CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1. Introduction
The following chapter gives a brief description of the study done. The researcher has tried to perform the study to his best ability. In this chapter the researcher also provides the results of the study and suggests various recommendation for other fellow researchers and scholars related to similar subjects. The researchers also shares his views on the study conducted.

5.2. Summary
We all at least have an ambiguous concept in our minds on the term “coaching” or we have our personal understandings of the tasks which should be contained within this profession. The expectations of people from the behaviors of an effective coach are also personal imaginations. People generally consider coaches or responsible managers guilty in the event of weak performance of a team and in contrast commend them in the event of winning or conferring upon awards. Despite the importance position of coach in matches, the sophisticated process of team coaching is a phenomenon which has not clearly been understood yet even among the people who train coaches (Gondi, 1998). In most resources coaching is considered an intensive job and a coach is described a person who should implement a set of communicative-managerial skills within a wide range of coaching roles (Sabok 1985, Pyke 1992). Since the modern coaching process especially in important sports like wrestling is a sophisticated process, only a systematic and objective evaluation of coaching can provide us with a clear knowledge about this process. Scientists should concentrate their attentions on a systematic effort aiming at recognizing the critical components of an effective coaching. For this reason and considering the point that there are not any special criteria for selecting national coaches, the researcher will present some criteria for selecting a national coach. Some criteria will be also defined in this study.

Initially, this chapter provides a summary of results of research and then with
focused on the background of accomplished researches in this field: the researcher discussed and interpreted the findings. In conclusion, in order to go for further researches and investigations, some aroused suggestions from research and some recommendations for other researchers will be rendered. Therefore, with attention to this point that the discussion and comment on the strengths and weaknesses, so it is essential to compare this research with the previous studies. Unfortunately, few studies have been done till now and it is not clear that what parameters and features should be considered for selecting national coaches. Due to the lack of such a model and its importance in identifying and selecting qualified and competent coaches to hold national team coach, it is necessary to determine and model the national coaches’ selection, in order to identify the best coach.

In the first chapter, overview of research was expressed and also research hypothesis and research questions regarding priorities and criteria for selecting wrestling national coach was presented.

In the second chapter, reviews of literature and a background of research were presented.

In third chapter, Method of research, Population, Sample, Methods of Data Collection, Measurement Scales and Data Analysis were mentioned. The research method was of descriptive-survey type. Data gathering tool was the researcher-made questionnaire. Its content validity was evaluated by the opinion of some experts who have strong background in coaching field. Also, its reliability was evaluated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient adjusted at the level of 0.86. Eventually, the final questionnaire which contains the features and criteria for selection of the coach of wrestling national team is designed by considering 8 aspects including motivational characteristics, sport characteristics, personality characteristics, management skills, scientific characteristics, communication skills, coaching experience and individual characteristics. The significance level of each criterion is determined using Likert measurement scale. The statistical population of this research was included five groups namely coaches, managers, officials, experts and wrestlers that according to Krejcie & Morgan table the number of 87 Free Style wrestlers, 79 Free Style wrestling coaches, 8 officials, 21 managers and 10 experts were selected from 439 participants.
at wrestling world championship competition in 2013 by classified random sample technique. First, descriptive statistics including frequency, percentage, standard deviation, mean, descriptive index and central tendency were used for each factor in the demographic section of the survey. This information included age, occupation, education qualification, field of study, best achievement as a wrestler, wrestling experience, coaching degree, best achievement as a coach, coaching experience in a national team. Friedman Test was used to determine the priorities of 8 major criteria and their subgroups for selecting wrestling national freestyle coach. Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the priorities of the main domains in ordinal means. Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of criteria for selecting wrestling national freestyle coach. One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used to indicate normality of data distribution and their point about the research variables. Excel Statistical Software was used to draw tables and diagrams. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences 18 (SPSS) and EasyFit was used to conduct the statistical analysis.

In the fourth chapter, research findings of testing research hypothesis were presented. In this research, due to lots of hypothesis, we just mention that Motivational Characteristics is the most important criteria from the view point of responders and then Personality characteristics, Management skills, Scientific Characteristics, Sport characteristics, Coaching Experience, Communication skills, and Individual characteristics has other priority respectively. Thus, those selection criteria can truthfully help to select the national coaches in freestyle wrestling.

In the chapter five that is the most important chapter of research, we concluded about research findings. As it was expressed in the previous chapters, the purpose of this study was to define and develop the criteria for selection of the coaches of wrestling national team and to determine the degree of importance of such criteria. These eight main dimensions were investigated from the point of view of responders. Also, in this chapter research findings regarding data analysis from chapter four and regarding review of literature from chapter two have been
investigated. First, the results of descriptive data were presented and then the result of each hypothesis was expressed. Recommendations and future research will be mentioned regarding research hypothesis.

Undoubtedly, it is a crucial and difficult duty to select the best person, who should be approved from different points of view and should be a pleasing and attractive person, as the coach of a national team. Therefore, it is expected that the criteria and measures for selection of the best person as the coach of the wrestling national team, who is verified by prominent national coaches and experts and eventually all community of wrestling, should be designed and prepared using the results of the current study.

The results of this study indicated that in general the selection criteria of the wrestling coaches of national team from the perspective of coaches, wrestlers, managers, officials and experts include: 1) motivational characteristics, 2) personality characteristics, 3) management skills, 4) scientific characteristics, 5) sport characteristics, 6) coaching experience, 7) communication skills and 8) individual characteristics.

