

The University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

JACKSON LIBRARY



ca

no. 1586

UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

GARVIN, LORRAINE M. Perceptions of CUNY Women Athletes and Coaches
About Selected Coaching Practices. (1977)
Directed by: Dr. Pearl Berlin. Pp. 79

This research described the beliefs and practices associated with women college coaches in the City University of New York. The inquiry attempted to characterize coaches' behavior as it related to three broad considerations: (a) leadership style, (b) coach-player relationships and (c) personal freedom of athletes. Two data sources were used: the coaches' responses to specific questions and the players' responses to the same questions.

The total number of sportswomen involved was 24 women coaches and 250 female intercollegiate athletes. They represent 12 institutions of higher learning in the CUNY system. Two forced-choice structure questionnaires were used as the data gathering instruments.

Analysis of data involved conversion of frequencies of responses into percentages allowing for classification according to arbitrarily designated "anchor adjectives" and calculation of chi square for selected items. Modal responses were used to describe the profile of the women CUNY coach.

The athletes' highest percentage of agreement was on the response to questions about the existence of team regulations; the greatest agreement among coaches was also found on an item referring to team regulations, specifically, their enforcement. For only 6 items were significant differences found. Athletes and coaches differed in their perceptions of the following items: (a) the existence of team regulations, (b) the coaches' effort to see that each athlete was aware of her contribution to the team, (c) the athletes' authority to make decisions, (d) the

coaches' promotion of positive team feelings, (e) the coaches' knowledge of the athletes outside of the team situation and (f) the coaches' awareness of players' concerns not related to sport.

PERCEPTIONS OF CUNY WOMEN ATHLETES
AND COACHES ABOUT SELECTED
COACHING PRACTICES

by

Lorraine M. Garvin

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Physical Education

Greensboro
1977

Approved by

Pearl Berlin

Thesis Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Adviser Pearl Berlin

Committee Members Raymond M. Gue
Margaret A. Worby
Hyman P. Gaskin

3 December 1976
Date of Acceptance by Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Leadership Style	2
Coach-Player Relationships	2
Personal Freedom of Athletes	3
Definitions	3
Basic Assumptions	4
Delimitations	4
Significance of the Study	4
II. REVIEW OF RELATED INFORMATION	5
The City University of New York	5
Changing Roles and Expectations of Women	7
The Socialization of Women	7
Woman and Sport	9
Recent Events in the Development of Women's Intercollegiate Sports	10
The Leadership Role of the Coach	13
Role Models	13
Lack of Women Coaches	14
Selected Research About Coaches and Athletes	15
III. PROCEDURES	17
Formulation of the Data Gathering Instrument	17
Selection of the Subjects	18
Administration of the Questionnaire	19
Preparation of Responses for Analysis	20
Analysis of the Data	21
Anchor Adjectives	21

CHAPTER	Page
IV. DATA, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	23
Data	23
Personal Freedom of Athletes.	34
Statistical Analysis.	34
Chi Square Analysis.	34
Profile of the Modal CUNY Woman Coach	47
Discussion	47
Leadership Style.	48
Competitive Situation	50
Coach-Player Relationships	50
Personal Freedom.	51
V. SUMMARY	53
Purpose	53
Leadership Style.	53
Coach-Player Relationships	53
Personal Freedom of Athletes.	54
Selection of the Subjects and Data	
Gathering.	54
Analysis of Data	54
Major Findings.	55
Conclusions	56
Leadership Style.	56
Coach-Player Relationships	57
Personal Freedom of Athletes	58
Recommendations	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	62
APPENDIXES	66
A. Coaches' Questionnaire	66
B. Athletes' Questionnaire	73
C. The CUNY Institutions and Sports	78
D. Sample Letter	79

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques: Pre-Season	24
2	Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques: Practice	29
3	Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques: Competitive Situation	32
4	Frequency of Responses Concerning Coach-Player Relationships	35
5	Frequency of Coaches' Responses to the Personal Freedom of Athletes	37
6	"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses: Very Similar	39
7	"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses: Quite Similar	42
8	"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses: Somewhat Similar	42
9	Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of the Coaches Regarding the Existence of Team Regulations	44
10	Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of the Coaches Effort to Make Athletes Aware of Their Contribution to the Team	44
11	Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of Coaches Allowing Athletes to Make Decisions	45
12	Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of Coaches Promoting a Positive Team Feeling	45
13	Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of Coaches Knowledge of Team Outside of the Team Situation	46
14	Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of Coaches Awareness of Players' Concerns Not Related to Sport	46

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As one peruses the research in physical education and sport, the preponderance of information dealing with male athletes and male coaches is noticeable. Such a review provides an awareness of the limited amount of published information concerning the abilities and characteristics of female athletes and female coaches. Wyrick (1971) states that 56% of the physical education studies associated with the 1970 year used male subjects as the source of data while only 19% of the investigations utilized female subjects. She calls attention to the fact that "ten years ago these percentages were even more biased toward the male species. Sixty-five percent of all studies reported in Research Quarterly utilizes male subjects. Only 18% investigate the abilities of women (Wyrick, 1971, p. 21)." Further examination reveals that reported studies about women are primarily concerned with the female participant not the coach.

This study focuses specifically on the female as coach. More and more in this era of "new athletics" for women, there is reference to the critical role of women sport leaders. Hopefully, this investigation marks just the beginning of explorations into a vast area which, up until now, has been largely ignored by physical educators and sport theorists.

Statement of the Problem

This research describes the beliefs and practices currently associated with women college coaches in the City University of New York. More specifically, the inquiry attempts to characterize coaches' behavior as it relates to three broad considerations: (a) leadership style, (b) coach-player relationships, and (c) personal freedom of athletes. Two data sources are used: the coaches' responses to specific questions and the players' responses to the same questions. The study seeks to answer the specific questions about three dimensions of coaching.

Leadership Style

1. How do coaches perceive their leadership style? How do athletes perceive the leadership style of their coaches?
2. How does the coach purport to allow for player leadership? How do the players perceive their opportunities for leadership?
3. How does the coach perceive the establishment of team goals? How do the players perceive the establishment of team goals?

Coach-Player Relationships

1. How does the coach perceive her relationships with the players as a group and as individuals? How do the players perceive the coach-player relationship?
2. How does the coach demonstrate her concern for overall team welfare? How do the players perceive the coaches' concern for overall team welfare?
3. How does the coach purport to promote positive social relationships among players? How do the players perceive the coaches' efforts at achieving positive social relationships?

Personal Freedom of Athletes

1. What freedom do coaches purport to allow their players? What restrictions, if any, do coaches place on the personal behavior of team members when they are not representing the team?
2. What restrictions, if any, do coaches place on the personal appearance of team members when they are not representing the team?

Given the importance generally assigned to the role of the coach and her potential influence on athletes and sport as a human enterprise, the data obtained from this study may offer clues for reinforcing, changing or modifying present conceptions about leadership style.

Definitions

For purposes of this report the following definitions are established:

CUNY--the various colleges which comprise the system of higher education of the City University of New York.

CUNY-College Coach--any woman who is presently coaching either a J.V. and/or a Varsity womens intercollegiate team for the City University of New York.

J.V. and/or Varsity Womens Intercollegiate Team--a team which is officially designated as the college representative for the purpose of intercollegiate competition.

Intercollegiate Competition--competition with other colleges within a designated season.

Leadership Style--the manner in which a coach interacts with her team.

Basic Assumptions

Two assumptions are fundamental to this study. First, the inquiry is based on the expectation that honest responses are given to the questionnaires by the players and coaches. Second and more important to the interpretation of the findings, face validity of the questionnaire, developed specifically for use in gathering the data, is assumed.

Delimitations

The nature and make-up of the sample delimit the study. For example, the specific duties called for in coaching some sports are ignored. Although various general functions and behaviors of women intercollegiate coaches of the colleges of CUNY are examined, not all CUNY women coaches nor all sports are included in the coaches sample.

Only three dimensions of coaching practices are investigated: leadership style, coach-player relationships and personal freedom of athletes. The determination of these is based totally on responses to forced-choice structured questionnaires--one prepared specifically for the coaches and one for the team members. With respect to the player sample, at least one varsity team for each of the participating schools took part in the study.

Significance of the Study

Since relatively little information about women coaches has been systematically gathered and reported, this research has the potential to contribute to general knowledge about women's leadership in competitive sports. Further, it provides a definite picture of coaching practices of the women of CUNY and how these are perceived by participating athletes.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED INFORMATION

In order to provide a background for understanding the setting in which this study was conducted, this chapter first describes the composition and functions of the City University of New York. Particular attention is directed to the University's diverse intercollegiate athletic program for its women students. Following is a brief overview of recent events in the development of women's intercollegiate sports at the national level. The discussion calls specific attention to certain decisions by controlling sport organizations which are believed to have influenced the development of women's programs. Inasmuch as this study is particularly concerned with the leadership role of the coach, research that is related to this topic is also presented. Finally, the chapter identifies other inquiries that bear upon the general nature of the subject under investigation.

The City University of New York

The CUNY system is comprised of 19 colleges which include both junior colleges and four year schools. Although all of the colleges function as part of CUNY, each college is independent of the others. Institutions are scattered geographically among the five boroughs comprising New York City: The Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, and Richmond (Staten Island). Since the schools do not provide dormitory

accommodations, the students commute to school by both private and public transportation.

Two unique features of CUNY are its tuition free financial structure and its policy of open enrollment.* These two characteristics provide for a free college education for any graduate of a New York City high school.

The development of the present-day women's intercollegiate sports program in the city university somewhat parallels the developments and changes taking place in women's sports programs all over the country. Keeping pace with the relatively recent emergence of the AIAW, as the leading sport association for college women, the sports programs for women in CUNY have been expanding in terms of budget, numbers of teams and higher levels of competition. There is now the opportunity for CUNY teams to compete in state, regional, and/or national tournaments in badminton, golf, basketball, field hockey, fencing, softball, gymnastics, competitive swimming and diving, volleyball, tennis, and track and field.

Each college in the system conducts its intercollegiate program independently. Furthermore, each institution assigns a coordinator for the women's intercollegiate athletic program. Her duties involve the development and administration of the budget, assignment of facilities, purchase of equipment and uniforms, scheduling of games,

*During the documentation of the present study, both of these features have been changed. Effective September 1976 students will pay tuition comparable to that paid by students in the State Colleges.

arrangement of transportation, and representation of the college at intercollegiate conferences. In effect, then, the coordinating task involves the formulation of policies and carrying them out.

The separate teams are under the guidance of coaches who are members of either the department of physical education or who are considered to be adjunct faculty. The length of a season and the number of contests are determined by sport. The scheduling of games for the entire year is accomplished at an annual spring meeting attended by the intercollegiate coordinators and/or the coaches. A number of colleges conclude the year's activities with a luncheon or a dinner at which time awards are presented to team members.

