

# **Risk Control Practices of Girls' High School Basketball Coaches During the Postcompetitive Period**

**James H. Conn**  
*Central Missouri State University*

**Dennis Docheff**  
*Elma (Washington) School District*

The sound of a whistle or horn may signal the end of the contest, thus terminating the coach's role of strategist. Today, the coach is responsible for preparing the players to accept postcompetitive roles in their new noncompetitive environment (Conn & Foshee, 1989-90; Conn & Foshee, 1990). Therefore, in light of increasing moral and legal scrutiny, the responsibility of the coach for providing reasonable care to his/her athletes may not stop on the court, field, or pool. During this postcompetitive period players may need to be reacclimated to their noncompetitive athletic roles in order to make a safe transition from the competitive environment to the noncompetitive one. Consequently, due to the increased exposure to litigation in sport, primarily caused by the change in the doctrine of governmental immunity (van der Smissen, 1990), planning and implementing strategies of risk management (Adams, 1989) has gained attention for controlling behaviors during the postcompetitive interval. For the purpose of this investigation, postcompetitive behavior refers to those behaviors that coaches and players exhibit between the interval of time immediately following the contest and dismissal from the locker room.

## **■ REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Empirical investigations as well as practical strategies to reduce exposure to litigation have found their way into the literature. Risk control practices of athletic (Gray, & Parks, 1991; Van Buskirk, & Conn, 1992), school administrative (Pepple, 1992), and recreational (Gray, 1992) personnel have been the target of recent investigations. In addition, a description of intervening practices or strategies for postcompetitive control for high school football players was addressed by Conn & Fisher (May, 1992). The concept of postcompetitive behavior is not new to research literature.

Vanek & Cratty (1970) first introduced the concept of postcompetitive behavior and concluded that little attention had been devoted to the topic. Later, postcompetitive behavior was discussed in terms of alerting coaches to postcompetitive tension in athletes (Henschen, 1973), preparation for the next contest (Cratty, 1989), and managing player burnout (Henschen, 1986). More

recently, at the 1992 American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) Convention in Indianapolis, postcompetitive behavioral practices of coaches were examined from both the standpoint of the coach's responsibility in helping players change roles (Sage, 1992, April 10) and also in adjusting arousal (Pilkington, 1992, April, 10). Noting the absence of empirical data, Foshee & Conn (in press) conducted an exploratory investigation of postcompetitive behavioral practices of head high school football coaches. More recently, investigations have been conducted to describe the risk control practices of interscholastic coaches (Conn & Foshee, 1992; Conn & Lyons, 1992; Lyons, Conn, & Martin, 1992). In sum, this postcompetitive period should more effectively represent the time during which coaches implement effective risk control practices to resocialize athletes into the mainstream, rather than utilizing this time for postmortem analysis and shaping the precompetitive attitudes and emotions of the next contest.

School enrollment figures are commonly utilized by state interscholastic activity association members to arrive at different interscholastic classifications, in part to equalize competition. Coaching experiences of these investigators suggest that schools with smaller school enrollments tend to provide a different atmosphere than larger schools relative to the coach/athlete/community triad. Appropriate alternative postcompetitive behaviors are expected from coaches representing different classifications of schools. Consequently, the postcompetitive behavioral practices of girls high school basketball coaches is hypothesized to appear significantly different based upon the classification of schools. Since human beings have the propensity to be extremely diversified in assuming responsibility, it is assumed that the perceived responsibility toward postcompetitive behavior practices might range from assuming little or no responsibility to the acceptance of a high level of responsibility. The assumptions are that (1) a coach who feels "highly responsible" to providing athletes with an appropriate postcompetitive behavior environment will reasonably insure that athletes are properly conditioned for ensuing social encounters, and (2) coaches who project "little or no responsibility" for providing athletes with appropriate postcompetitive behavior will not influence athletes' preparation for subsequent social encounters.

## ■ PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Risk control focuses partially on savoring those losses due to personal injury that occur after the conclusion of the contest and which may lead to litigation and/or absence from further participation. The general purpose of this preliminary study was to explore the extent to which head high school girls' basketball coaches prepare their athletes for postcompetitive encounters. A specific purpose of the study was to determine if postcompetitive behavior practices of coaches are influenced by student enrollment. A final purpose was to determine if different levels of perceived responsibility have an influence on postcompetitive behaviors of coaches.

