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ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DEGREE OF AUTHORITARIANISM OF FEMALE TENNIS COACHES AND CHANGES IN SELF-ACTUALIZATION OF FEMALE INTERCOLLEGIATE TENNIS PLAYERS

by

Susan Joan Hyde

Master of Arts in Physical Education

January, 1973

This study was undertaken to determine if the degree of dogmatism or authoritarianism of a coach was related to the change in self-actualization of her female intercollegiate players. The coaches and varsity players of the five universities in Conference I of the Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Tennis League served as subjects.

All subjects were administered the Personal Orientation Inventory early in the tennis season. At the end of the season the Personal Orientation Inventory was again administered to the players and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was administered to the coaches. The players' Personal Orientation Inventory scores were grouped on the basis of their coach's score on the Rokeach Dogmatism
Scale. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine the relationship between the degree of dogmatism of a coach and the change toward self-actualization of her players.

There was a small, but statistically significant, difference between the degree of authoritarianism of the five coaches. The analysis of the data indicated that the mean change toward self-actualization tended to be greater for the players of a less dogmatic coach. Other significant findings indicated that there was a high correlation between the degree of dogmatism and the level of self-actualization of the coaches.

Based on the findings and within the limitations of this research, the following conclusion was drawn: the female intercollegiate tennis players of the less authoritarian coaches tended to have a greater change toward self-actualization. Although the relationship was statistically significant, this relationship must be considered only as a possible tendency at this time due to the small differences in the scores, the small number of subjects, and the lack of additional research in this area. Furthermore, because this study examined only one segment of the entire coach-player relationship, it was felt that additional research in this area is needed before any far-reaching conclusions can be made.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Much has been written about the techniques of coaching, both in general, and in dealing with specific sports. There are also numerous books and articles dealing with psychology, some of which specialize in the psychology of coaching. Many of these books deal with psychological "tricks" or "gimmicks" that coaches can use to help produce a winning team. There is, however, relatively little literature that deals with the approaches to coaching which utilize the relatively new "growth theories" (7) of psychology.

The growth theories, based primarily on the works of Maslow, May, Rogers, and others, propose that individuals have a hierarchy of needs. As the needs at one level are met the individual has a need or desire to satisfy new or higher needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs proceeds from the most basic needs of survival and safety, through love and self-esteem, on to self-actualization. Many authorities in education and psychology agree that sports may be one avenue of developing self-esteem and therefore
of helping students to grow and develop as complete individuals (4,11,57,76). Several studies have suggested that physical education situations, if they are not too rigidly structured, and if each person is recognized as an individual, present excellent opportunities for guiding students to make their own decisions, to grow toward self-direction and maturity, and to make initial inroads toward becoming self-actualized (5,88,91,95,98). Other studies suggested that democratic methods of teaching physical education (99), pupil-teacher planning in physical education (107), and various methods of individualized instruction (51,97,104) helped give students a more realistic view of themselves.

Many coaches (5,42,47,58,95,116) admit that the players have certain needs, such as physical health and a need for personal recognition, which must be met before a person will be able to develop into a champion athlete. In collegiate athletics there appears to be two philosophies of coaching which, while they are quite different, do overlap to some extent. In one philosophy the emphasis is on how to get the students or team to win. In this case, the coaches do what they must, whether it be piped-in music or running penalty laps, to enable the player to have his or her basic needs met so he or she will be able to devote his or
her energies to the team. The second philosophy is also based on helping the players to fulfill some of the basic needs. However, in this school of thought, the coach is more concerned with counseling his or her players and with helping the player more as an individual (91). In this philosophy there is less emphasis on winning. Although, as mentioned above, these two philosophies are often combined to varying degrees, this study was primarily concerned with the second type of philosophy.

Some coaches seem to be moving toward a more humanitarian philosophy of coaching (56,58). This appears to be especially true in women's sports. However, these coaches are often the exception rather than the rule, and it appears that many coaches are not concerned with or do not know how to develop an approach to coaching that will lend itself to producing more self-actualized individuals and winning teams. Although the literature is inconclusive, some of the literature suggests that in order to implement a more humanitarian philosophy, coaches will have to adopt a less authoritarian approach to coaching. They will have to remove themselves from being the central figure in practice and should help the players to understand the principles involved in choosing a course of action (5).

Perhaps, if these guidelines were to be followed, schools
could produce more self-actualized individuals as well as successful teams.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

This study was concerned with determining if the degree of dogmatism or authoritarianism of a coach would be related to the level of self-actualization of female intercollegiate tennis players.

Hypothesis

There will be no significant relationship between a coach's degree of authoritarianism and the change in self-actualization of her female intercollegiate tennis players.

Sub-problems

The following sub-problems were investigated:

1. Is there a significant relationship between a coach's level of self-actualization and her degree of authoritarianism;

2. Does the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale give an indication of an individual's degree of dogmatism in a specific situation as a coach;
3. Does the Personality Rating Scale give an indication of how the players and coach see the coach in relation to the two major scales of the POI;

4. Based on the Personality Rate Scale, do a player's self-rating of her degree of authoritarianism and the coach's rating of the players' degree of authoritarianism tend to coincide;

5. Does the Personality Rating Scale give an indication of how the coach and each player see that player in relation to the two major scales of the POI?

Assumptions

The study was based on the following assumptions:

1. The coach does in some way affect the personality and growth of her players;

2. Fifteen to nineteen weeks was sufficient time for observable changes in personality;

3. Scores from general personality and dogmatism tests could be applied in specific situations;

4. Since all the schools were in Conference I of the Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Tennis League, the groups were relatively homogeneous in terms of past experiences and success in tennis.
Delimitations

The study was only concerned with the following variables:

1. the varsity female intercollegiate tennis players and coaches of the five universities in Conference I of the Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Tennis League for the 1971-1972 season;

2. "dogmatism" or "authoritarianism" as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale;

3. "self-actualization" as measured by Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory.

Limitations

The following were limitations of the study:

1. self-actualization is an abstract concept that is measured by an objective "paper and pencil" test;

2. the Rokeach test measures many aspects of a general authoritarian personality but it was used to assess dogmatic behavior in a specific area--that of coaching tennis;

3. lack of controls in the following areas:
   a. amount of exposure a player had to her coach in the past;
   b. exposure of players to outside coaches
during the school year;

c. amount of contact per week between a coach and her players;

d. exact length of time of the tennis season for each school;

e. outside influences on the students that might affect their change in self-actualization, such as (1) other teachers; (2) relationships with parents; (3) other clubs and organizations; and (4) changes in personal life.

Importance of the Study

Within the last decade there has been a movement in psychology, on the college campuses, and in society as a whole toward more concern for each person as an individual. College and public schools reflect this change through the use of more individualized instruction and independent study experiences. Psychology now has a well developed "third force"—that of humanistic psychology—which reflects this change. Words and phrases such as "human potential" and "personal fulfillment" have become commonplace in today's vocabulary. It appears that coaching and athletic competition in the public schools and universities
are also moving to the point where concern for the individual player is almost as important as having a winning season. This attitude is probably even more prevalent in women's sports. Authors such as Lawther (3), Ogilvie (12), Richards (28), and Tutko (12,28) have done much toward opening up the possibilities of using psychological avenues as well as physical principles to improve performance. At the same time, some physical educators have begun doing research in the relatively new field of Sport Psychology (35,71,87,96). However, much of the research deals with identifying personality characteristics either of athletes and non-athletes, or of coaches. There is relatively little literature in sport psychology that deals with the relationship between the coach and the players.

If one were to review the literature in psychology and psychotherapy it would be noticed that the role of the counselor is seldom ignored. The client is seldom studied by himself. Rather, a counseling technique or environment, involving both client and counselor, is studied. With this in mind, it was felt that in the field of sports psychology both the coach and the player should be studied. To merely describe one without the other appeared to be somewhat incomplete. This study was conducted to contribute to the knowledge in sport psychology.
If physical educators, and specifically those involved with women's athletics, are concerned with helping their players grow and move toward actualization, as it appears some are (5, 32, 88, 91, 95, 99, 117), then possibly something can be learned from what has developed in psychology and psychotherapy. Client-centered counseling situations have been fairly successful in helping individuals to become more self-actualized (11, 15, 16, 36, 117). A client-centered situation is one in which the client (student) is extremely involved in his education (self-development). For this to take place the counselor does not tell the client what is best for him, but rather the counselor and the client would work together toward the growth of the client. This approach appears to let the client, or student, come to a realistic understanding of where he is and of where he has the potential to go. It was felt that a similar approach could be applied in coaching. Possibly in a situation where there was a less authoritarian or non-authoritarian coach who worked more "with" the players, benefits similar to those found in client-centered counseling could be derived.

