1987

The Relationship between Self-Perceived and Observed Coaching Behavior among Inner-City High School Coaches

Sherman Blade
Loyola University Chicago

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-PERCEIVED AND OBSERVED COACHING BEHAVIOR AMONG INNER-CITY HIGH SCHOOL COACHES

by

Sherman Blade

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

May

1987

Sherman Blade

Loyola University of Chicago

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-PERCEIVED AND OBSERVED COACHING BEHAVIOR AMONG INNER-CITY HIGH SCHOOL COACHES

The notion of a coach as a significant other in the lives of young athletes has both theoretical and empirical support. Given the crucial role of the coach in the athletic experience of young athletes, it is important for coaches to develop an understanding and awareness of their own behavior as it relates to their role performance. However, there is currently little systematic research concerning the behavior of inner city high school football coaches.

This investigation approached this problem by determining the level of awareness coaches have of their own coaching behavior as identified by various assessment instruments (Curtin's Self-Perception Profile, Coaches Behavior Assessment System, and Coaches Behavior Assessment Systems). Specifically, this investigation examined the relationship between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior and their observed behavior when working with athletes during game situations. Eighty inner city high school football coaches served as subjects in this study.

The findings from this investigation revealed that coaches in this study generally maintained high self-perceptions of their coaching behavior on all aspects of the self-perception and observed behavioral profiles. However, correlational and multiple regression analysis revealed that coaches in this study demonstrated limited capacity to accurately perceive their coaching behavior relative to their actual observed behavior. The data from this study provide

valuable information to inner city high school football coach-educators concerning specific insights to behaviors inherent in their roles. It also has implications for educational institutions involved in training coaches.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the cooperation of the coaches of the Chicago Board of Education who participated in this study.

An expression of deep appreciation is given to the members of my advisory committee, Dr. Terry Williams, Dr. Manuel Silverman, and Dr. Steve Brown. I would like to give special recognition to Dr. Terry Williams, my major advisor, for his patient guidance and understanding. Also, sincere appreciation is given to Valerie Collier for her valuable assistance in typing and organizing.

The support, encouragement, and motivation from my family provided the primary source of inspiration that resulted in the completion of this study.

VITA

The author, Sherman Blade, is the son of Marshall Blade and Mary (Robinson) Blade. He was born September 3, 1949 in Bells, Tennessee.

His elementary and secondary education was obtained in the public schools of Chicago, Illinois, where he graduated in 1967.

In September 1967 he entered Southern Illinois University and in September 1971, received the degree of Bachelor of Science with a major in physical education. While attending Southern Illinois University, he excelled as a varsity player in two major sports. In October 1971, he began working for the Chicago Board of Education as a teacher of physical education and recreation. In 1975, he attended Concordia College in River Forest, Illinois and received the masters of arts degree in Guidance and Counseling in June, 1976.

Since 1978 to present, Sherman has devoted much of this time working with delinquent youth in group homes. He helped establish the Austin Group Home under the United Citizens Community (U.C.C.O.) Organization in Chicago. In 1980, he was appointed the Executive Director of U.C.C.O. and is currently active in that position in addition to working for the Chicago Board of Education.

In 1979, Sherman entered the Ed.D. program in Counseling and Counselor Education at Loyola University of Chicago. In the academic year of 1983-84, he was a clinical intern at Bobby Wright Mental Health Center in Chicago and taught career education classes at the Central Y.M.C.A. College in Chicago.

Since 1979, Sherman has continuously worked with youth recreationally, educationally, and therapeutically through his positions as a teacher with the Chicago Board of Education and Executive Director with the United Citizens Community Organization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades, there has been a phenomenal growth in formalized sports programs for youngsters. Estimates of the number of participants in the United States range as high as 20 million, and some 2.5 million adults devote their time and energy to supervising these programs (Debois, 1981). Indeed, youth sports are a firmly established part of American society and culture.

In spite of the success of sports in terms of the number of participants, the desirability of youth sports continues to be a topic of controversy and, at times, bitter debate. According to Smith, Smoll and Curtis (1978), many who favor youth sports see them as providing miniature life situations in which children can learn to relate more effectively to other people and to cope with realities they will face in later life. Smith states that "lifelong patterns of physical activity which promote health and fitness can be established in childhood through sports involvement. Perhaps more important, many athletes and adults regard sports as just plain fun" (pp. 189-190). On the other hand, critics claim that these programs place excessive physical and/or psychological stress on athletes; and that youth sports are conducted primarily to satisfy self-serving interests of parents and coaches (Ordick & Botterill, 1975).

In reality, neither advocates nor opponents of youth sports have

much solid scientific evidence to support their positions. According to conclusions reached by the American Medical and Physical Education Associations (AAHPER, 1968), sports are neither universally good nor universally bad for youngsters. However, experts are convinced that sports have tremendous potential for the positive personal development of athletes. Thus, the issue is not whether youth sports should exist, but rather how to increase the likelihood of a favorable outcome. In this regard, there is virtually unanimous agreement among leaders that the manner in which programs are organized and supervised is an important determinant of their ultimate effect on young athletes. Thus, the position of the coach becomes vital in the success or failure of both coach and athletes in sports.

The coach of an athletic team is a powerful and influential group leader. For example, the coach determines team membership, suggests goals and a plan of action to achieve those goals, and can influence whether athletes have a pleasant or negative athletic experience. Research conducted from a diversity of perspectives suggests that the coach can have a very substantial impact upon the social and emotional development of those athletes with whom he/she interacts. For example, studies have demonstrated that coaches are viewed as "significant others" by their athletes (Kenyon & McPherson, 1973; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1976) and that the socio-psychological developmental status of young athletes renders them very sensitive to the words and actions of others. Scanlan (1978) points out that "the developing athlete has little past experience upon which to draw, and consequently is very dependent on others for information about reality

and the adequacy of his or her abilities for dealing with this reality" (p. 134). In a related report, Scanlan and Passer (1978) further noted that preadolescent boys have been found to be very sensitive to social evaluation, particularly in terms of their demonstration of the "prized ability" of athletic prowess (p. 108). A seven year programmatic study of little league baseball revealed "specific relationships between coaching behaviors and athletes' perceptions and attitudes" (Smoll & Smith, 1980, pp. 46-47). Specifically, this research found that coaches who were supportive and "positive" in the manner in which they instructed and corrected errors of performance were better liked, had players with higher levels of self-esteem, and had players with more positive attitudes toward sport and team activities than coaches who behaved in a more negative fashion (Smith et al., 1978).

A key element to understanding the impact the coach has on the socialization of young athletes is to gain an understanding of the nature of his/her behavior. To a large extent, knowledge of these individuals is limited to popular image (Debois, 1982). The image is that of a well meaning, but hyper-competitive person who glorifies winning and self-aggrandizement at the expense of providing a wholesome educational experience for the young athlete (p. 97). Selected examples and quasi case studies by the popular press have helped to sustain this stereotype (Burchard, 1979; Carron, 1980; Kaufmann & Popper, 1976; Ralbovsky, 1974).

No matter what the image various groups of coaches generate for themselves, coaches have an important responsibility to provide

competent guidance and instruction in sports techniques and strategies, and to create a psychologically healthy situation in which athletes can derive the positive benefits of sports participation (Smith & Smoll, 1980).

In summary, the literature strongly suggests that the coach of youth sports is an important factor in the development of attitudes and values among young athletes; consequently, the effectiveness of the coach as a leader is dependent upon the pattern of coaching behavior exhibited by coaches.

Smoll and Smith (1978) points out that a person who wishes to coach obviously must have certain skills and knowledge. An abundance of resource materials is available concerning the techniques and strategies of various sports as well as instructional methods. Coaching clinics typically focus on specific sports skills and techniques (e.g., how to shoot a jump shot, proper blocking stances, and offensive and defensive strategies). Information is also available on training and conditioning programs for increasing physical strength and endurance. However, in terms of overall impact, the coaches' role in teaching skills may not be as crucial as the type of relationship that they form with their players through their behavior (Smoll & Smith, 1978).

Many aspects of coaching behavior can be explored. However, for the purpose of this study, coaches' self-perception of their behavior is considered. According to Orlick (1980), understanding the self is necessary in understanding and working with others. Therefore, the behavior of coaches, as it relates to their self-perception, will be

explored in this investigation. This information can be utilized to increase the value of organized sports that can benefit coaches' professional development and personal relationships they establish with their athletes.

Purpose of the Study

With the exception of the work of Smoll and Smith (1980), which concerns little league baseball coaches, currently little exists in the way of systematic, quantitative data which focus on the nature of coaching behavior. The notion of the coach as a significant other in the lives of young athletes has both theoretical and empirical support (McElroy & Kirkendall, 1980; Pooley, 1981; Scanlan & Passer, 1978). Given the crucial role of the coach in the athletic experience of young athletes, the development of an understanding of coaching behaviors and their impact upon athletes is important.

Ryan (1981) points out that a major need in sport psychology today is information concerning coaches' perceptions of their own coaching behavior relative to their actual behavior when working with young athletes. He maintains that coaches must have a realistic perception of their own behavior if they are to become effective leaders (p. 186). Many researchers consider this relationship a prerequisite to the study of other factors concerning coaching behavior (Ryan, 1981; Smith & Smoll, 1980).

Recent research (Debois, 1981; Smoll & Smith, 1978) revealed that coaches had very limited awareness of how frequently they behaved in various ways. These studies found that the players' perception of how their coaches behaved was more accurate than the self-ratings of the

coaches. One implication from this finding is that it may become difficult for coaches to be effective leaders of athletes without being totally aware of the dynamic aspects of their own behavior. A few studies have been conducted to support this implication (Buckelew, 1984; Fisher, 1982; Orlick & Botterill, 1975; Smith & Smoll, 1980). Although it has been found that coaches' accurate perception of their behavior is important for effective coaching, little research exists which has empirically investigated the relationship between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behaviors relative to their actual coaching behavior as determined by systematic observation of their behavior by trained observers.

The purpose of this investigation is to determine if a significant relationship exists between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior and their observed behavior when working with athletes during game situations. Specifically, this study will investigate the relationship between football coaches' self-perception of coaching behavior and actual observed behavior based on three categorical patterns of behavior: (a) "Technical aspects of coaching", involving coaches' fundamental and strategic knowledge of football, their organizational and instructional abilities at practice, and discipline procedures; (b) "Treatment of athletes", involving coaches' dealing with personality, value, and attitude differences among players, and their relationship with parents; and (c) "Coach's emotional maturity", involving the coaches' self-control in tense situations, their behavior following defeat, and rapport with players. These three categories of coaching behaviors were selected

because they reflect a broad range of significant behaviors demonstrated by coaches as determined by research in this area (Curtin, 1977; Smoll & Smith, 1978).

In order to examine the relationship between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior and their observed behavior, this investigation was guided by five questions that relate to the research problem:

1. What are the self-perceptions of inner city, high school football coaches regarding their coaching behavior?
2. Are coaches' self-perception of coaching behavior congruent with their actual observed behavior?
3. Are there major differences in coaches' observed behavior from one game to another?
4. Is there a relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches and self-perception of their behavior?
5. Is there a relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches and their observed coaching behavior?

Significance of the Study

Highly structured athletic programs for students constitute an important part of the sport sub-culture in Western societies (Weinberg, 1983). Literally millions of youngsters have been attracted to adult-supervised athletics, and these programs have become firmly entrenched in the American social and cultural milieu (Debois, 1981; Martens, 1978; Seefeldt, Gilliam, Blievernicht, &

Bruce, 1978). There has been tremendously rapid growth in organized sport programs, and according to Weinberg (1981), there is no reason to anticipate a decline. Furthermore, increasing participation by young athletes has been accompanied by a great degree of adult involvement in coaching and supervising them (Berryman, 1982); consequently, these programs are characterized by an extremely complex social system involving coaches and athletes that has attracted the attention of researchers interested in studying the impact of sport participation on the psychosocial development of both athlete and coach (Gould, 1982a; Magill, Ash & Smoll, 1982; Seefeldt & Gould, 1980; Smith & Smoll, 1980).

Although considerable attention has been given to the psychosocial development of athletes and coaches, most of the focus has been on instruction, strategy, and technical aspects of sports performance. Research involving coaching typically focuses on specific sports skills and techniques (e.g. biomechanics of blocking, pass receiving, offensive and defensive strategies, etc.). Research has also provided an abundance of information on athletic training and conditioning programs for increasing physical strength and endurance. Such information generally is based on sound principles derived from either scientific investigation or repeated and successful practice (Smoll & Smith, 1980). However, there has currently been little research involving coaches' self-perception and awareness of their actual coaching behavior. According to Smoll & Smith (1980), there is a critical need to provide coaches with information on how their behavior is perceived by others as well as themselves. In this

respect, the need to examine this aspect of the behavior of coaching is evident.

An initial survey of the related literature has revealed that coaches have a powerful impact on the psychosocial development of their athletes (Orlick, 1980; Singer, 1972; Smoll & Smith, 1980). It has also been revealed that coaches have very limited perception of how they behave or come across toward their athletes (Orlick & Botterill, 1975; Purdy, 1981; Smith & Smoll, 1980). Given this information, it becomes important that coaches develop an accurate perception of their behavior in relationship to possible effects it may have on their athletes. Information from this investigation can provide significant guidance for coaches. For example, Purdy (1981), in his study of the behavior of coaches, found that coaches who were aware of their behavior toward athletes were able to maintain higher levels of interest in the activities and lower levels of attrition among athletes. Other studies have shown that coaches who had limited and inaccurate levels of self-perception in their coaching behavior experienced more attrition and lower levels of motivation among their athletes (Debois, 1982; Smith & Smoll, 1980). Cratty (1983) points out that studies in this area are useful in that they provide a mirror for coaches, enabling the coach to better perceive the impact that he/she may be having upon their athletes.

Research in the area of coaching behavior involving Chicago's inner-city high school football coaches is non-existent. This research will fill an important gap by providing information to coaches that in turn can be used to facilitate their personal and

professional development. The data will provide these coaches with new insights into their coaching behaviors, thus helping them in working more effectively and efficiently with inner-city high school athletes.

In addition to providing coaches with useful information concerning their behavior that could possibly facilitate their coaching effectiveness, this information can also be utilized by institutions of higher education in establishing curriculum and training policies in programs for those aspiring to become coaches. According to Ryan (1981), "any effort to understand sport psychology must involve the athletic coach. The coach is so central to athletics that he/she must be understood before athletics can be understood" (p. 82). In this respect, Ryan maintains that the study of coaching behaviors should be included in sport psychology or physical education curricula for prospective coaches.

The strength of this investigation is in the utilization of techniques and methods which identify specific aspects of awareness, self-perception, and coaching behaviors through direct observations. The method provides the basis for an objective analysis of behaviors the way they actually appear. The measures from this investigation can assess variability of the same individual across a season(s), between individuals, or sports. The data from this investigation can provide mechanisms for identifying behavior characteristics of various coaches as they relate to individual perception of behavior, and can provide quantitative feedback to guide efforts to possibly modify behaviors of individual coaches.

The results of this investigation will also provide coaches and educators with a base for further studies. For example, using the results concerning perception and behavior, additional questions can be investigated to determine whether those results have a relationship to the psychosocial development of athletes, or the relationship between coaches' self-perception of behavior and athletes' perception of those behaviors.

The information obtained from this investigation is a start in providing valuable information to Chicago's inner-city high school football coaches that can serve as a collated foundation for future research. This will help researchers to take questions beyond speculations to some valid explanations in the area of coaching behavior.

Theoretical Framework

The present study of coaching behavior utilizes a conceptual framework involving the attribution theory of behavior as presented by Heider (1958).

Heider theorized that causal inferences are made by persons to understand the behavior of others. These inferences result from empirical observations; for example, the inferences one person makes about another's motivation takes into account the conditions surrounding the behavior. If behavior is exhibited in a situation where no external reward is apparent, then the perceived focus of control is within the person. The resulting inferences about motivation would then be seen as internal, causing the behavior to be explained as intrinsically motivated. Conversely, behavior perceived

in the presence of an external reward will be attributed to that external force, causing motivational inferences to be described with extrinsic terms (Weiner, 1974).

It is assumed that people implicitly or explicitly are constantly making attributions to causes about every salient event that occurs to them. The individual is regarded as a naive psychologist who is trying to answer questions about the environment, such as why this or that event occurred. Humans are conceived as active, information-processing organisms who use attributional schema or naive theories to make sense of the complex world in which they live. The focus is on the process of making cognitions relative to one's environment and the implications of making such inferences. The essential assumption is that thought precedes action (Weiner, 1974).

Although attribution theory is concerned with causal judgments made in a number of situations about many types of events, the focus for this study is on those attributions made after achievement events--more specifically, on the causal attributions coaches make after their own success or failure at an achievement-oriented task concentrated on competitive success and failure. The basic principles and concepts appear to be applicable in a wide variety of sport settings (Carroll & Payne, 1975; Elig & Frieze, 1979). Motor performance and sports setting are important achievement events for coaches because of the competitive or social evaluation components implicit in such settings (Scanlan, 1977); and the saliency of the outcome.

Applying Heider's theoretical model to self-perception of

coaching behavior would necessitate an understanding of the belief patterns coaches have about succeeding or failing at an achievement-oriented activity. Weiner and associates (1971, 1974) extended Heider's original attribution theory to provide a model of achievement behavior that assumes beliefs about the causes of success and failure which moderate between the perceptions of an achievement task and the final achievement outcome. The differential allocation of responsibility to a particular causal event then guides subsequent behavior. The attributions one makes following a success or failure are seen as having both emotional and behavioral consequences. The attribution one makes effects one's choice of activity, the pride or shame one feels, actual performance levels, and the expectancies of future performance levels (p. 279).

Weiner assumed that people attribute the causes of success and failure to one or more of four causal elements: ability, effort, luck, and task difficulty. Each causal element may be jointly classified as being either internal (ability, effort) or external (luck, task difficulty) and stable (ability, task difficulty) or unstable (luck, effort). Attributions along the locus of control dimension (internal-external) are assumed to influence affective reactions to outcome with internal attributions maximizing personal affect (pride or shame) and external attributions minimizing personal affect (Lanzetta & Hannah, 1969; Weiner & Kukla, 1970). The stability dimension (stable or unstable), on the other hand, mediates expectancies for future performance with stable attributions maximizing outcome expectancies consistent with past outcomes (success

or failure) and unstable attributions minimizing outcome expectancies consistent with past outcomes (Feather & Simon, 1971; Fontaine, 1975; McMahan, 1973; Simon & Feather, 1973; Weiner, Heckhausen, Meyer, & Cook, 1972).

The attributional process begins with a particular win or loss. After the outcome is established, the coach attempts to determine the cause of the outcome. For example, the coach may use the previous wins and losses of himself/herself or the team, the opponent's previous wins or losses, the expectancy associated with outcome, the weather, the home crowd, and the referee to determine the causes of the current win. This information determines the particular causal attributions that the coach or coaches use and the dimensions along which the causal elements are invoked. These particular causal elements in turn affect the emotional reaction of the coach to the outcome and the future performance expectancies of the coach. For example, a coach who has consistently won in the past and who wins a particular contest against a competent opponent would probably attribute high ability to himself/herself. This is an internal attribute that maximizes pride in the outcome, but ability is also a stable attribute, which indicates that the coach would expect similar outcomes in future contests. Further, these expectancies and the emotional reaction to the outcome are assumed to affect the coach's decision about future participation, the intensity of future participation, and persistence at the activity.

It is assumed that ability inferences are made from past history information; and, in particular, the pattern of past performance is

important. If a coach or team has won repeatedly in the past, one infers high ability to that coach or team. Effort inferences are also made from success outcomes. If a coach or team succeeds, then usually effort is inferred. Also, a win following previous losses is usually attributed to increased effort. Task difficulty inferences are usually made from social norms. If other teams or coaches lose to a particular team or coach, then that coach or team is considered hard to beat. In other words, the task is considered to be difficult. Luck inferences are made if a team or coach perceives the outcome to be out of their own personal control. For example, the team or coach may blame the referee, the bounce of the ball, or whatever, and consider that the particular outcome was determined more by luck factors than anything else.

