

Sports Coaching in Hong Kong: Profiles and Career Structure

**Chow Wah, Chung Chan Yuk Ngan
The Hong Kong Institute of Education
Ha Tak Shing
Hong Kong Polytechnic University**

August 1997



香港康體發展局
HONG KONG
SPORTS DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Acknowledgements

The Hong Kong Sports Development Board

The Hong Kong Sports Institute

The Hong Kong Archery Association

The Hong Kong Amateur Athletic Association

The Hong Kong Badminton Association

The Hong Kong Baseball Association

The Hong Kong Basketball Coaches Association

The Hong Kong Bodybuilding Association

The Hong Kong Boxing Association

The Hong Kong Canoeing Union

The Hong Kong Chinese Martial Arts Association

The Hong Kong Cricket Association

The Hong Kong Cycling Association

The Hong Kong Amateur Fencing Association

The Hong Kong Football Association

The Hong Kong Golf Association Limited

The Hong Kong Amateur Gymnastics Association

The Hong Kong Amateur Handball Association

The Hong Kong Hockey Association

The Hong Kong Judo Association

The Hong Kong Amateur Karatedo Association

The Hong Kong Mountaineering Union

The Orienteering Association of Hong Kong

Acknowledgements (cont.)

The Hong Kong Outward Bound School

The Hong Kong Shooting Association

The Hong Kong Roller Skating Association

The Hong Kong Amateur Rowing Association

The Hong Kong Sports Association for the Physically Disabled

The Hong Kong Squash Rackets Association

The Hong Kong Amateur Swimming Association

The Hong Kong Table Tennis Association

The Hong Kong Takwondo Association

The Hong Kong Tennis Association

The Hong Kong Tenpin Bowling Congress

The Hong Kong Triathlon Association

The Hong Kong Underwater Association

The Hong Kong & Kowloon Volleyball Association

The Windsurfing Association of Hong Kong

The Hong Kong Wushu Union

All NSA officials who helped liasing and/or providing information in the study

All sport coaches who took part in the study

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | II |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS (CONT.) | III |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | IV |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | VIII |
| CHAPTER 1 | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| <i>Sports Coaches Accreditation in Hong Kong</i> | 1 |
| <i>Sports Coaching as a Career in Hong Kong</i> | 1 |
| <i>Purpose of the Study</i> | 2 |
| <i>Research Strategy</i> | 3 |
| Descriptive and Exploratory | 3 |
| Delimited Sampling Frame | 3 |
| Individual as Unit of Analysis..... | 3 |
| <i>Treatment of Data</i> | 4 |
| <i>Organization of the Report</i> | 4 |
| CHAPTER 2 | 5 |
| INTERVIEWING NSA OFFICIALS | 5 |
| <i>Aims</i> | 5 |
| <i>Arrangement</i> | 5 |
| <i>Training for the Interviewers</i> | 5 |
| <i>Format of the Interviews</i> | 5 |
| <i>Interviewees</i> | 6 |
| <i>Findings</i> | 6 |
| Career Ladder for NSA Coaches..... | 6 |
| Number of NSA Coaches..... | 7 |
| Full-time Sports Coaches | 7 |
| Part-time Sports Coaches | 8 |
| Motivation to Strive for a Higher Level on the Career Ladder | 8 |
| Coach Education | 8 |
| Roles and Functions of Sports Coaches | 9 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| CHAPTER 3 | 11 |
| INTERVIEWING SPORT COACHES | 11 |
| <i>Aims</i> | 11 |
| <i>Arrangement</i> | 11 |
| <i>Training for the Interviewers</i> | 11 |
| <i>Format of the Interviews</i> | 11 |
| <i>Interviewees</i> | 12 |
| <i>Findings</i> | 18 |
| Monthly Income | 18 |
| Pay Rates for Coaching | 18 |
| Job Security | 19 |
| Coach Association | 19 |
| Some Psychological Attributes of Coaches | 19 |
| Coach Education | 20 |
| Coach Accreditation | 20 |
| Gender Issue | 21 |
| CHAPTER 4 | 22 |
| SPORTS COACHES SURVEY - SUBJECTS | 22 |
| CHAPTER 5 | 27 |
| SPORTS COACHES SURVEY - INSTRUMENTS | 27 |
| <i>Scales Construction for the Attitude Scores</i> | 27 |
| <i>Distribution and Collection of Questionnaires</i> | 29 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| CHAPTER 6 | 32 |
| FINDINGS OF THE SPORTS COACHES SURVEY | 32 |
| <i>Age.....</i> | <i>32</i> |
| <i>Coaching Experience.....</i> | <i>33</i> |
| <i>Number of Sports Served</i> | <i>34</i> |
| <i>Education Background</i> | <i>36</i> |
| <i>Marital Status</i> | <i>38</i> |
| <i>Parental Status.....</i> | <i>40</i> |
| <i>Number of Children</i> | <i>42</i> |
| <i>Age of Children.....</i> | <i>42</i> |
| <i>Monthly Income</i> | <i>45</i> |
| <i>Main Employment Occupation</i> | <i>46</i> |
| <i>Main Employment Job</i> | <i>49</i> |
| <i>Coach Education in General Sport Theory</i> | <i>52</i> |
| <i>Qualifications in Physical Education</i> | <i>55</i> |
| <i>Qualifications in Sport / Recreation.....</i> | <i>59</i> |
| <i>Sport Skill Proficiency.....</i> | <i>62</i> |
| <i>Experience in Different Coaching Duties</i> | <i>64</i> |
| <i>Hourly Pay Rate of Coaching.....</i> | <i>67</i> |
| <i>Coaching Load in a Recent Week.....</i> | <i>67</i> |
| <i>Coaching Load in a Busy Week.....</i> | <i>68</i> |
| <i>Experience in Coaching The Hong Kong Team.....</i> | <i>68</i> |
| <i>Experience in Coaching School Team.....</i> | <i>69</i> |
| <i>Experience in Coaching Other Courses.....</i> | <i>69</i> |
| <i>Scale Means of the Attitude Scores.....</i> | <i>71</i> |
| <i>Other Means</i> | <i>74</i> |
| CHAPTER 7 | 77 |
| CONCLUSION | 77 |
| <i>Summary of Results.....</i> | <i>77</i> |
| <i>Recommendations for Further Study</i> | <i>79</i> |

| | |
|--|-----|
| APPENDIX..... | 81 |
| <i>Appendix A. The HKSCQ</i> | 82 |
| <i>Appendix B. The HKSCQ (English translated script)</i> | 88 |
| <i>Appendix 3. Additional Tables of Subjects Listed by Sport</i> | 95 |
| Main employment occupation of subjects listed by sport (counts)..... | 95 |
| Main employment occupation of subjects listed by sport (row %)..... | 96 |
| Main employment job of subjects listed by sport (counts)..... | 97 |
| Main employment job of subjects listed by sport (row %)..... | 98 |
| Coaching load of subjects listed by sport..... | 99 |
| Subjects' monetary return gained from coaching listed by sport..... | 100 |
| Subjects' coach level listed by sport (counts)..... | 101 |
| Subjects' coach level listed by sport (row %)..... | 102 |
| General sport theory qualifications of subjects listed by sport..... | 103 |

List of Tables

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| TABLE 2-1. LIST OF NSA OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED IN THE STUDY. | 10 |
| TABLE 4-1. LIST OF NSAs THROUGH WHICH QUESTIONNAIRES WERE DISTRIBUTED. | 22 |
| TABLE 4-2. NUMBERS OF ALL RESPONDENTS (N=731) LISTED BY SPORT BY COACH LEVEL BY SEX. | 24 |
| TABLE 4-3. LIST OF RETURN RATES BY SPORT. | 25 |
| TABLE 4-4. NUMBER OF SUBJECTS LISTED BY SEX BY COACH LEVEL. | 26 |
| TABLE 5-5. FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE HKSCQ (FACTOR 1 TO 5). | 30 |
| TABLE 5-6. FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE HKSCQ (FACTOR 6 TO 10). | 31 |
| TABLE 6-1. AGE OF SUBJECTS. | 32 |
| TABLE 6-2. COACHING EXPERIENCE OF SUBJECTS. | 33 |
| TABLE 6-3. NUMBER OF SPORTS SERVED BY SUBJECTS. | 35 |
| TABLE 6-4. EDUCATION BACKGROUND OF SUBJECTS. | 37 |
| TABLE 6-5. MARITAL STATUS OF SUBJECTS. | 39 |
| TABLE 6-6. PARENTAL STATUS OF SUBJECTS | 41 |
| TABLE 6-7. NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF SUBJECTS. | 43 |
| TABLE 6-8. AGE OF CHILDREN OF SUBJECT. | 44 |
| TABLE 6-9. MAIN EMPLOYMENT INCOME OF SUBJECTS (HK\$1000 PER MONTH) . | 45 |
| TABLE 6-10. MAIN EMPLOYMENT OCCUPATION OF SUBJECTS (WITH ROW%). | 47 |
| TABLE 6-11. MAIN EMPLOYMENT OCCUPATION OF SUBJECTS (WITH COLUMN%). | 48 |
| TABLE 6-12. MAIN EMPLOYMENT JOB OF SUBJECTS (WITH ROW%). | 50 |
| TABLE 6-13. MAIN EMPLOYMENT JOB OF SUBJECTS (WITH COLUMN%). | 51 |
| TABLE 6-14. GENERAL SPORT THEORY QUALIFICATION OF SUBJECTS. | 53 |
| TABLE 6-15. TEACHING PHYSICAL EDUCATION QUALIFICATIONS OF SUBJECTS. | 56 |
| TABLE 6-16. SPORT / RECREATION QUALIFICATION OF SUBJECTS. | 60 |
| TABLE 6-17. SELF-PERCEIVED SPORT PROFICIENCY OF SUBJECTS. | 63 |
| TABLE 6-18. EXPERIENCE OF SUBJECTS IN COACHING THE HONG KONG TEAM. | 65 |
| TABLE 6-19. EXPERIENCE OF SUBJECTS IN COACHING SCHOOL TEAM. | 65 |
| TABLE 6-20. EXPERIENCE OF SUBJECTS IN COACHING OTHER COURSES. | 66 |
| TABLE 6-21. EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS OF SUBJECTS. | 70 |
| TABLE 6-22. SUBJECTS' SCALE MEANS OF THE HKSCQ. | 72 |
| TABLE 6-23. SUBJECTS' OTHER MEANS OF THE HKSCQ. | 75 |

Chapter 1

Introduction

This is a report of a research project titled *Sports Coaching in Hong Kong: Profiles and Career Structure*. The research project is funded by the Hong Kong Sports Development Board (SDB) under the SDB Policy and Guidelines of Funding For Research Projects 1995/96.

Sports Coaches Accreditation in Hong Kong

Coaches play important roles in sports development. They are responsible for selecting potential athletes, teaching sports skills, and conditioning athletes for competitions. Quality of sports coaches is crucial to the success of sports development at every level. In 1991, the Hong Kong Coaching Committee launched the Hong Kong Coach Accreditation Programme for National Sports Associations (NSA/HKCAP). This consists of a three-level instructional/accreditation hierarchy with each level geared towards a particular target level of athlete development¹. In the past few years (from January, 1991 to March, 1996), 40 out of the 53 National Sports Associations (NSAs) in Hong Kong participated in the NSA/HKCAP and more than 3000 sports coaches attended courses offered in the programme.

Sports Coaching as a Career in Hong Kong

The Coach Education Department (CED) of the Hong Kong Sports Institute (HKSI) has shown intention to work with the Urban Service Department and the Regional Services Departments (UC/RC), NSAs, the HKSI, and other employers to facilitate

¹ See Manual of the Hong Kong Coach Accreditation Programme for National Sports Associations issued by the Hong Kong Coaching Committee in December, 1995 (p. 1 & p. 2).

employment of NSA/HKCAP accredited sports coaches². This probably includes discussion with employers and potential employers of sports coaches concerning appropriate remuneration for NSA/HKCAP accredited coaches. However, at present, as pointed out by the CED, "full-time jobs in sports coaching are still scarce and are available only in the Hong Kong Sports Institute or in such sports as football, tennis, swimming, golf, etc.". Most sports coaches in Hong Kong work on part-time basis in sports centres, private sports clubs, schools, community centres and on courses run by the UC/RC. There are also some who are volunteers and get no pay for their work in sports coaching. At present, little is known about the working condition of sports coaches in Hong Kong. There is no research addressing issues such as supply and wastage of sports coaches, sports coaches' concern and needs, etc. A comprehensive study in this regard is thus very important and urgent. Data collected in this project will surely be constructive and beneficial to the strategic planning of sports development in the next decade.

Purpose of the Study

This project aims at providing descriptive data for an overview of sports coaching in Hong Kong, particularly in the following four domains:

1. profiles of sports coaches in Hong Kong, such as characteristics of the sports coaches in terms of sex, age, academic qualification, marital status, etc.
2. professional development of sports coaches in Hong Kong, such as preservice and inservice coach education, perceived contribution of Coach Education Department of the Hong Kong Sports Institute, etc.
3. profiles of sports coaching process in Hong Kong, such as coaches' concerns, coaching styles, etc., and
4. existing career structure of sports coaching in Hong Kong, such as system of coaches supply, characteristics of sports coaching as a career in terms of payment, incentives, working condition, social support, upward mobility, etc.

² See Manual of the Hong Kong Coach Accreditation Programme for National Sports Associations issued by the Hong Kong Coaching Committee in December, 1995 (p. 12).

Research Strategy

Descriptive and Exploratory

Due to the lack of previous studies in the topic, this study can only be exploratory and descriptive in nature. The whole study was conducted in 3 stages, using both survey method and interview technique. Findings derived from one stage were used to guide designing what to look for in the next stage. In stage 1, senior executives of the NSAs in Hong Kong were interviewed to acquire basic information of the coaching system of Hong Kong. In stage 2, sports coaches were interviewed to gain understanding in how they entered the profession and what their current concerns were. In stage 3, a survey labelled as Hong Kong Sports Coaching Survey was conducted to aiming at generating an overall picture of the characteristics of the sports coaches in Hong Kong and the career structure of the coaching profession they were working in. No particular research questions were asked and no hypotheses were formulated. Researchers of this study tried NOT to comment on the situation, but to organize and present the facts as objective as possible. It is hoped that such effort will be able to elicit further discussion and investigation in the field among sports coaches and administrators.

Delimited Sampling Frame

One difficult task in conducting the study was to determine the sampling frame of sport coaches in Hong Kong. It is because in addition to the coaches accredited by the NSAs or the HKCAP, there are numerous “non-accredited” coaches in the market. Also, there are many inactive coaches who are accredited but seldom or have already stopped coaching. Given the anticipated difficulty and the limited resources, the study only investigated subjects whose names were listed in the NSA’s current coaches list.

Individual as Unit of Analysis

It is very likely that differences exist among different sports. However, the study analysed individuals and focused on common features and issues across sports. Thus, group differences were not assessed by sports, but by coach level and by sex. It is believed that by doing so, profile and career structure of sports coaching in Hong Kong

could be better depicted. Nonetheless, additional tables on the profiles of subjects listed by sports were also provided in Appendix 3 so that people who are particularly interested in this aspect can go into it. In this study, all subjects were identified as in one of the following 4 coach levels:

- a) Level 0 (L0) - Coaches who do not hold any coaching certificates.
- b) Level 1 (L1) - Coaches who hold elementary or level 1 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP
- c) Level 2 (L2) - Coaches who hold intermediate or level 2 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP (excluding L1);
- d) Level 3 (L3) - Coaches who holding advanced or level 3 or international coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP or international sports association (excluding L2).

Treatment of Data

As mentioned in previous section, subjects were grouped by coach level and by sex, all statistics were then compiled in such way that group differences might be examined. Frequency counts (with row % and / or column %) and means (with standard deviations) were consolidated for the categorical and the interval-ratio variables respectively. To test for group differences Chi Square Test and Two-way ANOVA (coach level x sex) were utilized where appropriate. Significance level was set at .05 which is commonly adopted in physical activities research.

Organization of the Report

Findings of the study were presented in subsequent chapters. Chapter 2 and 3 contain findings derived from the interviews with the NSA officials and sports coaches. Characteristics of the sample were described In Chapter 4. Instruments used in the survey detailed in Chapter 5. Survey findings were presented in Chapter 6. Summary of results and recommendations for further investigations were listed in Chapter 7. The questionnaire and additional tables of statistics were included in the Appendix.

Chapter 2

Interviewing NSA Officials

Aims

The NSA Officials were interviewed and consulted for the purpose of capturing basic information about sports coaching in general and in the sports being investigated.

Arrangement

With the help of the HKSI, news about the Hong Kong Sports Coaching Survey was delivered to all NSAs in The Hong Kong. Then, letters were sent to individual NSA to invite their senior officials to attend interviews. The NSAs were found to be supportive and responses of their officials were very encouraging. Altogether, 37 interviews were successfully conducted.

Training for the Interviewers

To ensure that the data collection processes are valid and reliable, research assistants were not only required to rehearse the interview procedures, but were also required to study some background information about the NSA/HKCAP and about the NSAs they were going to visit.

Format of the Interviews

The interviews were conducted by two interviewers (research assistants) who took turn to ask questions and to record dialogues between interviewers and interviewees.

Except in one³, all interviews were audio recorded. The audio recording procedure helped ensuring accuracy in writing the interview reports. All interviews were conducted in the office of the NSA officials being investigated. Language used was either Cantonese or English, as preferred by the interviewees. Length of the interviews ranged from two to two and a half hours. Normally, the interviewers asked the interviewees for some factual information about the sport and about the NSA at the beginning of the interviews. Then, the interviewers tried to probe into areas related to roles and functions of coaches in sports development, coach accreditation, profiles of sports coaches, work conditions of sports coaches, concern of sports coaches, etc. Although content of the interviews were structured, the interviewers were encouraged to talk with the interviewees freely in a natural flow.

Interviewees

Officials of 37 NSAs were interviewed. Most of them occupied senior posts such as Chairman, Coaching Director, and Senior Sports Executive in the NSAs. Names of the NSAs and posts of the interviewees listed in Table 2-1.

Findings

Career Ladder for NSA Coaches

It appears that a very clear career ladder for sports coaches has been established in all sports. Although titles used by the NSAs differ, in most cases, coaches are categorized into hierarchical levels, such as level 1 (or elementary level), level 2 (or intermediate level), level 3 (or advanced level), and national level. In several NSAs, a pre-level 1 (pre-elementary level) grade called "level-0"⁴ or "instructor level" also exists. NSAs participating in the NSA/HKCAP generally possess clearly documented criterion for upward promotion on the career ladder. It seems that by attending courses and satisfying requirements laid down in relevant coach education programmes a sport coach can easily move up on the career ladder. For some NSAs, being active in coaching is an important

³ In one interview, the request on audio recording of the interview was rejected.

⁴ Note that this "level-0" is not the same as the L0 coach level operationally defined in this study.

factor to be considered. One thing worth noting is that coaching performance in terms of competition results or supervision reports on coaching were not mentioned by any of the interviewees as a criterion in this regard.

Number of NSA Coaches

“How many sports coaches are there in Hong Kong?” This is not an easy question to answer. More than half (21 out of the 37) of the NSA officials pointed out that non-accredited sports coaches exist in Hong Kong. This makes calculating the number of sports coaches in Hong Kong very difficult, if not impossible. In the internal conferences, the SCRT decided to delimit the subjects of this research project to those NSA coaches. Based on the statistics provided by the NSAs officials, the total number of sports coaches in Hong Kong (registered under the NSAs) were estimated to be about 6500. Variation among NSAs is found to be very great; Total number of coaches in each NSA ranges from 6 to 1250. Gender distribution is not equal; Majority of them are men (about 82%). The numbers of sport coaches at each level are as follows:

- Level 1 (or Elementary Level) coaches - about 4485 (69% of the total)
- Level 2 (or Intermediate Level) coaches - about 1365 (21% of the total)
- Level 3 (or Advanced Level) coaches - about 650 (10% of the total)

Full-time Sports Coaches

Except one, all NSAs being investigated have got full-time coaches. However, only a minority (10 out of 37) of the NSAs officials were satisfied with the number of full-time coaches they had got. They expressed their wish to have more full-time coaches in their sports and they believed that with the increase in the number of full-time coaches, development and performance in their sports will be enhanced. There is a tendency for the NSA officials to look upon the job of being a full-time coach as the highest rank at the career ladder of sports coaching. Strictly speaking, this is not logical because the way how one is employed to do the job is irrelevant to his/her qualification. However, in the particular situation of Hong Kong, since there are only few posts of full-time jobs for sports coaches, most of them are occupied by high level coaches.

Part-time Sports Coaches

Most NSA coaches work in the career on part-time basis. Hourly pay rate for them vary greatly across the sports. It can be as high as HK\$1600 or as low as HK\$60. Most, however, are around HK\$150. It seems that the social economic background also vary across the sports. However, this needs to be further clarified at Stage 3 of the project after the completion of the large scale survey. It is also found that in those sports which are commonly taught in schools, a significant proportion of the coaches are student teachers or teachers in physical education.

Motivation to Strive for a Higher Level on the Career Ladder

According to the interviewees, most NSA coaches were motivated by personal interest, recognition, and a sense of satisfaction. Salary and wages were only mentioned by two NSA officials in the interviews. If this is true, money and materialist rewards are not the concern of sports coaches in Hong Kong. However such phenomenon may be explained by the fact that promotion on the career ladder in sports coaching has little implication in salary and fringe benefit; So the interviewees did not mention it. Another way to interpret it is that sports coaches have undergone a self-selection process in which only those who do not care about money keep staying in the coaching career.

Coach Education

The interviewees appreciated that the NSA/HKCAP is helpful in upgrading their sports coaches. However, several interviewees reflected that some very experienced coaches did not believe in the usefulness of the part on general sports theory offered in the NSA/HKCAP. Most NSA officials were satisfied with quantity of their coaches. However, they hoped that quality of their coaches could be further improved. The following is a list of the ways the NSAs used to develop their coaches:

- conducting courses / seminars / workshops, etc.
- forming coaching committee
- issuing newsletter
- training of coaches by overseas experts (sending coaches overseas / inviting experts from overseas)

- exposing their coaches to international events
- apprenticeship
- using award

About 82% of the NSAs mentioned that they would make use of overseas expertise. About 60% of the NSAs mentioned that they hold seminars workshops, etc. consistently. Only a small portion of the NSAs issue newsletter (about 8%). Some NSA officials preferred recruiting overseas coaches to take up high level coaching.

Roles and Functions of Sports Coaches

In the interviews, all NSA officials confirmed that coaches were important in sports development, particularly in the following aspects: teaching sports skills, helping athletes make tactical decisions in competitions, providing counseling to athletes, arranging training and practice for athletes, and developing proper attitude and moral behaviors among athletes. "Teaching sports skills" was mentioned almost by every interviewee. However, most NSA officials tended to emphasize coaches' contribution in teaching sport skills at junior level. None of them talked about the importance of coaches in helping athletes to master advanced skills or to acquire high level skill proficiency.

Table 2-1. List of NSA officials interviewed in the study.

| NSA | Post |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| HK Archery Association | Coaching Director |
| HK Amateur Athletic Association | Coaching Director |
| HK Badminton Association | Coaching Director |
| HK Baseball Association | Chairman |
| HK Basketball Coaches Association | Development Director |
| HK Bodybuilding Association | Chairman, & Hon. Executive |
| HK Boxing Association | Chairman, & Hon. Secretary |
| HK Canoe Union | Chairman (Training Committee) |
| HK Chinese Martial Arts Association | Coaching Officer, & Vice Chairmen |
| HK Cricket Association | Executive Director |
| HK Cycling Association | Senior Sports Executive |
| HK Amateur Fencing Association | Senior Sports Executive |
| HK Football Association | Chief Executive Officer |
| HK Golf Association Limited | Vice President |
| HK Amateur Gymnastics Association | Chairman |
| HK Amateur Handball Association | Hon. Secretary |
| HK Hockey Association | Sports Executive |
| HK Judo Association | President, & Sport Executive |
| HK Amateur Karatedo Association | Vice Chairman |
| HK Mountaineering Union | Coaching Directors |
| Orienteering Association of HK | Coaching Officer |
| HK Outward Bound School | Training Director |
| HK Shooting Association | Hon. Secretary General |
| HK Roller Skating Association | Technical Officer |
| HK Amateur Rowing Association | Coaching Director |
| HK Sports Association for the Physically Disabled | Executive Secretary |
| HK Squash Rackets Association | Coaching Director |
| HK Amateur Swimming Association | Coaching Director |
| HK Table Tennis Association | Coaching Officer |
| HK Takwondo Association | Vice Secretary General |
| HK Tennis Association | Chairman of Coaches Section |
| HK Tenpin Bowling Congress | Coaching Director |
| HK Triathlon Association | Coaching Director |
| HK Underwater Association | Directors of Training |
| HK & Kowloon Volleyball Association | Coaching Director |
| Windsurfing Association of HK | Administrative Assistant |
| HK Wushu Union | Coaching Director |

Chapter 3

Interviewing Sport Coaches

Aims

The sports coaches were interviewed for the purpose of gaining understanding in how they entered the profession and what their current concerns were. Focus was on their perception and their inner thinking with regard to sports coaching as a career.

