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ABSTRACT

This study utilized qualitative methods to examine the perceptions of twelve Ontario University Athletics (OUA) men’s head basketball coaches. The value of intercollegiate athletics, and the coach’s role as an educator were the subjects’ perceptions under inquiry. Using qualitative interviews as the data collection method, the researcher attempted to provide the coaches with a voice to express their experiences as the “gatekeeper” of the intercollegiate athletic experience.

Coaches’ perceived that both the academic institution and the student-athlete were beneficiaries of the OUA intercollegiate athletic system. They also universally identified a commitment to fulfill a role as an educator to enhance this value to both their school and their players. Finally, the coaches identified the types of obstacles that exist within the OUA coaching environment, and potential solutions to these problems.

The discussion centres around the demonstrated uniqueness, complexity and diversity among the coaches with respect to the job that they performed, as well as in their philosophical approach to the educator role. A continuum representing the amount of personal responsibility assumed by each coach in their student-athletes’ educational endeavours was created by the researcher. The twelve coaches under study were represented by four levels identified within the central portion of the continuum, while a literature review identified two extremes that exist within the intercollegiate coaching profession. These findings further supported the use of qualitative methods as a reasonable and viable means of research protocol in coaching studies. The researcher then critically examined the implications of future directions intercollegiate athletics in Ontario may undertake, and the approaches that could be utilized to maintain the focus on the educational experience of the student-athlete.
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CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In 1990, John Thompson, the highly successful head basketball coach at Georgetown University, turned down a six million dollar salary offer to become the new coach of the National Basketball Association's (NBA) Denver Nuggets. When asked by reporters why he would turn down such a lucrative deal, Thompson discussed his perceived role as first and foremost an educator (Walton, 1992, p.161). Elaborating on his decision, Thompson stated, "I never felt there was nothing left to accomplish at Georgetown. I have always felt my responsibility was broader than wins and losses" (Wilbon, 1990, June 4). John Wooden, the legendary former coach at the University of California - Los Angeles (UCLA), was likewise offered opportunities to coach at the professional level:

[W]ooden] was not sidetracked by the passing glories of triumphs, many as there were...He enjoyed the simple daily routine of hard purposeful work. And he took pride in it. Money was incidental - his highest annual salary was $32,500 in 1975. Lavish offers did not detour him.

Walton, 1992, p.68

As Walton (1992, p.161) argues, "Both Wooden and John Thompson possess a peace of mind and sense of success in knowing that the work they do has high purpose - their profession is guiding youth".

Many elite Canadian intercollegiate coaches similarly perceive their primary function to guide the educational and personal development of their athletes. Former University of Victoria and Canadian Men's National Team Head Coach Ken Shields - arguably the most successful Canadian basketball coach of all-time - once stated:

The idea is you want to develop independent thinking, creative, responsible individuals who can make decisions when they leave. Clearly, it's incumbent upon the athlete to develop self-discipline and properly manage their time and priorities. There will be ups and downs, pitfalls along the way, but in the end, if they've survived a rigorous, demanding, and intense athletic involvement, and if
they've also done well academically, achieving their degree, what more rewarding experiences could you ask for?

(as cited by Salmela, 1996, p.50)

EDUCATION & ATHLETICS

Sport in North America has evolved into a pervasive institution. European amateur sport has long been under the control of clubs or government; however, in both Canada and the United States, amateur sport is generally dominated by high schools and post-secondary academic institutions (MacLean, 1992, p.5). The development of collegiate athletics began informally around the turn of the twentieth century. Organized originally by student bodies, many sports were being played in colleges and universities across North America by the year 1900 (Sage, 1975). Amateur sport in North America became "culturally entrenched", with intercollegiate athletics leading the way:

Educational and social forces combined to produce a dramatic increase in students attending college, an enormously expanded interest in spectator sports, and public interest in intercollegiate athletics. By the early years of the twentieth century, students, alumni, the public, and even a significant part of the college faculty and administrators considered the fielding of successful athletic teams as essential. Sage, 1975, pp. 400-01.

Specific social forces in Canada that resulted in increasing popularity for intercollegiate athletics included the expanding delivery systems of media outlets and the introduction of government involvement in elite athletics (MacIntosh, 1986). The science of training and level of expertise at some Canadian universities were greatly enhanced, as they became High Performance Training Centres for elite international-calibre athletes (MacIntosh, 1986). However, the ever-growing popularity of intercollegiate athletics in the United States and Canada often resulted in uncertainty as to the operative role that sport should play in the academic world.
**POTENTIAL ACADEMIC-ATHLETIC CONFLICT**

Intercollegiate sport has long wrestled with the emphasis student-athletes, coaches and athletic administrators place upon the sport at the expense of academic education. National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I athletics have become big business, and the major male intercollegiate sports have served as essentially minor league systems for professional leagues. In particular, NCAA Division I men’s basketball, men’s football and men’s baseball have become primary feeder systems for the NBA, National Football League (NFL) and Major League Baseball (MLB) respectively. Academic institutions and their athletic departments might have to make a philosophical decision: do they operate within a sport system or within an educational system, or can they reasonably operate within both simultaneously? It may seem like a simple philosophical answer, but when collegiate athletics generate millions of dollars in revenues based on the successful performances of their athletic teams, conflicting ideals may emerge.

Canadian intercollegiate athletic departments, in contrast, must often deal with the deficiency of administrative and financial support, as well as the lack of full-time staff members dedicated to the experience of Canadian student-athletes. This can potentially result in a lack of commitment and resources by coaches and athletic departments to the educational endeavors and development of Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU) athletes. When CIAU athletic programs are operating with minimal support, the performance of the athletes and teams may become the overriding focus of those involved.

An example of an intercollegiate program with athletics as the overwhelming priority is the University of Cincinnati and its men’s basketball team coached by Bob Huggins (Wolff,
Huggins discussed his preference for junior college graduates and transfers, stating:

"Jucos can be more mature than freshmen...They're hungrier and more appreciative. And if you recruit a really good high school player, you're only going to keep him two years anyway” (p.62).

Cincinnati's administrative philosophy is one of 'let-bygones-be-bygones': "As long as a young man is talented enough on the basketball court, the Cincinnati administration will enroll him despite untoward incidents in his past” (p.62). Some of the incidents identified included players who had beaten teammates and girlfriends into unconsciousness, been convicted for drug trafficking, and had assaulted police officers. In Huggins' eight years as head coach, only one player who came in as a freshman has graduated within six years; additionally, only three of eleven junior college transfers who have come to Cincinnati needing only two years worth of credits had graduated. Altogether, only seven players had received their degrees during Huggins' tenure. In response to these figures, one former player 'defended' Huggins' academic record stating: "You're required to do so much as a player at UC that you just want to get away when your eligibility runs out" (Wolff, 1996, p.69).

However, Huggins is quick to point out that three of his former players play in the NBA, several have, or continue to play professionally overseas, and one former player is a professional baseball player:

People can say it's a cop-out, but if these guys have a chance to play and make $60,000 or $70,000, they're not going to make that much their first couple of years out of school. I don't see anything wrong with them coming back later to graduate. I don't know when it became a race (p.69).

Obviously, the coach, athletic administration, and university administration have elected to run Cincinnati Bearcat basketball as a minor pro-like program operating within a sport system.
For the institutions choosing to perceive themselves philosophically operating within an educational system, there is still another potential conflict that must be considered. Intercollegiate athletic programs must decide if their academic focus will be on educational products, educational processes, or if they can provide both for their athletes. Educational products are the quantifiable outcomes of education, including athlete eligibility, player graduation and post-graduation employment. For example, Adler and Adler (1991) in their longitudinal study of a major Division I basketball program, identified the coach and athletic department as a committed group toward the education of their athletes. However, this commitment focused on the athletes doing well academically in order to stay eligible, with little consideration given to the educational process the athlete was undertaking. To assist with this objective, an athletic department representative selected the athletes’ majors, courses, and instructors to give them the best chance for academic ‘success’ (Adler & Adler, 1991). The coach also maintained a focus on educational products, constantly reminding his players to get their diplomas: that “piece of paper”, as the coach called it (Adler & Adler, 1991).

Institutions focusing on educational processes encourage the athletes to take responsibility for their own academic experience. While services are provided for athletes, the potential outcomes of their intercollegiate academic career is left up to them. Programs that emphasize both educational products and educational processes encourage the student-athletes to make the most of the education they receive: to not just get their degree, but to achieve an enhanced level of knowledge and ability to think critically, as well as to develop life-transferable skills.

Indiana University (IU) has been successful over the past two decades in establishing an
intercollegiate athletic program that is dedicated to both educational products and processes. In 1974 they introduced an academic counseling program that not only intended to maintain the athletes’ eligibility, but to also enhance graduation rates and to give each athlete the opportunity to get the most out of their academic experience (Karpius & Rose, 1982). The Indiana University athletic counseling program is committed to providing the athletes with the highest levels of assistance. However, personal responsibility and discipline are the foundation from which the program operates.

The IU athletic counseling program provides experienced, professional counselors that are on staff in the athletic department, to help “amplify the academic experience through more effective counseling” (Karpius & Rose, 1982, p.164). The athletic department’s commitment to education begins when the student-athlete first visits IU on their initial recruiting visit. At this time, the services provided and eligibility rules are discussed, as are the universities’ expectations for the student, and the responsibility they must individually accept. In the recruiting process, the intercollegiate coaches welcome this initial exposure of the athlete to the educational priority of the university:

The athletes and their parents are always impressed with the interest and knowledge the staff shows toward the student’s academic career. This counseling service helps the athletes keep their priorities straight.


For those athletes who choose to accept IU athletic scholarships, they must attend a two-day summer orientation program at which each student-athlete is tested in reading and writing skills, and are given the chance to become acquainted with the academic staff, campus and teammates. Once the school year begins, each freshman must attend a four day orientation
period where athletes are divided into small groups where issues such as time management, using the library, footnoting, and avoiding plagiarism are discussed (Karpius & Rose, 1982, p.165). Further, each student-athlete is given assistance with fall registration to ensure that eligibility requirements are fulfilled and other questions answered. During the competitive season, study table and tutoring programs begin. Three nights a week, supervised study tables are available. While all student-athletes are encouraged to attend, the coach decides who must attend; for those whose attendance is mandatory, a weekly progress report is sent to the coach, who must then take the responsibility of following-up on any problems. Tutor names and numbers are made available to all athletes; however, the athletes must individually contact and arrange these meetings while the athletic department pays the expenses. The athletic department attempts to eliminate the stigma of utilizing tutors by promoting the widespread use of them by all athletes - including top students who are looking for assistance to get into professional programs. Finally, each athlete must have two reports per semester filled out by their professors. The professors are asked to discuss the students’ current status or grade, and if necessary, to express reasons for unsatisfactory work and to provide comments and suggestions for the student-athlete. Should problems with student-athletes persist, the athlete, coach and counseling staff sit down to discuss potential strategies to improve the academic performance (Karpius & Rose, 1982).

Graduation should be the main goal of every student-athlete. When an athlete plays out his collegiate eligibility and does not receive his degree, he has wasted a lot of time and money and ends up only with a lot of memories.
-Larry Smith, IU baseball coach (Karpius & Rose, 1982, p.165)

While CIAU athletic programs may not have the financial and personnel resources to practically provide the same educational programs to their student-athletes as Indiana University,
they can provide a similar philosophical environment; an environment characterized by a commitment and dedication to providing the best possible opportunities and support for student-athletes to succeed athletically, academically, emotionally and socially.

**EDUCATOR ROLE OF THE COACH**

Arising from the growth of intercollegiate athletics are professional coaches, who are generally highly visible locally and often nationally (Sage, 1975, p.401; MacLean, 1992, p.6). In Canada, the professionalization of coaching has at times caused great concern. Full-time faculty members traditionally coached the athletic teams; however, the gap between athletic departments and physical education departments gradually widened. Two separate reports - one by the AUCC (1966), one by Matthews (1974) - examined the role of intercollegiate athletics in Canada. They both recommended that full-time faculty remain in control of sport in academic institutions, since “...one perceived advantage of integration is that physical education faculty provide a sound educational base for intercollegiate sport” (MacIntosh, 1986, p.6).

The concern is understandable; the coach, especially at the intercollegiate level, can be looked upon as the ‘gatekeeper’ of the athletic experience (Vernacchia, 1996). The commitment and dedication to academics by the athlete is often a reflection of the commitment and dedication to academics by the athletic administration and university as a whole, with the head coach at the forefront of promoting education:

The success of the academic counseling program depends on cooperation from all of those involved. The key individual is the head coach in each sport. Only the coach has the power to make academics a priority for the athlete...to be successful, however, it must also be a priority for the university.

Karpus & Rose, 1982, p.165

The coach, at any level, has the potential to fill an educational role. Many intercollegiate
coaches, such as John Thompson, John Wooden and Ken Shields, see their primary role as an *Educator*, using sport as a vehicle to ‘teach’ their athletes. Such coaches view intercollegiate sport as an opportunity to provide their athletes with life lessons, and the chance to develop transferrable life skills. Bob Knight - head basketball coach at Indiana University - when discussing the educational potential of intercollegiate sport, and the possible impact he as the coach can have in his players’ development, stated:

> I want him to go away and say, well, I learned more in basketball than in any class I took at Indiana. Basketball was by far the most educational experience that I had when I was at Indiana. And if that kid says, well, Chemistry 401 was my best, then I want to find out what the hell that guy is teaching in Chemistry 401 because I ought to be teaching it in basketball (Mellen, 1989, p.3).

As previously discussed, the head coach can be instrumental in assisting athletes with the educational products, such as maintaining eligibility and eventually graduating, as well as in finding post-graduation employment. Athletes frequently turn to coaches to develop contacts for off-season employment, as well as employment after their playing career is complete. Coach Joe Raso (Silver Fox Program, 1997), from McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, discussed this aspect in an open letter to potential recruits:

> At McMaster we encourage all our recruits and players to prepare for the future. We also suggest that they use basketball rather than have basketball use them. We feel that a Nationally recognized degree and the opportunity to play in front of family and large crowds of potential clients and employers will be worth the cost of their degree.

Mike Havey (Silver Fox Program, 1997), head coach at the University of Windsor in Ontario, similarly discusses the potential for opportunities once the athlete’s basketball career is complete:

> Over the course of a four (or five) year academic/athletic career at a Canadian university you will have the opportunity to develop a presence and profile that can greatly enhance your opportunities for post graduation employment.
EXAMINING THE ROLES OF INTERCOLLEGIATE COACHES

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Beyond the Educator role there are many other responsibilities and objectives of the intercollegiate coach. To best examine these other goals and tasks, they can be categorized into further sets and labeled in terms of ‘roles’. What happens to the roles of intercollegiate coaches can best be discussed by first introducing the theoretical framework used in examining these roles.

Donald Searing (1994) contends that as researchers, "...we are better trained to study institutions than to study individuals" (p.x). Therefore, to examine the actors within an institution - such as coaches in intercollegiate athletics - it is beneficial to look at the concept of roles. Roles are constructed by institutions and reconstructed by the individuals who play the roles, and use them to pursue their goals (Searing, 1994, p.xi).

The inquiry into roles has diminished since the early 1970's according to Searing (1994, p.1). One of the main reasons for this decline, Searing argues, is the "conceptual confusion" surrounding ‘role theory’ (p.6). He contends that there are no general role theories; instead, what is commonly referred to as ‘role theory’, are instead “frameworks that consist of topics, concepts and assumptions” (p.7). To examine individuals within institutions, researchers are encouraged to present “particular explanations about particular types of roles in particular types of institutional contexts” (p.7). The use of the term ‘role’ by the author is to be thought of "...as ‘organized conceptions’, as patterns, as configurations of goals, attitudes, and behaviours that are characteristic of people in particular positions” (p.18).

To examine the roles of intercollegiate coaches, a “motivational approach” was utilized.
The motivational approach focuses on *rules* and *choice* by integrating the formal rules of the institutions with the informal rules established through the actors interacting within the environment. It is concerned with how the formal and informal rules are followed, as well as taking into account the “individual choice, intention, and meaning with the connections among desires, beliefs and actions” (Searing, 1994, p.21). The motivational approach recognizes that the role players are “purposive actors with independent standpoints” (p.15). Therefore, it explains roles by “identifying and describing the relevant sets of characteristic desires, beliefs and behaviours and their interconnections” (p.22). This flexible framework of empirical study recognizes that the roles played by individual actors both enable and constrain them. Individual autonomy and independence is recognized, but consideration is also given to formal and informal rules that generally specify both the tasks to be performed and the primary objectives to be achieved.

At the core of roles in the motivational approach, are the career goals and emotional incentives: “our actions are ordinarily characterized by the purposes sought and explained by desires, feelings and emotions” (Taylor, 1985, p.23). Career goals are often focused on the institution, and defined by the institution while emotional incentives are usually focused on the actor. It is these emotional incentives that provide the passion of the actor, as they “intensify the striving in the career goals, shape the interpretations and applications of these goals, and in some cases, precede the goals and structure choices among them” (Searing, 1994, p.20).

Over time, individuals will learn to modify existing goals and develop new ones; this allows the actor to adapt to institutional environments and to problem situations. While these roles are being re-invented, other roles may be changed or adjusted to adapt to the individuals
changes in their goals. Further, attitudes and behaviours are constantly re-examined and re-defined by the actor. Therefore, the roles of individuals are "dynamic and adaptive patterns of goals, attitudes and behaviours" (Searing, 1994, p.21).

For the current study, the work of Patricia and Peter Adler (1991) was the guiding literature for examining the roles of intercollegiate sport. Adler and Adler (1991) spent five years examining the roles of Division I male basketball players, and how the intercollegiate environment, coaches and others who surround the athletic department, affected these roles. Their research demonstrated a pattern by which the roles performed by each college athlete undertook. The athletes' roles first became differentiated, then dominated, and finally engulfed or abandoned (Adler & Adler, 1991). These changes in the roles came about from both the formal rules of the institution, the informal rules of the intercollegiate athletic environment, and the perceptions and assumptions of each individual athlete. It was hypothesized that the roles performed by intercollegiate coaches may undergo similar transformations. For this reason, while the focus of this study is on the perceptions of OUA men's basketball coaches on their educator role, it is important to identify other potential roles that may compete for importance and focus of their resources.

**DIFFERENTIATING INTERCOLLEGIATE BASKETBALL COACHING ROLES**

Most coaches, including intercollegiate coaches, recognize the complexity and diversity of the position. Many hats may be worn by a coach, especially when working within an educational system. What many coaches do not expect, however, is that the multitude of differing roles can compete for prominence in commitment by the coach, and for valuable resources such as time and money. Adler and Adler (1991) term this *role differentiation,*
whereby the role expectations of the coach become distinguishable. Tasks become categorized and classified - often unconsciously - by the coach.

The intercollegiate basketball coach needs a wide range of skills and has a multitude of seemingly important and diverse roles to fill. Many researchers have attempted to identify the skills required of a good coach, and the roles they must fill in the position. Sabock (1985) identified thirty-seven qualities of a good coach and twenty-one roles the successful coach must assume; Schraibman (1989) identified twelve fundamental qualities to look for in coaching appointments; Leland (1988) developed nine categories from which to evaluate coaches; Bennett and Rhea (1979) identified four categories of evaluation for a coach. Others, including Norcross (1986), Pflug (1980), Phillips (1988), and MacLean (1992) have also examined the roles and skills required of coaches.

MacLean (1992, pp.91-93) developed the most comprehensive list of coaching tasks and coaching responsibilities by examining the relevant research of Adams (1979), Bennice (1990), Bennett and Rhea (1979), Cunningham and Fullerton (1988), Leland (1988). Margolis (1979), Norcross (1986), Pflug (1980), Phillips (1988), and Wasson (1985). She identified fifty tasks that a coach must be responsible for and then further subdivided these criteria under nine distinct headings for the purpose of evaluating Canadian University Coaches: Coaching in Practice Sessions, Coaching in Game Play, Administrative Performance, Philosophy, Public Relations, Team Performance Standards, Recruiting, Personal Performance Characteristics, and Professional Development (pp.94-96). Using the work of MacLean (1992), seven differentiated roles can be identified that an intercollegiate basketball coach may perform beyond the Educator role.
**Tactician**

The tactical role performed by the intercollegiate coach encompasses the tasks and concepts related to the on-court performance of the team. The tactical ability of the intercollegiate coach requires a high level of knowledge of the sport, including offensive and defensive systems to be employed by the team. The athletes must be taught the concepts that the team will utilize for the coming season within the team framework. Further, the intercollegiate coach must be able to apply their tactical abilities in practices, pre-game preparation, opponent scouting and in-game decisions made.

**Performance Trainer**

The intercollegiate coach must also be able to work with each athlete on an individual basis to assist in their athletic performance. A strong ability to teach is critical in a coaches' success in training each athlete. The intercollegiate coach must be able to teach and correct fundamental skills, train the athletes physically to be prepared for competition, as well as motivate and discipline the athletes so they can be in a position to perform maximally. Essentially, the intercollegiate coach must be responsible for providing biomechanical, physiological and psychological assistance to the athlete. For athletes with immense potential, the ability of the intercollegiate coach to provide them with appropriate training may result in an opportunity to compete professionally or internationally in the sport.