Definition of Terms

**Authoritarian Coach**--A coach who, on the basis of
the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, appeared to be more dogmatic or autocratic. This person would tend to be less open-minded than a non-authoritarian coach. (Synonyms: autocratic coach; dogmatic coach) (30).

**Autocratic Coach**—(see Authoritarian Coach) (30:100).

**Coach**—A professional worker in Physical Education who is responsible for instructing and aiding students in the techniques of a specific sport and who is responsible for preparing the students for competition in that sport against other schools and universities (94).

**Dogmatic Coach**—(see Authoritarian Coach) (30:431).

**Physical Educator**—A professional worker in Physical Education (94).

**Self-Actualization**—"The degree to which man approaches his feelings, communicates his needs and preferences, admits to desires and misbehaviors, enjoys a worthy foe, offers real help when needed, and is among other things honestly and constructively aggressive (19:5)."

For the purpose of this study, self-actualization is operationally defined as a subject's score on the Personal Orientation Inventory, with primary emphasis on his scores on the two major scales of the test. The two scales, "time competence" and "inner directed", are defined as
follows:

**Time Competence (Tc)**--A high score means that a subject tends to live more fully in the here-and-now. He is able to tie the past and future to the present in a meaningful continuity. He appears to be less burdened by guilts, regrets, and resentments from the past than is the non-self-actualized person. His aspirations are tied meaningfully to present working goals (20:15).

**Inner Directed (I)**--A high score means that a subject tends to be independent and self-supportive. He is free; but his freedom is not gained by being a rebel or pushing against others and fighting them. He is guided by internal motivations rather than external influences. He is guided by a small number of principles which become generalized as an inner core of principles and character traits (20:17).

**Varsity Intercollegiate Tennis Class**--The students who registered for the class that would enable them to compete against tennis players from the other universities in Conference I of the Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Tennis League on a scheduled basis. Conference I represents the highest level of competition in the league.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature dealing with the relationship between the degree of authoritarianism of a coach and the level of self-actualization of her players was divided into five areas: First, literature related to Physical Education and guidance; second, literature and studies related to female intercollegiate athletes; third, literature relative to the psychology of coaching; fourth, literature in Physical Education and other fields related to humanistic and behavioristic psychologies and to self-actualization measuring instruments; and fifth, research and articles related to dogmatism and authoritarianism and to the instruments that measure these characteristics.

Physical Education and Guidance

For many years physical educators have suggested that the physical education and coaching settings provide good opportunities for teaching such social characteristics as good sportsmanship and strong moral character. There is only limited research to either refute or substantiate this
suggestion. Snyder (73), in an article in *Quest*, discussed some aspects of socialization in sports and physical education. He has proposed that the diffusion of social characteristics in physical education and sport settings is dependent on the following variables: (1) the degree of involvement in the activity by the participant; (2) whether the selection and/or participation in an activity is voluntary or involuntary; (3) the degree of "attachment" the participant feels with the teacher or coach; (4) the prestige and power of the teacher or coach; and (5) personal and social characteristics of both the student and the teacher or coach. Several other authors noted the theoretical relevance of studying the coach's potential influence on his players (27,48). Snyder (74), in a later article reported the results of a study that used male athletes and coaches from two-hundred seventy Ohio high schools. The results of this study indicated that for forty-two percent of the athletes the coach had had "some influence" on them and for an additional forty-seven percent the coach had been a "great influence" to them. The coaches seemed to have the greatest influence in terms of educational and occupational plans. In the late 1950's and early sixties there were several studies by students working on graduate degrees in Physical Education dealing
with the feasibility and effectiveness of physical educators and coaches serving in an ex officio counseling position. All the studies agreed that physical education situations, if they are not too structured, and if they recognize the individual as an individual, present excellent opportunities for guiding students to make their own decisions, to grow toward self-direction and maturity, and to make initial inroads toward becoming self-actualized (88,90,91,95).

There have been several other graduate studies in Physical Education that examined various teaching methods. Kilday, in a study for his master's thesis, experimented with the use of democratic methods in teaching physical education (99). Robinson, in an earlier study, compared a teacher-directed method of teaching and a pupil-teacher planned method. For his doctoral dissertation, Dougherty (90) compared the effects of command, task, and individualized program styles of teaching. Issacs (97), another graduate student, experimented with individualized instruction and group instruction. These studies have suggested that democratic methods of teaching physical education, pupil-teacher planning in physical education, and methods of individualized instruction allowed more time for individual counseling and helped give students a more
realistic view of themselves in the physical education situation.

**Literature Related to Female Intercollegiate Athletes**

The literature dealing with female intercollegiate athletes is quite limited. Much of the current literature is theoretical in nature. The articles range from how to get better newspaper coverage for women in sports (31) to attitudes towards competition for women (44,105) to the lack of athletics for girls and women (55). Scott and Ulrich (67) and Atwood (33) have published articles in the *Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation* on the philosophy and standards of girls and women's sports and the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation has published a booklet on the philosophy and standards of girls and women's sports (14). In one issue of the *Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation* Spasoff (75) discussed the need for more women coaches and in another issue Neal (59) discussed some psychological aspects of coaching women in sports. Among these authors there appeared to be general agreement that athletics for women should be geared toward enriching and developing the complete individual, rather than toward
developing merely the skills needed in a specific sport. However, no studies could be found that substantiated or refuted that, in fact, this philosophy had been put into practice.

Most of the literature that dealt with systematic research studies of female intercollegiate athletes were concerned with personality variables of the competitors. The findings of the studies were inconclusive and often contradictory. Findings by Schreckengast (111), Malumphy (54), and Peterson (63) suggested that women who compete in individual sports have different personality traits from women who compete in team sports, while findings by Renneckar (106) suggested that there are no differences. Studies by Peterson (63) and Williams, et al. (92) suggested that individual sport participants are more self-sufficient and introverted than team sport participants, while a study by Malumphy (54) suggested that individual sport participants are more extroverted than team sport participants. Schreckengast (111) and Dayries and Grimm (39) included female intercollegiate tennis players in their studies, but no specific personality traits of tennis players were established. The only study that dealt specifically with female intercollegiate tennis players was a study by Dobie (39). This study was concerned with
various conditioning programs for the tennis players and did not examine any of the psychological or sociological aspects. No studies dealing with coaches of female intercollegiate tennis players could be found.

**Psychology of Coaching**

Most of the literature that deals with the psychology of coaching is concerned with men's athletics. Although there appears to be a philosophical difference in men's athletics and women's athletics (14,114) it was felt that a general review of the literature in the psychology of coaching would be beneficial to the reader. Much of the literature in men's athletics (42,47,66,80) and some of the literature in women's athletics (59) deals with ways to get players "psyched-up" to win. Some of the same literature discusses various approaches to coaching. Although there was seldom a clear-cut division between autocratic approaches to coaching and democratic approaches to coaching, much of the literature could be divided into strongly favoring one approach over the other. Authors such as Moore (9) seemed to prefer a more authoritarian approach to coaching. Authors such as Frost (1), Ogilvie (12), Tutko (12,28), Richards (28), and Singer (22), who acknowledge the value of an authoritarian approach, also
acknowledge the value of using various approaches to be able to work effectively with different types of players. However, there appeared to be general agreement that the players should respect the authority of the coach (1, 9, 12, 22, 29). Ogilvie and Tutko (12:27) suggested that one of the most significant personality traits necessary for an athlete to be "coachable" is his capacity to respect a person in authority. Moore (9:151) intimated that a successful sport season must be conducted similarly to a military campaign with "orders emanating from the top."

Singer (23:316) has suggested that "If the athlete...does not respect the coach...or agree with what is being taught, these negative attitudes will suppress learning effectiveness."

