

# CCQ QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

## Introduction

Thanks for reading the fun stuff. If you're interested, here comes the dorky stuff (WOO HOO!!!).

For the overall design of this book, my data gathering process consisted of three parts:

- 1) Fifty college coaches completed a questionnaire either by phone or on a dedicated survey page. Coaches identified themselves to me for demographic and sorting purposes only. This became the raw CCQ data, which will be shared in this section.
- 2) I spoke to 15 of those 50 coaches, as well as many of my former colleagues and mentors to gauge their reactions to the data. These interviews added important layers of context to the rationale of coaches in the recruiting process.
- 3) I interviewed 10 current or former college athletes to get their input on both their recruiting processes and the CCQ data.

I elected to keep the identities of the participants anonymous. They were clearly willing to share more once they knew they would not be identified in the final publication. The interviews informed most of the qualitative information in the book, so it would be redundant to share additional interview findings here. The CCQ data, however, was the engine that drove the book, so it is important to me that you get to see it.

This is certainly not meant to be a dissertation, but I still want to express two limitations before I share the data itself. First, there was no part of this process that was "blind." All of the participants knew, at an absolute minimum, my identity and my intentions with the data. I do not believe this is a significant issue, since this book was not written with the intention of academic publication, but being transparent about it is important to me.

Second, 50 coaches are not 500 coaches, so the total number of responses certainly suggests the need for greater research on this subject. That said, the CCQ had very strong and uniform responses to almost all of the questions. I draw additional attention to this in the presentation of the data wherever applicable by using a sub-category titled "response clustering." Because of the presence of these response clusters, I have reason to believe that even if we quadrupled the response pool, we would have very similar responses. This data solidifies my opinion that coaches are an extremely like-minded group of individuals who happen to have different personality and stylistic traits that differentiate them.

## **Research Methods:**

Participants were asked to respond to 17 prompts on a scale of 1-10. The prompts were divided into three sections and the prompt meanings were outlined at the beginning of each section. Participants also responded to four open-ended questions. If a participant elected to be interviewed by phone, they were given an opportunity to provide a rationale for their responses. These explanations were transcribed.

## **Demographics:**

- 62% Female Respondents\*
- 38% Male Respondents\*
- 48% Athletic Scholarship Level Coaches
- 52% Non-Athletic-Scholarship Level Coaches
- 15% Control Group of non-basketball coaches\*\*

*\*Upon sorting average responses by gender identity, I discovered no discernable difference in responses. There was no question where the average response between an identified male and female coach differed by a full point (the highest, was .9, and it only occurred once). Therefore, I do not sort any of the responses by gender identity.*

*\*\* Response clusters were so consistent across demographics that I wanted to control for responses from coaches of other sports.*

## **Section 1: Basic Recruit Background Questions (1 = Completely Disagree, 10 = Completely Agree)**

### **1) A top-tier recruit needs to be on a reputable AAU or Club team.**

Mean Response: 4.25

Median Response: 3

Most Common Response: 3

Scholarship level mean response: 4.75

Non-scholarship level mean response: 3.75

Control Group mean: 3.5

Response clustering (if applicable): n/a

### **2) A top-tier recruit needs to be on a reputable High School team.**

Mean Response: 3.28

Median Response: 3

Most Common Response: 1

Scholarship level mean response: 3.8

Non-scholarship level mean response: 2.75

Control Group mean: 1.25

Response clustering (if applicable): 80% of total responses were a 5 or lower

### **3) A top-tier recruit needs to be a single sport athlete.**

Mean Response: 1.5

Median Response: 1

Most Common Response: 1

Scholarship level mean response: 1.5

Non-scholarship level mean response: 1.5

Control Group mean: 1

Response clustering (if applicable): 49 of 50 responses were a 4 or lower

### **4) I will continue to strongly recruit a prospect if I hear from or interact with their parents/guardians more frequently than I do with the prospect.**

