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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate specific factors that affect an athlete’s perception and evaluation of coaching behaviors. All great relationships are built on key components such as time commitment, trust, and compatibility. Student-athlete and coach relationships are no different, and it’s important that athletes see their coaches’ behaviors and interactions in a positive light. Thirty-five student-athletes in a range of five different sports in a mid-size university in the Midwest participated in this study. The vast majority were white and roughly two thirds of the responses were female. Results indicated that there was a significant positive correlation between athlete-coach compatibility and athlete’s perception on positive coaching behavior, and between coache-initiated motivational climate and athlete’s perception on positive coaching behavior. However, there was no correlation between the amount of athlete’s time spent with coach and their perception of their coach’s behavior. Together, these findings suggest the importance of the coaches’ sharing their goals, values, and beliefs with their athletes and creating positive motivational climate.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Often times from the outside, a team’s success is mostly measured by its season record and overall wins and losses yet winning is only a minor part of success. In order for athletes and teams to be successful, they must have effective coaching and positive, personal relationships. How an athlete views their coach is extremely important. Coaches need to hold a place of respect and authority, but still feel reachable enough for their athletes to open up and view their coach as a role model or mentor. A strong coach-athlete relationship is important not only for the athlete’s growth as a positive, ethical and moral person, but for the team’s performance as a whole (Gels, 2017). Relationship coaching is about coaches connecting with their players, getting to the real pulse of the team, and releasing a powerful collective emotional energy. This very often is the edge that allows teams to survive the bad times and go on to remarkable achievements (Beswick, 2010).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate specific factors that affect an athlete’s perception and evaluation of coaching behaviors.

Background and Significance of the Study

Coaching is a highly complex process and coaches are required to take on a variety of tasks that involved their student-athletes. Perhaps one of the most important aspects of coaching is the way in which athletes perceive their coaches’ behaviors. Considering the importance of the coach in determining the quality and success of an athlete’s sport experience, surprisingly little research exists that identifies optimal coaching behaviors and factors that influence the
effectiveness of particular behaviors (Kenow & Williams, 1999; Williams et al., 2003). Smith, Smoll, and Curtis (1978) found that coaches actually have little awareness of how frequently they behave in various ways, not to mention the effect these behaviors have on their student-athletes.

In recent literature, we have seen a shift in research that includes the investigation of interpersonal relationships between coaches and athletes. This shift in research was necessary based on the realization that the basic unit of leadership, the coach-athlete relationship, is complex, dynamic, multifaceted, and reciprocal in nature (Poczwardoski, Barott, & Jowett, 2006). There is no one model or theory that can measure the many aspects of the coach-athlete relationship. Coaching behavior and effectiveness are crucial to the development of athletes as it can influence performance results in many aspects of their lives. Thus, the coach-athlete relationship can be personal and powerful for both parties involved, providing the athlete with a unique level of support, and promoting both physical and psychosocial development (Jowett, 2005).

Successful collegiate coaching occurs every day, but there is still much to be learned about this complex process and interactions between coaches and athletes. Researchers and coaching practitioners have long grappled with the problem of developing a comprehensive framework that accurately describes the process and phenomenology of coaching (Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003). With that being said, this study explored the following research question(s):

1. Is coach-athlete compatibility related to athletes’ perception and evaluation of coaching behaviors?
2. Does the amount of interactions between athletes and coaches affect the athlete’s perception of their coach’s behavior?
3. Does the coach-initiated motivational climate affect athletes’ perception and evaluation of coaching behaviors?

**Setting**

This study focused on student-athletes competing at the Division II institution in the upper Midwest region of the United State. The survey link was emailed to the athletes via the athletic office secretary and could be completely on their own time frames on their own laptops.

**Assumptions**

My assumptions for results of this study are based off of prior experience as a collegiate student-athlete, at both the Division II and III levels. The way an athlete perceives their coach’s behavior can have a great impact on their personal experience and success of the team. I believe that the results will show that compatibility, frequency of interactions, and motivational climate will all have some sort of correlation with the way an athlete sees their coach.

**Definitions**

- *Motivational Climate:* the psychological environment that the coach creates by designing sessions which provide instructions and feedback that will help to motivate the athletes in training and competition (Ames, 1992).

- *Compatibility:* “the degree to which your (athlete’s) goals, personality, and beliefs are consistent with your coach’s goals, personality, and beliefs” (Kenow & Williams, 1999).

