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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Each phase of the educational process must have clear cut objectives if it is to justify its existence. This is essential in order to know where it is heading, what it is striving for, and what it hopes to accomplish. Inter-scholastic athletics are no exception to this rule.

The Educational Policies Commission Report (1954) on School Athletics represents the ideals toward which all educators should be striving. This report in part reads as follows:

Making decisions and accepting responsibility for the consequences is required on the playing fields as in life. Repeated experiences of this nature on the playing field can build habits and character of lifelong worth. Growth in self-reliance, however, does not follow athletic participation if players are manipulated like puppets by coaches who set the strategy, call the signals, and make as many of the decisions as possible. Leaders who value educational outcomes above victories will see to it that players have the opportunity to plan, to make mistakes and profit from them, and to grow in self-reliance (44:15).

If it is the goal of athletics to develop self-reliance, initiative, and leadership, then means must be employed that will achieve these ends. If leadership within groups is to be developed, then it must be done through the building of a democratic atmosphere and the sharing of responsibility (4:3). Donald and Eleanor Laird also
(1956) state that leadership involves "...leading in ways that give the followers a feeling of taking part in setting the goals and methods of their groups (27:52)."

According to Kurtzman (1967), one can presently see the "play to win at all costs idea" engulfing the high school athletic program. He adds that in this sort of situation:

...there is an obvious losing sight of any values that were originally inherent in the game itself. The coach whose very job depends upon winning, as he has no tenure, is almost forced to adopt this attitude towards the game (25:55).

Quite possibly due to this need for job security and the necessity to consistently produce winning teams, coaches resort to methods which are highly autocratic. David Nelson (1962) says:

The first item in staff organization is the establishment of the principle placing the responsibility for all decisions and actions of the group into the hands of the head coach (38:363).

Paul Bryant (1960) says that a coach must have a definite plan and not allow himself to deviate from that plan. He further advises head coaches that "...you must from time to time make decisions that are unpleasant, but you cannot compromise if you expect to build a winner (7:11)."

Most coaching textbooks implicitly support what appears to be a basically autocratic approach to coaching. By definition, such an approach would be one in which the coach accepts and implements the decision making function
in regard to player selection, offense and defense selection, game strategy, etc., with little, if any, deference to the opinions, recommendations, or preferences of the players. In effect, then, it is the coach's team rather than the players' team which performs. If this is the general practice, as it appears to be, then the question arises as to how this methodology enables the player to grow in self-reliance.

The two points of view presented above appear to be at odds with each other. This apparent incongruity between professed goals in athletics and the means by which coaches are attempting to achieve these goals has prompted this study.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to determine whether certain attitudinal and behavioral changes would occur among players as a result of participation in a season of varsity basketball in which they were democratically involved in decision making.

This study was designed to test the following two null hypotheses:

(1) Basketball players will exhibit no change in self concepts from the beginning of the season to the end;

(2) Basketball players will exhibit no change in
dogmatism from the beginning of the season to the end.

The study was also designed to obtain player evaluations of "democratic coaching techniques" through the use of an opinionnaire completed anonymously at the end of the basketball season.

**Importance of the study.** This study is important in that it relates to one of the fundamental goals of education which almost invariably appears in the major policy statements and philosophical treatises underlying American education. This goal is specifically concerned with the schools' responsibility to teach the type of social cooperation which is essential to the preservation and improvement of democracy. According to Danford (1964):

Democratic ends cannot be achieved by autocratic methods. The means or methods must harmonize with the value sought. When we practice autocratic leadership we are creating the kinds of leaders who would subvert democracy. Even if it be true that democratic leadership at times may be less efficient than autocratic leadership, nevertheless, it nourishes values that are vital to the way of life in which we so deeply believe (10:93).

Another important aspect of this study is that it explores leadership techniques that have not been adequately explored, particularly in the context of competitive athletics. Available literature reveals little information concerning democratic coaching methods. This study is an example of one attempt to apply leadership techniques which appear to be consistent with the philosophy of athletics,
but, nonetheless, have seldom been employed. In regard to this fact Danford states that:

Superior leadership involves innovating, pioneering, exploring, investigating, and initiating. No particular leadership ability is required to persuade people to move in a direction they have already taken. There is no merit in being different just for the sake of being different, but the individual who lacks the courage to be different when he believes this is the right thing to do is no leader in the deeper meaning of the term (10:96).

If this study develops an awareness as to why and how democratic leadership should be implemented in the coaching of athletics, then it will aid in the realization of the purported goals and values in athletics.

This study also affords the opportunity to test the effect of democratic leadership upon a person's self concept and upon his tendency toward dogmatism as opposed to the tendency to be open to new experiences and ideas.

Limitations of the study. Because of the difficulties involved in providing an adequate control group, this study was limited to an experimental group consisting of the twelve players participating in varsity basketball at Central Kitsap High School during the 1966-1967 season.

It was anticipated that it would be difficult to systematically control the leadership techniques used. However, every attempt was made to be as consistent as possible in the application of democratic leadership throughout the study.
II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

**Autocratic leadership.** In this type of leadership the leader determines policy, establishes goals, decides what is to be done and how, and, in general, dominates the group.