Mean Response: 4.2

Median Response: 4

Most Common Response: 5\*

Scholarship level mean response: 4.1

Non-scholarship level mean response: 4.3

Control Group mean: 3.34 (note, one coach corresponded with an 8 or higher)

Response clustering (if applicable): 80% of total responses were a 5 or lower

\*10% of coaches responded with an 8 or higher

### **5) I refer to an athlete's stats at the High School/Club level when making recruiting decisions.**

Mean Response: 4.5

Median Response: 5

Most Common Response: 5

Scholarship level mean response: 4.8

Non-scholarship level mean response: 4.2

Control Group mean: 4.6

Response clustering (if applicable): n/a

## **Section 2: Evaluations and the Filtering Process (1 = Completely Disagree, 10 = Completely Agree)**

**1) The position the recruit plays in high school is the position they will play on my team throughout their college career.**

Mean Response: 3.1

Median Response: 3

Most Common Response: 1

Scholarship level mean response: 4.1

Non-scholarship level mean response: 2.

Control Group mean: 2.8

Response clustering (if applicable): 82% of total responses were a 5 or lower

**2) A prospect I am seriously recruiting is able to accurately speak to their own strengths and limitations pertaining to their sport performance.**

Mean Response: 7

Median Response: 7

Most Common Response: 8

Scholarship level mean response: 6.9

Non-scholarship level mean response: 7.2

Control Group mean: 6.5

Response clustering (if applicable): 80% of total responses were a 6 or higher

**3) The average high school-aged recruit understands the scope and magnitude of being a college athlete.**

Mean Response: 3.5

Median Response: 3

Most Common Response: 2.5

Scholarship level mean response: 3.4

Non-scholarship level mean response: 3.5

Control Group mean: 2.7

Response clustering (if applicable): 82% of total responses were a 5 or lower

**4) During initial conversations with a recruit, I evaluate them based on their level of engagement with me.**

Mean Response: 6.9

Median Response: 7

Most Common Response: 6

Scholarship level mean response: 7.5

Non-scholarship level mean response: 6.5

Control Group mean: 5.9

Response clustering (if applicable): 82% of total responses were a 6 or higher

**5) I evaluate recruits based on the quality of their questions in conversations with me.**

Mean Response: 6.2

Median Response: 7

Most Common Response: 7

Scholarship level mean response: 6.4

Non-scholarship level mean response: 6

Control Group mean: 5

Response clustering (if applicable): n/a

**6) What is the lowest performance level x/10 you would take on your team for someone with a 10/10 attitude who was unconditionally trustworthy?**