Arrangement

All sports coaches interviewed were invited through personal linkage of the investigators. Before interviewed, they were initially contacted by one of the investigators and were briefed clearly on the aims, procedures, and confidentiality of the study.

Training for the Interviewers

To ensure that the data collection processes are valid and reliable, research assistants were not only required to rehearse the interview procedures, but were also required to study some background information about the sport in which the interviewees specialized.

Format of the Interviews

Unlike interviewing the NSA officials, only 1 interviewer was used to interview the sports coaches. This arrangement was to make the interview less formal so that good interaction between interviewer and interviewee was ensured. Audio recording was employed for the sake of accurate interview report writing. In all 12 cases, Cantonese was used as the language medium. Length of each of the interviews were about two and a half

hours. At the beginning of the interviews, the sports coaches were told that there was no particular themes or focus for the interview. They were encouraged to talk anything about what they do and what they think in sports coaching. The interviewers were briefed to maintain a relax atmosphere and to listen patiently. The interviewers were also briefed to note not only opinions, but also details of stories and incidents.

Table 3-2. Sports coaches interviewed in the study.

| Label | Sex | Age | Marital Status | Children | Education | Experience | Main Employment |
|------------|-----|-----|----------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------------|
| L2-TeaM-01 | M | 27 | Married | — | Graduate | 6 years | PE teacher |
| L2-RacM-02 | M | 36 | Single | — | Secondary 5 | 3 years | Full-time coach |
| L2-IndF-03 | M | 23 | Single | — | Secondary 5 | 3 years | Clerical Officer |
| L3-RacM-04 | M | 37 | Married | 1 daughter | Graduate | 18 years | PE teacher |
| L3-RacM-05 | M | 37 | Married | 1 daughter | Secondary 5 | 14 years | Full-time coach |
| L3-RacM-06 | M | 30 | Married | no | Secondary 5 | 12 years | Full-time coach |
| L3-RacF-07 | F | 40 | Married | 1 daughter | Secondary 5 | 6 years | Full-time coach |
| L3-IndM-08 | M | 39 | Single | — | Post-graduate | 17 years | Full-time coach |
| L3-IndM-09 | M | 37 | Married | no | Graduate | 15 years | Full-time coach |
| L3-IndM-10 | M | 30 | Single | — | Graduate | 4 years | PE instructor |
| L3-IndF-11 | F | 55 | Married | 1 daughter | Graduate | 30 years | PE teacher |
| L3-IndF-12 | F | 35 | Married | 1 daughter | Secondary 5 | 6 years | Full-time coach |

Interviewees

12 sports coaches were interviewed. Three were at coach level L2 and 9 were at coach level L3⁵. Some personal information of the 12 sports coaches were listed in

Table 3-2. Since all of them were well known coaches in their sports, their names were anonymous and the specific sports they served were not indicated in this report. These 12 sport coaches came from 8 sports including 3 racket games, 1 team game, and 4 individual sports. The coaches so selected were either working full-time coaching or were spending great proportion of their spare time in part-time coaching. They were top level coaches in their sports irrespective of what coaching qualifications they were holding - all of them had the experience of coaching national squads or national junior squads. It is not the intention of the investigators to use these 12 sports coaches to represent all sports

⁵ See Chapter 1 for the operational definitions of coach level adopted in this study.

coaches in Hong Kong. The investigators only aimed at identifying some of the main features of sports coaching in Hong Kong through reading their unique experiences. In order to avoid disclosure of their identities, they were represented by labels in the following section and findings derived from the interviews were presented as a whole.

L2-TeaM-01

He is a physical education (PE) teacher in a secondary school. Like many other PE teachers, he possesses coaching certificates in a number of sports. At the beginning, sport coaching constituted part of his school duties. But then, he developed interest in the sport and started coaching the sport as an outside job. He works 4 to 6 hours per week in coaching the sport. Normally his hourly pay rate is HK\$140. He said he learns things in sports coaching and he likes the work. However, he has never considered to become a full-time sports coach because he is sure that he will not get salary and fringe benefit comparable to what he currently has by switching to full-time coaching in his sport.

L2-RacM-02

He was a player of the sport for many years. Three years ago, he got the level 1 coach qualification in his sport. He then quitted the job as an electric technician which he had worked for 11 years and started coaching the sport to earn his living. Now he works 4 to 10 hours per day and earns HK\$16800 to HK\$33600 each month. He told the interviewers that his decision on switching to sports coaching was strongly objected by his mother. But he found that sports coaching was more suitable for him so he went on. He reflected sports coaching is not an easy job. Since he is not employed by one particular organization, he needs to run here and there to serve different people and different organizations. For the time being, he has no plan on how long he will keep working in this way. Nonetheless, he believes that sports coaching can be as successful as other careers in Hong Kong.

L2-IndF-03

She started playing the sport when she was in primary school. She is now a clerical officer in a NSA. She started coaching the sport on part-time basis 3 years ago. She spends about 5 hours per week in coaching and gets HK\$120 per hour for remuneration. She likes children and gains satisfaction in the coaching work. She enjoys the contact with trainees and likes to share happiness with them. She has never thought of becoming

a full-time coach because she anticipates that being a full-time coach is very stressful. She feels that to train up Hong kong athletes to compete in the world is very difficult because there is not enough support from the society. Nonetheless, she said that she will keep working hard in her sport.

L3-RacM-04

His main employment is secondary school PE teacher. He started playing the sport from teenage and became a part-time coach after he had got elementary coach qualification in the sport. In late 1980s, he was one of those who proposed establishing a coach association in his sport to fight for coaches' benefits. He told the interviewer that he coaches for money, but to make use of his knowledge and skills to help youngsters in Hong Kong to accomplish their goals, which he also had once upon a time. Normally, he coaches 30 hours per week. He not only does coaching by himself, he also organizes classes and recruits coaches to work for him. Although his wife does not particularly support him in doing the part-time job, she is not against him. The hourly pay rate he gets is usually HK\$200.

L3-RacM-05

He started doing full-time coaching when he lost the job of lift maintenance 3 years ago. Before that, he had already been doing part-time coaching in his sport for 11 years, but received no pay in most cases. During his first year of full-time coaching, he mainly worked in UC/RC courses. From the next year onwards, he coaches only national junior squad and private classes. A typical rundown of his work days is: A two-hour training session for a tertiary institution in the morning, then a private class; in the afternoon, first, training session for the regional squad, then another private class; at night, he worked with the national junior squad. In very busy days, he works 12 hours a day. On the average, he earns HK\$26000 per month. However, this income is not very stable and can vary from as high as HK\$50000 to as low as HK\$6000.

L3-RacM-06

He was scholarship athlete in Hong Kong Sports Institute and represented Hong Kong to play in many international events. After retired from being an athlete, he worked in a NSA for 1 year or so and then changed to do full-time coaching. He coaches in schools and private classes, but not in the UC/RC courses. Usually, he coaches 20-25

hours per week. In very busy days, he works 10 hours each day, 7 days a week. He normally gets hourly pay-rate from HK\$150 to HK\$500, which are negotiable between his clients and him. His monthly income is about HK\$20000. He is satisfied with this income and enjoys the flexible working time very much. He used to coach the national junior squad, but finally quitted to avoid interest conflict which arised when members of the squad happened to be his students in private classes. He also pointed out that since he relies on full-time coaching to maintain living, he cannot afford spending too much time on training the national junior squad at the expenses of losing huge amount of income that he can earn from somewhere else.

L3-RacF-07

She played very hard in the sport before she became a full-time coach (she played the sport 7 days a week). She joined the coaching profession entirely because she had great interest in the sport. It is her desire to train up a new generation of players. To her, to coach is a challenge to herself. She did part-time coaching for 5 years, then switched to full-time coaching for 1 year, and then switched back to part-time coaching recently. The only reason for her to work full-time coaching was to gain the most practice time. She was not contended to practicing the sport for only 2 hours a day and by doing full-time coaching, she could practice the sport at any time and at any length as she preferred. She earned about HK\$10000 per month in most time, but in busy days, she could earn up to HK\$20000. However, finally she found that full-time coaching was not as flexible as she previously thought. She also felt that her work in full-time coaching was underpaid, so she quitted doing full-time coaching. Now she is employed in another occupation and does part-time coaching in private classes. Normally, she coaches 1 to 4 hours a day.

L3-IndM-08

He was an outstanding athlete in his sport in Hong Kong when he was young. However, like most local outstanding athletes, he was not good enough to win medals for Hong Kong in international events. In the interview, one could easily feel that he has got a very strong desire of producing world class athletes and promoting the sport to the general public. He has been coaching the national squad for 10 years on which he said he put the greatest effort but received the lowest pay. In other coaching duties he does in schools or private organziations, he normally gets hourly pay rate from HK\$300 to HK\$500, but in the national squad, the pay rate is HK\$150. He even has to cover part of

his expenses when he leads the national squad to compete in oversea events. However, he never think of not serving the squad because he takes it as his responsibility. In very busy days, he works 6 to 7 hours a day, 7 days a week, and gets a monthly income of about HK\$20000.

L3-IndM-09

He pointed out that most full-time coaches were athletes in those days and so did he. At the beginning of his coaching career, he did part-time coaching and received no pay in most cases, just for his interest. However, later, he found that full-time coaching suited him very much so he found a coaching job in a sport organization and started his full-time sport coaching. However, the salary he got from the sport organization was very low, so he have to also take up two more coaching jobs in private oraganizations. From time to time, he serves for at least two organizations in order to maintain his living standard. He is a national coach and have produced athletes who won medals in internationl events.

L3-IndM-10

He was a PE instructor in a technical institute. He started playing the sport since in his teenage and represented Hong Kong to compete in international events. Before he got coaching qualification, he helped other athletes in the sport. After retired from being an athlete he concentrated on coach, in part-time basis, receiving no payment in most cases. Although he had got only 4 years of coaching experience, he is now coach of the national junior squad and takes charge of almost all coaching matters in the NSA. He showed that he has great interest in the sport and hoped to make some contribution. Now he does part-time coaching 3 days a week (about 10 hours, excluding adminstrative work related to coaching). He believes that the coaching duties he is now undertaking are in line with his main employment as a PE instructor. He agreed that if he had not got support from his family, he would not have been so dedicated in the job. He pointed out that full-time coaching can hardly earn a living in his sport, mainly because the pay is too low. Most coaches were volunteer who did not even get travel allowances. For those who had, the travel allowance was normally HK150 per hour. He reflected that most coaches agreed that such pay rate was too low. And this rate seemed to be not attractive to those who were not really interested in the sport.

L3-IndF-11

L3-IndF11 and L3-IndM-10 come from the same sport. Unlike IndM7, she is a very experienced coach in the sport. She studied her degree in physical education, received sport training, and represented her province to compete in national events in mainland China in the 1950s. Now she coaches the national squad 3 days a week (3 hours each day), in part-time basis, receiving no payment. She said she loves the sport and takes the coaching work as her major entertainment from which she finds interest and gains satisfaction. She confessed that coaching duties do affect her family life because it is very time consuming. However, she said she is lucky to have her husband, who was also an athlete in those days, giving her full support.

L3-IndF-12

There were 3 members in her family. All of them like playing the sport and, thus, unlike many other female coaches or athletes in the sport, she receives no pressure from the family urging to stop spending time in the sport. In fact, she knew her husband in the sport. She mainly worked in UC/RC courses or recreation camps to conduct introductory classes or to act as on-site instructor of the sport. It is hard to say whether she is full-time sport coach because she is at the same time a house wife. She said that she does coaching mainly for an interest in the sport. She does not care about the pay. Usually, she gets only about HK\$5000 per month. She showed that such monthly income was not enough to cover living expenses in Hong Kong and she does not rely on it. In very busy days, she may do atmost 30 hours per week in coaching the sport.

FindingsMonthly Income

1. The full-time coaches reflected that they do not have very stable monthly income because their coaching duties are short term and are paid hourly. In examination months, such as May and June, they get light coaching load and thus earn less. However they are satisfied with their income.
2. One coach used an example to illustrate why the full-time coaches should be satisfied: Most coaches get HK\$200 pay rate per hour. Suppose they work for 30 hours each

week, they then get HK\$24000 a month. For most full-time coaches who have only secondary 5 education background, such monthly income should not be deemed as low.

Pay Rates for Coaching

1. In general, pay rate in private classes are much higher than that of the UC/RC courses.
2. Training of national squad or national junior squad are paid at a rate similar to UC/RC courses.
3. It was also found that full-time coaches in the HKSI earn less than coaches who do free-lance coaching outside.
4. In some courses, the pay rate for coaches depends on trainees' level - the higher the course level, the higher the coach fee. The coaches showed different opinions on this issue. Some support the existing way and some prefer linking coach fees with coaching qualifications and experience.

Job Security

1. In the eyes of the coaches, full-time coaching is not a very secure job because it is basically a self-employed business in which most coaching assignments are short term and subject to changes from time to time.
2. One thing worth noted is that several coaches pointed out that the UC/RC do not use a coach for too long.

Coach Association

1. The coaches confirmed that there are no coach association in their sports.
2. In general, the coaches agreed that forming a coach association is good. However, they did not believe in the effectiveness of the coach association.
3. They also questioned, if an association across sports is formed, how it can settle interest conflicts of coaches in different sports.
4. Another difficult task for the coach association to handle is how to treat set up and implement a coach accreditation system which will likely to affect a large number of

serving coaches who are not qualified.

Some Psychological Attributes of Coaches

1. The coaches emphasized that an interest in the sport is the most important attribute of a coach. They believe that monetary reward can help but it is not the most crucial factor.
2. The coaches pointed out that sometimes coaches need to help their solve psychological or even study problems.
3. The coaches pointed out that coaches's mood are affected by the trainees' performance.
4. The coaches believe that coaches should be happy going and should avoid losing temper.
5. Coach should deliver clear instructions and requirements to the players
6. Coaches should be flexible in coaching methods, keep very close monitoring on the trainees' physical condition, and adjust training schedules accordingly.

Coach Education

1. All except one, all the coaches interviewed received local coach education programmes.
2. All 9 L3 coaches believe that local coaches are good enough, in experience as well as in knowledge, to produce world class athletes. However, the situation in Hong Kong that have restricted many good athletes to develop.
3. The coaches see the need to keep themselves update in coaching knowledge, especially in scientific principles of training. They confirm that general sport theory courses offered in the HKCAP are helpful to them. However, they prefer something more specific to their sports.
4. It is quite interesting to find that the coaches intentionally emphasize the importance of coaching experience which enable them gradually develop coaching skill and knowledge by observing and experimenting. It seems that formal coach education do not have very high place in their mind.
5. Several coaches reflected that they find difficulty to attend seminars, courses, etc.

because, in most cases, these seminars, courses, etc. are conducted at times when they are busy earning money.

6. One coach believes that by learning some educational theories and skills, coaching will be enhanced, particularly in teaching methodology and discipline management.
7. The coaches agreed that sport skill proficiency is very important in learning to coach. They are not satisfied with some of the newly accredited L1 coaches who have got low sport skill proficiency.

Coach Accreditation

1. The coaches reflected that their clients do not care about coaching qualification. They said that most people, when looking for coaches to hire, mainly consider the coaches' track record, their own personal feeling, and recommendations from their significant others.
2. Several coaches pointed out that the existence of non-qualified coaches in the coaching profession are not healthy. They agreed that there should be some control, for the sake of the consumers. They agreed that an accreditation system should be enforced so that consumers know how to choose.
3. Quite a number of PE teachers involve in part-time coaching. Coaches showed positive attitude to this phenomenon. However, they do care about whether they hold coaching qualifications.

Gender Issue

1. All coaches pointed out that number of female coaches were far less than male coaches. In some sports, this may be explained by noting the smaller number of female players in the sport.
2. Several coaches pointed out that many female coaches do coaching only for a very short time after getting the coaching qualification and then "disappeared".
3. The coaches agreed that females face greater pressure than the males in keeping their interest in coaching.
4. One coach pointed out that female coaches inevitably have lower level of sport skill proficiency and fitness which make them less favorable in coaching.

5. One female coach quoted her personal experience to witness the existence of sex discrimination in her sport. She found that most male trainees showed unwillingness to be taught by a female coach. For this reason, she needs to show off her sport skill proficiency to convince the trainees that she is competent. She also perceived that the NSA did not give female coaches equal chance of coaching high level players.

Chapter 4

Sports Coaches Survey - Subjects

2038 questionnaires were distributed to sport coaches in Hong Kong through 30 NSAs (see Table 4-1 for the list of the NSAs). 731 responses were received. Numbers of subjects listed by sport by coach level⁶ by sex were presented in Table 4-2. Since some coaches serve in more than one sport, the total counts of subjects by sport (i.e. 1046) exceeded the total number of subjects (i.e. 731).

Return rates counted by sport varied from 0.5% to 76.5%. To ensure that findings were drawn from representative sample, data collected from sports with return rates lower than 25% were not used in subsequent analyses⁷. This came up with a sample of 643 subjects representing coaches of 21 sports in Hong Kong. Table 4-3 showed the response counts by sport and the respective return rates of each individual sport. Overall return rates was 41.9% and return rates of each sport ranged from 29.2% to 77.8% (with an average of 43.4%).

Sex distribution and coach level distribution in the sample (n=643) were shown as Table 4-4. 78.8% of the subjects were males. Coaches at elementary level (i.e. those who do not hold any coaching certificates plus those who hold Level 1 certificates issued by NSAs or HKCAP) constituted 51.3% of all the subjects. Age of the subjects ranged from 17 to 73 (mean=35.62, s.d.=8.99).

⁶ See Chapter 1 for the operational definitions of coach level adopted in this study.

⁷ In this procedure, all data from coaches who serve in one and only one sport of which the return rate is lower than 25% were discarded.

Table 4-1. List of NSAs through which questionnaires were distributed.

| Code | Sport | NSA |
|------|--------------------------------|---|
| Arc | Archery | HK Archery Association |
| Bad | Badminton | HK Badminton Association |
| Bas | Baseball | HK Baseball Association |
| BB | Basketball | HK Basketball Coaches Association |
| BBu | Body Building | HK Bodybuilding Association |
| Bow | Tenpin Bowling | HK Tenpin Bowling Congress |
| Can | Canoeing | HK Canoe Union |
| Cyc | Cycling | HK Cycling Association |
| FB | Fencing | HK Amateur Fencing Association |
| Fen | Football | HK Football Association |
| Gol | Golf | HK Golf Association Limited |
| Gym | Gymnastics | HK Amateur Gymnastics Association |
| HB | Handball | HK Amateur Handball Association |
| Hoc | Hockey | HK Hockey Association |
| Jud | Judo | HK Judo Association |
| Kar | Karatedo | HK Amateur Karatedo Association |
| Mou | Mountaineering | HK Mountaineering Union |
| Ori | Orienteering | Windsurfing Association of HK |
| RSk | Roller Skating | HK Roller Skating Association |
| Row | Rowing | HK Amateur Rowing Association |
| SPD | Sports for Physically Disabled | HK Sports Association for the Physically Disabled |
| Squ | Squash | HK Squash Rackets Association |
| Swi | Swimming | HK Amateur Swimming Association |
| Tab | Table Tennis | HK Table Tennis Association |
| Tae | Takwondo | HK Takwondo Association |
| USw | Underwater | HK Underwater Association |
| VB | Volleyball | HK & Kowloon Volleyball Association |
| Win | Windsurfing | Windsurfing Association of HK |

Table 4-2. Numbers of all respondents (n=731) listed by sport by coach level by sex.

| | L0 | | | L1 | | | L2 | | | L3 | | | ALL | | |
|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-------|
| | M | F | Total | M | F | Total | M | F | Total | M | F | Total | M | F | Total |
| Arc | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 23 | 17 | 4 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 47 | 6 | 53 |
| Bad | 3 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 9 | 29 | 21 | 7 | 28 | 13 | 4 | 17 | 57 | 20 | 77 |
| Bas | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| BB | 2 | 3 | 5 | 18 | 5 | 23 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 34 | 14 | 48 |
| BBu | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Bow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Can | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 11 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 41 | 4 | 45 |
| Cyc | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| FB | 12 | 3 | 15 | 34 | 4 | 38 | 16 | 3 | 19 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 78 | 10 | 88 |
| Fen | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 15 |
| Gol | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Gym | 0 | 3 | 3 | 19 | 20 | 39 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 28 | 30 | 58 |
| HB | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| Hoc | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 10 |
| Jud | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Kar | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 2 | 23 |
| Mou | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 20 | 3 | 23 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 35 | 4 | 39 |
| Ori | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 7 | 24 |
| Row | 6 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 6 | 25 |
| RSk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Squ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 4 | 38 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 48 | 5 | 53 |
| Swi | 10 | 3 | 13 | 36 | 16 | 52 | 30 | 7 | 37 | 16 | 7 | 23 | 92 | 33 | 125 |
| Tab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 6 | 30 | 24 | 5 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 50 | 11 | 61 |
| Tae | 10 | 2 | 12 | 18 | 5 | 23 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 36 | 7 | 43 |
| USw | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| VB | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 2 | 16 | 27 | 15 | 42 |
| Win | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 3 | 18 |
| Wus | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 3 | 17 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 23 | 11 | 34 |
| Oth | 0 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 19 | 44 | 24 | 3 | 27 | 11 | 3 | 14 | 60 | 30 | 90 |
| NoInd | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| Total | 57 | 25 | 82 | 339 | 129 | 468 | 266 | 56 | 322 | 141 | 33 | 174 | 803 | 243 | 1046 |
| Row % | 7.1% | 10.3% | 7.8% | 42.2% | 53.1% | 44.7% | 33.1% | 23.0% | 30.8% | 17.6% | 13.6% | 16.6% | -- | -- | -- |

Note 1. L0: Do not hold any coaching certificates; L1: Holding elementary or level 1 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP. L2: Holding intermediate or level 2 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP (excluding L1). L3: Holding advanced or international or level 3 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP(excluding L2).

Note 2. Other - 9 questionnaires were distributed to coaches who coached physically disabled athletes. However, no subjects in the sample marked this category. Some questionnaires came from coaches serving in sports to which the SCRT did not send questionnaires. These sports include athletics, boxing, cricket, dance, fitness, gateball, lawn bowling, rope course, rugby, sailing, tennis, and triathlon.

Note 3. NoInd - No indication; Several coaches did not indicate which sports they serve.

Table 4-3. List of return rates by sport.

| | Number of | | Sport A Count | Sport B Count | Sport C Count | Total Count | Response Rate |
|-------|------------------------------------|--------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Questionnaires Distributed (by) | | | | | | |
| Arc | 100 | (NSA) | 50 | 3 | | 53 | 53.0% |
| Bad | 240 | (SCRT) | 70 | 3 | 4 | 77 | 32.1% |
| BB | 101 | (SCRT) | 26 | 15 | 7 | 48 | 47.5% |
| BBu | 23 | (SCRT) | 8 | 2 | | 10 | 43.5% |
| Bow | 6 | (SCRT) | 2 | | | 2 | 33.3% |
| Can | 100 | (NSA) | 24 | 14 | 8 | 46 | 46.0% |
| Cyc | 18 | (SCRT) | 7 | | | 7 | 38.9% |
| FB | 200 | (NSA) | 63 | 23 | 3 | 89 | 44.5% |
| Fen | 50 | (NSA) | 15 | | | 15 | 30.0% |
| Gym | 168 | (SCRT) | 35 | 13 | 10 | 58 | 34.5% |
| HB | 30 | (SCRT) | 11 | 5 | 2 | 18 | 60.0% |
| Hoc | 28 | (SCRT) | 6 | 4 | | 10 | 35.7% |
| Kar | 30 | (SCRT) | 18 | 5 | | 23 | 76.7% |
| Mou | 83 | (NSA) | 27 | 8 | 4 | 39 | 47.0% |
| Ori | 50 | (NSA) | 23 | | 1 | 24 | 48.0% |
| Squ | 184 | (SCRT) | 52 | 2 | | 54 | 29.3% |
| Swi | 162 | (SCRT) | 65 | 42 | 19 | 126 | 77.8% |
| Tab | 171 | (SCRT) | 48 | 10 | 3 | 61 | 35.7% |
| VB | 144 | (SCRT) | 18 | 15 | 9 | 42 | 29.2% |
| Win | 50 | (NSA) | 13 | 4 | 1 | 18 | 36.0% |
| Wus | 100 | (SCRT) | 30 | 2 | 2 | 34 | 34.0% |
| Total | 2038 | — | 611 | 170 | 73 | 854 | 41.9% |

Note 1. If all NSA's response rates are averaged, the overall response rate will then be 43.4% instead of 41.9%.