Changing Roles and Expectations of Women

Consideration of the changing roles of women in American culture is believed, by the writer, to provide information for understanding the sportswoman and her behavior. Selected writings on the topic are presented which delineate recent ideas about contemporary women in our society.

The Socialization of Women

Janeway (1971) defined role as "a product of the social system within which it exists (p.100)." She further stated that one acquires the characteristics of the role as a result of socialization and learned behavior.

Kagan (1964) contended that acquisition of one's sex role is achieved through identification with another person, acquisition of

traits that society defines as feminine and masculine and through one's perception that other people regard the individual as displaying the approved characteristics of one's sex. Bardwick and Douvan (1971) called attention to parental influence, peer influence, and positive and negative reinforcement as means of socializing Americans. In the socialization process, individuals internalize the roles and norms expected of them (Felshin, 1974).

It is clear that very early in life girls learn that physical aggression is not considered an appropriate behavior among females. They also learn that society has a different standard of behavior for women than for men (Gerber, 1972; Kagan, 1964). The outcome of this socialization process has resulted in a stereotyped role for woman as wife and mother, submissive to the male. "The construct of woman is based on 'femininity' (Felshin, 1974, p. 189)." The "feminine" woman is typed as passive, weak, dull, submissive, non-competitive, talkative, emotional, unintelligent, cold, a wife, mother and child-bearer (Coffey, 1965; Felshin, 1974; Janeway, 1971; Kagan, 1964; McClelland, 1964; Menzie, 1974). On the other hand, the "masculine" man is aggressive, strong, intelligent, competitive, self-confident, dominant, independent, and loyal (Dunkle, 1974; Felshin, 1974; Mann, 1972; McClelland, 1964). At all times the female "is defined not in terms of her self but in relation to men (McClelland, 1964, p. 173)." The qualities that are most desired, valued and considered to be the norm are those attributed to males. If a woman deviates from the norm by expressing aggression

or independence (male qualities), she is considered unfeminine, unladylike and undesirable (Felshin, 1974; Gerber, 1972).

Woman and Sport

Many claims have been made for and about sport. Historically, it was believed that sport developed certain positive attitudes (Nash, 1931; Oberteuffer, 1963; Williams, 1930; Tutko, 1968; Voltmer & Esslinger, 1967). Ramo (1974) stated that for years the public accepted the idea that sport built character. Felshin (1974) alleged that sport institutionalizes a behavioral mode that conforms to an image of masculinity. Sport is considered to be a male preserve (Gerber, 1974; Felshin, 1974). As such, it "has offered the male recognition and acceptance . . . and a chance to develop desirable qualities (Mann, 1972)." Other writers indicated that sport is a place where a man can test his manliness and that sport serves as a masculinity rite for men (Menzie, 1974; Scott, 1974).

Where has this placed the sportswoman? The traits believed necessary for success in high-level competition are those traits associated with masculinity which contradict the expected role of woman (Dunkle, 1974; Harris, 1971). The sportswoman, then, is caught in a double bind between the desire to compete and the fear of losing her feminine image (Felshin, 1974; Harris, 1972). Komarovsky (1953) stated that at some time during adolescence the message was clear that competition was aggressive and unfeminine and that deviating from the norm threatened heterosexual relationships.

It has been pointed out that although society favors athletics for men, women are prohibited from engaging in sport for fear that they will acquire masculine characteristics (Gilbert & Williamson, 1973; Mann, 1972). Mann (1972), however, argued that if sport fulfills certain needs for men and develops such desired qualities as aggression and independence which are absent in the feminine image, it is important that women engage in sport.

Recent Events in the Development of Women's Intercollegiate Sports

The aforementioned comments about the socialization of women and the feminine image, cause one to recognize the influence that the feminine ideal had on the development of women's intercollegiate sports.

For many years, physical educators, both male and female, felt that high level competition was detrimental to the female athlete and "in many parts of the country, the philosophy arose that . . . indulging in strenuous activities and competition was physically and mentally harmful to the girl and young woman (Klafs & Lyon, 1973, p. 7)." Educators felt that the training required for high level competition had an adverse effect on the child bearing process. These notions had their origins in confusing medical opinions. There was also fear that women could increase the size of their muscles thereby causing them to look unfeminine and that participation in sports would tend to "masculinize the behavior of women (Harris, 1971, p. 1)." These prejudices and misconceptions were partly responsible for extremely limited programs of interscholastic and intercollegiate competition for women until long after the mid-century.

The philosophy of the Division of Girls' and Women's Sports, a group that exercised considerable control over educationally-based sports programs for girls and women, did not encourage high level competition for the highly skilled athlete (Scott, 1969). Instead, it stressed the development of sound instructional programs which were complemented by intramural programs and playdays (Bevans, 1968). Not until 1963 was competition for girls and women a serious concern of the organization. It was then that the DGWS formulated a statement of policies for competition in girl's and women's sports. Part of the statement suggested the "possibility" (*italics mine*) of including interscholastic programs (DGWS Statement, 1965; Scott & Ulrich, 1966). The DGWS in February 1965, prompted by continued national interest in newly developing competitive programs, held a Study Conference on Competition for Girls and Women to establish guidelines for these programs. The DGWS established and published guidelines for high school, college and university programs and noted that they were in the process of preparing an additional statement for junior high school programs (Scott & Ulrich, 1966). It was at this point in time that DGWS finally acknowledged the need for competitive opportunities for the highly skilled female athlete.

When it became apparent, in the mid-sixties, that women were gaining more and more opportunities to compete in high level competition, it was necessary for a formal organization to be formed to regulate and govern women's intercollegiate competition. Leaders in the field recognized that decisions concerning women's competition

would have far reaching effects on the sportswoman of the future (Coffey, 1965) and that there were sufficient numbers of competitors striving for individual excellence to warrant more serious examination of the needs of these women (Scott & Ulrich, 1966). Therefore, in January 1966, at the request of the Division of Girls and Women's Sports and with the approval of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) came into being (Ley, 1969; Scott & Ulrich, 1966).

In 1971-72 the CIAW was replaced by the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). This organization, under the direction of the DGWS, continued to provide "a governing body and the leadership for initiating and maintaining standards of excellence in women's intercollegiate athletic programs (Adams, 1972, p.6)."

As recently as 1972 the DGWS Scholarship Statement did not permit the awarding of athletic scholarships or grants to women (Adams, 1972). This policy, combined with the "new feminism," rooted in the women's liberation movement, has had far reaching effects on women's sport. In 1972 the DGWS scholarship policy was challenged in *Kellmeyer vs. NEA* (DGWS Philosophy, 1973). This challenge forced a revision in the DGWS Scholarship Statement. The April 1973 policy stated: "DGWS believes that the appropriate solution in our contemporary society is one directed to avoiding abuses while providing to female students, on an equitable basis, benefits comparable to those available to male students similarly situated (Policies, 1973, p. 51)."

Litigation and/or the threat of litigation opened a whole new world for women sport competitors. As of the writing of this research report, women can no longer be denied the opportunity to compete. Girls' and women's programs must have their fair share of budgets, coaching staff, facilities and competitive experiences. All of the ramifications resulting from this action are yet unknown. One can only speculate about the future of women's intercollegiate programs. However, it seems logical to predict that accountability and the prominence of the women coach will be more evident.

The Leadership Role of the Coach

Role Models

Research has shown the importance that role models have played in the formation of one's sex role identity (Smith, 1972; Zoble, 1971). Schram, Lyle, and Parker (1961) asserted that role models shape behavior and modify the social norms of children and adolescents. Kemper (1968) pointed out that achievement is related to the kind of reference groups available to individuals and that in the kind of these reference groups the individual's striving for achievement will be hampered.

Examination of reference groups for women showed that there are few positive role models. Zoble (1972) offered the view that the type of role model available for women was the traditional, stereotyped, feminine image. In addition, she remarked that the development of women in academic and sport achievement was hampered by the lack of reference groups of women who achieved in these areas. According to Smith (1972), in sport "violent role models with whom women can identify are conspicuously lacking (p. 105)," and Gilbert and Williamson (1973) noted

the lack of women coaches available to provide a role model for female athletes.

Feminists have claimed that the way to alter society's perception of the woman is to change the role model. The feminist movement has made continuous efforts to change the stereotypic, feminine image and the passivity and the dependence associated with it (Felshin, 1974). Menzie (1974) stated that the leaders of women's sport " . . . have to establish themselves as the role models with which to identify (pp. 109-110)."

Lack of Women Coaches

In what might be loosely referred to as contemporary era, the First National Institute on Girls' Sports marked the acknowledgement of the lack of women coaches and a concerted effort to change the picture (Jernigan, 1965). More recent writings by Gilbert and Williamson (1973) brought to the attention of the general public the disparity of athletic opportunities between women and men. Gilbert and Williamson (1973) pointed out that most often men's athletics receive the largest portion of the budget and are granted more prime time in the better facility. Also, they have highly qualified coaching staffs. Because the athletic program for men is so much better, more knowledgeable and highly skilled athletes are produced. Many later become coaches thereby adding to the number of available male coaches and also upgrading the competency levels. Since women's athletics have not had the same opportunities as men's, there have been fewer women available to coach. Additionally,

Hartman (1968), Neal (1969) and Spasoff (1971) have commented about the lack of women available to coach women.

Selected Research About Coaches and Athletes

Information about women coaches has been meager. Some investigation of leadership characteristics and their purported effects in sport have been reported with respect to males. Buhrer (1973), however, studied the perceptions of "the woman athlete" and "the woman coach." She reported that the perceptions of women coaches and the perceptions of women athletes differed with respect to the idea of these two percepts: "the woman athlete" and "the woman coach." Martin (1974) researched the expectations of female collegiate athletes and found that one dimension of coaching not highly valued by athletes was the coaches' philosophical commitments. She found that most highly valued was the coaches' consideration for each athlete's individuality. Kennick (1972) studied the self-profiles of highly skilled high school female athletes and found differences in the teams' perception of the coaches. Her finding may not apply to college athletes. Ziegler (1972) examined the self-perceptions of high school athletes and their coaches. She stated that it was important for players to know how their coach views them. In her opinion, the opposite is also important, namely, that the coach knows how the athlete perceives her. Hendry's work (1970) was concerned with males. He examined the interpersonal relations of athlete and coach. He stated that the social interaction between coach and athlete may have an effect on the performance of the athlete's skill. In general, the literature on the subject, though limited, pointed out that although

there are discrepancies between coaches' and athletes' perceptions, communication between coach and athlete seems to be regarded as a critical interaction for both individuals.

