

**AN ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR ATHLETES
TO JUDGE COACHING PERFORMANCE**

by

Karen Wiznuk ©

School of Physical and Health Education

Lakehead University
Thunder Bay, Ontario

January 1984

ProQuest Number: 10611711

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10611711

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	v
LIST OF TABLES.	vi
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	1
Significance of the Study	1
Delimitations	5
Limitations	5
Definitions	6
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Characteristics of a Good Coach	7
Coaching Evaluation	15
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	20
Development of a Question Pool.	20
Question Construction	20
Measurement Technique	21
Validity.	22
Reliability	23
Discriminability.	24
Objectivity	25
Final Questionnaire	26
Summary	26
4. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS	28
Item Pool	28
Validity.	28
Reliability	29
Restructuring	30
Discriminability.	32
Standardization Assessment.	33
Summary	36
Marking the Test.	37
Purposes.	38
5. CONCLUSIONS.	40
Summary	40
Recommendations	43
REFERENCES	44

	PAGE
APPENDICES	
A. Coach Evaluation Questionnaire	47
B. Panel of Judges	57
C. Letter of Instruction	58
D. Instructions for Administering the Coach Evaluation Questionnaire	60
E. Assessment of Response Set	62
F. Questions Deleted after Validity Check	63
G. New Questions Added after Validity Check	64
H. Reworded Questions after Validity Check	65
I. Reworded Questions after Readability Check	68
J. Coach Evaluation Questionnaire after Validity and Readability Checks	71
K. Questions Deleted after Readability Check	78
L. Restructured Coach Evaluation Questionnaire	81
M. Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	86
N. Original Data	87
O. Sample Computer Analysis	90

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: An Assessment Tool for Athletes to Judge Coaching Performance

Karen Ann Wiznuk: Master of Science in the Theory of Coaching, 1983

Thesis Advisor: Dr. B. S. Rushall
Professor
School of Physical and Health Education
Lakehead University

The purpose of this study was to provide an assessment tool to judge coaching performance that was appropriate for completion by athletes. The questionnaire underwent a variety of developmental stages. In its final form it contained 36 items. The tool was shown to be a valid, reliable, readable, and standardized assessment tool. It demonstrated discriminability and provoked honest, accurate responding in subjects. The test was capable of providing immediate feedback to coaches seeking feedback about athletes' perceptions of their performance. Responses on the developed scale were weighted to reflect the desirability of the coaching characteristics and behaviours of a good coach. It provides a total score which can be interpreted by the coach as a measure of how much of an "ideal" coach exists in him/her.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A sincere thank-you is extended to the expert panel of judges who took the time to evaluate the questionnaire developed in this study: Ms. E. McKinnon, Ms. M. Grace, Dr. N. Wood, Dr. G. Taylor, Mr. N. Vikander, Mr. J. Donohue, Dr. C. Botterill, Mr. G. Smith, Mr. D. Talbot, Dr. L. Holt, Dr. G. Gowan, Dr. C. Elimkie, Mr. T. Valeriote, Mr. B. Thayer, Dr. L. Leith, Mr. D. Bradshaw, Ms. A. Hoffman, and Mr. J. Bales.

A special thank-you also is extended to the coaches who allowed their athletes to participate in this study: Mr. B. Humby, Mr. F. Simzer, Mrs. B. Hutcheon, and Ms. V. Hutcheon.

Grateful appreciation is extended to Mrs. B. Morton and Dr. J. Jamieson for their assistance in running the computer program used in this study.

An extra vote of thanks to Dr. B. Rushall for his guidance. It was greatly appreciated.

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
Table	
1. Canonical Discriminant Functions	34
2. Discriminant Functions Evaluated at Group Means (Group Centroids)	35

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis was to construct an assessment tool to judge coaching performance that was appropriate for completion by athletes.

Significance of the Study

Recent years have witnessed an increasing concern regarding the effects of organized athletics upon participants. Existing data indicate that sports participation can result in both positive and negative experiences for athletes (Smith, Smoll & Hunt, 1977). It is likely that the type of experience gained from participation varies according to the personal characteristics of the participant, the way in which programs are structured and the kind of supervision that exists (Smith et al, 1977). The supervision provided by a coach has been suggested to be the most important element affecting the participant (Maetozo, 1981; Smoll & Smith, 1980) and is, thus the concern of this study.

Currently there is a growing social awareness of the coach's role in affecting individuals who participate in sports. The coach has enormous potential to create a positive impact for these individuals (Smoll & Smith, 1980). At this time however, there is no accurate means of measuring

this impact. The need for a tool that permits the measurement of the coach and his/her behaviour and characteristics was warranted.

In the past, coaches have relied more or less on experience and intuition to prepare athletes for competition and this may not be the best form of coaching preparation. The need to provide opportunities for training coaches in the sports skills and the strategies used to prepare athletes for competition has now become apparent and creating competent athletic coaches has become a professional concern.

The existence of the Coaching Association of Canada supports that concern. The primary objective of the Association is to increase coaching effectiveness across all sports at all levels. The Association attempts to produce a more balanced approach for preparing athletes and improve the future of coaching by increasing scientific research. In an effort to achieve this, a National Certification Program has been created to upgrade the coaching profession. The existence of organizations such as the National Coaching Association enhances the validity and potential value of professional and amateur coaches. The fact that Australia and other nations have followed Canada's lead in developing coaching supports their existence.

At present there is no means to measure the effectiveness of the Coaching Association's attempts to upgrade coaching. An assessment tool that allows coaching performance

to be evaluated would establish the effectiveness of the Association in preparing coaches to coach.

At present, assessment tools which evaluate a coach's ability and performance objectively are limited. There are a number of observation schedules for the behavioural assessment of coaches. These involve the use of numerous personnel, are time consuming, and in some situations it is not possible to gather all the information desired (Smith et al., 1977). For too long success has been the only criterion for evaluating a coach's performance (Davis, 1979). It is unwise and unfair to judge a coach purely on his/her win/loss record. A good coach does not always produce a winning team. The success of a team or club does not necessarily reflect the ability of the coach.

In attempting to fashion a tool which assesses the qualities that profile a coach it seems only logical that the evaluation be based on the perceptions of the athlete. The relationship between the coach and athlete is, perhaps the most critical feature in sports. In other fields the evaluation of a similar relationship has been focused upon. Course and teacher evaluation by the student has become a common measuring instrument (Murray, 1980). Just as students can provide useful information about how well an instructor presents material, athletes can provide an assessment of the coach.

This assessment would be useful in determining in what areas the coach is competent or needs improvement.

Evaluation of a coach could serve as feedback for the coach, encouraging self-improvement and continued upgrading; and result in the best possible coaching. A proper assessment tool would provide an objective and comprehensive record of the coach as perceived by the athletes. This would have the potential to be used for coaching certification as one measure of coaching effectiveness.

The intent of this study is timely. It evaluates a target group of growing social importance. There have been few evaluation instruments developed to appraise the efficiency of coaches of sport. There also has been little published research in the area. There are no valid, standardized tests for assessing a coach's performance from an athlete's viewpoint. A program for certifying coaches has been implemented, yet its effectiveness or merit is not known because there is as yet no means to measure its value to the athlete. This proposed tool could serve that purpose.

In summary, the justification for this thesis lies in the lack of valid scientific research in the area of coaching evaluation. The development of a coaching evaluation tool could be used in a variety of ways to enhance coaching effectiveness and development. Since the investigator has had some coaching experience there exists a personal interest in the topic.

Delimitations

1. The questionnaire constructed was suitable for assessing coaches in any sporting environment.
2. The response to the inventory was based on the athlete's perceptions. It was assumed that each athlete can accurately judge the presence or absence of the specified characteristics and content in a coach.
3. The tool was restricted to questionnaire format because it was deemed to be the most appropriate method for use in a sporting environment.
4. The content of the developed tool was restricted to what remained after validity, reliability, and redundancy had been considered.

Limitations

For this study the following assumptions were made:

- i) that the constructed tool reflected the athlete's perceptions of the coach;
- ii) that the constructed tool reflected the athlete's perceptions of the coaching program;
- iii) that the content validity was appropriate;
- iv) that greater than 10% of the panel of judges responding not appropriate removed the question from the item pool on the basis of validity criteria;

- v) that greater than 20% of the panel of judges responding that they had not seen a particular behaviour removed the question from the item pool on the basis of validity criteria;
- vi) that a test-retest reliability greater than 64% made a question item reliable: this was the co-efficient of determination equivalent to .8;
- vii) that questions that inter-related greater than $r = .8$ are redundant;
- viii) that testing the developed tool on four sports made it universal for application;
- ix) references to specific items regarding a particular sport were left out.

Definitions

Questionnaires - pencil and paper tests containing questions which were answered by an individual without any external prompting.

Opinions - areas covered by the questionnaire.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Characteristics of a Good Coach

The fact that coaching is a profession which has traditionally lacked trained personnel, accreditation, and certification is acknowledged (Maetozo, 1981). However sports participation is recognized as a medium that promotes the development of desirable personality traits among its participants (Smoll, Smith & Curtis, 1977). In another light, sports participation is also criticized for placing excessive physical and psychological demands on its participants (Smoll et al., 1977). While some criticism is both well-founded and constructive it is firmly believed that sports do have positive potential (Gallon, 1974; Smoll et al., 1977). Realizing and fulfilling this potential is the coach's responsibility to each participant. Current programs of coaching accreditation and education which have been developed recently also aim to achieve this end.

Most coaches underestimate the influence they have on their athletes (Smoll et al., 1977). Singer (1972) stated, however, that the many hours a coach spends with an athlete suggests the potential influence of the coach on an athlete's complete development. Brown (1974) insisted that the quality of the outcome of participation is dependent upon the quality of the leadership. Leadership is valued

by Smith (1974) as a vital role because it has the most advantage to affect behaviour. Frost (1971) felt that participants are most influenced by the ideals, principles, and actions of an outstanding leader. In sports, the coach is that leader (Smoll et al., 1977).

Coaches are second only to parents in having a major influence upon an athlete's education, goals, occupational plans and general value orientations (Level II, 1975). There is no question that every coach has the potential to influence the lives of those they coach. A coach's every act leaves its mark on the athlete, be it constructive or destructive (Kuzhukhov, Dondratovich & Loos, 1978). Orlick and Botterill (1975) emphasized that individuals learn from the examples set by those admired and upon whom they depend. As a coach, what one is, what one does, and what one says can have effects on the behaviour of the athletes, in and out of the sporting environment. A coach's actions and attitudes help to shape an athlete's view of the world and of himself/herself (Smoll et al., 1977).

