THE PREVALENCE OF BURNOUT IN
MINOR HOCKEY COACHES


A Thesis Presented
to the
School of Physical Education and Athletics
Lakehead University


In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Degree Master of Science
in
Applied Sport Science and Coaching


by
MICHAEL W. RICE
© 1994

ProQuest Number: 10611889

ProQuest

ProQuest 10611889

ISBN  0-315-97063-4

Canada

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree of burnout among minor hockey league coaches as assessed by the Adapted Maslach Burnout Inventory and Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout, and to identify various factors which are related to the stages of burnout in minor hockey league coaches. Thunder Bay Amateur Minor Hockey League Coaches (N = 229) completed the Adapted Maslach Burnout Inventory and a Minor Hockey League Coaches' Package via a mail survey. Both current and former coaches, who have been out of the system for one year, were polled. The results of this study indicate that volunteer minor hockey coaches experienced greater personal accomplishment, less emotional exhaustion, less depersonalization and therefore less burnout than the general (US) public, as shown in previous studies. Variables found to be related to higher burnout scores were intra-role conflict, emphasis placed upon winning, the perception of success, expectations of significant others, and athlete variables. Division and level coached, along with win/loss record, did not contribute significantly to burnout as was first anticipated. Contradictory to other studies, age, years of experience, marital status and education level were not found to be related to higher burnout scores in minor hockey league coaches.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# DEDICATION

This is for my parents,

**Wayne and Angela,**

whose constant, and never-ending love, support and encouragement

I will forever cherish.

This is also for

**Lisa,**

there will always be a very special place

in my heart for her.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

vi

# LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Interest has developed within the coaching profession concerning a phenomenon commonly referred to as 'burnout' (Quigley, Slack, & Smith, 1987). Burnout has been found to lead to a deterioration in the quality of care or service that is provided by service workers (doctors, lawyers, social workers), and appears to be a major factor in job turnover, absenteeism, and low morale (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Burnout is usually conceptualized as a process, as opposed to a single event (Quigley, 1985). This perception is reinforced by Dale and Weinberg (1989) who support the idea that burnout appears as a result of chronic everyday stress that develops over time in stressful environments. Burnout can result as a response to chronic job-related stress for some people in the helping or service professions, when the demands of the job exceed one's ability to cope with them (Capel, Sisley, & Desertrain, 1987).

The burnout syndrome has been correlated with various signs and symptoms of personal distress, including physical exhaustion, insomnia, increased use of alcohol and drugs, marital and family problems (Maslach & Jackson, 1981), and even suicide, in extreme cases (Maslach, 1976). Through the development of a Phase Model of burnout, Golembiewski (1983a) reported that the perceived quality of working-life deteriorated as burnout progressed.

1

Definitions of burnout have varied over the years. Dale and Weinberg (1989) suggest that this is due to the complexity of, and inability to accurately describe the syndrome. However, there is general agreement that its development represents a complex interaction among a number of components, producing symptoms that are behavioral, emotional, and psychological in nature (Dale & Weinberg, 1989).

The majority of burnout research focuses on the worker and/or work environment (Quigley, 1985). Both the worker and work environment are influenced by social, political, and economic factors which contribute to burnout (Cherniss & Krantz, 1983). The worker's role in life has changed drastically over the past century. As change occurs, whether it is in society or the work place, there may be periods of high stress and burnout (Capel, Sisley, & Desertrain, 1987).

In the early parts of this century, life was much simpler and one's self-identity and role in life were defined by the status held in the community (Quigley, 1985). In smaller communities, one's identity would be defined by the work one performed. As community life grew and became more urbanized, the values, attitudes and the interaction between the individual and the job also changed. As leisure time increased, individuals separated their work-life from their home-life. This change in attitude and behavior increased the rate of job stress and burnout (Cherniss, 1980).

In contrast to less than a century ago, today "our lives and our work are usually distinct and separate" (Quigley, 1985, p. 13). This distinction is an enormous change which has transpired over the past half century. With every change a period of adjustment will follow. A generation is a short time span for learning to adapt to change in the structure of society. Consequently, there is increasing ambiguity and conflict arising between work and home roles which results in greater burnout symptoms (Capel et al., 1987). Other factors contributing to burnout include the acceleration of change, and the depersonalization of neighbourhoods, schools, and work situations (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980).

Pressures and stress related to job performance (which can ultimately result in burnout) are increasing in society today. Often, burnout is a result of the close personal interaction between client and worker (Dale & Weinberg, 1989). Researchers have focused on the human service and helping professions and this client and worker interaction in an effort to learn more about the phenomenon of burnout (Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1983). Numerous studies have been conducted using a range of human service occupations including police officers, counsellors, teachers, nurses, social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists, attorneys, physicians, and agency administrators (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Results of these research studies suggest that human service occupation workers burn-out faster than those individuals in non-human service occupations. Although coaching is considered a helping profession due to the

contact with the athletes (Capel et al., 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989), only recently has it been studied with reference to burnout (Dale & Weinberg, 1989).

Human relationships are integral to the coaching profession. A coach is often required to be a disciplinarian, psychologist, parent figure, and public relations expert (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984). Encompassed within the pressures of coaching is the need to continuously interact personally with athletes. Inevitably, as the coach reveals his or her vulnerability over time, it becomes increasingly more difficult to maintain the care and commitment in personal encounters which appear to be the essence of coaching (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984). Hence, the human relationships which are an integral component of coaching, appear to be major contributors to coaching burnout.

## Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree of burnout among minor hockey league coaches as assessed by the Adapted Maslach Burnout Inventory and Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout, and to identify various factors which are related to the stages of burnout in minor hockey league coaches. It is hypothesized that Minor Hockey League Coaches who experience the greatest symptoms of burnout will be those who:

1) coach in the higher divisions (Bantam and above);

2) coach at a competitive level (A, AA, AAA & Junior);

3) possess mediocre to average coaching records (40-60 win percentage);

4) are required to perform additional administrative roles;

5)      experience intra-role conflict; and

6)      possess coaching career aspirations.

## Rationale for the Study

Coaches work in potentially stressful environments and therefore can experience various degrees of stress (Caccese, 1982; Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Capel, Sisley, & Desertrain, 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Haggerty, 1982; Kosa, 1989; Quigley, 1985; Quigley, Slack & Smith, 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1988; Wilson & Chambers, 1983; Vealey, Udry, Zimmerman, & Soliday, 1992). Burnout has been found to be less pronounced in some coaching studies compared to the norms established by both Maslach's (1981) and Golembiewski's (1983a) studies of populations within the helping and service professions (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Capel et al., 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Quigley, 1985; Quigley, Slack, & Smith, 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1984).

Although coaching may be considered a helping and service profession (Capel et al., 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989), differences do exist between coaches and the professions studied by both Maslach and Jackson (1981), and Golembiewski (1983). Therefore, although it may be considered a comparatively positive finding that coaches experience less pronounced burnout, burnout among coaches does exist and should not be ignored. Instead, we must be sensitive to the personal and situational variables that may be related to or predictive of burnout in coaches (Dale & Weinberg, 1989).

As of November 1st, 1992, the author located fewer than 15 known survey-studies pertaining to burnout in coaching populations conducted in North America. Seven studies surveyed high school teacher-coaches, and only three studies utilized a Canadian coaching population. Explanations for the lack of research in this area may lie not only in the definition and conceptual difficulties regarding the concept of burnout, but also in the lack of recognition that burnout is a potential problem in the coaching profession (Quigley, 1985).

The few studies pertaining to coaching burnout have produced equivocal results. One reason for these inconsistencies is the attempt to make comparisons across different sports, levels and organizations. However, all the studies conclude that burnout does exist within the coaching profession. There are many stressors inherent within this profession, and some coaches may not be prepared to cope with the physical and emotional exhaustion generated by the demands on their energy, emotions, and time (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984).

In fact, Wishnietsky and Felder (1989), in their follow up study to Lackey's (1977) survey of high school administrators, concluded that the reasons high school coaches are dismissed or resign have not changed over the years. Player/coach relationships, career changes and financial matters were the major reasons cited for dismissal or resignation. This is a very disturbing disclosure. In subsequent studies, player/coach relationships (Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982; Wilson & Bird, 1988; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989), financial matters (Wilson & Bird, 1988) and higher career aspirations (Locke &

Massengale, 1978) were also found to contribute to burnout in coaches. The results from Wishnietsky and Felder's (1989) study leads one to believe that little, if any progress has been made in the past decade toward solving the difficulties of burnout in the coaching profession.

Review of Related Literature

<u>Burnout</u>

## <u>What is Burnout?</u>

Currently, no widely accepted definition of burnout exists (Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Wilson, Haggerty, & Bird, 1986). Definitions of burnout have ranged from the simple such as a loss of concern for people with whom one is working or with whom one comes in contact (Maslach, 1976), to the complex such as:

> a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and
> reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among
> individuals who do people work of some kind. It is a response to
> the chronic emotional strain of dealing extensively with other
> human beings, particularly when they are troubled or having
> problems. Although it has some of the same deleterious effects as
> other stress responses, what is unique about burnout is that the
> stress arises from the social interaction between helper and
> recipient (Maslach, 1982, p.3).

In general, burnout occurs when the demands of the job exceed one's ability to cope with them (Capel, Sisley, & Desertrain, 1987). Regardless of what definition is used, most authorities agree that it takes a period of time for burnout to develop (Wilson, Haggerty, & Bird, 1986), and the effects of burnout do not diminish if they are ignored (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980).

## Why Does Burnout Occur?

Burnout occurs as the cumulative end-result of a complex process. It is not a simple phenomenon that occurs after 'X' period of time in 'Y' situation and resulting in 'Z' responses. Rather, it is indicative of a mismatch between a person and his or her environment. The unique personality characteristics of an individual are brought into play against various environmental factors including roles, rewards and responsibilities associated with his or her occupation (Wilson et al., 1986). In simple terms, burnout may occur when an individual is unable to effectively and efficiently adapt to his or her environment due to a change in workload, or some other factor(s).

## Symptoms of Burnout

It is not always easy to observe the signs and symptoms of burnout, because they tend to build up gradually over a long period of time (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980). A person experiencing burnout is not a very sympathetic individual on the surface, and may be cranky, critical, angry, rigid, resistant to suggestions and often display behavior patterns that turn people off. Tiredness is easy to recognize and is the best indicator for catching burnout early (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980).

People experiencing burnout generally do not view themselves as angry, cynical, rigid or depressed. Instead, victims of burnout view themselves as being bored, fatigued, and over worked. They tend to find fault with others and react negatively to what others suggest, and complain about the firm or organization of which they are a part (Wilson et al., 1986). While experiencing

burnout, the individual's self perception and view of the environment is altered. Therefore the coach, or any individual for that matter, who is experiencing burnout, is not the best person to evaluate his or her own behavior (Wilson et al., 1986).

As burnout progresses, the individual may feel abused and blame his/her tiredness on an increasing workload. He/she will begin to hate his/her job and surroundings, and everyone connected with it. The burnout victim often bursts forth in displays that are completely out of character, but that reveal classic burnout reactions such as cynicism, heightened irritability, mistrust of others, paranoia, and grandiosity (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980).

Before the burnout syndrome works its effect on the individual, he or she is usually a charismatic person, able to make friends easily, a leader, able to make rapid progress in any hierarchy, and who is rewarded for his/her efforts. However, once an individual begins to burnout, all that changes. People bore them and causes seem trivial. Whereas they used to participate at every meeting, coming up with plans and solid suggestions, they now sit silent, wishing they could get away (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980).

Of the few coaching burnout studies conducted, rare mention is made of the actual physical symptoms experienced by coaches. Felder and Wishnietsky (1990) did report however that 60% of the female coaches (n = 60) and 35% of the male coaches (n = 60) surveyed, indicated that they had trouble sleeping at night during the coaching season. Trouble sleeping would compound the tiredness associated with burnout, and as mentioned earlier, tiredness is the

best indicator of recognizing burnout early (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980).

Table 1 lists some known signs and symptoms of burnout.

**Table 1**
Signs and Symptoms of Burnout

| | |
|---|---|
| PHYSICAL | ●headaches, insomnia, and chronic fatigue;<br>●decrease in fitness level;<br>●shortness of breath, hypertension and ulcers;<br>●upset digestive system;<br>●weight changes;<br>●an increase in the number of colds or flu. |
| PSYCHOLOGICAL | ●impulse to aggression (when not appropriate);<br>●feelings of depression;<br>●quicker loss of temper;<br>●increased anxiety, fear or guilt. |
| BEHAVIORAL | ●increased use of drugs, alcohol;<br>●increased complaining;<br>●increased stubbornness and rigidity;<br>●spending more and more time getting less and less done |
| JOB REACTIONS | ●increased tardiness and absenteeism;<br>●reduced work goals;<br>●less idealism and acceptance of responsibility;<br>●lower productivity and quality of work. |
| FAMILY LIFE | ●increased isolation from family members and affairs;<br>●increased angry reactions with family members;<br>●reduced social life and fewer holidays;<br>●bringing coaching home and inability to relax. |

This table is adapted from "Burnout in Coaching" by V. E. Wilson et al., September 1986, Sports Science Periodical on Research and Technology in Sport, 3.

In the beginning stage of burnout, coaches will experience some fatigue, loss of enthusiasm, and increased instability. In the advanced stage of burnout, the expression of totally negative beliefs about the coaching environment and withdrawal from the profession are common (Wilson & Bird, 1988).

Who is Affected?

Freudenberger (1974), a practising psychoanalyst, after studying many patients with burnout symptoms concluded that it is the dedicated and the committed who are most prone to the syndrome.

> The people who fall prey to it are, for the most part, decent
> individuals who have striven hard to reach a goal. Their schedules
> are busy, and whatever the project or job, they can be counted on
> to do more than their share. They're usually the leaders among us
> who have never been able to admit to limitations. They're burning
> out because they've pushed themselves too hard for too long.
> They started out with great expectations and refused to
> compromise along the way (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980, p.
> 12).

Likewise, it appears that the very ingredients that constitute success in coaching are the same ones that eventually lead to burnout.

> Coaches who are perfectionists, who are overachievers, who have
> high need for control and high energy levels - these are the
> coaches at risk. They are more susceptible to burnout if they are
> "helpers" to-a-fault; that is, coaches who are extremely "other"

oriented or need to be liked or admired by others, coaches who are

unable to say "no" to requests, or who feel a responsibility to help

others even when not asked - these are the coaches who are

prone to burnout. These are the coaches who are usually sensitive

and motivated by social and interpersonal rewards rather than by

money or external gratification (Wilson et al., 1986, p. 2).

However, these are only suggested traits that lead to burnout in coaches, and

their prevalence may not lead to burnout in every coach (Wilson et al., 1986).

There is some evidence that personality can be indicative of whether or

not an individual is susceptible to burnout (Wilson et al., 1986). Characteristics

symptomatic of Type A behavior pattern were identified in some teacher-

coaches who were in the advanced stage of burnout (Quigley, 1985). This

partially reinforces the theory that the coaches who are driven, and strive for

success, are potential burnout victims. An excessive need for control was also

identified in 25% of the teacher-coaches interviewed who were in the advanced

stage of burnout (Quigley, 1985).

Not every personality is susceptible to burnout. Subsequently, it would

be next to impossible for the underachiever or the happy-go-lucky individual

with fairly modest aspirations to achieve a state of burnout. Burnout appears to

be limited to dynamic, charismatic, goal-oriented men and women, and to

determined idealists who want their marriages to be the best, their work records

to be outstanding, their children to shine, and their community to be better

(Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980; Shank, 1983).

## Instruments for Measuring Burnout

### Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)

The most widely utilized measure of the burnout syndrome has been the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Lee & Ashforth, 1990). It is a questionnaire containing 25 Likert-scales which measure the 3 dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment). Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally extended and exhausted by one's work. Personal accomplishment refers to feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people (Quigley et al., 1987). Depersonalization refers to an unfeeling and impersonal response toward the recipient of one's care or service (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

The MBI utilizes two dimensions, intensity and frequency, for each subscale (Quigley et al., 1987). For each of the items comprising the three subscales, the frequency of each item is measured by the subjects' responses on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (occurring every day). The intensity of the feeling is measured on an 8-point scale ranging from 0 (never), to 1 (barely noticeable) to 7 (major, very strong) (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In essence, the respondents answer each question or item twice, once for frequency and once for intensity.

The MBI can be utilized additively. It can be used as a total burnout score, but is more commonly utilized as three subscale scores whose covariation with demographic variables is then examined (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). With regard to coaching, some of the variables that have been

correlated to the MBI and its subscales include age, gender, marital status, total years coaching, coaching success, and the type of sport coached (Caccese, 1982).

## Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout

With Golembiewski's Eight Phase Model, burnout is conceptualized as a process as opposed to a single event (Quigley et al., 1987). Emotional exhaustion is viewed as the main contributor to burnout, followed by personal accomplishment and depersonalization (Quigley et al., 1987). This phase model builds upon, and adds to the MBI (Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1983).

The eight phases of this model, in uncomplicated terms, "are simply all of the dichotomous combinations of the three MBI subscales" (Golembiewski, Munzenrider, & Carter, 1983, p.470). Scores of high or low on each subscale are given to each respondent. A 'high' score simply means that the respondent scored in the top half of the sample population on that subscale (Golembiewski, Munzenrider, & Carter, 1983). Therefore scores from the three MBI subscales would range from Lo-Lo-Lo, reflecting very little burnout, to Hi-Lo-Lo, and eventually Hi-Hi-Hi, reflecting high to severe burnout. "The incidence of physiological symptoms increases, phase by phase, as burn-out heightens in about 90 per cent of the cases" (Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1985, p.149).

### Burnout Level

As previously stated, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is the most widely utilized measure of the burnout syndrome (Lee & Ashforth, 1990). The 25 items on the MBI questionnaire are designed to measure emotional

exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment (Quigley et al., 1987). Respondents' answers on the questionnaire are tabulated to produce burnout scores which can be compared between individuals and between groups (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Once the burnout scores have been tabulated, they can be categorized by Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout. With this model, subjects can be categorized into one of eight phases of burnout. Phase I is indicative of very little burnout, while phase VIII reflects high to severe burnout (Golembiewski, Munzenrider, & Carter, 1983).

Generally coaches are less burned out when compared to the norms established for other populations (doctors, lawyers, social workers, etc.) (Capel et al., 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Kosa, 1989; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992; Wilson & Bird, 1988). However some studies found coaches experienced what can be considered severe burnout (Quigley et al., 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1988). In fact, Wilson and Chambers (1988) stated that between 25-30% (n = 144) of the Canadian National Team Coaches surveyed reported wanting a year off or were considering quitting coaching. Refer to Table 2 for a comparison of the means derived from Maslach and Jackson's (1981) and Vealey et al's. (1992) coaching burnout studies.

