

Summer 2014

Football Head Coaching Evaluations: Perceptions on the NCAA Division III Level

Bryan Schnell
St. John Fisher College

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

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



Part of the [Sports Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schnell, Bryan, "Football Head Coaching Evaluations: Perceptions on the NCAA Division III Level" (2014). *Sport Management Undergraduate*. Paper 82.

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 http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad/82 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.

Football Head Coaching Evaluations: Perceptions on the NCAA Division III Level

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to look at the evaluation criteria used during the evaluation of a Division III head football coach. The reasoning behind the subject is because of the lack of knowledge on the criteria used. While some researches have given a short list of reasons why coaches get fired, however none of them have focused on Division III which's landscape is very different of that in Division I. A survey was sent out to 150 head coaches and athletic directors throughout the country. After looking at the results it showed the perceptions did differ between both subjects but their perceptions were also very similar. The top five criteria that were mentioned by both beach coaches and athletic directors were; winning, recruitment of student athletes, student athlete experience, organization and management of the football program, and retention. The findings of this study is important for a few reasons, it provides a better understanding of the criteria used in head coaching evaluations, and it also provides future researches a chance to use the criteria that were fond important in this study and use it in theirs to improve their own findings.

Document Type

Undergraduate Project

Professor's Name

Katharine Burakowski

Subject Categories

Sports Management

Football Head Coaching Evaluations: Perceptions on the NCAA Division III Level

Bryan Schnell

Saint John Fisher College

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to look at the evaluation criteria used during the evaluation of a Division III head football coach. The reasoning behind the subject is because of the lack of knowledge on the criteria used. While some researches have given a short list of reasons why coaches get fired, however none of them have focused on Division III which's landscape is very different of that in Division I. A survey was sent out to 150 head coaches and athletic directors throughout the country. After looking at the results it showed the perceptions did differ between both subjects but their perceptions were also very similar. The top five criteria that were mentioned by both head coaches and athletic directors were; winning, recruitment of student athletes, student athlete experience, organization and management of the football program, and retention. The findings of this study is important for a few reasons, it provides a better understanding of the criteria used in head coaching evaluations, and it also provides future researches a chance to use the criteria that were found important in this study and use it in theirs to improve their own findings.

Football Head Coaching Evaluations: Perceptions on the NCAA Division III Level

According to d3football.com (2014) there are 245 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division III (DIII) football programs all across the country. Meaning that at these schools there are 245 Head Coaches who at the end of each season are subject to evaluation by their institution's athletic department. Unfortunately, some of those 245 coaches do get fired passed on poor performance, or organizational issues dealing with violations or values of the head coach and the athletic department (Holmes, 2011). In addition to Holmes there have been studies that take a look at the business world and how they view the evaluation process. According to Mir & Ahmed (2014) all renewals are based on evaluations. In light of these two studies, there has not been a lot of information about the employee's perceptions of evaluation specifically, in college football head coaches. These two concepts will be used to gain a better understanding of the relationship between reasons for termination and the criteria used in the evaluation process. The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions that Athletic Directors and Division III head coaches have on the evaluation criteria.

This research is beneficial to the academic community because it expands on the knowledge already known about the employee evaluation criteria used. It also provided a different way of looking at the evaluation criteria because there has been no previous literature on evaluation criteria used in the evaluation of head college football coaches. This research is practical because it provides the athletic directors of the institution the perceptions of how coaches feel about being evaluated and also the coaches could use the research to further understand more of the criteria behind the process rather than the evaluation just happening.

The purpose of this study was to take a look at the perceptions of head coach evaluations and how they differ amongst the head coaches and athletic directors at NCAA Division III football programs. The research question of this study was:
How do perceptions of evaluation criteria differ between head football coaches and athletic directors at NCAA Division III level?

