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ABSTRACT

Differences on Perception of Evaluation Criteria Between Division I and III Head Basketball Coaches and Athletic Directors

by

Richard R. Hilliard

Dr. Gerald E. Landwer, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Sports Education Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to compare the differences in perceptions of evaluation criteria between athletic directors and head basketball coaches at National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I and III institutions in the western region of the United States. The objective of this study was to answer the question, is there a difference in perceptions of evaluation criteria by athletic directors and Division I and III basketball coaches? The researcher modified a 39 item questionnaire developed by Overton (1997) into a 21 item survey. The survey was sent to athletic directors and head men's and women's basketball coaches at a total of 114 universities and colleges in the western region: (a) fifty-four from Division I, and (b) sixty from Division III. Responses from
the returned surveys were entered into a SPSS program (version 14.0) and analyzed utilizing a MANOVA for evaluation. Comparisons between athletic directors and coaches were conducted.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In today's culture it is commonly accepted that the success or failure of an intercollegiate athletic team depends almost entirely upon the competence or incompetence of its head coach (McClowery, 1996). Intercollegiate head basketball coaches have usually experienced the pressure to develop a winning basketball program; however this pressure has increased dramatically over the past few decades. As basketball has become a major component in generating revenue for an institution's athletic programs. Major institutions generally use their athletic programs to gain national recognition through television contracts, post season tournaments, and national ranking. However, this can only happen when a team wins. This means that the head coach must win. In many cases, the head coach feels tremendous pressure to consistently win or he/she will be fired. The pressure for a head coach to win has always been a part of college athletics. However, it has increased mainly because of the revenue that it generates for its
institutions. Should winning be a factor in the evaluation of head basketball coaches, or should more importance be placed on ethical behavior, relationships with others, graduation rates of student athletes, public relations, recruiting, and coaching skills? Performance appraisal of coaches is a problematic area in athletic directorship. Coaches must be evaluated in order for athletic directors to make decisions on contract extensions, salary, training needs, and other important factors. There is little to no agreement among athletic directors in the field of intercollegiate athletics regarding the evaluation criteria that should be used to evaluate head basketball coaches. It was this discrepancy that prompted my hypothesis that there is a difference in perceptions of evaluation criteria between athletic directors and Division I and III head basketball coaches.

Statement of the Problem

The study was formulated to compare the differences in perception of evaluation criteria between athletic directors and head basketball coaches at National Collegiate Athletic Association Division (NCAA) I and III institutions in the western region of the United States. Although there is general consensus on the
importance of an evaluation process, the perception of
criteria varies widely from school to school. In order to
determine the differences in perception of criteria used
this researcher modified a survey designed by Overton
(1997) to be completed by current athletic directors, and
head men's and women's basketball coaches at Division I and
III institutions. The completion of the survey would
increase the body of knowledge in the evaluation process
for head coaches, and provide a better understanding of
specific criteria used. Specifically, the study was an
attempt to answer the following research question: Is there
a difference in perceptions of evaluation criteria by
athletic directors and Division I and III head basketball
coaches?

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the
differences in perceptions of evaluation criteria between
athletic directors and head basketball coaches at National
Collegiate Athletic Association Division I and III
institutions in the western region of the United States.
Specifically asking the athletic directors, and head men's
and women's basketball coaches at both levels of
competition to report on: Is there a difference in
perception of evaluation criteria by athletic directors and Division I and III head basketball coaches?

The study was designed to compare these criteria used in the evaluation process by athletic directors. The focus was on the agreement of criteria that made up the evaluation process.

Significance of the Study

A review of the literature indicates there is little research on formalizing standard criteria to be used in evaluating head basketball coaches. This study is a replication of a dissertation that was done with athletic directors and coaches at universities in Pennsylvania. It is the intent of this study to provide information for coaches that will enable them to better shape and develop their philosophy of coaching and become better prepared to meet the expectations for which they will be held accountable as a head coach. The results of the study will also provide information that athletic directors can use to reevaluate their current job performance evaluation systems. The findings will highlight the similarities and/or differences in the evaluation criteria of head basketball coaches at Division I and III institutions and
the criteria deemed to be the most important and least important in evaluation of a head basketball coach.

Delimitations
This study was delimited to the following:
1. Universities/Colleges in the Western States.
2. Division I and Division III Universities/Colleges in the Western States.
3. Division I and Division III Universities/Colleges that have a Men's and/or Women's Basketball team.
4. Fifty-four Division I and 60 Division III Universities/Colleges in the Western States.
5. The University/College Athletic Directors and Head Coaches who completed and returned the survey.

Limitations
This study was limited by the following:
1. The survey instrument was not evaluated for validity or reliability.
2. The athletic directors who participated in the study were volunteers and not a random sample.
3. The Head Basketball coaches who participated in the
study were volunteers and not a random sample.
4. The participants of the study may not have committed
time and effort in completing the study.
5. The participants in the study may not accurately
reflect the attitudes of other professionals in
other regions due to cultural influences.

Assumptions

This study is based upon the following assumptions:
1. There is no congruence between athletic directors
and basketball coaches in preferred evaluation
criteria.
2. There is no congruence between head men’s and
women’s basketball coaches in preferred evaluation
criteria.
3. There is no congruence between Division I and III
athletic directors and basketball coaches in
preferred evaluation criteria.

Operational Definitions
Athletic Director (AD) - The person in charge of
leading an intercollegiate athletic program, directly
responsible for all of the affairs of the athletic
programs, including success and progress. In addition, the
AD is responsible for running a program with integrity, managing fiscal resources, fundraising and maintaining excellence throughout. In most cases the Athletic Director reports directly to the President of the University.

*Head Basketball Coach* - The person who organizes, directs, and instructs the men’s or women’s basketball team during practice sessions and games.

*NCAA Division I* - The NCAA group of institutions have to sponsor at least seven sports for men and seven for women (or six for men and eight for women) with two team sports for each gender. Each playing season has to be represented by each gender as well. There are contest and participant minimums for each sport, as well as scheduling criteria. Men’s and women’s basketball teams have to play all but two games against Division I teams; for men, they must play one-third of all their contests in the home arena. Division I schools must meet minimum financial aid awards for their athletics program, and there are maximum financial aid awards for each sport that a Division I school cannot exceed.

*NCAA Division III* - The NCAA group of institutions have to sponsor at least five sports for men and five for women, with two team sports for each gender, and each playing season represented by each gender. There are
minimum contest and participant minimums for each sport. Division III athletics features student-athletes who receive no financial aid related to their athletic ability and athletic departments are staffed and funded like any other department in the university. Division III athletics departments place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators. Division III athletics encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities available to students, placing primary emphasis on regional in-season and conference competition.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There are many literature related studies attempting to define the dimensions used by athletic directors in their evaluations of men's and women's basketball coaches at Division I and Division III institutions; these attempts are reported in this chapter. For organizational purposes and in order to allow the reader to understand the current study, the literature is presented under the following topics: (a) Expectation and Importance of Winning in Intercollegiate Athletics; (b) Coaching Evaluation Criterion; (c) Distinction of Coaching Managerial Performance; (d) University Criterion Executed in Evaluation of Division I and Division III Coaches; and (e) Dynamic Perception Between Athletic Directors and Intercollegiate Coaches.