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to investigate specific factors (compatibility and interactions between student-athletes and coaches, and motivational climate) and the way that these may impact an athlete’s perception and evaluation of their coach’s behavior. It’s important
to understand the coach-athlete dynamic and understand that how athlete’s view their coaches can affect both that individual and team success.
Chapter Two  

Literature Review  

This study focuses on what factors could affect the way in which an athlete perceives and evaluates their coach’s behaviors. There are many different approaches to understanding the coach-athlete relationship, but there are three predominant themes that are focused on in this study. This literature review will first discuss how compatibility can affect relationships, then frequency of interactions, and finish with the discussion of motivational climate. Within each section, importance of the topic was reviewed and summarization of current thinking in the field was addressed. Having a better understanding of the coach-athlete relationship can help both parties have a more successful sport experience. In general, athletes and coaches who have a positive relationship have a better sport experience, but the factors that affect that relationship can be complex and difficult to understand.  

Compatibility  

All interactions on a daily basis have both positive and negative aspects. There are many dynamics to interpersonal relationships and it can be difficult to navigate these dynamics without some sort of understanding of the other person. In a team or sport setting, this can be a challenge for many coach-athlete relationships. The coach-athlete relationship is not an add-on to, or by product of the coaching process, but instead it is the foundation of coaching (Jowett, 2005). Figuring out what kind of behaviors athletes prefer will significantly help or hinder the development of any coach-athlete relationship. This is where compatibility comes into play.  

Compatibility can be defined as “the degree to which your (athlete’s) goals, personality, and beliefs are consistent with your coach’s goals, personality, and beliefs” (Kenow & Williams, 1999). Researchers have adopted the assumption that a wide range of dynamics linked with
coaching leadership behaviors, efficacy, motivational climate created by the coach, and coach-athlete compatibility are associated with overall athletic satisfaction (Jowett & Ntoumanis, 2004). In this research, we have seen the creation and reevaluation of many questionnaires, surveys and methods, all producing similar results as we can see below.

Kenow and Williams (1992) decided to take a closer look at the significant relationship of coach-athlete compatibility. As an expansion to their own previous studies, as well as studies done by Smith and Smoll (1989), Kenow and Williams wanted to see how compatibility with the coach may affect the way the athlete perceives and evaluates their coach’s behaviors. This study as a whole looked at the relationship between athletes’ trait anxiety, state cognitive and somatic anxiety, state self-confidence, compatibility, and total and factor scores of the Coaching Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ). It was found that athletes who felt more, compared to less, compatible with their coach experienced fewer negative cognitive/attentional and somatic effects from their coach’s behavior during game situations (Kenow & William, 1999). If the athlete and coaches have a consistent idea of goals, personality and beliefs, it is likely that their interactions will create a positive interpersonal atmosphere for all involved. However, there were a few shortcomings in this study. First, only one question about compatibility was used, thus more research on this specific topic is needed. Another limitation in this study was that the sample was homogenous (only women’s intercollegiate basketball players), thus the findings cannot be generalized.

It’s important to note that this does not necessarily mean that ALL goals, personalities and beliefs are the same between coaches and athletes. But rather, in particular, those that pertain to the sport and team. For example, beliefs about outside topics may not have a significant relationship to the compatibility with your coach on the court or playing field.
Motivational Climate

Motivational climate can be defined as the psychological environment that the coach creates by designing sessions which provide instructions and feedback that will help to motivate the athletes in training and competition (Amnes, 1992). A motivational climate is related to a variety of meaningful variables, including achievement goal orientations, intrinsic motivation, enjoyment, beliefs about the meaning of success, persistence in the face of adversity, perceived ability, and emotional responses such as anxiety (Smith, Cumming & Smoll, 2008). This idea is central to the coach-athlete relationship, as the interactions that occur within an interpersonal relationship have a significant effect on the environment that is created.

Originally develop by Seifriz, Duda, & Chi (1992) the Perceived Motivational Climate in Sport Questionnaire (PMCSQ) has been used to assess athletes’ perceptions of the prominent motivational climate goal structures created by their coach (Newton, Duda, & Yin, 2000). The exploratory analysis of this model lead to two major facets: mastery involved climate and ego involved climate.

Athletes who endorse mastery involved climates tend to be more resilient and confident (Vazou, Ntoumanis, & Duda, 2005). Research shows that having a growth mindset (mastery involved climate) orients student towards learning, being productive, and student’s reactions to setbacks (i.e. failure) (Haimovitz & Dweck, 2016). It has also been found that a mastery climate counteracts anxiety by reducing social comparison pressures, by focusing on controllable effort rather than incompletely controllable outcome, and by creating a mutually supportive team environment (McArdle & Duda, 2002).

In contrast, the ego climate indicates an environment where players perceive they were punished for making a mistake, the coach primarily recognizes and reinforces the better players,
and that intra-team member rivalry was present on the team (Newton et al., 2000). Those who endorse ego involved climates also tend to have more negative cognitive and emotional responses (Duda & Balaguer, 2007).

