

SAPPENFIELD, KOURTNEY B., M.S. Parental Influences on Youth Competitive and Recreational Sport: A Battle of Perspectives. (2019)
Directed by Dr. Jennifer L. Etnier. 63 pp.

Parental involvement has been shown to influence youth sport experiences. The perception of a parent's involvement in sport differs between parent and child. For example, a parent might perceive they provide more support than the child's perception. Ultimately, it is the child's perception of their parent's involvement which is likely to influence their sport experience. Previous research has also demonstrated that various contexts like level of play or type of sport are possible factors that influence parental involvement. The purpose of this study was to further understand the perceptions of parental involvement from both parents and children participating in a sport with moderate required parental involvement (United States soccer) at two different levels of play (competitive, recreation). We hypothesized that regardless of level of play (competitive, recreation), there would be a difference in perspectives between youth and their parents. Fifty-one parent-child dyads were sampled from a local soccer organization's competitive (n= 42) and recreation leagues (n= 9). The Parent Involvement Sport Questionnaire (PISQ) was utilized to compare parent and children's perception of parental involvement. Children were also asked to follow-up each question with their perception of preference of frequency for each behavior. Data suggests a collective difference in perspectives of parental involvement during and after a game. Due to the inability to compare between competitive and recreation, effect sizes are promising for future research. Overall, parents believe they are offering more supportive behaviors and providing less direction than is perceived by their children.

PARENTAL INFLUENCES ON YOUTH COMPETITIVE AND RECREATIONAL
SPORT: A BATTLE OF PERSPECTIVES

by

Kourtney B. Sappenfield

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Greensboro
2019

Approved by

Committee Chair

To my parents,
for inspiring me to write my thesis.

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis written by Kourtney B. Sappenfield has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am extremely thankful for my academic advisor, Dr. Jennifer Etnier, who's outstanding guidance and support helped bring a passion of mine to reality. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Jennifer Farrell, and Dr. Michael Hemphill, for their thoughtful feedback and assistance in the creation of this study. Lastly, I would also like to thank, Emily Morris, Derek Hevel, and Sean Cochran, for weathering Mother Nature with me at the soccer fields.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Literature Review Introduction	7
The Children’s Perspective: Qualitative	7
The Children’s Perspective: Quantitative	12
The Parent and Child Perspective: Qualitative	14
The Parent and Child Perspective: Quantitative	20
Literature Review Summary	23
III. METHODS	24
Participants	24
Description of the Leagues	27
Procedures	27
Instrumentation	29
Statistical Analysis	31
IV. RESULTS	32
V. DISCUSSION	39
Recommendations	44
REFERENCES	46
APPENDIX A. YA-PISQ EXAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE	49
APPENDIX B. P-PISQ EXAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE	50
APPENFIX C. YOUTH DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	51
APPENDIX D. PARENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	54

APPENDIX E. PISQ RELIABILITY SCORES.....	58
APPENDIX F. DATA COLLECTION TIMELINE	59
APPENDIX G. EXAMPLE EMAIL TO COACH	62
APPENDIX H. EXAMPLE EMAIL TO PARENT	63

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Demographic Information for Parent and Youth	26
Table 2. Difference Scores Between Youth and Parent Perspectives.....	35
Table 3. YA-PISQ Follow-Up Questions	37
Table 4. Moderating Effect of Level of Play (Competitive, Recreation)	38

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. Significant Mean Difference Questions Between Children and Parents.....	34

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Today's youth have the opportunity to take part in numerous extracurricular activities. Each activity has the potential to pique the interest of a child in ways that might not be available to them through opportunities in school or at home. Participation in extracurricular activities can also influence youth development cognitively, physically, and socially. However, out of all of these activities, sports have been argued to be the most influential (Holt et al. 2008).

Sports have the ability to teach children physical skills to improve performance and have been shown to provide a platform through which children can learn various life skills (Domingues & Gonçalves, 2013). Another factor in sports is that it provides youth with opportunities for interaction with their family. Youth rely on their parents during childhood and spend most of their time interacting with their parents (Fredericks & Eccles, 2004). Youth also look to their parents for support during their sport experience (Omli & Wiese-Bjornstal, 2011). Numomura and Oliveira (2013) reported parental involvement to be an important motivational factor for youth in sports for most ages (9-18 yrs.). The interaction between parents and their children has the potential to influence how the child feels about the environment (Domingues & Gonçalves, 2013) and their performance in sports (Elliot & Drummond, 2017, Knight et al. 2011). Parental involvement is important because it gives parents the opportunity to interact and

communicate with their child about the sport, both on the court and at home (Fredericks & Eccles, 2004). According to Fredericks and Eccles (2004), parents have an influence on their children in sports as *role models*, *interpreters of experience*, and *providers of experience*. The way parents behave or demonstrate their beliefs and expectations around their children may have an impact on the way their child perceives their sporting experience. If this interaction is positive and supportive, then children are more likely to enjoy the sport environment (Anderson et al. 2003). However, sports can be a negative, anxiety-inducing experience for youth (Anderson et al.). Anderson et al. (2003) found that children noted that sports were the only activity to be associated with pressure, which when present, can drop levels of enjoyment. It is important to focus on factors that can cause negative experiences for youth in sport because if these are present, children might not reap the same positive benefits from sports and may be faced with an environment that they do not enjoy (Anderson et al.). Therefore, it is imperative to understand more closely the influence parents have on their child's sport experience.

Since sport success is often viewed in the public, it is appealing for parents to be involved in their child's athletic experience based upon the possibility to benefit from such success (Lauer et al. 2010). Parents are also the key reason for their child to get involved in sports initially (Kanters et al. 2008) and influence the decision for youth to continue their participation in sports (Stein, Raedeke, & Glenn, 1999). This involvement has the ability to impact how their child experiences sport throughout their participation (Numomura & Oliveira, 2013). Parents can also offer financial or logistical support (Ede et al, 2012; Knight et al. 2010, 2016; Knight & Holt, 2014). The many forms of involvement that parents have may be viewed by parents as supportive, but that might not

be the case for the child. When a parent is too critical of performance and overbearing in the child's sport experience, anxiety and poor behaviors might occur (Kanters et al. 2008). This experience is not limited to, negative verbal behavior, as youth might also be aware of non-verbal behavior their parents may use during the game (Knight et al. 2010). Non-verbal behavior can influence the perception a child has of their parents during the game (pressure or support) (Knight et al. 2010). Regardless of the type of parental influence (positive or negative), it has an effect on the experience youth have in sports (Anderson et al. 2003). The influence that parents have on youth in sports has not only been found during a game, but also at home, on the drive home, at practice, and before a competition (Elliot & Drummond 2017; Knight et al. 2010, 2011, 2016). So, since parents are involved in various contexts with their children in sports, the consistency of their behaviors between these contexts can also influence the effect parents may have on their children (Knight et al. 2016).

A common perception that parents have about their involvement with their children in sports is that it is sustained under the notion of "good parenting" (Elliot & Drummond, 2017). "Good parenting" is defined by the parents and is not always reflective of a child's opinion. It also assumes that parents are the only factor in knowing what is best for their children. This makes it difficult for parents to understand that there are other perspectives of the same experience (Lauer et al. 2010). There is then a conflict because perspectives between parents and their children about sports are rarely aligned. In a study that Kanteras et al. (2008) conducted with youth hockey players, they found that parents generally had different perspectives from their children about the hockey experience. Also, through a survey asking about perceptions of a youth sports league,

youth generally rated the league as more positive than their parents (Schwab et al. 2010). Similar to their different views of the youth sport experience, parents and children may hold different expectations for parental involvement in a sport. Ede, Kamphoff, Mackey and Armentrout (2012) found children wanted their parents to be more involved than they currently were, whereas Stein, Raedeke, and Glenn (1999) found the athletes in their sample believed their parents were highly involved and found this to be acceptable. Perspectives are inherently individual, and Stein, Raedeke, and Glenn (1999) also found that a person's individual preference of the degree of involvement may be a better indicator than simply the explicit level of parental involvement. Therefore, a lack of awareness of the difference in perspectives between parents and youth may affect not only how a parent perceives their involvement themselves but also how they perceive the experience of their child. If there is a discrepancy, children are more likely to align their beliefs to their parents, which is then speculated to have a negative impact on intention to continue in sports (Elliot & Drummond, 2016; Kanters et al, 2008). Also, if parents are unaware of how their involvement is received by their child, it could have the potential to increase the chance of dropout or burnout (Numomura & Oliveira, 2013). Therefore, it is imperative to look more into the potentially different perspectives of parents and their children.

Researchers in this area have primarily focused on participants in sports expected to have high or low parental involvement. Specifically, there is an assumption that some sports, like tennis or ice hockey, have a requirement of parents to be heavily involved financially or logistically (Ede et al. 2012; Knight et al, 2010, 2016; Knight & Holt. 2014). This may be different than sports that may be played at a local recreation center

(Schwab et al. 2010) or a sport that is not considered “mainstream” with minimal potential for fame or monetary success like slalom canoeing (Knight et al. 2015). The level at which the sport is played may also influence the involvement of parents. The sport of soccer was selected because typically it has low-to-moderate parental involvement that can be dependent on the league played in. A non-competitive introductory camp (Omli & Wiese-Bjornstal, 2011) may have a different influence on parental involvement because there may be fewer performance expectations than in a competitive league of elite athletes when things like reputation and performance are more of a concern (Domingues & Gonçalves, 2013). However, there has not been a study that has explored these differences in perspectives in a sport that is expected to be more moderate in terms of parental involvement. Furthermore, no study has compared a recreation (assumed lower involvement) and a competitive league (assumed higher involvement) to understand whether there may be a difference in perceived perspectives of parental involvement. Hence, in this study, data was collected from a soccer club that has both a recreation and competitive league.