Attribution theory assumes that coaches use the available information in an essentially logical fashion to determine the causes of outcomes. Coaches analyze success and failure feedback in terms of the information they provide concerning the influence of a given causal factor. Thus, attribution theory utilizes an information-processing model based on the covariation of cause and effect (Kelley, 1971; Nicholls, 1975).

The model proposed by Weiner and associates (1971, 1974) implies that coaches attribute causes in a manner consistent with reality. However, an alternative position to the information-processing approach assumes that though coaches may need to process information in a logical way to arrive at decisions about the causes of an event, they also need to main self-esteem. The second position assumes that

coaches may adopt self-serving attributional strategies--variously called self-enhancement, ego-defensive, ego-enhancing, or ego-biased strategies--because coaches may be strongly motivated to view themselves positively (Beckman, 1973; Hastorf, Schneider & Polefka, 1970; Miller & Ross, 1975; Nicholls, 1975). Consequently, such persons attribute success and failure to those factors that promote the greater positive view of self. For example, success is attributed to internal factors and failure to external factors because such attributional biases are conducive to maintaining self-esteem. This line of thought implies that coaches may not be consistently logical in determining the causes of outcomes in achievement situations. It is important, therefore, to determine the extent to which coaches employ ego-biases as the basis of causal attributions in sport and motor performance settings--so that subsequent research on self-perception, behavior, and achievement change programs is based on the appropriate assumptions.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses that guide this investigation are influenced by the following independent and dependent variables:

Independent Variables

Age of subjects

Years of head coaching experience

Years of assistant coaching experience

Number of sports coached other than football

Percentage of wins in 1983

Percentage of wins before 1983 season

Number of playing years in sports

Coaching level (varsity or junior varsity)

Academic major in college

Number of total years coaching

Number of formal courses in coaching or sport psychology/sociology

Level of education (B.S., M.S., etc.)

Dependent Variables

A. Coach's Self-Perception: based on three factors of Curtin's (1977) Self-Perception Profile, (1) technical aspects of coaching; (2) treatment of athletes; and (3) coach's emotional maturity.

B. Coaches' Observed Behavior: These measures include 12 specific behaviors which include behaviors used in the three self-perception categories.

C. Coaching Questionnaire: measures of coach's perceived coaching behavior contained in the coaches' behavior assessment system.

Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis I - There will be no significant correlation between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CBAQ and their actual observed behavior measured by the CBAS.

Hypothesis II - There will be no significant correlation between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CSPP and their actual observed behavior measured by the CBAS.

Hypothesis III - There will be no significant difference in coaches' observed behavior from the first game observation as compared

to the second game observation as measured by the CBAS.

Hypothesis IV - There will be no significant relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches based on the CVP and the self-perception of their coaching behavior measured by the CSPP and CBAQ instrument.

Hypothesis V - There will be no significant relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches based on CVP and their observed coaching behaviors measured by the CBAS.

Definition of Terms

Coach: An individual with the title "head coach", "assistant coach", or "freshman coach" with the responsibility of coaching a high school football team at one of the 55 public high schools within the Chicago Board of Education School System.

Positive Coaching Behavior: Behavior exhibited by a football coach which is supportive and structuring in nature (positive reinforcement, encouragement, support, etc.) as a response to an athlete's playing performance on the football field during game situations.

Negative Coaching Behavior: Behavior exhibited by a football coach which is punitive in nature (non-reinforcement, criticizing, non-supportive, etc.) such as a response to an athlete's playing performance on the football field during game situations.

Coach's Self-Perception: The impression held by the coach of his/her coaching methods and player relationships.

Observed Coach's Behavior: The observation of behaviors exhibited by coaches on the football field during regularly scheduled

season games.

Observation: The visual and audio recording of verbal and non-verbal behaviors exhibited by coaches on the field during regulation playing time of regularly scheduled season football games.

Regulation game time: The time designated as actual playing time during a varsity football game. This includes 48 minutes of total time divided into four quarters (12 minutes each).

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the Chicago public high school football coaches during the 1984 football season; therefore, generalizability of the findings is consequently limited to this population only.

The observations and recordings of subjects' behaviors were limited to on-field behaviors during regulation game time only. It was not always possible for observers to enter the team's locker rooms for off-field observations and recordings; therefore, the findings of this study reflect only those behaviors exhibited by subjects on the football field during regulation time only.

Other limitations of the study arise from problems common to this type of research, but every attempt was made to guard against them.

1. Subjects, aware of the fact that they were being observed, may have reacted with unusual effort in their behavior.

2. Every attempt was made to adjust to the noise level of the crowd and the recurrent blocking vision of subjects by players for accurate observations and recordings; however, this could not be controlled for at times.

3. On a few occasions there were game scheduling mix-ups on the

part of administrative personnel. This necessitated that adjustments be made for observation periods of the subjects affected by the mix-ups.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between the self-perception of coaching behavior and the actual observed behavior during game situations among Chicago high school football coaches. This study is designed to investigate an area of importance to coaching in which very little research has been conducted.

This chapter describes a theoretical framework within which the study is conducted and the hypotheses to be tested. It also provides definitions of the terms and discusses limitations of the study.

Chapter II discusses the most relevant related literature to the present investigation. This includes the coach's role and relationship with athletes; the coach's self-perception and player perception of coaching behavior; and factors affecting communication between coach and athlete. Chapter III reports the methodology used to conduct this research. Information concerning the population, sample selection, inventory distributions, methods of collecting data, and follow-up procedures will be included in this section. Chapter IV contains the analysis of the data collected. Quantitative evidence is used to test whether or not the hypotheses are accepted or rejected. The results of the observations are described as they occurred to indicate support or rejection of the data. Chapter V contains a summary discussing the results of the data analysis in light of the

hypotheses under consideration. It also presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of research in the field of coaching behavior that is directly relevant to this dissertation. Efforts to understand the behavior of coaches have often been based on the assumption that coaches behave the way they do because they possess unique sets of personal characteristics. This means that when coaching behavior is subject to question, so is the character of coaches. It is assumed that coaches who are inflexible, traditional, or exceptionally straight are that way because of their personalities, attitudes, and individual orientations toward other people (Coakley, 1978). This approach ignores the fact that the position of the coach has unique characteristics as an occupation, and that the behavior of those in that position is usually a consequence of more than just personal attributes. Thus, an attempt to understand the factors that affect the behavior of coaches as it relates to the research issue will focus on the following areas: (a) the coach's role and relationship with athletes; (b) the coach's self-perception and player perception of coaching behavior; and (c) factors affecting communication between coach and athlete.

The Coach's Role and Relationship with Athletes

Literature about the role of coaches suggests that the effective coach is one who relates in terms of role relationships (Ouchi, 1981).

On a very general level, a role refers to a set of rights and obligations associated with a specific position within a social structure (Coakley, 1978). For the position of coach, this means that there is a set of interrelated norms that provide general guidelines for the behavior of both the individual coach and others with whom interaction occurs. However, the actual role behavior that occurs within any social setting is influenced by factors other than just these general guidelines (Secord & Backman, 1974). Other important factors to consider include unique situational demands, the individual characteristics of the coach's multiple roles, the coach's role expectations relevant to the relationship and the setting, and the interpersonal manner in which coach and athlete negotiate their relationship(s) with one another (Coakley, 1978).

The visibility and responsibility of the coach along with the diversity of his/her role behavior create a situation in which success depends on an ability to manage interpersonal relations as well as an ability to perform tasks directly related to goal attainment.

Ouchi (1981) views the major role of the coach as integrating the group into a smooth working unit that performs efficiently with a sense of pride; excellence, and collective identity. To achieve these ends a coach should be firm but affectionate. Ouchi maintains that a coach must discipline athletes according to the norms that govern the team, yet be receptive to athletes' interpersonal needs for affiliation, belonging, recognition, and security (pp. 32-36).

Although many would concur with Ouchi's view concerning the major role of coaches, consideration must be given to multifaceted roles of

coaches when discussing behavior.

Coaches Multiple Roles

The terms role or role set and multiple roles are often confused and used erroneously. While role relates to a position, multiple roles actually relate to many different positions that a person holds in different groups or organizations (Fross & Troppman, 1981).

Frequently, it has been stated that a coach plays such various roles as disciplinarian, guidance counselor, salesperson, diplomat, psychologist, leader, teacher, strategist, among others. These many roles are all within the single role set of the position of coach since he or she is expected to be a leader, to discipline the players, be diplomatic, be a strategist, be a tactician, and to fulfill other expectations. It is all part of a coach's job (Fross & Troppman, 1981, p. 22).

While a coach may be expected to play many roles, none is more important than that of a teacher. For example, Bucher (1975), Gallon (1974), Moore (1970), Sabock (1973), Scott (1971), all former coaches and members of college and university faculties, have referred to coaching as teaching. They all agree that "a good coach is a good teacher". Clary (1976) discussed the "winning philosophies" of eight National Football League coaches, each of whom referred to the fact that "coaching is teaching". Cope (1977) and Zimmerman (1980), both writers for Sports Illustrated, and Bisher (1980), for the Sporting News, and others, all have done feature articles on Chuck Noll, the Pittsburgh Steeler's head football coach, who is often quoted as saying, "I'm a teacher". Frequently Noll adds, "players win, coaches

teach them. I teach" (Bisher, 1980, p. 34).

In view of the coach's inherent role as a teacher, the application of his/her teaching role will be determined by the personal philosophy, personality, and leadership style which characterizes the individual. In addition to these factors, consideration must be given to athlete's expectations of their coaches as they influences behaviors and relationships between coach and athletes.

Role Expectations. Many studies and surveys have been conducted to determine the expectations that athletes have of coaches. Snyder (1972a, 1972b, 1975) found through his research that coaches serve as a role model, advisor, and socializing agent for their players. Le Grand (1973), in What Athletes Look for in Their Coaches, reported that athletes expect coaches to know their sport (subject), to know their players and to be able to relate to them in a variety of situations, and to possess the expertise and know-how of effective teaching-coaching methods to bring both subject matter and the players together.

Balaza (1974) conducted a clinical investigation of the psychological and social variables associated with the personalities of 25 female athletes who competed in the 1972 Olympics. One of her interview questions was, "What role did the coach play and how was he perceived by his athletes?" (p. 68). Balaza reported that she had anticipated good relationships and warm feelings would be expressed by those interviewed, but she did not expect them to express so much emotional involvement and enthusiasm, devotion, and gratitude toward

their coaches, such as, "He was a good friend, a father and a teacher all put together" (p. 69). While Balaza commented on the reference to the father figure, she noted affection and respect each girl had for her own father, which the psychologist perceived resulted in a good relationship with the male coach. Balaza also queried the athletes about how they might feel had their coach been female. Despite the fact that all of the female athletes, except two, had male coaches, most of the athletes expressed the same positive feelings might hold true in relating to a female coach. Several athletes expressed the viewpoint that if a girl and her mother got along well, then it was possible that a female coach would present a mother figure to the athlete and there would be a good coach-athlete relationship.

After analyzing the tapes of the Olympic competitors, Balaza perceived there was a uniqueness about athlete-coach relationship that went far beyond skill training. The girls' remarks bespoke of humanistic coach-athlete interactions, where the coach helped the athlete optimize her personality. Balaza concluded, "These are the words (on the tapes) that describe an `educator' in the purest sense of the word" (p. 70).

Athletes not only expect skills in know-how, in terms of knowledge and teaching-coaching methodology, but an athlete expects his or her coach to display competencies in interpersonal or human skills in the coach-athlete relationship (Balaza, 1974, pp. 72-77).

Interpersonal Relationships. Ogilvie and Tutko (1966) in their earlier studies indicate that in some ways, the most significant trait in effective interpersonal relationships is an athlete's capacity to

respect and trust those persons in the role of authority. They also stated that the nature of trust was reciprocal; it must go from coach to athlete and back again. To be certain, the deep attitudes of the coach will manifest themselves in his/her overt behavior, and in nonverbal cues as well as verbal expressions.

Buckelew (1984), in his contemporary study of coach-athlete relationships, concludes that coaches must understand the enormous challenge inherent in the role of directing and supervising athletes and of dealing with their multifaceted personalities. He contends that the first step in establishing a positive role-relationship with athletes is to get to know the players personally. Buckelew views the coach as a salesperson. He states, "a salesman cannot sell anything unless he knows the product inside out--or outside in. Neither can a coach show up with just a whistle and expect to coach effectively. He must develop perspective, perceptiveness, sensitivity, and an understanding of athletes" (p. 77). Buckelew believes that if coaches do this, they will be able to create an atmosphere of mutual understanding and better cope with situational demands, thus establishing positive relationships with athletes.

In the process of establishing positive coach-athlete relationships, athletes experience certain expectations which seem rather unique in this coach-athlete relationship. One of these expectations is to learn when to be cooperative and when to be competitive. Sage (1968) points out that the problem is to find the conditions under which both competition and cooperation function effectively as incentives.

In his studies of the effects of cooperation and competition upon group processes, Duetsch (1968) noted:

> The communication of ideas, coordination of efforts, friendliness and pride in one's team which are basic to team harmony and effectiveness appear to be disrupted when members see themselves to be competing for mutually exclusive goals. The greater the extent to which goals are perceived as shared among members of the group, the stronger the tendency of the individual to identify with the group (p. 482).

Other incentives toward prescribed behavior in this coach-athlete relationship are the reward and punishment variables, success or failure factors, a pride in team accomplishments, an effort to please the coach, loyalty to team standards, an insatiable desire to win, and a desire to contribute to team morale and effort (Duetsch, 1968).

The role relationship of coach and athlete suggests the existence of a very special relationship, and one which places both coach and athlete, particularly the latter, in a vulnerable position. The athlete is especially dependent upon the coach's role behavior, attitudes, and responses. Therefore, the athlete must rely heavily upon personal perception and understanding of the role behavior and messages of the coach for guidance which affect performance and personal development.

Carron and Bennett (1977) investigated the nature of coach-athlete interpersonal relationships through the study of coach-athlete dyad compatibility. They found that compatible coach-athlete dyads were characterized by greater amounts of interacting and exchanging control behavior (i.e., coaches and athletes both exert and receive control) than were incompatible dyads.

Carron and Bennett conclude:

> Coaches provided a great deal of information to their athletes, particularly in the form of lecture and demonstration. Coaches in the less satisfied environments, however, provided 70% more information to their athletes than did their counterparts in the satisfied environments. It is possible that by providing excessive information, coaches contribute to the dissatisfaction of their athletes because athletes cannot integrate all the coaches' suggestions into their performance as quickly and accurately as they might like. Therefore, the task in giving directions and offering suggestions lies more in the quality of what is said and the appropriateness of the delivery, rather than in sheer quantity (pp. 191-195).

Another behavior pattern, coaches' use of acceptance and praise, plays an important role because of its frequency of occurrence in satisfied environments and its conspicuous absence in the less satisfied environments (Fisher, Mancini & Hirsch, 1982).

It is not surprising that praise and acceptance are associated with satisfaction. As Brophy (1981) indicated in her critical review of praise and reinforcement, most individuals enjoy receiving praise. It provides encouragement and support when it follows athletes' efforts, and assists coaches in establishing friendly personal relationships with athletes.

In contrast to praise and acceptance, perhaps the clearest illustration of how coaches affect sport performance is the research showing the detrimental affects of negativistic coaching. That is, when coaches give mostly critical feedback, performance often declines, as do attitudes toward the game and sometimes attitudes toward the self (Weinberg, 1983). For example, Smith, Smoll, and Curtis (1979) rated the coaching behaviors of 51 Little League coaches and found that those who often made punitive remarks to their players had teams with less favorable attitudes toward baseball and, in some

cases, less favorable attitudes toward themselves. In a related vein, Kirschenbaum and his associates found that excessive negative feedback, compared to no feedback, resulted in much lower basketball performance by college students and a decrease in favorable attitudes and substained self-observation of performance (Kirschenbaum & Smith, 1983; Kirschenbaum et al., 1984).

Wotruba and Golden (1968) suggest that the coach must function within an atmosphere in which athletes feel the coach really cares about them as people in order for learning to occur. Within this environment the coach must be sensitive to each athlete's needs, possess the ability to communicate respect and concern for each athlete regardless of his/her present status, be open to personal relationships, and encourage opinions from athletes concerning the athletic program. This type of behavior by the coach will be conducive for a positive role and relationships with athletes and would create a satisfied and pleasant athletic environment for both coach and athletes (Brophy, 1981).

Coach's Self-Perception and Player Perception of Coaching Behavior

The coach's behavior is a function of his/her own personal characteristics (personality, ability, experience, etc.) as well as the influence of the situation in which he/she operates (Weinberg, 1983). Chelladurai (1984) identifies three important elements in coach's leadership behavior: the coach, the athlete, and the situation. Chelladurai maintains that the congruency among the three elements is the most significant and necessary condition for team effectiveness. That is, what the athlete prefers and how the coach

behaves or reacts must be consistent not only with each other's expectancies but also with the situational requirements or constraints (Chelladurai, 1978; Chelladurai & Carron, 1978). These contingent relationships are highlighted by the Multidimensional Model of Leadership developed by Chelladurai.

Briefly, the model envisages three states of leader behavior: actual leader behavior, leader behavior preferred by athletes, and required leader behavior. The antecedents of these three aspects of leadership consist of the characteristics of the leader, the athletes, and the situation. The model's major proposition is that the degree of congruence among the three states of leader behavior is positively related to performance and satisfaction.

Research testing this proposition is in the initial stages. For instance, Chelladurai (1984) reported that the discrepancy between athletes' perception of coaching behaviors and their preferences for specific behavior was significantly correlated with their satisfaction with leadership, team performance, and overall involvement. Although the pattern of relationships between the discrepancies in the dimensions of leader behavior and the satisfaction measures varied in the three sport groups studied (basketball, wrestling, and track and field), the relationship between discrepancy in training and instruction and satisfaction with leadership was similar in all three groups. The finding that athlete's satisfaction with leadership increased as the coach's perceived emphasis on this dimension increased was considered to be consistent with the task-oriented nature of athletes. Another finding of this study highlights the

effects of situational differences. Basketball players were satisfied even when the coach's positive feedback exceeded their preferences (linear relationships), while the wrestlers were dissatisfied with discrepancy in either direction (curvilinear relationship). Such discrepancy did not have any effect in the track and field group. Chelladurai argued that this pattern reflects the nature of the three sports: "The availability of objective feedback from the task itself progressively increases from the interdependent-open task (basketball), through the dependent-close task (track and field)" (p. 39).

A recent study by Fry, Kerr, and Lee (1983) reports the effects of tasks interdependence on perceived leader behavior of coaches. It was found that within interdependent sports (basketball, football, hockey, and volleyball), winning coaches were perceived to be higher on coordinating, exercising their leadership role, and emphasizing production than were the coaches of losing teams. Within the independent sports (swimming, track and field, golf, and wrestling), however, successful coaches were perceived to be more concerned with maintaining a closely knit group and resolving conflicts than were the unsuccessful coaches. Furthermore, successful coaches in interdependent sports, as compared to the successful coaches in independent sports, were perceived as displaying more role clarification, integrating group function, exercising the leadership role, and placing greater emphasis on production. These coaches also showed less tolerance for athletes freedom and less concern for their comfort and well-being.

Percival (1973) between 1969-71, collected both structured and unstructured comments and judgments from 382 Canadian athletes and 66 coaches representing 25 sports. Of the athletes, 318 were male, 64 female; 52 coaches were male, 14 female. Marked differences were obtained in mean scores when athletes were asked to rate their coaches on a 10-point scale as compared to the coaches' ratings of themselves. On the average, coaches ranked themselves at about seven on a 10-point scale; whereas the athletes ranked their coaches at about four on the same scale. These differences held up between athletes and coaches at various competitive levels. However, more experienced athletes competing at higher levels tend to be more critical of the coach. The greatest discrepancies in perceptions of athletes and coaches occurred within the personality dimension. Seventy-two percent of the coaches rated themselves as having a "positive" coaching personality, but only 32% of the athletes concurred. Sixty-six percent of the athletes generally rated their coaches in a negative fashion; only 24% gave their coaches a positive rating (pp. 236-243).

