

St. John Fisher College

Fisher Digital Publications

Sport Management Undergraduate

Sport Management Department

Spring 2014

Player Preferences for Coaching Behaviors

Tim Coykendall
St. John Fisher College

Follow this and additional works at: https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad



Part of the Sports Management Commons

[How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?](#)

Recommended Citation

Coykendall, Tim, "Player Preferences for Coaching Behaviors" (2014). *Sport Management Undergraduate*. Paper 52.

Please note that the Recommended Citation provides general citation information and may not be appropriate for your discipline. To receive help in creating a citation based on your discipline, please visit <http://libguides.sjfc.edu/citations>.

This document is posted at https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad/52 and is brought to you for free and open access by Fisher Digital Publications at St. John Fisher College. For more information, please contact fisherpub@sjfc.edu.

Player Preferences for Coaching Behaviors

Abstract

In athletics every athlete prefers different behaviors from their coach. Research hasn't been able to explain player preferences in terms of their preferred and expected coaching behaviors and if their coaches are meeting those behaviors. This study looked to see if coaches met the expected and preferred behaviors of their athletes. In order to examine this question, St. John Fisher student athletes of both genders, and individual sport and team sport athletes were surveyed. After examining prior research, results are expected to show that athletes prefer coaches who are inclusive in decision making, focus on building skills, and develop a positive coach-athlete relationship. Of the 581 student athletes at St. John Fisher College, 87 responded to the survey. The results revealed that athletes preferred a coach to work on improving their skills and building a relationship with them in season, and a coach who does not make all the decisions by himself. There was no significant difference in the expectations and preferences between males and females, type of sport, and the year of the athlete.

Document Type

Undergraduate Project

Professor's Name

Emily Dane-Staples

Subject Categories

Sports Management

Player Preferences for Coaching Behaviors

Tim Coykendall

St. John Fisher College

Abstract

In athletics every athlete prefers different behaviors from their coach. Research hasn't been able to explain player preferences in terms of their preferred and expected coaching behaviors and if their coaches are meeting those behaviors. This study looked to see if coaches met the expected and preferred behaviors of their athletes. In order to examine this question, St. John Fisher student athletes of both genders, and individual sport and team sport athletes were surveyed. After examining prior research, results are expected to show that athletes prefer coaches who are inclusive in decision making, focus on building skills, and develop a positive coach-athlete relationship. Of the 581 student athletes at St. John Fisher College, 87 responded to the survey. The results revealed that athletes preferred a coach to work on improving their skills and building a relationship with them in season, and a coach who does not make all the decisions by himself. There was no significant difference in the expectations and preferences between males and females, type of sport, and the year of the athlete.

Player Preferences for Coaching Behaviors

Making it or breaking it for an athlete is often dependent on the coaching he/she receives. When people think of great coaches they think of Coach K at Duke, Vince Lombardi of the Packers, Parsells, Wooden and more. These coaches exhibit certain behaviors that have made them successful in their sport. Coaches are a very important segment of sport because they are the first component to a college athlete's career. Coaches they are the ones that call the plays, make the line-ups, and determine playing time for that athlete (Cho, Hyun-Woo, & Magnusen, 2013). Many things go into being a great coach including philosophy, tactics, communication, strategy, and knowledge (VEA, 2003). Great coaching is very objective but regardless, great and poor coaches have specific behaviors. All of these influence the behaviors in which the coach exhibits. Athletes like coaches, have specific behaviors they prefer or expect from their coaches. Meeting or exceeding the expectations and preferences is an integral part of coaching athletes. Figuring out what kind of behaviors athletes prefer will significantly help or hinder the development of the coach-athlete relationship.

Chelladurai and Sahel developed the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) to determine the different coaching styles coaches embody. The LSS is important to this study because it will aid in defining the coaching behaviors most coaches exhibit within the different coaching styles. All of the styles Chelladurai and Sahel developed have different coaching behaviors that help to define them. These behaviors can be defined in the CBAS or Coaching Behavioral Assessment System developed by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt during their study in 1977. Their study categorizes the coaching behaviors into two broad behavioral segments. This system for categorizing coaching behavior will be very beneficial to generating a thorough survey. The study that created the CBAS is very similar to the current study but this study will look to see if college coaches meet the preferred behaviors of their athletes. This is where the study by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt and this study will differ. Smith, Smoll, and Hunt only determine

what the preferred coaching behaviors are and categorize them. It does not determine if coaches meet the preferred behaviors from their athletes.

The coach-athlete relationship is also influenced by the uniqueness of each athlete. Every athlete is different from one another from male to female; from individual sport athletes to team sport athletes, each athlete requires different coaching behaviors than another athlete. This uniqueness can influence the kind of motivational tactics a coach uses toward a team or player, as well as how the coach-athlete relationship is developed. Prior research has examined defining what the different coaching styles are and what are the preferences based on coaching styles. This study will look at how the different behaviors rather than the styles of coaches and what behaviors of coaches are preferred and expected from the athletes, as well as seeing if coaches are meeting those expectations of their players.

The results uncovered in this study can be beneficial to coaches across the college landscape. Depending on what the results reveal, coaches can use this to try to improve their relationships and interactions with their athletes, especially coaches at the college level. College coaches should be able to review the results and apply them to their own specific teams or athletes outside of St. John Fisher College. After analyzing the results coaches should be able to determine what behaviors they should exhibit in order to foster positive relationships with their athletes. By having positive relationships and learning how to best meet the preferences and expectations of their athletes, the athletes will likely have a more positive experience making them want to continue playing. Enjoying something especially in athletics, makes it much easier to increase the quality of performance because the athlete is enjoying what they are doing. The results can be used in educating coaches in certification classes to help ensure that the curriculum meets those preferences of the athletes. This is very important because player preferences of coaching behavior can affect both their attitudes toward their sport experiences and the team performance (Steward, & Owens, 2011).

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was developed by Chelladurai and defined in a study by Rune Høgaard, Gareth W. Jones, and Derek M. Peters (2008). The framework that will help to predict and explain why the results of this study occur is the Theoretical Multidimensional Model of Leadership Behavior. The theoretical multidimensional model of leadership behavior

suggested that actual coach behavior is influenced not only by the characteristics of the coach, but also by the coaching behavior (required and preferred) that is directed influenced by antecedent situational characteristics (team sport, individual sport, home or away location, success and failure) and member characteristics (gender, achievement motivation, skill level of the athlete) (Høgaard, Jones, & Peters, 2008, p. 241-242).

In simpler terms, the coach's behavior is influenced by the preferred behaviors of the player, what sport he or she coaches and the characteristics of the coaches themselves. Zuzanna Walach-Bista interpreted Chelladurai's model of leadership by saying that the model "emphasized that the effectiveness of coaching behavior is dependent on the interplay between players' preferences for specific types of coaching behavior and the numerous contextual conditions and requirements that arise" (2013, p. 265). Chelladurai's model of leadership explains why coaches behave the way they do and the different factors that influence them to behave in that specific manor thus warranting the use of his theory for this study. This specific study will examine the required or preferred coaching behaviors from athletes which according to the theoretical multidimensional model of leadership behavior directly affects how a coach behaves.

Coach-Athlete Relationship

Every athlete's demands are unique much like every human being is unique. Therefore each athlete might prefer difference behaviors from their coaches (Bloom, Duchesne, & Sabiston, 2011). The coach-athlete relationship that forms throughout the athlete's duration under the coach is vital to the growth of the athlete both physically and mentally. The strength of the coach-athlete relationship can

be a direct result of the coach meeting the preferred and expected coaching behaviors of the athlete. In an interview with Vernon Davis (tight end) for the San Francisco 49ers it became evident how large of an impact a coach could have on an athlete's wellbeing. Through the heart wrenching emotional interview, Davis discussed how his former coach Mike Singletary, who is known for showing behaviors of an authority, and those of a disciplinarian. Davis attributed his success on the field to the behaviors his coach demonstrated early in his career (CBS Sports, 2008). Davis was originally very selfish and confrontational with his veteran leaders and coaches. Due to his self-centered attitude Davis was benched on numerous occasions including a specific instance when Davis decided to leave the field and head to the locker room in the middle of the game (CBS Sports, 2008). Looking back on his career Davis said he did not prefer to have a coach who behaved like Singletary, but he needed it. Davis admitted that the behaviors coach Singletary exhibited are a significant reason Davis developed into a successful professional. If it wasn't for this "tough love" relationship that developed between the player and coach, Davis would have seen his career ending early.