While trying to meet the needs and expectations of a highly variable group of personalities a coach must become familiar with many roles (Smoll et al., 1977). What must be established first is that a coach is an individual with inherent virtues and shortcomings (Kuzhukhov et al., 1978; Singer, 1972). There is some evidence however, Gallon, 1974; Loy, McPherson & Kenyon, 1978; Singer, 1972) that good coaches do have a relatively consistent set of

personality characteristics and unique qualities that distinguish their kind. Indications of general behaviour characteristics have been confirmed by empirical observations and personality assessments (Singer, 1972). It is these characteristics plus the coach's entire personality that determine a coach's ability to perform the necessary functions and responsibilities.

The functions and responsibilities of a coach are many. To shape a successful team of skilled athletes and well adjusted human beings requires a diversity of talents (Singer, 1972). A coach is required to function as a leader, a teacher, a decision-maker, a counsellor, a role model, a group co-ordinator and a substitute parent (Level I, 1975). To be a good coach involves being all of these things at some time.

In fact, a synonym for coach is teach (Gallon, 1974; Roget's College Thesaurus, 1958; Singer, 1972). Frost (1971) described coaches as teachers who work with the development of individuals through physical activity. As a teacher it is imperative that a coach has an understanding of the methods, and a familiarity with the scientific principles of correct technique (Frost, 1972; Gallon, 1974). Rushall (1979) stated that a coach must have a balanced knowledge of physiology, biomechanics, and psychology. Coaches should never be satisfied with what they know. Frost (1971) asserted that there should be a continual effort on the coach's part to be kept aware of the most

up-to-date information concerning his/her sport. The higher the standard of the athletic group the more indepth and expansive should be the knowledge required (Rushall, 1979). Since coach and teacher are interchangeable, Hallet (1974) assumed that the objectives of each should be similar. To educate infers positive development; therefore a coach should also be involved with contributing positively to the growth of the athletes as individuals (Level I, 1975).

The goals of a coach should vary according to the needs of those being coached (Gallon, 1974; Singer, 1972). Unfortunately, quite often coaches establish goals for themselves without considering their athletes at all (Botterill, 1980). A successful coach seeks to develop athletes for their own sakes (Ward & Watts, 1967). Singer (1972) stated that a coach must be receptive and responsive to individual needs. Knowing that the coach cares about the athlete as a person will enhance the athlete's ability to learn. The coach's caring attitude is often sufficient inspiration and motivation for athletes to achieve their goals.

Athletes are individuals and in spite of the convenience and necessity to treat them as a group at times, sensitivity and respect for individual differences should always prevail (Gallon, 1974; Singer, 1972). Every athlete must be made to feel valued and accepted by the coach (Snyder & Spreitzer, 1978). Rushall (1975) felt that this is best accomplished by interacting frequently with all athletes.

This also helps increase team cohesion and decrease any feelings of resentment. It is important to recognize every athlete at least once during training (Smoll et al., 1977). Rushall (1975) stressed that the greater the number of interactions between the coach and athlete the greater the potential for effective coaching.

A coach cannot demand respect. Respect must be earned (Singer, 1972; Smoll et al., 1977). A coach who is fair, a caring and considerate leader, who displays maturity in judgement and wisdom in decisions, will earn respect (Singer, 1972; Smoll et al., 1977). If an athlete likes and respects the coach, he/she will be more receptive of the coach's methods and suggestions (Smoll et al., 1977).

Coaches work to help athletes achieve to the best of their ability. In doing so a close bond develops between the coach and athlete. In order for this bond to develop, the athlete must have confidence in, respect for, and want to play for the coach. To achieve this, the coach must have a pleasing personality, the ability to show warmth and compassion, a sense of humour, patience, and enthusiasm (Singer, 1972). Singer (1972) also stated that if a coach expects commitment from his/her athletes, he/she must display commitment and dedication. Gallon (1974) emphasized that a coach must keep his/her composure and behave professionally at all times. Since physical fitness is one of the objectives being stressed by the coach to the athlete, the coach should set an example with a good personal appearance (Gallon, 1974).

For effective learning to occur an athlete's interest and desire must be stimulated (Gallon, 1974). A good attitude is best developed positively. Something positive should be found in every athlete's behaviour and should be rewarded with verbal praise and approval (Bunker & Rotella, 1977; Gallon, 1974; Rushall, 1975). Gallon (1974) suggested that there are times when being a disciplinarian is warranted but threats and punishment can have detrimental effects if used continuously. More is gained by creating positive team morale (Bunker & Rotella, 1977).

Possessing the qualities of a good communicator will strengthen the bond between the coach and athlete (Smoll et al., 1977). Gallon (1974) believed that there is much value in the coach conducting regular discussion sessions with the athletes. Any athlete should feel comfortable approaching the coach to converse about anything from training programs to personal problems with an assurance that they will be heard (Smoll et al., 1977). Singer (1972) believed that the ability to communicate makes the difference between understanding and misunderstanding. It is the coach's responsibility to adequately prepare the athlete physically, mentally, and be developing an overall lifestyle that compliments the athlete's goals (Clements & Botterill, 1980). Having the knowledge to do so however, is of little avail unless the coach can relay it successfully to the athlete.

Building a relationship takes time. Toward the end of a coach-athlete relationship the athlete should have matured to a point where there is little need for the coach (Ward & Watts, 1967). A good coach fades into the background, leaving a successful, independent athlete.

Unfortunately, many coaches lose sight of the responsibilities of coaching by being preoccupied with the 'winning is everything' philosophy (Margolis, 1979; Smoll et al., 1977). There are sports ideals that consider goals other than winning. Orlick and Botterill (1975) felt participation is more important than the final outcome and if participation was fun and enjoyable those participating would continue on the basis of those positive rewards. Ward and Watts (1967) advocated that the aim of the coach is to guide the athlete to an athletic career where the best performance possible is achieved. The outcome is an improved athlete. Frost and Sims (1974) suggested that by providing an opportunity for self-expression, the opportunity to experience success is met.

The concern of the coach should be with the total welfare of the athlete (Orlick & Botterill, 1975). Goals structured for success should be realistic and attainable, difficult enough to challenge yet realistic enough to achieve (Clements & Botterill, 1980; Gallon, 1974). It is important that the coach and athlete set goals together (Botterill, 1980). Botterill (1980) suggested that involving the athlete in discussions and decisions can

increase the athlete's awareness and commitment to individual and group goals.

Clark (1967) felt that improving athletically or personally from defeat or victory is a realistic goal. If a coach works toward developing an athlete's skills winning will take care of itself within the limits of the athlete's talents (Smoll et al., 1977).

Neal (1978) was concerned that most coaches do not realize that both winning and losing, provide educational experiences. Every phase of life seems to be built on the desire to excel, to be at the top and number one. The fact that this does not always have positive effects is not understood. The philosophy emphasizing excellence, when adopted by a coach, often leads to restricted, inappropriate participation, unrealistic and unreasonable expectations, undesirable, violent and immoral behaviour, and unethical practices (Level I, 1975; Margolis, 1979). Murray (1974) supported this with the example of a University football coach. The coach admitted quite openly the fallacy in the statement that an athlete is a student first and athlete second. When a player was recruited for the team, the individual was being given the chance to play on a winning team first. A good education was the second consideration.

In summary, there are certain desirable behaviours and characteristics that distinguish a good coach. A coach, in fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of the position, must become familiar with many roles. A coach must

function as a leader, a teacher, a substitute parent, a counsellor, a decision-maker, a role-model, and a communicator. To fulfill these roles a coach must possess maturity, fairness, compassion, commitment, confidence, patience, knowledge, enthusiasm, and a sense of humour. A coach should use these attributes while developing an athlete's skills with the welfare of the athlete being foremost in mind.

Coaching Evaluation

Society puts intense pressure on coaches to produce winners (Adams, 1979; Davis, 1979; Margolis, 1979). Status and financial support are received for building a winner. The score-board and turnstile usually determine a coach's success and progression in the profession. The tendency is for the evaluation of coaches to be made on their win-loss record (Adams, 1979; Chambers & Smith, 1980; Davis, 1979; Margolis, 1979). Coaches frequently are not hired on the basis of their attitudes and personal qualities, they are hired to win and gain recognition for themselves and their team (Adams, 1979; Margolis, 1979). Margolis (1979) found that coaches are constantly being evaluated on these criteria by media, fans and administrators. In this process the perspective of the real lifelong values of organized competitive sports for the participant is lost.

Another proposed method for coach evaluation is a behavioural assessment system for coding and analyzing

coaching behaviours (Smith et al., 1977). This method involves the systematic observation and coding of a coach's behaviour in the actual sporting environment. The assessment system is based on a set of behaviour categories that have been shown to affect individuals in a variety of settings. There are some potential problems in utilizing the behavioural assessment system. Occasionally, observers who have been trained initially to a high level of reliability, drift away from the defined behaviour categories as they start to attach their own meanings to the categories. The observers might have expectations about what will be observed. Biases and expectations can cause observers to be selective to certain behaviours, disregarding those that are not consistent with their expectations. The mere presence of an observer may influence the coach's behaviour and a behaviour change occurs as a result of being observed. Although it has achieved a wide range of application the behavioural assessment system is an approach that requires a great deal of time and manpower.

For the sake of the participant an objective criterion to evaluate a coach's overall performance is needed (Chambers & Smith, 1980; Margolis, 1979). The primary goal of an evaluation is to develop ways to assist coaches in improving their performance (Barber & Skoglund, 1981). Pflug (1980) emphasized that an evaluative instrument is intended to provide an objective evaluation of coaching effectiveness. The intention is not to provide negative information to

support the firing of a coach. Evaluations will help a coach ascertain areas of strength and weakness (Athletic Educator's Report, 1979), and enhance the ability of coaches to relate more effectively to their athletes (Smoll & Smith, 1980).

There is a scarcity of evaluative tools for assessing the competencies needed in coaching (Adams, 1979; Athletic Educator's Report, 1979). One of the most effective means to assess the perceived characteristics of a coach is to ask the athletes. An athlete's feedback is a measure of the actual behaviour of the coach (Margolis, 1979). Greene (1975) suggested that the consumer is the best qualified to judge a product. Coaches then should be evaluated by their athletes (Margolis, 1979).

This practice has gone on in the classroom for years (Murray, 1980). More attention has been given to student ratings than to any other method of evaluating college teaching and the popularity of this method is steadily increasing. Murray (1980) suggested that the rationale of student ratings is because there is some difficulty in measuring student learning directly. The next best thing is to ask students to rate certain characteristics and behaviours. Students observe the teacher daily under natural conditions, and only students are capable of judging whether material is interesting or whether the teacher's comments have been helpful to them. In the same light, an athlete's perceptions and recall of a coach's

behaviour are important and relevant evaluative measures of a coach's effectiveness (Smoll & Smith, 1980).

