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ABSTRACT

SAMANTHA KIRBY: Creating and Maintaining an Organizational Culture of Value: A Study of NCAA Division III Volleyball Coaches and Student-Athletes (Under the direction of Coyte G. Cooper, Ph.D.)

In 2006, Myles Brand noted that many Division III schools see almost 30% of their student population participating in intercollegiate athletics. With such a large portion of Division III students taking part in intercollegiate athletics, it is vital to analyze those who work with the student-athletes on a day-to-day basis. This study uses transformational leadership and the leader-value continuum to examine whether or not coaches mold their team around an organizational culture that can foster the development of values within their student-athletes. It specially addresses the priority of values among coaches and student-athletes in five core areas; academics, athletics, campus/community involvement, conduct, and student-athlete development. The study uses an electronically distributed survey to all Division III Head Volleyball Coaches and Student-athletes. The results were analyzed using descriptive statistics and T-Tests.
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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

In 2006, Myles Brand noted that many Division III schools see almost 30% of their student population participating in intercollegiate athletics. That number has continued to increase in the past six years as schools have expanded their departments to add new sports and give students more opportunities to be a part of the student-athlete experience. Brand said that being a student-athlete gives you “an opportunity to develop a value system, a set of enduring goals, and a perspective on life” (p. 18).

With such a large portion of Division III students taking part in intercollegiate athletics, it is vital to analyze those who work with the student-athletes on a day-to-day basis. Scott Armstrong (2001) says, “The most important interpersonal relationship in athletics is between the coach and the athlete” (p. 46). He also noted that the experience of a student-athlete is a direct reflection of a coach’s philosophy, beliefs, values, and priorities. Coaches that lead by example make sure that their behaviors are consistent with the beliefs and their pursuit of the vision set by the team. These coaches are able to produce athletes with a positive intercollegiate athletic experience, and therefore achieve goals within the Division III philosophy (NCAA, 2012).

Danielle Charbonneau, Julian Barling, and Kevin Kelloway proposed a transformational leadership model that says that the success of a team is based on the ability of a leader to organize members around one culture and system of values (2001). A leader must be able to establish buy-in and make sure that everyone is on board with the values that are being emphasized (Charbonneau, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001; Cooper & Weight, 2011).
Without this value culturalization, the culture of the team is not meaningful and the ability to motivate and inspire athletes is minimal. Charbonneau et al. found that intrinsic motivation mediates the relationship between a transformational leader and the performance of a team (2001). In order for teams to be successful on the court, the coach must establish a culture as a transformational leader and then translate that culture through actions and behaviors.

Division III institutions hold the student-athlete experience at the highest of their priority (NCAA, 2012). This noted emphasis is markedly different from the other two NCAA Divisions and therefore poses an interesting route for research. Division III institutions are striving to create the best overall experience for their student-athletes, but do the student-athletes feel that their coaches are ensuring that athletics is a positive during their four years of play, or are coaches causing student-athletes to question the experience that they signed up for? Coaches are known for their influence on the student-athlete and their ability to alter the life of a player for better or worse (Chan, D. K., Lonsdale, C., and Fung, H. H. (2012)).

When playing such a large part in the development of a player it is vital to know whether or not the coach is influencing their players in a positive manner.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to examine whether or not coaches mold their team around an organizational culture that can foster the development of values within their student-athletes. More specifically it will gather data on the perception of student-athletes who observe coaching behaviors daily and determine whether or not these coaches are developing an organizational culture consistent with the values of the NCAA Division classification for their institution.
Research Questions

1. Which values do coaches and student-athletes rate as having the highest priority within their program?
   a. Academics
   b. Athletics
   c. Team Conduct
   d. Student-Athlete Development
   e. Campus/Community Involvement

2. Is there a variation in the rated priority of each value for coaches and student-athletes?
   a. Academics
   b. Athletics
   c. Team Conduct
   d. Student-Athlete Development
   e. Campus/Community Involvement

3. Do student-athletes feel that coaches are modeling these organizational team values in their program and do coaches feel that the student-athletes are buying in to the team’s values?

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that all survey respondents were truthful and accurate in their responses.
2. The completion of the survey was voluntary for coaches and student-athletes.
3. All participants are current Division III student-athletes and coaches.
Delimitations

1. This study is only representative of Division III women’s volleyball teams and cannot be generalized to Division I or II.

2. This study only involves current student-athletes and coaches at NCAA Division III institutions.

Limitations

1. Survey respondents might not be a representative sample of all Division III teams.

2. Due to the voluntary nature of the study, there may be a non-response bias.

3. Coaches are asked to forward the survey along to student-athletes, and may choose not to do so, affecting the response rate of student-athletes.

Definition of Terms

**NCAA**: The National Collegiate Athletic Association is a voluntary membership organizational of higher education universities and institutions that participate in intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA is the general governing body that develops, monitors, and enforces rules and regulations for all member institutions.

**Division III**: Division III is one of three divisions within the NCAA. It is based on the ideals of Discover, Develop, and Dedicate. It currently has 446 total members, 43 conferences, and 178,441 participating student-athletes.

**Organizational Culture**: Organizational Culture is a combination of the values, beliefs, goals, and expectations defined for a group or team.
Values: Values are the preference of a group or individual concerning a desired outcome or action. They are based on cultural and ethical preference and vary based on the situation and group.

Academics: The desire to place a high priority on the emphasis of a student-athlete’s academic success.

Athletics: The desire to compete and practice at the highest level, while developing the best athletes individually and as a team.

Team Conduct: The desire for a team to display responsible conduct on and off the volleyball court.

Student-Athlete Development: The desire for programs to enhance the student-athlete experience by providing leadership development opportunities that prepare them to lead a success life after graduation.

Campus/Community Involvement: The desire for student-athletes to be involved in organizations and activities on their institution’s campus and within the local community, unrelated to their intercollegiate athletic participation.

Significance of Study

The study will examine the priority on certain values for NCAA Division III volleyball coaches and student-athletes. In the 2011 Annual Report, Jim Schmotter stated that student-athletes chose to compete at the Division III level because they want to immerse themselves in an environment where participation in intercollegiate competition is based on the enhancement of the educational value and benefits received at the institution. They desire
to engage in the entire realm of campus life and at the very basic level choose to participate in the intercollegiate athletics because they love the game.

There is constant criticism by the media and scholars to suggest that student-athletes are part of a completely separate college culture than non-athletes at their institution. A culture where their academic performance suffers, they are socially segregated from the general student population and they graduate at lower rate (Gayles, 2009). While most of this criticism resides in Division I programs, there haven’t been any studies done to determine whether the same cultures are taking place in Division III institutions. It is very publically known that Division III institutions strive to achieve a balance in academics and athletics, but the research is lacking to prove that this is more than just words in a mission statement and philosophy.

Parents are a major part in the recruiting process for their children and ultimately play a large role in deciding what level of competition and specific institution their child will pursue. In 2009, Laurie Richter published a booked called, *Put Me In, Coach: A Parent’s Guide to Winning the Game of College Recruiting*. In her book she addresses the concern of choosing a priority of academics over athletics and she says that Division III programs attempt to maximize a student’s academic, athletic, and social experience (2009). What is notably absent in this chapter is proof that this actually takes place. A parent can pull up any research or blog and find out how corrupt college athletics are in the current society, but it takes some extreme digging to find a research study that focuses on institutions that are based upon providing a balanced student-athlete experience. This study will allow parents, prospective student-athletes, and coaches to know whether or not Division III athletics are the modeling the core values that they are expected to exhibit.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History of the NCAA

By 2004, the NCAA had been all across the map in terms of organization and leadership. Joseph Crowley felt it necessary to outline the history of the NCAA in his book, In the Arena: The NCAA’s First Century (2006). Crowley discusses how in 1906 the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) was formed to develop a safer playing environment for college football players. There were originally sixty-two charter members that decided that secondary educational institutions needed a governing body to determine rules. The IAAUS was a rule governing body that became the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1910 and eleven years later hosted their first national championship in track and field. 1922 brought an administrative change and the creation of the NCAA Council that was built on the foundation of amateurism, a fundamental theory that is still in place today. By 1951 the association was growing and changing so rapidly that the need for an executive director became pertinent and Walter Byers was hired to run the NCAA (Crowley, 2004).

Walter Byers brought a lot of change to the NCAA and began putting a larger focus on enforcement. He started addressing the long-standing concerns about the well-being of student-athletes by developing regulations for practice seasons, financial assistance, academic progress, and eligibility standards. Under Byers, the NCAA became focused solely on enforcing the rules and no longer left the individual institutions up to the decisions. This
change allowed for a more equal playing field and a more solid environment for institutions to develop student-athletes. The NCAA realized that through their increased enforcement they could play a large role in developing student-athletes and ensuring the best experience for all, but they quickly realized that it was not possible to maintain a level playing field in the College Division where there was such discrepancy between the budgets of different departments. In 1968, the first major division of the NCAA was enacted and schools were required to chose a division; the College Division or the University Division, with University being intended for larger budget institutions. The split was a necessary organizational change and as memberships continued to increase the association saw the need to make another split (Crowley, 2004).