It is widely accepted that the way coaches and athletes interact, relate to one another, and communicate with each other can have a significant impact upon the success of the athlete (Jowett, Yang, & Lorimer, 2012). The coach-athlete relationship is related to the positive and negative behaviors that a coach exhibits. Positive behaviors are those behaviors that are supportive and emotionally composed such as a coach recognizing an athlete's improvements in their physical appearance after coming back from training in the off-season (Cho, Lee, & Magnuesen, 2013). The negative behaviors a coach can exhibit are ones that are "distractive and disruptive" such as a coach ridiculing and making an athlete feel awkward when he or she is working out. These positive and negative can drastically impact the kind of relationship they have with their coach. Athletes confirmed that the positive behaviors their coach had strengthened and improved their relationship with their coach (Cho, Lee, & Magnuesen, 2013). Within their study they discuss that it is important to take the different genders into

consideration when studying the coach-athlete relationship. Winning and losing also has a significant impact on the perception an athlete has of their coach and the relationship they have with that athlete. A study done by Rui Trocado Mata and António Rui Da Silva Gomes concluded that athletes on winning teams were more satisfied with their coach's strategy and relationship with their coach (2013). They found that winning coaches displayed transformational leadership behaviors (vision, inspiration, technical instruction), the two positive dimensions of transactional leadership (positive feedback) and decision making (active management) lead to more satisfied athletes in terms of motivation, relationship with their coach, and their performance (Trocado, & Gomes, 2013). As a result of Trocado and Gomes' findings, the impact of winning and losing on the coach-athlete relationship became evident. Winning has a positive impact on the relationship leading to higher satisfaction and retention in terms of athlete participation.

Constant pressure from participation in sports may lead to physical/emotional exhaustion, lower self-efficacy, and an uncaring attitude toward sports (Chen, Kee, & Tsai, 2009). These effects are strongly linked toward athlete burnout. Athlete drop out and attrition sports is often a result from the negative coach-athlete relationship between the athlete and their coach. An aspect of the relationship an athlete has with his or her coach is dependent on whether or not the coach uses a model of perfectionism. This model is strongly related to athlete dropout because if the coaches focus so much on being "perfect" an athlete will dwell on their faults instead of their successes (Chen et al., 2009).

In the journal article, *Effects of Enhancing Coach-Athlete Relationships on Youth Sports* by Barnett, Smith and Smoll, attrition and dropout is discussed in depth based on their study involving Little League Baseball teams (1992). CET or Coach Effectiveness Training is designed to improve the coach-athlete relationship by instilling techniques involving positive control as opposed to aversive control, and the concept of "winning" as giving maximum effort. By using CET, the authors were able to determine if the training had a positive or negative impact on the attrition of athletes. (Barnett, Smith, &

Smoll, 1992).). The authors interviewed 18 male coaches and 202 Little League Baseball players (Barnett, Smith, & Smoll 1992). A total of 80 athletes played for coaches who were trained using the CET model, and of those 80 athletes, 95 percent continued to play baseball the following year with only four dropping out of baseball completely. Out of the 108 players who were playing under coaches who were not trained, only 74 percent continued to play with 28 dropping out of baseball leaving 80 returning the following year (Barnett, Smith, & Smoll, 1992). Following Barnett, Smith, and Smoll's study, Côté, Deakin and Frasier-Thomas found that coaches who showed behaviors that stressed instruction and reinforcement were preferred, created a more enjoyable atmosphere, created a high sense of unity amongst the team and had a much lower dropout rate than untrained coaches (Côté, Deakin, & Frasier-Thomas, 2008). Similar tactics and training could be used at the collegiate level to educate coaches on how to improve their relationship with their player.

Dealing with Athletes

The coach-athlete relationship is the way the coach interacts with their athletes. In order to deal with every athlete on the team a coach must realize the different ways to motivate both on game day and during practice settings, understand the unique attributes every athlete processes, how their behaviors affect athlete burnout, and how to best develop leadership amongst their athletes.

Motivational Tactics

Game-day

Certain kinds of coaching behavior utilize different techniques when motivating and inspiring players. One of the behaviors and actions that athletes have shown to expect out of coaches is the use of pregame speeches. Short and Vargas researched the impact of the pregame speeches and motivational tactics a coach uses and its effect on the athlete's performance for that game (2011). After interviewing 151 elite soccer players representing ten elite teams, 145 responded to the question regarding the coach's pregame speech and if it had an impact on their performance or met the

satisfaction of their athletes. Of the 145, 65.5% of the athletes said pregame speeches had an impact on their performance, 33.1% said no, and 1.4% said yes and no (Short, & Vargas, 2011). The pregame speech is just one way to improve an athlete's motivation to perform. This motivation is driven by the relationship the coach has with his/her players and whether they respond to intense, relaxing, or inspirational speeches. Coach Mike Krzyzewski (Coach K) men's basketball coach at Duke University, regarded as one of the best coaches, teachers, and minds in basketball history once said "sometimes you might do something to create emotion, create a conflict, so that the team comes together as one" (Bock, 1993, p.). Choi, Cho, and Huh (2013) found that interpersonal relationships with athletes can lead to higher levels of intrinsic motivation as well as higher levels of autonomy and competence. In order to be motivated and to measure the progress towards success, goals for both the athlete and coach must be set forth. An athlete with higher levels of competence and motivation are more likely to succeed in achieving their goals.

Practice Setting

Many coaches are personally inspiring. This personal inspiration within a coach is often times be seen within the team as they take on their coach's personal characteristics. John Wooden, the legendary UCLA men's basketball coach in the 1960's and 1970's, used his "pyramid of success" to motivate and inspire his athletes (Goethals, Sorenson, & Burns eds., 2004). The chapter "coaching" from the Encyclopedia of Leadership, states that on game day everyone is motivated: great coaches motivate and inspire their athletes during the non-essential periods of preparation, away from the intensity and excitement on game-day (Goethals, Sorenson, & Burns eds., 2004). The player's preference for certain motivation tactics and preferred coaching behaviors has been linked together. Berglund et al, found that athletes who were more motivated on their personal improvement preferred coaches who focused mainly on training their skills and technique, whereas athletes who played for the social aspects wanted their coaches to behavior in ways that develop a fun atmosphere and provide social support for that

athlete by developing an interpersonal relationship (2011). The player's preference for certain motivation tactics and preferred coaching behaviors has been linked together. Berglund et al, found that athletes who were more motivated on their personal improvement preferred coaches who focused mainly on training their skills and technique, whereas athletes who played for the social aspects wanted their coaches to behavior in ways that develop a fun atmosphere and provide social support for that athlete by developing an interpersonal relationship (2011).

Another study done on motivation points out that coach's and athlete's own personal motivation can be influenced by goals set forth for each other. This is done by behavior focused on social goals as well as promoting achievement-related behavior similar to the coaches who show behaviors that recognize success and facilitating positive social relationships (Burton, & Vidic, 2011). This quote from Coach K goes to show that figuring out a way to motivate the team to play together is more important than devising up a strategy. There are some times when understanding what the players need in order to motivate them is the most important aspect of coaching (Bock, 1993). Some athletes have bad habits (poor technique) and in order to motivate athletes to correct those poor habits coaches must call attention to those habits and instill some sort of discipline for those bad habits. Over recent years, coaches have been calling out athletes less than they have in years prior (Bock, 1993). This behavior exhibiting discipline is preferred by some athletes because they may need that disciplinarian behavior to break some of their habits.

Unique Attributes

"People are different, coaches are different, athletes are different, but a good coach is able to manage different people, because he/she has the knowledge and competence to perform it" (Szabo, 2012, pg. 42). Part of being good coach is being able to recognize problems with individual athletes and being able to address those issues regardless if they are physical (technique, strength, on field performance) or psychological (motivation, confidence, and decision making). In other words, a coach

must be able to recognize the individual learning styles of each athlete in order to be able to teach them the proper techniques and way of thinking (Cadorette, & Stevens-Smith 2012). Therefore, a “cookie-cutter” or “my way or the highway” approach to coaching may not be adequate to producing the best training and performance results since every athlete requires different coaching behaviors that pertain to their personal skill set or personality (Lee, Magnusen, & Cho, 2013). Cadorette and Stevens-Smith focus only on the coach side of the coach-athlete relationship rather the player’s perspective. This is where their study falls short because there are two sides to the equation. A coach who does not know the preferred learning styles of their athletes will not be able to education their athletes in an efficient manor on technique and physical improvements. For instance, some athletes need to learn by actually doing something or moving (kinesthetic athlete) rather than having it spoken to them through a lecture style of education (Cadorette et al., 2012). Becoming aware of which learning style athletes prefer and actually catering toward those styles, will ultimately increase their production and better the relationship between the coach and the athlete because they will be meeting the expectations of those athletes. One of the major factors in bettering the coach-athlete relationship is being able to realize the differences between male and female athletes in their preferences for certain coaching behavior.