## ■ METHOD

### **Selection of Subjects**

A random selection of subjects was solicited for the investigation. The specific population under investigation was a randomly selected group of high school head girls' basketball coaches representing high schools in the state of Washington. Twenty schools were randomly selected from each of the four state classifications (grades 10-12): B classification = 0 - 150 students; A classification = 151 - 499 students; AA classification = 500 - 1000 students; and AAA classification = 1001 students- above (*Washington Interscholastic Activities Association, 1990-1, p. 3-4*).

### **Description of Subjects**

Subjects were 13 female and 46 male coaches, ranging in age from 24 to 60 years with a mean of 38.5 years. The mean years of experience in coaching girls' basketball was 15.3 with a range of 1-36 years.

### **Instrument**

Risk management strategies were measured by the Coach's Postcompetitive Behavior Questionnaire (CPBQ). The CPBQ administered in this exploratory study was generated by Foshee & Conn (in press) to ascertain the behavioral practices of coaches during the time immediately following athletic contests until the time the players leave the locker room. This test is a 47-item Likert style questionnaire. The items can best be described as risk control strategies designed to decrease the exposure of the coach and players to litigation due to negligent supervision. Respondents rated the 47 risk control items using a five-point Likert scale to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each item. The statements of the CPBQ were divided into the following intervals in order to more specifically differentiate postevent behavioral practices: (1) immediate postgame (end of contest to arrival at the locker room); (2) early locker room (entry into locker room to postgame shower); (3) later locker room (postgame shower until dressed); and (4) dismissal (dressed until departing from the locker room). Thirteen items in the inventory were scaled in a negative direction to help control for validation of responses. The CPBQ is in the refinement stage of validating the concept of postcompetitive behavior. The CPBQ has been responded to by boys' (Conn & Foshee, 1992) and girls' (Conn & Lyons, 1992) high school basketball players and girls' high school volleyball players (Lyons, Conn & Martin, 1992). The establishment of validity for the instrument is in process.

### **Procedures**

Each subject was asked to respond to the CPBQ and complete a separate document of demographic information. The subjects were mailed an envelope containing a letter explaining (1) the purpose of the investigation; (2) background of the researchers conducting the investigation; (3) the method for ensuring anonymity and confidentiality of their responses; and (4) the date for returning the questionnaires. In addition, the envelope accommodated the demographic ques-

tionnaire, the CPBQ, and a self-addressed postage paid return envelope. The returns were as follows: B classification (n=16; return rate= 80%), A classification (n=14; return rate= 70%), AA classification (n=16; return rate= 80%), AAA classification ( n=13; return rate= 65%).

### **Analysis of Data**

The StatView SE + Graphics statistical package (Feldman, Hofmann, Gagnon, & Simpson, 1990) was used to analyze the data. To assess the extent to which head girls' high school basketball coaches prepare their athletes to reenter the noncompetitive environment, a descriptive analysis utilizing means and standard deviations was reported. A one-way ANOVA was performed to assess the levels of CLASSIFICATION of schools and its effects on postcompetitive practices of coaches as measured by responses to the CPBQ. The significant differences were followed up with post hoc comparisons using the Fisher PLSD to determine where the differences occurred.

For the purpose of data analysis, the continuous data from selected items of the questionnaire were converted into categorical data using the Stat View SE +Graphics statistical package (Feldman, Hofmann, Gagnon, & Simpson, 1990). The category of levels of RESPONSIBILITY was derived by recoding the continuous data from item number 22 of the CPBQ into the categories of LOW RESPONSIBILITY (reponses 1 -3) and HIGH RESPONSIBILITY (reponses 4 - 5 ). Item 22 stated, "The coach accepts responsibility for preparing the player emotionally to leave the locker room and behave appropriately into the next social engagement". Another one-way ANOVA was performed to assess the relationship between the levels of perceived RESPONSIBILITY and the behavioral scores on the CPBQ. Significant ANOVA effects were further analyzed using the Fisher PLSD methods. The .05 level for statistical significance was set for all tests.

