Ithaca College
Digital Commons @ IC

Ithaca College Theses

2001

An assessment of coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors

Nicole J. Detling
Ithaca College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.ithaca.edu/ic_theses

Part of the Sports Sciences Commons

Recommended Citation
Detling, Nicole J., "An assessment of coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors" (2001). *Ithaca College Theses.* Paper 70.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ IC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ithaca College Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ IC.

AN ASSESSMENT OF COACHES' AND ATHLETES' PERCEPTIONS OF COACHING BEHAVIORS

by

Nicole J. Detling

An Abstract

of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Exercise

and Sport Sciences at

Ithaca College

May 2001

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Greg A. Shelley

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors. Subjects included athletes (n=12) and coaches (n=2) from a Northeastern Division III intercollegiate varsity women's volleyball team. A qualitative phenomenological research design was utilized to assess athletes' and coaches' perceptions. Each athlete participated in a semi-structured interview examining her perceptions regarding coaching behaviors that were exhibited throughout the 1998-1999 competitive season. Each coach was then interviewed to analyze the extent of her agreement with the athletes' perceptions. Data were triangulated through researcher field observation notes and coaches' and athletes' weekly journals. Results indicated that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of positive coaching behaviors were similar (i.e., 94% agreement, coaches agreed with 16 out of the 17 positive behaviors identified by the athletes) while coach-athlete perceptions of negative coaching behaviors were markedly divergent (i.e., 33% agreement, coaches agreed with 5 out of 15 negative behaviors identified by the athletes). Concerning negative behaviors, coaches tended to agree with those behaviors that may have been beneficial to team success. For example, when a behavior had a positive connotation (i.e., fostered team success) coaches' and athletes' perceptions were similar. However, for those behaviors that had a negative connotation (i.e., hindered team success), coaches' and athletes' perceptions were divergent, with the athletes perceiving the coaching behaviors more negatively than the coaches.

Ithaca College
Graduate Program in Exercise and Sport Sciences
Ithaca, New York

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS

This is to certify that the Master of Science Thesis of

Nicole J. Detling

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in Exercise and
Sport Science at Ithaca College has been approved.

Thesis Advisor:

Committee Member:

Candidate:

Chair, Graduate Program
In Exercise and
Sport Sciences:

Dean of Graduate Studies:

Date: 4/22/01

AN ASSESSMENT OF COACHES' AND ATHLETES' PERCEPTIONS OF COACHING BEHAVIORS

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the

Graduate Program in Exercise

and Sport Sciences

Ithaca College

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

by

Nicole J. Detling

May 2001

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the following people, without whom the completion of this thesis would not have been possible.

Greg Shelley for believing in me even during those times I didn't believe in myself. His guidance, empowerment, encouragement, and friendship will always be with me.

Vic Mancini, my second reader, who helped guide the conceptualization of the study. He always listened to my ideas and gave valuable feedback.

Stacy Shelley who provided so much love and support throughout my time in Ithaca. She could always be counted on for a smile and a hug. I admire her in so many ways.

Beth Howland for the many long afternoons and evenings together talking about our theses and whether they would ever be completed. She was a constant source of motivation and support for me to finish this project.

The coaches and athletes who eagerly participated in this study. Their patience and friendships made this project go smoothly.

Finally, to my wonderful parents, "Padre", my hero, and "Pajama", my best friend. Without them, NOTHING would be possible. They continually keep me going, in more ways than one.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated first and foremost to Jesus Christ, my Lord and Savior. Thank you for loving me and teaching me that, with you in my life, there is nothing I cannot accomplish.

To my parents who have taught me to love the Lord and to live my life to the fullest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

DEDICATION iii

LIST OF TABLES ix

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Research Question 3

Scope of the Study 4

Delimitations 5

Limitations 5

Definitions of Terms 6

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 9

Perceptions of Coaching Behaviors 10

High School and Collegiate Levels 11

Elite Level 12

Actual Coaching Behaviors 13

Coach-Athlete Relationship 17

Athlete Satisfaction 18

Coach-Athlete Compatibility 24

Preferences for Coaching Behaviors 26

Youth Level 27

Summary 28

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES 30

Research Design 30

Role of the Pilot Study 33

Selection of Participants 34

Instrumentation 34

Researcher Field Observation Notes 34

Weekly Journals 35

Interview Guide 35

Testing Procedures 36

Researcher Field Observation Notes 36

Weekly Journals 37

Athlete Interviews 40

Coach Interviews 42

Data Analysis 44

Step I 44

Step II 45

Step III 46

Step IV 46

Step V 47

IV. RESULTS 48

Pilot Study Results 48

Head Coach Behavior Data 49

Athletes' and Head Coach's Interviews 49

Positive Behaviors 49

Negative Behaviors 57

Researcher Field Observation Notes 62

Positive Behaviors 65

Negative Behaviors 68

Athletic Trainer 70

Athletes' and Head Coach's Journals 71

Positive Behaviors 71

Negative Behaviors 74

Assistant Coach Behavior Data 77

Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Interviews 77

Positive Behaviors 77

Negative Behaviors 83

Researcher Field Observation Notes 85

Positive Behaviors 88

Negative Behaviors 89

Athletic Trainer 90

Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Journals 91

Positive Behaviors 91
Negative Behaviors 94
Ideal Coaching Behaviors 95
Athletes 95
Head Coach 100
Assistant Coach 100
Summary 100
Desirable Coaching Behaviors 103
Undesirable Coaching Behaviors 104
Ideal Coaching Behaviors 104
Research Question 105
Similarities 106
Differences 107
V. DISCUSSION 109
Desirable Coaching Behaviors 110
Undesirable Coaching Behaviors 112
Ideal Coaching Behaviors 121
Conclusion 123
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 124
Summary 124
Conclusions 125

Recommendations for Future Research 127

APPENDICES

A. Recruitment Statement -Athletes 130

B. Recruitment Statement - Coaches 131

C. Informed Consent Form - Athletes 132

D. Informed Consent Form - Coaches 134

E. Athlete Journal 136

F. Coach Journal 138

G. Interview Guide - Athletes 139

H. Interview Guide - Coaches 140

REFERENCES 141

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Identified Positive Behaviors by the Athletes and Coach	50
2.	Identified Negative Behaviors by the Athletes and Coach	51
3.	Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Head Coach, Positive Behaviors	53
4.	Identified Head Coach's Positive Behaviors by the Athletes and Head Coach	55
5.	Athletes' and Head Coach's Rank-Ordering of Positive Behaviors	56
6.	Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Head Coach, Negative Behaviors	58
7.	Identified Head Coach's Negative Behaviors by the Athletes and Head Coach	61
8.	Athletes' and Head Coach's Rank-Ordering of Negative Behaviors	63
9.	Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Assistant Coach, Positive Behaviors	79
10.	Identified Assistant Coach's Positive Behaviors by the Athletes and Assistant Coach	81
11.	Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Rank-Ordering of Positive Behaviors	82
12.	Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Assistant Coach, Negative Behaviors	84
13.	Identified Assistant Coach's Negative Behaviors by the Athletes and Assistant Coach	86
14.	Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Rank-Ordering of Negative Behaviors	87
15.	Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Athletes' Ideal Coaching Behaviors	97

16. Athletes' Identified Ideal Coaching Behaviors by Rank-Order..... 99

17. Head Coach Identified Ideal Coaching Behaviors..... 101

18. Assistant Coach Identified Ideal Coaching Behaviors..... 102

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

What characteristics constitute an ideal and effective leader? Coaches are continuously striving to answer this question. However, many coaches do not realize that their athletes may desire leadership qualities that they (coaches) do not possess. Further, athletes' perceptions of an ideal coach may be completely different from what the coach believes constitutes an ideal leader. Often, a coach will engage in a behavior for one reason, while an athlete perceives that same coach's behavior to mean something entirely different. This difference between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of leadership behaviors can be detrimental to athletes' satisfaction with their coach and ultimately athletic performance (Chelladurai, 1984; Yukl, 1971). Thus, the present study focused on conceptualizing the differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of leadership behaviors.

Anshel (1997) discussed four types of leaders: (a) authoritarian, (b) behaviorist, (c) humanist, and (d) democrat. The authoritarian leader is achievement-oriented, extremely confident, and procures a "tough love" attitude toward athletes. This leader takes complete control in a dictator fashion. The behaviorist uses rewards and consequences to mold each athlete's behavior into what the leader believes it should be. The humanistic leader is concerned with each athlete as an individual. This leader attempts to know each athlete individually and how he or she is affected by his or her environment to subsequently help meet each athlete's needs. Finally, the democratic

leader allows the athletes to be more involved in team decision making processes. Thus, decisions and conclusions are reached through coach-team communication and "team votes".

Many coaches attempt to display one or a combination of these specific leadership styles. However, it is the athletes' perceptions of their coach's leadership style that ultimately determines the type of leader and the effectiveness of the coach. Percival (1971) investigated coaching behavior perceptions of 382 Canadian athletes and 66 of their coaches. The majority of these athletes were competing at the elite level. Of the coaches interviewed, 72% believed that they had a positive coaching style while only 32% of the athletes indicated their coaches to be positive. Similarly, Bird (1977) found that collegiate volleyball coaches perceived their leadership style as socio-emotional, or focused on making sure each athlete's needs were met. In contrast, the players indicated that their coaches were more task-oriented, or focused on completing the task at hand, which was usually winning.

These studies (Bird, 1977; Percival, 1971) revealed that discrepancies exist between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors. The question then arises as to what specific behaviors coaches and athletes might disagree on. Anshel and Straub (1991) conducted an investigation to answer this question. High school and collegiate football players and their coaches were interviewed over a two year time period. These authors concentrated solely on those coaching behaviors that the athletes perceived as undesirable. Data obtained from interviewing the athletes ($n = 81$) were categorized

into seven undesirable coaching behaviors. The coaches ($n = 22$) were then asked to state their agreement or disagreement with the athletes' perceptions pertaining to engaging in those specific behaviors. Results indicated a significant disparity between the perceptions of the coaches and athletes regarding undesirable coaching behaviors. Specifically, 5 of the 22 coaches denied exhibiting any of the 7 identified behaviors. Of the remaining coaches, 13 identified with 1 behavior and only 5 identified with 2 behaviors. Not a single coach identified with more than two of the undesirable behaviors identified by the athletes.

Previous research has primarily resulted in dichotomous (yes or no) answers to the question of whether coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors are similar (Horne & Carron, 1985; Percival, 1971; Prapavessis & Gordon, 1991; Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996; Salminen, Liukkonen, & Telama, 1992; Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1978). All of these findings have indicated that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors are divergent. However, there is limited research to explain specific perceptual differences between coaches and athletes. Therefore, this study focused on conceptualizing the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors in regard to three behavioral dimensions: (a) desirable coaching behaviors, (b) undesirable coaching behaviors, and (c) ideal coaching behaviors.

Research Question

What are the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors?

Scope of the Study

This study was conducted with a Northeastern Division III intercollegiate women's varsity volleyball team. The participants included athletes ($n = 12$), their head coach ($n = 1$), and an assistant coach ($n = 1$). The researcher kept field observation notes throughout the sport season regarding the coaches' behaviors during practices and competitions. All athletes kept weekly journals regarding their perceptions of the coaches' behaviors that occurred the previous week. The coaches also kept weekly journals in which they recorded their own coaching behaviors that occurred the previous week. The primary data collection source was a semi-structured interview with each participant (i.e., athletes and coaches) during the three-week period immediately following the completion of the competitive season. A semi-structured interview guide was utilized to maintain consistency in the questions being asked to each participant. The interviews lasted between 30 and 90 minutes. All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. To ensure dependability and credibility, data were triangulated by combining the researcher's field observation notes, the weekly journals kept by each participant, and the post-season interviews. Data analysis consisted of inductive content analyses. Jackson (1995) described the inductive analysis process as:

> ...synthesize(ing) specific ideas expressed by individuals into meaningful themes which link similar ideas into a set of integrated concepts. Guiding the process is a search for patterns of similarity across the raw data themes...(p. 141).

This study was designed to identify specific similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors. By way of qualitative

methodologies, a detailed, thick description of each individual's personal perceptions of specific coaching behaviors was captured. This study is an exploratory attempt to better describe coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors, and as a result, provides a solid foundation for future investigations in this area.

Delimitations

The present study included the following delimitations:

1. Only Northeastern Division III intercollegiate varsity volleyball athletes and their coaches were interviewed.
2. Participants were members of a single team.
3. Only female athletes and female coaches participated.

Limitations

The present study included the following limitations:

1. Results are generalizable only to Northeastern Division III intercollegiate female varsity volleyball players and coaches.
2. Results are limited to the qualitative design employed in this study.
3. Results are limited by the truthfulness of the participants' responses to the interview questions.

Definitions of Terms

Coaching Behaviors - Any behavior of the coach (head and/or assistant) that was exhibited during the course of the competitive season.

Inductive Content Analysis - A systematic data analysis that allows patterns, themes, and categories to emerge from the raw data. Themes emerge out of the data rather than being decided prior to data collection and analysis (Patton, 1987).

Informal Conversational Interview - An interview style that relies entirely on the spontaneous generation of questions in the natural flow of an interaction, typically an interview that occurs as part of ongoing participant observation fieldwork (Patton, 1987). In the present study, the team's athletic trainers were interviewed using the informal, conversational style of interviewing. The data obtained from the athletic trainers was incorporated and reported with the researcher's field observation notes.

Interview Guide - A list of questions or issues that are to be explored during the course of an interview (Patton, 1987). The guide is used to ensure that the same questions are asked of all participants. A semi-structured interview guide allows individuals to express their own perspectives and experiences (Patton, 1990).

Meaning Unit - A group of identified perceptions and behaviors that are similar. This group is identified by a title or name that encompasses and exemplifies

all perceptions or behaviors within that group (Tesch, 1990).

Member Checking - A form of cross-checking the data by allowing each participant to check the accuracy and content of the information taken from her interview (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In the present study, the athletes and coaches were allowed to look over their lists of identified behaviors to correct any errors.

Peer Debriefer – A person who regularly challenges the researcher regarding the analytical process and decisions made in order to hold the researcher accountable for data management and interpretations (Jackson, 1995). Beth A. Howland, a Master's degree candidate in the Exercise and Sports Sciences Department (sport psychology concentration) at Ithaca College served as the peer debriefer for this investigation.

Perception - One's personal view or interpretation of a behavior, an event, or a situation.

Phenomenology - A form of qualitative research that focuses on descriptions of what people experience and how it is that they experience what they experience. Phenomenology asks the central question: What is the structure and essence of an experience for these people (Patton, 1990).

Qualitative Data - Data that is detailed, thick in description, in depth, and containing direct quotations capturing people's personal perspectives and experiences (Patton, 1990).

Raw Data - A quote obtained directly from a transcribed interview (Jackson, 1995).

Rigor - One's discipline, adherence, and accuracy in identifying the problem, designing the research, and analyzing the data with attention to dependability, credibility, and triangulation. It entails objectivity and conciseness on the part of the researcher (Patton, 1990; Shelley, 1998).

Study Auditor - An external examiner concerned with the systematic review of the study (Huberman & Miles, 1994). Greg A. Shelley, Ph.D., an assistant professor in the Exercise and Sport Sciences Department at Ithaca College, served as the study auditor for this research project.

Triangulation - A means of enhancing credibility by building checks and balances into a design through multiple data collection strategies. Using more than one data collection approach permits the researcher to strengthen the data (Patton, 1987). In the present study, triangulation of data was achieved through participant interviews, weekly journals kept by the participants, and researcher field observation notes.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Coaching effectiveness is largely dependent upon successful communication between the coach and the athlete. The leadership style of the coach emanates from the manner in which the coach communicates with his or her athletes. However, it is the way athletes perceive, or view, the coach's leadership style and communication techniques that determines the effectiveness of the player-coach interactions and ultimately athletes' satisfaction with their sport (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Chelladurai, 1984; Kenow & Williams, 1999; Yukelson, 1998; Yukl, 1971). Each athlete's perceptions of his or her coach's behavior, as opposed to the coach's actual behavior, determines that athlete's feelings and attitude toward the coach (Shaver, 1975).

Misunderstandings and miscommunications between the coach and his or her athletes can result in various interpersonal and relational problems. A coach's leadership behavioral intentions often do not correspond with his or her athletes' perceptions of those same leadership behaviors (Salminen et al., 1992; Smith et al., 1978). These differing perceptions regarding the coach's behaviors often result in miscommunication, which can be very detrimental to team performance. As a result, poor communication between coaches and athletes adversely affects motivation, confidence, concentration, team dynamics, and perceptions of coaching behaviors (Yukelson, 1998).

Perceptions of Coaching Behaviors

Several investigators have concluded that the perceptions of coaches and athletes regarding coaching behaviors are markedly divergent (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Horne & Carron, 1985; Percival, 1971; Prapavessis & Gordon, 1991; Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996; Salminen et al., 1992). It seems logical to expect an increase in the similarity of coaches' and athletes' perceptions with age because older athletes tend to analyze their coach more as opposed to idolizing their coach (Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996). However, perceptual discrepancies between coaches and athletes have been found from youth sport (Smith et al., 1978) to the elite sport levels (Percival, 1971). Not only have perceptions of behavior been found to be divergent (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Horne & Carron, 1985; Percival, 1971; Prapavessis & Gordon, 1991; Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996; Salminen et al., 1992), but perceptions regarding the causes of behavior have been found to contrast across gender and levels of sport (Jones & Nisbett, 1972).

Jones and Nisbett (1972) discussed the perceptual differences between the person who is performing the act (i.e., the actor, or coach) and the person who is observing the act (i.e., the observer, or athlete), particularly when the act is generally undesirable or negative. In these instances, the coach typically blames his or her negative actions on the situation or environment in which the behavior occurred. On the contrary, athletes tend to blame the coach's actions on the coach, claiming that the actions were part of the coach's personality. For example, a coach tirades through practice yelling at his athletes and forcing them to do extraneous amounts of physical activity. Later that night, the coach

may explain that his behavior was a result of a combination of the athletes' performances the previous night and that he is dealing with a lot of administrative pressure to win. The coach may say, "I don't like to run them into the ground like that, but they are forcing me to do it by the way they are playing". On the other hand, the athletes may explain their coach's behavior as a part of his personality. An athlete may say, "That's just coach. What a jerk. I can't believe they still let him coach." In essence, coaches tend to attribute their undesirable, or negative, behaviors to situational requirements, whereas athletes attribute those same behaviors to the coach's stable personal disposition (Jones & Nisbett, 1972).

High School and Collegiate Levels

As previously stated, Anshel and Straub (1991) hypothesized that there would be significant differences in perceptions of coaching behaviors by athletes and their coaches. These authors interviewed high school and collegiate football players ($n = 81$) and their coaches ($n = 22$) over a two year time period. They concentrated solely on those coaching behaviors that the athletes perceived as undesirable.

Athletes were interviewed immediately following each competitive season. Interviews consisted of three questions: (1) "identify the specific behaviors of coaches, by name, which you found unpleasant, undesirable, or ineffective", (2) "provide an example of each critical behavior", and (3) "rank order the list of undesirable behaviors from most offensive to least offensive for each coach you identified". After categorizing the data

obtained from the athletes' interviews into seven components (i.e., list of undesirable behaviors), the coaches were interviewed and asked to state their level of agreement with the athletes' perceptions (i.e., the list of undesirable behaviors outlined by the researchers). Results indicated a significant disparity between the perceptions of the coaches and the athletes pertaining to undesirable coaching behaviors.