Literature Review

Evaluation

Employee evaluation happens in every type of industry not just sports. According to Mir and Ahmed (2014) employee evaluation is a process that any institution can use to try and find the employees strength and weaknesses. The group's study was of the Pakistan Banking Sector and they surveyed 150 employees and managers to get both points of view (Mir & Ahmed, 2014). While the study was not done in sports the information provided could show the forms of motivation that comes from these evaluations. When looking at the employees the group wanted to see if the employee performance had improved when they knew they were being evaluated. This is important to the world of coaching because if the coach is shown in the media as being on the "Hot Seat" than they may sense that they are being looked at more than before. The study found that there is a significant effect on employee performance during the evaluation period (Mir & Ahmed, 2014).

To go along with Mir and Ahmed's idea of the definition of evaluation Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter state that it is not surprising that most managers make most of their important decisions based on their overall evaluation of performance (1993). Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter study is based on salesman's performance and the impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) (Mackenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993). According to Lambert OCB is

defined as behavior that goes above and beyond the requirements of the basic job, largely discretionary, and is to benefit the organization (2006). In this particular study the group breaks OCB into several forms; Altruism, courtesy, Sportsmanship, Civic virtue, and conscientiousness (Mackenzie et al., 1993). It is found the OCB has a major impact on a manager's evaluation of the salesperson and it is weighed just as if not more strongly than the overall performance (Mackenzie et al., 1993). This is important for head coaches of college football teams because the records are the coaches overall performance but the values of the school and coach can be seen as the OCB.

As Paul Holmes explains in his study coaches sometimes get fired if their values do not align with those of the school (2011). This could be issues such as not getting along with boosters or making questionable decisions when it comes to recruiting. As Bowling, Wang, & Li (2012) explain in their study employees who have a favorable job attitude they are more likely to give their organization by showing good OCB. They go on to explain that those employees with positive attitudes will stand up for their organization if someone criticizes it. If a member of the media is openly bashing the school a coach that is willing to defend the institution they have a positive job attitude and thus showing good OCB. The study looked at 200 New Zealand employees from various industries. This is important because it shows that OCB can be in any type of industry. They found that if an employee is given a positive evaluation they are more likely to use OCB to improve the welfare of the organization (Bowling et al., 2012).

Bush and Jiao (2011) looked at business students and with relevant fieldwork and gave them situations to see how they would handle the situations in the real world to. They would then rate their performance and have a supervisor rate them as well (Bush & Jiao, 2011). This is

used to try and show the relationship between performance and job OCB. The study found that there is no evidence that adding OCB to performance evaluations has any increase in employee satisfaction (Bush & Jiao, 2011). This improvement in employee satisfaction is because of a good evaluation. This shows that these business students felt that their overall job performance and satisfaction did not change.

When being evaluated, employees hope that they are being evaluated fairly and without any bias. Shoulihin and Pike (2013) set up a questionnaire for three major organizations in Europe. They set up three criteria for the sample being that they must have been with the organization for longer than a year, they have been evaluated, and that they have received feedback from these evaluations (Shoulihin & Pike, 2013). The purpose of the study was to take a look at the procedural fairness of these companies (Shoulihin & Pike, 2013). The previous research done on this topic was inconclusive (Shoulihin & Pike, 2013). The study found that fairness is affected by performance goals (Shoulihin & Pike, 2013). For example if during a coaches first three seasons they are expected to win twenty- five games and they come short of that mark than the coach is going to be evaluated poorly. This gives managers a point to look at when trying to evaluate. If an employee did not meet a mark or they went above and beyond it will determine the nature of the evaluation.

As Mir and Ahmed touched on in their research if an employee has a negative relationship with a boss than they will always feel as if they are being evaluated unfairly (2014). Mir and Ahmed talked about in their study the banking sector in Pakistan but the same type of ideas can be used in coaching. In coaching the coach deals with a lot of people from the athletic

director to people who fund the team such as boosters. If they have a negative relationship with these people they feel they can never be evaluated fairly. But with the addition of the performance goals if an employee fails to reach them that person has to expect that the evaluation is fair. If the renewal process is only based on the evaluation process than there is a great amount of pressure put on that employee (Mir & Ahmed). In some cases the pressure becomes too much for many college football head coaches.