**Recruiter and Team Selector**

Often considered the ‘lifeblood’ of intercollegiate athletics, the coach must recruit and select the team on a yearly basis. Recruiting continues to emerge as an ever-increasingly important task. With recruiting elevating to a ‘war-like’ intensity at times, the intercollegiate
coach must be skilled in assessing the potential of athletes, contacting the athletes, and eventually convincing the athletes to attend their institution to play intercollegiate basketball. If coaches neglect this role, they run the risk of having a collection of individuals inadequately skilled or physically unable to compete at the elite level. Further, recruiting requires the coach to look into the 'crystal ball' to assess the potential conflicts or benefits that could emerge from having certain individuals within the program. Future eligibility and potential team chemistry are two issues at the forefront of an intercollegiate coaches' concerns.

*Administrator*

Particularly a critical role in Canadian and lower-profile American institutions, the coach is often responsible for the off-court administration of the athletic team. Budgets must be adhered to, competitive and practice schedules must be developed, equipment must be purchased and cared for, and statistics must be kept and organized.

*Marketer*

For a coach at an academic institution, there is often a perception that their responsibility of a coach also includes *Marketing* the school. While not as significant a role in Canadian institutions, the athletic program has the potential to stimulate alumni donations and the sale of merchandise. High-profile American basketball programs, in contrast, can earn the school money by their performance, directly and indirectly. Television contracts, appearance fees and merchandise sales can grow into the millions of dollars. Alumni and booster support is also enhanced by the profile of the major sport teams. A 1994 study by Grimes and Chressanthis looked at how contributions made by alumni to academics was affected by the success, exposure and behaviour of NCAA intercollegiate sports program. The study found that the winning
percentage of the teams and the amount of television exposure the athletic program received had a positive relationship with the amount of money donated by the alumni. Conversely, NCAA sanctions were found to have had a negative relationship on donations to academics. The study does support the notion that the performance, exposure and behaviour of the athletic teams at academic institutions in the United States can have an affect on the monies collected through alumni donations.

**Public Relations Officer**

CIAU and lower-profile American institutions typically do not generate profits from their athletic programs. However, the performance and profile of the athletic teams can serve both a liaison function to future students, as well as a "school spirit" function for current students, faculty, staff, alumni, boosters and fans. Often, school image is the justification for the marriage between athletics and academic institutions. Representing the university or college often becomes a dominant duty of the coach. The coach must be able to communicate effectively, in particular with the media. A survey of the local newspapers demonstrates the public relations potential of the athletic program. Every day, stories and scores from the athletic realm are featured, while rarely is an academic department represented in the news. For example, *The Windsor Star* - a regional newspaper in Windsor, Ontario - has a sports reporter assigned to the University of Windsor athletics; conversely, there are irregular reports of the university in general. Coaches see a responsibility to fill the arena with people while also enhancing the school's reputation - especially outside of the institution's local area.

**Self-promoter**

A final role that coaches perform is the promotion of their own image or personality.
This role is driven by two variables: the available opportunity structure, and the coach’s level of ambition (Docherty, 1997). Coaches are often highly ambitious people - their life’s work revolves about a quest to improve and succeed. The coaches’ approach to the self-promotion can be influenced by one of three levels of ambition identified in political science research (Docherty, 1997; Schlesinger, 1966). Coaches with *Discrete* ambition, are looking to only coach for a specific amount of time, then leave or return to a former position. *Static* ambition suggests that the coach would like to remain in his current position for as long as possible. Finally, coaches with *Progressive* ambition utilize their current position as a “stepping stone” to what is perceived to be a more important position because of factors such as money, status or prestige.

These three levels of ambition can be influenced by the coach’s perceptions of the opportunity structure available to him (Docherty, 1997). The presumption from political science research is that different occupations have different opportunity structures available to them. Therefore, the opportunity structures perceived by the coach as available to him can influence his level of ambition, and thus affect his approach to the self-promoter role.

**IMPACTS ON INTERCOLLEGIATE COACHING ROLES**

**PRESSURES IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

There are many pressures in modern intercollegiate athletics that can affect coaches. Walton (1992, p.157) claims that the “new additional talents needed to win and promote the game” impact an intercollegiate basketball coach’s time and energy to critically examine their potential philosophical impact and educational role. Coaches are under extreme pressure to produce winning teams and to enhance the image of the University, all the while dealing with the
ever-changing technical and tactical advances. Further, NCAA Division I coaches in particular, must contend with the passion held by alumni, boosters and fans of the program, the need to turn the athletic program into a profitable business, and the enhanced media exposure and involvement. Canadian and lower-profile American institutions, conversely, must often overcome apathy and limited resources to be competitive and to provide for their student-athletes.

**Revenue Potential**

Money is often at the root of the pressures faced by modern-day coaches. NCAA Division I basketball programs have the potential to earn significant sums of money. Merchandise sales, appearance fees for teams, television and radio contracts, and ticket sales can earn elite intercollegiate athletic programs substantial revenues. Fans pay top dollar to attend major NCAA events as interest in intercollegiate athletics continues to expand. Further, as previously discussed, alumni and booster donations can be influenced by the performance, exposure and behaviour of the basketball program (Grimes & Chressanthis, 1994). Alumni and boosters’ yearly contributions can be critical to the program’s survival, and they often seem to want to be more than outside observers, adding to the pressure placed upon the coach (Adler & Adler, 1991). The program must win to continue to gain financial support from all of these avenues; “…the passion for victory is high, and the money flows to the victorious” (Walton, 1992, p.158).

For CIAU institutions, the need to generate revenue is becoming increasingly important with the diminishing resources available for the athletic program. While not likely to generate profits, the coach may be pressured to generate enough money to maintain and justify the
program’s existence.

**Personal Finances and Job Security**

Most coaches in the CIAU make their living as professional coaches, therefore their performance is essential to maintain their livelihood. For the NCAA Division I coach, there is an extreme personal financial stake involved. Coaches are well-paid, with salaries potentially reaching hundreds of thousands of dollars. Endorsement opportunities, radio and television shows, shoe and apparel contracts, speaking engagements and summer camp profits can further add to the staggering earning potential of a prominent Division I head coach. The downside is the expectations - often unreasonable - that come with such a lofty position. Job security is generally an oxymoron, with very few coaches ever getting the chance to leave on their own terms. When asked about the skyrocketing salaries of prominent Division I head coaches, Bob Knight defended the lofty compensation by saying:

> Who is the faculty member most likely to be fired for poor performance? Who is in the most visible and vulnerable position? It’s [the coach]. What single enterprise is going to bring the most publicity and money to [the institution]? It’s going to be [the coach]. You know, I would be content to work for a percentage. I’d take a percentage of the season tickets we sell. Or give me a percentage of the funds donated to Indiana University simply because our basketball team has played well. I mean, we are talking about millions of dollars now - there is no direct way to calculate it all. So if I’m responsible for all that, then I’d better be paid well (England, 1982, p.160).

Walton (1992, p.158) likens each competitive season to a corporation’s quarterly reports. Similar to a business manager in such a corporation, the high-profile coach must produce results each quarter. Walton contends that a coach can have up to two bad seasons, but a third will often result in a dismissal. Therefore, continuing with the business analogy, the intercollegiate basketball coach has three-quarters of a corporate year to “prove their work” (Walton, 1992,
Further, for basketball coaches who aspire to reach greater heights as a coach, their upward mobility is generally dependent upon their success in terms of wins and losses.

**Perceptions of Outsiders**

With all of this pressure and responsibility, the coaches must also fight the perception that much of the institution’s faculty has of them being “academic pariahs” preying on the talents of young student-athletes (Vernacchia, 1996). This perception is enhanced with the continuing professionalization of coaches, and the diminishing influence of faculty members on the athletic programs. Further, Walton (1992) argues that the existence of committed coaches is threatened if society continues to insist on “white-knight perfection” (p.163). He points to coaches such as Vince Lombardi who was criticized for being a social drinker and using profanity; John Wooden was denounced for his swearing and ‘uncompassionate’ demeanor; and Woody Hayes was belittled for his sometimes violent temper; a current coach who is constantly under attack by those outside his program is Bob Knight. Yet, all of these coaches, despite their imperfections, elicit loyalty and dedication from their players because of their commitment to each athlete’s overall development.

The importance of outside perceptions can expand to the local community and the media. When influential people have a negative perception of the coach, program or intercollegiate athletics in general, it can result in pressures for administrators to make changes, to eliminate personnel and resources, and to reduce financial support. Therefore, the label of “academic pariah” can be a dangerous tag for an intercollegiate coach to carry.

**Limited Resources**

For the Canadian or low profile American intercollegiate basketball coach making money
- personally or for the athletic department - is generally not a major concern, but often the justification for funds is critical. With student fees and alumni donations accounting for much of the athletic department’s budget, programs must demonstrate a level of both competence and value to continue to receive these funds. Further, financial constraints can cause several problems for Canadian or low profile American intercollegiate basketball coaches. Coaches generally cannot concentrate completely on coaching basketball. Often, they must fulfill other responsibilities within the institution, or work elsewhere to support themselves. All CIAU institutions are non-revenue generating, therefore the coaches often must dedicate much of their time and effort in raising money to fund the basketball program.

_**Competing with the ‘American Dream’**_

These lower profile American and Canadian intercollegiate coaches must also deal with the dilemma of the NCAA Division I American influence. This influence extends from the high school athletes being recruited, to the future and current coaches, all the way up through the athletic administrations. Young Canadian basketball players often dream of playing in the United States; similarly, there are many small-town American athletes lured by the draw of high-profile Division I basketball. There are many examples of young Canadians going to the United States on an athletic scholarship, either to never be heard from again or to return after a disappointing experience. The moment of signing the letter of intent to an American school can be the proudest moment of a high school athletes career, with all around taking pride in this accomplishment. This “Big-Time” mentality is evident in Canadian local newspapers; stories about young high school athletes traveling to the United States on athletic scholarships - often only partial in financial support - constantly emerge in the sports sections. Athletes who choose
to stay in Canada to compete in intercollegiate athletics - and often at a higher level of play - go unnoticed and their decisions go unreported by the very communities they will continue to represent.

Many coaches also look upon Division I NCAA athletics as their ultimate goal. Often they will spend intermittent periods at smaller institutions, always maintaining their goal to coach a high-profile program. As a result, a win-centered model of coaching is followed by high-school coaches or lower-profile intercollegiate coaches, with only wins and losses important for their self-presentation.

Students, fans, alumni and boosters similarly are affected by the elite American athletics' influence. They often provide more support to large institutions they do not even attend, at the expense of their own school's program. Administrators, too, get caught up in the American model of intercollegiate athletics. Championship tournaments are often held in half-empty venues, hoping for a "March Madness" NCAA tournament-like setting.

**RESULTANT OF THE PRESSURES: ROLE DOMINATION**

Overwhelmed by the modern-day coaching pressures, the roles and tasks that are to be performed become classified in terms of the perceived importance to the intercollegiate coach. With only so many resources individually available to the coach, certain roles and tasks begin to emerge in perceived significance; what results is the coach becomes immersed in these prioritized tasks, resulting in *role domination* (Adler & Adler, 1991, p.27). Thus, selective roles and tasks deemed possible and reasonable by the coach begin to dominate the resources of the coach. Therefore, with the prioritization of roles, it must be questioned whether coaches can remain committed to the educational endeavours of their student-athletes.
COACHING ROLE ABANDONMENT / ROLE ENGULFMENT

Resulting from the ever-increasing number of skills required of coaches, and the growing pressures discussed previously, coaches may choose to ignore undesirable roles and tasks. Termed role abandonment by Adler and Adler (1991), coaches may “progressively detach themselves from their investment in other areas and let go of alternative goals or priorities” (pp.27-8). As a result, coaches may turn to outside consultants to reduce their burden. Sometimes these undesirable roles may go completely unfulfilled and tasks can remain uncompleted; no one is responsible for replacing the coach as the provider of some services, thus role engulfment ensues (Adler & Adler, 1991, p.27).

ROLE ABANDONMENT: COACH AS ‘TECHNICAL OVERSEER’

Instead of providing all of the necessary competence for their athlete, the coaches often rely upon the work of external experts to overcome deficiencies. Thus, coaches may become “technical overseers”, rather than the central figure in the team’s philosophical development and implementation. For example, using the Wizard of Oz as an analogy, Dorothy - playing the role of the coach - does not recognize the potential impact she has on her “players” - the Scarecrow, Tin Man and Cowardly Lion. Instead of providing her followers with the answers they are looking for, she becomes reliant upon the “expertise” of outside consultants - the Wizard of Oz. “Dorothy” fails to understand the totality of her responsibilities, instead focusing on the physical and the strategic.

External consultants may include sport psychologists, nutritionists, strength and conditioning experts, academic counselors and independent recruiters. The expertise of such individuals can be invaluable to an intercollegiate program. However, the coach must take a
prominent and central role in the delivery process of all aspects of the student-athlete’s experience to avoid role abandonment. This may require the coach to become familiar with the information provided by outside consultants, or minimally, to be present during the delivery of the services by external experts. Thus, when the needs of the student-athlete require assistance beyond the expertise of the coach, they can be confidently referred to the necessary consultants. Therefore, the coach remains the central figure in the delivery of external assistance, rather than being merely a technical overseer.

**ROLE ENGULFMENT: THE SOPHIST APPROACH**

Corlett (1996a) argues that the philosophical teachings people adhere to may obstruct a coach from critically self-examining themselves. Many take a ‘Sophist approach’ to teaching; the teachings of the sophists centred on the individual and their own perceptions of right action and proper personal conduct. Thus, any opinion or action that served the practical needs of one’s daily life was considered of value: “They proposed that life was as matter of daily personal experience, not of universal truth” (Corlett, 1996a, p.85). ‘Sophisticated’ Greeks thus began to develop an arsenal of practical skills, without having to bear the responsibility of succumbing to traditional virtues and acknowledging the philosophy underlying these skills. As a result, sophists rely on the use of techniques, without ever developing a philosophical foundation the skills and strategies support and are drawn from.

Modern practitioners of any form today - including coaches - often rely upon an abundance of techniques they have at their disposal. Barrett (1979) explains that we as a culture have become captivated with the use of practical methods at the expense of any underlying philosophy, yet he contends:
Every technique is put to use for some end, and this end is decided in the light of some philosophic outlook or other. The technique cannot produce the philosophy that directs it (p.117).

Unfortunately, too many coaches and other practitioners do not take time for introspection and to recognize a philosophy that underlies the techniques they utilize. What results is an engulfment of many potential roles the coach may perform. Instead of asking “What ought I do”, we often ask “What can I do” (Corlett, 1996a, p.92). Coaches seem to continuously add to an overwhelming number of techniques to overcome the inevitable challenges they will face, without a philosophy to guide their actions. It does not leave much time for “philosophizing about sports, life and the quest for human progress,...for the mediocre or troublesome athlete, or for putting things into proper perspective” (Walton, 1992, p.159).

Consequently, insufficient energy can be spent by coaches to contribute to the sport ingenuity and novelty, or to progress beyond the simplicity of intercollegiate sport being just a game. The status quo often remains, leaving those like Walton (1992) to question:

How much time can a coach afford to spend for long-term planning needed to conceptualize a novel brand of play or a new approach to the game - a pyramid of success or a hierarchy of needs...? (p.158)

Vigorous self-examination gives way to “whatever it takes”; philosophical development is engulfed by “empty” techniques. There are few resources left for the coach to adequately focus on the overall pursuits of the student-athletes; and no one is there to take the coach’s place.

**A PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH TO THE EDUCATOR ROLE**

Modern-day coaching pressures result in it becoming increasingly difficult for an elite coach to resist the engulfment or abandonment of the educator role. However, by developing a
philosophical commitment to education, coaches may be better prepared to overcome the
pressure to sacrifice academic integrity and eliminate education as a priority.

Defined by Martens (1987a) as the “pursuit of wisdom”, philosophy looks to answer the
fundamental questions about “what”, “why” and “how” through the process of individual
introspection (p.3). Corlett (1996a) similarly espouses the potential value of self-analysis, and by
utilizing the philosophic writing of Socrates, defines the results of such introspection as “self-
knowledge” (p.87).

THE SOCRATIC APPROACH

The ‘Socratic Approach’ applies the belief of Socrates that the foundation for human
existence was the search for knowledge; thus, the Socratic Approach relies upon determining
what goals in life are real and what goals in life are illusory through “rigorous self-examination
and intellectual hard work” (Corlett. 1996a, p.86). Socrates challenged everyone to find the
existence of knowledge which would advocate how we should live: “...examining both myself
and others is really the very best thing that a man can do, and the life without this sort of
examination is not worth living” (Plato, 1961, sec.38a). Intercollegiate coaches, Socrates would
argue, should focus their efforts on searching for the true essence of their position. For coaches
who see themselves as central figures operating within an educational system, the educator role
will be the epitome of their job.

Though in the long run a philosophical approach may prove more successful, the
pressures they must endure often prompts coaches to search for a perceived ‘quick-fix’. Despite
the potential benefits - both practically and morally - of a well-defined, ethically-sound coaching
philosophy, many coaches do not take the time to critically examine themselves, or the roles they
fulfill.

COACHING PHILOSOPHY

A practical application of the Socratic Approach that can be utilized by the intercollegiate coach is a well-constructed coaching philosophy. Martens (1987a, p.3) contends that “coaches without well-developed philosophies lack direction and readily succumb to external pressures”. An analysis of great coaches can reveal the same characteristics of leadership. Highly successful coaches from all sports, such as basketball coaches John Wooden and Bob Knight, and football coaches like Joe Paterno and Bear Bryant, developed well-constructed coaching philosophies early on in their careers (Martens, 1987a). As a result, Martens (1987a) asserts that these coaches “discovered the art of coaching was using broad philosophical concepts in a skillful way to enhance the pursuit of their goals, regardless of whether others agreed with their particular coaching philosophies” (p.4). What these individuals share in common is a well-defined personal philosophy derived from critical self-examination and introspection.

Martens (1987a) argues that a well-developed coaching philosophy - and life philosophy - is one of the most practical things a coach can utilize. A coaching philosophy can act as a daily guide, give direction to long-term objectives and can interpret events that may occur. To be successful, Martens (1987a) insists that individuals must know where they are going, thus “coming to know yourself” is the key to developing a sound philosophy of coaching (p.3). The quest for self-awareness must be constantly ongoing, as events will either strengthen or call for re-evaluation of a coach’s philosophy.

Sport philosophers and other sport pedagogists would argue that having a critically-examined coaching philosophy is not enough, but that it also be ethically and morally sound.
Walton (1992, p.164) maintains that there are two reasons to make a commitment to living and working with integrity. First, Walton (1992, p.164) contends that integrity is “a powerful professional asset, and its absence can be a burdensome liability”. Walton insists that coaches who lack integrity may have short-term success, but eventually it will surface, resulting in the coaches downfall. Walton (1992) refers to a 1941 quote by Sir Winston Churchill:

The only guide to a man is his conscience. The only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions. It is very imprudent to walk through life without this shield because we are so often mocked by the failure of our hopes and the upsetting of our calculations. But with this shield, however, the fates may play, we march always in the ranks of honour (p.164-165).

The second reason why Walton (1992, p.165) claims living and working with integrity is worthwhile is because it is “essential to a satisfying life and to self-esteem”. Walton asserts that we must be pleased with what we have done in life and with how we did it. Martens (1987a) similarly espouses the need to live and work with integrity, claiming that our self-worth is our most important possession, and we should “go to great lengths to protect and nurture it” (p.11).

Emerging from the process of critical self-examination, from the interpretation of past experiences, is a well-defined, ethically-sound coaching philosophy. Challace McMillin (1996), when discussing the practical importance of an ethically sound coaching philosophy stated, “It doesn’t guarantee that you will make the right decisions, but you will make decisions for the right reasons”. These reasons may not be morally or practically infallible, however will have been developed through introspection and critical self-examination.

Socrates did not deny the need for techniques and productive knowledge, yet contends that they should come from a developed philosophy: from a Socratic approach to developing an ethically-sound coaching philosophy. For the modern-day intercollegiate coach, a Socratic
approach to critical self-examination might result in a rededication to the educational experience of the athlete. Those who do not analyze their underlying philosophy, or subscribe to the sophist approach, can lose sight of an important role coaches should play in academic settings: to be part of the educational process.

*If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained you will also suffer a defeat. If you know neither the enemy nor yourself, you will succumb in every battle...*

-ancient Chinese philosopher Sun Tzo (Clavell, 1983)

There is practicality inherent in the process of self-examination; the outcome of such introspection is an individually defined philosophy. Those coaches who operate from a philosophical foundation are termed ‘Philosopher Coaches’ by Walton. These Philosopher Coaches see their potential impact on others as being more than teaching young adults to put an orange ball into an orange hoop:

Philosopher coaches have the gifted knack of being able to step back from all the daily business to see what they’re about, why they work, and what’s wonderful about it. They see life as a process rather than an event.