Since sports are a common extracurricular activity for youth to participate in and parents are influential in their child’s life and their experience in sports, it is imperative to continue to understand the difference in perspectives between parents and their children in sports. This study aimed to understand the extent to which youth and parents in recreation and competitive leagues, in a sport that does not require a great amount of parental involvement, differ in perspectives of parental involvement and the quality of it. We hypothesized that regardless of level of play (competitive or recreation), there would be a difference in perspectives between youth and their parents. For exploratory analyses,

we also compared discrepancy scores across the two sport leagues in youth sport to further establish how influential parents may be on their children in sport relative to the league their child participates in.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature Review Introduction

Sports are a common activity for youth to participate in, therefore it is important to understand their experiences in sport. Based on this review of the literature, it is clear that children's perspectives of their sport experiences may be different from their parent's perspective of their child's sport experiences. In the existing literature, most research explores the child's perspective. These studies demonstrate the ability for children to provide explanations of their sport experiences and communicate what they want from parental involvement. Most of these studies are qualitative. A few studies examine parental involvement from the parent and child's perspective. This body of literature demonstrates the discrepancy between parent's and children's perceptions of parental involvement. This difference in perspectives may impact the youth sport experience.

The Children's Perspective: Qualitative

Exploring children's perspectives of parental behavior on the sideline, Omli and Wiese-Bjornstal (2011) conducted a study of fifty-seven 7-14-year-old girls and boys during a week-long tennis camp for beginners. The authors chose a beginner level camp to obtain a general preference for parental behavior rather than focusing on elite athletes who play tennis. Through the lens of grounded theory, the authors conducted interviews containing open-ended questions pertaining to what children thought about their parent's

sideline behavior. The authors found that children typically believed parents fit into three categories which they named *supportive parent*, *demanding coach*, and *crazed fan*. The supportive parent utilized both positive behaviors and forms of feedback. When describing the *supportive parent*, some children preferred silence whereas others liked cheering during the game. Generally, children found aggressive or negative behaviors reasonable if their parent was protecting them from something. The children explained that feedback from a supportive parent was implemented through praise or encouragement. A *demanding coach* parent who utilized conversations that were structured around performance and instruction were sometimes viewed as okay, however, they were not preferred by youth. Lastly, a *crazed fan* was characterized by behaviors a child did not want to see from their parents. The children described this as including cruel and nasty verbal behavior or actions directed at them or others during a game. The authors noted that to some children, the outcome of the game was not as important as having fun while playing. These children indicated that losing a game would be tolerable, if it meant their parents would not behave negatively during the game. The children said that not only was the yelling distracting, but it also made them uncomfortable and hence impacted their view of the situation. The authors concluded that parental behavior can impact their children's sport experience either by being stressful or by being supportive. Therefore, it is important to establish a clear understanding of what behaviors are appropriate based on the opinions of their children because youth ultimately want their parent present at their games. From this study, it is demonstrated that children have the ability to communicate how they feel and their preferences with respect to their parents' involvement in their sport experience.

Parents engage with their children in many different contexts relative to their child's sport experience. Identifying perspectives that their children have of their parents, Knight, Little, Harwood, and Goodger (2016) investigated three separate environments, during competition, at practice, and at home. Uniquely, because it diverges from mainstream sports, the authors chose eight elite youth slalom canoers. It is unconventional due to the limited fame and financial success associated with the sport. With more financial and logistical burdens because of its low popularity and requirements, this sport may unintentionally require parents to be more involved. Through interviews and a diary to document parental behaviors, the authors talked to a small sample of males and females (avg. 15 yrs.). Athletes were asked to talk about experiences that were both positive and negative. Interestingly, the authors found athletes discussed preferred behaviors as positive, and negative behaviors were just the absence of a preferred behavior. Participants responded with consistent behaviors regardless of different sport environments, with several major themes identified through the interviews. Various types of support (financial, logistical) are important as they allowed athletes time to attend to sport specific requirements. It was important if parents expressed an understanding of their child's experience, whether that be in terms of expressing interest, focusing on growth rather than performance, or awareness of the child and the environment and adapting communication to fit what is suitable for the child. Specifically, in training and competition, allowing the athlete space to learn autonomy and be social was valued. Also, emotional control and keeping sports in perspective were important at home and competition. However, at home, it was desired to be a place where

sports were not the sole focus and development was able to happen in other aspects of the child's life.

Identifying perspectives of parental support from boys and girls individually, Numomura and Oliveira (2013), implemented semi-structured interviews at various age levels of women's and men's artistic gymnastics. There were three age stages for girls ranging from 9-15 years old and four stages for boys from 9-18 years old. For girls, all three levels commented on parent's support in terms of being present at events (games or practices) and as a form of encouragement. Other positive aspects of support the girls commented on were *financial/logistical*, *positivity*, and *providing expectations*. However, these aspects varied in degree or presence within the three gymnastic age groups. The female gymnastics recognized that negative characteristics of support included too much focus on performance, disapproval, and distraction from the sport in terms of focus on health or school. Male gymnasts recorded similar aspects of support within the positive and negative categories however, they also varied on degree and presence within the four age groups. The authors discovered that male gymnasts commented on more positive aspects than females at all age levels. Overall, the authors recognize both female and male artistic gymnasts value the involvement of their parents and find the support they provide important to youth in their experience in sports.

Looking into female youth athletes' perspectives of their parents in sports more specifically, Knight, Neely, and Holt (2011) identified the perspectives of female athletes. These female athletes were from ages 12-15 because the authors wanted to explore an age range where competition and involvement were becoming a central focus for both the athlete and parent. Athletes were selected if their "main sport" was a team

sport that competed once a month at a minimum. The eligible female athletes were asked to participate in a semi-structured interview in regard to their perceptions and opinions of parental behavior. The athletes were asked to only think of the most involved parent (some said both) when answering the questions. The authors identified three specific circumstances (before, during, and after a game) in which the athletes expressed what they would like to see or not see from their parents. Before the game, the female athletes wanted parents centered around preparation. This type of parental involvement was desired in the form of supplying transportation, equipment, and game prep (i.e. food). Without this kind of support, it was believed that it could negatively impact an athlete's performance. It was also important to the athletes that parents understood how their child mentally prepared before a game, by either giving space or attending to their anxieties. During a game, positive interactions (avoiding negatives, controlling emotions) were important, and encouragement was generally preferred, if it was directed towards the whole team. Female athletes also preferred if parents directed comments more on effort (process orientation) instead of focusing on the end result of the game (outcome orientation). Regardless of the positive or negative nature, these athletes did not like when they were singled out during a game. Comments parents made directed at the athlete or at others could not only be embarrassing but also made the athlete feel responsible for their parent's actions. Also, during the game, it was considered confusing if parents gave advice that was counter to that given by their coaches. Instead, athletes wanted parents to match the coach's ideologies and to offer feedback framed more as recommendations than as demands. After the game, the authors noticed feedback was a common theme. It was important for parents to know how and when their child preferred

feedback, because for some children, positive immediate feedback was received better than others just as long as parents weren't being critical in front of their teammates. Additionally, children also thought implementing both positive and critical or performance-oriented comments could sometimes be helpful.

Exploring sports that are individual rather than team based, Knight, Boden, and Holt (2010) identified perspectives youth have of their parents during a game. These athletes were elite male and female tennis players (12-15 yrs.), chosen because they were in the "specialization" stage of sport development. The authors engaged participants through interviews and focus groups. Common themes arose about parental involvement, with the majority of discussion centered around types of support and the negatives of over-involvement centered around performance and winning. Generally, the athletes wanted support in the form of general parent advice rather than about technique or performance. Specifically, after a game, youth wanted parents to comment on things they could control, like effort, instead of their contribution to the outcome of the game. Also, it was important for parents to maintain appropriate emotional control ("respect tennis etiquette") and be cognizant of behavior during a game. The latter part was an interesting finding because youth commented on their ability to identify not only verbal behavior during a game, but also non-verbal behavior. This could become an added stressor for the athlete as the youth mentioned how they were keen to detect when the two did not match.

The Children's Perspective: Quantitative

A less explored route in youth's perspectives of their parents in sport is to collect data with quantitative measures. Attempting to understand different perspectives of support or pressure in extracurricular activities (specifically sports), Anderson, Funk,

Elliot, and Smith (2003), focused on elementary-aged-children (9-11 years, 238 girls and boys). They were given two surveys asking about activities participated in and parental involvement. Regardless of the type of parental influence (positive or negative), a parent's input has an effect on the experience youth have in sports. These authors found that sports were the only activity associated with pressure, which when present, can decrease levels of enjoyment.

Specifically, the Parental Involvement Scale Questionnaire (PISQ), was utilized in a study by Ede, Kamphoff, Mackey and Armentrout (2012). The authors also added questions pertaining to the child's enjoyment of the sport. Their sample included fifty-eight youth ice hockey players who were chosen because of the monetary and time investment this sport has. The PISQ contains questions pertaining to whether a child believed their parents' involvement coincided with "praise and understanding," "directive behaviors," and "active involvement." Youth perceived their parents as using more positive behaviors in the "praise and understanding" category than the other two categories. What is interesting about their findings was that youth reported they wanted more involvement from all three categories compared to their parent's current involvement levels. Also, levels of enjoyment did not demonstrate any relation to perceived levels of involvement by youth.

