

Development of Indicators of the National Judo Coaches Selection: Athletes and Coaches` Perspectives

S. A. Afsanepurak

Department of physical education, Gorgan branch, Islamic azad University, Gorgan, Iran

Rasool Norouzi Seyed Hossini

Student, (M.A.) Tarbiat Modares University, Iran

M. K. Seyfari

Faculty of physical education, Mazandaran University, Babolsar, Iran

Ebrahim Norouzi Seyed Hossini

Student, (M.A.) Shahid Beheshti University, Iran

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to design and develop National Coaches' Selection indicators in Judo from experts` viewpoints carried out through a descriptive field method. The statistical population included all managers, coaches and athletes involved in judo. A questionnaire with an acceptable validity and reliability ($\alpha= 0.76$) was distributed among the samples. The respective samples (59 coaches and 63 athletes) responded to the questionnaire consisting of two parts: a) Personal characteristics and b) 50 questions included 10 indicators. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics including Mann Whitney U Test and Friedman Test were used to analyze the data. There were ten criteria selected for the national team coaches from of the Delphi method. These indicators included Communicational, Psychological, Motivational, Personality-Moral, Supportive-Feedback, Goal setting, Experimental-Technique, Efficacy, Leadership and Management and Performance Assessment indicators. Data analysis results showed that there were no significant differences among statistical samples regarding Coaches' Selection indicators ($p> 0.05$). Also there were different priorities about Coaches' Selection indicators in samples ($p < 0.05$).

Keywords:

Design of indicators, Coaches, Judo, National team

Introduction

Coaches play a main role in the sports programs and teams. According to Martinez (1975), the coaches are important elements of sports teams. Among the three groups of athletes, coaches

and spectators, it is the coach acting as the team leadership and responsible for strong organization of the team's infrastructure. Hardy et al. (2004) thought of coaching as encompassing sports, information, education, and training elements which the coach should use correctly and accurately. It should be noted that the three objectives of the overall coaching are winning a team, enjoying the game and developing all-round athlete. Research on critical success factors of the various sports teams have pointed to organizations, goals, coach or leader, skills, resources, motivation and innovation as the most important variables Couch (2000) considered several criteria for coaches at all levels as following: Having knowledge of the coaching, mentoring, having values of sensitivity and confidentiality, personal skills, strong skills in assessing the stability of behavior and personality, ability to work, ability to plan and design Maps, leadership and authority. Cann (2002) believes that three major factors: personal knowledge, ability to control the emotional factors that influence athlete and having a strong and effective relationship with the athletes determine their success and failure. Martinez (2004) noticed effective coaching characteristics such as knowledge of sports coaching, sports science orientation, motivation, and having good communication and motivational skills, and evaluation of their athletes, organization and evaluation and planning. National Association for Sport and Physical Education Sciences of United States of America (2009) have introduced standards for coaches such as coaching philosophy and ethics, safety and injury prevention, physical condition, growth and development, teaching and social communication, organization and management, and evaluation. The present study tries to find an answer to the question of what are the indicators of the national judo team's coaches selection?

Methodology

The field survey was conducted to investigate the case. Overall the study sample was 122 from Judo coaches (n = 59) and outstanding Judo athletes (n = 63) chosen through random-stratified sampling. The Questionnaire composed of two parts: The first section was demographic information and the second part included 10 indicators set by the national judo experts consisting of 50 5-item Likert scale questions. To establish the content and face validity of the survey questionnaire, the Delphi method was used. We asked 15 experts including professors and administrators, and athletes and coaches to specify which indicators national team coaches should have. Finally, 50 questions were prepared encompassing 10 indicators (communication, psychology, motivation, personality - moral, safety - feedback, goals, experience - technical competence, leadership and management and performance evaluation), respectively. In order to investigate the reliability of the tool, before distributing the questionnaire among the subjects in a preliminary study, 30 were administered among the statistical population (15 coaches and 15 Athletes). Cronbach's alpha coefficient of $\alpha=0.763$ was reported. In order to analyze the data, we applied descriptive parameters such as mean, standard deviation, and frequency. Also, to determine differences between groups, we used Mann Whitney U test and Friedman test was used to determine the priority indicators.