Termination of Coaches

Reason for termination.

The reason behind a coach being fired is something that needs to be looked at further. This is might be important because it gives a better understanding of the effect coaching turnover may have on a program. As one could believe a simple reason for why a coach may be terminated is by not winning enough football games. Winning increases the revenue for not only the school, but for the overall compensation of that coach (Grant, Leadly, & Zygmunt, 2013).

Holmes (2011) talks about some of the reasons why a coach may be terminated in his study, which focuses on a coaching change and its effects on a NFL prospects draft stock. Holmes states that some factors of why coaches get fired include being: 1) organizational expectations in regards to performance, 2) the values and allegiances of the organization meaning what the organization stands for and who they have ties with in regards to boosters and alumni, 3) and the amount of power the head coach has during his tenure (Holmes, 2011). Holmes used these as reasons based on the previous literature. Holmes study eventually found that the draft stock of a prospect that experienced a coaching change during their time in

college fell an average of two-thirds of a round in the NFL draft (Holmes, 2011). This suggests that a coach has an impact on a player. The new coach has no incentive to play a player that is grandfathered in which will hurt that player's draft stock. However, the incentive to play a player could also be that the player was unable or unwilling to adapt to a new system that is put in place.

Holmes (2011) also introduces the factor of race of the coach. Race could also become a factor in regards to why a coach could get fired. In terms of the race and ethnicity of the head coach one study found that black coaches are 9.6% less likely to get fired than their nonblack counterparts (Mixon & Treviño, 2004). Holmes cites the article in his work however; he believes Mixon & Treviño's work is limited due to the way they conducted their research. Race is a delicate issue in regards to being a head coach at a Division I college football program. This suggests that the coaches may be the beneficiaries of special treatment by those universities because the universities do not want to be a part of a social scandal-involving race (Mixon & Treviño, 2004). The information in this article provides information about another factor in which is involved in the dismissal of a coach in college football.

Soebbing and Washington (2011) conducted a study about the performance of the team after a leadership change. The study took into account various different independent and dependent variables. One of the categories for the study's variables are organizational factors which included the conference affiliation, how old the program was, and years in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) (Soebbing & Washington, 2011). That showed what the coach is dealing with from the university's point of view. Another category that is important for this study was the institutional factors those included scholarship rule adjustments and the BCS championship

system (Soebbing & Washington, 2011). The rules of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) have changed regarding recruiting and even the championship formats.

Effects of coach termination.

Another area that needs to be discussed is the effect the termination has on the team and the organization. Fazel and D'Itri (1999) did a similar study to Soebbing and Washington but their study found that as long as the next manager's efficiency is greater than the former manager the negative effects of the succession should be minimized. Where Soebbing and Washington found that the longer the tenure of the coach the organizational performance improves (Soebbing & Washington, 2011). Fazel and D'Itri (1999) state that some managers will try and maximize the returns to themselves rather than to fulfill the goals of the organization. This supports Holmes' claim that coaches are fired if they don't conform to the organizational ideas (Holmes, 2011). They also support the idea that the more power the coach has the less likely they have of being fired. It states that the more powerful the manager is the less accountable they are held in certain situations (Fazel & D'Itri, 1999)

Pieper, Nüesch, and Franck (2014) looked at the coaches in the most competitive soccer league in Germany. While the sports of soccer and football are very different the data found in regards to the decision making process of a coach's future with an organization. The article compares managing a soccer club to being very similar to any other type of business however; it is difficult because it is also based upon the other teams the competition is against (Pieper, Nüesch, & Franck 2014). In sports the play of the other team can affect the outcome of games whether that is good or bad for the team. However, in business they will provide different products and services to the consumer while it is similar that a coach is competing against other

teams are and the competition cannot change the characteristics of the coach's team. The study has two types of turnover voluntary meaning that it was either consensual between the club and the coach, retirement, or the coach leaving for another club (Pieper et al., 2014). Involuntary is when a coach is terminated by the club before the expiration of the manager's contract (Pieper et al., 2014). Involuntary is simply if a coach is fired before his contract is up. While voluntary shows reasons in ways a coach could move onto a different opportunity. Involuntary is the type of termination focused on during this study.