**Democratic leadership.** In this type of leadership the leader, whenever possible, encourages members of the group to participate in the formulation of plans and decisions which affect them and to determine what steps should be taken to achieve the goals.

**Dogmatism.** In this study dogmatism refers to an individual's tendency to accept and/or employ "authority" as a means of imposing one's views upon others as opposed to evaluating such opinions through critical appraisal of evidence and experience.

**Self concept.** This is defined as the individual's view of himself and how he feels about himself. More specifically, in this study, self concept is used to refer to the self-reports of individuals obtained through the use of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.
III. OVERVIEW OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

Chapter two is a review of the literature concerning democratic and authoritarian leadership techniques and related studies that have tested dogmatism and self concepts.

Chapter three describes the procedures that were used to implement democratic leadership practices with the twelve varsity basketball players at Central Kitsap High School. This chapter will also describe the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and how these tests were administered.

Chapter four contains the results of the study and a statistical analysis of the data in relation to the two null hypotheses previously stated. A description of the information gathered on the player opinionnaire will also be included.

A summary, conclusion, discussion, and recommendations for further study will be included in the final chapter.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Little has been written that pertains directly to the use of democratic coaching techniques. There is, however, literature which compares the outcomes of democratic and autocratic leadership techniques applied in the classroom and other social settings. Many studies have been made in an attempt to better understand the changes that occur in one's self concept. To better understand what has been done in these areas, this chapter will review some of the more relevant literature concerning democratic and autocratic leadership, self concepts, and dogmatism.

I. LITERATURE COMPARING DEMOCRATIC AND AUTOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

Baxter (1943) examined the opportunities that are present in physical education experiences that better prepare boys and girls for democratic citizenship. She found that the "all-powerful-coach" patterns present in competitive athletics often carried over into the physical education class and presented a hazard to the possibilities for democratic, cooperative action. She suggests that
the physical education instructor:

...must be a person who sees himself as advisor and guide in a process of group action directed toward best development of the individuals concerned. The direction is toward responsible self-direction of the learner (1:13-15).

Lippitt and White (1960) tested the efficiency of democratic leadership to attain work and social goals in a series of experiments they conducted with children. They concluded, as a result of their experiments and their review of the available evidence regarding leadership techniques in general, that:

...pure autocracy is seldom very efficient, since it lacks the motivation-giving and wisdom-giving values of broad participation. The most efficient procedure does appear to be, as a rule, democracy, with clear acceptance not only of active leadership but also of the firm use of authority when firmness is called for (32:292).

These same men made the distinction that democratic leadership is not a passive, "stand by and watch," type of method, and added that:

...a leader must be prepared at one time to exert authority so broadly and energetically that his opponents are sure to call him "autocratic," and at other times to let other people take all the initiative. A teacher who wants to be "democratic" and also efficient should continually seek to broaden the base of participation in decision making, whenever participation is really functional and not too time consuming; yet he should usually (not always) exert active leadership (32:292).

Uris (1964) in discussing the three general classifications of leadership, mentioned a third type not previously mentioned. This form of leadership is laissez
faire and is characterized by a complete lack of centralization, relying entirely upon the individual for every action. He mentioned that the democratic approach combines the best features of laissez faire and autocratic leadership and thus recognizes the value of the individual and places emphasis on the satisfaction of individual psychological needs by encouraging individual participation (51:28-31).

A study by Mudra (1965) was made to determine college football coaches' awareness of learning principles and the applications that were being made of these principles in actual practice. Seventy-one coaches and fifty-six college administrators were surveyed to determine their preference of learning principles. A learning principles inventory was developed, contrasting two of the most highly developed learning theories: stimulus-response and Gestalt-field theory (36:1-4). The selection of principles differed greatly. According to Mudra:

...the major college coaches indicated they were more authoritarian, believed more in a survival of the fittest world, were more concerned about the product in learning rather than the process, emphasized winning more as a goal of the program, and did not have as much faith in the ability of players and assistant coaches as the small college coaches. The small college coaches were more concerned about process in learning than the product, were more democratic, were more optimistic about players, emphasized the development of the individual as the goal of the program and saw the players as more able than the major college coaches (36:162).
Mudra found the administrators to be much more Gestalt-field oriented than the coaches. The administrators:

...in every case chose the response that favored a democratic climate rather than an authoritarian climate, and favored the development of the individual player to winning as a goal (36:162).

As a result of his study and experience in the use of democratic coaching techniques, Mudra suggested the big difference between democratic and autocratic leadership to be:

...that the leadership in the democratic situation is enabling and the leadership in the authoritarian situation is manipulative. A good leader in a democratic situation needs to create an environment that will unleash the intense desire of each individual to become the ultimate that he can be, or to provide the most enabling situation. The authoritarian leader must take a different role. He has a predetermined end and individuals in the program exist merely to serve that end. Many times the purpose of his program is to win. He must determine the things he needs to know about people that will enable him to manipulate them so they will do the things he wants them to do (37:30).

Steinhaus (1960) stated that if athletics is to be considered physical education, the needs of the individual must be the primary purpose, not the winning of the contest (47:262). Wooden (1966) further developed this idea when he added:

I want to be able to feel and want my players to feel that doing the best that you are capable of doing is victory in itself and less than that is defeat (52:4).