Several authors discussed some of the advantages of an authoritarian coach. Tutko and Richards (28:22-24) suggested that an authoritarian coach will usually have a well-disciplined club and a club that is confident and eager for competition. Frost (1:223) said that the "unpleasant aspects of athletic participation [related to strict obedience to the authority of the coach] lead to self-discipline which is necessary to accomplish great things." Moore further suggested that the athletes often appreciate some forms of constraint (9:151).
Tutko and Richards (28:22-24) also discussed the disadvantages of an authoritarian coach. They suggested that under an authoritarian coach a team would be prone to dissension when things go badly. Furthermore, they pointed out that this type of coach is often feared and disliked and the players might try to get even with the coach by losing. They said that a third disadvantage is that a sensitive athlete will usually drop out of this type of team. Tutko and Richards (28:141) discussed the coaching philosophy that allows each player to discipline himself. They acknowledged that self-discipline requires a great sense of self-direction, which they feel is a lot to ask of non-professional athletes.

Not all of the coaches and writers subscribe to the values of authoritarian approaches to coaching. According to Tony Ward, in an article in The London Times Educational Supplement, the coaching philosophy based on training hard so one will win is a self-perpetuating and self-centered philosophy (81). Other coaches, while still primarily concerned with winning, use a more humanistic approach to achieve their goals. They make an effort to meet the needs of their players, such as the need for physical well-being, for security and affection. This type of coach may either help a player to meet these needs and work out problems, or
he may help the player to suppress these needs and problems. (41, 42, 47, 72). If the coach helps the player meet these needs and work out the problems, rather than to suppress them, he may be helping the player to make the initial inroads towards becoming more self-actualized. Moore, who appears to prefer the authoritarian approach to coaching, has suggested that eventually the coach's efforts should be directed toward helping the player to make self-appraisals, set his own goals, and criticize his own techniques (9:185).

While some of the authors previously discussed have emphasized the values of being successful, Ogilvie (60) has suggested that success, alone, may not insure that a player becomes more self-actualized. A successful player who has not been allowed to think independently or to develop from within may be plagued by a "success phobia." The success phobia is described as an emotional reaction that actually inhibits or interferes with top performance and may prevent an individual or team from such things as winning a conference championship or setting a new record. Ogilvie stated that as an athlete becomes successful, but does not feel worthy of his success, or cannot handle the pressures brought on by success, he may become unable to continue to perform at a level of which he is capable.
Some literature suggests that possibly self-developing approaches to coaching might help protect some athletes from the success phobia (5, 89, 95, 117). There are various ways of helping a student to grow and develop his potential as an individual. Prato (103) suggested that a coach should simply treat a player as he, as a coach, would expect to be treated. Mackenzie (5) felt that while it would be difficult for a formerly autocratic coach to change and to get out of the way of a player's development, it can and should be done. He further suggested that in the new role the coach must guide the students toward independent learning and self-direction. The coach must become less self-centered and possibly accept more losses, at least in the early stages of the new approach. H. M. Dandes (37), in an article in the Journal of Teacher Education, suggested that the personality or psychological make-up of an individual could determine what type of teacher or coach the person is. He stated that a large factor in becoming an effective teacher or coach is the degree to which the coach is psychologically healthy, or self-actualized. Ogilvie and Tutko (12) pointed out that to be psychologically healthy, a coach must examine his own prejudices. If a coach fails to do this, his prejudice and attitudes will probably still manifest themselves in
spite of the best intentions of the coach. The coach should work toward being able to dislike a particular trait but not disliking the whole person. Tutko and Richards (28), in their book Psychology of Coaching, concur that a coach must know his own personality. They explained that just as individual differences exist among the members of a team, a variety of personality types can be identified in the coaching profession. They suggested that the personality and psychological makeup of a team often helps determine what type of coach a person is.

**Literature Related to Humanistic and Behavioristic Psychologies**

The field of psychology is commonly divided into three basic branches: behaviorist psychology, Freudian psychology, and humanistic psychology. There has been much research and literature related to behavioristic psychology and how to apply this psychology in the teaching profession. Freudian psychology deals primarily with the subconscious. There is little literature that specifically relates Freudian psychology or Freudian analysis with approaches to teaching. It is recognized, however, that Freudian psychology may be used to gain an understanding of why a teacher or coach behaves in a particular way.
While there have been relatively few studies that relate the third branch of psychology, humanistic psychology, with teaching as such, the literature does indicate that it would be possible to apply some of the basic concepts of humanistic psychology to teaching or coaching. Because the behavioristic and humanistic branches have more practical application in the teaching profession, they are discussed in the review of the literature. Furthermore, more attention was given to the literature in the third force psychology because this study was primarily concerned with exploring the possible values of humanistic psychology in the area of teaching and coaching.

Literature Related to Self-Actualization

In the past decade much has been written about growth theories, client-centered therapy, and self-actualization. Abraham Maslow, who is responsible for developing the self-actualization theory, studied and revised his original definition of self-actualization. All too often, people not familiar with the works of Maslow and other growth theory psychologists, associate the term "self-actualization" with "self" or "selfish." For this reason Maslow considered using the term "full-humanness" to depict the qualities of altruism, dedication, self-
transcendence, sociability, and so forth which he felt should be associated with self-actualization (7).

While Maslow (7), Rogers (16), Shostrom (19), May (8), Burke (89), and others have discussed the theoretical basis of self-actualization, the literature dealing with systematic research studies of self-actualization is quite limited. There appeared to be general agreement among growth theory psychologists that psychotherapy and sensitivity training are two avenues of helping a person to develop his potential as an individual or to move toward self-actualization. Client-centered therapy, with the therapist accepting the client as he is and letting the client give leads as to the direction of change, appeared to be quite successful in helping people become more self-actualized (15). Also, according to recent studies, sensitivity training, T-groups, or encounter groups appeared to bring about increased self-actualization as measured by pre- and post- POI scores (36,117). Culbert's (36) study of self-actualization and sensitivity training indicated that the experience of sensitivity training, the experience of becoming more inner directed, is the major factor facilitating a change in increased self-actualization.
Caldwell (34) and Mackenzie (5) have published articles that discuss a possible relationship between self-actualization and Physical Education. Caldwell published an article in the *Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation* that discussed how movement and Physical Education instructors could help facilitate growth toward self-actualization. He suggested:

> Movement experiences appear to be one of the truly potent humanizing forces that can function to facilitate the development of self-identity, self-acceptance, self-direction, self-esteem, and self-actualization. Movement can serve as a facilitating and actualizing medium for the experiencing of those rare and elusive moments of the most intense, overpowering human feelings of joy, supreme well-being, ecstasy, that which Maslow identifies as the 'peak experience' (34:30).

Caldwell further stated that in order to help students move toward self-direction and self-fulfillment, the teachers themselves must be willing to risk and grow. The teacher must be genuine and authentic. He must express himself openly and freely and must be less judgmental of others. He must be receptive and open to the unknown and he must encourage independent thought and action. Lorch and Deutch (53) published an article in *The Physical Educator* that dealt with the relation of sport activities and "peak experiences." They suggested that "free will and individual effort in games, dance, and sport can lead one
to peak experiences not alluded to at other times in living (53:154)." As an example, they stated that a modern dancer might "become an instrument of the drum beat and move as a reflex organism in relation to the beat just as the freestyler knifes through the water with rhythmic stroke sequence (53:153)." Marlin Mackenzie, in the book Toward a New Curriculum in Physical Education, explained what he felt needed to be done in physical education and men's athletics to help facilitate a positive change toward self-actualization. Mackenzie suggested that sport should be a potent educational experience in which the student can develop his ability to learn and think independently. The student can become self-directed to the point of developing his own practice regimens, developing strategies, and evaluating his own performance. Mackenzie further suggested that the real task of the coach, if he is to actually help each student develop his potential, is to help players understand the principles involved in choosing a feasible course of action and then allowing the student the freedom to act. As the player gets used to being free to use his own knowledge and reactions, and as the coach gets used to being free from being the chief disciplinarian, scheduler, and strategist, Mackenzie feels that both the player and coach will develop their own
potential and become more self-actualized (5:109-119).