An anonymously answered questionnaire is a suggested format for coaching evaluation (Adams, 1979; Athletic Educator's Report, 1979; Margolis, 1979; Pflug, 1980). It is an appropriate indicator of overall performance as it focuses on specific behaviours which could differentiate good and poor coaches and it could return results quickly. Adams (1979) has proposed the following procedure in constructing an evaluation questionnaire. The specific areas of expected competency for a coach must be determined first. The desired characteristics and behaviours of a good coach within each of these areas then should be determined. The items included are selected from a large pool of coach-rating items. The evaluator assess the characteristics and behaviours implied by each question on a scale, developing the profile of a good coach. Through this comprehensive evaluation weaknesses can be identified and a plan of action formulated to improve them.

In summary, the use of an evaluative instrument for coaching will contribute to educationally sound programs, directed by competent individuals, who will contribute positively to the overall development of athletes (Margolis, 1979). The intent of an instrument to evaluate coaches is not to impose any threat but to focus on the benefits that will result for the participant and the coach. As in a student's evaluation of a teacher, an athlete's rating

would not represent the only method of evaluating a coach's performance. Unfortunately there is a tendency for coaches to be evaluated on their win/loss record. Behavioural assessment by observation is another suggested evaluative measure. All of these methods have advantages and disadvantages as measuring instruments. Athlete-ratings of a coach also have limitations and should never be treated as complete and total assessment of all aspects of coaching but their merit cannot be overlooked.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Development of a Question Pool

The information used to construct the questionnaire was obtained from four sources. They were: 1) a literature review of the features of a good coach, 2) currently available questionnaires that assess coaching/teaching performance, 3) the measurement of coaching behaviours through observation scales, and 4) the opinions of experts in the field. It was deemed that this discovery process would reveal a comprehensive set of items that would serve as the base pool for question development on good coaching characteristics.

Question Construction

The information gathered from the above sources was expressed as single item questions. The questions were grouped into four sections, each preceded by a sub-heading and presented as follows:

1. "Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

This section of the inventory included questions that dealt with the characteristics that profile a coach."

2. "Evaluating the Coach with respect to Personal and Professional Relationships"

This section of the inventory included questions that dealt with how the coach handles relationships with his/her athletes and other professionals in the field."

3. "Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills"

This section of the inventory included questions that related to the ability of the coach to structure participation."

4. "Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach"

This section of the inventory included questions that dealt with the coach's ability to perform those duties associated with the coaching profession."

Measurement Technique

Each of the inventory questions assessed a single characteristic or behaviour that was deemed appropriate in a coach. An answer sheet was supplied with each questionnaire (See Appendix A). The respondent was forced to select one of the response alternatives for each question. There were six alternative responses for each question item: 1) always, 2) often, 3) sometimes, 4) seldom, 5) never, 6) cannot respond - not applicable. The response alternatives were numbered in this manner for all of the odd numbered questions. The scale was reversed for the even numbered

questions: 1) never, 2) seldom, 3) sometimes, 4) often, 5) always, 6) cannot respond - not applicable. This eliminated the possibility of an order influence (Horrocks, 1964). The selection of a scale with six possible responses allowed respondents considerable discriminative ability in assessing the coach's attributes. Respondents would be able to accurately interpret answers which resulted in finer ratings (Horrocks, 1964).

Validity

The content validity of the constructed questionnaire rested on empirically validated assessments by competent judges. Each question's validity was assessed by a panel of judges, N=18 (See Appendix B). An individual who met 5 out of the 5 following selection criteria qualified as a member of the panel of judges: 1) practicing coach and/or, 2) provincial level and/or, 3) member of the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC) and/or, 4) international athlete and/or, 5) held a CAC Scholarship. The judges received a copy of the inventory with a letter (See Appendix C) instructing each to assess the content validity of the questionnaire with respect to two criteria: 1) was the question appropriate for evaluating a coach, and 2) had at least one coach been observed to exhibit the behaviour or characteristic desired.

After the panel's responses were received, two considerations that the question was not appropriate, or

three considerations that the behaviour or characteristic had not been seen, were deemed sufficient criteria to delete the question from the pool due to a lack of validity. The acceptance rates were made high to yield valid content. Each judge was also instructed to comment on the expression and clarity of each question as well as being asked to suggest other question content that had not already been covered. Where suggestions were made questions were formulated and added to the question pool. This was the process for determining the validity of the author established items.

After the validity of the questionnaire was established a readability check was performed to ensure that the meaning of each question was understood by the respondents. This eliminated the possibility of any question misinterpretation. Fifteen subjects between the ages of 10 and 14 years were given the validated questionnaire with instructions to underline words which were not understood. This was a means of checking the clarity of communication between the respondents and the questionnaire. Using Roget's College Thesaurus (1958), some of the words which were not understood were replaced by simpler synonyms.

Reliability

Since each question carried its own importance, the reliability for each question was determined through a test-retest procedure. The test-retest sample involved

40 athletes from five different sport groups. The questionnaire was administered to each group twice. The interval between testing was one day. On each occasion the questionnaire was administered under a standardized testing procedure. Disagreement of responses between test and retest results were compared for each question. Any question failing to elicit the same response from the same subject, at least 64 per cent of the time, was deleted from the questionnaire. This standard was expected to ensure the reliability of each question item. This absolute criterion was equivalent to the coefficient of determination for a Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of $r = .80$. This reliability screening process would reduce further the pool of items. Those questions which remained were deemed valid, reliable, and readable.

Discriminability

Since coaches are individuals and therefore, different in behaviours and personal bearing, it would be a necessary attribute of the developed tool that it be sensitive to such differences. To evaluate whether the final test was able to differentiate between coaches as revealed by athletes' answers, a discriminant function analysis was performed on a number of sets of data (SPSS, Update 7-9, 1979).

The test responses of athletes from five different sporting environments were entered as five distinct groups

of data. The ability of the analysis to predict group memberships indicated the sensitivity of the test to locate differences in the collective perceptions of groups of athletes of their respective coaches. Thus, if the discriminant analysis accurately predicted group membership based on athlete answers it was considered that the questionnaire was sensitive and extensive enough to locate the peculiarities of a particular coach. It was deemed that if the analysis yielded greater than 80% correct predictions it would be of a sufficient level of discriminability.

Objectivity

The degree to which two different test administrators produce the same test results in the same subjects was not evaluated. Objectivity was facilitated by providing standardized testing instructions and procedures for test administrators (See Appendix D). These instructions were an adaptation of an already existing set of instructions and procedures which had previously been shown to elicit reliable and honest responses (Rushall, 1976). The anonymous responding by subjects' also encouraged honesty and objectivity (Isaac & Michael, 1971).

To assess whether the questionnaire produced a desirable mode of responding in subjects, a post-test assessment of response set was performed (N = 84). The procedure was as follows (See Appendix E).

1. An anonymous check list was handed to each subject as they completed their assessment. The check-list asked the athlete to indicate any of two things:
 - a) did they answer honestly, and
 - b) did they answer to give the best impression of the coach.
2. The responses were tallied. If the percentage of honesty alternatives exceeded 90 then the standardized testing procedure was deemed to elicit the desirable response set in each athlete.

Final Questionnaire Form

The test underwent a variety of developmental stages. If the test was shown to be discriminating and standardized it would be produced in a final form. That form was developed as follows.

1. The subsection headings that originally classified sets of responses would be removed.
2. The questions would be re-numbered.
3. The questions would be ordered so that each set of response options alternated in sequence.
4. The answer sheet would be re-structured to provide space to underline the selected alternative for each question.

Summary

This set of procedures was determined so that the developed tool would have the following characteristics.

1. It would be valid.
2. It would be reliable.
3. It would be readable by athletes aged 11 years and older.
4. It would be sensitive for locating individual characteristics of a coach.
5. It would be standardized in its administration.
6. It would provoke honest (accurate) responding in the athletes who would take the tests.

The production of a tool with these characteristics would be a valuable addition to coaching science in that a new alternative method of assessing coaching effectiveness would have been developed.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION & RESULTS

Item Pool

One of the principal reasons for developing this tool was to give athletes a chance to express their opinions about their coaches. With this intention, information was gathered from: 1) a literature review of the features of a good coach, 2) currently available questionnaires that assess coaching/teaching performance, 3) the measurement of coaching behaviours through observation scales, and 4) the opinions of experts in the field. Each piece of information was expressed as a simple, single item question or description. The result of this procedure yielded 75 questions in the item pool relating to the characteristics and behaviours that profile a good coach (See Appendix A).

Validity

The questionnaire item pool that resulted was sent to a panel of judges, N=18, (See Appendix B for a list of authorities) who assessed its content validity. Each judge appeared to have evaluated the questionnaire with considerable interest. Based upon comments and suggestions offered by the panel of authorities, some of the questions on the questionnaire were deleted (See Appendix F), some new questions were formulated and added to the question

pool (See Appendix G), and some of the questions were reworded but the question content remained similar (See Appendix H). After this procedure the item pool was reduced to 71 items.

After the content validity of the questionnaire was established, a readability check was performed. This was done so as to ensure that the questions would be understood easily by potential respondents. It was also deemed necessary that little or no interpretation of the questionnaire on the part of the test administrator was needed. Based upon the suggestions of the student judges some of the questions were reworded to be more easily understood (See Appendix I).

The result of the content validity and readability procedures yielded a valid questionnaire containing 71 questions (See Appendix J).

Reliability

This questionnaire was administered to five subject groups to evaluate reliability. Administration of the questionnaire was simple. Each group of subjects was given a pre-test briefing as described in the test instructions and procedures. They then proceeded to answer the questionnaire.

To establish the questionnaire's reliability the following criterion was met. Those questions which failed to meet or exceed the 64 per cent standard were deleted from the questionnaire (See Appendix K). Of the 71 valid

questions, 36 questions were deemed reliable and 35 questions were deemed unreliable and consequently, deleted. The criterion that was used was stringent, that is, only questions which were replicated perfectly were deemed reliable. The reader should be aware that less stringent methods of reliability assessment, such as the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient, could have been used and may have indicated more items as being reliable than were accepted for this study. This extreme stringency was purely a personal decision on behalf of the investigator as it partially indicated response accuracy as well as reliability. Questions which were deemed unreliable included:

1. questions with negative connotations (for example, see Appendix K, section 4, item 24),
2. questions which were abstractly vague in their content nature (for example, see appendix K, section 1, item 16), and
3. questions that contained words which were understood by the respondents as general concepts but the implication of the words specifically for sport were not understood (for example, see Appendix K, section 1, item 4).

Restructuring

In order that the questionnaire be immediately useful to coaches seeking evaluation through it, responses on the

scale were weighted to reflect the desirability of the coaching characteristics expressed in each question. For example, the response scale for the question, "the coach is dedicated to the sport," now appears with a 5 weighting corresponding to "always", 4 for "often", 3 for "sometimes", 2 for "seldom", 1 for "never" and 0 for "not applicable". On the original answer sheet 1 corresponded to "always", 2 to "often", 3 to "sometimes", 4 to "seldom", 5 to "never", and 6 to "cannot respond - not applicable".