Previous literature has addressed the uniqueness of personal preference a child may have for the involvement levels of their parents, however, Stein, Raedeke, and Glenn (1999) attempted to further understand the different perceptions between youth. The athletes in the sample were involved in either volleyball, football, or soccer, but the level of play was not mentioned. The authors utilized questionnaires to identify how involved

youth felt their parents were (high to low) and also the degree of involvement (“too little, just right, too much”). Participants also were asked to comment on their levels of enjoyment and stress. Overall, youth rated their parents as moderately to highly involved. They believed this level of involvement was acceptable and thought their parents were mostly positive. When enjoyment was compared to involvement between mothers and fathers, youth noted more positive experiences with mothers who were highly involved, although this was not significant. On the other hand, degree, involvement level, and enjoyment were significantly related with fathers, demonstrating that higher involvement from fathers also generated more positive experience, unless youth rated the degree of involvement as “too much” then experiences became negative. Interestingly, stress felt by youth was consistent with both mothers and fathers but only in regard to the degree of involvement. The authors speculated youth perceptions of the quality of the relationship may be more important to understand than how much involvement parents engage in.

The Parent and Child Perspective: Qualitative

Elaborating on data from the same participant pool, Elliot and Drummond (2016, 2017) explored situations in a game that may be influenced by parents. With a focus group and individual interview format, Elliot and Drummond (2016, 2017) gathered information from 34 parents and 52 children (12-13 years). These athletes played junior Australian Football, and the authors chose this sport because of its popularity and history of bad behavior from parents. Focus groups were conducted separately with parents and children while interviews were solely engaged in with parents.

Analyzing perspectives during and after the game, Elliot and Drummond (2016) found common themes for these circumstances as follows. Parents generally believed

their actions were acceptable. They rationalized this belief as what parents were supposed to do with their children in sports. Parents often identified their interactions (positive or critical) as acceptable because it's what they thought parents were supposed to do. Even if the parent had prior knowledge of the sport their child would not be receptive to the action, parents still felt it was important to engage in, as an important *teaching moment*. Parents tended to believe it was important to be honest (even if believed harsh by youth) because they assumed honesty could increase understanding of the game and be a beneficial tool for the development of life skills. Parents thought that opportunities to engage with their children like this were what separated them from being unsupportive and believed their presence itself was positive and something children wanted to see at games. Similar to Knight et al. (2011), parents also believed that if negative statements were surrounded with positive ones, it would not hurt their child's feelings. The authors found parents also engaged in masking negative comments with positives, especially on the car ride home. Although some parents recognized the car ride home might be a hard time for their child to debrief, many thought it was necessary. Also, it was a commonly held belief that parents had the ability to accurately know when to use positive behavior during a game. In fact, the only negative behavior parents cited was generally towards referees, umpires, or other parents. Youth, on the other hand, tended to prefer positive feedback even in invasive times, like a break during a game. They also recognized the range of positive to negative structures of feedback during the game, with differing opinions on what bothered or did not bother them. On the ride home, youth only appreciated feedback (positive or negative) if they believed they had a good game; if not, parental comments (positive or negative) were taken more sensitively than intended by

the parents. The authors concluded, parents tend to leave out their children's preference of parental involvement and acknowledge the importance of the child's perspective in this dialogue.

Analyzing after-the-game parental behavior, Elliot and Drummond (2017) found this to be a less explored interaction in youth sports. Through the social constructionist lens, they recognize the post-game "debriefing" as being heavily rooted in society (e.g. interview, press conferences). The authors find the post-game "debrief" a common occurrence where youth often anticipated this conversation after the game. As mentioned above, parents believed the car ride home was an important time to talk to their children after a game, as it was a space with a clear beginning and end. However, there were certain circumstances when children believed this conversation would be helpful (win or close game) or not helpful (loss). Essentially, the debrief was also not helpful when parents engaged in feedback when the child was not receptive to it. A parent's ability to understand their child's debrief requests and opinions are important because though intended to be positive, youth may take the feedback as negative. The misconstrued feedback has the potential to not only impact the youth's current feelings but also in future performances. For example, a child may not do a certain action during a game, in order to avoid previous feedback a parent gave about that action.

Specifically, with the sport of tennis, Knight and Holt (2014), wanted to understand behaviors parents engaged in that were considered ideal for youth to have the best experience in sports. Tennis was chosen as a sport that has been associated with a financial and logistical burden on parents. The authors gathered ninety participants who were current athletes (12-15 years old) and their parents as well as adults who were

previous athletes and coaches. They also did not limit their selection by experience level or interest of the sport. Collectively, participants noted parental involvement was considered advantageous when parents not only helped improve their child's performance levels but also made the experience enjoyable. The authors found a general consensus from all participants on what they thought parental involvement should look like. As previous research has mentioned, the authors identified parents' ability to understand/adapt involvement based on the needs and emotions of the child (effort over performance) and engagement in appropriate behaviors during competitions (emotional control) as valued behaviors. Other desired behaviors included holding athletes accountable, parental enjoyment of the experience, and knowing their limits in the sport (sport knowledge v. parent knowledge). It was also important that parents and children shared goals and beliefs and made sure those stayed consistent throughout the course of the child's experience in sports. Overall, consistency was an important parental behavior. Consistency was valued by participants for parents on all levels of their involvement (goals, understanding child's needs, during competitions). The authors discussed how all areas of involvement parents engaged in influence each other, therefore, it is important that parents are consistent.

A common method for studying perspectives of parental behavior identifies the types of behaviors and actions parents use. However, Holt, Tamminen, Black, Zehn, and Wall (2008) explored the context from which these behaviors or actions may arise. The authors used a sample of four sport-centered families, conducting interviews and audio diaries as well as 120 hours of observation. This study also used a sociological approach by exploring context under Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory. The authors

explained that sports are a microsystem that youth engage in and that sports have an influence on development of an individual. Focusing not only on how parents engage in behaviors (feedback, support, behavior, etc.) but also the context that influences how parents engage in the youth sport setting. Parents' actions are influenced through various ways. Whether or not leagues employ policies regarding parental behavior impacts how parents may act. During the game, parental feedback was contingent on their child's performance and influenced the type of behavior the parent would use (supportive, instructional/performance based, and unsupportive behaviors). Empathy was also seen as an influencer in the way parents reacted to their children because some parents believed they had a heightened understanding of their child's feelings in sports. This prompted a belief for parents to think they are saying what their child wants to hear. Another contextual influencer in sports comes from "emotional intensity." Parents are influenced by other parents, the game, and the crowd, so the perceptions they may have or actions they use could be representative of the flow of the game or how the crowd is acting. Lastly, the belief of knowledge or experience of the sport prompted certain types of feedback or behavior from a parent. Overall, these authors established the complexity of parental and youth interaction in sports and how there may be other contextual factors that influence the way parents are involved in their child's sports.

Following Holt et al. (2008), Domingues and Gonçalves (2013) also explored Bronfenbrenner's BioEcological theory in order to investigate perceptions of parents through interviews of athletes and parents in higher levels of competitive youth football. The authors found the level of competition at which the child was playing could have an influence on parental involvement. Participation at a higher level, a club's reputation, and

athlete's and parent's reputation, all can have an impact on the way parents think about and use behaviors towards their children. This demonstrates that there may be layers to understanding perceptions of youth and parents at different levels in sports.

Exploring perspectives of behaviors of parents over a span of tennis development, Lauer, Gould, Roman, and Pierce (2010) identified perspectives of parental behaviors according to a triad (athletes, coaches, and parents). Although participants in this study were adult athletes, the researchers were attempting to learn more about youth experiences across their development in sports. Nine professional tennis athletes and eight parents and coaches were interviewed and asked questions pertaining to their experiences with parents over their sport development. Following similar stages, the athletes broke down their experiences into three stages of development, which the authors utilized as developmental categories. This includes an "early" stage (beginning years of sports), a "middle" stage (early teen, more organized), and an "advanced" stage (late teen, competitive). Parents and children valued support in sports. This support did not just pertain to emotional, but also tangible kinds of support like supplying transportation, equipment, and game prep (food). Other positive parental behaviors included communication (effective and emotionally appropriate), motivation, and keeping sports in perspective (teaching life skills and balancing life/success). However, the use of these behaviors differed depending on the level of development. By contrast, pushing was a negative parental behavior that was evident through all three stages. Generally, it was recognized as unintentional and something parents had a difficult time being aware of. Feelings of being controlled were also recognized by participants. They felt that their parents have a control over what they should be doing, making it difficult for youth to

feel autonomous in their actions. There was even potential for this dependence to extend into older competitive years when these athletes should be relying on themselves. Some negative behaviors also varied in degree across stages. For example, the authors noticed that through the first stage, parental behaviors were minimal. However, parents tended to become more involved during the second stage (big decision-making time), as well as utilize more negative behaviors. Lastly, parents generally stepped back in the last stage, allowing for the athlete to grow on their own. Overall, the authors discovered consistency of positive behaviors over time was key for parents to best keep a positive environment for their athletes.