Lewin (1944) stated that democratic behavior cannot be learned by autocratic methods. Efficient democracy may mean organization and leadership, but this organization
and leadership is based on different principles than autocracy. When it comes to educating future citizens, no talk about democratic ideals can substitute for a democratic atmosphere in the school (28:199). Mudra suggests that the athletic program should be player-centered, should emphasize process rather than product, and provide an enabling atmosphere in an effort to produce leaders who are best able to cope with the problems of democracy (37:30).

Mosston (1965) made reference to authoritarian methods of teachings, but he called this method the "command style." He contended that since by the definition and structure of this method there is little opportunity for interaction, then social and emotional development is minimal, and further claimed that the same is true for intellectual development because all decisions have been made by the teacher. Based upon observations of instructional situations where this method was employed, Mosston concluded that the method did not:

(1) consider the objectives and purpose of individuals;

(2) provide for a wider definition of discipline—inner, self-discipline;

(3) recognize each individual with his multiplicity of differences as the focus of the educational scheme;

(4) provide opportunities for small or large decisions to be made by the individual student, thus, it aborts the potentials of the emerging-self (35:7).
Todd (1952) experimented with the democratic method in physical education classes and through a sociometric analysis found improved acquaintanceship, fewer isolates, better group cohesion, and group approval and satisfaction (50:106-10).

The military service, long known for its use of highly authoritarian leadership techniques, has recently taken a look at the psychological effects of such leadership procedures. In a recent report Lacy (1965) concluded:

...that the organization of the United States Air Force is cognizant of the deleterious psychological effects created in an authoritarian environment, and consequently has assumed the official position that authoritarian leadership should be minimized (26:52).

The classic study by Lippitt and White (1960), mentioned earlier in the chapter, was designed to observe the effects of democratic and autocratic atmospheres.

Four groups were involved, each having three series of meetings under three different leaders. This design made it possible to hold constant the basic factor of child personality. It was possible to be sure that as far as personality is concerned the autocratically led and democratically led groups were strictly comparable because they were identical. Each child experienced both an autocratic and democratic form of leadership; consequently, if the children's behavior differed markedly in these two situations—as it did—the difference could not possibly be due to personality differences in the children involved (32:15).

In the democratic group all policies were a matter of group determination; alternate procedures were suggested and the group could choose whatever course it wanted to follow. In the authoritarian group, the leader determined the policy,
dictated the techniques to be used, and remained aloof from the group participation. In the authoritarian group, almost thirty times as much hostile domination occurred as in the democratic group. These demands were usually in the form of demands for attention and hostile criticism in child-to-child relationships. The democratic group displayed more cooperation, praise of the other person's work and constructive suggestions. If enough thought and effort are given to making democracy real, "...it can evolve into something more practical and effective than any autocracy that ever existed (32:310)."

II. SELF CONCEPT AND DOGMATISM

The body, as a symbol of the self, is central in the experience of athletics and this fact provides athletics with the unique opportunity for educating for the acceptance of one's self as a worthy person. Ogilvie and Tutko contend that athletics should provide intrinsic values which produce an ego integrating effect. More specifically, they have stated that "...there should be an increase in one's feeling of self worth which follows from meeting challenges head on and accepting the consequences (39:11)." Kluckhohn and Murray (1948) reported that:

It is now being increasingly recognized that almost all human actions are 'ego-evolved' and that the picture or conception that one has of himself has a great deal to do with one's behavior in a given situation (23:439).
Brownfain (1957) found in a study of sixty-two University of Michigan students that:

Students who have the most stable self concepts are, according to a number of criteria, better adjusted than students with the least stable self concepts. Students with more stable self concepts have higher self-esteem and self-acceptance, are better liked, more popular, less defensive, and more active socially than students with less stable self concepts (6:606).

Combs and Snygg (1959) described the self concept as being a kind of shorthand approach by which the individual may symbolize and reduce his own vast complexity to terms that are workable and usable. It is his generalized picture of himself, and the individual uses the self concept in perceiving and dealing with self (9:127).

Gividen (1959) sought to evaluate the effects of stress and failure on the self concepts of army paratroop trainees. These trainees were subjected not only to physical dangers but to attitude training in which failure was considered a disgrace. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was administered before and after this experience. The "Fail" group showed a significant decrease in acceptance of physical self and both groups showed less certainty in self description (15).

Fitts (1954) found that perceptions of self influence one's perception of others, that perceptions of others determine behavior toward them, and that the way children are treated influences the kind of self concept they
develop (12). Fitts hypothesized that participation in any group characterized by open, honest, nondestructive interaction should help correct distortions in the self concept. There is considerable evidence that through psychotherapy or other positive experiences, people's concepts of self do change. He suggested that an athletic team could be designed to provide the atmosphere needed for just such a change (13:12).