This re-ordering was necessary. On the original answer sheet the order of the responses on the scale was reversed but the weighting remained the same throughout. This re-organization of weights instituted the development of a scale score, that is, each athlete evaluates a coach on 36 questions with a maximum score of 5 and a minimum score of 0 possible for each question. In evaluating a scale score 0 responses are ignored. This means that the final test version yields a maximum score of 180 and a minimum score of 0 for each individual athlete's set of data (See Appendix L). This scaling process, which was produced through the use of a computer program (SPSS, Update 7-9. 1979), allowed the test results to be interpreted as: 1) a total test score for each athlete, 2) an average score for each item, and 3) an average total test score for all athletes.

Discriminability

The questionnaire that was developed had been shown to be valid, readable, reliable, standardized, and capable of producing item, subject, and group scores. The final assessment of its utility was to evaluate whether the data generated for different coaches was sufficiently sensitive to discriminate the individual characteristics of those coaches.

Athletes from five different sporting environments were asked to evaluate their coaches on the developed tool (rowers N=18; divers N=12; swimmers N=28; skaters N=16; and skaters N=6). The standardized administrative procedures were followed in conducting the evaluation.

The discriminant function analysis yielded several statistics which were noteworthy.

1. Inter-item correlations were low. Only three of the 1260 inter-correlations exceeded $\underline{r}=.6$, the majority of yielded figures ranging between $\underline{r}=.2$ and 0. No significant negative correlations were revealed. The questionnaire therefore, was deemed to consist of unique items which contributed positively to establishing a total test score.

2. All questions weighted heavily in at least one of the four standardized canonical discriminant functions that were produced (See Appendix M). This indicated that each question contributed to the discriminability of the questionnaire.

3. The four discriminant functions all contributed to statistically significant reductions in predicted variance (See Table 1). These functions when combined produced accurate group membership predictions in 80 of 80 cases. This indicated that the athlete responses in evaluating coaches accurately reflected the individual differences of the five coaches.

4. The test results were able to discriminate group memberships perfectly. Table 2 indicates the five group centroids for each of the four discriminant functions of the analysis. That perfect group discrimination was developed, indicated that the questionnaire was sensitive to the characteristics and nuances of individual coaches.

The original data (36 item responses for the 80 subjects) used in this analysis are included in Appendix N. This final assessment of the qualities of the developed questionnaire indicated that it discriminated between coaches from different sports very effectively.

Standardization Assessment

The administrative procedures were evaluated to see if they indeed did establish an honesty set for responding in the athletes. A total of 84 subjects in 3 different sports were given the final form of the questionnaire under standardized testing conditions. On the post-testing-evaluation form the responses were as follows: 1) 100% indicated they responded honestly, and 2) 0% indicated they tried to make the coach look good.

TABLE 1: CANONICAL DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS

Function	EigenValue	% of Variance	Cumulative%	Canonical Correlation
1	13.769	52.40	52.40	0.963
2	6.876	26.17	78.57	0.934
3	3.430	13.05	91.62	0.880
4	2.202	8.38	100.00	0.829

After Function	Wilk's Lambda	Chi-Squared	D.F.	Significance
1	0.000	433.40	144	0.000
2	0.009	275.89	105	0.000
3	0.070	155.16	68	0.000
4	0.312	68.08	33	0.000

TABLE 2: DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS EVALUATED AT GROUP MEANS (GROUP CENTROIDS)

Group	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3	Function 4
1	-4.356	3.532	0.333	0.100
2	3.632	0.456	1.146	-2.946
3	1.378	-1.361	1.442	1.265
4	2.686	0.409	-3.269	0.434
5	-7.790	-6.247	-1.305	-1.471

These figures substantiate that the standardization procedure for the questionnaire develops the correct response set for honesty in subjects.

Summary

It is impossible to prove that the questionnaire developed in this study does, in fact, measure a coach's performance. This was outside the scope of the study. Sincere efforts have been devoted to ensure that the questionnaire has fulfilled its intended purpose. It is an assessment tool, appropriate for completion by athletes, to indicate their perceptions of a coach's performance.

On this basis the following assumptions have been made:

1. The questionnaire in its final form indicates the desirable characteristics of a coach that can be measured reliably and validly by athletes.
2. The questionnaire is a measure of the characteristics of a good coach, as it was derived by developing a list of the good characteristics of a coach and did not focus on cataloguing characteristics considered inappropriate or undesirable for a coach.
3. The total score is a measure of how much of an "ideal" coach exists in the coach that is measured.
4. When a response is "0" that response is ignored for interpreting the question and the final score.
5. By focusing on the good characteristics, test results positively motivated the coach to achieve more of

the good characteristics that are evaluated. If negative characteristics were to have been emphasized then a coach might attempt to rid the negative characteristics rather than trying to do more or improve upon the good coaching behaviours. Therefore feedback from the analysis directs coaches to improve positive behaviours which may be incompatible with negative behaviours (which are not measured).

Marking the Test

The test yields three scores. These can be hand computed. The procedures for manually processing the results are described below.

A. Test Item Score

A score is derived for each test item. A low score indicates a coaching weakness which can be interpreted as being an area of coaching performance that needs to be improved. The computation is as follows:

1. Disregard the "0 not appropriate" category responses.
2. For each category multiply the score weight (the number which precedes it on the answer sheet) by the number of persons who responded to that category.
3. Add the total of the five category scores and divide this total by the number of athletes who responded to the 1 through five alternatives.
4. This yields a test item score which is the average score for the categories disregarding the "not appropriate" responses.

B. Total Test Score

The total test score ranges between 0 and 180. It is derived by simply adding all the test item scores as computed above. The computation is as follows:

1. Sum all the test item scores.
2. If a test item yields a score of 0, that is, no one answered any category other than "not appropriate" then the 0 is still included.

C. Percentage Test Score

The percentage test score is simply another way of expressing the total test score. It consists of converting the total test score to a percentage. The computation is as follows:

1. Multiply the total test score by 100 and divide the result by 180.
2. The score that is developed ranges from 0 to 100.

Any of the above developed scores can be used for comparison purposes, that is, coaches from different environments or sports can be compared since the questionnaire was developed independently of the type of coach or sporting environment.

Purposes

Considering each set of test data individually provides specific feedback to the coach for each individual athlete (see Appendix O). The evaluation is interpreted on a one

to one basis. Individual total scores give the coach a better understanding of how each athlete relates to him/her. The higher the score out of the possible 180, indicates how much of a good coach the athlete perceives in the coach.

Item scores serve as diagnostics indicating strengths as well as specific weaknesses and coaching characteristics which can be improved upon. A low score for a particular question item indicates that on the basis of the athlete's assessments, the coach needs to improve upon that particular characteristic or behaviour.

A total test score presents an overall assessment of coaching as perceived by all of the athletes. Higher or improved scores can be interpreted as better coaching performances.

The constructed tool can be used for coaching assessment in practical or research studies irrespective of the sport. This thesis was delimited to producing a tool for assessing a coach's performance and not conducting research studies using it. Its use in research remains as a topic or topics for future theses.

questionnaire item pool was sent to a panel of expert judges (N=18) who assessed its content validity. Judges evaluated each question item and based upon their comments and suggestions, some of the questions were deleted, some new questions were formulated and added to the question pool, and some of the questions were altered slightly. The evaluation by the panel of judges reduced the item pool to 71 questions.

Once the questionnaire's content validity was established a readability check was performed to ensure that each question would be understood by potential respondents. Based upon the suggestions of the student judges some of the question items were reworded to be more easily understood by the young respondents.

The questionnaire was then administered to five subject groups, a total of 40 athletes, to evaluate reliability. The questionnaire was administered to each group twice under standardized testing procedure. This disagreement of responses between test and retest results were compared for each question, to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. Of the 71 valid questions, 36 questions were deemed reliable and remained and 35 questions were deemed unreliable and deleted.

It was necessary for the questionnaire to have the ability to differentiate between coaches as revealed by athlete's answers. To establish the discriminability of the test a discriminant function analysis was performed on the five

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

A 36 item questionnaire was constructed. Its intended purpose was to provide an assessment tool to judge coaching performance, that was appropriate for completion by athletes. Since the questionnaire's validity, reliability, discriminability and objectivity were established it is believed that the questionnaire does measure what it was intended to; the occurrence of the characteristics and behaviours that profile a good coach.

The questionnaire in its final form was simple to administer and to evaluate. The questions were easily understood by the respondents and required little or no interpretation on the part of the administrator.

With respect to the results of this study, the questionnaire is acceptable as an assessment tool to judge a coach's performance and appropriate for completion by his/her athletes.

Summary

One of the principal reasons for developing this tool was to give athletes a chance to express their opinions about their coaches. With this intention, information relating to the characteristics and behaviours that profile a good coach was gathered from four different information sources. This procedure yielded an item pool of 75 questions. This

distinct groups of data from different sports. The ability of the analysis to yield an acceptable percentage of group membership predictions indicated the sensitivity of the test to locate differences in the collective perceptions of groups of athletes of their respective coaches.

Objectivity was facilitated by providing standardized testing instructions and procedures for test administration. To assess whether the questionnaire encouraged honest and objective responses in subjects, an assessment of response sets was performed. An anonymous check list completed by each subject prior to the completion of the questionnaire indicated that the standardization procedure for the questionnaire developed the correct response set for honesty in subjects.

The original questionnaire underwent a variety of developmental stages. In its final form a 36 question item questionnaire was produced. It was shown to be a valid, reliable, readable, standardized assessment tool that had discriminative power and provoked honest, accurate responding in subjects. The test was capable of providing immediate feedback to coaches seeking evaluation through it. Responses on the scale were weighted to reflect the desirability of the coaching characteristics expressed in each question. The test produces item, subject, and group scores for assessing the characteristics and behaviours that profile a good coach. It provides a total score which can be interpreted by the coach as a measure of how much of an 'ideal' coach exists in him/her.

Recommendations

The questionnaire constructed in this thesis is a valuable addition to the science of coaching. A new alternative tool for assessing coaching effectiveness has been developed. It focuses on good characteristics encouraging coaches to improve positive behaviours which may be incompatible with negative behaviours (which are not measured).

The use of this questionnaire as an evaluative instrument for coaching will contribute to educationally sound programs directed by competent individuals contributing positively to the development of athletes. The intent of an instrument to evaluate coaches is not to impose any threat but to focus on the benefits that will result for the participant and the coach. Athlete-ratings of a good coach also have limitations and should never be treated as complete and total assessment of all aspects of coaching but their merit cannot be overlooked.

The constructed tool can be used for coaching assessment in practical or research studies irrespective of the sport. This thesis produced a tool for assessing a coach's performance. Its use in research remains as a topic for future theses.