Several articles concerned with women in sports have alluded to the value of a sport program which should result in greater self-awareness and in the realization of one's potential, at least in the realm of sport participation. Neal, in discussing the psychological aspects of coaching women in sports, suggested that Physical Education and research have spent too little time with the mental side of an individual and too little time cultivating the total person. She stated, "Self-actualization is the need educators must recognize (59:75)." Spasoff (75), in his article about training women coaches, stated that the coach should be committed to the belief that the total athlete, both her personality development and her athletic ability, is the primary concern. A publication by the Division of Girls and Women's Sports suggested that part of the value of competition is that it should be viewed as "a self-testing situation, through which the individual can assess her ability in relation to her mental image of her potential (14:5)."

Literature Related to Behavioristic Psychologies

Behaviorism is based on a belief that the behavior, rather than the subconscious of the individual is what is
important (6:97). Men such as Pavlo (13:83), Watson (29:95), Hull (2:107), and Skinner (6:24,25,113) have developed the behavioristic branch of psychology. Skinner, one of the most significant of the behaviorists, bases his works on the principles of stimulus-response-reinforcement (70). Matson pointed out that Skinner suggested that the only difference between man and animal lies in the greater complexities of "verbal behavior." This concept may actually be understood as a denial of the concept of freedom (6:113). In one of Skinner's most recent works, he discussed the literature of freedom. He suggested that the literature of freedom is primarily concerned with how controlling powers may be weakened or destroyed (24:30). In other words, the actions of those who write about the concepts of freedom are determined by other sources—the controlling powers which they wish to weaken. Skinner recommended strict application of reinforcement techniques for the control of behavior in the classroom (6:329). The reinforcement techniques are applied in programmed instruction where the learner gradually progresses towards difficult ends. He further suggested that guidance, whether it be in the form of therapy or in the form of advice from a coach, is effective only to the extent that control is exerted (24:84).
The behavioristic approach may appear to be antithetical to the humanistic approach. However, Muska Mosston seems to have combined the two psychologies to some extent (10). In the forward of Mosston's book, B. J. Cratty made the following statement: "The older learning principle of gradual progression toward difficult ends—and of reinforcement—are wedded to the newer concepts emphasizing self-discovery and creativity (10:x)." Mosston has suggested that students should be required to learn to execute movement tasks on their own and that increased motivation will result from their individual involvement and self-direction (10:32,136). The main premise of Mosston's "guided discovery" approach appears to be based on the stimulus-response-reinforcement principle of Skinner (10:148-149). Mosston stated that "It is important for the teacher or coach to identify the aspects of the sports which are best teachable through problem solving, because the more the individual members of the team are keen and able in seeing situations and relationships, the better will be the team (10:226-227)."

The Outward Bound program appears to have similarly wedded the older learning principle of gradual progression toward a difficult task to the newer concepts emphasizing self-discovery and creativity (61). The Outward Bound
program is described as "a structured deliberate learning process which uses challenges found in a natural setting as its teaching medium (61:37)." An example of how the Outward Bound program combines the structured learning process with the concept of self-discovery can be seen in the goal of one group of Outward Bound participants. The goal of this group was "to provide experiences which would help the student to discover his own worth (self-realization) (46:41)."

Research Related to Physical Education and Self-Actualization

The research dealing with self-actualization and developing a sense of self-worth in physical education settings was inconclusive and contradictory. Although no research was found that dealt specifically with self-actualization and intercollegiate athletics, Rohaly (108) conducted a study to determine the relationship of self-actualization to movement participation and movement satisfaction in college freshman women. The results of her study indicated that there was no relationship between the level of self-actualization and the frequency of movement participation, but there appeared to be a tendency for high movement satisfaction to be positively related to high self-actualization. On the other hand, a study by
Vanderwilt and Klocke (79) suggested that participation in a very structured Outward Bound program may help female college students to move or grow toward self-actualization. There have been several doctoral dissertations related to physical education and self-concept. These studies were conducted primarily to determine if improved physical skills would result in improved self-concept. Lay (101) and Stone (113) suggested that improved physical performance can result in improved self-concept. Two other studies concluded that improved physical performance has no effect on self-concept (85,112). Sheppard (112) suggested that improved physical performance does not result in improved self-concept, but it does have a positive effect on self-description. Alexander (85) suggested that while self-concept may be improved at the end of positive physical activity experiences, the self-concept declines after a student is no longer involved in that experience. Rushall (110) conducted a study to determine the relationship between personality and physical performance. He made no attempt to measure change or growth. He simply tried to assess the relationship between personality and such factors as the level of performance, the success of performance, and whether the individual was a champion or non-champion. He concluded that personality and physical
performance classification do not appear to be related. LaBack (100) conducted a similar study to determine the relationship between self-actualization and such factors as age, sex, marital status, religion, extracurricular involvement, year in college, and so forth. She suggested, among other things, that there is no relationship between extracurricular involvement and Time-competence or Inner-direction. However, extracurricular involvement did appear to be related to several of the subscales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

Measures of Self-Actualization

There are several means that can be used for measuring one's degree of self-actualization. Maslow (7), in some of his original work, used in-depth interviews to find self-actualized individuals. Shostrom (20), in the process of developing his test of self-actualization, used judgments by clinical psychiatrists to determine the level of self-actualization of individuals. Grossack, et al. (43) used other personality measures, such as the MMPI, to find traits common to clinically judged self-actualized individuals. However, leading researchers in the behavioral sciences agree that Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) is one of the most reliable and useful
instruments for measuring degrees of self-actualization (20, 36, 40, 42, 117).

The POI has been used to measure change in self-actualization in studies that lasted from one week to thirteen or more weeks. A study by Elbert (72) involved twenty-four college students who participated in sensitivity training sessions three times a week for two weeks. At the end of the two weeks there were significant changes on the Inner-directed scale of the POI. Results from another study involving college students and sensitivity training over a thirteen week period also indicated there was a significant increase on the Inner-directed scale and an increase of the general level of self-actualization of the participants (36). Aubry (86) conducted a study involving a one-week workshop for developing self-actualization and effective interpersonal behavior. His study indicated that at the end of a three-month follow-up period participants still showed positive changes in inner-direction. This was the only lasting change from the workshop. The results of these studies seem to suggest that the Inner-directed scale may be one of the most significant scales for determining an individual's change in self-actualization.
Literature Related to Dogmatism

Most of the relevant literature about dogmatism and authoritarianism is related to testing instruments and therefore will be discussed in Chapter III. However, it was felt that a brief review of the literature about dogmatism and authoritarianism, and about dogmatism in teachers would be beneficial to the reader.

In 1950 the California F Scale was published and was used first as a measure of "Facist authoritarianism" and later as a measure of "general authoritarianism" (17:12-13). Rokeach felt that the F Scale measured right authoritarianism rather than general authoritarianism (17:14) so he constructed the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale to measure the extent to which belief systems are open or closed (17:19). Rokeach and others also conducted studies to examine whether the Dogmatism Scale measured general authoritarianism rather than right authoritarianism. Rokeach and Fruchter (65) gave two hundred and seven college students a battery of tests on dogmatism and related concepts. By using a factorial analysis of the tests results, it was determined that the Dogmatism Scale measured something more similar to authoritarianism than to rigidity or ethnocentrism. Studies by Plant, et al. (64)
and Zagona and Zurcher (84) further indicated that the Rokeach Scale is a reasonably good measure of general authoritarianism. Thompson and Michel (77) used almost four hundred college students to compare the F Scale and the Dogmatism Scale. Their study indicated that the Dogmatism Scale is similar to the F Scale but the Dogmatism Scale gives a measure of broader authoritarianism.

Two studies were found in which doctoral candidates examined some possible relationships of dogmatism or authoritarianism in teaching. Melograno (102) used the F Scale and a modification of Flanders System of Interaction Analysis to determine the relationship between ten male Physical Education teachers and one hundred and fifty-nine junior high school boys. His study indicated that there is no relationship between the degree of authoritarianism of the teacher and either cognitive or effective achievement of the students. Patrow (103), using baseball and track coaches in the Big River Conference, suggested that there is a negative relationship between dogmatism and successful coaching. The coaches with a greater degree of dogmatism were the less successful coaches.

Summary

Studies dealing with guidance through physical
education programs, female intercollegiate athletes, current coaching psychologies, humanistic and behavioristic psychologies, self-actualization, and dogmatism and authoritarianism have been discussed. Although the review of the literature was inconclusive, it suggested that it is tenable that a less authoritarian coach could help female intercollegiate athletes to develop a higher degree of self-actualization.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to determine if the degree of authoritarianism of a coach would be related to the change toward self-actualization of her female intercollegiate tennis players. This chapter includes descriptions of how and why the subjects were selected; the organization of the research; and testing instruments and how they were administered; and how the data were analyzed.