Walton, 1992, p.161

Yet, coaches still tend to neglect the potential they have, are short-sighted when it comes to the contributions they make, undervalue the results they obtain, and “measure their coaching worth by the amount of money they make” (Walton, 1992, p.161). The philosopher coach is well-positioned to impact the lives of young adults: athletically, academically, emotionally and socially. Generally, the coach-athlete relationship is entered voluntarily, giving the coach opportunities to touch the lives of people like no one else.

But as Sun Tzo predicts, to be successful, coaches must also know the “enemy” - the
challenges and obstacles coaches will face. Modern-day intercollegiate coaches must understand the environment within which they exist. It is not enough to have a well-defined coaching philosophy if the objectives, opportunities, limitations and expectations are not clearly recognized. As Socrates stated: “there is only one good, that is knowledge, and only one evil, that is ignorance” (Diogenes, 1959, sec.31).

MacLean and Zakrajsek (1994) identify the difficulty with which intercollegiate basketball coaches are evaluated in Canadian universities. Determining appraisal criteria is extremely difficult because of the complexity of the intercollegiate coaches’ job. If a coach’s job performance is measured by results alone, it may result in “behaviours dysfunctional to the organization” (MacLean & Zakrajsek, 1994, p.6); yet, how does one evaluate a coach if results are not a priority? Measuring and defining “effectiveness” of individuals working with people can be almost impossible. MacLean and Zakrajsek (1994) polled CIAU Athletic Directors on what measures were used to evaluate coaches, and the highest frequency response (seventy-nine percent) was “philosophy”.

However, current research on intercollegiate coaching tends to focus on how to measure effectiveness through performance variables. An example of such research is a study by Fizel and D’itri (1996). This study attempted to estimate coaching efficiency through an objective measure. The intention of the authors is commendable: to develop a measure of coaching efficiency that will reflect the true ability of the coach, beyond the simple measure of the overall winning percentage. The authors attempted to quantify that the true measure of an efficient coach is the ability to win with less talent. However, from a methodological perspective, the study is already subjective in nature. The two key components are based on subjective measures:
player ability rankings and strength of schedule, which takes into consideration the subjective team ranking polls. However, the more important criticisms are epistemological in nature. The study undermines several key responsibilities of the intercollegiate basketball coach by examining only the tactical role of the coach. Other responsibilities, including recruiting, performance training, marketing the institution, public relations, administrative functions and educational factors are not taken into consideration. Further, this study does not value any aspect if the player’s contribution to the team beyond his physical skill. Critically valuable members of the team, such as off-floor leaders and on-floor role players are not credited with the contributions they make toward the team. Being physically talented as an individual player does not guarantee success within the framework of the team, and often this is independent of the efforts and “efficiency” of the coach.

Understanding the environment, the expectations, the limitations and the opportunities is critical to the intercollegiate basketball coaches’ success. Thus, coaches must both develop a critically examined personal philosophy, and understand the climate within which they operate. With both a financial and philosophical rededication to academics from all involved, the academic pursuits of student-athletes can be the foundation upon which intercollegiate sport exists and coaches can make their educator role a priority.
CHAPTER II: PURPOSE OF STUDY

This study posed two general questions. The first was how OUA men’s basketball head coaches perceive the potential and actual educational value of intercollegiate sport. The second was how they perceive their role in the delivery of the educational component of intercollegiate athletics.

The literature suggested the first question by its demonstration that many elite intercollegiate coaches see the athletic opportunity as a potentially beneficial aspect of the student-athlete’s educational experience. They see intercollegiate athletics as a potentially valuable means by which student-athletes may gain valuable life-transferrable skills, while also providing an opportunity to receive the utmost assistance in their educational pursuits.

However, intercollegiate athletics and education are not always a mutually benefitting endeavor undertaken by the student-athletes. The use of participants as athletic commodities is not uncommon as intercollegiate athletics’ exposure and popularity continue to grow, and coaches salaries continue to escalate. In this study, coaches were asked to examine their own programs’ initiatives with respect to providing the best possible educational and athletic experience for the student-athletes.

The second question arose from the literature because even those coaches and athletic programs with a dedication and commitment to education of the student-athlete often must philosophically decide between a focus on educational products or educational processes, while some are able to focus on both. The conflict among the differentiated roles of coaches is often derived from the pressures of the intercollegiate athletic environment. The current study sought to elicit the coaches’ perceptions of the different roles they must perform, and what pressures
they must overcome to maintain the educational role as a priority.

Finally, because the literature reveals the practicality of a coaching philosophy to overcome role engulfment and role abandonment, a general analysis of the coaches' philosophical approach to coaching and intercollegiate athletics was done. Each coach's commitment to a philosophy that emphasizes education was analyzed.

**DIRECTIONAL PROPOSITIONS**

It was hypothesized that:

1. Coaches would perceive there to be considerable value to athletics and strong link between intercollegiate athletics and the enhancement of both educational products and educational processes.

2. Coaches would report doing a good job in maintaining academics as a priority in their coaching role, and in the services provided by the athletic program.

3. A wide variance would exist between the coaches' perceived responsibility for direct involvement in each individual student-athlete's academic progress.

4. Each coach would be able to articulate a philosophy that guides their role as an athletic coach in an academic setting.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The literature of Dewar and Horn (1992) and Patton (1990) as methodological guides, and the theses of Tracey (1994) and Gyurcsik (1994) as structural guides, were used to develop the methods for this study. This chapter discusses research concerns within sport psychology; identifies the environment and subjects of the study; outlines the methods of data collection, data analysis and data interpretation utilized by the researcher; identifies the qualifications of the researcher; and, lists the delimitations and limitations of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

RESEARCH ISSUES WITHIN SPORT PSYCHOLOGY

The choice of topics to investigate, the methods employed, and the perspective taken by sport psychology researchers has been heavily influenced by "sociological forces both within and outside the discipline" (Feltz, 1992, p.6). Sport psychology research trends have generally paralleled research within general psychology (Morgan, 1980). From 1950 to 1965, sport psychology research was characterized by empiricism with the bulk of the studies examining personality research (Landers, 1983). These studies paralleled the trait approach focus adopted by mainstream psychology. The time period from 1966-1976, in contrast, focused on a social analysis approach (Feltz, 1992). Theories and topics from general psychology, such as achievement motivation, social reinforcement, and arousal effects on motor performance, were individually tested within the realm of sport and exercise (Landers, 1983). Since the late 1970s, cognitive approaches to sport psychology have been the primary area of inquiry. The focus on cognitive approaches such as causal attributions, intrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy/self-
confidence, was influenced by the research leaders in psychology (Feltz, 1992).

A current issue within sport psychology is how to proceed with future research. To move forward it is vital for the qualitative researcher to understand the research paradigm debate in order to "appreciate why methods decisions can be highly controversial" (Patton, 1990, p.37). Patton (1990) considers this understanding of paradigms as the beginning point in developing a strategy for qualitative inquiry. Defined as "a world view, a general perspective, a way of breaking down the complexity of the real world" (p.37), paradigms are deeply embedded and tell practitioners what is important, legitimate and reasonable (Dewar & Horn, 1992; Patton, 1990; Martens, 1987b). Further, Patton argues that paradigms are also "normative, telling the practitioner what to do without the necessity of long existential or epistemological consideration (p.37).

Some researchers, including Roberts (1989), contend that the field would be furthered by the general acceptance of a conceptual paradigm to drive research and application. This conceptual paradigm would be a prescriptive method to focus studies and the utilization of the findings. Others in the discipline (Landers, 1989; Morgan, 1989) feel that a single paradigm of research would limit the breadth of study, and would diminish the understanding of sport behaviour problems (Feltz, 1992). Even Roberts concedes that the researchers within sport psychology should be "open to the work of those using other paradigms" (Feltz, 1992, p.8). Landers (1983, as cited by Feltz, 1992, p.8) contends that researchers must be willing to develop and test their "own logically formulated alternative explanations". Dishman (1983) and Alderman (1980) both argue that while general psychology is valuable in increasing the body of knowledge within sport psychology, a sport-specific approach must increasingly be taken to
explain and understand behaviour in sport.

Dewar and Horn (1992) challenge all sport psychologists and sport psychology researchers to question definitions of “what constitutes legitimate knowledge” and critically examine how our “ways of knowing have been developed in the field” (p.14). Yet despite the calls of several other writers (Landers, 1989; Morgan, 1989; Feltz, 1992) for an openness to new and varying research paradigms, Dewar and Horn (1992, p.14) argue that there is only a single, clearly accepted mode of knowledge acquisition in sport psychology. Martens (1987b) calls this the “orthodoxy” - the dominant mode of knowledge production (as cited by Dewar & Horn, 1992, p.14). This orthodoxy is referred to in many different forms, including “the scientific method, process-product research, research in the empirical analytic paradigm, experimental or quantitative research, or modernist science” (Dewar & Horn, 1992, p.14).

The assumption underlying this is that there is an objective reality that can be observed, quantified, explained, and predicted through the careful and systematic use of established procedures and techniques.

Dewar & Horn, 1992, p.15.

Theories about behaviour in sport have been and continue to be developed from objective, controlled experiments. However, beginning with Rainer Martens in 1979, criticism surfaced regarding the scientific method. This original criticism by Martens (1979) was methodological in nature, whereby he questioned the utility and practicality beyond the laboratory of this orthodoxy. In 1987, Martens wrote a more comprehensive critique of positivism and the scientific method. The second critique was more epistemological, contending that orthodox techniques as a way of knowing failed to study the “richness and complexity that characterized human behaviour” (Martens, 1987b, as cited by Dewar & Horn, 1992, p. 16).
Dewar and Horn (1992) further stated that as scholars and edited journals have searched for the “truth” using only a standard way of constructing knowledge, there has been an absence in giving a voice to the actual athletes, coaches and administrators involved in sport. Scholarly work based on quantitative methods tends to merely present the status quo. Likert scales - a common tool used in quantitative research - reveal what people perceive to be the reality of a situation, and the perceptions of those who do not fit into statistically significant groups are largely ignored. Often, however, it is those who do not fit into the norm that are at the forefront in creativity and future endeavors. Without their creative voice being heard, they must operate against continual resistance and scholarly rejection. Current research tends to celebrate the efforts of the 99 out of 100, with the perceptions of the differing respondent only included in the average of the group. Instead, future research could look more closely into the behaviours and perceptions of the one who does not meet the status quo.

Martens (1987b) suggests that researchers become interested, non-neutral observers located within the research process. This heuristic paradigm for inquiry would better explain and celebrate the complexity of the behaviours of sport participants, as the researcher attempts to derive information from personal experiences and contacts within the environment. More emphasis would be placed on case studies, clinical reports, and other introspective methods of acquiring knowledge (Martens, 1987b, p.52). Sport psychology researchers and practitioners “must begin to understand and investigate the possibilities that exist for understanding behaviour using paradigms other than logical positivism” (Dewar & Horn, 1992, p.17). By abandoning preconceived notions that the scientific method is the only legitimate way of knowing in sport psychology, it will become both possible and desirable to examine sport behaviour in diverse and
creative modes. Dewar and Horn (1992) challenge all researchers to make their positions explicit by identifying themselves and their values with respect to the research process. As a result, the knowledge produced will be contextualized, thus making the study of sport behaviours more appropriate and applicable.

Moving beyond quantitative/experimental methods and qualitative/naturalistic methods, Patton (1990) advocates a third paradigm option: Pragmatism - a paradigm of choice (p.39). Using methodological appropriateness as the primary criterion, Patton prefers pragmatism over one-sided paradigm allegiance and methodological orthodoxy for evaluating methodological quality:

The issue then becomes not whether one has uniformly adhered to prescribed canons of either logical positivism or phenomenology but whether one has made sensible methods decisions given the purpose of the inquiry, the questions being investigated, and the resources available. (p.39)

Patton (1990) reminds researchers that not all questions are theory based, therefore they must consider practice and pragmatism. As Halcolm once stated: "The apple of your eye won't satisfy the emptiness in your stomach. There is a time to talk about the nature of eating - and there is a time to eat" (Patton, 1990, pp.90-1).

In response to the critique of current research methods by Martens (1979; 1987b), Dewar and Horn (1992, p.20-22) provide three recommendations for future directions in research and scholarship in sport psychology. These three recommendations attempt to challenge researchers to philosophically examine the nature of the sporting environment, the means by which we collect data, and the ways in which we interpret our research results:
1. "Sport psychologists must recognize that human behaviour in sport is complex and multifaceted."

-Dewar & Horn, 1992, p.21

This recommendation for future research and scholarly work in sport proposes that sport psychologists acknowledge the dynamic nature of behaviours in sport; Dewar and Horn (1992) contend that the similarity and diversity of sport behaviour be both reflected and celebrated in future inquiries and applications. For the present study, the dynamic nature of coaching intercollegiate men’s basketball in Ontario was examined by giving coaches a voice to express their perceptions on the educator role they perform.

2. "We must be willing, individually and collectively to question how knowledge about sport behaviour is developed and created in sport psychology. We must explore alternative ways of understanding and explaining behaviour in sport and treat these as credible and useful contributions to the field."

-Dewar & Horn, 1992, p.20-21

This second recommendation proposed by Dewar and Horn (1992) calls for an examination of both the methodology and epistemology of future research and scholarship. Dewar and Horn contend that what will result is many different methods and interpretive strategies to compare and contrast research findings. By moving beyond the assumptions of logical positivism, sport psychology can better understand behaviour in sport utilizing new and creative research paradigms (Martens, 1987b). The current study attempted to implement this recommendation through its use of qualitative interviewing as the means of data collection.

3. "As sport psychologists, we need to interpret the results of our behavioural research in ways that are sensitive to the social and political contexts of sport in [North American] culture."

-Dewar & Horn, 1992, p. 22

Application of the third recommendation of Dewar and Horn (1992, p.22) requires the researcher to implement the results of the inquiry carefully so that inclusive ways of knowing are
developed. Attempts to develop inclusive ways of knowing will result in research and scholarship be furthered through the recognition and celebration of complexity and diversity found within the realm of sport (p.22). Thus, ways of knowing will begin to reflect the complexity and richness that characterizes behaviour in sport. In the present study, the qualitative interviews allowed those working within the OUA mens’ coaching environment to offer their views from their own unique perspectives.

**METHODOLOGY FRAMEWORK: QUALITATIVE INQUIRY ANALYZED**

**Study Samples**

For qualitative studies, the focus is on in-depth, relatively small, purposeful samples (Patton, 1990, p.169). This permits the researcher to find “information-rich” cases, where one can learn a great deal and illuminate the central question: “The much smaller sample of open-ended interviews add depth, detail and meaning at a personal level of experience” (p.18).

The general rule in determining sample size in qualitative research is that data is collected until no new information (or categories of fact) emerge; thus, the researcher looks for in-depth information that can be very valuable. The challenge for the researcher is to establish minimum samples that will reasonably cover the phenomenon and give the study purpose and validity.

Within the process of data collection, the sample size can change should information emerge to support such a change. The researcher is then “obligated to discuss how the sample affected the findings, the strengths and weaknesses of the sampling procedures, and any other design decisions that are relevant for interpreting and understanding the reported results” (Patton, 1990, p.186).
Data Collection

There are many options and strategies available to qualitative researchers. To determine the appropriate method of inquiry, the researcher must take into consideration who the information is for, what information is needed, how the information will be used, when is the information needed, and what resources are available? (Patton, 1990, p.12). The answers to these questions help the researcher to determine the research options and strategies most appropriate for the study. Therefore, the researcher must get the information to the people who can best utilize it, and deliver the information in an appropriate manner. With qualitative research, there are no rigid rules: it is as much an art as a science. As Patton (1990) states in a stolen paraphrase originally defining ‘politics’, “research is the art of the possible” (p.13).

The open-ended nature of qualitative inquiry permits the researcher to understand and capture the perceptions of those being studied. Standardized questions only “tap the surface” of the generalized patterns identified (Patton, 1990, p.14). Thus, the respondent is able to “describe what is meaningful and salient without being pigeonholed into standardized categories” (p.46). Therefore, the researcher must capture and learn the subjects’ point of view in their terms and categories for “rendering explicable and coherent the flux or raw reality” (Loftland, 1971, p.7). The qualitative researcher must provide the respondents with a framework that permits them to respond in an accurate and thorough manner about the issue being studied.

Two critical trade-offs in design must be made: Breadth vs. Depth and the Units of Analysis (Patton, 1990, p.162). Trade-offs are necessary because there is no perfect research designs, and researchers must deal with limited resources, limited time and human limits on the ability to “grasp the complex nature of social reality” (p.162). Essentially, the qualitative
researchers must determine and understand what is truly being examined, what to look for, and to know when the real thing has been obtained. Qualitative research methods consist of essentially three kinds of data collection: written documents, direct observation and, in-depth, open-ended interviews (Patton, 1990). The researcher may or may not be a participant in all or part of the phenomenon under study. The validity and reliability of qualitative data - often under attack - is dependent upon the researchers' methodological skill, sensitivity, and integrity.

The purpose of interviewing is to explore the inner perspectives of another individual. Breadth vs. Depth refers to the number of questions and the depth of the questions to study. Guba (1978) calls it the "boundary problem". Priorities must be established to determine what and when to pursue issues. Therefore, "essential and necessary questions" to be answered must be established (Patton, 1990, p.163). Review of literature can assist in establishing priorities, but it can also result in researcher bias and reduce the researcher's openness to emergent themes. Instead, a review of literature can interplay with data collection and researcher introspection. The depth and detail provided by qualitative research may therefore limit the breadth of the information examined.

Units of Analysis refers to what information will be of service, who the information will benefit, as well as the level of information required by such individuals/or groups, can widely vary. "The key issue in selecting and making decisions about the appropriate unit of analysis is to decide what it is you want to be able to say something about at the end of the study" (Patton, 1990, p.168).

With open-ended interviews, accessing the interviewee's perspective without putting things in their mind is the purpose: "The fundamental principle of qualitative interviewing is to
provide a framework within which respondents can express their own understandings in their own terms" (Patton, 1990, p.290). We are unable as researchers to observe feelings, thoughts and intentions, nor can we observe how other’s organize their world, past experiences or situations the researcher cannot be present for. Therefore, interviewing provides an opportunity for the researcher to enter the world of the subject. The respondent is able to use their own terminology, categories, perceptions, experiences and judgements, and the interviewer has the opportunity to capture the complexity of the individual. The interviewer must be able to obtain high-quality information, therefore must learn to listen to those who have knowledge to share: “...no less important than skill and technique is a genuine interest in and caring about the perspectives of other people" (p.279). The interviewer must also develop observational skills, able to read the non-verbal messages transmitted by the respondent: “Understanding that interviewing and observation are mutually reinforcing qualitative techniques is a bridge to understanding the fundamentally people-oriented nature of qualitative inquiry" (p.32).

The qualitative researcher must demonstrate “empathic neutrality" (Patton, 1990, p.55). The interviewer must develop an empathetic stance towards the subjects, while maintaining a neutral stance towards the findings. The researcher strives to understand the world as it is, to recognize the complexity and multiple perspectives, and to report both confirming and disconfirming evidence:

There are three general variations of qualitative interviewing a researcher may utilize. The first type of interview that can be utilized is the informal conversational interview. The questions from this type of interview variation emerge from the immediate context and are asked in the natural course of a conversation (Patton, 1990, p.288). There are no predetermined
question topics or question wording established by the interviewer. The second type of interview variation is the standardized open-ended interview. With this type of interview, completely open-ended questions are asked by the interviewer in an exact order, with the exact wording of each question (p.289). The final variation in interview instrumentation is the interview guide approach: the type of interview utilized in this study.

With the interview guide approach, topics and issues to be examined are specified prior to the interview by the researcher in an outline form (Patton, 1990). During the course of the interview, the researcher decides both the sequence and the wording of questions. The guide ensures that essentially the same information is obtained from all of the subjects covering the same material while maintaining a conversational and situational interview style. Therefore, the interview guide makes the information collection systematic for each subject, while also increasing the comprehensiveness of the data. Further, the interviewer can anticipate and eliminate logical gaps in the data collected. The interview guide will contain topics or subject areas to be "explored, probed and questioned that will elucidate and illuminate that particular subject" (p.283). Therefore, the interviewer can build a conversation and ask questions spontaneously while still focusing on predetermined issues.

Patton (1990) contends that there are six types of questions to be asked. The first type of questions are Experience/Behaviour questions. These questions are aimed at describing actions, behaviours and experiences that would have been or would be observable if the researcher was present (p.290). Opinion/Values questions look to develop an understanding of the cognitive and interpretive processes of the respondents - what they think (p.291). The third type of questions to ask are Feeling questions. These questions aim to understand the emotional responses of the
subjects to their experiences and thoughts. Feeling questions assume that the responses are spontaneous, not analytical, interpretive or opinionated (p.291). Knowledge questions examine the factual information held by the respondent - what they know about the 'facts' of the case (p.292). Sensory questions, the fifth type of questions to be asked, aim to discover what the respondents have seen, heard, touched and smelled - their sensory apparatus (p.292). The final questions to be asked are Background/Demographic questions. These questions attempt to identify the respondents’ characteristics (p.292).