As the burnout phases progress, there are numerous signals that the perceived quality of working life deteriorates (Golembiewski, 1983a). So, although coaches generally report experiencing less burnout than other populations, some coaches experience severe burnout symptoms (Wilson &

**Table 2**

Maslach and Jackson's (1981) Norm Burnout Means

| MBI Subscale | Gender | Frequency | Intensity |
|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Exhaustion | Males | 23.08 | 28.99 |
| | | 17.61* | 25.98* |
| | Females | 24.48 | 33.33 |
| | | 20.70* | 29.19* |
| Personal Accomplishment | Males | 35.65 | 39.55 |
| | | 38.04* | 43.49* |
| | Females | 36.18 | 39.82 |
| | | 37.29* | 42.53* |
| Depersonalization | Males | 10.43 | 12.68 |
| | | 6.60* | 9.99* |
| | Females | 8.94 | 11.10 |
| | | 6.24* | 8.73* |

*Coaching burnout means established by Vealey et al., 1992. The comparatively higher personal accomplishment scores contribute to lower burnout scores.

Note. From Intrapersonal and situational predictors of coaching burnout by Vealey et al., (1992), Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 14, 49.

Bird, 1988), and there is every indication that a great number of coaches are prime candidates for severe burnout. Up to this point, only individuals currently coaching have been studied with regard to burnout. Perhaps those coaches who experienced the greatest burnout symptoms have already left the coaching profession. If this is the case, and individuals who have been coaching were also included in burnout studies, expected burnout scores would be higher.

Burnout is most likely to occur within the first few years of one's career (Maslach, 1976; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). When burnout does occur, the

individuals experiencing its symptoms are more likely to leave their profession at this point (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). This exodus has serious repercussions for athletes and sport organizations who must look for new coaches to fill the void.

## Variables Which Affect Burnout

### Converging Variables

Overload. Overload may occur when the tasks or quantity of work become too great. Work overload and over-coaching are major factors contributing to burnout (Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992). Quigley (1985) found that 70% (n=75) of the teacher-coaches in her sample, who had coached three or more sports in the past year, measured in the upper four phases of burnout. Quigley's (1985) study reinforces the earlier findings of Locke and Massengale (1978). In their study, teacher-coaches admitted concern over the feeling that the quality of their teaching performance was impaired by the additional demands of coaching.

Coaches in smaller high schools have reported their coaching staff were overextended in an effort to maintain existing programs and compete with larger schools (Quigley, 1985). Coaches have indicated that extended responsibilities, such as teaching extra classes and administrative duties, contribute to overload (Locke & Massengale, 1978). Dale and Weinberg (1989) reported that the coaches (n=302 high school and college coaches) in their study spent an average of 40 hours a week coaching their athletes. Wishnietsky and Felder (1989) have suggested that coaches tend to assume

the heavy workloads, particularly the majority of teacher-coaches who teach full time and then coach one or more sports.

Overload may also be experienced when performing another job in addition to coaching (Capel et al., 1987). An overload situation can lead to a greater occurrence of experienced emotional exhaustion in teacher-coaches (Quigley et al., 1987). Overload can be further exaggerated by performing jobs or tasks that are diverse or unrelated in nature. Teaching courses other than physical education adds to the stresses associated with the roles of teacher and coach. "Since physical education courses are more related to coaching than other academic courses, coaches who teach athletic related courses experience less conflict between the two roles, and therefore, less stress" (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1989, p.10).

Responsibility for other coaching-related functions such as public relations, finances and recruiting (Humphrey, 1987) may contribute more to burnout than coaching itself (Quigley et al., 1987). Quigley (1985) suggests that administrators reduce the number of tasks not directly associated with coaching in an effort to reduce the overload which contributes to burnout.

Other factors contributing to coaching burnout may be the length of the season, and the number of games and practices. It is speculated that as the season progresses, so might the opportunities for burnout. One reason why the studies investigating coaching burnout have met with equivocal results, are inconsistencies in situational variables or circumstances such as the time of season the questionnaire was completed (Dale & Weinberg, 1989). Wilson and

Bird (1988) however, found no relationship between the answers on the questionnaire and the time of season the questionnaire was filled out. However, only 28% of the coaches polled (n = 500) responded to the questionnaire. Extreme caution must be exercised when interpreting Wilson and Bird's (1988) findings because of the low response rate. Therefore, since burnout is a chronic progression, speculation would still lead us to believe that those questionnaires completed at the beginning of the season may show low burnout, and those completed toward the end of the season may show high levels of burnout (Dale & Weinberg, 1989).

Role conflict and/or ambiguity. Role conflict generally occurs in two forms, as inter-role conflict or as intra-role conflict. Inter-role conflict may arise when one person occupies several different roles that demand incompatible behaviour (Bianco & Paese, 1984; Locke & Massengale, 1978). Inter-role conflict, for example, occurs when a coach is expected to both scout rival teams, design a game plan, and attend to duties as spouse or parent on any given day. Intra-role conflict may arise when a person occupies a single role for which different groups or individuals expect incompatible behaviours (Bianco & Paese, 1984; Locke & Massengale, 1978). Intra-role conflict may occur, for example, when the coach is expected by some parents to win every possible game and by other parents to give every player an opportunity to participate in each game (Locke & Massengale, 1978).

Role conflict is a contributing factor that has been linked to coaching burnout (Capel et al., 1987; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989). Role conflict may

arise for the coach when a task/role is too difficult (qualitative), or there are too many tasks/roles (quantitative) as a result of the coach's multiple roles (Capel et al., 1987). High school coaches have frequently reported experiencing role conflict. The unique dual role occupation of teacher-coach produces unavoidable situations where one role must be emphasized over the other, and may ultimately result in burnout (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990; Figone, 1986).

Results from studies investigating role conflict have been inconsistent. Although it has been reported that high school coaches frequently experience role conflict (Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989), other studies have reported medium to low levels of role conflict (Capel et al., 1987; Quigley 1985). No distinction has been made between the two forms of role conflict. Quigley (1985) found that the majority of teacher-coaches in her sample reported that their coaching experience helped their performance in the classroom, and that they perceived their role as coach to be an extension of their role as teacher, resulting in less inter-role conflict.

Role ambiguity is also a factor that has been linked to burnout in coaches (Capel et al., 1987; Quigley et al., 1987). Role ambiguity occurs when there is a lack of necessary information that is required to perform a role adequately. For the coach, role ambiguity may arise when there is no clear explanation of how they may be evaluated (Capel et al., 1987), or when they do not receive clear and consistent information regarding their duties and responsibilities (Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989). Ambiguity can be reduced by informing coaches about how their performance will be measured, their precise roles and

responsibilities, how they will be monitored and what type of feedback they will be receiving (Capel et al., 1987).

Role conflict and role ambiguity have been cited as a problem for high school coaches (Capel et al., 1987; Wishnietsky and Felder, 1989). No data are available to assess whether or not, and to what degree, role conflict and role ambiguity may be a problem for coaches who coach at levels other than high school.

Success. Burnout is associated with the belief that one's work is not very meaningful or worthwhile (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The personal accomplishment subscale of the MBI is designed to measure feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people. High scores of personal accomplishment correspond to lesser degrees of burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The outcome of this measurement appears to depend on how the individual perceives success.

Success can mean different things to different people. Depending on the individual, success can be synonymous with such words as fame, fortune, happiness, prosperity and triumph. To the coach, success is very individualistic. How a coach perceives his/her rewards in coaching, and the attainment of meaningful accomplishments in coaching have been found to contribute significantly towards the prediction of burnout (Vealey et al., 1992). Importance has been placed upon winning (Lackey, 1977), financial rewards (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990; Lackey, 1977; Quigley, 1985; Vealey et al., 1992), and career advancement (Locke & Massengale, 1978). Some coaches

correlate success with less tangible variables such as positive player-coach relations (Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987).

Another factor contributing to burnout is the lack of an equitable reward system (Quigley, 1985). Seventy-five percent of the coaches in phase VII or VIII of burnout in Quigley's (1985) study reported not receiving any compensation for coaching. Poor monetary compensation has been listed as a prevalent reason why coaches leave the profession (Lackey, 1977), and both genders have reported being bothered by the low pay they receive (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990). Often it is the reward(s), whether it be in the form of pay or other, that is the important fuel which keeps some individuals going. When an individual's efforts go unrewarded, their energy ebbs and burnout may begin (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980).

Coaching record. Some coaches measure success by their record and 'winning/losing' has been reported as another reason why coaches leave the profession (Lackey, 1977). Coaches with a moderate success rate (a winning percentage of 41-60) have reported strong symptoms of burnout (Caccese, 1982). However, another study investigating Canadian University Coaches suggested that coaching success, as measured by win/loss record, did not have an effect on burnout levels (Haggerty, 1982). More research in this area is required.

Expectations of significant others. The expectations of significant others, such as administrators, athletes and parents, placed upon the coach could very well contribute to burnout. A significant other is any individual

whom the coach perceives is important, or has a direct/indirect effect upon the coach's job.

For example, a coach might be caught between the dilemma of coaching to win and allowing every player equal opportunity to participate. Some parents will want the coach to try and win every game, while other parents would rather the coach concentrate on developing the athletes. This scenario leads to increased intra-role conflict (Locke & Massengale, 1978).

The expectations of significant others can not only lead to intra-role conflict, but also to overload. Administrators who create stressful situations have been reported as a major aggravation by Canadian National Coaches (Wilson & Bird, 1988). Lack of support by school administrators with regard to the interscholastic athletic program, has been found to contribute to burnout (Quigley et al., 1987). In fact, coaches in phase eight of burnout, reported lack of school related support more frequently than coaches in phase one or four of burnout (Quigley et al., 1987).

Other factors. It has become evident that there are many factors at work that contribute to coaching burnout. With respect to teacher-coaches, it has been suggested that other work-related sources may contribute more to teacher-coach burnout than coaching itself (Quigley et al., 1987). Administrative and financial matters were reported as major contributors to coaching stress (Wilson & Bird, 1988).

Often it is not just one factor, but a complex interaction between many factors or components which constitutes stress and consequently develops into

burnout (Dale and Weinberg, 1989). These components, which interact and climax in burnout, can range from the very obvious to the very obscure.

Apart from those factors which have already been mentioned, 14 percent (n = 93 teacher-coaches) of the coaches surveyed reported being unappreciated by administrators and 6.5% reported being unappreciated by the public (Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982). These results were reinforced by a later study which concluded that 'lack of support' by the school administrators for the interscholastic athletic program contributed to burnout (Quigley et al., 1987).

Failure to properly motivate players, personal coaching habits, poor public relations, social interaction ineptness, poor psychological coaching techniques, poor player-coach relations, lack of technical knowledge, winning/losing, money, and administrator relations were some of the most prevalent reasons reported for coaches leaving the profession (Lackey, 1977). Generally, higher career aspirations have been associated with higher burnout scores. Interestingly, male coaches working in lower-socioeconomic-schools have reported significantly more teacher-coach conflict resulting in higher burnout scores (Locke & Massengale, 1978).

Another contributing factor to coaching burnout is coaching style. Coaches who are categorized as consideration-oriented coaches are more genuinely concerned with their athletes and attempt to be caring, warm, and approachable. These coaches tend to experience more burnout when compared to initiating-structure oriented coaches who are more concerned about goal attainment through planning and scheduling. This approach may help them to

deal with stressful and emotional situations without getting emotionally involved, and allowing them to put some psychological distance between themselves and their players (Dale & Weinberg, 1989).

Demographic Variables

Age. Age has been found to be an important demographic variable when searching for significant differences in the various burnout phase scores (Caccese, 1982). Burnout appears to occur more frequently in younger coaches, less than 40 years of age (Caccese, 1982; Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987). These data correspond to studies conducted on other populations (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Quigley et al. (1987) found that the average age of the coach in phase VIII of burnout (the phase experiencing the most severe symptoms of burnout), was five years younger than coaches in phase I of burnout (the phase experiencing the least severe symptoms of burnout).

Consequently, it can be concluded that younger coaches experience greater symptoms of burnout. However, there are more convergent factors at play when correlating a coach's age with burnout. For consideration, younger coaches in phase VIII of burnout have reported factors such as overly idealistic, overloaded, overcommitted, job insecurity, and a lack of confidence due to inexperience as possible contributors to burnout (Quigley et al., 1987).

Years of experience. Years of coaching experience appear to lessen burnout symptoms. The more experienced coach generally experiences less severe symptoms of burnout (Caccese, 1982; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al.,

1987). In one study, with regard to the number of years coached, the mean for subjects in phase I of burnout was 11.3 years, compared to a mean of 6.9 years for subjects in phase VIII (a difference of 4.4 years) (Quigley et al., 1987).

It has been suggested that the experience acquired by the older coach results in a more balanced perspective of the role (Quigley, 1985), and older, more experienced coaches are better able to cope with the stressors involved with being a coach (Quigley et al., 1987). Coaches with more than 15 years of experience reported stronger and more numerous occurrences of feelings of personal accomplishment than less experienced coaches (Caccese, 1982), and therefore a lower degree of burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Gender. Regardless of the demographic variable involved, whether it be age, years of experience and so forth, female coaches report higher levels of burnout (Caccese, 1982; Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987). In fact, in one study, up to 63.1% (n of total sample = 75, n of females unreported) of the female coaches surveyed were found to be in the upper four phases of burnout. In comparison, only 49.0% of the surveyed male coaches were found to be in similar phases (Quigley et al., 1987). Maslach and Jackson (1981) have suggested that gender differences, as they relate to burnout, may reflect differences in occupations. The population in their study consisted of predominantly male physicians, police, and psychiatrists. Likewise, the nurses, social workers, and counsellors studied were predominantly female.

With regard to coaching, the fact that females generally coach women's teams may have an effect on their reported symptoms of burnout. Both males and females who coached female athletes, have reported significantly less intense feelings of personal accomplishment on the Adapted MBI (Quigley et al., 1987), indicating greater levels of burnout. The Adapted MBI is an inventory designed to measure burnout levels in coaches (Haggerty, 1982), and the personal accomplishment subscale measures individual feelings of competence and successful achievement (Quigley et al., 1987).

In general, female coaches report less intense feelings of personal accomplishment (Caccese, 1982; Haggerty, 1982; Quigley et al., 1987). It is generally recognized that male teams enjoy greater benefits and a greater public limelight, and for that reason experience greater personal achievements (Humphrey, 1987:82). Thus, it has been suggested that the comparative lack of support female sport receives, may influence the female coach's sense of personal achievement (Quigley et al., 1987).

The literature is clear with regard to the gender variable. Female coaches experience greater burnout symptoms (Caccese, 1982; Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992). Several reasons for this have been suggested. Greater role conflict due to the added traditional role of homemaker (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990), and a greater occurrence of overload as a result of multiple roles (Locke & Massengale, 1978; Quigley, 1985) have contributed to the burnout.

Athlete variables. In the helping and service professions, it is the constant helper-client contact that is a major source of burnout (Golembiewski, 1983a; Maslach Jackson, 1981). Due to the nature of the contact with athletes, coaching may be considered a helping profession (Capel et al., 1987). As is the case with the helping professions, over time it may become increasingly difficult to maintain the personal care and commitment to the athletes which appear to be the essence of coaching (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984).

In line with what has been found in helping and service profession studies, the client which in this case is the athlete(s), can be a major source of stress for the coach (Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982; Wilson & Bird, 1988; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989). 'Poor relationships with the athletes' has been cited as the number one reason why coaches leave (Lackey, 1977), or are dismissed from coaching responsibilities (Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989). Coaches have reported disrespect from players (42.8%), inability to reach athletes (20.7%), lack of appreciation by athletes (3.0%) (n = 93) (Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982), and a lack of dedication by athletes (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990; Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982) as sources of stress.

Not all studies investigating player-coach relations have drawn the same conclusions. In some studies student-athletes did not contribute to feelings of burnout (Quigley et al., 1987), but were instead a source of satisfaction and motivation (Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987). Many coaches receive satisfaction from dealing with the young men and women with whom they

associate, and have reported that they were the reason for their continued involvement in the profession (Humphrey, 1987; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987).

It is not uncommon for coaches to refer to their team and its members as family. From a sociological perspective, if the team is observed as a family unit, one can better understand the equivocal results regarding athlete variables. In most families, although the members love and respect each other, at the same time they can be stressful to each other (Humphrey, 1987). With this in mind, it is not surprising then that coaches can perceive their athletes as a source of satisfaction (Humphrey, 1987; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987), as well as a source of stress (Humphrey, 1987; Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982).

Marital status. In general, single coaches appear to experience a greater frequency of burnout and emotional exhaustion (Caccese, 1982; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987), and have been measured in the upper phases of burnout more frequently than married (Quigley, 1985) or divorced coaches (Caccese, 1982). This picture mirrors the helping and service professions where people who were either single or divorced scored higher on the emotional exhaustion subscale of the MBI for both frequency and intensity indicating a greater frequency of burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

It has been suggested that one reason for this finding may be that single coaches have more of a tendency to over identify, or become overly involved in their work. The opposite scenario is the coach with family commitments who may limit or restrict his/her coaching involvement (Quigley et al., 1987).

Married coaches have reported more frequent feelings of personal accomplishment (Caccese, 1982), decreasing the opportunity for burnout. The majority of coaches appear to be married (69%), as opposed to single (23%) and divorced (8%) (n = 302) (Dale & Weinberg, 1989). However, this situation could change as the breakdown of the nuclear family becomes more common.

Although single coaches have reported to be in the upper phases of burnout more frequently than married coaches, married female coaches have reported more burnout than single female or married male coaches (Quigley, 1985). Seventy-five percent of married female coaches measured in the upper four phases of burnout (n = 75 male and female high school coaches, specific n of female coaches = unknown) (Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987), compared to 47.5% for married males (Quigley et al., 1987).

Married women appear to experience the greatest symptoms of burnout (Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987). The above statistic may be the result of a "structural problem which affects women in coaching because of the general societal expectation that they play the major role in domestic labour" (Quigley et al., 1987, p.270). Another contributing factor to a higher level of burnout among married female coaches could be an increase in role conflict and overload, resulting from the multiple roles of spouse, parent, homemaker, teacher (or other occupation) and coach (Quigley, 1985).

Education level and background. Although information on the education level of coaches is limited, it appears that the majority of coaches are educated beyond high school (Capel et al., 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Wilson & Bird,

1988). When investigating head basketball coaches at large high schools,

Capel et al. (1987) found that all of their subjects had completed an educational

degree beyond high school, and 98% (n = 235) were certified teachers. From a

survey of high school and college coaches (n = 302), Dale and Weinberg (1989)

reported that 74.7% of the coaches possessed some post graduate education

with 44% having earned a graduate degree.

The relationship of educational level to burnout in the coaching

population is uncertain. However, in the helping and service professions,

differences by level of education were found for each of the MBI subscales

(Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In general, more education (people who completed

college or post graduate work) was associated with higher scores on the

emotional exhaustion subscale of the MBI for both intensity and frequency. The

reverse was found to be true for the depersonalization subscale, where lower

levels of education corresponded to higher scores. With regard to the personal

accomplishment subscale, post-graduates scored highest followed by people

who had not completed college (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Summary

There are a number of variables which can lead to a high rate of burnout

in coaches. Burnout appears more frequently in coaches who are less than 40

years of age, possess less than 15 years of experience, are female, coach

women's sports, are single (with the exception of married female coaches), and

are educated (completed college, graduate school, etc.).