It would seem that motivational climates could have a large implication on sports teams and interpersonal relationships, such as coach-athlete relationships. Based on Seifriz’ creation, Smith, Smoll, & Cumming (2007) crafted the Motivational Climate Scale for Youth Sports (MCSYS) to measure the effects of a motivational climate intervention for coaches on young athletes’ sport performance anxiety. Athletes in the intervention condition perceived their coaches as being more mastery-involving on the MCSYS when compared to athletes in the control condition and those athletes who played for the trained coaches showed decreases on all subscales of the anxiety tests (Smith et al., 2007). Smith and Smoll (2011) echoed these statements stated that compared to untrained coaches, the coaches train in MAC (Mastery Approach to Coaching) exhibited higher mastery scores on the MCSYS than did untrained coaches, and their athletes experienced increased self-esteem, reduced anxiety, reduced sporting dropout, and greater team cohesion.

O’Rourke, Smith, Smoll, & Cumming (2014) took the idea of motivational climate one step further and included the climate that parents create in their children/athletes. This research found that parent initiated motivational climates were significantly higher for self-esteem and autonomous motivational regulation. This implies that there is a need for parent interventions such as Harwood and Swain (2002), so that coach and parents influence on athletes are mutually reinforcing (Rourke et al., 2014). Parents likely had a significantly larger effect on self-esteem and autonomous motivational regulation due to the many other factors that parents influence in the lives of their children outside of sports.
Interactions and Interpersonal Relationships

Literature indicated that one of the most important topics related to coach-athlete relationship is that of understanding its nature as an interpersonal relationship. The facets of this relationship are built upon important aspects such as trust, respect, closeness, and many other important characteristics. Most methods used to measure the factor of closeness or frequency are based on a psychological approach and the frameworks provided to better understand relationships, such as the coach-athlete dyad, has mostly been conceptual theories.

Iso-Ahola (1995) proposed a framework that emphasized that in order for successful performance, an athlete must develop intrapersonal and interpersonal psychosocial factors. Sports psychology researchers have predominantly focused on intrapersonal factors such as motivation and anxiety (Ntoumanis & Biddle, 1997). While these aspects are extremely important, so are the relationships we create. There is evidence to indicate that our relationships with others (more so those relationships that we perceive as close and significant) affect our views about ourselves (Hinde, 1997). Jowett and Cockerill (2002) resonated with this statement expressing that in the sports arena, the relationship established between the coach and his/her athletes, plays a central role in athletes’ physical and psychosocial development.

The acknowledgement of the need to consider situational factors is evident in multiple theoretical frameworks of coach leadership that have been dominant over the last few decades. The Multidimensional Model of Leadership (Chelladurai, 1993) has implications that effective leadership occurs when there is coherence between the coach’s actual behaviors, those behaviors which are preferred by the athlete and those behaviors which are required by the situation. Correspondingly, the Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q) suggests that coaches’ and athletes’ emotions, thoughts, and behaviors through the constructs of Closeness,
Co-orientation, and Complementarity may be associated with the variable of satisfaction of coach-athlete relationship. Lastly, Smith & Smoll (2007) purposed that the effects of a coach’s behaviors are mediated by the athlete’s perceptions and evaluations regarding those behaviors.

From the research above, we can see how important situational factors are to the coach-athlete relationship. Jowett & Yang (2014) examined if there are fundamental differences in how athletes from team and individual sports view the quality of the relationship with their coach. The differences noted between the team and individual sports may have been found as a result of athletes and their coaches of individual sports spending more time together or through interacting more frequently on a one-on-one basis (Jowett & Yang, 2014). This research suggests that coaches with larger teams need to make a conscious effort to focus on individual relationships. This may help promote a truly interpersonal coaching climate where every single member in the team is valued and cared for (Jowett, 2005; Lyle, 1999).

Summary

This study focused on how the factors of compatibility, motivational climate, and frequency of interactions can affect the way an athlete perceives and views their coach’s behaviors. The research to date discusses these topics in a variety of ways, but more specific research should be done on their interactions and effects on the coach-athlete relationship. The nature of a coach-athlete relationship is complex and has both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects that should be examined. The following chapter will give a detailed description of what this study entailed and the results it presented.
Chapter Three

Methodology

As a reminder, the purpose of this study was to investigate specific factors that affect a student athletes’ perception and evaluation of their coach’s behaviors. In this chapter you will find the methodology of this study. First, this chapter will describe the research design used for this study and why this design is the best approach. Then I will explain the setting and describe how the participants were selected. Next, I will discuss the development of the survey, and I will conclude with a description of the process used to gather and analyze the data.

Research Design

The research design of this study was quantitative. Despite the significant amount of research which has greatly contributed to the understanding of coach-athlete relationships, there is substantial room for advancement from a methodological perspective (Poczwardowski, Barott, & Jowett, 2006). It has been a trend within the study of coach-athlete relationships to utilize qualitative methods and apply the findings toward the development of conceptual and theoretical models. The primary researchers responsible for the development of the models have recognized the need for effective quantitative instrumentation to consistently and accurately assess the coach-athlete relationship.