Each of these six types of questions can be asked within three different time frames: past, present and future; therefore there are eighteen possible question types that can be asked by the researcher. Patton (1990) recommends that the interviewer begin with non-controversial, present behaviours, activities and experiences to fill out a descriptive picture. The interviewer should then begin to ask for interpretations, opinions and feelings about the issues to be covered. Once a rapport has been established, the interviewer can begin to ask knowledge and skill questions within the content. The researcher should begin with present questions, then using the present as a baseline, ask past and finally future-oriented questions. Background and demographic questions - boring in nature - should generally be kept short at the end.

The wording of the questions should also be carefully considered by the researcher. Truly open-ended questions that encourage the respondent to answer in their own terms should be used. The interviewer should not "presuppose which dimension of feeling or thought will be salient for the interviewee" (Patton, 1990, p.296). The respondent should be permitted to take any direction and use any words they wish. Researchers should also be aware of the "Horns of Dichotomy" (p.297). Dichotomous-response questions suggest 'yes' or 'no' answers, as the
grammatical structure has been provided by the interviewer. Interviewers are also encouraged to utilize presupposition questions. By presupposing that the respondent has something to say about the issues raised, dichotomous responses can be minimized.

Patton (1990) further encourages interviewers to ask singular questions; each question should elicit only one idea, thus avoiding confusion and assisting in data interpretation. The interviewer must also take steps to ensure the clarity of questions. Identifying the terms and language used by the respondents can contribute to clear questions. Further, the interviewer may have to avoid using any labels that could be interpreted differently by the individual subjects. Finally, interviewers should take care in asking ‘Why’. ‘Why’ questions often presume cause-effect relationships, or can be unclear in direction. More detailed and focused questions should be used to elicit the proper question interpretation desired by the researcher.

The interviewer must also develop rapport and neutrality during the interview; questions must be asked without compromising neutrality. Using illustrative examples in inquiries and simulation questions may provide a comfortable context for the respondents to answer in.

Further, by using prefatory statements and announcements to introduce the next topic to be explored, the interviewee can be alerted and given a few seconds to collect their thoughts about the issue. Probes and follow-up questions can fill in blank spaces of responses, elaborate ideas, clarify positions, and provide contrasting ideas from which the respondent can “push off against” (Patton, 1990, p.324-6). Finally, their must be a two-way flow of communication. This provides the respondent with support and recognition, while also clarifying what is desired and feedback on how the interview is progressing. Patton (1990) recommends an opening statement that clarifies the purpose of the study, including what will be asked, who the information is for, how
the information will be handled (including confidentiality), the purpose of collecting the
information and how it will be used.

The interviewer maintains control of the interview by knowing what issues are to be
examined, by asking the right questions, and by giving appropriate verbal and non-verbal
feedback to the respondent. It is not enough to ask the right questions: the interviewer must
listen for the responses that provide the answers to the questions. The interviewer must also
consider the power of interviews. They are interventions that can affect people by making them
use introspection. Therefore, the researcher must proceed cautiously, maintaining a focus of
gathering information, not changing people.

Data Analysis

Patton (1990) warns the qualitative researcher that the purpose is not to produce findings,
nor are the results and interpretations an end in itself: “The culminating activities of qualitative
inquiry are analysis, interpretation, and presentation of findings” (p.371). Once the data has been
collected, the challenge becomes to make sense of the information, reduce the data, identify
significant patterns and construct the framework that will be utilized to communicate the essence
of the findings from the data. There are no formulas to determine if results are significant, and
no way for others to perfectly replicate the researcher’s thought processes:

   In short, there are no absolute rules except to do the very best with your full
   intellect to fairly represent the data and communicate what the data reveal given
   the purpose of your study (p.372).

Therefore, the researcher must individually analyze the method utilized and report the procedures
as truthfully as possible. The analysis will depend on the clarity of purpose and will vary greatly
dependent upon the purpose and the audience.
Once the data has been collected and verified, the analysis begins. The first task is to answer the basic questions by separating the descriptive information from the interpretive information. The detailed descriptive component gathering process is long and detailed work: however, Patton (1990) contends that this must come before the creative analysis can begin. Once the details have been established, it allows others to examine the information and individually interpret the data.

The interpretive data attempts to answer the "why" questions, explains the findings, discovers the patterns and attaches significance to certain events (Patton, 1990). The focus of the interpretation comes from the questions derived at the start of the process. Therefore, the researcher must first review the questions developed at the beginning to help the focus. In addition, for a scholarly work like this study, published literature and dialogue with scholars will assist in focusing the study; new literature should be sought and literature originally used should be revisited.

With respect to analyzing interviews, the first decision the researcher must make is whether to use a case analysis or cross-case analysis strategy (Patton, 1990). Cross-case analysis requires the researcher to group together and analyze the answers from different individuals to common questions. These groups of data are then analyzed to reveal the different perspectives on the central issues established. Conversely, case analysis requires the researcher to examine the data on a subject by subject basis, with no grouping of answers. The interview guide approach utilized by the researcher "actually constitutes a descriptive analytical framework for analysis" (p.376). The organization of the general interview guide will also allow the researcher to begin collapsing and categorizing the data as interviews were individually completed.
One of the strategic themes of qualitative research is the inductive nature of the analysis. General patterns and important analysis dimensions emerge from initial specific observations.

Qualitative methods are particularly oriented toward exploration, discovery, and inductive logic. An evaluation approach is inductive to the extent that the researcher attempts to make sense of the situation without imposing preexisting expectations on the phenomenon or setting under study.

(Patton, 1990, p.44)

As the data is analyzed, and the cross-case strategy used, patterns, themes and categories emerge from the data. From this natural variation, Patton (1990) suggests that there are two ways to represent the patterns that emerge: indigenous concepts and sensitizing concepts. Indigenous concepts are “categories developed and articulated by the people studied to organize presentation of particular themes” (p.390). Sensitizing concepts, in contrast, are “categories developed and brought to data by the analyst” (p.391). Once the emergent patterns are represented, the researcher utilizes two typologies in analysis. The first typology is termed “indigenous typologies”: verbal categories used by subjects to “break up the complexity of reality into parts” (p.393). The second typology used is “analyst-constructed typologies” (p.393). With analyst-constructed typologies, the analyst looks for patterns, categories and themes arising from the data collected.

To find the patterns and to consequently develop category systems requires the researcher to deal with the problem of convergence: how things fit together. Guba (1978) states that the first step to determining how data converges is by finding “recurring regularities” in the information (p.53). These recurring regularities result in patterns that can be categorized. These categories must next be judged by two criteria: internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity. Internal homogeneity examines how well data within a certain category hold together (p.53).
External heterogeneity, conversely, looks at how different categories are between one another.

External heterogeneity examines the boldness and clarity of the categorical separation (p.53).

Prioritizing each category system based on the "salience, credibility, uniqueness, heuristic value, special interests and materiality of the classification schemes" is the third step identified by Guba (p.53) in determining convergence. Finally, the researcher must test the category sets for completeness. Completeness is determined by examining the internal consistency and the external completeness, the completion in scope, the degree of replication, and the credibility of the subject pool.

A second problem identified by Guba (1978) is that of divergence. To achieve divergence, the researcher must "flesh out" patterns or categories (Patton, 1990, p.404). This is accomplished through extension (building on items of information already known), bridging (making connections among different items), and surfacing (proposing new information that ought to fit and then verifying its existence) (Patton, 1990, p.404).

**STUDY METHODS**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT UNDER STUDY**

The CIAU is the national governing body for Canadian interuniversity sport, composed of the "majority of degree granting universities in the country" (CIAU, 1996, p.iii). First established in 1906 with four active members, it grew to nineteen members by 1954 (OUAA & OWIAA, 1996, p.2). Currently, the CIAU has 48 member institutions which are divided into five geographically aligned regional associations (CIAU, 1996, p.iii). For basketball, these
associations are the Atlantic Universities Athletic Association (AUAA), the Quebec Student
Sport Federation (QSSF), Ontario University Athletics (OUA), the Great Plains Athletic
Conference (GPAC) and the Canada West Universities Athletic Association (CWUAA). The
stated mission of the CIAU is:

... to enrich the educational experience of the student-athlete through a national
sports program that fosters excellence through the following:
(1) Quality educational and athletic experience,
(2) Unity of purpose, respect for autonomy,
(3) Integrity and fair play
(4) Trust and mutual respect, and
(5) Equity and equality of experience

CIAU Operations Manual, By-Laws, p.1

By 1955, the wide variance in performance standards and philosophy towards athletics, as
well as the inability for member organizations to agree upon eligibility standards, led to a
reorganization of the CIAU (OUAA & OWIAA, 1996, p.2). Two sections - the Ontario-Quebec
Athletic Association (O-QAA) and the Ottawa-St. Lawrence Intercollegiate Association - were
formed. The original nine members of the O-QAA were joined by three new institutions by
1968, leading to a further realignment of Eastern and Western Divisions. In 1971, the three
Quebec-based universities withdrew from the O-QAA to form the Quebec Universities Athletic
Association (OUAA & OWIAA, 1996, p.2). The remaining nine O-QAA member institutions
then changed their name to the Ontario University Athletic Association (OUAA). Nine
additional universities have been granted full membership into the OUAA since its formation -
six in 1972, a seventh in 1973, an eighth in 1988 and the most recent member in 1993 - bringing
the total to eighteen member institutions (OUAA & OWIAA, 1996, p.2).

The 1997-98 intercollegiate athletic season sees a further change to the OUAA. With the
commencement of the fall sport season, the OUAA (men’s sports) and the Ontario Women’s Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA) merged to form Ontario University Athletics (OUA). The mission of the newly formed eighteen member OUA is:

To provide exemplary interuniversity sport competition experiences for student-athletes which respect the educational milieu of Ontario Universities, and further to provide leadership in fostering sportsmanship and fair-play in the pursuit of athletic excellence.

OUA Constitution and By-Laws, 2.1

A distinguishing factor of the OUA is its rejection all “first party” athletic awards (OUA General Regulations, 5.1.1). The CIAU does permit member institutions to provide a first party athletic award to a value of $1500 after the athlete’s first year of residency. Institutions outside of Ontario embrace this opportunity provided by the CIAU providing both first party and third party awards (generally government assistance) based solely on athletic participation. The OUA, however, stands in opposition to this CIAU policy (OUAA General Regulations, 5.1.1), and only permits financial awards to athletes when combined with an academic achievement component. The OUA most closely aligns philosophically with NCAA Division III athletics in terms of athletic scholarships. While NCAA Division I and II, as well as NAIA Division I and II member institutions permit first party athletic awards, the OUA and NCAA Division III member institutions do not.

OUA men’s basketball consists of fifteen of the thirty-seven institutions competing for the national championship under the jurisdiction of the CIAU. Since 1962, Ontario institutions have won the CIAU Men’s Basketball Championship ten times. The University of Windsor has captured five national championships (once as Assumption University), with Waterloo Lutheran University (now Wilfrid Laurier University), the University of Guelph, the University of
Waterloo, the University of Western Ontario and Brock University each capturing one CIAU men's title (CIAU, 1996, p.138).

OUA men's basketball is divided into an East and West Conference. Members of the OUA East include Carleton University (Ottawa), Laurentian University (Sudbury), the University of Ottawa, Queen’s University (Kingston), Ryerson Polytechnic University (Toronto), the University of Toronto, and York University (Toronto). The OUA West members are Brock University (St. Catharines), the University of Guelph, Lakehead University (Thunder Bay), McMaster University (Hamilton), the University of Waterloo, the University of Western Ontario (London), Wilfrid Laurier University (Waterloo), and the University of Windsor.

Most programs play approximately thirty games during the year. The OUA West plays a fourteen game conference schedule among the eight institutions beginning the first week in January until the final weekend in February. The OUA East plays twenty conference games as they interlock with four institutions from Quebec to complete their schedule. Non-conference games make up the rest of the schedule, with the bulk of these contests played before the conference season commences.

At the conclusion of the regular seasons, the top four OUA East teams and the top six OUA West teams advance to the playoffs. Each conference plays off to determine their conference championship, and each winner meets to compete for the Wilson Cup: the OUA championship game between the OUA West and OUA East champion. Both conference champions advance to the eight team CIAU championships currently held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, while the remaining Ontario teams hope for one of two "Wild Card" invitations that are available to all CIAU teams. The Wild Card teams are selected by a panel of coaches.
representing each conference. The two teams deemed most deserving of a National Championship opportunity are selected. Therefore, for teams hoping to receive a "second chance", non-conference games become increasingly important. As a result, coaches at varying levels of program competitiveness may approach the early games differently.

SUBJECTS

The subjects for the current study were twelve of the fifteen head men's basketball coaches from the OUA member institutions. These coaches make up the elite level of men's basketball coaching in Ontario and a considerable fraction of the coaching elite of men's basketball in the country as a whole. Interviewing all fifteen OUA coaches was initially proposed by the researcher. Upon completion of the first twelve interviews, however, it was decided that a sufficient data set for OUA men's basketball had been established. Various perceptions of coaches from differing backgrounds, institutions and geographical locations gave the study a broad and extensive focus.

The twelve coaches were treated as individual case studies, then analyzed using a cross-case study strategy to determine individual differences, unique variations and common themes that emerged (Patton, 1990, p.54). OUA men's basketball coaches were an information-rich population from whom a great deal can be learned about coaching intercollegiate basketball and intercollegiate athletics in general.

DATA COLLECTION

Each of the twelve subjects were contacted by phone or electronic mail. The original communication discussed the researcher’s intent to interview them and outlined the nature of the
interview. One by one, the coaches were contacted and arrangements were made to conduct the interviews. The locations of the interviews varied from coaches' offices, to athletic department meeting rooms, and from cafeterias to hotel rooms.

The twelve coaches were interviewed on an individual basis. Most interviews were approximately seventy-five minutes in length. Before commencing, the interviewer outlined the material that would be covered and a consent form that further outlined the study and the interviewees' rights was provided (see Appendix A). The interview began once the consent form had been read and signed, and confidentiality had been ensured. To direct the interview, a general interview guide was created and utilized as per the methodology literature review (see Appendix B). Each interview was tape recorded (upon approval of the subject) and interview notes were kept throughout the process.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Upon the completion of data collection, the first task of the researcher was to organize the information. From the tape recordings and interview notes, the resulting key responses were transcribed and used as data. Upon completion of the interview summaries, they were mailed back to the subjects to provide them with an opportunity to verify their responses, to eliminate material, or to add further thoughts. Follow-up correspondence via telephone and electronic mail ensured that the summaries had been received and that desired alterations were made to the data.

Once the data sets were complete, the cross-case analysis strategy began. The initial task of the researcher was to represent general indigenous concepts identified by the subjects. Concurrently, sensitizing concepts were represented by the researcher. Once these initial categories of data were established, indigenous typologies and analyst-constructed typologies
were used to identify recurring regularities within the data. The researcher placed all of the
subjects' responses into a number of original categories, and after examining the internal
homogeneity and external heterogeneity, the categories were re-organized several times. When
converging themes began to take shape, they were then prioritized and checked for completeness
to ensure their usefulness to the study.

Upon completion of the results, divergent patterns were identified for discussion
purposes. Through the use of extensions, bridging and surfacing techniques, the material for
discussion was established.

**STUDY CONSTRAINTS**

**QUALIFICATIONS OF THE RESEARCHER**

The current study required the researcher to become the instrument of inquiry. Therefore,
the validity of the qualitative methods utilized "hinges to a great extent on the skill, competence,
and rigor of the person doing fieldwork" (Patton, 1990, p.14). The literature of Dewar and Horn
(1992) and Patton (1990) were the primary guides from which the methodology of the study was
designed. However, the review of this and additional literature does not preclude the researcher
from maintaining "naivety" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1993). As one of the basic constructs of
conducting open-ended interviews, naivety "entails a frame of mind by which you set aside your
assumptions (pretensions, in some cases) that you know what your respondents mean when they
tell you something, rather than seek explanations about what they mean" (Glesne & Peshkin,
1993, p.80). Thus, an open frame of mind during the interview and data analysis stage allowed
for the possible findings of new data regarding the OUA coach as an educator, the deliberate probing for clarification instead of assuming the interpretation of a response, and the ability to refocus the purpose of the study when new and unexpected revelations took forefront in the data collection.

In addition to the review and understanding of current research literature, the researcher had gained much knowledge about the social construction and psychology of intercollegiate sport and coaching due to his undergraduate BHK degree and graduate MHK course work. Further, the researcher has participated in several training programs, including sport psychology conferences and coaching clinics. As a fully certified Level III coach in the National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP) for basketball, the author has had exposure to current coach training methods and philosophies. The models for these programs have been developed by the perceptions of "experts" within the coaching environment.

Finally, and of most benefit, is the researcher's practical experience within the OUA mens' basketball environment. Currently in his fourth season as an assistant coach for an OUA intercollegiate basketball team, the author has gained both valuable technical and philosophical insights into elite basketball and the coaching profession. The researcher has been heavily involved with all aspects of the basketball program, including high-school recruiting, opponent scouting, game-plan and practice preparation. Throughout the past three years, the researcher has interacted both professionally and socially with many of the study's subjects. As a result, interaction was comfortable and the subjects seemed to have the sense that the interviewer was an empathetic observer. The heuristic nature of the researcher's position allowed him to understand the language used within the coaching profession and interpretation of their
perceptions was aided by the researcher’s experience within the environment.

**DELIMITATIONS OF STUDY**

1. This study involved head coaches of twelve OUA mens’ basketball programs. No undue generalizations were made, and caution is emphasized in linking this study to dissimilar coaching environment.

2. No attempts were made to generalize to female coaches or coaches of women’s basketball programs. It is possible that some generalizations of this kind would be warranted, but these will be left to future study.

**LIMITATIONS OF STUDY**

1. While attempts to maintain neutrality and naivety were attempted, a level of interpretational bias was brought by the researcher to the data analysis. However, it is impossible to fully be without research bias. The researcher's own implicit hypotheses related to the study included a belief that OUA intercollegiate coaches recognize the complexity and diversity of their responsibilities; that university athletics have the potential to be a valuable experience for all involved; and finally, that intercollegiate athletics is considered valuable by the university administration for public relations, marketability, and for the opportunities afforded to students.

2. The perceptions expressed by the participants do not necessarily correlate with their behaviours. Subjects may have responded in a way that they perceived as socially acceptable, or as they ascertained to be desirable by the researcher. Every attempt was made by the researcher to try to show consistency or inconsistency, but no objective measures of coaching behaviour were used.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

DEVELOPMENT OF THE COACH

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

The twelve interviewees held twenty undergraduate degrees, five masters degrees, one doctoral degree and one Canadian National Coaching Institute (NCI) diploma. There was great diversity with respect to their educational pursuits; of the twenty undergraduate degrees, three were Physical Education degrees (BPE), one Kinesiology degree (BSc), one degree in Marketing (BComm), five Education degrees (BEd) and ten BA’s, including majors’ in Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Geography and Physical Education. There was similar diversity amongst the graduate degrees, with one Education degree (MEd), one Sport Administration degree (MPA) and three MA’s, including majors’ in Criminology, Psychology/Sociology, and Psychology of Coaching.

In addition to the formal education identified by the coaches, National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP) involvement was reported. One coach had completed Level IV certification, seven had completed Level III certification, two had completed Level II certification, and two had no NCCP certification. Further, five of the twelve coaches identified themselves as NCCP Course Conductors, with two holding the position of Master Course Conductor (Levels I - III), while the other three were Course Conductors for Level I and II.

Coaching tenures at their current institutions varied widely. For two coaches, the upcoming season would be their first, while one coach had been at his institution for twenty-three years. The twelve subjects also had a vast array of additional elite coaching experiences for both men and women at the CIAU, high school, college, youth and even National Team levels.
Three coaches had previously held men’s team head coaching positions at other CIAU institutions, while seven identified assistant coaching experiences. Two coaches also identified experiences as head coach for the institution’s men’s Junior Varsity (JV) basketball program. One coach had previously been the head coach, and another an assistant, for a women’s CIAU basketball team. Other intercollegiate coaches experiences include one subject who was head coach at a Canadian Community College, one subject who was head coach at an American College, another coach who was an assistant at an American NAIA institution, and one subject who was a head coach for a women’s program at a Canadian College.

There was also an abundance of elite youth coaching experience. Three coaches identified experiences coaching Provincial Regional men’s teams, while five identified experiences coaching Provincial Teams. One subject had coached a women’s Provincial Team. Three coaches also reported coaching high school programs.

Several subjects also had experience with various National Team Programs. Two coaches had experienced stints as National Team Assistant Coaches: one with the men’s program, and one with the women’s program. Three subjects identified opportunities to work with the various Junior National Teams, including the National Student Team, the Under 22 National Team, the Junior National Team, and the National “B” Team. Finally, one coach had a stint as the head coach for Canada’s Maccabiah Team.