Pieper, Nüesch, and Franck eventually state that sooner or later a decision is going to have to be made on keeping a coach or getting a new one (Pieper et al., 2014). This is true for any sport. If the executives feel the manager is underperforming then they must discuss the future of the coach. These studies show how performance may not be the only reasons for a coach. However, getting rid of an underperforming coach may not be as beneficial as one might think.

The place the manager or coach is put in can also affect the team performance thus creating more tensions towards keeping or getting rid of a coach. Some of the times the manager is used as a scapegoat to cover the underperformance of the top officials in the organization (Hughes, Hughes, Mellahi, & Guermat, 2010). However, if they make the change it does not always mean the performance will improve. Hughes, Hughes, Mellahi, & Guermat (2010) study looks at top managers over a twelve year period in football (soccer) organizations and the impact of a change in managers. They look at the short term effects of the change which as they define is ten games after a managerial change and the long term effects which are defined as 30 games afterwards (Hughes et al., 2010). They found that even if the short

term has stayed primarily the same that does not always mean that the long term effects are going to be great (Hughes et al., 2010).

This is important research because it shows that making a change is not often the best thing to do for long term success. While this research does not go into the reasons why a coach or manager gets fired it goes into why it is not always the best thing to do in some situations. It is an opposite point of view that provides information that plays devil advocate to those who believe that a coaching change is the only way to improve team performance.

Conceptual Framework

The first concept that needs to be looked at for this research question is evaluation. Evaluation is defined as the way the heads of the organization look down on the managers or coaches. This concept means to find what goes on during the evaluation process and what the criteria used is during the process, how the workers view the thought of being evaluated, and what effects does it have on the workers motivation. The second concept is coaches getting fired. This study aims to define this as why coaches are involuntary terminated by the institution. This concept will also take a look at the effect the termination has on the program.

For this research it is important to understand that the two concepts in evaluation and the reasons for termination are related. In the business world people are constantly under evaluation and the world of college football in the end is just a business. Mir & Ahmed (2014) state that renewals are based on evaluation so if a coach receives a bad evaluation based off of the on field problems or the off field problems the program faces than according to the authors how could that coach be retained.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to find out how head coaches and athletic directors at the Division III level have different perceptions of the evaluation criteria used. The above concepts provide a better understanding of how the evaluation process at the corporate level and also how the criteria used effects the workers motivation and what they will do more for the organization in the from of OCB. The concepts also help show the reader what are some of the reasons for the termination of a coach and how that termination affects the team in the future.

Methods

This study has been done in order to find out the perceptions of evaluation criteria in Division III College Football. There has been no previous research that takes a look at the way head coaches and athletic directors view the evaluation criteria. The research question asked in this study was:

How do perceptions of evaluation criteria differ between head football coaches and athletic directors at NCAA Division III level? The design of this research is a cross- section survey.

Desired Sample

According to D3football.com (2014) there are 245 DIII teams in country. During the process it was decided that it was not realistic to reach out to all 245 teams and getting responses from all of them. With 245 schools if all athletic directors and head football coaches responded that would mean there would have been 490 different results that would have been needed to be analyzed. It was decided that a random sampling would be

used to gain an accurate measure of the perceptions of both the athletic directors and head coaches in the country. The survey was sent out to 150 schools athletic directors and head coaches. The goal of the survey sample was to get around 75 responses from either the athletic directors or the head coaches, with a good mix of both so that both sides of the discussion were represented appropriately.