Setting and Participants

The study population included 200 student-athletes participating in one of the following sports: men’s or women’s basketball, softball, baseball, or football. The survey was anonymous, confidential and voluntary, and did not include any identifiers. The athletes were contacted only after both the athletic director and the head coaches were contacted to obtain permission. Participants were selected based on sports programs who currently had a full time (not interim
Participants were identified from a list provided by the athletic office assistant. The recruiting email that included a link to the survey was sent to the office assistant, and the assistant forwarded the email to potential participants. Of the 200 emails sent, 35 completed the survey. As presented in Table 1, 22 females (62.9%), 12 males (34.3%) and 1 who chose not to specify their gender participated in the survey. Thirty-three of the respondents were White/Caucasian and there was one respondent in each of the remaining categories: others (white & Asian) and no response. A large percentage of participants (42.9%) were sophomores, whereas all other respondents ranged from 2.9% to 20%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year at School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sport Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Women’s Softball</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Men’s Baseball</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (white&amp;Asian)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Men’s Football</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

The present study followed a quantitative research design and it was determined that an online survey was the best method to collect data and obtain responses. Prior to beginning the
survey (see Appendix II), athletes were asked to read and consent electronically. Athletes were reminded that at any time they are allowed to skip questions or leave the survey. There were four sections in the survey and each section measured a different factor that could potentially affect the way in which an athlete perceives and evaluates their coach’s behavior. By measuring multiple factors, we can see what specifically might impact the relationship between coach and athlete.

**Coaching behavior questionnaire.** Section one of the survey was based on research done by Kenow and Williams (1999). In order to assess athletes’ perception and evaluative reactions to selected coaching behaviors, Kenow and Williams developed the Coaching Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ). The original questionnaire had 28 items, but Williams et al. (2003) modified this questionnaire and took out the 8 “filler” questions and 6 other questions I do not feel applied, making this a 15-item questionnaire. This present study used the original questionnaire with 28 items, but only 15 items were analyzed by adopting Williams et al.’s analysis. Results were examined by two groups of items from the coach: *Negative Activation* and *Supportiveness /Emotional Composure*. Athletes were asked to respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree. Potential scores range from 20-80. For the present study, athletes were asked to assess coaching behaviors as if they were playing against one of the top three teams in the conference.

**Compatibility measure.** Kenow and William (1999) used a compatibility measure that defined compatibility as “the degree to which your (athlete’s) goals, personality, and beliefs are consistent with your coach’s goals, personality, and beliefs.” In order to expand on how compatible athlete’s feel with their coach, a 5-item questionnaire was created from Kenow and
Williams definition of compatibility. Athletes were asked to respond on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = not compatible to 9 = highly compatible.

**Coach-initiated motivational climate.** Smith, Cumming, and Smoll (2008) created the Motivational Climate Scale for Youth Sports (MCSYS) as a way to measure the higher-order factors of coach-initiated *mastery* (task) and *ego* (psychological threats) climates. Athletes were asked to answer 12 questions on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Not at all true to 5 = Very true. These questions were in response to their perception of their coaches. For example, “The coach spent less time with the players who weren’t as good.” All items have readability scores below Grade 4 as measured by the Flesch-Kincaid readability index (Kincaid, Fishburne, Rogers, & Chissom, 1975).

**Athlete-coach interactions or relationship closeness.** Originally known as the Relationship Closeness Inventory (RCI) and developed by Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto (1989) as a measure of closeness of interpersonal relationships, the relationship frequency and strength scale has been used to measure the construct of closeness. Slightly modified, this questionnaire assessed the amount of interaction athletes have with their coaches outside of practice. The relationship scale asked participants to rate how many hours or minutes they spend with their head coach during the day, alone and with teammates. Berscheid et al. (1989) administered the questionnaire to a sample of 241 undergraduate college students and found that individuals with close relationships rated high on the RCI, while individuals with more distant relationships scored low.

**Data Gathering and Analysis**

The first step to data gathering was obtaining internal approval from the athletic director in the athletic department. A letter of support was written and submitted for approval. The letter
of support shows that someone of authority, in this case our athletic director, is aware of and supports the research. This was critical as it allowed not only for approval of this present study but also the approval to retrieve names and emails of participants from each participant head coaches.

Once approval was obtained from the athletic director, all necessary materials were gathered and submitted for IRB approval. These materials included the following: letter of support, recruitment email, HRP 580 protocol, HRP 582 consent form, and a PDF copy of the survey. The approval process from IRB took approximately two weeks.

Once approval was received (see Appendix I), the researcher contacted the office assistants who have access to the email addresses of participants. The researcher sent out a recruiting email with the link to the questionnaire, to the assistants.