The route taken by each coach to their current position differed. Four coaches were hired after a national job search by their athletic departments: three subjects were head coaches at Canadian post-secondary institutions outside of Ontario and one subject was an assistant at an Ontario institution. Two subjects became coaches after being originally hired to lecture at the
institution and the coaching position eventually became vacant. Two coaches were coaching high school, when asked to join the coaching staff and take over the head coaching duties after a transition period. Two others were assistant coaches, and took over when the head coaches left for various reasons. One coach, after being spontaneously asked to coach the women’s team at his institution, eventually took over the men’s position when it became available a couple of years later. The final subject was hired by the institution on an interim basis in order to provide the athletic department with an opportunity to "advertise the position for the following year and find someone good with experience". He was eventually given the permanent position.

With respect to job responsibilities, the coaching workload varied from subject to subject. Two interviewees perceived themselves to be full-time head coaches. Of the two, one identified his coaching workload as 90%, while the other identified his coaching workload as 80%. In both instances, they were also assigned administration responsibilities within the athletic department. Therefore, the coaches for the most part, also had significant non-coaching professional endeavours to attend to. Two identified their coaching workload as 60%, four identified coaching to be 50% of their workload, one was at 45%, and three termed their coaching responsibility as part-time.

The types of additional professional responsibilities these coaches hold are highly diversified. Three coaches were considered lecturers of some form within the institution, while another held a position with a combination of lecturing and athletic administration responsibilities. Three coaches held administrative positions within their athletic departments

---

1 Bold text indicates words and phrases spoken by the coaches. Text representing words of the coaches without quotations indicates a culmination of many sources, while direct quotations are verbatim words of one or more coaches.
(one Sport Information Director, two Sport Co-Ordinators). The other three coaches held positions outside of the institution; two subjects were high school teachers with reduced teaching loads, while the other subject held a professional full-time position.

**PERSONAL COACHING INFLUENCES**

The coaches had a variety of introductions to coaching. The coaches spoke about their love for the game, and that they had played sports all of their life. However, the athletic experiences of the coaches varied greatly. Some took up coaching because they identified themselves as not strong athletically, yet they loved sports and therefore coaching was a way to remain involved. Others were successful athletes at the intercollegiate level who made the transition to coaching once their playing career was over.

Several coaches also identified an early recognition of coaching as a potential career. These coaches began to coach youth teams even before they began their post-secondary education, and then tailored their education to pursue coaching as a profession. Further, several coaches began as teachers, and spoke of their affinity to work with children. They spoke about the opportunity that coaching afforded them to spend “extra time with kids” as a main reason for choosing teaching as a profession. Another reason for choosing coaching as a profession identified by several subjects was the opportunity “to give back to the sport”:

> “I felt that sport had done a lot for me in regard to developing as an individual: it gave me a certain degree of self-confidence and helped mold my personality. So I felt I had something to give back to the younger athletes.”

Several coaches, in contrast, did not consider coaching until they had completed their

---

2 When perceptions or experiences were not universally expressed, but were expressed by more than one subject, terms such as “some”, “many”, “several” and the plural form of “coach” are used by the author.
playing careers. As one coach stated, "it was a fluke, but it turned out to be a Godsend". One coach turned to coaching after completing his education and finding himself unemployed. Others spoke about being asked to coach teams, and after hesitantly agreeing, enjoyed the experience so much they remained involved.

Often it was the inspiration of others that led these subjects to make coaching their chosen profession. Several coaches identified their fathers as former coaches that inspired them. They spoke about how they admired their fathers for being "tremendous teachers" and for the intimate relationships they formed with their players.

Several other coaches identified their own former coaches as inspiration. Coaches from high school, university and National Team experiences all impacted certain individuals. Some spoke about their high school coaches, with one identifying his coach as "the best teacher I ever had", even though he was not a staff member at the high school. Coaches spoke about the life lessons they learned from their high school coaches, and how they admired their love for the game, the impact they had on others, and their integrity and dedication. Others identified their intercollegiate and National Team coaches as having a big impact on their coaching development. As one coach stated, "I learned a lot of things [about coaching] at this level [from my intercollegiate coach]: good, bad and indifferent". The subjects identified the influence these elite level coaches had on their personal coaching philosophies and others identified the intimacy of the relationship with these men, with one calling his intercollegiate coach "my father away from home".

Others spoke about their experiences as assistant coaches, with the impression that the head coaches had made upon them. One coach spoke about how working with his head coach
was a "totally humbling experience", because he was on "another level of game knowledge, intuition, understanding of players, team management, role modeling and forward-thinking".

Finally, several coaches identified the coaching fraternity as having influenced their coaching development. Coaches from within their own institutions coaching other sports, high-profile elite coaches, and coaches within the same system were all identified as being influential. Being able to observe other coaches provided several interviewees with opportunities to "see a lot of different philosophies and ideologies" from which they could "pick and choose things that work and don't work, and incorporate them into their own style".

PROFESSIONAL COACHING GOALS

The coaches, when talking about their reason for involvement, identified the self-fulfillment they attained from coaching. Coaching at the intercollegiate level provided them with an outlet for the passion they have for basketball and the passion they have for competition. One coach identified himself as a "basketball junkie", while others spoke about the re-energizing process they underwent before each new season. Several coaches spoke about the periods of questioning they would occasionally go through, however after examining themselves, would realize level of satisfaction and enjoyment they derived from their position.

The coaches talked about how losing and the time commitments would take a toll, however there would always be something encouraging about the season that would make the sacrifice and commitment worth it. Several coaches spoke about the passion and commitment they had towards coaching as a profession, to the extent where they always
enjoyed going into work each day:

"...imagine you won a million dollars and you never had to earn another dollar in your life. Now go and do what you would want to do. Well that's what I'm doing and I'm getting paid for it."

The enjoyment and self-fulfillment that the coaches derive from their position extends beyond their love for basketball and competition. Several coaches also identified the "intensity of the relationships" that they established as a major reason for their continued involvement. The coaches spoke about how former players would come to visit them and keep them updated on what they were doing. As a result, the coaches found a sense of satisfaction from the relationships that were formed; therefore the coaches worked hard learning about recruits as people in order to surround themselves with players that would "make their life a real happy one" and result in them "look forward to coming in to the gym every day". Many coaches indicated that the relationships formed were of more importance to them than winning games, stating that "I'd rather lose with people that I want to be around and people that want to be around me than win with people that I don't respect."

The coaches also identified the desire to have the opportunity for upward mobility: both as a coach and in other professional pursuits. Some coaches admitted the desire to perhaps coach professionally (in Europe), at an NCAA institution in the United States, or to eventually coach the Canadian National Team Program. Further, several coaches identified the desire to in the future pursue other professional positions, such as university administration, athletic department administration, private sector promotion and marketing opportunities, as well as sports broadcasting.

The coaches also identified the desire to build and maintain basketball programs
competing at the highest levels as a professional goal. Dependent upon the current position of the program, the coaches either wanted to build or maintain a championship-calibre program, or to push their program to become more competitive on an annual basis. Coaches spoke about their desire to win conference championships, to play at the National Championship tournament, and to win a National Championship:

Several coaches indicated that they must also work to maintain any success achieved, with one coach stating that “if you don’t make good decisions, your program can go downhill fast”. Therefore, coaches must work diligently to maintain their programs by assembling a cast of athletes that are capable of taking the program to the ‘next step’ or maintaining success:

“It’s just a vicious circle to me. You start with a goal to win at the end of the season, and while you try to do that you also try to find kids that are going to replace the guys who are going to graduate.”

Thus, the recruiting process becomes a critical factor in the building of a high quality program. Ineffective recruiting can be detrimental to the team’s maintenance of success, because of the wasted resources and energy. Further, when student-athletes are unable to remain within the program, “it has a psychological effect on the rest of the team”

Another professional coaching goal identified by the coaches was to have successful student-athletes within their program. The coaches alluded to a desire to have their players be successful in a number of realms: as an athlete, a student, and as a professional: “turning out students and athletes, and doing both very well: I think that would be the ideal.”

In order to have successful student-athletes, the coaches identified the need to establish or promote priorities in their life. Several coaches indicated that basketball as a priority must rank behind “faith”, “family”, and “education”. Therefore, both the coach and the student-
athlete must recognize that academic pursuits must come before the athletic pursuits.

"I know that the role of the university is to teach. We are not there to babysit, and we are not there to provide athletic opportunities; we are not there for anything else but to teach kids. And therefore, I want all my guys to be academically successful. I want them to be pursuing a degree; I want them to be on line to get their degree."

In order to have successful student-athletes, the coaches again identified the importance of recruiting. Some indicated that they would shy away from or stop recruiting athletes who they deemed academic risks: As one coach stated: "[Academic ability] is important [when recruiting prospective players]. I don’t care if they can get in; I want to know they can get out with a degree."

However, other coaches believe that athletes, if eligible by the institution’s standards, should be given the same opportunities as any other student to be successful or unsuccessful academically and in the workplace after graduation:

"I would never say that I am going to stop recruiting high-risk students, because I’ve seen enough instances where those individuals have succeeded to make me believe that they should not be treated any different than general students. I’ve seen people who I’ve been told will never pass a course get degrees and make it; I’ve seen people come in with near honours grades and fail miserably. So to me, the only predictor of university success is university success."

The coaches’ desire for their student-athletes to be successful does extend to the athletic realm. Several coaches identified a desire to assist their student-athletes’ develop their athletic skills. For some athletes, this may mean a future opportunity to play for the National Team, or to play professionally: "To prolong a player’s career, especially one that is worthy."

The coaches also indicated a desire to affect their student-athletes beyond the classroom.
and the basketball court. They also wanted to instill positive values and ideals in their players, recognizing that they have more opportunity to influence their student-athletes because of the time commitments and the intimacy of the coach-athlete relationship.

One coach spoke about how the coach must “have his own personal values”, and thus “want to impart them” to other individuals. Therefore, student-athletes exposed to him must be prepared to change and rethink things: “It is my obligation not only to show by example, but also when I see [things incongruent with my personal values] I will address it.”

The coaches spoke about their desire to espouse values and ideals on players. Some of the values and ideals identified included fair and honest play, hard work, commitment and responsibility. For example, one coach spoke about his desire to create a sense of responsibility and teamwork amongst his players:

“Because we try and build an atmosphere that we are all in this together as a family, it is really destructive to the family atmosphere if there are constant changes in the body of the family. What makes your family special is that you’ve grown up with them, you are together all the time. Well that’s the same thing with our basketball family. I want kids to come in this year to know that he came in with the guy next to him, and they are going to graduate together.”

INHERENT VALUE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (MEN’S OUA BASKETBALL):

I/ TO THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTION

The coaches recognized that their individual universities did not need men’s basketball to survive or to serve the institution’s most fundamental purpose, however they felt that men’s basketball and intercollegiate athletics in general made a positive contribution to the
school. They felt intercollegiate athletics invaluably gave back to the school. Two areas identified in which the existence of men’s basketball benefitted the academic institutions were in Campus-Life and in Promotion and Public Relations for the University.

a) Men’s Intercollegiate Basketball Is an Important Aspect of Campus-Life

The coaches identified the value of men’s basketball, and intercollegiate athletics in general, to the overall environment on the campus: “Athletics are an integral part of all academic institutions right now, whether it is a grade school, high school or university.” Coaches perceive intercollegiate athletics as enhancing the atmosphere of the institution by providing a source of entertainment on campus. Competitions become an event not only for the school and the students, but also for the community-at-large. Further, the existence of intercollegiate athletics provides students, staff, alumni and the community with an opportunity to develop a sense of loyalty for the university through competition with other universities: “There is sense of pride developed in representing and supporting the university versus other institutions.”

b) Men’s Intercollegiate Basketball Is a Valuable Promotion And Public Relations Tool For The Institution

While campus-life is certainly a viable reason for the legitimization of intercollegiate athletics, the coaches felt the most important factor for the existence of intercollegiate athletics was the inherent promotional and public relations potential. If academic institutions have good athletics programs, the coaches felt intercollegiate athletics were a “relatively inexpensive public relations device”. The student-athletes would be transformed to become ambassadors for the institution. One coach stated that his program’s success has resulted in “people
nationwide becoming aware of the institution”. The inherent promotional and public relations benefit to the university was perceived in many areas, including increased media coverage, the creation of a link between the community and the university, a means for alumni re-involvement with the institution, a reflection of the university’s commitment to the ‘Pursuit of Excellence’, promotion of the institution’s campus-life, and an effective forum for high school liaison and recruitment.

The coaches contend that the academic institutions generally receive more coverage by all media outlets for their athletic programs than for the academic departments. From September until March, Canadian institutions have the opportunity to be profiled in the media on an almost daily basis because of intercollegiate athletics. Therefore, the coaches argue that from a media perspective, the university gains far more publicity from the athletic program than it does from any other institutional endeavour:

“One of the ways we can [get in front of the people] is through our athletics program. You don’t find a lot of news coverage for the geology department at anybody’s university, unless one year in twenty they discover a new rock.”

The coaches noted that the tangible value of the media coverage was of great value to the institution. Further, several coaches made the argument that the intercollegiate basketball program had the most potential for media exposure because of the greater number of games - generally around thirty - they played. Further, several coaches noted that basketball was the marquee sport at their institution: “...if our Sports Information Director decided to measure the amount of press [that you receive from men’s basketball, he would find it] is worth the price of the program.”

It was also noted by the coaches that the individual performances of student-athletes
both on and off the court had the potential to result in favourable media coverage for the institution. For example, having a student-athlete win the Russ Jackson Award, presented to a top CIAU athlete who demonstrates a proficiency both athletically and academically, can bring national recognition to a university because of the coverage of the award presentation on The Sports Network (TSN) - a national sports cable channel.

The enhanced media coverage combined with the opportunity for the local community to be on the campus and become involved in the institution’s athletic programs can develop a link between the community and the university that would otherwise not exist. There are few opportunities for the academic institution to create a direct involvement with the local community-at-large, therefore the resultant public relations from having intercollegiate athletics can be of great benefit: “I know that in the case of our basketball program, we have done more to knock down the ivory walls around this campus than probably any other group or organization on campus.” It gives the local community an opportunity to grab on to a loyalty for the school.

Similarly, the existence of intercollegiate athletics provides the university an opportunity to promote a re-involvement of the Alumni with the institution. The coaches cited the increasingly important role in finances that donations from alumni played. Therefore, the institutions are making a big push to get the alumni back involved with the school. Intercollegiate athletics is a “great way to involve the alumni”: for those still residing in the local area, and those who now living around the province and country.

Universities look to espouse a sense of excellence to the public. They encourage it in all facets of their environment, including teaching, research, arts, athletics, and physicality.
Academic institutions attempt to be on the cutting edge of all facets of society, and by demonstrating a commitment to athletics, the institution's commitment to excellence is represented.

As previously discussed, one of the benefits of intercollegiate athletics identified by the coaches was the contribution it made to campus-life. The existence of intercollegiate athletics is an effective means of promoting the atmosphere of the university to prospective students, to the community, to faculty, and to the media:

"I think that a lot of schools are afraid not to have sports, because it would show that the university doesn't have money, that it doesn't have student life, it's not active, has no school spirit, and is not attractive to certain kinds of people."

The aforementioned promotion and public relations benefits all add up to enhance an increasingly critical aspect of the academic institution: high school liaison and recruitment. The coaches felt that prospective students could be drawn to the university based on the presence of a successful intercollegiate athletics program. The recruitment of future students is of great concern to academic institutions because of shrinking government financial aid and the resultant increase in tuition fees, combined with dwindling entrance applications. High school student recruitment has become a competitive marketplace. Government cutbacks and education reforms in the province of Ontario have resulted in the institutions having a mandate to attract a certain number of students to meet budget requirements; "therefore, high school liaison place a huge emphasis on the athletic program to try and attract more students."

"So [intercollegiate athletics] allows universities an opportunity to get into the public, and that is very important now as we search for students in this
competitive market we are in."

As a result, the coaches contend that students are attracted to the school because of the athletic program. Therefore, by being ‘out there’ and actively recruiting the university that intercollegiate athletics indirectly generate more revenues for the school than are being spent to support athletics.

**IV/ TO THE STUDENT-ATHLETE**

In addition to the benefits to the academic institution, the coaches alluded to the positive educational impact that intercollegiate athletics inherently have on student-athletes. One coach, in fact, believed that the educational benefit to student-athletes was the only reason why university administrations continued to support intercollegiate athletics:

> "Universities themselves, I don’t think in most cases, are looking at intercollegiate athletics as a way to enhance the school. I think the focus is on academics and learning."

Four inherent educational impacts on the student-athletes were identified by the coaches: Physical and Mental Enhancement, the Benefits to Academic Processes and Academic Products, an Enhanced Educational Experience, and the Opportunity to Learn Transferrable Life-Skills.

**a) Physical And Mental Enhancement**

Several coaches identified the physical and mental enhancement of student-athletes because of their participation in athletics as a major benefit of intercollegiate athletics. By providing athletics within an educational system, Canadian academic institutions have followed the model utilized by the American intercollegiate system. One of the reasons for the adoption of this models, according to the coaches, is that “the whole idea of university is to
explore your mind and your body”:

“To me, university study and academic work are not the sole purpose of University. [The purpose] is to provide a broader context of not only emotional and intellectual development, but also physical development.”

In order to provide this “broader context”, universities support many types of extra-curricular activities that explore emotional, intellectual and physical development, resulting in “well-rounded” students. Athletics provides this context, as do acting classes, drama clubs, and fitness programs, providing students with “...an opportunity for not only a strong mind, but also a strong body”. Further, several coaches indicated that they believed physical activity made people sharper mentally and academically.

b) Academic Processes And Academic Products

Further to the potential for mental and physical enhancement, the coaches believed that participation in intercollegiate athletics were a benefit to the student-athletes’ academic processes and academic products. Two main educational impacts on the student-athletes were identified by the coaches: higher grades and an enhanced opportunity for post-graduation employment.

Several coaches mentioned that they believed that students who participated in intercollegiate athletics benefitted by receiving higher grades than they would without the experience. One coach stated that statistics kept within his athletic department indicated that student-athletes’ averages generally show that their marks are higher and that they were more successful academically than the general population. To explain why the academic products of student-athletes were enhanced, the coaches contended that the demands on time and performance required more of a commitment and organization to academics than the general student population. Therefore, the coaches believed that all students should balance a
number of things with academics.

The coaches also expressed a belief that participation in intercollegiate athletics assisted student-athletes in their post-graduation employment pursuits. Coaches argued that many of the perceived qualities of student-athletes - such as "teamwork experiences and versatility" - made them attractive to potential employers.

Also, once in the workplace, several coaches indicated that they believed the intercollegiate athletic experience of the student-athlete helped them be more successful within their professional career:

"A small group of people get the opportunity to develop skills that I think make them superior employees: the kind of people who become leaders - and I believe that. I think there are enough people with athletic backgrounds in leadership positions across this country to justify the claim that [intercollegiate athletics] are doing more to develop the skills that lead to [successful leadership] than any other program that this university offers."

Further, coaches indicated that many student-athletes have a greater opportunity to pursue professional athletic careers than in years past. There are more professional athletic leagues around the world, therefore some top-level athletes can parlay their intercollegiate athletic experience into a professional contract.

c) Enhanced Educational Experience (During Participation)

Beyond the academic processes and products realm, the coaches contended that intercollegiate athletic participation provided student-athletes with an opportunity for an enhanced overall educational experience. They indicated that they would "use the team environment and the travel environment to enhance the educational experiences of [the student-athletes] beyond the classroom".
The coaches indicated that they felt a university degree is more than just studying subjects, that it was a "growth process for a person". Extra-curricular involvement, such as music, drama or intercollegiate athletic participation, the coaches believe, has the potential to enhance the student's learning experience and result in "greater educational value" while attending university. In fact, one coach stated that he believed "involvement in extra-curricular activity often was a better indicator of future success than grades alone".

The coaches believe that intercollegiate athletics are all about education, and that education is about more than just going to class:

"[Intercollegiate basketball] is a viable and reasonable aspect of student-life, just the same as a lot of other student activities are justifiable from an educational point of view. I believe the value of a university degree is not just the forty courses that a student takes over four years and the degree that they receive. I believe that the value of education is the entire experience of being on a University campus and interacting with one another, and for those students who possess those special skills and abilities, intercollegiate basketball is a reasonable and justifiable outlet."

The coaches indicated that they believed athletic participation within the university had the most potential to enhance the learning experience than any other form of extra-curricular activity. They contend that the athletic environment allows athletes to interact with people who have different types of personalities and background, and that the dynamics of the group/team experience over a six to seven month period leads to many positive learning experiences and situations.

d) Acquisition of Transferrable Life Skills (Post-Participation)

Perhaps the most important inherent benefit to intercollegiate athletic participation, according to the coaches, is the opportunity for the student-athlete to learn transferrable life
skills from the experiences they are provided with. Several coaches indicated that they believed the learning of life skills was of more long-term benefit than the student-athlete's academic study. Thus, the benefits of the student-athlete experience can extend well beyond the time of participation. As one coach stated: "...the educational institution is there not only to impart information, it is also there to impart a set of values which will be operative in the kind of society you are trying to shape."