In 1972, the NCAA split into three major Divisions (I, II, III), all of which are still intact today. The purpose of the split was to allow schools a greater chance at competing in championships with institutions that were similar in size, financial assistance, and philosophy. At the inaugural split, 237 institutions chose to be in Division I, 194 chose Division II, and 233 chose Division III. A total of 664 institutions were members of the NCAA at the time of the Division split (Crowley, 2004). Forty years later there are a little less than twice the number of institutions with membership in the NCAA and each year that number grows (NCAA, 2012).

**Division III Philosophy**

According to the most current NCAA Facts and Figures, Division III is the largest of the three divisions, with 446 member institutions offering national sponsored championships in 27 sports (13 men, 14 women) (Facts, 2012). 57% of all male NCAA student-athletes compete in Division III athletics, while 43% of all female student-athletes are Division III
competitors. The statistics prove the large majority of intercollegiate student-athletes are competing at the Division III level. The overwhelming majority, in consideration to other Divisions, may have some relation to the Positioning Statement of Division III athletics; Follow your Passions and Discover your Potential (Facts, 2012). This guiding statement sheds minimal light into an intercollegiate athletics world where academics and athletics are given equal weight.

In September of 2012, the NCAA released the 2011-2012 Division III Annual Report detailing the ideals, philosophy, financial statistics, and a general overview of the continuous growth at this competitive level. The Division III Philosophy Statement reads:

Colleges and universities in Division III place the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students’ academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete’s athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete’s educational experience, and an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff (NCAA, 2012).

The Philosophy Statement also addresses fifteen specific points of focus for member institutions. The first of those points, stresses the importance of the institutional presidents to have supreme authority and responsibility for the conduct of their athletic program. The philosophy also states that no student may receive financial aid on the basis of anything related to athletics, thus proving the intent for athletics to not have a higher priority than the education received at the institution. Division III institutions strive to place all of the importance on the student-athletes and not rely on the approval of spectators, alumni, and the general public. Each Division III institution places value of the part of athletics as a
contributor to the overall educational experience through sportsmanship and the development of positive societal attitudes (NCAA, 2012). This can also be accomplished through broad based programs that encourage athletic participation for all students.

A Division III institution does not allow student-athletes to be treated any differently than the regular student body, either through the admissions process, recruitment, and/or the academic requirements while enrolled (NCAA, 2012). A Division III student-athlete is also encouraged to maintain an academic level that is consistent, if not above, that of the general student body. There is also an importance placed on equitable opportunities for participation and a support for gender and ethnic diversity within the department. Division III programs do their best to support student-athletes in their athletic endeavors by providing the best facilities, competitive opportunities, and coaches. The most relevant ideal, to this study, within the Division III community is that coaches and administrators should exhibit fair, open, and honest relationships with their student-athletes (NCAA, 2012).

The overall themes that can be determined from the fifteen points of focus is that Division III membership requires institutions to place a high priority on the overall student-athlete experience (NCAA, 2012). The purpose of a Division III athletic department is to create and enhance opportunities for members of the student body. Division III student-athletes are considered to be part of the general student body with an enhanced experience, made possible through athletics. This philosophy is different than Division I and II because the focus is on the experience and not on the highest level of play. While Division III athletic programs strive to provide a competitive experience for all student-athletes, they are more concerned that a student-athlete succeeds in the classroom, on the field, and in the
community. This well rounded approach is more clearly defined through the six attributes of Division III athletics (Annual Report, 2012).

**Division III Attributes**

As part of the 2011-2012 Annual Report the NCAA stated the Division III Vision as the following:

A dynamic and engaging group of colleges, universities, and conferences of varying sizes and missions, committed to an environment that encourages and supports diversity, values fairness and equity, and places the highest priority on the overall educational experience of the student-athletes in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics (p. 8).

This vision can be achieved by all Division III institutions through the enactment of six core attributes that define Division III; proportion, comprehensive learning, passion, responsibility, sportmanship, and citizenship. The Division III attributes are based on the NCAA brand values of balance, learning, spirit, character, fair-play, and community, but more concentrated to address the mission and vision of Division III athletics (Annual Report, 2012).

Proportion specifically refers to institutions allocating 25 percent of the annual division budget to key priorities that are not related to the on-the-field product (Annual Report, 2012). Similar to the NCAA idea of balance, Division III insures that they provide enough financial assistance to focus on “student-athlete well-being, diversity, sportmanship, integration, and membership communication/education” (p. 16). This top-down focus helps institutions to grow individually with the support of the President’s Council. The Division also strives to provide student-athletes with opportunities to continue their intercollegiate
experience after graduation through comprehensive learning. These institutions feel it is important for student-athletes to be educated in a broad-based learning environment that rewards them for success in the classroom. Division III universities give athletic participants the chance to pursue postgraduate work through annual scholarships and awards. These two attributes demonstrate the institutional emphasis on academics and the need for continued learning opportunities. Proportion and Comprehensive Learning are two ways that institutions receive and give support to student-athletes for reasons un-related to the on-the-field product.

Part of being a Division III athlete is about bringing a passion to the game. A passion that is not just about the level of competition, but also about loving the game, having fun and always improving. The Division III level sponsors 28 national championships for men and women, and giving athletes the chance to take part in a continued level of competition. Being a Division III athlete is about giving it your all and bringing a passion to the game that can’t be found in any other Division; a passion that is developed and supported by all members of the athletic department (Annual Report, 2012).

Coaches and administrators strive to hold athletes accountable and responsible through their level of commitment and their decisions on and off the court. Division III athletes are encouraged to take part in activities outside of their sport and therefore receive overwhelming support to be involved in leadership and campus activities, because those experiences will enhance the competitive environment on the court/field. Division III gives athletes a chance to pursue leadership grants and programs while competing in their undergraduate studies.
Division III athletes are required to exhibit positive sportsmanship and citizenship while participating in intercollegiate athletics. Student-athletes are impressed upon the necessity of this sportsmanship in relationship to other participants and spectators. They are also held to a high standard of citizenship development. A Division III student-athlete is encouraged to dedicate themselves to being a leader in the community. They take part in local community activities that help develop this citizenship and leadership. The Special Olympics is a partner of Division III and current student-athletes help to plan and lead community service activities benefiting this organization (Annual Report, 2012).

Being a student-athlete at a Division III member institution means that you will not receive athletic financial aid and you will not compete at the highest level of intercollegiate athletics, but it does mean that you will be developed athletically, academically, socially, and emotionally. Coaches, professors, and administrators place priority on the six attributes that allow for the most involved college student experience; proportion, comprehensive learning, passion, responsibility, sportsmanship, and citizenship (NCAA, 2012). This well rounded college experience allows student-athletes to leave their secondary educational institution prepared to lead in the community, succeed in the workplace, and practice a healthy lifestyle that all stems from their participation in Division III athletics.

**Division III Leadership Values**

In their 2011 study, Cooper and Weight have examined the leader values in different athletic department administrators at the Division I level. The duo also began looking into specific leader values at the Division III level and the results proved that the difference in Division affected the core values found to be a priority within the department. Through an online survey, Cooper and Weight determined that there are five organizational values found
to have a high priority in a Division III athletic department; student-athlete experience, academic excellence, health and safety, contribution to the university mission, and disciplined diversity (2012). These core values directly correspond to the Division III philosophy statement and the concept that a student-athlete should use athletics to enhance their educational experience through values of academic excellence, diversity, community involvement, and competitive athletics (NCAA, 2012).

Out of the 11 values measured in the Cooper and Weight (2012) study, there were four value responses that didn’t differ based on the level of administrator filling out the survey. These four values prove that no matter what level of priority identified by the administrator, it is known that they are important to the department and there are useful strategies in place to maintain a high level of importance on “academic excellence, athletic excellence, broad-based participation opportunities, and disciplined diversity” (p. 12). While is it clear these athletic departments have a grasp on the values that define them as a Division III institution, the study also yielded results that show a lack of a consistent value culture, based on lower-level administrator responses (Cooper & Weight, 2012). As their study revealed, without a culture of consistency and authenticity in a department, the use of values can become a detriment to the productivity and success of administrators and their subordinates (Cooper & Weight, 2012). When comparing the Division III results to those of the administrators in the Division I athletic departments, there were clearer strategies in place at many Division III institutions to allow for the culturalization of values and a value centered organizational culture (Cooper & Weight, 2011; Cooper & Weight, 2012). The conclusion allows this research study to test the validity of these responses and whether or
not this organizational culture is continuing down the chain of command from administrators all the way to student-athlete.

**Leader-Values**

In 2011, Cooper and Weight conducted a study among Division I Administrators to determine the authenticity of organizational and aspirational values within an athletic department. The results are a major factor in the significance of this research study, as they looked into the organizational core and aspirational values. The study defined core values as “deeply ingrained principles that guide all of a company’s actions” and aspirational values as “principles believed to be important that may not yet be consistently engrained in the organization” (p. 3). The values of an organization can influence the perception of the employees and affect the decisions that are made in a variety of contexts. Core values have been found to be linked to employee motivation and empowerment, when implemented correctly (Lim, 2001; Yukl, 1994). These values allow employees to reach their highest level of achievement while successfully attributing to the overall effectiveness of the organization. Cooper and Weight specifically note that there must be buy in from employees within an organization, otherwise empty value statements can be detrimental to the overall culture.