CHAPTER III PROCEDURES

After completion of the preliminary review of literature and careful specification to the problem, the method of carrying out the inquiry was planned. The following procedures were followed in data collection and analysis.

Formulation of the Data Gathering Instrument

Tuckman (1974) stated that "questionnaires . . . are used . . . to convert into data the information directly given by a person (subject) (p. 173)." He further pointed out that questionnaires provide access to information that is in a person's head. This type of instrument makes it possible to measure what people know and think. For the above reasons and because of the nature of the information desired in this research, a forced-choice structured questionnaire was identified as the most suitable data gathering instrument. However, the researcher was unable to locate an existing questionnaire that could provide data to answer the particular questions framing this study. This was expected because lack of information about the topic was partly responsible for the undertaking of this study. However, an investigation by Freeman (1970) examining the coaching philosophy and practices of high school male track coaches did serve as a guideline for formulating the questionnaire used in the present study. Some of Freeman's original questions were adapted for use; to them the researcher added more. The exact categories under which the questions were grouped were also

inspired by Freeman: leadership style, coach-player relationships and personal freedom of athletes. After establishing the main categories the tedious task of formulating, deleting, adding and changing questions followed. For purposes of description, each questionnaire item was reported as a sub-variable.

After completing the form which served as the coach's questionnaire, the athlete's questionnaire was prepared by appropriately modifying each question. If a coach's question read "Do you have a philosophic stance that you use as a guideline to your leadership behavior?," the matching question for the athlete read "Does your coach have a philosophic stance which she used as a guideline to her leadership behavior?"

For a trial administration, the questionnaire was distributed to coaches at UNC-G and to graduate students who had previous coaching experience. Revisions were made as a result of the pilot study. Suggestions from trial subjects which could contribute to semantic clarity were heeded. The final questionnaires are presented in Appendixes A and B.

Selection of the Subjects

Because of the writer's particular interest and experiences and considering the accessibility of the data, the coaching beliefs and practices associated with the women's intercollegiate teams of CUNY were identified as the population to be studied. Since this study was concerned only with women coaches, two teams which were coached by a male coach were excluded. A complete list of participating institutions and specific teams participating in the study is presented in Appendix C.

An alphabetical list of all women coaches was compiled and the participation of these individuals in the research was first solicited by letter. The nature of the study was explained. A follow-up telephone call for a specific appointment was identified in the letter. See Appendix D for sample letter. Final player participation occurred by virtue of the coach's involvement in the study.

The total number of sportswomen finally involved in the investigation was 24 women coaches and 250 female intercollegiate athletes. Altogether, they represented 12 institutions of higher education in the CUNY system. The universal of the population included 29 teams representing the following sports: basketball, fencing, field hockey, gymnastics, swimming and diving, and volleyball.

Administration of the Questionnaire

It was decided that the questionnaire be administered after the subjects had experienced at least half of the season's competition. This timing was important because several of the questions dealt with the competitive situation during the sports season. The investigator supervised the administration of the form to both coaches and athletes. She met with each team between November 1973 and mid-March 1974 on a pre-arranged basis. The coach was given her questionnaire in a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. She was asked to either complete the questionnaire immediately--at the same time that the members of her team were responding--or at a more convenient time if she preferred. When the latter choice was made, the form was returned by mail. At no time during the data gathering process was the coach present during administration of the questionnaires to the athletes.

Procedures for distribution, responding and collection of the completed questionnaires were carried out in each institution in the same way. First, the investigator explained the general idea of the study. It was carefully pointed out that the answers to the questionnaire would not be interpreted to reflect a value judgment of the coach. It was emphasized that it was not the purpose of the research to reveal whether the coach was good or bad and, furthermore, the pre-administration explanation asserted that the responses were not capable of indicating such value-loaded information. Also, the players were assured that their coach would not see their responses. Finally, the athletes were directed not to discuss any questions with a teammate while answering the questionnaire nor to discuss the questions with other school team members who might participate in the study at a later date. The researcher was present at all times to answer any questions and to collect each questionnaire when the athlete completed it.

Just prior to the end of the data collecting stage a brief reminder was sent to all those coaches who had failed to return the questionnaire. Of the 28 coaches surveyed, 24 (86%) returned the questionnaire.

Preparation of Responses for Analysis

It was decided that data analysis be accomplished, in part, by use of the computer. To accommodate questionnaire information obtained from both athletes and coaches, coding plans were devised. Because the coaches' form contained numerous questions not asked of the players, i.e., educational background information and a series of questions pertaining to beliefs and practices about players' personal freedom, two data decks were key-punched.

Analysis of the Data

Initial analysis of both sets of responses was accomplished by use of the program Marginals of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Computer facilities at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro were utilized in this processing. From the obtained tabulations of frequencies and percentages of responses, it was possible to describe coaches' and players' perceptions with respect to the questions framing this inquiry.

Anchor Adjectives

In order to enhance the discussion and interpretation of individual questionnaire items, a plan was arbitrarily adopted that permitted comparisons to be made between percentage results obtained from the athletes and the percentage response obtained from the coaches. Borrowing from Nunnally (1967), anchor adjectives were identified. Response alternatives by coaches and athletes which were within 1 to 24% of each other were interpreted to be very similar. When the percentage of yes or no or don't know was between 25 and 49% the comparison was considered to be quite similar. Somewhat similar was designed to stand for percentage differences between 50 and 74% and in instances where there was as much as 75% difference or more, the comparison was only slightly similar. Tables 6 and 7 reveal the items that fit the very similar and quite similar categories; table 8 shows the one response that fits the somewhat similar category. There were no responses that fit the only slightly similar category.

To evaluate the differences between coach and player responses, chi square analysis of selected items was undertaken. The latter statistical treatment was pursued, however, only for sub-variables where the distribution of responses was such that chi square assumptions were not violated. Although the data for other sub-variables might have been collapsed to permit chi square calculations, it was decided that the integrity of such questions as posed would be diminished; therefore, no such condensing of responses was done. Thus, nine chi squares were run; these were corrected for continuity in accord with Siegel's (1956) directives. Six analyses revealed statistically significant differences and are detailed in Chapter IV.

A final step in the analysis was made from coaches' responses. A single profile of the hypothetical CUNY coach was developed from modal responses to questions relating to personal factors, educational background and coaching experiences.

Questions categorized as relating to "Personal Freedom of Athletes" were considered according to percentages of responses. There were no comparable questions on this topic on the athletes' questionnaires.

CHAPTER IV
DATA, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the data was undertaken to answer the questions that structured this research. In the first part of the analysis the frequencies of responses of the coaches and athletes were tabulated. Then, the frequencies were converted into percentages to allow comparison between coaches' responses and athletes' responses. Frequencies for differences were also placed in contingency tables to permit calculation of chi square when indicated. Finally, modal responses were used to describe the profile of the CUNY woman coach.

Data

The frequencies and percentages of obtained responses to all questions except background coaches' data was presented below. All yes/no questions are tabled and identified according to broad category of coaching behavior and specific questionnaire item numbers. The answers to those sub-variables that did not call for a yes/no response are presented in text format. Frequencies are reported for 250 athletes and 24 coaches.

Other raw data not represented in the above table but concerned with Pre-Season Coaching techniques are:

Table 1
Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques:
Pre-Season

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 1*	Philosophic stance	110	44	37	15
Coach 15*		20	83	3	13
Athlete 2	Discuss philosophy	150	60	89	36
Coach 16		18	75	6	25
Athlete 3	Team goals	226	91	20	8
Coach 17		24	100	0	0
Athlete 4	Consult team in estab. goals	175	71	69	27
Coach 18		14	58	9	38
Athlete 6	Team regulations	77	77	107	20
Coach 20		20	83	4	17
Athlete 7	Consult team in estab. team regulations	132	53	107	43
Coach 21		13	54	10	42
Athlete 9	Regulations enforced	158	63	72	29
Coach 23		21	88	0	0

*In addition to tabled responses, 88 athletes indicated "don't know" to Question 1.

Table 1 (continued)
Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques:
Pre-Season

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 12	Athlete aware of contribution	170	68	76	29
Coach 26		21	88	2	8
Athlete 13	Assistance in admin. details	191	77	40	16
Coach 27		20	83	4	17
Athlete 14	Have captain	216	87	31	12
Coach 28		22	92	2	8
Athlete 15	Have manager	206	82	42	17
Coach 29		21	88	3	12
Athlete 16	Have publicity agent	71	28	166	67
Coach 30		11	46	13	54
Athlete 17	Have trainer	135	54	112	45
Coach 31		15	63	9	37
Athlete 20	Have other assistance	82	33	139	56
Coach 34		4	17	16	67

N = 250 athletes; 24 coaches

Summations that do not account for the total N were caused by either missing items or non-codable items.

1. AQ* 10; CQ* 24 regarding frequency of enforcement of team regulations, 12 (50%) of the coaches and 92 (37%) of the athletes indicated OFTEN while 9 (36%) of the coaches and 76 (13%) of the athletes indicated SOMETIMES.
2. AQ 11; CQ 24 regarding authority with respect to the enforcement of regulations, 8 (33%) of the coaches said that the CAPTAIN enforced regulations, 3 (13%) said the TEAM, 5 (21%) said ALL ENFORCE JOINTLY, 4 (17%) said COACH/CAPTAIN and 1 (4%) said COACH/MANAGER. Four (29%) athletes indicated CAPTAIN, 14 (6%) said TEAM, 49 (20%) said ALL ENFORCE JOINTLY, 12 (5%) said COACH/CAPTAIN, 1 (.4%) said COACH/MANAGER, 74 (30%) said COACH and 88 (35%) DID NOT RESPOND.
3. AQ 18; CQ 32 regarding the classification of the trainer, 13 (54%) of the coaches said STUDENT and 11 (46%) said PROFESSIONAL. Sixty-four (47%) of the athletes said that the trainer was a PROFESSIONAL, 58 (42%) said STUDENT, and 14 (45%) specified OTHER.
4. AQ 19; CQ 33 concerning the availability of the trainer, 15 (63%) coaches stated that the trainer was available for GAMES only, 3 (13%) stated PRACTICE only and 6 (25%) stated for GAMES AND PRACTICES. Seventy (53%) athletes indicated that the trainer was available for GAMES, 9 (7%) indicated PRACTICES, and 47 (36%) indicated both GAMES AND PRACTICES.

*Hereafter, AQ refers to the item numbered on the athletes' form; CQ designates the coaches' form.