Extra-curricular activity participation provides the student with an opportunity to extend their education beyond the academic realm; they can learn certain things, as well as reinforce current behaviours and attitudes through extra-curricular participation: "Extra-curricular programs probably do more to develop 'productive citizens' than the education process itself". And among the extra-curricular activities, the coaches feel that "...intercollegiate sports is the ideal situation and environment for learning life skills." The coaches spoke about the potential of intercollegiate sport to instill many desirable life skills and personal qualities:

"The value of being a student-athlete is all about the experiences they have. It's not about how many games they win and how many championships they get. Of course we are all chasing that; we are all competitive people and that is the nature of athletics: it's about competition. But the journey is far more important. It's about the lesson that you learn about not giving up, about working with other people, about working with people you don't even like sometimes; about managing conflict and managing stress."

The requirements of sport, the coaches argue, necessitate the possession and acquisition of many "intangibles". Other life skills that coaches identified as being inherent in the participation in athletics include discipline, self-motivation, work ethic, roles, team play, leadership, being determined, perseverance, skill development, self-preservation, time management and goal setting.
THE COACH’S POTENTIAL IMPACT:

IV. ON THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTION

As previously discussed, one of the professional coaching goals of the coaches was to build and maintain a competitive/championship-calibre program. Resultant from efforts to build this type of program comes potential positive promotion and public relations benefits to the academic institution. Several coaches spoke about their administrative abilities, including their ability to market and promote. Several indicated a desire to in the future expand upon their administrative opportunities, in areas such as Athletic Department Administration, University Administration, private business, and sport media.

Several coaches identified their work directly providing the university with promotional and public relations opportunities. The coaches understand the increased exposure for the program results in more attention and more press for the university. As one coach stated, “I’m not just coaching a team, I’m running a program”. Therefore, when filling out a yearly performance appraisal form for the university, he submits a blurb stating that he is on a variety of unrecognized committees, including recruitment, promotions, media, alumni, and scheduling committees. Further, he indicates that he is usually the ‘Chair’ and the sole member of the committee.

Beyond the work with the basketball program directly, several coaches indicated that they often worked and spoke in the local community, thus providing another form of promotion and public relations for the institution. The coaches identified such efforts as running camps and clinics for both youths and coaches, opening up their practices and facilities to the general public, guest speaking at various organizations, and being seen as an expert in coaching
and basketball in the local community through NCCP course conduction:

"It would be pretty easy to say no to those things. But I think that when you say no, that you are only hurting yourself professionally as a coach. It's a game that we do, and I'm a coach, and the only way that I can touch people and affect people is by going out and interacting with them. So you have to search for opportunities, let people know that you are able to do those things, and when you get asked, I think you have to say yes more than you say no."

Often, these above and beyond efforts of the coach go both unrecognized and uncompensated by the academic institution. However, the coaches recognize the potential positive value their efforts in the local community can have on the university, the basketball program and themselves professionally. Therefore, several coaches indicated that declining opportunities to interact with the community would "only hurt them as individuals" and that they must "attempt to affect people without much compensation and recognition".

II/ ON THE STUDENT-ATHLETE

For some coaches, the focus on impacting the student-athlete has always been part of their philosophy: "The concept and the notion probably haven't changed much since I was eighteen years old." One coach identified that he had always worked within an educational area, therefore his educational philosophy was well-established and he had disciplined himself to stick to it, and to express it to his athletes.

However, several coaches admitted that this was not always the case. One subject, discussing how the scope had broadened with respect to his perspective of the job of the coach, stated: "As you get older, you become more experienced, and you come to
understand that there are more important things than winning and losing; far more important things.” Several other coaches indicated that their coaching philosophy had changed, recognizing that it had “gotten wider” with “more parameters”.

Several coaches discussed how basketball had at one point, been an end in itself, and how they had been too highly competitive. However, over time, they began to understand the importance of the educational component, and redirected the focus of their philosophy to the student-athlete:

“When I finished [re-examining my coaching philosophy], I knew deep down inside that there was more to it than just winning basketball games. Now I can express the educational component of it, and really see the reinforcement of that process. I don’t think I would have been able to when I first started.”

The coaches acknowledged a need to regularly re-examine their coaching philosophy. Some indicated that they would examine their coaching philosophy on an annual basis formally, and often more times informally throughout the year. One coach consistently asked himself, “Am I demonstrating with my actions what I say I am going to do?” Because of the changing educational and intercollegiate athletic environment, as well as the changes in modern athletes, most coaches indicated a need to constantly re-examine their coaching approach and philosophy.

Several coaches also mentioned that they felt that having their coaching philosophy written down was an invaluable exercise. One coach, however, disagreed. He does teach his students to write it down “because you have to know where your starting point is”, but feels in his own personal development, it could have been a detriment. He felt that his personal life and coaching experiences shaped his coaching approach, therefore a rigid, stated
philosophy may have hindered his evolution over the years.

What has emerged from the examination of their coaching and educational philosophies is a group of subjects who describe themselves as honest, humanistic, organized, ethical and with much integrity. As one coach stated after discussing his ongoing re-examination of his philosophy: “You have to live with yourself, and you have to have some integrity. And I would like to think that I have that”. Furthermore, they often see themselves as having a ‘parental-like role’:

“I heard one of my colleagues a couple of years ago...say ‘Coaching is the second purest form of teaching next to parenting’. We deal with a relatively small and elite group...privileged from an athletic point of view and they are privileged from a point of view that they get opportunities that aren’t afforded other students because of their athletic ability; but they have many of the same problems that students in the general population have. They have problems with study habits...with alcohol and drugs...with relationships. And so I view myself almost as a ‘parent by extension’, because I am certainly spending more hours with these kids than any of their professors [or] any other person at the University spends with them.”

Therefore, the group perceived the coaching function as a “a very high, pure form of teaching”, and recognized that the “hardest and most important transition [that a coach must make] is to realize that you are a teacher”.

The subjects believe coaching “is the place where real teaching can occur” for two reasons. The first reason identified was because of the “intimacy of the relationship” that is formed between athlete and coach. The coaches spoke about having “a captive audience” with whom they “spend enormous amounts of time”. One interviewee called coaching “a teacher’s dream” because of the dedication and passion the students had for the opportunity. Furthermore, the opportunity to become part of this “audience” was limited, therefore students
competed to have the opportunity to participate. Therefore, they indicated a responsibility to teach more than basketball skills: to "try and take people who maybe wouldn't have done so well in their career or personal life and try and make it something more than that".

The second reason for the belief that coaching has the potential to be a very high, pure form of teaching is because of the sport environment itself. As previously discussed, several coaches believe that there is an inherent value in intercollegiate athletic participation to the student-athlete. They also indicated that they, as coaches, had the opportunity to enhance the value to the student-athlete through the sport environment. The coaches ascertained that the sport environment dealt with greater and larger topics than just the sport itself. They implied that sport provided a forum within which it was often easier to discuss and deal with problems and issues the students were faced with; that sport teaches student-athletes the important lesson that there are no guarantees in life; that intercollegiate athletics is a great setting to teach values such as the importance of learning fundamentals, dealing with setbacks and other transferrable human values.

Therefore, the subjects perceive their coaching responsibilities as far greater than merely tactical in nature; they see themselves as teachers and parental figures, utilizing the sport environment as their classroom setting:

"I think intercollegiate athletics and intercollegiate coaches are 'cogs in the wheel'; we are trying to give a group of students another way to refine skill that will allow them to be successful later on. They could get these skills in a wide cross-section of other activities, but [we have] chosen athletics as [our] teaching forum."

While there was a consensus among the coaches in making education a top priority, their individual approaches taken to enhance the education of their student-athletes varied greatly.
The educational services and the academic support provided by each coach and institution differed; in particular, the level of personal responsibility that each coach undertook for the educational progress of their student-athletes varied: from a sense of heavy responsibility, to a sense of minimal responsibility.

Several coaches indicated that they felt a heavy responsibility towards the educational performance of their student-athletes. These coaches talk about "owing something" to their athletes for all they do:

"I think that if I'm bringing students into the 'University of Wherever' to play this sport, and they're not getting any better, than we are doing them a disservice. In Canada, where it is costing everyone of them money for this wonderful opportunity, I think we are shortchanging them. That's no better than having a bad professor in biomechanics; and in fact it is much worse because the amount of time the student-athlete spends with the coach, and the direct relationship they have with the coach, we have a far greater impact on them than any other one prof of any one course."

One coach even went so far as to state: "I feel like if one of my athletes doesn't graduate then I have failed. The same way I would feel if I had a basketball player who doesn't improve: I feel I have failed as a coach".

Applications of academic initiatives used by coaches who feel a major responsibility to "pull" their athletes through are generally intervening and mandatory in nature. For example, some coaches demanded that athletes perform academic exercises for them to examine. One coach required his athletes to submit an essay draft to review the writing style, held mandatory meetings with the athletes whereby their notes and textbooks would be checked for highlighted material, and term plans, exam study schedules and three-week rolling plans were to be submitted to the coach for review. Some coaches would establish mandatory study hall
sessions where the athletes had to sign in, and attendance was kept. Further, other mandatory initiatives were established by coaches, including formal academic mentor programs, and the use of other outside consultants. However, even when people from outside the program were utilized, the coaches remained involved in the delivery of the services.

With respect to discipline, some coaches will suspend athletes if their academic progress in inadequate, calling the denial of participation opportunities “ultimately the only lever that I’ve got...that will get their attention”. This sense of responsibility for these coaches generally goes beyond the athlete’s years of eligibility. They also accept a heavy responsibility with respect to their endeavours upon the completion of their education, with once coach stating that “...one of my roles as a coach is to ensure that my athletes graduate, and secondly that my athletes find a job upon graduation...any failure along the way there means I obviously missed the boat somewhere along the line”.

A second group of coaches also felt a strong sense of personal responsibility towards the educational pursuits of their players. However, these coaches believe the student-athletes are in control of their own educational destiny, thus “absolving themselves of the ultimate responsibility”:

“I feel that I have the responsibility to be a leader...the same responsibility as a parent has because I am a parent by extension. But these are young men; the ultimate philosophy and the overall philosophy here is ‘you are responsible for you’. So they must be given opportunities to learn the skills that it takes to be a student. They must be pushed and prodded in those directions. But I draw the line when I am pulling them there; then I’m beyond my responsibility as a coach. If I’m dragging them there, then they are not ready to change, and dragging them won’t solve the problem ultimately: it won’t result in a change in behaviour.”

The coaches that subscribe to a philosophy of “pushing” their athletes to academic
success tend to utilize strategies that permit good, motivated students to work at their own pace, while spending more time dealing with new athletes and those performing poorly in the classroom. For example, some coaches use a report card system that only requires freshmen and high-risk students to return it to them. Similarly, while a study hall session may be available, these coaches tend to give the student-athletes the opportunity to earn the right to not attend by being successful academically. One coach stated that mandatory academic services, such as study halls, penalized good students by “imposing upon their structure”. He felt that motivated students should be allowed to organize their own life because they did not need to be “force-fed discipline skills or study skills”. Further, there may be more emphasis by these coaches on encouraging the student-athletes to compete for academic-related awards. One coach spoke about the “big deal” they made when an athlete received Academic All-Canadian recognition. In fact, he encourages all of his players to strive for Academic All-Canadian standing at least once in their career because of the potential employment opportunities the recognition could provide or enhance.

One coach likens his educational role to being at the bottom of a pyramid - with the players at the top - “jacking them up” with ideas, inspiration and motivation, rather than being at the top and letting things “trickle down”. These coaches will also turn to outsiders for expert assistance, however, they too believe that they should remain involved in the process as a “co-ordinator, a motivator, a link-up person and someone to throw out ideas and have people work on them...so I have to be just as big a resource as all the other people”

With respect to discipline, players are less likely to be “suspended”. Instead, these coaches tend to give their players “time off” to re-orientate themselves as students.
Suspensions generally only occur when athletes are not attempting to keep up with their workload. As one coach stated, "it's the difference between someone trying and being just a little overwhelmed, and someone not doing the work". Several coaches indicated that suspensions would limit the amount of influence they could maintain on their student-athletes, therefore, they kept them active within the program.

A third segment of the coaches believed that their educational role was to provide a supportive educational environment that would give their student-athletes an opportunity to be successful. They also indicated that as "young, grown men", the student-athletes" must take "ownership" for their educational pursuits: "to go to class...do the work...do the essays...study...go to the library...and to the extra work that they need to do". The coach's responsibility, these coaches believe, is "to provide an environment that is conducive to that".

The coaches who subscribe to this educational philosophy believe in providing the favourable environment, and communicating the importance of education to their student-athletes:

"I think the student-athlete is responsible for the student-athlete in the academic process. If I was responsible, I would have to write the exams and write the essays; and as I tell my players, I've been there and done that: I don't have to have that piece of paper or take that course again. ...anybody else who does it differently is short-changing that kid, because I think you're not preparing him for life. They are going to get a job next, or they are going to get married next, and the most important person in making whatever they do next successful is going to be them. So one of our responsibilities is to teach them that it is their primary responsibility."

Therefore, the coaches who subscribe to this educational philosophy tend to focus on providing a positive, supportive environment. Within this environment, the coach takes upon a guidance role, with the onus on the student-athletes to utilize the available assistance. As one coach states,
"...we have to try to understand that they are volunteers...what you do is you become more a parent in that you fill more of a supportive role, and you are sometimes a sounding board".

To provide an environment that is conducive to academic success, coaches take several steps. For example, one coach was extremely cognizant of the time demands he placed upon his athletes. He arranged practice schedules that did not interfere with classes and would give them opportunities to study; he arranged the game schedule to minimize the number of classes the students would miss and the amount of travel during the week the team would have; and he would only travel out of province when the students were not in classes, so that they would not miss classes, and so they could get the most out of the experience. Similarly, some coaches identified the renovation of rooms within their athletic complexes that the student-athletes could use as work environments. Other coaches identified such initiatives as having faculty members as advisors, providing information sessions on an "as needed basis", and recruiting academic mentors. Other outside experts may be available, but the coach did not participate in their activities, instead leaving full responsibility to the student-athlete to take advantage of the services: "So if you need help, it's up to you to formally find it, organize it and the whole bit. Then we will support you and help you any way that we can."

With respect to discipline, these coaches did not suspend their players for poor academic performance. In fact, one coach indicated that he would not check his athletes' grades unless they gave him permission. Therefore, once again, the onus is placed upon the student-athlete to look for, and ask for help, including time off from basketball to get caught up academically.
Another segment of coaches indicated that they believed their athletes should not be treated much differently than the general student population. These coaches feel that their primary responsibility is to stay out of the way of their players' academic pursuits, and do everything they could to not hinder the educational process. The coaches explained that they would assist their student-athletes if they came to them, however they would not initiate any supportive measures. They felt that the intercollegiate experience was an invaluable if the student-athlete took advantage of it. As one coach stated, the experience was “what [the student-athlete] made of it”.

These coaches tend to rely on the general services of the institution to serve the needs of the student-athletes. The onus is squarely on the shoulders of the students to find and take advantage of the resources of the university: as any student on campus would. They perceive their student-athletes to be the same as the general student population, therefore they provide no athlete-only academic services.

The final group of coaches indicated that they had a pragmatic approach towards the educational philosophy they subscribed to. Some coaches spoke about the need to deal with each player individually, and that each player required a different approach to best assist them in their academic endeavours. According to one coach, the backgrounds from which these athletes come from necessitate a pragmatic approach, as parental influence is often less than it was in the past because of a “lack of financial interest”, “personal interest”, or “too great a distance to affect the student-athlete”. Therefore, the coach feels he must become more involved than he would like.

Other coaches indicated that the type of students that played for them determined the
amount of responsibility they incurred and the educational philosophy they adopted. One coach indicated that the entrance requirements of his institution meant that he only had eighty to ninety percent students, therefore he had little involvement with their academic endeavours. Conversely, others work with students who they feel they must help more than they would normally. As a result, some coaches indicated that they were required to be more involved in the academic pursuits of their student-athletes than they were qualified to be. Several coaches indicated the need for a qualified person to be responsible for advising the student-athletes. One coach summarized by stating, “I'm driving the car without a licence sometimes”.

Still other coaches indicated that they adopted a more involved approach to their student-athletes’ academic endeavours because of the long-term value it would have on the program - particularly in terms of recruiting:

“To me, it is vitally crucial to the success of our program that a player come in here and do well, not only on the floor, but also in the classroom. Those are the people that we want out there in the business sector and in the school environment to help promote our program. It is crucial that we get as many players out there, in as many different forms of life, whether it be business or insurance, or as a teacher; it is really important for us to get those people out there.”

Further, taking a more aggressive approach to assisting the students academically can be beneficial to the program in the short-term. Therefore, to deal with the pressure coaches' feel to keep the athletes in their program thus maintaining continuity for the sake of the other players, they will do whatever it takes to help them stay eligible.

Finally, several coaches have indicated that the environment in which they operate determines the approach they take to assisting their student-athletes. Some coaches suggested
that the lack of athletic scholarships limited the amount of control they could exert on the student-athletes, referring to them as “volunteers”. However, if scholarships were available for athletic participation, several coaches indicated that they would “tell them exactly what they would be doing”. Instead, they currently provide guidelines and game plans: relying upon suggestion.

**OBSTACLES IMPEDING THE VALUE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (MEN'S OUA BASKETBALL)**

The coaches also identified several obstacles that they felt impede the potential value that intercollegiate athletics can have on both the institution and the student-athlete. The types of obstacles the interviewees specified affected not only the inherent benefits of intercollegiate athletics, but also their ability as coaches to enhance the value to the institution and the student-athlete.

The first obstacle identified by the subjects is the **insufficient resources and the lack of autonomy the basketball program receives**. The coaches reported that in many cases their budgets had been cut, yet the expectations placed upon the program have not changed. This negatively affects the program’s ability to both compete on the court, and to provide the best possible educational support for the student-athletes. For example, several coaches identified the need for additional support staff that could assist in delivering the intercollegiate athletic experience to the athletes. This increased assistance, the coaches argue, would allow them “to concentrate on more basketball-related items”, as well as to “…make sure the players are as prepared as they can be, both from an athletic point of view, and also an academic point of
Further, several coaches indicated that they felt they did not have enough autonomy to run the basketball program the way they wanted to. This lack of autonomy resulted from both the lack of resources, as well as the decrease in workload that the coaching aspect of their position constituted. As one coach asked: "Where do we go from there (reduction of coaching workload from 100% to 50%)? At fifty percent am I going to do less work in terms of coaching basketball?" Therefore, the coaches desire to have a framework provided within which they can better attend to their coaching responsibilities.

The coaches also identified the lack of support within the intercollegiate athletic environment as a major obstacle. One of the main culprits, in the opinion of the coaches, is the lack of support they often receive from the university administration. This is exemplified in the evaluation process many of the coaches undergo:

"At the university level, they love to brag about their university sport, but they don't do anything to encourage coaches by realistically assessing their performance and rewarding good performance."

Thus, several coaches indicated that they felt many of their colleagues were being "exploited" by their institution because of the limited financial reimbursement the coach received for their work. Further, the performance of the coach did not seem to matter to the institution, leading one coach to speculate, "...unfortunately, as in most institutions in Canada, I'm not sure they would fire you even if you are doing a [terrible] job - and that is a clear indication of the value most [institutions] place on athletics."

Some of the coaches also identified the "lack of teamwork" within the institution as a major problem. They indicated that they felt the individual members of the university needed to
come together to enhance the institution. One coach argued that "...no matter what you do, or what facet [of this institution] you are into, I think you have to have that perception...that you are fitting in and contributing to the overall theme that we are doing at [this university]".

This "lack of teamwork" was also identified as a problem among the coaching fraternity, according to several coaches. While some argued that the lack of a unified Ontario conference hindered the OUA's ability to market and promote men's basketball, others countered by believing the call for interlock was "change for change sake".

The coaches criticism extends beyond the coaching fraternity, and university administration and faculty, to the athletic administrators and athletic organizations that govern Ontario intercollegiate athletics. Several coaches indicated that they believed there were few "forward-thinking people within intercollegiate sport administration". One coach went as far as describing his Athletic Department as "living in the Stone Age". An issue of concern to the coaches was their perception of the poor job of promoting intercollegiate sport the athletic administrators were doing. They criticized the CIAU, OUA and individual athletic departments of "trying to be all things to all people" by being involved in too many sports. They felt that with more progressive athletic leadership, that OUA and CIAU athletics could operate at a high level, without sacrificing the commitment to education.