Of the 22 coaches that participated in the study, 5 (22.7%) denied engaging in any of the 7 identified undesirable behaviors, 13 (59%) only agreed to engaging in 1 behavior, and 4 (18%) agreed to two of the behaviors. None of the 22 coaches agreed to engaging in more than 2 of the 7 listed behaviors. Therefore, it was concluded that the coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors were markedly divergent from the perceptions of their players. Further, Anshel and Straub (1991) stated that accurate perceptions of athletes are often a necessary condition for successful coach-player interaction.

Elite Level

Differing perceptions of coaches and athletes have also been found at the elite level of sport. Percival (1971) investigated perceptions of coaching behaviors of 382 Canadian athletes and 66 coaches, most of whom were competing at the elite level. The purpose was to explore how athletes perceived their coaches compared to how the coaches perceived themselves.

Of the coaches interviewed, 72% believed that they had a positive coaching style while only 32% of the athletes indicated that their coaches were positive. Percival had the

coaches and their athletes rank the coaches' effectiveness on a 10-point rating scale. On this scale, a rating of 10 signified that, in the opinion of the athlete, the coach had no major faults that spoiled his efficiency as a coach. The same scale applied to the coach's self-rating. Overall, coaches rated themselves an average rating of 7 whereas athletes rated their coaches an average rating of 4. Percival (1971) stated that this study:

> ...indicates that perhaps we (coaches) have more of a problem than we are aware of; that perhaps the image we have of ourselves and the way we are being accepted by the athletes we coach, is not necessarily an accurate one (p. 286).

In summary, these investigations have concluded that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors can be significantly different. In order to understand the underlying causes for these differences, an identification and analysis of actual coaching behaviors is needed.

Actual Coaching Behaviors

While the previous studies have shown the disparity between athletes' and coaches' perceptions regarding coaching behaviors, other researchers have used trained observers and measurement instruments (e.g., Cheffers' Adaptation of Flanders' Interaction Analysis System [CAFIAS], the Coaching Behavior Assessment System [CBAS], and the Coaching Behavior Assessment Inventory [CBAI]) to identify actual coaching behaviors (Fisher, Mancini, Hirsch, Proulx, & Staurowsky, 1982; Solomon, Striegel, Eliot, Heon, Maas, & Wayda, 1996; Wandzilak, Ansorge, & Potter, 1988). These authors have concluded that athletes tend to have a more accurate perception of

their coach's actual behaviors than the coach (Solomon et al., 1996) and that, in general, coaches' perceptions of their own behavior are significantly different than their actual behavior as recorded on measurement instruments by trained observers (Wandzilak et al., 1988). However, it is quite common for the athlete to underestimate the power of situational factors influencing the coach's behavior (e.g., athletes being punished for a poor performance the previous day) and overestimate the uniqueness of the behavior itself (e.g., attributing the behavior to the coach's personality) (Jones & Nisbett, 1972). On the other hand, coaches often ignore the role of their own biases and dispositions when responding to situations, thus resulting in a distortion or misperception of reality (Fisher et al., 1982; Jones & Nisbett, 1972; Percival, 1971).

Fisher et al. (1982) utilized the CAFIAS (Cheffers, Amidon, & Rogers, 1974) with 50 high school basketball teams to assess the relationship between coach and athlete interaction patterns, team climates, and coach and athlete perceptions of team climates. The CAFIAS allows for the observing and coding of both verbal and nonverbal coaching behaviors. The Group Environment Scale (GES) was also employed to determine the relationship between member satisfaction and group climate. Basketball practices were videotaped and trained observers coded specific coaching behaviors using the CAFIAS.

Results indicated that coaches perceived their current team climate as ideal. Whereas, athletes reported that changes needed to be made regarding almost all aspects of their team climate in order to make it ideal. Therefore, coaches perceived their team climates more favorably than their athletes. Fisher et al. (1982) stated that this disparity

could be based on the coaches' perceptions of what they, as a coach, contribute to the team, which could be a misperception of reality. It was concluded that, in order to better understand teams dynamics and climate, coaches need to assess more clearly their own, actual behaviors.

Similarly, athletes' perceptions of their coaches' feedback were examined by Solomon et al. (1996). Division I basketball coaches ($\underline{n} = 8$) and their players ($\underline{n} = 23$) were selected to participate in this study in order to assess and understand the relationship between coaches' behaviors and athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behaviors. These researchers used the CBAS (Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977) to record each coach's behaviors. The CBAS is a systematic observation tool that consists of 12 categories by which one can categorize the observed coach's behaviors. Eight of these categories represent the coach's reactive behaviors (i.e., responses directly pertaining to players' performances) while four categories represent extemporaneous behaviors (i.e., spontaneous behaviors not generated as a result of players' performances) of the coach.

The athletes' perceptions of their coaches' feedback were measured using the Athlete Post-Observation Questionnaire, which was created for the purposes of this investigation. This tool consists of seven questions directly pertaining to coaches' feedback and expectations. Answers were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale. Ultimately, this questionnaire was used to compare the athletes' perceptions of feedback to the actual feedback received (as was measured by the CBAS).

The investigators found that athletes tended to perceive coaching behavior accurately. They also concluded that their findings provided evidence that athletes' perceptions of treatment influence their impressions and opinions of their coaches. For example, if athletes perceive they are being treated fairly and in a positive manner by their coach, they are more apt to like their coach than if they perceive they are being treated in an unfair and negative manner.

In one final study, youth sport soccer coaches and their players were studied by Wandzilak et al. (1988). The purpose of this study was two-fold: (a) to determine the coaching behaviors of youth soccer coaches in game and practice settings and, (b) to compare the perceived coaching behaviors of the coaches to the actual observed coaching behaviors.

Data were collected on 17 youth soccer coaches (both males and females) by utilizing the CBAI. Coaching behaviors were observed and recorded by 32 trained observers during a total of 60 games and 69 practices. During the final week of the season, coaches and players completed questionnaires designed specifically for this study to measure perceptions of the coaches' behaviors. Specifically, the coaches' questionnaire measured their knowledge of soccer while each coach also rated his or her ability as a coach and perceptions of his or her own behaviors used in practices and games. Athlete questionnaires included an evaluation of the coach, as well as a rating of satisfaction with their participation and team solidarity (based on a 7-point Likert scale). Coaches' actual behaviors, as recorded on the CBAI, were then compared with the coaches' and athletes'

answers provided on the questionnaires.

Significant differences were reported between the coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors and their actual observed behaviors. The investigators postulated that coaches are only partially effective in perceiving their own behaviors accurately. For example, coaches believed that they encouraged players to a greater degree than what actually occurred. These researchers further stated that coaches believed that they were more supportive of their players than what was actually observed and recorded on the CBAI.

In summary, athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors are often more accurate than coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors. These perceptual discrepancies may result in poor coach-athlete communication and thus, negatively impact the coach-athlete relationship.

Coach-Athlete Relationship

"The coach who considers the opinions and feelings of athletes seems to have the best relationship with athletes" (Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996, p. 65). Both coaches and athletes are responsible for the others' behavior (Fisher et al., 1982; Smith et al., 1978). Although coaches are in the leadership position, some of their behaviors (e.g., praise, criticism, etc.) are a reaction to their athletes' behaviors (Fisher et al., 1982).

Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) studied the relationship between 68 Finnish coaches and their 400 youth athletes. Coach-athlete relationships were measured by

comparing coaches' and athletes' responses toward coaches' leadership styles as measured by the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1978, 1980). Coaches completed the self-rating version (actual) of the LSS while athletes rated their coaches on the traditional (perceived) LSS. Results revealed a significant difference between coaches' and athletes' ratings of the coaches' leadership behaviors. Similar to Percival (1971), coaches tended to evaluate themselves more positively than did their athletes. Also, athletes tended to desire a more democratic style of leadership in contrast to the autocratic behavior they perceived their coaches to exhibit. Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) stated that people have a natural tendency to overestimate their socially desirable characteristics and underestimate their socially undesirable ones. They also concluded that female coaches tend to have a more realistic self-perception and, thus, may be better able to effectively communicate with their athletes.

Athlete Satisfaction

Sport satisfaction is largely influenced by the athlete's perceived relationship with his or her coach. Those athletes who are more compatible with their coach generally report a greater overall satisfaction and positive experience with their sport (Horne & Carron, 1985).

Horne and Carron (1985) studied the compatibility between 74 coach-athlete dyads from female intercollegiate Canadian teams (volleyball = 26 dyads, basketball = 19 dyads, track and field = 13 dyads, swimming = 16 dyads). They also compared coaches'

and athletes' perceptions of coaches' behavior by using the LSS. Athletes completed the "perceived" leader behavior version of the LSS while coaches completed the "actual" version. Perception discrepancies were calculated by the differences between the athletes' scores on the "perceived" version and the coaches' scores on the "actual" version. The results revealed significant differences between coach-athlete perceptions. Specifically, on four of the five dimensions of the LSS (i.e., training, democratic, social support, and reward dimensions), coaches perceived themselves as exhibiting more of these behaviors than was perceived by their athletes. This discrepancy of perceptions was linked to athletes becoming less satisfied with their coaches' leadership behaviors. Ultimately, differing perceptions resulted in incompatible coach-athlete dyads and thus, dissatisfied athletes.

A study conducted by Laughlin and Laughlin (1994) determined that students and athletes whose perceptions of leader behaviors were similar to their teachers and coaches evaluated their teachers and coaches more favorably than did students and athletes whose perceptions were less similar. These authors studied 162 collegiate students and 12 of their teachers as well as 125 collegiate athletes and 11 of their coaches. Perceptions of leader behavior were examined using the LSS while teaching and coaching effectiveness was measured using modified versions of the Instructor Opinion Questionnaire (IOQ). Coaches and athletes answered questions on the LSS and the IOQ on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = occasionally, 4 = seldom, and 5 = never). Coaches' and athletes' responses to the LSS and IOQ were then compared. Results indicated that when

teachers' and students' perceptions of leader behaviors were similar, students considered their teachers to be more effective. Similarly, when coaches' and athletes' perceptions of the coaches' leader behaviors were similar, athletes considered their coaches to be more effective. Therefore, according to these authors, coaches would be more effective if they modified their coaching methodologies based on the perceptions, preferences, and needs of their athletes (Laughlin & Laughlin, 1994).

Schliesman (1987) examined whether athletes' satisfaction with their coaches' leadership was related to the discrepancy between their preferences for ideal leadership behaviors and perceptions of actual leadership behaviors. Participants included 40 collegiate male track and field athletes. Four assessment instruments were utilized in this study. Two forms of the LSS were included: the preferred behavior form and the perceived behavior form. The preferred behavior form assessed individual preferences for specific leadership behaviors. The perceived behavior form measured the actual leadership of the coach as perceived by the athlete. Two additional questionnaires were administered to measure athletes' satisfaction with coaches' leadership. The first of these measures was designed to determine satisfaction with leadership in general. It consisted of one question, "How satisfied are you with the leadership you received?" This measure was accompanied by a 7-point Likert scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 7 = very satisfied). The second measure consisted of five-questions designed to assess each athlete's degree of satisfaction with specific leader behaviors. This measure was accompanied by the same 7-point Likert scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 7 = very satisfied).

The results indicated that athletes' general satisfaction with leadership was related to actual scores of leadership behavior as opposed to preferred behavior scores. Thus, athlete satisfaction was derived from perceptions of their coaches' actual behaviors. Once actual coaching behaviors started to reflect athlete preferences for coaching behaviors, athlete satisfaction increased. This signifies the relevance of coaches' behavior as perceived by their athletes. Athletes who regard their coaches' behaviors favorably are more likely to experience an overall satisfaction with their sport.

In order to specify the manner in which coaches' responses affect the attitudes and behaviors of their players, Smith et al. (1978) evaluated coaches and players in little league baseball. These investigators contended that little is known about how specific coaching behaviors effect the attitudes and behaviors of their players. For the purposes of this study, the authors assumed that the players' perceptions of their coaches' behaviors ultimately determined their reactions to their coaches' behaviors.

A total of 51 male coaches and 542 players participated in this study. Several measures were used in order to most accurately quantify coach and player variables. The coach measures included: the CBAS (observation system that classifies coaching behaviors), coach recall of behaviors, coaching goals, perceived behavioral instrumentalities (self-report measures developed to assess coaches' beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions), and perception of players' motives. Player measures included: perception of coach's behaviors, attitudes toward coach and participation, attraction toward teammates (how well the athlete got along with and liked teammates), general self-esteem (measured

by Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory), and athletic self-esteem.

Low correlations were found between the coaches' and players' ratings of the coaches' behaviors, which signified a discrepancy between coaches' and players' perceptions of the coaches' behaviors. A difference was also reported between the coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors and their behaviors as recorded on the CBAS. The researchers stated that, "It is clear that the ability of coaches to give self-ratings of their behaviors that correspond with the perceptions of others is limited indeed" (Smith et al., 1978, p. 187). It was also concluded that while coaches behave in certain manners for their own particular reasons, their rationality may not be understood by their athletes. Thus, athletes often perceive behaviors differently than their coaches.

Salminen et al. (1992) stated that the leader behavior of coaches is an important factor that affects the emotional atmosphere of sport. However, this emotional atmosphere is more affected by the athletes' perceptions of their leader's behaviors. Oftentimes, coaches think they are behaving in a certain manner, while their athletes perceive their behavior differently. To study these potential differences, Salminen et al. (1992) compared athletes' perceptions of their coaches' leader behaviors to the coaches' perceptions of their own leader behaviors.

Ninety-seven coaches and 399 players (9-18 years old) were surveyed using the LSS. These authors hypothesized that: (1) there would be differences in coaches' and athletes' evaluations of leader behaviors, (2) the differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions would be greater for female coaches, and (3) differences between

coaches' and athletes' perceptions would decrease with age and maturity of athletes.

Results supported the first hypothesis, showing that athletes' and coaches' perceptions of leadership behaviors were different. Specifically, coaches evaluated themselves as more socially supportive and rewarding than did their athletes. Coaches also believed they were more informative and less autocratic than was reported by their athletes. However, the second hypothesis was not supported. No differences were found between male head coaches and their athletes and female head coaches and their athletes. The third hypothesis was only partially supported in that differences in coaches' and athletes' perceptions did decrease with increasing age of athletes, but only in instruction (i.e., athletes understood directions from their coaches better).

Salminen et al. (1992) concluded that coaches and athletes evaluate coaching behaviors differently. Similar to Percival (1971) and Salminen and Liukkonen (1996), coaches felt they were more positive than did their athletes. It was speculated that this might be due to the fact that people in general overestimate their own socially desirable features and underestimate undesirable features, which is supported by Salminen and Liukkonen (1996). Another possible explanation was that athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behaviors were narrow and restricted. The investigators concluded that if the differences between coaches' and athletes' evaluations were dependent upon the athletes' perceptions, then it could be expected that these differences would decrease with age and sport maturity. An athlete's age has been found to significantly affect his or her expectations of a coach in that mature athletes expect less social interaction and more

instruction and training than novice athletes (Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). However, as noted earlier, perceptual differences of coaching behaviors have also been found among elite athletes and their coaches (Percival, 1971).

Coach-Athlete Compatibility

Coach-player relationships in tennis were examined by Prapavessis and Gordon (1991). The purpose of this study was to investigate those variables that best predicted coach-athlete compatibility in the sport of tennis. In order to understand compatibility factors, these authors measured the differences in coaches' and athletes' perceptions of and preferences for leadership behaviors. The LSS was again used to assess coach and athlete perceptions and preferences.

Fifty-three (32 males, 20 females) Canadian elite coach-player dyads participated in this study. Athletes ranged from 12 to 25 years of age ($\underline{M}$ = 16) while coaches ranged from 25 to 40 years of age ($\underline{M}$ = 27). After consent was obtained, the LSS was administered. Discrepancy scores were then calculated by: (a) subtracting athletes' preferences for coaching behaviors from the coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors, (b) subtracting coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors from the athletes' perceptions of those behaviors, and (c) subtracting athletes' preferences for coaching behaviors from their perceptions of coaches' behaviors.

The investigators postulated that there were marked differences between how coaches perceived their own coaching behaviors and how athletes perceived their coaches'

behaviors. There was a significant difference between athletes' preferences for coaching behaviors and coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors. As results have indicated from other studies, coaches and athletes whose perceptions of leader behaviors are more similar tend to be more compatible than those coaches and athletes whose perceptions are less similar (Laughlin & Laughlin, 1994). In addition, the more compatible the coach-athlete relationship, the more satisfaction the athlete experiences with his or her sport experience (Horne & Carron, 1985; Laughlin & Laughlin, 1994; Schliesman, 1987).

Prapavessis and Gordon (1991) have suggested that future research include measuring coach and athlete relationships by using interviewing techniques. By employing a qualitative, interview design, future investigations might allow for a more descriptive measure of the exact differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions. Because investigators have found that sport satisfaction is partially derived from the coach-athlete relationship and that relationships are driven by perceptions (Kenow & Williams, 1999), it behooves researchers to uncover the etiology of perceptual differences.

Kenow and Williams (1999) examined whether athletes' perceptions and evaluations of coaching behaviors were partially determined by coach-athlete compatibility. Sixty-eight female collegiate basketball players' perceptions and evaluations of their coaches' behaviors were assessed by using the Coaching Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ; Kenow & Williams, 1992). The CBQ is a 28-item instrument with a 4-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) that asks athletes to assess their coaches' behaviors. In this study, compatibility was measured by asking athletes to rate how

compatible they thought they were with their coach (i.e., degree to which athletes' goals, personalities, and beliefs were consistent with their coach's) on a 9-point Likert scale (1 = not very compatible, 9 = highly compatible).

Results revealed that athletes who felt more compatible with their coach had more favorable perceptions of their coach (i.e., evaluated their coach's communication skills higher as well as felt more supported by the coach). Kenow and Williams (1999) stated that the way athletes perceive and evaluate their coaches' behaviors appears to be one of the best methods for predicting coach-athlete compatibility.

Preferences for Coaching Behaviors

Chelladurai, Haggerty, and Baxter (1989) studied the preferences of coaches and athletes regarding leadership styles. A total of 99 male and female players and 22 coaches of university basketball teams participated in the study. Each participant was shown 32 situations where they were asked to identify their preference for a particular leadership style. Five leadership styles were examined: (1) autocratic I - where the coach solves the problem, (2) autocratic II - where the coach obtains the necessary information from relevant players then makes the decision, (3) consultative I - where the coach consults the players individually then makes the decision, (4) consultative II - where the coach consults the players as a group and then makes the decision, and (5) group - where the coach and the players make a joint decision. The results revealed that coaches and athletes differed in their preferences in only 8 of the 32 situations. Therefore, this study revealed

considerable congruence among coaches and players in their decision style preferences. This was the first study that found an appreciable similarity between coaches' and athletes' leadership style preferences. However, this study also assessed the preferences of decision-making as opposed to overall coaching behaviors, which was the focus of the majority of the aforementioned studies comparing the preferences of coaches and athletes. Still, Chelladurai et al. (1989) reported specifically that both coaches and athletes most preferred the autocratic I style, especially when a complex problem presented itself. When a complex problem arises, it is easiest for athletes to trust that the coach will make the decision. In this case, the coach solves the problem, whereby the athletes are freed from making the decision, which if required to do so, may cause a significant amount of anxiety. Ultimately, this anxiety may hinder the sport experience as athletes will not likely be able to make a unanimous decision. This may lead to difficulties in team cohesion and performance.