This email asked for athletes to consider participating in the survey and explained why they were chosen as possible participants. The duration of the study itself to complete the survey was approximately 15 minutes for 45 items. The duration to enroll all study participants was 6 weeks. The study was to be completed by May 2019.

Finally, the data from the survey was collected via online survey tool Qualtrics. Once the data was collected it was downloaded and organized in an excel file. The excel file was then transferred into an SPSS file to be analyzed. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, percentage, etc.) and inferential statistics (correlations, t-test and ANOVA) were used using functions in Excel and/or IBM SPSS Statistics 25 (2017) for each of the four sections of the survey.
Summary

Participants were 35 student-athletes at a Division II university in the mid-west region of the United States. An online survey was created to include coaching behavior, compatibility, athlete-coach interactions, and motivational climate.
Chapter Four

Results

This chapter reports the results of the data analysis. Results from the survey are organized and presented based on the three research questions. All data will be synthesized, and correlations will be drawn based on the results from the survey.

Coaching Behavior

Table 2 presents the descriptive results of the Coaching Behavior Questionnaire, which assessed athletes’ perceptions and evaluations of coaching behaviors. This was then used to compared to how comparability, the amount of interactions, and motivational climate might affect the way in which athletes view their coach’s. Actions that were believed to be received as negative (Negative Activation), such as “My coach’s behavior during a game makes me feel tight and tense,” were measured. The internal consistency reliability of the 7-item Negative Activation scale was $r = .82$, which is acceptable (an acceptable level is $r > .70$, Cortina, 1993; Taber, 2018). On a 4-point rating scale, the average of the Negative Activation scale was 2.22, which is close to Disagree (2.00); Thus, the coaching behavior rated with this scale was positive.

Actions that were believed to show support and emotional composure (Supportiveness/Emotional Composure), such as, “Criticism from my coach is done in a constructive manner” was also measured. The internal consistency reliability of the 8-item Supportiveness scale was $r = .80$, which is acceptable. On a 4-point rating scale, the average of the Supportiveness scale was 2.89, which is close to Agree (3.00); Thus, the coaching behavior rated with this scale was positive.
Comparability

Table 3 below shows the compatibility or comparability student-athletes felt with their coach’s. Compatibility was defined as “the degree to which your (athlete’s) goals, personality, and beliefs are consistent with your coach’s goals, personality, and beliefs” (Kenow & Williams, 1999). The internal consistency reliability of the 5-item Comparability scale was $r = .76$, which is acceptable. On a 9-point rating scale, the average of the Comparability scale was 7.22, which means that most athletes felt fairly to highly compatible with their coach’s goals, personality,
values and beliefs. The statement that participants agreed with the most (mean = 8.60) was, “We have similar goals for our team during the season (e.g. win the conference)”. Conversely, participants agreed least with, “Our personalities complement each other well (mean = 6.11)”.

Interactions or Relationship Closeness

The following two open-ended questions were used to assess the amount of time student-athletes spent with their coach’s.

- Question 1. During an average week, what is the average amount of time, per day, that you spend alone with your coach?

- Question 2. During an average week, what is the average amount of time, per day, that you spend with your coach and teammates?

The response to the question one was, on average, 8.64 minutes. The range shown in both responses suggests that there is a large variation between sports and potentially genders. Due to the significant range in answers for question two (minimum – 0 minutes, maximum – 1200 minutes), it was decided that this information should not be reported.

Table 3
Comparability Scale: Means and Standard Deviations of Items, and Cronbach Alpha Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My coach and I have similar goals for myself.</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We have similar goals for our team during the season (e.g. win the conference).</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our personalities complement each other well.</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We share similar beliefs and values on the playing field.</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We share similar beliefs and values off the playing field.</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of 5 items</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability, $r = .76$

*Scores are on a 9-point rating scale, where 1 = not compatible to 9 = highly compatible.
Coach-initiated Motivational Climate

Table 4 presents the results of the coach-initiated motivational climate using the Motivational Climate Scale, which is a 12-item scale with two subscales (Mastery and Ego factors). Six items assessed mastery climate (e.g., “The coach made players feel good when they improved a skill”). The internal consistency reliability of the 6-item Mastery scale was \( r = .80 \), which is acceptable. On a 5-point rating scale, the average of the Mastery scale was 4.01, which means that the coach-initiated motivational climate in terms of mastery was positive. Of the six items, the item with the higher rating was “5. Coach said that teammates should help each other improve their skills (4.31)”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The coach made players feel good when they improved a skill.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The coach encouraged us to learn new skills.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The coach told players to help each other get better.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The coach told us that trying our best was the most important thing.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Coach said that teammates should help each other improve their skills.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Coach said that all of us were important to the team’s success.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average of 6 items</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cronbach Alpha internal Consistency Reliability, \( r = .80 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ego Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Winning games was the most important thing for the coach.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The coach spent less time with the players who weren’t as good.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The coach told us which players on the team were best.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The coach paid most attention to the best players.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Players were taken out of games if they made a mistake.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Coach told us to try to be better than our teammates.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average of 6 items</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cronbach Alpha internal Consistency Reliability, \( r = .79 \)