Selvage (1963) and Hinze (1965) conducted two separate studies noting counselor change in dogmatism as a result of participation in a counseling and guidance institute at Central Washington State College. Both noted a significant decrease in dogmatism among enrollees in the institute from early to late in the program. Selvage found a decrease of sufficient magnitude to reject the null hypothesis at a point beyond the .001 level of confidence (45:27). Hinze noted a similar change in dogmatism, but found that self-regard as measured by the abbreviated California Q-Sort for real and ideal-self did not change significantly (20:28). Both hypothesized that the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale may lack sufficient subtlety and that the enrollees in the counseling and guidance institute may have leaned in the direction which they considered their instructors to think most favorable. Hinze felt that self-regard was more stable and less likely to change in such a short period of time (20:28).
III. SUMMARY

The literature has demonstrated a need for the use of democratic leadership in most social situations. Democratic leadership has been shown to be more efficient and more effective in the development of self-direction within the individual. The literature also seems to indicate that democratic methods would be more congruent with the goals athletics purport to achieve.

If democratic leadership provides an environment which will better enable an individual to desire to strive to become the best that he can be, and the literature suggests this to be true, then this study may prove to be useful as a frame of reference for others who attempt to employ similar techniques.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This chapter presents a discussion of the instruments that were used to test the hypotheses, the procedures used to implement democratic leadership, and the methods used to analyze the data.

I. THE INSTRUMENTS USED

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The purpose of this test, according to its author (Fitts, 1965), is to provide an instrument that will measure the self concept. The test is simple for the subject, widely applicable, well standardized, and multi-dimensional in its description of the self concept (ll:1). Fitts states:

...that the knowledge of how an individual perceives himself is useful in attempting to help that individual, or in making evaluations of him. The individual's concept of himself has been demonstrated to be highly influential in much of his behavior and also to be directly related to his general personality and state of mental health (ll:1).

The Scale consists of one hundred self descriptive statements which the subject uses to portray his own picture of himself. The Scale has a variety of purposes—counseling, clinical assessment and diagnosis, research in behavioral science, personnel selection, etc. The Scale is self administering for either individuals or groups and can be
used by subjects age 12 or older having at least a sixth grade reading level. Most subjects complete the Scale in ten to twenty minutes (11:1).

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale is not applicable to everyone and many questions remain regarding the difficult task of measuring the self concept. Fitts, however, regards this Scale to be the most universally applicable measure yet devised (11:3).

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E). Rokeach (1956) originally constructed this Scale to be used to assess an individual's dogmatism. The Scale was to be employed as a research tool in countries where the word "democracy" has a positive valence. This scale is supposedly, however, an instrument that is generally devoid of content specific to any particular ideological orientation. The content is broad enough to be clearly relevant to divergent ideological orientations (42:6-9).

The initial scale contained fifty-seven items and has since been revised four times in order to raise the reliability of the scale. The fifth and final edition (Form E) is used in this study and is composed of forty items, all of which differentiate significantly between high and low dogmatism, as determined by item analysis (42:6-9).
II. DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS USED

The subjects in this study consisted of the twelve players who were members of the varsity basketball squad at Central Kitsap High School, Silverdale, Washington, during the 1966-67 season. The squad was composed of six seniors, five juniors, and one sophomore. Six of these players had played basketball for the researcher during the 1965-66 season under leadership techniques which were highly autocratic.

III. ORGANIZATION OF TEST SITUATIONS

The players were given their pre-test of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale three days after basketball practices had begun. Fourteen varsity aspirants were given the pre-tests on November 14, 1966. The players were told that the tests were part of a research study about high school athletes and that the information received would in no way be used to analyze any one individual. It was announced that the tests would not be scored until the end of the school year. Players were not asked to put their names on the answer sheets, but a system was devised to keep track of individual scores for later comparison. During the post-testing environment, which took place two days after the last game (March 6, 1967) and included the twelve final varsity members, it became obvious
to the researcher that the players realized their names were being taken. The players were immediately told that names had been secretly kept in hopes that more honest responses to the scales would be given. At that point all players added their names to the post-tests and continued with the scales. It was only at the conclusion of all the testing, however, that the players were told of the exact nature of the study.

IV. THE DEMOCRATIC ENVIRONMENT

In contrast to the autocratic leadership techniques that are typically employed by coaches, democratic processes were used in the organization and operation of the 1966-67 Central Kitsap High School varsity basketball team. The following describes how this democratic leadership was introduced and employed during the season. This leadership was used in arriving at and implementing both the major and routine decisions essential to the operation of a successful basketball program.

The characteristics of a democratic group as described by Beal, Bohlen, and Raudabaugh (1962) were followed as closely as possible. These major characteristics of a
democratic group are as follows:

(1) The goals and objectives of such a group are established by group interaction;

(2) The means adopted to achieve these are determined by the same process;

(3) The interaction process is such that each member feels both freedom to contribute and responsibility for success;

(4) Group consensus prevails, even though individuals feel free to present their point of view;

(5) Ideas are dealt with on a basis of their value to the group rather than on a basis of who introduces them;

(6) Those in position of formal leadership recognize that their major role is that of facilitating group process (2:29).