Youth Level

Bortoli, Robazza, and Giabardo (1995) found significant discrepancies in what youth athletes perceived to be actual and ideal coaching behaviors. A questionnaire was administered to 240 boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 17. The purpose of this questionnaire was twofold. First, athletes were asked to evaluate their actual coaches' verbal and nonverbal behaviors before and during competition. Second, athletes were asked to identify how they would like the coach to behave before and during competition.

Results revealed that athletes were generally dissatisfied with their coaches' behaviors. Athletes also would have liked to have had better behavior from their coaches than what they experienced. However, potential reasons for this dissatisfaction and a definition of "better behavior" was not provided.

Summary

It is clear from the literature that coaches and athletes have divergent perceptions of coaching behaviors. These differences have been found from youth sport (Smith et al., 1978) to the elite sport levels (Percival, 1971). However, what is not clear from the literature, are the specifics of these perceptual differences. What coaching behaviors do coaches and athletes disagree with? With which coaching behaviors are coaches' and athletes' perceptions similar? Currently, there is a lack of information regarding the specifics of the perceptual similarities and differences between coaches and athletes.

Because coach-athlete relationships ultimately affect athletes' satisfaction with their sport (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Chelladurai, 1984; Kenow & Williams, 1999; Yukelson, 1998; Yukl, 1971) and athletes frequently drop out of sport due to dissatisfaction (Weinberg & Gould, 1999), it seems important to enhance coach-athlete relationships. Several studies have shown that coach-player relationships are affected by the differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions regarding coaching behaviors (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Chelladurai, 1984; Kenow & Williams, 1999). Therefore, it is important that researchers uncover the specific perceptual similarities and differences

between coaches and athletes in order to enhance coach-athlete satisfaction and ultimately, coach-athlete relationships.

Anshel and Straub (1991), Solomon et al. (1996), and several other investigators declared that more and different research is needed to assess athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors. For example, new methodologies for assessing these differences, as well as continued research across genders and sport levels is warranted. New methodologies should include qualitative inquiry designed to better understand coach-athlete perceptions. Qualitative research that focuses on describing what coaches and athletes experience and perceive should be followed by comparing these experiences and perceptions to uncover specific perceptual similarities and differences between coaches and athletes.

Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to conceptualize the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors. A qualitative phenomenological research design was utilized to assess and compare the perceptions of coaches ($\underline{n} = 2$) and athletes ($\underline{n} = 12$) of a Northeastern Division III intercollegiate varsity women's volleyball team. The methods and procedures used in this study with regard to the (a) research design, (b) role of the pilot study, (c) selection of participants, (d) instrumentation, (e) testing procedures, and (f) data analysis are outlined in this chapter.

Research Design

Anshel and Straub (1991) suggested that future investigations further conceptualize the relationship between coach and athlete perceptions. Coaches have the potential to be more effective leaders if their behaviors are accurately perceived and understood by their athletes. These same authors stated:

> ...coaches and athletes need to be much more cognizant of each others perceptions so that they may work more effectively together to achieve mutual goals (p. 63).

Laughlin and Laughlin (1994) suggested that if coaches were able to determine the perceptions and preferences of their athletes, they could modify their coaching styles to fit

the needs of the athletes in order to produce maximum results. In response to such statements, a qualitative phenomenological research design utilizing an in-depth, semi-structured interview format was developed to further conceptualize the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors. Phenomenology is the study of how individuals describe experiences through their own senses (Husserl, 1962). It is the study of the structure and essence of some phenomenon for each individual that is investigated. The semi-structured interview format allowed each athlete to describe her personal perceptions regarding her experiences with her volleyball coaches. This same interview format allowed the coaches to describe their own perceptions of their coaching behaviors. This design was used to expose each participant's unique experiences and perceptions regarding the aforementioned research question.

To provide strength to the research design and ensure credibility and dependability, data were triangulated. Triangulation is the use of multiple sources of information to answer a research question so that the information gained can be trusted to provide a comprehensive answer (Patton, 1990). Because each type and source of data has strengths and weaknesses, triangulation of data increases validity of the investigation (i.e., the strengths of one approach can compensate for the weaknesses of another and vice versa) (Patton, 1990). For example, one weakness of the interview portion of this study is the limitations of human memory. Because the interviews took place post-season, athletes and coaches may have had a difficult time remembering events that happened at the

beginning of the season. Thus, the weekly journals compensated for this weakness in that they were kept each week throughout the season and reflected early events as well as later events. Triangulation can also enhance the study's generalizability by using multiple sources of data to describe a phenomenon and more clearly answer the research question (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). In the present study, triangulation was achieved through: (a) the researcher's field observation notes, (b) weekly journals kept by the participants (i.e., coaches and athletes), and (c) post-season, in-depth interviews with athletes and coaches.

In answer to future research suggestions by Anshel and Straub (1991) and Solomon et al. (1996), the present study employed a phenomenological research design to provide a description of the differences, as well as the similarities, between athletes' and coaches' perceptions of coaches' behaviors. By comparing the descriptions from a variety of people who have a shared experience, one can attempt to truly grasp the essence of that experience and interpret the reality (Patton, 1990).

The phenomenological design used in the present study focused on conceptualizing the perceptual similarities and differences between coaches and athletes regarding the phenomenon of coaching behaviors. Comparing the experiences of athletes and coaches led to answering the research question: "What are the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors?"

Role of the Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted prior to the actual study. The purposes of the pilot study were to: (a) examine the methodology and procedures and make any changes deemed necessary, (b) assess and improve the researcher's interviewing skills, (c) clarify the interview guide questions and validate the accuracy for answering the research question, and (d) recognize any limitations of the study. In addition, following each pilot study interview, participants were asked to express their thoughts and feelings regarding the interview guide questions, the researcher's interview style, and overall impressions of the study.

Pilot study participants were purposively chosen due to team membership, availability to meet with the researcher (pilot study was conducted on summer break when most students/athletes had left the area), and willingness to participate. Participants included female intercollegiate varsity softball players ($n = 3$) and the assistant coach ($n = 1$) from a Northeastern Division III school. The results of the pilot study are included in Chapter 4.

Two changes in methodology were made as a result of the pilot study. First, the order of the questions on the coaches' interview guide were changed. Specifically, a series of two questions concerning, "what characteristics constitute an ideal coach," were placed at the beginning of the interview. This was to ensure that spontaneous answers were generated, which were not influenced by other questions asked throughout the interview. The second change was in response to suggestions made by two of the athletes

to keep a journal to help remember feelings and events that happened throughout the season. Thus, coaches' and athletes' weekly journals were added to the data collection procedures.

Selection of Participants

The participants were female intercollegiate varsity volleyball players and coaches from a Northeastern Division III school. Athletes ($n = 12$) and coaches ($n = 2$) were recruited and provided a recruitment statement (Appendices A and B) prior to a practice during the first week of the 1998-1999 season and given a verbal explanation of the study including what would be expected of them as participants. It was emphasized that participation was completely voluntary, all information would remain confidential, and that the participants were free to withdraw from participation at any time throughout the study without penalty. Athletes and coaches desiring participation in the study were then instructed to sign an informed consent form (Appendices C and D). The entire team ($n = 12$) and both coaches ($n = 2$) agreed to participate.

Instrumentation

Researcher Field Observation Notes

Field observation notes were kept by the researcher for the following reasons: (a) to provide the researcher with an understanding of the context within which team activities occurred, (b) to provide the researcher with firsthand experience to facilitate the

inductive, discovery-oriented approach to answering the research question, (c) to provide the researcher the opportunity to observe "things" that may escape conscious awareness of the participants, and (d) to permit the researcher to move beyond the selective perception of each participant (Patton, 1987).

Weekly Journals

Athletes kept weekly journals regarding their feelings and perceptions of their coaches' behaviors (Appendix E). Similarly, coaches kept weekly journals regarding descriptions of their own behaviors (Appendix F). Journals were completed one day each week designated by the head coach. Due to a variable game schedule, this day varied from week to week. Journal day was decided upon by the head coach at the beginning of each week. The purpose of the weekly journal was to provide the participants with a concrete description of their thoughts, feelings, and perceptions of coaching behaviors that occurred throughout the competitive season. Therefore, each participant had her own written season-long account of coaching behaviors to review prior to her individual, post season interview.

Interview Guide

Two semi-structured interview guides, one for athletes (Appendix G) and one for coaches (Appendix H), were used to explore the athletes' and coaches' perceptions of coaching behaviors. The interview guide gave the researcher an outline of questions

directly pertaining to the research question while allowing the researcher the freedom to probe, explore, and ask follow-up questions that might help clarify the participant's answers to the questions. An interview guide simply serves as a basic checklist during an interview to make sure that all relevant topics are covered (Patton, 1987).

The interview guides used in this study were constructed from a combination of (a) the pilot study, (b) a review of the existing literature pertaining directly to this subject (specifically, Anshel & Straub, 1991), (c) feedback received from 10 athletes, 10 non-athletes, and 6 coaches who reviewed the interview guides (these individuals were acquaintances of the researcher and made suggestions based on clarity of wording), (d) faculty consultations, (e) consultations with sport psychology consultants, researchers, and graduate students, and (f) the researcher's personal experience of being both a collegiate athlete and coach.

Testing Procedures

Researcher Field Observation Notes

The researcher attended as many practices and games as possible during the competitive season (i.e., a total of 14 practices and 15 games) and kept a log of her perceptions of the coaches' behaviors. Coaches and athletes were unaware of the field observation notes taken by the researcher. The purpose of this discreteness regarding the researcher field observation notes was to prevent the coaches from behaving in a more socially acceptable manner when the researcher was present. It was explained to the

participants that the researcher was spending as much time as possible with the team in order to develop individual trust and rapport. In order to maintain this covertness, the researcher took notes immediately following contact with the participants in the privacy of her own home or office.

In order to gain as much information as possible, the researcher also interviewed the team's athletic trainers concerning their perceptions of various coaching behaviors. These interviews were conducted at random times throughout the season in an informal, conversational style interview format (Patton, 1987). The information gained from these interviews was noted in the researcher's field observation notes.

In order to triangulate the researcher field observation notes, the information gained was placed on one of four separate lists: (a) head coach positive behaviors, (b) head coach negative behaviors, (c) assistant coach positive behaviors, or (d) assistant coach negative behaviors. These lists were then compared to the data obtained from the weekly journals as well as the post-season interviews.

Weekly Journals

As stated, athletes kept weekly journals regarding their feelings and perceptions of their coaches' behaviors. Similarly, coaches kept weekly journals regarding descriptions of their own behaviors. The athletes' weekly journals consisted of four questions. Two questions regarding the head coach's behaviors (one positive, one negative) and two questions regarding the assistant coach's behaviors (one positive, one negative).

Specifically, the athletes' journal questions were:

(1) List (the head coach's) behaviors of this past week that you thought were positive.

Give examples.

(2) List (the head coach's) behaviors of this past week that you thought were negative.

Give examples.

(3) List (the assistant coach's) behaviors of this past week that you thought were positive.

Give examples.

(4) List (the assistant coach's) behaviors of this past week that you thought were negative.

Give examples.

Coaches' journals consisted of two questions. One asked them to identify their own positive coaching behaviors and one asked them to identify their own negative coaching behaviors of the previous week. Specifically, the coaches' journal questions were:

(1) List your own coaching behaviors of this past week that you thought were positive.

Give examples.

(2) List your own coaching behaviors of this past week that you thought were negative.

Give examples.

Journal writing took place at the end of one practice each week designated by the head coach. The athletes, the assistant coach, and the researcher were notified of this day at the beginning of each week. This day was determined in accordance with the team's game schedule. For example, one week the journal day would be on Thursday, but the next week it would occur on Wednesday because the team schedule required them to leave town early Thursday morning. Therefore, journal days were decided upon according to the day each week that best fit the team's playing schedule.

To help assure confidentiality, at the beginning of the study, each athlete chose an identification number for her journal known only by her. Each week, participants were provided blank journals by the researcher. Upon completion of the journal, participants would write their individual identification number on the top of the journal and give the journal to the researcher. The researcher created a file for each identification number. Each week, the newly completed journal was added to the numbered, confidential file. Athletes and coaches were separated during journal writing to prevent the coaches' presence from influencing an athlete's honesty. The aforementioned journal questions also reflected similar questions that would be asked during the post-season interview with the researcher.

Individual journals were returned (i.e., journal files were placed on a table and

athletes chose their journal according to the number they had chosen at the beginning of the season) to the participants at the conclusion of the competitive season, one week prior to each athlete's and coach's individual interview. This gave the participants enough time to review journal comments and gather their season-long thoughts and feelings before their post season interviews.

In order to triangulate the participants' journals, the information gained was placed on one of four separate lists: (a) head coach positive behaviors, (b) head coach negative behaviors, (c) assistant coach positive behaviors, or (d) assistant coach negative behaviors. Each behavior also had a number placed next to it that corresponded with the number of athletes identifying that behavior. It was also noted when (i.e., the date) the behavior was written in either of the coaches' journals. These lists were then compared to the data obtained from the researcher field observation notes as well as the post-season interviews.

Athlete Interviews

Each athlete gave informed consent for her interview to be tape recorded (audio) and transcribed verbatim. All interviews took place in the three week period following the conclusion of the competitive volleyball season. Interviews occurred privately, involving only the participant and the researcher.

Due to the nature of the study and the methodology, all athletes' interviews were completed, transcribed, and analyzed before the coaches were interviewed. The interviews ranged in length from 30 to 90 minutes. Each athlete was assured of complete

confidentiality prior to the start of the interview. Interviews took place in a faculty office at Ithaca College in a quiet, closed-door, uninterrupted manner. A semi-structured interview guide (Appendix G), consisting of eight questions, was utilized for each athlete's interview. Six questions directly pertained to the athlete's perceptions of the head coach's behaviors and the assistant coach's behaviors during the recently completed season. Three of these six questions dealt with the athlete's perceptions of coaching behaviors that they perceived as positive, while the remaining three questions dealt with the athlete's perceptions of coaching behaviors that they perceived as negative. The two remaining questions asked athletes to identify and rank-order those behaviors they believed an ideal coach would display.

Athletes were first asked to identify specific head coaching behaviors that they perceived as unpleasant, undesirable, or ineffective (Question #1). Athletes were asked to list each unpleasant, undesirable, or ineffective behavior. Member checks were then performed to validate the accuracy of the data (i.e., each athlete was asked to look over the list of identified behaviors and make any changes deemed necessary). The second question asked athletes to give specific examples of each identified behavior (Question #2). After all negative behaviors had been identified and examples had been provided, athletes were then asked to rank-order their negative behavior list beginning with the most undesirable behavior (Question #3). The remaining three questions followed the same pattern. However, these questions asked athletes to identify coaching behaviors that they found to be pleasant, desirable, or effective. After specific examples

were given of the identified positive behaviors, athletes were asked to rank-order that list beginning with the most desirable behavior. These six questions were then repeated in relation to the assistant coach.

A seventh question was asked that had athletes identify ideal coaching characteristics. Again, member checks were performed to validate the accuracy of the data. Finally, the eighth question asked each athlete to rank-order the ideal characteristics list beginning with the most desirable coaching characteristic.

An inductive content analysis was performed for each interview. Inductive analysis is the "immersion in the details and specifics of the data to discover important categories, dimensions, and interrelationships" (Patton, 1990, p. 40). All athlete interview data were combined (i.e., inductively analyzed) to ultimately produce two master coaching behavior lists to be shown to each coach during her interview: a positive (desirable) behavior list and a negative (undesirable) behavior list.

Coach Interviews

Both coaches gave informed consent for their interviews to be tape recorded (audio) and transcribed verbatim. The coaches were also interviewed privately and individually. Each coach's interview guide consisted of seven questions (Appendix H). First, each coach was asked to identify and list those behavioral characteristics she believed to be possessed by an ideal coach. After those characteristics were listed, a member check was performed by that coach verifying her list of behaviors. Second, the

coach was then asked to rank-order that list beginning with the most desirable behavior. The third question asked what behavioral characteristics she believed her athletes would desire in an ideal coach. A member check was then performed to verify the accuracy of the data. The coach then rank-ordered that list beginning with the most desirable behavior. The coach was then shown her own master negative behavior list that was generated by the athletes' interviews and asked if she had engaged in any of the behaviors on that list in the recently completed competitive season. The list was not identified as being a list of negative behaviors and the coach was not told that the list came directly from her athletes. Once the coach had agreed with engaging in certain behaviors, she was asked to rank-order those identified behaviors with which she agreed, beginning with the most undesirable behavior. Once this was completed, the coach was shown her own master positive behavior list generated by the athletes' interviews and asked if she had engaged in any of the behaviors on that list in the recently completed competitive season. As before, this list was not identified as being a list of positive behaviors and the coach was not told that the list came directly from her athletes. Once the coach had agreed with engaging in certain behaviors, she was asked to rank-order those identified behaviors with which she agreed, beginning with the most desirable behavior.

Following the completion of each coach's interview, the researcher explained the study in detail, including how the coach's master lists were derived. Coaches were given ample opportunity to ask questions and discuss the methodology of the study as well as any outlined behaviors and procedures.

Data Analysis

Athletes' interviews (n = 12), coaches' interviews (n = 2), the researcher's field observation notes, and the participants' weekly journals were combined and analyzed.

Step I

The first step in the triangulation process was to analyze the athletes' interviews. All of the athletes' interviews were transcribed verbatim. The researcher then read and reread each interview individually to get a feel for it. An inductive content analysis was performed on all athletes' lists in order to produce one master positive behavior list and one master negative behavior list for each coach. Inductive content analysis allows themes and categories to emerge from the data as opposed to being decided before the data collection and analysis occurs (Patton, 1987).

Specifically, positive and negative rank-ordered lists were first extracted from each athlete's interview. Specific examples cited by the athlete to provide support for each identified behavior were then examined. All athletes' positive lists and all athletes' negative lists were compared (i.e., across participants) and categorized into meaning units. A meaning unit is a group of identified perceptions and behaviors that are similar. For example, one athlete identified a negative behavior for the assistant coach as "quiet", while another athlete identified the assistant coach as "not speaking up enough." These two behaviors, along with other similar behaviors, were combined to form the meaning unit, "quiet." In this case, the term "quiet" was a term that emerged from the data (and picked

by the researcher) that best summarized the athletes' collective thoughts, feelings, and perceptions about the assistant coach. The term "quiet" was then placed on the assistant coach's negative behavior master list.

Coaches' master lists were derived directly from the meaning units. That is, if three or more athletes (i.e., 25% of the athletes on the team) identified specific behaviors to form a meaning unit, that meaning unit was considered significant (a behavior that affected at least 25% of the team). That meaning unit name encompassed all behaviors identified within that meaning unit, and was placed on the coach's negative or positive master list.

Step II

The second step in the triangulation process was to analyze the researcher field observation notes. As previously stated, data obtained from these notes were placed on one of four lists: (a) head coach positive behaviors, (b) head coach negative behaviors, (c) assistant coach positive behaviors, or (d) assistant coach negative behaviors. These four lists were then compared to the negative or positive master lists (just described) obtained from the athletes' interviews. Those behaviors that were noted in the researcher field observation notes but were not indicated by at least 25% of the athletes during their interviews, and thus not placed on the coaches' master lists, were discarded and assumed to have not been significant. Those behaviors that were on the coaches' master lists derived from the interviews but were not noted in the researcher field observation notes, were further examined. Justifications for leaving particular behaviors on the coaches'

master lists (i.e., derived from the interviews) were made for each behavior and are outlined in the results and discussion sections.