However, a coach falling into any one or more of the above categories

will not automatically or necessarily experience severe burnout. There are also a number of convergent factors at play including overload, role conflict and ambiguity, success, and expectations of significant others. Any coach who does fall into one of the above categorizations can utilize preventative burnout strategies to reduce or combat burnout.

### How to Avoid Coaching Burnout:

The following are preventive burnout strategies gleaned from the literature. To reduce or combat burnout coaches should:

1) Attend seminars, conferences and workshops to keep abreast of new ideas and research (Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger, 1974; Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson et al., 1986; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989).

2) Become knowledgeable of the signs and symptoms of burnout, and take action against them (Bartolome, 1984; Wilson et al., 1986).

3) Reduce the number of hours that are spent with athletes (Freudenberger, 1974; Wilson et al., 1986).

4) Delegate greater responsibilities to other members of the coaching staff (Figone, 1986; Wilson & Bird, 1988).

5) Get involved in a hobby outside of sports (Figone, 1986; Malone & Rotella, 1981).

6) Know and endorse the philosophy of the sport association you are working with in order to reduce conflict and ambiguity (Wilson et al., 1986).

7) Know your limits and do not try to take on too much responsibility (Roaf, 1979).

8) Learn and develop a system of time management in order to improve efficiency in coaching related tasks (Cherniss, 1980; Humphrey, 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1988).

9) Learn from mistakes and failures by recognizing them, admitting them, correcting them and moving forward (Malone & Rotella, 1981).

10) Learn to take things less seriously (Humphrey, 1987).

11) Maintain a proper nutritious diet (Bartolome, 1984; Humphrey, 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1988).

12) Make an effort to improve communication which would enhance the mutual appreciation and understanding of everyone's (coaches and administrators inclusive) responsibilities, priorities and needs, thus reducing role ambiguity (Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson & Bird, 1988).

13) Partake in a systematic vigorous training program (Bartolome, 1984; Freudenberger, 1974; Roaf, 1979; Humphrey, 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1988; Wilson et al., 1986).

14) Realistically accept that very few coaches will ever establish outstanding records (Figone, 1986; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989).

15) Recognize your own accomplishments and reward yourself (Humphrey, 1987).

16) Remain flexible. Do not become rigid in your coaching style (Malone & Rotella, 1981).

17) Schedule some time off away from coaching (i.e., summer, season, vacation) (Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger, 1974; Malone & Rotella, 1981).

18) Sometimes a change of scenery, change of pace, or any change at all may be just as effective as a vacation or time off (Bartolome, 1984).

19) Prioritize life roles (Malone & Rotella, 1981).

20) Share your concerns and problems with other coaches (Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger, 1974; Humphrey, 1987; Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson et al., 1986; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989).

21) Try to lead a balanced, well-rounded lifestyle (Figone, 1986; Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson et al., 1986; Wilson & Bird, 1988).

22) Turn obstacles and problems into creative solutions (Malone & Rotella, 1981).

23) Utilize goal setting and other motivation techniques on a consistent basis (Cherniss, 1980; Figone, 1986; Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson & Bird, 1988).

24) Utilize relaxation techniques, regeneration methods, and other psychological skills on a consistent basis (Bartolome, 1984; Humphrey, 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1988; Wilson et al., 1986; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989).

CHAPTER 2

Methodology

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree of burnout

among minor hockey league coaches as assessed by the Adapted Maslach

Burnout Inventory and Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout, and to identify

various factors (ie. age, experience, coaching style, etc.) which are related to

the stages of burnout in minor hockey coaches.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that Minor Hockey Coaches who experience the

greatest symptoms of burnout would be those who:

1)    coached in the higher divisions (Bantam and above);

2)    coached at a competitive level (A, AA, AAA & Junior);

3)    possessed mediocre to average coaching records (40-60 win

      percentage);

4)    were required to perform additional administrative roles;

5)    experienced intra-role conflict; and

6)    possessed coaching career aspirations.

Subjects

Subjects were selected from a population of current and former minor

hockey league coaches. All current coaches in the Thunder Bay Amateur Minor

Hockey Association (TBAMHA), from the Novice Division through to the Junior

Division, were asked to participate. Former coaches who had left the TBAMHA within the past season, and still resided in the Thunder Bay area, were also asked to participate. All coaches had to be carded with the Thunder Bay Amateur Hockey Association (TBAHA). A list of such coaches was provided by the TBAMHA. All coaches were male and ranged in age from 13 to 57, with a mean age of 35.13 ±8.91 years. The number of years spent coaching in the TBAMHA ranged from 1 to 27 years, with the mean being 5.72 ±5.22 years.

<div align="center">Instruments</div>

Maslach Burnout Inventory

As previously mentioned, the most widely utilized measure of the burnout syndrome has been the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Lee & Ashforth, 1990). It is a questionnaire containing 25 Likert-scales which measure the 3 dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) (Quigley et al., 1987). The three dimensions of the MBI are closely related to variables reflecting aspects of strain, stress, coping and self-efficacy (Lee & Ashforth, 1990). Psychological and physiological strain is strongly associated with the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions of the MBI. Perceptions of performance and the use of control are strongly associated with the personal accomplishment dimension, while the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization dimensions relate more strongly to helplessness (Lee & Ashforth, 1990). Overall, Lee and Ashforth's (1990) study on the meaning of Maslach's three dimensions of burnout, supports the three factor model with the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization factors being

highly correlated.

The MBI was designed to measure the burnout level of the worker who "must deal directly with people about issues that either are, or could be problematic" (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p.101). Higher mean scores on the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales correspond to higher degrees of experienced burnout. Conversely, lower mean scores on the personal accomplishment subscale correspond to higher degrees of burnout (Quigley et al., 1987).

The test-retest reliability of the MBI, its subscales and coefficients are significant beyond the 0.001 level. The validity of the MBI was demonstrated by correlating an individual's MBI scores with: 1) behavioral ratings made independently by an individual who knew the person well (ie., spouse/co-worker); 2) job characteristics that were expected to contribute to burnout; and 3) measures of various outcomes hypothesized to be related to burnout. All three sets of correlations provided substantial evidence for the validity of the MBI (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Internal reliability for the MBI has been determined to be r = .83 (frequency) and r = .84 (intensity) for the 25 item scale. Test-retest reliability of the subscales has been determined to be r = .82 (frequency) and r = .53 (intensity) for Emotional Exhaustion, r = .80 (frequency) and r = .68 (intensity) for Personal Accomplishment, and r = .60 (frequency) and r = .69 (intensity) for Depersonalization. All reliability coefficients were significant beyond the p < .001 level.

A comparison of subjects' scores on the MBI and Job Descriptive Index (JDI) measure of 'general job satisfaction' rejects the notion that burnout is simply a synonym for job dissatisfaction (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Reported burnout is also not influenced by a social desirability response set (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). A Social Desirability Scale (SDS) was correlated with the MBI subscales to determine if coaches' responses were influenced by social desirability (Dale & Weinberg, 1989). The results indicated that no significant relationship existed between the SDS and MBI (Dale & Weinberg, 1989). Overall, the MBI has been found to be reliable, valid, and easy to administer (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Adapted Maslach Burnout Inventory

The Adapted Maslach Burnout Inventory (Adapted MBI), is the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) slightly reworded for use within the coaching population (Quigley et al., 1987). Haggerty (1982) who first adapted the MBI, reported that the slight rewording of the MBI for use on the coaching population did not effect the validity or reliability of the instrument (cited in Quigley et al., 1987). With the Adapted MBI, feelings of depersonalization may reflect coaches' feelings and association with the athletes with whom they work (Quigley et al., 1987).

The Adapted MBI differs from the MBI with regard to the manner in which respondents answer each item. Instead of answering each question twice, they answer only once. When answering each item, the respondents mark the extent to which each item is like or unlike them on a 7-point scale

(Quigley et al., 1987). Such a revision of the MBI does not distort Maslach's intent or results (Golembiewski, Munzenrider & Carter, 1983).

The MBI, or Adapted MBI, can be used as a total burnout score (if the personal accomplishment subscale scoring is reversed), but is more commonly utilized as three subscale scores whose covariation is then examined with demographic variables (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). With regard to coaching, some of the demographic variables that have been correlated include age, gender, marital status, total years coaching, coaching success, and the type of sport coached (Caccese, 1982).

Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout

As previously mentioned, with Golembiewski's Eight Phase Model, burnout is conceptualized as a process as opposed to a single event (Quigley et al., 1987). Emotional exhaustion is viewed as the main contributor to burnout, followed by personal accomplishment and depersonalization (Quigley et al., 1987). This phase model builds upon, and adds to the MBI by allowing the researcher to categorize respondents (Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1983).

The eight phases of this model, in simple terms, "are simply all of the dichotomous combinations of the three MBI subscales" (Golembiewski, Munzenrider & Carter, 1983, p.470). Scores of high or low on each subscale are given to each respondent. A 'high' score simply means that the respondent scored in the top half of the sample population on that subscale (Golembiewski, Munzenrider & Carter, 1983). Therefore scores from the three MBI subscales would range from Lo-Lo-Lo, reflecting very little burnout, to Hi-Hi-Hi, reflecting

high to severe burnout (Refer to Table 3).

**Table 3**

Golembiewski's Eight Progressive Burnout Phases

| MBI SUBSCALES | Proposed Burnout Phases | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Depersonalization | L | H | L | H | L | H | L | H |
| Personal Accomplishment | L | L | H | H | L | L | H | H |
| Emotional Exhaustion | L | L | L | L | H | H | H | H |

\* 'L' indicates a score below the mean for that subscale and 'H' indicates a score above the mean for that subscale.  Means are computed from the sample being tested.

From "Phases of progressive burnout and their work site covariants: critical issues in OD research and praxis" by Golembiewski et al. (1983), Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 19, 473.

A comparison of the four MBI scores, the three subscale scores, and the total score, with the phase of burnout within Quigley's (1985) study supported the validity of Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout.  However, student-athletes were found to be a source of satisfaction and motivation, as opposed to a source of burnout, and coaching was found to be a main source of satisfaction in the teacher-coach's job (Quigley, 1985).  Therefore, the reported feelings of depersonalization and personal accomplishment may not influence the degree of burnout experienced by these teacher-coaches (Quigley, 1985), as

they would in other helping profession studies (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In fact, the feelings of personal accomplishment reported by coaches have been found to be four times higher than the feelings reported in other helping professions (Wilson et al., 1986).

## Coaches' Survey

Items in the Coaches' Survey consisted of a cover letter, an Adapted MBI questionnaire, along with questions related to personal and coaching-related data for each subject. The cover letter contained a brief explanation about the study, along with detailed instructions on how to complete the survey. The personal data variables included gender, age, marital status, number of children, the ages of the children, educational background, primary occupation and the number of hours spent each week related to the primary occupation. The coaching variables included experience, workload, athlete variables, win/loss record, compensation, and coaching situation (division and level coached). The survey also included a small section on physical stress data (See Appendix A).

## Procedures

### Pre-assessment

In the first stage of this study, the Adapted MBI and Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey were distributed to all coaches who met the definitional requirements of this study. Permission to administer the questionnaires to the coaches was granted by the TBAMHA. The TBAMHA also provided the information necessary to make contact with the coaches.

Subjects (N = 479) were asked to respond to a mail survey. The overall

return rate of the survey was 58.2% (n = 279). Current coaches had a return rate of 61.5% (n = 206, N = 335). Former coaches had a return rate of 50.7% (n = 73, N = 144). Coaches were assured anonymity, and were provided with self-addressed, stamped envelopes to mail back their surveys. A second mailing was conducted, approximately one month following the initial mailing, for those coaches who had not yet returned their survey.

The list of former coaches was generated by comparing the 1992-93 TBAMHA coaches list with the 1991-92 TBAMHA coaches list. A coach was defined as a former coach if his name appeared on the 1991-92 TBAMHA coaches list, but not on the 1992-93 TBAMHA coaches list. Both lists were provided by the TBAMHA.

Fifty returned surveys did not meet the definitional requirements of the study and were therefore excluded. Some surveys were returned incomplete, and others were returned by coaches who were not carded with the TBAHA. Two hundred and twenty-nine returned surveys (n = 199 and n = 30 for current and former coaches respectively) were included in the statistical analyses. Therefore, the final response rate was 47.8% (n = 229, N = 479).

The objective was to measure the burnout level in current and former minor hockey league coaches who participated in the study. The respondents' Adapted MBI scores were tabulated. Based upon these results, the respondents were then placed into one of Golembiewski's eight phases of burnout.

To summarize, five scores for each subject were generated from the Adapted MBI items. Four scores were provided by the three Adapted MBI

subscales and the total burnout score. The fifth score was based on

Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analyses. Frequencies were tabulated for different

categories. Examples of categories included division and level. The purpose

was to determine the breakdown of subjects by different categories.

Frequencies were also tabulated for demographic and coaching situation

variables which consisted of non-parametric data. This information was used to

conduct a series of chi-square analyses.

Means and standard deviations were calculated for the Adapted MBI and

its three subscales. Means and standard deviations were also calculated for

demographic and coaching situation variables which consisted of parametric

data. This information was used to conduct inferential statistical analyses.

Correlations were calculated on a number of demographic and coaching

situation variables. The objective was to determine which variables correlated

with scores on the Adapted MBI and its three subscales. This information was

used to conduct multiple regression analyses.

Chi-square. A series of chi-square analyses were performed to determine

if trends existed among current coaches and select demographic and coaching

situation variables. The variables that were examined included age, marital

status, education level, years coached, division, and level. Age and years

coached were sub-divided into categories for this part of the analyses. Refer to

Table 4 and Table 6 for the categories which were examined.

Inferential statistics. Independent samples T-tests were conducted between current and former coaches to determine if the two samples were significantly different on age, years coached, contact hours, and duty hours. Independent samples T-tests were also conducted on current coaches who were classified into Phase I and VIII of Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout. The purpose was to determine if significant differences existed between the two samples on a number of variables. The variables that were examined included age, years coached, contact hours, duty hours, combined hours, the number of administrative roles, emphasis placed on win/loss record, rewards, recognition, and player development; win percentage; the number of related physical symptoms experienced; and statements numbered 26 to 50 of the Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey (Refer to Appendix A).

A series of one-way analyses of variance were conducted on age, marital status, education level, years coached, division, level, and win percentage. The purpose was to determine if significant differences existed among current coaches on any level of the variables. Only current coaches were used in this step of the analyses.

MANOVA was conducted on the three subscale scores of the Adapted MBI. A 2X2 factorial model was designed to test the hypotheses that coaches who coached in the higher divisions (Bantam and above), and at a competitive level (A, AA, AAA & Junior), experienced greater burnout. MANOVA was used to test for significance and interaction between the three subscale scores of the Adapted MBI. Only current coaches were used in this step of the analyses.

Multiple regression. Forward multiple regression analyses was conducted using variables which were found to correlate with scores on the Adapted MBI and its subscales. Forward multiple regression was used because it builds the equation one step at a time sequentially adding predictors to the equation. The first predictor, or variable, entered in the equation shows the highest squared correlation to the variable being predicted. Additional predictors are included in the equation until the inclusion fails to provide a significant increase in the squared correlation.

CHAPTER 3

Results

The results of this study are divided into three major sections. First,

descriptive analyses of the data are reported. Descriptive analyses include the

breakdown of subjects by demographic and coaching situation variables, and

the computation of Adapted MBI and subscale scores. Means and standard

deviations, frequencies, and correlations were examined. Finally, subjects were

placed into one of Golembiewski's VIII Phases of Burnout based upon relative

Adapted MBI subscale scores.

Second, statistical analyses were performed using both the current and

former coaching samples. Chi-square procedures were conducted on pertinent

non-parametric data. Inferential statistics were utilized on relevant parametric

data. Multiple regression was used to determine what variables best predicted

burnout.

Third, coaches, who were categorized into Phase I and VIII of

Golembiewski's Burnout Model, were compared on a number of variables

including win/loss record, emphasis placed on player development, and related

physical symptoms. Differences in responses to statements, numbered 26 to

50, on the Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey were also examined (Refer to

Appendix A.). Only current coaches, who were categorized into either Phase I

or VIII of Golembiewski's Burnout Model, were included at this step of the

analyses.

## Descriptive Analyses

Frequencies

Demographic variables. The majority (72.1%) of coaches were over the

age of 30. Of the 229 coaches surveyed, 33.2% were in the 30 to 39 age

bracket, and 38.9% were in the 40 and over age bracket. A large percentage

of the coaches were married or in a common law relationship (70.3%, n = 161).

Only 39.8% of the coaches possessed any form of college or university

education. Refer to Table 4 for a complete breakdown of demographic

variables.

**Table 4**

Demographic Variables by Coaching Status

| Variable | Current | | Former | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | % | n | % |
| Age (years) | | | | |
| under 20 | 8 | 4.0 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 20 to 29 | 48 | 24.1 | 7 | 23.3 |
| 30 to 39 | 67 | 33.7 | 9 | 30.0 |
| over 40 | 76 | 38.2 | 13 | 43.3 |
| Marital Status | | | | |
| single | 51 | 25.6 | 6 | 20.0 |
| married/common law | 140 | 70.4 | 21 | 70.0 |
| divorced/separated | 6 | 3.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| other | 2 | 1.0 | 3 | 10.0 |
| Education | | | | |
| Elementary School | 10 | 5.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| High School | 108 | 54.3 | 14 | 46.7 |
| College | 39 | 19.6 | 7 | 23.3 |
| University | 40 | 20.1 | 5 | 16.7 |
| other | 2 | 1.0 | 4 | 13.3 |

Coaching situation variables. With reference to coaching situation variables, it appears that a majority of coaches involved with the TBAMHA have coached for five years or less (60.7%). The majority of responding coaches also coached in the younger divisions, Novice through Pee Wee (68.5%), and at the less competitive levels, House and 'A' (62.4%). For a breakdown of coaches by division and level refer to Table 5. Refer to Table 6 for a complete breakdown of coaching situation variables.