REFERENCES

- Adams, S. H. A comprehensive plan for evaluating coaches. Athletic Purchasing and Facilities, 1979, 3(5), 14-20.
- Athletic Educator's Report, Evaluating your coaches. Oct. 1979, 836, 1-6.
- Barber, R., & Skoglund, F. Improving coaching through evaluation. The Athletic Director, 1981, 11(3), 3-4.
- Botterill, C. Psychology of coaching. In R. M. Suinn (ed.), Psychology in Sports Methods and Applications. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1980.
- Brown, R. Human values through sports a physical education perspective. In R. Frost & E. Sims (eds.), Development of Human Values Through Sports. Washington: American Alliance for Health, physical Education, & Recreation, 1974.
- Bunker, L., & Rotella, R. Getting them up, not uptight. In J. R. Thomas (ed.), Youth Sports Guide For Coaches and Parents. Washington: The Manufacturers Life Insurance Co., & The National Association for Sport and Physical Education, 1977.
- Chambers, D., & Smith, R. Is the coach doing the job. Hockey Scope, 1980, 2(4), 14-16.
- Clark, S. Competitive Swimming As I See It. Los Angeles: Swimming World, 1967.
- Clements, J. D., & Botterill, C. Goal Setting and performance. In R. M. Suinn (ed.), Psychology in Sports Methods and Applications. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1980.
- Davis, K. An approach to the analysis of a coach's performance. Sports Coach, 1979, 3(1), 26-29.
- Frost, R. Psychological Concepts Applied to Physical Education and Coaching. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1971.
- Frost, R., & Sims, E. Fair play. In R. Frost & E. Sims (eds.), Development of Human Values Through Sports. Washington: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.
- Gallon, A. J. Coaching Ideas & Ideals. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

- Greene, Dr. R. F. Student evaluation: of coaches a step toward accountability. Athletic Administration, 1975, 9(3), 20.
- Hallet, W. A human relations approach to coaching. Caper Journal, 1974, 14(4), 18.
- Horrocks, J. E. Assessment of Behaviour. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.
- Issac, S., & Michael, W. B. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp Publisher, 1971.
- Kpzhukhov, V., Dondratovich, D., & Loos, V. Forming the ability to coach a soccer team. Yessis Review of Soviet P. E. and Sports, 13, 81-83.
- Level I Coach's Manual. National Coaching Development Program. Ontario: Ministry of Culture and Recreation, 1975.
- Level II Coach's Manual. National Coaching Development Program. Ontario: Ministry of Culture and Recreation, 1976.
- Loy, B., McPherson, J., & Kenyon, G. Sport and Social Systems. Don Mills: Addison Publication Co., 1978.
- Maetozo, M. B. Athletic coaching: it's future in a changing society. JOPER, 1981, 52(3), 40-43.
- Margolis, J. A. A better way to evaluate your coaches. Athletic Administration, 1979, 14(2), 12-13.
- Murray, H. G. Evaluating University Teaching: A Review of Research. Toronto: Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations, August 1980.
- Murray, J. Sports or Athletics: A North American Dilemma. New York: Herald Press Ltd., 1974.
- Neal, P. Coaching Methods for Women. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Co., 1978.
- Orlick, T. & Botterill, C. Every Kid Can Win. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1975.
- Pflug, J. Evaluating high school coaches. JOPER, 1980, 51(4), 76-77.
- Roget's College Thesaurus. New York: The New American Library, 1958.

- Rushall, B. S. How to use psychological knowledge. In J. Taylor (ed.), How To Be An Effective Coach. Don Mills: The Manufacturers Life Insurance Co., & The Coaching Association of Canada, 1975.
- Rushall, B. S. Instructions For Administering Behaviour Inventories for Athletes. Unpublished, Lakehead University, 1976.
- Rushall, B. S. Coaches and sport psychology. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 1979, 3, 164-67.
- Singer, R. N. Coaching Athletics, and Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1972.
- Smith, R. Developing responsible leadership for teaching and coaching. In R. Frost & E. Sims (eds.), Developing of Human Values Through Sports. Washington: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.
- Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Hunt, E. A system for the behavioural assessment of athletic coaches. Research Quarterly, 1977, 48(2), 401-407.
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E., & Curtis, B. Coaching roles and relationships. In J. R. Thomas (ed.), Youth Sports Guide For Coaches and Parents. Washington: The Manufacturers Life Insurance Co., & The National Association for Sport & Physical Education, 1977.
- Snyder, E., & Spreitzer, E. Social Aspect of Sport. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- S.P.S.S. Update 7-9. N. Nie and C. Hull. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1979.
- Ward, I., & Watts, D. Athletics for Student and Coach. London: Pelham Books, 1967.

COACH EVALUATION

This inventory asks you to rate your coach on a number of characteristics. Be honest and fair in your answers.

Mark all your responses on the questionnaire. Do not sign your name.

Evaluating the Coach with respect to personal and Professional Relationships

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|
| 1. I feel that I can trust the coach. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 2. I like the coach. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 3. The coach is concerned about the welfare of each athlete on the team/club. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 4. The coach finds ways to make all members feel good about themselves. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 5. The coach is interested in me as a person. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 6. The coach is available for assistance with personal problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 7. The coach has the respect of the athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 8. At team meetings athletes are given an opportunity to make their opinions known. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 9. On this team/club the athletes have fun. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |
| 10. The coach handles himself/herself in a controlled manner, setting a positive example for the athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never |

11. The coach stays calm during competitions.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
12. The coach's conduct toward athletes at competitions is sportsmanlike.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
13. The coach's conduct toward officials at competitions is sportsmanlike.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
14. The coach maintains a good relationship with individual member's parents.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
15. The coach tries to keep team/club morale or spirit high.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
16. The coach has confidence in the athlete's ability to accomplish his/her goals.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
17. The coach allows the athletes time for relaxation and activities outside the sport.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

1. The coach is dedicated to the sport.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
2. The coach is patient.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
3. There is understanding between the athletes and the coach.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
4. The coach is enthusiastic.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
5. The coach refrains from abusive or foul language.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never

6. The coach sets an example for the athletes by appearance.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
7. The coach is a source of inspiration.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
8. The coach displays maturity in his/her judgement.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
9. The coach works as hard as the athletes do.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
10. The coach is a disciplinarian.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
11. The coach provides attention to each individual on the team.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
12. The coach is encouraging despite a loss in competition.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
13. The coach is confident with the decisions he/she makes.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
14. The coach does have a sense of humour.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
15. The coach has a policy of equal treatment for all athletes in the same situation.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
16. The coach tries to relive his/her own ambitions through the athletes' efforts.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

1. The coach is too concerned about winning.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
2. The coach knows the fundamentals of the sport.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never

3. The coach makes sure the team is physically prepared for each competition.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
4. The coach prepares the team mentally for each competition.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
5. The coach experiments with new coaching methods and ideas.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
6. The coach recognizes individual differences in ability.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
7. The coach lets the athletes have a hand in setting their own goals.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
8. The coach expresses his/her aims and objectives clearly.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
9. The coach is a good teacher.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
10. The coach encourages athletes to be independent.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
11. The coach's instructions are easily understood.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
12. The goals that the coach sets for the athletes are realistic.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
13. The goals that the coach sets for the team are realistic.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
14. The coach uses movies or video to point out errors.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
15. The coach uses demonstrations to help the athletes to understand.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
16. The coach assesses each individual's progress regularly so improvement
 can be measured.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never

17. The coach provides feedback for the correction of errors in technique.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
18. After a performance the coach compliments the good part of the performance but also points out the areas that could be improved upon.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
19. The coach rewards athletes with his/her approval.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
20. The coach tells athletes what to do but does not spend enough time telling them how to do it.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
21. The coach concentrates on fault finding.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
22. The coach rewards effort as much as results.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
23. The coach teaches athletes how to handle failure.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
24. The coach uses mistakes to provide the information needed to help improve performance.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
25. The coach is constructive in offering criticism.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
26. The coach offers punishment for poor performance.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
27. The coach yells at athletes embarrassing them in front of other team members.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
28. The coach knows how to teach difficult skills.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never
29. The coach uses positive methods to motivate athletes.
 1 2 3 4 5
 always often sometimes seldom never

30. The coach attends clinics and workshops to stay abreast of new coaching methods.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills

1. The training program set up by the coach is effective.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

2. The coach provides training sessions that are organized.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

3. The coach is in command during practice.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

4. The coach is concerned about the health and safety of the athletes during practice.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

5. The coach makes the best use of the time available for practice.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

6. The coach keeps accurate records of each athlete's performance.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

7. The coach considers the needs of each athlete in individualizing training to maximize potential.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

8. The coach interacts with each athlete daily at training.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

9. The coach encourages athletes to keep log books so they can measure their own improvement.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

10. The coach makes training challenging.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

11. The coach varies training sessions to maintain interest and prevent boredom.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

12. The coach sits down with every team member regularly to discuss their progress.

1	2	3	4	5
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never

Any other suggested questions or comments.

ANSWER SHEET

Please circle your answers.

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

1. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
2. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
3. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
4. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
5. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
6. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
7. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
8. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
9. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
10. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
11. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
12. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
13. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
14. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
15. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
16. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable

Evaluating the Coach with respect to Personal and Professional Relationships

1. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
2. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
3. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
4. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
5. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
6. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
7. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
8. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
9. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
10. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
11. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
12. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
13. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable

14. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 15. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable

Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills

1. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 2. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 3. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 4. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 5. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 6. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 7. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 8. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 9. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 10. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 11. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

1. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 2. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 3. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 4. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 5. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 6. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 7. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 8. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 9. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 10. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 11. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 12. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 13. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 14. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 15. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 16. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 17. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
 18. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable

19. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
20. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
21. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
22. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
23. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
24. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
25. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
26. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
27. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable
28. 1)never 2)seldom 3)sometimes 4)often 5)always 6)cannot respond-not applicable
29. 1)always 2)often 3)sometimes 4)seldom 5)never 6)cannot respond-not applicable

APPENDIX B

Panel of Judges

1. Dr. Geoff Gowan - President of CAC
2. Don Talbot - Executive Director of the Australian
Institute of Sport
3. Nils Vikander - National Coach
4. Dr. Frank Pyke - Canberra College of Advanced Education
5. Abby Hoffman - Director of Sport Canada
6. Jack Donohue - National Coach
7. Bob Thayer - National Coach
8. Dr. Nancy Wood - Technical Consultant of CAC
9. Elizabeth McKinnon - International Athlete
10. Graham Smith - Coach
11. Dr. Larry Holt - Coach/Sport Scientist
12. Maureen Grace - Coach
13. Dr. Bryce Taylor - Board of Directors CAC
14. Dr. Cal Botterill - Coach/Sport Psychologist
15. Dale Bradshaw - Coach
16. John Bales - National Coach
17. Dr. Cameron Blimkie - Assistant Technical Co-ordinator
of CAC
18. Dr. Larry Leith - Level III Course Conductor
19. Terry Valeriote - NCCP Co-ordinator



Lakehead University

THUNDER BAY, ONTARIO, CANADA, POSTAL CODE P7B 5E1

SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION & OUTDOOR RECREATION

/TITLE//FIRST//LAST/
 /POSITION/
 /ORGANIZATION/
 /STREET/
 /CITY/
 /PROVINCE/

Dear /FIRST/:

Please find enclosed a number of materials that are associated with a research project that Ms. Karen Wiznuk is conducting to complete her thesis for the Master of Science degree in the Theory of Coaching at Lakehead University. We would like to solicit your help in evaluating these materials.