5. AQ 21; CQ 35 concerning the method by which the positions of captain, manager, publicity agent and trainer were filled, for captain, 20 (83%) coaches and 186 (87%) athletes indicated ELECTED, 25 (12%) athletes indicated APPOINTED, 3 (13%) coaches and 2 (1%) athletes specified OTHER. For manager, 2 (8%) coaches and 36 (19%) athletes stated ELECTED, 15 (63%) coaches and 118 (62%) athletes stated APPOINTED, and 5 (21%) coaches and 36 (19%) athletes stated OTHER. For publicity agent 11 (14%) athletes indicated ELECTED, 6 (25%) coaches and 30 (48%) athletes indicated APPOINTED and 4 (17%) coaches and 30 (48%) athletes specified OTHER. For trainer, 6 (5%) athletes indicated ELECTED, 6 (25%) coaches and 84 (71%) athletes indicated APPOINTED, and 8 (33%) coaches and 29 (57%) athletes specified OTHER.
6. AQ 22; CQ 36 regarding the perception of the pre-competitive period as a time for experimentation and flexibility or as a period which was static, committed, and pre-programmed, 22 (92%) of the coaches and 130 (52%) athletes viewed the pre-competitive period as a time for EXPERIMENTATION AND FLEXIBILITY, and 0 (0%) coaches and 27 (11%) athletes viewed it as STATIC, COMMITTED AND PRE-PROGRAMMED. Two (8%) coaches and 74 (30%) athletes could not answer the question.

Other questions concerned with Practice Coaching techniques not represented in the above tables are:

1. AQ 23; CQ 37 concerning written plans for practice, 14 (58%) coaches stated that they had written plans for practice OFTEN,

- 9 (38%) SOMETIMES and 1 (4%) NEVER. Sixty (24%) athletes indicated that their coaches had written plans for practice OFTEN, 103 (42%) SOMETIMES, and 78 (31%) NEVER.
2. AQ 28; CQ 42 concerning the conditioning of athletes, 18 (75%) coaches and 121 (48%) athletes said both PHYSICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL, while 4 (17%) coaches and 39 (16%) athletes indicated PHYSICAL only and 2 (8%) coaches and 5 (2%) athletes said PSYCHOLOGICAL only.
 3. AQ 32; CQ 46 regarding the frequency of changes permitted in an athlete's practice regimen when requested by the athlete, 20 (83%) coaches and 176 (71%) athletes indicated that athletes were allowed to change SOMETIMES, and 1 (4%) coach and 25 (10%) athletes indicated OFTEN.
 4. AQ 33; CQ 47 relating to the percent of practice time during the pre-competitive period set aside for conditioning, for skills and for the competitive situation, 11 (46%) coaches said that they spent 0-15% of practice time on CONDITIONING, 12 (50%) said 16-60% and 1 (4%) said 61-100%. Thirty-six percent of the athletes stated that 0% was set aside for CONDITIONING, 24% stated between 1-15%, 43% stated 16-60% and 3% stated 61-100%. Seventeen percent did not respond.
 5. AQ 34; CQ 48 Three (13%) coaches stated that they spent 0-15% of practice time on SKILLS, 17 (71%) stated 16-60% and 4 (17%) stated 61-100%. Eight percent of the athletes indicated 1-15%, 62% indicated 16-60% and 14% indicated 61-100%. Fifteen percent did not respond.

Table 2
Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques:
Practice

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 24	Coach plans practice	216	87	29	12
Coach 38		23	96	1	14
Athlete 25	Athlete plans entire practice	31	12	216	87
Coach 39		7	29	17	71
Athlete 26	Athlete plans part practice	130	52	114	46
Coach 40		15	63	9	37
Athlete 27	Time for conditioning	176	71	70	28
Coach 41		20	83	4	17
Athlete 29	Athlete assist plan	87	35	152	61
Coach 43		8	33	16	67
Athlete 30	Athlete must follow cond. program	165	66	77	31
Coach 44		13	54	11	46
Athlete 31	Allow individual changes	192	77	49	20
Coach 45		21	88	3	12

Table 2 (continued)

Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques:Practice

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 36	Experts assist	61	25	182	73
Coach 50		6	25	18	75

N = 250 athletes; 24 coaches

Summations that do not account for the total N were caused by either missing items or non-codable items.

6. AQ 35; CQ 49 Four (17%) coaches stated they spent from 0-15% of practice time on the COMPETITIVE SITUATION, 17 (71%) stated 16-60%, and 2 (8%) stated 61-100%. Fourteen percent of the athletes stated between 1-15%, 62% stated 16-60% and 7% stated 61-100%. Sixteen percent of the athletes did not respond.

Additional data not represented in the above tables but concerned with coaching techniques for the competitive situation are:

1. AQ 45; CQ 58 concerning athletes authority to make decisions during competition, 2 (8%) coaches and 8 (3%) athletes specified OTHER.
2. AQ 50; CQ 63 regarding the coaches' characterization of self as a strict, moderate, or permissive coach, 1 (4%) coach indicated STRICT, 11 (46%) MODERATE, 4 (17%) PERMISSIVE, 5 (21%) a COMBINATION and 3 (13%) were missing. Twenty-six athletes characterized their coaches as STRICT, 87 (35%) said MODERATE, 32 (13%) said PERMISSIVE, 90 (36%) said a COMBINATION.

Other raw data not represented in the above table but concerned with Coach-Player Relationships are:

1. AQ 54; CQ 67 regarding the responsibility for initiating discussion of non-team matters, 1 (4%) coach indicated COACH, 2 (8%) indicated ATHLETE and 19 (77%) indicated both COACH AND ATHLETE. Eleven (5%) athletes stated COACH, 162 (79%) stated ATHLETE, 36 (17%) wrote in CAPTAIN, and 2 (1%) wrote in COACH/CAPTAIN.

Table 3
Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques:
Competitive Situation

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 39	Allow athlete make decision	173	69	70	28
Coach 53		22	92	1	4
Athlete 41	Substitute	46	19	178	71
Coach 54		6	25	16	67
Athlete 42	Call time-out	125	50	93	38
Coach 55		15	63	3	13
Athlete 43	Direct play	154	62	64	26
Coach 56		17	71	2	8
Athlete 44	Ask official about rule	179	72	53	21
Coach 57		18	75	4	17
Athlete 46	Bench players	116	47	120	48
Coach 59		11	46	10	42
Athlete 47	Personal clothing style	169	69	72	29
Coach 60		14	58	9	38
Athlete 49	Clothing differ home/away games	49	20	160	74
Coach 62		2	8	21	88

Table 3 (continued)

Frequency of Responses Concerning Coaching Techniques:Competitive Situation

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 51	Get "up-tight"	111	45	130	52
Coach 64		6	25	17	71

N = 250 athletes; 24 coaches

Summations that do not account for the total N were caused by either missing items or non-codable items.

2. AQ 64; CQ 77 regarding the name athletes most often used to address the coach, 9 (38%) coaches indicated a COMBINATION of responses, 3 (13%) indicated MISS, 4 (17%) indicated MRS., 2 (8%) indicated OTHER, 2 (8%) indicated FIRST NAME and 1 (4%) each indicated MS. and COACH. Sixty-three athletes (25%) stated MISS, 45 (18%) stated MRS., 40 (16%) stated a COMBINATION, 38 (15%) stated OTHER, 26 (11%) stated FIRST NAME, 12 (5%) stated DR., 11 (5%) stated MS., and 6 (3%) stated COACH.

Personal Freedom of Athletes

In responding to the Personal Freedom section the coach was directed to assume that she alone made all the team decisions to answer the questions based on her beliefs, not upon what she found she had to do in actual practice. The frequencies and percentages of the coaches' responses to the question are reported in Table 5.

Statistical Analysis

Chi Square Analysis

All of the items were first scrutinized for differences by placing frequencies in a contingency table. Nine items were selected for further analysis utilizing chi square. These items were analysed because the frequencies of responses permitted interpretation without violating chi square assumptions.

Table 4
Frequency of Responses Concerning Coach-Player
Relationships

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 52	Positive team feeling	170	69	70	28
Coach 65		22	92	1	4
Athlete 53	Talk non-team matters	213	88	30	12
Coach 66		22	92	1	4
Athlete 55	Know team outside team situation	179	73	62	25
Coach 68		22	92	0	0
Athlete 56	Talk informally	217	88	25	10
Coach 69		23	96	0	0
Athlete 57	Eat informally	148	59	46	35
Coach 70		16	67	7	29
Athlete 58	Social drink	97	39	130	53
Coach 71		11	46	11	46
Athlete 59	Visit home	43	17	193	78
Coach 72		5	21	18	75
Athlete 60	Party - special occasion	129	52	99	40
Coach 73		18	75	5	21

Table 4 (continued)
Frequency of Responses Concerning Coach-Player
Relationships

Question	Content	Yes		No	
		f	%	f	%
Athlete 61	Aware concerns not related to sport	156	63	77	31
Coach 74		22	92	1	4
Athlete 62	Academic standing	61	25	160	64
Coach 75		7	29	16	67
Athlete 63*	Consult other understand athlete	54	22	23	9
Coach 76*		18	75	5	21

N = 250 athletes; 24 coaches

Summations that do not account for the total N were caused by either missing items or non-codable items.

*In addition to tabled responses, 163 athletes and 5 coaches indicated "don't know" to Questions 63 and 76 respectively.