Selection of Subjects

The initial phase of this study was to determine which colleges and universities to include in the study. It was determined that all the subjects should be of similar skill level, so that factors such as the degree of success in a specific activity and competitive experiences in that activity, which could affect the level of self-actualization, would be similar. While it was not possible to assure that all the players had similar tennis backgrounds, it was felt that the players in the top competitive division would be more homogeneous than those in
the second and third divisions. Furthermore, questionnaires completed by the players in the top division indicated that most of the players had competed in tennis prior to their enrollment in college (Appendix A). The Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Tennis League has designated Conference I as the highest level of competition in the league. The following five universities, because of their previous records, were included in Conference I for the 1971-1972 season: (1) California State University, Long Beach; (2) California State University, Los Angeles; (3) University of California, Los Angeles; (4) University of California, Santa Barbara; (5) University of Southern California. All of the coaches and team members of the varsity tennis classes at each of the five institutions were included in the study.

Organization of the Research

On October 19, 1971 the coaches of the five universities involved in the study were contacted at a Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Tennis League coaches' meeting. The study was briefly explained as a study comparing the personality of a coach to the personalities of her players. The coaches were then asked to participate in the study. After the initial meeting, a
follow-up letter was sent to each coach, requesting a specific testing date and time (Appendix B).

A second letter finalizing the test date and time was sent to each coach one week prior to the test date which had been arranged for each university (Appendix C). Each university was tested on a different day during the first two weeks of the semester or quarter in which the tennis season began. The three schools on the quarter system were tested from one to four weeks earlier than the two universities on the semester system. At the designated test time, the investigator of the study met with the varsity tennis class and the coach. A standardized set of instructions was read to the subjects (Appendix D). The POI was administered to the coach and to all the class members. The students were also requested to fill in the following information at the top of their answer sheet: (1) birth date; (2) city and state of birth; (3) years in college; (4) marital status; (5) number of years of playing tennis; (6) number of years of playing competitive tennis; (7) number of years in the varsity tennis class at the university they were presently attending; and (8) major accomplishments related to tennis (Appendix A). The coaches were requested to state (1) the number of years...
they had been coaching tennis, (2) the number of years they had been coaching tennis at the present institution, and (3) the success of their teams (Appendix E). Although the entire varsity tennis class and coach of each university were tested at the same time, there was no interactive effect because each subject individually answered a written set of questions. At three of the universities the entire varsity tennis class was present. At one of the remaining universities the top player on the team was absent. However, no effort was made to administer the test to her later for she only competed for the team but did not practice with them. At the other university one player was also absent. Attempts to administer the test at a later date were unsuccessful so she was not included in the study.

Because the tests were administered so early in the season, most of the universities had not yet determined exactly which players would remain in the varsity tennis class. All the players present were tested and those who were later dropped from the team were also dropped from the study.

When all the tests were completed, the subjects were informed that a follow-up test would be administered at the end of the tennis season. A late-season test date
was then arranged with the coach.

The investigator returned to each institution at the end of the season and administered the POI to the subjects in the same manner as before. All the universities were tested during the two weeks following the all-league tournament. During this time all the teams were still meeting and competing in post-season tournaments. The three universities on the quarter system were tested during the first week and the two semester system schools were tested during the second week. At the same time that the players took the late-season POI, the coaches completed the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. All the coaches and players then completed a questionnaire in which they subjectively rated themselves on the following three scales: (1) Democratic--Authoritarian; (2) Present Oriented--Past/Future Oriented; and (3) Inner Directed--Other Directed (Appendices F, G). The coaches also rated each player on the three scales and each player rated the coach.

At the late-season testing period two of the universities had the entire varsity tennis class and coach present. One team was tested in shifts, with half the team taking the test at the beginning of practice and the other half taking the test at the end of the same practice period. The two remaining teams each had two students
absent. Only one of the four players completed the test at a later date. The three remaining players were dropped from the study (Table 1). After all the tests at a particular university were completed, the subjects received the results of the first test and were allowed to ask questions regarding the study.

**TABLE 1**

**NUMBER OF VARSITY PLAYERS FROM EACH SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Varsity Players Taking Early-Season Test</th>
<th>Number of Players Absent at Late-Season Test</th>
<th>Total Number of Players in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=39

*One student took the late-season test one week later

**Instruments**

**Personal Orientation Inventory**

The POI was used as a measure of self-actualization. It is a one hundred and fifty item forced answer inventory. The questions are comparative value and behavior judgments. The items are scored twice, first for
the two basic scales of personal orientation: (1) other directed/inner directed (127 items); and (2) time incompetence/time competence (23 items). The answers are then scored again on ten subscales, each of which measures an element of self-actualization. The POI scores may then be interpreted in the light of established adult norms.

Validity. Validity information derived from a study by Shostrom and other psychologists indicated that the POI significantly discriminated between clinically judged self-actualized and non-self-actualized groups (69). Other research has strongly suggested that the POI significantly discriminates between relatively self-actualized adults and specific occupational and clinical groups (49,69,83,93). Culbert, et al. (36) used the POI to measure the change toward self-actualization in normal adults as a result of therapy. He administered the POI before the therapy began and again thirteen weeks later after the completion of the therapy. Grossack (43) and Culbert (36) found that the POI measured significant differences between groups of patients before and after therapy.

Reliability. Test-retest reliability of the POI was established by using a sample of forty-eight college students who took the test with a one-week interval between the two administrations. Shostrom, in the Manual for the
POI reported that the major POI scales of Time Competence and Inner Directed displayed generally high reliability coefficients of .71 and .84 respectively (20:32). Also six hundred and fifty male college students were used to establish the test-retest reliability (68). The reliability coefficients in this study were as high as .93.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) was used as a measure of dogmatism. It was designed "to measure individual differences in openness and closedness of belief systems (17:72)." It also "serves to measure general authoritarianism (17:72)." It is a forty item questionnaire in which subjects respond to each question with a number from -3 to +3. This enables the respondent to indicate to what degree he agrees or disagrees with a statement (Appendix H). An individual receives a total score on the forty items. A high score indicates high dogmatism or authoritarianism, and a low score indicates low dogmatism. Because the Dogmatism Scale appears to be sensitive to sub-cultural differences, no absolute figures have been established for high and low dogmatism. However, positive scores indicate a trend toward dogmatism and negative scores indicate a trend away from dogmatism. A high
positive score would indicate a higher degree of dogmatism, while a high negative score would indicate a low degree of dogmatism.

**Validity.** Research by Rokeach, Gladin, and Trumbo indicated that the Dogmatism Scale significantly discriminates between selected individuals judged to be either high or low in dogmatism (18:102). Several other studies have compared the Dogmatism Scale to other opinionation scales and authoritarian scales (64,65,84). These studies have established the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale as a valid instrument for measuring general authoritarianism.

Rokeach also reported the results of an item analysis using high and low quarters from each of the college and veteran groups. High and low dogmatic subjects differed consistently and were statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence on all of the forty items (109:6).

**Reliability.** Rokeach, in *The Open and Closed Mind*, reported the results of studies dealing with the reliability of the Dogmatism Scale. Test-retest reliability of Form E of the Dogmatism Scale was established by using five groups of college students, with the groups ranging in size from twenty-one to fifty-eight members. Also three groups of veterans were used to establish the test-retest reliability.
The college students had correlations as high as .85. The reliability coefficients for the veteran groups ranged from .84 to .93 (17:89). Plant, Talford, and Thomas, using odd-even split halves reliability found reliability coefficients of .84 for four hundred male college students and .85 for four hundred female college students (64).

**Personality Rating Scale**

The rating scale was used primarily as an internal validity check for this study. All the coaches and students were asked to rate themselves on three personality scales. One scale, Democratic---Authoritarian, was designed to determine if the coach's and players' assessment of the coach's degree of dogmatism and her results on the Dogmatism Scale were similar. The other two scales, Present Oriented--Past/Future Oriented, and Inner Directed--Other Directed, were designed to be compared with the two major scales on the POI. Students were also asked to rate their coaches and the coaches were asked to rate their players on the same three scales. The terms were carefully defined for all subjects (Appendix I).