Gender differences cannot be ignored when studying the preferred coaching behaviors. One study found that male athletes tend to prefer a coach who makes all the decisions and acts more as an authority figure rather. Females preferred a coach who is more inclusive in nature allowing the athlete to have influence on decisions (Newell, 2007). Another study on gender differences showed that there was not a significant difference between the two genders and the preferred behaviors by both male and female was inclusion in decisions, recognition for accomplishments, and a focus on developing skills and techniques (Sherman, Fuller, & Speed, 2000). The behaviors that were not preferred were the authoritarian, and the behaviors tailored toward building an interpersonal relationship between the athlete and the coach.

Athletes are also unique in the reasons they continue to participate in sport. Some have different motivations for why they play. In high school athletes and in most Division III schools, athletes play for the pure enjoyment of the sport and more play more for the social aspect of being a part of a team (Barber, Collins, Laws, & Moore, 2011). One study done showed that high school athletes did not respond well to coaches who were extremely demanding, and punishment oriented (Seifried, 2008). At the youth level, coaches who created a more fun environment and stressed less on winning and more on developing skills were more successful in retaining interest in the sport (Barnett, Smith, & Smoll, 1992). Although the past few studies have dealt mainly with a younger demographic than the one this study is examining, it is still relevant to show that athletes unique from one another in more ways than just gender. One of those major ways an athlete is unique is the reason they continue to play a sport. Another factor that makes an athlete unique is their ethnicity.

International athletes playing in the United States often demand different behaviors out of their coaches than an athlete native to the area. In 1988, Chelladurai and a group of authors studied the preferences of Japanese athletes compared to Canadian athletes regarding coaching styles and behaviors. After surveying 100 athletes from each country it was concluded that Japanese athletes desired a coach that behaves more as an authoritarian. The Japanese were looking for their coaches to be the one who makes all of the decisions independently from the players while also developing a relationship that provided the athletes with social support. Canadian athletes on the other hand were looking for coaches that exhibited behavior more focused on developing skills, inclusion in decisions, and coaches that recognized and rewarded good performance (Chelladurai, Imamura, Miyauchi, Oinuma, & Yamaguchi 1988). The differences between the two countries could result in the differences between the cultures and the types of athletes the country produces. A study done on the cultural differences of Japanese, American, and Canadian natives showed that Japanese natives expressed significantly lower amounts of positive emotions than Canadians (happiness and surprise). This

correlates to the kind of emotions that often are related to athletes under authoritarian, disciplined behavior based coaches (Safdar, Friedlmeier, Matsumoto, Hee Yoo, Kwantes, Kakai, & Shigemasu 2009). The cultural differences between the athletes, in not only Japan and Canada but also in other countries, emphasize the uniqueness of the athletes. It is the cultural differences between Canada and Japan that leads to the uniqueness of the athletes and their preferred coaching behaviors. This could result from the different behaviors exhibited by leaders that each country values and the way were they brought up.

Studies done by Cadorette (2012) and Chelladuai (1988) depict different types of athletes and their preferences in coaching behavior and how the athlete's own personalities conform to certain coaching styles. This is seen mostly in intercollegiate athletics rather than youth sports. One coach's insight on coaching international athletes is that their athletes desired a more positively developed relationship, almost parental in nature (Berglund, Bloom, Horn, & Packard, 2011). The international athlete prefers coaches who aid in the development in social skills and behaviors that help foster positive relationships for them to build around to make their transition as easy as possible (Berglund, Bloom, Horn, & Packard, 2011). This is a result of the on-going problems with culture shock as a result of the internationalization of sport. Culture shock is when an athlete goes to compete in a completely different country unprepared for the cultural norms and practices and becomes overwhelmed (Bravo, Li, & MacIntosh, 2012). The positive relationships aided by the coach can help ease the athletes into the culture of the country and avoid the culture shock issue altogether.

Burnout

Burnout is often the precursor of drop out. Burnout amongst young athletes is often a result of having a negative coach-athlete relationship as well as low motivation to continue participating (Guillet-Descas, Isoard-Gauthier, & Lemyre, 2012). This burnout can be attributed to the lack of accomplishments, exhaustion, and sport devaluation, which means the sport, is less important and less of a priority to the athlete over time. This is not to say that athletes who do have a lot of

accomplishments do not become burnt out but those athletes who are lacking in accomplishments are more likely to become burnt out. If athletes are being burnt out over the course of the season due to the relationships they have with their coaches, it is fair to say that their feeling of being burnt out will increase the likelihood of complete dropout (Guillet-Descas, Isoard-Gauthier, & Lemyre, 2012).

The strength of the relationship an athlete has with his or her coach can help the athlete get through troubling times such as burnout, injury, failure to qualify for a major competition, or career termination (Choi, Cho, & Huh, 2013). Ronald Smith and Frank Smoll from the University of Washington (1997), concluded that educating young coaches with technical experience on the psychological side of coaching can help foster positive coach-athlete relationships and a positive environment for all parties involved. Educating coaches on how to foster these positive relationships will decrease attrition in youth athletics leading toward an increased amount of participation in sport in an athlete's adolescent years (Smith, & Smoll, 1997).

Developing Leadership

One of the behaviors prior research has shown is expected out of coaches is developing leadership. Leadership is vital to the success of a team. The argument can be made that leaders are born not made and trying to teach leadership is not worth the effort. However, Cannol, Kadushin, and Watson argue that leadership skills can be developed through the coach-athlete relationship (2011). The coach-athlete relationship can hinder or develop an athlete's own leadership skills, their autonomy, intrinsic motivation, and decision making that makes them an overall better athlete (Cannol, Kadushin, & Watson, 2011). A relationship between a coach and his/her athlete that puts the athlete in positions to be a leader will aid in developing leadership. Another behavior a coach can have that develops leadership is giving the athlete the authority to make some decisions similar to what some captains do (Cannol, Kadushin, & Watson, 2011). Team captains are an important to the quality of leadership on a team. Captains are the coaches on the field and the role models for younger athletes (Gould, Griffes, &

Voelker, 2013). Captains are also the eyes and ears for the coach within the team. According to one coach, her captains were required to report any issues or problems with the girls on the team (Gould, Griffes, & Voelker, 2013). By being the bridge between the coach and the team, the captains are more aware of the behaviors the players on the team want to see out of their coaches. This will make the relationship between the coaches and the players more likely to be positive because the coach can get a firsthand look into if they are meeting the expectations of their athletes based on what their captains are saying is successful and what isn't.

Athlete Preferences for Behaviors

As demonstrated throughout the literature review, certain athletes prefer different behaviors of coaching. The differences are likely due to the athlete's own personal physical and psychological characteristics (Berglund, Bloom, Horn, & Packard, 2011). Some of the preliminary research had been tailored toward a younger demographic since most of the psychological development occurs at younger ages. However, after looking deeper into previous research, more information was found regarding the kinds of coaches players wanted at the collegiate level and what the psychological characteristics were of that specific athlete (Berglund, et. al, 2011). The results of the study previously mentioned found that the most common preferred coaching behaviors were those that look to include athletes in decision making processes, the authoritarian and disciplinarian, and the coach who focuses primarily to improve skills and techniques. These results were consistent in another study done on the intrinsic motivations of college athletes. The results of the study from the *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology* concluded that college athletes with higher levels of intrinsic motivation preferred their coach's behaviors to be consistent with improving skills and techniques as well as including athletes in decision making (Amorose, & Horn, 2000). Even though including athletes in decision making and authoritarian and disciplinarian are opposite in nature, it is still a possibility for both to be some of the more preferred behaviors due to differences between each sport and even different teams within the same sport such

as offense and defense of football (Chelladurai, & Riemer, 1995). In a study done by Chelladurai and Riemer, the differences in preferred coaching behaviors between the offensive and defensive teams on a single football team became apparent (1995).

The results of their study concluded that defensive players looked for more behaviors from their coaches that allow the athletes to make more decisions independently or working with the coaches to make decisions. The defensive players also wanted their coach to take an interest in their lives and try to develop a personal relationship that supports them socially. This is likely the result of the defense being primarily instinctive because the coach cannot tell the player ahead of time what they will do on that specific play; it is all up to the individual player's natural instinct (Chelladurai, & Riemer, 1995).

Another set of results of a study involving European football (soccer) players concluded that athletes do have specific behaviors they expect their coaches to meet. Some of those behaviors were rewarding and recognizing good performance, progressing an athlete's skills and technique, and including athletes in decisions making giving some of the power back to the athlete (Høigaard, Jones, & Peters 2008). After looking at the studies involving European football players and American football players, it became apparent that despite the two sports being different from one another, the athletes still expect similar behaviors from their coaches. European football and American football are both strong team sports but there are other types of sports such as individual sports in which the athlete competes for self rather than team.