Step III

The third step in the triangulation process was to analyze the athletes' journals. As previously stated, data obtained from the athlete journals were placed on one of four lists: (a) head coach positive behaviors, (b) head coach negative behaviors, (c) assistant coach positive behaviors, or (d) assistant coach negative behaviors. These four lists were then compared to the negative or positive master lists obtained from the athletes' interviews. Those behaviors that were noted in the athletes' journals but were not indicated by at least 25% of the athletes during their interviews, and thus not placed on the coaches' master lists, were discarded and assumed to have not been significant. Those behaviors that were on the coaches' master lists derived from the interviews but were not noted in the athletes' journals, were further examined. Justifications for leaving particular behaviors on the coaches' master lists (i.e., derived from the interviews) were made for each behavior and are outlined in the results and discussion sections.

Step IV

The coaches' interviews were then transcribed verbatim and comparisons were made between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors. This consisted of comparing the master lists derived from the athletes' interviews with the agreement or

disagreement of each behavior by the coach. For example, on the head coach's positive master list, the athletes identified the behavior of "has confidence in players." During her interview, the head coach agreed with having engaged in that particular behavior. Therefore, that behavior received a label of "agreement." Percentages were drawn to indicate the level of agreement (i.e., the percentage of behaviors with which the head or assistant coach agreed) and disagreement (i.e., the percentage of behaviors with which the head or assistant coach disagreed) between coaches and athletes. Data obtained from both coaches' individual journals were then compared to the statements each made during her interview (i.e., the four lists [head coach positive, head coach negative, assistant coach positive, assistant coach negative] gained from the coaches journals were compared to each coach's agreement or disagreement with the positive or negative coaching behaviors resulting from the coach's interview).

Step V

An inductive content analysis (i.e., across subjects) generated a master list for athletes' ideal coaching characteristics. This list was then compared with the coaches' ideal lists (as identified during their individual interviews). Inferences were drawn as to the similarities and differences regarding what athletes and coaches desired in and perceived to be an ideal coach. The outlined data analysis process led to quantitative results based on percentages of agreement and disagreement on coaching behaviors, as well as qualitative results describing each identified behavior.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The following research question was examined: "What are the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors?" The results were derived from interviews with athletes (n = 12) and coaches (n = 2), researcher field observation notes, and participants' (i.e., athletes and coaches) journals. Interviews with the athletes and coaches served as the primary data source. The researcher field observation notes produced an account of the coaches' behaviors throughout the season as perceived by the researcher. In order to achieve triangulation, these notes were compiled into four lists that were compared to and incorporated with the data obtained through the participants' interviews. Information obtained from participants' journals provided a description of each athlete's and coach's own perceptions of coaching behaviors. Data obtained from the journals were also divided into four lists that were compared to and incorporated with data obtained in the interviews, as well as data obtained from the researcher field observation notes. Thus, data triangulation was achieved through: participants' interviews, researcher field observation notes, and participants' journals.

Pilot Study Results

Three athletes (n = 3) and one coach (n = 1) participated in the pilot study. The pilot study only consisted of participant interviews (no researcher observation notes were

taken and participant journals were not kept). Therefore, data obtained in the pilot study were not triangulated. The same interview methods were used as were used for the present investigation. Because of the small number of athletes participating in the pilot study, all behaviors identified by the athletes were placed on the coach's master lists. A total of eight positive and five negative behaviors were placed on the coach's master lists. Table 1 contains an account of the coach's positive master list as well as the coach's indication of agreement with the behaviors identified by the athletes. Results revealed that the coach agreed with 100% (i.e., 8 of 8) of the positive behaviors identified by the athletes.

Table 2 shows an account of the negative behaviors identified by the athletes and the coach's agreement or disagreement with those behaviors. The coach agreed with 40% (i.e., 2 of 5) of the negative behaviors identified by the athletes. Therefore, he disagreed with 60% (i.e., 3 of 5) of the negative behaviors.

Head Coach Behavior Data

Athletes' and Head Coach's Interviews

Positive Behaviors

A total of 71 positive head coaching behaviors emerged from the athletes' interviews. All identified positive behaviors were categorized into meaning units (a group of identified perceptions and behaviors that are similar). A total of 14 meaning units resulted. Seventeen identified behaviors did not fit into a meaning unit. That is, 17 behaviors were identified that did not correlate with any other identified behavior. These

Table 1.
Identified Positive Behaviors by the Athletes and Coach

	Coach's Agreement	
Positive Behaviors	**Yes**	**No**
1. Kept atmosphere light with humor	X	
2. Knowledge of game	X	
3. Easy to get along with	X	
4. Did beyond what was required	X	
5. Was enthusiastic	X	
6. Committed	X	
7. Respectful of players	X	
8. Responsible	X	

Table 2.
Identified Negative Behaviors by the Athletes and Coach

	Coach's Agreement	
Negative Behaviors	**Yes**	**No**
1. Talked behind players' backs	X	
2. Had favorites and least favorites		X
3. Took sarcasm too far		X
4. Corrected players' basic techniques	X	
5. Was too rough with players		X

behaviors were discarded. Any meaning unit that had at least three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identify behaviors within that meaning unit was considered significant and subsequently placed on the head coach's master list. This resulted in nine meaning units consisting of behaviors identified by three or more athletes. Table 3 represents the list of the head coach's 9 positive behaviors as were identified by at least three athletes during their interviews and the resulting meaning units.

The master list of the head coach revealed nine positive meaning unit behaviors. When asked during her interview if she had engaged in any of the behaviors on the list during the recently completed competitive season, she agreed with nine out of nine, or 100%, of the identified positive behaviors. In other words, the head coach believed that she engaged in every positive behavior on the list. Table 4 shows the master list (list of significant meaning units) of the head coach's positive behaviors. It also depicts the head coach's agreement with each behavior identified by the athletes.

Statistics regarding the number of athletes identifying each positive behavior, average athlete rank-order of behaviors (based on perceived importance to the athletes), and the head coach's rank-order (based on perceived importance to the head coach) are presented in Table 5. The athlete rank-order was derived from the average rank-order of all athletes identifying each behavior. That is, the highest average rank-order by the athletes was given the rank-order of #1, the second highest average rank-order was given the rank-order of 2, and so on. Therefore, the higher the number, the more desirable the behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the athletes to be the most desirable behavior). The head coach was also asked to rank-order all nine of the

Table 3.
Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Head Coach, Positive Behaviors

Identified Coaching Behaviors	Positive Behaviors (Meaning Unit)
Promotes academics	
Most of the time is flexible about schoolwork, comes before volleyball	*Cares about player problems outside of volleyball*
Concerned personality off-court	
Willing to help with outside problems	
Cares about players	
Always enthusiastic, loves volleyball, affects entire life	
Has a love for the game and competition	
Good intentions in coaching, likes to coach, wants to have fun	*Has a love for the game and competition and wants to have fun*
Makes me laugh	
Fun to talk to, not as a coach	
Comfortable to be around outside of volleyball, optimistic	
Has fun with team off the court	
Dedicated to coaching	
Positive when team was winning, congratulates good play	*Emphasizes positive points of play*
Started giving more compliments after drills (personal and team)	
Very good at emphasizing the positive points after games	
Picked up intensity level of practices	
Intense drills	
Tough practices	
Harder practices	*Holds intense practices*
Makes practices more intense	
Harder practices midway through season	
Tough love	
Tough love, wake-up call	

Fights for the team, good motivator Positive motivation Horse-n-Buggy, motivating Tries to motivate team Shows she believes in team (Horse-n-Buggy) High expectations, believes it	*Motivates team*
Could talk to her, she listens Sometimes listens better Is able to communicate after emotions calm down	*Listens to players*
Has confidence in me Tells players things that boost confidence More freedom at end of year, confidence	*Has confidence in players*
Always trying to think of different things that would make it work, make herself better Thinks of different angles to improve Lots of good ideas for working on something specific Inspirational video Showed film, different approach	*Tries different approaches to make things work*
Explains her actions Apologizes to players for her actions, words Apologizes and explains herself in front of team	*Explains actions*

Table 4.
Identified Head Coach's Positive Behaviors by the Athletes and Head Coach

Head Coach - Positive Behaviors	Coach's Agreement	
	Yes	No
1. Cares about player problems outside of volleyball.	X	
2. Has a love for the game and competition and wants to have fun	X	
3. Emphasizes positive points of play	X	
4. Holds intense practices	X	
5. Motivates team	X	
6. Listens to players	X	
7. Has confidence in players	X	
8. Tries different approaches to make things work	X	
9. Explains actions	X	

Table 5.
Athletes' and Head Coach's Rank-Ordering of Positive Behaviors

Athlete Rank-Order (no. of athletes; avg.)	**Coach Rank-Order**
1. Motivates team (6 athletes; avg. 2.33)*	1. Has confidence in players
2. Has confidence in players (3 athletes; avg. 2.33)*	2. Listens to players
3. Listens to players (3 athletes; avg. 3.00)	3. Emphasizes positive points of play
4. Holds intense practices (8 athletes; avg. 3.25)	4. Cares about player problems outside of volleyball
5. Explains actions (3 athletes; avg. 3.33)	5. Tries different approaches to make things work
6. Tries different approaches to make things work (4 athletes; avg. 3.40)	6. Motivates team
7. Cares about player problems outside of volleyball (3 athletes; avg. 3.60)	7. Has a love for the game and competition and wants to have fun
8. Has a love for the game and competition and wants to have fun (4 athletes; avg. 4.75)	8. Holds intense practices
9. Emphasizes positive points of play (3 athletes; avg. 5.66)	9. Explains actions

*Although "motivates team" and "has confidence in players" have the same average rank-order, "motivates team" was rank-ordered higher (more desirable), as number 1. This was due to the number of athletes identifying each behavior. "Motivates team" was perceived/identified by six players whereas "has confidence in players" was perceived/identified by three athletes.

behaviors (because she was in agreement with all behaviors) beginning with the most desirable behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the head coach to be the most desirable behavior).

Negative Behaviors

A total of 86 negative head coaching behaviors emerged from the athletes' interviews. All identified negative behaviors were categorized into meaning units as previously discussed. A total of 19 meaning units resulted. Ten identified behaviors did not fit into a meaning unit. This means that 10 behaviors were identified that did not correlate with any other identified behavior. These 10 behaviors were discarded. Any meaning unit that had at least three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identify behaviors within that meaning unit was considered significant and subsequently placed on the head coach's master list. This resulted in 12 meaning units consisting of behaviors identified by 3 or more athletes. Table 6 represents a list of the head coach's negative behaviors as were identified by at least three of the athletes during their interviews and the resulting meaning units.

The negative master list of the head coach revealed 12 behaviors. When asked during her interview if she had engaged in any of the behaviors on the list during the recently completed competitive season, she agreed with 4 out of 12, or 33%, of the identified negative behaviors (see Table 7). Therefore, she disagreed with 8 out of 12, or 67%, of the identified negative behaviors. Table 7 shows the master list (list of significant meaning units) of the head coach's negative behaviors. It also depicts the head coach's

Table 6.
Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Head Coach, Negative Behaviors

Identified Coaching Behaviors	**Negative Behaviors (Meaning Units)**
Not straightforward, manipulative, plays games with players, not honest Not being honest Plays head games Plays head games Not always honest with players	*Not honest with players and plays head games*
Different expectations for players Doesn't treat players equally, different expectations Doesn't demand the same things from everyone	*Different expectations for players*
Doesn't take others' emotions into consideration Oblivious to athlete's feelings and emotions Ignorant toward people's feelings Not starting (a senior) on senior night Called (a player) a "worthless piece of crap"; devalue as a person Not playing (a senior) during last game Demeaning to players Uses a lot more negative reinforcement, demeaning, called a player "crap"	*Doesn't take players' emotions and feelings into consideration*
No second chances Doesn't show confidence in individuals Pulls players for 1 or 2 mistakes Some poor team performance decisions	*Doesn't give players second chances*

Lacks positive reinforcement, lets negative emotions out	
Does not compose body language	
Points out what was wrong without feedback to correct, just points out mistakes, no constructive criticism	*Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out*
Dwells more on negatives	
Uses a lot more negative reinforcement, demeaning, called a player "crap"	
Criticism doesn't seem as constructive, negative	
"Oh really" statements, focuses on negatives	
Focused on negatives at the beginning	
Not a good motivator, does not demand respect	*Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently*
Not consistently motivational	
Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate	
Contradicts herself	
Contradicting herself	
Inconsistent in behavior	
Not giving consistent information	*Contradictory*
Contradicts herself	
Contradictory	
Contradicts herself	
Contradicting	
Contradicts herself	
Doesn't give good feedback as to her motives	
Not explaining herself, her motives	*Doesn't explain motives*
Not explaining why she did tough love, motives	
Not productive conversations, poor communication	
Doesn't listen, selective hearing	*Defensive and has selective hearing*
Doesn't realize what she says	
Bad interpersonal skills, absentmindedness	
Defensiveness	

Talks behind players' backs	
Not confronting person she is worried about	*Talks behind players' backs*
Talks behind peoples' backs	
Talks about other peoples' business	
Tells information about other players	
Expectations after sprints in practice	
Expectations too high, punishment when players don't reach them	*Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players*
Puts pressure on people	
Puts pressure on players	
Has favorite players	
Labels individuals, negative	*Has favorite players*
Plays favorites	

Table 7.
Identified Head Coach's Negative Behaviors by the Athletes and Head Coach

	Coach's Agreement	
Head Coach - Negative Behaviors	**Yes**	**No**
1. Not honest with players and plays head games		X
2. Different expectations for players		X
3. Doesn't take players' emotions and feelings into consideration		X
4. Doesn't give players second chances		X
5. Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out	X	
6. Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently	X	
7. Contradictory		X
8. Doesn't explain motives	X	
9. Defensive and has selective hearing		X
10. Talks behind players' backs*	X	
11. Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players		X
12. Has favorite players		X

*The head coach asked to rephrase the wording of this behavior to read, "Goes to teammates of player with problem to attempt to help them or solve problem without violating coach-player trust."

agreement or disagreement with each behavior identified by the athletes.

Statistics regarding the number of athletes identifying each negative behavior, average athlete rank-order of behaviors (based on perceived importance to the athletes), and head coach's rank-order (based on perceived importance to the head coach) are presented in Table 8. The athlete rank-order was derived from the average rank-order of all athletes identifying each behavior. That is, the highest average rank-order by the athletes was given the rank-order of number 1, the second highest average rank-order was given the rank-order of 2, and so on. Therefore, the higher the number, the more undesirable the behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the athletes to be the most undesirable behavior). The head coach was only asked to rank-order those behaviors that she identified as her own from the previous season beginning with the most undesirable behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the head coach to be the most undesirable behavior).

Researcher Field Observation Notes

Researcher field observation notes were kept throughout the season. Notes were recorded after each practice and game attended by the researcher. The purpose of the researcher observation notes was to gain an account of the coaches' behaviors from the perspective of an outside observer. The lists obtained from these notes were compared to the data obtained from the participants' interviews and the participants' journals. This allowed for another account of coaching behaviors that was compared to the information obtained through the interviews and journals.

Table 8.
Athletes' and Head Coach's Rank-Ordering of Negative Behaviors

Athlete Rank-Order (# of athletes; avg.)	**Coach Rank-Order**
1. Different expectations for players (3; avg. 1.33)	1. Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out
2. Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out (7; avg. 3.50)	2. Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently
3. Doesn't explain motives (3; avg. 3.66)	3. Doesn't explain motives
4. Doesn't give players second chances (4; avg. 3.75)	4. Talks behind players' backs
5. Doesn't take players emotions and feelings into consideration (7; avg. 3.87)	
6. Contradictory (9; avg. 4.00)*	
7. Defensive and has selective hearing (4; avg. 4.00)*	
8. Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently (3; avg. 5.00)**	
8. Has favorite players (3; avg. 5.00)**	
10. Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players (4; avg. 5.25)	
11. Not honest with players and plays head games (4; avg. 5.40)	

12. Talks behind players' backs (5; avg. 5.60)	

*Although "contradictory" and "defensive and has selective hearing" have the same average rank-order, "contradictory" was rank-ordered higher (more undesirable), as number 6. This was due to the number of athletes identifying each behavior. "Contradictory" was perceived/identified by nine athletes whereas "defensive and has selective hearing" was perceived/identified by four athletes.

**The two behaviors of "doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently" and "has favorite players" tied at number eight. Both behaviors resulted in an average rank-order of 5.00 with three athletes identifying each.

The researcher attended a total of 14 practices and 15 games from which the field observation notes were taken. The researcher also attended team dinners, team activities, and spent time with the team during road trips.

Several comparisons were made between the researcher's observations and the information (meaning units) gained from the interviews. Each of the outlined 9 positive and 12 negative head coaching behaviors are listed and comparisons drawn in relation to the researcher's observations. Rationale for keeping certain behaviors on the coaches' master lists even though the behaviors were not identified in the researcher field observation notes is outlined further in the discussion section (Chapter 5).

Positive Behaviors

Cares about player problems outside of volleyball. This behavior was not noted in the researcher field observation notes. Yet, because three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identified this behavior, it was considered significant and placed on the head coach's positive master list.

Has a love for the game and competition and wants to have fun. It was clear from the researcher field observation notes that the head coach was happy to be at practice and showed an enthusiasm for the sport of volleyball. For example, one entry read, "(She) seemed in an overly good mood today. She laughed a lot and showed an enthusiasm to be there (at practice) that appeared to rub off on players." Another entry in the researcher field observation notes stated, "(She had) everyone joking and laughing. Seemed to be a general positive attitude of the group."

Emphasizes positive points of play. At several practices and on several occasions, the head coach took time in between drills to give the players positive feedback concerning their performances.

Holds intense practices. This particular behavior was not documented in the researcher field observation notes. Yet, there was no documentation in the researcher field observation notes to refute this identified behavior. Therefore, this behavior was seen as accurate (was identified by eight athletes [i.e., 67% of the team] during interviews) and included on the head coach's positive master list.

Motivates team. Twice during the season the researcher noted the head coach to be motivational. In one of these instances, the head coach promised the team she would do a specific drill involving vigorous physical activity if the team performed well. The team won the game and the head coach kept her promise the next day in practice. A second notation of the head coach being motivational came at the end of practice the day before the team's first home tournament. The head coach gave a very motivational pre-game speech and the team responded very positively. This was shown through the enthusiasm of the players as they left the gym and was still evident before and during the tournament the following day.

Listens to players. The researcher noted this behavior after the head coach introduced a new drill into practice. It took the players time before truly understanding and correctly executing the drill. However, the head coach remained patient and allowed the players to work through the new situation. After the drill was completed, she brought the team together and asked for both positive and negative feedback. She listened and

accepted all comments from the athletes and took their comments into account when she structured the same drill the following day in practice.

Has confidence in players. On only one occasion did the researcher note the head coach showing confidence in her players. She held a team meeting where she explained her reasons behind doing a particular drill during practice one day. Although most of the team had not responded positively to the drill, the head coach informed the team that her reasons for incorporating the drill were because she believed and had confidence in them and their abilities.

Tries different approaches to make things work. The researcher noted on several occasions that the head coach consistently tried new drills to help athletes develop their skills. One note stated, "(She) introduced a new drill that (the team responded positively to)." A second citation indicated, "(She) tried something new to motivate the players, make them competitors, and get them to have more 'heart'."