The project is concerned with developing an inventory for the evaluation, by athletes, of a coach's performance. The questions that are contained represent those qualities or behaviours that are considered desirable in a coach. The questions contained in the inventory have been selected from three sources:

- 1) a literature review of features of a good coach;
- 2) the measurement of coaching behaviors through the use of observation scales; and
- 3) related questionnaires.

It would be appreciated if you could read through each question and evaluate it on two grounds:

- 1) Is the question appropriate for evaluating a coach? If not please mark the question alongside its number with the letters DA.
- 2) Have you seen at least one coach exhibit the behavior or characteristic described? If not, please mark the question alongside its number with the letters NS.

Thus, you only have to mark the questions that are deficient in either or both these qualities. Please feel free to comment on the expression, particularly ambiguity and clarity. If you could suggest other questions or question content it would be appreciated.

....2

....2

Your co-operation in this project would be most helpful. Once the study is completed a copy of the questionnaire will be forwarded to you. Would it be too much to ask that your evaluation be completed and returned within the next two weeks?

For your convenience a stamped return envelope is included in this package for the response. If you are not able to participate could the enclosed materials be returned?

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Brent S. Rushall, Ph.D.
Professor

Karen Wiznuk, B.P.H.E.
Graduate-assistant

encls.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE COACH EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

PRELIMINARY PROCEDURES

1. Check the number of test booklets and answer sheets which have been supplied.
2. Make sure the number of persons taking the test does not exceed the number of books and answer sheets available.
3. Schedule a time period of at least 30 minutes for testing. The test takes from 10 to 20 minutes to complete and administration takes 10 minutes.
4. Obtain an adequate testing site (well-lighted, quiet, comfortable writing facilities).
5. Obtain a supply of pencils with erasers for each individual.
6. Notify those who are taking the test, where and when the testing will be done.
7. Read the testing instructions to become fully aware of what must be done in the testing situation. It is advised that the test administrator complete the test to become familiar with the content.

TESTING PROCEDURES

A. Preparation

1. Prepare the testing room beforehand. The room should be comfortable and well-lighted.
2. Check the testing materials. Insert an answer sheet into each questionnaire. Make sure there is an extra supply of pencils with erasers.
3. Do not crowd the test subjects. It is essential that all subjects work individually.
4. Do not give out any materials until the appropriate time.

B. Administering the Test

1. When the athletes are seated and the tester decides to administer the test, no more people should be allowed into the room.

2. Read the following passage to the group:

"The questionnaire that you are about to answer concerns your association with your coach. Your answers will be marked and analyzed by a computer.*

The results of this testing will be used to tell your coach his/her areas of weakness and strength. This information is designed to help your coach do a better job of coaching.

You will notice that there is no place on the answer sheet or test for you to put your name. Since you will be answering anonymously you should be as exact in your answers as is possible. It is important that you answer the test as truthfully as possible. If you are not prepared to answer the test truthfully it is better for you not to take the test and you should leave the room now.
(pause)

You are now in testing conditions so there will be no further talking. There is an answer sheet inside each questionnaire. Do not write anything but read the cover of the questionnaire."

3. Hand out the questionnaires.
4. Read the questionnaire instructions aloud to the group.
5. Check that each athlete has a questionnaire and an answer sheet.
6. Instruct each subject to:

"Mark the answer sheet only and not the questionnaire. Are there any questions? When you have finished answering the questionnaire bring it and the answer sheet to me and leave the room. Turn the page and begin."

7. After about five minutes say to the subjects:

"Make sure the question you are answering matches the question you are marking on the answer sheet."

8. Some subjects will be slow in trying to provide the most truthful information possible. A wide range of response rates is normal. The information in the questionnaire is sufficiently interesting to maintain the attention of the test subjects for a considerable period of time.

* A computer analysis of results is available through Sports Science Associates, 376 North Algoma Street, Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada P7A 5B6 (807-345-6324).

PLEASE CIRCLE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| YES | NO | I answered this test to make the coach look good |
| YES | NO | I answered this test the way I truly and honestly felt |
| YES | NO | I answered this test the way that I thought I should even though I would have liked to put down some different answers |

HAND THIS SHEET BACK TO THE TESTER

APPENDIX F

Questions deleted after the validity check by the panel of judges.

Evaluating the Coach with respect to Personal and Professional Relationships

11. The coach stays calm during competitions.
14. The coach maintains a good relationship with individual member's parents.
16. The coach has confidence in the athlete's ability to accomplish his/her goals.

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

9. The coach works as hard as the athletes do.
16. The coach tries to relive his/her own ambitions through the athlete's efforts.

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

9. The coach is a good teacher.
13. The goals that the coach sets for the team are realistic.
25. The coach is constructive in offering criticism.

Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills

1. The training program set up by the coach is effective.

APPENDIX G

New question content added upon suggestion by the panel of judges.

Evaluating the Coach with respect to Personal and Professional Relationships

15. The coach is interested in the athlete's schoolwork or occupation.

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

13. The coach's physical appearance sets a good example for the athletes.
16. The coach expects too much from the athletes.

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

28. The coach knows when to use discipline and when not to.
29. The coach is willing to seek other input when making critical coaching decisions.

APPENDIX II

Question content that remained similar but the questions were reworded upon suggestion by the panel of judges.

Evaluating the Coach with respect to Personal and Professional Relationships

7. The coach has the respect of the athlete.
3. I respect the coach.
3. The coach is concerned about the welfare of each athlete on the team/club.
5. The coach is concerned about the welfare of each athlete.
8. At team meetings athletes are given an opportunity to make their opinions known.
8. At meetings of athletes the coach gives everyone a chance to make their opinions known.
9. On this team/club the athletes have fun.
9. Under the coach the athletes enjoy a positive sporting experience.
10. The coach handles himself/herself in a controlled manner, setting a positive example for athletes.
10. The coach sets a positive example during competitions.
15. The coach tries to keep team/club morale or spirit high.
13. The coach tries to keep the athlete's morale or spirit high.
17. The coach allows the athletes time for relaxation and activities outside the sport.
14. The coach encourages social activities for the athletes.

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

3. There is understanding between the athletes and the coach.
3. The coach communicates with the athletes.
6. The coach sets an example for the athletes by appearance.
6. The coach dresses appropriately setting a good example for athletes to follow.
7. The coach is a source of inspiration.
7. The coach is a source of motivation.

- 8. The coach displays maturity in his/her judgement.
- 8. The coach's judgement is based on reasoning and/or consideration.
- 11. The coach provides attention to each individual on the team.
- 10. The coach gives attention to each individual athlete.
- 13. The coach is confident with the decisions he/she makes.
- 12. The coach appears to be confident with the decision he/she makes.
- 14. The coach does does have a sense of humour.
- 14. The coach has a sense of humour.
- 15. The coach has a policy of equal treatment for all athletes in the same situation.
- 15. The coach has a policy of equal treatment for all athletes.

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

- 1. The coach is too concerned about winning.
- 1. The coach emphasizes winning too much.
- 2. The coach knows the fundamentals of the sport.
- 2. The coach teaches the fundamentals of the sport.
- 3. The coach makes sure the athletes are physically prepared for each competition.
- 3. The coach makes sure the athletes are physically prepared for each competition.
- 4. The coach prepares the team mentally for each competition.
- 4. The coach makes sure the athletes are mentally prepared for each competition.
- 7. The coach lets the athletes have a hand in setting their own goals.
- 7. The athlete's goals are set by the coach and the athlete together.
- 14. The coach uses movies or video to point out errors.
- 12. The coach uses visual aids to point out errors.
- 20. The coach tells athletes what to do but does not spend enough time telling them how to do it.
- 18. When the coach tells athletes what to do, he/she does spend enough time teaching them how to do it.
- 26. The coach offers punishment for poor performance.
- 23. The coach reacts negatively toward athletes who display a poor performance.

27. The coach yells at athletes embarrassing them in front of other team members.
24. The coach yells at athletes embarrassing them in front of others.

Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills

7. The coach considers the needs of each athlete in individualizing training to maximize potential.
6. The coach considers the needs of each athlete in individualizing training to maximize his/her athletic potential.
8. The coach interacts with each athlete daily at training.
7. The coach interacts with each athlete at training.
12. The coach sits down with every team member regularly to discuss their progress
11. The coach sits down with every athlete regularly to discuss their progress.

APPENDIX I

Questions reworded after the readability check upon suggestion by the student judges.

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

- 5. The coach refrains from abusive or foul language.
- 5. The coach does not use abusive or foul language.
- 3. The coach's judgement is based on reasoning and/or consideration.
- 3. The coach's judgement is based on reasoning and/or is well-thought-out.
- 9. The coach is disciplinarian.
- 9. The coach is strict.
- 10. The coach gives attention to each individual athlete.
- 10. The coach gives attention to each athlete.
- 11. The coach is encouraging despite a loss in competition.
- 11. The coach encourages athletes even after a loss or defeat in competition.
- 12. The coach appears to be confident with the decisions he/she makes.
- 12. The coach seems to be confident with the decisions he/she makes.
- 15. The coach has a policy of equal treatment for all athletes.
- 15. The coach treats all athletes equally.

Evaluating the Coach with Respect to Personal and Professional Relationships

- 8. At meetings of athletes the coach gives individuals an opportunity to make their opinions known.
- 8. At meetings of athletes the coach gives everyone a chance to make their opinions known.
- 15. The coach is interested in the athlete's scholastic endeavours or occupation.
- 15. The coach is interested in the athlete's schoolwork or occupation.

Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills

- 6. The coach considers the needs of each athlete in individualizing training, to maximize his/her athletic potential.
- 6. The coach considers the needs of each athlete by providing training programs which are suited to each individual's requirements.
- 9. The coach makes training challenging.
- 9. The coach makes training a challenge.
- 10. The coach varies training sessions to maintain interest and prevent boredom.
- 10. The coach provides variety in training sessions to maintain interest and prevent boredom.

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

- 1. The coach emphasizes winning too much.
- 1. The coach talks about winning too much.
- 2. The coach teaches the fundamentals of the sport.
- 2. The coach teaches the basics of the sport.
- 11. The goals that the coach sets for the athletes are realistic.
- 11. The goals that the coach sets for the athletes are possible to achieve.
- 12. The coach uses visual aids to point out errors.
- 12. The coach uses visual aids (movies, photos, video, etc.) to point out errors.
- 14. The coach assesses each individual's progress regularly so improvement can be measured.
- 14. The coach measures each individual's progress regularly so that improvement can be measured.
- 15. The coach provides feedback for the correction of errors in technique.
- 15. The coach provides feedback for the correction of errors in skills and technique.
- 16. After a performance the coach compliments the good part of the performance but also points out the areas that could be improved upon.
- 16. After a performance the coach indicates the good part of the performance but also points out the areas that could be improved upon.