5.3. Testing Hypothesis

\( H_0 \): There is no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints to determine the priorities of eight major criteria for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches.

\( H_a \): There is significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints to determine the priorities of eight major criteria for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches.

Friedman Test was used to determine the priorities of eight major criteria and their subgroups for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. According to the table 4.17, since the level of significant is less than 0.05. Moreover, with regards to the results of Friedman test, there is significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints to determine the priorities of eight major criteria for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. In general, all samples had
similar beliefs about the criteria important for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches, but they had some differences in the order of importance of the dimensions. The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the criteria for selection of the wrestling national freestyle coaches: Motivational characteristics, Personality characteristics, Management skills, Scientific characteristics, Sport characteristics, Coaching experience, Communication skills and Individual characteristics. The most prioritized factor in choosing a coach was “Motivational characteristics” with average 5.71. It was considered as a very important criterion so wrestling federations should pay a considerable attention on this dimension. As noted by Glen (1981)⁴, psychology in coaching plays an effective role in the coach’s success and the athlete’s functional development as well as motivational and communicational skills. The least prioritized factor was “Individual characteristics” with an average of 2.70. Thus, it has little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so it can be ignored. Such a finding correlates with the results of studies by Kohandel (2000)⁵, Shafiee (2007)⁶, Nasiri (2009)⁷ and Tajik (2010)⁸. “Management skills” and “Personality characteristics” were considered as important criteria. The results of the current study are also quite similar to the findings of Dahlkrist and Svenson (2001)⁹ which found type of leadership and appropriate behavior are more important in coaching process. All samples showed a strong similarity in “Scientific and Sport characteristics”. They believed that these criteria were relatively important. More coaching courses should be offered and publicized to current coaches so they can obtain updated information and professional knowledge to perform their coaching duties. If certifying all coaches is a future concern, then course planning and the implementation will be extremely important. Monazzemi (2009)¹⁰ gave the first priority to technical skills of a coach which is not in line with the results of the current study. “Communication skill” is another criterion which was considered as a less important factor. Glen (1981)⁴, Larson (1990)¹¹, Kevin Spink (1991)¹², Sabok (1992)¹³ and Maclean and Joanne (1996)¹⁴ referred to this criterion. “Sport characteristics” was put in seventh priority. In other words, it was considered as a less important factor. This criteria was also considered by FIFA (2012) and AFC (2011) in their coaching books and noted that a coach should be equipped with technical and tactical skills (FIFA coaching, 2008)¹⁵.
These criteria and their subthemes each represent the thoughts of many of the finest coaches, wrestlers, managers, officials and experts in freestyle wrestling, so developing strengths within each of these areas will assist a coach greatly in becoming an effective coach now and into the future.

**H₀**: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of personality characteristics.

**H₁**: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of personality characteristics.

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of importance of personality characteristics for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of personality characteristics. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, H₁ hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fails to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of personality characteristics (p=0.76). In other words, all samples agreed on the level of importance of personality characteristics. Browns (1975), Malhorta and Kan (1986), Jefferies and Stephan (1992), Salminen (1996), Luikonen (1990), Sharman (1986), Penman (1974), Gondi (1998), Lloyd (2000), ASCTA (1998), Gendron and Stenlund (2003), Martens (2004), Morris (2005) and Weeks (2011) believe that personality characteristics are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996) and Shafiee (2007). But contradicted result from studies by Kohandel (2000), Akbarzade (2008), Monazzemi (2009) and Tajik (2010) indicated significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers in the case of the level of importance of personality characteristics.
$H_0$: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of management skills.

$H_a$: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of management skills.

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of management skills for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of management skills. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, $H_a$ hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fails to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of management skills ($p=0.524$). In other words, all samples had similar beliefs about the level of importance of management skills for coaching selection. Sabok (1992)$^2$ consider some characteristics in his research such as: organizing, planning, communication skills, behavioral features and evaluation, are very important for a coach. Dick (1992)$^{30}$, Kim and Lee (1991)$^{31}$ point to the coach's managerial role and believe that managerial skills have an important and significant role in achieving the team goals and functional development. Gondi (1998)$^1$, Lloyd (2000)$^{23}$, ASCTA (1998)$^{24}$, Keith (1990)$^{32}$, Gendron and Stenlund (2003)$^{25}$, Martens (2004)$^{26}$ and Gaieni (2008)$^{33}$ believe that management skills are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996)$^{14}$ and Shafiee (2007)$^6$. But contradicted result from studies by Monazzemi (2009)$^{10}$ and Tajik (2010)$^8$ indicated significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers in the case of the level of importance of management skills.

$H_0$: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of individual characteristics.

$H_a$: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of individual characteristics.
Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of individual characteristics for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of individual characteristics. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, $H_0$ hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fails to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of individual characteristics ($p=0.416$). In other words, all samples had similar beliefs about the level of importance of individual characteristics. Eckstein (2004)$^{34}$, Admin (2012)$^{35}$ and Gaieni (2008)$^{33}$ referred to some individual characteristics such as having admirable appearance, being neat and tidy. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996)$^{14}$ and Shafiee (2007)$^{6}$. But contradicted result from studies by Kohandel (2000)$^5$, Akbarzade (2008)$^{29}$, Monazzemi (2009)$^{10}$ and Tajik (2010)$^8$ indicated significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers in the case of the level of importance of individual characteristics.