Explains actions. This behavior was noted in the researcher field observation notes. At one point during the season, the assistant coach brought it to the attention of the head coach that many players on the team had not understood the reasoning behind the head coach's use of a new coaching technique. The head coach immediately called the team together for a meeting and explained her rationale for her actions. She gave the team the opportunity to ask questions and explained in further detail when asked about the philosophies behind her new coaching technique.

Negative Behaviors

Not honest with players and plays head games. This particular behavior was not noted in the researcher field observation notes. The fact that four players (i.e., 33% of the team) noted this behavior prompted it's inclusion on the head coach's negative master list.

Different expectations for players. This behavior was also not noted in the researcher field observation notes. Still, because three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) noted this behavior, it was placed on the head coach's negative master list.

Doesn't take players' emotions and feelings into consideration. It was noted in the researcher field observation notes that the head coach did not let one of the seniors play during the last game of the season, and thus her career, when it was evident that the team would lose the match. Once the team lost, their season was over. The senior sat on the end of the bench and attempted to remain positive for the rest of the team, but was visibly upset over not getting to finish her senior year, and career, on the floor.

Doesn't give players second chances. This behavior was documented in that a player had made an error near the beginning of one game by hitting the volleyball out of bounds. The head coach pulled the player out of the game and made her sit on the bench next to the head coach for the remainder of the match. This player was a starter and ordinarily played the majority of each game.

Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out. During one game in particular, two notations were made. Unfortunately, the researcher was sitting in a location where she could not hear the verbal interactions between the coaches and the players. However, the head coach's nonverbal behaviors as well as the nonverbal

reactions of the players were noted. In one instance, the head coach called a time-out and apparently said something in the huddle that resulted in six players (each player on the floor prior to the time-out) slumping their shoulders and bowing their heads. A second notation was recorded when a player missed a game-point serve. The head coach reacted by throwing her clipboard, bowing her head into her hands, and shaking her head. The player who missed the serve observed the head coach's behaviors and then bowed her head.

Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently. This behavior was not noted in the researcher field observation notes. However, there were no recordings to refute this behavior in the researcher field observation notes. Therefore, because three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identified this behavior, it was placed on the head coach's negative master list.

Contradictory. The researcher noted the occurrence of this behavior on various occasions. For example, the head coach told the players they would get to play more in the game if they could accomplish specific goals in practice. At times players would accomplish outlined goals, yet not receive more playing time.

Doesn't explain motives. This was noted on one occasion when the head coach introduced a new drill into practice. It was obvious to the researcher that the athletes did not understand the meaning behind the drill and were getting irritated and frustrated. The head coach did not explain her motives before, during, or after the drill.

Defensive and has selective hearing. The researcher noted this behavior during one practice when a player attempted to ask the head coach her reasoning for running a

particular drill. The player did not think it was the most effective drill and requested that the coach run a different one. The head coach did not appear to listen to the player or take her reasoning into account. This was evident by the head coach simply telling the player that the drill had to be done and ending the conversation.

Talks behind players' backs. Although this behavior was not noted in the researcher field observation notes, it was not refuted either. Because five athletes (i.e., 42% of the team) identified this behavior, it was considered significant and placed on the head coach's negative master list.

Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players. Again, this behavior was not documented in the researcher field observation notes. However, because four athletes (i.e., 33% of the team) identified this behavior, it was placed on the head coach's negative master list.

Has favorite players. The researcher did not note this behavior in the field observation notes. However, no data was reported to contradict this behavior either. Therefore, because three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identified this behavior, it was left on the head coach's negative master list.

Athletic Trainer

It was of particular interest to the researcher whether or not the head coach's behaviors changed due to the presence of the researcher. To better understand this possibility, the team's athletic trainer was interviewed by the researcher in an informal, conversation style interview. According to the team's athletic trainer, the researcher's

presence did not seem to have much effect on the head coach's behaviors. The athletic trainer indicated that the head coach's behavior seemed to change most in accordance with how well (win/loss record) the team was doing at that particular point in the season. Particularly if the team had won or lost the previous game. If they had won, the head coach was very positive and upbeat. If the team had lost, the head coach was negative and seemed annoyed during the majority of the practices that followed.

Athletes' and Head Coach's Journals

Each of the 9 positive and 12 negative head coaching behaviors are listed and comparisons drawn in relation to the athletes' and coaches' journals. Rationale for keeping certain behaviors on the coaches' master lists even though the behaviors were not identified in the participants' journals is outlined further in the discussion section (Chapter 5).

Positive Behaviors

Cares about player problems outside of volleyball. This behavior was referred to by one of the athletes in her journal who stated, "Caring about how I feel and checking on me." Although the coach agreed with this behavior during her interview, she did not record it in her journal.

Has a love for the game and competition and wants to have fun. Several athletes' journals reflected this behavior. Examples included, "Has fun with us", "Laughing with us, interacting with us on our level", and "She was very upbeat in practice, which made it

seem more fun." The coach agreed with this behavior during her interview, but she did not comment on engaging in this behavior in her journal.

Emphasizes positive points of play. This particular behavior was found in both the athletes' and the head coach's journals. Athlete statements included, "Positive reinforcement during drills", "She really emphasized the positive points of the game and stressed the parts of our play that is [are] coming together." The head coach remarked, "[I] Stopped a drill to positively give feedback to two players" and "I'm gradually building each player up with positive feedback for the last 1/4 of the season."

Holds intense practices. Although this behavior was not recognized in the head coach's journal, it was reflected in several athletes' journals. Athlete statements included: "Picking up intensity", "Practices have been a lot harder, but in a good sense. She is really pushing us", "The practices have been more intense", and "She increased the intensity of practices to make us work harder." Although the head coach did not record this behavior in her journal, she did agree to having intense practices during her post-season interview.

Motivates team. Data obtained from several athletes' journals supported this behavior. For example, one athlete wrote, "Pre-game motivator." Another quote from a separate athlete's journal read, "(She) set motivational goals for us this week and really worked us hard in drills, which we needed." Yet another player wrote, "She is doing things to motivate us, like trying new drills."

The head coach also addressed being motivational in her journal:

> "I asked the players to give me ways to motivate them positively in practice. Examples would be that when the players reached their goal in a drill, then we would do what they wanted. Their motivational tasks were

that my assistant and I would do a sprint or wall sits or jump drills that we have them do."

Listens to players. Examples of this behavior quoted from athletes' journals included: "Asking us how we feel about...and listening to us", "Giving us choices", and "(She is) listening better, even if it takes awhile." Although this behavior was identified by athletes in their journals, it was not reflected by any comments in the head coach's journal. However, the head coach did agree (during her interview) to engaging in this behavior throughout the season.

Has confidence in players. This behavior was also identified in the journals by several athletes as well as the head coach. Athlete statements included, "The confidence of keeping me on the starting line-up for the ... tourney" and "Showed faith in our team even when we were doubting ourselves." The coach had written in her journal, "I told the kids I believe in them."

Tries different approaches to make things work. This behavior was recognized in both the athletes' and the head coach's journals. One athlete stated, "She incorporated a new drill into our warm-up." The head coach's journal read, "[I] Did the 'Juanita' (new drill) exercise", "I introduced a new player/coach into the team. The athletes like how I use him with the team."

Explains actions. Again, this behavior was not found in the head coach's journals, but it was recorded in athlete's journals. Specific statements from athletes regarding the head coach explaining her actions were, "Explaining herself" and "I think that (she) is telling us more of what we need to know, more of why she is doing what she is doing."

During her interview, the head coach agreed that she engaged in this behavior throughout the previous competitive season.

Negative Behaviors

Not honest with players and plays head games. Several athletes identified this behavior in their journals. Examples of journal entries included, "She tells me things all the time that seem to be positive and she takes them all away in the same sentence", "Lying to me and other players", "Instead of telling us what we needed to know, she told us what she thought we wanted to hear", "Sends mixed messages about what she wants and what she expects", and "Lots of head games with the outside hitters." Unlike the athletes, the head coach did not record this behavior in her journal.

Different expectations for players. Although the head coach did not recognize this behavior in her journal, several athletes made notation of it in their journals. Specific quotations included, "Allows certain people large room for error and others little or no room for error", "At one point she set a different goal for her non primary passers which I didn't agree with. We should all be given the same respect", and "Having drastically different expectations of certain people." The head coach did not comment on this behavior in her journal.

Doesn't take players' emotions and feelings into consideration. Contrary to several athletes, the head coach did not record this behavior in her journal. Examples of athlete's journal entries were, "Called (a player) 'crap'", "(She) has to try and realize that everyone's level of mentality on the team is not the same and she criticizes girls of all ages

the same way when the younger girls are a bit more sensitive", and "Not starting (a senior) on senior night."

Doesn't give players second chances. The following statements were recorded in the athletes' journals in support of this behavior, "She makes players hesitant and cautious because if you make one mistake you're out" and "Too quick to sub, doesn't let teammates or person being subbed have the chance to pick up." The head coach did not comment on this behavior in her journal.

Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out. This particular behavior was found in both the athletes' journals and the head coach's journal. Several athletes reported this behavior in their journals with the following statements: "Is very negative", "Slamming clipboard behind bench", "She was very negative, yelling at everyone when they did something wrong and took away their confidence", "She dwells too much on the negative", "Focuses too much on negatives and hardly ever the positives", and "She made a lot of negative comments that hurt the team mentally." Statements from the head coach's journals included, "I got up from the bench in disgust after repeated position errors were made during a match" and "I dropped my clipboard in disgust when we missed game point serve."

Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently. Comments from the athletes' journals included, "She tried to use her own version of psychology on me, which often upsets me" and "She used a coaching technique that I hated. She made us fear her to motivate us. It really bothered me a lot because she picked on my person, not just on my abilities to play volleyball." The coach did not

recount this behavior in her journal. Yet, she did agree to engaging in this behavior during her interview.

Contradictory. This behavior was recorded by more athletes in their journals than any other behavior. Examples included, "Telling a player one thing and doing the other", "Telling me one thing and then actually doing the opposite", "I hate it when she contradicts herself like a while ago she told us not to pay attention to the score and just play, yet now the score is the most important thing", "There was a lot of stuff from the (tournament) weekend where she contradicts herself. At (another tournament) she expected nothing, now she expects everything", and "Contradictory, tells people to have fun and be pumped but when you are, she rudely questions why you're happy." Although most athletes on the team identified this behavior in their journals at some point during the season, the head coach did not make any reference to engaging in this behavior.

Doesn't explain motives. Again, the head coach did not record this behavior in her journal. However, many athletes perceived this behavior and made note of it in their journals. Examples included, "Lack of information about me not playing", "Kept me guessing as to the reasons for not playing", "She told me I did a good job, then sat me out, I'm confused", "She took me out of the games yesterday without explanation", "She needs to tell us stuff and explain actions, not just assume we understand."

Defensive and has selective hearing. Athlete journals contained the following quotes supporting the occurrence of this behavior: "Still needs to work on listening, some things that were heard or translated wrong she insisted were right", "Not letting me explain things", "...when I tried to tell you how it (what the coach had said) made me feel,

she thought I was complaining about playing time." The head coach did not record engaging in this behavior at any point during the season.

Talks behind players' backs. Interestingly, this particular behavior was not recorded in the head coach's journal, nor was it found in any of the athletes' journals. However, with the stipulation of rewording the behavior to "Goes to teammates of player with problem to attempt to help them or solve problem without violating coach-player trust", the coach agreed to having exhibited this behavior during the season.

Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players. Only one athlete recorded this behavior in her journal by commenting, "Makes me feel as though everything I do is wrong. She puts too much pressure on us." The head coach did not make any statements in her journal concerning this behavior.

Has favorite players. Similar to the previously reported behavior, only one athlete entered this behavior in her journal making the statement, "Pointing out specific people to point out faults." The head coach did not record engaging in this behavior in her journal.

Assistant Coach Behavior Data

Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Interviews

Positive Behaviors

A total of 56 positive assistant coaching behaviors emerged from the athletes' interviews. All identified positive behaviors were categorized into meaning units (a group of identified perceptions and behaviors that are similar). A total of 13 meaning units were formed from the athletes' identification of the assistant coach's positive behaviors with

five behaviors not fitting into a meaning unit. This indicates that five behaviors were identified that did not correlate with any other identified behavior. These five behaviors were discarded. Any meaning unit that had at least three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identify behaviors within that meaning unit was considered significant and subsequently placed on the assistant coach's master list. This resulted in eight meaning units consisting of behaviors identified by three or more athletes. Table 9 represents the list of the assistant coach's eight positive behaviors as were identified by at least three of the athletes during their interviews and the resulting meaning units.

The positive master list of the assistant coach revealed eight meaning unit behaviors. When asked during her interview if she had engaged in any of the behaviors on the list during the recently completed competitive season, she agreed with seven out of eight, or 88%, of the identified positive behaviors. Therefore, she disagreed with one out of eight, or 13%, of the identified positive behaviors. Table 10 shows the master list (list of significant meaning units) of the assistant coach's positive behaviors. It also depicts the assistant coach's agreement or disagreement with each behavior identified by the athletes.

Statistics regarding the number of athletes identifying each positive behavior, average athlete rank-order of behaviors (based on perceived importance to the athletes), and the assistant coach's rank-order (based on perceived importance to the assistant coach) are presented in Table 11. The athlete rank-order was derived from the average rank-order of all athletes identifying each behavior. That is, the highest average rank-order by the athletes was given the rank-order of #1, the second highest average rank-order was given the rank-order of 2, and so on. Therefore, the higher the number, the

Table 9.

Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Assistant Coach, Positive Behaviors

Identified Coaching Behaviors	Positive Behaviors (Meaning Units)
Pride in the program, good motivator, role model Motivational On the court with team, notices mistakes more, motivating Has good things to say, knows what motivates people Shows she believed in team (horse-n-buggy)	*Motivates players*
Positive reinforcement Speaks positively to players Supportive of players Value what she says, important Doesn't stress negatives, stresses positives Good input	*Positively reinforces and is supportive of players*
Keeps lines open for communication, trustworthy Very approachable Can talk to her Easier to talk to at end of season Approachable Easy to talk to Listens, understood people more	*Approachable and easy to talk to*
Takes pressure off players, keeps the atmosphere fun Has fun off the court Able to joke around with Fun	*Fun*
Good mediator between players and coach Explains [head coach's] behaviors to team Listens to players and takes their thoughts to [head coach] Explained [head coach's] tough love practice Acts as [head coach's] translator Talks to players on side and brings opinions to [head coach]	*Mediator between players and head coach*

Demands a lot from players	
Brings up level of practice, expects a lot from players	*Has high expectations*
High expectations of players	*of players*
Pushes everybody to work harder when she plays with team	
Started giving more feedback at end of season	
Always very informative when players ask her	*Constructively criticizes*
Coaches players, tells them what they needed to do	
Constructive criticism	
Great hustle, effort in practice	
Leads by example, hates to lose	
Always ready to go, participates in practice,	*Always ready to go and*
willingness to help	*leads by example*
Comes to practice happy to be there	
Cheerful, cheers people up	

Table 10.
Identified Assistant Coach's Positive Behaviors by the Athletes and Assistant Coach

	Coach's Agreement	
Assistant Coach - Positive Behaviors	**Yes**	**No**
1. Motivates players	X	
2. Positively reinforces and is supportive of players	X	
3. Approachable and easy to talk to	X	
4. Fun		X
5. Mediator between players and head coach	X	
6. Has high expectations of players	X	
7. Constructively criticizes	X	
8. Always ready to go and leads by example	X	

Table 11.
Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Rank-Ordering of Positive Behaviors

Athlete Rank-Order (no. of athletes; avg.)	**Coach Rank-Order**
1. Motivates players (4; avg. 2.20)	1. Approachable and easy to talk to
2. Mediator between players and head coach (6; avg. 2.50)*	2. Mediator between players and head coach
3. Positively reinforces and is supportive of players (5; avg. 2.50)*	3. Positively reinforces and is supportive of players
4. Constructively criticizes (4; avg. 2.75)	4. Constructively criticizes
5. Always ready to go and leads by example (5; avg. 3.00)	5. Motivates players
6. Approachable and easy to talk to (7; avg. 3.29)	6. Always ready to go and leads by example
7. Has high expectations of players (4; avg. 4.25)	7. Has high expectations of players
8. Fun (4; avg. 5.25)	

*Although "mediator between players and head coach" and "positively reinforces and is supportive of players" have the same average rank-order, "mediator between players and head coach" was rank-ordered higher, as number 2. This was due to the number of athletes identifying each behavior. "Mediator between players and head coach" was perceived by six players whereas "positively reinforces and is supportive of players" was perceived by five athletes.

more desirable the behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the athletes to be the most desirable behavior). The assistant coach was only asked to rank-order those behaviors that she identified as her own from the previous season beginning with the most desirable behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the assistant coach to be the most desirable behavior).

Negative Behaviors.

A total of 47 negative assistant coaching behaviors emerged from the athletes' interviews. All identified negative behaviors were categorized into meaning units as previously discussed. A total of three meaning units resulted. Five behaviors did not fit into a meaning unit. This means that five behaviors were identified that did not correlate with any other identified behavior. These five behaviors were discarded. Any meaning unit that had at least three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identify behaviors within that meaning unit was considered significant and subsequently placed on the assistant coach's master list. This resulted in three meaning units consisting of behaviors identified by three or more athletes. Table 12 represents a list of the assistant coach's three negative behaviors as were identified by at least three of the athletes during their interviews and the resulting meaning units.

The negative master list of the assistant coach revealed three meaning unit behaviors. When asked during her interview if she had engaged in any of the behaviors on the list during the recently completed competitive season, she agreed with one out of three, or 33%, of the identified negative behaviors. Therefore, she disagreed with two out

Table 12.
Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Assistant Coach, Negative Behaviors

Identified Coaching Behaviors	**Negative Behaviors (Meaning Units)**
Quiet, keeps knowledge to herself Not much feedback Doesn't speak up enough Doesn't speak her mind Passive in voice Quiet Doesn't say anything when disagrees with [head coach] Doesn't speak up enough Not talking enough Has some great ideas but doesn't speak up Doesn't talk enough	*Quiet*
Focuses on certain players Didn't feel she liked me at the beginning, wasn't as friendly toward me Dedicates more of herself to setters	*Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players*
Brings outside influences on the court; takes it out on other people Bad mood one practice Irritable when doesn't work-out in mornings Brings bad attitude to practice	*Takes out bad mood on other people*

of three, or 66% of the identified negative behaviors. Table 13 shows the master list (list of significant meaning units) of the assistant coach's negative behaviors. It also depicts the assistant coach's agreement or disagreement with each behavior identified by the athletes.

Statistics regarding the number of athletes identifying each negative behavior, average athlete rank-order of behaviors, and assistant coach's rank-order are presented in Table 14. The athlete rank-order was derived from the average rank-order of all athletes identifying each behavior. That is, the highest average rank-order by the athletes was given the rank-order of #1, the second highest average rank-order was given the rank-order of 2, and so on. Therefore, the higher the number, the more undesirable the behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the athletes to be the most undesirable behavior). The assistant coach was only asked to rank-order those behaviors that she identified as her own from the previous season beginning with the most undesirable behavior (i.e., the behavior rank-ordered as #1 was perceived by the head coach to be the most undesirable behavior).