Table 5
Frequency of Coaches Responses to the
Personal Freedom of Athletes

Question	Content	Yes		No		Missing
		f	%	f	%	%
78	Permit smoking	8	33	14	58	9
79	Smoking when representing sch.	4	17	19	79	4
80	Smok. when not rep. school	13	54	10	42	4
81	Counsel ath. - marijuana	17	71	5	21	8
82	Expel. ath. - marijuana	4	17	17	71	12
83	Counsel ath. - homo. tend.	6	25	15	63	12
84	Expel. ath. - homo. tend.	1	4	21	88	8
85	Counsel - profanity	23	96	1	4	0
86	Expel. - profanity	12	50	10	42	8
87	Profanity outside team	15	63	7	29	8
88	Have a dress code	10	42	14	58	0
93	Wear headbands	20	83	2	8	9
94	Reg. dress not rep. school	2	8	22	92	0
95	Infl. who assoc. with outside team	3	12	21	88	0
96	Infl. who assoc. within team	2	7	22	79	14
97	Curfew during season	4	17	20	83	0
98	Expect notice of ath. abs. from practice	24	100	0	0	0

Table 5 (continued)
Frequency of Coaches Responses to the
Personal Freedom of Athletes

Question	Content	Yes		No		Missing %
		f	%	f	%	
99	Require ath. to practice on own time	10	42	13	54	4
100	Require ath. to practice during vacation	18	75	6	25	0
101	Allow ath. to compete on other team dur. season	14	58	10	42	0
102	Allow ath. to compete on other team not season	23	96	0	0	4
103	Compromise beliefs	14	58	10	42	0

Table 6

"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses:Very Similar

Questions	Content
AQ 2 - CQ 16	Discuss coaching philosophy
AQ 3 - CQ 17	Existence of team goals
AQ 4 - CQ 18	Consult team when establishing goals
AQ 6 - CQ 20	Existence of team regulations
AQ 7 - CQ 21	Consult team when establishing regulations
AQ 10 - CQ 24	Enforcement of regulations
AQ 12 - CQ 26	Coach's effort - athlete aware of contribution
AQ 13 - CQ 27	Have assistance
AQ 14 - CQ 28	Have captain
AQ 15 - CQ 29	Have manager
AQ 16 - CQ 30	Have publicity agent
AQ 17 - CQ 31	Have trainer
AQ 18 - CQ 32	Trainer - professional or student
AQ 19 - CQ 33	Trainer's presence
AQ 20 - CQ 34	Have other assistance
AQ 21 - CQ 35	How positions are filled
AQ 23 - CQ 37	Written practice plans
AQ 24 - CQ 38	Coach plans entire practice
AQ 25 - CQ 39	Athlete plans entire practice
AQ 26 - CQ 40	Athlete plans part of practice

Table 6 (continued)

"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses:Very Similar

Question	Content
AQ 27 - CQ 41	Conditioning time
AQ 29 - CQ 43	Athlete assist plan conditioning
AQ 30 - CQ 44	Athlete follows team conditioning program
AQ 31 - CQ 45	Changes in practice regimen
AQ 32 - CQ 46	Frequency of change in practice regimen
AQ 36 - CQ 50	"Experts" assist
AQ 37 - CQ 51	Type of assistance
AQ 39 - CQ 53	Athletes authority to make decisions
AQ 41 - CQ 54	Athletes substitute
AQ 42 - CQ 55	Athletes call time out
AQ 43 - CQ 56	Direct play
AQ 44 - CQ 57	Athletes ask official
AQ 46 - CQ 59	Coach "bench" players
AQ 47 - CQ 60	Coach's clothing style
AQ 48 - CQ 61	Coach's clothing everyday
AQ 49 - CQ 62	Coach's clothing home/away
AQ 50 - CQ 63	Coach's characterization of self
AQ 51 - CQ 64	Coach gets "up tight"
AQ 52 - CQ 65	Coach promote positive team feeling
AQ 53 - CQ 66	Coach available to talk

Table 6 (continued)

"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses:Very Similar

Question	Content
AQ 54 - CQ 67	Who initiates conversation
AQ 55 - CQ 68	Know team outside team situation
AQ 56 - CQ 69	Sit and talk informally
AQ 57 - CQ 70	Eat informally
AQ 58 - CQ 71	Social drink
AQ 59 - CQ 72	Visit home
AQ 60 - CQ 73	Have party
AQ 62 - CQ 75	Academic standing

Table 7

"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses:Quite Similar

Question	Content
AQ 1 - CQ 15	Philosophic stance
AQ 9 - CQ 23	Are regulation enforced
AQ 22 - CQ 36	Pre-competitive period
AQ 61 - CQ 74	Aware of players' concerns

Table 8

"Anchor Adjectives" Comparing Athletes and Coaches Responses:Somewhat Similar

Question	Content
AQ 63 - CQ 76	Coach consult with other persons

Each chi square analysis is presented in Table form below. Siegel's (1956) formula correcting for continuity was used. A one-tailed test using one degree of freedom was used. The following significance values were held to: (a) for .05, a chi square value of 3.84 was accepted; (b) for .01, a 6.64; and (c) for .001, a 10.83.

A significant difference at an alpha level of .001 was obtained between coaches' and athletes' responses to the item concerned with the existence of team regulations, $\chi^2 = 13.062$. A significant difference at an alpha level of .01 was obtained between coaches' and athletes' responses to the item regarding the coaches' awareness of players' concerns that are not directly related to sport, $\chi^2 = 6.84$. Four significant chi squares were obtained for items relating to the coaches' effort to see that each athlete was aware of her contribution as a team member, $\chi^2 = 4.01$; to the coaches allowing athletes to make decisions during competition, $\chi^2 = 5.23$; to coaches' conscious effort to promote a positive team feeling, $\chi^2 = 5.36$; and to the coaches' knowledge of team members outside of the team situation, $\chi^2 = 6.04$. Contingency tables and corresponding chi squares are presented in Tables 9 through 14.

Table 9
Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of the Coaches
Regarding the Existence of Team Regulations

Coach's Question 20			
	Yes	No	
Coach	20	4	24
Athlete	77	107	184
	97	111	208

$$\chi^2 = 13.0625$$

Significant at .001

Table 10
Chi Square Analysis of Perceptions of the Coaches Effort
to Make Athletes Aware of Their Contribution to the Team

Coach's Question 26			
	Yes	No	
Coach	21	2	23
Athlete	170	76	246
	191	78	269

$$\chi^2 = 4.01$$

Significant at .05

Table 11
Chi Square Analysis of the Perceptions of Coaches Allowing
Athletes to Make Decisions

Coach's Question 53

	Yes	No	
Coach	22	1	23
Athlete	173	70	243
	195	71	266

$$\chi^2 = 5.23$$

Significant at .05

Table 12
Chi Square Analysis of Perceptions of Coaches Promoting a
Positive Team Feeling

Coach's Question 65

	Yes	No	
Coach	22	1	23
Athlete	170	70	240
	192	71	263

$$\chi^2 = 5.36$$

Significant at .05

Table 13
Chi Square Analysis of Perceptions of Coaches Knowledge
of Team Outside of the Team Situation

Coach's Question 68			
	Yes	No	
Coach	22	0	22
Athlete	179	62	241
	201	62	263

$$\chi^2 = 6.04$$

Significant at .05

Table 14
Chi Square Analysis of Perceptions of Coaches Awareness
of Players' Concerns Not Related to Sport

Coach's Question 74			
	Yes	No	
Coach	22	1	23
Athlete	156	77	233
	178	78	256

$$\chi^2 = 6.84$$

Significant at .01

Profile of the Modal CUNY Woman Coach

A profile of the hypothetical CUNY woman coach was developed from modal responses to questions relating to personal factors, educational background and coaching experience. Following is a description of the hypothetical coach derived in this manner.

The CUNY woman coach was 29 years of age and single. She attended high school, college and graduate school in New York City. She was affiliated with NYSAHPER and AAHPER. While she did not have a designated coaching course in her undergraduate or graduate education, she had attended formal coaching workshop(s). During her schooling, she participated competitively in the sport she presently coaches.

Also, at the time of responding to the questionnaire, she was coaching the sport she preferred. The CUNY coach had been coaching her team between 1-5 years and although the team competed at State level competition, it had not participated in Regional and National level competition. She had not coached at the elementary level, yet had between 1-8 years experience at the secondary level and 3-4 years experience at the college level. She had little or no experience coaching a club or AAU team.

Discussion

It has been stated that the way a coach communicates with her players influences the actions and responses displayed by the athletes (Berlin, 1974). Research has shown that coaches' perceptions and athletes' perceptions of certain concepts often differ. Buhner (1973) reported that the perception of women coaches and the perceptions of

women athletes differed with respect to the idea of "the woman athlete" and "the woman coach." Martin (1974) researched the expectations of female collegiate athletes and found that one dimension not highly valued by athletes was the coaches' philosophical commitments. The dimension found to be highly valued was the coaches' consideration of each athlete's individuality. Based on these observations and her own experience, the investigator anticipated that the majority of the coaches and athletes responses would be clearly different. However, the findings of this study showed that the coaches and athletes had rather similar perceptions. This is supported by the arbitrary "anchor adjectives" interpretation of the data. More rigorous analysis, chi square, turned up only six of the more than 60 items as significantly different. Clearly, the meaningfulness of the generalized "anchor adjectives" classification must be questioned because of the six items one fell into the very similar category and the remaining 5 were categorized as quite similar. It is the investigators preference to place more confidence in the chi square calculations.

Leadership Style

Pre-Season. Coaches reported that they had a philosophic stance which guided their leadership behavior. Less than half of the athletes agreed with their coaches and over one-third indicated that they did not know. A comparison of the percentages of responses utilizing "anchor adjectives" placed this item in the quite similar category. Although the athletes were not particularly aware of their coaches' philosophic behavioral guidelines, both coaches and athletes agreed that there was a discussion of the coaches' coaching philosophy prior to the start of the season.

The athletes' strongest response of all 64 items concerned the existence of team goals. The 91% positive responses complemented the coaches 100% and placed the item in a very similar category. In the follow-up question which asked if the coach consulted the team when establishing team goals, most athletes said yes. This comparison of the coaches' and athletes' responses also placed this particular question in the upper limit of the very similar category.

The matter of team regulations revealed some interesting perceptions. It should be noted that in this questionnaire category a statistically significant difference in the recognition of the existence of regulations was found between athletes and coaches. Only 63% of the athletes acknowledged that team regulations were enforced. Whereas, 88% of the coaches responded that team regulations were enforced. The question is raised as to what is being enforced if athletes are unaware that there are regulations!

More than ninety percent of the coaches and half of the athletes viewed the pre-competitive period as flexible. The difference in percent classified the responses as somewhat similar.

Practice. Eighty percent of the athletes indicated that the coaches plan the entire practice; 87% of the athletes also stated that athletes did not plan entire practices but were permitted input into segments of practice. In discussing practice time for conditioning, players assistance in planning practice and/or conditioning programs and individual changes in practice regimens, coaches' and athletes' responses were very similar.

Competitive Situation.

The majority of coaches indicated that athletes made decisions during competition. However, an examination of the responses revealed a significant difference between the athletes' and the coaches' responses. The coaches were likely to allow athletes to ask an official about a rule and direct play on the court or field. They were more reluctant to permit the athlete to call time-outs or substitution. This suggests a hierarchy of importance among the decisions made in competitive sports.

When asked if their coach would bench players for not following directions, approximately half the athletes said yes and half said no. Policies and behaviors with respect to this problem may be realistically unclear. Thirteen percent of the coaches did not respond to the question. It is possible that the remaining respondents were reluctant to establish a "hard and fast" rule. Or maybe the particulars of the situation would influence their behavior. Still one more interpretation is that of "copping out" and just failing to come to grips with the issue.

Another question left unanswered by 13% of the coaches was concerned with the coaches' characterization of themselves as a strict, moderate or permissive coach. Of the coaches who did respond, 46% indicated moderate, 4% admitted that they were strict, 17% considered themselves permissive and 21% indicated a combination.