Procedure

Sampling.

The survey was distributed electronically through email. The emails of both the athletic directors and head coaches were available through the schools official athletic website. The websites are linked through page that lists all of the DIII teams in the country on the team's pages of d3football.com (2014). Using the team page on d3football.com through a random number generator it was decided that for every eighth school that athletic departments athletic director would be chosen to participate. Using the same number generator it was decided that every sixth school's head coach would be selected for the study. 75 head coaches and 75 athletic directors were selected to participate in the study.

Date Collection.

The data that was collected for this study was mostly primary. This is due to the fact that no previous literature has looked at the perceptions of evaluation from a sports perspective and also from a coaching and athletic director perspective. The data that is somewhat from the secondary nature is some of the demographic information gathered

mainly the conference affiliation, those affiliations can also be found of d3football.com through the team page. There is also a mix between quantitative and qualitative data gathered. Some of the questions asked had definitive nominal responses, while others had more of the open- ended answering.

Some questions resulted in nominal responses. Examples of these most came from the questions in regards to the demographics of the respondents. Questions such as: “Are you a head coach or an athletic director? What is your tenure at your current school? What conference are you affiliated with?” Some questions had answers that were received in an ordinal scale. “What are the top five things you believe are involved in the evaluation process? What are the most important criteria of the evaluation process?” For ratio answers questions such as: “How many coaches have you fired as an athletic director?” “How many times have you been fired as a head coach at a DIII school?” Open-ended responses came from the question listing the five top criteria, and “In a few words what parts of your job performance are you not evaluated on that you feel you should?”.

Analysis.

When analyzing the data descriptive statistics were used. The most often used descriptive statistics were the mean and the mode. Mean was used to analyze questions such as how many times a coach has been fired or how many coaches the athletic director has fired. Mode was used specifically to analyze the list of top five criteria’s according to the respondent’s answers. Some coding will be required for the open-ended questions. Since the previous literature was lacking in what some of the evaluation criteria for head

coaches are the study was unable to provide a group of answers for the participants to choose from. This caused the coding of the responses to happen.

Results

Sample

For this research 75 DIII athletic directors and 75 DIII head coaches were contacted through their school emails which are found on the athletic department's website. The total number of survey respondents was 36. However, four of them were listwise deleted due to the participant not consenting to complete the survey, the participants tenure was less than a year at their current position, or they did not answer the demographic questions, their top five criteria, or if they felt the criteria was appropriate or not. The final sample size was 32, 18 athletic directors and 14 head coaches. These participants represented 26 out of the 30 NCAA DIII conferences, and had tenures ranging from anywhere between 1 year into their current tenure to having over 20 plus years of experience at the participants current institution. The sample was representative of the population. The number of respondents before listwise deletion was 24 percent of the sampled population.

Descriptive Statistics

Athletic director.

One of the first questions asked of the Athletic Directors was about the number of head coaches they have fired. The mean of the number of head coaches fired by the 18 athletic director participants was 1.61 with a standard deviation of .698. The mean of the

level of appropriateness of the department's evaluation criteria was 2.89 which means that most of the athletic directors felt it was appropriate, with a standard deviation of .323. It was also found that none of the 18 participants felt that their evaluation criteria were inappropriate. The 18 athletic directors listed their top five criteria when it comes to evaluating their head coaches. The criteria that was used most frequently was winning coming up 11 times. The next two were tied with ten, those being recruitment of student athletes and the organization and management of the football program. Seven athletic directors felt that the integrity and values of the coach was in their top five criteria, where knowledge and skill, NCAA rules and compliance, and the student athlete experience was mentioned six times. The athletic directors most frequently used recruiting as their most important criteria of the five that the previously listed in the survey.

Head coaches.