**Statistical Design**

The Mann-Whitney U test (21:116-127) was used to determine if there was a significant relationship between
the coaches' degree of authoritarianism and the students' change toward self-actualization. T-scores were used to determine the student's level of self-actualization. The change in a student's early and late season t-score was used for the student's score. A Spearman rank correlation test (26:202-213) was used to compare the coaches' scores on the POI and their scores on the Rokeach Test.

The Personality Rating Scale scores were on a scale of one to six. To facilitate comparing the Rokeach and the POI scores with the Rating Scale scores, the Rokeach and POI test results were also converted to scores from one to six. Then the arithmetical difference was used to compare rating scale scores to either Rokeach or POI scores (Appendix J).
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The problem in this study was to determine if the degree of authoritarianism of a coach would be related to the change toward self-actualization of her tennis players. The data were analyzed to determine if there was a significant relationship between these two variables. The data were further analyzed to determine (1) the relationship between the coaches' scores on the POI and on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale; (2) the relationship between the coaches' scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the students' and coach's subjective ratings of the coach's degree of authoritarianism; (3) the relationship between the coach's score on the Time Competence (Tc) and Inner Directed (I) scales of the POI, and the students' and coach's subjective ratings on these two scales; (4) the relationship between the student's scores on the POI and the student's and coach's subjective ratings on the two scales; and (5) the relationship of the rating scale scores of the student on the Democratic--Authoritarian scale.
Hypothesis: There will be no significant relationship between a coach's degree of authoritarianism and the change in self-actualization of her female intercollegiate tennis players.

Results: The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine the relationship between the coaches' degree of dogmatism and the students' change toward self-actualization. While none of the coaches were highly dogmatic, there appeared to be two distinct groups of coaches, as determined by their scores on the Rokeach test. The "low" group (Group I) consisted of the two coaches whose scores indicated they were less dogmatic than the three coaches in the "high" group (Group II). While the scores of the coaches represent a range of thirty-three points, on a two hundred and forty point scale, the standard error of measurement yielded a value of 6.8 which suggested that the two groups were in fact different (Table 2). t scores were used to determine a player's level of self-actualization. The change in a player's early and late season t score was used for the student's score. Group I consisted of the players of the "low" coaches and Group II consisted of the players.
TABLE 2
COACHES' ROKEACH DOGMATISM TEST SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Standard Error of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-53</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the "high coaches (Table 3). The Mann-Whitney U test yielded a value of 101.5 \( z = -2.63 \) which permitted rejection of the hypothesis at the \( p < .01 \) level (Table 4). It was therefore concluded that the mean positive change toward self-actualization tended to be greater for the players of the less dogmatic coaches.

Discussion: The possibility of scores on the Rokeach test ranges from +120 to -120, with a higher score representing a higher degree of authoritarianism. The Rokeach test is designed only to measure degrees of authoritarianism—either high authoritarianism or low authoritarianism. Therefore a score of -100 would indicate an extremely low degree of authoritarianism, while a score of -50 would indicate low authoritarian but still more authoritarian than -100. Since all of the coaches in this study had
### TABLE 3

**RANK ORDER OF STUDENTS' POI t-SCORE CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-score change</th>
<th>Group I Rank</th>
<th>Group II t-score change</th>
<th>Group II Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N=16**  **R1=237.5**

### TABLE 4

**MANN-WHITNEY U TEST RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>237.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>-2.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>542.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01
negative scores, they all tended toward a low degree of authoritarianism. The total range of scores in this study was thirty-three points, and the standard error of measurement was 6.8 (Table 2). Although the coaches in the study represent only a small section of the possible range of authoritarianism, the coaches in Group I appeared to be the less authoritarian of the coaches involved in the study. In other words, the Group I coaches appeared to be moving toward a lower degree of authoritarianism than the Group II coaches. It is interesting to note that all the teams demonstrated a positive change toward self-actualization, with the greater changes being on the teams with the less authoritarian coaches (Table 5). However, the amount of change was small for all the teams and even though the difference between the two groups was statistically significant, the author suggests that the actual difference between the coaches was small. It would be interesting to repeat this study with a different set of subjects to see the degree and direction of change of students under an authoritarian coach.

As is the case in many studies in the behavioral sciences, there were relatively few controls in this study. Therefore, at this point one can only speculate as to possible causes for the observed relationship. Such
TABLE 5
COACHES' ROKEACH SCORES AND STUDENTS' POI SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Coach's Rokeach Score</th>
<th>Average POI t-Score Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>+6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>+4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>+2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>+1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors as the maturing process and level of success might effect one's POI scores. It is possible that because the coaches were not dogmatic, the players were free to continue growing and maturing. Also, because Conference I teams were used, many of the players had positive self-images and met with varied amounts of success during the tennis season. From discussions with players from the different teams, it was determined that regardless of external factors such as team standing or position on the team, most of the players had a positive experience in tennis during the 1971-1972 season.

Although the players received the results and an interpretation of their first test, they did not get this information until they had completed the second test. Therefore, knowledge of the results of the earlier test
could not have had any bearing on the second test or change score. Also, to prevent the players from trying to appear self-actualized, they were simply told that they were taking a personality test rather than a test of self-actualization.

Sub-problem 1: Is there a significant relationship between a coach's level of self-actualization and her degree of authoritarianism?

Results: A Spearman rank order correlation test was used to compare the coaches' scores on the POI and their scores on the Rokeach test. A correlation of .84 (p < .10) was found between the degree of dogmatism of a coach and her level of self-actualization (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Coach's POI Score</th>
<th>Coach's Rokeach Score</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10
**Discussion:** While all of the coaches tended to be more self-actualized than the normal adult population (20:26), the less dogmatic coaches appeared to be the more self-actualized coaches. This finding tends to confirm the results of a study by Dandes (37) who found that a more self-actualized person would tend to be less dogmatic or authoritarian. Furthermore, when studies describing the personality of a dogmatic individual (64,78,84) are compared with studies describing a self-actualized individual (7,49), the two personality types are often in direct conflict with each other.

**Sub-problem 2:** Does the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale give an indication of an individual's degree of dogmatism in a specific situation as a coach?

**Results:** Both the players and the coach rated the coach on the Democratic--Authoritarian scale. A coach's score on the Rokeach test was converted to a score of one to six, with one representing low dogmatism and six representing high dogmatism. A coach's score on the rating scale was compared to her score on the Rokeach test. The players' ratings of their coaches varied an average of .8 of a point from the coach's score on the Rokeach test. The coaches' self-ratings varied an average of .7 of a point.
from the coach's score on the Rokeach test (Table 7).

**TABLE 7**

COMPARISON OF COACHES' ROKEACH SCORES AND RATING SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Difference between Coach's Self-rating and Rokeach Score</th>
<th>Difference between students' rating of coach and coach's Rokeach score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x} = .7$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = .8$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** While the Rokeach test has been used in many studies (18,32,50,64,78,84) it has never been used to measure the degree of dogmatism of a person as a coach, per se. Because some coaches tend to act one way in most aspects of their life, but adopt a different philosophy while acting as a coach (45,52,114,115), it was necessary to determine if the coaches involved in this study had a special "coaching" personality. The coaches were instructed to complete the Rokeach test as part of a public-opinion survey rather than as a test related to their coaching. Later, both the students and the coach were asked to rate the coach as to her degree of authoritarianism as a coach.
On a scale of one to six (Appendix J), there was never more than a variance of 1.5 points between the coach's score on the Rokeach test and her students' assessment of her degree of authoritarianism. The average variance for all five universities was only .8 of a point which indicated that there was very little difference between the coach's degree of authoritarianism as measured by the Rokeach test and as seen by each coach's players.

The coaches were also asked to assess their degree of authoritarianism as a coach. With the exception of one coach who saw herself as a more authoritarian coach than either the players or test indicated, there was less than one point variance between the coaches' self-ratings and the Rokeach test scores. On the basis of these findings, it was concluded that the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale did, in fact, measure the degree of authoritarianism of an individual in her role as a coach.

Sub-problem 3: Does the Personality Rating Scale give an indication of how the players and coach see the coach in relation to the two major scales of the POI?