*Note.* Scores are on a 5-point rating scale, where 1 = Not at all true, 3 = Somewhat true, and 5 = Very true.
The internal consistency reliability of the 6-item Ego scale was $r = .79$, which is acceptable. On a 5-point rating scale, the average of the Ego scale was 2.75, which means that the coach-initiated motivational climate in terms of threatening ego was not true. Of the six items, the item with the lowest rating was “3. The coach told us which players on the team were best (2.00)”, which means that it is not true for the coaches of the respondents.

These results are consistent with previous findings in youth programs (e.g., Boyd, Yin, Ellis, & French, 1995 and Smith, Cumming & Smoll, 2008), in which participants perceived their coaching climate as being more mastery-involving than ego-involving. These findings demonstrate good reliability, high factorial validity, and strong construct validity (Smith et al., 2007).

**Relations Among Variables**

Table 5 below presents the results of correlations among three constructs to answer research questions 1, 2, and 3:

Question 1: Is coach-athlete compatibility related to athletes’ perception and evaluation of coaching behaviors?

Question 2: Does the amount of interaction between athletes and coaches affect the athlete’s perception of their coach’s behavior?

Question 3: Does the coach-initiated motivational climate affect athletes’ perception and evaluation of coaching behaviors?

Each question will have a minimum of two results due to the coaching behavior scale having negative activation and supportiveness factors and each other factor being crossed with it.
Regarding research question 1 (relation between compatibility and coaching behaviors) the results showed significant correlations for both negative activation/compatibility and support/comparability. Negative activation and compatibility showed a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.30, p < 0.05$). Supportiveness/emotional and compatibility showed a significant positive correlation ($r = 0.58, p < 0.01$). In simple terms, athletes that feel more compatible with their coaches perceive their coach’s behaviors as more supportive (e.g. “My coach shows support for me even when I make a mistake”). The compatibility affects the perception of coaching behaviors.

Research question 2 looked at the correlation between the amount of interactions and coaching behaviors. The results showed no statistically significant relations (negative activation, $r = -0.24, p > 0.05$ and supportiveness, $r = 0.15, p > 0.05$).

Research question 3 examined the correlations found between motivational climate (mastery and ego factors) and coaching behaviors (negative activation and supportiveness). All correlations found were statistically significant and present quality information that the motivational climate certainly could affect the way in which athletes view their coach’s

### Table 5

**Correlation Matrix: Coaching Behavior, Comparability, Motivational Climate, and Meeting Minutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coaching Behavior Negative</th>
<th>Coaching Behavior Support</th>
<th>Comparability</th>
<th>Motivational Climate Mastery</th>
<th>Motivational Climate Ego</th>
<th>Meeting (minutes/Day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Behavior Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.485**</td>
<td>-0.304*</td>
<td>-0.304*</td>
<td>-0.304*</td>
<td>-0.304*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Behavior Support</td>
<td>-0.304*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.438**</td>
<td>-0.438**</td>
<td>-0.438**</td>
<td>-0.438**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparability</td>
<td>-0.304*</td>
<td>-0.438**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.583**</td>
<td>0.583**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Factor</td>
<td>-0.264*</td>
<td>-0.438**</td>
<td>0.427**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery Factor</td>
<td>-0.249*</td>
<td>-0.438**</td>
<td>0.427**</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting (minutes/Day) Per Day</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$
behaviors. The coach-initiated climate focusing Mastery found to have a significant negative correlation with Negative Activation in coach’s behavior ($r=-.25$, $p<.05$) and a significant positive correlation with Supportiveness ($r=.43$, $p<.01$). The coach-initiated climate focusing on threatening Ego found to have a significant positive correlation with Negative Activation in coach’s behavior ($r=.26$, $p<.05$) and a significant negative correlation with Supportiveness ($r=.44$, $p<.01$). This means that the positive motivational climate that coaches created by focusing on mastering tasks and not threatening athletes ego is associated positively with the athlete’s positive perception on the coaches behavior in terms of support and less negativity.

**Summary**

Results indicated that there is significant correlation between coach-athlete compatibility and coaching behaviors, and between coach-initiated motivational climate and coaching behaviors. The data showed that student-athletes see their coach’s behaviors as most positive when they relate on some level, in particular when it comes to on the field and goals for their teams. The motivational climate (psychological environment that is built by coach’s) also has a significant impact on the way athlete view their coach’s behaviors. The more mastery motivational factor (e.g. “The encouraged us to learn new skills”’) and less ego-threatening factor (The coach told us which players on the team were best) a coach uses, the more positive athletes view their coach’s behaviors.
Chapter Five

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter describes a brief summary of the significant findings of this study, followed by the broader implications of the findings, recommendations for future research and limitations of this study.