The 14 head coaches that participated found that the mean of how times they were fired was 1 with a standard deviation of 0. When asked the level of appropriateness of the evaluation criteria used the mean was 2.50 with a standard deviation of .650. Unlike the athletic directors some of the head coaches did say that the criteria used in their evaluation was inappropriate. The head coaches were also asked what their top five criteria of evaluation are. Winning was used most frequently being used with 13 out of the 14 head coaches responding. The student athlete experience was second with nine. Both recruitment and retention of student athletes was mentioned six times. Whereas the schools values and vision was mentioned five times as being in the top five evaluation criteria of a head coach. When asked what criteria the head coaches felt was most

important. The number one response was winning. Five coaches said that there is a part of their job that they should be evaluated on. Those answers being professional development which two coaches stated they should be evaluated on, craftsmanship, amount of time recruiting, and their coaching ability.

Both athletic directors and coaches.

The two parties were combined to find out the frequency of the types of criteria used. Winning was number one being mentioned by both parties 24 times. Recruitment of student athletes was mentioned 16 times. Student athlete experience was the third highest with 15. Organization and management of the football program was mentioned 14 times. Whereas the retention of student athletes was mentioned as a criteria for evaluation 11 times.

Discussion

Research Question

The ultimate answer to the research question of how do the perceptions differ between head football coaches and athletic directors at the NCAA DIII level, is that in many ways their perceptions are similar but they are also different. They differ in what they believe the most important and what the top five criteria is of the head coach evaluation. They also differ on how they feel about the criteria used when it comes to if everything the coach is evaluated on and if that criteria is appropriate or not. They are similar in that some of the criteria were mentioned by both the coach and athletic director.

As Grant, Leadly, and Zygmunt (2013) and also Holmes (2011) the head coaches and athletic directors both agreed that winning and the success of the team had an effect on the evaluation. A majority of the head coaches listed winning as the most important criteria during the evaluation. Holmes (2011) also had a few other factors into the evaluation and reasons why coaches get fired. Three of those were also mentioned as criteria during the survey. Those being in regards to alumni and booster relations and the values of the coach aligning with the college. Holmes (2011) mentioned race as being a factor in the firing of a coach along with Mixon and Treviño (2004) however, race was never mentioned as a criteria of evaluation. Soebbing and Washington (2011) talked about some of the organizational rules and NCAA rules are always changing and that they could be a reason for termination. NCAA rules and compliance was mentioned by both the head coaches and athletic directors as criteria during the survey. Organization and management of the football program was also mentioned by the participants as being a criteria of evaluation.

It was talked about a lot in the literature review about Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. OCB is defined as behavior that goes above and beyond the requirements of the basic job, largely discretionary, and is to benefit the organization (Lambert, 2006). No coach or athletic director mentioned OCB as criteria. However, some of the criteria that were listed by the participants represent the definition of OCB. They both listed items such as community relations, positive visibility of the program, team conduct on and off the field, on campus involvement, retention of student athletes, and also recruiting. Recruiting is here because during the during the recruitment process the coach is not only selling the football program they are selling the college or university as a whole. Some coaches go above in beyond when a potential student athlete is deciding between

their school and potential a rival school they provide insight using current athletes and their own experience when it comes to the school major and minor programs, and things that go along with being a student at the given school. Bowling, Lang, and Li (2012) go along with Holmes' (2011) idea about the values of a coach or employee during evaluation. As Bowling, Wang, & Li (2012) explain in their study employees who have a favorable job attitude they are more likely to give their organization by showing good OCB, meaning that if the coach's values align with organization the evaluation will be more favorable. As said previously, the values of the coach were listed when asked about the top five criteria of evaluation.

Mir and Ahmed (2014) talked about if the two parties have a negative relationship than the employee will feel they are being evaluated unfairly. This can be compared to if both the head coaches and athletic directors felt that the evaluation criteria used is appropriate or not. While the data still suggested that both parties felt that the criteria used was appropriate some still felt that some of the criteria is inappropriate for evaluation. Also, the head coaches were asked if there was anything that they felt should be a criteria and isn't or that is not weighed enough. This is compared to Mir and Ahmed (2014) because the evaluation is somewhat unfair because they are not being evaluated on something that the coach feels they should be evaluated on.