**$H_0$:** There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of scientific characteristics.

**$H_a$:** There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of scientific characteristics.

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of scientific characteristics for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of scientific characteristics. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, $H_a$ hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fails to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials,
experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of scientific characteristics (p=0.52). In other words, all samples had similar beliefs about the level of importance of scientific characteristics. Edward (1990)\textsuperscript{36} believes that coach’s adequate knowledge would cause him/her to succeed. Gondi (1998)\textsuperscript{1}, Lloyd (2000)\textsuperscript{23}, ASCTA (1998)\textsuperscript{24}, Jefferies and Stephan (1992)\textsuperscript{18}, Gable (1999)\textsuperscript{37}, Gendron and Stenlund (2003)\textsuperscript{25}, Martens (2004)\textsuperscript{26}, Morris (2005)\textsuperscript{27}, Welker (2005)\textsuperscript{38} and Gaieni (2008)\textsuperscript{33} point out that coach’s knowledge are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The results of this study are partially in agreement with those of Mcklean (1996)\textsuperscript{14} and Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}. But contradicted result from a study by Kohandel (2000)\textsuperscript{5}, Akbarzade (2008)\textsuperscript{29}, Monazzemi (2009)\textsuperscript{10} and Tajik (2010)\textsuperscript{8} indicated significant difference between among coaches, experts, athletes and managers with respect to the level of importance of scientific characteristics.

**H\textsubscript{0}**: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of motivational characteristics.

**H\textsubscript{a}**: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of motivational characteristics.

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of motivational characteristics for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of motivational characteristics. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, H\textsubscript{a} hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fails to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of motivational characteristics (p=0.627). In other words, all samples had similar beliefs about the level of importance of motivational characteristics. Spink (1991)\textsuperscript{12} and Cross (1981)\textsuperscript{39} stated that psychology in coaching plays an effective role in the coach’s success and the athlete’s functional development as well as in their motivational and
communicational skills. Gondi (1998)\textsuperscript{1}, Lloyd (2000)\textsuperscript{23}, ASCTA (1998)\textsuperscript{24}, Jefferies and Stephan (1992)\textsuperscript{18}, Gable (1999)\textsuperscript{37}, MacCann (2002)\textsuperscript{40}, Eckstein (2004)\textsuperscript{34}, Martens (2004)\textsuperscript{26} and Weeks (2011)\textsuperscript{28} believe that motivational skills are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996)\textsuperscript{14} and Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}. But contradicted result from a study by Akbarzade (2008)\textsuperscript{29} and Monazzemi (2009)\textsuperscript{10} indicated significant difference between among coaches, experts, athletes and managers in the case of the level of importance of motivational characteristics.

\textbf{H}_{0}: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of sport characteristics.

\textbf{H}_{a}: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of sport characteristics.

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of sport characteristics for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of sport characteristics. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, \textbf{H}_{0} hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fails to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of sport characteristics (p=0.52). In other words, all samples had similar beliefs about importance of sport characteristics. Keith (1990)\textsuperscript{32}, Gendron and Stenlund (2003)\textsuperscript{25}, Mackenzie (2005)\textsuperscript{41}, Welker (2005)\textsuperscript{38} and Gaieni (2008)\textsuperscript{33} believe that sport characteristics are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The results of this study are partially in agreement with those of Mcklean (1996)\textsuperscript{14} and Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}. But contradicted result from a study by Kohandel (2000)\textsuperscript{5}, Monazzemi (2009)\textsuperscript{10} and Tajik (2010)\textsuperscript{8} indicated no significant relationship among coaches, experts, athletes and managers with respect to the level of importance of sport characteristics.
**H₀**: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of communicational skills.

**H₁**: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of communicational skills.

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of communicational skills for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of communication skills. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, H₀ hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fails to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of communication skills (p=0.59). In other words, all samples had similar beliefs about importance of communication skills. Sabok (1992)², Gable (1999)³⁷, MacCann (2002)⁴⁰, Martens (2004)²⁶, Weeks (2011)²⁸ believe that motivational skills are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Shafiee (2007)⁶. But contradicted result from a study by Monazzemi (2009)¹⁰ and Tajik (2010)⁸ indicated significant difference between coaches, experts, athletes and managers in the case of the level of importance of communicational skills.

**H₀**: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of coaching experience.

**H₁**: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of coaching experience.

Kruskal-Wallis Test was used for comparisons of differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints on the level of the importance of coaching experience for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches. Analysis of managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints using Kruskal-Wallis
Test found no significant difference on the level of importance of coaching experience. Chi-Square was also run. Accordingly, $H_0$ hypothesis was rejected. Hence, researchers fail to reject the null hypothesis, so it can be said with 95% confidence that there was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints on the level of importance of coaching experience ($p=0.099$). In other words, all samples agreed on the level of importance of coaching experience. Keith (1990) believe that coaching experience are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The results of this study are partially in agreement with the study of Mcklean (1996). But contradicted result from a study by Kohandel (2000), Shafiee (2007), Monazzemi (2009) and Tajik (2010) indicated significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers with respect to the level of importance of coaching experience.

$H_0$: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of personality characteristics.

$H_a$: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of personality characteristics.