Research has shown that team sports and individual sports demand different behaviors from coaches. Just based on the nature of the different types of sport, one can predict they will require different styles of coaching. Team sport coaches tend to use post game instruction, hustle and management behaviors than the coaches of individual sports (Bian, Leun, Liu, & Zeng, 2009). These behaviors are good examples of some less significant behaviors that can tie into some of the broader behaviors this study plans to examine.

To review the other side of the topic, coaches have preferred player behaviors much like players have preferred coaching behaviors. In the article *The Relationship Between Personality Traits and Coachability in NCAA Division I and II Female Softball Athletes* by J.K. Favor, athletes were more preferred if they were coachable, mentally stable and open minded. Athletes who were not preferred tended to have higher levels of anger and will likely get annoyed or frustrated easier (Favor, 2011). The preferences of coaches are not the main topic of this paper but it is important to look at both sides of a topic to fully understand the topic of coaching behaviors. The other side of this study will look at preferred player behaviors and actions that coaches look for.

Purpose

It is clear after reviewing previous research that meeting the preferred coaching behaviors of athletes is very important to becoming a successful head coach. Previous research has defined coaching behaviors and demonstrated the impact those behaviors have on the experience of sport participation for both athletes and coaches. Because of the significant impact a coach can have on an athlete's career, understanding what kind of behaviors a coach can exhibit that a specific athlete expects will drastically improve the experience for that athlete.

Where this study differs from previous research is figuring out if coaches are meeting the expectations of their players. Previous research has only looked at what the different behaviors are and what the different styles are rather than seeing if the coaches are showing the behaviors their players prefer. This concept ties into the research question of this paper.

What are the expected coaching behaviors for a coach in a certain sport?

What are the preferred coaching behaviors athletes are looking for from a coach?

Do the expected behaviors and preferred behaviors differ from one another or are they the same?

By answering this question, it will help answer some of the bigger issues of connecting coaches with athletes and the results may lead to future research that expands on this study. At the end of this study the question will show what behaviors are preferred and see if a specific set of coaches from one school meet the desires of their athletes.

Method

Sample

This study surveyed the 581 student-athletes at St. John Fisher College as its population of interest. Even though the population only spanned one school it provided significant diversity amongst the data due to the wide range of the sports offered at St. John Fisher College. In order to get a good representation from both genders, a survey was sent out to every athlete of both male and female. The survey needed to have responses from each of the 23 teams, individual and team, and from both genders to ensure accurate results. Accessing the contact information for the entire athlete at St. John Fisher was done by gathering the names of the athletes based on what is currently on the athletic homepage athletics.sjfc.edu under their specific team. The names were put in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet where the email addresses were looked up on the Fisher Google mail account and paired with their respective name.

Variables

There were a vast number of variables that were realized during this study. Based on previous research those variables are the athlete's demographics (gender, year in school, and sport played), and the different behaviors being surveyed (Bergund et al. 2011). In order to analyze the variables, each variable was paired with other variables to determine the results. One of the ways the variables were compared is by gender. Each question was compared the gender of the athlete who answered it to see if there is a correlation between certain preferred behaviors and gender. Also the sport played was analyzed and compared to each question to determine if there are preferred coaching behaviors for

each sport. Since the response rate for each team did not meet the requirements to examine each team on an individual level, each team was classified as an individual sport (Track and Field, Cross Country, Golf, and Tennis) and team sport (Baseball, Basketball, Football, Soccer, Lacrosse, Softball, Volleyball, Crew, and Field Hockey). Another aspect of the variables that was compared to each of the questions is the year in school of the athlete. Using the year in school and comparing it to the answers made it possible to determine if athletes have different preferences in their coaching behaviors from freshmen to senior or graduate year. The last variable that was tested was in season behaviors versus out of season behaviors. Testing these behaviors provided an insight into the expected and preferred coaching behaviors in season and out of season for athletes.

The independent variables of a study are the variables that are the presumed cause of the effect being researched (Gratton, & Jones, 2010). Therefore, the independent variables are the athletes' year in school, sport he or she plays, and gender. Gratton and Jones explain the dependent variable as the variables that can be explained by the effect of the independent variable (2010). For this study, using the definition given by Gratton and Jones, the dependent variables are the individual coaching behaviors.

Data Collection Instrument

In order to gather information, this study used a survey (See Appendix A) that was sent out to the entire research population. This survey was shared and distributed using Qualtrics software provided by St. John Fisher. Qualtrics provided a solid and reputable foundation for gathering answers and easily understandable data. In order to create formidable questions, the Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) was taken into consideration to provide a foundation for the questions to be based off of. CBAS is a system created by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt to categorize coaching behaviors and it is filled with questions involving many different behaviors that coaches can exhibit (Surujlal, & Dhurup,

2012). The survey used for this study was not a replica of the CBAS but part of the survey was however, based off of some of the questions and concepts used in the CBAS.

Questions were designed to determine the demographics of the participant, the behaviors the athlete expect from a coach, and the athlete's preferred behaviors of coaches. The demographics that were surveyed will be the gender of the participant, the sport they play, whether they are on a team sport or if their sport is an individualized, and year in school, and if they have had a coaching change/transfer in their time in college. The questions asking about the behaviors of their current coaches were designed to have the athlete rate the behavior asked on a Likert-scale of never-always. These questions are similar to the example statement; "my coach includes me in decision making processes." At the end of their section there was an open-ended question, allowing space for the athletes to indicate other behaviors not already articulated. The next section is very similar to the section above but it asks what players *prefer* instead of what the coach actually *does*. Asking questions on both what athlete's prefer for behaviors out of their coaches and what athlete's coaches behave like currently, provided a distinct view on if the coaches meet the expectations and preferences of their athletes.

The survey was tailored to keep the subject interested and engaged. This was done by creating a survey that is user friendly and easy to understand. The survey started off by asking what sport the subject plays and it gives the option to pick more than one sport if the athlete is a two-sport athlete. Once the athlete selects the sport he or she plays, the question sequence regarding what an athlete expects from a coach begins. Once the *expect* segment of the survey is completed, the *preferred* section is started. The questions are very similar from section to section but are differed in terms of expected behaviors and preferred behaviors. Once the last question is completed from this section it asks the subject to answer if he or she is a two sport athlete or one sport. If the athlete is a two sport athlete, the survey cycles through again and asked the subject to pick the second sport he or she plays. If the athlete

is not a two sport athlete then the survey was programmed go right to the demographics portion of the survey asking about the year in school and the gender of the athlete. Once the two sport athlete finishes the second sport survey, the survey directed the participant to the demographics section just like it does for the once sport athlete.

Due to there being two sport athletes, the survey can be over forty questions in length. However, for one sport athletes, the survey is 23 questions long with all but two having more than one section to be answered (in season vs. out of season). The survey looked at determining if there is a significant difference between being the preferences for certain coaching behaviors when athletes are in season as opposed to out of season.

The majority of the questions were formatted using the matrix table question format given by the Qualtrics Survey Software (See Appendix A). This format allows for there to be four scale points (never, occasionally, most of the time, always) and two statements (in season, out of season).

Data Collection Procedure

The procedure for collecting the data was standardized in an attempt to minimize any confounding variables. The first step was to have a select group of student athletes take a pilot test to make sure it makes sense. By doing a pilot test, it helped work out the kinks in the survey that need to be fixed before the final draft was sent out to the entire population. After the pilot tests were finished, the final edits and revisions were made to ensure perfection for the final survey.

The results from this test were used to determine if the answers can be measured and if the questions are answering the research questions. If something did not fit or becomes glaringly wrong with the survey's results, the pilot test showed where the mistakes were made and what needed to be corrected. After the revisions were made, the final copy was sent out with the email asking student-athletes to take part in the survey (See Appendix B). A few days after the survey and email were sent out; a reminder asking subjects to answer the survey if they had not done so yet will be sent hoping to

garner more responses (See Appendix C). The survey remained active for two and a half weeks running from Wednesday, March 19th through Tuesday April 8th. This gave athletes ample time to complete the survey. It also provided time to adjust for conflicts as well as take time to account for the possibility that students-athletes accidentally deleted the first email. After the subjects finished the survey, a thank you message was programed to be sent to their email thanking them for their participation in the survey. This message reiterated that the results would be completely anonymous and there would be no risk of their involvement being leaked to the coaching staff.