Note 2. Some of the questionnaires were distributed by the NSAs. The others were distributed by investigators (SCRT).

Table 4-4. Number of subjects listed by sex by coach level.

| Coach Level | | Whole Sample (n=643) | | |
|-------------|----------|----------------------|--------|---------|
| | | Male | Female | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 11 | 37 |
| | Row % | 70.3% | 29.7% | (5.7%) |
| | Column % | 5.1% | 8.1% | |
| | Total % | 4.0% | 1.7% | |
| L1 | Count | 226 | 67 | 293 |
| | Row % | 77.1% | 22.9% | (45.6%) |
| | Column % | 44.6% | 49.3% | |
| | Total % | 35.0% | 10.4% | |
| L2 | Count | 169 | 40 | 209 |
| | Row % | 80.9% | 19.1% | (32.6%) |
| | Column % | 33.3% | 29.4% | |
| | Total % | 26.2% | 6.2% | |
| L3 | Count | 86 | 18 | 104 |
| | Row % | 82.7% | 17.3% | (16.1%) |
| | Column % | 17.0% | 13.2% | |
| | Row % | 13.3% | 2.8% | |
| Total | Column % | 507 | 136 | 643 |
| | Total % | 78.9% | 21.1% | (100%) |

Note. L0: Do not hold any coaching certificates; L1: Holding elementary or level 1 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP. L2: Holding intermediate or level 2 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP (excluding L1). L3: Holding advanced or international or level 3 coaching certificates issued by NSA or HKCAP(excluding L2).

Chapter 5

Sports Coaches Survey - Instruments

A questionnaire (to be referred as HKSCQ in the following sections) was specifically designed to collect data in the survey. Content of the HKSCQ was shown in Appendix A and Appendix B. There are five sections in the HKSCQ which required subjects to supply information on their “personal information” (section 1), “coaching qualifications” (section 2), “coaching workload” (section 3), “coaching fees” (section 4), and “opinions or thinking on several issues relevant to coaching” (section 5). The HKSCQ was designed in such a way that coaches who serve in more than 1 sport needed to complete only 1 questionnaire. To ensure that all items in the questionnaire were clearly presented, the HKSCQ was put on trials in pilot studies⁸ during which wordings and format of the HKSCQ were revised accordingly.

Scales Construction for the Attitude Scores

In section 5 of the HKSCQ, subjects were required to give ratings on a list of statements on a 6-point-Likert-scale (with 1 = false, 2 = mostly false, 3 = more false than true, 4 = more true than false, 5 = mostly true, and 6 = true). Subjects were instructed to respond to the statements based on an overall impression even if they serve in more than one sport. These statement were used to tap for subjects’ opinions or thinking in several issues relevant to sports coaching which included “coaching education Hong Kong” (7 statements), “coaching career in Hong Kong” (12 statements), “about establishing coach association” (6 statements), “reasons for doing coaching” (16 statements), and “general feelings about coaching” (11 statements). Among these 52 statements, 40 were found to

⁸ Two pilot studies were conducted to try out the questionnaires. In the first pilot study, the HKSCQ Version 1.0 was distributed to 17 students in the Advanced Course of Teacher Education in the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Revision of the HKSCQ then followed. In the second pilot study, the HKSCQ Version 2.0 was trial used in 20 sports coaches.

be clustering on 10 factors when undergoing exploratory factor analysis using principal components extraction and varimax rotation. These 40 statements were then extracted to form scales for subsequent analyses. The factor structure, eigenvalues, and internal consistencies⁹ of these 10 scales (factors) were presented in Table 5-5 and Table 5-6. Their labels and meanings were shown below:

- Factor 1 (F1) - Attitude towards Coach Association - F1 includes 6 statements related to what a coach association should do. The fact that different functions of coach association loaded on the same factor showed that the subjects seemed to have a consensus on what functions a coach association should perform.
- Factor 2 (F2) - Altruistic Motive to Coach - F2 includes 5 statements related to coaches' motive to do coach work. It represents the sports coaches' desire to make contribution to the sport they play.
- Factor 3 (F3) - Rating of Local Coach Education - F3 includes 5 statements related to how good are the local coach education, both in quality and in quantity.
- Factor 4 (F4) - Egoistic Motive to Coach - F4 includes 5 statements related to coaches' motive to do coach work. It is different from F2 in that under this motive, subjects look for satisfaction and sense of fulfillment.
- Factor 5 (F5) - Satisfaction on the Wages of Coaching - F5 includes 4 statements related to how good the coaching duties are paid. It shows whether sports coaches deemed coaching to be a good job for earning money.
- Factor 6 (F6) - Quit Inclination - F6 includes 4 statements related to a negative attitude towards doing coach work. With high score in this factor implies a greater possibility of leaving the profession.
- Factor 7 (F7) - Work Inclination - F7 includes 4 statements related to a positive attitude towards doing coach work. It is just the opposite of F6. With high score in this factor implies a greater possibility of staying or becoming more involved in the profession.

⁹ Cronbach' alpha coefficients were used to represent internal consistency. See page 354 in Thomas, J.R., and Nelson, J.K. (1990). Research methods in physical activity. 2nd edition. IL: Human Kinetic Books.

- Factor 8 (F8) - Perception of Match between Coach-level and Pay - F8 includes 2 statements related to how pay rates for coaching is determined. Although the two statements represent two different system of determining pay rates, they loaded on the same factor. This probably showed that, in actual circumstances, higher level trainees are being coached by coaches.
- Factor 9 (F9) - Learning Motive to Coach - F9 includes 2 statements related to sports coaches' desire to learn things through doing the coach work.
- Factor 10 (F10) - Perception of a Career Ladder - F10 includes 3 statements related to how coach work is assigned according to coaching qualifications. High score in the factor implies that the coach accreditation system is well accepted in the field.

Distribution and Collection of Questionnaires

The questionnaires were distributed with the help from the relevant NSAs. Part of the questionnaires were distributed by the NSAs and part of the questionnaires were mailed to the subjects directly by the investigators. In both cases, the questionnaires were attached with a cover letter issued by the relevant NSA, another letter issued by the principal investigator, and a stamped return mail envelop. All return questionnaires were mailed back to the principal investigator's office at the Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Table 5-5. Factor structure of the HKSCQ (Factor 1 to 5).

| Items (N=643. Factor loadings less than .40 omitted) | Factor | | | | |
|---|--------|------|------|------|------|
| | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 |
| F1 Attitude towards coach association (CA) | | | | | |
| Q53A CA helps raising professional status of coaching | .82 | | | | |
| Q53B CA helps enhancing security in coaching career | .83 | | | | |
| Q53C CA enforces professional ethics of coaching | .83 | | | | |
| Q53D CA should represent coaches to fight for their benefits | .85 | | | | |
| Q53E CA should provide coach education courses | .76 | | | | |
| Q53F CA should be established as soon as possible | .80 | | | | |
| F2 Altruistic motive to coach | | | | | |
| Q54L you are really interested in the sport you coach | | .66 | | | |
| Q54N you think you belong to the sport so you want to contribute | | .75 | | | |
| Q54O this contributes to society (you want to be a good citizen) | | .56 | | | |
| Q55C as a coach, you have much contribution | | .66 | | | |
| Q55D you are satisfied with the reward you got in coaching | | .61 | | | |
| F3 Rating of local coach education | | | | | |
| Q51A adequate coaching courses are provided in HK | | | .75 | | |
| Q51B qualities of most HK coaches are high | | | .74 | | |
| Q51C HK coaches have access to all new coaching methods | | | .77 | | |
| Q51D your coaching knowledge/skill come MAINLY from local courses | | | .60 | | |
| Q51E qualities of most coaching courses in HK are high | | | .74 | | |
| F4 Egoistic motive to coach | | | | | |
| Q54A you like teaching others | | | | .43 | |
| Q54B you want to make friends | | | | .78 | |
| Q54C you want to make life more substantial | | | | .75 | |
| Q54D you want to challenge yourself | | | | .66 | |
| Q54E you gain satisfaction (respect, power, etc.) from coaching | | | | .55 | |
| F5 Satisfaction on wages of coaching | | | | | |
| Q52H compared with other part-time jobs, coaching is paid rather high | | | | | .68 |
| Q54F coaching has got flexible working time | | | | | .59 |
| Q54G coaching is highly paid | | | | | .87 |
| Q54H you want to earn more to cover living expenses | | | | | .73 |
| eigenvalue | 7.13 | 3.37 | 3.08 | 2.24 | 2.00 |
| % variance | 17.8 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 5.6 | 5.0 |
| Internal consistency | .93 | .79 | .78 | .80 | .76 |

Table 5-6. Factor structure of the HKSCQ (Factor 6 to 10).

| Items (N=643. Factor loadings less than .40 omitted) | Factor | | | | |
|---|--------|------|------|------|------|
| | F6 | F7 | F8 | F9 | F10 |
| F6 Quit inclination | | | | | |
| Q55H your family dislike your being a coach | .62 | | | | |
| Q55I you begin to dislike coaching | .80 | | | | |
| Q55J you start feeling that coaching is hard | .66 | | | | |
| Q55K for some reasons, you may give up coaching in the near future | .72 | | | | |
| F7 Work inclination | | | | | |
| Q55A you do part-time coaching, even if you are very busy | | .63 | | | |
| Q55B your family are proud of your being a coach | | .47 | | | |
| Q55E you really want to become a full-time coach | | .73 | | | |
| Q55F you hope to study full-time coaching courses | | .58 | | | |
| F8 Perception of match between coach level and pay | | | | | |
| Q52A holding higher level coaching certificates are normally paid higher | | | .70 | | |
| Q52B coaching higher level trainees are normally paid higher | | | .79 | | |
| F9 Learning motive to coach | | | | | |
| Q54I coaching enables you to improve sport skill proficiency | | | | .71 | |
| Q54K you want to learn new things (knowledge and skill) | | | | .77 | |
| F10 Perception of athlete-coach level-matching | | | | | |
| Q52C higher level coach are normally asked to teach higher level athletes | | | .51 | | .63 |
| Q52D lower level coach are normally asked to teach lower level athletes | | | | | .73 |
| Q52E without relevant certificate, one is normally not hired to coach | | | | | .65 |
| eigenvalue | 1.84 | 1.44 | 1.28 | 1.13 | 1.05 |
| % variance | 4.6 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.6 |
| Internal consistency | .68 | .69 | .69 | .73 | .72 |

Chapter 6

Findings of the Sports Coaches Survey

Age

- a) See Table 6-1 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $F(1, 627)=10.56$.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 627)=14.99$.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean age of all subjects was found to be 35.62 (s.d.=8.99). On the whole, males were found to be older than females by 4.21 years. Sex difference in age existed across all 4 coach level subgroups. Age differences in the coach level subgroups were 5.08 years (L0 < L1), 3.51 years (L1 < L2), and 2.23 years (L2 < L3) respectively.

Table 6-1. Age of subjects.

| Coach Level | Male | | Female | |
|-------------|-------|------|--------|------|
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| L0 | 29.62 | 7.49 | 26.73 | 5.10 |
| L1 | 34.77 | 9.08 | 30.70 | 8.16 |
| L2 | 38.04 | 8.20 | 34.38 | 6.96 |
| L3 | 40.12 | 8.53 | 37.06 | 9.23 |

| L0 | | L1 | | L2 | | L3 | | Male | | Female | | ALL | |
|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| 28.76 | 6.93 | 33.84 | 9.03 | 37.35 | 8.10 | 39.58 | 8.69 | 36.51 | 8.99 | 32.30 | 8.21 | 35.62 | 8.99 |

Coaching Experience

- a) See Table 6-2 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $F(1, 628)=12.42$.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 628)=17.52$.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean coaching experience of all subjects was found to be 8.12 years (s.d.=7.02. On the whole, males were found to be more experienced than females by 2.85 years. The differences of coaching experience between different levels of coaches were 0.86 years (L0 < L1), 4.43 years (L1 < L2), and 2.62 years (L2 < L3) respectively.

Table 6-2. Coaching experience of subjects.

| Coach Level | Male | | Female | |
|-------------|-------|------|--------|------|
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | SD |
| L0 | 5.17 | 4.63 | 3.60 | 3.24 |
| L1 | 5.76 | 5.46 | 4.91 | 4.64 |
| L2 | 10.73 | 7.78 | 6.90 | 4.27 |
| L3 | 13.52 | 8.06 | 8.39 | 3.79 |

| L0 | | L1 | | L2 | | L3 | | Male | | Female | | ALL | |
|------|------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|
| Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| 4.71 | 4.28 | 5.57 | 5.29 | 10.00 | 7.39 | 12.62 | 7.73 | 8.72 | 7.44 | 5.87 | 4.52 | 8.12 | 7.02 |

Number of Sports Served

- a) See Table 6-3 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $\chi^2 = 6.70$, 2df.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Not significant.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - 66.6% of the coaches served for one and only one sport. Numbers of coaches serving 2 sports or serving 3 sports were similar (17.3% and 16.2% respectively). In males, percentages of coaches serving 1 sport (69.0% of all males) was greater than that of the females (57.4% of all females).

Table 6-3. Number of sports served by subjects.

| Coach Level | | Male | | | | Female | | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-------|---------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | 1 Sport | 2 Sports | 3 Sports | Total | 1 Sport | 2 Sports | 3 Sports | Total |
| L0 | Count | 16 | 7 | 3 | 26 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 11 |
| | Row % | 61.5% | 26.9% | 11.5% | 70.3% | 54.5% | 36.4% | 9.1% | 29.7% |
| | Column % | 4.6% | 8.8% | 3.9% | 5.1% | 7.7% | 12.9% | 3.7% | 8.1% |
| L1 | Count | 168 | 31 | 27 | 226 | 32 | 18 | 17 | 67 |
| | Row % | 74.3% | 13.7% | 11.9% | 77.1% | 47.8% | 26.9% | 25.4% | 22.9% |
| | Column % | 48.0% | 38.8% | 35.1% | 44.6% | 41.0% | 58.1% | 63.0% | 49.3% |
| L2 | Count | 113 | 26 | 30 | 169 | 31 | 5 | 4 | 40 |
| | Row % | 66.9% | 15.4% | 17.8% | 80.9% | 77.5% | 12.5% | 10.0% | 19.1% |
| | Column % | 32.3% | 32.5% | 39.0% | 33.3% | 39.7% | 16.1% | 14.8% | 29.4% |
| L3 | Count | 53 | 16 | 17 | 86 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 18 |
| | Row % | 61.6% | 18.6% | 19.8% | 82.7% | 50.0% | 22.2% | 27.8% | 17.3% |
| | Column % | 15.1% | 20.0% | 22.1% | 17.0% | 11.5% | 12.9% | 18.5% | 13.2% |
| Total | Count | 350 | 80 | 77 | 507 | 78 | 31 | 27 | 136 |
| | Row % | 69.0% | 15.8% | 15.2% | 78.8% | 57.4% | 22.8% | 19.9% | 21.2% |

| Coach Level | | ALL | | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-------|
| | | 1 Sport | 2 Sports | 3 Sports | Total |
| L0 | Count | 22 | 11 | 4 | 37 |
| | Row % | 59.5% | 29.7% | 10.8% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.1% | 9.9% | 3.8% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 200 | 49 | 44 | 293 |
| | Row % | 68.3% | 16.7% | 15.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 46.7% | 44.1% | 42.3% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 144 | 31 | 34 | 209 |
| | Row % | 68.9% | 14.8% | 16.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.6% | 27.9% | 32.7% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 62 | 20 | 22 | 104 |
| | Row % | 59.6% | 19.2% | 21.2% | 100% |
| | Column % | 14.5% | 18.0% | 21.2% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 428 | 111 | 104 | 643 |
| | Row % | 66.6% | 17.3% | 16.2% | 100% |

Education Background

- a) See Table 6-4 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $\chi^2 = 7.63$, 1df.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Not significant.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant in L3-male-female subgroup; $\chi^2 = 6.40$, 1df.
- e) Highlight - Coaches having education background at secondary or above constitute 98% of all the subjects. In males, percentages of coaches having secondary or tertiary education were similar (47.9% and 49.9% of all males respectively). However, in females, percentages of coaches with tertiary education background was double of that of the coaches with secondary education (63.2% and 35.3% of all females respectively). In L3 coaches, this sex difference was found to be the greatest. Percentages of L3 male coaches with secondary education background was 55.8% (of all males), whereas, the percentage of L3 male coaches with tertiary education background was 41.9% (of all males). On the other hand, percentages of L3 female coaches with tertiary education background (72.2% of all female) was more than triple of those with secondary education background (22.2%).

Table 6-4. Education background of subjects.

| Coach Level | | Male | | | | Female | | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|
| | | Primary | Secondary | Tertiary | Total | Primary | Secondary | Tertiary | Total |
| L0 | Count | | 10 | 16 | 26 | | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| | Row % | 0.0% | 38.5% | 61.5% | 70.3% | 0.0% | 36.4% | 63.6% | 29.7% |
| | Column % | 0.0% | 4.1% | 6.3% | 5.1% | 0.0% | 8.3% | 8.1% | 8.1% |
| L1 | Count | 3 | 104 | 119 | 226 | 1 | 25 | 41 | 67 |
| | Row % | 1.3% | 46.0% | 52.7% | 77.1% | 1.5% | 37.3% | 61.2% | 22.9% |
| | Column % | 27.3% | 42.8% | 47.0% | 44.6% | 50.0% | 52.1% | 47.7% | 49.3% |
| L2 | Count | 6 | 81 | 82 | 169 | | 15 | 25 | 40 |
| | Row % | 3.6% | 47.9% | 48.5% | 80.9% | 0.0% | 37.5% | 62.5% | 19.1% |
| | Column % | 54.5% | 33.3% | 32.4% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 31.3% | 29.1% | 29.4% |
| L3 | Count | 2 | 48 | 36 | 86 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 18 |
| | Row % | 2.3% | 55.8% | 41.9% | 82.7% | 5.6% | 22.2% | 72.2% | 17.3% |
| | Column % | 18.2% | 19.8% | 14.2% | 17.0% | 50.0% | 8.3% | 15.1% | 13.2% |
| Total | Count | 11 | 243 | 253 | 507 | 2 | 48 | 86 | 136 |
| | Row % | 2.2% | 47.9% | 49.9% | 78.8% | 1.5% | 35.3% | 63.2% | 21.2% |

| Coach Level | | ALL | | | |
|-------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|
| | | Primary | Secondary | Tertiary | Total |
| L0 | Count | 0 | 14 | 23 | 37 |
| | Row % | 0.0% | 37.8% | 62.2% | 100% |
| | Column % | 0.0% | 4.8% | 6.8% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 4 | 129 | 160 | 293 |
| | Row % | 1.4% | 44.0% | 54.6% | 100% |
| | Column % | 30.8% | 44.3% | 47.2% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 6 | 96 | 107 | 209 |
| | Row % | 2.9% | 45.9% | 51.2% | 100% |
| | Column % | 46.2% | 33.0% | 31.6% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 3 | 52 | 49 | 104 |
| | Row % | 2.9% | 50.0% | 47.1% | 100% |
| | Column % | 23.1% | 17.9% | 14.5% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 13 | 291 | 339 | 643 |
| | Row % | 2.0% | 45.3% | 52.7% | 100% |

Marital Status

- a) See Table 6-5 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $\chi^2 = 12.80$, 1df.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $\chi^2 = 24.13$, 3df.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant in L2-male-female and L3-male-female subgroup; $\chi^2 = 5.12$ and 5.68 respectively, 1df.
- e) Highlight - Only 2.6% of the coaches were divorced / seperated / widowed. Majority of coaches at L1 or lower were single (59.5% and 52.7% in L0 and L1 coaches respectively), whereas, majority of L2 or above coaches were married (59.8% and 66.3% in L2 and L3 coaches respectively). Sex differences were also identified. Majority of males were married (56.3% of all males). On the contrary, majority of females were single (57.4% of all females). It could be seen that, in males, less than half of the coaches at elementary (L1 or No) coach level were married. Then in L2 and L3, more and more males coaches got married. The female coaches, however, did not follow this pattern. percentage of married female coaches increase slowly from 36.4% at coach level L0 to 38.9% at coach level L3.

Table 6-5. Marital status of subjects.

| Coach Level | | Male | | | | Female | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | Single | Married | DSW | Total | Single | Married | DSW | Total |
| L0 | Count | 15 | 10 | 1 | 26 | 7 | 4 | | 11 |
| | Row % | 57.7% | 38.5% | 3.8% | 70.3% | 63.6% | 36.4% | 0.0% | 29.7% |
| | Column % | 7.1% | 3.5% | 9.1% | 5.1% | 9.0% | 7.7% | 0.0% | 8.1% |
| L1 | Count | 114 | 106 | 5 | 225 | 40 | 23 | 4 | 67 |
| | Row % | 50.7% | 47.1% | 2.2% | 77.1% | 59.7% | 34.3% | 6.0% | 22.9% |
| | Column % | 54.3% | 37.2% | 45.5% | 44.5% | 51.3% | 44.2% | 66.7% | 49.3% |
| L2 | Count | 59 | 107 | 3 | 169 | 22 | 18 | | 40 |
| | Row % | 34.9% | 63.3% | 1.8% | 80.9% | 55.0% | 45.0% | 0.0% | 19.1% |
| | Column % | 28.1% | 37.5% | 27.3% | 33.4% | 28.2% | 34.6% | 0.0% | 29.4% |
| L3 | Count | 22 | 62 | 2 | 86 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 18 |
| | Row % | 25.6% | 72.1% | 2.3% | 82.7% | 50.0% | 38.9% | 11.1% | 17.3% |
| | Column % | 10.5% | 21.8% | 18.2% | 17.0% | 11.5% | 13.5% | 33.3% | 13.2% |
| Total | Count | 210 | 285 | 11 | 506 | 78 | 52 | 6 | 136 |
| | Row % | 41.5% | 56.3% | 2.2% | 78.8% | 57.4% | 38.2% | 4.4% | 21.2% |

Note. DSW stands for marital status of being divorced / separated / widowed.

| Coach Level | | ALL | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| | | Single | Married | DSW | Total |
| L0 | Count | 22 | 14 | 1 | 37 |
| | Row % | 59.5% | 37.8% | 2.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 7.6% | 4.2% | 5.9% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 154 | 129 | 9 | 292 |
| | Row % | 52.7% | 44.2% | 3.1% | 100% |
| | Column % | 53.5% | 38.3% | 52.9% | 45.5% |
| L2 | Count | 81 | 125 | 3 | 209 |
| | Row % | 38.8% | 59.8% | 1.4% | 100% |
| | Column % | 28.1% | 37.1% | 17.6% | 32.6% |
| L3 | Count | 31 | 69 | 4 | 104 |
| | Row % | 29.8% | 66.3% | 3.8% | 100% |
| | Column % | 10.8% | 20.5% | 23.5% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 288 | 337 | 17 | 642 |
| | Row % | 44.9% | 52.5% | 2.6% | 100% |

Note. DSW stands for marital status of being divorced / separated / widowed.

Parental Status

- a) See Table 6-6 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $\chi^2 = 10.91$, 1df.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $\chi^2 = 29.92$, 3df.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant in L1-male-female subgroup; $\chi^2 = 8.73$, 1df.
- e) Highlight - It was found that 39.5% of all subjects were parents. Sex difference was identified. Percentage of being a parent was greater in males (42.8% of all the males) than in females (27.2% of all the females). Majority of coaches at L2 or lower were non-parents (86.5%, 65.5%, and 58.4% in No, L1, and L2 coaches respectively), whereas, majority of L3 coaches were parents (58.7% in all L3 coaches). Sex difference in distribution of parents and non-parents was identified in L1 subgroup in which males had a greater proportion of parents (38.9%) than that of females (19.4%).