Squad selection. One of the most difficult problems facing every coach at the beginning of the season is who will become a member and who will be dropped from the squad. Basketball requires but five players in the game at one time and gymnasiums are usually quite limited as to the availability of space and teaching stations. Thus, when fifty or more boys are vying for twelve to fifteen varsity positions and a similar number of junior varsity positions, a selection process involving elimination of approximately half of the aspirants becomes essential.

This problem became one for all participants when they were asked to evaluate themselves at the end of the fourth day. A basic offense was taught all players
during the first day of practice and players were asked to mentally evaluate one another during scrimmages. Except for free shooting and warm up drills, the majority of the first week was spent observing the players in scrimmage situations. The self-evaluation chart (Appendix A) employed by the players was one used by Wooden (52:60) to aid the coach in the selection of the squad, but in this case became the sole determinant for squad selection. The players were asked to number each of the players, including themselves, in order of preference as basketball players and were asked to show no false modesty and to disregard non-athletic personality characteristics.

Subsequent self-ratings trimmed the squad to the twelve members who became varsity members and the thirteen players who became junior varsity members. These numbers were arbitrarily chosen by the researcher because of the availability of existing squad game uniforms and warm-up suits.

Since this experiment was performed only with the varsity members, the junior varsity coach continued the season from this point using the more "traditional" leadership techniques.

Goal selection. After the varsity had been selected, a team meeting was held in a convenient classroom to determine what goals the players would hope to achieve as a
result of participating as members of the team during the season. As a result of group discussion, the players established as their over-all goal that of becoming the very best basketball squad they were capable of becoming. Immediate goals, such as winning the league championship or getting to the state tournament were discussed, but as a result of group process, these goals were not felt to be as satisfying as knowing that one had done his very best.

A questionnaire (Appendix B), which had been completed by the players prior to the formulation of team goals, was discussed at the conclusion of the first meeting. This questionnaire was designed to obtain the players' recommendations about offense, defense, training rules, etc., and to elicit their opinions regarding the areas they would be vitally concerned with during the course of the basketball season.

A master plan was drawn up by the players that included all of the skills and situations that had to be discussed and practiced before the first game.

Training rules and disciplinary problems. As a result of group discussion it was decided that a long list of training rules is unnecessary. The players' conclusion was that if the ultimate goal of becoming the best player and squad possible was to be achieved, then each member must take it upon himself to see that he did everything possible
to achieve this goal. It was decided, however, that drinking and smoking definitely should not be allowed. They decided, further, that any infraction which appeared to any member to be a deterrent to the team's ultimate goal would be discussed openly by the squad and that final disciplinary action would be decided by a team vote after everyone had voiced his opinion.

**Practice sessions.** Players spend the majority of their time on the practice court. Throughout the season they were asked to list any suggestions they might have for better use of practice time. These suggestions were sometimes formally listed on paper (Appendix C) and other times were spontaneously given during the practice session. The suggestions were discussed with the players and immediately put into use if the group so desired. Holiday and vacation practice times were also determined by the squad.

**Selection of team offense.** The players were given a copy of four offenses (Appendix D) in addition to the basic offense (Passing Game) they were taught during the first week of practice. Each of the offenses was discussed and put into play on the court. After two days of analyzing the offenses, the players were asked to select an offense they felt could best be used by the squad. As the season progressed, many of the plays from the different offenses
originally introduced were added by group choice. The players added or dropped offensive plays they believed would or would not work, whenever a majority so ruled.

Selection of team defense. Many types of defenses were presented to the players and tried during practice sessions and non-league games. After much experimentation, the team chose a combination of the defenses and elected to rotate them during games according to a plan they devised before each game.

Game strategy and starting line-up. Players were asked to select by ballot the five players they believed should start each game. The players chose to use a secret ballot on this matter.

Players also determined what strategy would be used against their opponents. Various game plans were discussed before the squad chose the one they would prefer to use against a particular opponent. Sometimes the players would decide by ballot, other times by consensus.

During games, players would make suggestions during time-outs and quarter breaks. Immediate decisions were made concerning individual suggestions. It was sometimes necessary for the formal leader to exert active leadership due to the lack of time during time-outs and quarter breaks. At half-time a thorough discussion of each player's opinions would be made and the team would decide what course of action
to follow during the second half of the game. The coach would normally act as a consultant. The squad felt free to accept or reject the coach's suggestions and did so on numerous occasions.

Throughout the season the players were constantly evaluating individual and team progress toward the desired goal. Open, frank, give-and-take discussions were the rule, and player responses increased as the season progressed.

V. METHOD OF ANALYSIS

It was predetermined that all computations in this study regarding the null hypotheses stated in Chapter I must reach the five per cent level of confidence to be considered significant. An analysis of variance using the treatment X subjects design (30:156-164) and application of the F test were made to determine the significance of (1) change in player self concepts and (2) change in player dogmatism.

A player opinionnaire was taken anonymously in order to subjectively evaluate the participants' reactions to the democratic leadership techniques employed. A listing of each of the player's opinions was made concerning (1) What is your opinion of the coaching method (democratic atmosphere) that was used this season? and (2) Did participation in decision making affect you or the team in any way?
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

I. CHANGES IN SELF CONCEPTS AND DOGMATISM

This section presents data relative to the two null hypotheses presented in Chapter I concerning changes that would occur among players as a result of participation in a season of varsity basketball in which they were democratically involved in decision making.