Research Results and Findings

The Mann Whitney U test was used to determine differences between athletes and coaches about the indicators of the national team coach. There was no significant difference among the three study groups on the indicators of national teams Coaches `selection (df=1, p>0.05). This means that the indicators set for the national team coaches entailed no disagreements between coaches and athletes.

(Table 1) Indicator of Mann Whitney U test to determine the research groups ` differences in terms of the indicators of coaches selection

Indicators	Descriptive data			Mann-Whitney U		
	Group	n	Mean Rank	Z	df	Sig
Communicational	Coaches	59	82.02	1.421	1	0.491
	Athletes	63	81.87			
Personality-Moral	Coaches	59	90.77	2.655	1	0.265
	Athletes	63	77.20			
Goal setting	Coaches	59	80.78	0.115	1	0.944
	Athletes	63	83.56			
Motivational	Coaches	59	73.01	4.007	1	0.130
	Athletes	63	83.88			
Leadership and Management	Coaches	59	93.55	4.935	1	0.085
	Athletes	63	82.02			
Psychological	Coaches	59	81.84	1.928	1	0.381
	Athletes	63	89.03			
Experimental-Technique	Coaches	59	76.23	4.174	1	0.124
	Athletes	63	78.58			
Supportive-Feedback	Coaches	59	85.89	0.469	1	0.791
	Athletes	63	79.98			
Performance Assessment	Coaches	59	80.84	0.694	1	0.707
	Athletes	63	86.72			
Efficacy	Coaches	59	86.43	1.666	1	0.435
	Athletes	63	82.24			

According to Table 2 and the Friedman test results regarding the priority indicators from the coaches `perspectives($\chi^2= 18.456$, df=9,P<0.05), they considered leadership and management as the top priority (6.38) and lowest index was given to motivation (4.42).

(Table - 2) Friedman test to determine the priority I indicators from the perspectives of coaches

	Indicators	Mean Rank	X ²	df	sig
A	Leadership and Management	6.38	18.456	9	0.001
2	Personality-Moral	5.84			
3	Efficacy	5.77			
4	Psychological	5.86			
5	Supportive-Feedback	5.66			
6	Goal setting	5.56			
7	Performance Assessment	5.39			
8	Communicational	5.17			
9	Experimental-Technique	5.12			
10	Motivational	4.42			

According to Table 3 and the Friedman test results to determine the priority indicators from the perspectives of the athletes ($x^2 = 21.872$, $df=9$, $P<0.05$), they considered the highest index to performance assessment (6.02) and lowest rank was assigned to efficiency index (5.09).

(Table - 3) Friedman test to determine the priority statistical indicators from the perspective of athletes

	Indicators	Mean Rank	X ²	df	sig
A	Performance Assessment	6.02	21.872	9	0.001
2	Psychological	6			
3	Motivational	5.86			
4	Supportive-Feedback	5.56			
5	Personality-Moral	5.44			
6	Communicational	5.34			
7	Goal setting	5.33			
8	Experimental-Technique	5.22			
9	Leadership and Management	5.15			
10	Efficacy	5.09			

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was the compilation of indicators from the perspectives of experts in national judo team coaches. based on the Delphi method, a panel of experts developed 10 indicators for judo coaches of national teams. These indicators included indicators of communication, psychology, motivation, personality - moral, safety - feedback, goals, experience - technical competence, leadership and management and evaluation of performance. These indicators are consistent with those of Cann (2000), Kahn (2002), and the

Coaches Association of British Columbia (2007). It should be noted that each of the indicators is individually significant and has high value. Indicators set by the experts that share a common view among experts for the coaches there. For example Martens (2004) underscored the fact that coaches should have knowledge of exercise science, coaching or motivation, communication skills, knowledge, evaluation, organization and planning. The National Association for Physical Education and Sports Science of United States of America (2009) developed standards for coaches, such as coaching philosophy and ethics, safety and injury prevention, physical condition, growth and development, teaching methods, communication and social skills, organization and management, and evaluation.