In the study, Cooper & Weight further explained that authenticity is key to achieving an organizational culture centered on values, and that dissonance within a value system will lead to distrust and pessimistic attitudes among employees (2011). If values are communicated and are kept current than organizational value initiatives can succeed in the workplace. With intercollegiate athletic programs facing major scandals, their study chose to survey athletic administrators based on transformational leadership characteristics and determine which values in NCAA Division I institutions have the highest priority in relation
to the mission and the variation within those levels based on what position administrators currently hold. They used an online survey instrument to reach 342 institutions, totaling 1368 respondents in four different administrator levels; athletic director, senior AD, associate AD, and assistant AD. Their survey yielded a “return rate for research of 27%” (p. 11) and some extremely significant statistical and empirical results. There was a clear correspondence between the priority placed on certain values and the level of administration. This is more explicitly shown in the open ended responses, where one assistant AD respondent wrote “Some people do not live up to the ideals that they profess” (p. 21).

This landmark study showed for the first time that there is clear dissonance within athletic departments and the director’s ability to “walk the talk”. The higher level administrators proved to be failing at embracing their values and therefore inspiring a vision among their subordinates. This lack of influence could be enhanced with a more transformational leadership emphasis and the desire to intrinsically motivate the followers within the department. Administrators cannot expect their coaches and student-athletes to get on board with a vision if there is not a clear support at the top. This lack of authenticity within the department always trickles down and will eventually affect the athletic performances of student-athletes. Cooper and Weight’s (2011) study addressed these administrative issues, but left room for more research at the next level down; coaches and student-athletes. The Leader-Value Continuum, illustrated by Cooper, Weight, and Pierce shows that the most efficient and transformational leaders will embrace their aspirational values and then implement them into day-to-day decision making (2013). This side of the continuum supports the need for leaders to have transformational decision making and genuinely aspire to act on the values that they impress upon their subordinates.
Transformational Leadership

In 1978, Burns defined a transforming leader as someone who engages the full person within a follower and seeks to satisfy a higher need by discovering the follower’s potential motives. By doing this the leader can develop a relationship that is mutually stimulating and eventually the followers become leaders and leaders become moral agents (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders look into the potential of a follower and develop that through a relationship with them (Burns, 1978; Slack & Hinings, 1987).

Bass (1985) elaborated on Burns theory by discussing four main dimensions of transformational leadership; charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Charisma, sometimes referred to as idealized influence, is when a leader can influence the followers to behave in an admirable way by being a model of this behavior. When a transformational leader shows charisma they are more likely to take a stand against something and show a conviction that appeals to followers on an emotional level. The second dimension of a transformational leader is inspirational motivation or the degree that a leader inspires a follower through an articulate and appealing vision. This type of leader carries a higher standard and is optimistic about reaching future goals. Intellectual stimulation is the third dimension in transformational leadership, and it is when a leader challenges the followers and takes risks to solicit their ideas. This type of leader encourages a special kind of creativity in their followers and encourages them to take their own risks. The last dimension that Bass discussed is individualized consideration, where a leader is also a mentor to the follower and is always attentive to their personal needs. While different dimensions of Bass’ theory have been developed into a separate, individualized theory, the
four dimensions are necessary to tap into in order to completely satisfy the characteristics of transformational leadership (1985).

The four dimensions of transformational leadership were developed in 1985 by Bass and are still being used in research studies today. However, other scholars have proposed slightly different factors that leaders implement to transform their followers. For example, Podsakoff, MacKenize, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) proposed six factors that leaders use to transform their followers; “articulating a vision of the future, providing an appropriate role model, fostering the acceptance of goals, setting high performance expectations, providing individual support, and providing intellectual stimulation” (p. 112).

The behaviors identified by Podsakoff et al. (1990) give a more detailed description of the same dimensions that Bass defined earlier. They also relate more to a business and team setting because the detailed factors address specific areas that can be troublesome if the leadership isn’t strong. Podsakoff et al. define articulating a vision as a responsibility of the leader to create new opportunities that inspire followers to reach for the same future goal (1990). These factors emphasize the importance of the leader promoting cooperation and communication among the followers; this is referred to as fostering the acceptance of goals and feeds right into the next factor of setting high performance standards (Podsakoff et al. 1990; Yukl, 1994; Lim, 2001). It is vital for a transformational leader to behave in a way that makes expectations clear and concise to all involved. A transformational leader should also provide individualized support based on the needs of each follower and in the same way challenge each individual to find the most productive and successful way of accomplishing the goals set forth (Schein, 1990). The most important factor to this study is the concept of providing an appropriate role model (Podsakoff et al., 1990).
The Podsakoff et al. (1990) study is the first research to openly discuss the need for a transformational leader to be a role model for their followers. While all the other factors are necessary, without the consistency of a leader’s behaviors the other factors will not be useful. It is vital for a transformational leader to be consistent in their behaviors and set an example for all followers by acting on the same values they espouse. There must be a gained trust for any vision to come true and that starts at the top with the transformational leader. In a coaching situation, the coach has to be aware of the influence they have on student-athletes and the necessity for them to “walk the talk” and demonstrate the same values that they preach in the locker room (Podsakoff et al.).

A leader will always have to deal with change in the workplace, but it is how they adapt to it and how that affects their followers and determines the success of the project/company (Slack & Hinings, 1987). In a 2008 study on organization culture and climate, Sarros, Cooper, and Santora examined five different hypotheses related to leadership in the workplace. One of them looked at how a leader’s ability to articulate a vision was most related to a “competitive, performance-oriented organizational culture” (Sarros et al., 2008, p. 148). In a similar study, Grant (2009) discussed the importance for leaders to articulate this vision and its overall use to engage their followers. Sarros et al. used the six different factors of transformational leadership for examination and addressed individualized characteristics within each factor. In this study, the Transformational Leadership Scale was used to have items rated on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Grant also used this scale because it allowed for the messages of the leader to become clear and relate the results to the specific vision. Their study results revealed that articulating a vision was the most strongly related to a climate for organization innovation (Grant, 2008; Sarros et al., 2008). These
results show that a leader’s ability to articulate a vision and then provide individual support are key to promoting a competitive, performance-oriented environment.

In the 2000’s, two different studies were conducted to see how follower development and performance was related to a transformational leader. In 2002, Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir did a longitudinal study to test the impact of a transformational leader on follower development and their individual performance. Using Bass and Avolio’s Multifactor Questionnaire (1990), the authors studied infantry commanders and their followers to see how a transformational leader affected a follower’s motivation, morality, and empowerment. From their research, they determined that direct followers were influenced in motivation, morality, and empowerment, but not their active engagement, internalization of moral values, and self-actualization needs (Dvir et al., 2002). These results show how a follower’s direct involvement with a transformational leader can influence the motivation to succeed, value in the team as a whole, and self-management and development.

The second study concerned follower satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Judge, 2004). This research study used the four dimensions to determine if a transformational leader can have a positive influence on follower satisfaction, motivation, and group performance (Judge, 2004). The study specifically compared transactional and transformational leadership in a variety of settings. In all settings, there was a much greater correlation between transformational leadership and all of their examined criteria; follower satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, follower motivation, leader performance, group performance, and leader effectiveness (Judge, 2004). Even though the two studies looked at different parts related to followers of transformational leaders, they both found a positive
correlation in follower motivation. This speaks to the ability of a transformational leader to motivate their followers in a positive direction, and indirectly influence their performance.

**Leadership in an Athletics Context**

A Canadian study by Alison Doherty and Karen Danylchuk (1996) examined leadership behaviors of athletic directors and associate athletic directors in the Ontario Universities Athletic Association and the Ontario Women’s Interuniversity Athletic Association. A total of thirteen athletic directors (out of 17) within the associations agreed to participate in the study that would use Bass’ transformational leadership model to examine the behaviors of athletic directors as assessed by their coaches. One of the purposes for the study was to determine if transformational leader behaviors were associated with subordinate satisfaction, effectiveness, and commitment to the department. The researchers also hoped to find if the behavior of a subordinate was the outcome of the leader’s behavior (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996).

The study surveyed six head coaches at each of the institutions and targeted sport coaches that were common among all institutions (i.e. football, hockey, basketball, and volleyball). Coaches were mailed a survey to complete and researchers achieved a 59% response rate, with a total of 114 coaches participating. The questionnaire addressed five transformational leadership factors; attributed charisma, idealized influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. These five factors were a product of Bass’ previous research on transformational leadership (1985), but for the purpose of this specific study the researchers measured charisma and idealized influence separately as demonstrated in a previous study by Doherty and Danylchuk (1996). In particular, these factors were identified as either “leader-centered behavior” (charisma, idealized influence
and inspiration) or a “subordinate-centered behavior” (intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration). Ironically, the results yielded the strongest relationship with attributed charisma and individualized consideration, which are two different types of leader behaviors. These two factors alone accounted for 68% of the variance in the coaches’ satisfaction with their AD’s behavior. With the strongest relationship in this study coming from two different types of behaviors, it validates the belief that a transformational leader must be leader centered and subordinate centered. Without a concentration in their own behaviors, as well as the behaviors of those they are in charge of, the chance from miscommunication and failure increases. This study gives proof that two-way communication is the only way for a transformational leader to have a positive impact on their followers (1996).