Individual sport athletes rated their coaches less positively than did team sport athletes. Percival suggests that perhaps this is due to the fact that in team sports the presence of supportive team members can overcome less capable coaching. This group support is not as available in individual sports. In individual sports, most athletes rely upon a one-to-one relationship with the coach for technical support.

In a study of female athletes and their coaches, Horne (1982) found that satisfaction with leadership was related to (a) discrepancy

between perceived and preferred training and instruction, (b) discrepancy between coaches' self-reports of own positive feedback and athletes' perception of it, and (c) discrepancy between coaches' self-reports of democratic behavior and athletes' preferences for it. In all the instances, the results showed that the smaller the discrepancy, the greater the satisfaction with leadership.

Fisher (1984) investigated coach-athlete interaction patterns and team climates, and coach-athlete perceptions of team climates. The quantity, quality, and sequence of coach-athlete interactions revealed a clear difference between satisfied and less satisfied team climates. Coaches perceived their team climates as more ideal and less in need of change than athletes.

Coaches in this study perceived no difference between their current and ideal team climates (leader support, self-discovery, and team-coach cohesion). On the other hand, athletes perceived needed changes on almost all aspects of their team climates (p. 401). These results are consistent with the image of coaches, which Sage (1973) considers as "group-centered leaders who are responsible for creating a team atmosphere that prescribes standards and expectations for athletes" (p. 93).

Fisher concludes that it seems reasonable that coaches would have higher ideals about team climates than athletes. It is also likely that coaches, by virtue of their professional involvement, have a greater commitment to sport and therefore, are more predisposed to hold a more idealistic view of the athletic experience (p. 402).

Data from Fisher's study point to the limited relationship

between what coaches do and what they perceive they do (Percival, 1973). As in Percival's earlier research, current findings indicate that many coaches need to alter their self-perceptions if they hope to better understand and effectively work with their team. In addition, they need to be more sensitive to the quantity, quality, and directional nature of the coach-athlete interaction patterns on their teams (Tutko & Richards, 1971).

It has been found that when coaches' interaction patterns are fed back to them, they are likely to increase the positive and decrease the negative aspects of the interactions (Bar-Or, 1975; Smith et al., 1979). Apparently, the concrete nature of feedback promotes an awareness upon which change strategies can build (Smoll & Smith, 1980).

In the description of their pioneering work in coach effectiveness training, Smith et al. (1979) obtained correlation coefficients reflecting the relationships between observed behavior of coaches and performed behaviors. They found a significant negative correlation which reflected a discrepancy between what coaches do and what they think they do. Smith et al. (1978) state that:

> It is clear that the ability of coaches to give self-ratings of their behaviors that correspond with the perceptions of others is limited indeed. Whether self-perception skills can be improved through training, feedback, and self-monitoring procedures is a question deserving of empirical attention, since behavior change in coaches may be highly dependent on accurate self-monitoring and social comparison skills (p. 187).

Relationships between player perceptions of coaching behaviors and their evaluative reaction toward the coaches were also assessed in this study. Specifically, it was found that coaches who were

supportive and "positive" in the manner in which they instructed and corrected errors of performance were better liked and had players with higher levels of self-esteem and more positive attitudes toward sport and team than coaches who behaved in a more negative fashion (pp. 189-190).

In a follow up article, Smith and Smoll (1980) replicated their 1979 results. In retrospect, they suggested a framework that would provide coaches with a set of perceptional categories for organizing their own experiences and self-perceptions. Smith and Smoll (1980) stated that "coaches are often dismayed when shown their behavioral profiles" (p. 19). If it is assumed that the vast majority of youth coaches have positive and desirable motives for coaching (Martens & Gould, 1979; Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1978), then their limitations as coaches result primarily from a lack of information and a lack of awareness of how they affect their player (Smith & Smoll, 1980). Thus, an important component of a training program should be "to attempt to increase coaches' awareness of what they are doing" (p. 48). The focus of the present study will offer additional insight into the apparent importance of coaches' self-perception of their behavior as it relates to the interpersonal relationships with athletes.

Factors Affecting Communication Between Coach and Athlete

The foundation for effective communication between coaches and athletes is trust and mutual respect for one another (Likert, 1961; Nesvig, 1980; Orlick, 1980; Ouchi, 1981). A coaching staff should create an atmosphere in which athletes have the freedom to express

their ideas and feelings in a constructive, democratic way. Research indicates that athletes want to be involved in certain decisions that affect them directly (Carron & Chelladurai, 1978; Fisher, 1984). Consequently, open communication channels between coaches and athletes will lend depth and rationality to both interpersonal and task-related situations. Orlick (1980) appropriately notes that communication is a two-way venture, and both the coach and athlete have a responsibility toward one another for making it work.

Stern (1972) in earlier research provides some illustrations of factors which may create potential communication problems between coaches and athletes:

> Simply put, the problem is that student athletes perceive a conflict between the sport culture in which they participate and the larger culture, which values (or at least plays lip service to) the principle of participatory democracy and achievement on the basis of merit (p. 42).

Stern's research indicated that athletes questioned the limits of coaches' authority on the sports scene. Athletes requested (demanded) more involvement in making decisions directly affecting their lives. Stern suggested that coaches basically ignored these developments, perhaps because they posed a threat to the basic assumptions held by coaches regarding the value of organized sport.

Fisher (1984), in more contemporary research of athletes, reported that "there is a consistent plea from today's athletes wanting some input into the decisions that have to be made by coaches which affect them as players and individuals such as dress codes or discipline codes" (p. 400). One solution may be a form of participant leadership or consensus management (Campbell, 1980), in which coaches share the

leadership process by requesting or allowing athletes' input involving the entire group in goal setting activities results in a form of psychological contracting, which instills in group members an increased commitment to team goals and a greater awareness of the degree of effort and discipline required to reach those goals (Botterill, 1980). Botterill states that

> through a coach's guidance, teams should set both long-term distal goals and short-term proximal goals. Whereas long-term goals provide incentives, direction, and evaluation of progress along the way, the attainment of short-term goals reinforces intrinsic feelings of pride, confidence, and personal accomplishment (p. 145).

According to Botterill (1980) the coach should initially think about the upcoming season and determine the goals, priorities, and expectations for the team. Group planning sessions could revolve around such issues as: What are we going to try and accomplish this upcoming season? What are our strengths and weaknesses or areas of concern on the team? What are some specific goals to strive for? What are some strategies that can be used to achieve these goals? (Botterill, 1980).

One of the biggest tasks confronting the coach is to make sure the goals and plans made through group consensus are realistic, attainable challenges. A coach should not be afraid to change goals that are deemed unrealistically difficult. Consequently, once goals have been set, consideration should be given toward what obstacles might prevent their fulfillment and how the team might overcome these obstacles (Zander, 1978).

In support of this line of thinking, Fisher (1984) contends that

"athletes desire more organization and innovation, but not at the expense of increased coach control of the environment. If coaches recognize and understand the athlete's desires for input, at least one of the factors affecting communications between coaches and athletes may be reduced" (p. 401). Perhaps the most salient advice for coaches who seek a solution to a dilemma with athletes is to become aware of the changing youth culture and its values, and to modify their own behavior (Stern, 1972).

In terms of modifying behavior, Ogilvie and Tutko (1966) have found that no successful program or technique can be applied to modify the behavior of athletes that does not involve the personality of the coach:

> Unconscious attitudes and beliefs exist that are potential causes of communication problems between coaches and athletes. The best protection against limiting coaching effectiveness by such unconscious mechanisms is to engage in some serious introspection and put your attitudes to a critical, personal test (pp. 19-20).

If coaches would examine the specifics that cause them to react with strong feelings, this form of self-examination may reduce the emotional components producing unproductive relationships with individual athletes or teams. Cratty (1970) states that,

> Research dealing with the personality of the coach should be helpful to coaches seeking to improve their personal effectiveness. This type of investigation might encourage some coaches to become more flexible in their assessments of new practices and in dealing with individual differences among athletes (pp. 46-53).

Miller (1982) examines the qualities of aggressiveness or assertiveness in coaches as a possible factor affecting communication between coaches and athletes. Miller defines assertiveness as "the

appropriate expression of thoughts and feelings without impairment to the self-esteem of those to whom thoughts and feelings are being directed" (p. 100). Miller states that "in the formative years of early and late adolescence, it is essential that the coaching staff learns to communicate effectively with their players" (p. 108). He maintains that the communication process can and does have a profound effect on how athletes perceive themselves. Nonassertive coaches find it difficult to express their actual feelings. Often they become hurt and disappointed because they have difficulty communicating effectively with players or sport officials when they need to. Aggressive coaches, on the other hand, are able to express their thoughts and feelings, but they do so at the expense of the athletes' feelings. They may feel good about their behavior, but they may at the same time be impairing the relationship with players or game officials. Miller maintains that:

> Every player on a team sport faces the humbling experience of missing an assignment or failing to follow through on an important play, and the first words from the coach may well determine the psychological impact of this experience on the adolescent. A highly judgmental and accusatory statement may serve as a catalyst for withdrawal or oppositional tendencies which may only sabotage the goals of athletics and good sportsmanship. On the other hand, it may totally deflate the self-image of the player, causing him or her to experience a depressed state of "learned helplessness" (pp. 112-113).

Coaches face a dilemma because they need to encourage and respect athletes' input, but they must be careful that the invitation to share feelings does not extend into the domain of negative criticism of team members (Fisher et al., 1982). Coaches can avoid this dilemma by being perceptive, sensitive, and understanding of athletes as

individuals and a group (Buckelew, 1984). Nesvig (1980) suggests that one way to foster understanding between coaches and athletes is to conduct regular team meetings to allow both positive and negative feelings to be expressed in an open, honest, constructive manner. As Orlick has stated, "It is difficult to be responsive to other people's needs or feelings if you do not know what they are. It is difficult to respect another person's perspective if you do not understand what it is or why it is" (Orlick, 1980, p. 221). Consequently, a mature group can resolve its internal conflicts, mobilize its resources, and take intelligent action only if it has a means for consensually validating its own experience. According to Botterill (1980), team talks could revolve around various topics such as developing realistic expectations, redefining goals that may have been set too high or low, or learning from mistakes of losses; or team talks could simply provide an outlet for the expression of positive or negative feelings. Thus regular rap sessions that are genuine and constructively oriented can help improve team morale and overall productivity (p. 222). However, it should be stressed that the person in charge of the regular rap sessions have some background in group dynamic principles in order to steer group members toward what he/she thinks the group needs most at that time (Orlick, 1980). This will allow a coach and group to be more capable of dealing constructively with potentially disruptive issues.

With this understanding of athletes as individuals as well as group, the chances of effective communication is greatly enhanced. Fross and Troppman (1981) maintain that:

> Without effective communication, including the intangibles mentioned, it is difficult for effective joint action or understanding to take place. Since a head coach's function is to optimize the effectiveness of group activity that includes coaching staff subordinates as well as players, communication becomes one of the vital aspects of a coach's work (pp. 122-123).

Given the importance of communication in the coach-athlete relationship, the present study focuses on one aspect of the coach-athlete relationship considered vital to the communicative process. This aspect includes an accurate and realistic understanding and self-perception of the dynamics of coaches' own interpersonal communication skills.

Summary

The majority of the studies reviewed in the area of coaching behavior suggest that the effective coach is one who relates to athletes in terms of role relationships; this means that the coach recognizes the unique situational demands of his/her position. Some of the situational demands to consider are: the coach's role expectations relevant to the relationship of the setting; the interpersonal manner in which the coach and athlete negotiate their relationship(s) with one another, and characteristics of the coach's multiple roles. Coaches multiple roles may include that of counselor, teacher, disciplinarian, strategist, psychologist, and many others. Several studies suggest that the coach must first recognize the multiple roles of his/her position to effectively work with athletes, peers, administrators, and others.

Other findings suggest that the coach must function within an atmosphere in which the athletes feel the coach really cares about

them as people in order for learning to occur. It follows that the coach must be sensitive to each athlete's needs, be open to personal relationships, encourage opinions from athletes concerning the athletic program, and possess the ability to communicate respect and concern for each athlete regardless of his/her status on the team. Studies suggest that where there is mutual trust, respect, confidence, and cooperation between coach and athlete and members of the coaching staff, communication is usually open and effective.

Most researchers agree that the ability of the coach to communicate effectively with athletes will determine the nature of the coaches' interpersonal relationship with their athletes. One objective of the present study is to present data that will offer additional insights into the apparent importance of coaches' self-perception of their behavior as it relates to interpersonal relationships with athletes. In this respect, the preceding review of the related literature and research represents a support foundation that is most relevant to the present study.

Information from the related literature will greatly aid sport administrators in the selection of coaches who exhibit the behavior necessary for the successful implementation or enhancement of their particular athletic programs. The literature review of this investigation provides information in the area of coaching behaviors and serve to corroborate evidence of past and recent findings which provides direction and support for the present study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This investigation is directed toward assessing the coaching behavior of inner-city high school football coaches and their self-perception of this behavior. This chapter describes the research methodology used in this study. The population and the sample of the study are defined, and the instruments which were developed and administered during the study are reported. Questionnaire distribution and retrieval, and other data collection procedures are discussed. The chapter concludes with a description of the statistical analysis applied to the collected data.

Population

The population represented in this study consists of approximately 260, male, inner-city, high school football coaches employed during Fall 1984, by the Chicago Board of Education. These coaches work exclusively with inner-city high school athletes between the ages of 13 and 19 representing all ethnic backgrounds. Each of the coaches has a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university, and uniformly fulfills all of the professional requirements to teach/coach which are stipulated by the Chicago Board of Education.

Sampling

Letters were mailed in August of 1984, to all 260 coaches to

solicit their participation in this investigation. The Chicago Board of Education teacher/coach directory (Fall, 1984) was used to determine the mailing list. The letter explained the purpose of the study, solicited coaches' participation, and included a stamped, self-addressed return postcard on which coaches indicated their willingness to participate. From the group of 194 coaches who consented to participate, 80 subjects were randomly selected and subsequently contacted by telephone by the researcher. This process took place after regular school hours to avoid any disruption to the coaches' program of instruction.

Instruments

This investigation utilized the Coach's Vita Profile (CVP), the Curtin Coach's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP, Curtin, 1977), the Coach's Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ, Smoll & Smith, 1978), and the Coach's Behavior Assessment System (CBAS, Smoll & Smith, 1978).

The Coach's Vita Profile (CVP, see Appendix A). Developed by the investigator, the CVP seeks demographic information relevant to a coach's academic preparation, years of playing and coaching experience, win-loss percentages, and other demographic information. This instrument requires five minutes to complete.

The Curtin Coach's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP, see Appendix B). This instrument was developed by Curtin (1977) as part of an investigation to study the personality traits and self-perception of coaches' behavior. This 47-item instrument, on which the coach describes his/her coaching methods and player-coach relationships,

requires about 20 minutes to complete.

A jury, consisting of four coaches and/or physical educators not participating in Curtin's (1977) study, was asked by Curtin to evaluate the developed instrument. Additions and deletions were made consistent with their suggestions and recommendations. Individuals with a minimum of ten years of teaching and coaching experience at the high school and/or college levels in a variety of sports were asked to serve on the jury (Curtin, 1977).

The Coach's Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ, see Appendix C). This instrument was developed by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977) as part of an investigation to study coaches' self-perception of their behavior. The instrument assesses the self-perception of coaches' behavior by asking them to indicate on a 7-point scale, ranging from "almost never" (1) to "almost always" (7), how often they engage in the behaviors taken from 12 Coach's Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) categories.

The Coach's Behavior Assessment System (CBAS, see Appendix D). Developed by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977), the CBAS was designed over a period of several years. Initially, soccer coaches were observed during practice sessions and games to determine the classes of coaching behavior that occurred. The observers carried a portable tape recorder and essentially did a "play-by-play" of the coaches' behaviors using a time sampling procedure. The behavior descriptions were transcribed and content analyzed in light of concepts from social learning theory to develop an initial set of scoring categories from which the present system eventually evolved. Subsequent use of the

system in observing and coding behaviors of basketball, baseball, and football coaches indicated that the scoring system was sufficiently comprehensive to incorporate the vast majority of coaching behaviors, that individual differences in behavioral patterns could be discerned, and that the coding system could be used easily in field settings (Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977).

In the CBAS, two major classes of behaviors are described: (1) reactive behaviors, which are responses to immediately preceding player or team behaviors; and (2) spontaneous behaviors, which are initiated by the coach and are not responses to immediately preceding events. These classes are roughly analogous to the distinction between elicited behaviors (responses to identifiable stimuli) and emitted behaviors (behaviors that do not have clear-cut antecedents). Reactive behaviors are responses to either desirable performances, mistakes, or misbehaviors on the part of players; while the spontaneous class is subdivided into game-related and game irrelevant behaviors initiated by the coach. The system thus involves basic interactions between the situation and the coach's behavior.

Several studies have been performed to assess the reliability of the CBAS coding system, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of the observer training program. In the first study, 31 trainees viewed a videotaped sequence of 48 random-ordered, discrete coaching behaviors performed by an actor. In each instance, the game situation was verbally described by a narrator and the coach's behavior was then shown. Each of the 12 CBAS categories was represented four times. Scoring accuracy was defined in terms of agreement with scoring of the

behaviors by the authors. The number of scoring errors ranged from 0 to 5 with a mean of 1.06 errors per observer. This yielded an average agreement with expert scoring of 97.8% (Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977).

The consistency of scoring over time was assessed by readministering the videotape of the 48 coaching behaviors to 24 of the trainees one week after the first viewing. The trainees had been given no feedback about their initial codings. The index of consistency was the percentage of behaviors that were scored identically on the two administrations. These percentages ranged from 87.5% to 100%, with a mean consistency score of 96.4% (Smith, et al., 1977).

Two studies were performed to assess interrater reliability of CBAS scoring in field settings. In the first, five observers independently and simultaneously coded the behaviors of a female, Little League baseball coach during a six-inning game that lasted 84 minutes. An average of 250 behaviors were coded. The correlation coefficients between the coding frequencies of observer pairs across the 12 CBAS categories ranged from +.77 to +.99. The average interrater reliability coefficient was +.88 (Smith, et al., 1977).

A second interrater reliability study was undertaken by Smith, et al. (1977), in which two of the authors and 19 trained observers used the CBAS to code independently the behaviors of a male, Little League baseball coach during a five-inning game that lasted 91 minutes. An average of 208 behaviors were coded during this time interval. The authors scored each behavior in consultation to provide a basis for assessing the accuracy of the observers. Reliability coefficients

were computed between all possible pairs of observers, which resulted in a total of 171 coefficients reflecting the degree of correspondence of coding frequencies across the behavioral categories. A reliability coefficient of the number of observer pairs that attained various levels of interrater reliability was +.88 (Smith, et al., 1977).

Reliability coefficients computed between the 19 observers and the criterion codings of the authors indicated a high level of accuracy in the observers' coding of the data. The coefficients ranged from +.62 to +.98, with a mean reliability coefficient of +.86.

Training Procedures. In utilizing any behavioral assessment system, it is essential that observers be well trained and competent. Unless independent observers can agree on how a particular behavior is to be categorized, the system cannot be scientifically useful. Thus, a major goal of the CBAS training program is to establish high interrater reliability. A training program developed by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977) to achieve this includes: (a) extended study of a training manual containing an explanation of the CBAS and instructions for its use; (b) group instruction in use of the scoring system, including viewing and discussion of an audiovisual training module; (c) written tests in which trainees are required to define the CBAS categories and score behavioral examples; (d) the scoring of videotaped sequences of coaching behaviors; and (e) extensive practice in the use of the CBAS in actual field settings. A high degree of demonstrated expertise in the use of the CBAS should be required before an observer is permitted to use the system for research purposes.

A total of 20 observers were utilized for this investigation. Observers were recruited and selected based on the following qualifications:

1. must hold at least a baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university (degree may be in any field of study); and
2. must have participated in at least one major sport during their lifetime.

Individuals meeting the qualifications for observers were recruited on a voluntary basis.

All observers participated as a group in a two-day workshop undergoing CBAS training procedures. The training was conducted by an expert in the administration and analysis of the instrument.