The second step was to investigate the differences and prioritization of the indicators from the perspective of judo athletes and coaches. Results showed that there was no significant difference between coaches and athletes on the indicators for the national team coaches selection. In other words, coaches and athletes agreed on these indicators together. This result is in line with the results of research by Lyle Cross (1999) and Butler and Hardy (1999), cited. The other results of this study was the coaches and athletes prioritized different indicators. In a general conclusion, it can be acknowledged that sports organizations and federations for the national team coaches are facing a very complicated and difficult task. Perhaps the selection of qualified and competent person who meets all the criteria set by experts is impossible. Therefore, according to survey results and research mentioned in the introduction, it is recommended that the National Federation of National Judo Team coaches select those that meet the highest criteria and standards set by professionals in this way to witness progress and the success of national teams.

References

Butler, RJ Hardy, L. (1992). The performance profile: theory and application. *The Sport Psychologist*, 6, 253-264.

Cann, Sean mc (2002). So you want to be a great "big _ event coach" three things that can make of brake you. *Usa olampic e_ magazine spring issue*.

Carron, AV (1984). Cohesion in sports teams. In JM Silva and RS Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological Foundations of Sport* (pp. 340-351). Human Kinetics: Champaign, IL

Chelladurai, P. and Saleh, SD (1978). Preferred leadership in sport. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 2, 9-14.

Coaches Association of British Columbia (CABC). <http://www.coachesbc.ca>.

Couch, Stephan (2000) coach selection form. [http:// Www.vemp-Learning.org](http://Www.vemp-Learning.org) .

Cross, N. & Lyle, J.) 1999 (. *The coaching process: Principles and practice for sport "*, Butterworth-Heinemann, p: 77-80.

Gillberston, DW (2000). Transformational leadership in Australasian sport organizations. *New Zealand Innovation and Competitiveness Project Victoria University of Wellington*.

Hardy, T, Stewart. F & Meyers. L (2004). Investigate motivational characteristics of the young players if age and position impacted those traits, Physical Education. No. P: 6.
Helsen, WF, Starkes, JL and Hodges, NJ (1998). Team sports and the theory of deliberate practice. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20, 12-34.

Horne, T. and Carron, AV (1985). Compatibility in coach-athlete relationships. *Journal of Sports Psychology*, 7, 137-149.

Jowett, S. and Ntoumanis, N. (2004). The Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q) development and initial validation. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 14, 245-257.

Lyle, J. (1999). Coaches' decision making. In N. Cross and J. Lyle (Eds.), *the coaching process: Principles and practice for sport* (pp. 210-232). Butterworth Heinemann: Oxford.

Martens, R (2004). *Successful coaching*. Human kinetics. Third edition.
Martens, R. (1987). *Coaches guide to sport psychology*. Human Kinetics: Champaign, IL.

Martens, R. and Peterson, JA (1971). Group cohesiveness as a determinant of success and member satisfaction in team performance. *International Review of Sports Sociology*, 6, 49-61.

McMorris, T. Hale, T (2006). *Coaching science theory into practice*. wiley publisher.
National association for sport and physical education, (2002). *An Association of the american alliance for health, physical education, dance and Recreation*,
[Www.aahperd.org / Naspe](http://www.aahperd.org/Naspe).

Nazarudin, Mohammad Nizam Bin Hj. Omar Fauzee, Mohd Sofian. Jamalis Marjohan & at al. (2009). Coaching Leadership Styles and Athlete Satisfactions among Malaysian University Basketball Team. *Research Journal of International Studies - Issue 9*.pp: 4-11.

Roberts GC (1993). Motivation in sport: Understanding and enhancing the motivation and achievement of children. In RN Singer, M. Murphey and LK Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sports psychology* (pp. 405-420). MacMillan: New York.

Wade, A. (1967). *The Football Association guide to training and coaching*. Heinemann: London