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of personality characteristics. From the table 4.27, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of personality characteristics ($p=.000$). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of personality characteristics: keep cool in dealing with the athletes during practice sessions and competitions, commitment to their responsibility, being punctual in practice sessions, coaching confidence, being respected coach among athletes, officials and people, honesty in word and behavior.
in connection with athletes, colleagues and the organization, hard work and perseverance to achieve predetermined goals, love the service and having the inherent interest for coaching, being polite. The most prioritized factor was “Keep cool in dealing with the athletes during practice sessions and competitions” with average 6.19. It was considered as a very important criterion. The least prioritized factors were “Being polite” and “Love the service and having the inherent interest for coaching”. Thus, they have little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so they can be ignored. “Commitment to their responsibility” and “Being punctual in practice sessions” was considered as important criteria. All samples showed a strong similarity in “Coaching confidence and being respected coach among athletes, officials and people”. They believed that these criteria were relatively important. “Honesty in word and behavior in connection with athletes, colleagues and the organization” is a criterion which was considered as a less important factor. “Hard work and perseverance to achieve predetermined goals” was put in seventh priority. In other words, it was considered as a less important factor. Browns (1975)\textsuperscript{16}, Malhorta and Kan (1986)\textsuperscript{17}, Jefferies and Stephan (1992)\textsuperscript{18}, Salminenm (1996)\textsuperscript{19}, Luikonen (1990)\textsuperscript{20}, Sharman (1986)\textsuperscript{21}, Penman (1974)\textsuperscript{22}, Gondi (1998)\textsuperscript{1}, Lloyd (2000)\textsuperscript{23}, ASCTA (1998)\textsuperscript{24}, Gendron and Stenlund (2003)\textsuperscript{25}, Martens (2004)\textsuperscript{26}, Morris (2005)\textsuperscript{27} and Weeks (2011)\textsuperscript{28} believe that personality characteristics are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996)\textsuperscript{14} and Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}. But contradicted result from studies by Kohandel (2000)\textsuperscript{5}, Akbarzade (2008)\textsuperscript{29}, Monazzemi (2009)\textsuperscript{10} and Tajik (2010)\textsuperscript{8} indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers in the case of prioritizing the subgroups of personality characteristics.

**H\textsubscript{0}**: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of management skills.

**H\textsubscript{a}**: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of management skills.

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of
management skills. From the table 4.28, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of management skills (p=.000). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of management skills: Adopting punitive and encouraging measures to create motivation, Using personal charm to influence wrestlers and to attract them, Evaluation the performance of themselves, staff, wrestlers, Having ability to identify suitable athletes for the team and lead them, Using the most effective management methods for leading the team and wrestlers, Having ability to use methods of decision making accurate, Having ability to divide tasks, Control and overseeing programs directly and ensure their proper implementation, Having ability to instill discipline.

The most prioritized factor was “Adopting punitive and encouraging measures to create motivation” with average 6.08. It was considered as a very important criterion. The least prioritized factors were “Having ability to instill discipline” and “Control and overseeing programs directly and ensure their proper implementation”. Thus, they have little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so they can be ignored. “Using personal charm to influence wrestlers and to attract them” and “Evaluation the performance of themselves, staff, and wrestlers” was considered as important criteria. They believed that “Having ability to identify suitable athletes for the team and lead them” and “Using the most effective management methods for leading the team and wrestlers” were relatively important. “Having ability to use methods of decision making accurate” is a criterion which was considered as a less important factor. “Having ability to divide tasks” was put in seventh priority. In other words, it was considered as a less important factor. Sabok (1992)\textsuperscript{2} consider some characteristics in his research such as: organizing, planning, communication skills, behavioral features and evaluation, are very important for a coach. Dick (1992)\textsuperscript{30}, Kim and Lee (1991)\textsuperscript{31} point to the coach's managerial role and believe that managerial skills have an important and significant role in achieving the team goals and functional development. Gondi (1998)\textsuperscript{1}, Lloyd (2000)\textsuperscript{23}, ASCTA (1998)\textsuperscript{24}, Keith (1990)\textsuperscript{32}, Gendron and Stenlund (2003)\textsuperscript{25}, Martens (2004)\textsuperscript{26} and Gaieni
believe that management skills are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The results of this study are partially in agreement with the study of Mcklean (1996) but contradicted result from a study by Kohandel (2000) indicated no significant relationship between coaches and athletes with respect to prioritize coaching dimensions. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996) and Shafiee (2007). But contradicted result from studies by Monazzemi (2009) and Tajik (2010) indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers regarding prioritizing the subgroups of management skills.

H₀: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of individual characteristics.

Hₐ: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of individual characteristics.

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of individual characteristics. From the table 4.29, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of individual characteristics (p=.000). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of individual characteristics: having good fitness, being married, having good facial expressions, the coach’s age (age range desirable for national coach is considered of 35 to 60 years). The most prioritized factor was “Having good fitness” with average 2.95. It was considered as a very important criterion. The least prioritized factor was “The coach’s age”. Thus, it has little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so it can be ignored. “Having good facial expressions” was considered as a less important criteria. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996).
and Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}. But contradicted result from studies by Kohandel (2000)\textsuperscript{5}, Akbarzade (2008)\textsuperscript{29}, Monazzemi (2009)\textsuperscript{10} and Tajik (2010)\textsuperscript{8} indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers in the case of prioritizing the subgroups of individual characteristics.

\textbf{H}_0: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of scientific characteristics.

\textbf{H}_a: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of scientific characteristics.