Table 6-6. Parental status of subjects

| Coach Level | | Male | | | Female | | |
|-------------|----------|------------|--------|-------|------------|--------|-------|
| | | Non Parent | Parent | Total | Non Parent | Parent | Total |
| L0 | Count | 22 | 4 | 26 | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| | Row % | 84.6% | 15.4% | 70.3% | 90.9% | 9.1% | 29.7% |
| | Column % | 68.8% | 80.0% | 5.1% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 8.1% |
| L1 | Count | 138 | 88 | 226 | 54 | 13 | 67 |
| | Row % | 61.1% | 38.9% | 77.1% | 80.6% | 19.4% | 22.9% |
| | Column % | 71.9% | 87.1% | 44.6% | 28.1% | 12.9% | 49.3% |
| L2 | Count | 97 | 72 | 169 | 25 | 15 | 40 |
| | Row % | 57.4% | 42.6% | 80.9% | 62.5% | 37.5% | 19.1% |
| | Column % | 79.5% | 82.8% | 33.3% | 20.5% | 17.2% | 29.4% |
| L3 | Count | 33 | 53 | 86 | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| | Row % | 38.4% | 61.6% | 82.7% | 55.6% | 44.4% | 17.3% |
| | Column % | 76.7% | 86.9% | 17.0% | 23.3% | 13.1% | 13.2% |
| Total | Count | 290 | 217 | 507 | 99 | 37 | 136 |
| | Row % | 57.2% | 42.8% | 78.8% | 72.8% | 27.2% | 21.2% |

| Coach Level | | ALL | | |
|-------------|----------|------------|--------|-------|
| | | Non Parent | Parent | Total |
| L0 | Count | 32 | 5 | 37 |
| | Row % | 86.5% | 13.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 8.2% | 2.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 192 | 101 | 293 |
| | Row % | 65.5% | 34.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 49.4% | 39.8% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 122 | 87 | 209 |
| | Row % | 58.4% | 41.6% | 100% |
| | Column % | 31.4% | 34.3% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 43 | 61 | 104 |
| | Row % | 41.3% | 58.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 11.1% | 24.0% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 389 | 254 | 643 |
| | Row % | 60.5% | 39.5% | 100% |

Number of Children

- a) See Table 6-7 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex (only parents were considered) - Not significant.
- c) Group difference by coach level (only parents were considered) - Not significant.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex (only parents were considered) - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - In the 254 parents, most of them had got 1 (42.1% of all the parents) or 2 (46.5% of all the parents) kids. Neither sex nor coach level differences were identified.

Age of Children

- a) See Table 6-8 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Not significant.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant in both age of youngest child, $F(3, 246)=2.89$, and in age of eldest child, $F(3, 246)=3.09$.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean age of the youngest child and the eldest child were 9.27 years (s.d.=7.07 years) and 11.88 years (s.d.=8.21 years) respectively. Males and females did not differ. L0 coaches had got the smallest mean of youngest child (mean=5.60 years, s.d.=6.43years) as well as eldest child (mean=7.0 years, s.d.=6.04 years), whereas L3 coaches had got the largest mean of youngest child (mean=10.56 years, s.d.7.59 years) as well as eldest child (mean=13.21 years, s.d.=8.68 years). L1 and L2 coaches did not differ much.

Table 6-7. (cont.)

| | | ALL | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|-------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------|
| | | L0 children | 1 child | 2 children | 3 children | 4 children | 5 children | Total |
| L0 | Count | 32 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 86.5% | 5.4% | 8.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 8.2% | 1.9% | 2.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 192 | 46 | 41 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 293 |
| | Row % | 65.5% | 15.7% | 14.0% | 3.4% | 1.0% | 0.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 49.4% | 43.0% | 34.7% | 45.5% | 75.0% | 33.3% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 122 | 37 | 40 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 209 |
| | Row % | 58.4% | 17.7% | 19.1% | 3.8% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 31.4% | 34.6% | 33.9% | 36.4% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 43 | 22 | 34 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 104 |
| | Row % | 41.3% | 21.2% | 32.7% | 3.8% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 11.1% | 20.6% | 28.8% | 18.2% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 389 | 107 | 118 | 22 | 4 | 3 | 643 |
| | Row % | 60.5% | 16.6% | 18.4% | 3.4% | 0.6% | 0.5% | 100% |

Table 6-8. Age of children of subject.

| | L0 | | | | L1 | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|---------------|-------|-------------|------|---------------|-------|
| | Male (n=4) | | Female (n=1) | | Male (n=88) | | Female (n=13) | |
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| Age of Youngest Child (years) | 6.25 | 7.23 | 3.00 | | 8.47 | 6.08 | 13.08 | 8.71 |
| Age of Eldest Child (years) | 8.00 | 6.48 | 3.00 | | 11.24 | 7.15 | 16.00 | 9.86 |
| | L2 | | | | L3 | | | |
| | Male (n=72) | | Female (n=15) | | Male (n=53) | | Female (n=8) | |
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| Age of Youngest Child (years) | 9.03 | 7.11 | 7.67 | 7.79 | 9.92 | 7.51 | 15.00 | 6.99 |
| Age of Eldest Child (years) | 11.82 | 8.53 | 8.60 | 8.26 | 12.66 | 8.85 | 16.88 | 6.81 |
| | L0 (n=5) | | L1 (n=101) | | L2 (n=87) | | L3 (n=61) | |
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| | Age of Youngest Child (years) | 5.60 | 6.43 | 9.06 | 6.61 | 8.79 | 7.20 | 10.59 |
| Age of Eldest Child (years) | 7.00 | 6.04 | 11.85 | 7.66 | 11.26 | 8.52 | 13.21 | 8.68 |
| | Male (n=217) | | Female (n=37) | | ALL (n=254) | | | |
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | |
| | Age of Youngest Child (years) | 8.97 | 6.80 | 11.03 | 8.36 | 9.27 | 7.07 | |
| Age of Eldest Child (years) | 11.72 | 8.03 | 12.84 | 9.24 | 11.88 | 8.21 | | |

Monthly Income

- a) See Table 6-9 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $F(1, 551)=4.56$
- c) Group difference by coach level - Not significant.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean main employment income was found to be HK\$21350 (s.d.=13260). Sex was found to have main effect on main employment income. On the whole, males were found to have higher income (mean=HK\$22090, s.d.=HK\$14010) than females (mean=HK\$18000, s.d.=HK\$8430). Since the coach level difference was not significant, the finding that mean income of L0 coaches greater than that of L1 coaches was not further considered.

Table 6-9. Main employment income of subjects (HK\$1000 per month) .

| Subgroup | | | | Subgroup | | | |
|-----------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------------------------|--|-------|-------|
| by coach level by sex | | Mean | s.d. | by coach level or by sex | | Mean | s.d. |
| L0 | Male | 23.46 | 17.62 | L0 | | 22.70 | 16.76 |
| | Female | 20.30 | 14.90 | L1 | | 19.41 | 11.07 |
| L1 | Male | 19.87 | 12.14 | L2 | | 21.63 | 11.35 |
| | Female | 17.68 | 5.23 | L3 | | 25.50 | 19.07 |
| L2 | Male | 22.48 | 11.77 | Male | | 22.09 | 14.01 |
| | Female | 17.00 | 7.23 | Female | | 18.00 | 8.43 |
| L3 | Male | 26.41 | 19.60 | ALL | | 21.35 | 13.26 |
| | Female | 20.34 | 15.23 | | | | |

Main Employment Occupation

- a) See Table 6-10 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $\chi^2 = 70.17$, 9df.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $\chi^2 = 65.09$, 27df.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant sex difference found in coach level subgroups L1 ($\chi^2 = 52.37$, 9df), L2 ($\chi^2 = 14.85$, 7df), and L3 ($\chi^2 = 21.76$, 8df).
- e) Highlight - 78.7% of all subjects' worked in service sector¹⁰. Only 14.8% of all subjects worked in manufacturing industries. It could be seen that, other than those who worked in the government (20.1% of all the subjects indicated that they were government servants, but they did not specify what work they did), large portion of the coaches were employed in education sector (24.1% of all subjects) and recreation and sport (12.7% of all subjects). The top 3 main employment occupation of the whole sample were education (24.1%), government service (20.1%), and manufacturing (14.8%). Males and females showed different pattern of main employment. Coaches of different levels also differ. Percentage of coaches working in education was greater in females (44.3% of all the females) than in males (19.0% of all the males). Education was the top in female subgroup (44.3%) and the second top in male subgroup (19.0%). Government service was the top in male subgroup (22.7%) and the third top in female subgroup (9.8%). Although coach level differences were identified by the Chi Square Test, Education ranked top in all 4 coach level subgroups.

¹⁰ Occupations categorized in the service sector are sales / restaurant / hotel, transport / storage / communication, finance / business / real estate, government service / personal service, education, recreation and sport. See also page 460 of the Year Book of Hong Kong 1997.

Table 6-10. Main employment occupation of subjects (with row%).

| | | Male | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Coach Level | | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Ret | Total |
| L0 | Count | 6 | | | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 23 |
| | Row % | 26.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 21.7% | 21.7% | 4.3% | 8.7% | 17.4% | 0.0% | 69.7% |
| L1 | Count | 21 | 13 | 17 | 54 | 31 | 18 | 43 | 19 | 1 | 217 |
| | Row % | 9.7% | 6.0% | 7.8% | 24.9% | 14.3% | 8.3% | 19.8% | 8.8% | 0.5% | 78.1% |
| L2 | Count | 16 | 9 | 18 | 36 | 36 | 18 | 28 | 1 | | 162 |
| | Row % | 9.9% | 5.6% | 11.1% | 22.2% | 22.2% | 11.1% | 17.3% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 82.7% |
| L3 | Count | 9 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 8 | | 1 | 83 |
| | Row % | 10.8% | 2.4% | 9.6% | 18.1% | 24.1% | 24.1% | 9.6% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 83.0% |
| Total | Count | 52 | 24 | 43 | 110 | 92 | 57 | 81 | 24 | 2 | 485 |
| | Row % | 10.7% | 4.9% | 8.9% | 22.7% | 19.0% | 11.8% | 16.7% | 4.9% | 0.4% | 100% |
| | | Female | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Ret | Total |
| L0 | Count | 1 | | 2 | | 5 | | | 2 | | 10 |
| | Row % | 10.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 30.3% |
| L1 | Count | 2 | | 4 | 5 | 30 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 61 |
| | Row % | 3.3% | 0.0% | 6.6% | 8.2% | 49.2% | 13.1% | 6.6% | 9.8% | 3.3% | 21.9% |
| L2 | Count | 3 | | 1 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 2 | | 34 |
| | Row % | 8.8% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 14.7% | 26.5% | 26.5% | 14.7% | 5.9% | 0.0% | 17.3% |
| L3 | Count | | | | 2 | 10 | 3 | | | 2 | 17 |
| | Row % | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.8% | 58.8% | 17.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.8% | 17.0% |
| Total | Count | 6 | | 7 | 12 | 54 | 20 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 122 |
| | Row % | 4.9% | 0.0% | 5.7% | 9.8% | 44.3% | 16.4% | 7.4% | 8.2% | 3.3% | 100% |
| | | ALL | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Ret | Total |
| L0 | Count | 7 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 33 |
| | Row % | 21.2% | 0.0% | 6.1% | 15.2% | 30.3% | 3.0% | 6.1% | 18.2% | 0.0% | 100% |
| L1 | Count | 23 | 13 | 21 | 59 | 61 | 26 | 47 | 25 | 3 | 278 |
| | Row % | 8.3% | 4.7% | 7.6% | 21.2% | 21.9% | 9.4% | 16.9% | 9.0% | 1.1% | 100% |
| L2 | Count | 19 | 9 | 19 | 41 | 45 | 27 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 196 |
| | Row % | 9.7% | 4.6% | 9.7% | 20.9% | 23.0% | 13.8% | 16.8% | 1.5% | 0.0% | 100% |
| L3 | Count | 9 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 30 | 23 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 100 |
| | Row % | 9.0% | 2.0% | 8.0% | 17.0% | 30.0% | 23.0% | 8.0% | 0.0% | 3.0% | 100% |
| Total | Count | 58 | 24 | 50 | 122 | 146 | 77 | 90 | 34 | 6 | 607 |
| | Row % | 9.6% | 4.0% | 8.2% | 20.1% | 24.1% | 12.7% | 14.8% | 5.6% | 1.0% | 100% |

Note. Sal: Sales / Restaurant / Hotel; Tra: Transport / Storage / Communication; Fin: Finance / Business / Real Estate; Gov: Govt / Social / Personal Services; Edu: Education Rec: Recreation & Sport; Man: Manufacturing/Construction/Technology; Stu: Students; Hou: House Wives; Ret: Retired Persons.

Table 6-11. Main employment occupation of subjects (with column%).

| | | Male | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Coach Level | | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Ret | Total |
| L0 | Count | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 23 |
| | Column % | 11.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.5% | 5.4% | 1.8% | 2.5% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 4.7% |
| L1 | Count | 21 | 13 | 17 | 54 | 31 | 18 | 43 | 19 | 1 | 217 |
| | Column % | 40.4% | 54.2% | 39.5% | 49.1% | 33.7% | 31.6% | 53.1% | 79.2% | 50.0% | 44.7% |
| L2 | Count | 16 | 9 | 18 | 36 | 36 | 18 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 162 |
| | Column % | 30.8% | 37.5% | 41.9% | 32.7% | 39.1% | 31.6% | 34.6% | 4.2% | 0.0% | 33.4% |
| L3 | Count | 9 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 83 |
| | Column % | 17.3% | 8.3% | 18.6% | 13.6% | 21.7% | 35.1% | 9.9% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 17.1% |
| Total | Count | 52 | 24 | 43 | 110 | 92 | 57 | 81 | 24 | 2 | 485 |
| | | Female | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Ret | Total |
| L0 | Count | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| | Column % | 16.7% | --- | 28.6% | 0.0% | 9.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 8.2% |
| L1 | Count | 2 | | 4 | 5 | 30 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 61 |
| | Column % | 33.3% | --- | 57.1% | 41.7% | 55.6% | 40.0% | 44.4% | 60.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% |
| L2 | Count | 3 | | 1 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 34 |
| | Column % | 50.0% | --- | 14.3% | 41.7% | 16.7% | 45.0% | 55.6% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 27.9% |
| L3 | Count | | | | 2 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| | Column % | 0.0% | --- | 0.0% | 16.7% | 18.5% | 15.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 13.9% |
| Total | Count | 6 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 54 | 20 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 122 |
| | | ALL | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Ret | Total |
| L0 | Count | 7 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 33 |
| | Column % | 12.1% | 0.0% | 4.0% | 4.1% | 6.8% | 1.3% | 2.2% | 17.6% | 0.0% | 5.4% |
| L1 | Count | 23 | 13 | 21 | 59 | 61 | 26 | 47 | 25 | 3 | 278 |
| | Column % | 39.7% | 54.2% | 42.0% | 48.4% | 41.8% | 33.8% | 52.2% | 73.5% | 50.0% | 45.8% |
| L2 | Count | 19 | 9 | 19 | 41 | 45 | 27 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 196 |
| | Column % | 32.8% | 37.5% | 38.0% | 33.6% | 30.8% | 35.1% | 36.7% | 8.8% | 0.0% | 32.3% |
| L3 | Count | 9 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 30 | 23 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 100 |
| | Column % | 15.5% | 8.3% | 16.0% | 13.9% | 20.5% | 29.9% | 8.9% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 16.5% |
| Total | Count | 58 | 24 | 50 | 122 | 146 | 77 | 90 | 34 | 6 | 607 |

Note. Sal: Sales / Restaurant / Hotel; Tra: Transport / Storage / Communication; Fin: Finance / Business / Real Estate; Gov: Govt / Social / Personal Services; Edu: Education Rec: Recreation & Sport; Man: Manufacturing/Construction/Technology; Stu: Students; Hou: House Wives; Ret: Retired Persons.

Main Employment Job

- a) See Table 6-12 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $\chi^2 = 60.73$, 10df.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $\chi^2 = 75.80$, 30df.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant in subgroups L1 ($\chi^2 = 58.43$, 10df) and L3 ($\chi^2 = 17.46$, 9df).
- e) Highlight - Only 6.8% of the subjects were full-time coaches. The top 3 employment jobs were technicians/professional staff (21.9%), teachers with certificates in physical education/sport (20.9%), and clerical/administrative officers (20.6%). Males and females differ in this regard. In males, the top 3 employment jobs were technicians/professional staff (25.2%), clerical/administrative officers (21.9%), and teachers with certificates in physical education/sport (15.5%), whereas, in females, the subjects were mainly teachers with certificates in physical education/sport (42.6%) and clerical/administrative officers (21.9%). Such difference also occurred in different coach level. In all female coach level subgroups, teachers with certificates in physical education/sport got the greatest percentage, whereas, in males, different employment jobs were found to be dominant in different coach level subgroups. In elementary coaches (L0 and L1 coaches), technician/professional staffs got the highest percentage. In intermediate coaches (L2 coaches), clerical/administrative officers got the highest percentage. In advanced coaches (L3 coaches), both teachers with certificates in physical education/sport got the greatest percentage and clerical/administrative officers got the highest percentage ranked top.

Table 6-12. Main employment job of subjects (with row%).

| | | Male | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Coach Level | | Coa | Rec | St | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
| L0 | Count | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 23 |
| | Row % | 4.3% | 0.0% | 17.4% | 13.0% | 4.3% | 4.3% | 21.7% | 17.4% | 13.0% | 4.3% | 0.0% | 69.7% |
| L1 | Count | 3 | 6 | 19 | 25 | 6 | 11 | 69 | 44 | 17 | 4 | 13 | 217 |
| | Row % | 1.4% | 2.8% | 8.8% | 11.5% | 2.8% | 5.1% | 31.8% | 20.3% | 7.8% | 1.8% | 6.0% | 78.1% |
| L2 | Count | 9 | 8 | 1 | 29 | 6 | 7 | 37 | 40 | 15 | 2 | 8 | 162 |
| | Row % | 5.6% | 4.9% | 0.6% | 17.9% | 3.7% | 4.3% | 22.8% | 24.7% | 9.3% | 1.2% | 4.9% | 82.7% |
| L3 | Count | 17 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 83 |
| | Row % | 20.5% | 3.6% | 0.0% | 21.7% | 1.2% | 4.8% | 13.3% | 21.7% | 6.0% | 3.6% | 3.6% | 83.0% |
| Total | Count | 30 | 17 | 24 | 75 | 14 | 23 | 122 | 106 | 40 | 10 | 24 | 485 |
| | Row % | 6.2% | 3.5% | 4.9% | 15.5% | 2.9% | 4.7% | 25.2% | 21.9% | 8.2% | 2.1% | 4.9% | 100% |
| | | Female | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Coa | Rec | St | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
| L0 | Count | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | Row % | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.3% |
| L1 | Count | 5 | 3 | 6 | 29 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 61 |
| | Row % | 8.2% | 4.9% | 9.8% | 47.5% | 1.6% | 3.3% | 4.9% | 11.5% | 4.9% | 0.0% | 3.3% | 21.9% |
| L2 | Count | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 34 |
| | Row % | 11.8% | 8.8% | 5.9% | 26.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.8% | 29.4% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 17.3% |
| L3 | Count | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 |
| | Row % | 11.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 52.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 17.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 17.6% | 17.0% |
| Total | Count | 11 | 6 | 10 | 52 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 122 |
| | Row % | 9.0% | 4.9% | 8.2% | 42.6% | 0.8% | 1.6% | 9.0% | 15.6% | 2.5% | 0.8% | 4.9% | 100% |
| | | ALL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Coa | Rec | St | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
| L0 | Count | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 33 |
| | Row % | 3.0% | 0.0% | 18.2% | 24.2% | 3.0% | 3.0% | 18.2% | 18.2% | 9.1% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 100% |
| L1 | Count | 8 | 9 | 25 | 54 | 7 | 13 | 72 | 51 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 278 |
| | Row % | 2.9% | 3.2% | 9.0% | 19.4% | 2.5% | 4.7% | 25.9% | 18.3% | 7.2% | 1.4% | 5.4% | 100% |
| L2 | Count | 13 | 11 | 3 | 38 | 6 | 7 | 41 | 50 | 15 | 3 | 9 | 196 |
| | Row % | 6.6% | 5.6% | 1.5% | 19.4% | 3.1% | 3.6% | 20.9% | 25.5% | 7.7% | 1.5% | 4.6% | 100% |
| L3 | Count | 19 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 100 |
| | Row % | 19.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 27.0% | 1.0% | 4.0% | 14.0% | 18.0% | 5.0% | 3.0% | 6.0% | 100% |
| Total | Count | 41 | 23 | 34 | 127 | 15 | 25 | 133 | 125 | 43 | 11 | 30 | 607 |
| | Row % | 6.8% | 3.8% | 5.6% | 20.9% | 2.5% | 4.1% | 21.9% | 20.6% | 7.1% | 1.8% | 4.9% | 100% |

Note. Coa: Coaches / Instructors; Rec: Recreation / Sport Officers; Stu: Students; Tpe: Teachers(Holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Tea: Teachers(Not holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Dis: Discipline Forces; Tec: Technicians / Professional Staff; Cle: Clerical / Administrative Officers; Own: Owner of Businesses; Oth: Others.

Table 6-13. Main employment job of subjects (with column%).

| | | Male | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Coach Level | | Coa | Rec | St | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
| L0 | Count | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 23 |
| | Column % | 3.3% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 4.0% | 7.1% | 4.3% | 4.1% | 3.8% | 7.5% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 4.7% |
| L1 | Count | 3 | 6 | 19 | 25 | 6 | 11 | 69 | 44 | 17 | 4 | 13 | 217 |
| | Column % | 10.0% | 35.3% | 79.2% | 33.3% | 42.9% | 47.8% | 56.6% | 41.5% | 42.5% | 40.0% | 54.2% | 44.7% |
| L2 | Count | 9 | 8 | 1 | 29 | 6 | 7 | 37 | 40 | 15 | 2 | 8 | 162 |
| | Column % | 30.0% | 47.1% | 4.2% | 38.7% | 42.9% | 30.4% | 30.3% | 37.7% | 37.5% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 33.4% |
| L3 | Count | 17 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 83 |
| | Column % | 56.7% | 17.6% | 0.0% | 24.0% | 7.1% | 17.4% | 9.0% | 17.0% | 12.5% | 30.0% | 12.5% | 17.1% |
| Total | Count | 30 | 17 | 24 | 75 | 14 | 23 | 122 | 106 | 40 | 10 | 24 | 485 |
| | | Female | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Coa | Rec | St | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
| L0 | Count | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | Column % | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 9.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 10.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.2% |
| L1 | Count | 5 | 3 | 6 | 29 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 61 |
| | Column % | 45.5% | 50.0% | 60.0% | 55.8% | 100% | 100% | 27.3% | 36.8% | 100% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 50.0% |
| L2 | Count | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 34 |
| | Column % | 36.4% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 17.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 36.4% | 52.6% | 0.0% | 100% | 16.7% | 27.9% |
| L3 | Count | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 |
| | Column % | 18.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 17.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 27.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 13.9% |
| Total | Count | 11 | 6 | 10 | 52 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 122 |
| | | ALL | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coach Level | | Coa | Rec | St | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
| L0 | Count | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 33 |
| | Column % | 2.4% | 0.0% | 17.6% | 6.3% | 6.7% | 4.0% | 4.5% | 4.8% | 7.0% | 9.1% | 0.0% | 5.4% |
| L1 | Count | 8 | 9 | 25 | 54 | 7 | 13 | 72 | 51 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 278 |
| | Column % | 19.5% | 39.1% | 73.5% | 42.5% | 46.7% | 52.0% | 54.1% | 40.8% | 46.5% | 36.4% | 50.0% | 45.8% |
| L2 | Count | 13 | 11 | 3 | 38 | 6 | 7 | 41 | 50 | 15 | 3 | 9 | 196 |
| | Column % | 31.7% | 47.8% | 8.8% | 29.9% | 40.0% | 28.0% | 30.8% | 40.0% | 34.9% | 27.3% | 30.0% | 32.3% |
| L3 | Count | 19 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 100 |
| | Column % | 46.3% | 13.0% | 0.0% | 21.3% | 6.7% | 16.0% | 10.5% | 14.4% | 11.6% | 27.3% | 20.0% | 16.5% |
| Total | Count | 41 | 23 | 34 | 127 | 15 | 25 | 133 | 125 | 43 | 11 | 30 | 607 |

Note. Coa: Coaches / Instructors; Rec: Recreation / Sport Officers; Stu: Students; Tpe: Teachers(Holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Tea: Teachers(Not holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Dis: Discipline Forces; Tec: Technicians / Professional Staff; Cle: Clerical / Administrative Officers; Own: Owner of Businesses; Oth: Others.