**Responsibility of a Coach**

In Dr. Keith Bell’s book, *Coaching Excellence*, he discusses how a coach is in a position of authority and holds power over the team (1989). Joe Paterno once said, “I don’t think any coach can do the job expected of him if he can’t have control” (p. 13). This statement represents the power and control needed by a coach to lead a successful team. Dr. Bell addresses how critically important it is for the athletes to perceive a coach as having power, otherwise they will push the limits (p. 14). Bell makes a solid point by saying “athletes will go along with what you want only if they believe that their goals will be better served by acceding to your power than be resisting” (p. 16). It is vital that coaches be understood by their players, because the athlete must see the value in listening to the coach. This communication is key to the personal success of the athlete, coach, and overall team.
Bell (1989) cited Amos Alonzo Stagg, a pioneer college football coach, saying “No coach ever won a game by what he knows; it’s what his players have learned” (p. 39). Communication is a critical fundamental of the coach-athlete relationship. The excellence of a team is heavily dependent on the communication of the mission, goals, and skill set (Bell, 1989). Without proper communication channels, a team will fail on the field/court and the relationships on the team will not foster to their complete potential. Being a coach is about knowing that you are in a position of power and using that power to successfully communicate with your athletes.

In the book, *Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice*, Cassidy, Jones, and Potrac cover what makes a quality coach, the importance of a quality coach and the multitude of characteristics that surround a quality coach (2004). They surveyed 200 undergraduate students, and ask them to identify their perception of good coaches and the traits that made them successful. Their responses were similar to those traits discussed in other coaching literature. Traits such as being a motivator and not a dictator, the ability to teach, a good communicator, people manager, patient, and knowledge, just to name a few (p. 47). Many of these characteristics are common in a transformational, charismatic leader. These leader qualities are important to possess so that coaches can impress upon athletes their vision and then prepare the athletes to obtain it. Being a quality coach is vital to the success of the team and more specifically, the individual athletes. Coaches are always remembered for their successes or their failures, and these are determined by their ability to possess exceptional instrumental techniques and intrinsic characteristics (p. 53). The combination of both skill instruction and intrinsic leadership values will determine whether the coach as a positive of negative influence.
Influence of a Coach

In 1989, Frank Smoll and Ronald Smith did a theoretical research study on different leadership behaviors in youth sport. In the United States, more than 20 million children between the ages of 6 and 18 participate in some type of non-scholastic sport program. These community-based programs, such as Little League, Youth Soccer, and Pop Warner football are the first few rungs on a ladder that leads to intercollegiate sport participation. The majority of sport participation in the United States shows the large emphasis that our society places on sports at a young age. It is evident through professional sports that this emphasis only continues to grow as children get older. Researchers and parents both agree that a major determination in the success and participation of child is based on the relationship between the coach and athlete (Smoll & Smith, 1989; Weiss & Friedrichs, 1986).

Despite the low volume of research on coaching behaviors, Smith and Smoll (1989) state “The manner in which coaches structure the athletic situation, the goal priorities they establish, the attitudes and values they transmit, and the behaviors they engage in can markedly influence the likelihood that the outcomes of sport participation will be favorable in children” (p. 1526). Considering the continued rise in sport participation in the United States, it is necessary to provide more research on the influence of a coach with an athlete. There are many different questions that need to be answered, such as what type of encouragement, punishment, instruction and organization do coaches implement to engage their athletes in daily? And, how do those observable behaviors influence the reaction of children? These questions were addressed in an early study by Smoll, Smith, and Curtis in 1979. This team of researchers observed fifty-one male Little League Baseball Coaches during 202 complete games. They collected data on the coach’s perception of their own
behaviors and the children’s perception and recall of how their coach behaved. They also measured the athlete’s attitudes toward the coach and other effects on the sport experience (1979).

The study focused on three independent behaviors of coaches; supportiveness, instructiveness, and punitiveness (Smoll, Smith & Curtis, 1979). Supportiveness and instructiveness were found to closely correspond to leadership styles that are heavily concentrated in relationship and task orientation. These leadership methods had a significant, positive relation between the athlete attitudes toward the coach, teammates, and the sport (Smoll, Smith & Curtis, 1979; Weiss & Freidrichs, 1986). As to be expected, there was a negative relationship between the attitudes of players that had experienced the punitiveness behaviors, while a positive relationship was found with athletes whose coach exhibited supportive behaviors. The biggest finding overall was that coaches were unaware of many behaviors that they were exhibiting and therefore the athletes were the most accurate perceivers of the actual coach behaviors. Smith, Smoll and Curtis note that leadership effectiveness is largely perceptual based on the follower and many times the perception of the leader behavior is more important than the actual behavior (1979).

A major limitation of Smoll and Smith’s study was that it used the Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) to code the leader behaviors during the practices and games. CBAS has been shown to incorporate the majority of leader behaviors in two categories; reactive and spontaneous behaviors. While this study was extremely beneficial to determine the effectiveness of the coaching behaviors, it only addressed sport-specific coaching behaviors and didn’t cover any behaviors outside of practice and games. Much of a team setting takes place during the practice and games, but some of the most influential
coaching moments happen outside of the sport. For example, Smoll and Smith note that with the growing number of single-parent families, coaches are beginning to occupy a substitute parent role for the family (1989). It will be beneficial to use the fundamental categories from the CBAS and then include other areas of study that are not sport-specific.

**Coaching Effectiveness**

Consistent with the Smoll and Smith study (1989) is the Coaching Effectiveness research done by Horn (2002). This research developed a working model of coaching effectiveness that combines leadership theory research and influential coach behavior to determine what makes a coach effective within the sport domain (see Figure 1). Horn proposes in her model that a coach's organizational climate and personal characteristics are developed by “the coaches expectancies, values, beliefs, and goals”, therefore confirming the idea that a coach's behavior is partly a result of their values (p. 313). This model also brings to light that athletes are going to attach to their coach, thus the behavior of the coach will affect athletes differently and cannonball to their athletic performance, emotional perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes (Horn, 2002; Smoll & Smith, 1989). Based on this model it is clear that athletes will react to coaching behaviors on an individual basis; therefore, an effective coach must be able to assume a set of coaching behaviors that varies for the athlete and the context of the situation (Horn, 2002). In Figure 1, it is clear that the athlete’s perceptions of a coach's behavior (Box 8) will directly affect their perception of themselves (Box 9) and that determines their level of motivation (Box 10) and performance (Box 6). This shows the need for coaches to be aware of the major influence that their personal behaviors have on the development of the student-athletes on their team. In intercollegiate athletics, those coaching behaviors can take place on or off the court and will affect how a
student-athlete achieves in the classroom, on the court, and in our future society. Coaches will influence their student-athletes with every interaction so it is imperative that they are aware of the need for consistent communication and the presence of an authentic organizational value culture (Horn, 2002).
Chapter III
METHODOLOGY

Participants

The population of interest for this study is all NCAA Division III women’s volleyball head coaches and student-athletes. During the 2012-2013 school year, there were 428 institutions identified as competing in women’s volleyball at the Division III level, with an average of twelve student-athletes per team. This totals approximately 5136 student-athletes and 428 head coaches asked to complete the survey. Teams were asked to complete the survey within a one month time period at the beginning of the spring 2013 semester.

Instrumentation

The survey was created to accumulate information concerning the value systems and priority of different values surrounding Division III women’s volleyball teams. The survey required respondents to answer demographic questions, rate a total of twenty questions and answer a few short-answer questions regarding their intercollegiate volleyball participation. The demographic questions were used to match student-athletes with the appropriate head coach, allowing the instrument to yield data on team cultures. These questions will also yield future study based on the age and year of the student-athlete in respect to their multitude of experiences on the team. The value centered questions addressed specific parts of the four different values as they relate to the overall Division III student-athlete experience. Each value section consisted of a 5 point Likert-scale [1=Not a priority to 5=Essential Priority] where respondents were asked to rate the statements based on the present behaviors being exhibited on their team. The value categories being measured were academics, athletics,
community involvement, and campus involvement. Each category had five questions addressing different parts of the team’s values. Questions involved different areas within the team culture (e.g. academics-class attendance and study hall requirements).

**Procedure**

The initial version of the survey was created using relevant literature, theories, personal experience and discussion with experts in the field. Once the original instrument was constructed it was reviewed by a panel of experts (volleyball coaches, department faculty, and graduate students) to ensure that the research questions could be sufficiently answered using the collected data from the survey. After the panel review, editions and changes were made to address previous issues and a final survey was drafted.

