. However, these opinions are based on theoretical proposals and not on research (American Sport Education Program 2001; Hanlon, 2005; Ortega, et al., 2006a, 2006b).

The two game situations associated with highest satisfaction ratings were 5 -on- 5 and 3 -on- 3 , and with lowest satisfaction, 1 -on- 0 . These data confirm the strong preference of the young players for global situations as opposed to isolated situations. Global situations allow players to learn in constructive and reflexive ways (Collier, 2005; Richard \& Wallian, 2005; Turner, 2005).

Players preferred offense to defense. These data show the necessity for coaches of players in their formative years to dedicate more time to offense than defense. There are two reasons: this is the situation that the players like most and it most motivates them (American Sport Education Program, 2001; Ortega, et al., 2006b; Ortega, Palao, Cárdenas, Lorenzo, \& Gómez, 2007); and the learning of offensive actions in basketball requires more practice time (Graham, 2001; Grawer \& Rains, 2003; Gutman \& Finnegan, 2003).

TABLE 1
Players' Preferences For Technical and Tactical Actions (\%)

| Action | Mini-basketball |  | Under-14 |  | Under-16 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Game | Practice | Game | Practice | Game | Practice |
| Shooting | 38.9 | 40.4 | 55.6 | 50.2 | 55.4 | 54.9 |
| Dribbling | 15.0 | 19.4 | 9.3 | 14.0 | 9.9 | 13.1 |
| Rebounding | 13.8 | 10.7 | 16.1 | 12.1 | 13.6 | 8.9 |
| Passing | 10.9 | 8.0 | 6.8 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 6.1 |
| Defending | 21.5 | 21.5 | 12.2 | 14.5 | 11.7 | 16.9 |

Satisfaction According to Competition Level (\%)

| Game <br> Situation | Mini-basketball |  |  |  |  |  | Under-14 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Little | Some | Quite a bit | A lot | Little | Some | Quite a bit | A lot |  |  |  |
| 1-on-0 | 16.2 | 20.5 | 21.5 | 41.8 | 23.1 | 24.6 | 19.2 | 33.1 |  |  |  |
| 1-on-1 | 5.3 | 14.5 | 33.9 | 46.2 | 6.9 | 16.9 | 30.8 | 45.4 |  |  |  |
| 2-on-1 | 5.1 | 16.1 | 30.7 | 48.2 | 9.9 | 21.4 | 33.6 | 35.1 |  |  |  |
| 2-on-0 | 1.9 | 9.4 | 37.0 | 51.6 | 3.8 | 19.8 | 34.4 | 42.0 |  |  |  |
| 3-on-3 | 2.4 | 8.0 | 31.3 | 58.3 | 3.1 | 12.7 | 35.4 | 48.9 |  |  |  |
| 4-on-4 | 1.7 | 11.3 | 33.3 | 53.7 | 1.5 | 14.7 | 38.7 | 45.0 |  |  |  |
| 5-on-5 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 12.8 | 81.6 | 1.5 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 75.8 |  |  |  |
| Offense | .0 | 3.1 | 18.9 | 77.9 | .8 | 3.8 | 27.8 | 67.7 |  |  |  |
| Defense | 1.7 | 8.9 | 32.2 | 57.2 | 1.5 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 48.5 |  |  |  |
| Game |  |  | Under-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Situation | Little | Some | Quite a bit | A lot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 16.0 | 28.2 | 32.4 | 23.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-on-0 | 6.6 | 17.8 | 39.0 | 36.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-on-1 | 8.5 | 27.7 | 38.0 | 25.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2-on-1 | 3.8 | 22.1 | 42.3 | 31.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2-on-0 | .5 | 13.6 | 40.4 | 45.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-on-3 | 1.4 | 21.6 | 34.7 | 42.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4-on-4 | 5 | 12.7 | 25.8 | 61.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-on-5 | .5 | 30.0 | 63.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offense | .9 | 5.2 | 32.7 | 39.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Defense | 2.3 | 16.0 | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

In order to consider the needs, priorities, and progression of the players, they must implement various shooting styles and practice them often, players should take part in many, varied global situations, and priority should be given to technical-tactical content of offense as opposed to defense.
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