## **RESULTS**

Table 1 shows ranked means and standard deviations for all of the responses to the CPBQ in the study. The scores ranged from a high of 4.797 to a low of 1.31 on the 5-point Likert scale. Of the mean scores of the 47 behavior statements in the questionnaire, the mean scores of 3 items were responded to as ALWAYS (6%), 21 items as OFTEN (45%), 12 items as SOMETIMES (25%), 6 items as SELDOM (13%), and 5 items as NEVER (10%). The composite mean score for all responses was 3.333 with a standard deviation of .732. A large magnitude or diversity of the responses (standard deviation = 1.435 or above) was reflected in items 1, 8, 9 17, 41, 43, and 44. Item 32, "Lets players know of their value independent of competition," produced the smallest magnitude (standard deviation = .599).

Significant comparisons between levels of CLASSIFICATION and four postcompetitive variables were found. These results, presented in Table 2, suggest that coaches associated with the lowest school classification extended a more favorable response than coaches from the higher school classifications for item number 5, "Present with team immediately following the contest".

In addition, a significant difference was also found among levels of CLASSI-

**Table 1. Ranked Composite Means and Standard Deviations of CPBQ Statements**

Rank	Item	Descriptor	N	M	SD
12	1	Gathers team on court immediately following the contest	59	4.102	1.435
7	2*	Coach shows signs of being unhappy immediately following contest	57	4.282	.861
10	3	Shows a caring attitude for athletes immediately following the game	59	4.153	.638
14	4*	Ignores behavior of athletes after contest	59	4.068	.888
2	5	Present with the team immediately following the contest	58	4.534	.995
4	6*	Criticizes past performances of players on the way to the locker room	59	4.356	1.03
33	7*	Lets players visit with fans between end of contest and entering locker room	59	2.864	1.21
26	8	Asks players to behave in a certain manner on way to locker room	59	3.203	1.436
27	9	Tells the players to return to the locker room within three(3) minutes after the end of the contest	58	3.155	1.496
29	10*	Permits "outsiders" to visit with players immediately following the contest and upon entry into the locker room	58	3.121	1.285
1	11*	Allows team members to criticize other individual athletes	59	4.797	.761
13	12	Shows players of his/her mutual acceptance for a loss or poor effort	57	4.07	.799
19	13	Does not take personal credit if the outcome of the game was successful	56	3.786	1.107
44	14	Speaks with each player prior to showering and dressing	56	1.393	.846
45	15	Discusses the performance with players while the players are showering or dressing	56	1.375	.728
37	16	Reminds the players of what they are to do and not do between entering and leaving the locker room	59	2.356	1.297
30	17	Controls the sequence of activities in the locker room after the game	58	3.069	1.437
39	18	Entering the locker room, the coach tries to decrease the level of excitation or anxiety of the players	58	2.293	1.257
32	19	Determines the well-being of players following contests	58	3.034	1.154
41	20	Shows players how to use techniques to control excitability and depression following the game	57	2	1.086
25	21	Demonstrates concern for the emotional level of players following the game	57	3.316	.909
24	22	Accepts responsibility for preparing the player emotionally to leave the locker room and behave appropriately in the next social engagement	58	3.362	1.087
40	23	After the game, uses psyching techniques to raise the level of arousal of their players	57	2.088	.892
23	24*	Informs players about performance as they enter locker room	58	3.414	1.271
34	25	Checks the emotions of each player after showering and/or dressing	57	2.737	1.142
38	26	Assists and encourages players to use techniques to reduce the excitement prior to dismissal	58	2.328	.998
28	27	Tells the players how each performed in order to help the player deal with their own emotions while in the locker room	58	3.155	1.182
31	28	Tries to adjust the excitable state of the players after the game in the locker room to help the players safely enter into their social mainstream	58	3.052	1.099
43	29*	Lets players leave the locker room even though the coach knows the players may display disruptive behavior to themselves as well as to others	57	1.877	1.019
11	30	Tells players how well they performed just prior to dismissal	58	4.138	1.083
16	31	Relates game outcomes to the next contest	57	3.93	1.033
3	32	Lets players know of their value independent of competition	58	4.517	.599
15	33	Tries to show s/he is not a supporter of negative and unfair criticism from others regarding player performance	56	3.964	1.008
6	34	Treats athletes as individuals, recognizes some need to be left alone while others need immediate support	58	4.293	.749
20	35*	Allows team members to celebrate indefinitely over successful performance	58	3.655	.983
5	36*	Ignores depressed players brooding over a lost contest	58	4.345	1.069
35	37	Provides group activity for team members after contests	58	2.466	1.176
42	38	Coach likes to have a postgame meal with players	58	1.948	1.176
46	39	Coach provides a postgame swimming, bowling or similar activity	58	1.362	.667
47	40	Coach provides a postgame movie	58	1.31	.706
21	41	Leave locker room after dismissed by the coach	57	3.632	1.496
8	42*	Allows upset players to leave locker room after contests	55	4.218	.975
22	43	Confronts players who are suspected to engage in alcohol and drugs	58	3.586	1.463
18	44*	Coach knows of instances where players under their direction have consumed alcohol and drugs or engaged in risky behavior following contests	58	3.862	1.444
36	45*	Lets players leave the locker room after the contest that are either too under or overly excited to enter their next social encounter	54	2.389	1.036
17	46	Talks to players who did not play before leaving locker room	58	3.862	1.017
9	47	Is the additional time returning home after a road contest helpful to the coach and players in being in the correct frame of mind to leave the locker room	58	4.155	.721