Analyzing the Data

The data was analyzed using spreadsheets on the SPSS statistics software made available by Fisher (See Appendix D). In order for the spreadsheet to work, the data was prepared using four steps; coding, inputting, checking, and dealing with missing values (Gratton, & Jones, 2010). In order to quantify the results, the data was coded using a numerical number. For instance, males were 1 and females were 2. The different answers varying from “never, occasionally, most of the time, and always” for both in season and out of season were coded using “1” for never in season, “2” for occasionally in season, “3” for most of the time in season, “4” for always in season “5” for never out of season, “6” for occasionally out of season, “7” for most of the time out of season, and “8” for always out of season. The coding (1-4 and 5-8) happened for each question. By coding all of the data into numerical form, it allowed for easier analyzing using descriptive statistics (Gratton, & Jones, 2010).

In order to make the data from the survey easy to understand, each sport was coded with a corresponding number (Baseball=1, Men’s Basketball=2, Women’s Basketball=3, Football=4, Field Hockey=5, Men’s Lacrosse=6, Men’s Golf=7, Men’s Track and Field=8, Men’s Crew=9, Men’s Soccer=10, Softball=11, Men’s Tennis=12, Volleyball=13, Women’s Lacrosse=14, Women’s Crew=15, Women’s Soccer=16, Women’s Tennis= 17, Women’s Track and Field=18, Women’s Cross Country=19, and Men’s Cross Country=20). Each of the sports was then coded to be an individual sport “1” or a team sport “2.”

Also two sport athletes were coded by using a binary system with “1” meaning one sport athlete and “2” meaning two sport athletes. Lastly, due to the amount of respondents from each class, and the lack of responses in certain questions, the years in school were grouped according to upperclassman (juniors, seniors, and graduate) and underclassmen (freshmen and sophomores). Underclassmen were coded using “1” and upperclassmen were coded using “2.”

Analyzing the data took place using the statistics software SPSS. SPSS made analyzing the data much easier because it was able to formulate data and results that were easy to understand because it does all the calculations in the computer. The primary statistics that were used in analyzing the data were frequency, mean, chi-square, and percentage, and a bivariate correlation (Gratton, & Jones, 2010). Frequency measured the amount of times an answer was chosen showing which answers were most preferred by athletes. By looking at the frequency in which answers were chosen, it was easy to analyze the preferences of athletes depending on the sport they played, the type of sport the athlete played (individual vs. team), gender, and their year in school. Percentage provided an easier visual representation of the data. It allowed for someone to look the data and immediately know the percentage of the population preferred certain coaching behaviors. The results were categorized according to all of the different demographics. Since there were so many variables involved, a chi-squared test was used to analyze the differences between the different sports, ages, and genders. A chi-square test is a test that researchers use to determine if there are any differences between multiple categorical variables that are nominal (Gratton, & Jones, 2010). For instance, comparing the preferences of sport or television show between females and males would require a chi-square test. The bivariate correlation was needed in determining if there was a relationship between the expected and preferred behaviors of the entire student-athlete population tested. The strength of the relationship is dependent on whether or not the value is close to 1 (strong positive correlation) or 0 (weak negative correlation) (Gratton & Jones, 2010).

Results

Out of the 581 student athletes who were sent the survey, 87 student athletes completed the survey including an additional 12 two sport athletes bringing the total response number to 99 out of 581 or 17% of athletes. Of the 87 student athletes who took part in the study, 37.3% of the athletes were male, 48% were female, and 14.7% did not indicate male or female. There are a relatively equal number of participants from each year in school with 17.6% being freshman, 19.6% sophomore, 22.5% juniors, 21.6% seniors and the exception of 1% graduate student, with 17.6% choosing not to indicate their athletic year. There is at least one response for every varsity athletic team with Baseball being the highest with 15 participants and Men's Tennis being the lowest with only one participant. Since not all of the sports have the minimum of five respondents to validate the data, sports are grouped into team (football, baseball, basketball, etc.) and individual sports (track and field, cross country, golf, etc.). Team sport athletes make up the vast majority of the participants with 78.4% of athletes being a part of team sports, 18.6% of the athletes being an individual sport athlete and 2.9% failing to give their sport.

Males vs. Females

A significance level of .05 is being used to determine if there is a significant difference between males and females, team sports and individual sports, and the different years in school. Contrary to previous research, findings indicate no significant difference between males and females for the different behaviors they expect and prefer. The only significant difference between males and females is that females do not prefer a coach who uses punishment to make them better. Both in season and out of season, female athletes prefer a coach who uses punishment occasionally or never, whereas more male athletes prefer punishment most of the times and always (See Appendix E, Figure 1).

The significance levels for both in season use of punishment ($p=.050$) and out of season use of punishment ($p=.038$) are both $p>.05$ indicating there is a significant difference between males and females. Both male athletes and female athletes want a coach to build a personal relationship with them

in season and out of season with a mean score of 3.4949/4 for preferring a coach to build a relationship in season, and 7.2169/8 for preferring a coach to build a relationship with them. Unexpectedly, male athletes and female athletes are similar in their expectations for a coach to make all of the decisions without player input. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant difference for this behavior between males and females. Nor does the test reveal any difference between male and female athlete's preferences for a coach making all of the decisions without player input both in season and out of season. Of the 38 males who answered the questions regarding the preference for a coach making all the decisions both in season and out of season, only 5 of the answers selected are most of the time or always for both in season and out of season. Female athletes prefer an autocratic coach more than males with 9 female athletes out of 46 answering "most of the time" or "always" for in season but only 6 out of 46 for out of season.

Similar to prior research, athletes expect and prefer their coach to work on improving their skills and techniques both in season and during the off-season. There is no significant difference between males and females ($p=.226$ in season $p=.525$ off season) in the preferred behavior of improving skills. The expected behavior significance levels were .467 and .191 for a coach to work on improving skills. However, a higher percentage of males expect their coach to improve their skills "always" out of season whereas female athletes expect their coach to "always" work on improving their skills during the season at a higher percentage than that of the male athlete. Of the 87 athletes surveyed only one athlete "never" expects or prefers for his/her coach to work on improving the skills and techniques of their sport.

Individual Sport vs. Team Sport

In order to validate the data and have more than five respondents in each variable group, each sport is classified as a team or individual sport. The total number of sports played at the time of the survey was 99, including both of the sports the two sport athlete played at that time. Of the 99 athletes

playing sports, 80 (78.4%) of them are on team sports and 19 (18.6%) of are a part of an individual sport. As expected there are significant differences for certain behaviors between individual sport athletes and team sport athletes. The results and differences between an individual sport and team can be seen in Appendix E, Figure 2.

The results show the lack of significant difference for what athletes expect and prefer in season but it is really evident the significance of the difference between the preferred and expected behaviors out of season. Appendix E shows that the significance level for the difference between individual sport and team sport is .007 for the expected behavior of building a relationship out of season and the .005 for the preferred behavior of building a relationship out of season. Since both of the significance levels are below .05, there is a significant difference between the expected and preferred behavior for individual and team sport. A coach who allows athletes to assist in decisions regarding games out of season is another area where individual and team sport athletes differ from expectations. With a significance level of .039, the data shows the difference between the expected behaviors of a coach bringing in athletes to help in decisions regarding games out of season. However, there is not a strong difference for the preferred behavior of including athletes in game decisions out of season.

Similar to previous research, individual and team sport athletes expect and prefer their coach to improve their skills and techniques both in season and out of season. The mean score for expected in season behavior was 3.8469/4 and 3.7738/4 for the preferred in season behavior. For the expected behavior out of season, the mean score was 7.5979/8 and 7.5366/8. Any number higher than 3 out of 4 or a 7 out of 8 indicates that the number of respondents answering "most of the time" or "always" is much higher than that of "never" and "occasionally." Of the 98 valid responses, 85 athletes expect a coach to "always" and 12 "most of the time" to improve their skills in season. There are a few very significant differences between the preferred and expected behaviors of an individual sport and team sport athlete but there were some similarities discussed in prior research that were seen in this study.

Year in School

As athletes and students move on in school, they change and mature. Therefore it is expected that there is going to be a significant difference between the expected and preferred behaviors from freshmen student athletes to senior student athletes. In order to analyze valid data for this comparison, the “never” and “occasionally” are combined to ensure the most accurate responses. The results show one significant difference between underclassmen and upperclassmen; the expected behavior of rewarding good performance during the off season. The significance level is .041 for expecting a coach to reward good performance in the off season. This is the only behavior that shows a significance level of $p < .05$. Other behaviors that are approaching a significant difference are the behaviors of preferring a coach to make all the decisions in season ($p = .114$), preferring a coach to make all decisions out of season ($p = .095$), and preferring a coach who rewards good performances in season ($p = .187$). The behavior the most consistent from year to year is acknowledging successes out of season. The chi-square test shows a significance level of .979. This value indicates how similar the preferred behavior of acknowledging successes from year to year with no varying difference from freshmen to senior year. Of the 83 student athletes who answered this question, 4 of them said “never”, 25 of them said “occasionally”, 24 of them said “most of the time” and 30 of them said “always”. For the preferred behavior of acknowledging successes out of season the p value is only .473, much lower than the expected behavior. However, the in season preference of the same behavior has a significance level of .949 and the expected behavior has a p value of .645.