Significant Findings

This study supported the hypothesis that two factors, the coach-athlete compatibility and the coach-initiated motivational climate, have a significant impact on how athletes perceive their coach’s behaviors. In particular, compatibility was most agreed upon when the involvement of the team was mentioned. For example, “We have similar goals for our team during the season (e.g. win the conference).” The motivational climate was measured against coaching behavior and it was found that the more mastery motivational factor (e.g. “The encouraged us to learn new skills”) and less ego-threatening factor (The coach told us which players on the team were best) a coach uses, the more positive athletes view their coach’s behaviors.

However, the hypothesis that the amount of time student-athletes spend with their coach’s will affect the perception of coach behaviors, was not supported. Responses to the open-ended questions showed there was no significant correlation between the amount of time spent together and coaching behaviors.

Educational Implications

As a current collegiate coach, these findings are extremely important when it comes to individual and team success. The compatibility of athletes and coaches in terms of goals, values, and beliefs can have a significant impact on how an athlete views their coach’s behaviors.
Further, the motivational climate that coaches created heavily affect athlete’s views on their coach’s behaviors.

These findings were consistent with my personal experiences as a current coach. Sharing similar goals, beliefs and values with your athletes and helping athletes to develop a positive psychological environment allows them to develop life lessons that will be used far beyond the playing field.

**Limitations and Recommendations**

One limitation of this study is that participants were only from the mid-region, Division II university. I would caution the reader against making generalizations for Division I and Division III institutions. Another limitation of this study includes the small size of population that was used. Out of the fourteen varsity teams that compete for the chosen university, only five were asked to complete the survey.

Therefore, for future research I would recommend the researcher include all three NCAA divisions (DI, DII, DIII) and expand to include to all sports. Many previous studies have focused primarily on one sport and it would yield results that could be compared (e.g. fall sports vs winter sports). Each sport has a specific season and time allowed with coach’s and it would be interesting to see if this has any impact on how athlete’s view their coach’s. Given the small sample size of 35 participants, it would also be recommended that future studies include a larger sample to obtain more conclusive findings.

Another limitation of this study is the recruiting method. Relying on the office assistants to forward the emails to the athletes was not effective to obtain a desired response rate. It was because there was no way for the research to assure that the assistants properly forwarded the recruiting emails to the potential participants, and also there were limitation on asking to send
reminders. Past research at the University of Minnesota Duluth showed a stronger athlete participation when the link was sent out directly from the researcher versus from coaches or administrators.

In addition to these limitations, the vast majority of the participants were White/Caucasian (33 of 35), 1 other (White & Asian) and 1 with no response. Due to the lack of diversity on the study sample, it’s quite possible that the same results may not be found in ethnic minority groups.
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Title of Research Study: Student Athlete Perceptions of Coaching Behaviors
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For questions about research appointments, the research study, research results, or other concerns, call the study team at:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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Supported By: This research is supported by the University of Minnesota Duluth, MEd program.

Why am I being invited to take part in this research study?
We are asking you to take part in this research study because you are a varsity student-athlete at the University of Minnesota Duluth, participating in either men's or women's basketball, softball, baseball, or football.

What should I know about a research study?
- Someone will explain this research study to you.
- Whether or not you take part is up to you.
- You can choose not to take part.
- You can agree to take part and later change your mind.
- Your decision will not be held against you.
- You can ask all the questions you want before you decide.

Why is this research being done?
The purpose of this study is to determine the factors that may affect a student-athletes' perception and evaluation of their coach's behaviors.

How long will the research last?
We expect that you will be in this research study for approximately 15 minutes.

**What will I need to do to participate?**
You will be asked to respond to a survey questionnaire. The survey asks questions regarding the way you perceive your coach's behaviors. More detailed information about the study procedures can be found under “What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?”

**What happens if I do not want to be in this research?**
You can leave the research at any time and it will not be held against you.

**Detailed Information About This Research Study**
The following is more detailed information about this study in addition to the information listed above.

**How many people will be studied?**
We expect about 200 student athletes will be in this research study.

**What happens if I say “Yes, I want to be in this research”?**
- The online survey can be done on your own personal laptop at any time in any location.
- This will be a one-time survey.
- The 45-item survey consist of questions that cover the following topics: situational behaviors of coaches, compatibility measure, motivational climate and relationship frequency.

**What happens if I say “Yes”, but I change my mind later?**
You can leave the research study at any time and no one will be upset by your decision.

**What happens to the information collected for the research?**
Efforts will be made to limit the use and disclosure of your personal information, including research study and medical records, to people who have a need to review this information. We cannot promise complete secrecy. Organizations that may inspect and copy your information include the IRB and other representatives of this institution.