\* The scores of these negative items were reversed for comparative analysis

FICATION and variable number 10, "Permits 'outsiders' to visit with players immediately following the contest and upon entry into the locker room". The Fisher PLSD test noted differences among the B, A, and AAA CLASSIFICATIONS. In this sample, coaches from the B CLASSIFICATION are more likely to permit "outsiders" to visit the locker room immediately following the contest than coaches from the other classifications. Coaches from lower classifications believe interaction between "outsiders" and players immediately following the contest does not pose a threat to player safety or they may not foresee the possibility. On the other hand, the coaches from the AAA CLASSIFICATION recognizes the immediate interaction between players and outsiders may be unsafe and prefer to use this time to resocialize the player.

Another significant difference was found among the levels of CLASSIFICATION and the variable number 45, "Lets players leave the locker room after the contest that are either too under or overly excited to enter their next social encounter". A post hoc analysis revealed differences between the classification of B and A, B and AAA, A and AA, and AA verses AAA. Coaches from B CLASSIFICATION are less inclined than coaches from A and AAA CLASSIFICATIONS to release players who are either overly or under aroused into their new environment. The rationale for this finding is unclear. One finding might imply that athletes in the B, A and AA CLASSIFICATIONS are better prepared to interact socially following a contest than athletes representing the AAA CLASSIFICATION. Another speculation suggests the coaches in the B, A, and AA CLASSIFICATIONS refuse to release their athletes into the ensuing environment until they are ready.

A final significant difference was revealed between levels of CLASSIFICATION and the item number 46, "Talks to players who did not play in the contest before leaving the locker room". A Fisher PLSD yielded differences in the classifications of B verses AAA and A verses AAA. A closer inspection of the mean scores suggests that coaches from the B CLASSIFICATION are more inclined to talk with the players who did not play in the contest than coaches from the higher classifications, thus increasing the coach's opportunity to resocialize team members.

A one way ANOVA in Table 3 shows the significant differences found between levels of RESPONSIBILITY and nine items of the CPBQ which accounts for about 20% of the items. In eight of the nine items, the HIGH RESPONSIBILITY group performed in the more favorable position when compared to scores from the LOW RESPONSIBILITY group. The LOW RESPONSIBILITY group had a more favorable attitude toward telling the players how each performed in order to help the player deal with their own emotions.

## **Discussion**

The results of the investigation suggest that coaches NEVER provide post-game activities for players. This finding would strongly support the need for coaches to provide more opportunities for athletes to become better prepared to enter ensuing social encounters in a "proper" mental state. The mean scores for items 14, "Speaks with each player prior to showering and dressing" and 15,

**Table 2. An ANOVA comparison of CLASSIFICATIONS with postcompetitive behavior variables**

Item	Behavioral Practices	G(N)*	M	F**	p
5	Present with team immediately following the contest	B(16)	4.875	(3,54)4.814	.0048
		A(14)	4.786		
		AA(16)	4.635		
		AAA(12)	3.667		
10	Permits "outsiders" to visit with players immediately following the contest and upon entry into the locker room	B(16)	3.938	(3,54)4.224	.0094
		A(14)	2.786		
		AA(15)	3.133		
		AAA(13)	2.462		
45	Lets players leave the locker room after the contest that are either too under or overly excited to enter their next social encounter	B(14)	2.000	(3,50)3.659	.0184
		A(11)	2.909		
		AA(16)	2.000		
		AAA(13)	2.846		
46	Talks to players who did not play in the contest before leaving locker room	B(15)	4.333	(3,54)3.006	.038
		A(14)	4.071		
		AA(16)	3.688		
		AAA(13)	3.308		