Expectation and Importance of Winning in Intercollegiate Athletics

In the realm of intercollegiate athletics today, the
head coach is held accountable for the success or failure of his team. The pressure to develop a winning program has drastically increased in recent decades. The intercollegiate sport that this is seen most in is college football. Many times a coach is viewed successful by how many wins his team produces. If his team losses, the coach is usually the first one blamed and seen as an ineffective coach, that makes poor decisions. The institutions where these coaches coach at depend on the revenue that the sport generates. The majority of the time the revenue is brought in by programs that win. Ultimately, the coach must win. The pressure to consistently win is put on the coach, if not the ultimate consequence is being fired. Do athletic directors weigh win/loss record with greater emphasis when it comes to the evaluation of head coaches? Similar responses have shown the importance of win/loss criteria in the evaluation of head football coaches.

McClowry (1996) developed a rank-order questionnaire designed to determine which of ten evaluation factors collegiate athletic directors deemed most and least important when evaluating the performance of a head college football coach for job retention. The ten factors were: (a) compliance; (b) goals; (c) graduation; (d) knowledge; (e) loyalty; (f) organization; (g) public relations; (h)
recruiting; (i) role model; and (j) win/loss. From his questionnaire he concluded: Division I-A athletic directors prioritized the factors of win/loss, compliance, graduation, and recruiting as the most important factors involved in the evaluation of their football coaches; organization, public relations, and loyalty were the least important factors in the evaluation of their head football coaches. Division III athletic directors prioritized compliance and recruiting as the most important factors involved in the evaluation of their football coaches; with win/loss, and public relations the least important factors in the evaluation of their football coaches. Seventy eight percent of Division I-A athletic directors selected win/loss record as the most important factor involved in the evaluation of their football coaches. Twenty nine percent of Division III athletic directors selected win/loss as the most important factor involved in the evaluation of their football coaches.

Mikel (2003) formulated a new rank order questionnaire, based on an adapted version of McClowery's questionnaire, which consisted of sixteen criteria that athletic directors at the NCAA, NAIA, and NJCAA levels use when evaluating the performance of a head football coach. He included: (a) high moral standards; (b) recruiting; (c)
compliance with philosophy; (d) knowledge of football; (e) graduation rate; (f) communication; (g) role model; (h) enthusiasm; (i) sportsmanship; (j) organization; (k) loyalty; (l) goals of program; (m) win/loss record; (n) experience; (o) education; and (p) humor. Of the sixteen criteria, the participating NCAA athletic directors identified compliance with the NCAA philosophy, win/loss record, and high moral standards as three of the most important criteria when evaluating their head football coaches. Least important were humor, education, and role model. Of the sixteen criteria, the participating NAIA athletic directors identified high moral standards, recruiting, and enthusiasm as three of the most important criteria when evaluating their head football coaches. Least important were humor, win/loss record, and education. Of the sixteen criteria, the participating NJCAA athletic directors identified high moral standards, role model, and recruiting as three of the most important criteria when evaluating their head football coaches. Least important were humor, education, and win/loss record.

Pressure to win is undeniable in intercollegiate athletics today. It is a competitive business that fights for revenue dollars. The majority of institutions that make revenue off of their athletics are winning programs. A
coach is more likely to retain his job by putting wins in the record column.

Intercollegiate Coaching Evaluation Criterion

Universities and colleges for evaluation purposes have standard categories of employment broken down into three classifications: faculty, staff, and/or administration. Each classification has specific job related criterion for evaluation. Where does the intercollegiate coach at these universities and colleges fit into these classifications? They do not. Various answers are given to the question of where the intercollegiate coach fits in within the identity of the three categories and what specific criterion is used to evaluate them.

Astin (1964) described criterion as a comparison object or a rule; a standard or test for making a judgment; a behavior goal by which progress is judged; and the comparison which constitutes a measure of validity. Astin stated that by requiring the goals of research (athletic director) to be stated in operational terms, criterion development offers the investigator (coaches) the only means of assessing how close he has come to attaining those goals.
Duquin and Tomayko (1985) described the evaluation of coaching performance as a basic management function within any athletic department. Performance appraisal should be a rational process that assesses work performance, supplies data for future administrative decisions, motivates coaches toward improved performance, and enhances commitment to the purpose and goals of the organization. A performance analysis system was formulated by a five step process: (a) statement of departmental goals; (b) review of the position guide; (c) review of performance criteria and development of performance standards; (d) performance analysis; and (e) recognition of achievement. The purpose of the performance appraisal system is to help athletic departments achieve success, facilitate individual coaching excellence, and demonstrate accountability to the goals of athletics in education.

Gorney and Ness (2000) utilized a delphi technique which yielded twenty comprehensive categories that should be used for evaluations of full-time head athletic coaches at NCAA Division II institutions. These categories are: (a) primary focus of intercollegiate athletics is educational; (b) leads by example, (c) is a role model; (d) academic achievement of student-athletes; (e) organizational ability; (f) goal setting; (g) professional development;
(h) team management; (i) dedication to the game; (j) recruiting; (k) professional and interpersonal relations; (l) communication; (m) compliance; (n) knowledge of the sport; (o) applied coaching methods; (p) evaluation; (q) understands that competition is important in American society and that winning is important; (r) fund-raising; (s) administrative performance; (t) public relations and experience.

Paling (2002) mentioned when it comes to evaluating a coach, simplicity disappears. Unlike evaluating staff members of a business, human resource professionals evaluate whether the employees are fulfilling their job descriptions and assess if they are reaching annual goals. Intercollegiate coaching job descriptions are not so cut and dry. Paling compiled responses from colleagues and formulated ten specific performance criteria: (a) be a teacher, (b) organizer, (c) leader, (d) strategizer, (e) motivator, (f) counselor, (g) worker, (h) communicator, (i) mentor, and (j) learner. These ten specific performance criteria were suggested for evaluation coaches.

Knorr (1989) stated a major task of every athletic administrator is the annual review of all athletic department personnel. This process is misunderstood and regarded as pro forma. Knorr offers twelve suggestions
regarding the evaluation of coaching: (a) the purpose of the evaluation should be first and foremost concerned with job performance improvement; (b) evaluation must be carried out in a positive fashion; (c) criteria used in evaluation should be arrived at through a consensus of all parties involved in the process; (d) criteria stated in the job description should be consistent with the criteria used in the evaluation; (e) understanding the traits of successful coaches is an important element in the development of job performance criteria; (f) the key personnel in the evaluation process are the athletic administrator and the coach; (g) the evaluation process must start at time of hiring by communication of expectations and responsibilities; (h) formative evaluation is an important element of evaluation and is ongoing and informal; (i) self-evaluation is important and should be provided for during the evaluation process; (j) summative evaluation should be written and include a formal interview; (k) descriptive statements should be included especially when extreme high or low ratings are given; and (l) summative evaluation information should be used to redefine criteria and goals for the next season or year as the process starts over.