**Table 5**
Coaches by Division and Level

| Last Division Coached | | Total | House | A | AA | AAA & higher |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Last Level Coached | | |
| Novice | n | 54 | 38 | 9 | 7 | |
| | % | 23.8 | 16.7 | 4.0 | 3.1 | |
| Atom | n | 51 | 11 | 16 | 24 | |
| | % | 22.4 | 4.8 | 7.0 | 10.6 | |
| Pee Wee | n | 52 | 11 | 22 | 16 | 3 |
| | % | 22.8 | 4.8 | 9.7 | 7.0 | 1.3 |
| Bantam | n | 37 | | 23 | 13 | 1 |
| | % | 16.2 | | 10.1 | 5.7 | 0.4 |
| Midget & higher | n | 33 | | 13 | 13 | 7 |
| | % | 14.5 | | 5.7 | 5.7 | 3.1 |
| Total | n | 227 | 60 | 83 | 73 | 11 |
| | % | | 26.3 | 36.6 | 32.2 | 4.8 |

**Table 6**
Coaching Situation Variables by Coaching Status

| Variable | Current | | Former | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | % | n | % |
| **Coaching (years)** | | | | |
| 1 year | 41 | 20.6 | 4 | 13.3 |
| 2 to 5 | 81 | 40.7 | 13 | 43.3 |
| 6 to 10 | 45 | 22.6 | 6 | 20.0 |
| 11 to 15 | 18 | 9.0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| over 15 | 14 | 7.0 | 5 | 16.7 |
| **Division** | | | | |
| Novice | 47 | 23.6 | 7 | 23.3 |
| Atom | 50 | 25.1 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Pee Wee | 42 | 21.1 | 10 | 33.3 |
| Bantam | 31 | 15.6 | 6 | 20.0 |
| Midget | 25 | 12.6 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Juvenile | 1 | 0.5 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Junior | 3 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| other | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| **Level** | | | | |
| House | 53 | 26.6 | 7 | 23.3 |
| A | 70 | 35.2 | 13 | 43.3 |
| AA | 66 | 33.2 | 7 | 23.3 |
| AAA | 7 | 3.5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| Junior | 3 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| other | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 6.7 |
| Total | 199 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 |

Means and Standard Deviations

Demographic and coaching situation variable. The mean age of the coaching sample was 35.13 years (SD ±8.91). The mean number of years coached was 5.72 ±5.22. Contact hours refers to the approximate time the coach spent in direct contact with athletes. The mean hours/week the coach

was in direct contact with athletes was 4.84 ±2.26. Duty hours refers to the

approximate time the coach spent in total related to coaching duties. Duty

hours also encompass contact hours. The mean hours/week the coach spent

related to coaching duties was 7.76 ±4.54. Combined hours refers to the

combined time spent related to coaching and a primary occupation. The mean

combined hours/week was 50.37 ±11.28. Refer to Table 7 for a summary of

demographic and coaching situation variable means.

**Table 7**
Demographic & Coaching Situation Variable Means

|  | Total Coaches (N = 229) | Current Coaches (n = 199) | Former Coaches (n = 30) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age |  |  |  |
| Mean | 35.13 | 35.10 | 35.33 |
| SD | 8.91 | 8.86 | 9.41 |
| Years Coached |  |  |  |
| Mean | 5.72 | 5.66 | 6.11 |
| SD | 5.22 | 5.18 | 5.58 |
| Contact Hours |  |  |  |
| Mean | 4.84 | 4.88 | 4.61 |
| SD | 2.26 | 2.35 | 1.47 |
| Duty Hours |  |  |  |
| Mean | 7.76 | 7.83 | 7.24 |
| SD | 4.54 | 4.67 | 3.4 |
| Combined Hours |  |  |  |
| Mean | 50.37 | 50.08 | 52.48 |
| SD | 11.28 | 11.61 | 8.31 |

Burnout scores. Burnout scores were accumulated for each coach via the Adapted MBI. The highest score that could have been attained on the Adapted MBI was 175. The mean score for the sample was 69.16 ±17.12. The highest score that could have been attained on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale was 63. The mean score on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale was 22.14 ±9.42. The highest score that could have been attained on the Depersonalization subscale was 35. The mean score on the Depersonalization subscale was 11.69 ±4.81. The highest score that could have been attained on the Personal Accomplishment subscale was 56. The mean score on the Personal Accomplishment subscale was 23.24 ±6.9.

Former and current coaches scored 64.69 ±10.64 and 69.84 ±17.82 respectively on the Adapted MBI. Former coaches responded with mean scores of 18.81 ±6.84 and 10.36 ±3.97 respectively on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales, while current coaches responded with mean scores of 22.61 ±9.66 and 11.89 ±4.90) respectively on the same subscales. For a summary of Adapted MBI and subscale means by coaching status, refer to Table 8.

A number of demographic and coaching situation variables were examined with regard to current coaches only. These variables included age, marital status, education level, years coached, division and level coached. Current coaches over 40 years of age scored highest on the Adapted MBI with a mean of 73.16. With regard to marital status, current coaches who were either married or involved in a common law relationship scored highest on the

**Table 8**

Adapted MBI and Subscale Means ± SD for total (N = 229), current (N = 199) and former (N = 30) coaches.

| | Mean | SD | Range | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Minimum | Maximum |
| Adapted MBI(total score) | | | | |
| Total Coaches | 69.16 | 17.12 | 36 | 147 |
| Current Coaches | 69.84 | 17.82 | 36 | 147 |
| Former Coaches | 64.69 | 10.64 | 53 | 86 |
| Emotional Exhaustion | | | | |
| Total Coaches | 22.14 | 9.42 | 9 | 63 |
| Current Coaches | 22.61 | 9.66 | 9 | 63 |
| Former Coaches | 18.81 | 6.84 | 9 | 45 |
| Depersonalization | | | | |
| Total Coaches | 11.69 | 4.81 | 5 | 34 |
| Current Coaches | 11.89 | 4.90 | 5 | 34 |
| Former Coaches | 10.36 | 3.97 | 5 | 19 |
| Personal Accomplishment@ | | | | |
| Total Coaches | 23.24 | 6.90 | 8 | 50 |
| Current Coaches | 23.18 | 6.95 | 8 | 50 |
| Former Coaches | 23.70 | 6.61 | 16 | 45 |

@The higher the score/mean on this subscale, the lower the degree of personal accomplishment and the greater the burnout.

Adapted MBI with a mean of 71.13. Current coaches who completed high school, as their highest level of education, scored highest on the Adapted MBI with a mean of 71.11.

With regard to coaching situation variables, current coaches who coached for more than 15 years scored highest on the Adapted MBI with a mean of 72.33. Current coaches who coached in the Midget division, or above, scored highest on the Adapted MBI with a mean of 73.42. Current coaches

who coached at the 'A' level scored highest on the Adapted MBI with a mean of 72.57. For a complete breakdown of mean Adapted MBI and subscale scores of current coaches by demographic and coaching situation variables, refer to Table 9.

Current coaches scored lower than Maslach and Jackson's (1981) MBI Norms on all aspects of the MBI, except on frequency of the Depersonalization subscale. Since our sample consisted of male coaches only, their scores were compared to male scores of other studies. For a visual comparison of the current coaching sample to other studies, refer to Table 10.

## Correlations

Adapted MBI and its subscales. Since the Adapted MBI score is an accumulation of all three of its subscale scores, a high correlation should exist between the Adapted MBI and its subscales. Correlational analyses were performed to see if this relationship did exist, and to what extent. A high correlation existed between the Adapted MBI scores and its three subscale scores. The strongest positive correlation existed between the Adapted MBI scores and the Emotional Exhaustion subscale scores ($r = .90$, $p < .001$). Strong positive correlations also existed between the Adapted MBI scores and both the Depersonalization ($r = .79$, $p < .001$) and Personal Accomplishment ($r = .75$, $p < .001$) subscales. Refer to Table 11 for the correlation results between the Adapted MBI and its subscales.

Demographic variables. Correlational analyses were performed on select demographic variables to see if a relationship existed between them and the

**Table 9**

Demographic & Coaching Situation Variables of Current Coaches by Burnout Scores

| Variable/Category | Mean Burnout Scores | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Adapted MBI | EE | DEP | PA |
| **Age (years)** | | | | |
| < 30 | 66.08 | 20.51 | 10.96 | 21.89 |
| 30-39 | 69.30 | 22.21 | 11.42 | 23.32 |
| ≥ 40 | 73.16 | 24.51 | 13.00 | 24.09 |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Single | 67.98 | 21.17 | 11.70 | 22.24 |
| Married/Common Law | 71.13 | 23.47 | 12.05 | 23.75 |
| Divorced/Separated | 60.60 | 17.67 | 9.60 | 21.50 |
| **Education Level** | | | | |
| High School | 71.11 | 23.07 | 12.14 | 24.17 |
| College | 69.77 | 22.64 | 11.70 | 22.00 |
| University | 67.14 | 21.71 | 11.38 | 21.93 |
| **Years Coached** | | | | |
| 1 | 70.86 | 22.79 | 11.46 | 23.44 |
| 2 to 5 | 68.53 | 22.64 | 11.17 | 23.70 |
| 6 to 10 | 71.57 | 23.07 | 12.65 | 23.07 |
| 11 to 15 | 67.06 | 19.94 | 13.38 | 19.78 |
| > 15 | 72.33 | 24.36 | 13.00 | 24.42 |
| **Division** | | | | |
| Novice & Younger | 66.79 | 21.84 | 10.63 | 22.35 |
| Atom | 70.67 | 22.26 | 12.72 | 24.24 |
| Pee Wee | 70.81 | 23.45 | 12.13 | 23.30 |
| Bantam | 68.50 | 21.48 | 11.88 | 22.37 |
| Midget & Higher | 73.42 | 24.52 | 12.22 | 23.48 |
| **Level** | | | | |
| House | 65.61 | 21.40 | 10.06 | 23.82 |
| A | 72.57 | 23.03 | 12.72 | 23.62 |
| AA | 70.16 | 22.64 | 12.45 | 22.74 |
| AAA & Higher | 71.10 | 25.60 | 12.20 | 19.60 |

**Table 10**

Comparison of Current Coaching Sample to Other Studies and MBI Norms.

| MBI and Adapted MBI Subscales | Mean Burnout Scores | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | MBI Frequency | MBI Intensity | Adapted MBI |
| Emotional Exhaustion | | | |
| Maslach & Jackson (1981) | 23.08 | 28.99 | |
| Caccese & Mayerberg (1984) | 13.50 | 22.14 | |
| Vealey et al. (1992) | 17.61 | 25.98 | |
| Rice (1994) | | | 22.61 |
| Depersonalization | | | |
| Maslach & Jackson (1981) | 10.43 | 12.68 | |
| Caccese & Mayerberg (1984) | 6.75 | 10.35 | |
| Vealey et al. (1992) | 6.60 | 9.99 | |
| Rice (1994) | | | 11.89 |
| Personal Accomplishment@ | | | |
| Maslach & Jackson (1981) | 35.65 | 43.49 | |
| Caccese & Mayerberg (1984) | 18.64 | 19.68 | |
| Vealey et al. (1992) | 38.04 | 39.55 | |
| Rice (1994) | | | 23.18 |

Only scores of males were compared in this table.

@The higher the mean on this subscale, the lower the degree of personal accomplishment and the greater the burnout.

subjects' burnout scores on the Adapted MBI and its subscales. No significant

relationship existed between burnout score and either age, job hours or

combined hours. Refer to Table 12 for a summary of the correlations.

Coaching situation variables. Correlational analyses were performed to

see if a relationship existed between burnout scores and select coaching

situation variables. No significant relationship existed between burnout scores

and division, level, years coached, contact hours, duty hours, win percentage or

**Table 11**

Intercorrelations of Adapted MBI and Its Subscales for Current Coaches (n = 199).

| Subscale | EE | DEP | PA |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adapted MBI | .90*** | .79*** | .75*** |
| Emotional Exhaustion (EE) | --- | .61*** | .53*** |
| Depersonalization (DEP) | | --- | .46*** |
| Personal Accomplishment (PA) | | | --- |

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

administration roles. The strongest relationship existed between level coached and Depersonalization subscale score (r = .13), and it was considered very weak at best. Refer to Table 12 for a summary of the correlations.

Physical symptoms. Correlational analyses were performed to see if a relationship existed between burnout scores and the number of reported physical symptoms related to coaching. A significant positive relationship existed between the number of reported physical symptoms and both the Adapted MBI scores (r = .26, p < .001) and Emotional Exhaustion subscale scores (r = .33, p < .001). Refer to Table 12 for a summary of the correlations.

Measured success. How a coach measures, or perceives, success can be very individualistic. Further correlational analyses were performed to see if a relationship existed between burnout scores and how the coaches measured their success. Six variables were examined. A positive relationship existed between win/loss record and the Adapted MBI (r = .28, p < .001), the Emotional

**Table 12**

Correlations Between Burnout Scores and Select Variables for Current Coaches

| Variables | MBI | EE | DEP | PA |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demographic | | | | |
| Age | .12 | .10 | .07 | .10 |
| Job Hours | -.01 | -.06 | -.02 | .03 |
| Combined Hours | -.02 | -.03 | -.01 | -.04 |
| Coaching Situation | | | | |
| Division | .10 | .08 | .09 | .01 |
| Level | .09 | .10 | .13 | -.08 |
| Years Coached | .00 | -.02 | .08 | -.07 |
| Contact Hours | .03 | .07 | .04 | -.09 |
| Duty Hours | .00 | .07 | .03 | -.18 |
| Win Percentage | -.03 | .00 | -.04 | -.07 |
| Administration Roles | .09 | .12 | .11 | -.06 |
| Physical | | | | |
| Symptoms | .26*** | .33*** | .16 | .09 |

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$
(n = 199)

Exhaustion ($r=.27$, $p<.001$) and Depersonalization ($r=.25$, $p<.001$) subscale

scores. A negative relationship existed between player development and the

Adapted MBI ($r=-.24$, $p<.01$), the Depersonalization ($r=-.25$, $p<.001$) and

Personal Accomplishment ($r=-.25$, $p<.001$) subscale scores. Refer to

Table 13 for a summary of the correlations.

**Table 13**

Correlations Between Measured Success and Burnout Score for Current Coaches
(n = 199)

| Measure | Burnout Score | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | MBI | EE | DEP | PA |
| Win/loss record | .28*** | .27*** | .19 | .25*** |
| Financial rewards | .11 | .09 | .17 | .10 |
| Media Recognition | .07 | .06 | .04 | .06 |
| Recognition from others | .11 | .15 | .10 | .01 |
| Player development | -.24** | -.15 | -.25*** | -.25** |
| Self satisfaction | .02 | .02 | .03 | .07 |

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Golembiewski's VIII Phase Model of Burnout

Once the means for each of the Adapted MBI subscales were determined (refer to Table 8 and Table 10), the coaches could subsequently be categorized into one of Golembiewski's VIII phases of burnout. If a coach scored below the mean on all three subscales, he was categorized into Phase I indicating low burnout. If a coach scored above the mean on all three subscales, he was categorized into Phase VIII indicating high burnout. Only current coaches (n = 199) were used in this step of the analyses. Forty-eight (24.1%) coaches were categorized into Phase I, and 45 (22.6%) coaches were categorized into Phase VIII.

## Statistical Analyses

### Chi-square

Significant relationships were found to exist between years coached and division coached ($\chi^2$(16,$\underline{n}$ = 229) = 26.35, $\underline{p}$ < .05), and years coached and level coached ($\chi^2$(12,$\underline{n}$ = 229) = 43.62, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Both relationships indicated that as the experience of the coach increased, indicated by the number of years in coaching, so did the probability that the coach would be coaching at a higher division and level.

### Inferential Statistics

Differences between current and former coaches. Independent samples t-tests were performed on a number of select demographic and coaching situation variables which included age, years coached, contact hours, duty hours and combined hours (Refer to Table 7 for the means and standard deviations of listed variables). The purpose was to try to discover if underlying differences existed between current and former TBAMHA coaches. No significant differences were discovered.

Although the independent samples t-test is quite robust to violations of the assumption of homogeneity of variance, the sample sizes differed greatly (n = 199 and n = 30 for current and former coaches respectively) and it was thought that this assumption could have been violated. The $\underline{F}$ value, calculated for independent samples t-tests, was used to test for homogeneity of variance and its probability. Heterogeneous variance did exist between the two samples on the contact hours variable ($\underline{F}$(1,220) = 2.55, $\underline{p}$ < .01). A subsequent mann-

whitney U test was performed, but no significant difference was found.

The independent samples t-test was also used to check for significant differences between current and former TBAMHA coaches and their scores on the Adapted MBI and its subscales (Refer to Table 8). The purpose of these analyses was to see if in fact the two samples were different. A significant difference was found between current and former coaches and their scores on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale ($t_{(212)} = 1.97$, $p = < .05$). Unequal variances were detected between samples on the Adapted MBI ($F(1,196) = 2.81$, $p < .01$) and the Emotional Exhaustion subscale ($F(1,212) = 2.00$, $p < .05$). Subsequent mann-whitney U tests again showed a significant difference to exist between samples on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale ($U(214) = 1913$, $p < .05$), but not on the Adapted MBI.

Differences among current coaches. One-way Analyses of Variance were performed on each of the dependent variables listed in Table 9 for each of the burnout scores. The dependent variables included age, marital status, education level, years coached, division coached, and level coached. Burnout scores consisted of scores on the Adapted MBI and its three subscales. The purpose was to determine if significant differences existed among current coaches on any level of the variables. The variables included age, marital status, education level, years coached, division and level. A new variable, win percentage, was also investigated (refer to Table 14). Win percentage refers to the winning percentage of the last team with which each coach was involved.

**Table 14**

Comparison of Current Coaches by Level and Win Percentage

| Variable/Category | Adapted MBI | Mean Burnout Score EE | DEP | | PA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Level** | | | | | |
| House | 65.61 | 21.40 | 10.06 | * | 23.82 |
| A | 72.57 | 23.03 | 12.72 | | 23.62 |
| AA | 70.16 | 22.64 | 12.45 | | 22.74 |
| AAA & Higher | 71.10 | 25.60 | 12.20 | | 19.60 |
| **Win Percentage** | | | | | |
| < 40 | 69.94 | 22.32 | 12.33 | | 23.30 |
| 40 to 60 | 70.08 | 22.20 | 11.43 | | 23.43 |
| > 60 | 69.65 | 23.00 | 12.07 | | 22.94 |

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$

Only one significant difference was found among current coaches relating to the dependent variables which were previously stated. A significant difference existed between House and 'A' level coaches on the Depersonalization subscale scores ($F(1,184)=3.35$, $p<.05$). No significant difference was found among win percentage of current coaches.

A 2X2 factorial model was designed to test the hypotheses that coaches who coached in the higher divisions (Bantam and above), and at a competitive level (A, AA, AAA & Junior), experienced greater burnout. There were no significant main effects or interactions across either division or level.

## Multiple Regression

The ability to predict burnout was examined using forward regression

analysis. All current coaches were utilized in this step of the statistical

analyses. The variables included all those significantly correlated with Adapted

MBI scores (Refer to Table 12 and Table 13). The equation was expressed as:

(a)    Win + Sym + Pla --> BO

'Win' referred to the emphasis placed on win-loss record, in percent, by the

coach. 'Sym' referred to the total number of physical symptoms experienced

by the coach. 'Pla' referred to the emphasis placed on player development, in

percent, by the coach. 'BO' referred to predicted burnout score on the Adapted

MBI score. The results of the regression analyses for the equation are provided

in Table 15.