The Parent and Child Perspective: Quantitative

Identifying a difference in perspectives of both parents and their children, Schwab, Wells, and Arthur-Banning (2010) come from the perspective of a youth sport administrator to attempt to evaluate the differing experiences parents and children may have. At the end of an American football season, authors administered questionnaires to children (6-14) and invited one parent to participate. Questionnaires asked about the parent's and children's beliefs they had about different goals of the league. Following previous research, parent and children shared different perspectives of the experience in the league. Athletes cited aspects of the league as more positive than their parents. Interestingly, parents and children only saw one variable as similar, which was sportsmanship, however, the two groups ranked the importance of competition in sports differently. The authors recognize that bridging the gap between perspectives is important because parents at earlier levels are deciding factors for play. Helping parents recognize

their child's perspective of their experience in sports, may help parents enjoy the experience as well.

When comparing general opinions of involvement of parents from parents and youth in a football league, Goodman and James (2017) recruited male athletes (8-15 years) and their mothers. They were then asked to complete a questionnaire. Both the mothers and their children completed the Parental Involvement in Sport Questionnaire (PISQ), however two versions were used (P (parents)-PISQ and YA (youth athlete)-PISQ) depending on which group it was given to. Children were also given a second survey, YA-Help, which analyzed how helpful the child thought their parent's involvement was. Based on responses from the questionnaires, youth documented a higher parental involvement than their parents. Youth also cited a higher use of critical comments ("directive behaviors") than what parents assumed they engaged in. Interestingly, "directive behaviors" were most frequently noticed during post-game situations. Parents on the other hand, believed they were good resources for their children when problems (performance or not) were bothering them. However, overall parental involvement (specifically praise and encouragement), was viewed as positive by youth. Although, youth believed it was not helpful when parents could not control their emotions and negative behaviors or appeared disappointed. Children viewed specific feedback from parents as helpful but viewed non-specific behaviors as not helpful when attempting to learn from mistakes.

Involvement can be categorized positively or negatively in terms of support and pressure. Kanters and Casper (2008) analyzed perceptions of parental support and pressure from youth ice hockey players (average age = 9.54 yrs.) and their parents (both

mothers and fathers). Using an online questionnaire method, the authors asked both the parents and children about parental involvement (support and pressure) and feelings of personal skill level and participation in the sport. The authors found youth rated parents higher in pressure than they did in support, which was the opposite of what parents rated themselves. Thus, the authors concluded that parents and their children were generally not on the same page in regard to beliefs about involvement in hockey. This study demonstrated parents may not be able to correctly perceive how they interact with their children in sports and what their children feel and perceive while playing. What may seem like a positive environment to a parent, could be potentially stress-inducing to a child. This could be potentially harmful as children are more likely to align their beliefs and expectations to their parents. If children match these beliefs to their parents, it could inhibit the development of autonomy, which could be potentially detrimental long-term.

Involvement also does not have to be directed towards youth during the game. Omli and LaVoi (2011) investigated perceptions of background anger in soccer for youth athletes age 8-18 years. The authors describe background anger as a conflict a parent might engage in (e.g. with another parent) that does not directly include the child. Researchers gave parents and children questionnaires regarding sideline behavior of parents. Parents believed they did not yell or engage in background anger as much their children or coaches thought they did. When yelling was perceived by parents it was typically recognized as actions “other” parents engaged in or the parents reported that their own yelling was positive and helpful to their child. Background anger was found to be negatively impactful to children, and children don’t get used to background anger but

actually may become more anxious as they are exposed. This is not helpful as parents typically engage in background anger more frequently as a child gets older in sports.

Literature Review Summary

From this review, it is clear that children hold different opinions and expectations for preferred parental involvement. If one child perceives a behavior as supportive, another child may perceive the same behavior as negative and they can logically explain these preferences. A smaller body of literature suggests that the beliefs children hold about parental involvement may be different from what their parents believe they are doing. If children understand different types of parental involvement that are beneficial for them, then it is important that their parents understand how their child perceives their parental involvement, since negative parental behaviors can be detrimental to the youth sport experience.

Typically, youth and parent research has sampled participants from sports or contexts with required parental involvement (e.g. elite teams). However, since many athletes do not play sports with this required parental involvement (e.g. recreation leagues), it is important to also analyze perspectives of parental involvement in other environments. There has not been another study comparing two different levels of play (recreation and competitive), where the assumed parental involvement differs. Establishing an understanding of the perspectives parents and youth may have of parental involvement in these two levels of popular sport participation will help further create a better sport experience for athletes at all levels.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Participants

Participants for this study included children and one of their parents/caregivers. Children were selected from U13 and U14 soccer teams (11-13 years old). These ages were used to target children who are in the specialization stage. The “specialization stage” (second phase of child development in sports when more time is invested into a sport) is where parents tend to be the most negative and the most involved in their child’s sport development (Lauer et al. 2010). Some studies have used an age range of 12-15 as the specialization stage as this represents the ages during which children are starting to focus more on a sport and are more involved competitively (Knight et al. 2010; Knight et al. 2011). Lauer, Gould, Roman, and Pierce (2010) found most children enter the *specialization stage* around 9.5 years old and then enter a higher level of competitive sport as young as 13 years old. Children from U13 and U14 teams were selected for this study because there is not an exact age when children enter or leave the *specialization stage*, so using an age (11-13) at the middle of the ranges previously identified may best represent children who are still within this stage.

Only the parent who was present the day the researcher gave out the surveys was asked to take the survey. If more than one parent was present, they decided which parent would take the questionnaire. There were fifty-one parent-child dyads in total from the

recreation and competitive leagues. This includes 9 parent-child dyads from the recreation league and 42 parent-child dyads from the competitive league. As seen in Table 1, overall the parents in the study were mostly female (59%), mostly white (78%), and their highest level of sport played was high school (41%). The children were relatively equal in terms of sex (M 56%, F 44%), were mostly white (65%), played sports between 6-8 years (39%) or 9 or more years (35%), and mostly played another sport in addition to soccer (58%).

Table 1

Demographic Information for Parent and Youth

	Parent	Youth
Sex		
Male	41%	56%
Female	59%	44%
Hispanic		
Yes	4%	20%
No	96%	80%
Race		
American Indian	0%	0%
Asian	2%	0%
Black or African American	6%	6%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0%	0%
White	78%	69%
Two or more	6%	8%
Prefer to self-subscribe	8%	10%
Prefer not to answer	0%	6%
Education		
Less than high school	0%	N/A
High school graduate	4%	N/A
Some college	10%	N/A
Two-year degree	14%	N/A
Four-year degree	43%	N/A
Professional Degree	26%	N/A
Doctorate	2%	N/A
Highest Level of Sport Played		
Youth recreation leagues	7%	N/A
Middle school	5%	N/A
High school	49%	N/A
College	14%	N/A
Professional	2%	N/A
Adult recreation leagues	10%	N/A
Years Played Soccer		
1 to 2 years	N/A	4%
3 to 5 years	N/A	20%
6 to 8 years	N/A	40%
9 or more	N/A	36%
Play Other Sports		
I only play soccer	N/A	40%
I also play another sport	N/A	60%

Note. N/A demonstrates question did not apply to participants in that category.

Description of the Leagues

A competitive and recreation league affiliated with the same soccer club were sampled in this study. The director of the club provided the researchers with a description of the two leagues. To participate in the recreation league for one session, fees (with uniforms included) are \$85.00-\$105.00 (depending on early or late registration) whereas the competitive league fees (uniforms not included) are \$875.00-\$1,850.00 (depending on the specific level) for the whole year. Recreation teams practice once per week whereas competitive teams may practice two or three times. Competitive coaches are paid, and recreation coaches are volunteer. There is no formal coach education requirement at either the recreation or competitive level. The club does require coaches to complete Abuse Prevention Training and a NCYSA Risk Management background check. They do cover the cost of USSF coach education courses if a coach would like to participate, however this is mostly taken advantage of by the competitive coaches.

Procedures

Parents and children were sampled from a recreation and competitive soccer league in the area of the study. Since previous researchers have picked sports to sample based on their assumption of explicit parental involvement (price, equipment, transportation), soccer was chosen for the study because it is relatively cheap and explicit parental involvement should, therefore, be more dependent on the level of play. The sample consisted of recreational and competitive soccer teams in order to best represent teams with higher explicit parental involvement (competitive, i.e. higher price, equipment, transportation) and lower explicit parental involvement (recreation, i.e. low fees, minimal transportation). Both soccer leagues are affiliated with the same local

soccer club. Using teams under the same organization keeps the environment consistent except for the level of the play. Other than that, all levels of teams utilized the same facilities and follow under the same mission statement, guidelines, and required coach education. Teams were selected based on the type of league (competitive or recreation), age range, and the willingness of the coach to have their team participate. Participants were sampled mid-season at practice. Collection mid-season was chosen because there would have already been several games and practices completed, so participants would have recent experiences to pull from. Practices were chosen as the time at which to sample participants, rather than games, due to potential game situations that may influence the way participants responded on the questionnaire and logistical challenges of asking players to stay after games. Practice was more neutral, and the questionnaires were asking about parental involvement over the season and not just at one instance.