Surprisingly, there is no difference from freshmen to senior year in their preference for a coach building a personal relationship with them. The significance level is .474 for in season and .314 for out of season. Each question had a total of 84 responses with 39 being underclassmen and 45 being upperclassmen. The results showed that more upperclassmen want a relationship “most of the time” or

“always” out of season more so than the underclassmen but not enough to make the final significance value less than .05. See Appendix E for significance levels for all year to year comparisons.

Appendix E, Figure 3 shows how similar the preferences are underclassmen and upperclassmen. The only minuet difference is the percentage of upperclassmen that prefer the personal relationship in the off-season and in season compared to the rest of the years. Of the 45 upperclassmen that completed these two questions, a total of 41 or 91% of the upperclassmen prefer a coach to build a personal relationship with them “most of the time” or “always.” In the off season, underclassmen displayed that their preference for a personal relationship with their coach was much lower than in season. Only 74% (29 of 39) of underclassmen wanted their coach to behave in a way that would build a relationship with them during the off-season.

Preferred vs. Expected

Previous research indicated that athletes have preferences and expectations for coaching behaviors. The results from this study remained consistent to some previous research in that the most preferred coaching behavior for all the athletes was a coach who looks to improve skills both in season and out of season. Out of the entire student athlete population who took the survey, 99% preferred and expected their coach to improve their skills in season either “most of the time” or “always” and 91% expected the behavior out of season and 90% preferred the behavior out of season. Similar to prior research, the results showed that athletes did not prefer or expect their coach to make decisions independently without athlete input; 20% expected their coach to make all the decisions in season, 16% out of season, 17% said they preferred their coach to make all the decisions in season and only 13% out of season. The only other match between preferred behaviors and expected behaviors was the behavior of a coach recognizing successes in season. Over 83% of student athletes said they expected and preferred their coach to recognize their successes in season as opposed to the 67% expected out of season and the 76% preferred out of season.

Unlike previous notions, a high percentage of athletes did not expect their coach to include them in decision-making regarding games and practices. 57% of athletes in season and 40% out of season believed expected behavior of including athletes in decisions regarding games and the preferred behavior for games was a much higher percentage. Student athletes preferred aiding in game decisions in season at a 65% rate and 53% out of season. Even though athletes preferred their coaches to reward them for good performances in season (73%) and out of season (61%), they realized that it is not a behavior that can be expected either in season (63%) or out of season (46%). It was interesting to see that athletes expected and preferred a coach to build a relationship with them in season but not as much out of season. Only 61% expected their coach to build a relationship with them out of season as opposed to the 91% of in season.

The results show that there are not very many strong relationships between the expected behaviors and the preferred behaviors. The bivariate correlation statistic revealed that strongest relationship was a coach recognizing the successes of an athlete in season with a strong correlations being close to 1.000 and weak correlations being closer to .000. The Pearson Correlation significance value was .706. The lowest level of relationship the results show is the behavior of a coach that improves the skills and techniques in season with a correlation of .242. Most of the other statistics have a correlation between .400 and .600 indicating that there is not a strong relationship between the preferred and expected behaviors. Of the seven tested behaviors both in the preferred and expected section, 4 of the relationships indicate that there is a stronger correlation in the off season's expected and preferred behaviors and 3 of the relationships indicate that there is a stronger relationship during the season's expected and preferred behaviors.

Conclusion

After analyzing and reviewing the results, some conclusions can be made about athlete preferences and expectations for coaching behaviors. As expected, the most preferred behaviors were,

improving skills in season and out of season, and building a relationship in season. However building a relationship out of season was not a behavior that was expected or preferred nearly as much as previous research would have suggested (Bloom, Duchesne, & Sabiston, 2011). Evidence showed that athletes really were not as concerned with helping out with decision making regarding games and practices yet the statistics showed that athletes also did not want their coach to make all the decisions independently.

Contrary to the expected results, there was no indication of a major difference between male and female athletes. Each preferred similar behaviors with only one exception: the use of punishment to make an athlete better both in season and out of season. It appeared, at least for St. John Fisher College student athletes, that the expected and preferred behaviors remained consistent from males to females. Previous research indicated that females and males require different styles of coaching due to the female preference for building a personal relationship with a coach (Newell, 2007) but in the results of this study, a difference between males and females was not supported. This may have to do with the small size of the survey responses even though there was a balance of males and females from each sport.

Individual sport athletes and team sport athletes showed that there is a slight difference in the expected and preferred behaviors in each category of sport. However, even though individual sport is more one on one with the coach, individual sport athletes did not prefer to have a stronger personal relationship than team sport athletes, especially in the off season. In the off-season, team sport athletes expected and preferred a coach that wants to work toward building a relationship with them. The two types of sports did have a common ground on most aspects but especially on working toward improving the skills in season and out of season. As somewhat expected, team sport athletes cared more about aiding in decisions regarding games since individual sports do not have the same type of strategy involved with working together with a team to win a game.

In the beginning of this study, it was assumed there would be some difference in the preferences from freshman to senior year. After reviewing the results, the differences were not as prominent in the behaviors expected. Upperclassmen and underclassmen showed really no difference in their preferred and expected behaviors. It was actually more alarming how similar they were and how small of a p value there was for some of behaviors (the highest being .979). The main research question was aimed to see if the expected behaviors and preferred behaviors of St. John Fisher athletes are the same or similar. After looking at the correlations, it is evident that there is not a strong relationship between the expected and preferred behaviors. These numbers indicate the fact that the preferred behaviors are not meeting the expected behaviors of the athletes. It is evident that the biggest gap between the expect behaviors and preferred behaviors is improving the skill of the athlete having a correlation of .242 (See Appendix E table 4 for full chart of Pearson Correlation).

Discussion

This study has provided insight on the ever-changing topic of the preferences for certain coaching behaviors by athletes. There were a few limitations that skewed some of the results from being as accurate as they possibly could be. The first limitation was the amount of responses from the total survey population, or lack thereof. The main issue with this is that the amount of student athletes that actually completed the entire survey was not enough to paint the best picture to what the actual preferences and expectations are for the different athletes. There were also a lot of athlete's who started the survey and completed the expected portion but failed to continue on to the preferred portion. Due to this, some of the statistics may be off from what they would actually be if the participant actually continued on with the survey. The main issue with the study was the wording of the survey. There were many participants who indicated they had trouble figuring out the difference between *expected* and *preferred* behaviors. Some of the participants were not able to understand that the expected behavior is what an athlete can realistically expect out of a coach and the preferred behaviors

are those behaviors that an athlete is personally looking for from the coach. If this distinction was made clearer to the population then the results could have been more accurate. Unfortunately, to make sure the survey was not overly long, some questions and behaviors were cut out from the final survey.

Looking back on the questions, it would have been prudent to ask about some other behaviors that were missing. The main behavior that was cut out from the survey was a coach who uses constructive criticism to help athletes progress. Instead of focusing so much on the decision making process the survey should have been designed more toward the interaction between the coach and the athlete.

Future research should look to expand on this basic study to fully understand the preferences and expectation of athletes. There are many behaviors that were not surveyed; therefore future researchers should look to examine the other behaviors that were left out of this study. On top of examining other behaviors, research could be done to determine if there is a significant difference between athletes from Division III, Division II, and Division I schools. The results could be quite different due to the potential scholarship implications that Division II and I athletes have to deal with. As well as examining the different levels of collegiate athlete, a follow up study of very similar nature should be done to a much larger population than just the 581 student athletes at St. John Fisher College. Surveying many schools across the country or region would provide a more accurate conclusion based on the fact that there are more participants in the study itself. Lastly, research could be done to look at these results and determine the relationship between the strong correlated behaviors and the success of the athlete/team. Does the success of the athlete/team depend on a coach meeting the expectations and preferences of their athlete, or are they two things that are complete unrelated.

Overall, the study proved to be successful for the most part in determining the basic preferences and expectations of the student athletes at St. John Fisher College. As far as future research is concerned, there are endless ways to expand on this topic as it is changing every year with new athletes and coaches developing relationships with one another. Experiences vary from athlete to athlete and

ten years from now the results of this survey would likely change just like it did from when Chelladurai created the Leadership Scale for Sport in 1980 (1980). In the coaching profession, understanding the preferences and expectations of the athletes can only help those athletes perform and leads to a better experience for all of those involved including the coach themselves.