For the present study, several studies were conducted to assess the reliability of the CBAS coding system as well as to determine the effectiveness of the observer training program. In the first study, which was conducted by the present investigator and workshop leader, 20 trainees viewed a videotape sequence of 48 randomly ordered, discrete coaching behaviors performed by an actor. In each instance, the game situation was verbally described by a narrator, and the coach's behavior was then shown. Each of the 12 CBAS categories was represented four times. Scoring accuracy was defined in terms of agreement with scoring of the behaviors by the authors. The number of scoring errors ranged from 0 to 3, with a mean of 1.0 error per observer. This yielded an average scoring of 99%.

A second study was performed by the present investigator to

evaluate interrater reliability of CBAS scoring among the 20 observers in a field setting. All 20 observers independently and simultaneously coded the behaviors of a high school football game during four quarters which lasted 40 minutes. All of the observers were spaced independently apart as to avoid any influence among each other when making observations. An average of 150 behaviors were recorded by each observer of the same coach. The correlation coefficients between the coding frequencies of the observers across the 12 CBAS categories ranged from +.75 to +.98. The average interrater reliability coefficient was +.87. This demonstrated a high and sufficient estimate of reliability among the observers for the purpose of this investigation.

Data Collection

During the months of July and August 1984, each participating coach was mailed or hand delivered the Coach's Vita Profile and the Curtin Coach's Self-Perception Profile and was requested to complete and return them to the investigator by September 1, 1984.

In September 1984, the Coach's Behavior Assessment System was utilized by trained observers to record the behavior of coaches during two official season games. The first game observation took place during the second week of September, and the second observation occurred during the third week of September 1984. The observers rotated among the subjects; therefore, each subject was observed by at least two different observers for a total of two times.

Observations. Each observer was assigned four subjects to observe during each of two observation periods (the second and third

weeks of September 1984), for a total of eight observations. Each observer made one observation of each subject, for a total of four observations during the second week of September 1984. Observers rotated and observed different subjects during the third week of September 1984.

A total of 160 observations were made during September 1984 utilizing 20 observers. The two different observations of each coach were required to account for any extreme measures of coaching behaviors at any particular observation and to determine some degree of reliability of measures.

After receiving the completed instruments, a final letter and the Coach's Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire were sent to the 80 coaches requesting a final behavioral assessment and thanking them for their cooperation in the study. All of the 80 coaches returned the instruments by September 6, 1984. However, some of the instruments had to be retrieved by phone or personally by the researcher.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using correlational analysis and multiple regression. Since the sample size was more than 60 subjects, the Pearson-r was utilized.

Data analysis is organized in the following ways:

A. Descriptive analysis of coaches' profiles (from CVP)

B. Descriptive analysis of CSPP results

C. Descriptive analysis of CBAS results

D. Descriptive analysis of CBAQ results

E. Correlational analysis to test main hypotheses

F. Multiple regression analysis of dependent variables (from CVP)

The study was designed to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis I - There will be no significant correlation between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CBAQ and their actual observed behavior measured by the CBAS instrument.

Hypothesis II - There will be no significant correlation between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CSPP and their actual observed behavior measured by the CBAS instrument.

Hypothesis III - There will be no significant difference in coaches' observed behavior from the first game observation as compared to the second game observation.

Hypothesis IV - There will be no significant relationships between selected demographic characteristics of coaches and the self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CBAQ and CSPP instruments.

Hypothesis V - There will be no significant relationships between selected demographic characteristics of coaches and their observed coaching behavior based on the CBAS.

Hypotheses I and II attempt to determine the relationship between coaches' self-assessment of their coaching behavior and their actual observed behavior as determined by the Coach's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP), the Coach's Behavior Assessment System (CBAS), and the Coach's Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ). Hypothesis I bases its measurement on the CBAQ and the CBAS. Hypothesis II bases its measurement on the CSPP and the CBAS. The Pearson-r was used to

correlate the data obtained from the CBAQ, the CSPP, and the CBAS to determine the significance of the suggested relationship.

Hypothesis III attempts to determine if there is a significant difference in the coaching behavior of coaches from one game to another. This attempts to determine the consistency of the behaviors exhibited by coaches as well as assessing the factors that can possibly affect the variability in the measurement from the first game to the second game. A comparison of the mean scores obtained from the first and second games based on the CBAS was utilized for this assessment.

Hypothesis IV examines the degree of relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches and the self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CSPP and the CBAQ. Multiple regression and correlational analysis were used to assess this relationship.

Hypothesis V examines the relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches and the observed coaching behavior of coaches based on the Coach's Vita Profile (CVP) and the Coach's Behavior Assessment System (CBAS). The statistical procedures used in this assessment include multiple regression and correlational analysis.

Summary

The major goal of this study was to assess the relationship between the self-perception of coaches' behavior and the actual observed behavior of Chicago's inner-city high school football coaches. From the coaches who agreed to participate, 80 were selected

and treated as subjects. This study utilized four instruments. Three of the instruments (CBAQ, CVP, and CSPP) required written responses from the subjects; the fourth (CBAQ) required direct field observation by trained observers. The obtained measures from the coaches' written assessment were compared with results from actual on-field observations to determine relationships among those variables (dependent and independent).

The sample size of the study dictated that the Pearson correlation coefficient be used to assess the relationship between CBAQ and CSPP data and CBAS data. The consistency of this measurement from one game to another was also determined. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine how particular demographic characteristics of coaches related to their self-perceptions and actual coaching behaviors.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Chapters I and II provided an introduction to the study and a review of the literature. Chapter III presented the procedures and methodology used to collect the data for this study. This chapter presents the data collected and an analysis of that data.

Introduction

This chapter is designed to address the original research problem, which is to determine what the self-perceptions of inner-city high school football coaches are relative to their observed coaching behaviors during actual game situations.

The format of this chapter is divided into two major sections. Section I presents the findings in four parts. They include a profile of the coaches' demographic characteristics; the self-perception of the subjects based on two different instruments; and the actual observed behavior of the subjects during game situations. Section II provides an analysis of the findings in relationship to five hypotheses presented in this study.

The first part of Section I presents frequency data on 12 demographic variables for the coaches. These data include subjects' age, academic degree level, major field of study, minor field of study, type of sport participation, career wins and losses, number of wins in 1983, courses taken in sport psychology, level of high school

sports coached, number of years as head coach, and number of years as assistant coach.

The second part of Section I focuses on the self-perception of the coaches based on two different self-perception instruments administered to the coaches. The data from these two instruments are presented and discussed in two parts.

Data collected from the Curtin Self-Perception Profile (CSPP) are presented first. The CSPP provides information about how the subjects perceived their coaching behavior based on the following three factors: coach's technical knowledge of the sport; the manner in which coaches treat and relate to athletes; and the emotional maturity of coaches as characterized by their behavior during games and practice situations. A descriptive analysis of the CSPP provides an overall total score as well as a breakdown of the three factor scores. Each of the factors of the CSPP will be presented and discussed and a table reflecting the results of each factor is provided.

The third part of Section I provides information collected from the Coaches Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ). The CBAQ assesses the subjects' perception on how often they demonstrate the following 12 behaviors during game situations: positive reinforcement, nonreinforcement, technical instruction of mistakes, general communication, organization, encouragement of mistakes, keeping control, punishment, general technical instruction, punishment plus technical instruction of mistakes, general encouragment, and ignoring mistakes. The CBAQ asks subjects to indicate how often these behaviors or responses are descriptive of their coaching style during

various game situations. Data collected from the CBAQ are presented in table format to provide the reader with information about how the subjects scored on the 12 behavioral objectives.

The fourth and final part of Section I presents data collected from the observed behaviors of coaches as measured by the Coaches Behavioral Assessment System (CBAS). This system provides information about the actual observed behavior of coaches during game situations. The data collected from the subjects' behaviors include information from the following behavioral categories: positive reinforcement, non-reinforcement, technical instruction of mistakes, general communication, organization, encouragement of mistakes, keeping control, punishment, general technical instruction, punishment plus technical instruction of mistakes, general encouragement, and ignoring mistakes. A table is presented reflecting the type of behaviors subjects demonstrated during observation. The percentage and mean response are provided for each behavior. An analysis of these findings is presented in Section II.

In Section II, the findings are presented in relation to the five hypotheses guiding this investigation. The hypotheses are designed to determine whether significant correlations exist among selected coaches' demographic variables, self-perceptions, and observed behaviors. Data were collected and organized to test the five hypotheses. Tables are presented reflecting significant correlations among the variables as determined by the various statistical designs.

SECTION I

Part I: Demographic Characteristics of Subjects

Age of Subjects

As can be seen in Table 1, the age category was distributed in age intervals that extended from under 25 to 65 and over. Table 1 reports the following results: three subjects fell into the 25 and under group; nine subjects were between the ages of 25-34; the majority of the subjects (45) was between the ages of 35-44; 22 subjects were between the ages of 45-54; only one subject was between the ages of 55-64; and none of the subjects were over 65 years of age. The 35-44 age group constituted 56% of the total sample of subjects. The mean age for the total sample of subjects was 40.6 years (SD = 7.1).

Career Wins and Losses

The total number of career wins and losses of each respondent was computed in categories of over 50% and less than 50% of total games won. The career win category in Table 1 indicates that 39 subjects won over 50% of the total games coached over a lifetime career; and 41 subjects lost over 50% of their career games. Overall, it can be said that the slight majority of subjects in this study generally had more career losses than wins. Table 1 indicates that the mean number of career wins for the subjects in this study was 53.4 (SD = 16.3) out of approximately 130 total games.

1983 Season Wins

These data represented the win-loss record for the season record prior to this investigation. Each of the subject's 1983 football

Table 1

Frequency Distribution for Demographic Characteristics of Subjects

Age Interval	Number Cases	Percent	Mean	Standard Deviation
Under 25	3	3.7		
25-34	9	11.1		
35-44	45	56.0		
45-54	22	28.1		
55-64	1	1.1	40.6	7.1
65-Over	0	0.0	years	years
Career Win Record				
> 50% of Total Wins	39	48.8	53.4	16.3
< 50% of Total Wins	41	51.2	games	games
1983 Win Record (10 Games)				
Over 50%	51	63.8	5.2	1.9
Less 50%	29	36.2	games	wins
Years as Head Coach				
1 year-more	56	70.0	5.6	5.3
Less 1 year	24	30.0	years	years
Years as Assistant Coach				
1 year-more	77	96.3	5.3	4.4
Less 1 year	3	3.7	years	years
Total Years Coaching				
5 years-more	67	83.8	11.3	5.7
5 years-under	13	16.2	years	years
Degree Level				
B.S. or B.A.	37	46.2		
M.S. or M.A.	43	53.8	--	--

Table 1 (continued)

Age Interval	Number Cases	Percent	Mean	Standard Deviation
Degree Major				
B.S. in Physical Education	48	60.0		
Arts or Music	8	10.0		
Administration	5	6.2		
Engl., Soc., Comm.	5	6.2		
Math or Science	14	17.6	--	--
Degree Minor				
Physical Education	13	16.0		
Drivers Education	20	25.2		
Arts or Music	2	2.5		
Administration	5	6.3		
Engl., Soc., Comm.	14	17.5		
Math or Science	26	32.5	--	--
Sport Participation				
None	1	1.2		
High School	20	25.1		
College	57	71.2		
Professional	2	2.5	--	--
Sport Psychology Courses				
No - sport psychology	64	80.0		
Yes - sport psychology	16	20.0	--	--
Level of Coaching				
Junior varsity	12	15.0		
Varsity	68	85.0	--	--

schedule consisted of approximately eight regularly scheduled games and two practice games, for a total of 10 games during the year. Table 1 reports that 51 subjects won over 50% of their 1983 season games; they constituted 63.8% of the total subjects. Twenty-nine coaches won less than 50% of their 1983 season games, comprising 36.2% of the total number of subjects in this study. Overall, the majority of subjects in this study had winning seasons in 1983. The mean number of games won among all subjects in 1983 was 5.2 (SD = 1.9).

Years as Head Coach

These data were entered in categories of subjects with one year or more experience as head coach, and those with no years experience as head coach. The data indicate that 56 subjects had one or more years experience as head coach, and 24 coaches had less than one year or no experience as head coach. The 56 subjects with one or more years of experience constituted 70% of the total sample. Therefore, it can be stated that the majority of the subjects in this investigation were experienced head coaches. Thirty percent of the subjects had no experience as head coach. Head coach experience is considered in terms of head varsity and head junior varsity positions. The mean number of years subjects in this study served as head coach was 5.6 years (SD = 5.3).

Years as Assistant Coach

In addition to determining the head coaching experience, subjects were also asked to indicate the number of years they served as an assistant football coach during their coaching career. These data were classified in categories of one or more years as assistant coach

and no years experience as assistant coach. Table 1 indicates that 77 coaches, which comprised 96.3% of the total number of subjects, had over one year of experience as an assistant coach. Only three coaches, 3.7% of the sample, had no years experience as head coach during their career. The mean number of years coaches served as assistant coach in football during their career was 5.3 (SD = 4.4).

Total Years Coaching

Subjects with five years or more coaching experience were compared to those with less than five years of experience. The data in Table 1 indicate that 67 subjects (83.8%) in this study had over five years of coaching expeience and 13 coaches (16.2%) had less than five years experience. Coaching experience is considered in terms of varsity and junior varsity experience. The mean number of coaching years for the sample of coaches in this investigation was 11.3 (SD = 5.7).

Academic Degree, Major and Minor

Subjects in this investigation were asked to indicate their academic degree level. These data were collected in categories of Bachelor of Science (B.S.) or Bachelor of Arts (B.A.); and Master of Science (M.S.) or Master of Arts (M.A.). Results revealed that 43 subjects had a master's degree and 37 had only a bachelor's degree. Thus, the majority of coaches (53.8%) had an advanced academic degree. A breakdown of academic major and minor is presented in Table 1. The data indicate that 48 subjects, a majority of 60%, had majors in physical education; 10% of the subjects had majors in art or music; 6.2% majored in administration; 6.3% majored in English, social

science, or communications; and 17.5% of the subjects majored in math or science.

Subjects were also asked to indicate on the CVP their academic minor. The data reveal that 16% of the subjects who did not major in physical education had minors in this area. Driver education constitutes 25.2% of the minors; 2.5% have minors in art or music; 6.3% minor in administration; 17.5% minor in English, social science, or communications; and 32.5% of the subjects have minors in math and science.

Sport Participation

Subjects were asked to indicate the level of sport participation they experienced during their lifetime. The categories used to distinguish among the subjects' experience in sports were high school, college, and professional level of participation. Another category was included to indicate no participation in sports. As Table 1 indicates, 57 subjects, or 71.2%, had some college athletic participation experience. The data also revealed that 25.1% of the subjects participated in some form of athletics on the high school level. Only 2.5% of the subjects had sport experience on the professional level. Only one subject had no sport participation in any of the levels. Thus, 99% of the high school football coaches represented in this study had previously participated in some form of formal sport activity.

Sport Psychology Courses

The subjects in this study who had taken courses in sport psychology, psychology of coaching, and other related areas were

compared to those who had not taken courses in these areas. The various courses were grouped into the category of sport psychology on the CVP. The subjects were asked to indicate if they had taken courses in this area by indicating yes or no. Table 1 indicates that 80% of the subjects had not taken courses in the area of sport psychology; whereas, 20% of the subjects had taken such courses.

Level of Coaching

Level of coaching represents the varsity and junior varsity coaching positions. The subjects were asked to indicate whether they coached varsity or junior varsity (freshman-sophomore) high school football. The data from Table 1 reveal that 85% of the subjects were varsity football coaches, whereas 15% fell into the junior varsity category.

In summary, data from the demographic characteristics of the subjects in this study present a profile of the typical inner city high school football coach. The typical coach is characterized as a 40 year old male varsity coach, who has won over 50% of his prior and career season games. He has 11 years of coaching experience with six years as head coach and five years as assistant coach. He has a B.S. degree in physical education and a minor in math, science, or driver's education. He also was a college athlete; however, he has never taken any academic courses in sport psychology or related area.

Part II: Subjects' Self-Perceptions Based on the CSPP

The Curtin Self-Perception Profile (CSPP), described earlier in Chapter III, provides information about how subjects perceive their coaching behavior, based on three categorical factors of behavior:

Factor I, subjects' technical knowledge of the sport; Factor II, the manner in which subjects treat and relate to athletes; and Factor III, the emotional maturity of subjects during coaching activity. Data collected from the overall CSPP scores are presented as well as a breakdown of the results for Factors I, II, and III. Table 2 indicates the number of subjects who fell into a particular score category. The CSPP data, grouped among three score intervals of low, medium, and high scores, are presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5. The frequency and the percentage of subjects in each score interval are also presented.

Overall CSPP Scores

The overall CSPP Scores reflect the combined scores of Factors I, II, and III. Data presented in Table 2 indicate how the total sample of subjects scored among the low, medium, and high self-perception intervals. The score on the CSPP ranged from a possible high of 173 to a possible low of 62. A score of 173 reflects the highest possible self-perception (CSPP) rating subjects could have of themselves. A high score of 173 indicates a very positive evaluation of behavior based on positive images of overall coaching behavior; on the other hand, a CSPP score of 62 reflects the lowest possible self-evaluation based on negative images and evaluation of overall coaching behavior.

Table 2

Coaches' Overall Self-Perception of Coaching Behavior Based on the CSPP

Subjects	CSPP Score Intervals (Overall Self-Perception) High (Positive)	Medium (Average)	Low (Negative)	Total
Number	58.0	22.0	0	80.0
Mean	163.0	142.0	0	158.7
Percent	72.5	27.5	0	100.0

Table 2 reveals 58 subjects, representing 72.5% of all participants, scored in the high self-perception category. Twenty-two subjects (27.5%) scored in the medium self-perception category. No subjects scored in the low self-perception category. The mean score among all subjects was 158.7 (SD = 10.4), reflecting a relatively high and positive, overall self-perception score.

CSPP Factor I (Technical Knowledge of Coaches)

Data collected from Factor I of the CSPP provide information about the subjects' perceptions of the technical knowledge they have about the sport they coach. Technical knowledge includes the rules, strategies, and other technical aspects of the sport. The subjects' perception of their technical knowledge was categorized in terms of high, medium, and low intervals. Table 3 indicates that 64 subjects, representing 80% of the sample, scored between 59 and 72 on Factor I

Table 3

Coaches' Self-Perception of Technical Knowledge

Subjects	Factor I Score Interval of CSPP (Level of Knowledge) High (Positive)	Medium (Average)	Low (Negative)	Total
Number	64.0	16.0	0	80.0
Mean	65.5	52.0	0	64.0
Percent	80.0	20.0	0	100.0

of the CSPP. This category represents subjects who perceived themselves as having a high degree of technical knowledge of the sport. The data also reveal that 16 subjects, 20% of the sample, scored between 46 and 58; this score represents the medium score interval. Subjects who scored in the medium score interval range are categorized as having an adequate degree of technical knowledge of the sport. There were no subjects who scored in the low score interval. Thus, none of the subjects considered themselves as having a low degree of technical knowledge of the sport they coached. Generally speaking, the majority of subjects perceived themselves positively as having a high degree of technical knowledge of the sport.

CSPP Factor II (Treatment of Athletes)

Data collected from Factor II of the CSPP (coaches treatment of athletes) provide information about the manner in which the subjects perceived their behavior in terms of how they treat athletes. This

factor was assessed with questions reflecting behavior during coaching activity as well as non-coaching activity. Table 4 provides data which reflect high, medium, and low levels of subjects' self-perception. The data reveal that 76 coaches, reflecting 95% of the subjects, scored between 49 and 62 on Factor II of the CSPP. Subjects who scored in this score interval perceived their behaviors as very positive in terms of relating to players.

Table 4

Coaches' Self-Perception of Treatment of Athletes

	Factor II Score Intervals of CSPP (Treatment of Athletes)			
Subjects	High (Positive)	Medium (Average)	Low (Negative)	Total
Number	76.0	4.0	0	80.0
Mean	55.5	42.0	0	55.1
Percent	95.0	5.0	0	100.0

The data also reveal that four subjects, reflecting just 5% of the participants, scored between 25 and 32. This score reflects a medium or average degree of self-perception. Subjects who scored in this interval are categorized as perceiving their coaching behaviors as adequate in their relationships with athletes in performing their duties. The data in Table 4 reveal that no subjects scored in the low self-perception interval on Factor II of the CSPP.