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of scientific characteristics. From the table 4.30, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of scientific characteristics (p=.000). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of scientific characteristics: having high ability in bench coaching, knowing all techniques about wrestling, being familiar with the principles of nutrition before, during and after wrestling competitions, having ability to analyze right & left rivals in wrestling, being familiar with wrestling arbitration rule & regulations, being familiar with scientific methods of dieting & weight loss in wrestling, having up-to-date information about wrestling, knowing all tactics about wrestling and ability to analysis them for their wrestlers, being familiar with the process of weigh-in, table rules and draw in wrestling competitions, designing and implantation of appropriate training patterns in line with wrestlers’ demand, being familiar with exercise-related injuries in wrestling, having wrestling coaching relevant education, holding the valid certificate in wrestling coaching approved by the world wrestling federation, being familiar with emergency procedure in wrestling, being member in international centers or scientific communities of wrestling, using the latest
technology and teaching aids (dummies, video and audio tapes, showing films, ...),
being familiar with professional terms of wrestling in English. The most prioritized
factors were “Having high ability in bench coaching”, “Knowing all techniques about
wrestling” and “Being familiar with the principles of nutrition before, during and after
wrestling competitions”. They were considered as very important criterion. The least
prioritized factors were “Being member in international centers or scientific
communities of wrestling”, “Using the latest technology and teaching aids (dummies,
video and audio tapes, showing films, etc.)” and “Being familiar with professional
terms of wrestling in English”. Thus, they have little role in the selection process of
national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so they can be ignored. “Having
ability to analyze right & left rivals in wrestling”, “Being familiar with wrestling
arbitration rule & regulations”, “Being familiar with scientific methods of dieting &
weight loss in wrestling” and “Having up-to-date information about wrestling” was
considered as important criteria. All samples believed that “Knowing all tactics about
wrestling and ability to analysis them for their wrestlers”, “Being familiar with the
process of weigh-in, table rules and draw in wrestling competitions” and “Designing
and implantation of appropriate training patterns in line with wrestlers’ demand”
were relatively important. “Honesty in word and behavior in connection with athletes,
colleagues and the organization”, “Being familiar with exercise-related injuries in
wrestling”, “Having wrestling coaching relevant education”, “Holding the valid
certificate in wrestling coaching approved by the world wrestling federation” and
“Being familiar with emergency procedure in wrestling” were considered as a less
(1992), Gable (1999), Gendron and Stenlund (2003), Martens (2004), Morris
(2005), Welker (2005) and Gaieni (2008) point out that coach’s knowledge are
significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The results of this study are partially in
agreement with those of Mcklean (1996) and Shafiee (2007). But contradicted
result from a study by Kohandel (2000), Akbarzade (2008), Monazzemi (2009) and
Tajik (2010) indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and
managers with respect to prioritize the subgroups of scientific characteristics.
$H_0$: There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of motivational characteristics.

$H_a$: There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of motivational characteristics.

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of motivational characteristics. From the table 4.31, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of motivational characteristics ($p=.000$). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of motivational characteristics: “Having ability to stimulate wrestlers to achieve their maximum ability”, “Having ability to apply methods of reducing stress in wrestlers” and “Having ability to apply methods of mental relaxation to wrestlers after losing in competition”. The most prioritized factor was “Having ability to stimulate wrestlers to achieve their maximum ability” with average 2.13. It was considered as a very important criterion. The least prioritized factors were “Having ability to apply methods of mental relaxation to wrestlers after losing in competition”. Thus, it has little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so it can be ignored. “Having ability to apply methods of reducing stress in wrestlers” was considered as lesser important criteria. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Mcklean (1996)\textsuperscript{14} and Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}. But contradicted result from a study by Akbarzade (2008)\textsuperscript{29} and Monazzemi (2009)\textsuperscript{10} indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers with respect to prioritize the subgroups of motivational characteristics.
\textbf{H}_0: \text{ There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of sport characteristics.}  

\textbf{H}_1: \text{ There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of sport characteristics.}  

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of sport characteristics. From the table 4.32, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of sport characteristics (p=.000). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of sport characteristics: “Having sufficient mastery in performing wrestling techniques”, “Having a background of championship (at least in state)”, “Having high level of physical fitness to attend practice sessions and competition” and “Having a background of membership in national team as a wrestler”. The most prioritized factor was “Having sufficient mastery in performing wrestling techniques” with average 2.69. It was considered as a very important criterion. The least prioritized factors were “Having a background of membership in national team as a wrestler”. Thus, it has little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so it can be ignored. All samples believed that “Having a background of championship” was relatively important. “Having high level of physical fitness to attend practice sessions and competition” was considered as less important criteria. Keith (1990)\textsuperscript{32}, Gendron and Stenlund (2003)\textsuperscript{25}, Mackenzie (2005)\textsuperscript{41}, Welker (2005)\textsuperscript{38} and Gaieni (2008)\textsuperscript{33} believe that sport characteristics are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The results of this study are partially in agreement with those of Mcklean (1996)\textsuperscript{14} and Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}. But contradicted result from a study by Kohandel (2000)\textsuperscript{5}, Monazzemi (2009)\textsuperscript{10} and Tajik (2010)\textsuperscript{8} indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers with respect to prioritize the subgroups of sport characteristics.
**H₀:** There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of communicational skills.