Coaches of participating teams were contacted and asked if the researcher would be able to come in to administer the questionnaire either before or after practice (see appendix 1.G. for example email). Parents were then sent an email either by the coach or researcher to let them know at which practice the questionnaire would be administered (see appendix 1.H. for example email). Parents and children received separate questionnaires and were asked to take the questionnaire in response to each other (child think about the parent present and parent think about the child present). Both parent and child were asked for their consent to participate in this study at the start of their individual questionnaire. Parents were asked to consent for themselves and their children, and children were asked to assent to participate. Parents and children also took the questionnaires separately to eliminate any bias. Upon completion of the survey, parents

and children were entered into a drawing for a chance to win one of two \$25 gift cards to a local sporting goods store. Both the parent and the child had the chance to win this drawing. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Instrumentation

A quantitative survey incorporating a questionnaire called the Parental Involvement in Sport Questionnaire (PISQ) developed by Lee and Maclean (1997) was administered. The PISQ was designed to identify the level of parental involvement (behaviors) from a child's perspective (Lee & Maclean, 1997). This questionnaire contains three reliable categories based upon Cronbach's alpha: directive behaviors (0.82), praise and understanding (0.60), and active involvement (0.66) (Kamphoff et al. 2012; Lee & Maclean, 1994).

A recent version of the PISQ was adapted (Goodman & James, 2017) to best fit this study. This survey includes a parent version (P-PISQ) and a youth version (YA-PISQ). The PISQ was modified by phrasing the questions to fit with soccer in the United States ("before a *game*..." rather than "before a *match*..."). Questions represent the three subscales of directive behavior (e.g., "does your parent shout or cheer?"), praise and understanding (e.g., "does your parent praise you for trying harder?"), and active involvement (e.g., "does your parent help run the team?"). The P-PISQ and the YA-PISQ use the same questions however, questions are modified based on who they are directed toward (P-PISQ: "do you tell your child", YA-PISQ: "does your parent/caregiver tell you"). All questions were answered utilizing a five-point Likert scale (always - never) (Lee & Maclean, 1994).

The P-PISQ and YA-PISQ from Goodman and James (2017) both consist of 19 questions. However, only 18 questions were utilized in this version because the question pertaining to parents volunteering during the game is not applicable to both the competitive and recreation soccer leagues. In addition to the 18 questions adapted from Goodman and James (2017), eight additional questions were added to both the P-PISQ and YA-PISQ to follow up from previous research (questions: 1, 2, 8, 13,15, 16, 21, 25). These supplementary questions further explore praise (in context and performance), the car ride home, and alternative forms of support. For exploratory purposes, a question was asked about the parent’s motivation for their child participating in soccer and the child’s motivation to play soccer. However, Question 25 (Does your child play because you told your child to or because he or she likes to play?) was excluded from the analysis, after later realization that the Likert scale (always – never) does not reflect an appropriate answer. Participants repeatedly asked for help explaining the meaning behind this question.

Additionally, the YA-PISQ incorporated follow-up questions that ask the child their specific perception of their parent’s use of a behavior. These questions were scaled by a three-point Likert-scale: “too little” “just right,” “too much” (Stein et al. 1999). The follow-up questions were utilized because perceptions of the appropriateness of a specific parental behavior may vary independent of the judgment of the frequency of that behavior (Stein et al. 1999). A behavior may be high or low in frequency but a child’s perception of the appropriateness of that frequency of behavior further demonstrates if the child likes or dislikes that behavior (Stein et al. 1999). A demographics section was

included to find out additional information pertaining to age, sex, sibling order, and sport experience/identity.

Statistical Analysis

Internal reliability of the questionnaire was examined with Cronbach's Alpha. Discrepancy scores was calculated for each parent-child dyad. Discrepancy scores were analyzed by subtracting parent scores from youth scores. Positive mean differences denoted that the youth rated parent's behaviors higher on the Likert Scale than the parent's perceptions of their own actions. Using a single sample t-test, we compared the average discrepancy scores to 0. A single sample t-test was also used to compare preference of frequency scores to the neutral value of 2. Exploratory t-test analyses were conducted to test for a moderating effect of level of play (competitive, recreational).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Reliability scores of the PISQ were examined with Cronbach's alpha. The youth and parent PISQ and each subscale per questionnaire (directive behavior, praise and understanding, and active involvement) as well as both questionnaire's and subscales with the additional questions were examined. The additional questions were placed into corresponding categories where the researcher believed they would fit based on their sentence meaning. As seen in appendix 1.E, the original P-PISQ (.717), YA-PISQ (.749) and the original + additional P-PISQ (.788) and YA- PISQ (.758) had acceptable reliability scores. The directive behavior scales on both the original P-PISQ (.826), YA-PISQ (.836) and the original + additional P-PISQ (.845) and YA- PISQ (.843) also showed acceptable reliability scores. In contrast, both the praise and understanding scale (original P-PISQ (.489) and YA-PISQ (.446)) and the active involvement scale (original P-PISQ (.146) and YA-PISQ (.191)) had poor reliability scores. However, scores improved when additional questions were added to the original subscales (praise and understanding subscale: original + additional P-PISQ (.661) and YA-PISQ (.677) (active involvement subscale original + additional P-PISQ (.362) and YA-PISQ (.324).

Single sample t-tests were used to examine discrepancy scores. Results of these t-tests can be found in Table 2. Of the 18 questions adapted from Goodman and James

(2017), seven questions were found to have significant mean differences (Questions 3, 7, 12, 17, 18, 19, 23). Of those seven, four questions resulted in positive significant mean differences in the directive behavior subscale (youth rated parents as performing the behavior more often than their parents perceived they performed the behavior). One question was in the praise and understanding subscale (Q19). For this question, children also thought parents performed this behavior more than the parents perceived. However, this behavior was the only positive behavior found because children perceived their parents as understanding their feelings about soccer more than their parents realized they did. Also, in the praise and understanding subscale, as seen in figure 1, two questions demonstrated a significant negative mean difference (parents perceived that they performed the behaviors more frequently than their children perceived) (Q12 (-0.43) and Q23 (-0.86). Six additional questions were added to the P-PISQ and YA-PISQ. Questions 15 (0.60) and 16 (1.08) showed positive significant mean differences between discrepancy scores of youth and their parents. These questions asked about perspectives of verbal behaviors that may occur during the car ride home after a game.

Figure 1

Significant Mean Difference Questions Between Children and Parents

Q3	Before a game, does your parent/caregiver tell you what to do to play better?
Q7	After a game, does your parent/caregiver tell you what you need to work on?
^Q12	After a game, does your parent/caregiver praise you for trying hard?
*Q15	After a game, during the car ride home, does your parent/caregiver talk to you about the game?
*Q16	After a game, during the car ride home, does your parent/caregiver tell you how you could have played better?
Q17	Does your parent/caregiver tell you how to improve your technique?
Q18	Does your parent/caregiver push you to practice harder?
Q19	Does your parent/caregiver understand how you feel about soccer?
^Q23	Does your parent/caregiver encourage you to talk about your problems/worries about the sport or performance?

Note: ^ denotes a significant negative mean difference. *denotes additional questions added.

Table 2

Difference Scores Between Youth and Parent Perspectives

	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference (YA - P)
Q1	0.77	0.44	0.06
Q2	1.45	0.15	0.24
Q3	2.77	0.01*	0.67
Q4	0.52	0.61	0.10
Q5	1.03	0.31	0.16
Q6	1.09	0.28	0.17
Q7	4.82	0.00*	0.95
Q8	-1.00	0.32	-0.20
Q9	1.64	0.11	0.35
Q10	-0.11	0.91	-0.02
Q11	-0.74	0.46	-0.10
Q12	-2.67	0.01*	-0.43
Q13	-0.64	0.53	-0.12
Q14	-1.23	0.22	-0.12
Q15	2.96	0.01*	0.60
Q16	5.63	0.00*	1.08
Q17	3.87	0.00*	0.80
Q18	3.02	0.00*	0.75
Q19	2.40	0.02*	0.39
Q20	-0.42	0.68	-0.08
Q21	1.40	0.17	0.27
Q22	-0.62	0.54	-0.14
Q23	-3.28	0.00*	-0.86
Q24	0.78	0.44	0.18

Note. * Denotes a significant mean difference ($p < .05$)

In the YA-PISQ, there were follow-up questions examining preference of frequency scores for parental behaviors (Table 3). A single sample t-test was used to analyze differences between reported scores and the neutral value of 2. Questions 4 [t(49)= 2.45, p<.05], 9 [t(49)= -2.22, p<.05], 20 [t(49)= -3.06, p<.05], and 22 [t(49)= -2.91, p<.05], demonstrated significant differences. Positive t-values indicate children wanting less of a behavior and negative represent children wanting more of a behavior.

Exploratory analyses were conducted to test a moderating effect of level of play (competitive, recreational). An Independent samples t-test showed that there were no significant differences (Table 4). However, when examining effect sizes, questions 1 (*ES* = -0.64 and 22 (*ES* = -0.72) had large effect sizes. Questions 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24 had small-to-moderate effect sizes. The range of these effect sizes was from 0.231 to 0.497 in both the positive and negative direction. These effect sizes indicated questions on which significant differences might be reported if the effect sizes are robust and a larger sample size was obtained for the children in the recreation category.