CSPP Factor III (Coaches' Emotional Maturity)

The emotional maturity of the subjects was assessed under Factor III of the CSPP. Factor III assessed the manner in which subjects responded to questions concerning a variety of emotional game situations. The scores subjects received on Factor III of the CSPP were categorized into high, medium, and low intervals. Data in Table 5 indicate that 78 subjects, representing 97.5% of the sample, scored between 33 and 48. This interval categorizes subjects who rated themselves very positive in terms of their emotional maturity when working with athletes during game situations. Table 5 also reveals that two subjects, representing 2.5% of the sample, scored between 25 and 32. The scores reflect the image of having an average or adequate amount of emotional control during various coaching situations in order to adequately perform coaching duties. Consistent with Factors I and II, no subjects in the category scored in the low self-perception interval. This indicates that the subjects in this study perceived themselves as having very high degrees of positive coaching behaviors on all three factors of the CSPP.

In summary, the data generally indicate that approximately three of four subjects have high self-perceptions of their overall coaching behaviors. The data reveal that none of the subjects holds a low view of themselves on any aspect of their coaching behavior. The data also suggest that most subjects hold highest perceptions of their emotional maturity; 97.5% of the subjects perceived themselves as having good control of their emotions and behavioral responses during stressful game situations. This was followed closely by their perceptions of

Table 5

Coaches' Self-Perception of Emotional Maturity

Subjects	Factor III Score Interval of CSPP (Emotional Maturity) High (Positive)	Medium (Average)	Low (Negative)	Total
Number	78.0	2.0	0	80.0
Mean	40.5	28.5	0	39.4
Percent	97.5	2.5	0	100.0

positive treatment of athletes; 95% of the subjects perceived themselves as providing encouraging and positive treatment for athletes. Finally, four of five subjects hold high perceptions of their technical knowledge. Eighty percent of the subjects perceived themselves as possessing a high degree of knowledge in the rules, strategies, and technical aspects of the sport.

Part III: Subjects' Self-Perceptions Based on the CBAQ

The third part of Section I presents descriptive data on the self-perception of the subjects in this study as measured by the Coaches Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ). This instrument assesses the behavior of coaches based on the following categories of behaviors: positive reinforcement (PR), nonreinforcement (NR), general encouragement (GE), technical instruction of mistakes (TIM), punishment (P), punishment plus technical instruction of mistakes (P+TIM), general communication (GC), keeping control (KC), ignoring

mistakes (IM), general technical instruction (TIG), encouragement of mistakes (EM), and organization (O). The self-perception of coaches based on the CBAS behaviors is categorized into high, medium, and low intervals of self-perception. The high, medium, and low intervals are synonymous with positive, adequate, and negative coaching behaviors. Scores on this assessment are based on a seven-point Likert scale. A score of 6 or 7 on seven of the 12 questions reflects a high or positive self-perception. However, on five of the questions, a score of 1 or 2 reflects high or positive images of behavior because of the way the questions are structured (see Appendix A). Table 6 presents the data collected from the 12 behavioral categories. The number of subjects in each score interval is identified for each behavior and mean scores are given for each behavior.

The first seven behaviors (TIM, O, PR, EM, KC, TIG, and GE) listed in Table 6 indicate that all subjects scored between 6.0 and 7.0, which is within the high self-perception interval. The last five behaviors (GC, P, NR, P+TIM, and IM) listed indicate that the subjects scored between 1.0 and 2.0 on each of these behaviors which, as on the first seven behaviors, indicate high self-perception or positive images of behavior. Thus, Table 6 reveals that all of the scores of the subjects fell within the high self-perception interval for all 12 behaviors. The mean for each behavior indicates how the total group of subjects perceived their behavior on each of the 12 behavioral response categories. The data collected from the CBAQ reveal that all of the subjects in this investigation rated their behavior responses to various athletic situations as highly positive in nature.

Table 6

Coaches' Self-Perception of Coaching Behaviors Measured by the Coaches Behavior Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ)

CBAQ Behavioral Responses[a]	Number Coaches Responding in Each Self-Perception Score Interval: High (Positive)	Medium (Average)	Low (Negative)	Mean Score	S.D.
1. Technical Instruction of Mistakes (TIM)	80	0	0	6.8	.690
2. Organization (O)	80	0	0	6.6	.480
3. Positive Reinforcement (PR)	80	0	0	6.8	.333
4. Encouragement of Mistakes (EM)	80	0	0	6.1	.748
5. Keeping Control (KC)	80	0	0	6.4	.499
6. General Technical Instruction (TIG)	80	0	0	6.2	.758
7. General Encouragement (GE)	80	0	0	6.4	.809
8. General Communication (GC)	80	0	0	1.5	.811
9. Punishment (P)	80	0	0	2.0	.927
10. Non-Reinforcement (NR)	80	0	0	1.5	.795
11. Punishment + Technical Instruction of Mistakes (P+TIM)	80	0	0	2.0	1.097
12. Ignoring Mistakes (IM)	80	0	0	1.9	1.108

[a] Items 1-7
6.0-7.0 = High Self-Perception
3.0-5.0 = Average Self-Perception
1.0-2.0 = Low Self-Perception

Items 8-12
6.0-7.0 = Low Self-Perception
3.0-5.0 = Average Self-Perception
1.0-2.0 = High Self-Perception

In summary, subjects maintained very high self-perceptions on all 12 categories of coaching behaviors. This reflects a consistent pattern of coaches' high self-perception of coaching behaviors indicated by earlier studies.

Part IV: Observed Coaching Behavior of Subjects Based on the CBAS

The fourth and final part of this section reports data collected from the observations made of actual coaching behaviors of the subjects. The observed behavior of the subjects was recorded using the Coaches Behavior Assessment System (CBAS). The subjects' behaviors were recorded twice during the 1984 football season. Observations were made during the first and second weeks in September during competitive game situations.

The CBAS measures the number of times subjects demonstrate various behaviors among the 12 behavioral response categories. Behavioral responses include the following: Positive Reinforcement, Non-Reinforcement, General Technical Instruction, General Communication, Organization, Encouragement of Mistakes, Punishment, Punishment Plus Technical Instruction of Mistakes, Ignoring Mistakes, Keeping Control, General Encouragement, and Technical Instruction of Mistakes. These behaviors are classified as either negative or positive responses following the actions of players. Positive behavior includes Positive Reinforcement, Encouragement of Mistakes, Technical Instruction of Mistakes, and General Encouragement. Negative behaviors include Punishment, Non-Reinforcement, Punishment plus Technical Instruction of Mistakes, and Ignoring Mistakes. The remaining responses, General Communication, Organization, Keeping

Control, and General Technical Instruction, are considered neutral responses because they do not follow the actions of players and are neither negative nor positive in nature.

Table 7 provides means and standard deviations on each of the 12 behavioral responses for the total group of subjects. The behavioral responses are categorized into positive, neutral, and negative self-perception intervals. The mean for each behavior reflects the average number of times the total group of subjects demonstrated these behaviors during observation. Table 7 indicates that the most reoccurring response was that of Ignoring Mistakes. This behavior was twice observed to average 26.1 and 27.1 times per game by each subject. The least occurring behavior observed was Keeping Control, which was twice demonstrated to average only 2.7 and 3.1 times per game by each subject. The mean responses for the other behaviors are listed in Table 7.

The data reveal that subjects were observed to have an average of 75.1 behaviors (53.4%) in the negative response interval; 40.5 behaviors (28.8%) were positive; and an average of 25.0 neutral behaviors (17.8%) were observed for subjects during the course of Game I. In Game II, 52.4% of the observed behaviors are classified as negative; 30.1% are positive; and 17.5% are neutral.

Table 7

Mean Number (and Standard Deviations) of Observations of Coaches Behavior During Games

CBAS Behavioral Responses	Mean Number Observations Game I	Game II
Positive Behaviors		
Positive Reinforcement	8.7 (4.0)	10.7 (4.3)
Encouragement of Mistakes	6.7 (4.1)	8.1 (4.7)
Technical Instruction of Mistakes	8.9 (4.8)	9.8 (5.5)
General Encouragement	16.2 (8.5)	16.0 (7.7)
Neutral Behavior		
Keeping Control	2.7 (2.1)	3.1 (2.1)
General Communication	3.8 (4.6)	3.6 (3.1)
General Technical Instruction	10.5 (7.0)	10.9 (6.6)
Organization	8.0 (5.6)	8.4 (4.0)
Negative Behavior		
Punishment	15.4 (6.4)	16.3 (6.4)
Non-Reinforcement	22.5 (8.3)	22.9 (8.7)
Ignoring Mistakes	26.1 (10.7)	27.1 (10.3)
Punishment & Technical Instruction of Mistakes	11.1 (5.2)	11.5 (5.1)
Total	140.6	148.4

The results clearly reveal that the subjects in this investigation demonstrated many more negative behaviors than either positive or neutral behaviors while under direct observation.

In summary, data collected from the CBAS show little correspondence with results from the CSPP or CBAQ instruments. The data from the CSPP and CBAQ indicate very high self-perceptions of the subject; whereas, the CBAS generally reveals a negative behavioral profile of the subjects.

SECTION II

Results of Tests of Hypotheses

Analysis of the Data

Hypothesis I. The first hypothesis focused on the relationship between the self-perception of the subjects (using the Coaches Behavior Assessment Questionnaire) and the observed coaching behavior of the subjects (measured by the Coaches Behavior Assessment System).

Hypothesis I states "There will be no significant correlations between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behaviors based on the CBAQ and their actual observed coaching behaviors as measured by the CBAS."

To determine the relationship between coaches' self-perception based on the CBAQ and their actual observed behavior based on the CBAS, it was necessary to correlate 12 aspects of observed coaching behavior (CBAS) with 12 aspects of coaches' perception of their behavior (CBAQ). Utilizing the Pearson-r correlation, 144 correlations were tested to determine any significant relationships among the variables at the .05 level of significance. Eleven correlations were found to be significant at the .05 level of significance and are reported in Table 8. They include the following: Ignoring Mistakes and Technical Instruction of Mistakes, Keeping Control and Punishment, Keeping Control and Technical Instruction of Mistakes, Keeping Control and Keeping Control, Keeping Control and Punishment plus Technical Instruction of Mistakes, Keeping Control and Ignoring Mistakes, Keeping Control and Encouragement of Mistakes, General Communication and Keeping Control, General Communication and

Encouragement of Mistakes, General Communication and Punishment, and General Communication and General Technical Instruction. Five of 11 significant correlations are reverse relationships.

The first significant inverse correlation in Table 8 indicates that coaches who did not Ignore the Mistakes of their players perceived themselves as giving more Technical Instruction of Mistakes. Coaches who demonstrated more Keeping Control during game situations perceived themselves as giving less Punishment, more Technical Instruction of Mistakes, more Keeping Control, less Punishment plus Technical Instruction of Mistakes, less Ignoring Mistakes, and more Encouragement of Mistakes. Further examination of the data indicates that those coaches who demonstrated more General Communication during situations perceived themselves as giving more Encouragement of Mistakes, more Keeping Control, less Punishment, and more General Technical Instruction. Although 11 of the correlations are significant at the .05 level, seven of the significant relationships between variables could have emerged as significantly different from zero on the basis of chance alone; however, at least four relationships are recognized as being statistically significant which allowed the null hypothesis to be rejected.

Table 8

Significant Pearson-r Correlation Coefficients Pairing Coaches' Self-Perception and Actual Observed Behavior (N=80)

CBAS Observed Behavior	CBAQ Observed Behavior	Pearson-r	P
Ignoring Mistakes	Technical Instruction of Mistakes	-.2880	.010
Keeping Control	Punishment	-.3158	.004
Keeping Control	Technical Instruction of Mistakes	.2492	.026
Keeping Control	Keeping Control	.2255	.044
Keeping Control	Punishment & Technical Instruction of Mistakes	-.2313	.039
Keeping Control	Ignoring Mistakes	-.2677	.016
Keeping Control	Encouragement of Mistakes	.2802	.012
General Communication	Encouragement of Mistakes	.2513	.025
General Communication	Keeping Control	.2548	.023
General Communication	Punishment	-.2755	.013
General Communication	General Technical Instruction	.2492	.026

Hypothesis II. The second hypothesis of this study tested the relationship between the subjects' self-perception of their coaching behavior and their observed coaching behavior.

Hypothesis II states "There will be no significant correlations in coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the Curtin Self-Perception Profile (CSPP) and their observed coaching behavior based on the Coaches Behavior Assessment System (CBAS)."

To determine the possible relationships between the subjects' self-perception of their coaching behavior as measured by the CSPP and their actual observed coaching behavior based on the CBAS, it was necessary to correlate 12 aspects of coaching behavior (CBAS) with the

overall total score of the CSPP as well as the three factor scores (knowledge of the sport, treatment of athletes, and emotional maturity) of the CSPP. This made 48 possible relationships among these variables (12 CBAS X 1 CSPP + 3 factors of CSPP X 12 CBAS = 48 possible correlations).

The resultant Pearson-r correlation was tested for significance through the F statistic with the alpha level set at .05. When the subjects' overall total scores from the Curtin Self-Perception Profile (CSPP) were correlated with the 12 aspects of their coaching behavior (CBAS), no significant correlations were found. However, when the CSPP was separated into three factors and each was correlated with each of the 12 behavior categories of the CBAS, one significant relationship was found. This relationship was found between Factor III (coach's treatment of athletes) and the behavior related to Organization of the CBAS. The data in Table 9 indicate that this significant correlation revealed a reverse relationship in which subjects who believed they did less scolding or they treated athletes positively on the CSPP demonstrated more organizing behavior with their athletes during game situations. Since one significant relationship among the 48 correlations was found, which could have emerged by chance alone, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 9

Significant Pearson-r Correlation Coefficients Pairing Subjects' Self-Perceptions and Observed Behaviors (N=80)

CSPP Self-Perceptions	CBAS Observed Behaviors	Pearson-r	P
Treatment of Athletes (Factor III)	Organization	-.2552	.022

Hypothesis III. The third hypothesis of this study focuses on the subjects' behaviors during two games. To determine the consistency or difference in the subjects' coaching behavior from one game to another, 12 aspects of coaching behavior were observed and assessed during each game. The behaviors of the subjects were observed utilizing the Coaches Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) during game situations.

Hypothesis III states "There will be no significant difference in coaches' observed behavior from the first game observation as compared to the second game observation."

The mean and standard deviations are computed for each of the 12 behaviors of the CBAS for Games I and II, and are reported in Table 10. Also presented are the t-values and 2-tail probability levels of significance for each paired behavior from both games. The results indicate that three of 12 categories of coaches' behavior revealed a significant difference at the .05 level of significance. The following behaviors reflected a significant difference between the two

Table 10

Observed CBAS Behaviors for Games I and II

CBAS Categories	Game I Mean[a]	Game II Mean	Game I S.D.	Game II S.D.	T-Value	2-Tail Prob.
Positive Reinforcement	8.67	10.63	4.0	4.3	-4.28	.000*
Nonreinforcement	22.56	22.87	8.3	8.7	-.49	.627
Encouragement of Mistakes	6.75	8.13	4.1	4.7	-3.93	.000*
Technical Instruction of Mistakes	8.87	9.86	4.8	5.5	-2.15	.035*
Punishment	15.42	16.31	6.4	6.4	-1.73	.088
Punishment + Technical Instruction of Mistakes	11.17	11.55	5.2	5.1	-.74	.462
Ignoring Mistakes	26.12	26.97	10.7	10.3	-1.65	.103
Keeping Control	2.78	3.17	2.1	2.1	-1.93	.057
General Technical Instruction	10.46	10.93	7.0	6.6	-1.28	.206
General Encouragement	16.23	15.91	8.5	7.7	.46	.647
Organization	8.07	8.35	5.6	4.0	-.85	.397
General Communication	3.82	3.66	4.6	3.1	.55	.584

[a]Number of times behavior observed during game.
*$p \leq .05$.

games: Positive Reinforcement (PR1, PR2), Encouragement of Mistakes (EM1, EM2), and Technical Instruction of Mistakes (TIM1, TIM2).

The behaviors which revealed significant differences are noticeably classified as reactive behavioral responses which followed the actions of players during games. Those behaviors (PR, EM, TIM) reflected a mean increase in responses from Game I to Game II. Coaches demonstrated more Positive Reinforcement, Encouragement of Mistakes, and Technical Instruction following player mistakes during Game II. These particular reactive behaviors are considered more positive in nature than negative. Therefore, the subjects exhibited significantly more positive type behaviors in the second game than the first game. Behaviors considered more negative in nature (Punishment, Ignoring Mistakes, Non-Reinforcement, Keeping Control) remained constant from the first to the second game. This pattern could perhaps indicate that as the football season progresses, coaches tend to respond to their players with more positive and corrective coaching responses during game situations.

Three variables of coaching behavior revealed statistically significant differences withstanding acknowledgement of one relationship emerging by chance alone, the null hypothesis could still be rejected.

Hypothesis IV. The fourth hypothesis of this study focused on the relationships between subjects' self-perception of their coaching behaviors and selected demographic characteristics.

Hypothesis IV states "There will be no significant relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches (CVP) and the

self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CBAQ and CSPP instruments."

The self-perceptions of subjects' behavior were assessed with two different instruments; therefore, the data will be presented in two parts. The first part presents data from the Curtin Self-Perception Profile (CSPP), and the second part from the Coaches Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ). Each of these instruments is correlated with the subjects' demographic variables reported on the Coaches Vita Profile (CVP).

Coaches' total score on the Curtin's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP) was correlated with 12 demographic characteristics to determine significant relationships.

The data in Table 11 reveal that the only demographic characteristic that significantly correlated with the subjects' self-perception was the level of high school football coached. The results indicate that those subjects who coach varsity football had higher self-perception scores overall than those who coached on the junior varsity level. The emergence of one significant relationship is not strong enough to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 11

Significant Pearson-r Correlation Coefficients Pairing Coaches' Demographic Variables and Self-Perceptions (N=80)

Demographic Variables	Correlation Scores Self-Perception	Pearson-r	P
Varsity Coaching	CSPP (Total)	.2554	.022

A second test of the null hypothesis involved testing the relationship between subjects' perceptions of their coaching behaviors based on the Coaches Behavior Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ) and 12 demographic characteristics based on the Coach's Vita Profile (CVP).

Twelve categories of self-perception based on the CBAQ were correlated with 12 demographic characteristics.

The data in Table 12 reveal several demographic characteristics which were significantly related to various categories of the subjects' self-perception: degree in physical education was related to General Communication, Encouragement of Mistakes, Punishment plus Technical Instruction of Mistakes, General Encouragement, and Ignoring Mistakes. Additional significant relationships were found between the number of wins in 1983 and Technical Instruction of Mistakes and amount of Positive Reinforcement expressed by coaches.

Examination of the results indicates that those subjects who had a degree in physical education reported they had less General Communication with their players, more Encouragement of Mistakes, less

Table 12

Significant Pearson-r Correlation Coefficients Pairing Coaches' Demographic Characteristics and Self-Perception (N=80)

Demographic Variables	Self-Perception (CBAQ)	Pearson-r	P
B.S. in Physical Education	General Communication	.2295	.041
No B.S. in Physical Education	General Communication		<.050
B.S. in Physical Education	Encouragement of Mistakes	-.2319	.038
No B.S. in Physical Education	Encouragement of Mistakes		<.050
B.S. in Physical Education	Punishment + Technical Instruction of Mistakes	.2763	.013
No B.S. in Physical Education	Punishment + Technical Instruction of Mistakes		<.050
B.S. in Physical Education	General Encouragmeent	-.2564	.022
No B.S. in Physical Education	General Encouragement		<.050
B.S. in Physical Education	Ignoring Mistakes	.2462	.028
No B.S. in Physical Education	Ignoring Mistakes		<.050
Win Record in 1983 (Over 50%)	Technical Instruction of Mistakes	.3101	.005
Win Record in 1983 (Less 50%)	Technical Instruction of Mistakes		<.050
Win Record in 1983 (Over 50%)	Positive Reinforcement	.2972	.007
Win Record in 1983 (Less 50%)	Positive Reinforcement		<.050

Punishment with Technical Instruction of Mistakes, more General Encouragement, and less Ignoring of Mistakes by players, than those coaches who had degrees in areas other than physical education. The data also indicate that subjects who won more games in 1983 (over 50%) expressed more praise and provided more technical instruction than those who had won less than 50% of their previous season games. In summary, the hypothesis required a correlation of 12 demographic characteristics with 12 categories of subjects' self-perception; and the results reveal seven significant relationships among 144 relationships assessed. Although results revealed seven significant relationships, it is possible that they may have emerged by chance; therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

Hypothesis V. The observed behavior of the subjects based on the Coaches Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) was correlated with coaches demographic characteristics. The Pearson-r was used to correlate 12 categories of coaching behavior (CBAS) with 12 demographic variables for a total of 144 possible relationships.