Using the American Volleyball Coaches Association database, a list of all current NCAA Division III women’s head volleyball coaches was compiled and the survey was distributed electronically via Qualtrics. The participants were asked to complete the survey and then distribute it electronically to their student-athletes from the Fall 2012 season. This specific sample was chosen to eliminate any transfer/new students-athletes who have not spent a season with the team/coach and to give graduating team members, who may not be participating in spring practice, the chance to complete the survey. An introductory letter to the coach was included in the email along with the link to the survey and directions to forward the email and link on to their student-athletes.

**Data Analysis**

After the online survey was closed and all responses were collected, quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS in order to calculate descriptive statistics. These statistics proved to provide a solid foundation for the purpose of the research. The short answer questions were
independently reviewed to develop a coding scheme, which found trends within each qualitative question. The trends were then grouped together to determine which trends were more common and which could be considered valuable data related to organization culture values.
Chapter IV

MANUSCRIPT

History of the NCAA

By 2004, the NCAA had been all across the map in terms of organization and leadership. Joseph Crowley felt it necessary to outline the history of the NCAA in his book, *In the Arena: The NCAA’s First Century* (2006). Crowley discusses how in 1906 the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) was formed to develop a safer playing environment for college football players. The IAAUS became the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1910 and eleven years later hosted their first national championship in track and field. 1922 brought an administrative change and the creation of the NCAA Council that was built on the foundation of amateurism, a fundamental theory that is still in place today. By 1951 the association was growing and changing so rapidly that the need for an executive director became pertinent and Walter Byers was hired to run the NCAA (Crowley, 2004).

Walter Byers brought a lot of change to the NCAA and began putting a larger focus on enforcement (Crowley, 2004). Under Byers, the NCAA became focused solely on enforcing the rules and no longer left the individual institutions up to the decisions. This change allowed for a more equal playing field and a more solid environment for institutions to develop student-athletes. The NCAA realized that it was not possible to maintain a level playing field in the College Division where there was such discrepancy between the budgets of different departments. In 1968, NCAA required schools to choose a division; the College Division or the University Division, with University being intended for larger budget.
institutions. The split was a necessary organizational change and as memberships continued to increase the association saw the need to make another split (Crowley, 2004).

In 1972, the NCAA split into three major Divisions (I, II, III), all of which are still intact today. The purpose of the split was to allow schools a greater chance at competing in championships with institutions that were similar in size, financial assistance, and philosophy. At the inaugural split, 237 institutions chose to be in Division I, 194 chose Division II, and 233 chose Division III. A total of 664 institutions were members of the NCAA at the time of the Division split (Crowley, 2004). Forty years later there are a little less than twice the number of institutions with membership in the NCAA and each year that number grows (NCAA, 2012).

**Division III**

According to the most current NCAA Facts and Figures, Division III is the largest of the three divisions, with 446 member institutions offering national sponsored championships in 27 sports (13 men, 14 women) (Facts, 2012). 57% of all male NCAA student-athletes compete in Division III athletics, while 43% of all female student-athletes are Division III competitors. The statistics prove the large majority of intercollegiate student-athletes are competing at the Division III level. The overwhelming majority, in consideration to other Divisions, may have some relation to the Positioning Statement of Division III athletics; Follow your Passions and Discover your Potential (Facts, 2012). This guiding statement sheds minimal light into an intercollegiate athletics world where academics and athletics are given equal weight.

In September of 2012, the NCAA released the 2011-2012 Division III Annual Report detailing the ideals, philosophy, financial statistics, and a general overview of the continuous growth at this competitive level. The Division III Philosophy Statement reads:
Colleges and universities in Division III place the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students’ academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete’s athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete’s educational experience, and an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff (NCAA, 2012).

In addition to the Philosophy Statement, the NCAA released fifteen points of focus for Division III membership that requires these institutions to place a high priority on the overall student-athlete experience (NCAA, 2012). The purpose of a Division III athletic department is to create and enhance opportunities for members of the student body. Division III student-athletes are considered to be part of the general student body with an enhanced experience, made possible through athletics. While Division III athletic programs strive to provide a competitive experience for all student-athletes, they are more concerned that a student-athlete succeeds in the classroom, on the field, and in the community (Annual Report, 2012).

This vision can be achieved by all Division III institutions through the enactment of six core attributes that define Division III; proportion, comprehensive learning, passion, responsibility, sportsmanship, and citizenship. The Division III attributes are based on the NCAA brand values of balance, learning, spirit, character, fair-play, and community, but more concentrated to address the mission and vision of Division III athletics (Annual Report, 2012).

As mentioned previously, Cooper and Weight have studied the leader values in different athletic department administrators at the Division I level. The duo also began
looking into specific leader values at the Division III level and the results proved that the difference in Division affected the core values found to be a priority within the department. Through an online survey, Cooper and Weight determined that there are five organizational values found to have a high priority in a Division III athletic department; student-athlete experience, academic excellence, health and safety, contribution to the university mission, and disciplined diversity (2012). These core values directly correspond to the Division III philosophy statement and the concept that a student-athlete should use athletics to enhance their educational experience through values of academic excellence, diversity, community involvement, competitive athletics, and other keys areas (NCAA, 2012).

The Cooper and Weight study also revealed that without a culture of consistency and authenticity in a department, the use of values can become a detriment to the productivity and success of administrators and their subordinates (2012). When comparing the Division III results to those of the administrators in the Division I athletic departments, there were clearer strategies in place at many Division III institutions to allow for the culturalization of values and a value centered organizational culture (Cooper & Weight, 2012; Cooper et al., 2013).

Leader-Values

In 2011, Cooper and Weight conducted a study among Division I Administrators to determine the authenticity of organizational and aspirational values within an athletic department. The study defined core values as “deeply ingrained principles that guide all of a company’s actions” and aspirational values as “principles believed to be important that may not yet be consistently engrained in the organization” (p. 3). The values of an organization can influence the perception of the employees and affect the decisions that are made in a variety of contexts. Core values have been found to be linked to employee motivation and empowerment, when implemented correctly (Lim, 2001; Yukl, 1994). These values allow
employees to reach their highest level of achievement while successfully attributing to the overall effectiveness of the organization. Cooper, Weight, and Pierce specifically note that there must be buy in from employees within an organization, otherwise empty value statements can be detrimental to the overall culture (2013). With intercollegiate athletic programs facing major scandals, their study chose to survey athletic administrators based on transformational leadership characteristics and determine which values in NCAA Division I institutions have the highest priority in relation to the mission and the variation within those levels based on what position administrators currently hold.

The Leader-Value Continuum, illustrated by Cooper, Weight, and Pierce, shows that the most efficient and transformational leaders will embrace their aspirational values and then implement them into day-to-day decision making (2013). This side of the continuum supports the need for leaders to have transformational decision making and genuinely aspire to act on the values that they impress upon their subordinates.

**Transformational Leadership**

In 1978, Burns defined a transforming leader as someone who engages the full person within a follower and seeks to satisfy a higher need by discovering the follower’s potential motives. By doing this the leader can develop a relationship that is mutually stimulating and eventually the followers become leaders and leaders become moral agents (Burns, 1978). Burns discusses how a transformational leader looks into the potential of a follower and develops that through a relationship with them (1978).

Bass (1985) elaborated on Burns theory by discussing four main dimensions of transformational leadership; charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Charisma, sometimes referred to as idealized influence, is when a leader can influence the followers to behave in an admirable way by being a model of this
behavior. When a transformational leader shows charisma they are more likely to take a stand against something and show a conviction that appeals to followers on an emotional level. The second dimension of a transformational leader is inspirational motivation or the degree that a leader inspires a follower through an articulate and appealing vision. This type of leader carries a higher standard and is optimistic about reaching future goals. Intellectual stimulation is the third dimension in transformational leadership, and it is when a leader challenges the followers and takes risks to solicit their ideas. This type of leader encourages a special kind of creativity in their followers and encourages them to take their own risks. The last dimension that Bass discussed is individualized consideration, where a leader is also a mentor to the follower and is always attentive to their personal needs. While different dimensions of Bass’ theory have been developed into a separate, individualized theory, the four dimensions are necessary to tap into in order to completely satisfy the characteristics of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985).

The four dimensions of transformational leadership were developed in 1985 by Bass and are still being used in research studies today. However, other scholars have proposed slightly different factors that leaders implement to transform their followers. For example, Podsakoff, MacKenize, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) proposed six factors that leaders use to transform their followers; “articulating a vision of the future, providing an appropriate role model, fostering the acceptance of goals, setting high performance expectations, providing individual support, and providing intellectual stimulation” (p. 112).

In a 2008 study on organization culture and climate, Sarros, Cooper, and Santora examined five different hypotheses related to leadership in the workplace. One of them looked at how a leader’s ability to articulate a vision was most related to a “competitive,
performance-oriented organizational culture” (Sarros et al., 2008, p. 148). In a similar study, Grant (2009) discussed the importance for leaders to articulate this vision and its overall use to engage their followers. Their study results revealed that articulating a vision was the most strongly related to a climate for organization innovation (Grant, 2008; Sarros et al., 2008). These results show that a leader’s ability to articulate a vision and then provide individual support are key to promoting a competitive, performance-oriented environment.