**Table 15**
Prediction of Burnout

| Model | $R^2$adj | R | F | B |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Win + Sym-->BO | .118 | .358 | 12.36*** | |
| Win | | | | .247*** |
| Sym | | | | .222** |

*$\underline{p}$ < .05, **$\underline{p}$ < .01, ***$\underline{p}$ < .001

The equation resulted in the variables Win ($\underline{B}$ = .247, $\underline{p}$ < .001) and Sym

($\underline{B}$ = .222, $\underline{p}$ < .01) explaining 11.8% of the variance. The variable Pla did not

contribute significantly to the equation.

Comparing Coaches in Phase I and VIII

Demographic, coaching situation and physical variables. Current coaches classified into Phase I and VIII of Golembiewski's Phase Model of Burnout were compared on a number of select demographic and coaching situation variables. The purpose was to see if these coaches differed on any other variable besides burnout scores. Independent samples T-test were utilized. Refer to Table 16 for a summary of the significant findings.

The variables that were examined included age, years coached, contact hours, duty hours, combined hours, the number of administrative roles, emphasis placed on win/loss record, rewards, recognition, and player development, win percentage and the number of related physical symptoms experienced. A significant difference was found between coaches in Phase I and VIII on win/loss record emphasis ($t = -3.34, df = 91, p < .01$), player development emphasis ($t = 3.21, df = 91, p < .01$), and the number of related physical symptoms experienced ($t = -2.2, df = 91, p < .05$).

**Table 16**

Comparing Coaches in Phase I and VIII on Select Variables

| Variable<br>Mean<br>SD | Phase<br>I | Phase<br>VIII | t Value | df |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coaching Situation | | | | |
| Win/Loss Record | | | | |
| Mean | 17.81 | 28.73 | -3.34** | 91 |
| SD | 14.21 | 17.27 | | |
| Player Development | | | | |
| Mean | 53.22 | 39.44 | 3.21** | 91 |
| SD | 22.32 | 18.74 | | |
| Physical | | | | |
| Related Symptoms | | | | |
| Mean | 1.41 | 2.22 | -2.20* | 91 |
| SD | 1.83 | 1.69 | | |

*p<.05,**p<.01,***p<.001

Responses to statements. Specific statements were designed in the Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey to determine if coaches in low and high burnout categories perceived specific situations in a different way (Refer to statements 26 to 50 of the Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey in Appendix A). Responses were scored on a likert 7 point scale. Application of independent samples T-tests were utilized to indicate if differences existed on how each group responded to the statements.

For statements 26 to 34 the coach was asked whether the situation was unlike or like them. These statements dealt with such variables as flexibility,

emotions, sharing, fitness, and relationships. Refer to Table 17 for a summary of the significant findings related to the statements 26 to 34. (A cue word accompanies each statement number in the table). For questions 35 to 50 the coach was asked whether they disagreed or agreed with the situation. These statements dealt with such variables as success, changing jobs, winning, stress, administration, equal play, athlete dedication, rewards, recognition, time off, respect, quitting, player development, and aspirations.

Coaches in Phase I and VIII of burnout were found to differ in their perception of situations dealing with coaching flexibility, expression and control of emotions, sharing of concerns, fitness level and exercise, relationships with parents, athletes and administrators, success, winning, stress, recognition, time off, respect and quitting. Refer to Table 18 for a summary of the significant findings related to questions 35 to 50. A cue word accompanies each statement number in the table. For the exact wording, and entire list, of the statements refer to the Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey in Appendix A. Only those questions where the answers were found to differ significantly, between coaches in Phase I and VIII, were included in the summary tables. The importance of these results will be interpretated and discussed further in the following chapter.

**Table 17**
Comparing Phase I and VIII on Statements 26 to 34

| # | Cue Word | | Phase I | Phase VIII | t Value |
|---|----------|---|---------|------------|---------|
| 26 | flexibility | Mean | 6.41 | 5.02 | 5.03*** |
|    |            | SD   | .82  | 1.72 | |
| 27 | emotions | Mean | 1.33 | 3.33 | -7.44*** |
|    |          | SD   | .72  | 1.70 | |
| 28 | sharing concerns | Mean | 5.56 | 4.84 | 2.09* |
|    |                  | SD   | 1.66 | 1.65 | |
| 29 | fitness | Mean | 5.33 | 4.11 | 4.00*** |
|    |         | SD   | 1.37 | 1.57 | |
| 30 | relating to parents | Mean | 6.29 | 4.88 | 5.98*** |
|    |                     | SD   | .82  | 1.38 | |
| 31 | relating to athletes | Mean | 6.54 | 5.00 | 6.17*** |
|    |                      | SD   | .54  | 1.63 | |
| 32 | exercise | Mean | 4.95 | 4.02 | 2.66** |
|    |          | SD   | 1.54 | 1.84 | |
| 33 | emotions | Mean | 1.85 | 4.17 | -7.54*** |
|    |          | SD   | 1.25 | 1.69 | |
| 34 | relating to administrators | Mean | 5.85 | 4.64 | 3.89*** |
|    |                            | SD   | 1.30 | 1.68 | |

*$p<.05$,**$P<.01$,***$p<.001$, df = 91

**Table 18**
Comparing Phase I and VIII on Statements 35 to 50

| # | Cue Word | | Phase I | Phase VIII | t Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | success | Mean | 5.68 | 4.66 | 3.15** |
| | | SD | 1.29 | 1.80 | |
| 37 | coaching to win | Mean | 4.47 | 5.26 | -2.07* |
| | | SD | 2.03 | 1.60 | |
| 38 | stress | Mean | 2.77 | 5.02 | -6.99*** |
| | | SD | 1.78 | 1.25 | |
| 39 | winning | Mean | 3.72 | 4.51 | -2.60* |
| | | SD | 1.66 | 1.18 | |
| 44 | recognition | Mean | 3.04 | 3.97 | -2.44* |
| | | SD | 2.03 | 1.58 | |
| 45 | time off | Mean | 2.16 | 3.57 | -3.22** |
| | | SD | 1.98 | 2.24 | |
| 46 | respect | Mean | 2.25 | 3.51 | -3.43** |
| | | SD | 1.72 | 1.82 | |
| 47 | quitting | Mean | 1.43 | 2.62 | -3.41** |
| | | SD | 1.39 | 1.92 | |

*p<.05,**P<.01,***p<.001, df=91

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

## About the Sample

The sample consisted of current and former minor hockey volunteer coaches. Other coaching burnout studies focused on current full-time coaches (Caccese, 1982; Dale et al., 1989; Haggerty, 1982; Vealey et al., 1992; Wilson et al., 1988), or teacher-coaches where coaching was considered a job requirement or expectancy (Capel et al., 1987; Dale et al., 1989; Kosa, 1990; Felder et al., 1990; Locke et al., 1978; Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982; Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992). This was the first study to consider volunteer coaches and former coaches.

The sample was drawn from a population of TBAMHA coaches. All coaches belonged to the same organization (TBAMHA) and coached the same sport (hockey). The organization and sport variables were kept constant throughout the study. Lackey (1986) suggests that coaches who coach football, basketball, and track, feel a greater pressure to win than coaches who coach sports which are minor in comparison. Other coaching burnout study samples consisted of coaches from various organizations and sports (Capel et al., 1987; Caccese, 1982; Dale et al., 1989; Felder et al., 1990; Haggerty, 1982; Kosa, 1989; Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982; Locke, 1978; Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992; Wilson et al., 1988). Each organization and sport may carry with it, its own inherent stressors. Comparing coaches within each

69

study may have been like comparing apples and oranges.

Mediating Variables

Primary occupation. Due to the fact that the sample consisted of volunteer coaches, these coaches also had a primary occupation. There was a wide range of primary occupations. Some of the reported primary occupations included youthworker, engineer, papermaker, machinist, salesman, geologist, police officer, teacher, military personnel, letter carrier, truck driver, cook, pilot, plumber, adjudicator, inspector, superintendent, and funeral director. There were 106 separate classifications of primary occupations. Even when these classifications were subdivided into groups, the number of categories was still too large to consider comparisons. For this reason, no statistical analyses were conducted using the primary occupation variable. When discussing the results of this study one must keep in mind that the sample consisted of volunteer coaches with a wide variety of primary occupations.

## Burnout Scores

### Former Coaches

Adapted MBI scores. Former coaches scored lower on the Adapted MBI (Mean = 64.69 ± 10.64) than current coaches (Mean = 69.84 ± 17.82). By comparison, current coaches experienced greater burnout. Although this difference was not statistically significant, it does suggest a trend. The highest score that could have been attained on the Adapted MBI is 175. Former coaches' scores ranged from 53 to 86, and current coaches' scores ranged from 36 to 147. The larger range in scores for current coaches could be due to

their much larger sample size, but also to their relative proximity to the coaching environment.

Capel et al. (1987) suggested that those coaches who experience high levels of burnout leave the profession. This study surveyed former coaches who have been away from coaching for one year. The fact that former coaches scored lower on the Adapted MBI, indicates that one year away from coaching may be enough to recuperate from burnout related to coaching. Malone and Rotella (1981) have suggested, as a means of avoiding coaching burnout, to take a season, summer, or year off from coaching.

Emotional exhaustion subscale scores. Former coaches (Mean = 18.81 ± 6.84) scored significantly lower than current coaches (Mean = 22.61 ± 9.66) on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale of the Adapted MBI ($t_{(212)}$ = 1.97, $p < .05$). Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally extended and exhausted by one's work (Quigley et al., 1987). Since the Adapted MBI is a rewording of the MBI for use within the coaching population, in this case, one's work is coaching. Current coaches experienced higher levels of burnout related to emotional exhaustion. Coaching, at any level, is a very emotional occupation. A coach is often required to perform several different roles at once including that of disciplinarian, psychologist, father/mother figure, and public relations expert (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984). The coach must often continuously deal with many different people including athletes, parents, administrators and media. Different emotions are experienced with every role that the coach performs, and with every person with whom the

coach comes in contact.  Add the emotions that surface with winning and losing and the coaching environment is emotion-packed.  Current coaches were still active participants in this environment when they responded to the survey. Since former coaches were no longer active participants in this environment when they responded to the survey, this may be the reason why they scored lower on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale.  Scores may be close because coaches are caring individuals in general, and one of the reasons why they initially became involved in coaching is that they enjoyed the interaction with their athletes.

Depersonalization subscale scores.  Although the difference was not significant, former coaches (Mean = 10.36, SD = 3.97) also scored lower than current coaches (Mean = 11.89, SD = 4.90) on the Depersonalization subscale. Quigley et al. (1987) define depersonalization as referring to "an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of one's care or service"(p.263).  In this case, one's care or service was coaching.  To take the data at face value, one might have concluded that current coaches were more unfeeling and impersonal toward their athletes than former coaches.  It is important to remember that former coaches have been out of the system (TBAMHA) for one year.  One year ago they may have been just as unfeeling and impersonal toward their athletes.

Personal accomplishment subscale scores.  Former coaches (Mean = 23.70, SD = 6.61) and current coaches (Mean = 23.18, SD = 6.95) did not differ on Personal Accomplishment subscale scores.  Personal accomplishment refers to feelings of competence and successful achievement in

one's work with people (Quigley et al., 1987). In this case, one's work with people was coaching athletes. Regardless of time, although one's feelings of competence may change, one's sense of successful achievement probably does not. What a coach accomplishes during his tenure, such as winning championships etc., becomes a part of his personal coaching achievement portfolio. This could be the reason why former and current TBAMHA coaches differ so little on the Personal Accomplishment subscale scores.

## Current Coaches

Adapted MBI scores. The current coaches in the study were less burned out when compared to the norms established for other populations (doctors, lawyers, social workers, etc.) (Refer to Table 10 ). This finding is consistent with other studies (Capel et al., 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Kosa, 1989; Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992; Wilson & Bird; 1988). Overall, the results of this study indicate that volunteer minor hockey coaches experienced less emotional exhaustion, less depersonalization, and greater personal accomplishment, contributing less to burnout than the general (US) public (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Emotional exhaustion subscale scores. The mean score of 22.61 ± 9.66 on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale is consistent with other studies (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Vealey et al., 1992) (Refer to Table 10 ). However, one study did record a comparably high Emotional Exhaustion subscale mean score. Quigley et al.'s (1987) study recorded a mean of 29.4 for their sample. This is a comparably large mean score for coaches on the Emotional Exhaustion

subscale. Two reasons for the high Emotional Exhaustion subscale mean score is the fact that Quigley et al.'s (1987) sample consisted of teacher-coaches and included females. Teaching, as an occupation, may carry with it its own inherent stressors, or the particular teaching environment from which the sample was drawn may be more stressful than others. Also, it has been well documented that females report higher levels of burnout (Caccese, 1982; Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Felder & Wishnietsky, 1990; Quigley et al., 1987).

Depersonalization subscale scores. The mean of 11.89 (SD = 4.90) for this study, on the Depersonalization subscale, is similar to what Quigley et al. (1987) found for their sample (Mean = 11.2). Quigley et al's. (1987) mean of 11.2 was compared to Maslach's mean scores of 9.4 (frequency) and 11.7 (intensity) for both males and females. Quigley et al. (1987) concluded that a mean of 11.2 on the Depersonalization subscale placed their teacher-coaching sample in the middle third of Maslach's normative distribution for that subscale, indicating a moderate level of burnout.

The same can be said for this sample of volunteer minor hockey coaches. However, since the sample consists of males only, it must be compared to Maslach's normative distribution for males (Refer to Table 10). In this case, a mean of 11.89 (SD = 4.90) compares to Maslach's mean scores of 10.43 (frequency) and 12.68 (intensity). Therefore, the volunteer TBAMHA coaches are in the middle third of Maslach's normative distribution for males on the Depersonalization subscale, indicating a moderate level of burnout.

Remember that Quigley et al's. (1987) sample also consisted of female coaches. When compared to male scores of other studies, the mean of 11.89 ±4.90 is similar, but slightly higher (Refer to Table 10). Caccese and Mayerberg (1984) examined NCAA and AIAW Division I college head coaches, and Vealey et al. (1992) examined high school and college coaches. Both studies consisted of samples who scored lower on the Depersonalization subscale. For the most part, these samples consisted of coaches who coached athletes who were older than the athletes coached by the TBAMHA coaches. As the athlete becomes older, the coach will have less direct contact with his/her parents. Parents who openly criticize the coach may indirectly cause the coach to have an unfeeling and impersonal response toward that parent's son or daughter. The slightly higher scores found on the Depersonalization subscale for this study, as compared to similar studies, can possibly be attributed to this phenomenon.

Personal accomplishment subscale. The TBAMHA coaches (Mean = 23.18 ±6.95) scored much lower than Maslach and Jackson's (1981) mean scores of 35.65 (frequency) and 43.49 (intensity), for males, on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. Higher scores on this subscale contribute to a greater degree of burnout. Therefore, it can be said that TBAMHA coaches experience greater feelings of competence and successful achievement in their work, than do the general (United States) public. Coaches have placed importance upon, or compared their success with many things including, winning (Lackey, 1977), financial rewards (Felder & Wishnietsky, 1989;

Lackey, 1977; Quigley, 1985; Vealey et al., 1992), and career advancement (Locke & Massengale, 1978). However, what places coaches apart from other occupations is the fact that success has been correlated with less tangible variables such as positive player-coach relations (Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987). The lower scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale, for this sample, contributing to a lower degree of burnout, can possibly be attributed to the fact that coaches equate success with intangible variables such as positive relationships.

## Findings Relevant to Hypotheses

### Division

The TBAMHA, along with the majority of minor hockey associations across Canada, consists of a number of divisions ranging from Novice to Juvenile and/or Junior. Minor hockey participants are designated to a division according to their chronological age. The Novice division consists of the youngest players (9 years of age and younger), while the Junior division consists of the eldest players (up to 21 years of age). Generally, it is at the Bantam division where body checking is initially introduced. The game of hockey takes on new meaning for its participants at this level. The sport becomes more aggressive, and winning appears to become more important to the participants involved. For these reasons, the Bantam division has been chosen as the separating factor.

TBAMHA coaches who coach in the higher divisions (Bantam and above) do not necessarily experience a greater degree of burnout than TBAMHA

coaches who coach in another division (Pee Wee and lower). However, TBAMHA coaches who coached in the Midget division (and higher) reported the greatest burnout scores (Mean = 73.42, SD = 16.92), and those who coached in the Novice division (and younger) reported the lowest burnout scores (Mean = 66.79, SD = 17.70) (Refer to Table 9).

The Midget division is generally thought to be a very competitive division. The athletes participating in this division are generally older (16 and 17 years of age), and possess some hockey playing skills. Athletes in this division may be planning to play for a Junior team at some point in the near future. More emphasis is placed upon winning and succeeding.

The Novice division is generally thought of as a developmental division. The athletes participating in this division are young (up to 9 or 10 years of age), and on average, possess relatively few hockey playing skills. The difference in mean Adapted MBI scores may be attributed to this difference in emphasis between the Novice and Midget divisions.

It is difficult to compare total burnout scores to those of other studies because the studies often do not include the total MBI scores, often opting instead to use the totals of the three MBI subscales only. In doing so, the studies have excluded three questions on the MBI dealing with personal involvement. Although these questions do not fit under the scope of either subscale, they have been found to contribute to the total score (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Also, other studies have not separated the gender variable across the three subscale scores. This makes it difficult to compare our male sample with their mixed-gender samples. First, it is important to note that differences between division (or level of competition as it was sometimes referred to in other studies) are seldom examined because often the sample being examined belonged to one division, such as high school (Capel et al., 1987; Felder & Wishnietsky, 1989; Kosa, 1989; Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982; Quigley et al., 1987), or college/university (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Haggerty, 1982). And when the opportunity existed to compare differences among divisions, or level of competition, no mention was made of it (Dale & Weinberg, 1989), or it was found not to be related to burnout (Vealey et al., 1992). However, even though one-way analyses of variance did not detect any significant differences between divisions, it is interesting to note that those coaches who coached in the greatest division (Midget & higher) scored highest on the Adapted MBI, while those coaches who coached in the lowest division (Novice and younger) scored lowest. The dependent variable division, or age group categories, still needs further investigation.

Competition Level

Other studies have referred to a change in competition level as meaning a change in school division, such as from high school to college (Dale and Weinberg, 1989; Vealey et al. 1992). This study referred to such a change in schools as a change in division. A change in competition level would be a change in the level of competition at each division. At the college division, for

example, teams which compete in the NCAA Division I conference may be considered more competitive than teams which compete in the NCAA Division II or III conference.