Researcher Field Observation Notes

Several comparisons were made between the researcher's field observation notes and the information (meaning units) gained from the interviews. Each of the eight positive and three negative assistant coaching behaviors are listed and comparisons drawn in relation to the researcher's observations. Rationale for keeping certain behaviors on the coaches' master lists even though the behaviors were not identified in the researcher field

Table 13.
Identified Assistant Coach's Negative Behaviors by the Athletes and Assistant Coach

	Coach's Agreement	
Assistant Coach - Negative Behaviors	**Yes**	**No**
1. Quiet		X
2. Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players	X	
3. Takes out bad mood on other people		X

Table 14.
Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Rank-Ordering of Negative Behaviors

Athlete Rank-Order (no. of athletes; avg.)	**Coach Rank-Order**
1. Quiet (11; avg. 1.18)	1. Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players
2. Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players (3; avg. 1.67)	
3. Takes out bad mood on other people (4; avg. 2.75)	

observation notes is outlined further in the discussion section (Chapter 5).

Positive Behaviors

Motivates players. This behavior was noted in the researcher field observation notes. In one particular instance, the assistant coach had promised the team that she would do a physical exercise that the team had to do in practice if the team performed well. This served as a motivation force to the team who then performed very well. The assistant coach kept her promise and did the physical exercise in front of the team at practice the following day.

Positively reinforces and is supportive of players. During one road trip, the team had decided to do a supportive team activity where they wrote positive comments about their teammates and gave those comments to that teammate. The purpose was to show each other support and give each other positive feedback. Although the coaches were not asked to be a part of this activity, the assistant coach took the initiative to write positive comments about each of the players and see that they each got positive reinforcement from her.

Approachable and easy to talk to. This was noted when several players on the team went to the assistant coach to talk about issues that were bothering them (i.e., playing time, head coaching decisions, etc.). A couple of the athletes commented to the researcher that the assistant coach was very open and easy to talk to.

Fun. At different times during the season, it was noticed that the players seemed to have a lot of fun when they were with the assistant coach. The assistant coach seemed

to be able to laugh and enjoy the players, which encouraged the players to laugh and have a good time as well.

Mediator between players and head coach. At one point during the season, the team had a problem with one of the head coach's coaching decisions. They took this matter to the assistant coach who then spoke with the head coach about the incident.

Has high expectations of players. This behavior was not recorded in the researcher field observation notes. However, because four players (i.e., 33% of the team) identified this behavior, it was considered significant and placed on the assistant coach's positive master list.

Constructively criticizes. This behavior was noted during one practice when the assistant coach pulled a player aside and explained why that player's particular techniques were incorrect and how she could correct them.

Always ready to go and leads by example. The researcher noted that the assistant coach was always ready to jump into drills and scrimmages when the team needed an extra player.

Negative Behaviors

Quiet. This behavior was noted on three separate occasions in the researcher field observation notes. The assistant coach would often remain quiet without giving her opinion during both practices and games. Often, she would take the physical position of standing partly behind the head coach during team huddles and frequently, she would not join the team huddles at all. It was noted that she would rarely speak without first being

spoken to (either by the head coach or a player).

Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players. This behavior was noted on two separate occasions, both during game situations. In one instance, it was written that the assistant coach didn't talk to the team during time-outs. Instead, she pulled certain players aside, and addressed them one-on-one. The players that received this individual attention were always those players who played a specific position. The second situation occurred during warm-ups when the assistant coach and the aforementioned specific players seemed to have inside jokes that the rest of the players on the team were not privy to. Certain comments were made and seemed to be understood only by the assistant coach and these individual players.

Takes out bad mood on other people. This was noted at one practice during the season. The assistant coach physically moved a player to where she wanted her to be on the court. Nothing was verbalized, the coach simply moved the player. During that same practice, the assistant coach became uncharacteristically upset when she got hit with a ball, which was evident by her nonverbal actions (i.e., slamming balls, glaring at players, etc.).

Athletic Trainer

It was of particular interest to the researcher whether or not the assistant coach's behaviors changed in the presence of the researcher. To better understand this possibility, the team's athletic trainer was interviewed by the researcher in an informal, conversational style interview. According to the team's athletic trainer, the researcher's presence did not seem to have much effect on the assistant coach's behaviors. In the perception of the

team's athletic trainer, the assistant coach's demeanor rarely changed.

Athletes' and Assistant Coach's Journals

Several comparisons were made between the participants' (athletes and assistant coach) journals and the information gained from the interviews (meaning units). Each of the outlined eight positive and three negative assistant coaching behaviors are listed and comparisons drawn in relation to the weekly journals. Rationale for keeping certain behaviors on the coaches' master lists even though the behaviors were not identified in the participants' journals is outlined further in the discussion section (Chapter 5).

Positive Behaviors

Motivates players. This behavior was noted by the assistant coach as well as several of the athletes in their journals. The assistant coach wrote, "[I] participated in motivational drills for players ex: I ran as award (reward) for them to reach goal." Athletes' comments were, "Motivation during practice", "Able to motivate all quickly and efficiently", "Good motivator", "Motivation for the team", "(She) worked to get everyone pumped up for the weekend tournament."

Positively reinforces and is supportive of players. This behavior was also supported in the assistant coach's and several athletes' journals. Some of the assistant coach's recordings included, "Individual feedback", "Individual positive feedback regarding specific performances", "[I] Gave (a player) positive feedback/ideas on how to improve herself athletically and let her know I believed in her and what she could

accomplish", "Individual instruction and confidence builder with (a player)." The athletes wrote, "On the court, she would tell me what I was doing good", "She told me after a match that I did a great job", "Positive reinforcement during drills", "(She) was very supportive for me personally this week. She helped give me confidence...", "I know I can count on her to always tell me when I am doing a good job", "She always tells me when I'm doing well, and she's always very serious when she says it", "I think that she's almost always positive", "She can focus on the positives", "She gave compliments to everyone and was very supportive."

Approachable and easy to talk to. This behavior was also supported by the assistant coach's and several of the athletes' journals. The assistant coach commented that she, "Offered to listen if needed, individually." Athlete comments included, "After the game, she said that if any of us needed to talk to her, or needed a message to be passed on, that she was there for us", "I can go to her. Her advice and explanations are great because it comes from an assistant coach and a past player of (our head coach)."

Fun. This behavior was noted in both the assistant coach's and several of the athletes' journals. The assistant coach wrote, "[I] Make players laugh/lighten up when things are stressful off the court." Athlete comments included, "Joked around with me", "Good humor when there is tension", "Very open and fun", "Has fun with us", "Intense and fun as usual", "She joked around with us when it was appropriate." Although the assistant coach noted this behavior in her journal, she disagreed with it during her interview.

Mediator between players and head coach. This behavior was also noted in the journals by the assistant coach and the players. The assistant coach wrote, "Damage control at practice on Wednesday between (players) and (the head coach)." Some of the athletes wrote, "Resource as to (the head coach's) decisions", "Listening to us and then talking to (head coach)", "Talking to us and explaining stuff about (head coach)", "She came to our room last night and explained a lot of (the head coach's) behaviors."

Has high expectations of players. This behavior was supported by the data obtained from the assistant coach's and the athletes' journals. The assistant coach noted, "Pushed the athletes to bring more out of themselves." Athlete comments included, "She has been pushing us in a good way and working us hard" and "She always pushes us to work."

Constructively criticizes. This was noted in both the assistant coach's and several athletes' journals. The assistant coach reported, "Individual feedback - constructive and 1-on-1", "Loud and strong verbal cues", "Constructive feedback during games instead of 'oh really' statements." Athletes' reported, "On the court, she would tell me what I was doing wrong, helping me out", "She told me how to do something in a good way - like advice - not 'do this' ", "She gave me very constructive feedback, which helped me during practice", "(She) is really good at telling us what we are doing wrong in a positive manner and a strict manner", "Talking to us constructively", "Telling me what I was doing good and bad and how to fix it", "She gave me lots of feedback and it helped me a lot. It wasn't like, 'you do this wrong', more like, 'try it this way'."

Always ready to go and leads by example. This behavior was also supported by the assistant coach and several of the athletes. The assistant coach wrote, "Playing during practice, I feel I contribute positively with attitude, hustle, and communication." Athlete comments included, "Demonstrated what I needed to do", "High energy and enthusiasm", "She brought her energy into the gym", "She always seems happy and brings good spirits to the games and practices", "Great hustle and energy."

Negative Behaviors

Quiet. This behavior was not supported by the assistant coach. However, several athletes made note of this by commenting, "She didn't talk enough at one of the matches, was silent", "She needs to speak up and talk, I know she has great things to say, she needs to say them", "When she has something to say (it seems) she holds it back", "She still doesn't speak her mind to the team", "She doesn't speak up when something is bothering her, even though it might help us", "Sometimes she is too quiet and doesn't express when we are doing something wrong", "She needs to voice her opinion more often", "Not speaking up when [she] disagrees with (head coach)", "Not adding her own opinions to changes", "Not speaking up at practice", "Needs to give more input in practice and games", "She doesn't really talk much", "Needs to talk a little more", "Not speaking up sometimes", "Sometimes it seems as if she has something to say, but doesn't say it", "She's quiet at times", "(She's) still rather quiet", "She needs to talk more and give us her opinion, she has good things to say but doesn't say them enough."

Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players. This behavior was not documented in the assistant coach's journal. The athletes, however, did make note of this behavior by commenting, "I don't think she likes me", "She seems to spend a lot of time with (specific players according to their position)", "Deals mainly with (specific players according to their position)", "I think she sometimes pays too much attention to (specific players according to their position)", "She appears to focus on and compliment some players more than others for no apparent reason."

Takes out bad mood on other people. This behavior was supported by data obtained from the assistant coach's as well as several athletes' journals. The assistant coach reported, "Pissy attitude [at] Tuesday practice." Athlete comments included, "She got pissed when someone hit her - not a good attitude", "She was in a bad mood", "I didn't like it on Tuesday when she brought her bad attitude to practice", "Moodiness" , "When it's a bad mood day, it's a bad mood day", "Being cranky during practice, getting mad at us when we didn't deserve it", "She took her bad day out on us and got mad at things we did that she normally wouldn't care about." Although the assistant coach recorded this behavior in her journal, she denied engaging in this behavior during her interview.

Ideal Coaching Behaviors

Athletes

Athletes' ideal coaching behavior lists were also combined to produce a total of 102 reported behaviors. All identified behaviors that were similar were categorized into

meaning units. A total of seven meaning units resulted. Thirty-six behaviors were identified that did not fit into any meaning unit. This indicates that 36 behaviors were identified that did not correlate with any other identified behavior. These 36 behaviors were discarded. Any meaning unit that had at least three athletes (i.e., 25% of team) identify behaviors within that meaning unit was considered significant and subsequently placed on the ideal coaching behaviors master list. Table 15 represents the list of seven ideal coaching behaviors as were identified by the athletes during their interviews and the resulting meaning units.

Statistics for the athletes' seven ideal coaching behaviors are compiled in Table 16. The rank-order of each behavior was determined by the average of the athletes' rank-orders. That is, the highest average was given the rank-order of #1, the second highest average was given the rank-order of number 2, and so on. Therefore, the higher the number, the more desirable the behavior. Athletes rank-ordered ideal coaching behaviors beginning with the most desirable behavior. Also included in Table 16 are the number of athletes who identified each particular ideal coaching behavior and the number of athletes who identified that particular behavior as being the most desirable ideal coaching behavior (i.e., the number of athletes who rank-ordered the behavior as #1).

Six athletes rank-ordered an ideal coaching behavior as #1, the most important behavior to them, that did not fit into any of the formulated meaning units. That is, three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) had to identify a behavior for that behavior to be placed on the ideal coaching master list. Although the following listed behaviors were each identified as the most important behaviors to one athlete (who ranked the behavior at #1),

Table 15.
Identified Coaching Behaviors and Resulting Meaning Units - Athletes', Ideal Coaching Behaviors

Identified Coaching Behaviors	**Ideal Behaviors (Meaning Units)**
Authority that demands respect but also respects players Have respect for Respect and have fun with them Respect coach - respects team	*Mutual respect between coach and athletes*
Demands a lot from you and pushes you to succeed Demands that players work hard and settle for nothing less Tough drills Pushes team but knows players' limits Works players hard physically Pushes people to limit all the time	*Demands hard work*
Motivates you to push yourself Finds ways to motivate team Always pushing players in their own positive ways Motivational Motivates players Knows how to motivate every player, intrinsically and extrinsically	*Motivational*
Makes themselves approachable and easy to talk to - not defensive Willing to talk and listen to players Can talk to them; always has open door for players Can talk to and understand easy Open for suggestions; Easy to talk to off court	*Approachable and easy to talk to*

Knowledge of game	
Knowledge of game; Experience (coaching and playing)	
Played sport at some point	
Knows the game	*Knowledge of the game*
Communication - knows game and knows how to coach game	
Knows the sport - lots of drills	
Really good knowledge of game - lots of player and coach experience	
Know everything about sport	
Shows you what you need to do; Involved during practice	
Able to play with players and show them skills	*Teaches skills through modeling*
Knows how to teach it	
Explains what they are doing	
Has an answer for all questions	*Explains actions*
Explains everything that's going on	

Table 16.
Athletes' Identified Ideal Coaching Behaviors by Rank-Order

Rank-Order (by avg.)	Ideal Coaching Behaviors	# of Athletes Identifying Behavior	# of Athletes Rank-Ordering at #1
1 (avg. 3.25)	Mutual respect between coach and athletes	4	1
2 (avg. 4.33)	Demands hard work	6	2
3 (avg. 4.5)	Motivational	6	2
4 (avg. 4.71)	Approachable and easy to talk to	5	0
5 (avg. 5.22)	Knowledge of the game	8	1
6 (avg.5.25)	Teaches skills through modeling	3	0
7 (avg. 9.66)	Explains actions	3	0

they were not identified by at least two other athletes as being significant and thus, were not placed on the coach's master list. These behaviors were: (a) recognize accomplishments and faults to help you improve, (b) positive attitude, (c) enthusiastic about the sport, (d) plays players for playing ability, (e) dedicated, (f) gives you the feeling that you are the only one who can take yourself off the court - gives players confidence.

Head Coach

The head coach was asked to develop two separate ideal coaching behavior lists. One from her perspective as a coach (eight behaviors were identified) and one from what she believed her athletes desired (five behaviors were identified) (see Table 17). Both lists were rank-ordered by the coach beginning with the most desirable behavior.

Assistant Coach

The assistant coach was also asked to develop two ideal coaching behavior lists. One list from her perspective as an assistant coach (nine behaviors were identified) and the other list from what she believed her athletes desired (ten behaviors were identified) (see Table 18). Both lists were rank-ordered by the coach beginning with the most desirable behavior.

Summary

Results from this study indicated that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of positive, or desirable, coaching behaviors were similar. However, their perceptions of

Table 17.
Head Coach Identified Ideal Coaching Behaviors

Ideal Coach - Coach's Perspective	**Ideal Coach - Coach's Idea of Athletes' Desires**
1. Empowering; caring	1. Motivational
2. Inspirational; motivational	2. Enthusiastic
3. Create learning environment	3. Caring - empowering
4. Create an environment where athletes can take chances	4. Fun-loving yet a tough coach; hard on them
5. Playful environment	5. Knowledgeable
6. Giving 100% in effort	
7. Enthusiastic	
8. Aura of greatness reflected onto players; accepting nothing less than 100%	

Table 18.
Assistant Coach Identified Ideal Coaching Behaviors

Ideal Coach - Coach Perspective	**Ideal Coach - Coach's Idea of Athletes' Desires**
1. Honest	1. Honesty
2. Good communicator	2. Consistency
3. Match players' efforts and dedication to sport	3. Good communication
4. Consistent	4. Respectful (coaches and athletes)
5. Positive majority of time	5. Pushes them to their potential
6. Realistically demanding	6. Individual attention
7. Motivator	7. Knows the game, strategy, and when to use it
8. Know players individually; be mentor or supporter outside of athletics	8. Gives specific, useful feedback; constructive
9. Energetic	9. Positive reinforcement
	10. Good personality

negative, or undesirable, coaching behaviors were markedly divergent. Furthermore, ideal coaching characteristics as identified by coaches and athletes have similarities and differences.

Desirable Coaching Behaviors

When combined, the head coach's and assistant coach's positive master lists yielded a total of 17 meaning units (9 head, 8 assistant) as identified by the athletes. Of these, the coaches collectively agreed with having exhibited 16. This indicated a high similarity (i.e., 94% agreement) between the athletes' and coaches' perceptions of the coaches' positive behaviors that occurred throughout the competitive season. Specifically, positive behaviors in agreement were:

1. Cares about player problems outside of volleyball
2. Has a love for the game and competition and wants to have fun
3. Emphasizes positive points of play
4. Holds intense practices
5. Motivates team
6. Listens to players
7. Has confidence in players
8. Tries different approaches to make things work
9. Explains actions
10. Motivates players
11. Positively reinforces and is supportive of players
12. Approachable and easy to talk to
13. Mediator between players and head coach
14. Has high expectations of players
15. Constructively criticizes
16. Always ready to go and leads by example.

The only positive behavior with which the athletes and a coach disagreed was:

1. Fun.

Undesirable Coaching Behaviors

When combined, the head coach's and assistant coach's negative master lists yielded a total of 15 meaning units (12 head, 3 assistant) as identified by the athletes. Of these, the coaches collectively agreed with having exhibited 5. This indicated a high difference (i.e., 67% disagreement) between the athletes' and coaches' perceptions of the coaches' negative behaviors that occurred throughout the competitive season. Specifically, negative behaviors which the athletes and a coach disagreed with were:

1. Not honest with players and plays head games
2. Different expectations for players
3. Doesn't take players' emotions and feelings into consideration
4. Doesn't give players second chances
5. Contradictory
6. Defensive and has selective hearing
7. Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players
8. Has favorite players
9. Quiet
10. Takes out bad mood on other people

Negative behaviors with which the athletes and a coach agreed were:

1. Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out
2. Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently
3. Doesn't explain motives
4. Talks behind players' backs
5. Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players

Ideal Coaching Behaviors

Athletes' ideal coaching behavior list revealed seven behaviors. Collectively, the coaches' lists (i.e., head and assistant) produced 17 ideal coaching behaviors while their combined lists from what they believed their athletes desired produced 15 behaviors. The

following list of four ideal coaching characteristics was noted by both the athletes and one or both of the coaches:

1.	Athletes:	Mutual respect between coach and athletes
	Assistant Coach:	Respectful (coaches and athletes)
2.	Athletes:	Demands hard work
	Assistant Coach:	Pushes them to their potential
3.	Athletes:	Motivational
	Head Coach:	Inspirational; motivational
	Assistant Coach:	Motivator
4.	Athletes:	Knowledge of the game
	Head Coach:	Knowledgeable
	Assistant Coach:	Knows the game, strategy, and when to use it

Three ideal coaching behaviors were noted by athletes but not by the coaches. These behaviors were:

1. Approachable and easy to talk to
2. Teaches skills through modeling
3. Explains actions

Because the coaches identified four of the seven (i.e., 57%) ideal coaching behaviors that were listed by the athletes, it was concluded that athletes' and coaches' perceptions of ideal coaching behaviors were somewhat similar.

Research Question

The research question to be answered through this investigation was, "What are the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors?"