Results: There was an average variance of .9 of a point between the coaches' self-ratings of their Time Competence and their Time Competence as measured by the POI. The
students' ratings of the coaches' Time Competence varied an average of 1.1 points from the coaches' POI scores (Table 8). On the Inner Directed scale the average difference between a coach's self-rating and her POI score was .9 of a point, while the average difference between the students' ratings of the coach and the coach's POI scores was .7 of a point (Table 9).

### TABLE 8

**COMPARISON OF COACHES' POI SCORES (Tc Scale) AND RATING SCALE SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Difference between Coach's Self-rating and POI Score</th>
<th>Difference between Students' rating of Coach and Coach's POI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x} = .9$</td>
<td>$\bar{x} = 1.1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:** Both the coaches and players were asked to assess the coach on Time Competence and Inner Directness, which are the two major scales of the POI. While these terms were carefully defined for all subjects, the researcher observed that people unfamiliar with the concepts had some difficulty in applying the terms. The students
TABLE 9
COMPARISON OF COACHES' POI SCORES (I Scale) AND RATING SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Difference between Coach's Self-rating and POI Score</th>
<th>Difference between Students' Rating of Coach and Coach's POI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x = .9</td>
<td>x = .7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

found it extremely difficult to rate their coaches on these scales. The researcher was often told by a student that she had little basis for the judgment she had made.

Even with the difficulty in marking the scale, the scores of the coaches and students were quite close (Tables 8 and 9). One coach felt that she was less time competent than either the POI or the students indicated. Another coach, on the basis of the POI, appeared to be "other directed" more than either she or the students felt she was. Otherwise, the differences were negligible.

On the Tc scale, the scale that appeared to be the most difficult for the students, the scores from both the coaches and the students varied 1.5 points from the POI.
The students' scores of the coach varied 1.1 points from the coaches' POI scores, and the coaches' self-ratings varied only .9 of a point from their POI scores (Table 8).

It was also difficult for the students to give their coach a rating on the I scale, although their scores even more closely approached the POI scores of their coaches. Both the coaches' ratings and the students' ratings varied an average of only .7 of a point from the POI scores for the coaches (Table 9).

While the subjective ratings appear to substantiate the effectiveness of the POI to measure the personality of a person as a coach, the researcher feels that the reader should carefully review the rating scales and consider the students' comments before he considers accepting the rating scale as a means of verifying the use of the POI scores when applied in a specific situation. The main value of the rating scale, in regard to the POI scores of the coaches, appeared to be as an indicator of direction rather than of degree. In other words, the high degree of agreement between the rating scales and the POI scores indicated that the person's coaching personality tended to be in the same direction as her general personality. If
a coach's score on the POI indicated that she was primarily other-directed, the rating scales also indicated that she was primarily other-directed in her dealings with her team members.

**Sub-problem 4:** Based on the Personality Rating Scale, do a player's self-rating of her degree of authoritarianism and the coach's rating of the player's degree of authoritarianism tend to coincide?

**Results:** There was an average variance of 1.16 points between the students' self-ratings of their authoritarianism and the coaches' ratings of the students' authoritarianism (Table 10).

**Table 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Difference between Students' Self-ratings and Coaches' Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = 1.16 \]
Discussion: The students were asked to rate themselves from one to six on a Democratic-Authoritarian scale. The coaches also rated each player on the same scale. Since the students did not take the Rokeach test, only the student's rating and the coach's rating could be compared. The players and the coaches generally agreed on the direction of a player on this scale. The average variance between the students' scores and the coaches' scores was 1.1 points (Table 10). This finding seems to further indicate that one of the most critical factors in the rating scales was the subject's familiarity with the particular concept she was rating. Also, there is some question as to the validity and reliability of the self-rating scales.

Sub-problem 5: Does the Personality Rating Scale give an indication of how the coach and a player see that player in relation to the two major scales of the POI?

Results: There was an average variance of 1.4 points between the students' self-ratings of their Time Competence and their Time Competence as measured by the POI. The coaches' ratings of the students' Time Competence varied an average of 1.2 points from the students' POI scores (Table 11). On the Inner Directed scale the average difference between the students' self-ratings and their POI...
TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' POI SCORES (Tc SCALE) AND RATING SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Difference between Students' Self-ratings and POI Score</th>
<th>Difference between Coaches' Ratings of Students and Students' POI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 1.4 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 1.2 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average difference between students' POI scores was 1.9 points, while the average difference between the coaches' ratings of the students and the students' POI scores was 1.4 points (Table 12).

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' POI SCORES (I SCALE) AND RATING SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Difference between Students' Self-ratings and POI Score</th>
<th>Difference between Coaches' Ratings of Students and Students' POI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 1.9 )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} = 1.4 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: Each player was asked to assess herself on Tc and I. The coach was also asked to rate each player on these two scales. Again, the students appeared to have some difficulty in grasping the concepts of time competence and inner directedness, as is evidenced by the variance in their POI scores and self-rating scores (Tables 8 and 9). On both the POI and the rating scale, the students were assessing their own thoughts and behavior. Yet when they had to interpret their behavior in terms of a specific concept, they varied an average of 1.9 points on one scale and 1.4 points on the other scale, therefore varying an average of 1.6 points from the image they projected on the POI.

While the coaches seemed to have a better understanding of the concepts, they had difficulty in rating the student not "as a player, as such, but as a complete individual." Most of the coaches felt that several of their players related to their peers in one manner, to the coach in another, and to perhaps a younger person in another manner. It was therefore difficult for the coach to assign a specific score to a player. The coaches' ratings of the students were only slightly more closely aligned with the students' POI scores. The coaches' ratings of the students
varied an average of 1.3 points from the students' scores on the POI. The variance was 1.2 points on $T_c$ (Table 11) and 1.4 points on $I$ (Table 12).

On the basis of the above mentioned observations and as evidenced by the variance of the scores, the researcher concluded that the students' self-ratings and the coaches' ratings of the students served little useful purpose in this study.

**Summary of the Major Findings**

1. The average change toward self-actualization tended to be greater for the players of the less dogmatic coaches.

2. There was a high correlation between the degree of dogmatism and the level of self-actualization of the coaches. Therefore, a non-authoritarian coach would tend to be more self-actualized.

3. Based on the comparison of the players' and coaches' ratings of the degree of authoritarianism of the coach and the coach's score on the Dogmatism Scale, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale appeared to be a valid measure of a coach's degree of authoritarianism.

4. The players' and coaches' subjective ratings of the coach's Time Competence and Inner Directedness were
similar to the coaches' scores on the POI. The rating scale appeared to give a good indication of the direction of a coach's personality as measured by the POI.

5. The players and the coach showed basic agreement as to the direction of the student on the Democratic-Authoritarian scale.

6. The players' and coaches' subjective ratings of the players' Time Competence and Inner Directedness were similar to the players' scores on the POI. The rating scale appeared to give a good indication of the direction of a student's personality as measured by the POI.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if the degree of authoritarianism of a coach would be related to the change toward self-actualization of her female intercollegiate tennis players. The female varsity intercollegiate tennis teams of the five universities in Conference I of the Southern California Women's Intercollegiate Tennis League served as subjects. The study involved a total of thirty-nine players and five coaches and covered the duration of the 1971-1972 tennis season. Coaches completed the Personal Orientation Inventory at the beginning of the season and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale at the end of the season. The players were administered the Personal Orientation Inventory twice, once at the beginning of the season and once at the end of the season. The players' Personal Orientation Inventory scores were grouped on the basis of their coach's score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine the relationship between the degree of
dogmatism of a coach and the change toward self-actualization of her players.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant relationship between a coach's degree of authoritarianism and the change in self-actualization of her female intercollegiate tennis players was rejected on the basis of the following finding: The mean change toward self-actualization tended to be greater for the players of a less dogmatic coach.

Sub-problems of the study yielded the following:

1. There was a high correlation between the degree of dogmatism and the level of self-actualization of the coaches. Therefore, a non-authoritarian coach would tend to be more self-actualized.

2. Based on the comparison of the players' and coaches' ratings of the degree of authoritarianism of the coach and the coach's score on the Dogmatism Scale, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale appeared to be a valid measure of a coach's degree of authoritarianism.

3. The players' and coaches' subjective ratings of the coach's Time Competence and Inner Directedness were similar to the coaches' scores on the POI. The rating scale appeared to give a good indication of the direction of a coach's personality as measured by the POI.
4. The players and the coach showed basic agreement as to the direction of the student on the Democratic-Authoritarian scale.