\* Group and number \*\* Degrees of freedom are in parentheses

**Table 3. ANOVA of Relations Between Level of RESPONSIBILITY and Behavioral Practices of Coaches**

Item	Behavioral Practices	G(N)*	M	F**	p
3	Shows a caring attitude for athletes immediately following game	H(30)	4.333	1,56(5.107)	.027
		L(28)	3.964		
8	Asks players to behave in a certain manner between the end of the game and return to the locker room	H(30)	3.6	1,56(6.064)	.016
		L(28)	2.714		
15	Discusses the performance with players while the players are showering or dressing	H(28)	1.571	1,53(4.036)	.0497
		L(27)	1.185		
16	Reminds players of what they are to do and not do between entering and leaving the locker room	H(30)	2.667	1,56(5.354)	.0244
		L(28)	1.929		
17	Controls the sequence of activities in the locker room after the game	H(29)	3.552	1,55(7.919)	.0068
		L(28)	2.536		
21	Demonstrates concern for the emotional level of players following the game	H(28)	3.880	1,54(6.851)	.0115
		L(28)	3.607		
27	Tells the players how each performed in order to help the player deal with their own emotions while in the locker room	H(29)	2.821	1,55(4.201)	.0452
		L(28)	3.448		
28	Tries to adjust the excitable state of the players after the game in the locker room to help the players safely enter into their social mainstream	H(29)	3.31	1,55(4.646)	.0355
		L(28)	2.714		
41	Allows players to leave the locker room after they are dismissed by the coach	H(28)	4.036	1,54(4.912)	.0309
		L(28)	3.179		

\* Group and number \*\*parentheses are F ratios

“Discusses the performance with players while the players are showering and dressing”, would suggest that coaches NEVER discuss performances with players while the players shower. The mean scores and accompanying F test failed to reveal a difference between the gender of the coach and responses to items 14 and 15. This finding indicates that failure to most effectively resocialize athletes is not a gender issue, but a coaching issue.

Players report on items 20 and 23 that their coach SELDOM assists or provides them with techniques to control the level of excitement. This finding supports the findings of Foshee and Conn (in press) whereby the football coaches felt they owed a duty of care to desensitize players during the postcompetitive period but did not provide an atmosphere or techniques to do so. This result shows a distinctive difference between the foreseeability of coaches and subsequent actions of coaches. Reversing the scale for item 11 suggests that their coaches ALWAYS forbids teammates to criticize other athletes. Also, item 32, coaches ALWAYS “Let the players know of their value independent of competition”. This finding suggests that coaches “naturally” provide avenues for resocialization of athletes even though the degree of resocialization is not quite adequate.

A coach at a lower CLASSIFICATION is more likely to be present with the team immediately following the contest when compared with coaches from upper CLASSIFICATIONS. Also, it is important to note that a coach from the B CLASSIFICATION is more likely to permit outsiders to visit with players immediately following the contest and upon entry into the locker room than coaches from higher classifications. One explanation for these results is that coaches at the lower classification seem to have a “closer relationship” with athletes and outsiders. Lower classification schools are more likely to originate in small towns, where community members appear to be more closely related. Often coaches in smaller communities take on a “family” responsibility. They also become a part of the athlete’s family.

Another finding showed that coaches from the B and A CLASSIFICATIONS scored significantly higher than the AAA coaches in item 46, “Talks to players who did not play in the contest before leaving the locker room”. It is possible that, in this study, coaches from smaller classifications feel a greater necessity to reassure players about their abilities and personal value than do coaches from upper classifications. The results of this study also showed that coaches from AAA and A CLASSIFICATIONS allow “Players to leave the locker room who are either over or under excited” at a higher rate than coaches from AA and B CLASSIFICATIONS. Again, one can only speculate that coaches from the B CLASSIFICATION develop a closer relationship with their players than other classifications of coaches. However, the AA CLASSIFICATION finding remains unclear.