Coach-Player Relationships

Coaches and athletes had very similar responses on items dealing with social interactions, e.g., coaches and athletes having a social drink together, talking and eating informally and having a party for a

special occasion. But with respect to communicating about more basic concerns, coaches' and athletes' responses differed significantly. For example, they disagreed on the efforts made by the coach to see that each athlete was aware of her contribution as a team member. Athletes perceived that the coach did not consciously promote a positive team feeling. While the coach was considered to be available to talk about non-team matters, athletes expressed the opinion that their coaches did not take time to get to know team members outside of the team situation and were generally unaware of players' concerns that were unrelated to sport. It should be noted, though, that the research did not address the prior question of whether the athletes wanted their coaches to be aware of non-team matters and outside concerns. A large percent of the athletes did not know whether their coaches consulted other people or sources of information in an attempt to better understand their players. Both coaches and athletes had very similar responses with respect to coaches not assuming responsibility for the poor academic standing of any athlete. The "anchor adjectives" did not yield any interpretations of only slightly similar perceptions of coach-player relationships.

Personal Freedom

Only coaches responded to the questions involving the personal freedom of athletes. The coaches were asked to answer the questions based upon their beliefs, not upon what they found they had to do in actual practice. Respondents indicated that they would not permit their athletes to smoke during the season or when representing the school. Furthermore, they would feel obliged to counsel an athlete who smoked

marijuana and who used profanity during a contest and/or outside of the team situation. On the other hand, they would not feel obliged to counsel an athlete who had homosexual tendencies. They further indicated that they would not expel an athlete from the team for using marijuana or for having homosexual tendencies but would expel an athlete who persisted in using profane language. This finding is, for the writer, beyond logical explanation. One hundred percent of the coaches agreed that they expected notice of an athlete's absence from practice. At least half of the coaches stated that they have had to "compromise" their beliefs in actually fulfilling their leadership role.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Purpose

This research described the beliefs and practices associated with women college coaches in the City University of New York, as discerned from responses to a questionnaire. The inquiry attempted to characterize coaches' behavior as it related to three broad considerations: (a) leadership style, (b) coach-player relationships and (c) personal freedom of athletes. Two data sources were used: the coaches' responses to specific questions and the players' responses to the same questions. The study sought to answer specific questions about three dimensions of coaching.

Leadership Style

1. How do coaches perceive their leadership style? How do athletes perceive the leadership style of their coaches?
2. How does the coach purport to allow for player leadership? How do the athletes perceive their opportunities for leadership?
3. How does the coach perceive the establishment of team goals? How do the players perceive the establishment of team goals?

Coach-Player Relationships

1. How does the coach perceive her relationships with the players as a group and as individuals? How do the players perceive the coach-player relationships?

2. How does the coach demonstrate her concerns for overall team welfare? How do the players perceive the coaches' concern for overall team welfare?
3. How does the coach purport to promote positive social relationships among players? How do the players perceive the coaches' efforts at achieving positive social relationships?

Personal Freedom of Athletes

1. What freedom do coaches purport to allow their athletes?
2. What restrictions, if any, do coaches place on the personal behavior of team members when they are not representing the team?
3. What restrictions, if any, do coaches place on the personal appearance of team members when they are not representing the team?

Selection of the Subjects and Data Gathering

The total number of sportswomen involved was 24 women coaches and 250 female intercollegiate athletes. They represented 12 institutions of higher learning in the CUNY system. A forced-choice structured questionnaire was used as the data gathering instrument. The questionnaire was administered by the investigator after the subjects experienced at least half of the season's competition.

Analysis of Data

Analysis of the data involved conversion of frequencies of responses into percentages allowing for classification according to "anchor adjectives." The idea for such a descriptive plan was borrowed from

Nunnally (1967). However, the exact meanings assigned to the various percentages were arbitrarily designated by the investigator. Calculation of chi square for selected items provided a more stringent statistical analysis when appropriate. Also, modal responses were used to describe the profile of the woman CUNY coach.

Major Findings

Of the 4 dimensions of leadership studied; pre-season, practice, competitive situation and coach-player relationships, both the coaches' and athletes' strongest response to all questions dealt with the existence of team goals. This was one of two items on the entire questionnaire for which unanimity of response by the coaches was obtained. The other question which drew a 100% response was categorized under personal freedom of athletes. The question dealt with the coaches' expectation of notice of a players absence from practice. When asked if they had trainers, over 60% of the coaches said yes. However, it is interesting to note that of these coaches more than half indicated that the trainer was a student while only 46% had a professional trainer. Another finding dealt with decision making by athletes. The responses indicated a hierarchy of importance among the decisions permitted athletes. The least permissible decision was substitution. There was only one item that fell in the somewhat similar category. This question was concerned with the coach's consultation with other persons to better understand their athletes. Additionally, the findings failed to turn up any items which was only slightly similar.

Only 6 items were found to be significantly different. Athletes and coaches differed on the following items: (a) recognition of the existence of team regulations, (b) the coaches' effort to see that each athlete was aware of her contribution to the team, (c) the athletes' authority to make decisions, (d) the coaches' promotion of positive team feelings, (e) the coaches' knowledge of athletes outside of the team situation and (f) the coaches' awareness of players' concerns not related to sport.

While other studies showed that coaches' and athletes' perceptions differed, it should be noted that this study showed that there is a very similar perception between CUNY coaches and athletes about leadership behavior in general.

Conclusions

In answer to the questions posed at the outset the data permit the following conclusions.

Leadership Style

1. How do coaches perceive their leadership style? How do athletes perceive the leadership style of their coaches?

The perceptions with respect to leadership style were more similar than different. Both the coaches' philosophic stance and coaching philosophy were known to the athletes. There was awareness that team goals were jointly formulated and enforced. Coaches and athletes viewed the pre-competitive period as flexible and as a time of experimentation.

2. How does the coach purport to allow for player leadership? How do the athletes perceive their opportunities for leadership?

The coaches' and athletes' perceptions concerning player leadership differed on some items. While the athletes were permitted to elect captains, direct play, make changes in conditioning programs and provide input into practice plans, they indicated that their coaches were reluctant to allow them to call time-out or substitute.

3. How does the coach perceive the establishment of team goals? Coaches' and athletes' responses were also very similar with respect to this practice. Both groups agreed that the coaches consulted the athletes in the formulation of goals.

Coach-Player Relationships

1. How does the coach perceive her relationships with the players as a group and as individuals? How do the players perceive the coach-player relationship?

The finding that coaches and athletes had very similar perceptions also held for beliefs and practices concerning the coaches' relationships with the athletes. This was evidence by the agreement on the items dealing with social interactions, e.g., having a social drink, eating and talking informally and having a party for a special occasion. Coaches and athletes also agreed that the coach was available to talk about non-team matters.

2. How does the coach demonstrate her concern for overall team welfare? How do the players perceive the coaches' concern for overall team welfare?

Perceptions differed with respect to the coaches' concerns for

overall team welfare. Athletes indicated that the coaches were unaware of the players' concerns that were not related to sport. They also indicated that the coaches did not take time to get to know the athletes outside of the team situation.

3. How does the coach purport to promote positive social relationships among the players? How do the players perceive the coaches' effort at achieving positive social relationships? There was a significant difference in the relationships of the coaches' and athletes' responses to the items concerning social relationships among players. The athletes disagreed with the coaches and reported that the coaches did not always make an effort to see that each athlete was aware of her contribution nor to consciously promote a positive team feeling.

Personal Freedom of Athletes

1. What freedom do coaches purport to allow their athletes?

Coaches responses to questions pertaining to personal freedom of athletes varied. In two instances, coaches indicated they would restrict athletes' behavior, e.g., 79% of the coaches would not allow athletes to smoke when representing the school nor would 96% of them allow profane language during competition. Half of the coaches further stated that they would expel an athlete from the team if she persisted in using profane language. The coaches unanimously agreed that they expected notice of an athlete's absence from practice and three quarters of the coaches would require their athletes to practice during a vacation. The coaches would allow athletes to smoke when not representing the

school and allow them to wear headbands during competition. Also, the majority would not have a curfew nor would they attempt to influence with whom the athletes associated.

2. What restrictions, if any, do coaches place on the personal behavior of team members when they are not representing the team?

For the most part coaches would not place any restrictions on the personal behavior of the athletes when not representing the team. They did indicate that they would feel obliged to counsel athletes who smoked marijuana and used profane language.

3. What restrictions, if any, do coaches place on the personal appearance of team members when they are not representing the team?

The coaches reported that they would not have a dress code for their athletes and, therefore, placed no restrictions on their personal appearance.

Recommendations

Additional research into coach-player relationships is capable of adding further understanding to the sport experience and, also, to the nature of sport leadership. The present study reveals that although coaches and their athletes have common perceptions about some leadership practices, significant differences do exist with respect to others. It seems important that coaches be more aware of the expectations of their players and that the players, likewise, be cognizant of the expectations, demands and problems with which their coaches are concerned.

In particular, the personal freedom of athletes as perceived by athletes warrants more thorough inquiry. Infringements that might be made upon that which one regards as "personal" may have broader effects than less private matters. How personal freedom is viewed seems to have strong implications for coach-player relationships.

In addition to further research, coaches might consider utilizing the questionnaire devised for the present study with their own athletes to determine wherein they agree or hold differing perceptions. Such a technique might open lines of communication between the coach and her athletes. It is also possible that the questionnaire might be useful at a coaching workshop as a "consciousness raising" technique. The goal would be the improvement of relations between athletes and coaches resulting from an increased awareness of policies and practices pertaining to leadership behavior.

With respect to research methodology, the present study reveals that the use of "anchor adjectives" is a convenient way to group the

data. However, careful planning based on logic and the picture presented by preliminary review of the data is called for in the assignment of descriptive terms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, M. & Solady, D. (Eds.), AIAW handbook of policies and operating procedures, 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1972.
- Bardwick, J. & Douvan, E. Ambivalence: The socialization of women. In V. Gornick & E. Morgan (Eds.), Women in sexist society. New York: Signet Book, 1971.
- Berlin, P. Sport motivation: A cybernetic phenomenon. Paper presented to the Eastern Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Albany, New York, April 4, 1974.
- Bevans, B.J. The function of interscholastic sports for girls. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1968, 39 (9), 39.
- Buhrer, N. Perceptions of "the woman athlete" and "the woman coach." Unpublished master's thesis, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1974.
- Coffey, M. The sportswoman: Then and now. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1965, 38 (2), 38.
- DGWS philosophy reconsidered. Update. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1973, April.
- DGWS statement on competition for girls and women. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1965, 36 (7), 34-37.
- Dunkle, M. Equal opportunities for women in sports. In B. Hoepner (Ed.), Women's athletics: Coping with controversy. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1974.
- Felshin, J. The social view. In E. Gerber, J. Felshin, P. Berlin, & W. Wyrick. The American woman in sport. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1974.
- Freeman, W. The coaching attitudes and practices of Oregon high school track and field coaches, 1968-1969. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Oregon, 1970.
- Gerber, E., Felshin, J., Berlin, P. & Wyrick, W. The American woman in sport. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1974.
- Gerber, E. Forward in the tradition of our founding mothers. Women: Liberation and recognition. Proceedings of the Central Association of Physical Education of College Women. Lake Okobje, Iowa, October, 1972.