Coach Education in General Sport Theory

- a) See Table 6-14 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Not significant.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant in HKCAP Level 2 Certificate ($\chi^2 = 327.58, 3df$) and Level 3 Certificate ($\chi^2 = 280.98, 3df$).
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Percentages of coaches holding HKCAP Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 Certificate in general sport theory were found to be 56.5%, 30.5%, and 7.8% respectively. Male and females did not differ. 73.7% of L1 coaches hold HKCAP Level 1 General Theory Certificate. 72.7% of L2 coaches hold HKCAP Level 2 General Theory Certificate. However, less than half (i.e. 48.1%) of L3 coaches hold HKCAP Level 3 General Theory Certificate. Again, males and females did not differ in this regard.

Table 6-14. General sport theory qualification of subjects.

| | | Holding HKCAP General Sport Theory Level 1 Certificate | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| Coach Level | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 25 | 1 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 36 | 1 | 37 |
| | Row % | 96.2% | 3.8% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 97.3% | 2.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 11.2% | 0.4% | 5.1% | 19.6% | 0.0% | 8.1% | 12.9% | 0.3% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 60 | 166 | 226 | 17 | 50 | 67 | 77 | 216 | 293 |
| | Row % | 26.5% | 73.5% | 77.1% | 25.4% | 74.6% | 22.9% | 26.3% | 73.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 26.8% | 58.7% | 44.6% | 30.4% | 62.5% | 49.3% | 27.5% | 59.5% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 83 | 86 | 169 | 19 | 21 | 40 | 102 | 107 | 209 |
| | Row % | 49.1% | 50.9% | 80.9% | 47.5% | 52.5% | 19.1% | 48.8% | 51.2% | 100% |
| | Column % | 37.1% | 30.4% | 33.3% | 33.9% | 26.3% | 29.4% | 36.4% | 29.5% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 56 | 30 | 86 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 65 | 39 | 104 |
| | Row % | 65.1% | 34.9% | 82.7% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 17.3% | 62.5% | 37.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 25.0% | 10.6% | 17.0% | 16.1% | 11.3% | 13.2% | 23.2% | 10.7% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 224 | 283 | 507 | 56 | 80 | 136 | 280 | 363 | 643 |
| | Row % | 44.2% | 55.8% | 78.8% | 41.2% | 58.8% | 21.2% | 43.5% | 56.5% | 100% |

| | | Holding HKCAP General Sport Theory Level 2 Certificate | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| Coach Level | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 11.6% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 19.6% | 0.0% | 8.1% | 13.2% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 226 | 0 | 226 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 293 | 0 | 293 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 77.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 100.9% | 0.0% | 44.6% | 119.6% | 0.0% | 49.3% | 104.6% | 0.0% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 47 | 122 | 169 | 10 | 30 | 40 | 57 | 152 | 209 |
| | Row % | 27.8% | 72.2% | 80.9% | 25.0% | 75.0% | 19.1% | 27.3% | 72.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 21.0% | 43.1% | 33.3% | 17.9% | 37.5% | 29.4% | 20.4% | 41.9% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 50 | 36 | 86 | 10 | 8 | 18 | 60 | 44 | 104 |
| | Row % | 58.1% | 41.9% | 82.7% | 55.6% | 44.4% | 17.3% | 57.7% | 42.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 22.3% | 12.7% | 17.0% | 17.9% | 10.0% | 13.2% | 21.4% | 12.1% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 349 | 158 | 507 | 98 | 38 | 136 | 447 | 196 | 643 |
| | Row % | 68.8% | 31.2% | 78.8% | 72.1% | 27.9% | 21.2% | 69.5% | 30.5% | 100% |

Table 6-14. (cont.)

| Coach Level | | Holding HKCAP General Sport Theory Level 3 Certificate | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 11.6% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 19.6% | 0.0% | 8.1% | 13.2% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 226 | 0 | 226 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 293 | 0 | 293 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 77.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 100.9% | 0.0% | 44.6% | 119.6% | 0.0% | 49.3% | 104.6% | 0.0% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 169 | 0 | 169 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 209 | 0 | 209 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 80.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 19.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 75.4% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 71.4% | 0.0% | 29.4% | 74.6% | 0.0% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 45 | 41 | 86 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 54 | 50 | 104 |
| | Row % | 52.3% | 47.7% | 82.7% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 17.3% | 51.9% | 48.1% | 100% |
| | Column % | 20.1% | 14.5% | 17.0% | 16.1% | 11.3% | 13.2% | 19.3% | 13.8% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 466 | 41 | 507 | 127 | 9 | 136 | 593 | 50 | 643 |
| | Row % | 91.9% | 8.1% | 78.8% | 93.4% | 6.6% | 21.2% | 92.2% | 7.8% | 100% |

Qualifications in Physical Education

- a) See Table 6-15 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant only in the qualification of certificate/diploma ($\chi^2 = 38.88$, 1df). The percentage of females hold this qualification (39.7%) was greater than that of the males (15.4%).
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant in the qualification of advanced certificate/diploma ($\chi^2 = 19.76$, 3df) and the qualification of bachelor degree ($\chi^2 = 30.98$, 3df). In both cases, the higher the coach level, the higher percentage of subjects were found holding the qualifications (i.e. L3 > L2 > L1 > L0).
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant only in the qualification of certificate/diploma. Sex differences were found in L0 subgroup ($\chi^2 = 5.25$, 1df), L1 subgroup ($\chi^2 = 24.42$, 1df), and L2 subgroup ($\chi^2 = 7.43$, 1df).
- e) Highlight - 20.5% of all subjects hold the basic qualifications (i.e. certificate/diploma) of teaching physical education. Only 6.4% of all subjects held a degree and the numbers of coaches holding master degree and doctoral degree were very few (i.e. 4, and 1 respectively).

Table 6-15. Teaching physical education qualifications of subjects.

| Coach Level | | Holding Certificate / Diploma in Physical Education | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 23 | 3 | 26 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 29 | 8 | 37 |
| | Row % | 88.5% | 11.5% | 70.3% | 54.5% | 45.5% | 29.7% | 78.4% | 21.6% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.4% | 3.8% | 5.1% | 7.3% | 9.3% | 8.1% | 5.7% | 6.1% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 192 | 34 | 226 | 38 | 29 | 67 | 230 | 63 | 293 |
| | Row % | 85.0% | 15.0% | 77.1% | 56.7% | 43.3% | 22.9% | 78.5% | 21.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 44.8% | 43.6% | 44.6% | 46.3% | 53.7% | 49.3% | 45.0% | 47.7% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 145 | 24 | 169 | 27 | 13 | 40 | 172 | 37 | 209 |
| | Row % | 85.8% | 14.2% | 80.9% | 67.5% | 32.5% | 19.1% | 82.3% | 17.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.8% | 30.8% | 33.3% | 32.9% | 24.1% | 29.4% | 33.7% | 28.0% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 69 | 17 | 86 | 11 | 7 | 18 | 80 | 24 | 104 |
| | Row % | 80.2% | 19.8% | 82.7% | 61.1% | 38.9% | 17.3% | 76.9% | 23.1% | 100% |
| | Column % | 16.1% | 21.8% | 17.0% | 13.4% | 13.0% | 13.2% | 15.7% | 18.2% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 429 | 78 | 507 | 82 | 54 | 136 | 511 | 132 | 643 |
| | Row % | 84.6% | 15.4% | 78.8% | 60.3% | 39.7% | 21.2% | 79.5% | 20.5% | 100% |

| Coach Level | | Holding Advanced Certificate / Diploma in Physical Education | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.3% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 8.6% | 0.0% | 8.1% | 6.0% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 223 | 3 | 226 | 65 | 2 | 67 | 288 | 5 | 293 |
| | Row % | 98.7% | 1.3% | 77.1% | 97.0% | 3.0% | 22.9% | 98.3% | 1.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 45.9% | 14.3% | 44.6% | 50.8% | 25.0% | 49.3% | 46.9% | 17.2% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 160 | 9 | 169 | 37 | 3 | 40 | 197 | 12 | 209 |
| | Row % | 94.7% | 5.3% | 80.9% | 92.5% | 7.5% | 19.1% | 94.3% | 5.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 32.9% | 42.9% | 33.3% | 28.9% | 37.5% | 29.4% | 32.1% | 41.4% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 77 | 9 | 86 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 92 | 12 | 104 |
| | Row % | 89.5% | 10.5% | 82.7% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 17.3% | 88.5% | 11.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 15.8% | 42.9% | 17.0% | 11.7% | 37.5% | 13.2% | 15.0% | 41.4% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 486 | 21 | 507 | 128 | 8 | 136 | 614 | 29 | 643 |
| | Row % | 95.9% | 4.1% | 78.8% | 94.1% | 5.9% | 21.2% | 95.5% | 4.5% | 100% |

Table 6-15. (cont.)

| Coach Level | | Holding Bachelor Degree in Physical Education | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 36 | 1 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 90.9% | 9.1% | 29.7% | 97.3% | 2.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.5% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 7.9% | 11.1% | 8.1% | 6.0% | 2.4% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 221 | 5 | 226 | 63 | 4 | 67 | 284 | 9 | 293 |
| | Row % | 97.8% | 2.2% | 77.1% | 94.0% | 6.0% | 22.9% | 96.9% | 3.1% | 100% |
| | Column % | 46.5% | 15.6% | 44.6% | 49.6% | 44.4% | 49.3% | 47.2% | 22.0% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 158 | 11 | 169 | 39 | 1 | 40 | 197 | 12 | 209 |
| | Row % | 93.5% | 6.5% | 80.9% | 97.5% | 2.5% | 19.1% | 94.3% | 5.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.3% | 34.4% | 33.3% | 30.7% | 11.1% | 29.4% | 32.7% | 29.3% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 70 | 16 | 86 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 85 | 19 | 104 |
| | Row % | 81.4% | 18.6% | 82.7% | 83.3% | 16.7% | 17.3% | 81.7% | 18.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 14.7% | 50.0% | 17.0% | 11.8% | 33.3% | 13.2% | 14.1% | 46.3% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 475 | 32 | 507 | 127 | 9 | 136 | 602 | 41 | 643 |
| | Row % | 93.7% | 6.3% | 78.8% | 93.4% | 6.6% | 21.2% | 93.6% | 6.4% | 100% |

| Coach Level | | Holding Master Degree in Physical Education | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.1% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 8.1% | 0.0% | 8.1% | 5.8% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 226 | 0 | 226 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 293 | 0 | 293 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 77.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 44.8% | 0.0% | 44.6% | 49.6% | 0.0% | 49.3% | 45.8% | 0.0% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 168 | 1 | 169 | 39 | 1 | 40 | 207 | 2 | 209 |
| | Row % | 99.4% | 0.6% | 80.9% | 97.5% | 2.5% | 19.1% | 99.0% | 1.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.3% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 28.9% | 100% | 29.4% | 32.3% | 66.7% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 85 | 1 | 86 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 103 | 1 | 104 |
| | Row % | 98.8% | 1.2% | 82.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 17.3% | 99.0% | 1.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 16.8% | 50.0% | 17.0% | 13.3% | 0.0% | 13.2% | 16.1% | 33.3% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 505 | 2 | 507 | 135 | 1 | 136 | 640 | 3 | 643 |
| | Row % | 99.6% | 0.4% | 78.8% | 99.3% | 0.7% | 21.2% | 99.5% | 0.5% | 100% |

Table 6-15. (cont.)

| Coach Level | | Holding Doctoral Degree in Physical Education | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.1% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 8.1% | — | 8.1% | 5.8% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 226 | 0 | 226 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 293 | 0 | 293 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 77.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 44.7% | 0.0% | 44.6% | 49.3% | — | 49.3% | 45.6% | 0.0% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 168 | 1 | 169 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 208 | 1 | 209 |
| | Row % | 99.4% | 0.6% | 80.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 19.1% | 99.5% | 0.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.2% | 100% | 33.3% | 29.4% | — | 29.4% | 32.4% | 100% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 86 | 0 | 86 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 104 | 0 | 104 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 82.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 17.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 17.0% | 0.0% | 17.0% | 13.2% | — | 13.2% | 16.2% | 0.0% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 506 | 1 | 507 | 136 | 0 | 136 | 642 | 1 | 643 |
| | Row % | 99.8% | 0.2% | 78.8% | 100% | 0.0% | 21.2% | 99.8% | 0.2% | 100% |

Qualifications in Sport / Recreation

- a) See Table 6-16 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant only in the qualification of certificate/diploma ($\chi^2 = 6.38$, 1df). The percentage of females hold this qualification (17.6%) was greater than that of the males (9.9%).
- c) Group difference by coach level - Not significant.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant only in the qualification of certificate/diploma. Sex differences were found in L2 subgroup ($\chi^2 = 10.30$, 1df).
- e) Highlight - 11.5% of all subjects hold the basic qualifications (i.e. certificate/diploma) of teaching physical education. Only 1.1% of all subjects held a degree in sport/recreation. Not even one held a master degree or doctoral degree.

Table 6-16. Sport / recreation qualification of subjects.

| Coach Level | | Holding Certificate / Diploma in Sport / Recreation | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 24 | 2 | 26 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 34 | 3 | 37 |
| | Row % | 92.3% | 7.7% | 70.3% | 90.9% | 9.1% | 29.7% | 91.9% | 8.1% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.3% | 4.0% | 5.1% | 8.9% | 4.2% | 8.1% | 6.0% | 4.1% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 207 | 19 | 226 | 59 | 8 | 67 | 266 | 27 | 293 |
| | Row % | 91.6% | 8.4% | 77.1% | 88.1% | 11.9% | 22.9% | 90.8% | 9.2% | 100% |
| | Column % | 45.3% | 38.0% | 44.6% | 52.7% | 33.3% | 49.3% | 46.7% | 36.5% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 154 | 15 | 169 | 29 | 11 | 40 | 183 | 26 | 209 |
| | Row % | 91.1% | 8.9% | 80.9% | 72.5% | 27.5% | 19.1% | 87.6% | 12.4% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.7% | 30.0% | 33.3% | 25.9% | 45.8% | 29.4% | 32.2% | 35.1% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 72 | 14 | 86 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 86 | 18 | 104 |
| | Row % | 83.7% | 16.3% | 82.7% | 77.8% | 22.2% | 17.3% | 82.7% | 17.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 15.8% | 28.0% | 17.0% | 12.5% | 16.7% | 13.2% | 15.1% | 24.3% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 457 | 50 | 507 | 112 | 24 | 136 | 569 | 74 | 643 |
| | Row % | 90.1% | 9.9% | 78.8% | 82.4% | 17.6% | 21.2% | 88.5% | 11.5% | 100% |

| Coach Level | | Holding Bachelor Degree in Sport / Recreation | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 36 | 1 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 90.9% | 9.1% | 29.7% | 97.3% | 2.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.2% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 7.5% | 33.3% | 8.1% | 5.7% | 14.3% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 225 | 1 | 226 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 292 | 1 | 293 |
| | Row % | 99.6% | 0.4% | 77.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 99.7% | 0.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 44.7% | 25.0% | 44.6% | 50.4% | 0.0% | 49.3% | 45.9% | 14.3% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 168 | 1 | 169 | 39 | 1 | 40 | 207 | 2 | 209 |
| | Row % | 99.4% | 0.6% | 80.9% | 97.5% | 2.5% | 19.1% | 99.0% | 1.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.4% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 29.3% | 33.3% | 29.4% | 32.5% | 28.6% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 84 | 2 | 86 | 17 | 1 | 18 | 101 | 3 | 104 |
| | Row % | 97.7% | 2.3% | 82.7% | 94.4% | 5.6% | 17.3% | 97.1% | 2.9% | 100% |
| | Column % | 16.7% | 50.0% | 17.0% | 12.8% | 33.3% | 13.2% | 15.9% | 42.9% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 503 | 4 | 507 | 133 | 3 | 136 | 636 | 7 | 643 |
| | Row % | 99.2% | 0.8% | 78.8% | 97.8% | 2.2% | 21.2% | 98.9% | 1.1% | 100% |

Table 6-16 (cont.)

| Coach Level | | Holding Master Degree in Sport / Recreation | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.1% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 8.1% | — | 8.1% | 5.8% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 226 | 0 | 226 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 293 | 0 | 293 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 77.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 44.7% | 0.0% | 44.6% | 49.3% | — | 49.3% | 45.6% | 0.0% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 168 | 1 | 169 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 208 | 1 | 209 |
| | Row % | 99.4% | 0.6% | 80.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 19.1% | 99.5% | 0.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.2% | 100% | 33.3% | 29.4% | — | 29.4% | 32.4% | 100% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 86 | 0 | 86 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 104 | 0 | 104 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 82.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 17.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 17.0% | 0.0% | 17.0% | 13.2% | — | 13.2% | 16.2% | 0.0% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 506 | 1 | 507 | 136 | 0 | 136 | 642 | 1 | 643 |
| | Row % | 99.8% | 0.2% | 78.8% | 100% | 0.0% | 21.2% | 99.8% | 0.2% | 100% |

| Coach Level | | Holding Doctoral Degree in Sport / Recreation | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 26 | 0 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 70.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 29.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 5.1% | 0.0% | 5.1% | 8.1% | — | 8.1% | 5.8% | 0.0% | 5.8% |
| L1 | Count | 226 | 0 | 226 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 293 | 0 | 293 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 77.1% | 100% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 44.7% | 0.0% | 44.6% | 49.3% | — | 49.3% | 45.6% | 0.0% | 45.6% |
| L2 | Count | 168 | 1 | 169 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 208 | 1 | 209 |
| | Row % | 99.4% | 0.6% | 80.9% | 100% | 0.0% | 19.1% | 99.5% | 0.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 33.2% | 100% | 33.3% | 29.4% | — | 29.4% | 32.4% | 100% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 86 | 0 | 86 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 104 | 0 | 104 |
| | Row % | 100% | 0.0% | 82.7% | 100% | 0.0% | 17.3% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 17.0% | 0.0% | 17.0% | 13.2% | — | 13.2% | 16.2% | 0.0% | 16.2% |
| Total | Count | 506 | 1 | 507 | 136 | 0 | 136 | 642 | 1 | 643 |
| | Row % | 99.8% | 0.2% | 78.8% | 100% | 0.0% | 21.2% | 99.8% | 0.2% | 100% |

Sport Skill Proficiency¹¹

- a) See Table 6-17 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $\chi^2 = 7.40$, 2df.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $\chi^2 = 76.88$, 6df.
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant only in L0 subgroup ($\chi^2 = 9.16$, 2df).
- e) Highlight - On the whole, majority of the subjects thought that they were of mid level (77.7%) in sport skill proficiency. Only 18.5% of them thought that they were at high level. Greater percentage of males thought that they were at mid or above sport skill proficiency level. The percentage of males who perceived themselves as high, mid, and low level were 18.2%, 78.9%, and 2.9% respectively. The percentage of females who perceived themselves as high, mid, and low level were 19.7%, 73.2%, and 7.1% respectively. Greater percentages of females perceived themselves as either high level (16.7% of all females) or low level in sport skill proficiency. On the other hand, greater percentage of males thought that they were of mid level (88.6% of all males) compared to females (55.6%).

¹¹ Level of sport skill proficiency were categorized as High Level (Hong Kong Team athlete level), Mid-Level (elementary / intermediate / Hong Kong Junior Squad level), and Low Level (beginners level).

Table 6-17. Self-perceived sport proficiency of subjects.

| Coach Level | | Male | | | | Female | | | |
|-------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | High | Mid | Low | Total | High | Mid | Low | Total |
| L0 | Count | 3 | 39 | 2 | 44 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 18 |
| | Row % | 6.8% | 88.6% | 4.5% | 71.0% | 16.7% | 55.6% | 27.8% | 29.0% |
| | Column % | 2.6% | 7.9% | 11.1% | 7.0% | 8.3% | 7.5% | 38.5% | 9.8% |
| L1 | Count | 29 | 241 | 8 | 278 | 10 | 78 | 5 | 93 |
| | Row % | 10.4% | 86.7% | 2.9% | 74.9% | 10.8% | 83.9% | 5.4% | 25.1% |
| | Column % | 25.4% | 48.7% | 44.4% | 44.3% | 27.8% | 58.2% | 38.5% | 50.8% |
| L2 | Count | 40 | 166 | 8 | 214 | 16 | 30 | 3 | 49 |
| | Row % | 18.7% | 77.6% | 3.7% | 81.4% | 32.7% | 61.2% | 6.1% | 18.6% |
| | Column % | 35.1% | 33.5% | 44.4% | 34.1% | 44.4% | 22.4% | 23.1% | 26.8% |
| L3 | Count | 42 | 49 | 0 | 91 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 23 |
| | Row % | 46.2% | 53.8% | 0.0% | 79.8% | 30.4% | 69.6% | 0.0% | 20.2% |
| | Column % | 36.8% | 9.9% | 0.0% | 14.5% | 19.4% | 11.9% | 0.0% | 12.6% |
| Total | Count | 114 | 495 | 18 | 627 | 36 | 134 | 13 | 183 |
| | Row % | 18.2% | 78.9% | 2.9% | 77.4% | 19.7% | 73.2% | 7.1% | 22.6% |

| Coach Level | | ALL | | | |
|-------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | High | Mid | Low | Total |
| L0 | Count | 6 | 49 | 7 | 62 |
| | Row % | 9.7% | 79.0% | 11.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 4.0% | 7.8% | 22.6% | 7.7% |
| L1 | Count | 39 | 319 | 13 | 371 |
| | Row % | 10.5% | 86.0% | 3.5% | 100% |
| | Column % | 26.0% | 50.7% | 41.9% | 45.8% |
| L2 | Count | 56 | 196 | 11 | 263 |
| | Row % | 21.3% | 74.5% | 4.2% | 100% |
| | Column % | 37.3% | 31.2% | 35.5% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 49 | 65 | 0 | 114 |
| | Row % | 43.0% | 57.0% | 0.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 32.7% | 10.3% | 0.0% | 14.1% |
| Total | Count | 150 | 629 | 31 | 810 |
| | Row % | 18.5% | 77.7% | 3.8% | 100% |

Note. Missing cases=41.

Experience in Different Coaching Duties

- a) See Table 6-18, Table 6-19, and Table 6-20 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant in the experience in school team ($\chi^2 = 7.11, 1df$) and in other courses ($\chi^2 = 14.95, 1df$).
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant in all three types of coaching duties. Their chi squares were $\chi^2 = 78.38, 3df$; $\chi^2 = 10.24, 3df$; $\chi^2 = 25.79, 3df$. The pattern was found to be the higher the coach level, the higher the percentage in relevant experience (i.e. $L0 < L1 < L2 < L3$).
- d) Group difference by coach level by sex - Significant only in coaching The Hong Kong team in L3 subgroup ($\chi^2 = 11.62, 1df$) (M > F, 47.4% vs 8.7%), in L1 subgroup in coaching school team ($\chi^2 = 7.83, 1df$) (F > M, 32.5% vs 48.4%), and in L1 subgroup in coaching other courses ($\chi^2 = 8.20, 1df$) (M > F, 79.7% vs 65.3%).
- e) Highlight - The percentages of subjects having experiences in coaching The Hong Kong team, school team, and other courses were 15.0%, 39.5%, and 77% respectively. Greater percentage of subjects in males served school teams (79.9%) compared with that in females (66.5%). But, greater percentage of subjects in females served in other courses (47.9%) compared with that in males (37.1%).