Of most concern to the coaches was the lack of financial support provided to student-athletes. They argue that athletic scholarships of some form would be beneficial to both the institution and the student-athlete. For the institution, the provision of athletic scholarships would be beneficial because of the elite sport perception it would create. Therefore, more
attention would be provided by the media and community resulting in increased corporate
support and publicity for the institution. The student-athlete, most of the coaches contended,
deserved financial support in the form of at least a tuition waiver because of the sacrifices they
made to compete in intercollegiate athletics. They argued that the time and financial
commitments required of an intercollegiate athlete denied them the opportunity to hold
down part-time jobs, therefore tuition waivers would be “fair compensation”.

Several coaches indicated that they believed the resistance to providing financial
assistance to student-athletes was not based on philosophical reasoning, but on the disinterest
that Athletic Directors have in raising the funds. As a results, the coaches believe that student-
athletes will be hindered academically:

“During the periods of time that [the student-athletes] could be working, we
ask them to not take part-time jobs if they can help it because we are smart
enough to know that if they are working at a part-time job, going to school
and playing basketball, something is going to get hurt. And the biggest
problem with that is the thing that is going to get hurt is probably their
academics. And that is the most important of the three!”

The inherent limitations of having a marriage between elite sport and academic
institutions also results in obstacles according to the coaches. In fact, several coaches questioned
whether elite basketball should continue within the academic realm under the current system.

One coach called Canadian intercollegiate athletics a “bastardized system of academic
development for athletics”. He believes that by following the American model of mixing
academics and athletics without providing athletic scholarships, it results in a “huge gap in
training and everything”.

Other coaches feel that the educational environment will not permit athletics to remain at
academic institutions in Ontario. Some coaches predict that shrinking budgets will result in the “call for the elimination of all ‘fringe’ activities by academics”. Further, the rising tuition costs will result in more student-athletes leaving the province:

“I can see athletics in this country being in real trouble [if we don’t get athletic scholarships] because...more and more families cannot afford to go away for school. ...The next step is to look for financial aid...which means they will look to go across the border. I can see us losing more kids to the small schools over there who will give these kids some aid. We may start losing good quality students. Right now we are not losing a lot of good quality students, we are losing good athletes who are marginal students.”

However, some coaches still contend that having sport existing within the educational system is of most benefit to the athletes’ experience; they argue that academic institutions “...tend to hire coaches that are higher qualified and more committed, and [the university] tends to exercise more institutional control over the environment that the athletes play in”.

Many coaches did state that they believed academic institutions should give more consideration to extra-curricular involvement when selecting prospective students. Several coaches contended that highly involved people may be more successful as university students than as high school students.

“I think there should be a window of opportunity for some of these good athletes, or good musicians, or actresses et cetera, who may have spent so much time developing their game, and might not have made the grade academically. They should be given an opportunity to be successful and an opportunity to fail. I think life is made up of opportunities, and some of these kids do deserve that chance.”

This problem is enhanced because of the inherent limitations of each academic institution. Geographic characteristics and differing academic requirements were both identified as potential obstacles. In addition, the inability of the CIAU to develop truly
standardized eligibility requirements were also reported as obstacles.

Further, a limitation of the academic institutions identified is the inaccurate assumption of the academic ability of all incoming students. Therefore, the schools do not take the appropriate steps to provide new students with the opportunity to learn the necessary academic skills it will take to survive:

"The weakness is that schools for years have assumed that kids coming in know...how to set goals, to manage their time...to write essays...to study...to take notes...to schedule their time during the day...to monitor their grades...to know the school's rules. Well, the retention rate at a lot of schools is low because of this process."

Finally, some coaches see the change in today's student-athletes as a potential obstacle to overcome. Today's students in general were described by some coaches as "less motivated", "less committed", "more ego-driven", "more pampered", "too outcome-driven" and "unwilling to take responsibility for their own actions". Several coaches also discussed how today's student-athletes had "less innate trust in coaches" and "less willingness to do things without guarantees". The coaches looked at the changes in family structures, role models (such as professional athletes and coaches), and the different pressures placed upon them, as a major reason for the change in player attitudes and behaviours:

"The one comment I've heard is athletes haven't changed, parents have. Being in education, I see that all the time. Parents have changed, family structure has changed, values have changed, disciplined has changed; and I think [the difference in athletes today] has to do as much with parents changing as athletes changing."
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE COACHES’ PERCEPTIONS

The data in this study were the words of coaches; emerging from them is a glimpse into the profession of intercollegiate coaching in Ontario. In any inquiry, there is always a question about the validity of the material presented. Were the coaches’ perceptions stated candidly, or provided to satisfy the needs of the researcher or social desirability? Do the unobserved behaviours of the subjects match their stated beliefs? While these questions cannot be answered with certainty, a critical review of the recorded transcripts and interview notes provides an opportunity to reveal inconsistencies. The coaches in the current study reported a passion for their profession, an idealistic view of the potential benefits of sport participation, and a commitment to their student-athletes that transcends the need to win. The responses of the coaches tended to reveal a consistency in these beliefs. The transcripts repeatedly suggest that these coaches truly are “believers” in their potential impact on the educational endeavours of the student-athletes. Their perception is that they do things as coaches in a manner that is consistent with how they believe things ought to be done. Finally, it is clear that they have no doubts about the value of what they do. It is difficult to find an uncertain word in any of the transcripts.

The transcripts also suggest, however, that some OUA men’s basketball coaches operate in an isolated psychological environment. The perceptions of others regarding what one does is inevitably of importance in any institution, especially when those others are the ultimate decision makers. Within the academic realm, the perceptions of university administrators, athletic administrators, student-athletes and community members can all be important to the potential influence the coach holds, no matter how zealous his beliefs are. Resources provided, workload
determination, program reputations and performance evaluations derive from these groups; therefore, external perceptions of the value of intercollegiate men's basketball and the performance of the coach in providing these benefits are critical. Many administrators and faculty members stand in opposition to the use of valuable resources on athletics programs, particularly in times of financial turmoil. Concurrently, others challenge the social and educational value of sport participation. However, many see intercollegiate athletics as an "...integral part of the total educational program" (McKinnon, 1986, p.27). Further, many administrators similarly believe that intercollegiate athletic programs can be advantageous to not only the student-athletes, but also the university as a whole, to the alumni and the local community (McKinnon, 1986).

Despite the potential importance of influential outsiders, several coaches indicated an apathy towards external perceptions. They indicated that they were only responsible to themselves and their players. This is a potentially dangerous attitude for coaches to adopt, since shrinking budgets and the reduction of services could result in the elimination of intercollegiate athletics. Coaches must work to enhance the experience of the institution's students, and should work diligently to enhance the perception that others hold about the value of intercollegiate athletics.

It has often been questioned by many external groups - and some coaches - as to the appropriateness of operating elite athletics within the educational system. European countries separate education and athletics, with club systems existing as the primary delivery source of elite athletic programs (MacLean, 1992). Is it possible that the only reason why elite athletics remain housed in academic institutions is because of the historical link between the two
institutions? Ken Dryden (1983), when commenting on the decline of Canadian hockey dominance traced the fault back to what he termed the "burden of history" (p.259). He argued that Canadian hockey did not adapt to the advances and changes of the modern game because of a refusal to acknowledge styles not rooted in Canadian hockey history. A similar phenomenon may occur in other Canadian sports, such as elite basketball; they too may be held back because of a refusal to adapt to societal and environmental changes, and a blind allegiance to historical traditions. Nevertheless, operating elite athletics within the educational system has a multitude of benefits. Student-athletes, coaches, the academic institution and the science of sport can all be enhanced because of the academic-athletic marriage (Salmela, 1996; Fraleigh, 1990; Connell, 1986; McKinnon, 1986; Semotiuk, 1986). The coaches in this study certainly believe this to be the case.

While the perceptions of others regarding the intercollegiate sports program is important, it remains the coach who is most important in the delivery of athletics. As the 'gatekeeper of the athletic experience', the coach creates the environment in which the program operates (Vernacchia, 1996). However, when researching the potential value of sport, or when discussing its' potential merits for student-athletes, coaches are rarely involved. For example, at a 1986 conference in London, Ontario that discussed the role of Canadian intercollegiate athletics, a list of attendees showed no persons identified as coaches (Taylor, 1986). While undoubtedly some of these faculty members, athletic administrators or university administrators had coaching responsibilities, they were still in attendance primarily as managers or traditional physical educators. Further, when intercollegiate coaches are examined in academic study, it is generally misguided, quantitative research focusing on the high profile, NCAA Division I coach who
represents a small segment of the intercollegiate coaching fraternity (eg. Fizel & D’itri, 1996).

This may be at the root of some coaches’ disregard for external opinions of their work. They are, in effect, ignoring those who tend to ignore them or misrepresent them.

Therefore the purpose of this study, as previously discussed, was to first examine coaches’ perceptions of the educational value of intercollegiate athletics, and secondly to examine their perceptions of the role they perform in the delivery of this educational value. Rather than ask athletic directors, faculty members or university administrators about athletics and coaching, this study asked the coaches: the leaders and builders of the athletic program’s "organizational culture" (Weese, MacLean & Corlett, 1993).

PERCEPTIONS OF THE COACHES: A CLOSER LOOK

Coaches perceived that the value of intercollegiate athletics is twofold. First of all, intercollegiate athletics are of value to the academic institution as a whole by enhancing the campus life and by providing a promotional and public relations benefit. Secondly, the coaches perceived there to be value for the participating student-athlete. This finding was consistent with the first directional proposition offered: that the coaches would perceive there to be considerable value to athletics and a strong link between intercollegiate athletics and enhanced educational products and processes.

As previously discussed, many - including the coaches in this study - believe that athletics in general can be inherently valuable (Corlett, 1996b; Arnold, 1989). Conversely, there are those who view athletics negatively, and cite such problems in sport as the threat to co-
operation, the undermining of personal and social relationships by determining winners and losers, and the cultivation of envy, despair, selfishness, pride and callousness (as cited by Arnold, 1989). Specifically, some argue that athletics within the educational system often promotes negative personal experiences and sport as a means to foster dominance (Ennis, 1996).

However, those with a positive view rebut this opposition by contending that sport in an academic setting can “preserve serious play as a means of fostering creativity”, can “contribute to our understanding of humans at their limits”, and can be an environment in which “traditional virtues can be explored and examined” (Corlett, 1996b, p.443). Those with a negative view, often try to transform sport - which is inherently competitive - into something that it is not (Corlett, 1996c; Arnold, 1989). Both Corlett (1996c) and Arnold (1989) recognize that sport does not benefit everyone equally. However, for those involved in competitive athletics, the potential value is immense. But is the value inherent, or must the coach, as “guardian of the best traditions of sport” (Arnold, 1989, p.23) be conscious of his role as an educator within the athletic realm? Therefore, the role of the coach as an educator was examined.

If the teacher understands the nature of sport sufficiently well and is committed to it, the Lombardian ethic - where winning at all costs is emphasized to the detriment of social and moral values - will not be allowed to develop (Arnold, 1989, p.22).

When examining the second purpose of this study, - the coaches’ perceptions of their role as educators - the second directional proposition offered is supported: the coaches involved in the current study identified the educator role a top priority. Coaches cited both an opportunity and responsibility to enhance the educational value to both the institution and their student-athletes.
The educator role over the course of the interviews began to both converge and diverge from their other coaching roles. When discussing their potential impact on the academic institution and the student-athletes, the educator role seemed to encompass tasks generally performed by several other roles. The coaches perceived that their performance in the roles as tacticians, performance trainers, recruiter and team selectors, administrators, marketers, public relations officers, and self-promoters, all contributed to the academic institutions’ campus life, promotion and public relations. Further, when discussing the positive educational affect they could have on the student-athletes, they identified tasks that they would perform in their roles as tacticians, performance trainers, recruiter and team selectors, administrators, self-promoters and public relations officers, as being part of the educator role. However, when discussing the obstacles that impeded their efforts to enhance the value of intercollegiate athletics, the other roles became distinguishable; the demands and expectations of some of the tasks they were required to perform within these roles were often perceived as negative influences on their educator role.

When specifically asked about their educator role, however, all twelve of the subjects were able to articulate a philosophical approach: thus supporting the fourth directional proposition offered. All of the coaches perceived there to be a strong link between athletics and education - the first directional proposition - and also approached their coaching positions as educator functions. While the coaches as a whole identified a high level of commitment to the educational endeavours of their student-athletes, their individual philosophical approaches to the educator role varied. This finding supported the third directional proposition: that there would be a wide variance in the coaches’ perceived responsibility for direct involvement in their student-
athletes educational and personal development.

Many things must be taken into consideration by the intercollegiate coach before determining an educational approach. Attempts to determine a universally ‘correct’ approach will not likely provide satisfying results. Each coach perceives his role as an educator differently; yet, if a coach has critically self-examined his education philosophy, it is difficult to argue against the use of any one approach. Each coach in the study identified an educational philosophy that had been shaped by their personal experiences, their coaching experiences, their athletic experiences, their role models, their professional and coaching goals, and their education and training.

The university years are critical in the personal development of young adults. It is a time of major social and academic changes for university students. For student-athletes, it is also a time of major athletic transition. During this period of transition, the general student deals with increased autonomy and an emphasis on grasping broader issues (Gardner and Jewler, 1992). In contrast, the student-athlete must deal with these transitions, as well as the transition to a higher level of competition which may result in greater demands on both athletes and coaches (Tracey and Corlett, 1995). Therefore, there may be a potential conflict between the transitions and greater anxiety may ensue.

The environment within which each coach operated also differed greatly. The additional responsibilities that each coach was required to fulfill, the differences in coaching workload, and the environment of the individual academic institutions all combined with the coaches’ personal beliefs to reveal another finding from this study: that each coach had a unique coaching position.

Searing (1994) argues that the roles of individuals are constructed by institutions and
reconstructed by actors. Formal rules established by the institution - in this case, the unique intercollegiate sport environment that each individual coach operates within - and informal rules are established by the interaction between the actor - the coach - and the environment. At the core of shaping each individual’s roles are the career goals and emotional incentives of each actor (Searing, 1994). Since these career goals and emotional incentives are constantly being reshaped and re-invented, the roles do not remain stagnant; as identified by several of the subjects in the study, their perceptions of the roles they play as intercollegiate coaches had undergone major changes over the tenure of their coaching career. In particular, the coaches all identified a commitment to the educator role they performed and an ability to maintain that commitment despite obstacles. This differs from many of the high profile coaches whose intercollegiate athletic environment has resulted in the educator role first becoming dominated by the other roles, then finally abandoned or engulfed.

It is the uniqueness of each individual’s intercollegiate coaching position which supports the use of qualitative research methods when examining actors within environments. This phenomenon could not have been adequately represented by the use of quantitative examination. The emergence of this result may in fact be the most important finding from this study. It demonstrates the complexity of the coaching profession in the education environment. To evaluate or examine all individuals without taking this finding into consideration would be inappropriate. To say that a coach with a ninety percent coaching workload has the same job as someone considered part-time would be unfair; the recruiting processes for each coach differs based upon the entrance requirements of their institutions; the geographical location can even differentiate the job that each coach holds.
While each coach’s job is different, the dedication to a philosophical approach to their educator role was universal. Some coaches identified elements of a pragmatic approach to the educational role they undertook; however, they reported that this was necessary because of the environment in which they operated. O’Toole (1995) has argued that great leaders are often willing to compromise pragmatically on policies, strategies, alliances and tactics. Still, they never compromise on their true objective, as defined by their philosophical foundation. Every coach in the current study was able to articulate an education philosophy, thus suggesting that even coaches utilizing a pragmatic approach are operating from a philosophical foundation. The educational philosophies identified by the coaches can be represented across the continuum in Figure 5.1.

![Figure 5.1: Coaches' Philosophical Approach to the Educator Role](image)

The OUA men’s basketball coaches tended to fit in the middle four groupings on the continuum (from “Unobtrusive” to “Pulling”). These four approaches parallel the three systems of moral education used in public schools (Figley, 1984). Similar to the approaches identified by the coaches, the character education or indoctrination model, the values clarification model, and the two levels of the cognitive-developmental model (leaderless peer groups and teacher as facilitator) all utilize different philosophical foundations to achieve similar goals.

Some coaches identified having minimal responsibility in the educational pursuits of their
student-athletes. However, these interviewees also reported a conscious effort to avoid negatively affecting the student-athletes’ academic responsibilities and educational experiences. Thus, the approach taken by these coaches was entitled "unobtrusive". These coaches tend to believe that there is an inherent educational value in intercollegiate athletic participation for the student-athlete. Therefore, they looked upon their players as typical university students with a great opportunity to have their educational experience enhanced. The only responsibility they perceived themselves to have is to not interfere with the personal educational experiences of their student-athletes.

The "unobtrusive" philosophical approach to the educator role is similar to the values clarification model used in public schools (Figley, 1984). This approach encourages students to use personal choice to define their own value commitments. Moral education is learned through self-analysis and from an awareness of the implications stemming from values choices.

Some OUA men’s basketball coaches did subscribe to having a responsibility to "provide" educational opportunities for their student-athletes. These coaches identified a commitment to influence their players’ academic goals and to encourage them to achieve academic success. These coaches also reported that they stopped short of providing the student-athletes with these academic goals. They felt that a positive educational environment should be fostered; therefore, attempts were made to provide educational opportunities that the general student population would not have access to. However the onus was on the student-athlete to take advantage of these opportunities. As one interviewee stated, "...we’re here, and you have a tremendous opportunity; seize the moment, use us as a resource, and strive for excellence".

The "provider" philosophical approach to the educator role parallels the cognitive-
developmental model used in public school moral education training (Figley, 1984). The
students acquire moral development within a warm and accepting environment that is both
cognitively and socially stimulating. In this model, the teacher is responsible for providing such
an environment, and is philosophically guided by universal ethical principles; the students,
therefore, are taught to morally reason using logic based upon universal moral principles, and
learn morals because of their changing ideas of right and wrong.

Moving along the continuum, the next group of coaches reported that their philosophical
approach was to "push" their student-athletes educationally. These coaches identified a
responsibility to be facilitators and motivators, who look to push their student-athletes towards
academic success. They encouraged their athletes by helping them believe they could succeed
and reach their potential. They also attempted to impart in their players, a sense of self-
responsibility for their educational endeavours. As one interviewee stated:

"I am a 'parent by extension' to young men; they have to take responsibility for
their own lives...My role, I believe, is to set standards for them and set objectives
for them, and motivate and push and prod and cajole: to try and move them in that
direction...so I am a facilitator."

Like the "provider" group, these coaches similarly attempt to provide exceptional educational
experiences and academic services for their players; however, differing from the "provider"
group, they assume more of a personal responsibility for the utilization of these opportunities.

The "push" philosophical approach also parallels the cognitive-developmental model. It
differs from the previous group, however, by having the teacher be more involved in the
facilitation of moral development (Figley, 1984). While the "provider" group relies more on
creating an environment for self-discovery, the "push" group takes a more active role in the
process of moral development. The teachers' involvement relies not only on the provision of a challenging environment, but also upon their facilitation of dialogue among the students and the encouragement of Socratic questioning.

The remainder of the OUA men's basketball coaches imposed upon themselves an even higher level of personal responsibility for their players' education than the "pushing" group. This segment of the subjects identified a responsibility to "pull" their student-athletes toward academic success. They used terms such as "owe", and "significant responsibility" to describe the educational role they play in the student-athlete's academic pursuits. They remained involved in all aspects of their players' educational endeavours, provided as much assistance as they could, enforced strict disciplinary measures when academic performance was sub-par, and maintained this sense of responsibility for their players even after graduation. As one interviewee stated, "...we have a responsibility as coaches to provide an opportunity for the athletes to improve to their optimal capabilities; not only as a player, but as a student, and most importantly of all, as a person". However, even though these coaches would demand, discipline and reward, the "ultimate responsibility" was still with the student-athletes.

The "pulling" approach is similar to the character education or indoctrination model (Figley, 1984). This model of moral education used in public schools defines morality by constant societal rules and norms rather than by universal ethical principles. Using this approach, morality is taught to the students through the utilization of modeling, repetition, inculcation, reinforcement, and punishment.

Not represented in the current study were coaches subscribing to the two extremes. However, the literature would suggest that these extremes exist, particularly in NCAA Division I
athletics. For example, the educational approach taken by the University of Cincinnati’s basketball coach - Bob Huggins (Wolff, 1996) - would suggest that some intercollegiate coaches are “uninterested” in the educational endeavours of their student-athletes. Their responsibility does not extend beyond the playing surface, unless their ability to perform athletically is being hindered. The educator role of these coaches becomes engulfed, therefore they have no affect on the educational development of their student-athletes, instead treating them like athlete-students or professional athletes.

Similarly, the other extreme is most likely found in high profile NCAA Division I athletics. As previously identified by Adler and Adler (1991), some coaches take a “controlling” approach to their student-athletes’ educational endeavours. Focusing only on educational outcomes, they will structure their players’ education by selecting their courses, majors, professors and timetables. This controlling approach is utilized to ensure that the athletes will remain eligible, or will enhance the quantitative results of the athletic department’s “commitment to education” by having higher grade point averages, more eligible athletes, and enhanced graduation rates. In fact, while the approach is controlling and dominating in nature, Adler and Adler (1991) demonstrated that the coach generally abandons the role entirely. Instead, assistant coaches or academic counselors take over the role as educator. When this approach is adopted, the student-athlete loses all control and responsibility for their own education. Similar to the “uninterested” group, these coaches neglect the educator role they have the potential to fill.