References

- Amorose, A.J., Horn, T.S. (2000). Intrinsic motivation: Relationships with collegiate athletes' gender, scholarship status and perceptions of their coaches' behaviors. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 22*, 63-84.
- Barnett, N.P., Smith, R.E., & Smoll, F.L. (1992). Effects of enhancing coach-athlete relationships on youth sport attrition. *The Sport Psychologist, 6*, 111-127.
- Berglund, K.M., Bloom, P., Horn, T.S., & Packard, S. (2011). Relationship between collegiate athletes' psychological characteristics and their preferences for different types of coaching behavior. *The Sport Psychologist, 25*, 190-211.
- Bian, W., Leun, R.W., Liu, W., Zeng, H.Z. (2009). The differences in coaching behavior between individual and team sports at the college varsity level. *Asian Journal of Physical Education & Recreation, 15*(2), 35-42
- Blecharz, J., Siekanska, M., Wojtowicz, A. (2013). The athlete's perception of coaches' behavior towards competitors with a different sports level. *Journal of Human Kinetics, 39*, 231-242. doi. 10.2478/hukin-2013-0086.
- Bloom, G.A., Duchesne, C., & Sabiston, C.M. (2011). Intercollegiate coaches' experiences with elite international athletes in an American sport context. *International Journal of Coaching Science, 5*(2), 49-68.
- Bock, H. (1993, April 4). Coaching styles: More than w's and l's. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/282020716?accountid=27700>
- Bravo, G.A., MacIntosh, E.W., & Li, M. (Eds). (2012). *International Sport Management*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Burns, J.M., Goethals, G.R., & Sorenson, G.J. (Eds). (2004). Coaching. *Encyclopedia of Leadership* (199-206). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Burton, D., & Vidic, Z. (2011). Developing effective leaders: Motivational correlates of leadership styles. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 23*, 277-291.
- Cadorete, D., & Stevens-Smith, D. (2012). Coaches, athletes, and dominance profiles in sport: addressing the learning styles of athletes to improve performance. *The Physical Educator, 69*, 360-374.
- CBS Sports (Producer). (2008). *A players journey and a coach's impact- Vernon Davis on Mike Singletary*. Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=50muFk6Wwvs>
- Chelladurai, P., Imamura, H., Miyauchi, T., Oinuma, Y., & Yamaguchi, Y. (1988). Sport leadership in a cross-national setting: The case of Japanese and Canadian university athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 10*(4),374-389.
- Chelladurai, P., & Riemer H.A. (1995). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 17*(3), 276-293.
- Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S.D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 2*, 34-45.
- Chen, L.H., Kee, Y.H., Tsai, Y.M. (2009) An examination of the dual model of perfectionism and adolescent athlete burnout: A short-term longitudinal research. *Social Indicators Research, 91*(2), 189-201. doi. 10.1007/s-11205-008-9277-9.
- Choi, H., Cho, S., Huh, J. (2013). The association between the perceived coach-athlete relationship and athletes' basic psychological needs. *Social Behavior and Personality, 41*(9), 1547-1556. doi. 10.2223/sbp.2013.41.9.1547
- Cho, S., Lee, H.W., & Magnusen, M.J. (2013) Strength coach-athlete compatibility: Roles of coaching behaviors and athlete gender. *International Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 25*(1), 55-67.
- Connole, I., Kadushin, P., & Watson II, J.C. (2011). Developing young athletes: a sport

- psychology based approach to coaching youth sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 2, 113-122. doi: 10.1080/21520704.2011.586452
- Côté, J., Deakin, J., & Fraser-Thomas, J. (2008). Understanding dropout and prolonged engagement in adolescent competitive sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9(5), 645-622.
- Dane-Staples, E. (2013). SPST 399/495 course pack and workbook. *Department of Sport Studies*.
- Dhurup, M., & Surujlal, J. (2012). Athlete preference of coach's leadership style. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance (AJHERD)*, 18(1), 111-121.
- Fuller, R.R., Sherman, C.A., & Speed, H.D. (2000). Gender comparisons of preferred coaching behaviors in Australian Sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 23(4), 391-405.
- Gould, D., Griffes, K., & Voelker, D.K. (2013). Best coaching practices for developing team captains. *The Sport Psychologist*, 27, 13-26.
- Gomes, A.R.D.S., Mata, R.T. (2013). Winning or not winning: The influence on coach athlete relationships and goal achievement. *Journal of Human Sport & Exercise*, 8(4), 986-995. doi 10.4100/jhse.2013.84.09
- Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2010). *Research methods for sports studies* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Guillet-Descas, D., Isoard-Gautheur, S., & Lemyre, P.N. (2012). A prospective study of the influence of perceived coaching style on burnout propensity in high level young athletes: Using a self-determination theory perspective. *The Sport Psychologist*, 26, 282-298.
- Høigaard, R., Jones, G.W., & Peters, D.M. (2008). Preferred coach leadership behavior in elite soccer in relation to success and failure. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(2), 241-250.
- Hee Yoo, S., Friedlmeirer, W., Kaki, H., Kwantes, C.T., Matsumoto, D., & Safdar, S. (2009).

- Variation of emotional display rules within and across cultures: A comparison between Canada, USA, and Japan. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Jowett, S., Lorimer, R., & Yang, X. (2012). The role of personality, empathy, and satisfaction with instruction within the context of the coach-athlete relationship. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 6(2), 3-20.
- Newell, B. (2007). *The relationship of coaches' leadership styles and gender performance outcomes and academic performance in college basketball* (Masters thesis).
- Owens, L., Steward, C., (2011). Behavioral characteristics of 'favorite' coaches: Implications for coach education. *Physical Educator*, 68(2), 90-97.
- Seifried, C. (2008). Examining punishment and discipline: Defending the use of punishment by coaches. *Quest*, 60, 370-386.
- Short, S.E., & Vargas, T.M. (2011). Athletes' perceptions of the psychological, emotional, and performance effects of coaches pre-game speeches. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 5(1), 27-43.
- Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L. (1997). Coaching the coaches: Youth sports as a scientific and applied behavioral setting. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 6(1), 16-21. doi. 149.69.254.57
- Stirling, A.E. (2013). Understanding the use of emotionally abusive coaching practices. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 8(4), 625-639.
- Szabo, A.S. (2012). What is the meaning of sport coaching? (Expectations, possibilities, realities). *Sport Scientific & Practical Aspects*, 9(2), 39-44.
- Van Gastel, C. (2010). *Leadership scale for sport*. School of Exercise Science (NSW).
- VEA (Producer). (2003). *Characteristics of a respected coach* [video]. Available from <http://digital.films.com.pluma.sjfc.edu/PortalViewVideo.aspx?xtid=33270>
- Wałach-Bísta, Z. (2013). A polish adaptation of leadership scale for sports- A questionnaire

examining coach behaviors. *Human Movement*, 14(3), 265-274. doi. 10.2478/humo-2013-0032

Appendix A

ST JOHN
FISHER
 COLLEGE

Player Preferences for Coaching Behaviors

Player Preferences for Coaching Behaviors

The purpose of this survey is to take a closer look and to examine if coaches are meeting the expectations of their athletes. First we will look at what your coach does and how he or she behaves.

Please answer the following questions

What sport do you play? (Please select all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Baseball	<input type="checkbox"/> Track and Field
<input type="checkbox"/> Basketball	<input type="checkbox"/> Cross Country
<input type="checkbox"/> Soccer	<input type="checkbox"/> Volleyball
<input type="checkbox"/> Football	<input type="checkbox"/> Tennis
<input type="checkbox"/> Lacrosse	<input type="checkbox"/> Golf
<input type="checkbox"/> Softball	<input type="checkbox"/> Field Hockey
<input type="checkbox"/> Rowing	

If you selected more than one sport, the survey will ask you to answer all of the questions twice (one for each sport). Please indicate the sport you pick for each survey.

This section will examine what you **expect** out of a coach. In other words, What do you expect a coach in your sport to behave like?

Please answer the following questions

I expect my coach to put effort into building a personal relationship with me

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (other teammates) to assist in making decisions regarding strategies to be used in games

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (and other teammates) to assist in making decisions regarding practices

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (and other teammates) to assist in making decisions regarding workouts

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to make all the decisions independently without player input

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to focus on improving my skills as an athlete

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to acknowledge my successes

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to reward my good performances

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to reward my good performances

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What other behaviors do you expect your coaches to exhibit that were not listed above?