The hypothesis states that "There will be no significant relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches based on the CVP and their observed coaching behavior as measured by the CBAS."

The data reveal six significant relationships among all the variables. The relationships found to be significant at the .05 level include: Coaches' Degree Level with Keeping Control, Degree Major with Keeping Control, Degree Major with General Technical Instruction, Sport Participation and General Technical Instruction, Win Record in

1983 with Punishment, and Head Coaching Experience and General Technical Instruction.

The data reported in Table 13 indicate that subjects with master's degrees had less Keeping Control behavior when observed during game situations than those with B.S. degrees. The data also revealed that subjects with degrees in physical education demonstrated more Keeping Control and General Technical Instruction in their behavior during game situations than those whose academic degrees were in areas other than physical education. Further examination of the results reveals that subjects who participated in college football demonstrated more General Technical Instruction during game situations than those who did not participate in college football. The data also suggest that subjects who won more games the previous year demonstrated less Punishment behavior during game situations than those subjects who won fewer games the previous year. A final significant correlation indicates that subjects with more experience as head coach use more General Technical Instruction.

The data revealed six significant relationships at the .05 level of confidence from a possible 144 correlations; however, acknowledging the chance factor of emerging relationships, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The final part of Section II focuses on the significant relationships among all variables from instruments used in this investigation. To determine any significant relationships, a step-wise multiple regression analysis was used to provide information indicating which demographic characteristics and/or various categories

Table 13

Significant Pearson-r Correlation Coefficients Pairing Coaches' Demographic Characteristics and Actual Observed Behavior (CBAS) (N=80)

Demographic Variables	Subjects' Observed Behavior	Pearson	R
Subjects degree level	Keeping Control	-.2524	.024
Subjects with B.S. in P.E.	Keeping Control	-.2966	.008
Subjects with B.S. in P.E.	General Technical Instruction	-.3039	.006
Subjects who played college football	General Technical Instruction	-.2625	.019
Subjects with winning record in 1983	Punishment	.2335	.037
Head Coach experience (5 years more)	General Technical Instruction	.2670	.017

of their self-perceptions based on the CBAQ or CSPP were significant predictors of particular types of coaches' behaviors as measured by the CBAS during game situations. Twelve demographic variables, three factors of the Curtin's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP), and 12 categories of the Coaches Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ) were correlated using multiple regression analysis to determine if any relationships at the .05 level of significance existed among these variables that could predict subjects' behavior (CBAS).

The multiple regression analysis displayed in Table 14 shows that the use of Positive Reinforcement can be predicted by courses taken in sport psychology. The data indicate that coaches who have taken courses in sport psychology (or related areas) demonstrate the use of

more positive reinforcement during game situations than coaches who have not taken these courses. Also, the data indicate that the number of years of head coaching experience and age of the coach were found to be predictors of Positive Reinforcement. Specifically, the data indicate that younger coaches use more Positive Reinforcement than older coaches; and coaches with less years of head coaching experience use more positive reinforcement when observed during games.

Table 14 also reports other variables in the multiple regression analysis which revealed significant relationships: Keeping Control (CBAS) is predicted by the independent variables Punishment (CBAQ) and coach's Major (from CVP), General Encouragement (CBAS) was found to be predicted by degree of General Communication (CBAS) used by coaches, General Communication (CBAS) is predicted by the amount of Keeping Control (CBAQ) used by coaches, Punishment (CBAS) is predicted by level of Sport Participation (CVP) experienced by coaches, General Technical Instruction (CBAS) is predicted by coaches' Major field of study (P.E.) (CVP), number of years as head coach (CVP), and Factor I (technical aspects of coaching) of the CSPP. Organization (CBAS) is predicted by Factor III (coach's emotional maturity) of the CSPP.

Twelve significant relationships emerged from over 400 possible regression relationships. Although there were 12 significant correlations, the number is small considering the number of possible relationships among all of the variables. One interesting factor to note is that although the data indicate specific variables as predictors of particular behaviors, most coaches perceived themselves as using high levels of positive behaviors regardless of what the

Table 14

Multiple Regression Analysis of Significant CBAS Variables

Sig. CBAS Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Beta	Significant F
Positive Reinforcement	Sport Psychology (CVP)	116.40313 2244.48437	116.40313 28.77544	.22205	.0478
Positive Reinforcement	Years Head Coach (CVP)	53.77212 394.71538	53.77212 5.06045	-.27150	.0017
	Age of Coach (CVP)	74.39234	37.19611	-.22708	.0009
Keeping Control	Punishment (CBAQ)	13.24503 110.75497	13.24503 1.41994	-.32683	.0031
	Major (PE, CVP)	24.06670	12.03335	-.29582	.0002
General Encouragement	General Communication (CBAQ)	167.65266 1653.73484	167.65266 21.20173	.30339	.0062
General Communication	Keeping Control (CBAQ)	24.58413 403.41587	24.58413 5.17200	.23967	.0323
Punishment	Sport Participation (CVP)	79.20908 954.74092	79.20908 12.24027	.27678	.0129

Table 14 (continued)

Sig. CBAS Dependent Variables	Independent Variables	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	Beta	Significant F
General Technical	Major (PE, CVP)	75.94187 1257.445	75.94187 16.12110	-.20219	.0330
	Years Head Coach (CVP)	140.22604 1193.16146	70.11302 15.49560	.23294	.0139
	Curtin (Factor I)	203.81064 1129.576	67.936 14.862	.21981	.0054
Organization	Curtin (Factor III)	23.7304 435.957	24.7304 5.589	-.23169	.0386

various significant predictors indicated. This high self-perception of the subjects remains constant among all behavioral measurements of the CBAS.

Discussion

Section I presented data in four parts. Part I provided a profile of the typical coach based on the demographic characteristics of the subjects. Parts II and III presented the data from the self-perception profiles of the subjects; and Part IV revealed results of the observational behavior of the subjects during game situations. The data from each part of Section I were analyzed and presented in Section II relative to the five hypotheses of this study. Finally, significant relationships from all variables tested under multiple regression analysis were reported.

The focus of this study was to examine the relationships between selected aspects of coaching behaviors based on the Coaches Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) and various aspects of coaches' self-concept based on the Coaches Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ) and Curtin's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP) relative to the subjects' demographic characteristics (CVP).

In general, the significant intercorrelations obtained between the independent and dependent variables attest to the diverse interrelationships among the coaches' background, self-perceptions, and observed coaching behaviors. These data present evidence for the existence of some form of relationship between selected aspects of the hypothesized self-perception (CBAQ, CSPP) of coaches and some of the operationally defined and measurable aspects of the coaches' observed

behaviors.

Overall, coaches maintained very high self-perceptions of their coaching behavior on both the CBAQ and CSPP. The data indicate that coaches perceived their behavior as being highly positive in nature when working with athletes. One focus of this investigation was to determine the relationship between coaches' self-perception and background characteristics. Examination of the data taken from the correlation of the CVP with the CSPP indicates only one significant relationship--level of sport coached and Factor II (treatment of athletes) of the CSPP. The relationship indicates that those who coached varsity football had higher self-perceptions on Factor II of the CSPP. This relationship is responsible for a significant overall relationship between the Curtin total self-perception score and the varsity variable of the CVP, although Factors I and III reflect no individual significant relationship with the varsity variable. The data indicate that subjects who coach varsity football perceive their behavior as positive in terms of how they deal with personality, values, attitude differences among players, and the coaches' relationship with parents. In contrast to the positive perceptions coaches have of themselves, the actual observation of their behavior based on the CBAS does not support their views of themselves based on either the CBAQ or CSPP.

A few significant relationships emerged among demographic variables (CVP), Coaches' Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ), Curtin's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP), and the Coaches Behavioral Assessment System (CBAS). However, with the exception of one

significant correlation (general communication and general communication) no other identical behavioral variables could be observed which consistently support the self-reported high and positive perceptions coaches have of their behavior. The positive self-perceptions coaches have of their behavior based on CBAQ and CSPP are not supported by observational measurement of these behaviors relative to particular background characteristics of coaches. This finding is supported by earlier research by Smoll and Smith (1978) in their study of little league baseball coaches. The results in that study indicated that correlation coefficients reflecting the relationships between the CBAS observed behaviors and coaches' rating of how frequently they performed the behaviors were generally low and non-significant. It thus appears that although there are many significant correlations among different variables, the significance does not reflect identical correspondence of variables. For example, coaches who rated themselves high in demonstrating positive reinforcement in their behavior on the CBAQ and CSPP are not supported as giving high levels of positive reinforcement when actually observed with the CBAS. It thus becomes clear that the ability of coaches to give self-ratings of their behavior that correspond with the perceptions of others is limited. Whether self-perception skills can be improved through training, feedback, and self-monitoring procedures is a question deserving of empirical attention, since behavior change in coaches may be highly dependent on accurate self-monitoring and social comparison skills. It is hopeful that coaches can adjust their behavior with awareness of themselves relative to their goals in

sport.

Coaches' ability to adjust their behavior is supported in this study with findings from Hypothesis III. Three aspects of coaches' behavior changed from Game I to Game II. Those behaviors that changed were reactive responses which were positive in nature. The other nine CBAS behaviors remained constant. The data also imply that the loss or win of games as the season progresses dictates the adoption of more positive behaviors by coaches responding to their players (see Table 10). The important factor is that coaches have the potential and ability to adjust and change their behavior when necessary. Perhaps with more self-awareness and monitoring of coaches' behavior, a greater percentage of the CBAS behavioral responses can be adopted in a direction that would promote the positive psychosocial development of young athletes and a positive coach-athlete relationship.

Limitations of the Findings

The data analysis and interpretation of results have two major limitations.

First, it is recognized that the self-perception profiles (CSPP, CBAQ) of the subjects appear to be highly positive in nature. It is statistically acknowledged that the restricted ranges obtained on the self-perception measures affect all reported correlations. Thus, the resulting coefficients may be considered an underestimate of the true population correlation. Given the fact that the range was restricted on both self-perception measures used in this study, all correlations obtained and the direct observation measures may be smaller than they should be. Any interpretations of the results should be made in view

of this fact.

Secondly, in testing the study's major hypotheses, the alpha level was set at .05. Because of the chance factor in measurement, this procedure resulted in the acceptance of null hypotheses II, IV, and V although significant findings were revealed in each. The significant relationships found in these hypotheses are recognized even though they were not strong enough to reject the null hypotheses.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The professional literature, which was reviewed in this study reveals that much has been written about how student athletes perceive the behavior of their coaches; however, very little has been written on how coaches view their own behavior. Consequently, little information is available on the self-perception of coaches relative to their actual coaching behavior. The study provides valuable new information concerning the self-perception of coaches in relationship to their coaching behavior. According to Smith and Smoll (1980), it is important for coaches to develop and maintain accurate perceptions of their behavior in order to avoid any potential discrepancies between the image they have of themselves and the real image they reveal to others.

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if significant relationships between coaches' self-perceptions of their coaching behavior relative to their actual coaching behaviors exist when working with athletes during game situations. This study investigated the relationship between football coaches' self-perception of their coaching behaviors and their actual observed behavior based on three categorical patterns of self-perceived behavior measured by the Curtin's Self-Perception Profile (1977) (see Appendix B) and 12

aspects of coaches' self-perception based on the Coaches' Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire (1977) (see Appendix D). The actual observed behavior of coaches was measured by the Coaches' Behavior Assessment System (1977) (see Appendix C).

The analysis of this study was guided by five hypotheses. The first hypothesis focused on the relationship between the self-perception of the subjects' coaching behavior (using the Coaches' Behavioral Assessment Questionnaire) and the observed coaching behavior of the subjects (measured by the Coaches Behavior Assessment System).

Hypothesis I stated "There will be no significant correlations between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behaviors based on the CBAQ and their actual observed coaching behaviors as measured by the CBAS."

The second hypothesis tested the relationship between the subjects' self-perception of their coaching behavior (based on the CSPP) and their observed coaching behavior (measured by the CBAS).

Hypothesis II stated "There will be no significant correlations between coaches' self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the Curtin's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP) and their observed coaching behavior based on the Coaches' Behavior Assessment System (CBAS)."

The third hypothesis examined the behavior of the subjects between two different games (measured by the CBAS).

Hypothesis III stated "There will be no significant difference in coaches' observed behavior from the first game observation as compared

to the second game observation."

The fourth hypothesis focused on the relationship between the subjects' self-perception of their coaching behaviors and selected demographic characteristics.

Hypothesis IV stated "There will be no significant relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches (CVP) and the self-perception of their coaching behavior based on the CBAQ and CSPP instruments."

The fifth hypothesis focused on the observed behavior and demographic characteristics of coaches.

Hypothesis V stated "There will be no significant relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches based on the CVP and their observed coaching behavior as measured by the CBAS."

A random sample of public high school football coaches from Chicago volunteered to participate in this study. All selected coaches completed a pre-season Coach's Vita Profile (see Appendix A) developed by the investigator to obtain background information on the participants in this study. Coaches later completed the two self-perception instruments. The data collected from the Coach's Vita Profile, two self-perception instruments, and the observational behavior instrument were then correlated to determine if any statistically significant relationships exist among selected variables.

To determine the existence of relationships among the variables, the Pearson-r correlation coefficient, multiple regression analysis, and T-tests were utilized.

Results. The major findings in this study were presented in two sections in Chapter IV. The first section presented the data in four parts. The first part presented a profile of the typical inner city high school football coach in Chicago; who was characterized as a 40 year old male varsity coach who won over 50% of his prior and career season games. He has 11 years of coaching experience with six years as head coach and five years as assistant coach. He has a B.S. degree in physical education and a minor in math, science, or driver's education. He also was a college athlete; however, he has usually not taken college courses in sport psychology or related areas.

The second part of section I presented data which revealed that coaches generally maintain high self-perceptions of their overall coaching behaviors. None of the subjects in this study was found to have low images of themselves on any aspects of their coaching behavior. Subjects also perceived themselves as having good control of their emotions and behavioral responses during stressful game situations. A high percentage of the subjects perceived themselves as providing positive treatment and encouragement for their athletes. Finally, a majority of the coaches perceived themselves as having a high degree of knowledge of the rules, strategies, and technical aspects of the sport.

Part three of section I revealed data which indicate that coaches maintained very high self-perceptions on all 12 categories of perceived coaching behaviors measured by the Coaches Behavior Assessment Questionnaire.

The data in part IV of Section I indicated that the observed

behavior of coaches measured by the Coaches Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) showed no consistent correlations with the self-perceptions of coaches measured by the Coaches Behavior Assessment Questionnaire and the Curtin's Self-Perception Profile.

Section II of Chapter IV presented findings relative to the five hypotheses presented in this study. The focus of section II was to examine the relationship between selected aspects of coaching behaviors based on the Coaches Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) and various aspects of coaches' self-perception measured by the Coaches Behavior Assessment Questionnaire (CBAQ) and Curtin's Self-Perception Profile (CSPP). Section II also focused on determining the relationship between the self-perceptions and actual observed behaviors of coaches relative to their demographic characteristics (CVP). In addition, consistency in observed behavior from one game to another is also determined.

The findings from hypothesis I revealed that 11 significant correlations were found among the 144 possible relationships between the CBAS and CBAQ; however, only one significant relationship was found among similar variables (e.g. keeping control and keeping control) on the two instruments. This indicated low ability of coaches to accurately rate their perceived behavior related to their actual observed behavior.

The results from hypothesis II revealed that among 48 possible correlations between the self-perception of coaches (CSPP) and their observed coaching behavior (CBAS), only one significant correlation emerged.

The findings from hypothesis III indicated that three of 12 aspects of coaches' actual observed behavior (measured by the CBAS) changed from the first game observation to the second game observation. The three behaviors that changed on the second observation reflected those which are classified as positive reactive behaviors.

Hypothesis IV examined the relationship among coaches' demographic characteristics (measured by the CVP) and their self-perception measured by two different self-perception profiles (CSPP and CBAQ). Only one significant correlation was found between the CVP and CSPP measures, whereas seven significant correlations were found among measures between the CVP and CBAQ.

Hypothesis V examined the relationship between coaches demographic characteristics (measured by the CVP) and the observed behavior of coaches (measured by the CBAS). The findings revealed six significant correlations among the possible 144 relationships.

Overall, the many significant correlations among all the variables presented in this study attest to some weak and strong interrelationships among the coaches' demographic background, self-perceptions, and observed behaviors as tested by the five hypotheses.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study, the following conclusions are presented as they relate to the five research questions which guided this study.

Research question 1. What are the self-perceptions of inner

city, high school football coaches regarding their coaching behavior?

Generally, coaches in this study maintain very high self-perceptions of their coaching behaviors. None of the 12 demographic characteristics of the coaches is significantly related to how the coaches perceive their coaching behaviors. The results from the administration of both self-perception instruments (CSPP and CBAQ), which measure how the coaches view their coaching behaviors, reveal consistently high scores on all aspects of self-perception. The high image maintained by coaches in this study is consistent with the few previous studies conducted in this area (Debois, 1984; Smith & Smoll, 1980). Earlier research revealed that coaches frequently believe they are administering a good deal of positive reinforcement, encouragement, and support to their athletes that in turn warrants a positive image of themselves. Even though coaches in this study sometimes demonstrate negative and punitive behaviors towards athletes, they still maintained positive images of their own behavior as measured by the instruments. The positive self-perception measures revealed by the coaches reflected restricted ranges. The restricted ranges obtained on all the self-perception measures may affect all reported correlations. Specifically, whenever one or both variables entered into a correlation had a restricted range, the resulting coefficient could be considered an underestimate of the true population. Thus, since the data revealed that the range was restricted on all of the self-perception measures used in this study, all correlations obtained between them and the direct observation measures will be smaller than they should be. This limitation should

be considered when interpreting the results of this study.

Research question 2. Are coaches' self-perceptions of coaching behaviors congruent with their actual observed behavior?

The self-perceptions of the subjects in this study are measured by two different instruments (CBAQ and CSPP). Therefore, conclusions related to the second research question are presented in two parts.

The CBAQ assesses the self-perceived behaviors of the subjects based on 12 aspects of behavior which are similar to the 12 aspects of observed behavior measured by the CBAS. The Pearson Correlation revealed 11 significant correlations between these two measures. However, among the 144 correlations calculated between the CBAQ and CBAS, seven significant relationships could have emerged by chance. Thus, hypothsis I was rejected on the basis of four among the 11 significant relationships found. All of the significant correlations found were between different variables of the CBAQ and CBAS. No significant relationship was found between the same variable on the two measures. For example, the positive reinforcement (PR) variable on the CBAQ had no significant correlation to the same positive reinforcement variable measured by the CBAS. The initial intent of the research question was to determine if any significant relationships exist between similar variables of the CBAQ and CBAS. Thus, with one exception, the data do not reveal any significant relationships between the same variable of coaches' self-perceptions of their coaching behavior and their actual observed coaching behavior. Although the subjects generally maintained a high self-perceived rating of themselves on the CBAQ, the ratings lacked

any congruency with measures from the CBAS.