Table 6-18. Experience of subjects in coaching The Hong Kong team.

| Coach Level | | Having Experience in Coaching HK Team | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 42 | 3 | 45 | 18 | 1 | 19 | 60 | 4 | 64 |
| | Row % | 93.3% | 6.7% | 70.3% | 94.7% | 5.3% | 29.7% | 93.8% | 6.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 7.6% | 2.8% | 6.8% | 10.8% | 4.8% | 10.1% | 8.3% | 3.1% | 7.5% |
| L1 | Count | 273 | 22 | 295 | 87 | 8 | 95 | 360 | 30 | 390 |
| | Row % | 92.5% | 7.5% | 75.6% | 91.6% | 8.4% | 24.4% | 92.3% | 7.7% | 100% |
| | Column % | 49.1% | 20.6% | 44.5% | 52.1% | 38.1% | 50.5% | 49.8% | 23.4% | 45.8% |
| L2 | Count | 190 | 36 | 226 | 41 | 10 | 51 | 231 | 46 | 277 |
| | Row % | 84.1% | 15.9% | 81.6% | 80.4% | 19.6% | 18.4% | 83.4% | 16.6% | 100% |
| | Column % | 34.2% | 33.6% | 34.1% | 24.6% | 47.6% | 27.1% | 32.0% | 35.9% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 51 | 46 | 97 | 21 | 2 | 23 | 72 | 48 | 120 |
| | Row % | 52.6% | 47.4% | 80.8% | 91.3% | 8.7% | 19.2% | 60.0% | 40.0% | 100% |
| | Column % | 9.2% | 43.0% | 14.6% | 12.6% | 9.5% | 12.2% | 10.0% | 37.5% | 14.1% |
| Total | Count | 556 | 107 | 663 | 167 | 21 | 188 | 723 | 128 | 851 |
| | Row % | 83.9% | 16.1% | 77.9% | 88.8% | 11.2% | 22.1% | 85.0% | 15.0% | 100% |

Table 6-19. Experience of subjects in coaching school team.

| Coach Level | | Having Experience in Coaching School Team | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 29 | 16 | 45 | 11 | 8 | 19 | 40 | 24 | 64 |
| | Row % | 64.4% | 35.6% | 70.3% | 57.9% | 42.1% | 29.7% | 62.5% | 37.5% | 100.0% |
| | Column % | 7.0% | 6.5% | 6.8% | 11.2% | 8.9% | 10.1% | 7.8% | 7.1% | 7.5% |
| L1 | Count | 199 | 96 | 295 | 49 | 46 | 95 | 248 | 142 | 390 |
| | Row % | 67.5% | 32.5% | 75.6% | 51.6% | 48.4% | 24.4% | 63.6% | 36.4% | 100.0% |
| | Column % | 47.7% | 39.0% | 44.5% | 50.0% | 51.1% | 50.5% | 48.2% | 42.3% | 45.8% |
| L2 | Count | 141 | 85 | 226 | 29 | 22 | 51 | 170 | 107 | 277 |
| | Row % | 62.4% | 37.6% | 81.6% | 56.9% | 43.1% | 18.4% | 61.4% | 38.6% | 100.0% |
| | Column % | 33.8% | 34.6% | 34.1% | 29.6% | 24.4% | 27.1% | 33.0% | 31.8% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 48 | 49 | 97 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 57 | 63 | 120 |
| | Row % | 49.5% | 50.5% | 80.8% | 39.1% | 60.9% | 19.2% | 47.5% | 52.5% | 100.0% |
| | Column % | 11.5% | 19.9% | 14.6% | 9.2% | 15.6% | 12.2% | 11.1% | 18.8% | 14.1% |
| Total | Count | 417 | 246 | 663 | 98 | 90 | 188 | 515 | 336 | 851 |
| | Row % | 62.9% | 37.1% | 77.9% | 52.1% | 47.9% | 22.1% | 60.5% | 39.5% | 100.0% |

Table 6-20. Experience of subjects in coaching other courses.

| Coach Level | | Having Experience in Coaching Other Courses | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|---|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | Male | | | Female | | | ALL | | |
| | | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total | No | Yes | Total |
| L0 | Count | 20 | 25 | 45 | 10 | 9 | 19 | 30 | 34 | 64 |
| | Row % | 44.4% | 55.6% | 70.3% | 52.6% | 47.4% | 29.7% | 46.9% | 53.1% | 100% |
| | Column % | 3.6% | 23.4% | 6.8% | 6.0% | 42.9% | 10.1% | 4.1% | 26.6% | 7.5% |
| L1 | Count | 60 | 235 | 295 | 33 | 62 | 95 | 93 | 297 | 390 |
| | Row % | 20.3% | 79.7% | 75.6% | 34.7% | 65.3% | 24.4% | 23.8% | 76.2% | 100% |
| | Column % | 10.8% | 219.6% | 44.5% | 19.8% | 295.2% | 50.5% | 12.9% | 232.0% | 45.8% |
| L2 | Count | 39 | 187 | 226 | 14 | 37 | 51 | 53 | 224 | 277 |
| | Row % | 17.3% | 82.7% | 81.6% | 27.5% | 72.5% | 18.4% | 19.1% | 80.9% | 100% |
| | Column % | 7.0% | 174.8% | 34.1% | 8.4% | 176.2% | 27.1% | 7.3% | 175.0% | 32.5% |
| L3 | Count | 14 | 83 | 97 | 6 | 17 | 23 | 20 | 100 | 120 |
| | Row % | 14.4% | 85.6% | 80.8% | 26.1% | 73.9% | 19.2% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 100% |
| | Column % | 2.5% | 77.6% | 14.6% | 3.6% | 81.0% | 12.2% | 2.8% | 78.1% | 14.1% |
| Total | Count | 133 | 530 | 663 | 63 | 125 | 188 | 196 | 655 | 851 |
| | Row % | 20.1% | 79.9% | 77.9% | 33.5% | 66.5% | 22.1% | 23.0% | 77.0% | 100% |

Hourly Pay Rate of Coaching

- a) See Table 6-21.
- b) Group difference by sex - Not significant.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 435)=17.31$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean hourly pay rate was found to be HK\$163.32 (s.d.=HK\$73.04). It seemed that pay rate was linked to coach level. L1 coaches received lowest pay rates (mean=HK\$150.59, s.d.=HK\$65.53). L3 coaches received highest pay rates (mean=HK\$197.53, s.d.=HK\$113.09). It should be noted that L0 coaches (those who do not hold any coaching certificates) received pay rates higher than L1 coaches.

Coaching Load in a Recent Week

- a) See Table 6-21.
- b) Group difference by sex - Not significant.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 635)=4.48$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean coaching load in a recent week was found to be 6.68 hours (s.d.=13.68 hours). The differences between different levels of coaches were 1.33 hours (L0 < L1), 4.03 hours (L1 < L2), and 3.37 hours (L2 < L3) respectively.

Coaching Load in a Busy Week

- a) See Table 6-21.
- b) Group difference by sex - Not significant.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 635)=4.18$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean coaching load in a busy week was found to be 16.62 hours (s.d.=18.41 hours). The differences between different levels of coaches were about 4 hours. The higher the coach level, the more hours they coached. L3 coaches worked 22.44 hours per week (s.d.=25.48 hours).

Experience in Coaching The Hong Kong Team

- a) See Table 6-21.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $F(1, 635)=4.52$
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 635)=6.55$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 635)=5.0$.
- e) Highlight - Mean number of years in coaching Hong Kong team was found to be 0.92 (s.d.=2.52). The mean in L0, L1, L2 coaches were lower than 1, whereas, L3 coaches got a mean of 2.72 (s.d.=4.17). This showed that coaching of Hong Kong were normally done by advanced coaches. However, the fact that coaches other than L3 also got experience in coaching Hong Kong team indicated that the coach-athlete-level-linkage was not very strongly established. On the whole, males got a higher mean (mean=1.01, s.d.=2.70) in the coaching of Hong Kong team when compared to females (mean=0.56, s.d.=1.66). However, this sex difference did not occur in every coach level. Results of the 2 (male vs female) x 4 (No vs L1 vs L2 vs L3) ANOVA indicated that there was interaction effect of the two independent variables. It could also be seen that in L0, L1, and L2 subgroups, the two sexes showed little difference, but, in L3 subgroup, males' mean (3.16, s.d.=4.34) was very much higher than that of the females' (0.61, s.d.=2.35).

Experience in Coaching School Team

- a) See Table 6-21.
- b) Group difference by sex - Not significant.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 635)=3.94$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean number of years in coaching school team was found to be 3.21 (s.d.=7.52). Males and females did not differ in this regard.

Experience in Coaching Other Courses

- a) See Table 6-21.
- b) Group difference by sex - Significant. $F(1, 635)=10.77$.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Significant. $F(3, 635)=10.67$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - Not significant.
- e) Highlight - Mean number of years in coaching courses was found to be 7.16 (s.d.=8.05). Males were more experienced (mean=3.28, s.d.=8.13) than the females (mean=2.94, s.d.=4.57) in this regard.

Table 6-21. Employment conditions of subjects.

| | L0 | | | | L1 | | | |
|---|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | |
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| Hourly Coaching Pay Rate (HK\$) | 161.98 | 62.14 | 115.83 | 20.36 | 153.40 | 70.87 | 139.28 | 35.34 |
| Coaching experience - HK Team (years) | 0.54 | 1.68 | 0.55 | 1.29 | 0.41 | 1.83 | 0.33 | 1.31 |
| Coaching experience - school team (years) | 1.50 | 2.40 | 2.27 | 3.07 | 2.15 | 6.78 | 2.49 | 4.25 |
| Coaching experience - other courses (years) | 3.23 | 4.38 | 1.27 | 1.62 | 5.41 | 6.93 | 4.42 | 5.85 |
| Coaching Load in a recent week (hours) | 3.12 | 5.90 | 2.45 | 4.27 | 3.92 | 5.29 | 5.33 | 8.24 |
| Coaching load in a busy week (hours) | 10.73 | 18.39 | 8.00 | 8.00 | 12.36 | 14.52 | 18.31 | 18.59 |

| | L2 | | | | L3 | | | |
|---|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | |
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| Hourly Coaching Pay Rate (HK\$) | 166.26 | 47.29 | 156.64 | 55.57 | 178.18 | 64.80 | 283.24 | 210.67 |
| Coaching experience - HK Team (years) | 0.80 | 2.14 | 0.93 | 1.90 | 3.16 | 4.34 | 0.61 | 2.35 |
| Coaching experience - school team (years) | 3.69 | 8.73 | 2.53 | 4.25 | 5.97 | 10.39 | 5.94 | 6.13 |
| Coaching experience - other courses (years) | 9.53 | 8.64 | 4.53 | 4.49 | 12.29 | 9.99 | 7.94 | 6.58 |
| Coaching Load in a recent week (hours) | 8.71 | 20.60 | 6.48 | 10.15 | 12.07 | 17.42 | 9.67 | 9.34 |
| Coaching load in a busy week (hours) | 18.59 | 17.33 | 14.15 | 16.41 | 22.33 | 26.60 | 23.00 | 19.86 |

| | L0 | | L1 | | L2 | | L3 | |
|---|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| Hourly Coaching Pay Rate (HK\$) | 154.70 | 59.70 | 150.59 | 65.53 | 164.17 | 49.17 | 197.53 | 113.09 |
| Coaching experience - HK Team (years) | 0.54 | 1.56 | 0.39 | 1.72 | 0.83 | 2.10 | 2.72 | 4.17 |
| Coaching experience - school team (years) | 1.73 | 2.60 | 2.23 | 6.28 | 3.47 | 8.08 | 5.96 | 9.76 |
| Coaching experience - other courses (years) | 2.65 | 3.86 | 5.18 | 6.70 | 8.57 | 8.24 | 11.54 | 9.60 |
| Coaching Load in a recent week (hours) | 2.92 | 5.42 | 4.25 | 6.10 | 8.28 | 19.04 | 11.65 | 16.30 |
| Coaching load in a busy week (hours) | 9.92 | 15.95 | 13.72 | 15.71 | 17.74 | 17.21 | 22.44 | 25.48 |

| | Male | | Female | | ALL | |
|---|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| Hourly Coaching Pay Rate (HK\$) | 162.30 | 63.04 | 167.38 | 104.09 | 163.32 | 73.04 |
| Coaching experience - HK Team (years) | 1.01 | 2.70 | 0.56 | 1.66 | 0.92 | 2.52 |
| Coaching experience - school team (years) | 3.28 | 8.13 | 2.94 | 4.57 | 3.21 | 7.52 |
| Coaching experience - other courses (years) | 7.84 | 8.48 | 4.66 | 5.54 | 7.16 | 8.05 |
| Coaching Load in a recent week (hours) | 6.86 | 14.71 | 6.01 | 8.86 | 6.68 | 13.68 |
| Coaching load in a busy week (hours) | 16.04 | 18.59 | 16.88 | 17.77 | 16.22 | 18.41 |

Scale Means of the Attitude Scores

- a) See Table 6-22 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - Scales showing sex differences included "Altruistic motive to coach", $F(1, 635)=7.15$, "Egoistic motive to coach", $F(1, 635)=8.68$, and "Work inclination", $F(1, 635)=10.64$.
- c) Group difference by coach level - Scales showing coach level differences were "Altruistic motive to coach", $F(3, 635)=4.84$, "Rating of local coach education", $F(3, 635)=5.09$, "Work inclination", $F(3, 635)=3.31$, and "Perception of athlete-coach level-matching", $F(3, 635)=3.14$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - Only "Satisfaction on employment conditions" showed interaction effects of sex and coach level, $F(3, 635)=3.23$.
- e) Highlight - It could be seen that subjects being investigated show very positive attitude towards forming a coach association (mean=4.96, s.d.=1.05) which function to raise professional status of coaching, to enhance security in coaching career, to enforce professional ethics of coaching, to represent coaches to fight for their benefits, and to provide coach education courses. It is encouraging to have found that the quit inclination was found to be quite low (mean=2.65, s.d=1.04).

Table 6-22. Subjects' scale means of the attitude scores of the HKSCQ.

| Scale | L0 | | | | L1 | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|------|--------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|
| | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | | |
| | Mean | s.d | Mean | s.d | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | |
| F1 | Attitude towards coach association | 4.96 | 1.17 | 5.17 | 0.58 | 4.97 | 1.05 | 4.78 | 1.25 |
| F2 | Altruistic motive to coach | 4.44 | 0.64 | 3.71 | 1.78 | 4.39 | 0.99 | 4.28 | 0.89 |
| F3 | Rating of local coach education | 3.02 | 0.95 | 2.62 | 0.72 | 3.54 | 0.89 | 3.38 | 0.85 |
| F4 | Egoistic motive to coach | 4.72 | 0.82 | 4.15 | 1.48 | 4.53 | 0.98 | 4.30 | 1.04 |
| F5 | Satisfaction on the wages of coaching | 3.22 | 0.98 | 2.52 | 1.39 | 3.29 | 1.14 | 3.36 | 1.23 |
| F6 | Quit inclination | 2.57 | 0.95 | 2.16 | 1.51 | 2.58 | 1.13 | 2.69 | 1.19 |
| F7 | Work inclination | 3.71 | 1.16 | 2.80 | 1.35 | 3.55 | 1.13 | 3.24 | 1.31 |
| F8 | Match between coach-level and pay | 3.87 | 1.45 | 4.14 | 1.23 | 4.11 | 1.25 | 3.85 | 1.26 |
| F9 | Learning motive to coach | 4.12 | 1.31 | 4.18 | 1.98 | 4.20 | 1.37 | 4.10 | 1.31 |
| F10 | Match of athlete-coach level | 4.29 | 1.35 | 4.67 | 0.98 | 4.47 | 1.10 | 4.46 | 1.34 |

| Scale | L2 | | | | L3 | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|------|--------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|
| | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | | |
| | Mean | s.d | Mean | s.d | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | |
| F1 | Attitude towards coach association | 5.03 | 0.85 | 4.62 | 1.30 | 5.06 | 1.12 | 5.06 | 0.82 |
| F2 | Altruistic motive to coach | 4.77 | 0.75 | 4.38 | 1.18 | 4.72 | 1.06 | 4.70 | 0.66 |
| F3 | Rating of local coach education | 3.56 | 0.90 | 3.40 | 0.78 | 3.26 | 0.88 | 3.49 | 0.90 |
| F4 | Egoistic motive to coach | 4.67 | 0.79 | 4.32 | 1.28 | 4.63 | 1.05 | 4.34 | 1.22 |
| F5 | Satisfaction on the wages of coaching | 3.26 | 1.15 | 3.49 | 1.22 | 3.00 | 1.19 | 3.83 | 1.03 |
| F6 | Quit inclination | 2.70 | 0.93 | 2.68 | 0.81 | 2.76 | 1.00 | 2.63 | 0.71 |
| F7 | Work inclination | 3.83 | 1.04 | 3.48 | 1.27 | 4.00 | 1.33 | 3.68 | 1.10 |
| F8 | Match between coach-level and pay | 3.99 | 1.25 | 3.85 | 1.39 | 3.58 | 1.43 | 3.39 | 1.49 |
| F9 | Learning motive to coach | 4.39 | 1.22 | 4.00 | 1.42 | 4.41 | 1.27 | 4.44 | 1.17 |
| F10 | Match of athlete-coach level | 4.51 | 0.98 | 4.11 | 1.18 | 3.99 | 1.25 | 3.94 | 1.26 |

Table 6-22. (cont.)

| Scale | | L0 | | L1 | | L2 | | L3 | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| F1 | Attitude towards coach association | 5.02 | 1.03 | 4.93 | 1.10 | 4.95 | 0.96 | 5.06 | 1.07 |
| F2 | Altruistic motive to coach | 4.22 | 1.13 | 4.37 | 0.97 | 4.69 | 0.86 | 4.71 | 1.00 |
| F3 | Rating of local coach education | 2.89 | 0.90 | 3.50 | 0.89 | 3.53 | 0.88 | 3.30 | 0.89 |
| F4 | Egoistic motive to coach | 4.55 | 1.07 | 4.48 | 1.00 | 4.60 | 0.91 | 4.58 | 1.08 |
| F5 | Satisfaction on the wages of coaching | 3.01 | 1.14 | 3.31 | 1.16 | 3.31 | 1.17 | 3.14 | 1.20 |
| F6 | Quit inclination | 2.45 | 1.14 | 2.60 | 1.14 | 2.69 | 0.91 | 2.74 | 0.95 |
| F7 | Work inclination | 3.44 | 1.27 | 3.48 | 1.18 | 3.76 | 1.09 | 3.94 | 1.29 |
| F8 | Match between coach-level and pay | 3.95 | 1.38 | 4.05 | 1.26 | 3.96 | 1.28 | 3.54 | 1.43 |
| F9 | Learning motive to coach | 4.14 | 1.51 | 4.18 | 1.36 | 4.31 | 1.26 | 4.41 | 1.25 |
| F10 | Match of athlete-coach level | 4.41 | 1.25 | 4.47 | 1.16 | 4.43 | 1.03 | 3.98 | 1.25 |

| Scale | | Male | | Female | | ALL | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|
| | | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| F1 | Attitude towards coach association | 5.01 | 1.01 | 4.80 | 1.18 | 4.96 | 1.05 |
| F2 | Altruistic motive to coach | 4.58 | 0.93 | 4.32 | 1.06 | 4.52 | 0.96 |
| F3 | Rating of local coach education | 3.47 | 0.91 | 3.34 | 0.85 | 3.45 | 0.90 |
| F4 | Egoistic motive to coach | 4.60 | 0.92 | 4.30 | 1.16 | 4.54 | 0.99 |
| F5 | Satisfaction on the wages of coaching | 3.23 | 1.14 | 3.39 | 1.24 | 3.26 | 1.17 |
| F6 | Quit inclination | 2.65 | 1.03 | 2.64 | 1.06 | 2.65 | 1.04 |
| F7 | Work inclination | 3.73 | 1.15 | 3.33 | 1.28 | 3.64 | 1.19 |
| F8 | Match between coach-level and pay | 3.97 | 1.30 | 3.81 | 1.32 | 3.93 | 1.31 |
| F9 | Learning motive to coach | 4.29 | 1.30 | 4.13 | 1.38 | 4.26 | 1.32 |
| F10 | Match of athlete-coach level | 4.39 | 1.12 | 4.31 | 1.26 | 4.38 | 1.15 |

Other Means of the Attitude Scores

- a) See Table 6-23 for the details.
- b) Group difference by sex - 5 items showed sex differences. They were "Most people think that winning is important to coach", $F(1, 635)=4.66$, "It is common for coaches to have injuries/accidents", $F(1, 635)=9.73$, "Coaching is a requirement of your job", $F(1, 635)=8.32$, "Coach because being invited", $F(1, 635)=4.24$, and "Full-time coaching job does not have good prospect", $F(1, 635)=7.53$.
- c) Group difference by coach level - 2 items showed coach level differences. They were "It is common for coaches to have injuries/accidents", $F(3, 635)=3.08$, "Coach because being invited", $F(3, 635)=2.93$.
- d) Group difference by sex by coach level - "Coach because good friends/class-mates coach", $F(3, 635)=2.78$, and "Full-time coaching job does not have good prospect", $F(3, 635)=2.77$.
- e) Highlight - The subjects believed that advanced courses on coach education should be taught by overseas experts (mean=4.38, s.d.=1.40), This showed that they did not have adequate confidence in local coach educators. The low means in "coaching is a requirement of your job/course work" (mean=2.52, s.d.=1.81), "coach because good friends / class-mates go to coach" (mean=2.90, s.d.=1.57), and "coach because being invited (no particular reasons!)" (mean=2.57, s.d.=1.58) showed that most coaches were active in seeking coaching opportunities.