Gerber, E. The changing role of women in sports. Presented at a symposium on the changing role of women in American society. Cober College, Hartsville, S.C., January, 1974.

Gilbert, B. & Williamson, N. Are you being two faced? Sports Illustrated, 1973, 38 (2), 44-54.

Gilbert, B. & Williamson, N. Programmed to be losers. Sports Illustrated, 1973, 38 (23), 60-73.

Gilbert, B. & Williamson, N. Sport is unfair to women. Sports Illustrated, 1973, 38 (21), 88-98.

Harris, D. DGWS research reports: Women in sports. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1971.

Harris, D. Women and sport: A national research conference. University Park, Philadelphia, 1972.

Hartman, B. Training women to coach. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1968, 39 (1), 25.

Hendry, L.B. The coaching stereotype, 1970. In H.T. Whiting (Ed.), Readings in sports psychology. Lafayette, Ind.: Baltimore Publishers, 1972.

Janeway, E. Man's world woman's place. New York: Dell Publishing, 1971.

Jernigan, S. The institute challenge. Proceeding of the First National Institute of Girls' Sports, 1965. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1966.

Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity. In M.L. Hoffman and L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. Vol. 2. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Kemper, T. Reference groups, socialization, and achievement. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33 (1), 34-45.

Kennick, L. Self-profiles of highly skilled female athletes participating in two types of activities: Structured and creative. Unpublished master's thesis, Penn State University, 1972.

Klafs, C.E. & Lyon, M.J. The female athlete: Conditioning, competition, and culture. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Company, 1973.

Komarovsky, M. Women in the modern world. Boston: Little Brown, 1953.

- Ley, K. Commission on intercollegiate athletics for college women. Proceedings of the National Conference: Sports programs for college women, 1969. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1970.
- Mann, C. The lack of girl's athletics. The Physical Educator, 1972, 29 (1), 9-10.
- Martin, P. Expectations of women collegiate athletes regarding coaching style. Unpublished master's thesis, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1974.
- McClelland, D. Wanted: A new self-image for women. In R. Lifton, (Ed.), The women in America. Boston: Riverside Press, 1964.
- Menzie, B. Sociological aspects of women in sports. In B. Hoepner (Ed.), Women's athletics: Coping with controversy, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1974.
- Nash, J.B. Physical Education: Its interpretations and objectives. New York: A.S. Barnes, 1948.
- Neal, P. Coaching methods for women. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Nunnally, J. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Oberteuffer, D. Of learning values through sport. Quest, 1963, 1 (23).
- Policies on women athlete changes. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1973, 44 (7), 51.
- Ramo, R. Legal issues in girls' and womens' sports. Paper presented at the Conference on Women and Sport, Western Illinois University. Macomb, Illinois, June 25, 1973.
- Schram, W., Lyle, J., & Parker, E. Television in the lives of our children. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1961.
- Scott, J. The masculine obsession in sports. In B. Hoepner (Ed.), Women's athletics: Coping with controversy. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1974.
- Scott, P. Intercollegiate sports for women: present problems and future directions. National Conference: Sports programs for college women, 1969. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1970.
- Scott, P. & Ulrich, C. Commission on intercollegiate sports for women. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1966, 37 (8), 10.

- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Smith, M. Aggression and the female athlete. In D. Harris (Ed.), Women and sport: A national research conference. University Park: Philadelphia, 1971.
- Spasoff, T. Needed: More women coaches. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1971, 42 (6), 55.
- Tuckman, B. Conducting educational research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
- Tutko, T. Conflict in sport. Contemporary psychology of sport. Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Sport Psychology. Washington, D.C., 1968.
- Voltmer, A. & Esslinger, A. The organization and administration of physical education. Meredith Pub., 1967.
- Wert, J.E., Neidt, C.O., & Ahmann, J.S. Statistical methods in educational and psychological research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.
- Williams, J.F. & Hughes, W. Athletics in Education. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1930.
- Wyrick, W. How sex differences affect research in physical education. In D. Harris (Ed.), DGWS research reports: Women in sports. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1971.
- Ziegler, S. Self-perceptions of athletes and coaches. In D. Harris (Ed.), Women and sport: A national research conference. University Park: Philadelphia, 1971.
- Zoble, J. Femininity and achievement in sports. In D. Harris (Ed.), Women and sport: A national research conference. University Park: Philadelphia, 1971.

Appendix A

Coaches Questionnaire

Subject Code # _____

Directions: Circle "Y" for yes; "N" for no. For the sub-questions make as many responses as are appropriate.

1. Age (answer to nearest year) _____
2. What is your marital status? Single__ Married__ Divorced__ Widowed__
3. In what organizations do you hold membership?
- | | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| New York Board of Women Officials | Y | N |
| Long Island Board of Women Officials | Y | N |
| A.W.P.E.N.Y.S. | Y | N |
| N.Y.S.A.H.P.E.R. | Y | N |
| A.A.H.P.E.R. | Y | N |
| Other (specify) | _____ | _____ |

Educational Background

4. Did you attend high school
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| In New York City? | Y | N |
| In New York State? | Y | N |
| Outside New York State (specify city and state) _____ | | |
5. Was the institution from which you obtained your undergraduate degree
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| In New York City? | Y | N |
| In New York State? | Y | N |
| Outside New York State (specify city and state) _____ | | |
6. Did you undertake the majority of your graduate study
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| In New York City? | Y | N |
| In New York State? | Y | N |
| Outside New York State (specify city and state) _____ | | |
| Have done no graduate study | Y | N |

Coaching Experience

7. What team(s) are you presently coaching? .
- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Basketball | Y | N |
| Fencing | Y | N |
| Field Hockey. | Y | N |
| Softball. | Y | N |

Swimming . . . Y N
 Tennis . . . Y N
 Volleyball . . . Y N
 Other (specify) _____

8. Have you had a formal coaching course(s)? Y N
9. Have you attended a formal coaching workshop(s)? Y N
10. Did you participate competitively (at any level) in the sport you are now coaching? Y N
11. Are you coaching the sport that you most prefer to coach? . Y N
12. Indicate the approximate number of sport seasons in which you have coached a team, including the present season. (place a number in the space)
- | | |
|------------------|-------|
| Elementary Level | _____ |
| Secondary Level | _____ |
| College Level | _____ |
| Club Team | _____ |
| A.A.U. | _____ |
| Other | _____ |
13. How many seasons have you coached the present sport? . . . _____
14. Has your team participated in State Competition? Y N
 Regional Competition? Y N
 National Competition? Y N

I. Leadership Style

Coaching Techniques

A. Pre-Season

15. Do you have a formal philosophic stance which you use as a guideline to your leadership behavior? Yes ___ No ___ Don't know ___
16. Do you discuss your coaching philosophy with your team before the season begins? Y N
17. Do you have team goals? Y N
18. Do you consult with your team in establishing team goals? . Y N
19. If no, do you alone establish team goals? Y N
20. Do you have any type of team regulations? Y N

Swimming . . . Y N
 Tennis . . . Y N
 Volleyball . . . Y N
 Other (specify) _____

8. Have you had a formal coaching course(s)? Y N
9. Have you attended a formal coaching workshop(s)? Y N
10. Did you participate competitively (at any level) in the sport you are now coaching? Y N
11. Are you coaching the sport that you most prefer to coach? . Y N
12. Indicate the approximate number of sport seasons in which you have coached a team, including the present season. (place a number in the space)
- | | |
|------------------|-------|
| Elementary Level | _____ |
| Secondary Level | _____ |
| College Level | _____ |
| Club Team | _____ |
| A.A.U. | _____ |
| Other | _____ |
13. How many seasons have you coached the present sport? . . . _____
14. Has your team participated in State Competition? Y N
 Regional Competition? Y N
 National Competition? Y N

I. Leadership Style

Coaching Techniques

A. Pre-Season

15. Do you have a formal philosophic stance which you use as a guideline to your leadership behavior? Yes ___ No ___ Don't know ___
16. Do you discuss your coaching philosophy with your team before the season begins? Y N
17. Do you have team goals? Y N
18. Do you consult with your team in establishing team goals? . Y N
19. If no, do you alone establish team goals? Y N
20. Do you have any type of team regulations? Y N

21. Do you consult with your team in establishing team regulations? Y N
22. If no, do you alone establish team regulations? Y N
23. Are the team regulations enforced? Y N
24. If yes, designate how often team regulations are enforced .
Sometimes ___ Often ___
25. If the answer to #23 is yes, designate by whom
Coach ___ Capt. ___ Team ___ All Enforce Jointly ___ Other ___
26. Do you make a distinct effort to see that each athlete is aware of her contribution as a team member? Y N
27. Do you have assistance in the administrative details of team management? Y N
28. Do you have a captain? Y N
29. Do you have a manager? Y N
30. Do you have a publicity agent other than yourself? Y N
31. Do you have a trainer? Y N
32. If yes, is the trainer a professional or a student?
Professional ___ Student ___ Other (specify) _____
33. Is the trainer available for games and/or practices?
Games ___ Practices ___ Both ___
34. Do you have other assistance? (Specify) Y N
35. How are these positions filled?
Captain: Elected ___ Appointed ___ Other (specify) _____
Manager: Elected ___ Appointed ___ Other (specify) _____
Publicity
Agent: Elected ___ Appointed ___ Other (specify) _____
Trainer: Elected ___ Appointed ___ Other (specify) _____
Other
Assistance: Elected ___ Appointed ___ Other (specify) _____
36. Do you view the pre-competitive period as a time for experimentation and flexibility or is it a period which is static, committed, and pre-programmed?
Flexible ___ Static ___ Cannot Answer ___

B. Practice

37. Do you have written plans for practice? Never ___ Sometimes ___ Often ___
38. Do you plan practices yourself? Y N
39. Do your athletes ever plan the entire practice? Y N
40. Do your athletes ever plan part of the practice? Y N
41. Do you set aside practice time for conditioning? Y N
42. In what manner do you condition your athletes?
 Physical : . Y N
 Psychological . Y N
43. Do your athletes assist in planning any aspect of the conditioning phase of your program? Y N
44. Must your athletes follow the prescribed team conditioning program? Y N
45. Do you allow for individual changes in practice regimens if an athlete requests it? Y N
46. How often do these changes occur? Never ___ Sometimes ___ Often ___
47. Approximately what percent of your practice time during the pre-competitive period do you set aside for conditioning? . _____ %
48. for skills? _____ %
49. for the competitive situation? _____ %
50. Do you have "experts" assist you with the practice? . . . Y N
51. If yes, specify the type of expert assistance
 Assistant coach _____
 Male "counterpart" _____
 Colleagues in the department _____
 Films _____
 Personal friends _____
 Other _____