Limitations and Delimitations

One of the limitations of this study was that there was no previous research on the evaluation criteria of a head coach at any level not just at the DIII level. This made it very difficult in that there was no set list of what goes into the evaluation of a head football

coach. While some of the research on evaluation itself shows what could be taken into account in the business world it is still different when it comes to the world of sports. The research on the causes of termination also didn't show enough examples of what the criteria of the evaluation is and it only suggests some of the causes of termination. Another limitation was that all of the information gathered about evaluation is about business or health services organizations. While what the authors suggested can be used to describe the process. They provided nothing on the criteria used and even if they did those criteria were not concrete enough to use as examples of criteria used during the evaluation of a head football coach. The evaluation criteria may differ according to the different divisions of the NCAA. While most coaches at the different levels emails are listed on the school's athletics website DIII had a higher incentive to respond to a survey from a former DIII athlete and someone who wishes to enter that profession. Another limitation to this study was that there were 35 usable respondents to the study.

While not being able to expand the survey to the different levels of the NCAA it was also a delimitation of the study. That is because it was decided that DIII head coaches and athletic directors had more incentive to respond to the study during the summer than their counterparts in the higher divisions. Another item that was chosen not to be a part of the study was demographic of race and race as a criteria of evaluation. This was because the sample was chosen at random and there was no guarantee that a minority head coach or athletic director would have been chosen to participate in the study. Gender was along the same line as race. Gender was chosen to not be a demographic for the study because it was decided that the gender of the participant would not have an effect of the participant's perceptions of the evaluation criteria.

Recommendations for Future Research

Taking a look at the other sports at the DIII level to see if the criteria used in the evaluation of a football coach is the same or similar to that of a women's soccer or a men's basketball coach. This will provide a better look at the landscape of evaluation in DIII athletics. As said in the limitations and delimitations taking a look at the other levels of the NCAA could be done by other researchers. This can be done not only for head football coaches but the other sports as well.

Expanding the sample in different ways can also help improve this research. Sampling more than 75 head coaches and 75 athletic directors can help get a better answer on their perceptions. Also, looking at the participants by region rather than the nation as a whole could be helpful. Football is a lot bigger down southeastern part of the untied with the Southeastern Conference in Division I than it is in the upper New England region of the United States. If a researcher was able to gain access to the NCAA Division I coaches and athletic directors, than it maybe more beneficial for them to focus on an area of the country rather than the whole country for their study.

Summary

In closing results from this study should that the perceptions of evaluation criteria at the DIII do differ in some ways between head coaches and athletic directors. We further found that winning, recruiting, the student athlete experience, the organization and management of the football program, and then the retention of the student athletes were listed as the most common of the criteria used in evaluation. Due to the finding of this study further research of this area can be improved and undoubtedly warranted.

References

BCS (2013). BCS conferences. Retrieved from:

<http://www.bcsfootball.org/news/story?id=4809755>

Bowling, N. A., Wang, Q., & Li, H. (2012). The moderating effect of core self-evaluations on the relationships between job attitudes and organisational citizenship behavior. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 61(1), (pp. 97-113). doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00458.x

Bush, M. S., & Jiao, C. (2011). Including organizational citizenship behavior in performance evaluations: An investigation of employee reactions. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 6(10), (pp.50-58). doi:10.5539/ijbm.v6n10p50

D3 Football. (2014). Division III team pages. Retrieved from: <http://www.d3football.com/teams/index>

Fizel, J.L., & D'Itri, M.P. (1999). Firing and Hiring of Managers: Does Efficiency Matter? *Journal Of Management*, 25(4), 567-586.