Wilson (2000) documented that supervisors must put in
place a valid evaluation method to determine staff productivity. She along with the Minnesota State Moorhead athletics department created the Professional Development Plan that includes five criteria areas: (a) demonstrated ability to teach effectively and/or perform effectively in other current assignments; (b) scholarly or creative achievement or research; (c) evidence of continuing preparation and study; (d) contribution to student growth and development; and (e) service to the university and community.

Adams (1979) was among the first to propose that the evaluation of a coach is a difficult task at best and should include more than win loss record. He stated that the educational aspect of athletics is usually lost in intercollegiate programs where winning is the only or most important criterion for evaluating the coach. He created a profile format of a coach which is an assessment tool that evaluates seven important categories: (a) the coach in the profession; (b) coach’s knowledge of and practice of medical aspects of coaching; (c) coach as a person; (d) coach as an organizer and administrator; (e) coach’s knowledge of the sport; (f) coach and public relations; and (g) coach’s knowledge of and application of kinesiological and physiological principles. Within each category are sub
categories that outline competencies that a successful coach must have. The purpose of this particular assessment tool includes: (a) assisting coaching personnel in self improvement; (b) educating the public concerning the multicomplexity of coaching; and (c) removing and replacing the win loss type of evaluation.

MacLean (1993) stressed the need for using a formalized process for evaluating coaches of athletic teams. The lack of a formalized job performance evaluation process is a result of undefined criteria. MacLean presents a step wise procedure towards developing performance criteria specific to individual jobs involving: (a) job assessment; (b) creating a job description; (c) defining the domain of performance for the job; (d) investigating behavioral product and process factors; and (e) determining task and maintenance related process factors. The use of this procedure will allow those responsible for evaluating coaches to approach the assessment process with more objectivity and a broader range of performance expectations.

Martin, Arena, Rosencrans, Hunter, and Holly (1986) followed that if athletics were structured, administered, and evaluated according to its educational function and value, then there should be little conflict between the
role of teacher and the role of coach. The authors proposed using three criteria: (a) evaluation of scholarly and creative performance; (b) evaluation of teaching and advising; and (c) evaluation of university and community service to evaluate coaches. The same criteria are used in faculty evaluation at many higher education institutions.

MacLean and Kakrajsek (1994) designed a study that described the process used to evaluate the job performance of coaches of C.I.A.U. member institutions with emphasis on identifying the procedures and criteria used. The results identified six procedures in evaluating coaches: (a) observation; (b) evaluative forms; (c) self-evaluation; (d) curriculum vitae update; (e) meetings with athletes; and (f) peer judicial committee. The study identified ten evaluation criteria: (a) coaching in practice sessions; (b) coaching in game play; (c) administrative performance; (d) philosophy; (e) public relations; (f) team performance standards; (g) recruiting; (h) personal performance characteristics; (i) professional development; and (j) summary evaluation.

Leland (1988) mentioned that coaches often receive little evaluative feedback other than the kind of appraisal that tends to result solely from game day results. The inability of athletic departments to define specific
appraisal criteria has furthered the informal nature of the evaluation process. Leland proposed an eight step process that will formalize the evaluation procedure: (a) develop a written job description; (b) develop performance review criteria; (c) discuss performance review criteria with coach and reach consensus; (d) set goals; (e) the athletic director must observe the team; (f) written evaluation; (g) formal evaluation interview; and (h) coach’s response. Following this process will help coaches and athletic directors reduce reliance on informal evaluations, increase the level and quality of communication in both directions, help identify goals and clarify priorities for each program, and provide the basis for contractual rewards and salary adjustments.

Moskovitz (1992) stressed that professionalizing the coaching profession is one of the most important functions of a quality evaluation process. He recommended three steps in how to improve coaches’ performance: (a) establish some type of record on which to base evaluation; (b) developing a standard set of criteria by which the coach is to be evaluated; and (c) sharing the criteria, goals, and expectations with the coach. These steps will help the coach’s evaluation become a positive process to increase overall productivity and effectiveness.
Eckman (1983) was the first researcher to use the Delphi technique to developed an instrument to assess the abilities of intercollegiate athletic coaches. She concluded that the need existed to refine the evaluation procedures for coaches and to balance the emphasis on winning with the educational values of athletics. She stated that an established coaching evaluation process could provide factual data to identify those coaches who are effective or ineffective in the total coaching process. The following are the major criteria developed from her study to be used in such an evaluation: (a) personal qualities; (b) administrative procedural abilities; (c) personnel management; (d) knowledge and practice of medical-legal aspects; (e) theory and techniques of coaching; (f) player-coach relationships; and (g) public relations skills.

Accountability has been an ongoing focal point in intercollegiate coaching. The emphasis on accountability has led to the call for a rigorous evaluation of coaching effectiveness. Establishing specific criteria and a systematic evaluation of intercollegiate coaching is essential for success.
Distinction of Coaching
Managerial Performance

The success of an intercollegiate team depends upon the head coach excelling in his job responsibilities. Coaching is often thought of as a simple job. But in fact, there are many different managerial tasks that can go into the job of being a head coach. These managerial tasks might include: (a) recruiting athletes; (b) liaising with parents; (c) planning training regimes; (d) monitoring fitness levels; (e) designing strength and conditioning programs; (f) supervising training and competition schedules; (g) assisting individual athletes with personal goal-setting; (h) organizing facilities and equipment; (i) developing team selection criteria; (j) selecting teams; and (k) doing all the administrative work that accompanies a competitive schedule. It also means being a bit of an accountant, a travel agent, an insurance broker, a psychologist, a chaperone and a guardian. It's clear to see that being a head coach goes far beyond the gymnasium.

Anderson (1985) described the demands of faculty-coaches as: (a) grappling with recruitment of athletes; (b) specialization of training; (c) year round programs; (d) employment contract periods at odds with the academic calendar; (e) greater public relations demands from sports;
(f) increased travel and contests; (g) regional and national play offs; (h) expectations for winning; and (i) the growth of the sport culture. Anderson constructed a continuum which defined the complex role of faculty-coach. The continuum illustrates the difficulty in managing dual-role appointments. Separate academic and athletic departments appear to be the best solution when the roles clearly fit either position. Institutions unable to afford this situation could experience professional identity problems.

Poskanzer (1989) indicated that much of the confusion over the role of the coach arises from the failure of scholars and educational administrators in giving any sustained, serious thought to the purpose that the coach serves. Poskanzer proposed two models by which a coaching job description can be distinguished: (a) teacher/coach model; and (b) employee/coach model. In the teacher/coach model, coaches are hired as faculty members with credentials and responsibilities to teach usually in physical education departments. In the employee/coach model, coaches do not have academic duties. Coaches responsibilities primarily involve the performance of many different tasks, such as public relations, recruiting,
running practices, planning and implementing game strategies, teaching values, and fundraising.