In the 2000’s, two different studies were conducted to see how follower development and performance was related to a transformational leader. In 2002, Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir did a longitudinal study to test the impact of a transformational leader on follower development and their individual performance. Using Bass and Avolio’s Multifactor Questionnaire (1990), the authors studied infantry commanders and their followers to see how a transformational leader affected a follower’s motivation, morality, and empowerment. From their research, they determined that direct followers were influenced in motivation, morality, and empowerment, but not their active engagement, internalization of moral values, and self-actualization needs (Dvir et al., 2002). These results show how a follower’s direct involvement with a transformational leader can influence the motivation to succeed, value in the team as a whole, and self-management and development.

The second study concerned follower satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Judge, 2004). This research study used the four dimensions to determine if a transformational leader can have a positive influence on follower satisfaction, motivation, and group performance (Judge, 2004). The study specifically compared transactional and transformational leadership in a variety of settings. In all settings, there was a much greater correlation between transformational leadership and all of their examined criteria; follower
satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, follower motivation, leader performance, group performance, and leader effectiveness (Judge, 2004). Even though the two studies looked at different parts related to followers of transformational leaders, they both found a positive correlation in follower motivation.

**Leadership in an Athletics Context**

A Canadian study by Alison Doherty and Karen Danylchuk (1996) examined leadership behaviors of athletic directors and associate athletic directors in the Ontario Universities. A total of thirteen athletic directors (out of 17) agreed to participate in the study that would use Bass’ transformational leadership model to examine the behaviors of athletic directors as assessed by their coaches. One of the purposes for the study was to determine if transformational leader behaviors were associated with subordinate satisfaction, effectiveness, and commitment to the department. The researchers also hoped to find if the behavior of a subordinate was the outcome of the leader’s behavior (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996).

The study surveyed six head coaches at each of the institutions and targeted sport coaches that were common among all institutions (i.e. football, hockey, basketball, and volleyball). Researchers achieved a 59% response rate, with a total of 114 coaches participating. The questionnaire addressed five transformational leadership factors; attributed charisma, idealized influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. These five factors were a product of Bass’ previous research on transformational leadership (1985), but for the purpose of this specific study the researchers measured charisma and idealized influence separately as demonstrated in a previous study by Doherty and Danylchuk (1996). In particular, these factors were identified as either “leader-
centered behavior” (charisma, idealized influence and inspiration) or a “subordinate-centered behavior” (intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration). Ironically, the results yielded the strongest relationship with attributed charisma and individualized consideration, which are two different types of leader behaviors. These two factors alone accounted for 68% of the variance in the coaches’ satisfaction with their AD’s behavior. With the strongest relationship in this study coming from two different types of behaviors, it validates the belief that a transformational leader must be leader centered and subordinate centered. Without a concentration in their own behaviors, as well as the behaviors of those they are in charge of, the chance from miscommunication and failure increases (1996).

**Responsibility of a Coach**

In Dr. Keith Bell’s book, *Coaching Excellence*, he discusses how a coach is in a position of authority and holds power over the team (1989). Dr. Bell addresses how critically important it is for the athletes to perceive a coach as having power, otherwise they will push the limits (p. 14). Bell makes a solid point by saying “athletes will go along with what you want only if they believe that their goals will be better served be acceding to your power than be resisting” (p. 16). It is vital that coaches be understood by their players, because the athlete must see the value in listening to the coach. This communication is key to the personal success of the athlete, coach, and overall team.

Bell (1989) cited Amos Alonzo Stagg, a pioneer college football coach, saying “No coach ever won a game by what he knows; it’s what his players have learned” (p. 39). Communication is a critical fundamental of the coach-athlete relationship. The excellence of a team is heavily dependent on the communication of the mission, goals, and skill set (Bell, 1989). Without proper communication channels, a team will fail on the field/court and the relationships on the team will not foster to their complete potential. Being a coach is about
knowing that you are in a position of power and using that power to successfully communicate with your athletes.

In the book, *Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice*, Cassidy, Jones, and Potrac cover what makes a quality coach, the importance of a quality coach and the multitude of characteristics that surround a quality coach (2004). They surveyed 200 undergraduate students, and ask them to identify their perception of good coaches and the traits that made them successful. Their responses were similar to those traits discussed in other coaching literature. Traits such as being a motivator and not a dictator, the ability to teach, a good communicator, people manager, patient, and knowledge, just to name a few (p. 47). Many of these characteristics are common in a transformational, charismatic leader. These leader qualities are important to possess so that coaches can impress upon athletes their vision and then prepare the athletes to obtain it. Being a quality coach is vital to the success of the team and more specifically, the individual athletes.

**Influence of a Coach**

In 1989, Frank Smoll and Ronald Smith did a theoretical research study on different leadership behaviors in youth sport. In the United States, more than 20 million children between the ages of 6 and 18 participate in some type of non-scholastic sport program. Their research found that “The manner in which coaches structure the athletic situation, the goal priorities they establish, the attitudes and values they transmit, and the behaviors they engage in can markedly influence the likelihood that the outcomes of sport participation will be favorable in children” (p. 1526). Considering the continued rise in sport participation in the
In an earlier study by Smoll, Smith, and Curtis in 1979, they observed fifty-one male Little League Baseball Coaches during 202 complete games. The researchers collected data on the coach’s perception of their own behaviors and the children’s perception and recall of how their coach behaved. They also measured the athlete’s attitudes toward the coach and other effects on the sport experience (1979). The study found that leadership methods involving support and instruction had a significant, positive relation between the athlete attitudes toward the coach, teammates, and the sport. As to be expected, there was a negative relationship between the attitude of players that had experienced the punitive behaviors, while a positive relationship was found with athletes whose coach exhibited supportive behaviors (Smoll, Smith & Curtis, 1979; Weiss & Friedrichs, 1986). The biggest finding overall was that coaches were unaware of many behaviors that they were exhibiting and therefore the athletes were the most accurate perceivers of the actual coach behaviors. Smith and Smoll note that leadership effectiveness is largely perceptual based on the follower and many times the perception of the leader behavior is more important than the actual behavior (1979).

Coaching Effectiveness

Consistent with the Smoll and Smith study (1989) is the Coaching Effectiveness research done by Horn (2002). This research developed a working model of coaching effectiveness that combines leadership theory research and influential coach behavior to determine what makes a coach effective within the sport domain (see Figure 1). Horn proposes in her model that a coaches organizational climate and personal characteristics are
developed by “the coaches expectancies, values, beliefs, and goals”, therefore confirming the idea that a coaches behavior is partly a result of their values (p. 313). This model also brings to light that athletes are going to attach to their coach, thus the behavior of the coach will affect athletes differently and cannonball to their athletic performance, emotional perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes (Horn, 2002; Smoll & Smith, 1989). Based on this model it is clear that athletes will react to coaching behaviors on an individual basis; therefore, an effective coach must be able to assume a set of coaching behaviors that varies for the athlete and the context of the situation (Horn, 2002). In Figure 1, it is clear that the athlete’s perceptions of a coaches’ behavior (Box 8) will directly affect their perception of themselves (Box 9) and that determines their level of motivation (Box 10) and performance (Box 6). This shows the need for coaches to be aware of the major influence that their personal behaviors have on the development of the student-athletes on their team. In intercollegiate athletics, those coaching behaviors can take place on or off the court and will affect how a student-athlete achieves in the classroom, on the court, and in our future society. Coaches will influence their student-athletes with every interaction so it is imperative that they are aware of the need for consistent communication and the presence of an authentic organizational value culture (Horn, 2002).

**Method**

The research was pursued by quantitative and qualitative analysis to determine what values were held to a high priority in Division III Women’s Volleyball Programs. The research addresses the value perspective of coaches and their current student-athletes. The survey was distributed to 328 NCAA Division III Head Women’s Volleyball Coaches and a total of 89 coaches responded to the survey, which equates to a 27.13% response rate. The
head coaches were asked within the initial and follow up survey distribution to forward along the survey and instructions to their current student-athletes. It was estimated that each Division III Women’s Volleyball team has approximately 12 student-athletes, therefore the survey could have been sent to 3936 student-athletes. After all responses were collected, the conferences where no coaches or student-athletes responded were eliminated from the student-athlete calculations. Given this formulation, a maximum possibility of 852 student-athletes received the survey and a total of 69 responded, equating to a minimum (very conservative estimate) response rate of 8%.

The qualitative analysis of the results involved the researcher developing a coding scheme to address research question #3. The researcher and a second coder were trained on the coding scheme and then independently coded the results to ensure intercoder reliability.

Results

Coach/Student-Athlete Perceptions of Organizational Values

The first research question addressed the priority of different organizational values coaches and student-athletes held within their programs. Utilizing a 4-point Likert scale, with Strongly Disagree (SD=1), Disagree (D=2), Agree (A=3), and Strongly Agree (SA=4) the possible responses, respondents rated academic, athletic, team conduct, student-athlete development, and campus/community involvement values. In addition to identifying the total overall importance of the different value categories, the analyses helped to determine the areas within each organizational value that were most important.