Table 3

YA-PISQ Follow-Up Questions

	N	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Q1a	50	-1.00	49	0.32	-0.02
Q2a	50	-1.77	49	0.08	-0.06
Q3a	50	1.95	49	0.06	0.12
Q4a	50	2.45	49	0.02*	0.14
Q5a	50	-1.00	49	0.32	-0.06
Q6a	50	-1.00	49	0.32	-0.06
Q7a	50	1.43	49	0.16	0.04
Q8a	50	0.00	49	1.00	0.00
Q9a	50	-2.22	49	0.03*	-0.16
Q10a	50	-1.14	49	0.26	-0.06
Q11a	50	-1.77	49	0.08	-0.06
Q12a	50	-1.77	49	0.08	-0.06
Q13a	50	0.00	49	1.00	0.00
Q14a	50	-1.43	49	0.16	-0.08
Q15a	50	1.70	49	0.10	0.10
Q16a	50	0.00	49	1.00	0.00
Q17a	50	-0.63	49	0.53	-0.04
Q18a	50	-0.38	49	0.71	-0.02
Q19a	50	-1.35	49	0.18	-0.06
Q20a	50	-3.06	49	0.00*	-0.16
Q21a	50	0.44	49	0.66	0.02
Q22a	50	-2.91	49	0.01*	-0.18
Q23a	50	-1.70	49	0.10	-0.10
Q24a	48	1.77	47	0.08	0.063

Note. * denotes a significant mean difference ($p < .05$) and “a” signifies a follow-up question.

Table 4

Moderating Effect of Level of Play (Competitive, Recreation)

	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	ES
Q1	-1.74	49	0.09	-0.64*
Q2	-0.67	49	0.51	-0.25*
Q3	0.21	49	0.83	0.08
Q4	0.84	48	0.41	0.31
Q5	-0.48	49	0.64	-0.17
Q6	-1.25	23.27	0.22	-0.31*
Q7	-0.67	48	0.51	-0.25*
Q8	-0.07	14.96	0.94	-0.02
Q9	-1.03	18.46	0.32	-0.28*
Q10	-0.30	15.84	0.77	-0.09
Q11	-0.43	49	0.67	-0.15
Q12	1.11	10.55	0.29	0.46*
Q13	0.40	18.45	0.70	0.11
Q14	0.04	48	0.97	0.02
Q15	-1.12	49	0.27	-0.41*
Q16	0.33	11.08	0.75	0.13
Q17	0.68	49	0.50	0.25*
Q18	1.32	49	0.19	0.49*
Q19	-0.79	49	0.43	-0.29*
Q20	0.75	9.33	0.48	0.37*
Q21	-1.18	49	0.25	-0.43*
Q22	-1.18	49	0.25	-0.72*
Q23	1.55	13.89	0.15	0.50*
Q24	0.74	14.74	0.47	0.23*

Note. df are different from 48 or 49 when the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated. *denotes small, moderate, and large effect sizes.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine perspectives of youth and their parents on parental involvement in recreation and competitive leagues in moderately involved soccer. It was hypothesized that regardless of level of play (competitive or recreation), there would be a difference in perspectives between youth and their parents. We were unable to adequately test for a moderating effect of level of play due to low numbers sampled for recreation participants. However, effect sizes were analyzed to further understand whether a significant difference between level of play might occur if sample size was increased. Competitive was subtracted from recreation to find effect sizes. Question 1 (attending games) and 22 (discuss progress with your coach) had large effect sizes. Several other questions (2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24) had small-to-moderate effect sizes. These questions might demonstrate a significant difference between competitive and recreation if the sample size was increased. However, it may also be that these are simply change differences that are not robust enough to remain in subsequent research. Interestingly, the direction of the differences in the scores was not consistent across questions. Half of the questions in each of the subscales (directive behavior, praise and understanding, and active involvement) yielded positive effect sizes (discrepancy scores were positive toward competitive) while the other half were in the opposite direction (discrepancy scores were negative with positive recreation scores).

This means that competitive and recreation scores were not consistent in perspectives between parents and children across the different levels of play. Direction may be important when understanding the difference between competitive and recreation perspectives. Future studies should look into this comparison of perspectives between different levels of play.

When analyzing the discrepancy scores of the 51 parent-child dyads, there is a difference in perspectives of parental involvement between youth and their parents. This study demonstrates that in youth soccer, parents and children hold different perspectives for seven questions asked from Goodman and James (2017) P-PISQ and YA-PISQ. In particular, in this study, we found discrepancies on what to do to play better (question 3), praise for trying hard (question 12), pushing to practice harder (question 18), understanding feelings about soccer (question 19), what children need to work on (question 7), what they need to do to improve technique (question 17), and talking about performance problems (question 23). These findings are consistent with previous research that demonstrated a difference in perspectives between parents and their children in sport (Elliot & Drummond 2016, 2017; Goodman and James 2017; Kanteras et al. 2008; Schwab et al. 2010). It is possible that parents may not fully understand the extent of their behavior and level of involvement. Parents may attribute negative behavior to other social agents in youth sports (officials or other parents) rather than seeing themselves as using a particular behavior (Elliot & Drummond, 2016; Holt et al. 2008).

In all cases except one, children perceived that parents gave more directives and less praise than the parents perceived. The category with the most significantly different questions were listed in the directive behavior subscale (questions 3, 7, 17, 18). Three

other significant mean difference questions were in the praise and understanding subscale (questions 12, 19, 23). However, questions 12 and 23 had negative mean differences. This demonstrates that parents believed they engaged in praise behaviors more frequently than youth perceived they did. Previous research has noted parents may perceive themselves as behaving more positively than perceived by their children (Goodman & James, 2017; Kanteras et al. 2008). Regardless, behaviors perceived as negative by youth could potentially be harmful on the child's experience in sport (Omli & Wiese-Bjornstal, 2011, Lauer et al. 2010) and their future performance in sport (Elliot & Drummond, 2017). The one exception was that children perceived parents understood their feelings about soccer more than parents believed. Though this seems like a contradiction, children may be aware of their parent's positive intentions with their parental involvement in sport even if the parent is engaging in negative behaviors (Knight & Holt 2014; Lauer et al. 2010).

Consistent with previous studies, significant mean differences in the additional questions (Questions 15 and 16) demonstrate that the car ride home may be an additional place where parents and children hold different perspectives of the experience. Youth noted that parents engaged more frequently in car ride home behaviors ("talk to you about the game" and "tell you how you could have played better") than parents perceived. Elliot and Drummond (2016, 2017) found that parents believed honesty in the car ride home might not be received well by the child, but felt it was important because it would be helpful to their youth sport development. They also found that children often expected there would be a conversation in the car ride home and the willingness to participate in this conversation could be dictated by context of the game (win or loss)

(Elliot & Drummond, 2017). Post-game “analysis” is seen as a norm in sport society and may be trickling down to youth sports as a necessary part of the game (Elliot & Drummond, 2017).

In addition to the YA-PISQ, youth were asked follow-up questions about their perception of preference of frequency for each behavior. In this study, responses to question 4 (shout or cheer) indicated that children believed the behavior is performed “too much.” However, responses to questions 9 (tell you what you did badly), 22 (discuss progress with the coach), and 20 (help run the team) showed that children perceived that the behavior was performed “too little.” It is possible that children may tolerate behaviors that may be considered “negative” because it gave them specific direction (Goodman & James, 2017; Omli & Wiese-Bjornstal, 2011), the feedback is regarding something they can fix (Knight et al. 2010), or because they aligned their beliefs with the beliefs of their parents on sport behavior (Kanteras et al. 2008). The parent-youth relationship in sport is complex (Holt et al. 2008), and children may perceive these behaviors as normal and appropriate. It is also important to note that it is possible that the participating children did not fully understand the instructions for the follow-up questions. These questions frequently required extra explanation of the instructions.

There were several limitations in this study. First, there was a low number of recreation participants. This could be due to the relatively lower numbers of participants in the recreation league and cancellations of practices from the weather (see appendix 1.F. for collection timeline). Cancellations were especially difficult with recreation participants due to those teams only practicing once a week. Also, only children with a parent present at practice could participate and many parents either dropped their child

off or asked their child to carpool with another parent. Another limitation was the context in which the questionnaire was taken. Participants took the questionnaire before or after practice. This proved to be difficult sometimes because participants may have rushed through in order to join practice faster or to go home. Also, participants could have felt rushed to take the questionnaire due to weather (rain or cold) because both parent and child took the questionnaire outside. There may also be a difference of responses between parents because of different use of behaviors for each parent. Since the sample reported on in this study was made up mostly of moms, it is possible that there may have been different responses from dads. This was not done on purpose, but probably reflects that one parent attends more practices than the other, making that parent more likely to be sampled for this study. The researchers also noticed that the follow-up questions on the YA-PISQ needed extra explanation, so it is possible that youth participants may not have fully understood these additional questions. Also, due to poor reliability of the active involvement subscale, it is unclear whether or not these questions were answered in the way they were intended. Lastly, both the parent and child were advised to take their questionnaires at the same time. Although the researcher advised both parent and child to take the questionnaires individually and away from each other, there were some occasions when they did not follow this request. It is possible that there could have been bias in some of the answers because of the child being close to the parent.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated a difference in perspectives of parental involvement between parents and their children. Of the questions with significant mean differences, parents engaged in more directive behaviors than praise behaviors. This study adds to the growing body of literature that focuses on the car ride home as a

potential place of difference between parent and child. Initially, discrepancies between parent and child perspectives in sport were to be compared between two levels of play, however the small sample of recreation participants precluded these comparisons. Future studies should continue to explore these perspectives with a goal of improving the youth sport experience at all levels. Studies should also continue quantitative research by further improving measures like the PISQ to establish a consistent measure. It is also important to acknowledge that the parent-child relationships in sport may be more complex than just a judgment of positive and negative parental behaviors (Knight & Holt, 2014). Children hold different individual preferences for parental involvement (Knight & Holt, 2016) and parent's roles in sport are complex and socially influenced (Domingues & Gonçalves, 2013; Holt et al. 2007; Lauer et al. 2010). With that being said, it is clear that this study adds to the literature demonstrating that youth can display an understanding of their parents involvement behaviors in sport (Knight et al. 2010, 2011, 2014) and can be a part of the conversation about parental involvement (i.e. Elliot & Drummond, 2016, 2017; Omli & Wiese-Bjornstal, 2011) Overall, future studies should look to develop interventions that acknowledge these complexities and include youth in the conversation about parental involvement at all levels of play (competitive and recreation) to better the youth sport experience.