**H₁:** There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of communicational skills.

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of communicational skills. From the table 4.33, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of communicational skills (p=.000). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of communicational skills: Having ability to communicate with wrestlers, Having ability to interact with technical staff, Having ability to interact with other age categories coaches, Having ability to communicate with wrestling coaches from different countries, Having ability to interact well with referees in wrestling competitions, Having strong connections with the mass media. The most prioritized factor was “Having ability to communicate with wrestlers”. It was considered as very important criterion. The least prioritized factor was “Having strong connections with the mass media”. Thus, it has little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so they can be ignored. “Having ability to interact with technical staff” was considered as important criteria. All samples believed that “Having ability to interact with other age categories coaches” and “Having ability to communicate with wrestling coaches from different countries” were relatively important. “Having ability to interact well with referees in wrestling competitions” is a criterion which was considered as a less important factor. The result of the current study is in line with the results of research by Shafiiee (2007). But contradicted result from a study by Monazzemi (2009) and Tajik (2010) indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers with respect to prioritize the subgroups of communicational skills.
**H₀:** There was no significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of coaching experience.

**Hₐ:** There was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of coaching experience.

Friedman Test was used to indicate the differences among coaches, managers, wrestlers, officials and experts’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of coaching experience. From the table 4.34, it is clear that the significance level of test is less than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis was rejected thus alternative hypothesis was accepted, so it can be noted with 95% confidence that there was significant difference among managers, officials, experts, coaches and wrestlers’ viewpoints regarding prioritizing the subgroups of coaching experience (p=.000). The results of Friedman test indicate that all subjects ranked respectively the following items as the subgroups of coaching experience: Having a background of training and introducing successful wrestlers to the national team, Having successful background in coaching in national teams, Having successful background in coaching in famous clubs or province-teams in wrestling, Having experience as assistant coach in club, provincial, and national team. The most prioritized factor was “Having a background of training and introducing successful wrestlers to the national team”. It was considered as very important criterion. The least prioritized factor was “Having experience as assistant coach in club, provincial, and national team”. Thus, it has little role in the selection process of national coaches in respect to all subjects’ viewpoints so it can be ignored. All samples believed that “Having successful background in coaching in national teams” was relatively important. “Having successful background in coaching in famous clubs or province-teams in wrestling” is a criterion which was considered as a less important factor. Keith (1990)³² believe that coaching experience are significant aspect necessary for hiring coaches. The results of this study are partially in agreement with the study of Mcklean (1996)¹³. But contradicted result from a study by Kohandel (2000)⁵, Shafiee (2007)⁶, Monazzemi (2009)¹⁰ and Tajik (2010)⁸ indicated no significant difference among coaches, experts, athletes and managers with respect to prioritize the subgroups of coaching experience.
5.4. Discussion

We all at least have an ambiguous concept in our minds on the term “coaching” or we have our personal understandings of the tasks which should be contained within this profession. The expectations of people from the behaviors of an effective coach are also personal imaginations. People generally consider coaches or responsible managers guilty in the event of weak performance of a team and in contrast commend them in the event of winning or conferring upon awards. For instance, since 1978, more than 34 coaches have seat on the chair of the head coach of Iran’s national wrestling team. This implies that in Iranian wrestling national team, the mean life of coaching is up to 12 months indicates the lack of definitive and specified measures by which the best option should have been selected as the head coach of wrestling national team. Although there is no evidence of any similar research on coach selection criteria specially in free style wrestling at international level, the results of present research, in general, are comparable with the findings of some studies by many researchers such as Latham (1953), Browns (1975), Malhorta and Kan (1986), Edward (1990), Keith (1990), Admin (2012), etc., who considered some criteria of great importance in different sports. It should be pointed out that all researchers have paid attention to the importance of coaches' specifications in order to achieve success in their goals. They tried to investigate coaches' performance. Generally, it is suggested that each specification has sufficient effect on coaches' success. In this research, the researchers tried to find a suitable pattern for selecting national team coaches. The results of the research showed that each selection criterion and its subgroups are sufficiently valuable; even the last dimension “individual characteristics” in this research is important in national coach selection. The results of this study indicate that coaches, managers, officials, experts and wrestlers consider respectively the following items as the criteria for selection of the coach of wrestling national team including 1) Motivational Characteristics, 2) Personality characteristics, 3) Management skills, 4) Scientific Characteristics, 5) Sport Characteristics, 6) Coaching Experience, 7) Communication Skills, 8) Individual characteristics. Thus, those selection criteria can truthfully help to select the
national coaches in freestyle wrestling.

Most researchers elaborate specific traits for a good coach; for instance, Martens (2004)\(^{26}\) believes that three factors are important in making a successful coach. The factors include relationship skills, support principles and understanding of stimulant. He finalizes the required features for meeting coaching obligations within 11 items including awareness of sport knowledge, using the best coaching method, allocating priorities in the process of preparing objectives and plans, having motivation, ability of transferring thoughts, familiarity with relationship skills, familiarity with persuasion principles, using motivation skills, organizing and scheduling exercises, evaluating oneself as well as players’ activities and implemented programs, familiarity with skill training principles and players learning quality. Sabok (1992)\(^{2}\) pointed to some traits like planning, communication, knowledge skill, behavior traits and evaluation. To compare these two scientists’ viewpoints, you can see an agreement about some criteria and its subgroups as follows: communicational skills, planning, organizing and evaluation. The results of this research endorse the value and importance of these components of selection.