Similarities

Similarities between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors appeared to lie in those behaviors that were perceived as desirable, or positive, by both the coach and the athletes. If one party (typically the athlete) viewed the act as undesirable, it was likely that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of the behavior would differ. In the present study, there was a 94% agreement between coaches' and athletes' on those behaviors perceived as desirable by both parties. Specifically, these behaviors dealt with the constructs of:

1. Caring about, listening to, and supporting the players
2. Loving the game and leading by example
3. Emphasizing the positive, yet using constructive criticism
4. Having intense practices and high expectations of players
5. Motivating the team
6. Having confidence in the players
7. Trying different approaches to make things work
8. Explaining actions.

Also, similarities between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of what constitutes an ideal coach include the following concepts:

1. Mutual respect
2. Demanding hard work
3. Being motivational
4. Having a knowledge of the game

Of these four ideal coaching characteristics, the coaches in this study were identified as possessing two: demanding hard work and being motivational.

Differences

Differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors appeared to lie in those behaviors that were perceived as undesirable, or negative, by the athletes. If one party (typically the athlete) viewed the act as undesirable, it was likely that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of the behavior would differ. In the present study, there was a 67% disagreement between coaches' and athletes' on those behaviors perceived as undesirable by the athletes. The negative behaviors on which the athletes and coaches disagreed all had negative connotations and were likely also perceived by coaches as negative. Therefore, coaches' and athletes' perceptions differed on those behaviors that were likely perceived by both coaches and athletes as negative. These behaviors were:

1. Not honest with players and plays head games
2. Different expectations for players
3. Doesn't take players' emotions and feelings into consideration
4. Doesn't give players second chances
5. Contradictory
6. Defensive and has selective hearing
7. Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players
8. Has favorite players
9. Quiet
10. Takes out bad mood on other people.

However, those behaviors that were perceived as negative by the athletes but which the coaches' agreed to engaging in, could have been perceived as positive by the coaches. These behaviors may have had a negative connotation to the athletes and a positive connotation to the coaches:

1. Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out

2. Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently
3. Doesn't explain motives
4. Talks behind players' backs
5. Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players.

In summary, coaches and athletes tended to agree with those behaviors that were viewed as positive by both the coaches and the athletes. Also, they agreed with those behaviors whose connotation may have been negative to the athlete, but positive to the coach. On the other hand, coaches and athletes tended to disagree with those behaviors that both the coaches and athletes perceived as negative.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Previous research has primarily resulted in dichotomous answers (yes or no) to the question of whether coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors are similar (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Horne & Carron, 1985; Percival, 1971; Prapavessis & Gordon, 1991; Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996; Salminen at al., 1992). The majority of these findings indicated that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors are divergent. However, limited research has been conducted to explain specific perceptual similarities and discrepancies between coaches and athletes. Therefore, this study focused on conceptualizing the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors in regard to three behavioral dimensions: (a) desirable coaching behaviors, (b) undesirable coaching behaviors, and (c) ideal coaching behaviors. Specifically, the research question to be answered was: "What are the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors?" Several noteworthy comparisons emerged from this study and are discussed in this chapter.

Results from this study indicate that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of positive, or desirable coaching behaviors are similar. However, their perceptions of negative, or undesirable coaching behaviors are markedly divergent. Also, what coaches and athletes believe to be ideal coaching characteristics were found to be somewhat similar. Although coaches often think they know what behaviors their athletes prefer in a coach, research indicates that may not always be the case (Percival, 1971; Salminen et al., 1992; Smith et

al., 1978; Wandzilak et al., 1988). In fact, athletes may desire entirely different behaviors in a coach than what the coach believes his or her athletes desire.

Desirable Coaching Behaviors

Three behaviors (two for the head coach and one for the assistant coach) were left on the coaches' positive master lists although not listed in either the participants' journals or the researcher field observation notes. Rationale for including these behaviors follows.

In relation to desirable behaviors of the head coach:

1. *Cares about player problems outside of volleyball.* This behavior was not noted in the researcher field observation notes. However, rarely did the researcher spend time with the team outside of the volleyball arena (i.e., practices and games). Therefore, the researcher was not exposed to the athletes' outside problems and how the coach may have dealt with those problems off the volleyball court. Also, this behavior (i.e., caring) may have occurred more on a one-to-one basis between the head coach and each player that identified the behavior. Usually, outside problems are discussed outside of the sport arena and in the coach's office or another private location. Thus, the researcher was not privy to such conversations. Yet, because three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identified this behavior, it was considered significant and included on the head coach's positive master list.

2. *Holds intense practices.* This particular behavior was not documented in the researcher field observation notes. However, because the researcher did not participate with the team and did not attend every practice during the course of the season, the

fluctuations in intensity levels at practices were difficult to assess. Yet, there was no documentation in the researcher field observation notes to refute this identified behavior. Therefore, "intense practices" was included on the head coach's positive master list.

In relation to the desirable behaviors of the assistant coach:

3. *Has high expectations of players*. This behavior of the assistant coach was not listed in the researcher field observation notes. It might be that this behavior was noticed more by individual players than by an outside observer. The expectations that each athlete perceived are difficult to speculate.

When assessing positive, or desirable coaching behaviors, athletes' and coaches' perceptions were strikingly similar (i.e., 94% agreement). The head coach agreed with nine out of nine of her desirable behaviors that were identified by the athletes while the assistant coach agreed with seven out of eight of her desirable behaviors (she disagreed with being "fun"). During her interview, the assistant coach explained her perceptions of her own personality, which could also explain why she disagreed with being "fun" the previous season:

> It's probably just my mannerism and sometimes just being quiet. But also just being intense at some points. I just think that certain personalities know how to joke with me and can get me to lighten up and talk to me and other people are either too nervous to try to do that or don't care to try to do that. I just think it's a general, I don't know, aura I give out.

The pilot study coach also agreed with eight out of eight of his desirable behaviors that were identified by the pilot study athletes. Salminen et al. (1992) and Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) declared that, in general, people tend to overestimate their socially

desirable characteristics. When presented with a list of positive, or socially desirable behaviors and asked whether or not one possesses those qualities, it would be more desirable and socially acceptable for most people to say that they do. Not only does that make the person feel good about him or herself (increases self-confidence), it also makes him or her look good to others (increases self-image). Also, the behaviors listed on the coaches' positive master lists all have a positive connotation. Therefore, if the coaches' intentions are to benefit the team, which is likely the case, the coach will engage in behaviors that he or she perceives to be helpful to the team, which encompasses the behaviors on the coaches' positive master lists.

Undesirable Coaching Behaviors

Six behaviors were left on the head coach's negative master list although not listed in either the participants' journals or the researcher field observation notes. All negative behaviors of the assistant coach were documented in either the participants' journals or the researcher field observation notes. Rationale for including the six negative behaviors on the head coach's master list follows.

1. *Talks behind players backs.* This was the only behavior that was not identified in the participants' journals nor in the researcher field observation notes. This behavior was believed to have effected those individuals who were "talked about" or "talked to" by the head coach. In fact, when reviewing the interviews, the athletes who identified this behavior gave examples of specific times when the head coach talked about or to them on an individual basis. Thus, the researcher was not there to witness the interaction, which

resulted in the behavior not being documented in the researcher field observation notes. Speculation behind why this behavior was not listed in the journals is due to the timing of journal writing. Journals were completed at the end of a practice. What was most likely fresh in the athletes' minds was actual practice time as opposed to situations they may have encountered off the court. It is difficult to believe that the coach talked behind a players' back to another player in the presence of other team members. Also, this behavior may have occurred in the period between the last journal collection and the athletes' post season interviews (approximately five weeks). Because five athletes (i.e., 42% of the team) identified this behavior during their interviews, it was considered significant and placed on the head coach's negative master list.

2. *Not honest with players and plays head games.* This particular behavior was not noted in the researcher field observation notes. However, it is believed that the researcher would need to actually be a member of the team, and thus be involved directly, in order to grasp the occurrence of this behavior. The fact that four players (i.e., 33% of the team) noted this behavior prompted its inclusion on the head coach's negative master list.

3. *Different expectations for players.* This behavior was also not noted in the researcher field observation notes. Again, it is believed that the researcher would need to be a member of the team in order to grasp this behavior. Still, because three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) noted this behavior, it was placed on the head coach's negative master list.

4. *Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently.* This behavior was not noted in the researcher field observation notes. It is believed that this is a behavior that effects each individual separately and is based on individual preferences. Those athletes who were not motivated by the coach probably identified this behavior as being significant during their interviews. This included three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) and therefore was placed on the head coach's negative master list.

5. *Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players.* This behavior was not documented in the researcher field observation notes. This is a behavior that is considered individual and is likely perceived differently by each individual. It is difficult to speculate how each individual player might perceive the head coach's expectations and/or "pressure." However, because four athletes (i.e., 33% of team) identified this behavior during their interviews, it was placed on the head coach's negative master list.

6. *Has favorite players.* The researcher did not note this behavior in the field observation notes. This behavior is believed to be experienced by those who do not see themselves as the coach's "favorite player." Because three athletes (i.e., 25% of the team) identified this behavior during their interviews, it was left on the head coach's negative master list.

When assessing negative, or undesirable coaching behaviors, athletes' and coaches' perceptions were found to be markedly divergent (i.e., 67% disagreement). This supports the findings of several investigators (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Horne & Carron, 1985; Percival, 1971; Prapavessis & Gordon, 1991; Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996;

Salminen et al., 1992) who have pointed out that perceptions of coaches and athletes regarding coaching behaviors conflict.

Anshel and Straub (1991) investigated perceptual differences between high school and collegiate coaches and athletes regarding undesirable coaching behaviors. Of the 7 undesirable, or negative, coaching behaviors identified by athletes ($n = 81$), none of the 22 coaches agreed to engaging in more than 2, and 5 coaches denied affiliation with any of the listed undesirable coaching behaviors. As a result, these investigators concluded that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors (undesirable) were markedly divergent.

In the present study, the head coach only agreed with 4 out of 12 (i.e., 33%) negative behaviors, thus disagreeing with 8 of 12 (i.e., 67%). The assistant coach agreed with one out of three (i.e., 33%) negative behaviors, thus disagreeing with two out of three (i.e., 66%). Specifically, the negative behaviors with which either the head coach or the assistant coach disagreed were:

1. Not honest with players and plays head games
2. Different expectations for players
3. Doesn't take players' emotions and feelings into consideration
4. Doesn't give players second chances
5. Contradictory
6. Defensive and has selective hearing
7. Has too high expectations and puts pressure on players
8. Has favorite players
9. Quiet
10. Takes out bad mood on other people

The negative behaviors with which either the head coach or the assistant coach agreed were:

1. Dwells more on negatives and lets negative emotions out
2. Doesn't know each of the players well enough to be able to motivate them consistently
3. Doesn't explain motives
4. Talks behind players' backs
5. Focuses on and dedicates more to certain players

When the coaches were initially presented their negative master lists, they were not told that their master list came from their athletes nor were they told that the list consisted of negative characteristics. They were simply asked whether or not they had engaged in any of the behaviors on the list during the previously completed competitive season. Therefore, the coaches may not have perceived every behavior on the list to have a negative, or harmful, connotation. For example, the assistant coach agreed with the negative behavior of, "focuses on and dedicates more to certain players." During her interview, when this particular behavior was presented, she made the comment that her job was to be the 'setter coach.' Therefore she tended to work more with the setters. She perceived this to be positive and beneficial to the team while not realizing that other players may have felt rejected due to their position on the team. Still, when examining the list of negative behaviors that the coaches disagreed with, it appears that their implied meanings would likely be perceived as negative. When the coaches were asked whether or not they had engaged in these behaviors, they could have perceived some of these behaviors to be behaviors that may potentially be harmful to the team. For example, the head coach disagreed with the behavior of "contradictory." A coach sending

contradictory messages to his or her team will likely have a very confused and frustrated team that hears something one day (e.g., a promise to start the next game) and gets an entirely different message the next day (e.g., being told they will sit the bench the entire game). Coaches, as well as leaders in general, are usually not prepared to admit they may have done something destructive toward their subordinates, as harming the team is frequently not the intent of the coach.

On the other hand, when viewing the list of negative behaviors the coaches agreed with, it could be that these behaviors were not perceived as negative or harmful to the team. In fact, some of these behaviors may be perceived by a coach to be helpful to the team when engaged in at the proper time. Therefore, the coaches may have engaged in these behaviors for "the good of the team." For example, the head coach was presented with the behavior of, "talks behind players' backs." She admitted to engaging in this behavior only if she could reword it to appropriately reflect what she believed she had done. Her reworded behavior was, "Goes to teammates of player with problem to attempt to help them or solve problem without violating coach-player trust." The head coach's intentions when performing this behavior was to help the individual player, which would ultimately help the team. However, as reported in the literature, a coach's leadership behavioral intentions often do not correspond with his or her athletes' perceptions of those same leadership behaviors (Salminen et al., 1992; Smith et al., 1978).

Interestingly, the same behavior of "talks behind players' backs" was also on the pilot study coach's negative master list. This coach also agreed with engaging in that behavior, but made it clear to the researcher that, although that phrase had a negative

connotation, he did not perceive it as a negative behavior and his intent when engaging in that behavior was to help, or benefit, the players on the team.

The results from the pilot study also supported the contention that behaviors on the coach's negative master list may have been perceived as beneficial to the team from the coach's perspective. The coach in the pilot study was presented a negative master list of five behaviors. This coach disagreed with three of the behaviors (i.e., 60% disagreement) and agreed with two (i.e., 40% agreement). Specifically, the negative behaviors the coach disagreed with were:

1. Has favorites and least favorites
2. Takes sarcasm too far
3. Is too rough with players.

The negative behaviors the coach agreed with were:

1. Talks behind players' backs
2. Corrects players' basic techniques.

The three negative behaviors the coach disagreed with all likely have negative connotations that have the potential to harm the team. However, the two negative behaviors the coach agreed with could be perceived as beneficial to the team. In fact, comments made by the pilot study coach during his interview included:

(In response to "talking behind players' backs")

> I don't, this is not the way I would phrase it but as coaches we would talk about players. So, I would say I exhibited that behavior, but not in the negative sense.

(In response to "corrected players' basic techniques")

> Yeah, I believe I tried to do that as much as possible. On a very high level a lot of athletes had bad techniques that I saw that had to be corrected.

Therefore, in the pilot study, it becomes clear that this coach's intentions for exhibiting these negative behaviors was to benefit the team. However, it is apparent that athletes did not have this same perception regarding these behaviors, seeing them as negative, or undesirable.

Some explanations for the discrepancies between athletes' and coaches' perceptions of negative behaviors have been provided by previous investigators. Jones and Nisbett (1972) described the differing perceptions of the person who is committing the act (e.g., coach) and those who are witnessing the act (e.g., athletes). When the act is generally undesirable, or negative, there tend to be perceptual discrepancies. Salminen et al. (1992) and Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) defined this phenomenon in more detail, stating that people generally tend to underestimate their own socially undesirable characteristics. As in the present study, when presented with a list of negative behaviors, it would be socially unacceptable to admit to exhibiting many, if any, of these behaviors.

Due to the large number of negative behaviors that were perceived by the athletes with which the coaches disagreed, it appears that the athletes viewed the coaches more negatively than the coaches viewed themselves. This conclusion is similar to that found by Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) and Percival (1971).

Researchers have found that athletes with lower state self-confidence perceive and evaluate their coaches' behaviors (Kenow & Williams, 1992), teammates, and sport

(Smith et al., 1978) more negatively than those athletes with a high state self-confidence. It may be that the athletes in this study generally had a low state self-confidence at the time of their interviews. The post-season interviews took place within three weeks following the completion of the competitive season. The last game of the season was a devastating loss to the team's biggest rival. During their individual interviews, many athletes expressed regret and feelings of inadequacy regarding their level of play during that last game and desired a second chance at playing the last game. Therefore, their state self-confidence may have been lower, thus leading them to evaluate their coaches more negatively. This negativity may have been targeted more toward the head coach because she was the one who primarily made the decisions as far as who was playing, what plays were called, etc. This may have also led some athletes to blame the head coach for that loss, which would have led them to feel more negatively toward her. This may partially explain why the head coach's master lists contained more negative behaviors than positive behaviors.

Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) compared coaches' and athletes' responses (i.e., regarding coaches' leadership) using the LSS. As a whole, coaches tended to evaluate themselves more positively than did their athletes. Percival (1971) found that 72% of coaches interviewed believed they had a positive coaching style whereas only 32% of their athletes believed they were positive. Also, on a 10-point rating scale, with 10 being the most positive, these same coaches rated themselves a 7 while their athletes rated them a 4.

Furthermore, Percival (1971) stated that, regardless of the coach's intentions, his

or her behaviors could be perceived entirely different by his or her athletes. As in the present study, the coaches often did not recognize that many of their behaviors were perceived as negative by their athletes, regardless of their intentions. When reading the list of negative behaviors, a coach may have perceived specific behaviors to be helpful to the team, not realizing that her athletes had listed them as negative behaviors. Coaches frequently have a misperception of reality concerning what they actually contribute to the team (Fisher et al., 1982; Wandzilak et al., 1988).

Anshel and Straub (1991) stated the importance of coaches and athletes to be aware of each others' perceptions. Without this awareness, effectiveness in building competent coach-athlete relationships will be, at best, difficult to attain. Kenow and Williams (1999) stated that coaches should make a conscious effort to improve their individual relationships with each of their athletes. These researchers found that coach-athlete compatibility is one of the best predictors of how athletes will perceive their coaches' behavior. From these two studies (Anshel & Straub, 1991; Kenow & Williams, 1999) it appears that perceptions of coaching behaviors and coach-athlete compatibility form a cyclic relationship. The better the relationship between the coach and the athlete, the more favorable that athlete will view his or her coach, which will in turn enhance the coach-athlete relationship, and so on.

Ideal Coaching Behaviors

Athletes identified 7 ideal coaching behaviors that they would desire in a coach. The head coach identified 8 ideal coaching behaviors and 5 behaviors that she believed her

athletes would desire. The assistant coach identified 9 ideal coaching behaviors and 10 behaviors she believed her athletes would desire. Of these 39 behaviors, only 4 were identified as ideal coaching behaviors by both the athletes and the coaches. The 4 ideal coaching behaviors were:

1. Mutual respect
2. Demands hard work
3. Motivational
4. Knowledge.

These behaviors are similar to the leader characteristics identified by Anshel (1997) who stated having mutual respect with players, being able to motivate players, and possessing a working knowledge of the game to be crucial components for effective leadership. Athletes and coaches in the present study also identified "demands hard work" as an ideal coaching behavior. This too is supported by Anshel's (1997) description of effective coaching behaviors. Specifically, hard work can be viewed as a precurser, as well as a stable component, of long term commitment and a desire to reach goals. Therefore, all four ideal coaching behaviors identified in this study, by both the athletes and the coaches, reflect and support the existing literature in the area of effective and ideal coaching behaviors.

Other identified ideal coaching behaviors were based on individual preferences and did not reflect the wishes of the group as a whole. Because coaches were not given the opportunity to refute ideal coaching behaviors identified by the athletes, only comparisons of agreement (and not disagreement) on ideal coaching behaviors were made between the

athletes and coaches.

Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors are strikingly similar regarding positive coaching behaviors. However, there exists many differences regarding coaches' and athletes' perceptions of negative coaching behaviors. Coaches tended to evaluate themselves more positively than did their athletes. Also, coaches may think they are engaging in a behavior that will benefit the team while athletes perceive the coaches' behavior as negative, which could potentially be detrimental to team performance. Ultimately, it is the athletes' view, or perception, of the coaches' behavior that will determine the effect and effectiveness of the coaches' behavior (Shaver, 1975; Smoll & Smith, 1989).