Recommendations

Based on the results from this study there are several recommendations that can be made for parents and children participating in sports. Parents and children should have conversations about parental involvement to further understand each other's perspectives of behaviors. There is not a uniform preference for parental involvement, so a child's

preference and perception of parental involvement may differ from child to child. It's important for a parent to learn about his/her child's preferences for parental involvement because regardless of how positive and supportive a parent might think their behaviors and words are, their child's perception is what leads to a positive or negative sport experience. Parents could ask their children a series of questions listed below:

- Do you enjoy participating in the sport?
- How much do you want me to be involved?
- Do you want to talk about the game/practice before the game/practice?
- Do you want to talk about the game or practice in the car ride home?
- Do you like how I behave during your games?
- How can I help you be successful?

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J., Funk, J., Elliott, R., & Smith, P. (2003). Parental support and pressure and children's extracurricular activities: Relationships with amount of involvement and affective experience of participation. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 24*(2), 241-257.
- Domingues, M., & Gonçalves, C. (2013). The role of parents in talented youth sport. Does context matter? *Polish Journal of Sport and Tourism, 20*(2).
- Ede, S., Kamphoff, C., Mackey, T., & Armentrout, S. (2012). Youth hockey athletes' perceptions of parental involvement: They want more. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 35*(1), 3-18.
- Elliott, S., & Drummond, M. (2016) During play, the break, and the drive home: The meaning of parental verbal behaviour in youth sport. *Leisure Studies, 36*(5), 645-656, DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2016.1250804
- Elliott, S., & Drummond, M. (2017). Parents in youth sport: What happens after the game? *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(3), 391-406.
- Fredericks, J., & Eccles, J. (2004). Parental influences on youth involvement in sports. In M. Weiss, *Developmental Sport and Exercise Psychology: A Lifespan Perspective* (pp. 145-164). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

- Goodman, M., & James, I. A. (2017). Parental involvement in young footballers' development: A comparison of the opinions of children and their parents. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review, 13*(1).
- Holt, N., Tamminen, K., Black, D., Sehn, Z., & Wall, M. (2008). Parental involvement in competitive youth sport settings. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 9*(5), 663-685.
- Kanteras, M. A., Bocarro, J., & Casper, J. (March 01, 2008). Supported or pressured? An examination of agreement among parents and children on parent's role in youth sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 31*(1), 64-80.
- Knight, C., Boden, C., & Holt, N. (2010). Junior tennis players' preferences for parental behaviors. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 22*(4), 377-391.
- Knight, C., & Holt, N. (2014). Parenting in youth tennis: Understanding and enhancing children's experiences. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 15*(2), 155-164.
doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.10.010
- Knight, C., Little, G., Harwood, C., & Goodger, K. (2016). Parental involvement in elite junior slalom canoeing. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 28*(2), 234-256.
doi:10.1080/10413200.2015.1111273
- Knight, C., Neely, K., & Holt, N. (2011). Parental behaviors in team sports: How do female athletes want parents to behave? *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 23*(1), 76-92.
- Lauer, L., Gould, D., Roman, N., & Pierce, M. (2010). Parental behaviors that affect junior tennis player development. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11*(6), 487-496.

- Lee, M., & MacLean, S. (1997). Sources of parental pressure among age group swimmers. *European Journal of Physical Education, 2*(2), 167-177. doi: 10.1080/1740898970020204
- Nunomura, M., & Oliveira, M. (2013). Parent's support in the sports career of young gymnasts. *Science of Gymnastics Journal, 5*(1), 5-17.
- Omli, J., & LaVoi, N. M. (June 01, 2009). Background anger in youth sport: A perfect storm? *Journal of Sport Behavior, 32*(2), 242-260.
- Omli, J., & Wiese-Bjornstal, D. (2011). Kids speak: Preferred parental behavior at youth sport events. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 82*(4).
- Schwab, K., Wells, M., & Arthur-Banning, S. (2010). Experiences in youth sports: A comparison between players and parents perspectives. *Journal of Applied Sport Management, 2*(1).
- Stein, G., Raedeke, T., & Glenn, S. (1999). Children's perceptions of parent sport involvement: It's not how much, but to what degree that's important. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22*(4), 591-591.

APPENDIX A

YA-PISQ EXAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Thinking about the parent/caregiver who is also completing a questionnaire today, please place an X in the corresponding box with your level of agreement to each statement. Think about how often your parent/caregiver uses a specific behavior (Never-Always). Then, think about if you think the behavior is.. (too little, just right, or too much)?		Never	Sometimes	About half of the time	Most of the time	Always	Too little	Just right	Too much
1	Does your parent/caregiver attend your games?								
2	Does your parent/caregiver attend your practices/trainings?								
8	After a game, does your parent/caregiver praise you for the good things you did, even if you felt that you played poorly or your team lost?								
13	After a game, does your parent/caretaker praise you for your performance?								
15	After a game, during the car ride home, does your parent/caregiver talk to you about the game?								
16	After a game, during the car ride home, does your parent/caregiver tell you how you could have played better?								
21	Does your parent/caregiver help you prepare for your game (for example, prepare food for you, get your equipment together, make sure you have water)?								

APPENDIX B

P-PISQ EXAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Thinking about your child who is also completing a questionnaire today, please place an X in the corresponding box with your level of agreement to each statement. Think about how often you use a specific behavior (Never-Always).		Never	Sometimes	About half of the time	Most of the time	Always
1	Do you attend your child's games?					
2	Do you attend your child's practices/trainings?					
8	After a game, do you praise your child for the good things he or she did, even if you felt that they played poorly or their team lost?					
13	After a game, do you praise your child for his or her performance?					
15	After a game, during the car ride home, do you talk to your child about the game?					
16	After a game, during the car ride home, do you tell your child how he or she could have played better?					
21	Do you help your child prepare for the game (for example prepare food, get equipment together, make sure they have water)?					

APPENDIX C

YOUTH DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

YA-PISQ

Demographics Section:
Please fill out the questions according to what best represents you.

1. Sex

- Male
- Female
- Prefer to self-subscribe: _____
- Prefer not to answer

2. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin?

- Yes
- No

3. Which of these categories best represents your race/ethnic background?

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Two or more
- Prefer to self-subscribe: _____
- Prefer not to answer

4. Do you have siblings?

- Yes
- Yes, and I am a twin/triplet/etc.
- No

5. What order sibling are you?

- First born
- Second born
- Third born
- Fourth born
- Fifth or more born

6. How many years have you played soccer?

- 1 to 2 years
- 3 to 5 years
- 6 to 8 years
- 9 or more

7. Do you play in a recreation league or on a club team?

- I play in a recreation league
- I play on a club team

8. How many days a week do you dedicate to soccer (team practices, games, fun play, talk about soccer at home)?

- Never
- Once a week
- 2-3 times a week
- 4-6 times a week
- Daily

9. Do you play other organized sports (a team that meets for practices and games)?

- I only play soccer
- I also play another sport (please list all other sports):

10. Do you consider sports to be an important part of your life?

- Definitely not
- Probably not
- Might or might not
- Probably yes
- Definitely yes

11. To what extent are you specializing in soccer?

- Not at all
- Somewhat (I play more than one organized sports)
- Completely (I only play soccer)

12. If you are not currently specializing in soccer, do you see yourself in the future only playing soccer?

- Not at all
- Completely
- I already specialize in soccer

APPENDIX D

PARENT DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

P-PISQ

Demographics Section:
Please fill out the questions according to what best represents you.

1. Sex

- Male
- Female
- Prefer to self-subscribe: _____
- Prefer not to answer

2. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin?

- Yes
- No

3. Which of these categories best represents your race/ethnic background?

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Two or more
- Prefer to self-subscribe: _____
- Prefer not to answer

4. What do you describe yourself as?

- Mother
- Father
- Caregiver
- Other: _____

5. Education level

- Less than high school
- High school graduate
- Some college
- 2-year degree
- 4-year degree
- Professional Degree
- Doctorate

6. Approximate household income

- <\$20,000
- \$20,000-\$39,000
- \$40,000-\$59,000
- \$60,000-\$79,000
- \$80,000-\$99,999
- >\$100,000

7. How many years did/do you play unorganized sport in your life (pickup basketball, sports played for fun, etc.)?

- Insert number of years: _____
- I did not play unorganized sport

8. How many years did/do you play organized sport in your life (recreation league, competitive league, etc.)?

- Insert number of years: _____
- I did not play organized sport

9. What was the highest level of sport you played?

- Youth recreation leagues
- Middle school
- High school
- College
- Professional
- Adult recreation leagues

10. How many days a week do you dedicate to your child's activity in sports? (team practices, games, fun play, talk about soccer at home)?