The selection criteria of this study are consistent with those considered by FIFA (2012) and AFC (2011) in their coaching books and notes for a perfect coach in today’s modern football style. FIFA knows today’s football coaches as multi-skilled coaches and believes that a coach should be equipped with technical, tactical, psychological, social, appropriate relationship with media, and managerial skills (FIFA coaching, 2008)\(^{15}\). Redmond Football Club (2000)\(^{43}\) has presented criteria and measures for the selection of coaches and evaluation process of football teams within a form of scoring system in which scores range from 1 to 5. It consists of the following measures: background in coaching, ability of motivating the players, knowledge of coaching, ability of creating the atmosphere of sprightliness and happiness in exercises, making competitive atmosphere among the players and at the same time emphasizing on fair play, using effective leadership approaches and idealistic team directing, being a positive and ideal symbol for the players, ability of making appropriate relations with the players and supporting team and the sense of individual responsibility.
Communicational skill is another criterion. Glen (1981), Larsoon (1990), Spink (1991), Sabok (1992) and Mac Lean and Joanne (1996) referred to this criterion. They also referred to the role of effective communication between coaches and athletes. In this research, communicational skills have been concerned under humanity factors. In addition, motivational criterion and sense of emotion and duty are placed under this dimension. Other criteria for coaches to succeed are effective as well. Although some dimensions may be more effective, all of them are essential for a good and successful coach. All researches, articles and books about coaching point to those aspects of effective coaching.

Liukonen et al. (1990), Salminen (1996), Dodge and Hasties (1993) referred to leadership style; especially recommend contingency leadership for young coaches and democratic style recommended for well-experience coaches. The results of their research showed that young coaches have more tendencies to use imperative models for controlling and leading athletes’ behavior due to their less experience. Anyway, the importance of using leadership styles in controlling and leading the athletes is completely obvious and it is necessary for coaches to be familiar with leadership styles and to use them in appropriate situations. Because of the importance of this criterion in coaching, this research paid attention to it in managerial skills dimension.

Dahlkvist and Svenson (2001) through their study titled “the duties of a coach as the head coach of a national team” found that in coaching process, there are 4 aspects which are more important in achieving championship place. These aspects include type of leadership, appropriator leadership, coach relations and communications and coach personality.

Ghahfarrokhi and Jalali Farahani (2010) investigated and analyzed the phenomenon of changing the coaches of Iran’s premier league. The results indicated that more than 75 percent of clubs’ selection within a season were useless or were low effective which were not led to the improvement of team results or continuous positive changes within the teams. They emphasized this issue that the coaches had been selected via imprecise measures and carrying out no necessary expertise studies. The criteria for selection of coaches, which contain indices like personal characteristics, emotive-human skills, technical skills, social
characteristics, managerial skills and background in sports and are consistent with the selection criteria of this study, have been designed in some sports fields by Kohandel (2000)\textsuperscript{5}, in swimming, diving and water polo by Shafiee (2007)\textsuperscript{6}, in Handball by Nasiri (2009)\textsuperscript{7} and in Taekwondo by Tajik (2010)\textsuperscript{8}.

Couch (2000)\textsuperscript{46} and Monazzami (2009)\textsuperscript{10} give the first priority to technical skills of a coach which are not in line with the results of the current study. Research it has been effort to identify and design criteria selection of wrestling national coach team and identify the most important factors influencing the selection. Their importance was estimated and finally a suitable pattern was designed to select national coach.

Designing criteria for the process of selecting sports coaches was the common point of the studies of MacLean and Joanne (1996)\textsuperscript{14}, Couch (2000)\textsuperscript{46}, Cunningham (2003)\textsuperscript{47}, Mallet (2006)\textsuperscript{48} and Coaches Association of British Colombia (CABC, 2007)\textsuperscript{49} through separate studies.

Hamidi (Hamidi et al, 2011)\textsuperscript{50}, in his study which was carried out with the purpose of preparing a model for performance evaluation of national coaches, found out that investigation scale of national coaches consists of five factors. In this model, three factors i.e.: technical skills, leadership skills and special skills were appeared as independent factors affecting the relationship skills of coaches which in turn affects the operational ability of coaches.

Lloyd (2000)\textsuperscript{23}, Jefferies and Stephan (1992)\textsuperscript{18}, Gondi (1998)\textsuperscript{1} and Redmond football club (2000)\textsuperscript{43}, presented some patterns for coaches selection or evaluation at different levels. Their criteria are rare and limited but each component points to a specific aspect of coaching. Thus, these aspects alone could not be effective in national and professional coaches.

Undoubtedly, it is a crucial and difficult duty to select the best person, who should be approved from different points of view and should be a pleasing and attractive person, as the head coach of a national team. Therefore, it is expected that the criteria and measures for selection of the best person as the head coach of the wrestling national team, who is verified by prominent national coaches and experts and eventually all community of wrestling, should be designed and prepared using the results of the current study. In this research it has been tried

to categorize the components of coaching by selecting the important dimensions that are effective in coaching and then by analyzing data extracted from questionnaires. Their importance was estimated and finally a suitable pattern was designed to select national coaches.

5.5. Conclusions

The following conclusions were derived from analyzing and studying the data collected on the 205 subjects who participated in wrestling world championship competition in 2013. Experts, officials and wrestlers placed the highest priority on “Personality characteristics”. In contrast, managers and coaches agreed on this dimension as a second priority. Overall, it was placed on second priority (important) with respect to all samples’ viewpoints.