Table 6-23. Subjects' other means of the attitude scores of the HKSCQ.

| | | L0 | | | | L1 | | | |
|------|--|------|------|--------|------|------|------|--------|------|
| | | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | |
| | | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| q51f | advanced courses rely on overseas experts | 4.23 | 1.77 | 4.18 | 1.78 | 4.36 | 1.39 | 4.40 | 1.46 |
| q51g | general theory courses enhance quality of coaches | 4.77 | 1.56 | 4.73 | 1.74 | 4.69 | 1.24 | 4.25 | 1.39 |
| q52f | most employers sign contracts with coaches | 3.96 | 1.43 | 4.27 | 1.95 | 3.77 | 1.70 | 3.54 | 1.69 |
| q52g | most employers provide clear work guidelines | 3.38 | 1.58 | 3.55 | 1.86 | 3.75 | 1.51 | 3.39 | 1.53 |
| q52i | merely by coaching is not adequate to earn a living | 4.62 | 1.72 | 4.91 | 0.83 | 4.82 | 1.46 | 4.43 | 1.69 |
| q52j | most people think winning is important to coach | 4.62 | 1.42 | 4.18 | 1.60 | 4.35 | 1.51 | 4.10 | 1.63 |
| q52k | it is common for coaches to have injuries/accidents | 2.77 | 1.34 | 3.27 | 1.01 | 2.87 | 1.32 | 3.39 | 1.57 |
| q52l | most athletes respect coaches | 4.15 | 1.22 | 3.91 | 1.30 | 3.97 | 1.21 | 3.87 | 1.29 |
| q54j | coaching is a requirement of your job/course work | 2.19 | 1.74 | 2.82 | 2.44 | 2.33 | 1.61 | 3.27 | 2.10 |
| q54m | coach because good friends/class-mates coach | 3.00 | 1.65 | 2.18 | 1.72 | 3.01 | 1.61 | 3.09 | 1.65 |
| q54p | coach because being invited (no particular reasons!) | 1.92 | 1.38 | 2.09 | 1.87 | 2.68 | 1.58 | 2.96 | 1.55 |
| q55g | full-time coaching job does not have good prospect | 3.88 | 1.51 | 2.64 | 1.69 | 3.42 | 1.50 | 3.27 | 1.78 |

| | | L2 | | | | L3 | | | |
|------|--|------|------|--------|------|------|------|--------|------|
| | | Male | | Female | | Male | | Female | |
| | | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| q51f | advanced courses rely on overseas experts | 4.33 | 1.34 | 4.30 | 1.49 | 4.58 | 1.40 | 4.56 | 0.86 |
| q51g | general theory courses enhance quality of coaches | 4.75 | 1.01 | 4.38 | 1.31 | 4.56 | 1.34 | 4.28 | 1.41 |
| q52f | most employers sign contracts with coaches | 3.40 | 1.72 | 3.35 | 1.58 | 3.27 | 1.81 | 3.94 | 1.70 |
| q52g | most employers provide clear work guidelines | 3.63 | 1.52 | 3.48 | 1.48 | 3.35 | 1.61 | 4.17 | 1.25 |
| q52i | merely by coaching is not adequate to earn a living | 4.89 | 1.37 | 4.50 | 1.60 | 4.98 | 1.41 | 4.78 | 1.35 |
| q52j | most people think winning is important to coach | 4.60 | 1.43 | 4.08 | 1.58 | 4.69 | 1.47 | 4.28 | 1.53 |
| q52k | it is common for coaches to have injuries/accidents | 2.85 | 1.30 | 3.30 | 1.49 | 3.35 | 1.46 | 4.00 | 1.24 |
| q52l | most athletes respect coaches | 3.99 | 1.22 | 3.98 | 1.27 | 3.67 | 1.32 | 4.06 | 1.16 |
| q54j | coaching is a requirement of your job/course work | 2.50 | 1.82 | 2.58 | 1.87 | 2.35 | 1.82 | 3.28 | 1.87 |
| q54m | coach because good friends/class-mates coach | 2.80 | 1.49 | 2.95 | 1.54 | 2.53 | 1.46 | 3.61 | 1.50 |
| q54p | coach because being invited (no particular reasons!) | 2.49 | 1.55 | 3.00 | 1.80 | 2.14 | 1.43 | 2.78 | 1.52 |
| q55g | full-time coaching job does not have good prospect | 3.51 | 1.44 | 2.68 | 1.37 | 2.97 | 1.58 | 3.11 | 1.68 |

Table 6-23. (cont.)

| | | L0 | | L1 | | L2 | | L3 | |
|------|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| q51f | advanced courses rely on overseas experts | 4.22 | 1.75 | 4.37 | 1.40 | 4.32 | 1.37 | 4.58 | 1.32 |
| q51g | general theory courses enhance quality of coaches | 4.76 | 1.59 | 4.59 | 1.29 | 4.67 | 1.08 | 4.51 | 1.35 |
| q52f | most employers sign contracts with coaches | 4.05 | 1.58 | 3.72 | 1.70 | 3.39 | 1.69 | 3.38 | 1.80 |
| q52g | most employers provide clear work guidelines | 3.43 | 1.64 | 3.67 | 1.52 | 3.60 | 1.51 | 3.49 | 1.58 |
| q52i | merely by coaching is not adequate to earn a living | 4.70 | 1.51 | 4.73 | 1.52 | 4.82 | 1.42 | 4.94 | 1.40 |
| q52j | most people think winning is important to coach | 4.49 | 1.46 | 4.29 | 1.54 | 4.50 | 1.47 | 4.62 | 1.48 |
| q52k | it is common for coaches to have injuries/accidents | 2.92 | 1.26 | 2.99 | 1.40 | 2.94 | 1.34 | 3.46 | 1.44 |
| q52l | most athletes respect coaches | 4.08 | 1.23 | 3.95 | 1.22 | 3.99 | 1.23 | 3.74 | 1.30 |
| q54j | coaching is a requirement of your job/course work | 2.38 | 1.96 | 2.55 | 1.78 | 2.51 | 1.82 | 2.51 | 1.85 |
| q54m | coach because good friends/class-mates coach | 2.76 | 1.69 | 3.03 | 1.61 | 2.83 | 1.50 | 2.72 | 1.52 |
| q54p | coach because being invited (no particular reasons!) | 1.97 | 1.52 | 2.74 | 1.57 | 2.58 | 1.61 | 2.25 | 1.46 |
| q55g | full-time coaching job does not have good prospect | 3.51 | 1.64 | 3.38 | 1.57 | 3.35 | 1.46 | 2.99 | 1.59 |

| | | Male | | Female | | ALL | |
|------|--|------|------|--------|------|------|------|
| | | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. | Mean | s.d. |
| q51f | advanced courses rely on overseas experts | 4.38 | 1.40 | 4.38 | 1.42 | 4.38 | 1.40 |
| q51g | general theory courses enhance quality of coaches | 4.69 | 1.20 | 4.33 | 1.39 | 4.61 | 1.25 |
| q52f | most employers sign contracts with coaches | 3.57 | 1.73 | 3.60 | 1.68 | 3.58 | 1.72 |
| q52g | most employers provide clear work guidelines | 3.62 | 1.53 | 3.53 | 1.52 | 3.60 | 1.53 |
| q52i | merely by coaching is not adequate to earn a living | 4.86 | 1.43 | 4.54 | 1.56 | 4.79 | 1.47 |
| q52j | most people think winning is important to coach | 4.50 | 1.48 | 4.13 | 1.58 | 4.42 | 1.51 |
| q52k | it is common for coaches to have injuries/accidents | 2.94 | 1.35 | 3.43 | 1.47 | 3.05 | 1.39 |
| q52l | most athletes respect coaches | 3.94 | 1.24 | 3.93 | 1.26 | 3.93 | 1.24 |
| q54j | coaching is a requirement of your job/course work | 2.38 | 1.72 | 3.03 | 2.04 | 2.52 | 1.81 |
| q54m | coach because good friends/class-mates coach | 2.86 | 1.55 | 3.04 | 1.62 | 2.90 | 1.57 |
| q54p | coach because being invited (no particular reasons!) | 2.49 | 1.55 | 2.88 | 1.65 | 2.57 | 1.58 |
| q55g | full-time coaching job does not have good prospect | 3.39 | 1.51 | 3.02 | 1.65 | 3.32 | 1.55 |

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Summary of Results

This project aims at providing descriptive data for an overview of sports coaching in Hong Kong so no particular research questions were asked and no hypotheses were tested in the study. The findings derived from the sports coach survey were summarized as follows:

- Number of Subjects - 37 NSA officials and 12 sports coaches were interviewed in the initial stage. 2038 questionnaires were distributed to sports coaches coming from 30 sports.
- Response Rate - Of the 731 returned questionnaires, 643 were processed. The response rate was 41.9% and was deemed to be satisfactory.
- Sex distribution - There are more males than female in the sample and their ratio is about 7:1.
- Proportion of coaches in different coach level -
 - Only a few (about 5%) of the coaches being investigated do not hold coaching certificates.
 - 45.6% of the subjects hold elementary / level 1 coaching certificates.
 - 32.5% of the subjects hold intermediate / level 2 coaching certificates, and 16.1% of the subjects hold advanced / international coaching certificates.

- Profile of sports coaches in Hong Kong
 - Most coaches are in their mid thirty and have been coaching for about 8 years.
 - 66.6% of all the subjects served one and only one sport.
 - Nearly all sports coaches have secondary or above education and slightly more than half have got tertiary education qualifications.
 - Slightly more than half of all the coaches were married.
 - 39.5% of all coaches were parents who have 1 or 2 children.
 - Most of the coaches have their main employment in service sector and earns about HK\$21000 per month.
 - In the sample, full-time sports coaches only constitute 6.8%. About one-fifth of the sports coaches are physical education teachers.
 - Slightly more than half elementary / level 1 coaches hold HKCAP Level 1 certificates. Slightly less than half intermediate / Level 2 coaches hold HKCAP Level 2 certificates. Only 13.8% of advanced / Level 3 coaches hold HKCAP certificates.
 - Only 1.1% of coaches hold degree in sport / recreation.
 - Less than 20% of coaches perceived themselves to have acquired sport skill proficiency equivalent to national squad of Hong Kong.
 - 15% of the coaches have experience in training national squad of Hong Kong. 39.5% have trained school teams and 77% have worked in UC/RC course and other private classes.
 - The reason for coaching is to contribute (altruistic motive to coach), to seek sense of fulfillment (egoistic motive to coach) and to learn from doing the coach work.

- Career structure of sports coaching in Hong Kong
 - Mean hourly pay rate is about HK\$160.
 - Coaching load in a busy week is about 17 hours.
 - There are no coach associations in nearly all sports in Hong Kong.
 - Most coaches support forming a coach association.
 - Coaches are rather hesitate to agree that local coach education is good enough.
 - There is a match between athlete level and coach level, i.e. athletes are coached by appropriate level of coaches.
 - Most coaches think that advanced coach education still rely on overseas experts.
 - Most agreed that merely by coaching is not adequate to earn a living.
 - Winning record is regarded as an attribute of successful coach.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. The present study is exploratory and descriptive in nature. In further studies, relationships between different variables may be investigated.
2. It is worthwhile to focus on studying the full-time coaches. There are two types of full-time coaches in the market. Some are hired as professional staff in the HKSI to coach high level athletes. Some are doing free-lance coaching in private classes. Comparison may be made between these two groups of coaches to examine how they differ in needs and expectations.
3. The forming of coach association is well supported by the subjects. However, as pointed out by the high level coaches in the interviews, forming a coach association is a very difficult task. Obstacles come from both inside and outside. Much thinking is required. So it is suggested that some research should be done to assess the feasibility of forming coach association.
4. The study did not study the clients of sports coaching. In the future, thinking and opinions and the sports users may also be investigated so that a more comprehensive picture of coaching profession may be depicted.
5. Physical education teaching profession was found to be one major source of part-

time coaches in Hong Kong. How their motives in sports coaching can be enhanced and their coaching knowledge and skills can be further refined needs to be put on the agenda. In other words, research should be designed to maximize physical education teachers' potentiality in producing high level athletes that can win medals in the world.

Appendix

Appendix A. The HKSCQ.

**C SPORTS
COACHING**

Research Team

運動教練工作研究小組

九龍琵琶山郝德傑道六號香港教育學院柏立基第一分校 M207 室

親愛的教練先生/小姐：

本研究小組受香港康樂體育發展局委托，進行一項名為《運動教練在香港》的調查研究。

較早前，我們已開展了對各運動總會行政人員一連串訪問活動；現在，誠邀閣下花 15 分鐘時間填寫問卷一份，反映業內人仕工作狀況及困難。閣下提供的資料將成為當局在訂定本港教練發展政策時之重要依據，請給予支持。

此問卷採不記名方式，搜集得來的資料只供本研究小組使用、並將在研究完成後全部銷毀；請絕對放心資料保密問題。問卷內所有題目均沒有標準答案，請根據閣下真實情況或感覺回答。

填妥問卷後，請用隨函附上的回郵信封寄交九龍琵琶山郝德傑道六號香港教育學院柏立基第一分校 M207 室。如有任何疑問，可直接向本研究小組召集人周華先生查詢(電話 23614121, 傳真 23867480, 電郵 wachow@bc.ied.edu.hk)，多謝合作。

《運動教練工作研究小組》召集人

周華 xx.xx.1997

1. 個人資料

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1.1. 出生年份: (請填寫年份最後兩個數字) | 19 ____ | |
| 1.2. 性別: (請在適當的格內加✓) | a. 男 <input type="checkbox"/> | b. 女 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.3. 教育程度: (請在適當的格內加✓) | a. 未受正規教育(包括幼稚園) <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | b. 小學 <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | c. 中學 <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | d. 大專/大學 <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 1.4. 婚姻狀況: (請在適當的格內加✓) | a. 未婚 <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | b. 已婚 <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | c. 分居 / 離婚 / 喪偶 <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 1.5. 子女數目: (請填寫數字, 如0,1,2,3,等) | _____ | |
| 1.6. 子女年齡: (請填寫數字, 如0,1,2,3,等) | 最小的 _____ 歲; | 最大的 _____ 歲 |
| 1.7. 正職(主要職業/工作): | | |
| 行業: (請填寫) | 職位: (請填寫) | 每月入息: (請填寫) 港元 |

2. 教練資歷

| | |
|---|--------------|
| 2.1. 請列出你擔任教練的運動項目 (假如你任教超過一個運動項目, 請分別在運動項目A,B,及C等空格內列出) | 運動項目 A _____ |
| | 運動項目 B _____ |
| | 運動項目 C _____ |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2.2. 你本身的運動技術水平在最高峰時曾達到以下那個級別? (請在適當的格內加✓) | 在 運動項目A | 在 運動項目B | 在 運動項目C |
| a. 香港代表隊運動員 | a <input type="checkbox"/> | a <input type="checkbox"/> | a <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. 香港青、少年代表隊運動員 | b <input type="checkbox"/> | b <input type="checkbox"/> | b <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. 初、中級運動員(或學員) | c <input type="checkbox"/> | c <input type="checkbox"/> | c <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. 初學者、略懂皮毛 | d <input type="checkbox"/> | d <input type="checkbox"/> | d <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 2.3. 你曾在下列每類別工作做了幾多年？ (請填寫數字) | 在 運動項目A | 在 運動項目B | 在 運動項目C |
|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| ● 香港隊運動員訓練(包括香港青、少年代表隊運動員) | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ● 學校校隊訓練(包括小學、中學、工業學院、大專 / 大學) | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ● 各類訓練班(由運動總會、體育會、市政署、區域市政署、或私人機構主辦) | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ● 其他(請註明): | _____ | _____ | _____ |

2.4. 從第一天做教練開始計算，至1997年3月31日為止，
你在上列各類別工作總共做了幾多年？(請填寫數字)

| | |
|--|---|
| | 年 |
|--|---|

| 2.5. 你任教的運動項目中，有沒有獨立註冊的教練職工會、教練聯誼會等組織？ (有則加✓，沒有則留空) | 在 運動項目A | 在 運動項目B | 在 運動項目C |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 2.6. 你有沒有參加獨立註冊的教練職工會、教練聯誼會等組織？ (有則加✓，沒有則留空) | 在 運動項目A | 在 運動項目B | 在 運動項目C |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 2.7. 你持有運動總會頒發的教練證書嗎？ (有則加✓，沒有則留空) | 在 運動項目A | 在 運動項目B | 在 運動項目C |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ● 初級(第一級)教練證書 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● 中級(第二級)教練證書 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● 高級(第三級)教練證書 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● 國際級教練證書 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 2.8. 你持有香港教練培訓委員會頒發的運動通論證書嗎？ (有則加✓，沒有則留空) | ● 第一級證書 <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|----------------------------------|
| | ● 第二級證書 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | ● 第三級證書 <input type="checkbox"/> |

-
- 2.9. 你持有大專院校頒發的體育教學證書嗎？
(有則加✓，沒有則留空)
- 基本師資教育證書/文憑
 - 高級師資教育證書/文憑
 - 教育/體育學士學位
 - 教育/體育碩士學位
 - 教育/體育博士學位
-

- 2.10. 你持有大專院校頒發的其他與運動訓練、管理有關之證書嗎？
(有則加✓，沒有則留空)
- 證書/文憑
 - 學士學位
 - 碩士學位
 - 博士學位

3. 教練工作量估計

(請用數字顯示工作時數)

| | 在 運動項目 A | 在 運動項目B | 在 運動項目 C |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| 3.1. 在過去一星期內，你做了幾多小時教練工作？ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3.2. 在全年中較忙的月份的一個星期內，你通常做幾多小時教練工作？ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

4. 教練薪酬估計

(請用數字顯示獲得的港元數目；不適用則留空)

| | 在 運動項目A | 在 運動項目B | 在 運動項目C |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 4.1. 如你在一個機構擔任全職教練，請填寫每月薪金 | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4.2. 如你的教練薪酬是按工作時數計算的；請填寫通常得到的時薪 | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4.3. 若將月薪及時薪一併計算，你通常每月可以獲得幾多教練薪酬？ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

5. 請判斷下列句子的真確程度

| 注意： | 十分不真確 | 大部份不真確 | 不真確稍多於真確 | 真確稍多於不真確 | 大部份真確 | 十分真確 |
|---|-------|--------|----------|----------|-------|------|
| ● 就算你擔任超過一個運動項目的教練，都請用整體的感覺去考慮下列句子之真確程度。 | | | | | | |
| ● 請在每一句子的右方圈上適當數字。數字愈接近「6」，表示你認為該句子的描述，與你的感覺愈吻合；數字愈接近「1」，就表示愈不吻合。 | | | | | | |
| 5.1. 本港的教練培訓的實況 | | | | | | |
| a) 有關機構提供了非常足夠的教練培訓課程 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b) 本港教練的質素非常高 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c) 教練有足夠的途徑或資料去了解最新的教練方法 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d) 你的教練知識、技能主要來自本港教練培訓課程 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e) 本港的教練培訓課程有非常高的質素 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f) 本港高級教練培訓必需依靠外國(外地)專家協助 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g) 修讀運動通論課程，可以提高專項運動教練質素 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5.2. 本港的教練工作的實況 | | | | | | |
| a) 持有較高級教練證書的人，通常得到較高的薪酬 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b) 受訓學員的水平愈高，教練得到的薪酬愈高 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c) 較高級的教練通常被委派教導較高水平的運動員 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d) 較初級的教練通常被委派教導較低水平的運動員 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e) 無認可教練資格的人，通常不獲聘用做教練 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f) 各機構聘用教練時，通常與教練簽訂聘用合約 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g) 僱主通常給予教練明確的工作守則或指引 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| h) 與其他行業的兼職比較，教練得到的薪酬亦算高 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| i) 單靠做教練得到的薪酬，是很難生活的 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| j) 多數人認為：能令運動員獲獎的，才是優秀教練 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| k) 教練在工作中受傷或遇到意外，是常常發生的 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| l) 運動員通常都很尊重教練 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5.3. 你對成立教練職工會的意見 | | | | | | |
| a) 成立教練職工會可以提高教練的專業地位 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b) 教練職工會可以令教練得到較大保障 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c) 教練職工會應該監察會員的專業操守 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d) 教練職工會應該協助、代表會員爭取權益 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e) 教練職工會應為會員提供培訓機會 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f) 應該盡快成立教練職工會 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5.4. 現時，你當教練的原因是甚麼呢？

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) 喜歡教導別人 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b) 想結識朋友 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c) 令生活更充實 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d) 挑戰自己能力 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e) 從中獲得滿足感(例如受到尊重、得到權力等) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f) 工作時間有彈性 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g) 工作人工高 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| h) 賺錢幫補開支 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| i) 藉此提高自己的運動技術水平 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| j) 這是職業或學業的其中一項要求或功課 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| k) 從中學習新知識、新技能 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| l) 對該運動有濃厚興趣 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| m) 相熟的朋友或同學都當教練 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| n) 對該運動有歸屬感，希望作出貢獻 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| o) 為社會盡一點力，這是公民責任 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| p) 沒有甚麼原因，有人邀請就去教 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5.5. 其他想法

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) 無論幾忙，你都抽時間做兼職教練 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b) 你的家人，因你做教練而感到光榮 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c) 你覺得自己作為一個教練，貢獻很大 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d) 你對自己在教練工作上得到的回報，感到很滿意 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e) 你非常希望做全職教練 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f) 你希望有機會全時間修讀教練培訓課程 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g) 做認為做全職教練是沒有前途的 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| h) 你的家人，不喜歡你做教練 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| i) 你開始對教練工作感到厭倦 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| j) 你感到教練工作很辛苦 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| k) 為了某些原因，你可能在不久的將來放棄所有教練工作 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Appendix B. The HKSCQ (English translated script).

C **SPORTS**
 COACHING

Research Team

運動教練工作研究小組

九龍筲山郝德傑道六號香港教育
學院柏立基第一分校 M207 室

Date: xx.xx.1997

Dear Coach,

Sports Coaching in Hong Kong: Profiles and Career Structure

The Sports Coaching Research Team (SCRT) is an independent research team commissioned by the Hong Kong Sports Development Board to conduct a study on the captioned topic. Earlier, members of the SCRT have interviewed senior officials of the national sports associations (NSAs) in Hong Kong. Now, you are cordially invited to complete a questionnaire which asks how you work and what problems you encounter in your sports coaching career.

The information you provide are very important and will surely be considered by the government in future planning of sport development in Hong Kong. Please support the SCRT. The questionnaire is self-explanatory. There are no right or wrong answers for the questions. Please respond truthfully and return the completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience to Room M207, Black Campus I, the Hong Kong Institute of Education, 6 Caldecott Road, Kowloon.

Please be ensured that all data collected by the SCRT will be kept confidential and that all completed questionnaires will be destroyed after use. If you have any inquires, please feel free to contact the convener of the SCRT (Tel: 23614121, Fax: 23867480, email: wachow@bc.ied.edu.hk). Thank you so much.

CHOW Wah

Convener, Sports Coaching Research Team

1. Personal Information

1.1. Date of Birth: (Please provide the last two digits) 19 ____

1.2. Sex: (Please put a ✓ in appropriate box)
a. male
b. female

1.3. Education: (Please put a ✓ in appropriate box)

- a. pre-primary / no formal education
- b. primary
- c. secondary
- d. tertiary

1.4. Marital Status: (Please put a ✓ in appropriate box)

- a. single
- b. married
- c. divorce / separated / widowed

1.5. Number of Children: (Please write 0, 1, 2, 3, etc.) _____

1.6. Age of Children: (Please write 1, 2, 3, etc., or write NA if not applicable.)

- a. your youngest child is _____ years old
- b. your eldest child is _____ years old

1.7. Full-time Job:

| Occupation (Please complete) | Rank (Please complete) | Monthly Salary (Please complete) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | HK\$ <input type="text"/> |

2. Coaching Qualifications

2.1. What sport(s) do you coach?

(Please put the names of sports in spaces provided on the right side)

Sport A _____

Sport B _____

Sport C _____

2.2. What level of sport skill proficiency have you attained in the sport(s) you coach?

(Please put a ✓ in appropriate box)

| | In Sport A | In Sport B | In Sport C |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Hong Kong team level | a <input type="checkbox"/> | a <input type="checkbox"/> | a <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Hong Kong junior squad level | b <input type="checkbox"/> | b <input type="checkbox"/> | b <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. low- to mid- level athlete level | c <input type="checkbox"/> | c <input type="checkbox"/> | c <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. beginner level | d <input type="checkbox"/> | d <input type="checkbox"/> | d <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 2.3. How many years have you been working in the following coaching tasks? (leave it blank if not applicable) | In Sport A | In Sport B | In Sport C |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| ● coaching the Hong Kong team or The Hong Kong junior squad | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ● coaching primary, secondary, or tertiary school teams | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ● teaching courses organized by national sport associations / Urban Services Department / Regional Service Department / private clubs | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ● others coaching tasks (Please specify): | _____ | _____ | _____ |

2.4. Counting from the first day you coached sport until the day on 31.03.1997, how many years have you been coaching? (including all the above coaching tasks) years

| 2.5. Are there independently registered coach association(s), coaching club(s), etc. in the sport(s) you coach? (Put a ✓ for YES, leave it blank for NO) | In Sport A | In Sport B | In Sport C |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 2.6. Have you joined the independently registered coach association(s), coaching club(s), etc. in the sport(s) you coach? (Put a ✓ for YES, leave it blank for NO) | In Sport A | In Sport B | In Sport C |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 2.7. Do you hold coaching certificate(s) issued by relevant national sport association(s)? (Put a ✓ for YES, leave it blank for NO) | In Sport A | In Sport B | In Sport C |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| ● elementary (level 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● intermediate (level 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● advanced (level 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ● international level | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 2.8. Do you hold General Sports Theory Certificate(s) issued by the Hong Kong Coaching Committee? (Put a ✓ for YES, leave it blank for NO) | ● level 1 certificate | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | ● level 2 certificate | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | ● level 3 certificate | <input type="checkbox"/> |

-
- 2.9. Do you hold qualifications in Teaching of Physical Education issued by relevant tertiary institution(s)?
(Put a ✓ for YES, leave it blank for NO)
- teacher certificate
 - advanced teacher certificate
 - BEd / BPE
 - MEd / MPE
 - EdD / PhD
-

- 2.10. Do you hold qualifications issued by tertiary institution(s) which are relevant to sports (training, management, etc.)?
(Put a ✓ for YES, leave it blank for NO)
- certificate / diploma
 - bachelor degree
 - master degree
 - doctoral degree

3. Estimation of Workload in Sports Coaching

| | In Sport A | In Sport B | In Sport C |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 3.1. What is the total number of hours you have coached in the past week? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3.2. What is the total number of hours you have coached in a busy week of a year? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

4. Estimation of Coaching Fees

| (Please write the amount of money in HK\$; leave it blank if not applicable) | In Sport A | In Sport B | In Sport C |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 4.1. If you are now a full-time coach, write you monthly salary you are now receiving. | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4.2. If you do work part-time coaching, write the hourly wages you normally receive. | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4.3. How much do you earn in a month by coaching sport(s) (including full-time and part-time work)? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

5. Please consider how true the following statements are

- Even if you coach more than one sport, do respond to the statements based on an overall impression. Put a *circle* on appropriate numbers. The smaller the number, the less true the statement is; the larger the number, the more true the statement is.

1 = false

4 = more true than false

2 = mostly false

5 = mostly true

3 = more false than true

6 = true

5.1. Coach Education in Hong Kong (HK)

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. adequate coaching courses are provided in HK. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. qualities of most HK coaches are high. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. HK coaches have access to all new coaching methods | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d. YOUR knowledge and skill in coaching come MAINLY from coaching courses offered in HK | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e. qualities of most coaching courses in HK are high. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f. advanced coaching courses in HK have to be taught by overseas experts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g. attending general sports theory courses helps enhancing quality of sport coaches. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5.2. Coaching Career in Hong Kong (HK) ...