Stier (1983) formulated four broad categories of competencies that coaches should possess: (a) technical aspects of sports; (b) interpersonal relationships; (c) use of conceptual skills, i.e., the ability to "see" the big picture; and (d) dedication to the duties and responsibilities required of a coach. Stier stated coaches are usually technically competent and willing to demonstrate adequate dedication to the performance of their tasks. It is usually the areas of interpersonal relationship skills and conceptual skills that tend to be impediments to the success of coaches.

Over the years the managerial tasks of intercollegiate coaching have broaden. No longer are the days where a college coach is only responsible for how his team executes during a game. He is held accountable for much more than that. Whether it be recruiting athletes, liaising with parents, planning training regimes, monitoring fitness levels, designing strength and conditioning programs, supervising training and competition schedules, assisting individual athletes with personal goal-setting, organizing facilities and equipment, developing team selection criteria, selecting teams, and doing all the administrative
work that accompanies a competitive schedule, the performance and execution of these managerial tasks are essential.

University Criterion Executed in Evaluation of Division I and Division III Coaches

Universities and colleges will offer different answers to the question of where the head coach fits in among administrators, faculty, professors, and students. The schools that offer degrees in physical education or athletic administration may differ from that of universities without such programs. Universities at the Division I level may also differ from that of colleges at the Division III level. The classification of the head coach determines the specific criteria used for the evaluations.

Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Non-Academic Faculty Members (2004) designates the term non-academic faculty for use as a generic category and applies to intercollegiate athletic professional staff. Non-academic faculty members shall fulfill their individual job obligations by: (a) carrying through with their professional responsibilities in accordance with university and unit bylaws or procedure manuals and the University and
Community College System of Nevada Code; (b) counsel, teach and work with students; (c) continue their professional growth and development; and (d) encourage and support the development of their staff and unit. The evaluation should be completed at least once annually by department chairs, supervisors or heads of administrative units. Procedures for evaluation have been established in institutional bylaws. The evaluator must plan for the performance review discussion with through outlined procedures: (a) all information pertaining to position and any notes regarding performance should be gathered and organized; (b) schedule the review with the faculty member; (c) note how the faculty member has exceeded or met the performance expectations; and (d) discuss all observations with the faculty member. In the performance review, the following factors are delineated: (a) setting the climate and initiating the appraisal; (b) obtaining the non-academic faculty member’s views; and (c) planning for the non-academic faculty member’s growth and development. The evaluation form is divided into four major sections: (a) essential functions and special projects; (b) goals and objectives; (c) professional development plan; and (d) related factors. The following rating scale excellent, commendable, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory is used.
Policy On Coaches (2000) provides a guide to the appointment, classification and evaluation of coaches as temporary faculty employees. Their policy dictates that all coaches shall be evaluated on a regular basis. The evaluations shall include student evaluations of instruction (for those coaches with teaching responsibilities), evaluation by direct supervisor and an opportunity for peer input. Peer evaluations of instruction by tenured members of the Department of Kinesiology shall be conducted in classes. The evaluation guidelines of coaches list the following: (a) an annual written evaluation shall be prepared by the direct supervisor; (b) a coach may request that an evaluation be performed at any time; and (c) a written record of any periodic evaluation shall be placed in the individual's open personnel file. California State University, Fresno stated criteria of evaluation include: (a) adherence to and implementation of university trustee policies; (b) planning; (c) operation and management of the overall sport program; (d) supervision and evaluation of assistant coaches and sport staff; (e) developing and implementing a plan to recruit; (f) developing sport specific skill and coaching strategies; (g) developing and enforcing written team rules; (h) promoting education; (i) supporting the
conditioning and training of athletic team members; (j) planning and conducting practices within NCAA rules; (k) assisting in monitoring and maintenance of academic progress; (l) planning, monitoring and being accountable for the administration of sports budget; (m) arranging a competitive schedule; (n) cooperating with the Compliance Coordinator; (o) adhering to University Student-Athlete Recruitment Codes; (p) preparing data and reports; conducting the sport program; (q) supporting the Bulldog Foundation and community events through team and personnel participation; (r) assuring booster club compliance with university and NCAA rules; and (s) coordinating a liaison function between the booster club and the Athletic Corporation.

College of Liberal Arts Faculty Handbook (2003) describes the committee for review of the coaching staff of the Department of Athletics will be the Women’s Athletic Director, the Men’s Athletic Director, the Physical Education chair, a representative from the Faculty Personnel Committee, a faculty representative from the Athletic Policies Committee, and a representative from the office of the Dean. Hamline is a Division III University. Performance will be evaluated in a fashion similar to Faculty Personnel Committee practices, and recommendations
will be forwarded to the Dean. Primary performance criteria are effectiveness in recruitment and coaching of intercollegiate athletic teams, and effectiveness in teaching in the College of Liberal Arts. Hamline classifies coaches as Coach-lecturers in their job descriptions. Coach-lecturers function as coaches, recruiters, and teachers. An evaluation dossier for each Coach-Lecturer is to be set up and maintained in the office of the Dean of the College. The dossier will consist of yearly submissions of the following materials: (a) evaluation of coaching and recruiting by athletic director; (b) evaluation of coaching by student-athletes; (c) evaluation of teaching by chair of Physical Education; and (d) self evaluation form. The evaluation by the athletic director will take into account preseason and post-season meetings that the Athletic Director holds with the Coach-Lecturer. The evaluation by student-athletes occurs each season and in specific years different forms are utilized (years 1, 2, 5 long form; years 3, 4, 6 short form). The evaluation by the Chair of Physical Education will include teaching evaluation forms collected on the following schedule: Coach-Lecturer I in every course, each term; Coach-Lecturer II is every course, each term; and Coach-Lecturer III is one course per year as designated by the chair. The self-evaluation form involves
a personal assessment by each Coach-Lecturer of their coaching, recruiting, and teaching as well as information about other professional and institutional activities. The formal evaluation of the Coach-Lecturer is conducted by the Evaluation Committee on the basis of the material provided in the Coach-Lecturer’s dossier. Formal evaluation occurs according to the following schedule: Coach-Lecturer I in the first and third year; Coach-Lecturer II in the third year; and Coach-Lecturer III every three years. The Athletic Director or the Coach-Lecturer may also request evaluation in other years. The Evaluation Committee makes recommendations to the Dean of College of Liberal Arts as to contract renewal and promotion to higher rank. The Coach-Lecturer is notified on or before March I of his/her contract status for the following year(s).