C. Competitive Situation

52. Who decides upon pre-game warm-ups? Coach ___ Capt. ___ Athletes ___ Other ___

53. Do you allow athletes to make decisions during competition? Y N
If yes, may they
54. make substitutions? Y N
55. call times-out? Y N
56. direct play on the field (court)? Y N
57. ask an official about a rule which is not clear to them? Y N
58. other (specify) _____
59. Do you "bench" players for not following your directions? . Y N
60. Do you have your own personal clothing style for games? . Y N
61. If yes, does your clothing style for games differ from your
"everyday" clothing style? Y N
62. Is there a difference in your clothing style for home and/or
away games? Y N
63. In general, do you characterize yourself as a strict,
moderate, or permissive coach?
Strict ___ Moderate ___ Permissive ___ Combin. ___
64. Do you get "up tight" when competition gets tough? . . Y N
- II. Coach-Player Relationships
65. Do you consciously promote a positive team feeling? . . Y N
66. Are you available to talk with your athletes for non-team
matters? Y N
67. If yes, at whose initiative? . . . Coach ___ Athlete ___ Both ___
68. Do you take time to get to know your team members outside of
the team situation? Y N
69. Do you sit and talk informally with your players? . . . Y N
70. Do you go out to eat informally? Y N
71. Do you have a social drink with your athletes? . . . Y N
72. Do you encourage your athletes to visit you at home? . . Y N

73. Do you have a party for your athletes for some special occasion? Y N
74. Are you generally aware of your players' concerns that are not directly related to sport? Y N
75. Do you assume responsibility for the poor academic standing of your athletes? Y N
76. Do you consult other persons and/or use other sources of information to assist you in understanding your athletes? . Y N
77. By what name do your athletes most often address you? . . .
 Miss ___ Mrs. ___ Ms. ___
 Dr. ___
 Coach ___
 First name ___
 Other (specify) _____

III. Personal Freedom

(ASSUME THAT YOU ALONE MAKE THE TEAM DECISIONS AND ANSWER THIS SECTION BASED UPON YOUR BELIEFS, NOT UPON WHAT YOU FIND YOU MUST DO IN ACTUAL PRACTICE).

78. Would you permit your athletes to smoke during season? . . Y N
79. When representing the school? Y N
80. When not representing the school? Y N
81. If one of your athletes used marijuana would you feel obliged to counsel with her? Y N
82. Would you expel her from the team? Y N
83. If one of your athletes had homosexual tendencies would you feel obliged to counsel with her? Y N
84. Would you expel her from the team? Y N
85. If you heard one of your athletes using profane language during competition would you feel obliged to counsel with her? . Y N
86. Would you expel her from the team if this persists? . . Y N
87. If you heard one of your athletes using profane language outside of the team situation would you feel obliged to counsel with her? Y N

88. Would you have a dress code for your athletes? Y N
89. If yes, may they wear jeans? Y N
90. May they wear "nice" slacks? Y N
91. Who should establish this dress code?
 Athlete ___ Coach ___ Combination ___ Other (specify) _____
92. If the answer to #88 is no, would you have a dress code for
away games? Y N
93. During competition would you allow your athletes to wear
 headbands which cross the forehead? Y N
94. Would you have a regulation regarding players' dress when
 they are not representing the team? Y N
95. Would you try to influence your athletes with regard to whom
 they associate with outside the team situation? Y N
96. Would you try to influence your athletes with regard to whom
 they associate with within the team situation? Y N
97. Would you establish a curfew for your athletes during the
 season? Y N
98. Would you expect your athletes to tell you if they find it
 necessary to be absent from a practice? Y N
99. Would you require your athletes to practice on their own
 outside of scheduled practice hours? Y N
100. Would you expect your team to practice during vacation if it
 should fall within the season? Y N
101. During the season, would you allow your athletes to compete
 on a team other than the school team? Y N
102. Would you allow your athletes to compete on a team other than
 a school team when it is not your season? Y N
103. Do you find that you have to "compromise" your beliefs in
 actually fulfilling your leadership role? Y N
104. If yes, how often? Sometimes ___ Often ___
105. Please indicate which question you most disliked having to answer.

- Do you wish to receive an abstract of the complete study? . . . Y N

Appendix B
Athletes Questionnaire

College _____ Team _____

Directions: Circle "Y" for yes; "N" for no. For the sub-questions make as many responses as are appropriate.

I. Leadership Style

Coaching Techniques

A. Pre-Season

1. Does your coach have a formal philosophic stance which she uses as a guide to her leadership behavior? . Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___
2. Does your coach discuss her coaching philosophy with the team before the season begins? Y N
3. Does your coach have team goals?. Y N
4. Does your coach consult with the team in establishing team goals? Y N
5. If no, does she alone establish the team goals? Y N
6. Does your coach have any type of team regulations? Y N
7. Does your coach consult the team in establishing team regulations?. Y N
8. If no, does she alone establish team regulations? Y N
9. Are the team regulations enforced? Y N
10. If yes, designate how often team regulations are enforced .
Sometimes ___ Often ___
11. If the answer to #9 is yes, designate by whom
Coach ___ Capt. ___ Team ___ All Enforce Jointly ___ Other ___
12. Does your coach make a distinct effort to see that each athlete is aware of her contribution as a team member? . . Y N

13. Does your coach have assistance in the administrative details of team management? Y N
14. Does she have a captain? Y N
15. Does she have a manager? Y N
16. Does she have a publicity agent other than herself? . . . Y N
17. Does she have a trainer? Y N
18. If yes, is the trainer a professional or a student? . .
Professional Student Other (specify) _____
19. Is the trainer present at games and/or practices?
Games Practices Both
20. Does your coach have other assistance? (specify). . . . Y N

21. How are these positions filled?
Captain: Elected Appointed Other (specify) _____
Manager: Elected Appointed Other (specify) _____

Publicity Agent: Elected Appointed Other (specify) _____
Trainer: Elected Appointed Other (specify) _____

Other Assistance: Elected Appointed Other (specify) _____
22. Does your coach view the pre-competitive period as a time for experimentation and flexibility, or is it a period which is static, committed, and pre-programmed?
Flexible Static Cannot Answer

B. Practice

23. Does your coach have written plans for practice?
Never Sometimes Often
24. Does your coach plan practices herself? Y N
25. Do the athletes ever plan the entire practice? Y N
26. Do the athletes ever plan part of the practice? Y N
27. Does your coach set aside practice time for conditioning? . Y N

28. In what manner does your coach condition her athletes?
 Physical Y N
 Psychological Y N
29. Do the athletes assist in planning any aspect of the
conditioning phase of the program? Y N
30. Must the athletes follow the prescribed team conditioning
 program? Y N
31. Does your coach allow for individual changes in practice
 regimens if an athlete requests it? Y N
32. How often do these changes occur? . . . Sometimes ___ Often ___
33. Approximately what percent of your practice time during the
 pre-competitive period does your coach set aside for
 conditioning? _____ %
34. for skills? _____ %
35. for the competitive situation? _____ %
36. Does your coach have "experts" assist her with the practices? Y N
37. If yes, specify the type of expert assistance
 Assistant Coach _____
 Male "counterpart" _____
 Colleagues in the department _____
 Films _____
 Personal friends _____

C. Competitive Situation

38. Who decides upon pre-game warm-ups?
 Coach ___ Capt. ___ Athletes ___ Other ___
39. Does your coach allow athletes to make decisions during
 the competition? Y N
40. If yes, may you
41. make substitutions? Y N
42. call times-out? Y N
43. direct play on the field (court)? Y N
44. ask an official about a rule which is not clear to you? . Y N

45. other (specify) _____
46. Does your coach "bench" players for not following her directions? Y N
47. Does your coach have her own personal clothing style for games? Y N
48. If yes, does her clothing style for games differ from her "everyday" clothing style? Y N
49. Is there a difference in her clothing style for home and/or away games? Y N
50. In general, would you characterize your coach as strict, moderate, or permissive?
 Strict ___ Moderate ___ Permissive ___ Combin. ___
51. Does your coach get "up tight" when competition gets tough? . Y N
- II. Coach-Player Relationships
52. Does your coach consciously promote a positive team feeling? . Y N
53. Is your coach available to talk with her athletes for non-team matters? Y N
54. If yes, at whose initiative? Coach ___ Athlete ___ Both ___
55. Does your coach take time to get to know her team members outside of the team situation? Y N
56. Does she sit and talk informally with her athletes? Y N
57. Does she go out to eat informally? Y N
58. Does she have a social drink with her athletes? Y N
59. Does she encourage her athletes to visit her at home? Y N
60. Does she have a party for the team for some special occasion? Y N
61. Is your coach generally aware of her players' concerns that are not directly related to sport? Y N
62. Does your coach assume responsibility for the poor academic standing of the athletes? Y N

63. Does your coach consult with other persons and/or use other sources of information to assist her in understanding her athletes? Yes ___ No ___ Don't Know ___
64. By what name do you address your coach?
- Miss ___ Mrs. ___ Ms. ___
Dr. ___
Coach ___
First name ___
Other (specify) _____

APPENDIX C
THE CUNY INSTITUTIONS AND SPORTS

Participating Institutions

Brooklyn College	Kingsboro Community College
Bronx Community College	New York City Community College
City College	Queens College
Herbert H. Lehman College	Queensboro Community College
Hostoss Community College	Staten Island Community College
Hunter College	York College

Sports Surveyed in the Study

Basketball	Swimming
Fencing	Gymnastics
Field Hockey	Volleyball

APPENDIX D

Sample Letter to the Coaches

Dear _____:

Your cooperation is sought in an investigation of the coaching beliefs and practices of C.U.N.Y. women athletic personnel. This study is being conducted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the Degree of Master of Science at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. An abstract from the thesis prospectus, which describes the study, is included on the following page.

The research tool will be a questionnaire, which is comprised largely of yes-no type questions; you and your team members will be asked to read each question carefully and to respond according to your own perceptions of various situations.

I will phone you in about a week to make arrangements for scheduling a brief meeting with you and your team.

I hope you will participate and contribute to the growing "bank" of information about women in sport and competition. Your assistance will be greatly appreciated and the results of the study will be sent to you if you so indicate on the questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Lorry Garvin

Enclosure: Prospectus