Further observed results were obtained with post hoc groups. The continuous data in EXPERIENCE was converted into the categories of LOW EXPERIENCE (1 - 9 years), MEDIUM EXPERIENCE (10 - 16), and HIGH EXPERIENCE (17 - 36). Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for EXPERIENCE and its effect on postcompetitive behavior practices of girl’s head basketball coaches. Only three significant items (6% of all the items) were found. The significant differences were found relative to the variable, “Reminds the players of what they are to do and



not do between entering and leaving the locker room”. A post hoc analysis of the data using a Fisher PLSD found the significant differences appeared between LOW EXPERIENCE v MEDIUM EXPERIENCE and MEDIUM v HIGH EXPERIENCE. This study showed that the LOW and HIGH EXPERIENCE groups remind players of appropriate behavior before entering and leaving the locker room.

EXPERIENCE also affected the variable, “Allows team members to celebrate indefinitely over successful performance”. The specific differences were found in LOW EXPERIENCE v MEDIUM EXPERIENCE and LOW EXPERIENCE v HIGH EXPERIENCE which suggests that the inexperienced coach does not find the indefinite celebration of performance objectionable. Perhaps the results indicate that the coaches were influenced by the excessive celebration that occurs after other outstanding occurrences in sport. If allowed to speculate, one might wonder if coaches with more experience have a more mature perspective regarding winning and losing. Possibly, along with experience comes a more learned view of “success”.

A LOW EXPERIENCE v MEDIUM EXPERIENCE effect was also found in the variable, “Lets players leave the locker room after the contest that are either too under or overly excited to enter their next social encounter”. The MEDIUM EXPERIENCE group was more likely to allow this to occur then the LOW EXPERIENCE group. Coaches from the LOW EXPERIENCE group aren’t as foreseeable regarding the “resocialization of athletes” during postcompetition as the MEDIUM EXPERIENCE group.

A post hoc comparison was conducted on item 19, “The coach makes formal

**Table 4.** An ANOVA comparison of EXPERIENCE with postcompetitive behavior variables

Item	Behavioral Practices	G(N)*	M	F**	p
16	Reminds the players of what they are to do and not do between entering and leaving the locker room	H(16) M(14)	2.625 1.5	(2,46)4.583 2.684	.0153
35	Allows team members to celebrate indefinitely over successful performance	H(16) M(14)	1.938 1.786	(2,45)8.649 2.833	.0007

\* Group and number \*\*Degrees of freedom in parentheses

attempts to determine the well being of each player following the game,” and the results suggested a wide dispersion of responses. Based upon the frequency distribution of scores, a category of WELLBEING was derived by converting responses 1 and 2 into categories of [LOW PRIORITY (responses 1 - 2; n=18), MEDIUM PRIORITY (response 3; n=21), and HIGH PRIORITY (responses 4 - 5; n=19)]. Table 5 shows significant differences among the levels of WELLBEING and six items of the CPBQ or nearly 13% of the items.

A careful inspection of the mean scores of the levels of WELLBEING across

**Table 5.** An ANOVA comparison of WELLBEING with postcompetitive behavior variables

Item	Behavioral Practices	G(N)*	M	F**	p
20	Instructs players in using techniques to control arousal following the contest	LP(17)	1.529	(2,54)3.272	.0456
		MP(21)	2.000		
25	Checks the emotions of each player after showering and/or dressing	HP(19)	2.421	(2,54)7.944	.0009
		LP(17)	2.176		
32	Lets players know of their value independent of competition	MP(21)	2.524	(2,54)4.728	.0128
		HP(19)	3.474		
37	Provides a group activity for the entire team after the contest	LP(17)	4.294	(2,54)4.184	.0204
		MP(21)	4.429		
43	Confronts players who are suspected to engage in alcohol and drugs	HP(19)	4.842	(2,54)5.777	.0053
		LP(17)	3.176		
47	Is the additional time returning home after a road contest helpful to the coach and players in being in the correct frame of mind to leave the locker room	MP(21)	3.19	(2,54)3.353	.0424
		HP(19)	4.474		
		LP(17)	3.882		
		MP(21)	4.095		
		HP(19)	4.474		

\* Group and number \*\* Degrees of freedom are in parentheses

the six items suggests the HIGH PRIORITY level scored consistently higher than the LOW and MEDIUM PRIORITY levels. In this limited discussion, the HIGH PRIORITY subjects placed a greater emphasis on postgame behavioral practices with players than the LOW and MEDIUM priority groups. This finding might suggest that coaches who place a higher priority on their responsibility toward their athletes do, in fact, have a higher concern for the overall wellbeing of their athletes. However, further investigation is needed to support or refute the observed.