- 19. The coach concentrates on fault finding.
- 19. The coach emphasizes the faults in athletes.

- 23. The coach reacts negatively toward athletes who display a poor performance.
- 23. The coach reacts badly toward athletes who display a poor performance.

COACH EVALUATION

This inventory asks you to rate your coach on a number of characteristics. Be honest and fair in your answers.

Please answer all of the questions. If a question does not apply to your situation mark it accordingly. Mark all your responses on the answer sheet. Do not sign your name.

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

- | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1. The coach is dedicated to the sport. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 2. The coach is patient. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 3. The coach communicates with the athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 4. The coach is enthusiastic. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 5. The coach does not use abusive or foul language. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 6. The coach dresses appropriately, setting a good example for athletes to follow. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 7. The coach is a source of motivation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 8. The coach's judgement is based on reasoning and/or is well thought-out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
| 9. The coach is strict. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |

10. The coach gives attention to each athlete.
 1 never 2 seldom 3 sometimes 4 often 5 always 6 cannot respond-not applicable
11. The coach encourages athletes even after a loss or defeat in competition.
 1 always 2 often 3 sometimes 4 seldom 5 never 6 cannot respond-not applicable
12. The coach seems to be confident with the decisions he/she makes.
 1 never 2 seldom 3 sometimes 4 often 5 always 6 cannot respond-not applicable
13. The coach's physical appearance sets a good example for the athletes.
 1 always 2 often 3 sometimes 4 seldom 5 never 6 cannot respond-not applicable
14. The coach has a sense of humour.
 1 never 2 seldom 3 sometimes 4 often 5 always 6 cannot respond-not applicable
15. The coach treats all athletes equally.
 1 always 2 often 3 sometimes 4 seldom 5 never 6 cannot respond-not applicable
16. The coach expects too much from the athletes.
 1 never 2 seldom 3 sometimes 4 often 5 always 6 cannot respond-not applicable

Evaluating the Coach with respect to Personal and Professional Relationships

1. I feel that I can trust the coach.
 1 always 2 often 3 sometimes 4 seldom 5 never 6 cannot respond-not applicable
2. I like the coach.
 1 never 2 seldom 3 sometimes 4 often 5 always 6 cannot respond-not applicable
3. I respect the coach.
 1 always 2 often 3 sometimes 4 seldom 5 never 6 cannot respond-not applicable
4. The coach is interested in me as a person.
 1 never 2 seldom 3 sometimes 4 often 5 always 6 cannot respond-not applicable

5. The coach is concerned about the welfare of each athlete.
1 2 3 4 5 6
always often sometimes seldom never cannot respond-
not applicable
6. The coach finds ways to make all athletes feel good about themselves.
1 2 3 4 5 6
never seldom sometimes often always cannot respond-
not applicable
7. The coach is available for assistance with personal problems.
1 2 3 4 5 6
always often sometimes seldom never cannot respond-
not applicable
8. At meetings of athletes the coach gives everyone a chance to make their opinions known.
1 2 3 4 5 6
never seldom sometimes often always cannot respond-
not applicable
9. Under the coach the athletes enjoy a positive sporting experience.
1 2 3 4 5 6
always often sometimes seldom never cannot respond-
not applicable
10. The coach sets a positive example during competitions.
1 2 3 4 5 6
never seldom sometimes often always cannot respond-
not applicable
11. The coach's conduct toward athletes at competitions is sportsmanlike.
1 2 3 4 5 6
always often sometimes seldom never cannot respond-
not applicable
12. The coach's conduct toward officials at competitions is sportsmanlike.
1 2 3 4 5 6
never seldom sometimes often always cannot respond-
not applicable
13. The coach tries to keep the athlete's morale or spirit high.
1 2 3 4 5 6
always often sometimes seldom never cannot respond-
not applicable
14. The coach encourages social activities for the athletes.
1 2 3 4 5 6
never seldom sometimes often always cannot respond-
not applicable
15. The coach is interested in the athlete's schoolwork or occupation.
1 2 3 4 5 6
always often sometimes seldom never cannot respond-
not applicable

Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills

1. The coach provides training sessions that are organized.

1	2	3	4	5	6
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never	cannot respond-not applicable
2. The coach is in command during practice.

1	2	3	4	5	6
never	seldom	sometimes	often	always	cannot respond-not applicable
3. The coach is concerned about the health and safety of the athletes during practice.

1	2	3	4	5	6
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never	cannot respond-not applicable
4. The coach makes the best use of the time available for practice.

1	2	3	4	5	6
never	seldom	sometimes	often	always	cannot respond-not applicable
5. The coach keeps accurate records of each athlete's performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never	cannot respond-not applicable
6. The coach considers the needs of each athlete by providing training programs which are suited to each individual's requirements.

1	2	3	4	5	6
never	seldom	sometimes	often	always	cannot respond-not applicable
7. The coach interacts with each athlete at training.

1	2	3	4	5	6
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never	cannot respond-not applicable
8. The coach encourages athletes to keep log books so they can measure their own improvement.

1	2	3	4	5	6
never	seldom	sometimes	often	always	cannot respond-not applicable
9. The coach makes training a challenge.

1	2	3	4	5	6
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never	cannot respond-not applicable
10. The coach provides variety in training sessions to maintain interest and prevent boredom.

1	2	3	4	5	6
never	seldom	sometimes	often	always	cannot respond-not applicable
11. The coach sits down with every athlete regularly to discuss their progress.

1	2	3	4	5	6
always	often	sometimes	seldom	never	cannot respond-not applicable

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | The coach talks about winning too much. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 2. | The coach teaches the basics of the sport. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 3. | The coach makes sure the athletes are physically prepared for each competition. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 4. | The coach makes sure the athletes are mentally prepared for each competition. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 5. | The coach experiments with new coaching methods and ideas. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 6. | The coach recognizes individual differences in ability. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 7. | The athlete's goals are set by the coach and the athlete together. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 8. | The coach expresses his/her aims and objectives clearly. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 9. | The coach encourages athletes to be independent. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 10. | The coach's instructions are easily understood. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-
not applicable |
| 11. | The goals that the coach sets for the athletes are possible to achieve. | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-
not applicable |

12. The coach uses visual aids (movies, photos, video, etc.) to point out errors.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
13. The coach uses demonstrations to help the athletes to understand.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
14. The coach measures each individual's progress regularly so that improvement can be judged.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
15. The coach provides feedback for the correction of errors in skills and technique.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
16. After a performance the coach indicates the good part of the performance but also points out the areas that could be improved upon.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
17. The coach rewards athletes with his/her approval.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not application |
18. When the coach tells athletes what to do, he/she does spend enough time teaching them how to do it.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
19. The coach emphasizes the faults in athletes.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
20. The coach rewards effort as much as results.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
21. The coach teaches athletes how to handle failure.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
22. The coach uses mistakes to provide the information needed to help improve performance.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |

23. The coach reacts badly toward athletes who display a poor performance.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
24. The coach yells at athletes, embarrassing them in front of others.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
25. The coach knows how to teach difficult skills.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
26. The coach uses positive methods to motivate athletes.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
27. The coach attends clinics and workshops to stay abreast of new coaching methods.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |
28. The coach knows when to use discipline and when not to.
- | | | | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| never | seldom | sometimes | often | always | cannot respond-not applicable |
29. The coach is willing to seek other input when making critical coaching decisions.
- | | | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| always | often | sometimes | seldom | never | cannot respond-not applicable |

APPENDIX K

Questions deleted after the reliability check.

Evaluating the Coach's Personal Qualities

4. The coach is enthusiastic
12. The coach seems to be confident with the decisions he/she makes.
15. The coach treats all athletes equally.
16. The coach expects too much from the athletes.

Evaluating the Coach with respect to Personal and Professional Relationships

5. The coach is concerned about the welfare of each athlete.
7. The coach is available for assistance with personal problems.
9. Under the coach the athletes enjoy a positive sporting experience.
13. The coach tries to keep athlete's morale of spirit high.

Evaluating the Coach's Organizational Skills

5. The coach keeps accurate records of each athlete's performance.
6. The coach considers the needs of each athlete by providing training programs which are suited to each individual's requirements.
9. The coach makes training a challenge.
10. The coach provides variety in training sessions to maintain interest and prevent boredom.
11. The coach sits down with every athlete regularly to discuss their progress.

Evaluating the Coach's Performance as a Teacher and Coach

1. The coach talks about winning too much.
2. The coach teaches the basics of the sport.
4. The coach makes sure the athletes are mentally prepared for each competition.
5. The coach experiments with new coaching methods and ideas.
6. The coach recognizes individual differences in ability.
7. The athlete's goals are set by the coach and the athlete together.
8. The coach expresses his/her aims and objectives clearly.
9. The coach encourages athletes to be independent.
12. The coach uses visual aids (movies, photos, video, etc.) to point out errors.
13. The coach uses demonstrations to help the athletes to understand.
14. The coach measures each individual's progress regularly so that improvement can be judged.
15. The coach provides feedback for the correction of errors in skills and technique.
17. The coach rewards athletes with his/her approval.
18. When the coach tells athletes what to do, he/she does spend enough time teaching them how to do it.
19. The coach emphasizes the faults in athletes.
20. The coach rewards effort as much as results.
21. The coach teaches athletes how to handle failure.
22. The coach uses mistakes to provide the information needed to help improve performance.
23. The coach reacts badly toward athletes who display a poor performance.
24. The coach yells at athletes, embarrassing them in front of others.

26. The coach uses positive methods to motivate athletes.
29. The coach is willing to seek other input when making critical coaching decisions.

APPENDIX L

COACH EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire asks you to rate your coach on a number of characteristics. Answer all of the questions. Mark only the answer sheet that is provided. Do not sign your name. Be honest and fair in the way you answer each question.

If you are not prepared to answer this evaluation in an honest and fair manner you should hand it back in an unmarked condition to the person who has given it to you.