Academics Value. The results show that student-athletes and coaches combined rated academics as the highest value of importance, with a mean value of 3.56. All four value areas of academics were rated above a 3, providing support for a conclusion that student-athletes
and coaches found all areas of academics to be of a high importance within their volleyball programs. See Table 1 (below) for all mean values and standard deviations related to Academic Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must Attend all Academic Classes</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices do not Interfere with Class Schedules</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance is Monitored</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis Placed on Graduation Rates</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Team Conduct Value.** Team conduct was the next highly rated value, with a mean value of 3.45. All four value areas of team conduct were also rated above a 3, showing that student-athletes and coaches found all areas of team conduct to be of a high importance within their volleyball programs. See Table 2 (below) for all mean values and standard deviations related to Team Conduct Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Rules and Expectations</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captains Held Responsible for the Team</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Conduct is Consistent with Student Body</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Social Media Expectations and Monitoring</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Athletics Value.** Athletics were rated by student-athletes and coaches as having a fairly high level of importance with a mean value of 3.40. The interesting statistic to note regarding athletics was the differing standard deviations related to the individual value.
questions. When asked about required weekly strength and conditioning, student-athletes and coaches had a mean value of 2.86 and a standard deviation of .93. These statistics show that some programs place a high priority in this area, but others place little to no value on it. See Table 3 (below) for all mean values and standard deviations related to Athletic Values.

Table 3
*Perceptions of Value Importance - Athletics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Playing Schedule</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Strength and Conditioning</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Making Good Nutrition Choices</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strive to Compete at the Highest Level</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student-Athlete Development Value.** Student-Athlete Development was rated much lower than academics, team conduct, and athletics, but still remained as a high level priority with programs, with a mean value of 3.16. When asked whether or not student-athletes were encouraged to develop leadership qualities by attending seminars and classes, the group rated the importance at a mean value of 2.59. This statistics places Leadership Development, as a part of student-athlete development, as the second lowest specific value in the study. While student-athlete development and the majority of its components are found to be a high priority in programs, Leadership Development is not a priority. See Table 4 (below) for all mean values and standard deviations related to Student-Athlete Development.
**Table 4**

*Perceptions of Value Importance - Student-Athlete Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Mental Toughness</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Bonding</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-One Coach/Student-Athlete Meetings</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Campus/Community Involvement Value.** In a surprising result, campus/community involvement was found to be the lowest value rated in the study, with a mean value of 2.85.

The overall mean shows that coaches and student-athletes do not find their programs placing a high level of importance on being involved on campus and in the community. This finding will be discussed more in depth, later in the discussion. All four value areas within Campus/Community Involvement were rated with means that are lower than the majority of the other value area and fairly high standard deviations. These statistics make note of the low priority that this value holds within programs, but also the disparity among coaches, student-athletes, and different programs. Further statistical analysis will give a more in-depth look at the variance between respondents. See Table 5 (below) for all mean values and standard deviations related to Campus/Community Involvement.

**Table 5**

*Perceptions of Value Importance - Campus/Community Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged Participation in Academic Clubs</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged Participation in Social Clubs</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Community Service Projects</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Philanthropic Endeavors</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the results above were based on solely on the mean and standard deviation of the value areas. Both of these statistics are more defined and reinforced by running a One-Sample T-Test, run against a test statistic of $\mu \geq 3$. The One Sample T-Test provided mean results within each prioritized area, held highest by coaches and student-athletes individually (see Table 6).

It is interesting to note that on all values, the majority of the coach responses were slightly higher than the student-athletes, except in the team conduct area. This will be discussed more in-depth later in the discussion/conclusion section. In the areas of academics, athletics, team conduct, and student-athlete development, it can be noted that all those overall values were rated as being a high priority by coaches and student-athletes. Campus and Community Involvement was rated slightly below the high priority level with coaches and student-athletes only rating at means of 2.96 and 2.7, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Student-Athlete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Conduct</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete Development</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/Community Involvement</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Coach and Student-Athlete Perceptions of Value Priorities

The second research question addressed whether or not there was a variation in what coaches and student-athletes rated as being the highest value of priority in their program. All respondents were asked whether or not they agreed with statements on five different organizational value areas; academics, athletics, team conduct, student-athlete development,
and campus/community involvement. Each question used a 4-point Likert scale, with Strongly Disagree (SD=1), Disagree (D=2), Agree (A=3), and Strongly Agree (SA=4) being the possible responses. The results of the One Sample T-Test, against a test statistic of \( \mu \geq 3 \), yielded values with a high priority in 4 of the 5 value areas for both test groups; academics, athletics, team conduct and student-athlete development. An Independent Samples T-Test measuring coach and student-athlete responses was also conducted and the analyzed results of both statistical tests can be found in Tables 7-11.

**Academic Values.** Statistical analyses demonstrated that Academic Values was the only area where coaches and student-athletes rated each of the sub-categories at the “high priority” (\( \mu=3 \)) level (see Table 7). When focusing on the differences between coaches and student-athletes, the Independent Sample T-Test demonstrated that the following two sub-categories were rated as statistically significant: practices do not interfere with class schedules and a high emphasis is placed on the graduation rate of student-athletes. Even though two of the four categories were statistically significant, all of the mean values for coaches and student-athletes were above a value of 3, making them a high priority within all programs.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Student-Athlete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must Attend all Academic Classes</td>
<td>3.70*</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices do not Interfere with Class Schedules</td>
<td>3.67*</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance is Monitored</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis Placed on Graduation Rates</td>
<td>3.77*</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 alpha level
Athletics Values. The One Sample T-Test for the Athletics Value further confirmed the mean values that were addressed in the previous section and demonstrated that the subcategory Weekly Strength and Conditioning, was rated by both groups as not having a priority within their programs. The mean value for student-athletes, in regards to nutritional choices, was above a 3, at 3.16, and is approaching significance with a p-value of .058. When focusing on the differences between coaches and student-athletes, the independent sample t-test demonstrated that none of the sub-categories were rated as statistically significant. It is interesting to note that the weekly strength and conditioning values yielded a high standard deviation (.93), the data below confirms that coaches and student-athletes had the same standard deviation and very close mean data points. This lends to a conclusion that programs differ in their requirements, but on average coaches and student-athletes are on the same page. The data for Athletic Values can be found in Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Student-Athlete</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Playing Schedule</td>
<td>3.74*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Strength and Conditioning</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Making Good Nutrition Choices</td>
<td>3.30*</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strive to Compete at the Highest Level</td>
<td>3.78*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 alpha level

Team Conduct Values. When comparing the mean values of coaches and student-athletes to mean of 3, the majority place a high priority of the overall team conduct, with 6 out of 8 specific values being statistically significant. The independent sample t-test did not yield any statistically significant p-values when coaches and student-athletes were compared.
Without significant p-values, we will continue to examine the mean values and standard deviations, which are fairly similar in all areas except that captains are held responsible for the team conduct. Student-athletes, on average, rated this as a high priority than coaches, which is not surprisingly since student-athletes are the captains. Aside from the differing means in relation to captains, the data analysis related to team conduct does not provide very much room for discussion. The Team Conduct data set can be found below, in Table 9.

Table 9  
*Coach and Student-Athlete Perceptions of Importance of Team Conduct*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Coach Mean</th>
<th>Coach SD</th>
<th>Student-Athlete Mean</th>
<th>Student-Athlete SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Rules and Expectations</td>
<td>3.67*</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.63*</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captains Held Responsible for the Team</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.17*</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Conduct is Consistent with Student Body</td>
<td>3.52*</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Social Media Expectations and Monitoring</td>
<td>2.73*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 alpha level

**Student-Athlete Development Values.** The One-Sample T-Test determined that 6 of the 8 student-athlete development values were rated as a high priority by coaches and student-athletes. Developing mental toughness was not statistically significant, so despite close mean values we must assume that it happened by chance. When the Independent Samples T-Test was run in regards to Student-Athlete development there were no statistically significant results. The only interesting data points to mention are that leadership development was rated as a low priority by both student-athletes and coaches. This is another confirmation that leadership development in these programs is not seen as a high priority. See Table 10 (below) for all means related to Student-Athlete Development Values.
Table 10
Coach and Student-Athlete Perceptions of Importance of Student-Athlete Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Student-Athlete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>2.67*</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Mental Toughness</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Bonding</td>
<td>3.41*</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-One Coach/Student-Athlete Meetings</td>
<td>3.57*</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 alpha level

Campus/Community Involvement Values. Further data analysis proves that the low priority of coaches and student-athletes, in relation to campus/community involvement, still remains but only two of the studied areas within this value are statistically significant. The most interesting value area to note is the encouraged participation in academic clubs, because it is significant and student-athletes and coaches place a different level of priority on this area. The Independent Samples T-Test on Campus/Community Involvement produced one statistically significant category, encouraged participation in academic clubs. It is a valid assumption that coaches and student-athletes are on two different pages in regards to participation encouragement in Academic Clubs. Student-athletes did not find it to be a priority, while coaches placed it as a fairly high priority. All the other Campus/Community Involvement data analyzed was not statistically significant, but it is rated much lower than the other value areas. This allows us to conclude that, on average, campus/community involvement is not a high priority value in the programs measured. The full data set can be found below in Table 11.
Table 11
Coach and Student-Athlete Perceptions of Importance of Campus/Community Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student-Athlete</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged Participation in Academic Clubs</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.66*</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged Participation in Social Clubs</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Community Service Projects</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Philanthropic Endeavors</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.90</strong></td>
<td><strong>.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>.89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 alpha level