Mean Response: 5

Median Response: 5

Most Common Response: 5

Scholarship level mean response: 5.4

Non-scholarship level mean response: 4.5

Control Group mean: 4.5

Response clustering (if applicable): 75% of responses fell between a 4 and a 6

**7) What is the lowest attitude level x/10 you would take on your team for someone that was a 10/10 performance?**

Mean Response: 5.7

Median Response: 5

Most Common Response: 5

Scholarship level mean response: 6.2

Non-scholarship level mean response: 5.1

Control Group mean: 5.8

Response clustering (if applicable): 74% of responses fell between a 5 and an 8

## **Section 3: Visits and “Fit” Finding**

**(1 = Completely Disagree, 10 = Completely Agree)**

**1) A positive and engaging unofficial/official visit can move a recruit from a “maybe” up to a “yes.”**

Mean Response: 8.5

Median Response: 9

Most Common Response: 10

Scholarship level mean response: 8.5

Non-scholarship level mean response: 8.4

Control Group mean: 9.3

Response clustering (if applicable): 78% of total responses were an 8 or higher

**2) A negative and disengaged unofficial/official visit can move a recruit from a “yes” to a “maybe” or a “no.”**

Mean Response: 8.6

Median Response: 9

Most Common Response: 10

Scholarship level mean response: 8.9

Non-scholarship level mean response: 8.3

Control Group mean: 9.3

Response clustering (if applicable): 82% of total responses were an 8 or higher

**3) I solicit feedback from current players about a recruit at the end of a recruit's campus visit.**

Mean Response: 9.4

Median Response: 10

Most Common Response: 10

Scholarship level mean response: 9.7

Non-scholarship level mean response: 9.1

Control Group mean: 9.1

Response clustering (if applicable): 88% of total responses were a 9 or higher

**4) When circumstances permit, our staff ideally offers roster spots to recruits in person.**

Mean Response: 7.8

Median Response: 9

Most Common Response: 10

Scholarship level mean response: 7.7

Non-scholarship level mean response: 7.9

Control Group mean: 8.6

Response clustering (if applicable): n/a

**5) When we offer a roster spot to a recruit, we expect a decision immediately.**

Mean Response: 2

Median Response: 1

Most Common Response: 1

Scholarship level mean response: 2.3

Non-scholarship level mean response: 1.8

Control Group mean: 1.3

Response clustering (if applicable): 72% of total responses were a 2 or lower



## **Anecdotal Notes**

*In response to the open-ended questions, the below themes emerged:*

### **In the time since you started coaching, have you noticed any significant changes to recruiting that you think are worth discussing with high school students?**

- a) There is a higher level of social media impression and influence on the process.
- b) Recruits' preferred methods of communication have changed. They're particularly less interested in verbal communication (i.e. on the phone or in person).
- c) AAU programs/events are over-saturating the recruiting space. Athletes are also playing too many games and not spending enough time refining their skills.
- d) There is less of an emphasis on relationship building during the process.
- e) Parents want to be involved in the process earlier (especially at the non-scholarship level, due to financial implications).
- f) A single-sport focus has developed among many high school-aged athletes.
- g) There is a growing trend of college coaches who leverage the transfer portal earlier than they previously would have and engage with high school-aged prospects later than they previously would have (i.e. starting to recruit a prospect in the summer of their junior year instead of their sophomore year, etc).

### **What is your biggest recruiting "red flag?"**

- a) Parents that demonstrate an excessive level of involvement in multiple facets of their child's process (examples included: badmouthing opponents/coaches/refs, not allowing children to fail, inflated views of their child's attitude or ability, children looking to parents before looking to coaches for instruction).
- b) A prospect who displayed poor attitude/body language in-game and on the sidelines would turn off a coach evaluating them.
- c) A prospect engages in disrespectful and/or offensive behavior either in person or on social media.
- d) The prospect in question displays a poor work ethic or poor response to mistakes.
- e) There is a pronounced lack of engagement from the prospect to the coaching staff recruiting them (unreturned calls/texts, disinterest on campus visits etc.).
- f) A recruit has played on multiple High School and/or Club Teams without explanation. Coaches often interpret this as a sign that the prospect cannot handle being held accountable by a coach.

### **How do you handle over involved parents during the process?**

- a) Nearly half of all respondents articulated a strategy where they attempt to re-direct communication directly to the prospect. If that didn't work, they would attempt to have an honest conversation with the parent about their need to take a step back.
- b) Staffs will schedule intentional time with the prospect and staff on visits without parents present.

- c) Coaches will establish clear boundaries with parents during the recruiting process and make sure parents know they can always talk about their child's safety with a coach, but that other conversations will be limited once the recruit matriculates.
- d) More than 25% of respondents indicated that they would stop recruiting a prospect after multiple failed attempts at re-directing and setting expectations with parents.

**Is there anything else you think would be important for a recruit to know?**

- a) The more engaged you are in the process, the better the results will be.
- b) Ask yourself hard questions to confirm your top school is an actual fit.
- c) Be able to identify the difference between good people and good stuff.
- d) Do not enter the recruiting process banking on the transfer portal later in your journey.
- e) Know your "red flags" and take extra visits to ensure you've discovered all of them.
- f) Do your homework in advance of a call or visit with a coach.
- g) Your recruiting process isn't over once you've arrived on campus for the start of your first year.
- h) Do not let external factors and comparison distract or sadden you.