Intercollegiate coaching does not fit easily into the standard categories of university employment making it difficult for universities and colleges to have universal evaluation criteria. Consequently these schools must understand the role it expects the coach to play, articulate this role to the coach, and pursue an ideal standard through evaluations.
Perception of Evaluation Between Athletic Director and Intercollegiate Coach

The most challenging aspect of an athletic director’s job is to evaluate the performance of coaches and to help them improve weaknesses and/or build on strengths. Few coaches operate under a formalized evaluation process. One criteria that a coach views important many not hold much weight in the eyes of an athletic director. There is a dynamic perception of what coaches and athletic directors view as important evaluation criterion.

Overton (1997) developed a 39 item questionnaire and mailed it to 65 athletic directors, 65 head men’s basketball coaches, and 65 head women’s basketball coaches. Part I was designed based upon demographic information. Part II of the questionnaire for all three groups of subjects contained 39 items that asked about the processes that were being used to evaluate the head coaches of men’s and women’s basketball teams at each NCAA Division III college and university in Pennsylvania. This part of the questionnaire was broken into six sections: (a) why coach is evaluated; (b) what criteria are used to evaluate the coach; (c) who is involved in the evaluation; (d) when the coach is evaluated; (e) what methodologies are used to evaluate the coach; and (f) additional comments. Part III
of the questionnaire for all three groups of subjects contained 39 items that asked about the processes that should be used to evaluate the head coaches of men’s and women’s basketball team at each NCAA Division III college and university in Pennsylvania. The results showed athletic directors and head women’s coaches clearly agreed on the suitability of the current evaluative process. Head men’s coaches had a lower agreement on what is/should be used. The responses from head men’s coaches were inconsistent with responses from athletic directors and this signified a lack of agreement on what an evaluation is and should be. These differences were primarily due to ineffective communication and a lack of a formal evaluation process between head coaches and athletic directors. Overton found that 27 out of the 39 total criteria had significant differences in response between athletic directors and head coaches. The largest differences were found in criteria that pertained to win-loss record, coaching effectiveness, public relations, recruiting, student-athlete evaluation participation, and whether external evaluators participated in the evaluation. The results of this study confirmed there was a lack of agreement between athletic directors and head coaches as to which processes are used and should be used to evaluate the head coaches’ performance. There
was no evidence supporting the use of a formal evaluative instrument for evaluating head basketball coaches. Specific differences in perception between athletic directors and head coaches were found in each of the four main areas of the questionnaire: (a) what criteria should be used to evaluate coaches; (b) who should be involved in the evaluation; (c) when should coaches be evaluated; and (d) what methodologies should be used in the evaluation.

The difference of perception of importance of evaluation criteria used to assess the effectiveness of coaches between athletic director and head coaches stems from the lack of communication, information, and an unformalized process. A systematic approach to the evaluation process is needed in order for a formalized process to be created. Formalizing the evaluation process will help head coaches improve weaknesses and build on strengths.

Summary

There have been very few empirical data studies gathered on the dimensions important for a coaching performance evaluation. Overton (1997), Gorney and Ness (2000), McClowry (1996), and Mikel (2003) are the only individuals to actually survey individual college coaches
and athletic directors to determine dimension to be used for coaches during evaluations.

The literature reviewed in this chapter has focused on the available research regarding expectation and importance of winning in intercollegiate athletics, coaching evaluation criterion, distinction of coaching managerial performance, university criterion executed in evaluation of Division I and Division III coaches, and dynamic perception between athletic directors and intercollegiate coaches.

The researcher exhausted all available literature pertaining to evaluative processes that were used or should be used by athletic directors at NCAA Division I and III colleges and universities to evaluate head coaches of men's and women's basketball teams.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted to fill the void in the knowledge base about the evaluation criteria of head basketball coaches. The purpose was to compare the differences in perceptions of evaluation criteria between athletic directors and head basketball coaches at National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I and III institutions in the western region of the United States. The study included the following organizational steps: (a) procedures for conducting the study; (b) selection of subjects; (c) development of the instrument; (d) administration of the survey instrument; (e) design of the study; and (f) treatment of the data.

Procedures for Conducting the Study

The study was conducted with Division I and Division III institutions in the western United States upon receipt of the researcher’s Institutional Review Board approval.
The selection of Division I and Division III institutions to participate in the study was based on the following criteria: (a) institution was located in the western states; (b) institution was listed as either Division I or Division III by the most recent NCAA listing; and (c) provided athletic programs for both men and women.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were athletic directors and head men’s and women’s basketball coaches at NCAA Division I and III universities and colleges in the western region. The universities and colleges in this study were identified in a database of colleges and universities provided by the National Collegiate Athletic Association from www.ncaa.org. A total of 114 universities and colleges in the western region, which included every Division I and III institutions, were targeted to participate in this study: (a) fifty-four from Division I, and (b) sixty from Division III. A response of at least 80% of the possible universities and colleges in each division was sought.

Development of the Instrument

The survey instrument utilized in this study was
developed by Overton (1997) (Appendix C). The instrument contained basic demographic components to gauge the position, competition division, gender, age group, years at position, number of sports at institution, sponsorship of college/university, college/university setting, and enrollment of college/university of the head men's/women's head coach and athletic director being surveyed. The survey consisted of five main dimensions:

1. Why the coach is evaluated?
2. What criterion is used to evaluate the coach?
3. Who is involved in the evaluation?
4. When the coach is evaluated?
5. What methodologies are used to evaluate the coach?

The actual survey utilized for the collection of data was modified to include only the dimension of “What criterion is used to evaluate the coach?” This two-page instrument was developed to provide the researcher with information in relation to the differences in perceptions of evaluation criteria between athletic directors and head basketball coaches.

The survey was subsequently presented to three professionals with experience in intercollegiate athletics.
for content analysis prior to its use in this study. No attempts were made to extract construct validity prior to dissemination to participants. It was assumed the language provided in the instrument concerning statements on the evaluation process were simple enough in nature to warrant reliable responses.

Administration of the Survey Instrument

A complete listing of athletic administrators and addresses from each of the identified institutions was compiled. Each potential participant was sent a packet including a formal letter of introduction explaining the purpose of the study (Appendix A), a human subject consent form (Appendix B), and the survey instrument (Appendix C). The content of the letter of introduction served to inform the participants why they were selected and how the information would be used as well as instructions for completing the survey instrument, and a deadline for returning the survey instrument to the researcher. An acknowledgement of the participant’s time and effort in completing this survey was noted in the letter. The
participants were asked to return the survey within seven days of receipt.

Reference numbers identifying the institution were placed on the survey instruments disseminated. The reference numbers were used to assist the researcher in following the return rate of the survey instruments. If after the return deadline less than 100 surveys were obtained then individuals at institutions where no surveys were returned were sent a new packet containing the same material as previous. Again a seven-day deadline was given to return the survey. Rather than identify individuals who may have or may not have returned the surveys the reference numbers helped to gather a wider input from Division I and Division III institutions. The researcher had no way to accurately connect which survey was returned from a particular individual but rather if participation from a particular institution was noted.