Conclusions derived from the administration of the CSPP were somewhat consistent with the conclusions reported above from the CBAQ. The CSPP assessed the self-perceived behavior of the subjects based on three categorical patterns of behavior. Among 48 possible relationships between the CSPP and CBAS, only one significant relationship emerged. This relationship involved the manner in which coaches treat athletes and their observed organizing behavior. The analysis indicated that coaches who perceived themselves as demonstrating positive treatment with their athletes were observed to demonstrate less organizing behavior. The significance of this particular relationship did not offer support to the issue of congruency between self-perceived and observed behavior of the subjects. Positive treatment of athletes on the CSPP did not significantly correlate with any of the observed positive variables of the CBAS (i.e., PR, EM, GE). Organizing behavior is considered to be a neutral behavior. Therefore, consistent with the results from the CBAQ, the analysis of the CSPP revealed no significant congruent correlations between the self-perceived behavior of coaches and their actual observed behavior. It is acknowledged that at least two significant relationships among the 48 correlations may have emerged by chance alone. In view of this, hypothesis II could not be rejected.

These findings are consistent with earlier studies which found that coaches in little league baseball had limited self-perceptions of their actual coaching behavior (Smoll & Smith, 1980). It is

interesting to note that inner city high school football coaches in this study demonstrated the same inability to perceive accurately their actual coaching behavior.

Research question 3. Are there major differences in coaches' observed behavior from one game to another?

The focus of this research question was to determine if various aspects of coaches' behavior measured by the CBAS changed from one game to another. Consistency is an important factor in determining the overall nature of coaches' behavior during game situations. Two different games were observed, recorded, and the data compared utilizing a T-test. Among the 12 behaviors observed and recorded on the CBAS during the two games, three reflected a significant difference at the .05 level of significance. One of the three significant relationships could have emerged by chance alone; however, the other two significant relationships were strong enough to reject hypothesis III. Coaches exhibited more positive behaviors on three aspects of the CBAS (PR, TIM, EM) during the second game observation.

All three of these behavioral aspects are classified as positive behavioral patterns. Therefore, coaches appeared to demonstrate more reinforcement and encouragement as the season progressed; however, the reasons for this change in behavior cannot be accurately stated without further investigation. Previous research does not offer any explanation for this behavioral change; however, observation would suggest that change toward more positive behaviors as the season progresses may be an adjustment to achieve more positive outcome. Previous research does suggest that coaches who utilized more positive

reinforcement are respected and liked more by their athletes and achieve better relationships (Buckelew, 1984; Smith & Smoll, 1980). The data reflect that coaches do have the potential to adjust their behavior to perhaps accomplish goals potentially related to the game or their athletes.

Research question 4. Is there a relationship between selected demographic characteristics of coaches and the self-perception of their behavior?

The focus of this question was to determine the relationship between selected demographic characteristics of the subjects in this study and their self-perceptions as measured by the CSPP and CBAQ.

Twelve demographic characteristics as measured by the CVP were correlated with all aspects of the CSPP and CBAQ profiles. Among all the correlations taken between the CVP and CSPP, no significant relationships were found. No demographic characteristic of the subjects was related to any aspect of the subject's self-perception based on the CSPP. However, when the demographic variables of the coaches were correlated with the self-perception measured by the CBAQ, two significant and interesting relationships were found. The data revealed that coaches who have a higher percentage of winning games the previous season perceived themselves as utilizing more positive reinforcement and technical instructions following the actions of their players than coaches who win fewer games. This finding does not imply that coaches who had a higher percentage of season wins actually demonstrate more behaviors of positive reinforcement and technical instruction than those with less wins; the data only suggest that

these coaches perceive themselves as providing more of these positive behaviors. Implications from this finding would suggest that coaches who win more games develop higher levels of positive self-concept than those who lose more. It must be kept in mind that this research question focuses on finding significant relationships as they relate to perception and not actual behavior. Although significant correlations were found between the CVP and CSPP/CBAQ, they were not strong enough to reject hypothesis IV.

The findings from research question 2 revealed a lack of congruency between coaches' self-perception and actual behavior. Although significant relationships were found between certain coaches' demographic characteristics and self-perception, it does not imply that coaches with particular characteristics actually behave in certain ways, but only perceive themselves to behave in certain ways.

The second significant correlation found between the demographic characteristics of the coaches and their self-perception of their behavior was that coaches with a degree in physical education perceive themselves as demonstrating more general communication, less ignoring of mistakes, more punishment and technical instruction of mistakes, more encouragement of mistakes, and more general encouragement during games than coaches with other types of degrees. Coaches with degrees in physical education have more definable self-perceptions of their coaching behavior than those with other degrees. These data suggest only what physical educators as coaches perceive, and not what behaviors they actually demonstrate during game situations.

Research question 5. Is there a relationship between selected

demographic characteristics of coaches and their observed coaching behavior?

In contrast to determining the relationships between coaches' demographic characteristics and how they think they behave. This question focused on the relationship between coaches' demographic characteristics and their actual observed behavior. Twelve background characteristics of coaches were correlated with 12 aspects of their coaching behaviors during game situations to determine if significant relationships existed among the many possible correlations. Utilizing the Pearson-r correlation analysis, the data revealed that coaches with a master's degree demonstrated less keeping control behavior during games than those without master's degrees. The data also indicated that coaches with physical education degrees demonstrated more keeping control and general technical instructions than coaches with other types of degrees. Coaches who participated in college football demonstrated more general technical instruction and those with greater win percentages in the previous season punished their players less during games. Finally, the data revealed that coaches with more experience as head coach demonstrated more general technical instruction before games than those with less head coaching experience.

Although many significant correlations were found among the demographic variables and the CBAS measures, it was interesting that no significant correlation is found between coaches' self-perception and observed behavior among any similar CVP variables. For example, the data revealed that a degree in physical education had significant

correlations with the observed behaviors of technical instruction and keeping control; however, a degree in physical education had no relationship with the self-perceived behaviors of technical instruction and keeping control. Although no demographic variable was significantly correlated with similar behavioral characteristics of the CBAQ and CBAS, significant correlations were found between various aspects of the CVP and CBAS as related to the original research question. However, the significant relationships found could have emerged by chance alone, and were not strong enough to reject Hypothesis V. Further research is needed to provide additional information for the significant relationships found between the background characteristics and particular behavioral patterns of individuals.

Summary of conclusions. Inner-city high school football coaches generally maintained positive or high self-perceptions of their coaching behavior on all aspects of the CSPP and CBAQ profiles. Coaches demonstrated a limited capacity to accurately perceive their coaching behavior relative to their actual observed behavior. In fact, coaches' self-perceived behaviors in this study were not congruent with their actual observed behavior. Generally, in terms of consistency in behavior from one game to another, coaches behaviors remained consistent. However, some coaches did demonstrate more positive types of behavior during the second game observation.

Significant correlations were revealed between selected demographic characteristics and the self-perception variables of the subjects.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made as a result of the conclusions derived from the present study.

1. Correlation coefficients reflecting the relationship between CBAS observed behaviors and coaches' rating of how frequently they performed the behaviors were generally low and non-significant. These data suggest a strong need for coaches to become more aware of their own perceptions as they relate to their behaviors. It is recommended that coaches obtain player perceptions of their coaching behaviors to determine the best method of coaching effectiveness. Coaches can utilize this feedback information to effect necessary potential modification in their behaviors that would assist them in accomplishing their goals. The proper use of feedback information could help to improve communication and understanding as well as behavioral awareness between coaches and players.

2. College and university faculty in the fields of physical education and sport psychology should design curricula which prepare individuals to perform effectively the high school coaching role. Students preparing to be coach-educators should be required to explore their own values, attitudes, expectations, and other perceptions about the nature and role of coaching, especially its relationship to the psychosocial development of youth athletes.

3. In addition to colleges and universities developing curriculum standards for coaches, they could also promote certification standards for prospective coaches. Many boards of education throughout the United States have developed certification

standards for coaches. These standards are designed to assist coaches in acquiring the skills and competencies necessary for effective coaching and to insure the physiological and psychological safety of young athletes under the supervision of these coaches. The State of Illinois does not have a certification program for coaches. The possible consequences of the absence of such a program would require further investigation. Research has shown that inaccurate perceptions of coaching behaviors could have very serious repercussions if it extends into the physical or psychological capabilities of the athletes; therefore, it becomes important for coaches to develop accurate perceptions of themselves as well as their athletes which will positively correlate with their coaching behavior and the physical capabilities of their athletes.

Recommendations for Future Study

1. Student perceptions of coaching behavior should be systemtically collected and compared with coaches' own self-perceptions to determine the degree of congruency. An important element of this research would be ascertaining the referents that student athletes claim most influence their perceptions of coaching behavior.

2. Experimental research should be conducted with coaches who are assessed to hold inaccurate self-perceptions of their coaching behavior to determine the effects of a training intervention designed to improve levels of self-awareness.

3. This study could be replicated with coaches in sports other than football and on different levels of competition (i.e., junior

high school, high school, community college, four-year college, etc.).

4. Research comparing the behavioral characteristics of coaches who work in states requiring coach certification with coaches who are not required to be state certified should be conducted.

5. A study to determine differences between male and female coaches should be conducted to ascertain differences in coaching behaviors for similar sports.

REFERENCES

AAHPER Committee on Athletic Competition for Children of Elementary School Age. (1968). Desirable athletic competition for children of elementary school age. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER.

Anderson, F., & Albeck, S. (1964). Coaching better basketball. New York: Ronald Press.

Balaza, W. (1974). Coach-athlete relationship. Journal of Sport Psychology, 8, 60-84.

Bar-Or, O. (1975). Predicting athletic performance. The Physician and Sportsmedicine, 3, 80-85.

Beckman, L.J. (1973). Teachers' and observers' perception of causality for a child's performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 198-204.

Berryman, J.W. (1982). The rise of highly organized sports for preadolescent boys. In R.A. Magill, M.J. Ash, & F.L. Smoll (Eds.), Children in sport: A contemporary anthology (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Bisher, C. (1980). Coaches as teachers. Sporting News, 10, 34.

Botterill, C. (1980). Psychology of coaching. In R. Suinn (Ed.), Psychology in sports: Methods and applications. Minneapolis: Burgess.

Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. Review of Educational Research, 51, 5-32.

Bucher, S. (1975). Group cohesiveness reexamined. Group, 5, 10-18.

Buckewlew, S.M. (1984). Hard facts in coaching high school athletes. Scholastic Coach, 37, 31.

Burchard, H. (1979). Boys play the men's game. Sport Sociology: Contemporary Themes. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt.

Campbell, D. (1980). If I'm in charge here why is everybody laughing? Niles, IL: Argus.

Carroll, J., & Payne, J.W. (1975). Judgement of criminality: An analysis of the parole decision. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago.

Carron, A.V. (1980). Social psychological of sport. Ithaca, NY: Mouvement.

Carron, A.V., & Bennett, B.B. (1977). Compatibility in the coach-athlete dyad. Research Quarterly, 48, 671-679.

Carron, A.V., & Chelladurai, P. (1978). Psychological factors and athletic success: An analysis of coach-athlete interpersonal behavior. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 3, 43-50.

Chelladurai, P. (1978). A contingency model of leadership in athletics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo.

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

Chelladurai, P., & Carron, A.V. (1978). Leadership. Ottawa: CAHPER.

Clary, M. (1976). Winning philosophies. Sports Illustrated, 9, 61-67.

Coakley, J.J. (1978). Sport in society. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company.

Cope, W. (1977). How coaches relate to problem athletes. Sports Illustrated, 34, 26-31.

Crase, D. (1972). Athletics in trouble. Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, 39, 48-52..

Cratty, B.J. (1970). Coaching decisions and research in sport psychology. Quest, 15, 46-53.

Cratty, B.J. (1983). Social psychology in athletics. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Curtin, R.S. (1977). A study of self-perception, personality traits, and player perception of selected male high school basketball coaches. Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University.

Deutsch, M. (1968). The effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. In D. Cartwright, & A. Sander (Eds.), Group dynamics: Research and theory (pp. 461-482). New York: Harper and Row.

Dubois, P.E. (1981). The youth sport coach as an agent of socialization: An exploratory study. Journal of Sports Behavior, 6, 95-105.

Elig, T.W., & Frieze, I.H. (1979). Measuring causal attributions for success and failure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 621-634.

Eskamp, A. (1962). Psychology and the track coach. Scholastic Coach, 31, 50-57.

Eysenck, H.J. (1964). Sense and nonsense in psychology. Baltimore: Pelican Books.

Feather, N.T., & Simon, J.G. (1971). Causal attributions for success or failure in relation to expectations of success based upon selective or manipulative control. Journal of Personality, 39, 527-541.

Fisher, A.C. (1982). Psychological analysis of athletes' anxiety responses. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 139-158.

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

Fontaine, C. (1975). Causal attribution in similated versus real situations: When are people logical, when are they not? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 1021-1029.

Fross, R., & Troppman, A. (1981). Deviation, rejection and communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46, 122-123.

Fross, R., & Troppman, A. (1982). Communication feedback and sustained goal striving. Sociometry, 29, 213-227.

Fry, L.W., Kerr, S., & Lee, C. (1983). An extension and test of path goal leadership theory, using athletic teams as research samples. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Dallas.

Gallon, D. (1974). Motivating young athletes. East Lansing, MI: Youth Sports Institute.

Getzel, J. (1968). Educational administration as a social process, theory, research, practice. New York: Harper and Row.

Gould, D. (1982a). Sport psychology in the 1980's: Status, direction and challenge in youth sports research. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 203-218.

Hastorf, A., Schneider, D., & Polefka, J. (1970). Person perception. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.

Helmstadter, G.C. (1970). Research concepts in human behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Hendry, L.B. (1968). Assessment of personality traits in the coach-swimmer relationship, and a preliminary examination of the father-figure stereotype. Research Quarterly, 39, 543-551.

Hendry, L.B. (1969). A personality study of highly successful and "ideal" swimming coaches. Research Quarterly, 40, 229-304.

Horne, T.E. (1982). Compatibility in coach-athlete relationship. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Western Ontario.

Kaufman, M.J., & Popper, J. (1976). Pee wee pill poppers. Sport, 12, 16-25.

Kelley, H.H. (1981). Attribution in social interaction. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kenyon, G.S., & McPherson, B.D. (1973). Becoming involved in physical activity and sport: A process of socialization. In G.L. Rarick (Ed.), Physical activity: Human growth and development. New York: Academic Press.

Kirschenbaum, D.S., & Smith, R.J. (1983). Sequencing effects in simulated coach feedback: Continuous criticism, or praise, can debilitate performance. Journal of Sport Psychology, 5, 332-342.

Kirschenbaum, D.S., Wittrock, D.A., Smith, R.L., & Monson, W. (1984). Criticism inoculation training: Concept in search of strategy. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 77-93.

Lanzetta, S.T., & Hannah, T.E. (1969). Reinforcement behavior of "naive" trainers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11, 245-252.

LeGrand, C. (1973). What others look for in their coaches. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Lennard, L., & Bernstein, A. (1960). Expectation and behavior in therapy. In B.T. Briddle, & J. Edwin (Eds.), Role theory (pp. 179-191). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Magill, R.A., Ash, M.J., & Smoll, F.L. (Eds.) (1982). Children in

sport: A contemporary anthology (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Martens, R. (1978). Joy and sadness in children's sports. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Martens, R., & Gould, D. (1979). Why volunteer to coach children's sports? In G.C. Rogers, & K.M. Newell (Eds.), Psychology of motor behavior and sport-1978. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

McElroy, J.F., & Kirkendall, R. (1980). Sportsmanship and attitude of 6th, 7th and 8th grade boys. Research Quarterly, 26, 120.

McKay, J.H. (1966). Football coaching. New York: The Ronald Press.

McMahan, I.D. (1973). Relationships between causal attributions and expectancy of success. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 108-114.

Miller, D.T., & Ross, M. (1975). Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or fiction? Psychological Bulletin, 82, 213-225.

Miller, T.W. (1982). Assertiveness training for coaches: The issue of healthy communication between coaches and players. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 107-114.

Meggyesy, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Moore, W.P. (1970). Contemporary readings in sports psychology. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Nesvig, D. (1980). Use of groups to improve athletic performance. In R.M. Suinn (Ed.), Psychology in sports: Methods and applications. Minneapolis: Burgess.

Nicholls, J.G. (1975). Causal attributions and other achievement-related cognition: Effects of task outcome, attainment value, and sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 179-189.

Nie, N.H., Brent, D.H., & Hull, C.H. (1971). Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ogilvie, B.C., & Tutko, T.A. (1966). Problem athletes and how to handle them. London: Pelham Books.

Ogilvie, B.C., & Tutko, T.A. (1967). The role of the coach in the motivation of athletes. In R. Slovenko, & J. Knight (Eds.), Motivation in play, games, and sports. Springfield, IL: Charles

C. Thomas.

Ogilvie, B.C., & Tutko, T.A. (1970). Self-perception as compared with measured personality of selected and physical educators. In G.S. Kenyon (Ed.), Proceedings of the second international congress of sport psychology (pp. 73-77). Chicago: The Athletic Institute.

Orlick, T.D. (1980). In pursuit of excellence. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Orlick, T.D., & Botterill, C. (1975). Every kid can win. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Parrish, B. (1971). They call it a game. New York: Signet Books.

Percival, L. (1973). The coach from the athletes viewpoint. In B. Cratty (Ed.), Psychology in contemporary sport: Guidelines for coaches and athletes (pp. 236-243). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pooley, J.C. (1981). Drop-outs from sport: A case study of boys' age-group soccer. Paper presented at AAHPERD Conference, Boston.

Purdy, E. (1981). Children's perceived satisfactions and stresses in sport. Paper presented at the Australian Conference of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Ralbovsky, M. (1974). Destint's darlings. New York: Hawthorne.

Ryan, F. (1981). Sport and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Sabock, M.E. (1973). Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sage, G.H. (1968). Team morale and the problem of intrasquad competition. The Athletic Journal, 61, 44-45.

Sage, G.H. (1973). The coach as management: Organizational leadership in American sport. Quest, 19, 35-40.

Scanlan, T.K. (1977). The effects of success-failure on the perception of threat in a competitive situation. Research Quarterly, 48, 144-153.

Scanlan, T.K. (1978). Social evaluation: A key developmental element in the competition process. In R.A. Magill, M.J. Ash, & F.L. Smoll (Eds.), Children in sport: A contemporary anthology.

Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Scanlan, T.K., & Passer, M.W. (1978). Anxiety-inducing factors in competitive youth sports. In F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith (Eds.), Psychological perspectives in youth sports. Washington: Hemisphere.

Schecter, L. (1970). The coming revolt of the athlete. Coach Magazine, 10, 22-24.

Scott, J. (1971). The athletic revolution. New York: The Free Press.

Secord, G.E., & Backman, E.W. (1974). Behavioral and situational factors affecting performance. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1, 221-228.

Seefeldt, V., Gilliam, T., Blievernicht, D., & Bruce, R. (1978). Scope of youth sports programs in the state of Michigan. In F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith (Eds.), Psychological perspectives in youth sports. Washington: Hemisphere.

Seefeldt, V., & Gould, D. (1980). Physical and psychological effects of athletic competition on children and youth. Washington: ERIC Clearinghourse on Teacher Education.

Sheehan, T.J. (1971). An introduction to the evaluation of measurement data in physical education. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Simon, J.G., & Feather, N.T. (1973). Causal attributions for success and failure at university examinations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 64, 46-56.

Singer, R. (1972). Coaching athletics and psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smith, R.E., & Smoll, F.L. (1980). Leadership behaviors in youth sports: A theoretical model and research paradigm. Unpublished manuscript.

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

Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L., & Curtis, B. (1979). Coach effectiveness training: A cognitive behavioral approach to enhancing relationship skills in youth sport coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1, 59-75.

Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L., & Hunt, E. (1977). A system for the

behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. Research Quarterly, 48, 401-407.

Smoll, F.L., & Smith, R.E. (Eds.) (1978). Psychological perspectives in youth sports. Washington: Hemisphere.

Smoll, F.L., & Smith, R.E. (1980). Psychological oriented coach training programs: Design, implementation, and assessment. In C.H. Nadeau, W.R. Halliwell, K.M. Newell, & G.C. Roberts (Eds.), Psychology of motor behavior and sport-1979. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Snyder, E. (1972a). Coach's role relationship among athletes. Journal of Sport Psychology, 10, 125-130.