**Hypothesis I.** Basketball players will exhibit no change in self concepts from the beginning of the season to the end.

**Hypothesis II.** Basketball players will exhibit no change in dogmatism from the beginning of the season to the end.

The degree of change in players' self concepts and dogmatism as reflected by scores received using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was measured by an analysis of variance using the treatment X subjects design and application of the F test. The comparison of team pre-test vs. post-test mean scores failed to indicate any changes that were of sufficient magnitude to reject the null hypotheses at the .05 level of confidence.
Of the nine categories of "self" tested on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Total Positive, Identity, Self-Satisfaction, Behavior, Physical Self, Moral-Ethical Self, Personal Self, Family Self, and Social Self), only one (Physical Self) approached significance at the .05 level of confidence (Table I). One category (Social Self) decreased slightly and one (Personal Self) remained the same. All of the others showed increases in a positive direction. In addition a slight decrease in self-criticism was also noted. Player dogmatism as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale showed a very slight increase.¹

### Table I

**SUMMARY TABLE OF F TEST FOR PHYSICAL SELF AS MEASURED BY THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic vs. Autocratic (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects (S)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>91.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (AS)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.05 $F_{df 1,11} = 4.84$

$F = \frac{48}{11.64} = 4.12$

¹Raw data for these variables are shown in Appendix E.
II. RESULTS OF PLAYER OPINIONNAIRE

At the conclusion of the season a two-item opinionnaire was given each of the players (Appendix F), and a one-hundred per cent response was obtained. They were asked:

1) "What is your opinion of the coaching method (democratic atmosphere) that was used this season?"

2) "In your opinion, did participation in decision making affect you or the team in any way?"

In regard to the first question, all but one of their responses included an evaluative statement of a positive nature, such as, "It was good," and the twelfth individual made no evaluative comment of either a positive or negative nature. In addition to these evaluative statements, each respondent gave a "rationale" for the evaluation. Several themes for these rationales emerged.

The reason most commonly given for the "good" evaluation was simply that the democratic method gave the participants opportunities to have a voice in the decision-making which affected them individually and as a team.

Many of the players believed that the chance to participate in decision-making stimulated thinking and increased their knowledge of the game.

Others felt that the participation in decisions vital to the team helped develop individual and team pride.
Four of the players felt that the democratic atmosphere was good, but they had some qualifications for their decisions and listed their individual suggestions or criticisms.

In regard to the second question, all but one of the players included an evaluative statement of a positive nature; the twelfth individual believed it generally helped the team, but still felt the coach should decide most issues.

The reason most gave as to what had the greatest effect on the team was the chance to have a say in what the team did. This "voice" in team decisions was reported to have increased their desire to play harder in support of their own ideas.

Others stated they believed that team morale and pride was increased as a result of participating in decisions vital to them.

The players reported that the opportunity for the entire team to participate in decisions and to decide what they believed was best for themselves brought the team greater unity and increased incentive.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine what changes in self concepts and dogmatism would occur among players participating in a season of varsity basketball in which they were democratically involved in decision making. The players were given the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale at the beginning and the end of the season. At the completion of the season the players were asked to express their individual opinions concerning the coaching methods that were employed throughout the season. A two-item opinionnaire was used to gain this information.

Throughout the season the players were actively involved in such matters as selecting the squad, team offense, team defense, and game strategy, establishing team goals and training rules, deciding how to handle disciplinary problems, planning practice session drills, and in designating the starting team for each game.

II. CONCLUSIONS

A comparison between pre-test and post-test data was made, and although there was a general increase in total
positive self concepts as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the null hypothesis could not be rejected in respect to any of the comparisons made between the pre-and post-test sub-scores of that Scale nor of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. It may have been that the Tennessee Scale was not applicable in this instance, since the author of the Scale has previously mentioned that it is not universally applicable.

It may also have been that the sixteen week period covered by this study was not long enough for measurable changes in self concepts to occur because of the tendency for one's view of himself to remain relatively stable. Other studies have shown that adjustment to a democratic leadership environment is not easily accomplished. According to Bell (1965), the change from autocracy to democracy seems to take more time than from democracy to autocracy. Autocracy is imposed upon the individual whereas democracy has to be learned by him (3:417). In order to adjust to a democratic environment, one must unlearn the response tendencies which are associated with autocratic situations. Consequently, changes in self concepts which might be attributed to difference in treatment (autocratic vs. democratic) may not become significant in the short period of time embraced by this study.

Perhaps the most important consequence of this study
was the players' reactions to the democratic atmosphere. These reactions indicated an almost unanimous acceptance of the democratic methods employed throughout the season. Most players attributed certain "benefits" (greater team pride and morale, more confidence in the system of play, increased concentration on team goals, more incentive to "do your best" in games and practice sessions) acquired by the team to the fact that they had, in fact, participated in the decision making processes. One player seemed to convey the majority attitude of the squad when he stated that "the game is for the players and this method made it more enjoyable and interesting for the players. We played better because we did what we thought was best and believed in."