**Will I have a chance to provide feedback after the study is over?**
The HRPP may ask you to complete a survey that asks about your experience as a research participant. You do not have to complete the survey if you do not want to. If you do choose to complete the survey, your responses will be anonymous.

If you are not asked to complete a survey, but you would like to share feedback, please contact the study team or the HRPP. See the “Investigator Contact Information” of this form for study team contact information and “Whom do I contact if I have questions, concerns or feedback about my experience?” of this form for HRPP contact information.

**Consent Statement**
There is no written documentation of consent requiring your signature. As an online survey questionnaire, please select the option below to indicate your consent to participating in this study:

- I agree to participate in this study. I may print this page for my records
I decline to participate in this research. The survey will close.

Q1. Please answer the following questions regarding your current head coach’s behaviors. Please assess the following coaching behaviors as if you were playing against one of the top three teams in the conference.

Select the number that most accurately describes the way you see their behaviors. 1 - strongly disagree to 4 - strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (strongly disagree)</th>
<th>2 (disagree)</th>
<th>3 (agree)</th>
<th>4 (strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Before and during a game, my coach clearly communicates what he/she expects us to do.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Criticism from my coach is done in a constructive manner.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I trust my coach.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My coach’s behavior during a game makes me feel tight and tense.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My coach displays confidence in me as a player.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When my coach gets too emotional, it alters his/her effectiveness to coach a game.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When I need it, my coach’s tone of voice is soothing and reassuring.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My coach is appropriately composed and relaxed.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Emotional outbursts from my coach help me get fired up.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My coach’s mannerisms and displays of emotion contribute to me playing poorly.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1 (Continued). Please answer the following questions regarding your current head coach’s behaviors. Please assess the following coaching behaviors as if you were playing against one of the top three teams in the conference.
Select the number that most accurately describes the way you see their behaviors. 1 - strongly disagree to 4 - strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (strong disagree)</th>
<th>2 (disagree)</th>
<th>3 (agree)</th>
<th>4 (strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. My coach shows support for me even when I make a mistake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. During timeouts and halftime/between innings, my coach emphasizes what should be done rather than what we did not do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My coach's mannerisms and display of emotions help me relax and play better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My coach's sideline behavior distracts my attention during a game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My coach uses timeouts and halftime to build our confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My coach controls his/her emotions well during games.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. When my coach appears uptight, I don't play well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My coach's behavior during a game makes me worry about my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I get more nervous watching my coach on the sidelines than I do playing a game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My coach gets more stressed out when we play the top teams in the conference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My coach makes me feel uptight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Please answer the following question regarding your current head coach. Answer each question based on how compatible you feel with your coach. 1 - not compatible to 9 - highly compatible.

**Compatibility is defined as** "the degree to which your (athlete's) goals, personality, and beliefs are consistent with your coach's goals, personality, and beliefs."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (not)</th>
<th>9 (highly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

https://umn.ca1.qualtrics.com/Q/EditSection/Blocks/Ajax/GetSurveyPrintPreview
Q3. Below are statements about **what your current head coach is like**.

Please read each one and select the number that most accurately describes how you feel about the statement. Please answer these questions in regard to your current head coach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 (Not at all true)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (Somewhat true)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (Very true)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Winning games was the most important thing for the coach.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The coach made players feel good when they improved a skill.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The coach spent less time with the players who weren’t as good.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The coach encouraged us to learn new skills.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The coach told us which players on the team were the best.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The coach told players to help each other get better.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The coach told us that trying our best was the most important thing.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The coach paid most attention to the best players.
9. Coach said that teammates should help each other improve their skills.
10. Players were taken out of games if they made a mistake.
11. The coach said that all of us were important to the team's success.
12. Coach told us to try to be better than our teammates.

Q4-Q5. Please answer the following questions with regard to your current head coach. I would like you to estimate the amount of time you typically spend with your coach outside of practice.

Think back to a week which was characteristic to a normal week in your relationship and write in the average amount of time per day that you spent alone with your coach and how much time you spent with your coach and teammates (e.g. watching film, volunteering, anything outside practice).

Please specific hours versus minutes, for example 1 hour 20 minutes or 30 minutes. If you did not spend any time with your coach alone write 0 hours 0 minutes.

Q4. During an average week, what is the average amount of time (X hours X minutes), per day, that you spend alone with your coach?

Q5. During an average week, what is the average amount of time, per day, that you spend with your coach and teammates?

Q6. Demographic Questions

What is your current age?
What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other

What is your race/ethnicity?

- White/Caucasian
- Black/African American
- Asian
- Prefer not to say
- Other, please specify

What is your current year in school?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- 5th Year

What sports team are you currently a part of?

- Women's Basketball
- Women's Softball
- Men's Basketball
- Men's Baseball
- Men's Football