5. The players' and coaches' subjective ratings of the players' Time Competence and Inner Directedness were similar to the players' scores on the POI. The rating scale appeared to give a good indication of the direction of a student's personality as measured by the POI.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and within the limitations of this research, the following conclusion was drawn: the female intercollegiate tennis players of the less authoritarian coaches tended to have a greater change toward self-actualization. Although the relationship was statistically significant, this relationship must be considered only as a possible tendency at this time due to the small differences in the scores, the small number of subjects, and the lack of additional research in this area.

Recommendations for Further Study

The following recommendations are made for further research:
1. Since there were no authoritarian coaches in the study, a future study might include a larger sample of both men's and women's varsity intercollegiate tennis teams so that the chances of having both dogmatic and non-dogmatic coaches would be increased.

2. Because some of the current literature (87) indicates that individual sports and team sports attract people with different personalities, it would be interesting to see if the team sport players demonstrate a similar relationship between the authoritarianism of the coach and the change toward self-actualization of the player.

3. This study dealt with only one segment of a student's life during the research period. The POI scores of the subjects covered only the tennis season and the coach was the only other variable considered. It would be interesting to test the subjects three times during the school year: once at the beginning of the fall semester or quarter, once at the beginning of the tennis season, and once at the end of the tennis season. It could then be determined if the participation in sports was related to either a greater or lesser degree of change toward self-actualization. Along the same line, it would be interesting to conduct a longitudinal investigation from the freshman through the senior year.
4. The possibility of investigating the same problem but with different tools should be considered in future research. While the objective tests which were used appeared to be valid and reliable instruments, it would be beneficial to use another means to attempt to answer the same questions. A future researcher might choose to use such methods as more in-depth case studies or journal and interview techniques rather than the objective "pencil and paper" tests.

5. If the basic design of this study were to be used again, the researcher suggests that the rating scales not be included in the study. The coaches' and students' ratings of the degree of authoritarianism of the coach proved helpful in determining the usefulness of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale in a study of this nature. However, regardless of the results of the scores on the other scales, little useful information was obtained from them.

6. It was felt that in some cases a certain type of coach may attract a certain type of player. Also, there are possibly differences in both the type of faculty member and the type of student that chooses to attend a private university, a state college or university, or one of the University of California schools. It would be interesting
to collect data from a larger cross-section of colleges and universities and then examine the data to see if either of these assumptions are correct.
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APPENDIX A

COVER SHEET FOR PLAYERS

NAME__________________________

BIRTH DATE____________________

CITY AND STATE OF BIRTH______________________________

FRESH. ___ SOPH. ___ JUNIOR ___ SENIOR ___ GRAD. ___ OTHER ________

MARRIED ___ SINGLE ___ DIVORCED ___ WIDOWED ___

How long have you been playing tennis? ______

How long have you been playing competitive tennis? ______

Briefly list any major accomplishments or honors related to your tennis experience.

How many years have you participated in intercollegiate tennis at this school? ______

What position on the team do you expect to play this season? ______
Dear

At the recent tennis coaches meeting held at California State University, Los Angeles I spoke to you about a study dealing with the personalities of female intercollegiate tennis coaches and players. As you may recall, I am conducting this study as part of the Master of Arts program at California State University, Northridge.

I would like to administer the Personal Orientation Inventory to the entire varsity tennis class and coach as early in the season as possible. The test will take approximately forty-five minutes. It will also be necessary to administer the test again late in May, after the league tournament.

At this time I would like to request that you return the enclosed form, indicating the date and time that would be convenient for the first administration of the Personal Orientation Inventory. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed. Please return the form on or before Friday, January 7, 1972. Your cooperation will help to make this project a success.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (213)885-3242 (school) or (213)342-4528 (home).

Sincerely,

Susan J. Hyde

Enc.
Please indicate three choices for a preferred meeting date and time. I will contact you as soon as possible after the form has been returned to finalize the testing date and time.

Name of institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

LETTER FINALIZING TEST DATE AND TIME

Dear

This is just a note to remind you that I will be at (name of university) at (time) on (day and date) to administer the Personal Orientation Inventory to the entire varsity tennis class and coach. It is important that all the varsity players be present at this time. The test will take approximately forty-five minutes. If you have any questions I may be contacted at (213) 885-3242.

Sincerely,

Susan J. Hyde
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

I am conducting a study dealing with the personalities of intercollegiate tennis players and coaches. As part of this study you are being asked to take the POI--Personal Orientation Inventory, which is a personality measure. All information will be kept strictly confidential. It is important that you answer as honestly as you can. When the study is completed you may receive the results of your own inventory if you wish.

Please carefully read the instructions on the inventory before you begin answering the questions. Attempt to answer all questions. Answer the questions as to your own opinion of yourself. Also, please complete the inventory without talking to people around you. If you have any questions about the instructions, I'll try to clarify them for you. Notice that you always choose the answer that is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE.

This is not a timed questionnaire. You may begin whenever you are ready and may take as long as you need. Again--please attempt to answer all the questions and answer as honestly as you can.
APPENDIX E

COVER SHEET FOR COACHES

NAME ____________________________
BIRTH DATE ____________________________
CITY AND STATE OF BIRTH ____________________________

How many years have you been coaching tennis? ______
How many years have you been coaching tennis at this school? ______
What was the team's standing in the league for the past three seasons?

1970-1971 ______
1969-1970 ______
1968-1969 ______

Do you want to receive a copy of the results of the study? YES____ NO____
APPENDIX F

PERSONALITY RATING SCALE FOR PLAYERS

On the following scales you are being asked to assess yourself as an individual. Please indicate with an X where you feel you are on each of the three scales.

Democratic [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Authoritarian
Present Oriented [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Past/Future Oriented
Inner Directed [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Other Directed

Again, use an X to show where you would place your coach on each of the scales.

Democratic [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Authoritarian
Present Oriented [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Past/Future Oriented
Inner Directed [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] Other Directed
APPENDIX G

PERSONALITY RATING SCALE FOR COACHES

On the following three scales, you are being asked to assess yourself as a coach. Please indicate with an X where you feel you are on each scale.

Democratic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Past/Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Again, use an X to indicate where you feel each of the players on your team lie on the three scales. The number to the left of each set of scales indicates the player being rated. A player's number is the position she is presently playing, barring temporary position changes caused by injury or illness. For instance, the number 1 singles player would be rated on the #1 set of scales, and so forth. Please, do not assess a player as a team member, per se, but rather rate her as a complete individual.

#1

Democratic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Past/Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#2

Democratic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Past/Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### APPENDIX G (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democratic Present Oriented</th>
<th>Authoritarian Past/Future Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed</td>
<td>Other Directed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democratic Present Oriented</th>
<th>Authoritarian Past/Future Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed</td>
<td>Other Directed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE
ROKEACH DOGMATISM SCALE

The following is a survey of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH

-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH
APPENDIX I

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE PERSONALITY RATING SCALE

On the next pages, you are being asked to make assessments of three personality factors. The personality factors are divided into three scales, or continua. One extreme of a given personality trait is listed at one end of the continuum and the opposite extreme is listed at the other end of the continuum. Please read and use the following definitions as you mark your ratings.

On each of the scales, it is important that you mark your ratings as honestly as you can.

DEMOCRATIC - Considering and treating others as one's equal.

AUTHORITARIAN - Characterized by unquestioning obedience to authority, rather than individual freedom of judgment and action.

PRESENT ORIENTED - Tend to live in the present with full awareness, contact, and full feeling reactivity.

PAST/FUTURE ORIENTED - Tend to live in the past with guilt, regrets, and resentment AND/OR in the future with idealized goals, plans, expectations, predictions, and fears.

INNER DIRECTED - Tend to be independent and self-supporting being guided by internal motivations rather than external influences.

OTHER DIRECTED - Tend to be dependent and supported by the views of others; being guided primarily by the views and opinions of the peer group or some other approving group.
APPENDIX J

CONVERSION OF ROKEACH SCORES AND POI

SCORES TO SIX-POINT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rokeach Dogmatism Scale Score</th>
<th>-120</th>
<th>-80</th>
<th>-40</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+40</th>
<th>+80</th>
<th>+119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Orientation Inventory t score</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Scale Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>