Now go through and think about the behaviors you **prefer** out of your coaches. In other words, What are you specifically looking for from your coach in terms of how he or she behaves

Please answer of the following questions

I prefer a coach that works on developing my skills as an athlete

	Never	On Occasion	Most of the Time	Always
In season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach who wants to build a close personal relationship with me

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that makes all the decisions without player input

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that uses punishment to make me better

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

This section will examine what you **expect** out of a coach. In other words, What are you specifically looking for from your coach in terms of how he or she behaves

Please answer the following questions

I expect my coach to put effort into building a personal relationship with me

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (and other teammates) to assist in making decisions regarding strategies to be used in games

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (and other teammates) to assist in making decisions regarding practices

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (and other teammates) to assist in making decisions regarding workouts

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (and other teammates) to assist in making decisions regarding practices

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to allow me (and other teammates) assist in making decisions regarding workouts

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to make all the decisions independently without player input

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to focus on improving my skills as an athlete

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to acknowledge my successes

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to reward my good performances

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What other behaviors do you expect your coaches to exhibit that are not listed above?

Now go through and think about the behaviors you prefer out of your coaches. In other words, What are you specifically looking for from your coach in terms of how he or she behaves

Please answer of the following questions

I prefer a coach who works on developing my skills as an athlete

	Never	On Occasion	Most of the Time	Always
In season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that becomes more of a friend to me

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that makes all the decisions

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that makes all the decisions

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach who uses punishment to make me better

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that includes me (and other teammates) in making decisions for in-game strategies

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that includes me (and other teammates) in making decisions for practices

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I expect my coach to focus on improving my skills as an athlete

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I prefer a coach that rewards me when I have good performances

	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
In Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Out of Season	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What other behaviors do you prefer to see out of a coach that were not listed above?

Are you male or female?

Male Female

What year are you in school?

Freshman Senior
 Sophomore Graduate Student
 Junior

Appendix B

Dear SJFC Athletes,

My name is Tim Coykendall, a senior sport management major here at St. John Fisher. I am in the process of doing research on the preferred coaching behaviors of SJFC athletes and if the coaches at SJFC meet those expectations. I would like to ask for a few minutes of your time to take part in my research by answering a few questions I have compiled as a part of my survey.

This study is completely anonymous and will remain anonymous when the results are shared after completing my research. This study will not be distributed to the coaching staff after completion. Like I stated earlier, participation in this survey is anonymous.

I thank you for taking time out of your day to read my email. I will be sending you a survey within the next two weeks. Your response will be extremely helpful in determining how well your coaches meet your expectations and preferences.

Sincerely,

Tim Coykendall

Appendix C

Post completion thank you email

Dear SJFC Athlete,

I just wanted to thank you for taking part in my study. Your answers and insight provided me with the necessary data that I needed to conclude my study. If any of you are interested in the results of my study or if you have any questions regarding your participating, please feel free to contact me and I will be happy to address and inquiries that you may have. Again, thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to help me by taking part in my study.

Sincerely,

Tim Coykendall

Appendix D

SPSS Variable Spreadsheet

	Name	Type	Width	Decimals	Label	Values	Missing	Columns	Align	Measure	Role
1	sport	Numeric	8	2	sport played	{1.00, base...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
2	IndivTeam	Numeric	8	2	Individual vs Te...	{1.00, Indivi...	None	7	Right	Nominal	Input
3	TwoSport	Numeric	8	2	Two Sport Athl...	{1.00, One ...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
4	RelatIn	Numeric	8	2	Building a relati...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
5	RelatOut	Numeric	8	2	Building a relati...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
6	DecGameIn	Numeric	8	2	Decisions regar...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
7	DecGameOut	Numeric	8	2	Decisions regar...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
8	DecPractIn	Numeric	8	2	Decisions regar...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
9	DecPractOut	Numeric	8	2	Decisions regar...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
10	DecWorkIn	Numeric	8	2	Decisions regar...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
11	DecWorkOut	Numeric	8	2	Decisions regar...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
12	IndependDe...	Numeric	8	2	Coach makes d...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
13	IndependDe...	Numeric	8	2	Coach makes d...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
14	SkillsIn	Numeric	8	2	Improving skills...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
15	SkillsOut	Numeric	8	2	Improving skills...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
16	SuccessesIn	Numeric	8	2	Acknowledge s...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
17	Successes...	Numeric	8	2	Acknowledge s...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
18	RewardsIn	Numeric	8	2	Rewards good ...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
19	RewardsOut	Numeric	8	2	Rewards good ...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
20	PrefSkillsIn	Numeric	8	2	Prefer improvin...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
21	PrefSkillsOut	Numeric	8	2	Prefer improvin...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
22	PrefRelatIn	Numeric	8	2	Prefer building ...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
23	PrefRelaOut	Numeric	8	2	Prefer building ...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
24	PrefCoachD...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer a coach ...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
25	PrefCoachD...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer a coach ...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
26	PrefPunishIn	Numeric	8	2	Prefer coach th...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
27	PrefPunish...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer coach th...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
28	PrefDecGa...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer including...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
29	PrefDecGa...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer including...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
30	PrefDecPraIn	Numeric	8	2	Prefer including...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
31	PrefDecPra...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer including...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
32	PrefSucces...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer a coach ...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
33	PrefSucces...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer a coach ...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
34	PrefRewardIn	Numeric	8	2	Prefer a coach ...	{1.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
35	PrefReward...	Numeric	8	2	Prefer a coach ...	{5.00, never}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
36	Gender	Numeric	8	2	Male or Female	{1.00, Male}...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input
37	YearInSchool	Numeric	8	2	Year In School	{1.00, Fresh...	None	8	Right	Nominal	Input

Appendix E

Table 1

Gender Differences for In and Out of Season Coaching Behaviors

	Preferred Behaviors		Expected Behaviors	
	In season	Out of season	In season	Out of season
	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2
Builds a personal relationship	1.280	1.388	4.932	1.870
A coach that uses punishment	7.826*	8.431*	N/A	N/A
Allow athlete input in workout decisions	N/A	N/A	.286	1.702
Allow athlete input in game decisions	2.535	4.671	1.347	3.113
Allow athlete input during practice decisions	1.703	.634	5.013	2.234
Coach makes decisions independently	1.227	4.339	3.808	3.736
Help improve skills and techniques	2.976	1.289	1.525	4.747
A coach that acknowledges successes	2.397	6.041	.458	.563
A coach that rewards good performance	1.900	2.048	2.016	.964

Note: * significant at p<.05 level, ** significant at p<.01 level

Table 2

Sport (individual vs. team) Differences for In and Out of Season Coaching Behaviors

	Preferred Behaviors		Expected Behaviors	
	In season	Out season	In season	Out season
	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2
Build a personal relationship	5.999	13.063**	.423	12.051**
A coach that uses punishment	.376	.309	N/A	N/A
Allow athlete input in workout decisions	N/A	N/A	2.719	8.013
Allow athlete input in game decisions	1.219	.395	.716	8.395
Allow athlete input during practice decisions	5.429	3.318	5.780	.920
Coach makes decisions independently	1.473	2.211	2.969	1.834
Help improve skills and techniques	.434	.868	1.182	.611
A coach that acknowledges successes	3.076	.576	4.376	1.860
A coach that rewards good performance	4.153	2.956	1.372	3.749

Note: * significant at p<.05 level, ** significant at p<.01 level

Table 3

Year Differences for In and Out of Season Coaching Behaviors

	Preferred Behaviors		Expected Behaviors	
	In season	Out of season	In season	Out of season
	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2
Build a personal relationship	2.510	3.554	2.123	3.503
A coach that uses punishment	.369	4.447	N/A	N/A
Allow athlete input in workout decisions	N/A	N/A	.633	1.308
Allow athlete input in game decisions	3.466	2.925	2.210	2.583
Allow athlete input during practice decisions	1.919	.776	1.799	.721
Coach makes decisions independently	5.411	6.370	2.438	3.667
Help improve skills and techniques	1.182	2.847	2.307	2.096
A coach that acknowledges successes	.104	2.515	.877	.193
A coach that rewards good performance	4.795	2.443	1.884	8.253*

Note: * significant at p<.05 level, ** significant at p<.01 level

Table 4**Correlations between Preferred and Expected Behaviors**

<i>Behaviors</i>	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>
Building a Relationship in season	.443
Building a relationship out of season	.516
Decisions regarding games in season	.582
Decisions regarding games out of season	.596
Decisions regarding practices in season	.535
Decisions regarding practices out of season	.470
Coach makes decisions independently in season	.286*
Coach makes decisions independently out of season	.399
Improving skills in season	.242*
Improving skills out of season	.514
Recognizing successes in season	.706**
Recognizing successes out of season	.592
Rewarding good performances in season	.659**
Rewarding good performances out of season	.567

*. Correlation is weak if P is close to .000

** . Correlation is strong if P is close to 1.0