Grant, R.R., Leadley, J.C., & Zygmunt, Z.X. (2013). Just win baby? Determinants of NCAA football bowl subdivision coaching compensation. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 8(1), 61-74.

Holmes, P. (2011) Win or go home: Why college football coaches get fired. *Journal of Sports Economics* doi: 10.1177/1527002510378820

Hughes, M., Hughes, P., Mellahi, K., Guermat, C. (2010). Short- term versus long term impact of managers: Evidence from the football industries. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2), 571-589.

Lambert, S.J. (2006) Both art and science: Employing organizational documentation in workplace-based research. In Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Kossek, E.E., & Sweet, S. (Eds.). *The work and family handbook: Multi disciplinary perspectives, methods, and approaches*. 503- 525. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 70- 80.

Mir, T., & Mir Ahmed, M. (2014). impact of employee evaluation on employee performance: A study of

- banking sector of Pakistan. *Global Conference on Business & Finance Proceedings*, 9(1), 413-420.
- Mixon, J., & Treviño, L. (2004). How race affects dismissals of college football coaches. *Journal of Labor Research*, 25(4), 645-656.
- Pieper, J., Nüesch, S., & Franck, E. (2014). How performance expectations affect managerial replacement decisions. *Schmalenbach Business Review (SBR)*, 66(1), 5-23.
- Sholihin, M., & Pike, R. (2013). Investigating the determinants of perceived procedural fairness in performance evaluation. *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, 11(1), 29-42.
- Soebbing, B. P., & Washington, M. (2011). Leadership succession and organizational performance: football coaches and organizational issues. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(6), 550-561.

Appendix A

Project Title: Football Head Coaching Evaluations: Perceptions on the NCAA Division III Level
Researcher: Bryan Schnell E-mail: bms03511@sjfc.edu

Advisor Dr. Katharine Burakowski E-mail: kburakowski@sjfc.edu

Phone: 585-385-7389

Purpose and Description: The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding about the perceptions of coaching evaluations from both a coaching and administrative point of view at the NCAA Division III level. As a participant in this survey you are being asked to complete a survey. For example you will be asked if you feel that the way your schools evaluation criteria is fair or not. The survey will take approximately 15- 20 minutes to complete.

The information you provide may help in changing or bettering the schools evaluation process of their head coaches. Risks associated with participation in this survey are that your co-workers or administration could be aware of your participation through conversations you may have or by watching you complete the survey. The participants in this study's identities will be kept confidential because the results will be presented as a collection of responses. No contact information will be included the presentation of results.

There will be no added incentive or benefit for completing this survey.

While participation will be appreciated this survey is completely voluntary. You may decide not to participate and if you begin you are free to stop at anytime if you decide to do so. If you chose to not continue your decision will be respected. Having read the above you are free to complete the survey if you choose to do so. By completing this survey you will give me permission for participation. You may print this consent letter for future reference. If you have any issues with your selection or treatment as a participant, please feel free to contact my research advisor Dr. Katharine Burakowski at kburakowski@sjfc.edu.

Do you agree to participate?

What **conference** is your school affiliated with?

What is your current tenure at your institution? (**Years**)

What is primary role in your athletic department?

How many head football coaches have you fired in your time as a Division III Athletic Director?

To what degree do you feel the criteria of the head football coach evaluation is appropriate? **Criteria is what you base the evaluation on.**

What are the top five criteria you evaluate your head football coaches on? Rank is not needed.

Out of the previous five answers which do you feel is most important?

How many times have you been fired from a head coaching position at the DIII level?

To what degree do you feel the criteria you are being evaluated on is appropriate? Criteria is what the evaluation is based on.

What are the top five criteria that you feel that you are being evaluated on? Rank does not matter.

Which out of the five previous answers do you consider to be the most important criteria?

Do you feel that there are components of your job performance that you are not evaluated on that you should be?

In a few words what parts of your job performance are you not evaluated on that you feel you should be?