TBAMHA coaches who coached at the higher levels (A, AA, AAA & Junior), did not necessarily experience a greater degree of burnout than TBAMHA coaches who coached at lower levels (House and lower). However, it is important to note that TBAMHA coaches who coached at the House level reported the lowest scores on the Adapted MBI (Mean = 65.61 ±16.97). TBAMHA coaches who coached at the 'A' level reported the highest scores on the Adapted MBI (Mean = 72.57 ±19.76). A significant difference existed between House and 'A' level coaches on the Depersonalization subscale scores $(\underline{F}(1,184) = 3.35, \underline{p} = <.05)$.

The House level, although it transcends most divisions, is generally considered to be a developmental level. Athletes who participate at this level generally lack the skills of athletes participating at higher levels, or are participating purely for fun. The 'A' level is thought of as a feeder or farm system for the 'AA' level, and the 'AA' level for the 'AAA' level, etc.. Depending on their skill level, athletes will move from level to level, year to year, as they grow in age and compete in the different divisions. Generally, comparably more emphasis is placed on winning and succeeding at the 'A' and higher levels. This emphasis on winning may account for the differences in mean scores between House and 'A' level TBAMHA coaches (Refer to Table 9).

## Coaching Record

Coaches with a moderate success rate (a winning percentage of 41 to 60) have reported strong symptoms of burnout (Caccese, 1982). The current study did not find any differences to exist between coaches with a winning percentage of 40 to 60, and coaches with winning percentages of less than 40 and greater than 60, across the Adapted MBI and its subscale scores. Haggerty's (1982) study investigating Canadian University coaches also found that win/loss record did not have an effect on burnout levels.

However, coaches who reported greater burnout scores (classified into Phase VIII of burnout) also reported placing a greater emphasis on win/loss record (Mean = 28.73 ± 17.27) than coaches who reported lower burnout scores (classified into Phase I of burnout) (Mean = 17.81 ± 14.21, and $t_{(91)}$ = -3.34, $p < .01$). Although no differences were found to exist between burnout scores and winning percentage, it appears that those coaches who reported greater burnout scores, thus experiencing greater burnout, placed a greater emphasis on winning and losing. A positive relationship also existed between Adapted MBI scores and emphasis placed upon winning ($r = .28$, $p < .001$), signifying that as greater emphasis was placed upon winning, the likelihood increased that the coach would experience greater burnout.

## Administrative Roles

No correlation was found to exist between the number of administrative duties a coach was expected to perform, and burnout score. No difference existed between the number of administrative duties a coach was expected to

perform, between coaches in Phase I and VIII of burnout. It was believed that additional administrative duties, responsibility for related functions other than coaching, may contribute more to burnout than coaching itself (Quigley et al., 1987). The present study did not find this to be true. However, the number of reported additional administrative duties was relatively low overall. Coaches in Phase I of burnout reported having to perform a mean of 2.5 ±2.13 administrative duties, and coaches in Phase VIII reported a mean of 2.62 ±2.01.

## Intra-role Conflict

Intra-role conflict may arise when a person occupies a single role for which different groups or individuals expect incompatible behaviors (Bianco & Paese, 1984; Locke & Massengale, 1978). The minor hockey coaching environment is a prime setting for intra-role conflict. Locke and Massengale (1978) have suggested that intra-role conflict may occur when the coach is expected by some parents to win every possible game, and by other parents to give every player an opportunity to participate in each game. It was believed that this scenario was occurring frequently at the minor hockey level.

The statement, "Some parents expect me to win every game, while other parents expect me to play everyone equally", was designed to test this hypothesis (Refer to statement number 49 of the Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey in Appendix A.). If intra-role conflict was contributing to burnout, then coaches in Phase I and VIII of burnout would differ on how they responded to this statement. However, coaches in Phase I (Mean = 5.76,

SD = 1.44) and VIII (Mean = 5.60, SD = 1.28) did not differ in their responses. However, both means were relatively high considering the fact that the highest answer that could be achieved was seven. In fact, the mean for all current coaches who responded to this statement (n = 194) was 5.34 ± 1.55 signifying that intra-role conflict existed across the sample. Therefore, intra-role conflict existed in the TBAMHA coaching environment at a much greater extent than first anticipated. It appears that the majority of coaches, regardless of division or level, have experienced intra-role conflict with parents as the source of the conflict.

To further test the hypothesis, the statements, "Some people want me to coach to win every game", and "Some people want me to play every player equally", were examined. For intra-role conflict to exist, both statements should be responded to in much the same manner. Conflict arises because the goals of both statements cannot be achieved simultaneously. A coach who is expected to win every game cannot do so if he must play every player equally. A coach who is expected to play every player equally cannot do so and win every game. A coach who expected to do both is in conflict.

Both questions were answered in much the same fashion with means of 4.55 (SD = 1.94) and 5.53 (SD = 1.49) respectively. The majority of coaches agreed that some people want them to coach to win every game, while other people want them to play every player equally. The majority of TBAMHA coaches have experienced intra-role conflict, and this intra-role conflict probably was a major source of stress for them.

## Coaching Career Aspirations

It was hypothesized that those TBAMHA coaches who possessed coaching career aspirations, experienced greater burnout symptoms than those who did not. Possessing coaching career aspirations was an underlying hypothesis. In other words, regardless of other variables, if a coach had designs on advancing through the coaching ranks, he would experience burnout attributed to coaching. Higher career aspirations have been associated with higher burnout scores (Locke & Massengale, 1978).

The statement, "I have aspirations of making coaching a career", was designed to test this hypothesis (Refer to statement 50 of the Minor Hockey League Coaches' Survey in Appendix A). Coaches in Phase I (Mean = 2.64, SD = 1.95) and VIII (Mean = 2.60, SD = 1.68) of burnout did not differ on how they answered the question. In fact, the majority of current coaches (n = 196) tended to disagree that they have aspirations of making coaching a career (Mean = 2.49, SD = 1.79). The majority of TBAMHA coaches examined appeared to have coached for reasons other than advancing through the coaching ranks. This finding does not indicate that the hypothesis was necessarily incorrect. If the majority of TBAMHA possessed coaching career aspirations, then higher burnout scores would have been expected.

<u>Variables Which Affect Burnout</u>

<u>Converging Variables</u>

<u>Overload</u>.  Other studies have found that work overload and over-coaching were major factors contributing to burnout (Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992).  This study found no relationship between overload and burnout score.  The variables that were examined included duty hours, combined hours, and the number of administrative roles a coach was expected to perform.

When coaches classified into either Phase I or VIII of burnout were examined on the above variables, no significant differences were found.  In the case of combined hours, this result could be attributed to the wide range of primary occupations, and large variety of work hours.  The duty hours were relatively low (Means of 8.51 ±4.36 and 7.26 ±3.56) when compared to what might be expected of the 467 college coaches in Vealey et al.'s (1992) study.  With regard to administrative roles, TBAMHA coaches perform comparably few (discussed earlier).  One reason that could account for this situation is the fact that the majority of minor hockey teams card managers who assume such roles.

<u>Role conflict and/or ambiguity</u>.  Intra-role conflict was found to exist across the sample as was discussed earlier.  Role ambiguity is also a factor that has been linked to burnout in coaches, and occurs when there is a lack of necessary information to perform a role adequately (Capel et al., 1987; Quigley et al., 1987).  To test for the existence of role ambiguity in the TBAMHA coaching sample, coaches were asked if they were aware of the TBAMHA sport

philosophy and how they felt about it. It would appear to be much more difficult for a coach to perform his/her duties if he/she was not aware of the organization's philosophy, or did not endorse it. Wilson et al. (1986) has suggested that coaches know and endorse the philosophy of the sport association for which they are working in order to reduce conflict and ambiguity.

Only 37% of the current coaches (n = 199) polled were aware of the TBAMHA sport philosophy. Those coaches who were aware of the TBAMHA sport philosophy reported lower burnout scores on average (Mean = 66.78 ± 17.89), when compared to those coaches who were unaware of the TBAMHA sport philosophy (Mean = 71.73 ± 17.53). Although the difference was not significant, the trend does suggest that if coaches are made aware of an organization's sport philosophy, this knowledge could provide them with a direction thus reducing role ambiguity. As a result, burnout could be reduced. Of the coaches who were aware of the TBAMHA sport philosophy, only two were opposed to it.

Success. Success can be very individualistic. How a coach perceives rewards and the attainment of meaningful accomplishments in coaching, has been found to contribute significantly towards the prediction of burnout (Vealey et al., 1992). In the current study, emphasis placed upon win/loss record produced a weak correlation with burnout score ($r = .28$, $p < .001$). Those coaches who placed greater emphasis upon winning tended to report greater burnout scores. Those coaches who placed greater emphasis upon player

development tended to report lower burnout scores ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$).

Expectations of significant others. A significant other is any individual whom the coach perceives as important, or has a direct or indirect effect upon the coach's job. In the minor hockey environment, parents can have a profound effect on how a coach is able to perform his duties. In the current study, those coaches who reported getting along well with the parents of their athletes also reported comparably lower burnout scores ($t_{(91)} = 5.98$, $p < .001$).

Administrators have also been reported as a source of stress for coaches (Quigley et al., 1987; Wilson & Bird, 1988). In the current study, those coaches who reported getting along well with administrators also reported comparably lower burnout scores ($t_{(91)} = 3.89$, $p < .001$). In the current sample, administrators were members of the TBAMHA executive.

## Demographic Variables

Age. Other studies have found that burnout occurred more frequently in younger (less than 40 years of age) coaches (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Quigley et al., 1987). This result corresponded with studies conducted on general populations (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Quigley et al. (1987) also found that the average age of the coach in Phase VIII of burnout was five years younger than the age of coaches in Phase I.

This study found no relationship between age and burnout scores (Refer to Table 12). No significant difference existed in age between coaches in Phase I and VIII of burnout. Coaches in Phase VIII of burnout were approximately three years older (Mean = 37.22 ± 8.06) on average than coaches in Phase I

(Mean = 34.13 ± 8.79). This trend is in the opposite direction to Quigley et al.'s (1987) findings, and suggests that older coaches may be burning out. It is also important to note that, although no significant differences were found between age groups, coaches over 40 years of age reported the highest burnout scores indicating greater burnout (Refer to Table 9).

Years of experience. Other studies have found that more experienced coaches generally experience less severe symptoms of burnout (Caccese, 1982; Quigley, 1985; Quigley et al., 1987). This study found no relationship between coaching experience and burnout scores (Refer to Table 12). However, coaches with 15 years or more of coaching experience reported the greatest burnout scores, and coaches with two to five years of experience reported some of the lowest levels (Refer to Table 9). This trend is in the opposite direction to earlier studies. However, keep in mind that the sample utilized in this study consisted of volunteer coaches who may be coaching for altruistic reasons.

Quigley et al. (1987), in their study of teacher-coaches, found coaches in Phase I of burnout to possess a mean of 11.3 years of experience, compared to a mean of 6.9 years for subjects in Phase VIII. The results of this study indicated that no differences existed between coaches in Phase I (Mean = 5.29, SD = 4.83) and VIII (Mean = 5.15, SD = 4.37) of burnout, and years of coaching experience. Again, this contradicts the findings of earlier studies. However, it should be noted that 60.7% of the sample had been coaching for five or less years.

It has been suggested that more experienced coaches are better able to cope with the stressors involved with being a coach (Quigley et al., 1987). However, in this study the coaches with the most experience, 15 years or more, reported the greatest burnout scores. The job of minor hockey coach is often a thankless position, and perhaps the satisfaction of coaching is simply not enough reward after a long period of time.

Burnout is a process which may appear as a result of stress that develops over time in stressful environments (Dale & Weinberg, 1989). The TBAMHA coaching environment may be creating stress for coaches which accumulates over time in the form of intra-role conflict. Coaches do not appear to be learning how to cope with the stressors inherent within the TBAMHA coaching environment. In the case of intra-role conflict, where coaches deal with parents, each conflict that arises may be unique due to individual differences among parents and how they react. Each year the coach may be dealing with a new group of parents. It may be the stressors generated by this uniqueness, when it comes to dealing with situations concerning intra-role conflict which is inherent to the TBAMHA coaching environment, which places a great demand on the coaches' energy and emotions.

Caccese (1982) found that coaches with more than 15 years of experience reported stronger and more numerous occurrences of feelings of personal accomplishment than less experienced coaches, leading to a lower degree of burnout. The findings of this study indicate that coaches with 15 years of experience, or more, reported the highest scores on the Personal

Accomplishment subscale, reflecting the lowest feelings of personal accomplishment. It should be noted that no major differences exist between years of experience and Personal Accomplishment subscale scores (Refer to Table 9). However, TBAMHA coaches do not appear to have accumulated the personal successes over the years which may help to alleviate burnout. Perhaps coaching, for the TBAMHA coaches, is truly a thankless job.

Athlete variables. Athletes can be a major source of stress for the coach (Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982; Wilson & Bird, 1988; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989). 'Poor relationships with athletes' has been cited as a main reason why coaches leave the profession (Lackey, 1977). In the current study, those coaches who reported getting along well with their athletes, also reported comparably lower burnout scores ($t_{(91)} = 6.17$, $p < .001$).

In Kroll and Gundersheim's (1982) study, 42.8% of the coaches (n = 93) surveyed reported disrespect from players as a source of stress. In the current study, those coaches who reported comparably higher burnout scores, also reported that some of their athletes were disrespectful towards them ($t_{(91)} = -3.43$, $p < .01$). It appears that player-coach relations can have a profound effect on coaching burnout levels. In the current study, if a coach perceived his relations with his athletes to be poor, greater burnout scores tended to be reported. It appears that working toward correcting, or maintaining, good player-coach relations will decrease coaching burnout symptoms.

Marital status. No significant differences existed between marital status and burnout scores. However, coaches who were married, or in a common law relationship, reported the highest burnout scores (Refer to Table 9). This trend is in contradiction with earlier studies which found single coaches to experience a greater frequency of burnout (Caccese, 1982; Quigley et al., 1987). It has been suggested that the coach with family commitments may restrict or limit his/her coaching involvement (Quigley et al., 1987), thus reducing the opportunity for burnout. This scenario does not appear to be true with the current coaching sample. In fact, married, or common law, coaches may be extending themselves too much. Or, perhaps they are not receiving the support and encouragement, from their partners, to continue with their coaching endeavours. However, marital status does not appear to be a factor contributing to burnout in the TBAMHA coach.

Education level and background. No significant differences existed between education level and burnout scores. However, coaches with high school education reported the highest burnout scores, and burnout scores tended to decrease as education level increased (Refer to Table 9). This is in contradiction with earlier findings related to the general (United States) public. In general, more education was associated with higher scores (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

It is unclear as to why the findings of this study should contradict that of Maslach & Jackson (1981). However, it should be noted that a very large percentage (59.3%) of the current coaching sample have completed high school

as their highest level of education (Refer to Table 4). The sample differs from samples in other studies which report the majority of their coaches to be educated beyond high school (Capel et al., 1987; Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Wilson & Bird, 1988). One contributing reason why the findings of this study have contradicted the findings of other studies could be the differences in education level between samples. Perhaps, coaches who are more educated aspire to coach at a higher level and have vacated the minor hockey coaching ranks.

## Predicting Burnout

Weak positive correlations were found to exist between emphasis placed on winning and burnout score ($r = .28$, $p < .001$), and experienced physical symptoms and burnout score ($r = .26$, $p < .001$). When these two variables were used to predict burnout in the sample, they could account for only 11.8% of the variance. So, although the above two stated variables were the only ones to show a significant correlation, they do not provide enough information from which to reliably predict burnout in the sample. There are obviously many other variables at play, and burnout appears to be very individualistic.

A weak negative correlation between emphasis placed upon player development and burnout score was found to also exist in the sample ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$). However, this variable did not contribute significantly towards the prediction of burnout in the sample.

A Practical Comparison of Coaches in Phase I & VIII of Burnout

Flexibility and Coaching Style

Coaches in Phase I (Mean = 6.41 ± .82) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 5.02 ± 1.72), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout were more flexible in their coaching style, and more open to new ideas ($t_{(91)}$ = 5.03, $p$ < .001). Malone and Rotella (1981) have suggested, as a means of reducing or preventing burnout, for coaches to remain flexible, and not to become rigid in their coaching style. This study found that those coaches who tended to perceive themselves as flexible, and open to new ideas, reported lower burnout scores signifying lower burnout.

Feeling Emotionally Drained From Practices and Games

With regard to feeling emotionally drained from practices, coaches in Phase I (Mean = 1.33 ± .72) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 3.33 ± 1.70), indicating that coaches in Phase VIII of burnout felt more emotionally drained from practices ($t_{(91)}$ = -7.44, $p$ < .001). Coaches who tended to perceive practices as emotionally draining, reported greater burnout scores signifying higher burnout.

With regard to feeling emotionally drained from games, coaches in Phase I (Mean = 1.85 ± 1.25) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 4.17 ± 1.69), indicating that coaches in Phase VIII of burnout felt more emotionally drained from games ($t_{(91)}$ = -7.54, $p$ < .001). Coaches who tended to perceive games as emotionally draining, reported greater burnout scores signifying higher burnout.

In summary, there are definite differences on how coaches in Phase I and VIII of burnout approach practices and games. Perhaps those coaches in Phase I simply enjoy the act of coaching, while those coaches in Phase VIII may place too much emphasis on the tangible outcomes of their coaching endeavours.

Sharing Concerns and Problems With Other Coaches

The sharing of concerns and problems among coaches has been suggested as a strategy to prevent and reduce burnout (Humphrey, 1987; Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson et al., 1986; Wishnietsky & Felder, 1989). Coaches in Phase I (Mean = 5.56 ± 1.66) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 4.84 ± 1.65), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout were more likely to share some of their concerns and problems with other coaches ($t_{(91)} = 2.09$, $p < .05$). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to have shared some of their concerns and problems with other coaches, reported lower burnout scores, signifying lower burnout.

Fitness and Exercise

Partaking in a systematic vigorous training program has been suggested as a preventative strategy to reduce or combat burnout (Bartolome, 1984; Freudenberger, 1974; Humphrey, 1987; Roaf, 1979; Wilson & Bird, 1988; Wilson et al., 1986). When responding to whether or not a coach consider himself to be in good physical condition, coaches in Phase I (Mean = 5.33 ± 1.37) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 4.11 ± 1.57), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout were more likely to consider themselves to be in good physical condition

($t_{(91)} = 4.00$, $p < .001$). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to consider themselves to be in good physical condition, reported lower burnout scores, signifying lower burnout.

When asked if they exercised regularly, coaches in Phase I (Mean = 4.95 ± 1.54) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 4.02 ± 1.84), indicating that coaches in Phase I were more likely to have exercised regularly ($t_{(91)} = 2.66$, $p < .01$). Our study found that those coaches who were more likely to have exercised regularly, had lower burnout scores. Perhaps those coaches who considered themselves to be in good physical condition were the ones who were partaking in a systematic vigorous training program. If this was the case, then those coaches who are experiencing greater burnout could participate in a training program to help reduce their burnout symptoms.