Snyder, E. (1972b). Coach's role relationship among athletes. Journal of Sport Psychology, 11, 140-146.

Snyder, E. (1975). Correlates of sport participation among adolescent girls. Research Quarterly, 47, 804-809.

Snyder, E.E., & Spreitzer, E. (1976). An analysis of organized sports for children. The Physical Educator, 33, 59-62.

Stern, B.E. (1972). The cultural crisis in American sport. Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, 42, 16-18.

Strauss, A.L. (1959). Mirrors and masks. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Tutko, T.A., & Richards, J.W. (1971). Psychology of coaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Underwood, J. (1969). The desperate coach. Sports Illustrated, 16, 66-76.

Veller, D. (1968). The big question: Praise or punishment? The Athletic Journal, 40, 78-81.

Weinberg, R.S. (1981). The effect of pre-existing and manipulated self-efficacy on a competitive muscular endurance task. Journal of Sport Psychology, 3, 345-354.

Weinberg, R.S. (1983). Psychological foundations of sport. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Weinberg, R.S., & Silva, J.M. (1984). Psychological foundations of sports. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, Inc.

Weiner, B. (1974). Achievement motivation and attribution theory. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R.M. (1971). Perceiving the causes of success and failure. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press

Weiner, B., Heckhausen, H., Meyer, W.V., & Cook, R.E. (1972). Causal ascriptions and achievement behavior: A conceptual analysis of effort and reanalysis of locus of control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21, 239-248.

Weiner, B., & Kukla, A. (1970). An attributional analysis of achievement motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 1-20.

Wooden, J. (1966). Practical modern basketball. New York: The Ronald Press.

Wotruba, R.T., & Golden, D. (1968). The importance of the coach-athlete relationship. Track and Field Quarterly Review, 10, 21-24.

Zander, A. (1978). Motivation and performance of sports groups. In W.F. Straub (Ed.), Sport psychology: An analysis of athlete behavior. Ithaca, NY: Mouvement.

Zimmerman, B.J. (1980). The relationship between coach behavior and athlete anxiety. Sports Illustrated, 12, 18-22.

APPENDIX A

COACH'S VITA PROFILE

Name _____ Date _____

School and Address _____

_____

School Phone _____ Home Phone _____

Home Address _____

_____

Age _____

Please list college degree(s) earned, and specify major and minor field of study:

Degree(s)	Major Field of Study	Minor Field of Study
B.S. _____	_____	_____
B.A. _____	_____	_____
M.Ed. _____	_____	_____
M.S./M.A. _____	_____	_____
Ed.D. _____	_____	_____
Ph.D. _____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____

Have you taken any full credit courses with a major emphasis in the area of sport psychology/sociology? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, list the name of the course(s):

_____

_____

_____

What high school level are you presently coaching?

Varsity _____ Junior Varsity _____

Have you ever been a Head coach? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what sport(s) and how many years?

Sport(s)	Number of Years
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Have you ever been an assistant coach? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, what sport(s) and how many years?

Sport(s)	Number of Years
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

As coach (assistant or head) state overall career wins and losses.

Won _____ Loss _____

If you coached during the 1983 football season, state record of wins and losses.
Won _____ Loss _____

Have you (as coach) ever played a major sport? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, what sport(s) and what level? (youth, high school, college, pro)

Sport(s)	Level
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

If you wish to receive an abstract of the results of this study, please check line _____.

APPENDIX B

CURTIN COACH'S SELF-PERCEPTION PROFILE

FORM A

Date _____

Coach's Name _____

Instructions - Please Read Carefully

Describe yourself on each of the following statements in terms of the degree to which they are a part of your personality. Consider each statement before responding. Circle the answer that best applies to you following each statement. Please respond to every statement. Use the following scale as a guideline.

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1. My primary responsibility as a coach is to win games.	1	2	3	4
2. My practices are well organized.	1	2	3	4
3. I am available to athletes during the school day for consultation should they seek my advice.	1	2	3	4
4. I provide an equal opportunity for every player to make the starting team.	1	2	3	4
5. I have a thorough strategic knowledge of my sport.	1	2	3	4
6. I believe that team policies and regulations should be somewhat democratic, and not totally determined by the coach.	1	2	3	4
7. When discipline of an athlete is necessary, the penalty I impose is commensurate with the infraction and not personal.	1	2	3	4
8. I use threats to motivate athletes.	1	2	3	4

FORM A

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

		STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
9.	I attempt to promote self-assurance in athletes.	1	2	3	4
10.	Hypocrisy is not characteristic of my personality.	1	2	3	4
11.	I allow my athletes to be individuals in their personal grooming.	1	2	3	4
12.	The solution to personal problems of athletes should not be the responsibility or concern of the coach.	1	2	3	4
13.	I adhere to established team policies, regardless of the player that may violate an existing rule or regulation.	1	2	3	4
14.	As the coach I attempt to establish rapport with parents of players.	1	2	3	4
15.	I have my players in good physical condition.	1	2	3	4
16.	I insert substitutes into the game to provide them with an opportunity to play.	1	2	3	4
17.	Teamwork is characteristic of my squad.	1	2	3	4
18.	I exhibit self-confidence to my players.	1	2	3	4
19.	I establish high but realistic goals for my players.	1	2	3	4
20.	I am honest and truthful with my team.	1	2	3	4
21.	I have established good rapport with my players.	1	2	3	4
22.	When coaching I try to build upon the athlete's positive skills rather than dwelling on his shortcomings.	1	2	3	4

FORM A

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

		STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
23.	I treat athletes with respect and dignity.	1	2	3	4
24.	I do not ignore athletes after a loss.	1	2	3	4
25.	I am seldom late for practices or meetings.	1	2	3	4
26.	As a coach I never criticize players when talking with sportswriters, or blame a loss on specific players when being interviewed by reporters.	1	2	3	4
27.	I respect athletes as individuals, attempting to consider unique differences among team members, while preserving the team as a unit.	1	2	3	4
28.	I do not ridicule athletes for pre-game idiosyncracies or superstitutions.	1	2	3	4
29.	As a coach I am willing to learn from my players.	1	2	3	4
30.	As a coach I trust my players.	1	2	3	4
31.	Team morale was high during the past season.	1	2	3	4
32.	I attempt to intimidate officials (referees) whenever possible.	1	2	3	4
33.	It is not difficult for players to trust me.	1	2	3	4
34.	I consider points of view other than my own.	1	2	3	4
35.	During practice I know when the team is tired.	1	2	3	4
36.	I know when the team is confused.	1	2	3	4
37.	I remain in contact with athletes between seasons and am familiar with what they are doing.	1	2	3	4
38.	I am precise when stating instructions at practice.	1	2	3	4

FORM A

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Agree
4. Strongly Agree

		STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
39.	I have a sense of humor.	1	2	3	4
40.	I accept the responsibility for my actions and decisions.	1	2	3	4
41.	During practice sessions, I am not a patient coach.	1	2	3	4
42.	As a coach I place the good of the team above personal opinion.	1	2	3	4
43.	I do not expect athletes to participate in games when injured.	1	2	3	4
44.	I am concerned with the grade point averages of my players.	1	2	3	4
45.	With respect to the fundamentals of the game my coaching is sound.	1	2	3	4
46.	At times I am impulsive.	1	2	3	4
47.	Athletes value my advice in areas not directly related to athletics.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C

A SYSTEM FOR THE BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENT OF ATHLETIC COACHES

Ronald E. Smith, Frank L. Smoll, and Earl Hunt

Description of the Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS)

A behavioral assessment system for coding and analyzing the behaviors of athletic coaches in naturalistic settings is described. The Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) consists of 12 behavioral categories derived from content analyses of coaching behaviors during practices and games. The manner in which coders are trained and the CBAS used in field settings is described, and the results of several reliability studies are reported. These studies indicate that high scorer accuracy and interrater reliability can be attained. The potential use of the CBAS to extend the study of interpersonal behavior into the realm of sport psychology is also discussed.

In recent years, the behavioral assessment approach has achieved a widening range of application. Since it involves the systematic observation and coding of behavior in naturalistic settings, behavioral assessment complements psychometric trait approaches based on self-reports of behavior (4). The present report describes the development and application of a behavioral assessment system within the emerging subdiscipline of sport psychology.

Recent years have witnessed an increasing concern regarding the effects of organized athletics upon the psychosocial development of children. Existing data indicate that sport participation has neither a universally positive nor a uniformly negative effect (6). Rather, it is likely that the effects vary as a function of the way in which programs are structured, the kind of supervision that exists, and the personal characteristics of the child. Unfortunately, the

manner in which these factors interact has not been empirically determined. Doing so will require methodological advances in the measurement of relevant factors. The Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) was developed to permit the measurement of one factor presumably important in sports -- coaching behavior. Both the measurement approach and the behavioral categories of the CBAS are an outgrowth of social learning theory (2,5). The categories, though empirically derived, tap behavioral dimensions that have been shown to affect both children and adults in a variety of nonathletic settings (1,3).

Development of the CBAS.

The CBAS was developed by Ronald Smith, Frank Smoll, and Earl Hunt. The CBAS was developed over a period of several years. Initially, soccer coaches were observed during practice sessions and games to determine the classes of behavior that occurred. The observers carried a portable tape recorder and essentially did a "play-by-play" of the coaches' behaviors using a time sampling procedure. The behavior descriptions were transcribed and content analyzed in light of concepts from social learning theory to develop an initial set of scoring categories from which the present system eventually evolved. Subsequent use of the system in observing and coding the behaviors of basketball, baseball, and football coaches indicated that the scoring system was sufficiently comprehensive to incorporate the vast majority of coaching behaviors, that individual differences in behavioral patterns can be discerned, and that the coding system can be used easily in field settings.

Behavioral Categories

In the CBAS, we deal with two major classes of behaviors: 1) reactive behaviors are responses to immediately preceding player or team behaviors, while 2) spontaneous behaviors are initiated by the coach and are not responses to immediately preceding events. These classes are roughly analogous to the distinction between elicited behaviors (responses to identifiable stimuli) and emitted behaviors (behaviors that do not have clear-cut antecedents). As shown in figure 1, reactive behaviors are responses to either desirable performances, mistakes, or misbehaviors on the part of players, while the spontaneous class is subdivided into game-related and game-irrelevant behaviors initiated by the coach. The system thus involves basic interactions between the situation and the coach's behavior.

The CBAS contains 12 behavioral categories:

I. Reactive Behaviors

Responses to desirable performances

1. Positive reinforcement or reward (R). A positive reaction by the coach to a desirable performance by one or more players. R may be verbal or nonverbal in nature. Examples include congratulating a player or patting a player on the back after a good play.
2. Nonreinforcement (NR). A failure to reinforce a positive behavior; the coach essentially fails to respond. An example would be a player getting a base hit and the coach showing no reaction.

Reactions to mistakes

3. Mistake-contingent encouragement (EM). Encouragement of a player by a coach following a player's mistake.

4. Mistake-contingent technical instruction (TIM). Telling or showing a player who has made a mistake how to make the play correctly. TIM behavior requires that the coach instruct the player in some specific way. An example is showing a player how to field a ball after an error has been made.

5. Punishment (P). A negative response by the coach following an undesirable behavior. Like R, P may be either verbal or nonverbal. Examples include making a sarcastic remark to a player who has just struck out or the coach waving in disgust after a player has made an error.

6. Punitive TIM (TIM + P). Sometimes TIM and P occur in the same communication, as when a coach says, "How many times do I have to tell you to catch the ball with two hands!" Whenever a coach gives TIM in a punitive or hostile manner, P is also scored (TIM + P).

7. Ignoring mistakes (IM). A lack of response, either positive or negative, to a mistake on the part of a player or team. Essentially, IM occurs when a coach does not respond with EM, TIM, P, or TIM + P to a mistake.

Response to misbehaviors

8. Keeping control (KC). Responses that are designed to maintain order. Such behaviors by a coach are ordinarily elicited by unruly conduct or inattentiveness by the players.

II. Spontaneous Behaviors

Game-related spontaneous behaviors

9. General technical instruction (TIG). A communication that provides instruction relevant to techniques and strategies of the sport in question. As in the case of TIM, the purpose of these communications is to foster the learning of skills and strategies for dealing with game situations. The message must clearly be one of instruction. Unlike TIM, TIG is not elicited by an immediately preceding mistake by a player or team. Rather it is coach-limited. Baseball examples include telling or showing a player how to bat or field, telling a fielder which base to throw to, telling a pitcher to take more time between pitches, and shifting the infield or outfield in a strategic manner.

10. General encouragement (EG). Encouragement that does not immediately follow a mistake. EG differs from the R and EM categories in that it is not a response to specific actions

by the players. It relates to future hopes, rather than the behaviors of the past. It differs from technical instruction in that the coach makes requests with which the players may not necessarily be able to comply (e.d., "Come on, team, let's get some runs".)

11. Organization (O). Behavior directed at administrative organization, such as reminding the players of the batting order, announcing substitutions, reassigning positions, and telling players to coach on the bases. It involves organizational behavior that is not intended to influence play immediately. Thus, putting in a new shortstop is scored O, while positioning the shortstop closer to second base is scored technical instruction.

Game-irrelevant spontaneous behavior

12. General communication (GC). Interactions with players that are unrelated to game situations or team activities, such as joking with players, conversation about family members, daily activities, etc.

In utilizing the CBAS, observers station themselves at a point from which they can observe the coach in an unobtrusive manner. Observers do not introduce themselves to the coach, nor do they indicate in any way that they will be observing him or her. Naturally, consent for observation will have been obtained prior

to observation, but this is generally done before the start of the season. Observations are recorded by writing the behavioral codes (e.g., R, P, TIM) as the behaviors occur.

APPENDIX D

Coaching Questionnaire
Page 4

5. Encouraging a player after he has made a mistake. For example, "Good try, don't worry you'll do better next time."

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

6. Keeping order and preventing players from goofing off or getting into mischief. For instance, telling several players who are shoving each other on the bench to cut it out and watch the game.

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

7. Scolding players when they make a mistake. For example, "Come on, Tom, that's terrible, get with it!"

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

8. Giving instructions on playing techniques and strategy even though a player has not made a mistake.

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

9. Withholding praise from a player even though he has just made a good play or shown a lot of hustle.

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

10. Expressing displeasure with mistakes while giving instructions on how to correct them. For example, "Good gosh, how many times do I have to tell you to catch the ball with two hands?"

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

11. Spontaneously encouraging players to do well. For instance, "OK, let's get 'em!"

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

12. Showing no reaction to a player's mistake.

During Game _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

In Practice _____ Never _____ Rarely _____ Not that Often _____ Sometimes _____ Usually _____ Almost Always _____ Always

PART C. COACHING SITUATIONS

Directions: In this part are described a few situations which you may face numerous times during a game. After each description are listed several possible responses you make to that situation. Please indicate the percent of the time in that situation you normally respond with each of the possible alternatives. Look at the first situation. If you normally respond with praise about three quarters of the time when a player has made a good play, then you would write 75% beside answer A and 25% beside answer B which indicates withholding praise. Within each situation the percents you assign the various alternatives should add up to 100%.

Situation 1: A player has just made a good play (a good hit, catch, or throw), or has put out good hustle on a play. What percent of the time do you normally respond by

A. Praising or rewarding the player. _____%
B. Withholding praise from the player. _____%
Should equal 100%

APPENDIX E

I look forward to your positive response. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sherman Blade
Playground Teacher
Mason Upper Grade Center

Enclosure

SB/vdc

APPENDIX F

Dear Coach_____:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research on The Relationship Between Self-Perceived and Observed Coaching Behavior Among Inner-City High School Coaches.

Enclosed you will find two items for your completion: 1) the Coach's Vita Profile and 2) the Coach's Self-Perception of Behavior Profile. Please complete these two instruments by September 1, 1984. Upon completion of the two instruments, I will be contacting you concerning the details of the practice and game observations.

My research will be conducted under guidelines established by the American Psychological Association and the Institutional Review Board at Loyola University of Chicago. All of the data collected will remain confidential. Participation is fully voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from participation at any time. A summary of the research will be provided to you upon request.

If you should have any questions concerning the completion of these instruments, please feel free to contact me at work (521-7040) or home (745-5613).

Thank you again for your participation.

Sincerely,

Sherman Blade
Playground Teacher
Mason Upper Grade Center

Enclosures

SB/vdc

APPENDIX G

1307 North Lorel
Chicago, Illinois 60651

June 1, 1984

Mr. Orpen Bryant
Deputy Superintendent
Field Services
Chicago Board of Education
160 West Wendell
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Dear Superintendent Bryant:

I am employed by the Chicago Board of Education as a Playground Teacher at Mason Upper Grade Center, and have held this position for the past 13 years. This letter is to request permission to conduct research at various Chicago public high schools for my doctoral dissertation.

I am presently a doctoral candidate in Counseling and Counselor Education at Loyola University of Chicago. The proposed title of my dissertation is The Relationship Between Self-Perceived and Observed Coaching Behavior Among Inner-City High School Coaches. By conducting this study, I want to determine if there is a relationship between a coach's self-perception of coaching behavior and his/her actual observed behavior when working with athletes.

I plan to administer two instruments to participating coaches. The Coach's Self-Perception of Behavior Profile by Robert Curtin (1977) will be used to measure the level of coaches' self-perception of behavior. The Coaching Behavior Assessment Scale by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977) will be used to measure coaches' actual (real) behavior when working with athletes. I am enclosing copies of these instruments for your information. Coaches will be observed during three practice and three game situations. The purpose of these observations is to gain information on the relationship between coaches' actual and observed coaching behavior.

To conduct my research, I will need 110 high school football coaches as subjects. Fifteen minutes will be sufficient time to administer each instrument. I would like to collect the data from September to November, 1984. If the Board has standard procedures for obtaining permission to participate in research, I will be glad to follow these procedures. If you prefer, I am prepared to construct a form to obtain such permission. My research will be conducted under guidelines established by the American Psychological Association and the Institutional Review Board at Loyola University. All of the data collected will remain confidential. Participation is fully voluntary, and subjects would be free

to withdraw from participation at any time. At the completion of the research, you will be provided with a summary of the results.

If you would like further information concerning this proposed study, you may feel free to contact my academic advisor and chairperson of my dissertation committee, Dr. Terry Williams, Assistant Professor in the Department of Counseling Psychology and Higher Education, Graduate School of Education, Loyola University. Dr. Williams may be reached at 670-3030. I am enclosing a summary of my dissertation proposal to enable you to judge the suitability of my study.

If you should have any questions concerning this matter, or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at your earliest convenience. I may reached at work (521-7040) or home (745-5613).

I look forward to your positive response. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sherman Blade
Playground Teacher
Mason Upper Grade Center

Enclosures

SB/vdc

APPENDIX H

Item Analysis for Curtin
Coach's Self-Perception Profile

Factor 1: Technical Aspects of Coaching

A description of the technical aspects of coaching; specifically, the coach's fundamental and strategic knowledge of football, his organizational and instructional abilities at practice, and discipline procedures.

Question number

(2 A)	(4 A)	(5 A)	(7 A)	(10 A)	(13 A)	(23 A)
(46 B)	(44 B)	(43 B)	(41 B)	(38 B)	(35 B)	(25 B)
(29 A)	(38 A)	(45 A)				
(19 B)	(10 B)	(3 B)				

Factor 2: Treatment of Athletes as Individuals

A description of the treatment of athletes as individuals; specifically dealing with personality, value, and attitude differences among players, promoting self-confidence in players, and the coach's relationships with parents.

(9 A)	(11 A)	(14 A)	(23 A)	(27 A)	(34 A)
(39 B)	(37 B)	(34 B)	(25 B)	(21 B)	(14 B)

Factor 3: Coach's Emotional Maturity

A description of the coach's emotional maturity; specifically, his self-control in tight situations, behavior following a defeat, and his rapport with players.

(18 A)	(20 A)	(21 A)	(24 A)	(26 A)
(30 B)	(28 B)	(27 B)	(24 B)	(22 B)

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Sherman Blade has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Terry E. Williams, Director
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Steven D. Brown
Associate Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Loyola

Dr. Manuel S. Silverman
Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

April 15, 1987
Date

Terry E. Williams
Director's Signature