From the Friedman test of subgroups of personality characteristics it can be concluded that all subjects consider “keeping cool in dealing with the wrestlers during the practice sessions and competitions” as a very important while they believe “being polite” is unimportant criteria to select wrestling national freestyle coach.

The results showed that all subjects put communicational skills in priority 7 that it means it was considered as a less important factor to select wrestling coaches in national team.

From the Friedman test of subgroups of communicational skills it can be concluded that all subjects consider “having ability to communicate with wrestlers as well as technical staff” as a very important while they believe “having ability to communicate with officials” is unimportant criteria to select wrestling national freestyle coach.

The most prioritized factor in choosing coach is motivational characteristics. From the Friedman test of subgroups of motivational characteristics it can be concluded that all subjects consider “having ability to stimulate wrestlers to achieve their maximum ability” as a very important while they believe “having ability to apply methods of mental relaxation to wrestlers after losing in
competition” is unimportant criteria to select wrestling national freestyle coach. All samples showed a strong similarity in scientific characteristics. They believed that it is a relatively important factor for selecting wrestling national coaches. From the Friedman test of subgroups of scientific characteristics it can be concluded that all subjects consider “having high ability in bench coaching” as a very important while they believe “being familiar with professional terms of wrestling in English” is unimportant criteria to select wrestling national freestyle coach.

Management skills was considered important factor by wrestlers, experts and managers while others believed that it is relatively important dimension in selecting national coaches. From the Friedman test of subgroups of management skills it can be concluded that all subjects consider “adopting punitive and encouraging measures to create motivation” as a very important while they believe “having ability to instill discipline” is unimportant criteria to select wrestling national freestyle coach.

Sport characteristics was put in priority 5 by all subjects’ viewpoint that it means it was considered as a relatively important factor to select wrestling coaches in national team. From the Friedman test of subgroups of sport characteristics it can be concluded that all subjects consider “having high level of physical fitness to attend practice sessions and competition” as a very important while they believe “having a background of membership in national team as a wrestler” is an unimportant criterion to select wrestling national freestyle coach.

Coaching experience was placed in priority 6 with respect to all subjects’ viewpoint that it means it was considered as a less important factor to select wrestling coaches in national team. From the Friedman test of subgroups of coaching experience it can be concluded that all subjects consider “having a background of training and introducing successful wrestlers to the national team” as a very important while they believe “having experience as an assistant coach in club, provincial and national team” is unimportant criteria to select wrestling national freestyle coach.

Individual characteristics has little role in the selection process of wrestling

national freestyle coach. It was placed in priority 8 with respect to all subjects’ viewpoint that it means it was considered as an unimportant factor to select wrestling coaches in national team.

From the Friedman test of subgroups of individual characteristics it can be concluded that all subjects consider “having good fitness” as a very important while they believe “the coach’s age” is unimportant criteria to select wrestling national freestyle coach.

From the combined analysis, it can be concluded that the all subjects considered respectively the following criteria for selecting wrestling national freestyle coaches: 1) Motivational Characteristics, 2) Personality characteristics, 3) Management skills, 4) Scientific Characteristics, 5) Sport Characteristics, 6) Coaching Experience, 7) Communication Skills, 8) Individual characteristics.

With respect to the findings of this research, the evaluation model of wrestling national coaches was prepared. In this theoretical evaluation model, the distance between vertical line and horizontal line indicates the level of importance and the priority of these criteria in comparison with each other.

5.6. Recommendations for Future Study

Based on the results, this study recommends that:

- Selection committee may use this “selection criteria” to determine the best coaches for wrestling national team.
- Research workers may reasonably find the similar principal of models in other sports.
- Similar study on female and in Greco-Roman, has been suggested.
- Similar study on other age groups and different levels has been recommended.
- Further study on other variables such as emotional skills, technical skills, social characteristics, ethical characteristics and educational characteristics is suggested.
- This newly model, reasonably, be applied as a kind of guide or research tool for coaches, selection committee and federations.
• It is necessary to offer and publicize more coaching and training courses in Wrestling Federation according to significant difference between the views of mentioned population so they can obtain updated information and professional knowledge to perform their coaching duties. If certifying all coaches is a future concern, then course planning and the implementation will be extremely important.

• The mentioned criteria and their subthemes in this study, each represent the thoughts of many of the finest coaches, wrestlers, managers, officials and experts in freestyle wrestling, so developing strengths within each of these areas will assist a coach greatly in becoming an effective coach now and into the future.

• In accordance to the obtained results in this study, the authorities, who are responsible for selecting national coaches in freestyle wrestling, are highly recommended to apply these criteria and model, especially motivational characteristics, for selecting national coaches at different levels.

5.7. Contribution to the Knowledge

• The present model is very specific and sufficient to select and evaluate national team coaches in wrestling. After application of this model one can get a feedback on one’s strength and weakness points regarding the scope of his function. In other hands coaches can come to know their own strength and weakness, which ultimately motives them to improve further.

• This study would contribute to the literature of world sports with specific reference to wrestling, providing their scientific process and criteria for selecting wrestling national free style coaches.

• This study would contribute to world wrestling federation, wrestling federation of different countries, wrestling clubs, sport committees and sport decision makers to select wrestling coaches for the national teams or club coaches, furthermore, it may help to distinguish the
degree and level of the coaches in all aspects so it may meet the needs of the coaches in different fields.
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