- Never
- Once a week
- 2-3 times a week
- 4-6 times a week
- Daily

11. How many organized sports have you played in your life time?

- I only played one sport (please list): _____
- I played more than one sport (please list all other sports):

- I did not play any organized sports

12. Do you consider sports to be an important part of your life?

- Definitely not
- Probably not
- Might or might not
- Probably yes
- Definitely yes

13. Do you consider sports to be an important part of your child's life?

- Definitely not
- Probably not
- Might or might not
- Probably yes
- Definitely yes

14. To what extent is your child specializing in soccer?

- Not at all
- Somewhat (plays other organized sports)
- Completely (only plays soccer)

15. If your child is not currently specializing in soccer, do you see your child in the future only playing soccer?

- Not at all
- Completely
- My child already specializes in soccer

16. Is there a parental code of conduct for your child's soccer league?

Yes

No

I am not sure

APPENDIX E
PISQ RELIABILITY SCORES

	Cronach's Alpha	N=Questions	Questions in my thesis PISQ
PARENT			
Original PISQ	0.717	18	2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11,12,14,17,18,19,20,22,23,24
Original and new PISQ	0.788	24	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,22,23,24
Original Directive Behavior Scale	0.826	9	3,4,5,6,7,9,10,17,18
Original and new (15&16) Directive Behavior Scale	0.845	11	3,4,5,6,7,9,10,17,18,15,16
Original Praise Scale	0.489	5	11,12,14,19,23,8,13
Original and new (8&13) Praise Scale	0.661	7	11,12,14,19,23
Original Active Involment Scale	0.146	4	2,20,22,24
Original and new (1&21) Active Involment Scale	0.362	6	2,20,22,24,1,21
YOUTH			
Original PISQ	0.749	18	2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11,12,14,17,18,19,20,22,23,24
Original and new PISQ	0.758	24	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,22,23,24
Original Directive Behavior Scale	0.836	9	3,4,5,6,7,9,10,17,18
Original and new (15&16) Directive Behavior Scale	0.843	11	3,4,5,6,7,9,10,17,18,15,16
Original Praise Scale	0.446	5	11,12,14,19,23,8,13
Original and new (8&13) Praise Scale	0.677	7	11,12,14,19,23
Original Active Involment Scale	0.191	4	2,20,22,24
Original and new (1&21) Active Involment Scale	0.324	6	2,20,22,24,1,21

APPENDIX F

DATA COLLECTION TIMELINE

9/24/18: Proposed thesis

9/25/18: First email received from GUSA from the competitive director. He said everyone was excited and looking forward to it. They selected four teams for us to work with and gave us the times and locations but told me he would tell me when I was able to start going to these practices.

- 06(13U) Boys White: Tuesday/Thursday 6:45-8:00pm at Leonard Center
- 05(14U) Boys Gold: Tuesday/Thursday 8:00-9:15pm at Leonard Center
- 05(14U) Girls Gold: Wednesday/Thursday 6:45-8:00pm at Smith
- 06(13U) Girls Silver: Tuesday/Wednesday 6:45-8:00pm at Proehlfic Park

9/28/18: Submitted a poster abstract to the Institute of the Study of Youth Sport Conference at Michigan State University

10/4/18: Thesis was certified and sent for review process by IRB

10/9/18: Email was received by IRB to make minor changes

10/15/18: Back and forth dialogue with Dr. Etnier. This chain was in regard to checking in to see if she had heard back from the Recreation Director (she had not) and checking in on my IRB modification because I had not heard anything back. I called Melissa Beck and asked if there was an issue and she told me that it shouldn't be long because my IRB was on the desk of the final reviewer.

10/15/18:

- IRB was approved
- The director of the Recreation league sent out an email to all of the coaches

10/16/18:

- I received the IRB stamped documents for my study and had them printed
- One recreation coach reached out to us
- I reached out to the competitive director that I could start to collect but he emailed back and said that due to the weather that I couldn't start to collect until the next week (10/24, 10/25). The director also acknowledged that they would reach out to their coaches in the meantime.

10/18/18: I had only heard back from one recreation coach. I emailed Dr. Etnier to see if she could reach out to the Recreation Director again. She sent an email to all of the coaches.

10/19/18:

- I heard back from a recreation girl's coach to attend practice Thursday, October 25th
- I heard back from a recreation boy's coach to attend practice Wednesday, October 24th

10/24/18: I had two recreation practices around the same time across town. I communicated with Dr. Etnier about how I could maximize this opportunity and try to go to both. She suggested I bring "helpers." I had two people come and help. However, the

first practice we attended, the coach and team were late. At this point and time, I was the only one that could give consent, so I had to stay and wait. They trickled in slowly and I tried to consent everyone at the same time, but I could not, and I did not have enough time to make it to the other practice.

10/25/18: Still had not heard from more than two recreation coaches. I emailed the recreation director and told him that my age criteria were 11-14 years old so, if there were any U15 coaches I could contact 14 years.

- I followed up with the competitive director about when to start going to practices. He then told me to check back next week because the weather had still knocked off everyone's schedules.

10/26/18: I emailed back the coach from 10/24 that I missed, and they advised me to come to practice next Wednesday (10/31). That was Halloween. So, the coach advised me to come to the game on Saturday 10/27.

10/27/18: Saturday games were canceled due to weather.

10/29/18: I was supposed to visit Dr. Etnier's practice, but the coach cancelled and moved practice to Thursday. I ended up attending the practice time and worked with the team next to where their practice would be.

- The recreation coach emailed me back with a list of recreation coaches that fit my criteria. There were only 6.
- A coach said that they were canceling for Halloween but that I could come to their game on 11/3. Coach said that that would be their last outing together. The coach never emailed me back about coming to their game.
- I heard back from another coach for their practice on Tuesday (10/30).

10/30/18: I added three people to the IRB to help me consent

- I attended two competitive practices
 - One team changed locations and didn't email me about it
 - Coach emailed me and said they were taking the team to Chik-fil-A next Tuesday (11/6)
 - One team was not contacted by the director like the director said he would, so I had to ask on the spot.
 - A rec coach emailed me to attend practice on 10/31. This would have been their last practice. However, this coach cancelled with me on Halloween at 5:55PM. Their practice would have been at 6:15PM.

10/31/18: Several teams (rec/competitive) cancelled because of Halloween. The coach I was following from 10/24 never responded back after Halloween.

- A rec coach offered me to attend their game on 11/3.

11/1/18: Attended Dr. Etnier's team's practices and ended up staying for 4 hours that night and got 4-5 more teams that came for practice. (competitive)

- A recreation coach contacted me saying that the weather had prevented them from having their last practice but that I could come to their game on 11/3. I followed up and asked about when I should come and what day his team preferred but I never heard back.

11/3/18: Coach told me to attend a game on this day and email the parents. I emailed them on 11/1/18 and only received one parent response back. I had an RA attend the

game because I had a wedding I had to attend that weekend. The RA said the coach was late and their parents were not interested to do it during the game. He waited for after but said the coach bolted and no parent wanted to participate.

11/5/2018: Competitive director was reached out again for teams. CC'd Dr. Etnier and I into an email with more competitive coaches for us to reach out to.

- A rec coach emailed and said that his team was done and would not want to participate any further. The coach offered his partner to take the survey somewhere local, but I never heard back from this coach after 11/7
- A competitive coach was asked if we could attend their practice. The coach responded back to attend practice on 11/8.
- The Chik Fil A coach emailed me back and said that they added another game to their schedule (11/12) and would not be doing Chik-fil-A anymore but rather decide to practice on 11/6.

11/6/2018: Recreation practice was cancelled due to weather

11/8/18: I attended two competitive practices

11/12/2018: Game was cancelled due to weather and that was the last team gathering.

11/30/2018: Presented a poster of my thesis at the ISYS conference at MSU

APPENDIX G

EXAMPLE EMAIL TO COACH

Hi Coach X,

I know there is not much time left in the recreation season, but I would appreciate an opportunity to work with you and your team. I am a UNCG master's student interested in administering a short survey to the players and parents on your team. I am interested in learning more about the parent and the child's perceptions of the parents' behavior prior to, during, and after competitions. If possible, please let me know if I can attend one of your practices. I would be happy to come prior to or after the practice depending upon your wishes. If you could then introduce me to the parents and athletes, and I will briefly (3 min) describe my study and invite them to participate. If they want to participate, they would complete a survey that would take ~10 minutes. If you are interested, I have attached a draft parent email below to send out to your parents. Thank you for your help with this.

Thanks,
Kourtney Sappenfield

APPENDIX H

EXAMPLE EMAIL TO PARENT

Dear Parents,

We have an opportunity to work with a UNCG master's student (Kourtney Sappenfield, kbsappen@uncg.edu) who is interested in administering a short survey to the players and parents on our team. She is interested in learning more about the parent and the child's perceptions of the parents' actions prior to, during, and after competitions. Kourtney will attend the beginning of practice tonight to invite you and your child to participate. If you are willing to help out with her study, could you please come a few minutes early and walk out to the field when you drop your child off (INSERT PRACTICE DATE HERE)? Kourtney will briefly (3 min) explain things to you, and then you both will complete separate surveys that will take <10 minutes.

Thank you for considering participating!