This investigation revealed that coaches and athletes tend to agree with those behaviors that are perceived as positive by both the coach and the athletes. Also, coaches and athletes appear to agree with those behaviors perceived as negative to the athlete, but positive to the coach. On the other hand, both coaches and athletes tend to disagree with those behaviors that are perceived as negative.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to conceptualize the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors in regard to three behavioral dimensions: (a) desirable coaching behaviors, (b) undesirable coaching behaviors, and (c) ideal coaching behaviors. Specifically, the research question to be answered through this investigation was, "What are the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors?"

Summary

The results of this study were derived from interviews with athletes (n = 12) and coaches (n = 2) from a Northwestern, Division III women's volleyball team, researcher field observation notes, and participants' (i.e., athletes and coaches) journals. Interviews with the athletes and coaches served as the primary data source. In order to achieve triangulation, data obtained from the participants' interviews, researcher field observation notes, and participants' journals were compared.

The positive master list of the head coach consisted of nine behaviors while the positive master list of the assistant coach consisted of eight behaviors. Of the 17 identified positive behaviors, the coaches agreed with having engaged in 16, or 94% (thus, disagreeing with 1 of 17 behaviors, or 6%). This indicates a high degree of agreement between the coaches' and athletes' perceptions of the positive coaching behaviors that

were exhibited by the coaches throughout the competitive season.

The negative master list of the head coach consisted of 12 behaviors while the negative master list of the assistant coach consisted of 3 behaviors. Of the 15 identified negative behaviors, the coaches agreed with having engaged in 5, or 33% (thus, disagreeing with 10 of 15 behaviors, or 67%). This indicates a high degree of disagreement between the coaches' and athletes' perceptions of the negative coaching behaviors that were exhibited by the coaches throughout the competitive season.

In regard to ideal coaching behaviors, the coaches and athletes in the present investigation agreed on four ideal coaching behaviors. Specifically, a coach should: (a) develop mutual respect with his or her athletes, (b) demand hard work, (c) be motivational, and (d) have knowledge of the game.

Conclusions

This investigation revealed that coaches and athletes tend to agree with those coaching behaviors that are perceived as positive by both the coach and the athletes. Also, coaches and athletes appear to agree with those behaviors perceived as negative to the athlete, but positive to the coach. On the other hand, both coaches and athletes tend to disagree with those coaching behaviors that are perceived as negative.

The athletes in this investigation viewed the coaches more negatively than the coaches viewed themselves. This conclusion is similar to that found by Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) and Percival (1971). This may be explained in that people (in this case, the coaches) generally tend to underestimate their own socially undesirable characteristics

(Salminen et al., 1992; Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996). Therefore, the coaches may have underestimated their own negative behaviors.

The fact that the athletes viewed the coaches more negatively may also be explained in that athletes with lower state self-confidence often perceive and evaluate their coaches behaviors more negatively (Kenow & Williams, 1992). The athletes in this study were interviewed after a devastating season-ending loss, which may have adversely affected their state self-confidence. As a result, the athletes' perceptions and evaluations of their coaches may have been more negative than if they were interviewed following a season-ending win.

The four ideal coaching behaviors identified by athletes and coaches were: (a) mutual respect, (b) demands hard work, (c) motivational, and (d) knowledge. These behaviors are similar to the leader characteristics identified by Anshel (1997) who stated having mutual respect with players, being able to motivate players, and possessing a working knowledge of the game to be crucial components for effective leadership. Athletes and coaches in the present study also identified "demands hard work" as an ideal coaching behavior. This too is supported by Anshel's (1997) description of effective coaching behaviors. Specifically, hard work can be viewed as a precurser, as well as a stable component, of long term commitment and a desire to reach goals. Therefore, all four ideal coaching behaviors identified in this study, by both the athletes and the coaches, reflect and support the existing literature in the area of effective and ideal coaching behaviors.

Recommendations for Future Research

An interesting follow-up to this investigation would be to take the undesirable (i.e., negative) master coaching lists generated in the present study and survey a number of coaches across all levels of sport as to whether or not each behavior on the list is perceived as a positive or a negative behavior. This could either provide strength for or refute the results found in the present study. If future studies found coaching behaviors perceived by athletes as negative and coaches as positive, to be generally viewed by coaches as positive, or helpful to team success (as was perceived by the coaches in this study), then the results of the current study would be supported. However, if those same behaviors were found to be perceived by coaches as negative, or hindering team success (as was perceived by the athletes in this study), then the results of the current study would be refuted.

Salminen and Liukkonen (1996) concluded that female coaches tended to have a more realistic self perception and, thus, may be better able to communicate with their athletes. However, the present study only investigated female athletes and female coaches. As a result, across gender comparisons were not examined. Therefore, it is recommended that this investigation be replicated with more collegiate sport teams and across genders (i.e., male coaches with male athletes, female coaches with female athletes, female coaches with male athletes, and male coaches with female athletes). Replication would provide a greater understanding of the influence of gender (i.e., both coaches and athletes) on perceptions of coaching behaviors as discussed by Salminen and Liukkonen (1996).

It would also be of interest to assess perceptual similarities and differences of coaching behaviors across levels of sport (e.g., youth, high school, collegiate, elite) and specific sports (i.e., both individual and team sports). Previous studies have shown that perceptual differences exist from youth sport (Smith et al., 1978) to the elite sport levels (Percival, 1971). However, these studies have yielded dichotomous (yes or no) answers. A conceptualization of these differences is warranted to further understand the unique coach-athlete relationship.

According to Laughlin and Laughlin (1994), athletes are more satisfied with their sport experience and consider their coaches to be more effective if their coaches are willing to modify their coaching methodologies based on the perceptions, preferences, and needs of the athletes. Future investigations targeting athletes' perceptions, preferences, and needs could provide coaches with valuable information. Future research in this area may include replication of the present study, focusing on defining the specific perceptions of athletes and coaches. Also, this study could be replicated focusing on athlete preferences or needs. Most athletes are unwilling to have a true heart-to-heart talk with their coach about their particular preferences or needs for fear of losing playing time. However, when given the opportunity to discuss such preferences and remain anonymous, athletes are likely to provide such information. A starting point would be to administer questionnaires to teams asking for coaching behavior preferences in particular coaching situations. These preferences could then become a foundation for future research in this area.

The more research conducted in the area of coach-athlete perceptions and

preferences of coaching behaviors, the more coaches and sport psychology consultants will understand athletes' perceptions, preferences, and needs. The end result may be enhanced athlete satisfaction with sport. With enhanced sport satisfaction may come enhanced sport performance. The more that is learned from athletes, the better coaches and consultants can facilitate consistent peak performances.

Appendix A

RECRUITMENT STATEMENT (ATHLETES)

The purpose of this study is to compare coaches' and athletes' perceptions regarding coaching behaviors. I will conduct an interview consisting of questions regarding your perceptions of your coaches' behaviors. The interview will consist of open-ended questions and will take between 20-30 minutes to complete. Responses will be tape recorded. The researcher and Dr. Greg A. Shelley will be the only persons to have access to these tapes. All tapes will be kept under lock and key and will be destroyed at the end of the study. Your participation will be kept confidential and your names will not be used at any time throughout the study. Your coaches will also be interviewed concerning their perceptions of their own coaching behaviors. By agreeing to participate, you acknowledge that you are 18 years of age or older. If there are any questions, please feel free to contact Nicole J. Detling at (607)274-1275, (607)272-0900 (offices), (607)256-8012 (home), or ndetlin1@ic3.ithaca.edu. You may keep this sheet for your own personal records.

Appendix B

RECRUITMENT STATEMENT (COACHES)

The purpose of this study is to compare coaches' and athletes' perceptions regarding coaching behaviors. I will conduct an interview consisting of questions regarding your perceptions of your own coaching behaviors. The interview will consist of open-ended questions and will take between 20-30 minutes to complete. Responses will be tape recorded. The researcher and Dr. Greg A. Shelley will be the only persons to have access to these tapes. All tapes will be kept under lock and key and will be destroyed at the end of the study. Your participation will be kept confidential and your name will not be used at any time throughout the study. Your athletes will also be interviewed concerning their perceptions of your coaching behaviors. If there are any questions, please feel free to contact Nicole J. Detling at (607)274-1275, (607)272-0900 (offices), (607)256-8012 (home), or ndetlin1@ic3.ithaca.edu. You may keep this sheet for your own personal records.

Appendix C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM - ATHLETES

Coaches' and Athletes' Perceptions of Coaching Behaviors

1. Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this investigation is to compare coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors exhibited throughout the competitive season. This study will be conducted with the *(school name)* women's volleyball team.

2. Benefits of the Study
The coaches and athletes involved in this study will benefit by the knowledge gained about the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaches' behaviors. The coaches will be able to gain an awareness of how their particular coaching style is perceived by their athletes. Information gained from this study may also be used by the coaches to enhance coaching effectiveness. Athletes will benefit by the coaches using the information obtained to be more sensitive to the athletes' perceptions of the coaches' behaviors. This may ultimately enhance the coach-athlete communication and relationship. This study will also benefit researchers in the field of sport psychology by fulfilling the need for more qualitative studies examining the relationship between coaches' and athletes' perceptions.

3. What You Will Be Asked To Do
You will be asked to participate in one interview with the researcher at the end of the season. The interview will consist of open-ended questions and will take 20-30 minutes to complete. The interview will be tape recorded and transcribed following the interview. All tapes will be kept under lock and key and destroyed at the completion of the study.

4. What You Can Expect to Happen as a Result of Your Participation in This Study
You may gain a better understanding of your coaches and your relationship with them. There are no foreseeable risks of discomforts to you as a participant. This study does not present any physical or psychological risks to you, your teammates, or your coaches.

5. If You Would Like More Information About the Study
If you have any questions before, during, or after the study, you can contact Nicole J. Detling at (607)274-1275, (607)272-0900 (offices), (607)256-8012 (home), or ndetlin1@ic3.ithaca.edu.

6. Withdrawal from the Study
Participants of this study are free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time. This includes the right to refuse an answer to any question that makes you feel uncomfortable. Participation is voluntary. If you desire to withdraw from the study at anytime, you should notify the researcher immediately.

7. How the Data Will Be Maintained in Confidence
Interview responses will be kept confidential. Pseudonyms will be used in place of your real name. The interviews will be tape recorded and transcribed without the use of names. The researcher and Dr. Greg A. Shelley will be the only persons to have access to these tapes. The tapes will be kept under lock and key and will be destroyed at the end of the study.

I have read the above and I understand its contents. I agree to participate in the study. I acknowledge that I am 18 years of age or older.

_____
Print or Type Name

_____ _____
Signature Date

I understand and consent to my interview being tape recorded.

_____
Print or Type Name

_____ _____
Signature Date

Appendix D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM - COACHES

Coaches' and Athletes' Perceptions of Coaching Behaviors

1. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation is to compare coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaching behaviors exhibited throughout the competitive season. This study will be conducted with the *(school name)* women's volleyball team.

2. Benefits of the Study

The coaches and athletes involved in this study will benefit by the knowledge gained about the similarities and differences between coaches' and athletes' perceptions of coaches' behaviors. The coaches will be able to gain an awareness of how their particular coaching style is perceived by their athletes. Information gained from this study may also be used by the coaches to enhance coaching effectiveness. Athletes will benefit by the coaches using the information obtained to be more sensitive to the athletes' perceptions of the coaches' behaviors. This may ultimately enhance the coach-athlete communication and relationship. This study will also benefit researchers in the field of sport psychology by fulfilling the need for more qualitative studies examining the relationship between coaches' and athletes' perceptions.

3. What You Will Be Asked To Do

You will be asked to participate in one interview with the researcher at the end of the season. The interview will consist of open-ended questions and will take 20-30 minutes to complete. The interview will be tape recorded and transcribed following the interview. All tapes will be kept under lock and key and destroyed at the completion of the study.

4. What You Can Expect to Happen as a Result of Your Participation in This Study

You may gain a better understanding of your athletes and your relationship with them. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to you as a participant. This study does not present any physical or psychological risks to you or your athletes.

5. If You Would Like More Information About the Study

If you have any questions before, during, or after the study, you can contact Nicole J. Detling at (607)274-1275, (607)272-0900 (offices), (607)256-8012 (home), or ndetlin1@ic3.ithaca.edu.

6. Withdrawal from the Study
Participants of this study are free to withdraw consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time. This includes the right to refuse an answer to any question that makes you feel uncomfortable. Participation is voluntary. If you desire to withdraw from the study at anytime, you should notify the researcher immediately.

7. How the Data will be Maintained in Confidence
Interview responses will be kept confidential. Pseudonyms will be used in place of your real name. The interviews will be tape recorded and transcribed without the use of names. The researcher and Dr. Greg A. Shelley will be the only persons to have access to these tapes. The tapes will be kept under lock and key and will be destroyed at the end of the study.

I have read the above and I understand its contents. I agree to participate in the study.

_____
Print or Type Name

_____ _____
Signature Date

I understand and consent to my interview being tape recorded.

_____
Print or Type Name

_____ _____
Signature Date

Appendix E

ATHLETE JOURNAL

Date_____ ID# _____

1. List *(the head coach's)* behaviors this past week that you thought were *positive*. Give examples.

2. List *(the head coach's)* behaviors this past week that you thought were *negative*. Give examples.

3. List *(the assistant coach's)* behaviors this past week that you thought were *positive*. Give examples.

4. List *(the assistant coach's)* behaviors this past week that you thought were *negative*. Give examples.

Appendix F

COACH JOURNAL

Date_____ Coach_____

1. List your own coaching behaviors this past week that you thought were positive. Give examples.

2. List your own coaching behaviors this past week that you thought were negative. Give examples.

Appendix G

INTERVIEW GUIDE - ATHLETES

1. Identify specific behaviors of (the head coach) that you found unpleasant, undesirable, or ineffective.

2. Provide an example of each of these behaviors.

3. Please rank-order these behaviors beginning with the most undesirable.

4. Identify specific behaviors of (the head coach) that you found pleasant, desirable, or effective.

5. Provide an example of each of these behaviors.

6. Please rank-order these behaviors beginning with the most desirable.

Questions 1 - 6 repeated regarding the assistant coach.

7. Identify specific coaching characteristics that your "ideal coach" would possess.

8. Please rank-order these ideal characteristics beginning with the most desirable.

Appendix H

INTERVIEW GUIDE - COACHES

1. Identify specific coaching characteristics that you feel an "ideal coach" would possess.

2. Rank-order that list beginning with the most desirable characteristic.

3. Identify specific coaching characteristics that you feel your athletes would desire in an "ideal coach".

4. Rank-order that list beginning with what you think is the most desirable characteristic for your athletes.

(The following questions pertain to the master lists derived from athletes).

5. Did you exhibit any of these behaviors during this past season?

6. Give me specific examples of those behaviors that you identified as displaying this past season.

7. Rank-order the identified behaviors beginning with the most undesirable.

Questions 5 - 7 repeated pertaining to the coach's positive master list.

REFERENCES

Anshel, M.H. (1997). Sport psychology: From theory to practice (3rd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Anshel, M.H., & Straub, W.F. (1991). Congruence between players' and coaches' perceptions of coaching behaviors. Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual, 1991, 49-65.

Bird, A.M. (1977). Leadership and cohesion within successful and unsuccessful teams: Perceptions of coaches and players. Psychology of Motor Behavior and Sport, 2, 176-182.

Bortoli, L., Robazza, C., & Giabardo, S. (1995). Young athletes' perception of coaches' behavior. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 81, 1217-1218.

Cheffers, J.T.F., Amidon, E.J., & Rogers, K.D. (1974). Interaction analysis: An application to nonverbal activity. Minneapolis, MN: Association for Productive Teaching.

Chelladurai, P. (1984). Discrepancy between preferences and perceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 27-41.

Chelladurai, P., & Carron, A.V. (1983). Athletic maturity and preferred leadership. Journal of Sport Psychology, 5, 371-380.

Chelladurai, P., Haggerty, T.R., & Baxter, P.R. (1989). Decision style choices of university basketball coaches and players. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11, 201-215.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S.D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sport. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 3, 85-92.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S.D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. Journal of Sport Psychology, 2, 34-45.

Fisher, A.C., Mancini, V.H., Hirsch, R.L., Proulx, T.J., & Staurowsky, E.J. (1982). Coach-athlete interactions and team climate. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 388-404.

Horne, T.H., & Carron, A.V. (1985). Compatibility in coach-athlete relationships. Journal of Sport Psychology, 7, 137-149.

Huberman, A.M., & Miles, M.B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Husserl, E. (1962). Ideas. New York: Colliers.

Jackson, S.A. (1995). Factors influencing the occurrence of flow state in elite athletes. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 7, 138-166.

Jones, E.E., & Nisbett, R.E. (1972). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E. Jones (Ed.), Attributions: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kenow, L., & Williams, J.M. (1992). Relationship between anxiety, self-confidence, and the evaluation of coaching behaviors. The Sport Psychologist, 6, 344-357.

Kenow, L., & Williams, J.M. (1999). Coach-athlete compatibility and athlete's perception of coaching behaviors. Journal of Sport Behavior, 22(2), 251-259.

Laughlin, N., & Laughlin, S. (1994). The relationship between the similarity in perceptions of teacher/coach leader behavior and evaluations of their effectiveness. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 22, 396-410.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1995). Designing qualitative research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Percival, L. (1971). The coach from the athlete's viewpoint. In L. Perceival (Ed.)., Proceedings, Art and Science of Coaching Symposium, Toronto.

Prapavessis, H., & Gordon, S. (1991) Coach/player relationships in tennis. Canadian Journal of Sports Science, 16, (3), 229-233.

Salminen, S., & Liukkonen, J. (1996). Coach-athlete relationship and coaching behavior in training sessions. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 27, 59-67.

Salminen, S., Liukkonen, J., & Telama, R. (1992). The differences in coaches' and athletes' perception of leader behaviour of finnish coaches'. In T. Williams, L. Almond, & A. Sparkes (Eds.), Sport and physical activity: Moving towards excellence (pp. 517-522). London: E. & F.N. Spoon.

Schliesman, E.S. (1987). Relationship between the congruence of preferred and actual leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with leadership. Journal of Sport

Behavior, 10(3), 157-166.

Shaver, K.J. (1975). An introduction to attribution processes. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Shelley, G.A. (1998). The lived experience of athletic injury: A phenomenological study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.

Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L., & Curtis, B. (1978). Coaching behaviors in little league baseball. In F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith (Eds.), Psychological perspectives in youth sport (pp. 173-201). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L., & Hunt, E.B. (1977). A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. Research Quarterly, 48, 401-407.

Smoll, F.L., & Smith, R.E. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19, 1522-1551.

Solomon, G.B., Striegel, D.A., Eliot, J.F., Heon, S.N., Maas, J.L., & Wayda, V.K. (1996). The self-fulfilling prophecy in college basketball: Implications for effective coaching. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 8, 44-59.

Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools. New York: The Falmer Press.

Wandzilak, T., Ansorge, C.J., & Potter, G. (1988). Comparison between selected practice and game behaviors of youth sport soccer coaches. Journal of Sport Behavior, 11, (2), 78-88.

Weinberg, R.S. & Gould, D. (1999). Foundations of sport and exercise psychology (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Yukelson, D. (1998). Communicating effectively. In J.M. Williams (Ed.), Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Yukl, G. (1971). Toward a behavior theory of leadership. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6, 414-440.