Design of the Study

Athletic directors and head men’s and women’s basketball coaches from Division I and III institutions in the western states were identified for this study. Responses from these participants allowed the researcher to compare differences in perception of evaluation criteria.
The design of the study was such that responses from one position; Division I athletic directors could be compared against Division I head men's basketball coaches regardless of size of institution, conferences competing in, or number of teams fielded. The use of a short two-page survey was to enhance the probability of completion and return of the instrument. It was hoped that a simple checklist type of survey would allow greater positive response in terms of completion, and thus increase the likelihood of return.

Treatment of Data

Responses from the returned surveys for evaluation purposes were entered into a SPSS program (version 14.0) (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2006). Survey information was coded for position, competition division, gender, age, years at position, number of sports at institution, sponsorship of institution, institution setting, and enrollment of institution. The specific responses to the statements on the survey were the dependent measures. Cross-tabulations were conducted to view responses by coded attributes. Comparisons were made between athletic directors and head basketball coaches.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to compare the differences in perceptions of evaluation criteria between athletic directors and head basketball coaches at National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I and III institutions in the western region of the United States. The athletic directors, and head men's and women's basketball coaches at both levels of competition were asked to report on: Is there a difference in perceptions of evaluation criteria by athletic directors and Division I and III head basketball coaches?

The data was collected from athletic directors and head men's and head women's basketball coaches at National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I and III institutions in the western region of the United States. The following topics will be discussed in this chapter:

(1) The Demographics of the Participants
Demographics of the Participants

The participants of this study were athletic directors and head men's and head women's basketball coaches in the western region of the United States. Potential colleges and universities in the western region were identified by using the listing of institutions on the NCAA website. Fifty-four Division I and Sixty Division III institutions were selected for inclusion in this study. A total of 342 athletic directors and head coaches (1 athletic director and 2 coaches at each institution) were mailed a packet containing a formal letter of introduction explaining the purpose of this study (Appendix A), human consent form (Appendix B), and a study survey (Appendix C). Of the 342 recipients, 104 surveys were received back, a return rate of .30%.

Some of the surveys were returned with the respondent not designating the NCAA division affiliation and/or selection of gender. Therefore the demographics reported in this paper represent only those that have identified themselves in those categories. Forty-eight surveys were
received from Division I institutions and 56 surveys from Division III institutions. Of those designating gender there were 69 males and 25 females (Table 1).

Respondents were asked to select among five age groupings ranging from 25 years of age to greater than 55 years of age. Forty of the respondents were less than 45 years of age and 61 were greater than 45 years of age (Table 1).

Respondents were also asked to select the number of years at their current position at their institution. Seventy-three individuals have been in their current position less than ten years and 30 individuals at their current position for greater than ten years with 41 of the athletic directors (56%) being in their position less than ten years (Table 1).

Ninety-nine of the respondents were from institutions with more than ten athletic teams. There were responses from 46 public institutions and 58 private institutions. The distribution of surveys received was diverse with 45 from urban settings, 22 from rural settings, and 33 from suburban settings. The enrollment at these institutions was predominantly from institutions with less than 16,000 (78%) students (Table 1).
Comparison of Survey Responses
by Individual Statement

Athletic directors and head men’s and head women’s basketball coaches were asked to rate specific evaluation criteria statements on a five point Likert scale. Several statements were stated in the negative. Prior to inputting the data into a SPSS program the values were adjusted. The scores on the Likert scale were reversed for the statements that were stated in the negative. The Likert scale ranged from one for strongly agree to five for strongly disagree.

Table 3 delineates mean scores and standard deviations for each statement broken down by position. This table is provided to better present the overall responses from the different groups. I used a SPSS program (version 14.0) to conduct a MANOVA on the mean statement scores by position to compare the means of each individual statement score between athletic directors and head basketball coaches. The dependent variables were the responses to the 21 statements. The independent variable was position. There was a statistically significant difference between athletic directors and head basketball coaches on the combined dependent variables: $F(104,1) = 14.12 \ p < .001$; Wilks’ $\Lambda = 2.34$; partial $\eta^2 = .41$. The MANOVA revealed significance between athletic directors and head basketball
coaches for seven of the 21 statements (Table 4). An inspection of the total mean statement score indicated that the athletic directors reported slightly higher levels of importance on the evaluation criteria (M=1.76, SD=.29) than head basketball coaches (M=2.00, SD=.29).

Statement 3. I believe the coach should be evaluated on criteria derived from his/her job description. There was a significant difference between athletic director and head coaches (p< .001).

Statement 4. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her win/loss record. There was a significant difference between head basketball coaches and athletic directors (p= .031).

Statement 7. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her relationship with others. There was a significant difference between head basketball coaches and athletic directors (p= .028).

Statement 11. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her recruiting skills. There was a significant difference between head coaches and athletic directors (p= .040).

Statement 12. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her teaching techniques and strategies. There was a
significant difference between head coaches and athletic directors \( (p= .008) \).

Statement 17. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her performance. There was a significant difference between head coaches and athletic directors \( (p= .001) \).

Statement 18. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her self-improvement. There was a significant difference between head coaches and athletic directors \( (p= .041) \)

Discussion of Findings

This section of the chapter will discuss and interpret the findings that were previously reported. Specifically, this section will discuss demographic information and agreement on statements on the evaluation criteria between head basketball coaches and athletic directors. Surveys were sent to the athletic directors and head men’s and women’s basketball coaches at 114 institutions in the Western Region of the United States. A total of 104 surveys were returned. Ten of the respondents chose not to self-identify their gender, affiliation and or some of the other demographic information. Of those returned 51 were from athletic directors and 43 from head basketball coaches. The respondents identifying gender were 69 males and 25
females. There were 48 surveys received from individuals from Division I institutions and 56 surveys from Division III institutions. Generally most of the surveys came from institutions with at least 10 intercollegiate athletic teams. There was approximately an equal distribution of surveys from public (46) and private (58) institutions. The geographic representation of respondents were 45 from urban locations, 22 from rural, and 33 from suburban locations. Respondents were asked to identify the student enrollment of their institutions. There were surveys from 61 of 104 (59%) respondents with school enrollment of less than 10,000 students.