III. DISCUSSION

The conditions surrounding this study differed from many research environments in that it was conducted in a natural and highly competitive setting rather than a laboratory environment. As a result, it was impossible to apply environmental and situational controls that would be present in a truly experimental study. On the other hand, because this study was conducted in a "real" environment, the results should have some practical implications.

It was observed during the season that the players expressed more interest in playing their best, rather than
merely winning the contest. After winning some contests in which they played rather poorly, for example, the players were quite critical of their performance rather than being satisfied with the simple fact of the victory. There were also instances where, after having played well but losing the game, the players expressed satisfaction in feeling their play approached the best that they were capable of playing. There were contests during the season in which the team fell far behind, but was able to come back to regain the lead. It might be hypothesized that this "never-say-die" attitude was a result of the active involvement of the players in determining what changes in strategy were made during the actual contest and of then being individually and collectively committed to making that particular strategy work.

It should be apparent that the person who uses democratic techniques must have confidence in the player's ability to make the decision that is best for him and the team. It is recognized, of course, that some players and teams will require differing amounts of direction by leaders, but it is quite probable that, traditionally, coaches have exerted too much direct control.

The team on whom this study was made achieved the co-championship of their "AA" Olympic League. From almost any coach's standpoint, such a season might be termed very
successful. The data provided by this study cannot support the unqualified assumption that this record was achieved solely because of the democratic leadership techniques employed with the team. It might be meaningful, however, to contrast the superior win-loss record of this team with that of the two preceding teams of seemingly comparable ability who were directed by the same coach using the autocratic method (Appendix G).

A more important outcome, perhaps, was the observable growth in self-direction that was evident in the players as the season progressed. This study attempted to test the use of democratic leadership techniques as the means that will be more congruent with the professed goals of athletics.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This study was limited to a small experimental group of varsity basketball players over a sixteen week period. This fact, coupled with the insight gained as a result of conducting this study, has led this researcher to make the following recommendations for further study:

(1) The small number of subjects in this study warrants retesting of the hypotheses with a greater number of subjects;

(2) It might be true that self concepts could be
significantly increased in players participating in a democratic atmosphere for more than one season. It is therefore recommended that a study of longer duration be made;

(3) A study might be made (if adequate controls can be devised) contrasting control vs. experimental groups. If comparable teams coached by democratic and autocratic methods could be studied, significant differences might be found;

(4) Conscientious coach-educators should seriously consider the implications of this study for application in their coaching situations.

The surface has only been scratched regarding the psychological ramifications of athletics, and studies should be made and reported by coaches who are seriously concerned about what is most likely to enhance the psycho-social development, as well as the physical development, of the athlete.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

1966-67 VARSITY BASKETBALL SQUAD

SQUAD SELF-EVALUATION CHART

Number each of the following juniors and seniors from 1-16 in your order of preference as basketball players. Give every player a different number, show no false modesty in rating yourself, and disregard personalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate the following juniors and seniors in your order of preference for the position(s) under which they appear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Forwards</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Centers</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Guards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1In regard to the second half of the chart, it should be noted that a player may be evaluated under more than one position.
APPENDIX B

PRE-SEASON QUESTIONNAIRE

Central Kitsap Team Member:

This questionnaire has been designed to help in the selection of team procedures for this year's squad. An outgrowth of this survey will be a system that is representative of YOUR thoughts and opinions.

Answer every part of every question. Place an (X) in the box that you feel best represents your opinion.

Think through each question thoroughly and be as accurate as possible.

--Coach Moawad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASKETBALL QUESTIONNAIRE--C.K.H.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe that this year's squad should:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. be a fast breaking ball club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. fast break only when the opportunity presents itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. use a free-lance offense based on a few general team rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. use a patterned offense (set plays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. play a tight pressure man to man def.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. play a loose sagging man to man def.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. use a full court zone press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. play a zone defense (1-2-2, 2-1-2, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. alternate defenses during the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. be included in planning game strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. handle discipline problems as a team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. It is my opinion that:

   a. making the starting five is my goal | ![Neutral Opinion] |
   b. a player should strive to become the very best he is capable of becoming | ![Strongly Agree]  |
   c. I've always "pushed" myself to the best physical condition possible | ![Agree] |
| o. | winning the game is the most important outcome or goal of athletics |
| p. | the most important thing to consider is whether or not I did my best |
| q. | the "team player" in the long run will benefit the squad more than the individualist |
| r. | training rules should be made and strictly enforced by the coach |
| s. | most players don't really "push" themselves during practice |
| t. | the entire team should decide the length of haircuts the squad will wear |
| u. | the players should decide and enforce training rules |
| v. | the coach should have to remind me to push myself during practice drills |
APPENDIX C

FORMAL PLAYER SUGGESTION FORM

TEAM MEETING:
JANUARY 18, 1967

1. What can we do to improve practice sessions, game performance, etc. Please give any and all thoughts you might have concerning these matters.

2. Please list your weaknesses and areas in which you need improvement. Critically evaluate yourself so our practice sessions can be designed to meet YOUR needs.