1. The coach is dedicated to the sport.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
2. The coach is patient.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
3. The coach communicates with the athletes.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
4. The coach uses abusive and foul language.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
5. The coach dresses appropriately, setting a good example for athletes to follow.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
6. The coach is a source of motivation.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
7. The coach's judgement is based on reasoning and/or is well thought-out.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
8. The coach is strict.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
9. The coach gives attention to each athlete.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
10. The coach encourages athletes even after a loss or defeat in competition.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
11. The coach's physical appearance sets a good example for the athletes.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
12. The coach has a sense of humour.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
13. I feel that I can trust the coach.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
14. I like the coach.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
15. I respect the coach.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
16. The coach is interested in me as a person.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
17. The coach finds ways to make all the athletes feel good about themselves.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable

18. At meetings of athletes the coach gives everyone a chance to make their opinions known.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
19. The coach sets a positive example during competitions.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
20. The coach's conduct toward athletes at competitions is sportsmanlike.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
21. The coach's conduct toward officials at competitions is sportsmanlike.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
22. The coach encourages social activities for the athletes.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
23. The coach is interested in the athlete's schoolwork or occupation.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
24. The coach provides training sessions that are organized.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
25. The coach is in command during practice.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
26. The coach is concerned about the health and safety of the athletes during practice.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
27. The coach makes the best use of the time available for practice.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
28. The coach interacts with each athlete at training.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
29. The coach encourages athletes to keep logbooks so they can measure their own improvement.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
30. The coach makes sure the athletes are physically prepared for each competition.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
31. The coach's instructions are easily understood.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
32. The goals that the coach sets for the athletes are possible to achieve.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
33. After a performance, the coach indicates the good part of the performance but also points out the areas that could be improved upon.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable

34. The coach knows how to teach difficult skills.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable
35. The coach attends clinics and workshops to stay abreast of new coaching methods.
always often sometimes seldom never not applicable
36. The coach knows when to use discipline and when not to.
never seldom sometimes often always not applicable

This is the end of the questionnaire. Hand your completed answer sheet and this set of questions to the person who is conducting the evaluation.

Answer every question (underline or circle the number-word that is your answer)

Q1.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q2.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q3.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q4.	5 never	4 seldom	3 sometimes	2 often	1 always	0 not applicable
Q5.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q6.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q7.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q8.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q9.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q10.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q11.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q12.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q13.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q14.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q15.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q16.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q17.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q18.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q19.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q20.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q21.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q22.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q23.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q24.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q25.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q26.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q27.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q28.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q29.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q30.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q31.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q32.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q33.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q34.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable
Q35.	5 always	4 often	3 sometimes	2 seldom	1 never	0 not applicable
Q36.	1 never	2 seldom	3 sometimes	4 often	5 always	0 not applicable

TOTAL SCORE

APPENDIX M

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

	Function 1	Function 2	Function 3	Function 4
Q1	-0.147	-0.001	-0.038	-0.459
Q2	-0.311	0.023	0.370	0.047
Q3	-0.278	-0.113	0.331	-0.154
Q4	0.463	0.210	0.709	0.037
Q5	0.411	0.714	-0.206	0.737
Q6	0.566	0.205	-0.065	0.412
Q7	-0.805	-0.040	0.205	0.459
Q8	-0.372	0.516	-0.680	0.446
Q9	-0.194	-0.363	0.408	0.185
Q10	-0.527	0.366	-0.018	0.120
Q11	0.357	0.306	-0.372	-0.936
Q12	0.059	0.324	0.649	0.204
Q13	0.202	0.177	-0.230	-0.058
Q14	0.440	-0.504	-0.018	0.550
Q15	0.327	-0.206	0.641	-0.513
Q16	0.471	0.691	-1.284	-0.835
Q17	0.009	-0.414	0.087	-0.400
Q18	0.154	0.477	0.221	0.677
Q19	-0.135	0.101	-0.012	0.274
Q20	-0.580	0.051	-0.529	-0.387
Q21	-0.056	-0.012	-0.113	0.773
Q22	0.457	-0.167	0.855	-0.800
Q23	0.176	-0.069	0.293	-0.225
Q24	-0.458	-0.789	0.550	0.179
Q25	-0.003	-0.110	0.436	0.108
Q26	-0.195	0.348	-0.312	0.121
Q27	0.155	-0.211	-0.066	-0.636
Q28	-0.686	0.186	-0.021	0.710
Q29	0.030	-0.294	-0.575	0.511
Q30	0.348	0.719	0.141	0.545
Q31	0.341	-0.003	-0.326	-0.522
Q32	0.352	-0.062	-0.101	0.080
Q33	0.444	0.078	-0.065	0.048
Q34	-0.562	-0.132	-0.032	-0.168
Q35	1.164	-0.813	0.506	-0.216
Q36	0.336	0.276	-0.131	-0.198

APPENDIX N

ORIGINAL DATA

36 item responses for the 80 subjects

Subject	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36			
1	5	4	4	3	0	5	4	4	4	5	0	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
2	5	4	5	3	0	5	5	5	4	4	5	0	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
3	5	4	4	3	5	2	4	3	2	5	4	4	3	3	3	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
4	5	5	5	3	5	4	4	3	2	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
6	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
7	5	4	3	3	5	4	4	3	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
8	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	3	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
9	5	5	5	1	5	5	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
10	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
11	5	4	4	2	5	4	5	2	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
12	5	4	4	2	5	4	5	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
13	5	4	5	2	0	5	5	4	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
14	5	4	5	2	0	5	5	4	5	5	0	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
15	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	5	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2
16	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	
17	5	4	5	3	4	3	4	3	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	
18	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
19	5	5	5	2	5	4	4	1	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
20	5	4	5	3	5	3	2	2	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
21	5	4	5	2	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
22	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
23	4	3	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
24	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
25	5	3	5	1	5	5	3	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
26	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
27	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
28	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
29	5	4	5	2	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
30	5	4	5	2	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	

G R O P U P 1

2

Question

Subject 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36

31	5	5	4	2	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	4	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	4						
32	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	2	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4						
33	5	5	5	1	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5					
34	5	5	5	1	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5				
35	4	5	5	1	5	5	0	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	0	4			
36	5	5	4	4	5	5	0	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	0	5	5	5	5	0	3	4	5	5	0	5	0	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	4			
37	5	4	5	5	5	0	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	2	2	5	4	5	5	0	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	4			
38	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	2	3	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4			
39	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5			
40	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4			
41	5	4	4	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		
42	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	
43	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	2	5	5	0	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	3	4	
44	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	2	5	5	0	3	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	5	5	
45	5	4	5	3	5	4	3	2	4	5	1	4	5	5	4	3	4	0	5	4	5	2	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	
46	5	4	5	5	4	3	2	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	4	3	0	5	4	5	4	2	2	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	
47	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	0	5	4	5	2	2	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
48	5	5	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	2	4	5	4	5	4	3	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	
49	4	4	5	3	3	4	4	3	4	5	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	0	5	4	
50	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	0	5	0	
51	5	4	4	1	0	5	0	2	5	5	0	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	0	3	0	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	
52	4	4	5	1	0	5	0	0	5	5	0	4	5	5	4	4	5	0	4	4	4	0	0	3	0	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4
53	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	3	4	5	2	4	5	4	4	3	3	0	4	3	3	2	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
54	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	2	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	
55	4	5	4	0	3	4	5	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	0	5	4	5	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
56	4	4	5	2	3	5	5	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	5	3	4	0	3	5	4	5	1	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	
57	5	3	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	3	4	5	
58	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	

G R O U P 3

Question

Subject	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36		
59	5	4	5	2	5	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	
60	5	4	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	
61	5	4	4	2	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
62	5	4	5	2	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	3	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
63	5	1	5	1	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	1	2	5	4	5	2	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	
64	5	5	5	1	5	5	4	2	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	2	5	5	5	5	3	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
65	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
66	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
67	4	3	5	4	2	4	4	4	2	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	
68	3	3	4	4	2	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	2	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	
69	4	5	5	1	5	4	4	3	2	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	
70	5	5	5	1	5	4	4	4	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
71	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	2	4	3	4	4	3	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3
72	4	4	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	2	3	5	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	3	3	
73	5	5	4	1	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	2	4	4	5	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	4	
74	5	4	4	1	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	2	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
75	4	4	4	1	5	2	4	2	4	5	0	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	0	4	4	1	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	
76	4	4	4	1	5	3	4	2	4	4	0	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	
77	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	2	3	5	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	
78	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	1	2	5	5	5	3	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	0	3	
79	5	4	4	1	5	3	5	3	4	5	0	3	5	5	5	5	3	3	0	5	5	4	3	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	5	
78	5	4	4	1	5	3	4	3	3	4	0	4	3	5	5	5	5	3	3	0	5	4	2	3	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	5	0	

G R O U P 4 5

SAMPLE COMPUTER ANALYSIS 80

COACH EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

COACH: An Example

DATE: 27/10/83

Percentage of Responses for Each Category

Question	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Always	N/App.	Score
1	0.0	0.0	5.0	35.0	60.0	0.0	4.6
2	0.0	5.0	5.0	70.0	15.0	5.0	4.0
3	0.0	0.0	5.0	55.0	40.0	0.0	4.4
4	20.0	35.0	35.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	3.7
5	0.0	5.0	25.0	30.0	35.0	5.0	4.0
6	0.0	0.0	15.0	40.0	45.0	0.0	4.3
7	0.0	0.0	10.0	75.0	15.0	0.0	4.1
8	0.0	10.0	45.0	45.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
9	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	4.5
10	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	75.0	5.0	4.8
11	0.0	0.0	25.0	30.0	40.0	5.0	4.2
12	0.0	0.0	10.0	55.0	35.0	0.0	4.3
13	0.0	0.0	5.0	35.0	60.0	0.0	4.6
14	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	4.3
15	0.0	0.0	10.0	45.0	45.0	0.0	4.4
16	0.0	5.0	10.0	65.0	10.0	10.0	3.9
17	0.0	0.0	30.0	55.0	15.0	0.0	3.9
18	0.0	0.0	5.0	30.0	65.0	0.0	4.6
19	0.0	0.0	5.0	40.0	45.0	10.0	4.4
20	0.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	60.0	5.0	4.5
21	0.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	65.0	0.0	4.6
22	5.0	5.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	3.3
23	0.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	5.0	5.0	3.1
24	0.0	0.0	5.0	65.0	30.0	0.0	4.3
25	0.0	0.0	10.0	25.0	65.0	0.0	4.6
26	0.0	5.0	15.0	30.0	50.0	0.0	4.3
27	0.0	0.0	15.0	50.0	30.0	5.0	4.2
28	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	20.0	5.0	3.9
29	5.0	5.0	5.0	35.0	50.0	0.0	4.2
30	0.0	5.0	5.0	35.0	50.0	5.0	4.4
31	0.0	0.0	20.0	45.0	35.0	0.0	4.2
32	0.0	5.0	0.0	40.0	55.0	0.0	4.5
33	0.0	0.0	5.0	20.0	75.0	0.0	4.7
34	0.0	0.0	10.0	55.0	25.0	10.0	4.2
35	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.0	40.0	5.0	4.4
36	0.0	0.0	10.0	55.0	35.0	0.0	4.3

TOTAL SCORE FOR EVALUATION IS 151.288 NUMBER OF ATHLETES 20

EVALUATION SCORE OUT OF 100 = 84.0491