Relationships

Making an effort to improve communication (which would enhance the mutual appreciation of everyone's responsibilities), priorities and needs, has been suggested as a preventative strategy to reduce or combat burnout (Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson & Bird, 1988). Included would be: parents (since parents are an integral and dynamic component of the minor hockey coaching environment), as well as athletes, administrators and other coaches.

When asked if they got along well with the parents of their athletes, coaches in Phase I (Mean = 6.29 ± .82) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 4.88 ± 1.38), indicating that coaches in Phase I of

burnout were more likely to get along well with the parents of their athletes

($t_{(91)} = 5.98$, $p < .001$). Since parents have been proven to be a source of intra-

role conflict, leading to burnout, efforts can be made on behalf of the coach to

alleviate this source. Team meetings could be organized, with parents included,

or memos could be handed out from time to time relating to various

responsibilities, priorities, needs and goals.

When asked if they got along well with their athletes, coaches in Phase I

(Mean = 6.54 ±.54) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII

(Mean = 5.00 ± 1.63), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout were more

likely to get along with their athletes ($t_{(91)} = 6.17$, $p < .001$). Our study found

that those coaches who were more likely to get along with their athletes,

reported lower burnout scores, signifying lower burnout. Athletes can be a

major source of stress for the coach (Kroll & Gundersheim, 1982; Wilson &

Bird, 1988; Wishnietsky & Felder; 1989). In fact, 'poor relationships with

athletes' has been cited as a main reason why coaches leave their profession

(Lackey, 1977). The coach can reduce this source of stress by making an

effort to improve communication with his athletes, thus enhancing the mutual

appreciation and understanding of each other's roles and responsibilities,

priorities and needs (Malone & Rotella, 1981; Wilson & Bird, 1988).

When asked if they got along well with administrators, coaches in Phase

I (Mean = 5.85 ± 1.30) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII

(Mean = 4.64 ± 1.68), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout were more

likely to have got along well with administrators ($t_{(91)} = 3.89$, $p < .001$). This

study found that those coaches who were more likely to have got along well with administrators, reported lower burnout scores, signifying lower burnout. Canadian National Coaches have reported administrators as being a major source of stress (Wilson & Bird, 1988), and lack of support by school administrators has been found to contribute to burnout in teacher-coaches (Quigley et al., 1987). In summary, those coaches who experienced comparably positive relationships with parents, athletes and administrators, reported lower burnout scores.

## Perceived Success

To the coach, success is very individualistic. The attainment of meaningful accomplishments in coaching have been found to contribute significantly towards the prediction of burnout (Vealey et al., 1992). When asked if their team had been very successful this year, coaches in Phase I (Mean = 5.68 ± 1.29) of burnout scored higher than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 4.66 ± 1.80), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout reported a greater perception of experienced success ($t_{(91)} = 3.15$, $p < .01$). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to have experienced, or perceived what they believed to be, success reported lower burnout scores, signifying lower burnout. Since success can be very individualistic, the perception of success among coaches could range from winning (Lackey, 1977), to less tangible variables such as positive player-coach relations (Quigley et al., 1987).

## Perception of Others

When responding to the statement, "Some people want me to coach to win every game", coaches in Phase I (Mean = 4.47 ±2.03) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 5.26 ±1.60), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout reported a comparably lowered perception of pressure to win ($t_{(91)}$ = -2.07, $p$ < .05). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to have perceived a pressure to win from other people, reported higher burnout scores, signifying greater burnout.

## Perceived Stress

When responding to the statement, "Overall, coaching is stressful", coaches in Phase I (Mean = 2.77 ±1.78) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 5.02 ±1.25), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout reported a comparably lowered perception of stress in the coaching environment ($t_{(91)}$ = -6.99, $p$ < .001). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to have perceived coaching as stressful, also reported higher burnout scores signifying greater burnout.

## Importance of Winning

When responding to the statement, "Winning is important to me", coaches in Phase I (Mean = 3.72 ±1.66) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 4.51 ±1.18), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout reported that winning was comparably less important to them ($t_{(91)}$ = -2.60, $p$ < .05). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to have perceived winning as important, also reported higher burnout

scores signifying greater burnout.

## Importance of Recognition

When responding to the statement, "Recognition for coaching is important to me", coaches in Phase I (Mean = 3.04 ± 2.03) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 3.97 ± 1.58), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout reported that recognition for coaching was comparably less important to them ($t_{(91)}$ = -2.44, $p$ < .05). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to have perceived recognition for coaching as important, also reported higher burnout scores signifying greater burnout.

## Considering Time Off

When responding to the statement, "I am considering taking a year off from coaching", coaches in Phase I (Mean = 2.16 ± 1.98) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 3.57 ± 2.24), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout reported that they were less likely to be considering taking some time off away from coaching ($t_{(91)}$ = -3.22, $p$ < .01). This study found that those coaches who were more likely to have considered taking some time off away from coaching, also reported higher burnout scores signifying greater burnout.

## Perceived Respect From Athletes

When responding to the statement, "Some of my athletes are disrespectful towards me", coaches in Phase I (Mean = 2.25 ± 1.72) of burnout scored lower than coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 3.51 ± 1.82), indicating that coaches in Phase I of burnout reported that they were less likely to have

perceived their athletes as being disrespectful towards them

($t_{(91)} = -3.43$, $p < .01$). This study found that those coaches who were more

likely to have perceived their athletes as being disrespectful towards them also

reported higher burnout scores, signifying greater burnout.

## Quitting Coaching

When responding to the statement, "I am considering quitting coaching

entirely", coaches in Phase I (Mean = 1.43 ± 1.39) of burnout scored lower than

coaches in Phase VIII (Mean = 2.62 ± 1.92), indicating that coaches in Phase I

of burnout reported that they were less likely to have considered leaving the

coaching profession ($t_{(91)} = -3.41$, $p < .01$). This study found that those coaches

who were more likely to have considered leaving the coaching profession also

reported higher burnout scores, signifying greater burnout.

CHAPTER 5

Summary of Important Findings

This study found no difference to exist between former and current

coaches on reported burnout scores. The current coaches in the study were

less burned out when compared to the norms established for other populations

(doctors, lawyers, social workers, etc.). Overall, the results of this study

indicate that volunteer minor hockey coaches experienced less emotional

exhaustion, less depersonalization, and greater personal accomplishment,

contributing less to burnout than the general (United States) public. This

finding is consistent with other coaching burnout studies (Capel et al., 1987;

Dale & Weinberg, 1989; Kosa, 1989; Quigley et al., 1987; Vealey et al., 1992;

Wilson & Bird; 1988).

TBAMHA coaches who coached in the higher divisions (Bantam and

above) did not necessarily experience a greater degree of burnout than

TBAMHA coaches who coached in another division (Pee Wee and lower).

TBAMHA coaches who coached in the Midget division (and higher) reported the

greatest burnout scores while those who coached in the Novice division (and

younger) reported the lowest burnout scores. There was a trend to higher

burnout scores with higher level coached, but the difference was only

significant between House and A level on depersonalization. TBAMHA coaches

who coached at the higher levels (A, AA, AAA & Junior), did not necessarily

experience a greater degree of burnout than TBAMHA coaches who coached at

lower levels (House and lower).

The current study did not find any relationship to exist between actual win/loss record and burnout score. Although no differences were found to exist between burnout scores and winning percentage, a positive relationship existed between Adapted MBI scores and emphasis placed upon winning, signifying that as greater emphasis was placed upon winning the likelihood increased that the coach would experience greater burnout.

Intra-role conflict existed in the TBAMHA coaching environment at a much greater extent than first anticipated. The majority of coaches, regardless of division or level, have experienced intra-role conflict with parents as the source of the conflict.

Other variables found to be related to higher burnout scores were the perception of success, expectations of significant others, and athlete variables. Contradictory to other studies, age, years of experience, marital status, and education level were not found to be related to higher burnout scores.

Practical Suggestions for the Coach:

TBAMHA coaches who reported the lowest burnout scores were ones who:

●were comparably more flexible in their coaching style and open to new ideas;

●were more likely to share their concerns and problems with other coaches;

●considered themselves to be in good physical condition;

●exercised regularly;

●got along with parents, athletes and administrators;

●reported a greater perception of success;

●reported a lower perception of pressure to win;

●placed comparably less emphasis on winning;

●placed comparably less emphasis on recognition for coaching;

●were less likely to be considering taking time off away from coaching;

●were less likely to perceive their athletes as disrespectful; and

●were less likely to have considered leaving the coaching profession.

Recommendations for the TBAMHA:

Only 37% of the current coaches polled were aware of the TBAMHA

sport philosophy. Those coaches who were aware of the TBAMHA sport

philosophy reported lower burnout scores on average, when compared to those

coaches who were unaware of the TBAMHA sport philosophy. Although the

difference was not significant, the trend does suggest that if coaches are made

aware of an organization's sport philosophy, this knowledge could provide them

with a direction, thus reducing role ambiguity. As a result, burnout could be

reduced. Wilson et al. (1986) have suggested that coaches know and endorse

the philosophy of the sport association for which they are working in order to

reduce conflict and ambiguity.

Recommendations and Future Research Directions

Every study on coaching burnout, known to this researcher, has surveyed

coaches only once, and the samples have consisted of coaches still actively

coaching. Therefore, follow-up studies which survey coaches who have left

coaching is warranted. Monitoring coaches at various times during the

competitive season may shed some light on the potential impact time of season has on burnout.

This researcher believes that competition level, and/or division coached has an impact on coaching burnout. This hypothesis could be tested by looking at a large sample size of coaches from one sport, across a number of divisions such as minor, high school, college/university, junior and professional.

Once more information has been acquired on when burnout occurs and at what levels burnout is more prevalent, the effect of intervention strategies on burned-out coaches is also a potential area for future study.

Lastly, total burnout scores must be reported for all groups and classifications of subjects along with the three subscale scores of the MBI. Often, not all of the scores have been reported in previous studies. This lack of information has made comparisons among groups difficult.

# REFERENCES

Bartolome, F. (1984). Stress, its sources and ways of coping with it. In R. Burke (Ed.), Current issues in occupational stress: Research and intervention (pp.476-510). York University: Faculty of Administrative Studies.

Bianco, A., & Paese, P. (1984). So you want to be a teacher/coach. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 55, 55.

Caccese, T. M. (1982). Differences in perceived burnout of NCAA and A1AW Division I head coaches grouped according to selected demographic variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia.

Caccese, T., & Mayerberg, C. (1984). Gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 279-288.

Capel, S., Sisley, B., & Desertrain, G. (1987). The relationship of role conflict and role ambiguity to burnout in high school basketball coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 9, 106-107.

Cherniss, C. (1980). Staff burnout: Job stress in human services. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Cherniss, C., & Krantz, D. (1983). The ideological community as an antidote to burnout in the human services. In B. A. Farber (Ed.), Stress and burnout in the human service professions (pp. 198-212). Toronto: Pergamon Press.

Dale, J., & Weinberg, R. S. (1989). The relationship between coaches' leadership style and burnout. The Sport Psychologist, 3, 1-13.

Felder, D., & Wishnietsky, D. (1990). Role conflict, coaching burnout and the reduction in the number of female interscholastic coaches. Physical Educator, 47, 7-13.

Figone, A. J. (1986). Teacher-coach burnout: Avoidance strategies. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 57, 58-61.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. Journal of Social Issues, 30(1), 159-165.

Freudenberger, H. J., & Richelson, G. (1980). Burnout: The high cost of high achievement. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Golembiewski, R. (1983a, September). Symptoms of physical distress and psychological burnout. Unpublished Paper Presented at the University of Alberta.

Golembiewski, R. (1983b). Progress in exploring burn-out phases: Five empirical features and their implications for research and practice. A paper presented at the Southwestern Academy of Management.

Golembiewski, R., & Munzenrider, R. (1983). Testing three phase models of burn-out mappings on a cluster of work site descriptors. Journal of Health and Human Resources Adminstration, 5, 374-392.

Golembiewski, R., & Munzenrider, R. (1985). Tracking active and passive models of burn-out: Testing for differences between advanced phases. In L. R. Moise (Ed.), Organizational policy and development: Interdisciplinary conference (pp. 149-162). Louisville: University of Louisville.

Golembiewski, R., Munzenrider, R., & Carter, D. (1983). Phases of progressive burnout and their work site covariants: critical issues in organizational development research and praxis. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 19, 461-481.

Haggerty, T.(1982). An assessment of the degree of burnout experienced by canadian university coaches: A national survey. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, York University.

Hardy, D. (1984). Coach burnout. 15th National Federation of State High School Associations Conference. Milwaukee.

Horton, L. (1984). What do we know about teacher burnout? Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 55(33), 69-70.

Humphrey, J. H. (1987). Stress in coaching. C.C. Thomas: Springfield, IL.

Kosa, B. (1989). The relationship between burnout and selected demographic and job-related variables among oregon public school teacher-coaches: Identifying coping strategies. Unpublished master's thesis, College of Human Development and Performance, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Kosa, B. (1990). Teacher-Coach burnout and coping strategies. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 61, 153-158.

Kroll, W., & Gundersheim, J. (1982). Stress factors in coaching. Coaching Science Update, pp. 47-49.

Lackey, D. (1977). Why do highschool coaches quit? Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 48, 22-23.

Lackey, D. (1986). The high school coach: A pressure position. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 57, 28-32.

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1990). On the meaning of Maslach's three dimensions of burnout. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75(6), 743-747.

Locke, L. & Massengale, J. (1978). Role Conflict in Teacher/Coaches. Research Quarterly, 49, 162-174.

Malone, C., & Rotella, R. (1981). Preventing coaching burnout. Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, 52, 22.

Maslach, C. (1976). Burned out. Human Behavior, 5(9), 16-22.

Maslach, C. (1982). Burnout: The cost of caring. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113.

Quigley, T. (1985). Burnout among high school coaches. Thesis, Department of Physical Education and Sport Studies, Edmonton Alberta.

Quigley, T. A., Slack, T. and Smith, G. J. (1987). Burnout in secondary school teacher coaches. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 33(4), 260-274.

Roaf, P. (1979). The Coach and stress. Coaching Review, 2(7), 10-17.

Shank, P.A. (1983). Anatomy of burnout. Parks and Recreation, 17, 52-58.

Steinburg, J. (1984). Why coaches are leaving the profession and what we can do to retain them. In, the proceedings of the National Federation's Annual National Conference of High School Directors of Athletics, Alexandria, Va., Computer Microfilms International, p.46-50. National Federation of State High School Associations Conference, 15th, Milwaukee.

Vealey, R. S., Udry, E. M., Zimmerman, V. & Soliday, J. (1992). Intrapersonal and situational predictors of coaching burnout. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 14, 40-58.

Vessel, R. (1980). Devastating costs of professional burnout. Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 14(3), 11-14.

Wilson, V. E., Haggerty, T., & Bird, E. T. (1986 September). Burnout in Coaching. Sports Science Periodical on Research and Technology in Sport, Ottawa: The Coaching Association of Canada.

Wilson, V. E., & Bird, E. I. (1988). Burnout in coaching - Part two: Results from survey of national coaches. Sports Science Periodical on Research and Technology in Sport, 8(9), 1-6.

Wishnietsky, D., & Felder, D. (1989). Coaching problems: Are suggested solutions effective. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 60, 69-72.

APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Minor Hockey League Current Coaches' Package

February, 1993

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to request your cooperation in completing a study that I am undertaking as part of the requirements for my Master of Science Degree here at Lakehead University. The study requires the completion of a questionnaire and your efforts in providing the information requested in this package, would be greatly appreciated.

Having coached at various minor hockey levels for a number of years, I am very aware that coaching can be as rewarding and challenging as it can be stressful and demanding. There has been a great deal of research that has investigated the effects of stress in sport relating to the athlete. However, very little research has been done looking at the accumulated or long term effects of sport stress upon coach's performance and the quality of his/her life.

This study is to be conducted in two separate phases. In the first phase all coaches in the Thunder Bay Amateur Minor Hockey Association are being asked to complete the enclosed survey. The second phase involves a small percentage of the respondents to take part in a half hour interview which will be scheduled at the convenience of the coach. The ultimate goal of this study, is to better understand the demands that are placed on the minor hockey coach.

The questions asked in this survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. The information and the results of each survey will be strictly confidential and only the accumulated results of all coaches will be used as part of this masters thesis. A final copy of the masters thesis will be made available to the Thunder Bay Minor Hockey Association.

Your participation is essential if an accurate assessment of the coaching environment is to be made. Please do not consult other colleagues when responding to the questions in this survey. Please complete and return the survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Michael W. Rice, HBHK
Master of Science Candidate
Lakehead University

# MINOR HOCKEY LEAGUE COACHES' SURVEY

Please fill in the necessary personal data. Some individuals will be contacted for interviews after the surveys have been returned, therefore it would be appreciated if you would indicate your name and phone number below. At that time, you may refuse the interview if you so desire. Thank you.

Name: (please print) _____

Phone: _____

Team: _____

Please check the appropriate division and level that you coach.

| Division | | Level | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Junior | ☐ | Junior | ☐ |
| Juvenile | ☐ | AAA | ☐ |
| Midget | ☐ | AA | ☐ |
| Bantam | ☐ | A | ☐ |
| Pee Wee | ☐ | House | ☐ |
| Atom | ☐ | Other (specify) | |
| Novice | ☐ | | |
| Other (specify) | | | |

**Personal Data:**

Gender:        Male ☐        Female ☐

Age: _____ years

Marital Status:        single                                    ☐
                       married/common law                       ☐
                       divorced/separated                       ☐
                       other                                     ☐

Please indicate the number of children you have in each of the following age categories:

no children              _____
under 5 years of age     _____
6-10 years of age        _____
11-15 years of age       _____
16-20 years of age       _____
over 20 years of age     _____

Highest level of education completed

Elementary school    ☐
High School          ☐
College              ☐
University           ☐
Other                ☐        (please specify) _____

**Job-Related Data:**

What do you do for a living:

What is your primary occupation? _____

On average, how much time do you spend each week related to your job?

Approximately _____ hours per week.

**Coaching Data:**

1.  How many years have you coached minor hockey?

    _____ years


2.  Please write in the division you have coached and the gender of your players for each of the following years:

    | Example: | Bantam | 'A' | Male |
    |----------|--------|-----|------|
    | 1992-93  | _____ | _____ | _____ |
    | 1991-92  | _____ | _____ | _____ |
    | 1990-91  | _____ | _____ | _____ |
    | 1989-90  | _____ | _____ | _____ |


3.  On the average, how many hours per week are you in direct contact with your athletes?

    Approximately _____ hours per week.


4.  On the average, how many hours per week do you spend in total related to your coaching duties? (Including games, practices, practice planning, scouting, fund-raising, etc.)

    Approximately _____ hours per week.