These two extremes tend not to exist in Canada, or at low profile American institutions, because these basketball coaches have few of the same problems that high level American coaches must face. The media is uninterested in comparison, athletic programs must raise the
funds to continue operating, coaches do not have weekly television shows and athletes are not
turning to professional sports after a couple of years of intercollegiate athletic participation.

Therefore, Ontario intercollegiate athletics fosters the kind of environment that provides coaches
with the opportunities to be what Walton terms ‘Philosopher Coaches’.

Walton (1992) referred to coaches whose primary focus was the overall enhancement of
the athlete, as ‘Philosopher Coaches’. Philosopher Coaches, he stated, “...see life as a process
rather than an event” (p.161). He identified ten characteristics of philosopher coaches:

1. Committed to individual integrity, values, and personal growth.
2. Profound thinkers who see themselves as educators, not just coaches.
3. Well-educated (formally and informally) in a liberal arts tradition.
4. Long-run commitment to their athletes and their institutions.
5. Willing to experiment with new ideas.
6. Value the coach-player relationship, winning aside.
7. Understand and appreciate human nature.
8. Love their sport and work.
9. Honest and strong in character.
10. Human and therefore imperfect. (p.162)

The coaches in the current study appear to fit Walton’s characteristics. And similar to coaches -
such as John Wooden - discussed by Walton, the OUA men’s basketball coaches seem to
approach their position as though it were a "calling": with a true passion and love for what they
do. But Walton contends that Philosopher Coaches are a dying breed:

No one is to blame. It is not the fault of the coaches, nor the players...or fans.
The changing character of coaching is being driven by the market place, by the
growing number of fans willing and able to pay top dollar for sports
entertainment, by technical progress in the development of athletes, and by the
media. These forces are pulling the modern head coach in directions different in
both scope and intensity than coaches of earlier generations (p.157).

But are they a dying breed at all levels? The current intercollegiate environment of the
CIAU, NCAA Divisions II and III, and NAIA Divisions I and II are still conducive to the
existence of Philosopher Coaches. In fact, while there are three hundred and eight NCAA Division I men’s basketball programs competing in the 1997-98 season, there are two hundred and seventy-nine NCAA Division II programs, three hundred and fifty-six NCAA Division III programs, one hundred and forty-four NAIA Division I programs, one hundred and seventy-four NAIA Division II programs, and thirty-seven CIAU basketball programs. These numbers seem to suggest that to perceive all intercollegiate programs in the same light would be both inaccurate and unfair.

The potential impact that coaches can have on the lives of young men and women is extensive. Athletes generally enter sport voluntarily and with great enthusiasm. At a time in which the traditional family in North America continues to go through upheaval, the coach remains a potential mentor (Walton, 1992). As a mentor, the coach can “...forge in young people the strength of character to not compromise their integrity” (p.164). The coach has the opportunity to use the sport environment to provide their athletes with the opportunity to develop strong character. When done in combination with a post-secondary education, the potential value to student-athletes is immeasurable. Further, the intercollegiate coach works with individuals at a critical point in their development: entering adulthood, at a time of self-discovery (Chartrand and Lent, 1987). But like teachers, courage is required by the coach to assist students in achieving their academic goals. The coach not only must be prepared to “...meet problems and issues with firmness, conviction, and persistence”, but also “...to initiate them despite student resistance” (Costin, 1985, p.125). The role of the teacher is to reduce passivity on the part of the student, to help raise their consciousness, and to treat controversial and sensitive ideas (Costin, 1985). As stated by Ken Dryden (1995):
Good teachers don’t teach subjects, they teach people. But to teach people, they must know them, spend time with them, care about them, believe in them (p.4).

**THE FUTURE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS IN CANADA**

Despite the potential value of the current Ontario and Canadian intercollegiate athletic environment, many coaches indicated the need for great change. At the top of the list are some form of athletic scholarship, conflicting support for the interlock of the OUA West and OUA East to better promote and profile the provinces’ university basketball teams, and measures taken to increase media exposure locally, provincially and even nationally. Further, the issues of funding sources and departmental control are of great concern to many coaches, faculty and administrators. But how would these, and other, changes affect the educator role of the OUA men’s basketball coach?

The debate centres around the ability of Canadian institutions to keep the top student-athletes in Canada. The drain of top Canadian student-athletes is of great concern to coaches and administrators who are trying to enhance the profile of their programs and institutions. As a result, many call for intercollegiate athletic reforms that would make the Canadian system similar to the NCAA Division I model. However, the potential for coaches committed to education in NCAA Division I basketball to emerge has been questioned, with an athletic focus taking centre stage instead.

At the forefront of discussion on intercollegiate athletic reform in Canada is the athletic scholarship issue. Several coaches reported that they would like to see some form of financial support provided for student-athletes. This issue has been discussed for several decades. The
arguments against athletic scholarships used by those in opposition today, are the same arguments made by Van Vliet in 1971; (a) athletic scholarships would not stop the drain of top athletes to the United States, (b) there are no degrees offered for sports like those offered in music and drama, (c) the competitive level gap would widen between institutions, (d) athletic scholarships don’t develop excellence since they are rewarded to the advantaged, (e) they are institutions of higher learning, not for the development of professional athletes, and (f) the money could be more appropriately spent on providing more opportunities in intercollegiate athletics and intramural-recreation programs.

Many of the coaches interviewed indicated that the presence of athletic scholarships would change their approach to the educator role; while they currently viewed their student-athletes as “volunteers”, they reported that they would take more “control” of the educational pursuits of scholarship athletes. As earlier identified, this often results in the utilization of external sources to dictate the educational pursuits of the student-athletes. Therefore, the two extremes of the philosophical approach to the educator role (Figure 5.1) could become more prominent in Canadian and Ontario intercollegiate athletics. The educator role could become engulfed, thus resulting in an “uninterested” approach; or the educator role could become abandoned and left to outside experts to “control” the educational processes and educational products of the student-athletes.

Full scholarship athletes have in a sense become employees of the university. They "owe" their coaches their undivided attention because these coaches are paying the bills. This creates a role conflict for student-athletes, with the student role often being neglected or de-emphasized (Purdy, Eitz, & Hufnagel, 1982, p.445).

A further problem in the scholarship debate is the issue of funding sources. The ability of
institutions to finance intercollegiate athletics is diminishing, despite the call for the university's general fund to be the primary funding source (Matthews, 1974). Currently, student fees are the other primary source of funding for intercollegiate athletics (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a). Rising tuition costs and the financial turmoil most institutions face require new funding sources to be obtained, particularly if athletic scholarships were to be awarded. However, the potential problem with non-university funding control is that "...the funding source(s) may not necessarily embrace the underlying educational principles of a university and may exert pressures that could lead to a compromise of the educational philosophy of interuniversity athletics" (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a, p.60). This is the route that NCAA Division I programs took resulting in more demands and pressures placed upon all involved (André & James, 1991; Chu, 1989; Frey, 1985). Canadian institutions need to only look at the brief involvement of the federal government in intercollegiate athletics to see the potential for philosophical conflict. The 1970's saw large sums of money injected into CIAU athletics to promote national and international athletic excellence (Moriarty & Holman-Prpich, 1987). Several argued that the government's high performance mandate did not correlate with the universities educational priorities (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a; Connell, 1986; Keyes, 1986; MacIntosh, 1986).

While Canadian intercollegiate athletics fight to maintain institutional control, and American intercollegiate athletics attempt to gain institutional control, the real danger in all of this is the potential negative influence intercollegiate athletic participation can have on the student-athlete's overall development. The elite American system many Canadians covet is a double-edged sword: while it provides many opportunities, it also results in abuses (Chartrand & Lent, 1987). Further, intercollegiate sport participants may come to perceive themselves as
"athletes"; Bem's self-perception theory (1972) contends that with reinforcement and context, inferences can be drawn about our own attitudes, and we begin to commit to behaviours consistent with this self-image. For example, if coaches abandon their roles as educators, and turn the responsibility over to external sources, the student-athlete becomes an athlete-only when with the coach, and a student-only when with academic advisors. When this occurs, the potential for role conflict between their athletic role, academic role, and social role is greatly increased (Chartrand & Lent, 1987; Figler, 1988). Upon the inevitable completion of their playing career, athletes must then deal with what Orlick (1990) terms the "Hero to Zero" phenomenon. Yet, current research trends focus on the provision of academic services for student-athletes by counselors (e.g. Miller & Wooten, 1995; Jordan & Denson, 1990) while little research is focused on the coach performing the educator role.

Therefore, coaches and administrators must take into careful consideration the values of intercollegiate sport that they want as priorities. Fraleigh (1990) argues:

...because of multiple possible values, because of possible conflict, and because differences in organization and management impact positively or negatively on chosen value priorities, it is crucial to identify appropriate priorities so that appropriate choices are made, unnecessary conflict is avoided, and management strategies are adopted (p.78).

Fraleigh (1986) identified three approaches to establish value priorities in sports contests. The first approach is to establish value priorities by identifying a dominant point of view; the second approach is to establish which values deserve priority because of the particular context within which the sport occurs; and the third approach is to have moral values take priority over other types of values. This approach can be "...justified by rational choice that is free, enlightened, and impartial" (p.76).
To establish value priorities in an educational setting, Fraleigh (1990) recommends the second approach. Therefore, coaches and administrators must establish the purpose of intercollegiate athletics, and then choose the most compatible values to champion. Fraleigh (1990) identifies five potential purposes that athletics in an educational setting can have, which he terms value orientations. The first is *disciplinary mastery*, where intercollegiate athletics would primarily serve to develop elite athletes. The second potential value orientation identified is *social reconstruction*, where intercollegiate athletics primary purpose would be to encourage inclusiveness in sport, the promotion of play as a valuable aspect of a human existence, and a revision of the nature and value of competition; multiple sports and enhanced intramural-recreation programs would be the focus of such a value orientation. The third potential purpose identified is *learning process*, whereby intercollegiate athletics would be an opportunity for scientific and academic study; tactics, problem solving opportunities and technological advances would be studied and tested in intercollegiate athletics. The fourth potential purpose identified is *ecological validity*; the development of post-participation skills (educational products) to be used by the student-athlete would be emphasized using this value orientation. Finally, the fifth value orientation identified is *self-actualization*, whereby the intercollegiate athletics would be part of an enhanced overall educational experience; the primary focus would be that intercollegiate athletics provide student-athletes with an opportunity to develop a better appreciation of themselves (educational processes).

Fraleigh (1990) does not suggest that the value of athletics to the institution should be the primary focus. The role of intercollegiate athletics must be clearly defined within each institution, that the operative goals of the intercollegiate athletic program be defined and
prioritized, and that the athletic programs be "...in harmony and entirely consistent with the aims of higher education" (Semotiuk, 1986, p.59). Yet, much of the current debate focuses on the institutions themselves: how they cannot attract the best athletes, how they are not receiving enough media coverage, and how the playing field is not level for championship pursuits.

Perhaps while all of these arguments rage on, many are missing the opportunity that exists. The Canadian intercollegiate athletic environment, like the hundreds of non-NCAA Division I programs, can provide an experience for student-athletes "...in which school, sport and social life are integrated in balance" (Tracey & Corlett, 1995, p.83). While sport can be taken seriously at these institutions, it does not have to take a higher priority than life and school, as often occurs at elite NCAA programs (eg. Sinclair & Orlick; Lapchick, 1987; Gurney & Stuart, 1987). As Orlick (1990) states:

It is possible to pursue high levels of excellence without destroying the rest of your life, but only if some balance is built into your ongoing program (p.168).

Student-athletes should be the primary focus and major beneficiaries of intercollegiate athletics programs (Connell, 1986). The person best positioned to ensure this is the intercollegiate coach. If the coach is willing to accept a role as an educator and attempts to operate in a manner that is consistent with the essence of Philosopher Coaching, then intercollegiate athletics can be an opportunity for educational, personal and moral growth for all involved.

CONCLUSION / APPLICATIONS

The current study attempted to reveal the perceptions of a representative pool of intercollegiate men's basketball coaches on the value of intercollegiate athletics, and their role as
educators. The study answered a call by Walton to more closely look at the overall potential impact that coaches could have on their athletes. Further, several have criticized the lack of attention placed upon the educational philosophy that underlie Canadian intercollegiate athletics programs (Connell, 1986); others have criticized the emphasis of research on elite NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics, thus ignoring the larger, lower profile intercollegiate athletics programs in Canada and the United States (Tracey and Corlett, 1995).

There are several applications which may emerge from the results of this study. The first application is the need for coaches to understand the environment in which they operate, to recognize the priorities, capabilities and emotions of their athletes, and to develop a personal coaching philosophy that will address all of these issues. It is critical that coaches at all levels understand the potential they have to influence young people through the use of the sport environment. This information should be utilized in the formation and re-structuring of coach training programs.

The second application is a desire for the results of this study to act as a catalyst for young student-athletes and parents to make education a priority when selecting a school. Beyond the courses the student-athlete will take, the educational approach utilized by the coach should be thoroughly researched before making a decision. Student-athletes should identify the type of educational environment they will be best suited to operate within.

Third, university administrators and athletic administrators should understand the uniqueness of the OUA men's basketball coaching position. When evaluating coaches, all aspects of the position should be recognized. Further, when hiring new coaches, or examining programs, the type of person brought in should be consistent with the educational philosophy of
the institution. Appropriate resources should also be made available to ensure the student-athletes and the institution are being best served by the coach.

Fourth, all members of the university environment should recognize the contributions made by each program. Providers of extra-curricular programs (such as athletics), administrators, and faculty should work in concert to enhance the experience of the institution’s students.

Finally, coaches and decision makers should take care in determining future directions for Ontario intercollegiate athletics. Priorities should be well established before any major changes are introduced. The student-athlete, not the coach or the institution, should remain at the forefront when making administrative decisions.

FUTURE RESEARCH

1. This project should be replicated on other coaching pools, including coaches of women’s intercollegiate programs and other sports in Ontario, at other Canadian institutions outside of Ontario, at American institutions in the NCAA and NAIA, and on high school coaches.

2. Similar studies should be performed on other non-intercollegiate sport organizations to reveal the potential impact that coaches can have on their athletes outside of the academic realm.

3. A comparison should be made between the overall benefits of the European sport club system on athletes and the intercollegiate athletics system.

4. A continuation of the current study should examine the perceptions of student-athletes, university administrators, athletic administrators, general students, coaches and assistant coaches
on the approach to further verify the results of the current study, and to determine value priorities and the potential value of intercollegiate athletics.

5. A more in-depth examination should be made of the obstacles that impact the role of intercollegiate athletics on higher education.

6. Utilize the two variables of the self-promoter role - perceived opportunity structure and the level of ambition - in a qualitative inquiry to explain the educator role.
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APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this study seeks to pose two general questions to OUA men’s basketball head coaches. The first question asks each coach to describe their perceptions of the potential and actual educational value of intercollegiate sport. The second asks these same coaches to describe their role in the delivery of the educational component of intercollegiate athletics.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and can be terminated at any point in the process. There is no monetary reward for your participation in this study. If you have any other questions concerning this study you may contact the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Windsor. The phone number of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research is (519) 253-4232.

This study will involve a ninety (90) minute interview between you, the coach, and the interviewer, Tim Elcombe. In this interview, you will be asked questions about your coaching experience, your perception of the potential and actual value of intercollegiate sport, your athletic departments’ services for student-athletes, your perception of the role you play in the delivery of these services, the obstacles that must be overcome to provide these services, and potential changes you would like to see in the future to the educational experience of the student-athlete. You do not have to answer any questions during the interview if you do not wish to for any reason(s) that you do not have to provide to the interviewer. In addition, the interview will be taped on a cassette recorder. However, if you do not wish to have parts or all of the interview taped, then the recorder will be turned off. Once the interview is complete, interview summaries will be prepared by summarizing the taped conversation and the notes taken during the interview. Copies of the interview summaries will then be mailed to you for your review. This will provide you with an opportunity to change, eliminate, or add any material you may desire.
All information provided will be held in strict confidence. In most cases, the interviewer will be the only person who will listen to the cassette recorded interview and who will review the entire written interview notes. However, some material may be discussed with the Masters Committee Chairperson, Dr. John Corlett of the School of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor. In addition, some parts of the written interview notes will be discussed with the other two committee members from the University of Windsor: Dr. Joanne MacLean from the School of Human Kinetics and Professor Richard Price, from the Department of University Services. In addition, any information that may identify you will not be made available in the write-up of this study or to any inquiries regarding this study.

Any information that you provide will be made accessible to you at any time. If you wish to see a final copy of the results of this study, please fill out the address section at the bottom of this page.

I have read the above information and understand the purpose and methods of this study. I agree to participate and I am aware that I may withdraw my consent to participate at any time.

Signature ______________________

Address Section

Name:

Street:

City:

Province:

Postal Code:
APPENDIX B: GENERAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

To begin, I would briefly like to ask:
A/ How do you justify the existence of intercollegiate basketball in Canadian academic institutions?
   1. What is your perception of the value of intercollegiate athletics?

B/ How did you get into coaching?
   1. What personal experiences (i.e. playing) impacted your decision to become a coach?
   2. What individuals impacted this decision? How did they impact the decision?
   3. Under what circumstances were you hired?

C/ Do you intend to continue coaching into the foreseeable future?
   1. Have you ever quit coaching or considered quitting?
      If yes... For what reasons did you come back, or choose not to quit?
   2. What are your short and long-term goals in coaching? Career objectives?
   3. What are the characteristics of your ideal coaching position?
   4. If you were not a coach, what would you be best suited to do? Do you have any other professional goals?

D/ Could you articulate your philosophy with respect to the educational role of coaching intercollegiate basketball?
   1. Is your philosophy written down?
   2. How often do you revisit this philosophy?
   3. How much has it changed over the years?

E/ How are you currently evaluated as an intercollegiate basketball coach?
   1. What are your personal feelings regarding this process? What would you change?
   2. Is this evaluation consistent with your job description, or the circumstances under which you were hired?
   3. Tell me a little about the other things you do that might or might not be evaluated.
      i/ Tactician Role
      ii/ Performance Trainer Role
      iii/ Recruiter and Team Selector Role
      iv/ Administrator Role
      v/ Marketer Role
      vi/ Public Relations Officer Role
      vii/ Self-Promotion Role
The next two sections of this interview will focus on the initiatives and services provided by your athletic department, and the role you, as head coach, play in the delivery of these services.

F/ What educational initiatives or services does your athletic program provide for your student-athletes?
   1. What personnel and/or services are available only for athletes?
   2. What personnel and/or services are available for the general student population that your athletes are encouraged to use?
   3. What academic-related rewards/recognition does your athletic department provide?
   4. What type of statistics with respect to the educational endeavors of your student-athletes are kept?

G/ What role in the education of your athletes do you play personally?
   1. What initiatives have you implemented?
   2. What type of monitoring or evaluation systems do you use?
   3. What type of disciplinary actions do you utilize or are prepared to implement?
   4. How much responsibility do you feel you personally have regarding each athlete’s academic performance, eligibility, and graduation?
   5. How much of a consideration is academic ability when recruiting prospective players?
   6. How much do you rely on outside consultants to assist in the academic progress of your athletes?
   7. How do you remain involved in the delivery of services by outside consultants?

For the next two sections, I would like to discuss the adversities that you must face as an intercollegiate coach.

H/ What obstacles must you deal with as an intercollegiate coach?
   1. What pressures exist that you may have to overcome?
   2. What resources are limited?
   3. What additional responsibilities must you fulfill?
   4. How do you feel those outside the athletic department, (faculty and university administration) perceive you, and your program as a whole?
   5. How have athletes and intercollegiate athletics as a whole changed over the past few years?
   6. What obstacles in the future may you have to deal with?
I/ **What steps do you take to overcome or deal with the obstacles identified?**
1. How do you overcome the pressures and limited resources?
2. How do you manage your additional responsibilities?
3. How do you attempt to change the perceptions of outsiders with respect to your role and the value of your program as a whole?
4. How do you deal with the changes in today's athletes and the changes in intercollegiate athletics in general?
5. How will you deal with the future obstacles you identified?

J/ **What would you change in the system of intercollegiate athletics if you could?**
1. What resources and funding would you like to see made available?
2. What would you use these additional resources and funds for?
3. How do you feel about first party athletic scholarships? *How would you justify your position?*
4. How would you alter the relationship between your basketball program and the university as a whole?
5. Are there any changes to the eligibility system, or entrance policies that you would like to see changed?
6. If the above changes could not be made, what may result?

K/ **What is your educational and coaching background?**
2. What level of coaching certification do you hold?
3. How many years have you been head coach at this institution?
4. What exactly is your position at this institution? *Full-time or part-time?*
5. What other coaching positions have you held, or currently hold?
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