Overall Coach/Student-Athlete Value Perceptions

The qualitative results of the study were analyzed using intercoder reliability and two independent coders. A coding response key was developed for all qualitative questions and a Scott’s Pi of .825 was recorded. The tables below display the results of the qualitative questions. The results show a high priority on trust and commitment in Division III programs (see Table 12). The overwhelming majority of coaches and student-athletes feel that their programs are preparing student-athletes to be well rounded adults- 96% (see Table 14). Overall the high intercoder reliability measurement and Scott’s Pi make for a large reliability on the qualitative measures.
### Table 12
**Important Program Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity and Honesty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Preparation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and Commitment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being the Best</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/Responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13
**Fundamental Values to Address Within Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearlong Commitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Involvement off the Court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Personal Life Decisions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Specifics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Together</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other values</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus on academics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14
**Preparation of Student-Athletes for the Future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The results of this study provide clear data to support the notion that Division III volleyball programs are operating under the Division III guiding principles and philosophy statement. The majority of data collected provides support that Division III women’s volleyball student-athletes are getting a well-rounded experience at their institution and the coaches are placing importance on a high range of value priorities.

The results demonstrated that academic values are the highest rated priority among all respondents. This correlates to the Division III Philosophy that emphasizes placing the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and the successful completion of all students’ academic programs (NCAA, 2012). All areas of academics that were studied were found to be statistically significant against a test statistic of 3, proving the high priority that programs place on the academic life of a student-athlete. The Division III Vision also states that athletics should provide a Division III student-athlete the overall educational experience, further confirming why academics was found to be of such important among the studied programs (Annual Report, 2012).

The results also yielded some dissonance between the goal of Division III programs and the actual priorities of teams and coaches. The literature states that Division III athletes receive overwhelming support to be involved in leadership and campus activities, because those experiences will enhance the competitive environment on the court/field (Annual Report, 2012). The results of this study show that leadership development, participation in campus wide social organizations, and philanthropic participation are not high priorities within the programs. The goal of Division III is to give athletes a chance to pursue leadership
grants and programs while competing, but the reality is that coaches do not emphasize and encourage this type of development within their programs.

An interesting aspect to note about this study was that it confirmed the earlier research done by Cooper and Weight in 2011. Their study determined the five organizational values of high priority in a Division III athletic department were student-athlete experience, academic excellence, health and safety, contribution to the university mission, and disciplined diversity (2011). While this study did not address health and safety, all the other organizational values were found to be consistent with these results. Qualitative results confirm that there is a high emphasis on the student-athlete experience. When asked what values were most important to their program, Coach #22 said the following:

Teaching our student athletes to become leaders in their industry, community, and their peers. We indeed attempt to prepare them as well as we can to be able to balance all of their commitments and be successful at all of them.

Similarly, student-athlete #35 echoed similar sentiments:

Our five values at our college are respect, stewardship, hospitality, love of learning and community. I believe that these are important values to have on and off the court.

Our coaching staff does a great job of making sure that we are thinking about these values and what they mean on and off the court. I feel that I have become a better person because of being taught about why these values truly mean and how to use them in life.

The quantitative results also confirm that academics, conduct, and discipline are all high priorities and receive a lot of attention within these programs.
In the same 2011 study, Cooper and Weight found that athletic departments have a grasp on the values that define them as a Division III institution, but show a lack of a consistent value culture, based on lower-level administrator responses. As their earlier study revealed, without a culture of consistency and authenticity in a department, the use of values can become a detriment to the productivity and success of administrators and their subordinates (Cooper et.al, 2013). The current study revealed more confirmation of this conclusion, when student-athlete and coach results were compared. The only values that were found to be clearly communicated and consistent among the two respondent groups, were the value in graduation of student-athletes, participation in academic clubs, and the scheduling of practices to not interfere with classes. These three value areas are further confirmation that coaches clearly communicate their expectations in regards to academics, but they are not making clear the other areas of their programs.

While it is difficult to make assumptions regarding the influence that coaches had on their student-athletes, based on the low response rate, it is important to note that of the sample collected the majority of student-athletes feel that their coaches are portraying the values in an efficient and consistent manner. Leaders must realize their impact on their followers and the necessity for clear and consistent communication (Horn, 2002, Cooper et. al, 2013). A transformational leader can clearly articulate a vision and portray the charisma and authenticity to convince a group of followers (Bass 1985). The results of their study show that on a consistent basis coaches are making their values known to student-athletes and those student-athletes are putting those values into action. This conclusion is based on the closely correlated means for all organizational culture values. In four of the five value areas, the means for student-athletes were slightly lower than the coach means, indicating a
slight drop off in communication, but the high number of statistically significant high priority means is enough to prove that Division III coaches, for the most part, are creating a culture of authenticity and consistency.

The most important finding in the study comes from the qualitative question regarding whether or not the respondent’s Division III program prepares student-athletes to be well-rounded adults. The results were definitive and promising for Division III institutions. 96% of coaches and 95% of student-athletes felt that their volleyball programs prepared student-athletes to be well rounded adults. Some of the explanations were as such:

*Having to balance the student and athlete portions of being an athlete and having the opportunity to "do it all" at the Division III level prepares student-athletes well for life after college. They learn time management, teamwork, communication, and leadership skills (Coach #44).*

Another student-athlete explained the same life preparations in the following statement:

*Absolutely. At my school, the time dedication to my program is similar to the D1 programs...On top of that, academic performance is not only encouraged, it is demanded because there are no accommodations for athletes (on the contrary, being an athlete makes your academic responsibilities more difficult). We have to learn how to balance these two huge aspects of our lives. We also learn how to focus and be efficient for long periods of time (Student-athlete #78).*

While the research may not have yielded a majority of statistically significant figures, the responses of coaches and student-athletes on the values that they place importance on within their program make it clear that volleyball programs at NCAA Division III institutions are
preparing college students for the real world, and in turn accomplishing the mission of the NCAA (NCAA 2012).

Limitations and Future Research

This study was limited to only AVCA Division III Head Women’s Volleyball coaches. This limitation means that conclusions from the study can only be generalized to the 328 AVCA Division III Women’s Volleyball Teams. Division I and Division II volleyball programs would most likely yield very different results in a similar study.

Another limitation was the process for gaining participation from the sample population. Coaches were asked to complete an online survey and then forward the survey the research study information to their student-athletes, which allows for a high amount of drop off between the coaches and the student-athletes. This limitation was the biggest concern for the validity of the study’s results, but given the similarity among the results gathered in small numbers, it is safe to assume that future research would find the same results on a larger scale. Student-athlete responses are extremely valuable and allow coaches and administrators to truly understand their impact.

It would be extremely valuable to further develop this research by narrowing the population and concentrating on a specific conference or geographical area. This would allow the researcher to personally contact the student-athletes and coaches, therefore eliminating the need for coaches to forward on to the student-athletes. Another possible expansion of the study would be to measure the same organizational culture values in Division I and Division II student-athletes. Expanding and focusing this study are two
different options that will allow for a greater understanding of the organizational culture of Division III volleyball teams.

The last recommendation for future research is to expand the study to cover more than just one Division III sport. This research yielded some very positive results in regards to Division III student-athletes getting the ultimate education experience. It would be interesting to see if different sports garner the same results. A future study could narrow to a specific Division III conference and compare the organizational values of two different sports. This would allow for more comparison of the results to the Division III Philosophy and Guiding Attributes.

Division III has the largest number of student-athletes out of any NCAA division (NCAA 2012). With such high participation numbers the opportunity for quality research is limitless at this level. There are numerous different opportunities to manipulate and expand this study and determine the quality experience of a Division III student-athlete.
Figure 1  Horn's Model of Coaching Effectiveness (2002)
APPENDIX 1

Coding Response Key

11. What values are most important within your program? Explain.
1- Family
2- Integrity and Honesty
3- Hard Work
4- Preparing student-athletes to be leaders on the court and in the future
5- Trust and Commitment
6- Academics
7- Respect
8- Faith
9- Being the best
10- Accountability/Responsibility

12. Are there any fundamental values that you feel the coaching staff should address within your program? Explain.
1- Respect
2- Commitment through the year
3- Being more involved outside of academics and athletics
4- Focus on S-A making good personal life decisions and coaches holding them responsible for those decision.
5- Volleyball Specific Issues
6- Working together as team/one unit
7- No/Unrelated
8- Consistency in communication and standards
9- Other
10- More focus on academics
11- Hard work

13. Do you feel that your Division III program prepares student-athletes to be well rounded adults? Why or why not?
1- Yes
2- No
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