The statements on this modified version of the survey were associated with one dimension "What Criteria is Used to Evaluate the Coach" from Overton (1997). The means of the individual evaluation criteria were examined for significance for position. There were seven evaluation criteria that demonstrated significant difference between athletic directors and head basketball coaches (Table 4). There was disagreement between the head basketball coaches and the athletic directors on whether the coach should be evaluated on criteria derived from his or her job description. There was also disagreement on whether the coach should be evaluated on his or her win/loss record.
Interestingly, the head basketball coaches differed on their agreement that the coach should be evaluated on his/her relationship with others. These coaches felt it was not an important issue. When it came to the importance of whether the coach should be evaluated on his/her recruiting skills, head basketball coaches gave this evaluation criteria a lower importance. This might be explained that recruiting duties are usually given to assistant coaches and new head coaches inherit players previously recruited by the former coach. Thus, holding the coach responsible for recruiting might be seen as somewhat out of their control. In terms of importance of a coach being evaluated on his/her teaching techniques and strategies, the head basketball coaches placed less of importance on this criteria than athletic directors. Head basketball coaches also placed less importance on evaluating coaches on his/her performance as compared with athletic directors. There was a significant difference between agreement among the groups with regards to evaluating the coach on his or her self improvement. This level of agreement ranged from athletic directors in strong agreement to head basketball coaches in agreement. One evaluation criteria while not significant did disclose an interesting view point by all groups. On whether the coach should be evaluated on the
same general criteria that are used to evaluate traditional faculty members, the three groups jointly disagreed.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare responses from athletic directors and head basketball coaches at Division I and Division III colleges and universities in the western region of the United States to determine what differences in perceptions might be evident.

A survey form developed by Overton (1997) and used to evaluate what evaluation criteria is used or should be used by athletic directors was modified to contain 21 evaluation criterion statements on whether they should be used for evaluation. The criterion were re-written to allow a 5-point Likert scoring scale for ease of analysis.

The population for this study was the athletic directors and head men's and head women's basketball coaches at NCAA Division I and Division III colleges and universities. This is a pseudo replication study on one conducted by Overton (1997) on athletic directors and head
Basketball coaches in Pennsylvania. The colleges and universities identified for this study were selected from a listing of colleges and universities provided by the NCAA. A total of 114 colleges and universities were identified as meeting the criteria of Division I or III participation with two head basketball coaches. Three surveys were sent to each institution, one for the athletic director and one each for the two head basketball coaches, for a total of 342. One hundred and four surveys were completed either online or by return of the survey via postal mail, which resulted in a response rate of 30%. For athletic directors the response rate was 51 (48%). The head men’s basketball coaches completed 17 out of the 114 surveys sent (15%). Head women’s basketball coaches had a response rate of 26 (23%). Division I colleges and universities had a response rate of 48 out of 114 (42%). Division III colleges and universities had a response rate of 56 out of 114 (45%). In terms of gender, 69 (61%) surveys were from males, and 25 (22%) were from females, with 10 individuals not identifying gender. Age-wise there were eight (7%) individuals 25-35 years old; 14 (13%) individuals 36-40 years old, 18 (16%) individuals 41-45 years old, 24 (21%) individuals 46-50 years old, 14 (12%) individuals 51-55 years old, and 26 (23%) individuals older than 55 years of
age. The number of years serving in their current position at their college or university was noted as 21 (18%) individuals at their job 1-2 years, 28 (25%) individuals at their job 3-5 years, 24 (21%) individuals at their job 6-10 years, 12 (11%) individuals at their job 11-15 years, 6 (5%) individuals at their job 16-20 years, and 12 (11%) individuals at their current job for greater than 20 years. Forty-six (40%) of the responses were from public institutions with 58 (51%) coming from private institutions. Responses were received from 45 (40%) individuals in urban settings, 22 (19%) from individuals in rural settings, and 33 (29%) from individuals at suburban settings. Four individuals did not identify their college or university setting. The highest rate of return for enrollment was institutions with less than 10,000 students, which returned 61 (54%), schools with 10,000 to 15,999 students had 20 (18%), schools with 16,000 to 21,999 students had 15 (13%), and schools with enrollment above 22,000 had 8 (7%) responses.

Conclusion

With respect to the limitations and delimitations of this study, the following conclusions were reached from analysis of the data:
1. There was a joint agreement between athletic directors and head basketball coaches that coaches should not be evaluated on the same criteria as academic faculty.

2. There is a significant difference in perception by position in evaluating a coach on criteria derived from his/her job description.

3. There is a significant difference in perception by position in evaluating a coach on his/her win/loss record.

4. There is a significant difference in perception by position in evaluating a coach on his/her relationship with others.

5. There is a significant difference in perception by position in evaluating a coach on his/her recruiting skills.

6. There is a significant difference in perception by position in evaluating a coach on his/her teaching techniques and strategies.

7. There is a significant difference in perception by position in evaluating a coach on his/her performance.
8. There is a significant difference in perception by position in evaluating a coach on his/her self-improvement.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations in evaluation of head men's and head women's basketball coaches by athletic directors are offered:

1. Athletic directors and head men's and head women's coaches meet before the season to discuss what is expected from the coach by the administration.

2. Athletic directors and head men's and head women's coaches determine the method and type of evaluation being used.

3. A study be conducted on how to resolve differences in stated importance perception between athletic directors and coaches on the process of evaluation.

4. A study be conducted to determine what criteria are/should be used by athletic directors to evaluate head coaches in each NCAA Division.
5. A study be conducted to develop an objective based and research driven evaluation form that satisfies the evaluation needs of both athletic directors and head basketball coaches.
APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION
Differences on Perception of Evaluation Criteria Between Division I and III Head Basketball Coaches and Athletic Directors

Dear Coach or Athletic Director,

My name is Richard Hilliard. I am currently working on my Master’s Thesis in Athletic Administration at The University of Nevada Las Vegas. I am the Video Coordinator for the Men’s Basketball Team here at UNLV. I want to eventually work my way up through the ranks to become a Head Basketball Coach. My experience with the UNLV Men’s team and my academic pursuits are preparing me for that adventure.

I write to invite you to participate in a study I am conducting on how collegiate basketball coaches are being evaluated. The survey can be completed either by hard-copy (attached) or online. The time required to complete this survey is less than 10 minutes. I recognize that your time is valuable and in your position you have many requests for your time. Your assistance in this survey will help me graduate in May 2007.

To complete the survey online please visit:

http://education.nevada.edu/survey/sportsed/

If you choose to complete the hard-copy it can be submitted to:

Richard Hilliard
Men’s Basketball Office
The University of Nevada Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 450011
Las Vegas, NV 89154-0011

I appreciate your time and hope you may be able to assist me in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Hilliard
APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECT CONSENT FORM
TITLE OF STUDY: Congruence of Evaluation Between Head Basketball Coaches and Athletic Directors in Division I and III

INVESTIGATOR(S): Dr. R. R. Apache & Richard Hilliard

CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: 702-895-2493

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to determine whether there is congruence between how Athletic Directors at Division I and III universities evaluate Head Basketball Coaches and how coaches perceive they are being evaluated.

Participants
You are being asked to participate in the study because you are either an Athletic Director or Head Basketball Coach (Men’s or Women’s) at a Division I or III University in the Western United States, and you are between the ages of 25 and 70 years.

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following: Read the Informed Consent and agree to volunteer for this study. Then complete the enclosed survey by either marking the hard-copy and returning through the mail or by fax, or complete the survey online at that website listed on the introduction letter. The time required to complete the survey is 10 minutes and can be accomplished at your leisure.

Benefits of Participation
There may not be direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, we hope to learn more about what elements are included in the annual evaluation of Head Basketball Coaches and how these coaches perceive they are being evaluated.