### Conclusions & Recommendations

The list of responsibilities for "the coach" appears to be escalating. The concept of appropriate postcompetitive behaviors implies that a coach's responsibility does not end at the conclusion of a contest or practice session. This preliminary study does suggest that there is a difference in postcompetitive behaviors of coaches based on CLASSIFICATION and perceived RESPONSIBILITY to the team. As coaches become more aware of their responsibility for resocializing athletes, a gradual change of responsibility should occur.

The purpose in studying these types of behaviors is two-fold; (1) to create the best situation for the athletes and coaches, and (2) to reduce the likelihood of litigation for coaches and athletes as a result of improper care (resocializing the athlete) and supervision. These investigators recommend that coaches: (1) realize the need for resocialization of athletes before releasing them to ensuing social encounters; (2) take a serious, well-planned approach toward postcompetitive behaviors that will resocialize athletes; (3) study the postcompetitive behaviors of themselves and other coaches through discussions and research; (4) use the postcompetitive behaviors/resocialization of athletes as a boost to public relations with parents and community; and (5) take a more responsible approach toward

providing athletes with the most positive occurrence in sport - to enjoy the game before, during, and after the contest.

### References

- Adams, S. (1989). *Sports risk management program*. Washington State University: Pullman, WA.
- Conn, J. & Fisher, E. (May, 1992). The point after. *Athletic Management*, 4 (3), 19-22.
- Conn, J. & Foshee, D. (1989-1990). Potential litigation: A case for resocialization of athletes. *GAHPERD Journal*, 24(1), 6, 17.
- Conn, J. & Foshee, D. (1990). The duty to resocialize. *Tennessee Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 28(2), 10-11
- Conn, J. & Foshee, D. (1992). [Player perceived behavioral practices of interscholastic boy's basketball coaches during the postcompetitive interval]. Unpublished raw data.
- Conn, J. & Lyons, M. (1992). [Postcompetitive behavior of girl's high school basketball coaches]. Unpublished raw data.
- Cratty, B. J. (1989). *Psychology in contemporary sport*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Foshee, D. P. & Conn, J. H. (in press). Prevalence of postcompetitive behavioral practices of arousal management by high school football coaches. *Applied Research on Coaching and Athletics Annual*.
- Gray, G. (1992). Risk management behaviors of wilderness outfitters and guides in North America. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 2(1), 101-109.
- Gray, G. & Parks, S. (1991). Risk management behaviors among Iowa high school athletic directors. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 1, 57-65.
- Henschen, K. P. (1973). Coaches beware: Post-competition tension. *Scholastic Coach*, 43(4), 52-53.
- Henschen, K. P. (1986). Athletic staleness and burnout: Diagnosis, prevention, and treatment. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (pp. 327-341). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Lyons, M., Conn, J. & Martin, P. (1992). [Postcompetitive behavior of girl's high school volleyball coaches]. Unpublished raw data.

- Pepple, T. (1992). [An exploratory investigation of high school principals attitudes of risk management for physical education instructional programs and extracurricular athletic programs]. Unpublished raw data.
- Sage, G. H. (1992, April 10). Postcompetitive behavior: A change of roles. A paper presented at the American Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Indianapolis, IN.
- Pilkington, J. W. (1992, April 10). Postcompetitive behavior: A manipulation of arousal. A paper presented at the American Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Indianapolis, IN.
- Vanek, M. & Cratty, B. J. (1970). *Psychology and the superior athlete*. New York: Macmillan.
- van der Smissen, B. (1990). *Legal liability and risk management for public and private entities*. Anderson Publishing Co.: Cincinnati, OH.
- Van Buskirk, R. & Conn, J. (1992). [Risk management behaviors among Kansas City, Missouri Athletic Directors]. Unpublished raw data.
- Washington Interscholastic Activities Association Handbook* (1990-91). Bellevue, WA: WIAA Publication.