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. holding higher level coaching certificates are normally paid higher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. coaching higher level trainees are normally paid higher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. higher level coach are normally asked to teach higher level athletes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d. lower level coach are normally asked to teach lower level athletes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e. without relevant coaching certificate, one is normally not hired to coach | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f. most employers sign contracts with coaches they hire | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g. most employers provide clear guidelines / instructions to coaches they hire | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| h. compared with other kinds of part-time jobs, coaching is paid rather high | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| i. merely by coaching is not adequate to earn a living | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| j. most people think that "winning record" is an important indicator of coach competency | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| k. it is common for coaches to be injured / to have accidents | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| l. most athletes respect coaches | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5.3. About Establishing Coach Association (CA) ...

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. CA helps raising professional status of coaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. CA helps enhancing security in coaching career | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. CA enforces professional ethics of coaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d. CA should represent coaches to fight for their benefits | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e. CA should provide coach education courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f. CA should be established as soon as possible | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5.4. Why do you coach? Because ...

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. you like teaching others | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. you want to make friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. you want to make life more substantial | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d. you want to challenge yourself | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e. you gain satisfaction (respect, power, etc.) from coaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f. coaching has got flexible working time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g. coaching is highly paid | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| h. you want to earn more to cover living expenses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| i. coaching enables you to improve sport skill proficiency | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| j. coaching is a requirement of your job / course work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| k. you want to learn new things (knowledge and skill) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| l. you are really interested in the sport you coach | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| m. your good friends / class-mates go to coach | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| n. you think you belong to the sport so you want to contribute | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| o. this contributes to society (you want to be a good citizen) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| p. you are invited (no particular reasons!) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5.5. You think that ...

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. you do part-time coaching, even if you are very busy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| b. your family are proud of your being a coach | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| c. as a coach, you have much contribution | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| d. you are satisfied with the reward you got in coaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| e. you really want to become a full-time coach | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| f. you hope to study full-time coaching courses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| g. full-time coaching job does not have good prospect | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| h. your family dislike your being a coach | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| i. you begin to dislike coaching | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| j. you start feeling that coaching is hard | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| k. for some reasons, you may give up coaching in the near future | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Appendix 3. Additional Tables of Subjects Listed by Sport

Main employment occupation of subjects listed by sport (counts)

| Sport | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Hou | Ret | Total |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|------------|
| Archery | 5 | 5 | 7 | 18 | | 8 | 6 | | | | 49 |
| Badminton | 9 | 1 | 8 | 18 | 21 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 2 | | 74 |
| Basketball | 2 | | | 4 | 31 | | 2 | 6 | | | 45 |
| Body Building | | | 1 | 4 | | 4 | 1 | | | | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 2 |
| Canoeing | 3 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 12 | | | | 43 |
| Cycling | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 7 |
| Football | 6 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 33 | 6 | 6 | 10 | | | 85 |
| Fencing | 2 | | | 2 | | | 1 | 6 | | | 11 |
| Gymnastics | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 40 | 3 | 1 | 8 | | | 57 |
| Handball | | | | | 15 | | | 3 | | | 18 |
| Hockey | | | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | | 10 |
| Karatedo | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | | | | 23 |
| Mountaineering | 5 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 12 | | | | 39 |
| Orienteering | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 11 | 2 | | | 23 |
| Squash | 6 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 1 | | | 51 |
| Swimming | 13 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 38 | 29 | 10 | 5 | | 1 | 120 |
| Table Tennis | 3 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 22 | 6 | 2 | | | | 55 |
| Volleyball | 1 | | | 2 | 35 | 2 | | 2 | | | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | | | | 16 |
| Wushu | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 31 |
| Total | 70 | 25 | 60 | 145 | 258 | 99 | 104 | 44 | 4 | 2 | 811 |

Note. Sal: Sales / Restaurant / Hotel; Tra: Transport / Storage / Communication; Fin: Finance / Business / Real Estate; Gov: Govt / Social / Personal Services; Edu: Education Rec: Recreation & Sport; Man: Manufacturing/Construction/Technology; Stu: Students; Hou: House Wives; Ret: Retired Persons.

Main employment occupation of subjects listed by sport (row %)

| Sport | Sal | Tra | Fin | Gov | Edu | Rec | Man | Stu | Hou | Ret | Total |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Archery | 10.2% | 10.2% | 14.3% | 36.7% | 0.0% | 16.3% | 12.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 49 |
| Badminton | 12.2% | 1.4% | 10.8% | 24.3% | 28.4% | 10.8% | 8.1% | 1.4% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 74 |
| Basketball | 4.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.9% | 68.9% | 0.0% | 4.4% | 13.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 45 |
| Body Building | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 40.0% | 0.0% | 40.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| Canoeing | 7.0% | 2.3% | 11.6% | 14.0% | 11.6% | 25.6% | 27.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 43 |
| Cycling | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 28.6% | 14.3% | 14.3% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7 |
| Football | 7.1% | 3.5% | 5.9% | 18.8% | 38.8% | 7.1% | 7.1% | 11.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 85 |
| Fencing | 18.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 18.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 54.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11 |
| Gymnastics | 1.8% | 0.0% | 3.5% | 3.5% | 70.2% | 5.3% | 1.8% | 14.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 57 |
| Handball | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 83.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 18 |
| Hockey | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.0% | 10.0% | 40.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10 |
| Karatedo | 17.4% | 8.7% | 21.7% | 17.4% | 4.3% | 4.3% | 26.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 23 |
| Mountaintearing | 12.8% | 2.6% | 7.7% | 23.1% | 5.1% | 17.9% | 30.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 39 |
| Orienteering | 13.0% | 0.0% | 13.0% | 13.0% | 4.3% | 0.0% | 47.8% | 8.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 23 |
| Squash | 11.8% | 7.8% | 5.9% | 23.5% | 7.8% | 13.7% | 27.5% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 51 |
| Swimming | 10.8% | 2.5% | 4.2% | 13.3% | 31.7% | 24.2% | 8.3% | 4.2% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 120 |
| Table Tennis | 5.5% | 5.5% | 5.5% | 29.1% | 40.0% | 10.9% | 3.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 55 |
| Volleyball | 2.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.8% | 83.3% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 18.8% | 0.0% | 6.3% | 18.8% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 43.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16 |
| Wushu | 9.7% | 6.5% | 16.1% | 22.6% | 12.9% | 12.9% | 9.7% | 0.0% | 6.5% | 3.2% | 31 |
| Total | 8.6% | 3.1% | 7.4% | 17.9% | 31.8% | 12.2% | 12.8% | 5.4% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 811 |

Note. Sal: Sales / Restaurant / Hotel; Tra: Transport / Storage / Communication; Fin: Finance / Business / Real Estate; Gov: Govt / Social / Personal Services; Edu: Education Rec: Recreation & Sport; Man: Manufacturing/Construction/Technology; Stu: Students; Hou: House Wives; Ret: Retired Persons.

Main employment job of subjects listed by sport (counts).

| Sport | Coa | Rec | Stu | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Archery | 1 | 7 | | | | 3 | 14 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 49 |
| Badminton | 6 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 74 |
| Basketball | | | 6 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 45 |
| Body Building | 4 | | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | 2 |
| Canoeing | 3 | 6 | | 4 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 4 | | 3 | 43 |
| Cycling | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | 3 | | | | 7 |
| Football | 4 | 3 | 10 | 30 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 85 |
| Fencing | | | 6 | | | | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | 11 |
| Gymnastics | 1 | | 8 | 39 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | | | 3 | 57 |
| Handball | | | 3 | 15 | | | | | | | | 18 |
| Hockey | | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | 4 | 1 | | | | 10 |
| Karatedo | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 2 | | 23 |
| Mountainteering | 3 | 4 | | 1 | | 4 | 15 | 10 | 1 | | 1 | 39 |
| Orienteering | | | 2 | 1 | | | 9 | 7 | 4 | | | 23 |
| Squash | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 13 | 5 | | 2 | 51 |
| Swimming | 12 | 6 | 5 | 34 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 120 |
| Table Tennis | 4 | 1 | | 18 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 55 |
| Volleyball | | 2 | 2 | 32 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | 42 |
| Windsurfing | | 1 | | 1 | | | 7 | 4 | 2 | | 1 | 16 |
| Wushu | 4 | | | 4 | | 1 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 31 |
| Total | 44 | 35 | 44 | 232 | 21 | 32 | 157 | 147 | 48 | 12 | 39 | 811 |

Note. Coa: Coaches / Instructors; Rec: Recreation / Sport Officers; Stu: Students; Tpe: Teachers(Holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Tea: Teachers(Not holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Dis: Discipline Forces; Tec: Technicians / Professional Staff; Cle: Clerical / Administrative Officers; Own: Owner of Businesses; Oth: Others.

Main employment job of subjects listed by sport (row %).

| Sport | Coa | Rec | Stu | Tpe | Tea | Dis | Tec | Cle | Sal | Own | Oth | Total |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|
| Archery | 2.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.1% | 28.6% | 36.7% | 6.1% | 2.0% | 4.1% | 49 |
| Badminton | 8.1% | 1.4% | 1.4% | 21.6% | 4.1% | 6.8% | 16.2% | 24.3% | 6.8% | 2.7% | 6.8% | 74 |
| Basketball | 0.0% | 0.0% | 13.3% | 66.7% | 2.2% | 2.2% | 6.7% | 4.4% | 2.2% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 45 |
| Body Building | 40.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.0% | 30.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| Canoeing | 7.0% | 14.0% | 0.0% | 9.3% | 2.3% | 4.7% | 27.9% | 18.6% | 9.3% | 0.0% | 7.0% | 43 |
| Cycling | 0.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 42.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7 |
| Football | 4.7% | 3.5% | 11.8% | 35.3% | 2.4% | 4.7% | 12.9% | 15.3% | 5.9% | 1.2% | 2.4% | 85 |
| Fencing | 0.0% | 0.0% | 54.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 27.3% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 11 |
| Gymnastics | 1.8% | 0.0% | 14.0% | 68.4% | 1.8% | 0.0% | 3.5% | 5.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.3% | 57 |
| Handball | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 18 |
| Hockey | 0.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 30.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 40.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10 |
| Karatedo | 0.0% | 4.3% | 0.0% | 4.3% | 0.0% | 8.7% | 21.7% | 39.1% | 13.0% | 8.7% | 0.0% | 23 |
| Mountaineering | 7.7% | 10.3% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0% | 10.3% | 38.5% | 25.6% | 2.6% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 39 |
| Orienteering | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.7% | 4.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 39.1% | 30.4% | 17.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 23 |
| Squash | 3.9% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 3.9% | 3.9% | 3.9% | 41.2% | 25.5% | 9.8% | 0.0% | 3.9% | 51 |
| Swimming | 10.0% | 5.0% | 4.2% | 28.3% | 2.5% | 2.5% | 14.2% | 16.7% | 5.0% | 0.8% | 10.8% | 120 |
| Table Tennis | 7.3% | 1.8% | 0.0% | 32.7% | 7.3% | 7.3% | 16.4% | 16.4% | 3.6% | 1.8% | 5.5% | 55 |
| Volleyball | 0.0% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 76.2% | 7.1% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 43.8% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 6.3% | 16 |
| Wushu | 12.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.9% | 0.0% | 3.2% | 25.8% | 16.1% | 12.9% | 6.5% | 9.7% | 31 |
| Total | 5.4% | 4.3% | 5.4% | 28.6% | 2.6% | 3.9% | 19.4% | 18.1% | 5.9% | 1.5% | 4.8% | 811 |

Note. Coa: Coaches / Instructors; Rec: Recreation / Sport Officers; Stu: Students; Tpe: Teachers(Holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Tea: Teachers(Not holding Cert. in PE/Sport); Dis: Discipline Forces; Tec: Technicians / Professional Staff; Cle: Clerical / Administrative Officers; Own: Owner of Businesses; Oth: Others.

Coaching load of subjects listed by sport.

| Sport | In a recent week (hours) | | | in a busy week (hours) | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|------------------------|-------|-------|
| | Mean | s.d. | Cases | Mean | s.d. | Cases |
| Archery | 2.62 | 2.96 | 53 | 8.74 | 7.39 | 53 |
| Badminton | 7.31 | 14.37 | 77 | 14.04 | 26.39 | 77 |
| Basketball | 2.10 | 2.46 | 48 | 6.96 | 6.77 | 48 |
| Body Building | 26.40 | 25.12 | 10 | 27.20 | 25.34 | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | 8.00 | 2.83 | 2 | 14.50 | 7.78 | 2 |
| Canoeing | 4.91 | 7.91 | 45 | 16.00 | 19.66 | 45 |
| Cycling | 6.57 | 6.16 | 7 | 22.00 | 27.42 | 7 |
| Football | 1.84 | 3.99 | 89 | 7.83 | 9.32 | 89 |
| Fencing | 2.67 | 2.79 | 15 | 7.40 | 5.95 | 15 |
| Gymnastics | 1.91 | 3.37 | 58 | 5.78 | 7.21 | 58 |
| Handball | 2.06 | 2.88 | 18 | 6.33 | 4.03 | 18 |
| Hockey | 2.00 | 2.36 | 10 | 9.10 | 8.96 | 10 |
| Karatedo | 5.57 | 3.82 | 23 | 8.35 | 5.12 | 23 |
| Mountaineering | 4.18 | 6.48 | 39 | 15.05 | 13.09 | 39 |
| Orienteering | 1.04 | 2.12 | 24 | 8.96 | 6.80 | 24 |
| Squash | 9.58 | 34.13 | 53 | 10.34 | 10.62 | 53 |
| Swimming | 5.95 | 9.96 | 125 | 16.52 | 17.58 | 125 |
| Table Tennis | 4.92 | 7.11 | 61 | 12.05 | 12.10 | 61 |
| Volleyball | 2.29 | 3.05 | 42 | 7.05 | 6.47 | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 5.11 | 6.76 | 18 | 17.00 | 12.58 | 18 |
| Wushu | 7.50 | 10.42 | 34 | 10.03 | 11.40 | 34 |

Subjects' monetary return gained from coaching listed by sport.

| Sport | Hourly pay rate (HK\$) | | | Monthly income (HK\$1000) | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
| | Mean | s.d. | Cases | Mean | s.d. | Cases |
| Archery | 164.69 | 102.02 | 45 | 4.18 | 6.47 | 20 |
| Badminton | 169.69 | 40.72 | 52 | 4.64 | 4.78 | 32 |
| Basketball | 171.50 | 80.02 | 20 | 9.02 | 14.98 | 9 |
| Body Building | 140.20 | 65.23 | 5 | 7.88 | 6.64 | 4 |
| Canoeing | 133.76 | 56.14 | 25 | 8.58 | 20.80 | 14 |
| Cycling | 91.00 | 47.97 | 4 | 9.77 | 11.21 | 5 |
| Football | 139.41 | 30.17 | 58 | 6.33 | 8.77 | 26 |
| Fencing | 158.33 | 20.31 | 9 | 2.58 | 1.52 | 6 |
| Gymnastics | 139.96 | 47.08 | 26 | 6.32 | 7.79 | 5 |
| Handball | 186.67 | 165.99 | 12 | 1.56 | 0.25 | 5 |
| Hockey | 105.20 | 48.74 | 5 | 1.02 | 0.88 | 3 |
| Karatedo | 149.23 | 64.09 | 13 | 1.13 | 0.47 | 6 |
| Mountainteering | 139.41 | 51.48 | 17 | 1.87 | 0.91 | 6 |
| Orienteering | 117.37 | 42.57 | 19 | 5.46 | 8.13 | 5 |
| Squash | 162.20 | 34.08 | 46 | 5.68 | 5.96 | 25 |
| Swimming | 194.31 | 113.83 | 74 | 9.82 | 7.90 | 42 |
| Table Tennis | 175.07 | 49.14 | 46 | 7.03 | 7.35 | 23 |
| Volleyball | 166.94 | 72.16 | 16 | 3.09 | 2.76 | 8 |
| Windsurfing | 270.00 | 408.08 | 11 | 4.27 | 4.48 | 5 |
| Wushu | 192.33 | 81.40 | 18 | 9.25 | 10.11 | 12 |

Subjects' coach level listed by sport (counts).

| Sport | Coach Level, counts | | | | Total |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | No | L1 | L2 | L3 | |
| Archery | | 23 | 21 | 9 | 53 |
| Badminton | 4 | 30 | 28 | 15 | 77 |
| Basketball | 5 | 27 | 12 | 4 | 48 |
| Body Building | | 2 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Canoeing | | 13 | 25 | 7 | 45 |
| Cycling | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| Football | 17 | 43 | 16 | 13 | 89 |
| Fencing | | 11 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| Gymnastics | 5 | 38 | 12 | 3 | 58 |
| Handball | 1 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| Hockey | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| Karatedo | 2 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 23 |
| Mountaintearing | 1 | 13 | 21 | 4 | 39 |
| Orienteering | | 15 | 9 | | 24 |
| Squash | | 38 | 12 | 3 | 53 |
| Swimming | 21 | 50 | 37 | 17 | 125 |
| Table Tennis | | 32 | 28 | 1 | 61 |
| Volleyball | 3 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 2 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 18 |
| Wushu | 1 | 8 | 15 | 10 | 34 |
| Total | 64 | 390 | 277 | 120 | 851 |

Subjects' coach level listed by sport (row %).

| Sport | Coach Level, row% | | | | Total |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | No | L1 | L2 | L3 | |
| Archery | 0.0% | 43.4% | 39.6% | 17.0% | 53 |
| Badminton | 5.2% | 39.0% | 36.4% | 19.5% | 77 |
| Basketball | 10.4% | 56.3% | 25.0% | 8.3% | 48 |
| Body Building | 0.0% | 20.0% | 50.0% | 30.0% | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 2 |
| Canoeing | 0.0% | 28.9% | 55.6% | 15.6% | 45 |
| Cycling | 0.0% | 14.3% | 42.9% | 42.9% | 7 |
| Football | 19.1% | 48.3% | 18.0% | 14.6% | 89 |
| Fencing | 0.0% | 73.3% | 13.3% | 13.3% | 15 |
| Gymnastics | 8.6% | 65.5% | 20.7% | 5.2% | 58 |
| Handball | 5.6% | 55.6% | 27.8% | 11.1% | 18 |
| Hockey | 20.0% | 60.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10 |
| Karatedo | 8.7% | 39.1% | 21.7% | 30.4% | 23 |
| Mountainteering | 2.6% | 33.3% | 53.8% | 10.3% | 39 |
| Orienteering | 0.0% | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0.0% | 24 |
| Squash | 0.0% | 71.7% | 22.6% | 5.7% | 53 |
| Swimming | 16.8% | 40.0% | 29.6% | 13.6% | 125 |
| Table Tennis | 0.0% | 52.5% | 45.9% | 1.6% | 61 |
| Volleyball | 7.1% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 11.1% | 44.4% | 33.3% | 11.1% | 18 |
| Wushu | 2.9% | 23.5% | 44.1% | 29.4% | 34 |
| Total | 7.5% | 45.8% | 32.5% | 14.1% | 851 |

General sport theory qualifications of subjects listed by sport.

| Sport | Holding General Theory Level 1 Certificate | | | | | Holding General Theory Level 2 Certificate | | | | |
|----------------|--|----------------|------------|----------------|------------|--|----------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| | No | (%) | Yes | (%) | Total | No | (%) | Yes | (%) | Total |
| Archery | 18 | (34.0%) | 35 | (66.0%) | 53 | 32 | (60.4%) | 21 | (39.6%) | 53 |
| Badminton | 26 | (33.8%) | 51 | (66.2%) | 77 | 46 | (59.7%) | 31 | (40.3%) | 77 |
| Basketball | 23 | (47.9%) | 25 | (52.1%) | 48 | 38 | (79.2%) | 10 | (20.8%) | 48 |
| Body Building | 3 | (30.0%) | 7 | (70.0%) | 10 | 5 | (50.0%) | 5 | (50.0%) | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | 1 | (50.0%) | 1 | (50.0%) | 2 | | (0.0%) | 2 | (100.0%) | 2 |
| Canoeing | 18 | (40.0%) | 27 | (60.0%) | 45 | 22 | (48.9%) | 23 | (51.1%) | 45 |
| Cycling | 3 | (42.9%) | 4 | (57.1%) | 7 | 5 | (71.4%) | 2 | (28.6%) | 7 |
| Football | 62 | (69.7%) | 27 | (30.3%) | 89 | 71 | (79.8%) | 18 | (20.2%) | 89 |
| Fencing | 4 | (26.7%) | 11 | (73.3%) | 15 | 13 | (86.7%) | 2 | (13.3%) | 15 |
| Gymnastics | 32 | (55.2%) | 26 | (44.8%) | 58 | 46 | (79.3%) | 12 | (20.7%) | 58 |
| Handball | 8 | (44.4%) | 10 | (55.6%) | 18 | 15 | (83.3%) | 3 | (16.7%) | 18 |
| Hockey | 5 | (50.0%) | 5 | (50.0%) | 10 | 9 | (90.0%) | 1 | (10.0%) | 10 |
| Karatedo | 11 | (47.8%) | 12 | (52.2%) | 23 | 19 | (82.6%) | 4 | (17.4%) | 23 |
| Mountaineering | 11 | (28.2%) | 28 | (71.8%) | 39 | 22 | (56.4%) | 17 | (43.6%) | 39 |
| Orienteering | 5 | (20.8%) | 19 | (79.2%) | 24 | 18 | (75.0%) | 6 | (25.0%) | 24 |
| Squash | 17 | (32.1%) | 36 | (67.9%) | 53 | 41 | (77.4%) | 12 | (22.6%) | 53 |
| Swimming | 71 | (56.8%) | 54 | (43.2%) | 125 | 88 | (70.4%) | 37 | (29.6%) | 125 |
| Table Tennis | 21 | (34.4%) | 40 | (65.6%) | 61 | 37 | (60.7%) | 24 | (39.3%) | 61 |
| Volleyball | 24 | (57.1%) | 18 | (42.9%) | 42 | 32 | (76.2%) | 10 | (23.8%) | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 11 | (61.1%) | 7 | (38.9%) | 18 | 14 | (77.8%) | 4 | (22.2%) | 18 |
| Wushu | 12 | (35.3%) | 22 | (64.7%) | 34 | 17 | (50.0%) | 17 | (50.0%) | 34 |
| Total | 386 | (45.4%) | 465 | (54.6%) | 851 | 590 | (69.3%) | 261 | (30.7%) | 851 |

Note. General sport theory certificates refer to those issued by the Hong Kong Coaching Committee in the Hong Kong Coach Accreditation Programme.

General sport theory qualifications (cont.)

| Sport | Holding General Theory Level 3 Certificate | | | | Total |
|----------------|--|----------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| | No | (%) | Yes | (%) | |
| Archery | 45 | (84.9%) | 8 | (15.1%) | 53 |
| Badminton | 64 | (83.1%) | 13 | (16.9%) | 77 |
| Basketball | 45 | (93.8%) | 3 | (6.3%) | 48 |
| Body Building | 9 | (90.0%) | 1 | (10.0%) | 10 |
| Tenpin Bowling | 2 | (100.0%) | | (0.0%) | 2 |
| Canoeing | 38 | (84.4%) | 7 | (15.6%) | 45 |
| Cycling | 7 | (100.0%) | | (0.0%) | 7 |
| Football | 87 | (97.8%) | 2 | (2.2%) | 89 |
| Fencing | 13 | (86.7%) | 2 | (13.3%) | 15 |
| Gymnastics | 57 | (98.3%) | 1 | (1.7%) | 58 |
| Handball | 16 | (88.9%) | 2 | (11.1%) | 18 |
| Hockey | 9 | (90.0%) | 1 | (10.0%) | 10 |
| Karatedo | 16 | (69.6%) | 7 | (30.4%) | 23 |
| Mountaineering | 36 | (92.3%) | 3 | (7.7%) | 39 |
| Orienteering | 24 | (100.0%) | | (0.0%) | 24 |
| Squash | 53 | (100.0%) | | (0.0%) | 53 |
| Swimming | 118 | (94.4%) | 7 | (5.6%) | 125 |
| Table Tennis | 60 | (98.4%) | 1 | (1.6%) | 61 |
| Volleyball | 40 | (95.2%) | 2 | (4.8%) | 42 |
| Windsurfing | 17 | (94.4%) | 1 | (5.6%) | 18 |
| Wushu | 26 | (76.5%) | 8 | (23.5%) | 34 |
| Total | 782 | (91.9%) | 69 | (8.1%) | 851 |

Note. General sport theory certificates refer to those issued by the Hong Kong Coaching Committee in the Hong Kong Coach Accreditation Programme.

END