3. Comment on team morale. Is it good? fair? great? poor? What can be done to improve it?
APPENDIX D

OFFENSE SELECTION FORM

Each of the players received a copy of four offenses and the player qualifications necessary for each offense. This appendix will include the introduction and one of the offenses that was presented.

WHAT OFFENSE WILL C.K. USE??

YOU decide for YOURself:

The following pages include four offenses and some basic plays that could be used with each offense. There is also a place for YOU to devise a play that you would like to include in each particular formation.

 Analyze the offensive alignments and determine in your mind which offense is best suited for the material and personnel C.K. has this season. Which offense do YOU prefer?

Offense No. 1: THE TANDEM POST OFFENSE (1-3-1)

The guard is the playmaker and is almost solely responsible for setting up plays. He should be fast, have a good outside shot, be a good ball handler and driver, and his leadership ability should be superb for he must direct the attack.

The forwards should possess a combination of guard-forward abilities. They should be able to shoot from the sides and corners, but since some plays will send them to the guard position, they should be able to drive the baseline or the key from their position.
The pivotment should be the better rebounders and better pivot scorers. The baseline man should be a good low-pivot scorer. The high-post player should be a good shooter from the free throw area, a good driver, a good screener, and a strong rebounder.

This basic set is often used against zones and requires fast ball handling. The forwards must get to the boards quickly whenever a shot is attempted.

**TANDEM POST OFFENSE**

1 passes to 3 and cuts off 4. If 1 does not receive pass he continues low and screens for 5.

1 passes to 3. 3 passes to 4 and cuts over 4. 1 cuts off 4 for handoff or 4 drives.

1 passes to 3. 3 passes to 5. 3 and 4 split off 5 (3 first).
APPENDIX E

RAW DATA OBTAINED ON THE TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE
AND THE ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE

CODE

A - Physical Self
B - Moral-Ethical Self
C - Personal Self
D - Family Self
E - Social Self

1 - Identity
2 - Self Satisfaction
3 - Behavior
P - Overall Self Esteem
SC - Self Criticism
RD - Rokeach Dogmatism Scores

A

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

787 821 736 754 748 749 816 835 813 797

M_1 65.6 68.4 61.3 62.8 62.3 62.3 68.0 69.6 67.8 67.3

M_2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
M_1 \quad 122.6 \quad 124.5 \quad 97.0 \quad 99.4 \quad 105.7 \quad 105.8 \quad 325.3 \quad 329.8
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
M_1 \quad 39.9 \quad 38.2 \quad 166.9 \quad 167.1
\]
APPENDIX F

PLAYER OPINIONNAIRE

At the conclusion of the season an opinionnaire was given each of the players. Their individual responses to each question are listed here.

(1) What is your opinion of the coaching method (democratic atmosphere) that was used this season?

(a) It was really good and it gave us something to think about. Knowing that we could run whatever we wanted I believed really helped the team.

(b) The atmosphere this year was much better than any team that I've ever played on. It gave us a chance to participate in decisions which we never would have considered before.

(c) It was very much better than other methods I've ever seen. There was a lot of pride generated on the team and we all played hard for the entire season.

(d) I think it was good because it enabled all the players to feel more secure even if they didn't get to play often because they got a word in on what to do and how to do it.

(e) It was good because it gave us a chance to say what we felt.

(f) It stimulated team and individual thinking toward basketball and demanded concentration on each member part.

(g) It was very good. This method gave everyone his voice on what went on.

(h) It is great to a certain point, but the coach should have the upper hand on agreeing on certain matters.

(i) I like it because I don't like being told what to do all the time.
(j) I thought that letting players make decisions was good, but it's hard for the players in the game to see what should be done, then the coach should make the decision.

(k) It was good on some things (planning practices, drills we like and dislike), but in others it didn't seem as good (conditioning, game adjustments).

(l) I think it was pretty good and the players this year used the method well. We learned quite a lot from thinking of the things we wanted to do throughout the season, but I think the coach should do most of the coaching.

(2) Did participation in decision making affect you or the team in any way?

(a) Yes, I think it really helped us, because it makes you think for a while and then go out and try to do it your way. It seemed to make everybody work harder, too.

(b) It made us feel like a team. Team morale and effort was helped quite a bit. I think that it is the winning method.

(c) Yes, I thought we played harder than usual to support our own decisions. We had more pride in ourselves and the way we played as a team.

(d) I thought we tried hard because it was our plan.

(e) Yes, because we didn't have to play anything in which we had no confidence.

(f) Yes, we got first place this year, it couldn't have been all that bad.

(g) Yes, it gave us more incentive because we were doing what we thought was best.

(h) It made everyone feel he is a part of the team and not just a sub who gets to play every now and then. It brought the team closer together.

(i) Yes, by having a say in what the team did, it made us more of a "team."
(j) The game is for the players and this method made it more enjoyable and interesting for the players. We played better because we did what we thought was best and believed in.

(k) I believe it generally helped the team, but the coach should decide most things unless the team feels strongly about certain points.

(l) This experience helped us to understand the real problems and things that have to be thought out in planning a basketball program.
APPENDIX G

A THREE YEAR COMPARISON AGAINST LEAGUE OPPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Central Kitsap</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Won</th>
<th>Lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-Champions of the Olympic "AA" League