Risks of Participation
There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks. You may become uncomfortable when answering some questions, however those feelings will quickly fade at completion of the survey.
INFORMED CONSENT
Department of Sports Education Leadership

TITLE OF STUDY: Congruence of Evaluation Between Head Basketball Coaches and Athletic Directors in Division I and III

INVESTIGATOR(S): Dr. R. R. Apache & Richard Hilliard

CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: 702-895-2493

Cost /Compensation
There will not be financial cost to you to participate in this study. The study will take approximately 10 minutes of your time. You will not be compensated for your time. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas may not provide compensation or free medical care for an unanticipated injury sustained as a result of participating in this research study.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact Dr R. R. Apache at 702-895-2493. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 702-895-2794.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

Confidentiality
All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be shredded and destroyed.

Participant Consent:
I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age. A copy of this form has been given to me.

INFORMED CONSENT
Department of Sports Education Leadership

TITLE OF STUDY: Congruence of Evaluation Between Head Basketball Coaches and Athletic Directors in Division I and III
INVESTIGATOR(S): Dr. R. R. Apache & Richard Hilliard
CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: 702-895-2493

Participant Note: Your completion and submission of the survey indicates your willingness to participate in this study. Do not place your name, either in print or by signature on the survey and/or informed consent to maintain anonymity.
APPENDIX C

SURVEY
The Evaluation of Head (Men’s and Women’s) Basketball Coaches

Demographics
Please complete the following section by selecting a choice.

Position: Athletic Director □ Head Men’s Basketball Coach □ Head Women’s Basketball Coach

Competition Division: Division I □ Division III □

Gender: Male □ Female □

Age Group:
25-35 years □ 36-40 years □ 41-45 years □ 46-50 years □ 51-55 years □ >55 years □

Years at Position:
1-2 years □ 3-5 years □ 6-10 years □ 11-15 years □ 16-20 years □ >20 years □

Number of Sports at your Institution:
1-4 sports □ 5-9 sports □ 10-15 sports □ >15 sports □

Sponsorship of College/University: Public □ Private □

College/University Setting: Urban □ Rural □ Suburban □

Enrollment of College/University:
Less than 10,000 □ 10,000-15,999 □ 16,000-21,999 □ Above 22,000 □

Indicate your agreement to the following statements by selecting one level of the Likert Scale.
SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  N = Neutral  D = Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe the coach should be evaluated on the same general criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that are used to evaluate traditional faculty members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her adherence to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athletic department’s objectives and philosophies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on criteria derived from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his/her job description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her win/loss record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I believe the coach should be evaluated on the graduation rate of his</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her student-athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on his/her relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on his/her public relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement (cont.)</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her motivational skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her recruiting skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on his/her teaching techniques and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her training techniques and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on his/her coaching knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her coaching skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her coaching effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on his/her performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on his/her self-improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her coaching and sports-related service to the college or university and to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I believe the coach should NOT be evaluated on his/her professionalism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I believe the coach should be evaluated on his/her ethical behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Please provide any additional comments pertaining to the evaluation of Head Basketball Coaches as you please:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Demographics of Athletic Directors and Head Basketball Coaches Responding to Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 55 years</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sports at Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-15,999</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000-21,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 22,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Statement Score by Position and Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Athletic Director</th>
<th>Men’s Head Basketball Coach</th>
<th>Women’s Head Basketball Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.61)</td>
<td>(.53)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.99)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.52)</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.59)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.53)</td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
<td>(.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total is mean and standard deviation of male and female women’s head basketball coaches responses to the statement. Standard deviation indicated by parenthesis.
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Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations of Statement Score by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Athletic Director</th>
<th>Men's Head Basketball Coach</th>
<th>Women's Head Basketball Coach</th>
<th>Head Coaches (Men's &amp; Women's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=51</td>
<td>n=17</td>
<td>n=26</td>
<td>n=43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.43 (.24)</td>
<td>3.33 (.90)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.39 (.70)</td>
<td>1.67 (.49)</td>
<td>1.60 (1.50)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.37 (.60)</td>
<td>1.80 (.56)</td>
<td>2.08 (1.88)</td>
<td>2.09* (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.37 (.94)</td>
<td>2.27 (.46)</td>
<td>3.12 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.74* (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.86 (.72)</td>
<td>2.27 (.80)</td>
<td>1.92 (.76)</td>
<td>2.02 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.94 (.54)</td>
<td>2.20 (.56)</td>
<td>1.96 (.46)</td>
<td>2.02 (.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.63 (.63)</td>
<td>2.13 (.64)</td>
<td>1.80 (.50)</td>
<td>1.86* (.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.80 (.75)</td>
<td>2.20 (.68)</td>
<td>2.24 (.97)</td>
<td>2.07 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.86 (.66)</td>
<td>2.20 (.41)</td>
<td>2.00 (.71)</td>
<td>2.00 (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.88 (.59)</td>
<td>2.33 (.82)</td>
<td>2.00 (.58)</td>
<td>2.07 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.51 (.58)</td>
<td>2.00 (.58)</td>
<td>1.72 (.61)</td>
<td>1.79* (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.65 (.63)</td>
<td>2.07 (.80)</td>
<td>2.08 (1.08)</td>
<td>2.28* (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.90 (.74)</td>
<td>1.93 (.46)</td>
<td>2.12 (.88)</td>
<td>1.93 (.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.63 (.80)</td>
<td>2.20 (.86)</td>
<td>1.70 (.93)</td>
<td>1.63 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.59 (.50)</td>
<td>1.67 (.62)</td>
<td>1.75 (.53)</td>
<td>1.67 (.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.65 (.69)</td>
<td>1.60 (.51)</td>
<td>1.92 (.57)</td>
<td>1.70 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.49 (.55)</td>
<td>1.80 (.41)</td>
<td>1.88 (.53)</td>
<td>1.81* (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.82 (.60)</td>
<td>2.47 (.64)</td>
<td>2.00 (.51)</td>
<td>2.14* (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.90 (.54)</td>
<td>2.07 (.59)</td>
<td>2.08 (.57)</td>
<td>2.05 (.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.45 (.70)</td>
<td>1.80 (.41)</td>
<td>1.60 (.71)</td>
<td>1.63 (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.37 (.49)</td>
<td>1.86 (1.03)</td>
<td>1.64 (.86)</td>
<td>1.51 (.51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance noted at p<.05. Standard Deviation indicated by parentheses.
Table 4

MANOVA of the Mean Individual Statement Score by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>3.295</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.828</td>
<td>19.164</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.726</td>
<td>4.790</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>5.014</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>2.493</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>4.332</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.652</td>
<td>7.256</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.074</td>
<td>11.249</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>4.294</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>2.482</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>1.832</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance noted at p<.05. DV (dependent variable) number is in relation to each individual statement on the survey instrument of evaluation criteria.
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