5.  Please check any administrative duties which you are required to perform in addition to your coaching duties. (Add any duties which have not been listed.)

    | | |
    |---|---|
    | fund-raising | ☐ |
    | budgeting | ☐ |
    | travel/accommodation arrangements | ☐ |
    | scheduling | ☐ |
    | registration | ☐ |
    | _____ | ☐ |
    | _____ | ☐ |
    | _____ | ☐ |

6. How do you measure coaching success? Please fill in the proper percentages. Make sure that your total adds to 100%.

|  | Example: | Your Scores: |
|---|---|---|
| win/loss record | 50 | _____ |
| financial rewards | 10 | _____ |
| media recognition |  | _____ |
| recognition from others | 10 | _____ |
| player development |  | _____ |
| self-satisfaction | 30 | _____ |
| other (please specify) |  |  |
| _____ |  | _____ |
| _____ |  | _____ |
| _____ |  | _____ |
| **Total** | **100** | **100** |

7. What is the approximate winning percentage of the team you are coaching right now?

Approximately _____ %.

8. a. Are you given any financial compensation for coaching?

Yes ☐
No ☐

b. **If yes**, please specify in what form. (Check any that may apply.)

extra pay ☐
honorarium ☐
travel expenses ☐
other (please specify) _____

9. Please list any coaching certifications that you have, e.g. NCCP.

| Year | Certification |
|---|---|
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

10. a. Are you aware of the Thunder Bay Minor Hockey Association's sport philosophy?

Yes ☐
No ☐

b. **If yes**, do you endorse this philosophy or are you opposed to it?

I endorse it ☐
I am opposed ☐
I am indifferent ☐

11.  Do you use psychological techniques to help **yourself** cope with your coaching duties? (Please check which ones apply.)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| None | ☐ | Goal Setting | ☐ |
| Imagery | ☐ | Mental Practice | ☐ |
| Relaxation | ☐ | Time Management | ☐ |

Others _____

_____

12.  Do you teach psychological techniques to your **athletes**? (Please check which ones apply.)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| None | ☐ | Goal Setting | ☐ |
| Imagery | ☐ | Mental Practice | ☐ |
| Relaxation | ☐ | Concentration | ☐ |
| | | Pre-competition Routines | ☐ |

Others _____

_____

13.  On average, how much time do you spend per week teaching and/or using psychological techniques with your athletes?

Approximately _____ hours per week.

14.  Please check any of the following symptoms which you have experienced during the past year:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| allergies | ☐ | colitis | ☐ |
| depression | ☐ | diarrhea | ☐ |
| digestive problems | ☐ | fatigue | ☐ |
| heart disease | ☐ | high blood pressure | ☐ |
| insomnia | ☐ | loss of appetite | ☐ |
| moodiness | ☐ | nausea | ☐ |
| rapid heart rate | ☐ | respiratory problems | ☐ |
| skin problems(rashes) | ☐ | ulcers | ☐ |

others (please specify) _____

On the following pages are several statements of coaching-related feelings you might have. Please read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about your coaching job.

Allow approximately 30 seconds for each answer, then assign a number from 1 to 7 by circling the appropriate number on each scale.

To what degrees are each of the statements **Like** or **Unlike** you?

| very much unlike me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | very much like me |
|---|---|---|

| | **EXAMPLE:** | **Unlike me**          **Like me** |
|---|---|---|
| A | I do not look forward to practices. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |

By circling the 2, you have indicated that it is **unlike you** not to look forward to practices. In other words, you **do** look forward to practices.

| | | **Unlike me**          **Like me** |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | I deal very effectively with the problems of my athletes. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 2 | I feel burned out from coaching. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 3 | I feel I am positively influencing other people's lives through my coaching. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 4 | I've become more calloused toward people since I took this job. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 5 | I worry that this coaching job is hardening me emotionally. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 6 | I feel energetic. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 7 | I feel frustrated by my coaching job. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 8 | I feel I am working too hard on my coaching job. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 9 | I don't really care what happens to some athletes. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 10 | Working directly with athletes puts too much stress on me. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |
| 11 | I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my athletes. | 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 |

**Unlike me**          **Like me**

| | | Unlike me | | | | | Like me | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | I feel exhilarated after working closely with my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13 | I have accomplished many worthwhile things in my coaching job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14 | I feel emotionally drained from practice/games. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15 | I feel used up at the end of practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16 | I feel similar to my athletes in many ways. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17 | I feel personally involved with my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18 | I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19 | I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20 | I can easily understand how my athletes feel about things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21 | I feel I treat some athletes as if they were impersonal objects. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22 | Working with athletes all day is really a strain for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23 | I feel like I am at the end of my rope. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24 | In my coaching, I deal with emotional problems very calmly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25 | I feel athletes blame me for some of their problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26 | I am flexible in my coaching style, and I am always open to new ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27 | I feel emotionally drained from practices. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28 | I share some of my concerns and problems with other coaches. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29 | I consider myself to be in good physical condition. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Unlike me        Like me

| | | Unlike me | | | | | Like me | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | I get along well with the parents of my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31 | I get along well with my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 32 | I exercise regularly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 33 | I feel emotionally drained from games. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 34 | I get along well with administrators. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Unlike me         Like me

To what degrees do you **Agree** or **Disagree** with the following statements?

| strongly disagree | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | strongly agree |
|---|---|---|

| | EXAMPLE: | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | I find practices boring. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

By circling the 5, you have indicated that you **slightly agree** that practices are boring.

| | | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | My team has been very successful this year. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 36 | I am considering changing coaching jobs for next season. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 37 | Some people want me to coach to win every game. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 38 | Overall, coaching is stressful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 39 | Winning is important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly Disagree         Strongly Agree

| | | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | I am considering moving into administration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 41 | Some people want me to play every player equally. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 42 | Some of my athletes lack dedication and commitment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 43 | Monetary rewards for coaching are important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 44 | Recognition for coaching is important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45 | I am considering taking a year of from coaching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 46 | Some of my athletes are disrespectful towards me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 47 | I am considering quitting coaching entirely. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 48 | Player development is important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 49 | Some parents expect me to win every game, while other parents expect me to play everyone equally. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 50 | I have aspirations of making coaching a career. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

|  | Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

f you would like a summary of the findings from this survey, please print your name and address below;

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Postal Code: _____

Appendix B:

Minor Hockey League Former Coaches' Package

March, 1993

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to request your cooperation in completing a study that I am undertaking as part of the requirements for my Master of Science Degree here at Lakehead University. The study requires the completion of a questionnaire and your efforts in providing the information requested in this package, would be greatly appreciated.

Having coached at various minor hockey levels for a number of years, I am very aware that coaching can be as rewarding and challenging as it can be stressful and demanding. There has been a great deal of research that has investigated the effects of stress in sport relating to the athlete. However, very little research has been done looking at the accumulated or long term effects of sport stress upon coach's performance and the quality of his/her life.

This study is to be conducted in two separate phases. In the first phase all coaches who have coached in the Thunder Bay Amateur Minor Hockey Association in the past two years, are being asked to complete the enclosed survey. The second phase involves **a small percentage** of the respondents to take part in a half hour interview which will be scheduled at the convenience of the coach. The ultimate goal of this study, is to better understand the demands that are placed on the minor hockey coach.

The questions asked in this survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. The information and the results of each survey will be **strictly confidential** and only the accumulated results of all coaches will be used as part of this masters thesis. A final copy of the masters thesis will be made available to the Thunder Bay Minor Hockey Association.

Your participation is essential if an accurate assessment of the coaching environment is to be made. Please do not consult other colleagues when responding to the questions in this survey. Please complete and return the survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Michael W. Rice, HBHK
Master of Science Candidate
Lakehead University

# MINOR HOCKEY LEAGUE COACHES' SURVEY

Please fill in the necessary personal data. Some individuals will be contacted for interviews after the surveys have been returned, therefore it would be appreciated if you would indicate your name and phone number below. At that time, you may refuse the interview if you so desire. Thank you.

Name: (please print) _____

Phone: _____

Did you coach in 1992-1993?      yes ☐          no ☐

Please check the appropriate division and level that you last coached.

| Division | | Level | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Junior | ☐ | Junior | ☐ |
| Juvenile | ☐ | AAA | ☐ |
| Midget | ☐ | AA | ☐ |
| Bantam | ☐ | A | ☐ |
| Pee Wee | ☐ | House | ☐ |
| Atom | ☐ | Other (specify) | _____ |
| Novice | ☐ | | |
| Other (specify) | _____ | | |

Please state the primary reason why you are no longer coaching in the T.B.A.M.H.A.?

_____

_____

**Personal Data:**

Gender:     Male ☐      Female ☐

Age: _____ years

Marital Status:     single            ☐
                    married/common law  ☐
                    divorced/separated  ☐
                    other           ☐

Please indicate the number of children you have in each of the following age categories:

no children              _____
under 5 years of age    _____
6-10 years of age       _____
11-15 years of age     _____
16-20 years of age     _____
over 20 years of age    _____

Highest level of education completed

Elementary school  ☐
High School        ☐
College            ☐
University         ☐
Other              ☐    (please specify) _____

**Job-Related Data:**

What do you do for a living:

What is your primary occupation? _____

On average, how much time do you spend each week related to your job?

Approximately _____ hours per week.

**Coaching Data:**

1.  How many years have you coached minor hockey?

    _____ years

2.  Please write in the division you have coached and the gender of your players for each of the following years:

    Example:     Bantam                          'A'                     Male

    1992-93      _____      _____      _____

    1991-92      _____      _____      _____

    1990-91      _____      _____      _____

    1989-90      _____      _____      _____

3.  On the average, how many hours per week were you in direct contact with your athletes?

    Approximately _____ hours per week.

4.  On the average, how many hours per week did you spend in total related to your coaching duties?  (Including games, practices, practice planning, scouting, fund-raising, etc.)

    Approximately _____ hours per week.

5.  Please check any administrative duties which you were required to perform in addition to your coaching duties.  (Add any duties which have not been listed.)

    fund-raising                              ☐
    budgeting                                 ☐
    travel/accommodation arrangements         ☐
    scheduling                                ☐
    registration                              ☐

    _____              ☐

    _____              ☐

    _____              ☐

    _____              ☐

6. How did you measure coaching success? Please fill in the proper percentages. Make sure that your total adds to 100%.

| | Example: | Your Scores: |
|---|---|---|
| win/loss record | 50 | _____ |
| financial rewards | 10 | _____ |
| media recognition | | _____ |
| recognition from others | 10 | _____ |
| player development | | _____ |
| self-satisfaction | 30 | _____ |
| other (please specify) | | |
| _____ | | _____ |
| _____ | | _____ |
| _____ | | _____ |
| **Total** | <u>**100**</u> | <u>**100**</u> |

7. What was the approximate winning percentage of the last team you coached?

Approximately _____ %.

8. a. Were you given any financial compensation for coaching?

Yes ☐
No ☐

b. **If yes,** please specify in what form. (Check any that may apply.)

extra pay ☐
honorarium ☐
travel expenses ☐
other (please specify) _____

9. Please list any coaching certifications that you have, e.g. NCCP.

Year        Certification

_____     _____
_____     _____
_____     _____
_____     _____

10. a. Were you aware of the Thunder Bay Minor Hockey Association's sport philosophy?

Yes ☐
No ☐

b. **If yes,** did you endorse this philosophy or were you opposed to it?

I endorse it          ☐
I am opposed          ☐
I am indifferent      ☐

11.    Did you use psychological techniques to help **yourself** cope with your coaching duties? (Please check which ones apply.)

None          ☐          Goal Setting          ☐
Imagery       ☐          Mental Practice       ☐
Relaxation    ☐          Time Management       ☐

Others        _____

              _____

12.    Did you teach psychological techniques to your **athletes?** (Please check which ones apply.)

None          ☐          Goal Setting               ☐
Imagery       ☐          Mental Practice            ☐
Relaxation    ☐          Concentration              ☐
                         Pre-competition Routines   ☐

Others        _____

              _____

13.    On average, how much time did you spend per week teaching and/or using psychological techniques with your athletes?

Approximately _____ hours per week.

14.    Please check any of the following symptoms which you have experienced during the past year:

allergies              ☐          colitis                  ☐
depression             ☐          diarrhea                 ☐
digestive problems     ☐          fatigue                  ☐
heart disease          ☐          high blood pressure      ☐
insomnia               ☐          loss of appetite         ☐
moodiness              ☐          nausea                   ☐
rapid heart rate       ☐          respiratory problems     ☐
skin problems(rashes)  ☐          ulcers                   ☐

others (please specify) _____

On the following pages are several statements of coaching-related feelings you might have. Please read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about your coaching job.

Allow approximately 30 seconds for each answer, then assign a number from 1 to 7 by circling the appropriate number on each scale.

To what degrees are each of the statements **Like** or **Unlike** you?

| very much unlike me | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | very much like me |
|---|---|---|

| | **EXAMPLE:** | **Unlike me** | | | | | **Like me** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | I did not look forward to practices. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

By circling the 2, you have indicated that it was **unlike you** not to look forward to practices. In other words, you **did** look forward to practices.

| | | **Unlike me** | | | | | **Like me** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | I was able to deal very effectively with the problems of my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2 | I felt burned out from coaching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3 | I felt I was positively influencing other people's lives through my coaching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4 | I've become more calloused toward people since I took this job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5 | I worry that this coaching job is hardening me emotionally. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6 | I felt energetic. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7 | I felt frustrated by my coaching job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8 | I felt I was working too hard on my coaching job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9 | I didn't really care what happens to some athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10 | Working directly with athletes put too much stress on me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11 | I easily created a relaxed atmosphere with my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

**Unlike me**                    **Like me**

|  | | Unlike me | | | | | Like me | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | I felt exhilarated after working closely with my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13 | I have accomplished many worthwhile things in my coaching job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14 | I felt emotionally drained from practice/games. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15 | I felt used up at the end of practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16 | I felt similar to my athletes in many ways. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17 | I felt personally involved with my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18 | I felt fatigued when I got up in the morning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19 | I felt uncomfortable about the way I have treated some athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20 | I can easily understand how my athletes felt about things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21 | I felt I treated some athletes as if they were impersonal objects. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22 | Working with athletes all day was really a strain for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23 | I felt like I was at the end of my rope. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24 | In my coaching, I was able to deal with emotional problems very calmly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25 | I felt athletes blamed me for some of their problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26 | I was flexible in my coaching style, and I was always open to new ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27 | I felt emotionally drained from practices. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28 | I shared some of my concerns and problems with other coaches. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29 | I consider myself to be in good physical condition. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Unlike me                    Like me

| | | Unlike me | | | | | | Like me |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30 | I got along well with the parents of my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31 | I got along well with my athletes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 32 | I exercise regularly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 33 | I felt emotionally drained from games. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 34 | I got along well with administrators. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

To what degrees do you **Agree** or **Disagree** with the following statements?

| strongly disagree | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | strongly agree |
|---|---|---|

| | EXAMPLE: | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | I found practices boring. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

By circling the 5, you have indicated that you **slightly agree** that practices were boring.

| | | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | The last team I coached was very successful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 36 | I am considering coaching again in the future. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 37 | Some people wanted me to coach to win every game. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 38 | Overall, coaching was stressful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 39 | Winning was important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly Disagree        Strongly Agree

| | | Strongly Disagree | | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | I am considering moving into administration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 41 | Some people wanted me to play every player equally. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 42 | Some of my athletes lacked dedication and commitment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 43 | Monetary rewards for coaching were important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 44 | Recognition for coaching was important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45 | I am considering returning to coaching next season. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 46 | Some of my athletes were disrespectful toward me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 47 | I am considering quitting coaching forever. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 48 | Player development was important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 49 | Some parents expected me to win every game, while other parents expected me to play everyone equally. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 50 | I have aspirations of making coaching a career. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Strongly Disagree                    Strongly Agree

## Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

you would like a summary of the findings from this survey, please print your name and address below;

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Postal Code: _____

Appendix C:

Definitions

Definitions

COACHING SITUATION is a term which refers to sport and level coached, gender coached, and so forth.

CONSIDERATION ORIENTED COACHES (leadership style of coaching) tend to be genuinely concerned with their players and attempt to be caring, warm, and approachable (Dale and Weinberg, 1989).

COPING STRATEGIES are preventive or minimizing techniques employed by teacher-coaches to combat role conflict and burnout.

DEPERSONALIZATION involves the generation of negative, cynical and impersonal feelings about one's clients.

EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION can be described by feelings of tedium, fatigue, stress, and frustration leading in extreme cases to mental illness or thoughts of suicide.

INITIATING-STRUCTURE ORIENTED COACHES are more concerned about goal attainment through planning and scheduling (Dale and Weinberg, 1989).

INTER-ROLE CONFLICT is role conflict that may arise when one person occupies several different roles that demand incompatible behavior, for example, when the assistant coach is expected on a given Saturday both to scout rival teams and to attend to duties as spouse or parent.

INTRA-ROLE CONFLICT is role conflict that may arise when a person occupies a single role for which different groups or individuals expect incompatible behaviors, for example, when a coach is expected by some parents to win every possible game and by other parents to give every player an opportunity to participate in each game.

JOB DESCRIPTIVE INDEX (JDI) measures satisfaction with five facets of work and also provides a total satisfaction score. As burnout increases, one expects reduced satisfaction on all JDI measures with the possible exception of JDI Pay. The host organization's pay policies are considered superior, generally, and satisfaction with them consequently might not differ among those experiencing various degrees of burnout (Golembiewski, 1983b).

JOB DIAGNOSTIC SURVEY (JDS) measures satisfaction with 10 facets of the job. As burnout increases, with the possible exception of JDS compensation, one expects reduced satisfaction with all JDS facets (Golembiewski, 1983b).

JOB-RELATED VARIABLES refer to certain factors related to teaching and coaching such as: school size; number of years in teaching; number of years at present school; number of classes taught and so forth.

MAJOR SPORT is defined as any competitive team sport within the secondary
school interschool sport program which has a competitive season of at least
ten weeks, and has a minimum of 10 scheduled league competitions.

MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY is a questionnaire containing 25 Likert-scale
type items which measure the three dimensions of burnout; emotional
exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT refers to the degree of feeling associated with
one's competence and successful achievements in working with people.

ROLE AMBIGUITY occurs when the role player lacks the information necessary to
perform a role adequately.  Lack of direction from administrators, inadequate
job descriptions, or unclear evaluation procedures may contribute to role
ambiguity for coaches.

ROLE CONFLICT occurs when dual or multiple roles are in conflict.  The unique
occupation of teacher coach produces unavoidable conflicts because either
the role of teacher or coach must be emphasized.  The most frequent forms
are identified as qualitative (tasks that are too difficult), and quantitative (too
many tasks) overload.

SCHOOL-RELATED FACTORS is a term utilized to refer to a group of items such as
the size of the school, support by the school administrators for the
interscholastic athletic programs, role-ambiguity, lack of compensation for
coaching, lack of recognition, and the lack of an equitable reward system .

TEACHER-COACH refers to those school based personnel who coach in the
secondary school system, and teach full time as well.

VOLUNTEER COACH refers to the coach who is receiving no pay for his/her
coaching duties.